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NATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND STRATEGIES FOR RESEARCH USE
NANCY SAHLI


These article headlines and advertising slogans from a recent issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education are clear evidence of the climate in which all discussions of national information systems for archives and manuscripts must be placed, a climate in which the educated user population will be increasingly familiar with and, consequently, dependent upon, computer applications as a fact of daily life.1 Already, software packages are available that can teach us everything from how to speak French to how to prepare for a bar mitzvah. Computer summer camps are all the rage, and George Washington University has even developed a service enabling individuals, simply by dialing a phone number, to receive instruction in programming in BASIC.

The temptation in such times is to become very agitated and to succumb to the technological hype that demands automation for everything as rapidly as possible. This tendency is certainly more of a reality now than in the late 1960s, when the initial SPINDEX programs first beckoned archivists toward the lure of automated archival description and administrative control. Yet the successful implementation of national information systems for archives and manuscripts requires much more than the existence of an appropriate technology.

For several years the Society of American Archivists' National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) played an important role in the movement toward automation by identifying and defining data elements and format requirements for archival information systems and information exchange. NISTF's approach—developing generally applicable standards, rather than promoting the devel-
opment of software- and hardware-specific implementations—was designed to ensure optimum flexibility in a rapidly changing information environment. Formalized in NISTF's "Data Element Dictionary" and the USMARC Archival and Manuscripts Control Format, these standards are an important link between the creation of descriptive information in the repository and its ultimate utilization by users in searchable systems and finding aid products.2

Applications employing these standards are currently underway; they range from the Research Libraries Group's nationwide computer network of information about the holdings of research libraries—RLIN—to microcomputer applications in individual repositories. SPINDEX users, still tied to their IBM-based data files, will be served by a program developed at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, which converts SPINDEX records into MARC-compatible ones with a minimum of manual editing.

Into this context of burgeoning technology steps the archives user. And, more often than not, discussion of national information systems involving the exchange of data between institutions implies a user community composed of individuals seeking information about the holdings of more than one institution, probably in geographically scattered areas. These prototype users would presumably welcome the advent of national, user-friendly systems with telecommunications links between institutions as a means of facilitating their research, regardless of the topic. No longer would researchers have to wade through the multiple volumes of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC), spend countless hours sifting through endless subject guides, or even browse around reference shelves and stacks. Even if telecommunications and computer-based, searchable systems were not a reality, it is assumed that the adoption of consistent standards would mean a general uniformity in finding aids and hence greater ease of research use.

The ultimate success of national information systems for archives and manuscripts will depend on a much wider range of variables than the simple adoption of data element definitions, the new MARC format, or the development of RLIN. For the bottom line of any system, be it the most clumsy and cumbersome, is information and how that information reaches and influences its users. No system is effective if no one knows it exists, and no system for exchanging information is necessary if no one perceives a compelling reason to exchange.

Illustrations of problems relating to researcher awareness and use of archival finding aids and information systems can be drawn from an examination of three comparatively different works selected at random from the author's general reading: Lucy Dawidowicz's The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945, Ruth Rosen's The Lost Sister-
hood: Prostitution in America, 1900-1918, and Colin Fletcher's The Man From the Cave. Although they are on different subjects—the Holocaust, prostitutes in the Progressive era, and the life of a recluse who lived in a Nevada cave—the three share several characteristics. They were written by American authors working largely in American libraries and archives. Each work is historical in nature and utilizes archives and manuscripts from more than one repository. And each appears to have been initiated because its author was interested in documenting some particular historical topic regardless of the availability of source materials, although Rosen and Dawidowicz were certainly aware, from prior research, of the general existence of the types of materials they needed to use.

Dawidowicz relied heavily on archives located in New York City—the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, the Leo Baeck Institute, and others—as well as some materials from foreign repositories. She decided, however, because of their bulk, not to use the National Archives' holdings of captured German records, except those that had appeared in published form. Because of her focus on the holdings of a few institutions in the New York City area, which not only held the primary materials needed for her research but also were geographically accessible—Dawidowicz lived and taught in New York—her need for a national information system involving institutional exchange was lessened. In Dawidowicz's case, access to information about holdings in institutions outside New York City would probably not have had much impact on her final product. Her need for institutionally-generated finding aids remained, however. A related point of reflection might be what effect English language-based descriptive systems would have on facilitating research in materials that are both written and described in non-English tongues. Another might be to what extent a nationally-based American system facilitates access to materials that are not located in the United States but are nevertheless needed by our nation's researchers.

Ruth Rosen, who relied heavily on printed materials, confined her archival research to two repositories: the Bancroft Library at the University of California and the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College. Since Rosen teaches in California, her use of materials in the Bancroft is understandable, and the Schlesinger houses the primary sources used in her earlier work, The Maimie Papers. Questionable, however, is her apparent assumption that most unpublished sources are housed in these two repositories.

A cursory examination of the index and contents of Andrea Hinding's Women's History Sources shows that there are many additional sources relating to prostitution in the period Rosen was studying. In California alone, for example, there are records at the
National Archives branch at Laguna Niguel from the Arizona Territorial Court containing materials on prostitution; police records, including arrest records, in the Riverside City Archives; and U.S. District Court records for the Northern District of California at the NARS San Bruno branch, containing materials on Chinese prostitutes. Outside of California one could look to the records of the American Social Health Association in the Social Welfare History Archives at the University of Minnesota, or to countless records at the National Archives in Washington, D.C., including military, Surgeon General, and Public Health Service files.

This is not to say that Rosen's conclusions or her use of the sources that she consulted were in error. For example, her analysis of municipal vice commission reports provides an establishment perspective in the same way that The Maimie Papers provided the prostitute's perspective. The interesting point, from the perspective of this article, is that Rosen's selection of archives and manuscript materials does not appear to have been based on a systematic search of the available national finding aids. She does not say that she examined other materials and found them to be lacking in useful information or that materials in repositories other than the Bancroft or the Schlesinger could not be studied due to the exigencies of time.

Lack of awareness of major guides, finding aids, and, consequently, resources may be a problem that is all too typical. A recent conversation with another academically trained historian, an American specialist in 19th century French history who is teaching American students in an American university, showed that that individual had never heard of NUCMC. An independent researcher from San Francisco, who had used his own funds for a trip to Washington to study World War II materials at the National Archives, was both pleased and dismayed to learn of the NARS branch in San Bruno. An American historian whose research was focused on upstate New York, a professor at a leading university and editor of one of the historical profession's most respected journals, had never heard of the New York Historical Resources Center's guides to historical records in the counties of that state. The list could go on and on.

The case of Colin Fletcher is perhaps the most interesting of the three. On a whim, he decided to attempt to unravel the life story of a man who lived in a cave, a site discovered by Fletcher while hiking in Nevada in 1968. Starting with the handicap of not even knowing his subject's name, Fletcher's determination to trace the identity of this unknown individual resulted in one of the most fascinating historical detective stories ever written. On a search that took him from county courthouses to cemeteries, from the National Archives to the California desert, Fletcher relied on his intuition, the advice of researcher friends, and the assistance of NARS staff members to find his man.
Would national information systems have helped Fletcher? Certainly ready access to archival and public records information would have made his task easier, but where would have been the exciting search that resulted in this book? Fletcher's discovery in the recorder's office in Riverside, California, is a case in point. Examining a ledger of mining claims, he suddenly connects the pieces, and realizes that the name he is looking at is the name of his man: "I stood there in front of the ledger, staring down at the two adjacent names that now shrieked up at me from the white page. I stood there, back still bent, breath blocked, heart sledgehammering. And in that first moment, even before I read the notation 'Mining Claim Deed,' I knew that 'Anthony W. Simmons' must after all be Bill." 7 As Robin Winks' *The Historian as Detective* so beautifully demonstrates, it is the thrill of pursuit, of finding the unknown, that brings the excitement to research. 8

Sometimes there is a real danger that crucial evidence may be lost. This was certainly true in Fletcher's case, where his failure to find certain links in the chain would have spelled disaster for his entire project. Barbara Tuchman, as well, narrowly missed bypassing a crucial bit of evidence while doing research for her book *Stilwell and the American Experience in China.* 9 Tuchman's experience, as described in her essay, "The Houses of Research," merits recounting. Working at the New York Public Library, she was examining a microfilm of the *Sentinel*, the weekly journal of the 15th Infantry stationed in Tientsin, to which Stilwell was attached between 1926 and 1929. After scanning the first reel and finding nothing to distinguish the paper from a counterpart produced in Kansas, she decided as a matter of conscience alone to look at the second reel.

There on the first page of the first issue was an article by Major Stilwell, the regiment's recognized expert on Chinese affairs, inaugurating a *series*, no less, on the personalities and issues of the civil war! His articles continued to appear each week in the *Sentinel* for more than a year, providing me with my protagonist's own judgment of events at a climactic time in which he shared. The frightening thing was how close I had come to missing them altogether. No one among his family or former colleagues of the 15th Infantry had mentioned to me the existence of the articles; the originals had not been among his papers; and the *Sentinel* was not, of course, indexed in the *Periodical Guide*. With no clue to their existence, I might never have found them, which would have been a serious omission for Stilwell's biographer. This is the kind of thing that makes one shiver to think of what else one may be missing. 10

These examples of research experience, both clearly articulated and inferred, are intended not only to demonstrate the wide variety of research strategies evinced in contemporary historical writing,
but to indicate that no national information system or systems is
going to be a panacea for the archives and research communities.
Researchers will continue to be governed by a wide variety of
motives. Some will welcome the chance to develop a broader base of
possible research options, while others will continue to use re-
sources on a limited scale in particular geographical areas. Others,
no doubt, will remain frustrated by the lack of specific detail in
descriptions. But the group that we should be most concerned about
are those who aren’t aware that the resources exist at all, like the man
from San Francisco, the French historian, and the editor of the
professional journal, who had never heard of San Bruno, NUCMC,
or the New York county guides. They may be amateurs, profession-
als, genealogists, or whoever the potential users of archives and
manuscripts are these days, but they are the audience we must reach
with our information systems, no matter what shape or form they
might take.

If there is a danger of failure at this point, as there may well be,
what is its source? Nearly twenty years ago, the late Walter Rundell,
Jr., began his study of historical research and training in the United
States under the auspices of the National Historical Publications
was based on structured oral interviews and questionnaires involv-
ing academic historians, graduate students, archivists, and librari-
ans throughout the United States. Calling for closer cooperation
between historians and archivists in such areas as methodological
training of graduate students and preparation of finding aids, Run-
dell’s analysis suggested the need for development of a solid ground-
ing in historical research techniques, including bibliographic
skills, among the history students of the nation. Although he advo-
cated the use of computers for archival description, he cautioned
that “those who expect that in the future machines will do all the
bibliographic grubbing for historians must realize that someone has
to know what should be fed into the computers.”

