

# Reviews of Books

GENEVA H. PENLEY, *Editor*

*National Archives*

---

## MANUALS

*The History of Photography From 1839 to the Present Day*, by Beaumont Newhall. (4th enlarged and revised edition; New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1964. Distributed by Doubleday. 215 p. \$12.50.)

The current edition of Newhall's *History of Photography* is a fourth revision of an earlier work, enlarged by the addition of new material at the end of each chapter and by a new chapter, "Recent Trends." Patterned closely after the 1949 edition, the book is greatly improved by inclusion of a selective bibliography of general histories of photography and of obscure source material on the contributions of more than a hundred individual photographers whose work has furthered the development of photography, either as an art or as a science. It includes a new section of notes, lacking in earlier editions, and a comprehensive index. The book is illustrated with a generous number of outstanding photographs, each one carefully selected for its pertinence and reproduced with great skill. Although most of the illustrations come from the museum holdings of either the George Eastman House of Photography (of which Newhall is director) or from the Museum of Modern Art (where he served as curator of photography for many years), other illustrations come from collections both public and private throughout the world.

Archivists will note with interest the author's comments on "straight photography" and on "documentary photography." Photographic librarians will appreciate his lucid discourse on printmaking techniques. Those concerned with the whole aspect of visual communication will be intrigued with his analysis of the objectives of the various art movements in this country from 1884 and his concentration on the accomplishments of the group known as the Photo-Secessionists.

This is a scholarly work—as significant as that of J. M. Eder (*History of Photography*, New York, 1945) and of Helmut Gernsheim (*History of Photography*, London, 1955). For beginners, however, it is not so readable as Robert Taft's *Photography and the American Scene* (New York, 1938 and 1942). Nor is it an encyclopedic reference tool. Omitted are the names of more than 50 photographers and writers on the subject who were cited, in 1962, for Photography's Hall of Fame, adjudged outstanding by Louis Walton Sipley of the American Museum of Photography. This omission emphasizes the fact that Mr. Newhall writes largely of the contributions made by those of English-speaking countries, giving less attention to the contributions made by those who work and write in other lands and tongues.

*National Archives*

JOSEPHINE COBB

---

Books for review and related communications should be sent to Miss Geneva H. Penley, Room 303, Library, The National Archives, Washington, D.C. 20408.

German Democratic Republic, Ministry of the Interior, State Archival Administration, *Ordnungs- und Verzeichnungsgrundsätze für die staatlichen Archive der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Principles of Arrangement and Inventorying for the State Archives of the German Democratic Republic). (Potsdam, 1964. 127 p. 1.50 DM.)

A commission of experts under the guidance of Helmut Lötze was largely responsible for the formulation of these principles. Their publication, after several years of preparation, doubtless represents one of the most important archival developments in East Germany since the division of Germany following World War II. The German Central Archives in Potsdam produced a draft of a set of principles, and the draft, together with the arrangement and inventorying procedures of a number of East German state archives, was used in the formulation of the principles as published.

The preface points out that one of the prime purposes of the archival profession in East Germany is to further the cause of the socialist state. The principles expounded are primarily applicable to archival holdings covering the "socialist epoch," but they are also to be applied to archives covering the "capitalistic and feudalistic era."

The goal of all archival arrangement and cataloging work in the German Democratic Republic is to make the holdings readily available to society. The principles take into account the knowledge and experience of archivists in other countries—particularly, according to the introduction, in the socialist states. It is pointed out that the principles represent a new development in archival science but are not to be taken as final and invariable. Archivists are to put them to the test and share any suggestions for improvement.

By and large the manual is an orderly codification of archival practice. It attempts to standardize, insofar as practical, the varying practices of states and municipalities.

The rules of arrangement are closely tied to the systems of registry common in Germany. Future practice will be a continuation of past arrangement for bodies of records already in an orderly arrangement. Where a body of records is already arranged in more than one scheme or when reorganization of an office in the past required changes, these several systems will be maintained if not too numerous or impractical. When the original arrangement can no longer be determined, arrangement is to follow the organizational structure of the office of registry.

