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ABSTRACT: 3-D modeling and printing within the archives setting offer new tools for archivists to interpret collections and provide innovative avenues of outreach to many types of audiences. This article explores the recent initiative to invigorate architectural records collections at Ball State University’s Drawings + Documents Archive using rapid prototyping skills already employed by students in the College of Architecture and Planning. Transforming the information on nineteenth-century drawings using twenty-first-century technology creates a new level of interest and engagement in the archival collections among students, faculty, researchers, and casual visitors.

Introduction

While the substantial hurdles of 3-D printing are difficult to overcome—such as the equipment costs for high-quality printers and printing materials, as well as the time and technological skills required—it is possible for many archives to approach 3-D printing on a modest budget and garner big results. Such is the case at the Drawings + Documents Archive at Ball State University, where staff recently completed a pilot project to reproduce a three-dimensional model of a building and many of its details from original architectural drawings from the late nineteenth century. The project is called Indiana Architecture X 3D (IAX3D), and it was made possible through key
partners at the University Libraries, the College of Architecture and Planning, and the Department of Architecture who graciously allowed access to expensive printers, graduate assistants with the knowledge to produce 3-D models, and an online platform to make the information available worldwide. These partnerships allowed the archives staff to pursue this project on a budget of less than $300.

While the 3-D prints based on the collections are compelling products and contemporary artifacts in their own right, it should be made clear that the main emphasis throughout the project has been on the original archival drawings. The intention of the project was never to supplant the drawings, but to support them and generate a new level of interest among patrons. The prints serve as outreach tools to enhance and add value to the original drawings largely because they engage and inspire our students and other researchers to learn more about the buildings and the ideas they represent. In addition to the physical 3-D prints available in the archives, the University Libraries’ Digital Media Repository hosts an online collection of 3-D renderings of each piece that are easy to manipulate with a computer mouse, as well as 3-D print files available for download for patrons to print on their own printers.

The Drawings + Documents Archive

The Drawings + Documents Archive, physically located in the Ball State University College of Architecture and Planning, collects records documenting architecture, landscape architecture, historic preservation, and urban planning from sites and structures throughout the state of Indiana. These records include architectural working drawings, presentation drawings, landscape plans, project files, photographs, specification books, trade catalogs, and models. The primary patrons within the university community are undergraduate and graduate students in architecture, landscape architecture, historic preservation, and urban planning, as well as faculty and alumni. The collection also draws many patrons from outside the university, including architects, landscape architects, home owners, historians, and historic preservationists in the state of Indiana.

Both general introductory sessions and specific embedded classroom projects facilitate use of the archives’ resources by College of Architecture and Planning undergraduate- and graduate-level students. In the introductory sessions, students are shown a rotating selection of the archives’ “greatest hits.” These are beautiful, full-color presentation boards and construction drawings skillfully hand drawn on paper or linen drafting cloth by some of the greatest Indiana architects of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For a few moments, museum-quality drawings lie before the students, ready and waiting for close examination and discussion. However, it became obvious during these introductory sessions that some students had difficulty connecting with the drawings and often appeared indifferent to them, despite their obviously keen interest in the built environment.

Certainly not every student seemed disconnected during archives sessions, but the number of uninterested students was significant enough to notice. These students lingered at the back of the group and had a difficult time tearing themselves away from their smart phones. One student even brazenly left her earbuds in with the music loud
enough for others to hear, and another sent text messages a few feet from the archivist leading the session. These students clearly belonged to a section of the student population that couldn’t be reached by further explanation about the importance of the drawings or by pointing out examples of skillful line drawing. As with many students in the college, these students generally tended to be creative, visual learners comfortable with technology. They may have little to no experience in drawing by hand or reading construction drawings at the time they come to the archives. For students whose creativity is largely expressed in a digital format, perhaps the drawings seemed to them to be what many archivists fear—old, quaint, and irrelevant. With each introductory session, it became increasingly apparent that we needed to find a better way for these students to connect with the drawings in the collection.

All undergraduate students in the College of Architecture and Planning begin their education with a shared first-year program before they choose whether to go into architecture, landscape architecture, or planning. During this first year, they are exposed to all the disciplines in the college and taught how to draw and perceive space. It is their only year dedicated to the fundamentals of drawing and sketching. Computer-aided design and drafting (CAD) comes later, in their discipline-specific courses, and then drawing quickly figures less prominently in their coursework. Some students discontinue drawing altogether at this point, while others who enjoy it and have honed their skills continue to add some hand drawings into their presentations. However, most student work at this point is digital. Students are required to become proficient in CAD programs such as Rhino, Revit, and Illustrator, and also in using the fabrication lab equipment, such as the 3-D printer, the router, and now even robots, to create rapid prototypes of their CAD designs. The computer programs and technological tools are clearly vital to their academic success, as well as their future careers, so it is fairly easy to construe how students without an inherent interest in history might not see the value in visiting the archives.

“Meet Them Where They Are”

The teaching philosophy of “meet them where they are” applies to a wide range of issues outside of the archives, but it also resonates when working with many different kinds of archives patrons. For those unfamiliar with this philosophy, it simply means what it says: discover the patron’s abilities and knowledge as it relates to the topic and work from his or her current base of knowledge. Some patrons may be familiar with archival research and embrace the process; others may have just walked into their first archives and have no idea where to begin. Just as a French language teacher can’t expect her students to speak fluently without first learning vocabulary words and sentence construction, archivists can’t expect patrons to be literate in primary sources without learning the basics. The reference interview is the opportunity for an archivist to assess the research inquiry and the patron’s comfort level with archival research. Once that has been ascertained, the archivist decides whether to send the patron off to begin the search for records or to educate him or her through each step of the process. It’s
certainly not a new philosophy or one limited to the fields of archives or librarianship, but it is an effective way to provide reference.

Applying the same philosophy of “meet them where they are” to undergraduate and graduate students in the design fields involved taking a closer look at their course curricula, attending class juries and presentations, and talking with the faculty across the disciplines. To help make the archives’ collections more relevant to a larger percentage of these students, it became clear we should use the same technologies they currently use or aspire to use. With all of the capabilities and buzz surrounding 3-D printing, it seemed like a natural tool to use to interpret historical drawings. The only barriers in the way were not having the requisite technological skills, time, or a large budget.

The barriers seemed insurmountable until the archives received its first graduate assistant from the Architecture Department. Austin Pontius, a first-year graduate student in architecture who had just earned his bachelor’s degree in architecture at Ball State University, received his assignment to work in the archives in the fall of 2013. He brought with him the technological skills necessary to do the work and, at an assignment of 20 hours per week of work in the archives, he also had the time to do it. Pontius was scheduled to leave for an internship in the spring semester, but another architecture graduate assistant, Chris Hinders, would take his place. The budget, while important, became a minor issue because the college owned a 3-D printer and planned to charge the archives only for the cost of materials used to make each print. While the archives was able to use the college’s $30,000 printer, the 3-D prints ultimately cost the archives a mere $13 to $25 each. We then had two semesters worth of skills, time, and funds to begin our first project. Now staff needed to choose the first set of drawings to prototype out of the thousands of drawings in the collection.

Selection turned out to be the easiest part of this endeavor. One set of drawings that often finds its way into class sessions is the beautiful collection of Wyisor Grand Opera House drawings. Built in 1891, this impressive Romanesque Revival theater exemplified the architectural exuberance of gas boom–era Muncie, Indiana, where Ball State University is located. The city grew dramatically after the Ball Brothers Company, responsible for the iconic glass canning jars still used today, was lured to Muncie in 1887 to take advantage of an abundance of natural gas in the area. Other manufacturers followed, and Muncie quickly became a prosperous, fashionable city in the middle of a building boom.

Facing page: This Wyisor Grand Opera House detail sheet, 1891, displays an artistry rarely seen in modern drawings. Kibele and Garrard Architectural Drawings, Drawings + Documents Archive, Ball State University.
Of all the extraordinary buildings built in the city during this time, the Wysor Grand Opera House was considered one of the finest. Located in the heart of downtown, this stately, three-story opera house featured a prominent limestone arch and columns along the front brick façade and intricate wrought iron details throughout the interior and along the exterior porticos. Commercial store spaces flanked each side of the impressive entrance to the theater.

The Wysor Grand Opera House provided an extraordinary venue that attracted a wide variety of entertainment to Muncie from its dedication in 1892, when it opened with Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. Harry Houdini, Pavlova, Al Jolson, Sophie Tucker, and John Philip Sousa all graced the Wysor’s stage at some point. Owners of the Wysor Grand Opera House adapted to the twentieth century by converting it to a motion picture theater in the 1920s. However, the later popularity of the multiplex theater on the outskirts of town and the demand for convenient downtown parking led to the building’s demolition in 1963 to create a parking lot. Its fortunes and ultimate fall parallel the boom-and-bust periods of the city, a former factory town in the Rust Belt. Given the building’s interesting history and the opportunities it affords to discuss numerous architectural, cultural, and social issues related to the disciplines in the college, it seemed like the ideal candidate for the inaugural 3-D printing project.

The drawings themselves are extraordinary examples of architectural drawings from the late nineteenth century. Drawn by architect Harry W. Matson, who was well known for his many hours spent working at the drafting table, the drawings display an artistry rarely seen in modern architectural renderings. Matson was based in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and designed numerous opera houses across Indiana, but the Wysor Grand Opera House was his last and likely greatest creation.

**Building the 3-D Models**

To begin the process of making 3-D prints, the original drawings were first scanned as TIFF files with a resolution of 300 pixels per inch in 24-bit color. The University Libraries uses the Colortrac SmartLF Gx+ T56, which is a roll scanner that physically moves an item through the scanner. It can accommodate drawings up to 42 inches wide of virtually endless length. The size makes this type of scanner desirable for scanning construction plans, but the drawings must be shielded from the friction caused by their movement through the scanner. A long sheet of six mil polyester can be folded in half to create an envelope that effectively surrounds a drawing as it moves through the process, thereby ensuring its safety.

The scans were then imported into the design program Rhino and used to create an image underlay and baseline. Rhino is a computer program well known to architecture students, including the graduate assistants working on the project, so their only learning curve was in perfecting their techniques for some of the complicated shapes and intricate details of the Wysor Grand Opera House.
In Rhino, the image in the underlay was traced, which created vector lines needed to create volumes and surfaces to give it three dimensions.\(^\text{17}\) The online guides *Preparing Rhino Files for 3D Printing* and *ZCorp Architecture Design Guide*, the latter written specifically for the printer used, were particularly helpful when troubleshooting unexpected glitches with the files.\(^\text{18}\)

*These screen captures were taken during the process of creating the 3-D models in Rhino. Images by Austin Pontius.*

In Rhino, the image in the underlay was traced, which created vector lines needed to create volumes and surfaces to give it three dimensions.\(^\text{17}\) The online guides *Preparing Rhino Files for 3D Printing* and *ZCorp Architecture Design Guide*, the latter written specifically for the printer used, were particularly helpful when troubleshooting unexpected glitches with the files.\(^\text{18}\)

*This screenshot shows the west façade being built in Rhino, with original drawing on the right for comparison. Image by Chris Hinders.*
After completion, the working file (3DM) created in Rhino was converted to a stereo-lithography file (STL), a standard file format for rapid prototyping. This file format creates a mesh layer over the object, which must be solid with no open or unconnected seams. If any raw edges are present, they must be fixed before the object can be printed. In essence, the model must be considered “watertight.”

Different types of 3-D printers and kinds of materials are used to create 3-D prints. Some printers extrude plastic or resin to create shapes, and others build the print layer by layer. Still others print metal, acrylic, and glass; not to mention the important work being done in the medical fields with biocompatible materials. The College of Architecture and Planning’s ProJet 450 printer by Z Corporation builds an object by layering a proprietary composite powder called VisiJet® PXL, which is approximately 85 percent calcium sulfate hemihydrate (commonly referred to as gypsum or plaster of Paris), at a vertical build speed of .9 inch per hour. This powder can have color added to it via a color toner cartridge, but we chose to print in white to highlight the form of each object without the distraction of color. The print bed volume is 8 x 10 x 8 inches, which means no single print can be larger than that size. Numerous smaller projects can be printed at the same time, up to the volume of the build bed. The printing process is fairly lengthy, depending on the size of the object and whether other objects are being printed at the same time. Our typical workflow allows us to run the prints overnight, and they are ready for excavation the next day.

The finished build bed appears to be a smooth tray of powder, much like fresh snow on an empty field. Excavating the objects from the build bed involves using large brushes and a suction tube to remove unused powder from the solid objects. The base platform for the build bed can be raised and lowered to accommodate powder removal from around the objects so that they can be safely moved. At this stage, the goal is to remove large sections of powder in the negative space created by the use of the powder. The unused powder is recycled back into the printer for future use.

The final traces of powder are removed during the postprocessing phase. Photo by Austin Pontius.
Within the printer, but separate from the build chamber where the print is made, is the postprocessing unit for final and complete powder removal. Once the majority of powder has been removed from the surface of the print in the build bed, it is moved to the postprocessing unit.\textsuperscript{23} This area has a perforated floor and a small air hose to gently blast away the final lingering traces of powder. In addition to the compressed air, smaller brushes are also used to dislodge stubborn powder. For safety, a glass hood over the work area protects the operator against breathing fine powder particles; one manipulates the piece via arm holes in the glass. Throughout this process, the print is rather delicate until the final step to harden it.

The lab uses two methods for hardening, although there are others.\textsuperscript{24} One choice is to use a hot wax–dipping process that works well on simple designs but tends to obscure some of the fine details, and the other is a propriety resin called StrengthMax produced by Z Corporation, the maker of the printer.\textsuperscript{25} Students typically use the hot wax method because it is more economical; however, the archives staff prefer StrengthMax for its durability and unobtrusive finish.\textsuperscript{26} While the wax tends to remain on the surface of the print, StrengthMax penetrates the print more effectively. The print is fully dipped into the resin and removed after a few seconds. Goggles and gloves are worn for safety during this stage of the process. The print is then placed on parchment paper to dry for a few hours. After it dries completely, it can be handled normally.

At this stage, the 3-D prints are treated nearly like any other item in the collection. They are cataloged, secured in appropriate archival housing, and utilized in class sessions. The prints are stored much like small models or other objects in the collection, in oversize archival boxes with sheets of foam padding underneath and individually cut foam padding for each print to prevent contact with the other prints in the box. However, they have the distinct difference of being replicable, unlike anything else in the collection. While touching the 1891 ink-on-linen drawings is not encouraged in the class session, handling of the 3-D prints is absolutely encouraged. The prints can also be taken outside of the archives for presentations. These particular prints traveled to Kansas City for a presentation at the 2014 Midwest Archives Conference (MAC), a trip they would not have taken if they were irreplaceable objects.

Creating a Web Portal

The leader in providing 3-D file content is the Smithsonian Museum and its Smithsonian X 3D (SIx3D) initiative that supports all 19 museums, 9 research centers, and the National Zoo.\textsuperscript{27} The project is still in its beta phase, but it has already produced downloadable 3-D print files of Abraham Lincoln’s life mask from the National Portrait Gallery as well as a graceful \textit{Embreea} orchid from the Smithsonian Gardens. For scans that are too large to print, such as the Liang Bua Cave laser scans, the site offers high resolution, 3-D model image downloads. Staff at the Drawings + Documents Archive became aware of SIx3D after the Wysor Grand Opera House modeling project was well underway and decided to model elements of the project after it, including the name.

Smithsonian X 3D has its own separate website with tours, downloads, and pages for educators to utilize in conjunction with the 3-D prints. The project also has a
$350,000 annual budget and corporate sponsors, and it intends to raise $15 million to build a new innovation center on the National Mall. Clearly this is well above the average archives’ budget and dramatically surpasses the Drawings + Documents Archive’s minimal budget for this project. Using SIx3D as a model, we still needed to use workflows already in place without buying additional equipment or programs.

Ball State University Libraries uses CONTENTdm management software for all of the online collections in the institution’s Digital Media Repository. To streamline access to content in a platform already familiar to our patrons, we needed to use CONTENTdm for IAX3D too. The scope of the collection and working with 3DM and OBJ file types were unfamiliar territory for most in the University Libraries’ Metadata and Digital Initiatives and Library Information Technology Services Departments; however, everyone’s enthusiasm for the project soon led to results.

The three main components of the online IAX3D collection items are the print-ready files that can be downloaded directly from the site, the 3-D image that can be manipulated with the click of the mouse, and the still image of the original Wysor Grand Opera House drawing for comparison. The latter is a straight-forward JPG file, already available in the Kibele and Garrard Architectural Records online collection. The downloadable print-ready files are 3DM files stored in an online share designated for the project. They appear as a link within the metadata field titled “3-D Print-Ready File (.3dm)” at the top of the metadata fields. These 3DM files are useful for people who are planning to print the file on a 3-D printer, but the average user will not have the correct software needed to view these files. Therefore, it was vital to include a file type accessible enough for most people to view the 3-D object. Under the guidance of Robert Seaton, the University Libraries’ emerging technologies analyst, we saved the 3DM files as OBJ files and embedded them in the viewing area using a Javascript called three.js. This file format supports 3-D graphics and can be opened with updated versions of Internet Explorer, Chrome, and Firefox, making it accessible to most users. For performance and security purposes, OBJ files are hosted on a separate server and only include the viewer as an iframe in the CONTENTdm page. These files allow the viewer to enlarge the graphic, rotate it 360 degrees, and move it to best fit the screen, all with the click of the computer mouse. The end result is a new type of content in a digital collection format already utilized by our audience and staff.