Yet how are we to know what each researcher needs in order to
successfully achieve his or her research goals? The needs of a Colin
Fletcher seeking the identity of a single unknown individual are
vastly different from the needs of a Ruth Rosen trying to document
both public attitudes toward, and the private lives of, an entire
group of people. Rosen, for example, could rely heavily on pub-
lished materials. Fletcher could not. A genealogist’s information
needs are vastly different from those of a historian writing on Soviet-
American relations, and the genealogist’s computer skills may be
much more highly developed than those of his or her historian
colleague, let alone those of the archivist trying to serve their mutual
research needs. We as archivists make value judgments about which
user community to serve and how. Too often these judgments are based on our own subjective ideas about who our users ought to be, how they ought to approach our holdings, and what skills and knowledge they ought to bring to the task.

The continued production of traditional, hierarchically-based inventories lacking even basic subject or proper name access and control has greatly limited their utility for many users, if those users even know of their existence. Those who prepare finding aids too often assume that descriptions reflecting the records' provenance provide sufficient intellectual access points for their users. Yet does it make any sense to expect researchers to read through a 150 or 200-page inventory to find specific subject or name references when an index to the finding aid might have been created? Might we not, in some cases, dispense with the inventory altogether? Could archivists not drastically reduce the time they need to respond to reference requests by constructing information systems that relate to user needs rather than those that reflect traditional practices of doubtful utility for archivist and researcher alike?

As Walter Rundell observed nearly twenty years ago, the impression given is that finding aids are constructed with little attention being paid to the questions that researchers ask of the records. Moreover, adherence to these traditional concepts, both of the nature of the user community and the structure of descriptive tools, has been accompanied by comparative neglect of new user constiuencies and their information needs.

In light of this it is heartening to note efforts currently underway that are attempting to deal with this problem. One interesting beginning is the publication, Identification of the Historical Records of County Government in California. Prepared by the California State Archives and the California Historical Records Educational and Consultant Service with funding from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, this volume seeks to identify the most common types of records that occur throughout all of the county governments of California. Information on the records' content and arrangement is provided, but the most interesting aspect of the guide is its inclusion of information on research uses for the material. These range from short blurbs to a page and a half devoted to a discussion of the varied uses of court records. The entry for Recorder's Office Pre-emption Claim Files is accompanied, for example, by the following note: "Source for study of land ownership and impact of federal laws on patterns of settlement, mobility, and county development." Although some refinement is certainly needed, this is a useful attempt to serve the user community that is not found in more traditionally structured guides and finding aids.
It is clear that if current developments in the area of national information systems for archives and manuscripts are to take root and flourish, a number of activities must be undertaken. First the archival profession as a whole needs to develop a better sense of who the users of repositories are, who they might be, and how these individuals are likely to approach the use of archival materials. Hard statistics and facts are crucial here. If, as recent studies indicate, many researchers are relying on their predecessors’ footnotes rather than on finding aids to guide them to appropriate primary sources, there must be a reason. How, for example, are the members of the various user communities we serve taught to do research in archives and manuscripts? Perhaps those involved in archival education need to be concerned as much about this problem as they are about training the members of the profession. If programs for microcomputers can teach us how to speak French and how to cook, why can’t a program teach us how to use archives and manuscripts?

Related to this is the need for current, reliable information about the state of the art in a wide range of activities relating to the development and implementation of national information systems. A centrally located, professionally managed clearinghouse of archival information is long overdue. Such a central clearinghouse could serve as a conduit for a wide range of products as well as information. We sometimes forget that national information systems need not necessarily imply a nationwide computer network. A good beginning might simply be the establishment of one central location, well-publicized to users of all types, to which they might turn for copies of guides, registers, inventories, and other finding aids. The Chadwyck-Healey microfilming project may, to some extent, serve this need, but it is not designed to perform educational functions or to provide an interface between the archival profession and the user community in the same way as could a clearinghouse.15

Third, the profession needs to be realistic about its own limitations and capabilities. The development of national information systems will do us little good if these systems are employed by only a minority of institutions; or worse yet, if each individual institution is called upon to bear alone the rigors of systems analysis, startup, and implementation. There must be some clear, measurable benefit to the institution in terms of both time and money if our vision is to become a reality. We cannot continue to expect the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Department of Education, NHPRC, and other funding agencies to permanently provide the resources for this activity. New strategies are needed. Perhaps, for example, it is time for institutions to start collecting and accessioning less and, instead, to allocate their staffs to activities involving the implementation of information systems. A two-year moratorium nationwide on acquisitions might have a very interesting effect indeed.
We have reached a new plateau, both in terms of the intellectual tools and the technology we have available to make national systems a reality. We now need an assessment of what is required to achieve this goal. Be it a national clearinghouse or new strategies for marketing our wares to users, the profession cannot afford to sit back and wait for things to work themselves out on their own. Archives-library cooperation needs to be strengthened, as does archival awareness of user needs. Only by developing a clear perception of the present and a plan for the future will we be able to succeed.

FOOTNOTES

2. The NISTF "Data Element Dictionary" has not been formally published, but is being revised for possible future issuance by the Society of American Archivists. The USMARC Archival and Manuscripts Control Format will be issued by the Library of Congress as MFBD Update No. 10.
6. Examples drawn from the author's personal experience. Since 1978, the New York Historical Resources Center at Olin Library, Cornell University, has been surveying repository holdings of archives and manuscripts in New York. As of this writing more than two dozen county guides have been completed. They are distributed free of charge to participating institutions, and are also available for sale to the public.
7. Fletcher, *The Man From the Cave*, p. 89. Citation is to the 1982 paperback edition, published by Vintage.
13. In 1982 Chadwyck-Healey Inc., a British-based microform publisher, began work on a *National Inventory of Documentary Sources in the United States*. This indexed microfiche reproduction of finding aids will include selected holdings of federal repositories, such as the Library of Congress and the National Archives; state archives, libraries, and historical societies; and academic and research libraries. Initial sections of the *Inventory* have already been released.
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American Catholic archives, according to Boston Archdiocesan archivist James O'Toole in a recent article, are experiencing a "renaissance in progress." In fact, since the National Conference of Catholic Bishops urged dioceses, religious communities, and institutions to "inaugurate a nation-wide effort to preserve and organize all existing records and papers" in 1976, archival programs in many sees, motherhouses, and parishes throughout the country have been born again. The Boston Archdiocese, for example, utilizing seed money from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, built a strong internal program, secured a veteran professional archivist to direct it, and adapted its Chancery facility to house the records of the faithful in a safe, stable setting. The New Jersey Catholic Historical Records Commission, pursuing a very different approach, rescued hundreds of feet of moldy sacramental registers, insect-infested bishops' diaries, and faded, virtually illegible adoption records from a basement boiler room in an overcrowded Chancery Office in Downtown Newark, and transferred them to Seton Hall University, where students and scholars might leisurely peruse the documents in a more comfortable, hospitable environment.¹

These strategies do not exhaust Catholic record-keepers' solutions to their documentary dilemmas. Like their colleagues throughout the profession, Catholic archivists usually disagree, often develop "practical" seat-of-the-pants solutions for technical and theoretical problems, comprise a diverse mosaic of priests, women religious, and laypersons with a wide assortment of training, publish lots of newsletters but few monographs, and have managed to devise almost as many archival approaches as there exist dioceses. Despite their diversity, Catholic archivists have become conscious in recent years of (to use an SAA catchword) their professional affinity, and diocesan archivists now meet annually in conjunction with the
Society of American Archivists' conventions. They are taking steps to publicize their holdings—a guide to Boston's Archdiocesan Archives recently appeared, and a survey of Women's Religious records in the United States is available. They are hiring people to work in their repositories and advertising for them in professional journals—a perusal of recent SAA Employment Bulletins confirms that Detroit and Baltimore have hired new archivists, Boston recently employed an assistant, and the New Jersey Catholic Historical Records Commission has hired three Field Archivists under a National Endowment for the Humanities grant. And they are wrestling with many of the same issues which plague their brethren in businesses, historical societies, and universities.  

Though this article focuses on official Church records and archival programs at the diocesan level, the universe of Catholic documentation is much broader. Many records and personal papers relating to the history of the Church in America are found in the archives of religious communities of men and women at provincial offices, abbeys, and motherhouses; in the archives of Catholic universities such as Catholic University, Georgetown, Marquette, and Notre Dame with a broad range of collecting programs including "Catholic social action;" and in secular historical agencies and repositories. These archival programs have developed markedly during the past decade. In particular, religious communities are employing professionally trained archivists, who are processing collections on a large scale and are making traditionally closed or inaccessible records available for scholarly research.  

If Catholics have in fact escaped the archival ghetto, they still have a unique tradition which they can draw upon for methodological guidance, and which can liberate them from rigid records policies. When did Catholics begin establishing archives? Why did they consider their records valuable? Who used the records and for what purposes? What effect did Catholic historiographical trends have on religious repositories? How did all of these factors change over time, and what implications does this have for the future? An examination of the early words and deeds of Catholic bishops and chroniclers helps us place the current situation into an appropriate historical perspective and suggests some new approaches for some complex archival issues.  

America's earliest Catholics thought very little about history or archives. When John Carroll was nominated as the new nation's first bishop in 1790, he served as the spiritual shepherd of a small, geographically dispersed flock centered mainly in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Though he fought and felt Protestant prejudice at many points throughout his long life, this well-connected prelate moved easily among Chesapeake aristocrats and sought to move
Catholics into a broad, consensual American mainstream. A supporter of the American Revolution, an advocate of an English language liturgy, an opponent of nationality-based parishes, and a believer in the election of bishops by the priests, Carroll also insisted on a native clergy loyal to American institutions. The Church's minimal bureaucratic structure generated relatively few records, and America's first bishop saw no need to construct a distinct Catholic history. Rather, Catholics should adapt their institutions to mirror and complement American republicanism, and their history should blend in with the national experience.3

By the 1840s, the Catholic hierarchy began expressing very different attitudes. Between 1840 and 1860, Irish and German immigrants began flocking into northeastern port cities in ever-increasing numbers, filling pews and collection plates, and exacting new spiritual and social demands on the Church's rudimentary administrative structure. These new Catholics carried a score of local religious traditions and practices across the Atlantic. Many could not speak English. A sizable percentage found unskilled, low-paying seasonal jobs in the mill towns and urban manufacturing centers now dotting the northeastern landscape. Religious leaders bemoaned the immigrants' mobility, fearing that the New World's urban, secular attractions might weaken their faith.4

The institutional Church responded by creating new dioceses, establishing nationality-based parishes, and importing religious orders from Europe to staff rapidly multiplying institutions. Bishops, who bore the burden of administering these expanding, diversified operations, placed a new emphasis on recordkeeping. Small Chancery bureaucracies developed to manage diocesan finances, maintain order and deference among the priests, and insure that the good word spread to every corner of the diocese. Bishops mandated annual reports from every pastor which described in minute detail the spiritual and financial condition of every parish. They codified the keeping of accurate sacramental registers and books of receipts and expenditures in diocesan statutes, and began maintaining their own episcopal diaries, which recorded significant events during their administrations. Bishop James Roosevelt Bayley of Newark went so far as to order each pastor to obtain "a good, strongly-bound Blank-Book" to record trustee minutes and warned that "habitual or willful neglect" of good recordkeeping "will be considered a sufficient cause for the removal of any pastor."5

Of course, episcopal edict did not insure clerical compliance. Parish priests retained considerable administrative autonomy and recordkeeping practices frequently reflected personality quirks rather than bureaucratic mandate. Personal and parish property often became intermingled, and priests occasionally carried church
records to their changing pastoral assignments. Thus, for example, a mid-nineteenth century baptismal register for St. James Church in Newark begins with an account of “monies recd. for Church at Middletown point” near the New Jersey shore. When bishops attempted to obtain information concerning churches under their jurisdiction they usually discovered a distressing documentary apathy. Bishop Michael Corrigan, for example, consulted Philadelphia’s Chancellor in 1879 to gather information concerning Catholic settlements in Pleasant Mills and Port Elizabeth, New Jersey, and received a disheartening reply. “Search among the Archives did not enlighten me a whit in regard to the history of the missions” complained the Chancellor. Indeed, he admitted, “I cannot dignify by the name of Archives what remains in our hands to tell our own history of the early part of the century.” At the local level, bookkeeping problems appeared even worse. Bayley recognized this deficiency during the 1840s, while attempting to unravel a financial scandal at Roundout, New York. A perusal of the trustee records revealed that “they have been kept as such accounts are usually kept in matters of Catholic Church building... pencil orders, paying in the streets, at the quarry, around the foundation is the usual practice, and is not calculated to bring out a set of [regular] books.”