The three types of inventories are the simple, expanded, and group. The ordinary unit of entry in an inventory is the volume, folder, dossier, bundle, parcel, or portfolio. An individual document within a folder or bundle may also be the inventorying unit if it can stand alone in terms of content. The group inventory may be used when one entry will sufficiently identify the contents of a series or group of records.

The amount of detail to be included in an inventory is determined by the value and significance of the record group or series and its individual items. Preliminary inventories may be made in advance of the regular inventories in

order to make bodies of records more quickly available for research. (These are quite unlike the preliminary inventories prepared in the U.S. National Archives.)

The following information must be included in inventorying an item: provenance and series designation, file item number, file title, and date(s). Registry symbol, note of file content, volume number, references and cross-references, and additional remarks may be included as appropriate. Group inventories may generally be covered by the following information: series and group designation, number of volumes or bundles, and dates.

The principles are to be utilized for the handling of special archival holdings such as rare documents, maps, and films; the Archival Administration, however, intends to issue more detailed rules for these and other specific types of archives.

The use of the manual is facilitated by a consecutive numbering of its 311 paragraphs; the index is keyed to paragraph numbers. Examples are provided to illustrate the application of almost every rule and procedure.

*National Archives*

DONALD E. SPENCER

"A Records Management Glossary," comp. by Ben F. Gregory, Milton Reitzfeld, and William Rofes. (*Records Management Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3; autumn 1964. 32 p.)

It is rare for the *American Archivist* to give space to the review of another periodical, but an exception has rightly been made in the case of this issue of *Records Management Journal*, which devotes its entire contents to a glossary of records management terms. President William Rofes of the Association of Records Executives and Administrators, which publishes the *Journal*, reminds us that records management, "as a circumscribed area of administrative science, has existed for a generation," and in this time it has created a language peculiar to the records manager. The glossary, which is "one attempt to delineate, categorize, and define" this professional language contains almost 400 terms arranged in strict alphabetical order from *Abstract* to *Xerography*. A generous quota of cross-reference entries makes reference a simple business, and the user will find that as much attention is paid to technical processes and types of equipment as to managerial terms. As one would expect from *Records Management Journal*, the layout is attractive, the commentary upon the terms is satisfactory, and the whole production conveys a sense of purpose. The compilers readily acknowledge their debt to certain U.S. Government glossaries brought out in the last decade. They indicate their readiness to receive further contributions so that an expanded glossary may be produced in the autumn 1968 issue. To this end, the following thoughts are offered—if a reviewer may be allowed to participate in putting a few finishing touches to what is a splendid production for the use of English-speaking archivists and records managers.

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

1. There are full entries for *Card tickler* and *Follow-up file* and a cross-reference under *Tickler file*. In Britain and Canada these are also known as *Carry forward*, *Carry over*, and *Bring forward* files. Action regarding the last is popularly known as "to BF."

2. *File* is defined as a folder (or collection of folders) or the action of putting papers in a folder. The term also seems to be used in North America for 4-drawer storage equipment, which the British call a *Filing cabinet*. Perhaps this aspect could be expanded.

3. An important characteristic of a file is the method of attaching related papers therein, and only a *Prong fastener* is mentioned. Entries for staples, tags, and thongs would be useful.

4. One of the important steps in reclassifying a current filing system is to arrange for all material prior to an agreed date to be "frozen" in its existing state and for only the later papers to be incorporated in the new scheme. An entry under *Freezing*—or any other similar term in wider use—is recommended. One notes, however, the inclusion of *Cutoff*.

5. The term *Particular instance papers* has crept into use in Britain since the publication in 1954 of the report on departmental records prepared by the Grigg Committee. Briefly, it means "very large groups of papers the subject matter of which is the same, though each relating to a different person, body or place." It is convenient for indicating major groups of recurrent and similar items which can be appraised en bloc. This or a similar term should appear in the expanded glossary.

