

The American Archivist

Volume 45
Number 3
Summer 1982

Business Archives: A Special Issue

49 1/2	22 1/2	Sperry	1.92	8.5	4	697	22 1/2	22 1/2	22 1/2	1/8
28 1/2	20	Springs	1.36	5.3	5	9	26	25 1/4	25 1/4	3/8
34 1/2	22 1/2	SquarD	1.84	7.5	7	356	24 1/4	24 1/4	24 1/2	1/4
37	26 1/2	Squibb	1.26	3.5	14	240	35 1/2	35 1/2	35 1/4	1/8
17	9 1/2	StaRite	.40e	2.6	8	7	15 1/2	15 1/2	15 1/2	1/8
25 1/2	15 1/2	Staley	.80	4.3	5	556	18 1/4	18 1/4	18 1/4	1/8
32	20	StBPnt	.90	3.8	9	98	23 1/2	23 1/2	23 1/2	1/4
22 1/2	13	StMot	s .56	3.0	7	78	18 1/2	17 1/2	18 1/2	1/2
46	28 1/2	StOilCI	2.40	7.5	6	1754	32 1/2	31 1/2	32	1/8
64 1/2	34 1/2	StOInd	2.80	6.6	6	1615	42 1/2	42 1/2	42 1/2	1/4
54 1/2	29 1/2	StdOOH	2.60	7.1	5	1004	36 1/4	36	36 1/2	1/8
16 1/2	7	StPacCp	.20	2.8	22	6	7 1/4	7 1/4	7 1/4	1/8
19 1/2	12 1/2	Standex	.95b	7.5	6	8	12 1/4	12 1/4	12 1/4	1/8
20	12 1/2	StanWk	.76	5.3	8	134	14 1/4	14	14 1/4	1/4
35	19 1/2	Starrett	1a	4.8	6	1	21	21	21	1/8
9 1/2	7 1/2	StaMSe	1.20a	13	...	23	9	9	9	1/8
26 1/2	17	StaufCh	1.44	8.2	5	129	17 1/4	17 1/4	17 1/2	1/2
5 1/2	2 1/2	Steepe	.12b	3.8	7	6	3 1/2	3	3 1/2	1/8
14	10	Sterchi	.76	7.6	8	2	10 1/2	10	10	1/4
11	7 1/2	StrlBcp	.72	9.0	7	13	8	7 1/2	8	1/8
28 1/4	18 1/2	SterlDg	1.08	5.3	10	767	20 1/4	20 1/4	20 1/2	1/8
18	11 1/2	StevnJ	1.20	8.1	...	52	15	14 1/4	14 1/2	1/8
26 1/2	20 1/2	StwWt	s1.58	7.6	9	44	22 1/4	22	22	1/8
35 1/2	24	StokVC	1.68	6.0	8	3	28	27 1/4	28	1/4
9 1/2	7 1/2	StkVC	pf 1	12	...	220	8 1/4	8 1/4	8 1/4	1/4
44 1/2	29	StoneW	1.60a	4.5	6	75	35 1/4	35 1/4	35 1/4	1/8
20 1/2	12 1/2	StonC	s .60	4.1	7	33	14 1/2	13 1/2	14 1/2	3/8
27	17 1/2	StopShp	1.48	5.5	4	463	u27 1/2	26 1/2	26 1/2	7/8
40 1/2	21	StorTec	...	8	845	22 1/4	21 1/2	21 1/2	21 1/2	1/8
41 1/2	22 1/2	Storer	.72	2.5	15	335	29 1/4	28 1/4	29 1/2	1/8
30 1/2	16 1/2	StridRit	1.34	5.7	8	869	24	23	23 1/2	1/8
14 1/2	7 1/2	SuavSh	.30	3.5	5	286	8 1/4	8 1/2	8 1/2	1/8
36 1/2	23 1/2	SubPrG	1.60b	6.5	5	10	24 1/4	24 1/2	24 1/2	1/8
22 1/4	7	Sullair	.32	4.3	98	7 1/4	7 1/2	7 1/2	7 1/2	1/8
22 1/2	16 1/2	SunBk	n 1	5.8	7	62	17 1/4	17	17 1/2	1/4
28 1/4	19	SunCh	.48	2.6	5	119	19	d18 3/4	18 1/2	1/8
18 1/2	8 1/2	SunEl	.181	66	9 1/2	9	9	1/8
48 1/4	29	SunCo	2.30	6.5	4	143	35 1/4	34 1/2	35 1/4	1/2
100	60 1/4	SunC	pf 2.25	3.1	...	1	73	73	73	1/4
51 1/2	24 1/4	Sundstr	1.80	7.1	5	408	25 1/4	24 1/4	25 1/4	1/4
12 1/2	5 1/2	SunMn	370	5 1/4	5 1/2	5 1/2	5 1/2	1/8
8 1/4	4 1/4	Sunstat	1	5	5	5	1/8
20 1/2	14 1/4	SuprVI	s .48	2.9	9	194	16 1/2	16	16 1/2	1/4
48 1/2	23 1/2	SuprOil	.20	8.0	10	3798	27 1/2	26 1/4	26 1/2	1/8
24	15 1/4	SupmKG	.68	2.9	6	117	23 1/2	23 1/2	23 1/2	1/8
6 1/4	2 1/4	Supscp	72	2 1/2	2 1/2	2 1/2	2 1/2	1/8
16 1/2	10	Swank	1	9.2	10	16	11	10 1/2	10 1/2	1/8
21	14	Sybron	1.08	6.3	8	55	17 1/2	17 1/4	17 1/4	1/4
33 1/4	25 1/2	Sybrn	pf2.40	7.9	9	301	30 1/4	30 1/4	30 1/4	1/8