Still, mid-nineteenth century bishops did begin paying more attention to their archives. A few even decided to write their own histories. At the very moment that American Catholicism was becoming an urban, immigrant church, and that Protestant nativists were challenging their Catholic neighbors in the press and on the streets, some ecclesiasts looked back to a simpler, somewhat idealized past. Native-born Catholic convert James Roosevelt Bayley, for example, authored a short history of Catholicity in early New York, penned a laudatory episcopal biography of the first bishop of Vincennes, and generally venerated the pre-immigrant Church that was quickly passing out of existence. Early Catholic historians also became significant manuscript collectors. Again, Bayley accumulated a substantial collection of Mother Elizabeth Ann Seton’s letters, retained possession of notebooks, letters, and manuscript fragments of New York’s first resident bishop, and permanently borrowed the personal papers of Bishop Simon Gabriel Brute of Vincennes. Excepting a few half-hearted notes from Brute’s successor in the 1860s requesting that Bayley return these latter papers, few dioceses bothered about the loss of dusty, old non-current documents. Administering the present, not preserving the past, occupied the attentions and energies of most. The few who wished to dabble in the past were given free reign to do so, manuscripts became alienated from dioceses, and custody of significant collections fell into private hands.
Between 1880 and 1920, the Catholic Church experienced another major spurt of growth. Once again, immigrants provided the principal stimulus. As second-generation Irish and German Catholics now dominated the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Italians, Poles, Slavs, Ukrainians, and other southern and eastern European immigrants swelled the ranks of the laity. Dioceses mushroomed into full-blown bureaucracies. Separate school offices now directed and coordinated educational endeavors. Social welfare efforts moved out of individual parishes and into centrally administered diocesan agencies. Chancery offices moved into more spacious quarters and supported growing administrative and clerical staffs. New ethnic parishes grew everywhere, finances became more complicated, and the Church hierarchy confronted a more pressing informational crisis. As the bureaucracy swelled, so did its records.8

The new immigration also renewed conflict among Churchmen. Assimilationists among the hierarchy, fearing new outbreaks of nativism and scornful of the persistence of foreign traditions in America, preached practical coexistence with and accommodation to the dominant national environment in tones reminiscent of John Carroll. Others sensed a fundamental tension between the Roman religion and American society. These clerics argued that Catholics needed separate institutions to retain their cultural identity and halt spiritual declension. After a series of conflicts and controversies in the 1890s, the separatists generally gained the upper hand and shaped the future course of Catholicism. Nowhere was their influence more evident than in the area of Catholic history.9

Around the turn of the century, as dioceses and parishes approached significant anniversaries, bishops and pastors commissioned reliable members of the faithful to immortalize their accomplishments in history books. Newark's fiftieth anniversary in 1903, for example, prompted Bishop John J. O'Connor to characterize the previous half-century as "a glorious record...of apostolic zeal, of unwavering fidelity, of sublime devotion" and to praise the "almost incredible achievements" of former diocesan bishops. O'Connor secured a Morristown pastor to write a monumental history of the Catholic Church and produce a "piece of literature that will make the Catholics of the State of New Jersey proud of their religion." Incidentally, the diocese hoped to reap other benefits from this publication as well. Proceeds were to be deposited in a New Cathedral Fund and, hopefully, add "very materially to the finances" of the diocese. While the stacks of volumes reposing in diocesan offices to this day document the book's commercial drawbacks, it did create a common historical mythology for the diverse, heterogeneous parishioners attending early twentieth century Sunday masses.10
Throughout the nation, Catholic history was to serve a similar purpose. One historian has chronicled the emergence of a "Church and School Triumphant" tradition in the writings of such historians as John Gilmary Shea and James A. Burns during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These writings chronicled the "triumphant progress of the Catholic Church in the face of incredible obstacles." Institutional growth demonstrated God's Providence and his earthly preferences. Celebrating their Americanism, uncritical in tone, rigorously documenting quantitative growth, and usually constructed within a narrow institutional framework, the parochial polemics written during this time moved Catholic history decidedly outside the American historiographical mainstream.11

If Catholic history was to be written for Catholics, it would also be written by Catholics. Catholic historians institutionalized their separation by creating distinct organizations. An American Catholic Historical Society was founded in Philadelphia in 1884 to collect historical materials, publish significant primary sources, and encourage research into Catholic history. A United States Catholic Historical Society was established in New York shortly thereafter for broadly similar purposes. By 1915, a Catholic Historical Review offered Catholic historians an additional outlet for their scholarship.12

And these Catholic historians took their mission very seriously. Peter Guilday warned fellow chroniclers as late as 1935 that "it goes without saying that not one word, not one line that might give scandal to anyone should ever be written . . . the responsibility involved should not be assumed by the writer alone. This is a matter which requires the judgement of his superiors." A relative handful received episcopal sanction to examine parochial archives. Henry Browne characterized Catholic institutional archives as "in good measure family secrets" in 1951, and twenty-five years later Richard Juliani observed that access to parish records still depended primarily on "the specific agreement and relationship between the researcher and the pastor."13

Though bishops bestowed their blessings and placed their nihil imprimaturs on some historical efforts between 1890 and 1920, few took any active interest in preserving Catholic records. Paradoxically, this period—which witnessed with beginnings of a Catholic historical renaissance—coincided with a dark age of records neglect. While episcopal authorities recognized that the Catholic laity needed a history, they rarely connected the writing of that history with the need to preserve Catholic primary sources. Thus, the early twentieth century became a period of great carelessness in the administration of institutional records. A long litany of archival atrocities—including broken custody, alienation of records from
dioceses and parishes, and indiscriminate trashing of already decaying materials—has been documented by several historians and archivists.\textsuperscript{14}

It remained for a few interested individuals to salvage what they could. Foremost among the concerned Catholics of the period was Notre Dame University's librarian James Farnam Edwards. Dreaming of a National Catholic Archives at South Bend, he began aggressively acquiring materials from enthusiastic private donors and dour ecclesiastical officials alike. Edwards badgered, cajoled, and courted prominent Catholics to obtain access to their manuscripts and commitments concerning their disposition. Consistent with the historiographical trends of the period, he concentrated primarily on gathering manuscripts from members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, papers from the first families of American Catholicism, and official diocesan records from obliging institutions.

His methods are revealed in a letter to a somewhat pompous Jersey City pastor, who had received the honorific title Archbishop of Heliopolis. Lamenting that the "the diaries you have kept since your return to Europe are claimed by your nephew," Edwards pronounced this development a "calamity." Rather, the papers should be transferred to Notre Dame, "where they will be sacredly preserved for posterity . . . every scrap of information concerning your grace should be preserved . . . your biography will be written . . . it will be a model of its kind, a classic." Finally, pulling out all the stops, Edwards informed this potential donor that "you ought to be a Cardinal . . . I have heard it said you would not accept a Cardinal's Hat because of the restrictions around a personage holding that dignity."\textsuperscript{15} Ultimately, Edwards succeeded with this individual, and a number of other important Catholics as well. Undeniably, he built the most significant Catholic archives in America, saved many records from neglect and destruction, and insured Notre Dame's position as the center of American Catholic scholarship. While many contemporaries and some future archivists attacked him for pirating manuscripts and alienating administrative records from their creating institutions, his elite-based collecting policies (typical of the time) also limited his institution's scope in significant ways.

As this sketchy historical review reveals, Catholic diocesan records often ended up where they did because of a particular individual's interest, an accidental turn of events, or an unofficial policy of benign neglect. Diocesan administrators considered Catholic records a house-keeping nuisance and rarely consulted them. A handful of officially sanctioned Catholic historians utilized them to construct episcopal biographies and diocesan chronicles, but most historians neither knew of the records' existence or cared to penetrate the ecclesiastical fortresses housing them.
Today, Catholic archivists confront a very different world. Catholics have suburbanized and made significant economic strides. They have exerted a tremendous influence on American culture, while having been profoundly shaped by it in turn. No longer the immigrant church, Catholicism now represents a widely shared experience for a very broad spectrum of the American population. Historians are examining and interpreting this transformation from a very different perspective. Jay Dolan has urged Catholic historians to write their histories “from the level of the street and not just from the level of the bishop’s desk.” A feeling has emerged that Catholics no longer need celebratory, laudatory works to bind them together, but rather hard-nosed monographs which critically explore their past and dissect its failures as well as successes.

Placing Church experiences into a broader social context requires that historians begin asking some very different questions. Where did America’s Catholics come from? What sort of communities did they create or recreate in the New World? What role did ritual and tradition play in easing their adjustments to urban industrial life? Did religious observance decline under the strains of urbanization, industrialization, and constant geographic mobility? What role did Catholic schools have in assimilating children into American life, or in separating them from their native-born peers? Did Church and school serve as important social control mechanisms? If so, how? Who went to Catholic Schools? Why? How did the experiences of Catholic students differ from their public school counterparts? The answers to these and a score of similar questions will not be found in celebratory historical works of the 1860s or the narrowly conceived monographs of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Nor will they be found in the bishop’s papers which Catholic archivists have carefully collected, calendared, and catalogued over the years. In the past, Catholic archives have been organized and structured to conveniently service certain interests—diocesan administrators assembling information, native-born bishops reflecting on a simpler past, clerical authorities seeking to discover a common heritage for a remarkably diverse people, and Catholic historians writing for their peers and sponsors. Now, diocesan archivists face new challenges, are consulted by different constituencies, and are confronted with scholarly questions their traditional repositories are not prepared to answer. Catholic scholars are expanding the scope of their studies at the same time that social, labor, and ethnic historians are beginning to examine seriously the nature and impact of the Church in society. Both groups are writing thoughtful social history. Unfortunately, the burden of the Catholic archival past has left archivists ill-equipped to deal with the demands of social scientists and humanistic scholars. At the very moment that many
bishops have expressed a greater, more widespread willingness to allow researchers into their diocesan archives, these repositories appear lacking in the diversity and scope of documentation which practitioners of the new social history demand.