6. Perhaps the entry for *Disposition schedule* could be revised to make it clear that this is a register of intent (*i.e.*, preservation or destruction) rather than just a destruction list as the present wording implies.

7. There is a cross-reference from *Dead files* to *Noncurrent records*: are the terms synonymous? Laymen use the former term loosely, admittedly, whereas the implication is that dead records have completely served their purpose and are ripe only for the fire or the shredding machine. The significance of the term *Noncurrent records* is surely that there is still some chance of usefulness, even if they are not in regular use.

8. The distinction between *Weeding* (the eradication of individual files *in toto* from a general series) and *Stripping* (the removal of ephemeral papers from individual folders) is not clearly brought out in the relevant entries for *Screening* or *Segregation*. A rewording is suggested with cross-references from *Purging*, *Sifting*, *Winnowing*, and *Stripping* to *Screening* and from *Weeding* to *Segregation*.

"To make dictionaries is dull work," said Dr. Johnson, but the work under review reflects nothing but the skill and enthusiasm of the three compilers. We owe them a great debt of gratitude for their enterprise and for their promise of more to come.

McGill University

ALAN D. RIDGE

#### BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND FINDING AIDS

"Bibliographie analytique internationale des publications relatives à l'archivistique et aux archives." (*Archivum; revue internationale des archives, fascicule bibliographique no. 1*; Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 108 blvd. Saint Germain, 1964. 290 p. 20 fr.)

This list of nearly 2,900 titles published in 1958 and 1959 is divided into two sections: generalities and publications relating to separate countries. The former contains 935 entries, listed under 23 rubrics such as bibliography,

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 3, JULY 1965

auxiliary sciences, private archives, disposal, audio-visual archives, publication of documents, buildings, preservation, and restoration. The second, despite its heading, contains nearly 20 entries relating either to international archives or to several countries. Some 1,930 titles reflect activities in 59 countries, including both Germanies and both Chinas. From Europe 26 countries are represented; from Africa, 8; from Asia and Oceania, 9; and from the Americas, 16. In this section some countries offer but a single entry each; *e.g.*, Chile, Ireland, Japan, Mongolia, Monaco, and Turkey. Under the United States, however, are listed more than 200 titles, and under the USSR more than 340. As is to be expected, the items cited vary in size from a book of considerable bulk to a very brief article. For the countries under which a large number of titles is listed the material is broken down into appropriate categories—*e.g.*, under the United States: generalities, National Archives, records centers, Presidential papers, archives of the States (by State), Library of Congress and other libraries and museums, and economic and church archives; and under the USSR: generalities, the (nine) Central State Archives, archives of the various republics, the Party, libraries and museums, publication of documents, and archival meetings. Manuscripts, in the American usage, receive much attention along with archives proper. Titles the content of which is not self-evident are briefly annotated in French. The material is served by an 8-page, 3-column *index locorum* listing countries, major subdivisions, and cities; and a 4-page, 2-column *index serum* listing in elaborate detail the subjects covered by the bibliography. Some 84 periodicals are cited so frequently that the abbreviated forms of their titles are listed. As was to be expected, the few American titles checked were found in the annual bibliography published in the *American Archivist*. The 5-year lag in publication of a bibliography such as this is not unusual, but it is always unfortunate for the user. Nevertheless, the compendium continues to fill a need not otherwise satisfied.

*Library of Congress*

LESTER K. BORN

General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Service, *Bibliography for Records Managers*. (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, July 1964. 58 p. 35c.)

This is the latest in the series of *Records Management Handbooks* developed by the National Archives and Records Service. It ranges from traditional records management material to Time and Motion Study, Optical Scanning, Electronic Data Processing, Information Retrieval, Office Equipment, Organization and Management, and many other subjects. From 30,000 items of literature, it refers to 527 books, articles, magazines, and glossaries. Indexed by author, it also has a special index to publications issued by Federal agencies.

This handbook is timely and valuable as the latest summation of noteworthy books and articles culled from a vast area of literature about management and administrative processes. The selection does not overemphasize Federal Government sources, which in fact are less than 25 percent of the total. The

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

content of each reference is digested, and there is ample treatment of emerging disciplines and techniques that even now are changing the form and content of traditional recordkeeping.