**Archival Preservation**

Archiving the 3-D model file formats brings up issues common to archivists managing other born-digital materials, but particularly architectural collections of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Currently, the archives’ print-ready files are being stored as 3DM files on the Digital Media Repository server and the archives’ server, but we are exploring the idea of converting files to an interchangeable and easily preserved format for future storage. At this stage, there are options, such as PDF/e, U3D, STEP, and E57, although there is no clear answer or published standard for architectural archives, and digital preservation archivists continue to search for solutions.
Outreach

The heart of this project lies in the interest it generates from students, faculty, and other researchers. From the dean of the college to a first-year undergraduate, the physical re-creation of a long-lost building combined with the novelty of 3-D printing elicit an enthusiasm not typically seen for archival materials. The fact that these drawings and subsequent prints are more detailed than anything the students tend to produce also adds to their allure.

And what about the students who have a difficult time connecting with the drawings? The ones who lingered in the back of the class and didn’t think the archivist noticed they were on their phones are the same ones who now put their phones in their pockets and sidle up to the table as soon as the archivist brings out the 3-D prints. They understand and value the work involved in creating the 3-D models and that appreciation then tends to extend to the drawings themselves. Students pick up the models, marvel at details such as the thin arc of the gas lamp on the staircase or the intricacies of the wrought iron decoration on the column. Then they match the 3-D prints to their 2-D counterparts to check on the accuracy of the print compared to the drawings.

They also ask questions and pass the prints among themselves, generating discussions ranging from how they were made to bigger issues of architectural design, preservation, and urban planning. The students quickly want to learn more about the building. They become invested in the structure, which is important when bringing up issues of historic preservation and adaptive reuse, and they are saddened to discover that the building has been torn down to create, of all things, a parking lot. The discussion often organically turns to issues of urban renewal, changes in building trades over the centuries, and the development of the city of Muncie. The conversations often end with laments over the loss of a beautiful structure and a better understanding of historic preservation. Their engagement with the objects and participation in the discussion help cement in their minds the archives as a place for ideas, research, and discoveries.

This is certainly not meant to espouse 3-D printing as a panacea that will inspire all students to immediately and enthusiastically embrace working with archival materials. It is still merely a tool for interpretation and participation meant to engage our users, much like any other outreach tool we currently use. In the end, the drawings are still the truest connection to our lost architecture. Throughout this process, staff has never wavered from the conviction that “it’s all about the drawings,” because the prints and online collection cannot stand on their own. Without the original drawings, the prints themselves are little more than nifty paperweights.

However, in our experience working with these same drawings, the 3-D prints prompt far more interesting and engaging conversations among the students than ever before. The students are perhaps more comfortable interacting with technology they can touch and relate to their sphere of knowledge. It’s also a relatively new innovation that is still exciting and fresh to a generation grown accustomed to technological advances throughout their lives.

The IAX3D project also appeals to the archives’ patron groups. The faculty, alumni, and working architects, landscape architects, and preservationists are often equally as enchanted as the freshman students when they pick up one of the prints. This group
tends to appreciate the drawings already because they spent countless hours at the drafting table learning to draw and often still carry on the tradition in their own practices. Their interest in the models has more to do with marveling at the innovations and how much model-making has changed through the years.

IAX3D continues to evolve. Current projects underway involve modeling a Baltimore through-truss bridge built by the Indiana Bridge Company in 1891, the Indiana State Library built by architects Pierre and Wright, and the former Negro League baseball stadium, also built by Pierre and Wright, that was recently converted into condos. All of these diverse projects create challenges and opportunities for interpretation via 3-D modeling. The bridge was specifically chosen for its steel pin–connected construction that allows for printing it in individual pieces. Students have the opportunity to piece together elements of the bridge by reading the original 1891 engineering drawings. It is, essentially, a puzzle activity that helps them learn to read engineering drawings and understand historic bridge construction.

As it changes through gained experience and use, it is worth noting how the project affects the archives. Once an overlooked aspect of the college tour given to prospective high school students, as well as younger elementary and middle school groups, the archives now features prominently on the tours. Student groups typically visit the archives after the fabrication lab, where they see the 3-D printer, routers, robot, and other prototyping equipment, and before they go into the class studios. For most of these visitors, this is their first foray into an archives, and the staff wants them to have a great experience.

Fifth graders assemble a 3-D printed bridge truss pin construction modeled after an 1891 drawing from the Indiana Bridge Company. Drawings collection at the Drawings + Documents Archive. Photo by Carol Street.
Because these tours often arrive with little advance notice, having the 3-D prints enables staff to quickly assemble a few objects that will immediately capture interest and provide a launching pad for a wide range of discovery, depending on the age of the group. A small group of fifth graders was the first class to engage the bridge prints. The students quickly grasped the concept and immediately began working collaboratively to put the bridge together. Discussions ranged from the practical “I think this piece goes there” to why that piece would go there—for strength or connection. From an architecture graduate student leading the group, the young students learned about engineering and weight loads necessary for bridges to support trains, cars, and people over a length of space.

For a recent class of 25 second graders, the 3-D prints were the basis of a matching game in which students linked the prints to the objects in the drawings. The prints supported a discussion of the featured architectural elements. Staff held the objects so the entire class could see them, and the children enthusiastically talked about what they recognized in the prints and learned architectural terms such as *column*, *window casing*, *rosette*, and *façade*. But, perhaps even more important, they learned to feel comfortable in the archives space. Positive, early introductions to archives create a strong foundation on which students can build research experience as they grow in their educational careers.

While the collections at the Drawings + Documents Archive pertain to specialized areas of study that already utilize 3-D technologies for rapid prototyping, the possibilities exist for other institutions with very different types of archival collections to leverage this utility. Using photogrammetry or 3-D scanners to replicate 3-D objects, such as those that are particularly fragile, sculptures, or manufactured objects that played an important role in the development of an area, is certainly a good choice. Re-creating 3-D objects on a printer can engage patrons in the design process of making the objects. For example, students re-creating the relative simplicity of the Ball canning jar, a Muncie icon manufactured by the Ball Brothers Company from 1880 to 1996, using computer design programs would learn the geometry of design choices that led to its enduring success. We can effectively not only show patrons objects, but help them understand the process of their design.

Another possibility for 3-D printing in archives lies in transforming 2-D designs into three dimensions, just as we are doing with architectural plans. Drawings, marginalia doodles, and other illustrations can be transformed into 3-D objects using current print technology. Companies are cropping up to convert children’s hand drawings to 3-D–printed characters, resulting in charming objects for parents to treasure. Using a similar process, but with historically significant materials such as Kurt Vonnegut’s doodles or the Kelmscott Chaucer illustrations, could enable different audiences to see or feel archival 2-D materials in another dimension. A 3-D printed page from the Kelmscott Chaucer would never replace the beauty of the book in its original form, but it could enable sight-impaired patrons the opportunity to relate to its design. These are just a few examples of how 3-D printing can be extended to special collections, and archivists will undoubtedly find far more creative and meaningful ideas within their own collections.
In conclusion, the value of the positive outreach response has vastly outweighed the technological glitches, considerable investment of time, and steep learning curve staff encountered in initializing the Indiana Architecture X 3D project. As the barriers to 3-D printing—namely, high cost and technological knowledge required—decrease, archivists will likely discover a wide array of uses for the technology to benefit their collections. Partnering with those who already have the technology at their disposal, as well as the knowledge to use it, is a viable strategy to bring currency to archival collections, attract new audiences, and engage patrons now.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Carol Street is the archivist for architectural records at Ball State University Libraries’ Drawings + Documents Archive, located within the College of Architecture and Planning. She manages the archives’ extensive collection of architectural drawings, photographs, documents, and building remnants documenting the history of Indiana’s built environment, and actively engages students in the use of these materials. Street received her BA, MLS, and graduate certificate in museum studies from Indiana University and has previously worked at the Museum of Modern Art, Indiana Historical Society, Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art, and as a consultant to the Columbus Indiana Architectural Archives.

NOTES

2. Those key partners are John Straw; Brad Faust; Arthur Hafner, PhD; Philip Repp (University Libraries and Information Technology); Guillermo Vasquez de Velasco, PhD; Michel Mounayar (College of Architecture and Planning); and Mahesh Daas, PhD (Department of Architecture).
6. A search for journal articles using the philosophy of “meet them where they are” resulted in a wide range of articles on a broad series of topics, such as teaching pedagogy in K–12 and college classrooms, evangelism, yoga instruction, nursing, marketing, and business.


12. Harry W. Matson died in 1892, the same year the Wysoy Grand Opera House was erected. Other examples of his work can be found in the Harry W. Matson biographical file at the Drawings + Documents Archive.


15. These talented master of architecture graduate assistants are (in order of working on the project) Austin Pontius, Chris Hinders, Matt Jennings, Patrick Gerhart, and Ashley Urbanowich.


19. The selection of a 3-D printer is essentially a Venn diagram where the level of expertise available, budget, and expectation of results collide. It will vary by institution. An inexpensive MakerBot, which uses PLA filament resin in an extrusion process, could be perfect for one institution but not have adequate detail for a different institution. Given the rapid changes in technology for 3-D printing, I’m hesitant to recommend specific products or types of machines because they are likely to be outdated in short order. When you’re ready to purchase equipment, reviews are easily available online. As library maker spaces evolve, colleagues will increasingly become good resources for information on what works in this sphere.


24. Ibid.


30. Much appreciation to Brandon Pieczko, digital archivist for manuscript collections at Ball State University, for brainstorming ideas with me regarding uses for 3-D printing in local history collections.


ABSTRACT: The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established the Agricultural Extension Service to disseminate agricultural research to farmers. An unintended by-product of this work was a huge rural history archives: Federal Record Group 33, the Records of the Extension Service, which provides a granular record of life on farms and in rural communities. This article illustrates the use of the Extension Service’s annual reports for researching local history and genealogy and evaluates access to these archival materials and their depictions of rural communities. The study finds that the rural communities documented in the Extension Service materials often are unaware of this resource because of limited local finding aids and online access.

Introduction: The Archives of the Agricultural Extension Service

In 1914, the US government launched an ambitious education program to improve agricultural production and the livelihoods of rural families. An unintended by-product of this work was a huge rural history archive: Federal Record Group 33, the Records of the Extension Service. Two pieces of nineteenth-century legislation laid the groundwork for these Extension Service records. The Morrill Land-Grant College Act, signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1862, provided each state with land or money to endow a college that would emphasize education in agriculture and engineering. The Hatch Experiment Station Act (1887) extended the work of these “land-grant colleges” by providing states with funds to conduct agricultural research. Scientists conducted research at “experiment stations,” publishing the results of their studies and demonstrating them in field trials. However, the impact of the Hatch Act was limited, because the legislation provided no mechanism to disseminate the results of agricultural research. As Wayne Rasmussen observed, “If the research were to be of benefit, its results would have to be communicated to farmers.” Not until the Smith-Lever Act, now a century old, did the federal government begin systematically delivering scientific information from research universities directly to farmers. William J. Spillman, the head of the Office of Farm Management, developed a national system of “extension agents,” also called...
“county agents,” paid for by federal, state, and local funds, which delivered scientific agricultural knowledge into the field. Because of the Extension Service’s unique cooperative structure, extension agents are located in virtually every US county, and county offices are affiliated with their nearby land-grant universities. These extension agents also included female “demonstration agents” who shared home economics information with women and were “free to develop programs they saw fit for local needs.” An additional responsibility for extension agents was their supervision of county 4-H clubs, an extension service program for rural youth that provided boys and girls with both agricultural education and leadership training. Because the Extension Service remained segregated until the Civil Rights Act of 1964, many counties also employed additional “Negro Work” male and female agents who performed both agricultural and home demonstration duties. The language of the Cooperative Extension Act tasked agricultural and home demonstration agents with “the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or resident in said [land grant] colleges” and imparting information “through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise.” Signing the Smith-Lever Act into law, President Woodrow Wilson called it “one of the most significant and far-reaching measures for the education of adults ever adopted by the government.”

The Smith-Lever Act required extensive documentation of the money spent and work conducted by Extension Service employees; indeed, quarterly federal payments to states were contingent upon the submission of a “detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.” As a result, extension and home demonstration agents in every US county filed an “Annual Narrative and Statistical Report” to document activities. For the “Statistical Report” section of their submissions, agents completed several pages of questions that captured data about residents’ participation in Extension Service programs, for example, the number of letters agents received, the number of farm visits agents conducted, or the number of people attending Extension Service events. In contrast, the “Narrative” section required of all agents was less formulaic. In this portion, agents described the projects they had conducted throughout the year, but they also could include county residents’ own descriptions of completed projects. In addition, agents frequently included photographs documenting county residents and their home and farm demonstrations. Agents submitted the ribbon copy of their reports to the Extension Service office in Washington, DC; multiple carbon copies, created simultaneously, frequently were shared with local land-grant universities and also retained in the agents’ local offices.

The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) ultimately received the Extension Service agents’ annual reports, preserving them within Record Group 33, the Records of the Extension Service. NARA’s numbered record groups comprise the records of each major government agency, with an agency’s number reflecting the order in which its record group was established. Following the principle of provenance, records are “arranged thereunder as they were filed when in active use.” NARA further arranged record groups into series, organized by “the creating office’s filing system or otherwise kept together by the creating office’s filing system” or in some other way reflecting a specific type of agency activity or function. Using this
numbering convention for record groups and series, the Extension Service “Annual Narrative and Statistical Reports, 1909–1968” was assigned to Record Group 33.6. This archive, generated during the course of county agents’ daily work, comprises 3,500 linear feet; the corpus is reproduced on more than 7,000 rolls of microfilm, which patrons may request for off-site viewing. The entire archive is available at the NARA site in College Park, Maryland, but land-grant universities such as Texas A&M in College Station, Texas, and Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma, also hold copies of Extension Service documents specific to their states. The politics and effectiveness of the Extension Service policies can be debated, but the massive volume of records in Federal Record Group 33 is undisputed.

The Extension Service archive provides a rich data source for agriculture and social historians, who have examined its photographs, statistics, and first-person narratives for depictions of early twentieth-century rural life. The author of the US National Archives and Records Administration’s Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the Extension Service described the “Annual Narrative and Statistical Reports” as “an intimate account of the details of farm operation and rural life in every state of the Union, in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, in Puerto Rico, and, to a minor extent, in the District of Columbia.” D. Clayton Brown’s review of the Arkansas Extension Service records at the NARA Fort Worth site illustrated how historians can make use of these county-level reports; his study found that the archive provides an “opportunity to observe the transformation of farm and home life from an undeveloped condition into modern contemporary living.”

While scholars and archivists are familiar with these records, genealogists and local historians appear not to have mined Record Group 33.6. Ironically, genealogists are the primary users of many archives, despite the fact that, as Duff and Johnson have noted, “the traditional archival information system does not meet their needs.” Traditional finding aids, even those with EAD encoding, fail to provide the types of data retrieval that Duff and Johnson identified as crucial to genealogists, who search by name, document type, event, and geographic area. NARA archivist Claire Prechtel-Kluskens promoted the Extension Service archive for genealogists to connect with their family history, declaring that “If your relatives lived on farms in the first half of the twentieth century, you’ll want to read Extension Service annual reports.” Genealogist blogger Robyn Smith illustrated the effectiveness of Prechtel-Kluskens’s outreach. After hearing a presentation on the Extension Service “Negro Work” records at a 2011 NARA genealogy fair, Smith wrote that “I had never heard of these records before, but after her lecture, I knew I needed to look at them.” Elizabeth Yakel’s study of genealogists’ information-seeking methods noted that their processing is “characterized by making connections with other genealogists and family historians” through activities that include participation in genealogical groups, sharing of transcripts, and volunteering at local archives. That Smith, an experienced family historian, had “never heard” of the Extension Service records suggests the degree to which these annual reports remain underused. Extension Service records are effectively hidden from local or family historians conducting online research, presenting what Kate Theimer described as “archival silences,” because they are “not represented in the digital collections that have been marked up in ways that make them useful for this kind of research.”
researchers can review the general description of Record Group 33 in NARA’s Guide to Federal Records, or Prechtel-Kluskens’s thorough summary of the Extension Service annual reports, prepared for the 2011 NARA Genealogical Fair. However, these reference materials provide an overview of the entire record group, rather than a description of individual records’ contents. Because the records are not digitized and available for key-word searching, these “intimate” historical vignettes are effectively hidden to the people most familiar with their details: the families and communities profiled in these annual reports.