How can today's Catholic archivists remedy this situation and transform their facilities into vital social science laboratories operating on the frontiers of humanistic scholarship? Part of the answer, I believe, lies in centralization and in professional archivists defining broader responsibilities for their institutions. In fact, many of the building blocks necessary to construct a new Catholic history have survived. Sacramental registers, student roll books, social welfare case files, and benevolent and fraternal organization records—all constitute valuable tools for the social historian of the 1980s. Diocesan archivists can play a critical role in aggressively seeking out such materials, removing them from the frequently physically dangerous church lofts and rectory basements which usually serve as makeshift repositories, and bringing them under bibliographic control to increase their accessibility. Rather than narrowly defining their responsibilities as preserving only the documents generated by the Chancery Office bureaucracy, diocesan archivists must consciously attempt to document a broad spectrum of Church life and experience, and insure that a wide range of clerical and lay activity is available for analysis.

Such a commitment will frequently involve moving outside the Church's formal institutional structure. Rather than merely documenting religious consumers' lives as seen through the eyes of parish priests, schoolteachers, and caseworkers, archivists must seek out—indeed, even create—documents which allow the laity to speak. Oral history interviews can fulfill this mission. Home movies which record sacramental ceremonies and ethno-religious festivals offer another underutilized source.

Church archivists must also remain sensitive to contemporary religious trends and shifts. Hispanics, for example, now populate many inner city parishes. How has their experience differed from other immigrant groups? Have they developed a distinctive form of Roman Catholicism by blending their own traditional rites, ceremonies, and rituals with Church-sanctioned forms of worship? The oral sources for constructing a history of post-World War II immigration in America clearly exist. Archivists must aggressively seek out and exploit them. Black Catholicism and the Church's attempts to convert non-whites in the urban north constitutes another particularly significant contemporary topic. During the 1970s, many Catholics experienced a charismatic reawakening. Oral and visual sources provide especially important insight into this aspect of the faith.
Constructing collections which adequately document the breadth and scope of religious life can strain conventional approaches and budgets. If individual dioceses cannot afford or choose not to build and staff substantial central manuscript repositories, alternatives exist. Placing materials on deposit at already existing repositories appears a very sensible step. College and university archives offer especially suitable environments. They usually provide a wide range of support services, including secondary reference collections, microfilm and fiche reader-printers, microfilming equipment, photo-processors, media equipment, and exhibit space, which increase the collection's utility and encourage its analysis by scholars. Academic environments also offer a corps of eager graduate students anxious to work with the collections, utilize the sources to enrich their understanding of the past, and contribute to professional scholarship. They further provide a familiar, comfortable working environment for visiting scholars, who might set foot only with the greatest trepidation into a bishop's office. Historical societies, it should be noted, can, under the right circumstances, offer many of these same advantages.

Other approaches can also produce similar effects. Regional repositories, for example, created by several sees in a particular province, constitute another possible solution. Dioceses can thus pool their resources, bringing together a wide range of scholarly sources in a single, centrally-planned location. Such cooperative ventures can cut archival costs for the participants, insure that uniform access policies govern the use of all records, and ease researcher burdens significantly. They might also stimulate other cost-sharing efforts between dioceses in the areas of publication, common data bases, and public outreach programs.

These thoughts, it should be noted, proceed from a single assumption and a single conviction. If Catholic diocesan archives have, in the past, been created and structured to service several somewhat narrow constituencies, they can best serve the future by responding to and by, in fact, leading one very important group they have too often excluded from their considerations. By committing themselves to humanistic scholarship, archivists make a substantial, invaluable contribution to all of their more immediate users—the bishops, the men and women religious, and the laity. To accomplish this, they must think creatively, remain open to novel archival approaches, and structure their repositories so that their documents accurately reflect Catholic life and their collections are open for analysis. In practice, this means bringing significant local records together in professionally-staffed diocesan, regional, or state-wide repositories which scholars will visit and utilize. It may mean cooperative, cost-sharing projects, perhaps in conjunction with existing Catholic
archives and historical agencies. It could mean the creation of national data bases to aid researchers and contributions to local and regional data base projects. It certainly means a more creative and humanistic archival approach than most diocesan curators—indeed, a more profoundly humanistic approach than most curators in general—have heretofore practiced.

FOOTNOTES


5. See James Roosevelt Bayley, “Rules for the Administration of Churches that have no Trustees,” Circular, 1 November 1853; Circular to all pastors, 22 February 1865; Circular to all pastors, 12 December 1865, James Roosevelt Bayley Papers, Archives of the Archdiocese of Newark at Seton Hall University [hereinafter cited as AAN].


12. *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Volume I, 1884-86 offers discussion concerning the establishment of this institution; page 14 quotes a letter from John Gilmary Shea, who “informed us that the United States Catholic Historical Society was about to be organized” in New York. The *Catholic Historical Review* began publication in April 1915.


RECOVERING FROM A MAJOR DISASTER
JEAN MARIE DEKEN

According to Noah Webster, disaster occurs when one's governing planet or star is in "an unfavorable aspect." There are those who claim that they can read your stars and those who claim that they can predict when your stars will cross and bad fortune will befall, but I have yet to hear of anyone who has made the claim that they can "change" the stars. If you believe in the techniques of astrologers, you might consider consulting one to predict the fortunes of your archives, but even an astrologer will not claim to be able to protect you from your "star-crossed" fate. Disaster is bound to happen; it's in the stars. Have you ever thought about it? What will you do? Let's take a little time to think the unthinkable: let's create an archives, subject it to calamity, and then look at the various procedures necessary for coping and recovering.

You are the curator of a medium-sized archives in a small city of 75,000-100,000 people in the midwest. Your collection is housed on its own floor in the main library building of the local college. This building is approximately seventy years old, of brick and stone construction, possessing all of the charm and cussedness typical of structures of that style and vintage. Your collection, of which you are, naturally, inordinately proud, contains the customary collections of the papers of former college staff, the archives of the college, the archival records of the leading industries in your city, and the very valuable papers of three prominent and historically important 19th century midwesterners whom we will call the Reformer, the Inventor, and the Banker. The Reformer's papers contain over 4,000 photographs and negatives, and the papers of the Inventor contain the microfilm equivalent of 36 linear feet.

But you are not really thinking about any of this. It's Monday morning, and like any other Monday, you are not quite awake as you head down the back stairs to the rear entrance of your facility. As you open the door, however, this Monday loses all semblance of Mondays past because you find yourself in the middle of a DISASTER!
The sight that greets your eyes is water pouring out of the ceiling and cascading in sheets from the tops of the stacks to the floor below. This spectacle stops you cold for a moment, but, being an extremely competent and professional archivist, you realize immediately that you have a choice of one of the following reactions:

a. scream.
b. faint.
c. wade into the room picking up boxes and calling for help.
d. slog to your office and start the coffee.
e. find the nearest telephone OUTSIDE of the flooded area.

You certainly feel like screaming, but you look around and decide that fainting would be sloppy, and probably not very healthy, since you wouldn’t have a dry place to land. You rule out options C and D immediately; your instincts tell you that one should never rush into the site of a disaster, especially while the disaster is still in progress. You decide to telephone for help from a safe place. You go upstairs to call emergency services (campus police, building maintenance) and your supervisor from a telephone outside of the affected area. You wait near the phone until the police arrive.

When the police and maintenance personnel have arrived, you tour your facility and discover the following:

1. There has been a water main break in your sprinkler system. The break is located in the east stacks; water is still pouring out, but it will be shut off within the hour.
2. There is water standing six inches deep in all of the stacks and in the processing area. It is beginning to seep into the research room.
3. Waterlogged boxes of records have tumbled from the top two shelves of the stacks in aisles one through four.
4. Your staff of three has arrived and is waiting for you to tell them what to do.
5. Several patrons are standing on the front steps waiting for you to open your doors for business.

Since you are a competent archivist, you have copies of your previously prepared disaster plan in your office, at home, and at the house of your assistant. You now retrieve the copy from your office and assemble your staff and the building maintenance personnel. Following the disaster plan, you:

Establish Recovery Headquarters

- You choose the research room, just off of the lobby, as recovery headquarters. It has been relatively unaffected by the water and has two operating telephones.
- You assign the calmest staff member to make phone calls for
recovery supplies and aid, using the list of suppliers and telephone numbers in your disaster recovery plan.

- You ensure personal safety by having the maintenance staff check all electrical systems in the building. The electrician notifies you that the house electricity is inoperable, and so you ask the employee assigned to the telephone to rent a portable generator that fits the electrician's specifications. You also have the electrician check to make sure that your supply of extension cords, to be used with the portable generator, meets current standards for waterproofing and grounding.

- You remind your staff to MAKE HASTE SLOWLY, since wet floors are slippery and standing water presents hidden hazards.

- When your supervisor arrives, breathless and on the verge of hysteria, you let him know that you have the situation in hand but that certain salvage supplies and services will need to be purchased quickly. You ask him to arrange for emergency procurement authorization for you.

Stabilize The Environment

- The next step is to arrange to have the standing water pumped out of the stacks. Maintenance does not have the proper equipment, but with prodding from you and your supervisor, they are persuaded to rent the necessary equipment from the local hospital and pump the water out. (You develop a strong suspicion that they will try to charge your department for this and make a mental note to follow up on the billing as soon as the crisis is over.)

- Next you ask maintenance to reduce the building temperature to sixty-five degrees or less as rapidly as possible. It is summer, and so you keep the building cool with two window unit air conditioners and several fans that are run on the portable generator, because you know that reduced temperature delays the growth of mold and mildew.

- Throughout, you keep constant watch, before and during the salvage operation, for signs of mold development. Since it is hot and the water has been standing in the building for hours, mold is beginning to develop on the damp papers, boxes, and volumes. From your reading on disasters and disaster recovery, you know that in cases like this fungicidal fogging may be necessary. You have the phone employee call the fumigator listed in your disaster plan, and when he arrives both of you tour the stacks. The decision is made not to fumigate at this time, since the waters have receded and the materials can be removed immediately.

- To retard the further development of mold, you create maximum air flow in the affected area with the fans and air conditioners.
Salvage The Collections

• Organize a salvage crew consisting of yourself, your staff of three, your conservation consultant, and any volunteers you have deemed conscientious enough to be of real help. Salvaging is hard, frustrating, and dirty work which must be done with a great deal of care and thought. You make sure that neither you nor your staff become overtired. Everyone rests frequently, and you try to keep the atmosphere as light as possible. Someone starts an informal contest to rename the stack area, and “Sog City” becomes the runaway favorite.

• To set up the salvage operation, you look for an area for packing and drying the materials to be salvaged. You know that it should have flat work surfaces at table or counter height which can be covered with polyethylene sheeting. You successfully commandeer a chemistry lab in a building 200 feet away from the library. It has rows of counters with sinks that are covered with three-inch plywood lids. You remove all equipment and supplies from the lab that are not needed for your operation.

• Next, the salvage crew removes and packs materials to be salvaged. The materials on the floors in the aisles are handled first, then the items on the lower shelves; and, finally, partially wet or damp items from the upper shelves are removed.