There are, however, some aspects of paperwork that are not covered in depth. Microfilming is discussed sparingly (nine references in a subchapter), although this technique draws increasing attention in connection with information retrieval systems. A wider audience would be served by fuller treatment of records in State and local governments, laws affecting records disposition, legality of data incorporated in such mediums as magnetic and perforated paper tape, work simplification films, training through programed learning, and the Records Management Workshop produced by the National Archives and Records Service itself.

This is a handbook that records managers and systems people, in and out of government, will welcome.

*Los Angeles County*

JAMES T. O'CONNELL

*Indiana Methodism, A Bibliography of Printed and Archival Holdings in the Archives of DePauw University and Indiana Methodism*, comp. by Eleanore Cammack. (Greencastle, Ind., DePauw University, 1964. vi, 64 p.)

To study the growth of our Midwest and ignore Methodism would be like studying medieval Europe and ignoring Catholicism. The Archives of DePauw University and Indiana Methodism is an invaluable research center for this facet of our history. The Archives itself is a monument to the vision of Worth M. Tippy, the founder. The publication reviewed here not only publicizes his efforts but reflects the skill and devotion of the compiler.

The bibliography is divided into two parts, the first listing printed or library material and the second describing archival or manuscript records.

The printed materials are numbered 1 through 811 and are entered under 22 alphabetically arranged headings such as Bible, Biography, Church History, Conference, Minutes, etc. Under each of these headings the entries are alphabetically arranged by author and occasionally subject. Thus, materials under Bible have the lowest entry numbers (1-12) while entries under the heading Youth Groups have the highest (793-810). Entry 811, *Histories of Individual Churches*, alphabetically lists the histories of several hundred Methodist churches in the Indiana area.

Part II, dealing with archival or manuscript records (occasionally microfilm copies), consists of 455 entries with inclusive dates for records of 384 Methodist camp or conference meetings in the Indiana area in the 19th and 20th centuries. There are also 70 collections of documents, manuscripts, correspondence, and other papers of outstanding Methodists dating back to the 17th century—e.g., 413, Hitt, Peter (1682-1771), and Family. These records include papers of past presidents of DePauw University such as those of Matthew Simpson, the first president, G. Bromley Oxnam, and William Clark Larrabee, an important figure in Indiana Methodism and history. Records of early Methodist missionary and circuit riders are included in these collections.

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 3, JULY 1965

On the whole this publication is a useful and needed finding aid for the researcher in church archives. The rigidity of the arrangement scheme may create a problem for future accessions, but arrangement schemes can be changed. Miss Cammack has provided us with a useful key to records important to our national history.

*National Archives*

WILLIAM E. LIND

#### DIRECTORIES

South Carolina Archives Department, *Biographical Directory of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, 1776-1964*, comp. by Emily Bellinger Reynolds and Joan Reynolds Faunt. (Columbia, South Carolina Archives Department, 1964. ix, 358 p. Outline maps. \$5.50.)

By a 1956 resolution the senate of the general assembly of South Carolina made possible the eventual realization of this compilation. The senate's general desk clerk, Emily Bellinger Reynolds, that year became State Librarian, and she and her daughter, Joan Reynolds Faunt, under the direction of the Senatorial Research Committee and with the cooperation of Clerk of the Senate Lovick O. Thomas, carried through the meticulous spadework. Director Charles E. Lee of the South Carolina Archives Department wrote the foreword. By 1962 a prototype volume, *The Senate of the State of South Carolina, 1776-1962*, was published.

Roughly half the present book is ancillary to the biographical sketches that comprise the other half. Leading the introductory matter are remarks about each of the seven different constitutions under which the State has functioned since 1776. The legislature has met in the present State House in Columbia since 1869, and some mention is made of where it earlier met. Most of the legislative journals have been preserved, affording a near continuity of documentation of South Carolina's legislative history.