As an archival body, the Records of the Extension Service remain oddly disconnected from their original, county-level creators. Housed in federal and state university repositories, these first-person accounts of twentieth-century rural life are virtually invisible to the twenty-first-century families whose farms and communities are documented in Extension Service records. This article examines a fragment of the yearly filings of county agricultural and home demonstration agents within subgroup 33.6 to explore how an individual researcher might retrieve these meticulously recorded materials and perhaps reintroduce them to its community of origin. Specifically, I will share what this archival record reveals about specific members of my family and places of significance to my family’s history. Like the many family historians who cannot travel great distances to examine historical documents, I did not view original records housed at the National Archives or the carbon copies found at land-grant colleges such as Texas A&M University. By necessity, I researched records by borrowing and purchasing NARA microfilm and digital copies. My study describes information gleaned from these records and discusses how available technologies make records accessible while at times complicating the research process. Genealogical researchers might expect to retrieve records arranged by individual community, by the names of the Extension Service agents who wrote reports, or by the names of individuals featured in the documents. None of those indexing and searching tools exist for the Extension Service records. Neither were detailed state- or county-level finding aids extant to help locate family members or their rural communities. The general finding aid for the federal record group guided this research, in addition to published and online catalog records for NARA and catalog information provided by land-grant universities. I explored these records with no specific guides to what I might find; nevertheless, because my family fit the demographic described by Prechtel-Kluskens, I took her advice and looked in Record Group 33.6.

The Woodruff Sisters in the Archival Record

My search began with family I knew would be represented in the archival record in some capacity: great-aunts Grace and Reba Woodruff, who served as Texas home demonstration agents. Family records told me that Grace served in Parker County in 1930, Reba in Lipscomb County in 1941. With this essential information, I followed Prechtel-Kluskens’s instructions to select the NARA microfilm ordering page, “Research Our Records,” where, she assures researchers, “you do not need to register, sign in, or buy anything.” From this page, I selected the “Order online” link, at which
I could perform a keyword search for “Extension Service.” This search returned 54 records from Record Group 33 annual reports: one for each state, in addition to records for Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, “Photograph of Extension Service Activities and Personnel, 1928–1941,” and “South 1913–1914.” Following the link for Extension Service Annual Reports: Texas, 1909–1944 on the search results page, I retrieved a list of the microfilmed records of the Texas Extension Service, numbered T890, which includes 182 rolls of microfilm. From this page, I identified the microfilm roll numbers for 1930 Parker County (roll 70) and for 1941 Lipscomb County (roll 155), ordered the records through Interlibrary Service, and received them within a month.

Reading NARA’s Extension Service microfilm was challenging. Indeed, roll 70 arrived with the disclaimer that “some images are unreadable.” I deciphered the contents only because microfilm reader workstations at the University of Texas at Austin scan microfilm images and then adjust the reproduction quality with Photoshop software; roll 70 of the Texas Extension Service was illegible before this adjustment. The microfilm contained no index, requiring readers to advance tediously, alphabetically, from Ochiltree County at the beginning of the roll, to Parker County, near the end.

Prechtel–Kluskens advised that “each agent’s report reflects his or her personality, so you’ll never know what you will find.” What I found was 22-year-old Grace Woodruff, a new college graduate, performing her home demonstration duties with élan. She crafted her account as an Extension Service public relations document, opening the narrative with a highly placed local official’s praise of her county fair exhibit: “‘Parker County gardens have been wonderful this year. We just could not have done without them,’ is a statement made by Mr. D. H. Green, President of the Weatherford Chamber of Commerce, as he viewed a display of twenty-one vegetables covering a floor space of 5 x 15 feet.” Woodruff emphasized her work’s momentum, describing 4-H spring gardening demonstrations that “capitalize [on] the enthusiasm roused by successful fall gardens.” Supplementing Woodruff’s summaries were participants’ descriptions of their experiences, which relate their projects in their own distinctive voices. For example, Mrs. Roy Young, who admirably canned 1,000 pounds of cured meat, extolled the virtues of both her pressure canner and her home demonstration agent:

“For some time I had been hearing wonderful reports of the benefits derived from owning a pressure canner. I paid very little attention to these reports until at last the Home Demonstration Agent through her untiring effort finally gained my interest. I consider July 2, 1929, as one of my luckiest days, because on that day I bought a National Pressure Canner. . . . I feel greatly indebted to the Home Demonstration Agent, Miss Grace Woodruff, who has given me such wonderful encouragement and has furnished most of the splendid recipes.

Woodruff’s report resounded with examples of her “untiring effort.” The statistics for her year of service told one story: 301 homes visited, 565 calls received, 228 days spent in the field. Yet the details of her narrative revealed her drive to succeed with her Parker County projects. For example, 89 county girls participated in the clothing work section of their 4-H projects; each was given “a sample seam suitable for her garment that had been prepared by the Home Demonstration agent.” Preparing 89 separate...
seam samples would have been no small feat; the inclusion of the task in Woodruff’s narrative underscores her determination to ensure county projects’ success.

Woodruff’s narrative highlights the engagement and accomplishment of numerous Parker County citizens, from Mrs. Young’s pressure canner to “Zada Wiggins of Peaster, a first year club girl, [who] raised a flock of 43 chickens.” Parker County residents looking for genealogical details in Woodruff’s records would be rewarded with detailed accounts of fairs, rally day programs, and 4-H activities that offer a wealth of names, places, and dates of potential interest to the area’s communities and families. Woodruff’s depiction of the county’s character, however, is perhaps as significant as the individual names she includes in her account. Her narrative pointedly indicates an awareness of how engagement in Extension Service projects empowered rural women to action. Marilyn Holt has observed how farm women’s home demonstration projects offered them the opportunity to “ease and enhance their lives” while illustrating how they contributed to their farms’ economies “by engaging in home industries, modernizing their homes, and changing work strategies.” Parker County home demonstration projects offered examples of the enhancements Holt described, including multiple reports of upgrading and improving farm homes. In addition, the narrative specifically noted the money and goods farm women created: cash through the sale of poultry and eggs, and savings through gardens and food preservation.

Woodruff’s report highlights the connection between women’s contributions to their farms’ incomes and their ability to upgrade their homes. In detailing a “Home Furnishings” project, she observed that many women overcame the objections of resistant husbands to make over their living rooms, noting the manner in which they funded renovations: “Fifty women earned the money to make this improvement themselves by the sale of poultry, dairy, and other farm products, and one woman sold some of her useless furniture, and two of the women took stenographic work to get their money.” The narrative of Mrs. E. P. Kerby, age 75, emphasizes this independence. Kerby hesitated to enter the countywide “Home Furnishings” contest, noting that “I thought that room that had not been changed in so long was a hopeless proposition. Then Miss Grace Woodruff, County Home Demonstration Agent, came out to our house.” When her husband objected to her changes, Kerby observed that “It is hard to go across a husband’s path, but I saw the paper hanger and he said he would come over the next morning. I just said to Mr. Kerby, ‘The paperhanger is coming this morning.’ Thus the paper went up.” An unrepentant Mrs. Kerby won first prize in the county contest: “I was so pleased with the result that my conscience did not hurt a bit, for I knew that I would not object to anything he [Mr. Kerby] did on the farm.”

In her short tenure with the Agricultural Extension Service, Woodruff produced a fine-grained account of Parker County life during 1929 and 1930. The records that reveal her engagement and enthusiasm may leave readers in agreement with Mrs. D. P. Walker, who ended her 4-H narrative with a hearty encomium: “All of the work has been done under the supervision of our Home Demonstration Agent. We think there is no one like her.” In contrast to Grace Woodruff’s narrative of satisfying rural accomplishment, Reba Woodruff’s record of service in Lipscomb County reflects hardships in the Texas Panhandle during World War II. The underlying theme of her 1941 report is scarcity: key foodstuffs were rationed, scrap materials were gathered
for reuse, and, because the county’s men had been conscripted, county farmers were shorthanded. Indeed, the Lipscomb County Fair, annual picnic, and Christmas party planned by the Lipscomb County Home Demonstration Agent all were cancelled “because of transportation problems and labor shortages which required the help of many farm women in the fields.” Lipscomb County women engaged in the home improvement work seen in the earlier Parker County reports, but wartime realities severely circumscribed their activities.

Woodruff’s Extension Service narrative describes the full scope of her year’s work with 4-H groups and home demonstration clubs around the county, but a “Contributions to the War Effort” report within that larger work summarizes her home-front responsibilities. In 1941, the “Contributions” report noted that Woodruff assisted with tire rationing, scrap metal and scrap rubber drives, and USO fund-raising. She also helped with war bond sales, held meetings about the farm machinery repair program, and worked with PTA groups to develop family entertainment nights to assist with “keeping up the family morale.” Her emphasis, however, was on helping families produce and preserve food for the war effort through a US Department of Agriculture program called “Food-for-Freedom,” which encouraged the creation of family Victory Gardens to supplement commercial sources of food. In addition, the federal program set wartime goals for specific agricultural products and declared to producers that “every farmer must plan to turn out just as much of each needed wartime commodity as he can.” Woodruff wrote that she “has discussed the program in every community in the county at least once and in some of the larger ones twice with a different group attending each time.” Seventy-seven county residents planted gardens for the first time in 1941, and Woodruff pragmatically noted that “Not all these gardens were successful, however none were complete failures.” To make the best use of their home gardens, families needed to preserve the fruits and vegetables they produced. The statistical section of Woodruff’s report notes that she assisted 477 families throughout the year with “food preservation problems,” such as canning and freezing. Her Food-for-Freedom efforts, then, reached a substantial percentage of households in Lipscomb County, which had a population of fewer than 4,000 people in 1940.

One telling detail at a time, Woodruff’s Extension Service narrative describes her work in helping her county’s citizens make do with less. References to daily deprivations, such as her success in encouraging the use of honey and sorghum as sweeteners, illustrate the degree to which wartime shortages impacted even rural families who produced much of their own food. Her report speculates that “perhaps use of these substitutes [honey and sorghum] is responsible for the fact that few people have experienced any difficulty in making their sugar ration meet their needs.” Included in Woodruff’s description of food shortages and rationing is an account of her encounters with Lipscomb County immigrant groups as she demonstrated the modern, scientific technique of pressure canning, which was considered safer than the traditional “water bath” canning method. “Every thing possible has been done to discourage the use of the water bath and oven methods of canning non-acid vegetables and meat but people are still using those methods,” Woodruff reported. “This condition is true especially among the foreign-born—German and Russian—people in the county.” Marilyn Holt noted the Extension Service’s emphasis on “erasing traditions and old ways of
thinking,” finding that immigrant groups resisted this change, and Reba Woodruff’s report illustrates Holt’s observation. In this example, Woodruff’s Lipscomb County Home Demonstration Records could enhance scholars’ knowledge of the immigrant resistance to assimilation in wartime Texas. As a member of Woodruff’s family, however, I was fascinated by the archive’s depictions of the Woodruff sisters’ energy and persistence in the course of their service. In their narratives, I discovered the young women I never met but who continue to inhabit family stories. Their records of life in Parker and Lipscomb Counties allow their family to know them through their work; these accounts, if made accessible and easily available, could provide genealogists with similar glimpses of other Texas families at work in rural Texas.

**Extension Service Records of Kingfisher County, Oklahoma, 1941**

To research my home county, where my family began raising cattle in 1889, I followed the same procedure used to identify the microfilm records for the Woodruff sisters. To access Kingfisher County’s records (T881, roll 118), however, I purchased them in CD format from NARA. The CD format offered much better resolution than microfilm, and the Oklahoma records were markedly more legible than those of Grace Woodruff’s home demonstration service (T890, roll 70). However, the CD format presented its own challenges. The four discs of roll 118 contained more than 7,000 JPEG images of the records of multiple counties, but the images were not separated into folders for individual counties. As a result, searching the archival record on CDs was a time-consuming effort that required blindly opening unmarked files to locate Kingfisher County.

Despite this effort, I discovered only two family references within the 1941 archive: my grandfather E. S. Hobbs was listed on two committees making up the Kingfisher County Agricultural Advisory Council, a group of county citizens that set goals to determine the focus of Extension Service programming. This record offered not a single compelling story or colorful anecdote about my family. Indeed, the township maps within the report shows virtually no Extension Service activity within Coronado Township, the location of my family’s ranch. Yet this omission itself tells a story. My grandfather represented the Advisory Council’s Pasture and Livestock Management committees—not Wheat Improvement or Cotton Gin—because his native-grass ranchland was too poor to raise these crops. My family would not have participated in the 4-H activities popular in small towns because they lived too far away, and unpaved roads made travel too difficult. The Extension Service archive confirmed my family’s isolated geography. Indeed, the records of home demonstration agent Edith Smith highlight the difficulty of traveling to Extension Service events. Smith noted how county resident Dave Foster helped women from the Big Four, a community centered around the consolidated Big Four School, attend the Kingfisher County Dress Revue in the town of Hennessey after a heavy rain: he pulled their car with his tractor. Smith’s record describes how more than 200 people braved the poor roads to attend the event, with others, in addition to Dave Foster, using their tractors to assist with transportation.

Although my family is little represented in the Kingfisher County archive, the
Extension Service records enhanced my understanding of farm and ranch life in a time of drought, disease, and economic depression. Extension agent L. J. Cunningham painted an endearingly prickly portrait of farmers’ resistance to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, a New Deal farm relief program. Cunningham observed that the county was farmed by a “self-reliant group of thrifty people,” and that it never had endured a complete crop failure:

Their homes are mostly paid for and many are equipped with as many modern conveniences as the city home. . . . It is not at all unnatural to expect a people so sturdy and self-sufficient to feel little need of an agricultural governing program and as a matter of fact actually resent its very existence.57

Farmers notoriously resented farm relief programs that required them to plow under existing crops or destroy their livestock to raise market prices.58 Cunningham’s report clarifies and confirms the family stories passed down about E. S. Hobbs, who resisted New Deal policies that slaughtered brood sows to raise their market price.59 Cunningham’s report on the Livestock Management Committee also speaks to ongoing problems with livestock loss, noting that “many of the [committee’s] objectives have not been wholly reached. The outstanding objective of this committee—that of disease control through legislation—failed to pass.”60 Cunningham’s report corresponds to family stories noting that E. S. Hobbs stopped raising hogs after losing his herd to cholera. My grandfather’s participation in a committee that lobbied for farm legislation provided me with additional information about his political activities, and it illustrates ranchers’ difficulties in controlling animal diseases before the advent of effective vaccines. The 1941 Kingfisher County records could not provide me with details about individual members of my family, but they deepened my understanding of the material conditions that affected their lives—what they wore, how they traveled, and how they conducted their business. With this context, my own family stories are amplified beyond their Kingfisher County origins and can be read as reflections of the economic and social concerns of their historical period.

Listening to Kingfisher County’s Archival Silences

Kate Theimer has noted the “archival silences” that result when records are not represented in accessible, searchable digital collections.61 I discovered the significance of this silence when I looked for extant copies of the Kingfisher County Extension Service records. Frustrated by the awkwardness of reading microfilm and CD records, I examined Oklahoma State University’s catalog holdings of Extension Service records in hopes of reading them during a visit. Land-grant universities typically are repositories of Extension Service records, although their holdings may be incomplete. Oklahoma State does not hold the Kingfisher County Extension records, but the university archivist suggested that the local extension service office might have retained these documents. When I called the Kingfisher County Extension Service, officials there had no knowledge of an archive of their agents’ annual reports, but they helpfully encouraged me to contact an agent who recently had retired after 30 years of
service. When reached, the retired agent confirmed that the records are indeed extant. Subsequently, the current extension agent located this archive in the county courthouse basement and made them available to me.\textsuperscript{62} The Kingfisher County Extension records, beautifully readable carbon copies in excellent condition dating from 1930 to 1970, contain numerous original photographs, images that invariably are distorted by the microfilming progress.\textsuperscript{63} Uncataloged and uncurated, this silent archive reveals the voices, images, and aspirations of rural neighbors, of classmates’ grandparents, of long-ago residents whose names still resound for me from family stories. If, as George Eliot claimed, “our dead are never dead to us until we have forgotten them,” then the counymen and women recorded in the Kingfisher County Extension Service archive remain vital and vigorous.\textsuperscript{64}

The Extension Service annual narratives will remain underused as a local history resource until they are made available as digital records, or until online finding aids alert researchers to the records’ scope and contents.\textsuperscript{65} Archivists could employ a number of strategies to make these records more accessible. One simple aid would be to identify individual counties within the annual reports by pointing to microfilm frame or CD file number. In addition, archivists could provide community users with a broad overview of coverage within individual counties by creating indices with the names of county agents and the communities they served. Most useful to genealogists, of course, would be access to the individuals mentioned in Extension Service records—the “list of names” cited by Duff and Johnson.\textsuperscript{66} Genealogists would be avid users of searchable digital records that would allow them to quickly locate individuals such as Zada Wiggins and Mrs. E. P. Kerby buried within the Extension Service’s annual narratives. While the resources and staff time required to provide this data might appear daunting, we as archivists might consider partnering with local genealogical groups and 4-H organizations, the natural constituents of these records, to crowdsource the reports and glean the names and keywords that are most useful to these researchers.