• Materials are removed in the condition found. You instruct your crew not to attempt to separate sheets, close swollen books, or open sodden folders. Material is passed separately, via a human chain, out the door and to the dry salvage area where the packing team will work. You do not allow anyone to stack wet materials on the floor.

• Paper items are packed in the condition you find them. If an archival box is too wet to be lifted or to stand on its own, a crew member carefully removes the contents and repacks them in plastic milk crates or in new boxes.

• Plastic milk crates are used to pack unboxed papers. Milk crates are sturdy and lightweight, and their open sides allow air to circulate freely around the wet materials. Fortunately, one of your student assistants is the grandchild of the owner of the local dairy. The milk crates have arrived in abundance, along with some much-appreciated pastries and a few gallons of chocolate milk.

• The crew is instructed NOT to turn drawers or wet manuscript boxes upside down to empty them, since the wet contents may
stick to the container and be torn if handled roughly. Container and papers are frozen as found. One over-enthusiastic student volunteer is observed repeatedly dumping wet boxes, and so you take him from his place on the removal crew and put him to work unloading empty milk crates from the dairy truck.

- The packing crew packs the milk crates and dry boxes loosely to allow for maximum air circulation during the freezing process, but makes no attempt to remove mold from wet papers or to separate single sheets found in masses.

- When each crate or box is full, your accessioning clerk tags it, using paper labels coded to show the original location of the damaged materials. The labels are attached to the boxes and crates with string because glue does not always survive freeze-drying intact. The accessioning clerk is the right person for this job since she knows your description techniques and the location coding system.

- After the crates and boxes are tagged, the packing crew moves them into a waiting refrigerated truck which has been leased by the staff member operating the phone. When the truck is filled, the driver (a chemistry professor who was eager to get involved) and one of your staff members take it to the nearest vacuum-drying facility, a twelve-hour trip.

As the salvaging of papers in aisles one through four is progressing, it is discovered that a portion of the Reformer's collection—ten boxes of photographs and negatives—has also been subjected to water damage. You alert your conservation consultant, who reminds you that photographic materials should not be frozen unless they cannot be professionally dried.

- You immediately have the salvage crew seal the wet black and white negative film and prints in polyethylene bags, and place the bags in plastic garbage cans (NOT METAL) under clean, cold running water. The sinks in two janitor's closets in the chemistry building are pressed into service. Your conservation consultant reminds you, also, that the film and prints can be kept under these conditions for only three days without damage.

- The employee making the telephone calls makes yet another one, this time to Eastman Kodak's emergency service for cleaning and drying the negatives and prints. Kodak agrees to take them, and you ship them "Express" in ice and water, in the sealed plastic garbage cans which themselves have been packed in styrofoam from a local commercial cold-storage facility.

Later that day, in another aisle, the salvage crew uncovers a box of microfilm—records of the Inventor's patents—that has been soaked through. Another call is made to Kodak, and another package is sent off in the same manner. You are exasperated at the duplication of
effort, until your assistant curator somewhat testily reminds you that the microfilm and the photographic negatives would have required separate packaging anyway. You make an "executive decision" to send out for ice-cream at this point, and tempers are restored. You try not to imagine how that expense will be received by the controller.

As your staff is busy packing and dispatching containers of soggy papers, they discover two shelves of cloth-bound account books from the Banker’s papers. One shelf is completely soaked, the other only slightly damp.

- You instruct the crew to pack the completely soaked volumes loosely in milk crates for freezing. They make no attempt to close the swollen books or to squeeze out excess water.
- The conservator washes the moderately wet volumes and stands them upright on the head end, to ease the strain on the stitching caused by the heavy, sagging book block. The volumes are set upright on several layers of blank newprint, which is changed often as it becomes soaked with the runoff from the books.
- The conservator also prepares thymol-impregnated sheets according to Peter Waters’s directions and places them between the front and back covers and the book block, because the covers dry very, very slowly and thus are more subject to mold growth than the rest of the book. These thymol-treated sheets will reduce the possibility of mold damage as the books are drying.
- Under the conservator's watchful eye, the salvage crew begins placing a single sheet of aluminum foil between each of the thymol sheets and the book block to halt the migration of moisture from the slow-drying covers to the faster drying pages.
- As the volumes become drier, the salvage crew begins opening them slightly and inter-leaving them with thymol-impregnated paper. They are careful not to open a volume more than thirty degrees at first. They interleave at fifty-page intervals, starting from the back of the book. The handling of the account books proceeds with great caution under the supervision of the conservation consultant.
- Some of the book bindings become distorted as they dry and develop concave spines when they are closed. Such problems are corrected by hanging each volume on three short lines of monofilament nylon. The conservator hangs only the books that are not dripping, feel damp but are not wet to the touch, and can be opened easily throughout.
- Books with wet edges only are air dried without inter-leaving because the room temperature is kept between 50 and 60 degrees Fahrenheit, and the relative humidity is kept constant at 25 to 35 percent. Under these conditions, the books dry in two weeks.
When the books are nearly dry, the salvage crew closes them, lays them flat on a table, forms them gently to their normal shape, and then places each under a light weight. They are returned to the stacks after four weeks of drying, when the conservator judges them to be thoroughly dry.

As the salvage operation progresses, your archives slowly takes on a revised routine. Handling of the ordinary day-to-day work is cancelled or severely curtailed until the crisis has abated. These ordinary activities include:

- **Mail Delivery.** You have mail redirected to a temporary collection point in the library until two weeks after the salvage operations in the chemistry lab are finished. A staff member sorts mail according to priority, and only letters containing fee payments are handled. A one-page explanatory/apology letter is sent to all regular correspondents.

- **Reference Service.** Despite your private disaster, life goes on as usual in the rest of the world, and your services continue to be sought. You keep as many of your reference services as possible functioning throughout the recovery effort. You reduce the number of hours that the reference room is open from seven per day to three and relocate it to a small lounge in the library. Because the college archives were not damaged in the flood, researchers are allowed to continue using these records.

A portable bulletin board in the lobby of the library informs your public of the disaster, lets it know how you are responding, and explains the special needs that have arisen as a result. This board generates much interest, and several students who did not know of your repository’s existence wander in to introduce themselves and to peruse the collection inventories. College administrators, who pass the bulletin board every day, are kept aware of your plight and, therefore, are supportive when your supervisor approaches them about an increased allocation for the fiscal year.

As the salvage effort concludes, it is time to call your staff together and evaluate the experience. You ask staff members to complete reports on their part in the recovery operation, and then you meet to hear the reports and to assess and change the disaster plan. On the whole, you find relatively little to change in the plan. You decide that a yearly review of the plan with all staff would be a good idea, since newer student staff were not familiar with it, nor with salvage procedures, when the flooding occurred. You let your staff know how much you have appreciated their help and announce that a “going out of business” party will be held in the chemistry lab which served as the salvage headquarters. Suppliers, maintenance personnel, and the dairy owner who was so helpful are also invited to the party, where mock awards for valor are given.
You become used to the sad fact of life that for many Mondays to come you will hesitate before putting your key in the door at work, wondering what kind of unpleasant surprise awaits you. That feeling will eventually pass, leaving behind one of justifiable pride in your and your staff's extraordinary achievement in rescuing and preserving a large slice of history that was threatened with extinction.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

There are many publications available on disaster prevention, preparedness, and recovery. Each archives should designate one staff member to keep abreast of new developments in disaster planning and salvage techniques by reading current publications and by acquiring training in basic conservation procedures.

ANALYSIS OR PRESCRIPTION?
RICHARD BERNER ON ARCHIVAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

ANN PEDERSON


Richard Cox recently reminded the American archival profession yet again that our “past is prologue” and described the history of archival enterprise in the United States as weak, uneven, and full of large and numerous holes. So it was with the relief of the besieged sighting the dust of the approaching cavalry that I received the news of the imminent publication of our profession’s first comprehensive, reflective work, Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis, by Richard Berner. At last, an experienced and well-published practitioner would achieve what all had been calling for—a benchmark book tracing the development of American archival principles and practices and highlighting those points of genuine progress and contribution which are so hard to identify as events unfold day-to-day.

Richard Berner brings credentials to the task that increase one’s expectations for the product. He is head of the University Archives and Manuscript Division of the University of Washington Libraries, a position he has held and enhanced since 1967. Although Berner’s career has been concentrated within a single institution, the academic environment has encouraged his research and writing; thus his publications, both as sole and as joint author, are numerous. They focus primarily on the application of archival principles to the arrangement and description of manuscript collections. He has a long and distinguished record of service in the Society of American Archivists, which was recognized in his being named a Society Fellow in 1975.

But, more importantly, he is of that generation of archivists who entered the profession as many of the pioneer contributors to Ameri-
can archival thought and practice were reaching the peak of their insights. The ten years between 1955 and 1965 were seminal in the codification of American archival principles and practices with Ruth Bordin and Robert Warner, Lester Cappon, Oliver W. Holmes, Lucile Kane, Ernst Posner, and Theodore R. Schellenberg all producing major publications for the guidance of the profession. From these authors Berner drew inspiration and a deep conviction that manuscripts had characteristics inherently similar to those of archives and, as such, should be managed by the same principles.\(^2\) His approach, bordering on the evangelical, has been to drive home this theme consistently in his publications. Though Berner's specific solutions to particular manuscript processing problems and his strong critiques of the practices of other professionals have made him a controversial figure, he speaks with admiration of the example set by Schellenberg.

Although there are weaknesses in his writings, he had fewer than other writers. Fortunately for the field Schellenberg shared his views in abundant detail. He did not avoid controversy, he courted it—and imparted this attitude to some others. Without it there probably would have been even less progress than we have seen.\(^3\) Clearly, Berner numbers himself among the "some others" who share Schellenberg's commitment to the forthright expression of ideas as essential to the intellectual health of the profession.

Having had a look at the credentials of the author, what of the product? Let us examine the focus of the book as set out by the author. Here the reader may need to alter expectations set by the book's title.

Berner begins by announcing on the first page that his book "is essentially a historical analysis, not a history of the field."\(^4\) However, he neglects to explain his concept of "a historical analysis," though there are early indications that Berner's analysis intends to introduce professional archivists to a more effective way of doing things.

On reading further, the frame of reference implied by the title also proves to be too broad. Although the work is entitled *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis*, the author announces that he has limited his attention to the evolution of principles of arrangement and description in the United States, excluding such major archival functions as preservation and reference and their supporting administrative, managerial, and informational activities and issues. Berner does not really explain his decision; rather he dismisses the need to consider these functions, contending that, in contrast to arrangement and description, which are "uniquely archival," "[a]ll else in the archival world, except
appraisal, is a matter of philosophy and attitude, or is part of a body of theory from another field."\(^5\) Subsequently, he also declines to treat appraisal because of "the primitive nature" of appraisal theory's development.\(^6\) While most would agree that the documentation of all aspects of archival work in the United States is far from complete, it is hard to accept these exclusions in a book bearing such a comprehensive title, particularly when Berner includes chapters on automated archival systems and archival education and training, neither of which could be remotely described as "uniquely archival."