38 1/2	24 1/2	Syntex	s1.20	3.4	10	2003	35 1/2	34 1/2	35 1/2	1/2
34 1/4	20	WIMrt	pf 1	1	30	30	30	1
30 1/2	21 1/4	Walgrn	s 1	3.7	9	366	27 1/4	26 1/2	27 1/4	1/8
29 1/2	11 1/2	WkHRS	q1.32	70	13	12 1/2	13	1/8
36	25 1/2	WalCSV	.66	2.2	10	15	30	30	30	1/8
28 1/2	16	WalJm	1	5.6	...	80	17 1/2	17 1/2	17 1/2	1/8
31	18	WalJJ	pf1.60	8.3	...	8	19 1/2	19 1/2	19 1/2	1/8
34 1/2	20 1/4	Warnac	1.20	3.9	6	273	31 1/2	31 1/2	31 1/2	1/8
63 1/4	40 1/2	WrnCm	1	2.1	12	4314	48 1/2	48 1/2	48 1/2	1/8
25 1/2	17	WarrnL	1.40	6.7	11	1683	20 1/2	20 1/2	20 1/2	1/8
43 1/2	25 1/2	WashGs	2.76	9.8	8	12	28 1/4	28 1/4	28 1/4	1/8
35 1/2	14 1/4	WshNat	1.08	6.8	7	80	16 1/2	16	16	1/2
19 1/2	16 1/2	WshWt	2.40	14	5	76	17 1/2	17 1/2	17 1/2	1/8
40 1/2	25 1/2	Waste	.52	1.7	15	618	30 1/4	30 1/4	30 1/4	1/8
37 1/2	20 1/2	Watkin	.48	1.5	15	75	32 1/4	32 1/4	32 1/4	1/4
6 1/2	4	WeanU	.051	...	12	2	4 1/2	4 1/2	4 1/2	1/8
11 1/4	9 1/2	WeanU	pf1.26	...	1	10 1/2	10 1/2	10 1/2	10 1/2	1/8
12	4 1/2	WebbD	10	76	6 1/4	6	6	1/4
28 1/2	21 1/4	WeissM	s .76	2.8	9	10	27 1/2	26 1/2	26 1/2	1/8
36 1/2	20 1/4	WellsF	1.92	9.1	4	85	21 1/4	21	21 1/2	1/8
24 1/2	19 1/2	WelfM	2.80	14	9	40	19 1/2	d19 1/4	19 1/2	1/8
19 1/4	12 1/4	Wendys	.28	1.8	10	777	16	15 1/2	16	1/2
19 1/2	11 1/2	West	s	...	9	157	16	15 1/4	15 1/4	1/4
33 1/2	28	WPENP	pf4.50	14	...	2300	32 1/2	32 1/2	32 1/2	7/8
25 1/2	19 1/2	WPTP	s1.80	7.7	6	29	24	23 1/2	23 1/2	1/8
11 1/2	9 1/2	WstcT	q1.04	11	...	4	9 1/4	9 1/4	9 1/4	1/8
11 1/4	3 1/2	WnAirL	798	4 1/2	4 1/2	4 1/2	4 1/2	1/4
29 1/2	8 1/2	WAIr	pf	...	159	12 1/4	12 1/2	12 1/2	12 1/2	1/8
32 1/2	9	WCNA	.24	2.7	4	1012	9	d 8 1/2	8 1/2	1/4
63 1/4	48 1/4	WPacI	...	5	9	57 1/2	57	57	57	1/2
37 1/4	21 1/4	WUnion	1.40	4.4	9	310	32 1/2	31 1/2	31 1/2	1/8
8 1/4	7	WUN	dpf1.18	15	...	83	8	7 1/2	7 1/2	1/8
18 1/4	15 1/4	WUTI	pf2.56	15	...	5	17	17	17	1/8
32 1/4	21 1/2	WestGE	1.80	7.3	5	1120	24 1/2	24	24 1/4	1/8
40	33 1/2	Wstg	pf 3.80	10	...	210	37	37	37	1/2
28 1/4	18 1/2	Westvc	1.20	6.0	6	58	20	19 1/2	20	1/8
37 1/4	22 1/2	Weyerhr	1.30	5.5	14	917	23 1/2	23	23 1/2	1/4
47 1/4	31 1/2	Weyr	pf2.80	8.7	...	175	32 1/4	31 1/2	32 1/4	1/8
52	36 1/4	Weyr	pf4.50	11	...	12	39 1/4	39 1/4	39 1/4	1/8
60	27 1/2	WheelF	1.80	6.2	6	104	29 1/2	28 1/2	28 1/2	1/8
52	33	WheelF	pf4.12	12	...	4	33 1/2	33 1/4	33 1/4	1/2
40 1/2	12 1/2	WheelPit	...	4	24	14 1/4	13 1/2	13 1/2	13 1/2	1/8
35	28 1/4	WhPit	pf 5	17	...	210	29	29	29	1
30 1/2	22	Whirpl	1.60	5.5	9	437	29 1/4	29	29 1/2	1/8
35 1/4	22 1/2	WhitC	1.50	5.7	8	91	26 1/2	26	26 1/4	1/4
25	12 1/2	WhitHl	s	...	11	149	16 1/4	16 1/4	16 1/4	1/8
48 1/2	21 1/2	Whitak	1.60	6.7	5	108	24	23 1/4	23 1/4	1/8
8	3	Wiebldt	...	10	16	72	4 1/2	4 1/2	4 1/2	1/4
34 1/4	14	William	1.20	8.0	7	535	15	14 1/2	15	1/4
18 1/2	11 1/4	WilmE	n.10e	...	7	6	167	14 1/2	14 1/2	1/8
12 1/2	6 1/2	Wilshro	.65t	7.6	11	50	8 1/2	8 1/2	8 1/2	1/8