The records created over a century by a small army of county and home extension service agents are not simply static records of a government program; instead, they are portraits of those of communities and of their local character. The continued “archival silence” of the Extension Service narratives is a loss not only to researchers seeking detailed family histories, but also to rural communities facing twenty-first-century economic, climate, and cultural challenges. The Extension Service records reviewed in this article describe living room makeovers, dress revues, and pressure canning taking place in the teeth of the Great Depression, the Dust Bowl, and World War II. The collective message of this archive to local communities is an affirmation of their residents’ endurance and hard-won survival skills. Laura Millar observed that archives are tools for preserving individual and collective memory that help a society interpret and articulate its identity. As such, she argued, “records and archives must be managed so that they can be articulated, mediated, and used. The foundation of individual memory is that it is created, stored, and retrieved. . . . The foundation of archives, then, must be that they are records acquired, preserved and made available” (emphasis Millar).\textsuperscript{67} Before I spoke with the retired extension agent, he was perhaps the only county resident aware of the existence of the Kingfisher County Extension Service records. The records had likely not been used, retrieved, or made available to
county residents in living memory. Yet this archive, populated by friends, neighbors, and yes, even my grandfather, contains not just the county’s history, but also the materials of a rural community’s cumulative memory and self-definition. Cultures tell their stories as a means of survival, of preserving the details, and making meaning for their communities. What would happen if archivists could provide Extension Service narratives of Parker, Lipscomb, and Kingfisher Counties to residents challenged by falling crop prices and declining populations; to farmers facing climate change and seeking information about how early-day residents coped with the historic drought of the 1930s; or to relatives searching for family members, such as Reba Woodruff or E. S. Hobbs? Archivists providing access to these site-specific stories, which illustrate the challenges and successes of distinct places and times, could help researchers investigate their families’ rural roots. More significantly, perhaps, archivists facilitating access to this archive could provide a valuable resource for local rural communities: a depiction of their residents successfully coping with historic adversity and change.

About the Author: Colleen Hobbs received her MSIS, with a concentration in digital archives, from the University of Texas School of Information in 2014. She was a metadata intern for the Bernard Rapoport Legacy Project at the Dolph Briscoe Center for American History and is contributing to a project that will digitize, translate, and encode archival records at Concordia University Texas. She has a PhD in English literature from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. She was born in Kingfisher, Oklahoma, and lives in Austin, Texas.
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ABSTRACT: Archives routinely mount exhibits to promote collection strengths, to bring attention to newly acquired or processed collections, educational resources, and programs; and to showcase innovative research. The digitized archival objects institutions share online also enhance access to collections. Once released, those objects enter a flow of information beyond the control of the archivists who selected them. This study considers digitized images related to the historical phenomenon of “tin can tourism” to examine how archival objects, digital exhibition and contextualization, and reuse by web-based patrons inform public history discourse. By examining a digital exhibit published by the Florida Memory Program, this study looks at how the archival objects determined by curators to be worth featuring are then understood and utilized by constituents and subsequently interpreted in contexts separate from the collections in which they originated. The study also considers the relevance of social media in promoting archival collections and the role of exhibited objects in discussions by online communities apart from the curatorial oversight of the archives that made them available.
create nonprofessional, albeit primary-resource–based historical interpretations—are informing new virtual communities that echo historic tourist associations.1

The Florida Memory Program released the digital photo exhibit, Tin Can Tourism, on its website September 20, 2011. The program intended the exhibit to encourage engagement with obscure images and other resources available through its online digital repository and to spur discussion about this historical topic explored by both museums and popular histories of the state’s tourism legacy. The online exhibit also influenced public discussion of the history of camper tourism in ways the program did not anticipate.

Digital exhibiting allows archivists to participate in the democratization of archival holdings by both making digital surrogates more readily available and by allowing users to interpret archival objects outside the control of holding institutions. By promoting digital access to high-quality surrogates, archivists determine how much description and curatorial contextualization to provide in the form of metadata and exhibition narrative. They also accept that greater digital access means a loss of control over how archival objects are used and understood. This study examines the intersection between the capacity of digital representations to enhance online access and the production of public history using digitized archival objects, often beyond curatorial control. That intersection also underscores the valuable role played by archivists, particularly those willing to share high-quality surrogates, in facilitating broadly defined historical interpretation through contextualized digital images.

In this dynamic age of social media, examples abound of decontextualized images embarking on evolutionary development away from their origins: look at any of the countless memes made from snagged images or GIFs that, once posted to Twitter, Reddit, or other sites, almost instantaneously take on lives of their own. The image-sharing, social media platform Flickr has facilitated the sharing of massive amounts of archival material with people around the world, far afield from the regular constituents served by reading rooms and remote reference services. Since the exhibit discussed here was released, the major repositories involved expanded their open-access initiatives through Flickr and other platforms. This article does not suggest a need for forensic drudgery in the interest of control. Rather, it suggests means archivists can employ to embrace their role as shepherds of digitized historic images and other representations of objects from their collections whose meanings are more malleable and subject to democratized interpretation as a consequence of successful archival advocacy. By providing robust metadata and strong narrative framing when needed, archivists can contribute their professional expertise and subject knowledge, needed now more than ever, to facilitate the well-informed and accurate use of digitized images and other archival objects by a growing and increasingly unrestrained body of users.

This study also investigates the tensions between public access and archival authority encountered by curators of unique and often undiscovered collections held by public institutions. When is it the archivist’s, librarian’s, or other curator’s responsibility to advocate for a particular subject, while adding scholarly interpretation to the presentation of that material? Or should they instead always allow larger intellectual debate and patron concerns to dictate development of outreach and access programs? In Archives and the Public Good, Richard Cox and David Wallace included studies of archives
and memory in an edited collection of work by archivists on the social importance of protecting and sharing public records. This topic will continue to require careful attention as electronic record keeping and record sharing evolve into the future. Writing still relatively early in the life of the Internet, before YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter, Cox and Wallace advised, “The kinds of concerns raised by man about the reliability of records in electronic information systems long predate the emergence of computers, but they have existed since writing and record-keeping systems first emerged.” The historical memory of tin can tourism does not approach the significance, in terms of social justice and archival responsibility, as topics such as the Holocaust, American foreign policy secrecy, and the destruction of state records by the outgoing apartheid regime of South Africa. But images and documents available for discovery and dissemination on the Internet will inform public understanding of historical issues. The use of tin can tourism digital surrogates examined here highlights a case when curatorial choices exercised by an archivist resulted in greater historical understanding, in addition to wider awareness, of available resources.

**Florida’s Archival Images Online**

Florida, the historical destination of millions of car-traveling American vacationers for generations, has made a massive number of historical images available through a free, publicly funded program. Through grant funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Sciences (IMLS), the State Archives of Florida since 1997 has utilized the Florida Memory Program (FMP) to engage the citizens of the state and people around the world with photographic, archival, and historic materials collected by the state’s archives and other heritage and culture programs. FMP seeks to make hidden collections better known and draw attention to the collections of the State Library and Archives to promote use by researchers at all levels, from elementary school students to professional scholars and government officials. Its holdings of state records, political collections, family manuscript collections, Florida-related rare books, limited-run published volumes, and other collections represent valuable and substantial bodies of records for academic researchers and lay patrons alike. The photographic collections of the State Library and Archives contain more than a million images, of which more than 200,000 are available in an easily accessible and fully searchable digital repository.

Within the State Archives of Florida’s photographic collections, however, are images and documents more representative of curiosity or oddity than of corpuses suitable for large-scale historical or scholarly research. Some of those incorporated into the online photographic database have been included because of the interests of individual staff members and other contributors. The digital project includes other objects as a result of routine digitization efforts without thorough, or any, curatorial assessment. As a result, seemingly lone archival images and loosely related selections drawn by staff from the photographic collections are readily discoverable through FMP. Such
images are often so decontextualized or isolated as archival objects, and only occasionally happened upon through the program’s discovery platform by patrons, as to represent little historical value, at least for scholarly projects. However, as public history resources, particularly those available to users in remote locations around the world through online access, seemingly isolated historical images can successfully engage people in further browsing and discovery. They can promote the collections for deeper, more dedicated research endeavors. If they are sometimes unusual or bizarre to people unfamiliar with their historical context, they can sometimes be even more effective in bringing attention to obscure subjects.

The *Tin Can Tourism* digital exhibit presents 73 images already available in the FMP photograph database in a simple, four-page design. The images are arranged thematically: “Highways in the Sun” (an introduction and overview of the history), “The Tin Can Tourists and Early Camper Culture,” “The Golden Age of Camping,” and “From Campers to Trailer Parks.” As of March 1, 2013, the original photo exhibit hosted on the Florida Memory site had received upwards of 10,000 views in just less than two years’ time. “Of those, the first page received 4,500 views with fewer views on each of the subsequent pages.” Two years later the exhibit still receives more than 600 views per month.

Some months after FMP published the digital project, the program began adding the same images to an album in its Flickr Commons project. Flickr Commons is a social media partnership between Flickr photo-sharing web company and repositories of historical photographs from around the world that allows users to access archival images from a myriad of sources, to use them freely, and even to repurpose them through commons licensing. Importantly, the partnership also allows repositories with intellectual control of the images to provide the content accompanied by appropriate description and metadata while soliciting the public to engage with images, many of which they would never otherwise utilize.

Florida Memory was the first state archives in the United States to join the Flickr Commons project pioneered by the Library of Congress in 2008. As of March 2013, the FMP main page on Flickr Commons had received more than 2,500 visits, and individual images had been viewed as many as 1,600 times. Florida Memory also has featured the *Tin Can Tourism* exhibit on its Twitter feed and on its Facebook page. While those numbers are not staggering, especially compared to other areas of the program’s digital efforts such as folk songs that receive millions of visits annually, they mark an impressive number of uses of otherwise obscure archival materials.

Many of the images in the exhibit are from the Tin Can Tourists of the World Collection held by the State Archives of Florida. The exhibit also came to include images from the Commerce Collection, which contains thousands of images created over decades by state programs promoting tourism, industry, and other state-sponsored initiatives. A few images also originated in the general photographic reference collection maintained by the archives.
The Tin Can Tourists (TCT) Association began as a loosely organized group of highway travelers at Desoto Park in Tampa, Florida, in 1919. The group grew quickly into a thriving social organization complete with fraternal rituals, camp rules, and annual events. The debate continues to this day over the origins of the group’s name. As explained on the Florida Memory Program site:

Some have suggested that it refers to the campers’ reliance upon canned foods. Others have asserted the name refers to the small Ford automobile of the era, the Model T or “Tin Lizzie,” which was a popular and affordable automobile option among middle class Americans from which the majority of T.C.T. members came. The modified automobile driven by tin can tourists often included large metal barrels for carrying water attached on the vehicles’ exteriors. The original recognition emblem of the T.C.T. was a tin can soldered to the radiator cap of a member’s car.8

The brief history of the organization in the text of the exhibit goes on to say that TCT usually held a summer meeting in Michigan each year, while a winter meeting was held at a campground in Florida “in various places, including Tampa, Sarasota, Ocala, and Eustis.” The meetings provided social opportunities, a venue for formal club business, and exhibits by “manufacturers of trailers, mobile homes, and camping gear.” Vendor exhibiting continued when meetings resumed after a brief hiatus during World War II.

---

8. Tin Can Tourists (TCT) Association began as a loosely organized group of highway travelers at Desoto Park in Tampa, Florida, in 1919. The group grew quickly into a thriving social organization complete with fraternal rituals, camp rules, and annual events. The debate continues to this day over the origins of the group’s name. As explained on the Florida Memory Program site:

Some have suggested that it refers to the campers’ reliance upon canned foods. Others have asserted the name refers to the small Ford automobile of the era, the Model T or “Tin Lizzie,” which was a popular and affordable automobile option among middle class Americans from which the majority of T.C.T. members came. The modified automobile driven by tin can tourists often included large metal barrels for carrying water attached on the vehicles’ exteriors. The original recognition emblem of the T.C.T. was a tin can soldered to the radiator cap of a member’s car.
Although really a loose confederation of local and regional clubs, the association’s stated aim was to provide members “with safe and clean camping areas, wholesome entertainment, and high moral values.” By the end of the 1930s, the TCT estimated membership numbers as high as 100,000 people in the United States. Over five decades, local associations began across the United States and in many other nations. Although some cities in Florida, including Tampa, and other parts of the American South expressed resistance to the influx of northern tourists, other Florida cities such as Arcadia actively recruited the tourists, establishing special camping parks for them.

Despite its rapid initial growth, by the 1960s, TCT membership was declining steadily. The TCT as it exists today acknowledges 1968 as the last year for an official convention and suggests that the association was basically nonexistent by the 1980s. While membership in the TCT waned during the middle of the twentieth century, Florida increasingly became a center for the tourist industry. With the opening of Disney World, decades of population growth, the development of ever-more sophisticated roadside attractions, and the growth of South Florida’s resort communities, tourism replaced citrus as the state’s chief industry. Florida’s population rapidly expanded as well, and as suburban sprawl spread throughout the state, many of the new residential areas resembled the tourist camps of years past, often largely consisting of temporary housing units.

Beginning in the late 1990s, TCT organizations experienced a resurgence around the United States and in other nations such as Australia. With a vibrant web presence, numerous annual meetings, and active outreach, TCT members now not only have thriving organizational outlets for their fascination with automobile history and leisure travel, but are also actively engaged in the public history of those interests. Internet social networking through listservs, blogs, and social media has allowed the TCT to re-emerge even more decentralized than before.

**Literature Review and Theory**

Several recent studies note that historians and other researchers utilizing archival materials are increasingly relying on those available online. Consequently, the librarian and archivist have an even greater responsibility to ensure that the digital resources available online faithfully represent the historical resources. Archivists and librarians endeavor to do this through best practices such as including both item- and collection-level information so that users can understand the resources contextually. Their role as arbiters of historical value is increasing, even as their professional concerns about privileging certain items or subject subareas, as well as decontextualization and metadata integrity, persist. At the same time, individuals and communities—physical and virtual—are actively engaged in shaping their own historical narratives and cultural identities through the use of readily available imaging hardware and ever-expanding options for online publishing and social media. Public, governmental, and academic libraries and archives increasingly use online exhibits and digitized collections to promote resources, many of which will be discovered at the item level. As Zhang and Mauney have written recently in “When Archival Description Meets Digital Object
Metadata,” archivists and librarians are facing a growing need to ensure that archival objects are contextualized in the expanding digital world.\textsuperscript{12}

Digitized historical resources allow communities to define their own identities on the Internet. Ann Denkler, in her 2007 work, \textit{Sustaining Identity}, argued that communities that consciously shape their cultural landscapes through historic sites and monuments are able to maintain closer ties to their histories and cultural identities.\textsuperscript{13} Members of those communities make choices to promote specific aspects of their shared cultural identities. However, those foregrounded cultural identities can be contested by other, often minority, members of the communities whose identities and stories are not central to the dominant narratives, such as African Americans in communities that strongly promote the heroism of Confederates during the Civil War.

Carl Abbott, a Portland State University professor of urban history, published “How Scanners Democratize History,” a very optimistic take on the use of digital technology and discovery databases by historians—professional and amateur alike—in the American Historical Association’s \textit{Perspectives on History}.\textsuperscript{14} All practitioners of archival outreach and public history can agree on his point that readily available archival images greatly enhance the richness and accessibility of historical content, whether meant for public presentation, in lecturing, or in writing. Abbott asserted, “The availability of images is a great equalizer that smooths the disconnect between academic and popular approaches.” Abbott rightly pointed out the ease with which family and other historians can now self-publish on the Internet and generate their digital archives of personal and other materials. The democratized digital production of archival materials, in some ways similar to the legions of volunteers that have enabled the Library of Congress and other institutions to undertake large-scale scanning projects, is increasing not only the number but the diversity of objects and perspectives.

One response to Abbott’s enthusiasm, however, is that while we are experiencing a liberalization of the field of digitized historical resources, the balance of resources used and the authority of the sources remain areas of concern for archivists and other custodians committed to maintaining intellectual authority. Encouraging more people to “play in the fields of history” is a wonderful goal, but the biases created by content selection on the institutional side and by the decontextualization of materials complicates the growing number of historical narratives created by expanded public discourse. In looking at the questions of selection, representations, and interpretation, Frank Ankersmit’s distinction between historical interpretations and representation is useful. In \textit{Meaning, Truth, and Reference in Historical Representation}, Ankersmit delved into a concept that every curator and host of an online exhibit of archival objects has contended with, even if less directly than he does in theorizing the role of the historian in presenting text.\textsuperscript{15} Whether digital curators want to or not, they grapple with the problems that confront postmodern historiography, including institutional controls, authority, data integrity, and audience.

James Opp has studied the effect digital projects, like all archival and investigative treatments, have in augmenting the meaning of the objects. In his 2008 article, “The Colonial Legacies of the Digital Archive,” Opp argued for the need to reconnect material history with the digital surrogates. “Digital collections, despite their recent appearance and explosive growth, carry within them the fragments and shrapnel of earlier archival
transformations.”16 Opp examined the vestiges of colonialism evident in photographic metadata as seen in the database that provides access to the James Lupson collection of photographs of First Nations people housed at the Glenbow Museum. The impact of digitized collections of archival materials on user experience remains an area requiring further investigation by information science analysts. As Paul Conway and Ricardo Punzalan stated in 2011, how we study user experience and consequently, “how users extract meaning from digital surrogates of photographic archives are not well understood.”17 By employing the literature of visual literacy, Conway and Punzalan offered a theory dubbed “fields of vision” that provides archivists a way of measuring impact by observing user experience first-hand.

Archivists make available photographic images that have intrinsic meaning and that may be accessed and manipulated (represented and interpreted) by historians and other users. A debate persists, even decades and millions of digitized images later, over the efficacy of providing digital surrogates of objects that closely, almost exactly, represent the original objects.18 The democratization of access to realistic representations of archival objects exacerbates a growing separation between the user and the actual material holdings of archives. While much of the content of the objects is accessible, the archival context is not.