The core element of Berner's analysis is his identification of two main strands in the development of archival arrangement and description in the United States. The first of these, the historical manuscripts tradition, evolved from the older and more established profession of librarianship, and had as its major characteristics a discrete item approach to manuscripts control, access based upon subject analysis of content, and a central card catalog as the finding aid. The second, the public archives tradition, adapted European archival practices to the American context, further expanded the scope of archival authority to embrace the management of current records, and developed the concept of hierarchical control to cope with mass quantities of records. The main finding aid created under the public archives approach was the inventory, which described types of records and their relationship to the work of the offices that created and/or maintained them.

The bulk of the book is a chronological exposition of the development and eventual intertwining of the two strands. Berner shows how, particularly after 1956, the historical manuscripts tradition accepted the validity of archival principles for managing collections of modern records, while the public archivists explored the standards and techniques developed by the manuscripts tradition in order to improve access to official records. The concluding chapters of the book, "Automated Archival Systems," "Archival Education and Training, 1937 to the Present," and "Hindsight, Foresight," review developments in their respective areas through 1979, but mainly serve to outline the author's views of what remains to be done to create a more effective and comprehensive system of archival controls in the United States: that is, to use the impetus of automation to eliminate the problem of "bifurcation" of finding aids; to complete the merger of selected principles from librarianship, archives administration, records management, history, and information science to form a coherent body of professional knowledge; and to develop a curriculum for the education of archivists at the post-graduate level.

Looking more closely at Berner's phases of development, we see that the first period, 1800-1936, was dominated by the efforts of state
historical societies and libraries to collect the papers of "great Americans," which they arranged topically, chronologically, and/or geographically and described as discrete items. Formal recognition of the organic nature of public records did not come until 1898, when frustration with the fragmentation caused by the manuscript library approach led the American Historical Association to form the Public Archives Commission as a companion to the recently established Historical Manuscripts Commission.

During this period, the Library of Congress became the arbiter of practice in the manuscript field; its *Notes on the Care, Cataloging, Calendaring, and Arranging of Manuscripts* (1913) was the first American codification of manuscript processing guidelines. Unfortunately, according to Berner, this pioneer work described the steps for processing artificial collections and thereby, institutionalized the practice of topical arrangement of manuscripts.7

For Berner, the second phase of archival development began in 1936 with the formation of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) and the anniversary of the first full year of operation for both the National Archives of the United States and the Historical Records Survey of the Works Progress Administration which provided a laboratory for the refinement of techniques suited to the management of large scale archival holdings. In the twenty years between 1936 and 1955, the public archival tradition, fueled by New Deal funding, gained strength as the staff of the National Archives codified and published handbooks of its principles and techniques, which were widely regarded as standards by government archives at all levels. The library field benefited from the cross-over of men like Luther Evans, Solon J. Buck, and Philip C. Brooks, who contributed their public archives perspectives to the Library of Congress' effort to design standards for the descriptive cataloging of manuscripts.8

The third period of development, 1956 to 1979, is, according to Berner, marked by a merging of the two traditions into a single body of practice, with the major accomplishment being the general acceptance of archival principles as applicable to the management of manuscript collections. In his chapter "Schellenberg and the Merging of the Public Archives and Historical Manuscripts Tradition, 1956-1979," Berner examines the influence of T. R. Schellenberg, who, by the mid-fifties, was recognized as the leading exponent of the public archives tradition. He contends that Schellenberg did not develop a comprehensive, archival approach to the management of modern manuscript collections, even though he was convinced that the concepts of the public archivist were valid for such materials. However, his clear statements of archival principles did inspire other leading practitioners from both strands to refine and express their own views on the subject.
While generally accepting major archival concepts, writers representing the historical manuscripts tradition also urged archivists to embrace relevant practices from librarianship to improve overall access to holdings, most particularly to provide researchers with comprehensive indexes. The effort to merge the two traditions is most recently exemplified by David B. Gracy II’s *Archives and Manuscripts: Arrangement and Description*, a work which Berner discusses in some detail.

Berner also takes a close look at examples of work which he feels demonstrate the persistence of the historical manuscripts tradition during this period of growing consensus, particularly the works of Robert S. Gordon and Kenneth W. Duckett. He continues to explain his view that both the *National Union Catalog of Manuscripts Collections (NUCMC)* and the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)*, versions 1 and 2, have failed to create the truly integrated, comprehensive finding aid system for manuscript materials that their creators intended. Rather, they have simply perpetuated the fragmentation of the historical manuscripts tradition.

The chapters on “Automated Archival Systems” and “Archival Education and Training, 1937 to the Present” are brief. Concentrating on efforts to automate finding aids, particularly on the genealogy and varieties of SPINDEX, the automation chapter is dated by its omission of developments after 1980. Thus the remarkable achievements of the inter-professional National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF), led by Richard Lytle and David Bearman, are missing. It also strikes one as odd that Richard Lytle’s experiment with the automated access system at the Baltimore Region Institutional Studies Center (BRISC) is not discussed here, rather than in the last part of Chapter 4 to which it bears little relation.

In his chapter on “Archival Education” Berner chronicles the failure of the archival profession in the United States to develop a curriculum of post-graduate study. Even after the founding of the National Archives in 1934 stimulated the beginnings of a formal education program, there continued to be too few jobs to justify more than a specialized course or two within the larger disciplines of librarianship and academic history. Cooperation was hampered by lack of consensus among practitioners as to the proper course of study and by inter-professional rivalries which polarized archivists, librarians, and historians into separate factions. Despite a flurry of interest during the late 1970s, there is yet to be a post-graduate degree program devoted exclusively to archives administration in the United States.

The concluding segment of the book proposes an agenda for action for the profession. Needed as a first step is a careful study of manual finding aid systems to determine what the profession needs and wants. Agreement on levels of description, on terminology, on
format, and on points of access through indexing are all required before one “buys” into an automated system, especially one designed around the needs of another discipline. As a corollary to this first item, Berner contends that archivists must become intimately involved with the management of current records. Early identification and protection of archives and attention to the development of standard terms and systems to facilitate access are essential and best accomplished by a team representing all interested parties. Finally, Berner maintains that the archivists must develop a high standard of professional training to equip themselves for this active and more powerful role as leaders of a team of information management decision makers. To meet the challenge of this task, archivists must look to the disciplines of information science, records management, history, and librarianship for content and to the best of its practitioners for instructors.¹⁴

Having completed our brief tour of the contents of Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis, let us now study the book with a critical eye, to identify its strengths and its weaknesses and assess the importance of its contribution to the literature of the archival profession.

One of the main strengths of the work, in my opinion, lies in Berner’s conceptualization of the two historical strands comprising the legacy of modern archival practice in the United States and his tracing of their intertwining through 1979. Though the lines of demarcation between the historical manuscripts and the public archives traditions are not always hard and firm, the author has developed a useful vehicle to advance his narrative and ideas. Berner is also to be complimented on the relationship among these early chapters, having organized them to highlight benchmarks in the publication of influential works that codified archival principles and practices. The challenges of creating a framework for any chronicle, especially an analytical one, are great. First, the writer must deal with the fact that the leading contributors to the field evolved their ideas, often over considerable periods of time. Also, in a profession that deals with unique materials, it is often difficult to discern patterns of influence or to attribute accomplishments accurately. Berner’s conceptual/chronological framework permits the reader to compare the published ideas of individuals at key intervals and, thereby, to identify a pattern of achievement. However, Berner’s approach also rests upon a large assumption. That is, if one did not formally present his/her ideas in a book or journal, one did not practice or even think them. It would be exceedingly interesting to compare the published ideas of those who contributed to the professional literature with the finding aids produced by their repositories to see whether or not the ideas were
operational or conceptual at the institutional level. Conversely, one should view a sample of finding aids created by non-published practitioners to determine if there were any significant differences. The old adage “do as I say, not as I do,” may be applicable here.

A third area of strength is the obvious depth of research required to produce a work of this scope. Berner has combed the published literature, including many long-out-of-print institutional reports and manuals. He has also made an effort to glean information from unpublished addresses whose importance is unquestionable in a field that draws the bulk of its literature from articles that were initially presented as papers before professional meetings.

Despite these accomplishments and the respect I hold for Berner’s extensive contributions to the profession, I found the book to be disappointing in both presentation and content. I was unable to understand why the book carries such an all-embracing title when its focus is clearly limited to a discussion of matters relating to arrangement and description. Whatever the reason for the misnomer, the result is that potential purchasers or readers are misled as to the nature of the work offered which does not reflect well upon either author or publisher.

Moving to a deeper examination of the book’s content, this reader’s expectations were again disappointed. In my opinion, the narrative does not sustain the standard of objectivity required of high quality historical work beyond its first three chapters, which describe the evolution of the great consensus that archival principles of arrangement and description were applicable to the management of modern manuscript collections. Thereafter, the book becomes more and more openly prescriptive, with Berner justifying and promoting his own concept of a comprehensive finding aid system that will offer researchers a single point of access to all holdings. Thus his accounts of developments from 1956 to 1979 are punctuated with examples of how his colleagues missed opportunities to develop or, later on, to adopt the unified approach of the Berner model. Whether they lacked insight, didn’t follow ideas through, or both, the result was the same—the perpetuation of what Berner terms a “bifurcated system,”

one in which catalogs exist co-equally with inventories, registers, shelf lists, and other finding aids. No attempt is made in such a system to use the catalog as an integrative tool by which the other finding aids would be cataloged, resulting in a single access point to the entire holdings.15

Unfortunately, Berner’s book itself is replete with examples of the “bifurcation” he so abhors. That is, it often fails to approach its content in a consistent, comprehensive, and integrated manner.
Structurally, the book is difficult to use. The text portion, which accounts for little more than half of the total pages, references twenty-three separate appendices comprising 20% of the book's content. The remaining 23% consists of a glossary, notes, and bibliography. Thus the reader is constantly switching back and forth from the text to the appendices to the notes in an effort to appreciate the full force of the author's arguments. Of the appendices, more than fifteen were either one-page or could have been abbreviated to a single page and included opposite their related text passages.

There are also instances when documents mentioned as worthy of note or adoption as models were not included in either text or appendices. These are the data collection form used by the WPA Historical Records Survey and the "model register" or inventory format developed prior to 1976 by the Finding Aids Committee of the Society of American Archivists.16

Despite the flaws previously mentioned, the book still had great potential value in another capacity—as a work comprising an updated, cohesive, and comprehensive presentation, in an historical context, of Richard Berner’s own views on arrangement and description systems for manuscript collections, as well as his agenda for action in the areas of interprofessional cooperation, automated access to original records, and suitable curricula for archival education. But, unfortunately, Berner has been unable to improve upon the ideas he expressed in his various journal articles and to consolidate them into a consistent, integrated work. The result is a narrative that tends to ramble and repeat itself, particularly in Chapters 4 through 8, and that offers no update on concepts expressed much earlier in Berner's career.17

What, then, can be said to assess the contribution of Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis to the literature of the profession? It is the first comprehensive effort to describe the evolution of principles and practices of arrangement and description in the United States, particularly as they are applied to manuscript collections. The book has unquestioned value, both as a retrospective analysis of this evolution and as an exposition of the views of Richard Berner, the most widely published and controversial writer on the subject, who has devoted more than twenty years of his career to studying arrangement and description and to promoting his concept of an integrated finding aids system.
This is not to say that I necessarily agree with the ideas, concepts, or conclusions reached by Berner or endorse his choice of structure or content; rather, I acknowledge that the book represents a major contribution to the literature, regardless its flaws. However, speaking as one of the besieged awaiting a full and objective history of archival endeavour in the United States, I am sorely disappointed that relief is still not in sight.

