

at what students in our archives courses are now being told about methods of arrangement and description, about archival appraisal, about access policies and research and reference use, and about architectural design and physical equipment, one realizes that what is being taught today is almost entirely merely a distillation of what we have learned from doing these things in this country in the past forty years. In that sense, we are all self-taught.

We do not have too much cause for self-congratulation, but one of the things that should hearten us and lead us to believe that we must be doing some things right is the fact that it is now the United States to which archivists from all the newly-created countries come to learn how to do their work properly. It bears repeating that what we tell them about how to perform their archival functions properly is what we have taught ourselves about archival work in the last three generations in this country.

The Second Generation: The Teachers and the Taught

by FRANK B. EVANS

[In his opening remarks the author described how, as a graduate student working on his doctoral dissertation in 1958, he had accidentally discovered the Pennsylvania State Archives, had been offered a position because he had been willing to climb ladders and work with dirty records, and had accepted because the salary was significantly more than the teaching salary on which he was attempting to support a family of five. He paid tribute for the excellent on-the-job training provided him by Henry Howard Eddy, Martha L. Simonetti, and William H. Work; and the support of Sanford W. Higgenbotham, Donald H. Kent, and the late S. K. Stevens. In 1960 he had taken an Archives Institute in Washington directed by Ernst Posner and Theodore R. Schellenberg, had returned to Harrisburg and reorganized the agency, and, following a visit by Ernst Posner in connection with the research for his study of *American State Archives*, had been invited in 1963 to join the staff of the National Archives and Records Service. Since that date he had directed in-service archival training for NARS, had served as director of the annual archives institutes, and had succeeded to Ernst Posner's courses in archives administration at the American University. This was the frame of reference, the "value structure and the limitations," in terms of which he made the following observations on change and continuity in the archival profession during the past two decades.—ED.]

THE MOST BASIC CHANGE, in my judgement, has been the change in the very concept of archives. Less than two decades ago the term was

generally understood to mean primarily noncurrent institutional records of continuing value, and archival agencies, to quote Schellenberg, were essentially "receiving" rather than "collecting" agencies. Today there are very few "pure" archival agencies, in the sense of receiving only transfers of records from a legally designated parent institution of which they are a part. Just as most of us now choose to call ourselves archivists, so have we all become collectors to some degree, of one thing or another. Basic to this transformation has been the emergence of multifunction state historical agencies, religious archives, and, particularly in recent years, of college and university archival agencies with extensive manuscript collecting programs.

This new concept of archives requires neither justification nor apology—it is a fact—and it is celebrated in the title of a number of sessions at this annual meeting. But to recognize this fact, it seems to me, does not require that we ignore, as some have, the basic differences between archives and manuscripts. Too frequently "activist archivists," to use Howard Zinn's term, in their zeal to document contemporary cultures and society have ignored or failed to assume adequate responsibility for the archives of their own institutions. In addition, archives collected from other institutions and organizations frequently have been reduced to the level of historical manuscripts, with no official or legal standing whatsoever, because of inappropriate accessioning and processing policies and practices. In this area I would urge the need to reaffirm our commitment as a profession to the maintenance of archival integrity—to that standard that requires that archival holdings not only be identified and arranged by provenance, but that they also be maintained in their original filing order and preserved in their entirety without mutilation, alteration, or unauthorized destruction of any part of them. And recent events have dramatically underscored our need to pay very close attention to questions of title and to the legal status of transfers, gifts, and deposits.

I would also suggest that the concept of the activist archivist itself deserves much more thought and study than it has received. Traditionally, the ideal, if not always the actual, role of archivists has been that of honest brokers, preserving, with impartiality and objectivity, the records of the institutions of which they were a part, for use in the present and the future. We have given very little attention to what we, as a profession and as individual professionals, gain—and what we lose—when, in becoming activists, we abandon our traditional neutrality and become partisans—partisans in the sense of collecting materials that document our own view of those contemporary problems and issues that we deem significant, or when we participate directly in creating, as in oral history projects, documentation of a certain type or certain topics that would not otherwise exist.

I don't presume to have the answer to these problems, but I do want to share with you my concern. In this connection I should like also to share with you the words of Sir Hilary Jenkinson on the occasion of the

opening in 1947 of the new archives course at the University of London. The archivist, he explained, "exists in order to make other people's work possible, unknown people for the most part and working very possibly on lines equally unknown to him: some of them perhaps in the quite distant future and upon lines as yet unpredictable. His Creed, the Sanctity of Evidence; his task, the Conservation of every scrap of Evidence attaching to the Documents committed to his charge; his Aim, to provide, without prejudice or afterthought, for all who wish to know the Means of Knowledge."

"The good archivist," Sir Hilary continued, "is perhaps the most selfless devotee to Truth the modern world produces. That form of devotion has not been common of late years; in fact there has been a strong tendency in the opposite direction; . . . [toward] . . . the deliberate perversion of Truth, the elevation of Untruth to the position of a Science, if not a Faith . . ." "I am not so foolish," he concluded, "as to claim for the work I have endeavored to describe . . . the quality of a panacea against the evils from which we are suffering; but the men and women who take it up may, I think, tell themselves that at least in their Profession the world has found one answer to the Propagandist." Also, one is tempted to add, to some press secretaries, advertising executives, and public information officers.