Conway and Punzalan’s study looked at high-level users of digital photograph collections, focusing on the types of products they produced, the rigor of their research methods, and their affiliations. In earlier studies, Conway looked at different levels of users. The literature examining the relationships among online exhibiting, patron use and archival practice, and public history and physical exhibiting is relatively recent and scattered. Arjun Sabharwal, in “Digital Representation of Disability History,”

examined the thematic, structural, and semantic dimensions of developing a virtual exhibit, including how the archivists’ need to reach patrons influences the selection of themes and construction. While they are vital to outreach, virtual exhibits must address several understandings of accessibility. This point was particularly well made by Sabharwal in his description of planning and executing an exhibit on disability history. He pointed out the need for archival description to be extended to exhibits. “The practice of historical writing and archival description are not identical but are mutually informative.” This must be done so that objects can be more grounded within their virtual structures.

Measured by the guidelines set forth by Sabharwal, the FMP photographic database and generative exhibits are reasonably well established in terms of accessibility. The photographic database is an easily and intuitively used resource for which all virtually exhibited items are well connected, albeit through static structures, to their descriptive contexts. That is to say that the connections are in place until efforts such as social media distribution and release via external media loosen authority control.

Archivists must contend with the inherent “link” between digital exhibiting and advocacy. R. V. Roberto, in “A Critical Look at Online Exhibitions: When Creating One Resource Is More Effective than the Other,” examined the suitability of materials chosen for online exhibiting, distinguishing between online exhibiting and educational resources or collections. Focusing on resources developed for the 2007 bicentennial of the British Empire’s abolition of slavery, Roberto found that institutions developed sites for many reasons, including promoting themselves (using the opportunity offered

by the anniversary), exploring large or small portions of their collections, or applying political opinion or language to the larger public discussion.\textsuperscript{21} Roberto concluded, not surprisingly, that “Not any original material kept in museums, archives, or library special collections will be suitable or automatically provide enough inspiration to make a good online exhibition.”

\textbf{The Curatorial Problem}

Archivists and other custodians of digitized historical objects are actively participating in the democratization of archival resources. Communities use digitized resources to establish new identities, although they provide the resources at widely varying levels of scan quality and description. Sometimes the holding institution and practitioners with subject expertise contextualize those resources, and sometimes they do not. In the collections of the State Archives of Florida, the collecting and descriptive predilections of the previous generations are certainly in evidence. The TCT collections, like the Museum of Florida History exhibit that influenced the later FMP digital exhibit, show a romantic connection to tin can tourism and, with that, the interest of Florida agencies in preserving and promoting the state’s long history as a tourist destination.

The landscape of digitized historical resources witnesses the use of greater means of shaping, and contesting, community identities. Items shared online by lay users are produced at various levels of scan quality with infinitely varied types of description. They then immediately enter a flow of exchange that very quickly can separate those items from their origins through cascading generations of duplication and repurposing. So, while the number and variety of objects is remarkable, and the options of access and dispersal are greater than ever, custodians of historical images confront a growing confusion of historical meaning, context, and archival authority.

Selecting, describing, and sharing archival images, documents, and other sources require an interpretation of the materials, as well as assignment of meaning, even as the librarian or archivist strives to use digital media to provide representations of archival objects that are as accurate as possible. This remains true even as the sophistication and output of digital archives have grown exponentially over the past decade and more.\textsuperscript{22} A separation still exists between the reasons and methods for database creation and design and the actual uses and search strategies used by recipients of that work. The responsibility remains for the archivist and rare materials librarian to promote the accessibility as well as the relevance of the collections. The concern raised by dematerialization is certainly at play in the dynamics of tin can tourism images, many of which entered a stream of Internet media where the objects themselves moved farther and farther from their archival context.

The loosening of authority control takes place even as the digitized objects become more engaged in public discourse. The \textit{Tin Can Tourism} exhibit itself is exceedingly simple, based on a nondynamic style sheet design with data copied from, and then hyperlinked to, database records. Even so, it is also a selection that is inherently biased toward certain segments of the collections represented in the photographic database, based on previous work, prior interest, and scholarly perception. Much of the success,
it turns out, depended on the effectiveness of design or the understanding of the audience. For archival institutions, exhibitions are advocacy at least in one form or another, and that reality should inform the selection and development of projects.

After hatching the initial idea for the *Tin Can Tourism* exhibit, FMP of course conducted research for curation of the exhibit in the available historical literature to supplement the available archival information. Meanwhile, FMP’s curators chose objects to include content and a thematic thrust designed to correlate with a permanent physical exhibit at a sister institution, the Museum of Florida History. Since the exhibit opened on the FMP website, the Old Florida State Capitol Museum used it as one of the bases for a temporary physical installation. Subsequently, the reformulated Tin Can Tourist Association obtained that physical exhibit, with the text and images from the initial digital project, for a touring exhibit, and the content has been the basis for other digital media treatments.

The exhibit communicates a historical thesis through images specifically chosen to appeal to a wide audience, including people without any understanding of tin can tourism as a historical concept. It also aims to speak to those very familiar with the subject, and who might be motivated by the digital exhibit to pursue deeper historical investigation. In curating the exhibit, FMP developed an underlying historical thesis: the opening of highways to southern states during the second decade of the twentieth century brought increased access to unique and obscure Florida sites while also shaping urban development and material culture among newly permanent residents of the state. The thesis guided the development of the exhibit, which was designed in part to appeal to constituents assumed to be less interested in historical nuance than in celebrating the Tin Can Tourist Association and its personal connections, recreation, or passing affinity for tourist camps and campers in Florida. FMP’s staff historian served as curator and so constructed the underlying thesis for the project. The historian relied in part on kitschy and engaging images related to the lighthearted topic as a more effective means to convey historical analysis to a wide audience.

*Young tin can tourist Michael Sadler at camp, Dead Lakes, Florida, 1947. Image C006771, Department of Commerce, State Archives of Florida.*
Public archival and library institutions often charge curators with the task of making materials and cultural resources accessible and comprehensible to the lay public. This task creates the dual responsibilities of applying scholarly analysis and creating products appropriate for the wider public. Grabowski and others have shown the importance of exhibits for archives to grow their user bases and to publicize collections for researchers. Exhibits also educate researchers and the general public about the importance of an archives’ collecting efforts and the social benefit of archival institutions. Digital collections, of course, allow innumerable ways of taking on that responsibility. The FMP digital exhibit was produced in an attempt to use curious—though marginally significant—photographic and archival materials already available as digital objects to engage the public while also investigating deeper historical and cultural themes. While the positive response to a commemoration of the tin can tourists was expected, a wider engagement with the thematic arrangement of the materials was not.

Scholarly inquiry in other disciplines also influenced the thesis of the exhibit, including the work of architectural theorist Charlie Hailey and his discussion of how people express themselves by the places they occupy and shape through their occupation. In *Campsite Architecture and the Duration of Place*, Hailey focused on the evolution of spaces in Florida, which has been subject to transitory settlement for millennia. The work is not a definitive treatment of campsite history, as Hailey is far more concerned with cultural discourse and the permeable definitions of place, community, architecture, and campsite. Hailey’s historical treatment of the issues and periods touched on in his book are incomplete at times. However, his theoretical consideration uses Florida for its setting. The connection he provides between campsites and the emergence of very real cities in modern Florida helped establish an architecture for the exhibit, so to speak. In addition, Hailey’s discussion of certain cultural tensions in the state—such as the utilization of mobility in settlement development—helped inform a selection of historical representations from the digital holdings that was both appropriate for public consumption and a challenge to the public to think critically about historical issues. Hailey also touched on the transitory nature of settlement and the similarities it shares with virtual communities. This dual existence of campsite creation is interesting with regard to the tin can tourists, of course. Since the decline of the organization, members began to occupy virtual settlements through a growing web presence they inhabited via public memory and mutually developed popular narratives, personal stories, discussion forums, and images. Some of those images are historical, while many more document the re-creation of TCT associations and belonging through their rehabilitation of old vehicles and renewed public gatherings. The historical line, very loosely drawn from Hailey, between vacation campers and urban development and trailer communities in Florida is not represented in the histories presented by TCT members. Rather, it is a historical narrative that permits more images from the databases to provide richer historical significance. It allows those images to inhabit a more significant place in historical context even while their archival context is maintained though accompanying descriptive data.
Florida has been profoundly affected by tourism and the self-identification of locales as tourist destinations not exclusively occupied by permanent residents. The absence of cultural unity is at the core of many Florida communities. Although there are Florida cities and neighborhoods with strong architectural character, from older resort locations on the Panhandle and the northeastern coast to old urban areas such as Tampa, the cultural landscape is more often characterized by evolution, impermanence, rapid development, class divisions, and spatial negotiations between tourists, residents, and itinerant laborers. Tin can tourism epitomized the transitory nature of Florida’s residents and its fluid communities.

*Where the Digital Exhibit “Traveled” Next*

Historical interest in Florida tourism has grown in recent years. *Sunshine Paradise*, by Tracy Revels, published in 2011, looks at the long arc of tourist development in the state. In 2012, an entire panel at the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society looked at tin can tourism. That academic interest parallels the growing public interest in the history. The availability of digitized materials, including objects from FMP, has also fueled a democratized exploration of the subject by the lay public.
A few months after the release of the TCT digital exhibit, the Florida Historic Capitol Museum included the digital exhibit and select physical prints as part of the promotion of its program *Traveling to Paradise: Tin Can Tourists on Parade*. That exhibit featured restored trailers on the capitol lawn and was presented in conjunction with an exhibit in the museum itself, *Remembering Paradise: Souvenirs of Historic Florida Attractions*. The information in the FMP digital exhibit informed item selection for the physical exhibit, and the Capitol Museum promoted the work of the Department of State as a concurrent partnership. Interactions with the modern TCT, locally and nationally, also strongly influenced that exhibit programming.

Publicity for the Historic Capitol Museum program featured historical background provided by FMP and photographs printed for the standing exhibit. In addition to linking to the digital exhibit on the FMP with a description of its “short historical narrative” and numerous images, many of the images were used in a self-standing exhibit on the Florida Historic Capitol website. After the success of the museum programming and the publicity garnered by the featuring of tin can history by the Historic Capitol Museum, the national TCT Association informed the Florida Memory Program about plans to use the images and text originally provided through the FMP photo exhibit for a touring physical exhibit.

Furthermore, staff members at FMP have reported how other libraries supported by the State Library used the opportunity to post images on Facebook and used the *Tin Can Tourism* exhibit as content for various social media endeavors. FMP has also used the exhibit as one of many topics populating its Twitter and Facebook feeds. The digital exhibiting and social media promotion eventually led to the use of the images and text by a newspaper in the United Kingdom. The online edition of the *Daily Mail UK* published an extensive article about the tin can tourists and the images held at the archives. All of the content and images included in the online newspaper edition were taken from the digital exhibit and, for a time, usage statistics for the photo exhibit increased substantially.

Not all repurposing of digitized archival images is so transparent or easy to trace. TCT maintains a wiki where members and other contributors can provide images and contribute to the historical narrative. The wiki includes numerous images (largely unaccredited) from the FMP website. Many of those images were also used in the original digital exhibit. The history on the wiki is much more substantial than that provided by the FMP project and draws from user contributions and the research of site managers. Despite its breadth, much of the material is available from other sources, and nearly all is unsourced. Significant portions predate the online exhibit created by FMP. However, several of the images were lifted from the FMP photo database either before or after the program began promoting the holdings. (While the wiki managers suggest that the images are held under a Creative Commons license, the State Archives of Florida, for one, would appreciate credits.) The use of images and content on sites such as TinCanTourists.com influenced other sites to include images, usually credited back to that website, instead of to the repository with the original records.

In contrast, the Hemmings Daily website of vintage car news included the images and text from the Florida Memory Project with context provided. In fact, they were lifted directly from the original content, with credit given and quotations indicated.
The TampaPix website, last edited in July 2009, features a more robust, independently researched history of tin can tourism, which includes images from the FMP site as well as images from Burgert Brothers photographic archives of the Tampa-Hillsborough County Public Library.32

**Conclusion**

The history provided through the TCT organizations’ online efforts, personal blogs and sites, and other digital representations provides factual and personal discussions of the people, places, and chronology involved. However, the relevance within a broader historical narrative is either not addressed or is obscured by disparate data. Meanwhile, the invisible chain of informational sources perpetuates unverified—however democratically generated—historical narratives. That said, the FMP exhibit itself and other online efforts by the State Library and Archives of Florida do not emphasize historical citation, as the historical information provided is so widely available. Nevertheless, a tension exists between the archival content being promoted and the unsubstantiated publications in which it has been used. The images—the actual historical objects provided—make those representations more substantial, in large part because of the authority they convey, even if the origins of that authoritative content remain unacknowledged.

Another tension for projects such Tin Can Tourism arises between allowing discovery of digitized collections by researchers and promoting specific items and collections through “historical representation.” Collecting and describing images for the purpose of exhibiting interrupts the process of researcher discovery. However, the prompt to access collections no doubt allows new users to further their inquiries into the available materials.

This project clearly achieved the goal of getting original content into public discourse despite the obvious concerns for control over the chain of information provided for free and promoted by a state institution. So what is the impact of the digital outreach on public understanding of the history of tin can tourism in Florida? How are the scholarly and administrative choices of archivists and digital curators influencing public understanding of—or even the creation of public interest in—historical issues? Beyond influencing the decisions made by scholarly researchers, which archivists and librarians do every day through their professional service, the creation of digital projects can spur new popular interpretations. Interested constituent groups seize upon these initiatives to push their own representations into other media that can influence the programming of nonprofit groups and voluntary associations. But that’s not necessarily a bad thing.

The case of the Otho Granford Shoup photograph is interesting to reflect upon.33 Considering the paucity of data associated with many archival images, much is actually known about this one. The image was taken between 1923 and 1925 in Gainesville, Florida, and, significantly, the TCT “Royal Chief” is identified by name. That data is available in the archival record provided by the FMP. Unfortunately, as the engaging image has been re-represented, that data failed to follow along. Despite available descriptive data, the image as it was repurposed on multiple websites is reduced to
merely an interesting depiction of a self-titled TCT chief. Many viewers could use context clues to discern a date range of the 1920s, but, beyond that, the independent blogs and amateur history sites where images like this one appear provide little information to encourage a deeper user experience. Revived interest in tin can tourism, spurred by objects like that image, however, will lead to further patron research. That researcher interest can occur even if the content-enriching information provided in the metadata in the original digital context does not greet a new set of users when they first encountered the object.

Archivists have to bear in mind that exhibiting, online or otherwise, represents advocacy for certain collections or intellectual perspectives. Given that responsibility, they must acknowledge that meanings that attach to archival objects they make available are largely beyond their control. Meanwhile, archivists and others responsible for making unique image and text collections digitally accessible still must provide contextual environments and archival authority whenever possible to make informed historical analysis more achievable for the amazing variety of users now accessing archival objects like historical images in digital environments. They must do what they can so that those traveling objects sent out along the digital highways can find their ways home again.

*Otho Granford Shoup at Gainesville, c. 1925. Image PR01241, Print Collections, State Archives of Florida.*
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5. Google Analytics data provided by the Florida Memory Program, March 15, 2013.
6. For an in-depth discussion of archival participation in the Flickr Commons project, see Kate Theimer, Web 2.0 Tools and Strategies for Archives and Local History Collections (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, 2010), and A Different Kind of Web: New Connections between Archives and Our Users (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011).
9. Ibid., 2.
10. For more information about the current organization of the Tin Can Tourists, see www.TinCanTourists.com.
15. F. R. Ankersmit, Meaning, Truth, and Reference in Historical Representation (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012). Ankersmit uses a concept derived from “historism,” “that objects cannot be studied apart from their past” (2), to distinguish between the direct reference to an object or source and its description, and subsequent representation of it in context and interpretation of the object as part of an effort to assign meaning and significance.


18. Ibid., 68–72. Conway and Punzalan describe the dilemma of digital access eroding archival context through description of the real materiality represented by digitized object, which leads always to an actual dematerialization of the photographic archives.


20. Ibid., 3.


26. For instance, Hailey ascribes credit for the success of the Federal Writers Project in Florida to the famous Stetson Kennedy, instead of the unsung female head of the program, Caritta Dogget Corse.

27. Hailey, *Campsite: Architectures of Duration and Place*.


33. The image is available to view through the Florida Memory Flickr Commons project, http://www. flickr.com/photos/floridamemory/6684136127/in/set-72157627722129852/.

34. Roberto, “A Critical Look at Online Exhibitions and Online Collections.”

In Ephemeral Material: Queering the Archive, Alana Kumbier makes a number of important contributions to archival practice and studies, including making queer archives and archival practices accessible and furthering their creation and recognition, developing new participatory archival frameworks, and enriching archival studies through the inclusion of new materials, approaches, and understandings. It is important to note that Kumbier’s work establishes the relevance and resonance of queer approaches beyond the explicitly LGBTQ archives and collections upon which they have previously centered. Her book also serves as a key touchstone for those involved as archivists, community members, documentarians, activists, and scholars in documenting queer lives by opening new spaces for responding to the demands that are particular to queer histories and cultures. Kumbier powerfully argues that queering the archives—by pushing ourselves to think through queer interests, experiences, theoretical frameworks, and cultural practices and to align ourselves with these queer values and practices—opens the possibilities for us to critically engage in new and much-needed ways with established archival theory and practice.