FOOTNOTES

5. Ibid., p. 5.
6. Ibid., p. 6.
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13. Ibid., pp. 100-110.
14. Ibid., pp. 111-123.
15. Ibid., p. 9.
17. Ibid. An example of this is Berner's discussion of aspects of automated access in Chapters 4, 6, and 8. See pp. 70-72, 85-99, and 113-115. The work of the very important National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) is mentioned only in the final chapter as a lengthy footnote compiled in collaboration with a student, Uli Haller.
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RICHARD BERNER’S RESPONSE

Well, I’ve met my match in combative tone in Ann Pederson’s review. She is not alone in expecting a broader treatment of what purports to be a general work on archival theory and practice, and I will not repeat what I wrote about this limitation (pp. 5-7) except to note that to have dealt with an appraisal would have been largely a recap of Maynard Brichford’s SAA manual and that doesn’t take us far. However, I do suggest that we look at records management as being, at heart, a system of appraisal (98-99, 117-119), a novel idea to which she pays no heed. If I were writing the book now instead of 1980 there would have been a systematic treatment of appraisal in light of Leonard Rapport’s “No Grandfather Clause”, Uli Haller’s “Appraisal in Context” (Provenance, Fall 1983) and some recent items on sampling. And I should have stated that evidential values are reflected better by provenance than by an original order that obscures records provenance.

The chapter on automated archival systems is justified because it is the data in manual finding aid systems that must be automated, and this has everything to do with “arrangement and description.” Originally, the BRISC program was part of that chapter, but Lytle thought it best to view it as a manual system and, on further examination, I agreed.

The chapter on education is relevant because it shows how archivists, librarians, and historians have thought about archival education and training and why our literature is so weak—only formal archival education will provide archivists with the intellectual corpus that distinguishes archivy from librarianship and relieve archivists from the pressure by historians to do ever more content analysis. That we are still trying to differentiate between the basic concepts of provenance and original order illustrates the point. The book attempts to perform this task.

Lacking in Pederson’s summary is reference to the catalytic role I portray for the changed nature of collection development in the manuscripts field; how this change to a concentration on organic/integral manuscripts of recent origin makes the Historical Manuscripts Tradition (HMT) largely irrelevant as a mode of intellectual control. That she finds nothing in chapters 4 through 8 that go...
beyond my earlier writings is disturbing because there are many extensions. So that others might not miss them, a brief but incomplete listing follows:

1. There should be a comprehensive controlled information source in inventory format for cataloging/indexing.

2. The complementary relationship between the “PM” and “CI” methods is fully portrayed for the first time, showing the inferential power of provenancial data when its context is preserved.

3. Appendices 3 through 21 are the first formal presentation of what control at different record levels means.

4. The Glossary contains novel extensions of definitions from the original AA glossary (1974) and some fresh terms/concepts are introduced, among them: original order, record levels, subject series, and integral records/papers. (One commentator privately thought the Glossary “worth the price of admission.”)

5. In order to give readers a better handle on the principle of provenance I coined the concept “every series has a parent.” In the relatively uncontrolled records environment of the U.S. the first step in arrangement is to group together all records of common parentage.

Her complaint about not examining unpublished finding aids and items I find simply contentious. Published finding aids were suitable and extracts from some appear for examination in Appendices 3-21.

I trust that other readers are more diligent in reading a book that is not easy going, even for the author. Incidentally, the complaint that I did not include any material written since 1980 is unfair because the book was accepted for publication in November 1980. But my updating footnotes on pp. 113-115 have more substance than is implied in her remarks.

In closing, Pederson's harsh review is what I expected more of, but have not received thus far. If it helps to sharpen our archival wits, more power to her; that was part of my intent.

Rich Berner

In 1977 then SAA President Robert Warner appointed a committee to study the question of institutional accreditation and archival standards. Two years later a written draft was presented to SAA Council, circulated, revised, and published in the SAA Newsletter in 1980. At this time the Committee became the SAA Task Force on Institutional Evaluation and the document was revised to a self-study and site visit questionnaire. The procedures were tested at six institutions, and then the final product was published by SAA.

This manual should be of interest and value to all archivists and all archives and manuscript repositories. It has two functions, one being a detailed guide for any institution to conduct a self-study of its operations and evaluate its strengths and weaknesses. The other function is to prepare the repository for an on-site visit by outside consultants who will evaluate the archives and submit a written report to the institution.

The publication is divided into three major sections, the first of which is on evaluative services. This unit is further broken down into several one- and two-page subdivisions which describe the purpose of a self-study or on-site visit and the procedures involved in conducting either form of institutional analysis. The Task Force stresses the fact that this process is designed as a positive means to determine the strengths and weaknesses of a program and then enable it to take action to strengthen those areas that require improvement.

The Task Force makes several points of interest to any institution preparing to conduct either an internal or external review of its operation. The need to make all interested individuals aware of the study and obtain their input is stressed. For a site visit the consultants wish to conduct confidential interviews with individuals at all levels involved with the operation of the repository. The manual also recommends that consultants be given a list of researchers they
can interview on a confidential basis. Finally, it is noted that this is a working visit and that evening social events should not be scheduled for the visitors.

The advantages of having outside reviewers is emphasized in the manual. Outside reviewers bring a neutral perspective that should enable them to observe the institution from a wider perspective and provide a more detached analysis than can be realized from a self-study. A potential corollary not mentioned in the manual is the possibility that the site review team can make inappropriate recommendations because of their unfamiliarity with the institution involved. Undoubtedly, the more candid and comprehensive the information sent to the site reviewers before their visit, which is emphasized by the Task Force, and the care the consultants take to prepare themselves for the visit, the less likelihood of such an unhappy situation occurring.

Within a month of the site visit a report is to be sent to the institution evaluated and to the SAA Task Force. The institution may do anything it wishes with the report, including publication if it so desires. The repository is also guaranteed that the report sent to the Task Force will be kept confidential and that the site visitors are bound by confidentiality. Success of the site visitation program is dependent upon the consultants and the Task Force maintaining their confidentiality and this has been recognized. The Task Force has outlined procedures that should be followed in the event an institution believes confidentiality has been broken.

The second section of the manual briefly discusses the Principles of Institutional Evaluation that would be used in a self-study or on-site review. These include legal and governing authority, staff, financial resources and physical facilities, collecting policy, preservation, arrangement and description, access, and outreach programs.

The third section of the manual, which is almost half the publication, is the Guide to Self Study. This part takes each of the principles in the above section and lists two sets of questions which are divided into factual and self-study questions.

This is an excellent little manual that should be on the shelf of every archive and manuscript repository, regardless of its size. Even if there is no intention of having a self-study or an on-site evaluation of the institution in the foreseeable future, a careful reading of the manual will be of lasting value.

Frederick L. Honhart
Michigan State University

This welcome publication records the fates of the papers of the nearly 1,700 former U.S. senators to 1982. One or more entries for each senator tell varied tales of destruction, disappearance, deposit in archives, and sequestration by family. The Senate Historical Office labored seven years gleening this information from NUCMC, published biographies, reports from researchers, repository and collection guides, and a repository survey.

The guide, the first in a projected series of publications marking the Senate's bicentennial, is a boon to researchers and archivists. It brings together collections scattered among some 350 public institutions and frequently notes oral histories and visual records as well as papers. A casual sampling of entries showed that a significant portion of the materials are unreported in NUCMC. Of equal importance, the guide gives fair warning of lost papers, and there are such warnings in abundance.

Collection entries are uneven and mostly minimal, e.g. "1838-1870, 9 containers," although many are much more complete. This is a predictable consequence of the uneven responsiveness of the surveyed institutions, but it is really of secondary importance. Researchers can make reasonable and usually correct inferences about a senator's papers. The critical need is to tell researchers where to write, not spare them having to write. Appendices conveniently group collections by repository and provide basic data on each state's Senate delegations.

Although every guide suffers omissions, this one does require a special caveat. The editors decided, defensibly enough, to include even the very smallest senatorial collections of single item each. This became, willy-nilly it seems, a practice of including every reported mention of any senatorial item, no matter in what collection. Thus there are frequent entries such as "six letters in various collections" and occasional ones such as "mentioned in oral history with . . ." But the volume of historical material about and from senators is truly unreportable and was in fact unreported.

While single items are tallied everywhere, there is no mention of the more than 15,000 feet of Senate records in the National Archives. Nor is there any mention of the millions of pages, now in presidential libraries, amassed by White House aides whose sole function was Senate liaison. Any archives, collecting modern political papers
will find numerous omissions if the criterion is all material about and from senators.

Two specific omissions prompt another concern. The omissions are the presidential materials of former Senator Richard Nixon and the major collection of secretary of state papers of John Foster Dulles, another former senator. The concern is that many other exclusively pre- and post-senatorial collections may have been unreported because of misinterpretation of survey parameters or the vagaries of description systems. To be sure, many such collections were reported.

Finally, the briefest reading makes clear the vast carnage wrought on senatorial papers by man and nature, by intent and accident. This reviewer's examination of nearly one hundred instances of virtually total disappearance of papers, however, revealed that only eight were post-World War II. Of these eight senators, four had a combined Senate career of merely ten months. True, a modern political collection is a behemoth that is hard to destroy totally, though it does happen. But intelligent records management has replaced fear of fire, vermin, and flood as the order of the day. The John McClellan Papers at Ouachita Baptist University apparently exceed in bulk all National Archives Senate records, 1789-1981. In thanking the Senate Historical Office for this valuable guide, we should thank it again for its valuable work in records management as well.

David A. Horrocks
Gerald R. Ford Library


The Society of American Archivists has long been a proponent of professional education. At the same time, however, it has recognized a basic fact of archival life—many practitioners never have had, and never will have, formal classroom training. In response to this lack, the Society for many years has sponsored workshops on basic archival administration, as well as on such specialties as conservation and business archives. In addition, numerous archival agencies have presented their own workshops for local groups or their own staffs. Now, with Thomas C. Pardo's Basic Archival Workshops: A Handbook for the Workshop Organizer, SAA has published guidelines for
planning and executing a basic archival workshop. The handbook is another in SAA's ongoing series of basic manuals designed to acquaint novices with archival theory and practice.

The manual is well-balanced. More than half its space deals with planning the workshop, for Pardo stresses that planning is crucial to success. First, a decision must be reached on whether a workshop is in fact the most appropriate forum for disseminating the information. Standards for selecting both personnel and participants must be established and a budget developed. The workshop must be advertised, and local arrangements made. Pardo shows how pitfalls can be avoided through careful scheduling, by allowing enough time to accomplish each step. He warns against common mistakes—attempting to compress a four-day workshop into two, for example, will diminish its effectiveness and lose the audience. He also stresses the importance of social interaction at meals and receptions. The workshop period is an intense time for all involved.