The nature of the volume is somewhat comparable, at the State level, to the *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*, at the national level. The main difference in the State volume is its omission of specific coverage of the lower house and its personnel. In view of the fact that about half of the South Carolina senators were at one time or another members of the South Carolina house of representatives the omission is slightly more palatable than might otherwise be the case. Preferably a compilation of this dimension ought to cover, designedly, the personnel of the entire bicameral operation.

The volume nevertheless has abundant assets. It provides convenient lists of State executives and senate officials, by category. Separate itemizations of the makeup of the senate for each general assembly from the 1st through the 95th take up almost a hundred pages and yield at a glance the designations of constituencies, the names of incumbent senators, and the initial and terminal dates of sessions. After this chronological breakdown come 60 pages of geographical breakdown, arranged by election districts, 1776-90, 1790-1865, and 1865-1964. This is a fine feature—one that the national publication men-

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST



tioned above does not have—enabling a quick determination of the names of successive persons who have represented a particular area. Three specially drawn outline maps aid in orientation.

The biographical sketches of what the stump speakers would call the solons are printed in double-column style, averaging eight sketches to a page, set in easily readable type. Although some luminaries like John C. Calhoun and James H. Hammond were never State senators and do not figure here, a host of other statesmen—some 1,360 individuals from Henry Laurens to Strom Thurmond—do qualify for inclusion.

The Columbia firm of R. L. Bryan Co. has done a superb printing job. The very great amount of detail that goes into the making of a reference volume of this caliber did not deter the South Carolina Archives Department from getting it done happily and well.

*National Historical Publications Commission*

H. B. FANT

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Rocky Mountain Region Archives and History Symposium, July 26–28, 1964, *The Responsibility of the Individual for Our Documentary Heritage*. (Denver, Colo. [1964?]. Processed. Various paging.)

Archival activities and interests are becoming increasingly more complex and diversified. Too often the people in various branches of this field are unaware of just how complex and diversified it is. And, even more important, people outside the immediate archival field who share these interests are unaware basically of what modern archival work entails.

The long-range plan of the Society of American Archivists for sponsoring cooperative symposia in various areas of the Nation may prove of important educational and communicative value.

As revealed by this apparently verbatim report of the proceedings of one of these symposia, an excellent beginning has been made. The session was held in conjunction with the University of Denver's annual archives institute. The Society was joined in sponsoring the symposium by the department of history and the graduate school of librarianship of the university, the Colorado Division of State Archives and Public Records, and the National Archives and Records Service. Dolores Renze, Colorado State Archivist, directed the symposium in her capacity of archives institute director.

The papers there presented adequately reflect the increasing breadth of archival interests. The role of the archivist in dealing with public records was discussed from the viewpoints of the National Archives, an outstanding State archives, and an exceptional State historical society. Other sessions dealt with business and institutional archives, with the often overlooked exceptional quality of the work of the avocational historian-archivist, and with the future of the archival profession.

Unfortunately a document such as this will receive only limited circulation. Hopefully, the papers by Nyle Miller of the Kansas State Historical Society, Ralph Ellsworth of the University of Colorado, Robert Eckles of the

*VOLUME 28, NUMBER 3, JULY 1965*



American Microform Academy, and William Ellis of the Oil Law Project will receive the widest possible circulation. I was especially impressed with Dr. Ellsworth's realistic approach to the handling of institutional archives.

Let me make two suggestions to those who are planning future programs of this type: It would help if some sort of annotated commentary were added to tie the various papers together and to the general theme of the symposium. And it would be best to review the typescript of the papers before they are printed. A person working from a taperecording who is not totally familiar with the subject matter can make many minor but distracting errors. For example, the name of the computer manufacturer is Burroughs—*not* Burrows.

Finally, I could hope that the role of records management in the total archival picture will receive more imaginative treatment in future sessions. And I could hope that these programs will continue to draw those beyond the immediate archival fold into active participation.

Nevertheless this is an encouraging report of an encouraging development.