Ephemeral Material is the fifth book in the fantastic Litwin Books series on Gender and Sexuality in Information Studies. It grew out of Kumbier’s dissertation in comparative studies at the Ohio State University, as well as the last decade of her professional work as an academic librarian at Wellesley and Hampshire Colleges, and her artistic, activist, and personal involvements in and passions for zine-making, drag performance, and queer communities and cultures. Her interdisciplinary background allows her to draw on an expansive body of work by scholars in history, media, disability, queer, cultural, and gender studies, as well as what will be, for many, more familiar works in archival and information studies. The book makes great use of Kumbier’s diverse experiences and is not afraid to be deeply personal in a manner that is critical, self-reflexive, and honest. This is particularly evident in her willingness to share the challenges, failures, and difficult lessons learned in less successful queer archival projects. The book does a masterful job grounding its complex theoretical work with concrete examples. Drawn from a wide range of archival projects and media representations of archival spaces and practices, these examples make it an engaging and accessible text that will meet the diverse needs of a broad range of readers.

The book is structured into two sections—each with its own introduction to the major issues and questions addressed in the section. The first section, “Negotiating Archives,” works with two media representations of archives and archival practices in the documentary films, The Watermelon Woman and Liebe Perla. This section crucially draws sustained attention to the challenges and troubles of users of diverse abilities in accessing archives and materials and how we in the archival community might better respond to these problems. It also brings to light issues of the creation of histories where there were none and the impacts of the lingering presence of difficult, painful pasts on the present in archival contexts. The chapters in the second section, “Archiving from the Ground Up,” explore the questions raised in the first section.
regarding participatory archives through a number of case studies of specific queer archival projects—including documenting drag king culture, an archival art installation, and the Queer Zine Archiving Project (QZAP). Kumbier sets forth a new framework for participatory archives that can empower individuals and communities, particularly queer ones, to get involved in archival projects.

Significantly for archivists, scholars, and students, this book does important work in challenging and transforming existing participatory archival frameworks. Kumbier develops a very useful collaborative, participatory archival practice she terms “archiving from the ground up” through case studies in the book’s second section (p. 117). This practice is a direct response to “archival exclusions,” the long-term marginalization through both explicit historical exclusion and underdocumentation of queer cultures, communities, and individuals in the archives. It is a practice of working with members of those cultures and communities to document their presents and to make their futures through the creation of the record. It is distinct from other frameworks, in its focus on archivists working with members of cultures and communities that they hope to document, rather than archivists working for constituents by creating projects, collections, or records on their behalf (p. 125). Beyond its focus on archivists working alongside participants, Kumbier focuses on the importance of archivists advocating for archives to communities through DIY archival workshops and conversations, and decentering the role of the archivist in creating the archives (p. 146). Finally, in this approach the participants decide on the who, what, why, and how of documentation, rather than confining their options to traditional documentation projects or dictates. Kumbier grounds this framework solidly in archival experience by looking critically at projects in which she was intimately involved, using them to show the learning context in which she came to understand archival practices from the ground up. She argues that even though the projects she describes took place outside of the context of traditional archives, they offer successful models, ideas, and practices that can be adopted for queer cultural documentation across archival contexts. Perhaps most significantly, this framework has the ability to transform archival power relations—identifying and sharing “the power to represent, to define, to describe” and to arrange as part of practice (p. 151). Though the book only just begins the work of answering the questions raised by such a practice, Kumbier does an important service by raising them and demonstrating so clearly why they matter.

Kumbier has undoubtedly begun an important project for archival studies and practice. This reviewer’s primary critique of the book is that it lacks cohesion. The two sections are slightly disjointed with more work needed to make the book into a cohesive whole. The first two chapters stand very well on their own as essays. However, they do not flow as smoothly as they could into the second section, in which the chapters build more closely upon one another. This issue could have been better addressed through a conclusion essay. As it stands, the book’s ending feels rather abrupt. Kumbier also raises a few points of interest, such as the use of documentary films as a form of creative “documentation strategy” (p. 47), that could have used more explication and follow-up. As a resource intended to inspire action, the book would also have benefited from the inclusion of a resource list to better meet the needs not only of archivists, but
also of community members interested and engaged in the queer archival projects and practices that Kumbier describes so beautifully.

*Ephemeral Material* will be of great interest to archivists, artists, activists, and scholars. It makes important contributions by documenting the work being done by queer archives, archival practices, and studies. It goes beyond that success to achieve its primary goal—making a critical intervention into information studies by bridging queer and archival discourses that serves to inspire and inform action, the creation of future documentation projects, and archival collaborations of all sorts. It demonstrates clearly not only what queer and archival discourses are, but also why they matter so deeply. This book is sure to inspire future work in these queer modes in the archives, the classroom, and far beyond.

Marika Cifor  
Doctoral Student  
Department of Information Studies  
University of California, Los Angeles

This edited collection brings together the papers and discussions from symposia funded by the UK Jisc (formerly Joint Information Systems Committee) under the heading of Preservation of Complex Objects (POCOS). It represents a predominantly European state of the art on the subject of preservation of complex digital objects—here represented by reports and case studies on current and past work on digital art, simulations and visualizations, virtual worlds, and videogame environments, together with summary chapters on the core issues of metadata, workflow tools, and legal considerations. Its aim is “to set out what is currently understood about dealing with complex digital objects” and to “provide a broad framework for starting to manage and address relevant issues” (p. xii). This reviewer feels confident in saying that if you read only one book this year about the state of digital preservation, this is the book you should read.

For those who have been breathing a sigh of relief that with a few workshops and some well-recommended software, archivists are now ready to tackle anything digital that comes our way, this book is full of bad news. It makes clear—and repeats several times—that the relatively easy stuff, for which government concerns have driven the earliest digital preservation work in North America, is pretty well in hand. But the really interesting stuff, that which people admire as having complex cultural value (art, cultural reconstruction visualizations) and which represents new, never-before-seen challenges (videogames, digital video, and film), represents a nest of difficulties, not least of which are the exceedingly complex intellectual property issues that beset these often very collaborative works. Furthermore, the characteristics that make these works complex—their interactivity, their construction from multiple parts that depend upon specific hardware and software configurations, and sometimes even their dependence upon the existence of flows of data and modes of access totally beyond the creator’s control—mean that it is impossible to draw a single line around the “object” to be preserved, since it is almost always necessary to preserve in some way all or most of the environment in which the object originally lived and performed.

If one message comes through loud and clear from this collection, it is that except as a partial assisting modality, migration is dead as a preservation method for complex digital objects except for certain niche applications such as the adaptation of an artwork to a new environment with the full consent and experimental interest of the original creator or current owner. Instead, it has become clear that if preservation means the ability to present the original object to a later user in its original and authentic form, then preservation for complex objects now means emulation and/or virtualization. For this reason, a newly serious interest has arisen in the preservation both of software—executable software and preferably the original code as well—and the object’s native hardware environment. Several viable projects are already working toward preserving libraries of software; more difficult will be the preservation of hardware that is likely to wear out and fail in unanticipated ways. The consensus here is to depend on computer museums for the curation of working systems from the past, at the very least to be used to judge the authenticity of an emulation and at most as venues where complex digital
objects may be exhibited. However, the number of such museums and any guarantees of some kind of documentation strategy approach to accumulating collections of computer systems by them are clearly insufficient at present.

As far as software is concerned, the problems are even more difficult: though code in whatever form can potentially be preserved without change forever, permission to do so (which demands repeated copying for the life of the software object) is something else again. This will require either business models that guarantee continued profit to the commercial creators or determined worldwide deposit laws that demand the deposit of software code and permissions for its preservation in exchange for the benefits of copyright. In addition, archivists are already familiar with the long wait to secure a paper collection while knowing that it is moldering away; in the digital world, particularly with commercial software products that may either be the primary target of preservation or be necessary to the primary target’s performance, current commercial business models find little profit in preserving even for their own purposes software that they no longer support. Because artists often push the limits of software that they use, the fine-grained details of a particular version of a software product vital to the very possibility of a particular artwork might not even be saved along the revision path by anyone except possibly programmers who worked for the company.

In short, preserving complex digital objects, while the often excellent essays in this book much clarify its demands, still has a long way to go to scale to the intensity of preservation presently accorded to conventional cultural objects. As usual, the problems digital preservation confronts, though they are technically complex, are more challenging from social and legal perspectives. In the book’s closing chapter authored by the editors, a litany of challenges discussed in the symposia is offered: 8 for visualizations and simulations, 4 for software art, 18 for gaming environments and virtual worlds. Although the main issues I have highlighted suggest multiple overlaps, these numbers alone are evidence of the size of the task that remains. The real value of the book as a whole lies in the constituent essays that address first the urgency and importance of the preservation task and then offer examples that show what has been and is being done: projects addressing practices and devising tools; work on documentation metadata guidelines; case studies of actual experiments in preservation ranging through the major areas of complex digital objects; and the serious issues raised by legal barriers to preservation. The chapter authors represent a broad range of expertise, from artists, designers, and academics to computer scientists and archivists. They take the reader effectively into an experience of the complexity of the preservation tasks related to complex digital objects by achieving a rare consistency of clarity in explanation. The participants in and sponsors of the POCOS symposia are to be congratulated for having produced a landmark summary that is adequately scary but hopeful and constructive at the same time.

Patricia Galloway
Professor
School of Information
University of Texas at Austin
Archives function as the collective memory of the past. In a sense, these repositories exist to save us from ourselves. Why should history repeat itself if past mistakes and triumphs, as well as the mundanities of daily life, are clearly documented? In a mere 14 chapters, Helen Forde and Jonathan Rhys-Lewis have mapped the directions for preserving archives and thereby civilization itself, which is no small feat! *Preserving Archives* attempts this Herculean task with mind-boggling thoroughness and beautiful arrangement. From a comprehensive section on the characteristics of archival materials to digital preservation management to micro- and macro-environments to managing risks and using volunteers, it appears that the authors have thought of everything and gone about developing the chapters and structuring the content in a most methodical and comprehensive way. Readers familiar with the first edition will be pleased to find updates throughout, as well as new topics added to the repertoire of best practices: digital preservation, green building, and management and training of volunteers. Updates to the five appendices (especially the advisory template for compiling a preservation policy), a thorough bibliography, and the British and International standards all add value to this indispensable reference.

*Preserving Archives* begins predictably with an introduction to archives preservation including a succinct explanation of the distinctions between the conservation and preservation professions’ trajectories—preservation is a holistic practice or an umbrella, while conservation is quite specialized and married to science—followed by a thorough listing and description of common archival material types and their characteristics in chapter 2. The third chapter dives right into managing digital preservation. Embedding a dedicated chapter on the most current archival process rather than simply tacking it on as an afterthought reflects both digital preservation’s importance to contemporary processing and the strategic vision of the authors. Waller and Sharpe’s 2006 cleverly titled study, “Mind the Gap” (pp. 29–30), includes alarming statistics on the state of digital preservation. Strides have been made in the last decade, but the “Gap” is a moving target that requires cooperation across systems, developers, and platforms. The authors have provided an excellent overview including cautionary tales as to cost, selection for preservation, in-house versus contracting out solutions, and starting points. In short, this chapter is an invaluable resource for institutions on the verge of digital preservation programs and for those ready to re-evaluate their fledgling programs.

The buildings that actually house archives are of utmost importance in preserving them, and the next three chapters tackle facilities issues with aplomb. The building is the first line of defense, so building techniques and construction materials are paramount. The checklists for construction and layout (pp. 50–51) are heartening to see. Every project manager for a renovation, an addition, or a new building should take note and consider the ramifications of refurbishment versus new construction, especially in light of contemporary thermal inertia building techniques and their lower energy consumption. After building envelopes, fire suppression and security deserve consideration and are addressed accordingly. A variety of gaseous, low-oxygen, and water-based systems are discussed and paired with real examples such as the Dorset Record...
Office that chose a low-pressure Inergen system to replace its Halon fire-extinguishing system for financial and safety reasons. Chapter 6, “Managing Archival Storage,” is one of the most comprehensive sections in the book but still leaves the reader wanting more information on environmental conditions, monitoring, and controls. To be fair, the authors have done the topic justice and include more information in subsequent chapters, but the topic itself is vast and complicated.

Just as the last three chapters relate to each other, the next three—“Managing Risks and Avoiding Disaster,” “Creating and Using Surrogates,” and “Moving the Records”—all build on a recurring theme. Up-to-date examples such as the Cologne Archives collapse in 2009, the earthquakes in Haiti in 2010, and the Japanese tsunami of 2011 drive home the need to mitigate risk and to be prepared for the unexpected. For those responsible for disaster recovery planning at their respective institutions, the checklists for equipment and gear are quite helpful as is the pre-prepared press statement on page 113. On the use of surrogates, which eliminates risk exponentially, the authors wisely ask us to consider the complexity and expense of a full digitization program with its accompanying standards for image capture, metadata, online delivery, and ongoing digital preservation needs—nothing is ever as simple as it might seem. Forde and Rhys-Lewis shed some light on a perceived “digital tsunami” with a 2010 quote from Bulow and Ahmon (p. 137) stating that 80 million images online (and millions of pounds spent delivering them) represents only 3 to 5 percent of the National Archives UK’s collection! Readers are reminded that digital surrogates are but one piece in the big preservation puzzle.

Mitigating risks continues as a recurring theme in chapters 10 and 11: “Exhibiting Archives” and “Handling the Records.” Arguably, chapters 12 and 13 follow the same pattern; what are “Managing a Pest Control Programme” and “Training and the Use of Volunteers” if not blueprints for avoiding calamity? In “Exhibiting Archives,” the authors are careful to point out the differences between UK and US standards, which speaks to Preserving Archives’ universal appeal to the international archives/library/museum community. The sample exhibition policy on page 161 is a succinct reference, as is the short list of standards and guidelines on page 163. Of note is the layman’s explanation of cumulative light damage. Light levels are an ongoing source of debate, and being able to point administrators and public services professionals clamoring for higher light levels to a reputable source strengthens the preservation case.

Of all the chapters, “Handling the Records” seems strangely placed. Good practices for physically accessing materials are so embedded in an archives’ daily activities and purpose that the subject appears to be an afterthought so late in the text. In reality, Forde and Rhys-Lewis have simply moved from the macro to the microscopic. With their emphasis on continued staff training, perhaps chapter 11 would be better placed in proximity to 13: “Training and the Use of Volunteers.” “Managing a Pest Control Programme” is sandwiched between the two; perhaps this placement is a subtle reminder that human pests also require management. Regardless, acknowledging the continued movement away from chemical intervention and toward better housekeeping as prevention is worth highlighting. In fact, the discussions on chemicals in disuse and the temperature and humidity levels required for common storage pests to thrive are very helpful indeed.
The overarching theme of *Preserving Archives* is this: Minimize Risk. Minimize risks during collections moves, when designing and installing exhibits, when planning and implementing storage areas and housings, and during documentation and digitization. Minimize risk and future access is possible. The insets and notes at the end of each chapter are hugely interesting and contribute to the ease with which “dry” material can be read. Minor details bring the history of the profession to life in a way that lists and procedural advisories cannot possibly convey. For example, after World War II, junior staff in the Public Record Office (now the National Archives, UK) were required to mend documents upside down just in case they were tempted to read them (p. 3)! Helen Forde and Jonathan Rhys-Lewis are serious invigilators of their chosen profession; their practical reference with its rich historical details is a gift to all cultural heritage organizations.

Julia Merkel
Preservation Officer
James Madison University Libraries

The editors Mary A. Caldera and Kathryn M. Neal begin Through the Archival Looking Glass: A Reader on Diversity and Inclusion with an explanation of their own interest in diversity. Caldera relates a story where, as a student, she discovered some records that spoke to her personally and showed her that the archival record could include the history of minorities, underrepresented groups, and ultimately her history as a Latino, lesbian woman. Kathryn M. Neal studied African American history and culture in college and became interested in the diversity of the archival record through her research. They then outline the history of the archival profession's interest in diversity from presidential addresses made to the Society of American Archivists (SAA) to journal articles to the A*Census survey, and they point out how the study of the topic has evolved over time.

The book addresses two main themes: building diversity within the profession and within collections. Case studies in several chapters illustrate projects that have done just that. While there is some minor overlap of subjects between the chapters, each is different enough to keep the reader interested. The chapters range from ethical discussions to nuts-and-bolts descriptions of how to pull off a documentation study of a controversial topic to examples of successful projects that involve working with underrepresented communities. Throughout, the authors caution against rigidly applying archival laws to these types of collections while encouraging archivists to work with the groups they are trying to document by seeking their help with describing and granting access to these materials.

In chapter 1, Marisol Ramos and Valerie Love write about their own personal histories and difficulties with documenting underrepresented communities. They show readers many of the typical pitfalls that institutions encounter when trying to diversify their collections, such as thinking that hiring someone from a minority group will automatically mean that their collection will become diversified or that one person can then speak for the entire group. Their chapter clearly illustrates why true institutional commitment to diversity needs to be the work of the entire organization and not just one staff member.