Part II discusses the workshop itself. It is an experience in adult education, as Pardo emphasizes throughout the manual, and as such attracts a group of people who are there to learn something. They want to participate in the learning experience. Lectures are not enough. If properly chosen, those attending the workshop are involved in archival work, and have a true need for the workshop. Group discussions, role playing, demonstrations, and the possibility of hands-on experience are important elements of the successful workshop. Participants want to be able to ask questions when appropriate, and to receive help on specific problems confronting them. They also anticipate taking something concrete away with them, in the form of handouts, reading lists, and information about persons and places to contact for help. Instructors must also be carefully chosen. In addition to presenting sessions, they must be prepared to mingle with participants at social gatherings and to offer help with specific problems on a one-on-one level.

Part III discusses the value of and need for evaluations of the workshop by both participants and instructors. Pardo recommends constructing an evaluation questionnaire to elicit information which will be useful in planning future workshops. He urges that the entire workshop experience be evaluated—sessions, social activities, and arrangements such as lodging and meals.

The manual ends with suggestions for further reading which include books and articles in both adult education and archival subjects, and with a listing of audiovisual programs available for sale, rent, and loan which can be incorporated into a workshop.

While Pardo's objective is to show how to plan and execute a basic archival workshop, a second virtue of the manual is that it can be used in preparing for other events as well. Planning is essential to
the success of other types of workshops, conferences, and symposia. The same problems have to be considered and similar arrangements made. Thus, the manual can serve as the starting point in planning almost any successful professional meeting.

Nancy Lankford
Western Historical Manuscript Collection-Columbia


The relatively small but rapidly expanding community of business archivists has been quite active in developing guidelines and generating publications for its constituents. Within the past ten years, business archivists have been working actively with allied professionals in records management, information services, and museum administration to confront many of the challenging issues of the much-heralded "Information Age." Yet, during this same period, the growth of business archives throughout the United States has prompted its practitioners to evaluate basic archival procedures in the context of the corporate environment. The need for useful sources of information to assist business archivists in these times of change is critical. With Karen Benedict's excellent bibliography, business archivists now have a resource that will gain them entry to numerous publications.

Relying upon a team of 18 annotators from the SAA Business Archives Section, Benedict has produced a bibliography which, in her words, will "provide a useful and current guide to the literature in the fields of business archives and records management." The bibliography contains references to 421 articles and 18 books, virtually all of which are accompanied by annotations. Within each type of publication, the citations are arranged in alphabetical order by author and are assigned a control number for indexing purposes. Additional information can also be obtained through the use of author, title, and subject indices.

In her introduction, Benedict explains the scope, selection criteria, organization, domain, information fields, and bibliographic units of the bibliography. As one might expect from such a prodigious work, the scope of this bibliography is wide-ranging. The basic archival functions of appraisal, arrangement, description, and conservation are covered as well as the establishment of records
management programs and business archives. An interesting aspect of the bibliography is its treatment of foreign repositories, such as the Canadian National Railway, and the use of citations, from English-language foreign periodicals, like *Archives and Manuscripts* from Australia and *Archives* from Great Britain. More specialized subjects are also given careful examination by Benedict and her annotators. Among the issues cited in this work are the uses of records for business purposes, business history, cost benefits of records programs, equipment and supplies, scheduling records for retention or disposal, forms design and control, automation, legal requirements for records retention, records centers, vital records protection, and filing techniques.

Even though she has provided the user with a variety of sources covering many topics, Benedict has been very careful to confine her selections to the business archives and records management fields. It is very tempting to develop a bibliography that duplicates other bibliographic efforts and thus includes everything but the kitchen sink. In an effort to achieve comprehensiveness, bibliographers are prone to lose sight of their audience and cite many unrelated works in their compilations. Benedict has avoided this problem skillfully. She addresses the important need of business archivists for references pertaining to the basic archival functions and provides specialists with sources that are relevant to specific aspects of their work.

Another attribute of this publication is the sense of balance achieved with the various subjects. The bibliography is not weighted down with an overwhelming number of citations in one or two subject areas, but rather is designed to give the user a sufficient overview of the sources available for many topics. Whether it be references on vital records protection, appraisal strategies, or any other subject, Benedict’s work will clearly enable the user to locate publications that will facilitate research.

Like guides to manuscript collections, a bibliography is only as good as its latest edition. Benedict and the SAA Business Archives Section are very aware of this problem and are taking steps to provide updates to this fine bibliography. It is hoped that the SAA will support this endeavor and make future editions available for sale through its publications service.

This bibliography is undoubtedly an important contribution to business archives and records management. If affirms the growth and development of this field. More importantly, the bibliography gives the business archivist and records manager a reference tool that will prove to be quite useful. To this end, Karen Benedict and her co-workers are to be commended.

Thomas C. Pardo
Standard Oil Company (Indiana)
It is at once difficult and rewarding to review the product of an endeavor in which one played a role, albeit many years ago. The product is *Social Action Collections at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin: A Guide* and the endeavor was the process of assembling these collections.

Any historian interested in probing American socialism and radicalism and the various activist movements of the 1960s, especially the anti-Vietnam war movement and the civil rights movement, must plan on spending some time in Madison, Wisconsin, mining the incredible lode of papers, records, and printed and audio visual materials documenting these movements that comprises the State Historical Society of Wisconsin's social action collection. It would not be exaggerated to state that the Society's holdings pertaining to American movements for social, economic, and political change constitute the single most extensive and important body of such documentation in the United States.

The appearance, then, of the *Guide* to these holdings, compiled by Menzi L. Behrnd-Klodt and Carolyn J. Mattern, is particularly significant. In a 158 page, 8½ by 11 format, the *Guide* provides access to 454 collections ranging in scope from the 55 box collection of the records of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) to a photocopy of the notebook of Dion Diamond, a civil rights activist jailed in East Baton Rouge, Louisiana in 1962. The *Guide's* entries are arranged alphabetically by collection title. Each entry usually includes such standard information as the collection's title, vital and span dates, amount in both cubic feet and number of boxes, name of the donor and the date of donation, and a narrative description of the contents of the collection. Other pertinent information is also given including terms, if any, of restricted access and whether the collection is available on microfilm. Unpublished finding aids are available for all processed collections. The final entry is a list of an additional 133 related collections held by the Society that were unorganized as the *Guide* went to press. A 50-page comprehensive index provides subject, title, and name access to the entries.

The entries are preceded by an excellent introductory essay by Sarah Cooper, who played a key role in collecting most of the more recently acquired collections. The essay places the collections in historical context and provides an account of the origins and evolution of the collection as a whole. As Ms. Cooper notes, the terms social action, social activism, and the "movement" are all rather
amorphous. Perhaps the unifying theme that ties these collections together was the commitment on the part of their creators to the struggle in one form or another for social, economic, and political justice.

The most notable individual collections are far too numerous to recount here. Representative among them, however, are the records of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and its local affiliates, the papers of Dalton Trumbo and other members of the “Hollywood Ten” who were blacklisted for their political views during the McCarthy period, and the papers of Carl Braden, the renowned civil rights activist and socialist. The collections also include the records of virtually all of the major national anti-Vietnam war organizations and many local organizations. As one might expect, the various “movement” organizations in Madison are especially well documented.

The strengths of this Guide are many; its faults few. Its terminology could be more precise. Records of organizations should be designated as records rather than papers. The acronym for the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador should be CISPES rather than CISPUS. The records of the major newspaper on the American left, the Guardian (formerly the National Guardian), for some reason were not listed in the Guide. On the whole, however, this Guide is superb. It should be considered as a major enhancement to scholars concerned with twentieth century American social movements, as a key to what is genuinely a national treasure, and as a rich source of information both for those who participated in the struggles that occasioned the creation of the documentation that it describes and for their successors who must carry on present and future struggles. The State Historical Society and its dedicated staff who gathered these collections over the past quarter-century and who produced this Guide, with generous support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, ought to be proud of their efforts and of the Guide. Their efforts are indeed worthy of their legendary predecessor, Lyman Copeland Draper, for the collections described in the Guide will serve to illuminate a critical period in twentieth-century American history, much as Draper’s collecting activities helped us to comprehend the trans-Appalachian frontier society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Patrick M. Quinn
Northwestern University

The Midwest China Center was established in 1975 to promote greater awareness and knowledge of the Chinese people and their culture. As a major repository of related oral history interviews, archival records, and museum artifacts, the Center seeks to accomplish this goal in several ways. It provides a number of reference services, encourages further research and study, and endeavors to bring many regional, national, and international China-oriented programs into contact with each other.

While writing her thesis at the University of Minnesota in 1976, Jane Baker Koons (now the Project Director) did oral history interviews with people who lived and worked in China prior to 1952. The narrators of those interviews indicated that there were many other people in the St. Paul area as well as in the Midwestern U.S. who had also lived and worked there. Since further research indicated that a valuable legacy was soon to be lost because no one else was working in this area, the decision was made to begin a formal oral history project. Six and a half years later, 112 narrators had been interviewed, 460 hours of recordings had been made, and more than 10,000 pages of narrative were transcribed. In addition, artifacts and related records were received to such a degree that it became necessary to establish an archives and museum to support the oral history program.

Each phase of the oral history program was carefully thought out and planned. A trial run of the program was carried out as a feasibility study. Possible narrators were combined into a central name file. An evaluation process was then initiated to determine the most valuable narrators. This process considered factors such as institutional sponsorship, vocation, geographic location, length of time in China, period when in China, and involvements after leaving. Narrators were then selected with the goal of creating a balanced view of life in China prior to 1952. Midwestern Americans were targeted because of their traditional closeness with the Chinese people. The interviews were essentially biographical in nature though standard questions were frequently included.

The program's goal of creating a balanced view of life in China prior to 1952 has been successfully achieved. Among the 112 narrators are missionaries, teachers, doctors, nurses, relief workers, diplomats, agriculturalists, military personnel, and business persons. During their years in China, they collectively witnessed events such as the fall of imperial rule, the collapse of constitutionalism, warlord fragmentation, the rise of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists,
the Japanese invasion, and the Chinese civil war. These interviews will be a very valuable resource to all students of this momentous era in Chinese history.

While the oral history program itself was very well-planned and implemented, the Guide has two basic weaknesses which could pose some problems for researchers. First, they will have to work with 112 abstracts of interviews which essentially list topics in the order in which the narrator mentions them. After reading the abstracts, it is difficult to sort out the many topics of discussion. The inclusion of a comprehensive index would have avoided this problem. Second, even though the names of narrators are visibly identified in each abstract, they tend to remain somewhat anonymous. The inclusion of photographs with each abstract would have been very helpful.

The patient researcher will undoubtedly find much of merit in this oral history collection. It should also be mentioned that the Center is currently conducting an oral history project with twenty-five Jews who escaped from Nazi Germany and lived in China for the duration of the war. It will be published as a supplement to the Guide. Both projects are imminently important.

H. Douglas Wright Jr.
Sacred Heart Fathers & Brothers
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