Published Quarterly by
The Society of American Archivists

The American Archivist

Harold P. Anderson, *Editor*, Summer 1982 issue

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Deborah Risteen, *Managing Editor*

Janet G. Sted, *Copy Editor*

DEPARTMENT EDITORS

Christopher Beam, *Shorter Features*

Ben DeWhitt, *Technical Notes*

F.L. Eaton, *News Notes*

Brenda A. Beasley Kepley, *Reviews*

Ronald J. Plavchan, *The International Scene*

Mary Elizabeth Ruwell, *Reviews*

Thomas E. Weir, Jr., *News Notes*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Edmund Berkeley, Jr., chair (1982-85), *University of Virginia*

Francis X. Blouin, Jr. (1980-83), *University of Michigan*

C. F. W. Coker (1982-85), *Library of Congress*

J. Frank Cook (1979-82), *University of Wisconsin, Madison*

Mabel E. Deutrich (1980-83), *Aptos, California*

J. R. K. Kantor (1979-82), *University of California*

James B. Rhoads (1981-84), *Rhoads Associates International*

Hugh A. Taylor (1981-84), *Public Archives of Canada*

The Society of American Archivists

PRESIDENT Edward Weldon, *National Archives and Records Service*

VICE PRESIDENT J. Frank Cook, *University of Wisconsin, Madison*

TREASURER Paul H. McCarthy, *University of Alaska*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Ann Morgan Campbell

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Lynn A. Bonfield (1979-83), *Bonfield Archival Consultants*