In chapter 2, Mark A. Greene explores the history of diversity within the archives profession, but mostly in this chapter he explores his own history with diversity. He uses his work experience at both the Minnesota Historical Society and the University of Wyoming American Heritage Center to increase diversity within their collections as a framework for his recommendations. Greene advocates that diversifying is not a passive activity and that archivists must go into and engage the communities we want to document and not just expect them to come to us. He also recommends that we involve minority communities in the entire archival process and that larger archival institutions make peace with community archives and actually reach out and help them preserve and document their collections so that a fuller record of these communities can be preserved.
Jeffrey Mifflin’s chapter, “Regarding Indigenous Knowledge in Archives,” has a twofold purpose. He offers background on indigenous collecting and illustrates some of the important uses of these collections, like winning lawsuits to recover tribal lands and resurrecting extinct languages and cultural practices. Mifflin discusses the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials and advocates for the archival profession to accept these protocols and work with indigenous people to help collect, grant appropriate access to, and describe their materials. However, he also urges the creators of the Protocols to better define certain terms, such as “culturally sensitive,” so that archivists would be more willing to accept these guidelines.

T-Kay Sangwand questions the inclusiveness of archives in chapter 4. She applauds the profession’s movement toward diversity, but questions whether the processes put in place to diversify the profession will actually result in a more diverse record. Sangwand writes about methods of preserving nontraditional materials, like oral performances, and illustrates the creation and uses of these types of materials through her history of Cuban hip hop. This chapter is interesting because it urges the archival profession to reexamine its ideas of what an archival record is and suggests that we include the record creators in our work of appraisal, accessioning, description, and access so that the materials can better represent their communities and original meanings.

In chapter 5, Vivian Wong, Tom Ikeda, Ellen-Rae Cachola, and Florante Peter Ibanez discuss the importance of using digital methods and social media to document groups that would otherwise go undocumented and how these technologies allow communities to document themselves and disseminate their histories in the ways that they want to be represented. The chapter follows the history of three Asian American community projects that have become highly successful digital archives projects and explains the impact that these collections have had on their communities and on research.

Sonia Yaco and Beatriz Betancourt Hardy discuss the Desegregation of Virginia Education (DOVE) project launched in 2008 in chapter 6. The authors give a short history of desegregation in Virginia and then discuss the creation and implementation of this statewide documentation strategy to preserve the history of this event. The authors address everything from the importance of choosing a name for the project to leadership struggles and problems they faced throughout the project. This chapter is a convincing case study on how to document a phenomenon, and its “how to” style of writing would be a good way to help future projects avoid some pitfalls.

In chapter 7, Kim Walters uses the Brown Research Library and the Southwest Museum of the American Indian’s 20-year history of working with Native American communities to illustrate the many benefits of working with these communities to better identify collections, increase collecting efforts, and better represent each group’s history, even if following its wishes goes counter to the policies of the institution. Walters stresses that finding compromises to respect cultural wishes while involving the community in the preservation of its own history equals a win-win for everyone.

Sharon Thibodeau takes her chapter in a slightly different direction when she explores NARA’s Office of Records Service’s efforts to increase diversity in its workforce. She explains the many programs that NARA put in place to increase diversity, from recruiting efforts at universities from underrepresented communities, to mentorship, training, and internship programs set up at NARA to give its diverse employees the
work, resume, and job interviewing skills necessary to move to higher positions within the organization. Although interesting, this chapter would have benefited from the inclusion of more concrete statistics that show the effectiveness of these programs and thus demonstrate their benefit to other institutions.

In chapter 9, Daniel Hartwig and Christine Weideman address a critical aspect of diversifying the archival profession: classroom outreach to high school students in schools with significant numbers of minority students through Yale’s Sterling Memorial Library’s Family and Community Archives Project (FCAP). High school programs like this one in conjunction with the scholarships, internships, and mentoring programs mentioned at the beginning of the chapter could have a real impact on bringing diversity to our profession.

Anne J. Gilliland’s chapter is an academic discussion of how archival education can better prepare students to deal with diverse collections. She recommends that students study codes of ethics and diversity protocols, and that students should take multidisciplinary classes in anthropology or gender studies. The concept that I found most intriguing in her chapter is a service learning course where students work in a community archives that is very different from their personal backgrounds. In addition to their work, students write journals about their experiences, and then give class presentations. The writing style of this chapter did not speak to this reviewer, but if readers are looking for a more academic or theory-based discussion, they will enjoy this chapter on expanding archival education theory.

This compilation of essays discusses many aspects of diversity, both of archival professionals and of archival collections and documentation. Many of the chapters offer important advice for building diversity within an institution, and this book is a good starting point for people who want to begin collecting materials from underrepresented groups. As the editors say in their introduction, “Our purpose is neither to define diversity in archives nor to prescribe ways to achieve it. . . . We seek to stimulate further conversation in the hopes of coming a little closer to a common understanding of what diversity is or can be and how it may be realized” (p. xix).

Amy Mondt
Associate Director
The Vietnam Archive

NOTES


Oral history has become a vital part of the historical record, filling in gaps and providing nuanced perspectives on how individuals and communities perceive and remember events. For the purposes of this work, oral history has been defined as

Primary source material collected in an interview setting with a witness to or a participant in an event or a way of life and is grounded in the context of time and place to find its meaning. It is recorded for the purpose of preserving the information and making it available to others.

The term refers to both the process and the final product (v. 1, p. 11).

Historians, academic institutions, memory organizations, local community centers, and many other entities have conducted oral history projects with varying degrees of success. Oral histories require long-term planning, strategic oversight, committed participants, ongoing support, and clear goals. These attributes may be difficult to attain even for large institutions such as universities, libraries, and museums. The issues are exacerbated for smaller organizations or groups of individuals without the infrastructure or clear mandate to collect and preserve records. Despite the challenges, many organizations and individuals undertake memory-gathering projects without any clear understanding of the effort involved. A community may decide to record oral histories for a variety of reasons, from commemorating a milestone to documenting shared experiences for future generations. The Community Oral History Toolkit was designed as a reference work for people or groups interested in developing oral history programs independently of an academic institution. The work’s purpose is to provide a practical set of guidelines adaptable to a variety of situations.

Community Oral History Toolkit is the product of a collaboration between three authors with diverse credentials and experiences. Nancy MacKay, Mary Kay Quinlan, and Barbara W. Sommer, with backgrounds in the fields of librarianship, journalism, and public history respectively, have spent decades partnering with communities to produce oral histories. All three have published multiple works, including manuals and histories developed out of local projects. The Toolkit places particular emphasis on the aspects of oral history unique to community-based endeavors. Community is an amorphous term that can refer to any group with a sense of shared identity. It may be based on geography; organizational membership; association with an ethnic, racial, or religious identity; employment; sexual orientation; or even participation in a particular event. The authors seek a balance between practical advice and theory, providing information on topics as diverse as project management, the construction of memory, and digital preservation. However, the major themes that emerge throughout the work focus on defining and implementing a project with clear goals and a means of accomplishing them.

There are five volumes in the Community Oral History Toolkit. The books may be read independently; however, each volume makes numerous references to the other works. The sections, “Introduction to Oral History,” “Planning a Community Oral History Project,” “Managing a Community Oral History Project,” “Interviewing in
Community Oral History,” and “After the Interview in Community Oral History,” build upon and expand the overview provided in the series introduction reproduced at the beginning of each volume. To make the work accessible to the average individual with no experience in the discipline, the introduction contains repeated references to the profession’s standards, including the best practices and guidelines of the Oral History Association and the legal and ethical underpinnings of the field. The series makes clear the numerous resources and organizations upon which the reader can rely for expertise and instruction beyond the work itself. Key points are highlighted throughout the text in bold, emphasizing significant ideas. In addition, the volumes have appendices that include a wide variety of information. Glossaries, forms, additional readings, resources, equipment and recording standards, and surveys used to gather data from oral history professionals make the work a handy reference guide on a variety of subjects. This is not a work that needs to be read cover to cover, but instead can be used as a useful introduction to oral history and a guide to specific tasks and issues.

Volume 1 is an excellent summary of the field of oral history, its place within the broader discipline of history, and its best practices. This volume is divided into eight chapters, each of which explores one aspect of understanding, creating, or using oral histories. The authors ground the discipline in a discussion of historical practice and an exploration of how community initiatives are distinct from academic projects in the first three sections. The following three chapters provide concrete instruction on the practical, technological, and ethical considerations community members must address when undertaking oral histories. Analysis and interpretation of the Oral History Association’s best practices in chapter 7 enrich this information. Finally, the remaining volumes of the Community Oral History Toolkit are outlined. The appendices of volume 1 contain the richest source of additional resources, terms, and forms. A selection of forms is also downloadable from the publisher’s website.

The second and third volumes cover the planning and management of community oral histories. The planning stage is broken down into key components, such as selecting a project director; determining the scope of the undertaking; securing funding, space, community support, and equipment; acquiring personnel; and record keeping. Of particular interest to information professionals is the emphasis on working with a repository for ultimate disposition of oral histories from the outset of the project. Volume 3 is similarly divided into individual chapters on managing each aspect of an oral history project. These volumes introduce three fictitious examples of oral history projects with varying levels of funding and support to illustrate how different organizations address issues and challenges. The two sections are greatly redundant, but when read together, they offer a step-by-step process for developing a project and translating that planning into action.

The oral history process is divided into its multiple components in volumes 4 and 5 of the Toolkit. The characteristics that set an oral history apart from other types of interviews are explored and explained. Volume 4 provides a wealth of detailed information on the interview itself, from interviewer training and background research to selecting participants and transcription protocols. Volume 5 focuses on how oral histories are preserved and made available through processing or cataloging at a repository. It also offers examples of exhibits, books, documentaries, and other projects created from
oral histories. These volumes reiterate the significant concepts woven throughout the text, focusing on the issues that community members may not immediately recognize. The importance of defining a project scope, developing consistent and thorough documentation, respecting the interviewer, and considering the long-term preservation and access needs of a project are the crux of the work.

The Community Oral History Toolkit contains an incredible amount of detailed, clear information, but as a single entity, the work can be repetitive. The five volumes that make up the Toolkit contain over 700 pages, but a large amount of content is repeated from one section to another. It is likely the subject could be covered in far fewer pages, although breaking it into manageable volumes has its advantages. The reader may focus on a particular phase of a project or topic while still getting an overview of the discipline. Despite the length, the work would also benefit from additional, diverse models for oral history projects. The fictitious examples are a good starting point, but real-world situations and solutions are always useful.

Information professionals would benefit greatly from reading the Community Oral History Toolkit. Although those unaffiliated with a repository are the work’s target audience, any reader will gain insight into the methods and tools used to complete a successful oral history. It is valuable both for those conducting and managing oral history projects and the repository staff who will assume ultimate control over the finished products. The effort that goes into making oral histories available is often underestimated, especially in the digital age. The Toolkit educates the general reader on the misconception of the web as a preservation medium as well as the ongoing commitment necessary to maintain records. We work in a time when archivists are increasingly tasked with “creating” history through collection development and the documentation of underrepresented groups. Oral history is a valuable tool in this effort, and the Toolkit provides a unique perspective that incorporates the specific challenges communities encounter. It is especially useful for those archives that do not have the resources to take on an oral history program. The book is also an excellent bridge for archivists who collaborate with external partners to expand the work of preserving the stories and memories of varied groups throughout the community.

Heather Oswald, CA
Archivist and Coordinator of Outreach
Kennesaw State University
Management: Innovative Practices for Archives and Special Collections is the fourth book in a series focusing on how practicing archivists are overcoming challenges in their repositories. The 13 case studies presented cover a wide range of topics incorporating management themes in various ways. The volume is appropriate for a wide range of archivists, librarians, administrators, and students with diverse interests. The programmatic studies cover intersecting elements of people, technology, and resources to improve programs and services.

Kate Theimer is the author of the ArchivesNext blog, where she writes about developments in the archives field. She served on the Council of the Society of American Archivists from 2010 to 2013, is a frequent writer and speaker on various archival issues, and formerly worked in the policy division of the National Archives and Records Administration. While Theimer has not managed an archives department, she has in-depth knowledge of current trends and practices in the field. Her blog’s large readership no doubt enabled her to recruit a diverse set of authors and topics for the book.

While presented in no apparent order, the case studies can be read in two distinct groups. Seven case studies focus on more traditional management topics and various aspects of managing an archives and special collections department. These include discussions of knowledge transfer in the wake of a retirement, creating a laboratory environment to increase access and engagement with users, managing the merger of departments, managing organizational change, developing curricula to teach leadership skills, planning for shared personnel and resources, and strategic planning.

A major thread throughout many of the case studies is the realignment of staff duties and functions to meet the needs of a department or library. A current trend in the field is the unification of disparate archival units into one larger department within academic libraries. Caroline Daniels, Delinda Stephens Buie, Rachel I. Howard, and Elizabeth E. Reilly describe the thoughtful process undertaken at the University of Louisville to merge departments and staff. Their focus on communication, careful analysis to produce shared policies, and teamwork would be helpful in similar situations or when changing staff roles within a department. While not explicitly discussed, their case study is an excellent example of a successful change in management techniques. Fynnette Eaton’s piece on managing organizational change provides the theoretical framework for change management strategies, but her specific example at the National Archives is less helpful because Eaton retired before the change management efforts were finished.

Erin Passehl-Stoddart and Jodi Allison-Bunnell describe their experiences sharing personnel and resources between institutions in two successful grant-funded projects. With dwindling budgets, many institutions may want to explore sharing work through consortia efforts or partnerships with other organizations. Passehl-Stoddart and Allison-Bunnell outline essential lessons learned in the scheduling and supervision of shared staff, building upon existing infrastructure and relationships, devoting enough time to project administration, and the need for strong communication and clear expectations.

Maija Anderson’s experience of building knowledge transfer principles into the planning for employee turnover is refreshing. Many repositories skip transition planning
or rush to complete it in the last weeks of an employee’s tenure. This has negative ramifications for all involved and creates problems that managers can prevent. Anderson captures essential internal knowledge of a retiring archivist, and she outlines how using knowledge transfer techniques enabled many other essential activities in the management of the department. These included creating written documentation of policies and procedures, training more staff in essential functions, and creating outreach opportunities for stakeholders including library colleagues, users, and donors.

Mark Greene’s chapter on strategic planning is a great introduction to those unfamiliar with or frightened by the process. He outlines multiple rounds of strategic planning over the years and the changes he made to the process along the way. Particularly useful are the descriptions of who was involved at different phases of the process, the evaluation of the progress of planning activities, and the reminder that your strategic plan is a tool at your disposal.

The remaining six case studies relate to management in a broader sense by focusing on project management of large-scale projects or major policy and workflow changes led with a management perspective. These chapters cover using Kickstarter for fundraising, developing internships, planning a collection assessment, utilizing precustodial processing techniques, and selecting archival management software. They provide helpful examples of how to utilize management techniques or cover topics in which many managers have oversight. Archivists leading particular units or functions will be able to glean insights into their particular areas. Many approaches and elements of these projects can also be transferred to different types of projects. Particularly helpful in many of these case studies is the focus on and explanation of decision making.

Overall, *Management: Innovative Practices for Archives and Special Collections* is an enjoyable read and a welcome addition to practical examples of management in the archives field. Readers may wish to read straight through or choose the topics most relevant to their work or interests. Either way, most archivists will find something of interest and relevance, whether they are already managers or not.

Cassandra A. Schmitt
Special Collections Librarian
Hornbake Library
University of Maryland, College Park

As readers of this journal will know, archival history abounds in fascinating stories. As we also know, we are not alone now in our interest in how records have been kept and used. What discipline today is not touched by stories of the first computers, the first use of the word “metadata,” the first inclination and continuing realization that memory-keeping could be coordinated across great expanses of time and space?

For these reasons alone and many more, archivists and records managers will find appealing and useful Anne Gilliland’s new book, Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives. A professor in UCLA’s Department of Information Studies and now director of the archival studies specialization program there, Gilliland largely explores the twentieth century along with the first decade in the new century. She groups together essays that represent the historical, contemporary, and future technological innovations and networks of people that define us, as well as test us, as “the profession of the record” (p. 258).

Gilliland’s intent is to place what the book calls “the shifts and divergences that technologies have necessitated, facilitated, or inspired” (back cover). She describes, and sometimes lists to compare, emergent practices and theories (archives as place and postcustodial approaches, definitions of archivization and archivalization, concepts of communities of memory and record, recognition of community archives and practices of cocreatorship, digital repatriation and the overall archival multiverse). In beginning with these broad constructs, Gilliland notes the need to see both the larger communities in which we operate (the global) as well as the local, and thus borrowing from sociologist Roland Robertson’s “glocal”—the coexistences of the great overall with the particular (p. 4). Building on this framework, she presents the history and questions we must now ask about innovations and responsibilities concerning research in electronic records management and new areas of research (personal digital archives and social media, cloud and movie computing, and digital forensics, to name a few). Her more complete historical investigations include attention to the documentation movement (1900–1950), standardization and automation in employment of points of access, metadata, early analog computing, and machine-readable records as building blocks to digital formats. Her future-looking chapters address record-keeping models, digital repositories, preservation, and curation.

Gilliland begins many of her chapters with excerpts of conversations from professional history. These compelling quotes set the tone of her inquiry and purposes for the book: to shift through the nuances within the trajectory in which archives today came to be built, and the opportunities taken and missed, as well. These excerpts also inspire a pleasant (and indeed confident) glance backward. There is a richness of characters here. One of Gilliland’s aims is to frame the “growing intellectual and practical complexity of the status, role, and practices of archives in society” (p. 12). These beginning quotations do just that.