*Records Management Journal*

BELDEN MENKUS

#### SURVEY REPORTS

U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, *The Federal Paperwork Jungle; A Report on the Paperwork Requirements Placed Upon Business, Industry, and the Public by the Federal Departments and Agencies*. (89th Cong., 1st sess., *H. Rpt.* 52; Washington, Government Printing Office, 1965. 220 p.)

Businessmen who have complained about the number of reports they have to make to the Federal Government may be intrigued by the catchy title of this document. Inside they will find a factual account of the background of the present situation, statistics and comment on the size of the problem, and some recommendations for alleviating it. Since 1959 the House Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics has concerned itself with Federal reporting requirements; its *Preliminary Report* (1959) was reviewed by Everett O. Alldredge in the October 1960 issue of this journal.

Sections headed "One Billion Reports" and "Two Billion Forms" document the size of the problem. One learns that 8 agencies together require annually over 10 printed forms for each person in the United States, and that the cost to the public of filling out these forms was estimated to be \$20 billion for the year 1964. An appendix takes 16 pages to list reports, exclusive of tax forms, that one company (Dow Chemical Co.) submits to the Federal Government each year; another fills 72 pages with a list of repetitive forms approved by the Bureau of the Budget and in use as of March 10, 1964.

In spite of an occasional scolding tone in the body of the report, the Committee's recommendations appear to be reasonable; I shall note some of the more interesting ones. Besides urging the strengthening of the Federal Reports Act of 1942, which gave responsibility in this area to the Bureau of the Budget, the Committee recommends setting up an Office of Federal

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

Reports, to include a Division of State Services, in the Bureau. It also urges the strengthening of the present Advisory Council on Federal Reports, and it would add a Council on Federal-State Reports, a Small Business Advisory Council on Federal Reports, and a Joint (congressional) Committee on Federal Reports. Of particular interest is the recommendation that the records management program of the National Archives and Records Service (which receives praise elsewhere in the report) be expanded in the areas of paperwork simplification, standardization, and research, and that this Service undertake a new study of the records retention requirements of the Federal agencies.

Few scholars or thoughtful businessmen would ask that Federal Government reporting requirements be substantially reduced; the value of the current statistics and the subsequent historical use of the records themselves are strong arguments in their favor. But scholars and businessmen alike might ask that there be simplification and coordination of such requirements, where possible, so that the cost to the Government and the public may be kept at a justifiable level. It is appropriate that one aspect of the records problem (relating to the creation of records asked of the public by the Government) should be the continuing concern of a congressional committee.

ROBERT W. LOVETT

*Baker Library, Harvard University*

---

### **"That's Something"**

"I didn't know the Yard used Fiats," I said.

"Well, we don't use foreign cars as a general rule," said Franks. "But we have to have a certain number of cars that aren't too obviously police cars, and we find that people don't usually associate small foreign cars with the police."

"I gather that the place we're going to is secret."

"Not exactly secret, sir. I've no doubt that anyone who's really interested in Colonel Ravenscroft knows all about it. But the Colonel doesn't like us to make a song-and-dance about anybody we bring to see him. So if we arrive inconspicuously, nobody's any the wiser, and the Colonel's the better pleased."

The car threaded its way through Putney High Street and up the Hill until the big Victorian mansions of Wimbledon Park Side began to stretch away on the left of the road. Many of them were already being demolished, making way for the new private estates of flats and maisonettes which marched down the flank of the Common like the vanguard of the social revolution.

We turned in at the gate of one shabby but imposing villa, and the Fiat's tires scrunched on the gravel of the laurelled drive. There was a white-lettered notice-board at the entrance. It said: ADMIRALTY RECORDS AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION.

Franks saw me glance at it, and grinned.

"I suppose it wouldn't deceive anybody who really cared," he said. "But it keeps the locals quiet, and that's something."

—DOUGLAS ORGILL, *Journey Into Violence*, p. 27-28 (New York, 1963).  
Copyright © 1962 by Douglas Orgill. Quoted by permission of  
William Morrow and Co., Inc.