Shonnie Finnegan (1978-82), *State University of New York at Buffalo*

Meyer H. Fishbein (1979-83), *American University*

Robert S. Gordon (1980-84), *Public Archives of Canada*

Sue E. Holbert (1981-85), *Minnesota Historical Society*

William L. Joyce (1981-85), *The New York Public Library*

Richard H. Lytle (1981-82), *Smithsonian Institution*

Virginia C. Purdy (1980-84), *National Archives and Records Service*

The cover illustration shows the stock performance of some of the publicly held corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The American Archivist

Volume 45 / Number 3 / Summer 1982

Business Archives: A Special Issue

Business Archives: A Corporate Asset/264

Foreword by Harold P. Anderson

Business Archives Guidelines/267

Linda Edgerly

An Historical Look at Business Archives/273

David R. Smith

Corporate Archives Today/279

Douglas A. Bakken

Dusting Off the Cobwebs: Turning the Business Archives into a Managerial Tool/287

George David Smith

Commentary I/291

Philip F. Mooney

Commentary II/293

Deborah S. Gardner

Access Policies for Corporate Archives/296

Anne Van Camp

Microcomputer Archives and Records Management Systems: Guidelines for Future Development/299

Richard M. Kesner

Business Archives Literature/312

Karen Benedict

Photographs in a Business Setting: Atlantic Richfield Company/315
Mildred Simpson

Shorter Features/323

**The American Brass Company: A Case Study of the Disposition
of Business Records**
Lynn A. Bonfield and Karen R. Lewis

The Forum/259

Reviews/327

Technical Notes/341

International Scene/343

News Notes/353

Historical Editing/356

REVIEWS

**Grimsted, Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Estonia, Latvia,
Lithuania, and Belorussia/327**
reviewed by Dane Hartgrove

**Lewanski, ed., Eastern Europe and Russia/Soviet Union: A Handbook of West
European Archival and Library Resources/328**
reviewed by Patricia K. Grimsted

**Lynch and Slotkin, Processing Manual for the Institute Archives and Special Collec-
tions M.I.T. Libraries/329**
reviewed by Beverly Bishop

Gracy, An Introduction to Archives and Manuscripts/330
reviewed by Edward Oetting

Roe, Teaching with Historical Records/332
reviewed by Marilyn Childress

Rinhart and Rinhart, The American Daguerreotype/333
reviewed by Pamela Haas and Lori Gross

**Noggle, Working with History: The Historical Records Survey in Louisiana and the
Nation, 1936-1942/334**
reviewed by Thomas E. Mills

The Forum

TO THE EDITOR:

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST IS THE ROCK upon which any course in archival theory, practice or management must be built. Your journal provides the key reading assignments since all the published books on the subject barely make a two foot reserve shelf in my Library's reading room. Thus only other teachers of archival management could have greeted the Winter, 1982 issue of *American Archivist* as enthusiastically as I did. With the next session of my class devoted to arrangement and description, I eagerly started Frank Boles' article, "Disrespecting Original Order." What a dismaying experience!

Others may write in anger about Boles' low opinion of archivists' ability, judgement and common sense to apply archival principles to real situations or express their shock at his "proof text" technique of quoting words of respected archivists out of context and thus reversing their intended meaning. My concern is with meaningful communication among archivists. Boles' pleasantly sassy article thus becomes a clear example of how confusing it is to argue out of context.

Boles equates a late 19th century European governmental archival practice with that of a mid-20th century American private manuscript library.

He would have us believe that Messrs. Muller, Feith, Fruin in the Dutch archives treated 18th-century public records in 1898 the same way Ruth Bordin and Robert Warner at the Bentley Historical Library processed a group of private papers in 1966. Boles also shifts his argument among different documentation levels from record group to file and item. Finally he does not stress that the actual arrangement of a particular collection is just one step in a total administrative process to provide the most effective intellectual and physical access at the least expenditure of resources. In short Boles supports his arguments by using examples out of the contexts implied by the differences in time, institutional types, clientele, staff training, levels of documentation, and stages of processing.

Archivists' processing decisions are made within several coexistent contexts: a specific collection, a certain type of institution, limitations in funds, staff, equipment and space, and a particular time. Meaningful discussion or application of archival principles takes place when archivists recognize the institutional reality in which they must exercise professional judgment. Boles "theory of simple usability" itself will be judged useful or useless as it is applied by ar-

chivists as they process actual collections.