Take, for example, the quotations that begin chapters 2 and 6. Dating from 1938, the first of these comes from Charles Samaran, professor of bibliography and archivistics at the École Nationale des Chartes. He defined various aspects of archives, noting,
Thus we come to recognize in the term archives two meanings: one broad and vague, generally used in ordinary language, and the other narrow and precise, on which the specialists are beginning to agree (p. 37).

Would Samaran not be surprised today at our meeting of the word archives at every technological turn, indeed a word now in ordinary language and often unknown in a narrow and a precise way? Gilliland goes on to illuminate archival engagement over the last five decades and concludes that the lack of media limitations and the transcendence of physical housing of records offer new ways that must be integrated for “federating collections online, and for opening up the archive” to more and more uses and types of user interactions (p. 51).

The second example of a quotation and the historical look Gilliland evokes comes from 2003 as Meyer Fishbein remembered the 1960s and the first machine-readable tapes of the government:

I conducted many interviews to learn major elements of the computer system. To my question about eventual disposition of the tapes, the managerial staff told me that the tapes would be erased and reused to save money. . . . [he] pointed out, mistakenly, that the National Archives had declared punch cards and machine-readable media to be “non-records.” After much discussion, the Census Bureau agreed to temporarily discontinue erasing their magnetic tapes (pp. 131–32).

Here Gilliland begins her chapter on the early efforts to understand how quickly record keeping could be understood and practices implemented, and how the work of archivists entered this type of electronic environment. She follows this with another chapter on a later period (1990 to almost the present) and descriptions of personal digital archives, areas of digital forensics, and an especially helpful list of actions involved in cloud storage. Her list of actions needed for creating policies for record storage in the cloud contains just enough foundational ideas and practicalities to help one navigate the fast-changing world of technological innovations without being overwhelmed.

Gilliland’s strongest chapter is that on record-keeping models. She explains better than anyone has the records continuum model, which is very useful for teaching the logics and the theories of archives today. She pays attention to the nimble way that archives must begin to consider stewardship rather than custody alone.

In its entirety, this is a book from which teachers, students, and archivists can pull specific chapters for various purposes. The charts will be useful to instructors in library science and archival studies, especially those addressing the ranges involved in pondering memory-keeping, records creation and use, and key contributions to evolving ideas, practices, standards, and technologies by regions. The examples of areas of archival engagement over the past 50 years show not only increases in work outside what were once our narrow specialties but also some surprises, such as the steadiness of lobbying against unduly restrictive records closures and copyright protections, and support of human rights concerns (pp. 48–49).

Those praises aside, the book is not consistently well edited. The long sentences add up to make the text less than engaging. If we are, as she argues, the profession of record, we want to be transparently so to others. Here an opportunity is missed in telling our wonderful journey, the logics and beginnings of our work, to others. It
seems especially odd that editing could not have been better handled since 5 of the 11 chapters were published in earlier forms.

In addition, one disappointing aspect is that Gilliland does not, even in her bibliography, touch on the wealth of material about other definitions of archives outside our profession. She mentions only Derrida, Foucault, and Stoler but leaves out such books as the *Digital Memory and the Archives* by Wolfgang Ernst (English translation, 2012), *Big Archives* by Sven Spieker (2008), *The Archive* by Charles Merewether (2006), *The Allure of the Archives* by Arlette Farge (English translation, 2013), and many more. Would it not have been helpful to have briefly addressed these or others since surely our networked world will require our work as academics and recordkeepers together? Her footnotes mostly reflect the period before 2010, and while this might be expected in the slowness of publishing, again, it seems an oversight that could have been corrected in editing. She includes very few readings even from archival journals in general past 2009.

Nevertheless, the book was to me, and will be to you, a treat to read. Archivists in general do not often have the time to wander into our pasts. First, this past seems close to us in time, and second, we are a practical group, usually understaffed in our facilities as well. By setting the present within the past, and by asking us to look to the future, Gilliland allows us to grow toward the “intellectual and practical complexity of the status, role and practices of archives in society” (p. 12).

Susan Tucker
Curator of Books and Records
Newcomb Archives
Tulane University
Since the earliest days of the World Wide Web, and even before, there have been visions of a computer model where all information could coexist and interrelate, allowing for easy access, dissemination, and discoverability. This was fully articulated in 2001 by Tim Berners-Lee, when he proposed the semantic web vision—an Internet that is readable and interpretable by computers, not just humans. Given the scale of the web, however, it became increasingly clear that a fully semantic web is not feasible, and, in 2006, Berners-Lee changed course and developed the principles of linked data—a “simple way to format data so it can be interpreted by software” (p. 45). Rather than a specific technology, linked data is a set of best practices for the publication of structured data on the web, identifying data through the use of Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that in turn link to other URIs so that additional information can be discovered.

The intention of *Linked Data for Libraries, Archives and Museums: How to Clean, Link and Publish Your Metadata* is simple: to provide readers with a practical guide for understanding and using linked data. Writing largely for the nontechnical user, the authors combine history, theory, and hands-on application to focus on the common needs of those in the cultural heritage sectors (libraries, archives, and museums), helping to lower the technical barriers that may exist. With examples using freely available tools and services, this handbook can help cultural heritage professionals to make the most of their institutions’ existing metadata, as well as to plan for the future.

While other books cover linked data, none fills this niche. The authors understand these concepts well and are successful at conveying them to their audience. Van Hooland (PhD in information science) is a metadata expert in charge of the master of information science program at the Université libre de Bruxelles. Verborgh (PhD in computer science engineering) is a researcher in semantic hypermedia and web technologies. Together, they are able to help make sense of a topic that can be “quite complex and even outright messy” (p. 1).

The book’s layout is clearly defined and easy to follow. After an introduction that, in part, addresses the challenges and limitations of linked data, the authors discuss various aspects of evaluating and preparing a local institution’s metadata for linking to and sharing with the linked data cloud. The book is designed so that each section can be taken on its own and studied as deeply as is needed, or it can be read in its entirety as a “global handbook” for an understanding of the subject. Framed within an “elaborate historical overview,” the authors present each section as it relates to the larger context of metadata evolution. Rather than a high-level theoretical view, this approach provides grounding and helps the reader understand how the various pieces came to be, how they fit together, and most important, how to use them.

The authors begin with an analysis of the ways in which metadata is stored, from tabular format (spreadsheets) to relational databases; the emergence of meta-markup languages (such as XML) for data portability; and finally the triple store approach that comprises Resource Description Framework (RDF), the data model underlying the linked data vision. We see how metadata itself has developed from largely unstructured
descriptions (narrative-centric) to highly structured and standardized fields (data-centric), enabling interconnectedness of data but losing narrative richness in the process.

In the RDF data model, “triples” are used to store data. Each triple consists of a subject, a predicate, and an object, with each of these being represented by a URL whenever possible. The subject and object are related—the predicate describes the relationship (a very simple non-URL example would be: <The artwork 'Puppy'> <was created by> <Jeff Koons>). Since all of the information is contained within the individual triple, RDF does not rely on an outside schema to help interpret the meaning of the data (as XML does). This inclusiveness allows data to connect and interact. Through the use of URIs, computers can automatically link many triples together, unlocking intricate interrelationships and meanings that can be difficult to identify or extract through other methods. The technical aspects of this are not easy to comprehend, but with the help of a variety of examples, the authors lay a good foundation for further study.

The book emphasizes the value of metadata quality and the challenges in creating it: “It is difficult to overstate the importance of data quality in our current information-driven society. . . . At its best, publishing bad data is useless. At its worst, it can have disastrous consequences” (p. 73). Using OpenRefine, an interactive data-transformation tool (IDT) with a spreadsheet-like interface and some very powerful features, the authors offer simple and practical steps on data profiling—“the first and essential step towards data quality” (p. 77)—and data cleaning to enhance the consistency and quality of your metadata. As someone who learns better by doing rather than reading, I found that working through these accompanying tutorial exercises really helped to cement and enhance the textual explanations in the book.

Subsequent sections of the book go into detail on adding value (“enrichment”) to your existing metadata, both in structured data fields (through mapping, or “reconciling,” existing locally controlled vocabularies to well-established thesauri, such as LCSH or AAT) and in unstructured descriptive data fields (through named-entity recognition and automated linking with the linked open data cloud). Although this process can be technical and time intensive, the authors have developed a plugin for OpenRefine that allows the user to fully leverage these services as part of an easy-to-use data analysis workflow, resulting in a robust system of data that may produce search results with better recall and precision than natural language searches.

Once the metadata has been processed, the final step is to publish it so that it can be used as part of the cloud: “Good datasets not only link to others, but become linked themselves” (p. 210). The last section of the book discusses how best to prepare your content for “sustainable publishing” through best practice guidelines for “future proof” URL construction, content markup, and architectural style. For readers with minimal background in this area, this section contains some concepts that can be challenging to grasp. The authors, though, write with this in mind and present the information understandably and thoroughly.

Throughout the book, the authors present these sometimes complicated concepts in a clear and descriptive manner, situating them firmly within the larger framework of metadata evolution. However, in some ways, the real value of this book is in the case studies. Each of the major sections of the book ends with a real-life case study of how that specific topic can (or has been) applied in an actual working environment. Whether
it is cleaning the metadata of the Schoenberg Database of Manuscripts, or enriching the
descriptive unstructured metadata fields of the British Museum through named-entity
recognition, the reader is invited to download metadata sets and work alongside the
authors to get hands-on experience with each of these tasks. Beginning with a walk
through the basics and moving into application of selected tools and services, the
reader obtains “a full understanding of how [they] work at the lowest level” (p. 137),
making these technologies much more accessible. This practical application provides
the average reader with a degree of understanding, far beyond simply a theoretical
approach, that is crucial before contemplating working with linked data.

You will not be an expert in linked data application when you finish reading this
book. Some of the practical exercises are led more than explained, and some tasks, such
as learning the complex RDF query language, SPARQL, are by necessity outside the
scope of this text. However, you almost certainly will feel much more confident about
understanding linked data principles and what they can and cannot do in real life. You
will learn some valuable and user-friendly tools to help get you started, and you likely
will be prepared to begin both to identify where linked data can help your institution
and to experiment with your own data. While not necessarily a book for the casual
reader, Linked Data for Libraries, Archives and Museums is certainly recommended
for cultural heritage professionals who want to learn more about linked data and its
application for their collections.

Erin Wolfe, CA
Digital Archivist
Dole Institute of Politics
Archives are vital to imagining and strengthening communities, however broadly or narrowly one defines the term community. Archives also are essential to the control of people, the waging of wars, and the maintenance of power. Import of the Archive: US Colonial Rule of the Philippines and the Making of American Archival History by Cheryl Beredo is a book of archival history that already has come to terms with these unfortunate roles. But whereas other archival works simply discuss the theoretical or moral implications of these processes, Import of the Archive details how these roles actually played out in the Philippines. Through an exploration of bureaucratic organization and reorganization, Beredo effectively demonstrates the significant impact an archives can have on a country.

Import of the Archive surveys a brief, yet formative time period in the history of the Philippines from the Spanish-American War in 1898 to the passage of the Jones Act in 1916, which established the Philippine Senate and provided the first glimpse of autonomy for the people of the Philippines. More specifically, it centers on the role that archives played in the wars and subsequent administration of the archipelago by the United States. In this 20-year period, one colonial power fell, only to be replaced by another, and Import of the Archive describes that uneasy transition from the perspective of the victorious colonizing power. Beredo divides the book into three thematic chapters, “Archives and War,” “Archives and Anti-Imperialism,” and “Archives and Land.”

The first chapter, “Archives and War,” addresses the Spanish-American War (1898) and the later Philippine-American War (1899–1902), focusing on the martial origin and use of many of the records in the Philippines during this period. Included in the $20,000,000 price tag of the 1898 Treaty of Paris, which ended the Spanish-American War, was the transfer of an enormous trove of Spanish colonial records, which proved invaluable throughout American war efforts in the Philippines. During the Philippine-American War a year later, both the United States and the would-be Philippine Republic acknowledged the need for good record keeping. As Beredo deftly points out, accurate records were so important to the Philippine forces that their preservation even outweighed the danger of their seizure by the Americans, a result that would have harmed the republic’s cause. Likewise, American forces created the Office of Insurgent Records, specifically dedicated to the compilation and translation of captured Filipino records.

The second chapter, “Archives and Anti-Imperialism,” explores what Beredo calls an “unofficial archive” of materials (such as pamphlets, editorials, books, and testimonials) produced in the United States by the Anti-Imperialist League and other opponents of America’s colonial aspirations. This chapter underscores the monumental challenges that opponents of the war and later occupation encountered in creating a counternarrative in the face of the dominant one produced by imperial supporters in the government and in the American press.

The third chapter, “Archives and Land,” investigates the civil administration of the Philippines once hostilities ceased and the United States defeated the Philippine Republican forces. Though not as visible as other signs of “progress” such as education
and road construction, the archives nevertheless contributed to the perceived improvement of the Philippines. During the occupation, the government attempted to encourage homesteading on the islands, and, as a result, the Bureau of Archives became the registrar for active land patents. Beredo also mentions controversies that placed the archives in the front and center of public attention. These included the friar lands, property previously owned by the Spanish friars, and the branding and registration of carabao cattle.

Instead of being an apology for imperialism, Beredo’s almost exclusive, but fully intentional and acknowledged, focus on the American government of the Philippines serves an entirely different purpose. She succeeds in putting the reader inside the Bureau of Archives and more important, into the growing government bureaucracy. The effect is that both the impersonal and insidious natures of colonial record keeping come through. She clearly concedes that this book is not an attempt to explore “silences” found in official documentation. Quite the opposite. She shows how the sheer volume of records could serve to obscure other voices and alternative narratives. The unique perspective of this book is not simply its highlighting of the role that archives play and have played in creating and sustaining the regime in the Philippines, but the normalization of it through archival practice. For instance, she describes the Bureau of Archives’ cross-referencing systems and filing cabinets as the “unremarkable workhorses of the bureaucracy” (p. 12). Though archivists are often loath to admit it, they are the handmaids of bureaucracy. This is also part of the power of archives, as Beredo points out. “It [the archives] transformed records of remarkable events—imperial conquest and colonial governance—into matters of routine business” (p. 13). Her matter-of-fact approach to archives is a rare one. Beredo strips much of the mystique from archives to reveal how essential archives are in controlling and subjugating peoples, in this case, the peoples of the Philippines. Import of the Archive doesn’t contain much in the way of specific advice to current archivists, but Beredo does offer one prescient warning that “. . . archivists must at least consider how present practice helps to maintain whatever ‘invisible,’ unquestioned, or readily-accepted order” exists (p. 102). Beredo’s book offers a clear illustration of how the act of record keeping has been and can be politicized.

Another theme that runs throughout this book, and one to which many archivists today can relate, is organizational or institutional placement. The Bureau of Archives’ situation within the governmental hierarchy helped to determine its prestige and, ultimately, its importance to the US regime. Though Beredo does not include much information on the structure of Spanish colonial archives administration before the Spanish-American War, she notes that Manuel Yriarte was the colonial government’s archivist for the Crown of Spain, and he continued to serve through the American occupation. In 1901, before the conclusion of the Philippine-American War, the Bureau of Archives became a part of the Department of Public Instruction. In 1905, the bureau then became a division of the executive branch, and, in addition to registering land and homesteads, it also served as the repository for active records such as patents, copyrights, and trademarks. This configuration lasted for nearly 10 years until 1916, when the bureau was incorporated into the Philippine Library and Museum in the Department of Public Instruction. Two years later, the Division of Archives, Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks lost these added responsibilities and, as a result, lost much
of its administrative esteem and usefulness to the civil government. It then became primarily a cultural service with a wider audience, a role familiar to many archivists today.

Missing in *Import of the Archive* is the counterpoint of American archival theory and record-keeping practices at the time. We’re left questioning what exactly was imported, as the title suggests. While the formation of a National Archives in the United States was nearly 20 years off, by 1916, archivists in the Philippines had managed to centralize many archival operations and to add many other important responsibilities to their purview. The importance of the Bureau of Archives makes one wonder what effect it had on the growth and development of the archival profession in the United States.

Despite this unanswered question, *Import of the Archive* is a valuable contribution to the field of archival history, Filipino history, and the study of archives and colonialism. Beredo’s work will help to ensure that this overlooked chapter of American archival history will be taught alongside the writings of Sparks, Buck, Norton, and Schellenberg. In particular, it could supplement the opening chapter of Richard Berner’s *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (1983). As a work of Filipino history, *Import of the Archive* could help scholars better understand the place of archives in the immense bureaucracy that led to and supported the occupation of the archipelago. Beredo ensures that readers see archives as institutions and not simply as the records housed within. As a study of archives and colonialism, it accompanies previous works such as Jeannette Bastian’s *Owning Memory, How a Caribbean Community Lost Its Archives and Found Its History* (2003) and the essays from the Sawyer Seminar, later published in Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg’s *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory* (2007). It is also a perfect case study and companion reading for some of the ideas that Randall Jimerson discusses in *Archives Power: Memory, Accountability, and Social Justice* (2009).

Archivists have much to gain in further engaging Beredo’s subject matter, adopting her institutional approach to history, and replicating her investigation into the blind spots of our professional history.
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