To changes in the concept of archives and in the role of the archivist I would add changes during this period in the functions and activities of archival agencies. Archival agencies are no longer willing or, indeed, able to compete effectively for necessary resources by maintaining an essentially passive program centered on preserving and making available to qualified visitors the materials in their custody. Instead, both public and private archival agencies have launched a variety of new services and programs. Reference has already been made to manuscript collecting and oral history programs. Many of the new activities result from the conviction that archives and manuscripts should not only be accessible, but that archival agencies should promote actively, in whatever way possible, the most effective utilization of these research resources by as many persons and groups as can benefit from them.

While continuing to promote and expand scholarly use, particularly through decentralization of holdings and microfilm and letterpress documentary publication, new attention is being given to the broader educational and cultural value and uses of archives and manuscripts. New exhibit programs have been created, and existing ones expanded and reoriented. Training sessions and courses have been organized on where to find and how to use archives and manuscripts. Selected facsimile documents have been integrated with other instructional resources in the elementary school curriculum, and "archive kits," as our British and Canadian colleagues term them, have been developed for use in history and social studies classes. Conferences and public programs highlighting the unique resources of the archival agency are

being held, newsletters and scholarly journals have made their appearance, and efforts are being made to gain additional financial support through broad-based appeals to the general public.

Obviously these and similar programs and activities are necessary if archival agencies are to survive in our increasingly service-oriented economy and society. The basic problem, it seems to me, is not one of alternatives but of priorities. To revert to contemporary jargon, in archival no less than in other types of institutions, the quality of our output is ultimately dependent upon the quality of our input and our throughput. If its parent institution's records are not covered by current and comprehensive retention schedules, if basic problems in appraisal and disposition are ignored, if preservation and restoration needs and arrangement and description responsibilities are neglected, it is simply not realistic for an archival agency to expect to improve the quality or to plan to add to the variety of its services. We need only remind ourselves of the number of archival agencies and manuscript repositories that have yet to publish the first general guide to their holdings, or that have no program for preparing and publishing finding aids to particular record or manuscript groups and collections. I suggest that in some cases we may not be giving enough attention to fundamentals in our ordering of priorities and our use of limited resources.

There is one final area of change on which I should like to comment—the matter of education and training. Compared with the time I entered the profession we have today many more institutes, workshops, and regular academic courses on archives and manuscripts, and a higher percentage of persons seeking formal training. As one indicator, average enrollment in the annual archives institute in the early 1960s was twenty; today the semiannual institutes accommodate a total of about ninety persons, and a lengthy waiting list has developed. What began and is still intended as emergency post-appointment training has been also attracting in recent years undergraduate and graduate students, librarians, and historians who do not hold archival positions and many of whom do not intend to seek such positions. In this area we have made notable if not outstanding progress.

In assessing our progress, however, we should take into consideration a number of factors. Quantitatively, training has not kept pace with the rapid growth of our profession, nor has formal training been made a requirement for either obtaining or remaining and advancing in most professional archival, manuscripts, or records management positions. A recent survey revealed that fewer than 50 percent of agency and unit heads and upper grade professionals in all three fields had had any kind of formal training. Furthermore, after thirty-five years we are still at the level of offering only introductory courses and institutes, and the best established of these are generally taught by archivists who hold full-time non-teaching positions. Finally, many of the new academic courses begun in the past few years in library schools and history departments are being taught by faculty members who

themselves have never received any training or had any experience with administering archives and manuscripts.

If training is indeed desirable and necessary, I suggest we devote whatever time and talents are required to developing and advancing the body of theory and practice upon which it is based, and to making possible the internships generally regarded as essential to our profession. We may well find it desirable in the future to adopt minimum certification standards, with appropriate grandfather clauses; and to promote the adoption of training requirements and qualifications for all professional positions.

Coupled with the concept of change in the title of this session is the concept of continuity. The one necessarily implies and is relative to the other. From one perspective, the changes that have been discussed may be viewed as successive but only partial answers to continuing basic problems. In a dynamic society the prevailing view of the concept of archives, the role of the archivist, the functions and activities of archival agencies, the education and training required for the archivist, and a host of related matters will and should always be susceptible to and capable of change. The continuity in our basic problems and the changes in our attempted solutions reveal our continuing relevance to the contemporary world, while the documentary materials which are our particular province afford us, as archivists, the unique opportunity to construct bridges from the past to the future across the flux of the present. To this teacher and student of archives administration this is the continuing challenge that my generation inherited from earlier ones, and that we will in turn bequeath to the new generation.

The Third Generation: War, Choice and Chance

by ANDREA HINDING

DEFINING A GENERATION seems a task only for the very foolish or the very brave. Using a purely chronological definition is arbitrary, for it allows many individuals to fall through the cracks between generations, finding themselves included or excluded because of the accident of a few months or years. Defining a generation by stating its essential characteristics is equally hazardous, for space, condition, and perception create wide variations even in relatively homogeneous groups. But in spite of the risks, I believe one can describe a third generation of archivists, consisting of those who grew up in the 1940s and 1950s and came of age professionally in the 1960s. The third generation is the one which faced, while still in its formative years, the "ordeal of the human spirit" which was the 1960s.¹

¹ I am grateful to Lucile M. Kane, curator of the Minnesota Historical Society, for her assistance in formulating the ideas in this paper and for her characterization of the 1960s as an ordeal of the human spirit.