Boles' final modest conclusion—that his theory will be to former archival theory what Einstein's theory of relativity was to Newton's law of gravity—implies some belief in "laws of archives" or an immutable exterior reality against which archivists can measure archival behavior. This is a delusion, but archivists do have a lot going for them: a rich tradition to be properly understood, interpreted, and applied and a multitude of talented, practicing archivists willing to share their experiences.

RICHMOND WILLIAMS
*Eleutherian Mills
Historical Library*

AUTHOR'S RESPONSE:

OF COURSE I DISAGREE with Mr. Williams' opinions. I do not believe the article abused evidence nor do I believe Mr. Williams has portrayed the meaning of the article's conclusion accurately. I hope, however, that our disagreement can be productive, helping to stimulate still better ideas.

FRANK BOLES
University of Michigan

TO THE EDITOR:

I AM SADDENED by the fact that I can no longer debate Leston Cappon on the issues that he raises in the Winter 1982 issue of the *American Archivist* in response to my article on archival theory from the Winter 1981 issue. In his loss, the profession has lost one of its pillars; and coming soon after the loss of Ernst Posner, Julian Boyd, David Mearns, Oliver Holmes, James Masterson and others, we are aware of the passing of an era. Some of us stand in awe and perhaps even fear of what faces us

without their guidance. I do not, therefore, intend to prolong a debate that can only be one-sided.

I believe, however, that the arguments made by Dr. Cappon in his comments on my article reflect the thoughts of one raised in the era of "pure-thinking" about the nature and construction of archives that has undergone considerable change in our own generation. Archivists and archives are no longer concerned only with government or corporate records. The life cycle of records is a concept that rarely takes traditional form in practice, as one looks upon the innumerable corporations that have no archivists to tend to such matters, and treat their records as so many other pieces of property to be surplussed when they have been amortized. Even the National Archives has just lost its traditional records management function, and there are not many states or municipalities where archives and records management are under the same administrative control. Manuscript repositories are regularly making subjective decisions as to what corporate archives they will "collect" and which they will pass by, thus sending them on to oblivion. Jerry Ham's disturbing article on the "Archival Edge," cited by Dr. Cappon, calls for a reanalysis of archival principles in an era of electronic information where it is difficult if not impossible to say where a document "originated," or what is the original or true copy. Thus "provenance" as known to Jenkinson, Leland, Posner and Schellenberg is an elusive concept in today's records-creating world.

Archivists (broadly defined) do select and collect records, often those that are not their own (the NAACP at the Library of Congress, United Artists at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and many others), and we have no theory or even basic ground rules on

how that process should operate. My call was not to develop such theory only in history departments, but anywhere in an academic setting, far removed from the distractions of the workplace. It just seems that in light of the education and training of most archivists today, as well as the reality of what is happening, history departments are the most likely place for such theoretical thinking to blossom.

Lester, we salute you, for showing us the way for the first half century of our profession. Would that you could stay with us to discuss and debate in these pages the problems that we all will face in the next 50 years.

FRANK G. BURKE

*National Historical Publications
and Records Commission*

TO THE EDITOR:

I READ WITH CONSIDERABLE INTEREST Jay Hammond's article, "Adaptive Reuse of Old Buildings for Archives," (*American Archivist*, Winter 1982) on converting the former Rio Grande railroad depot to a facility for the Utah Historical Society. I was, however, disturbed by his statements opposing the installation of a sprinkler system in the building. The rationale given by the author for this position is that in a fire "damage to them (records) usually comes from water". The St. Louis Military Records Center fire and subsequent investigation and GSA report, and numerous other smaller fires have all demonstrated the need for automatic fire suppression equipment. These disasters have also demonstrated that water-damaged paper material can generally be restored through various techniques (cold storage, freeze drying, vacuum chambers) developed over the last 20 years. There is no chance, however, to recover the information when the docu-

ment has been destroyed by the fire.

I am also at loss to understand Haymond's rationale for saying "records in most storage areas are not a combustible load." As the GSA report makes clear, archives and record center storage areas are fires waiting to take place. Paper based manuscripts and records, which comprise the vast majority of the holding of archival repositories, are an excellent fuel source, and storage on shelves assures sufficient quantities of oxygen for rapid fire buildup.

Finally, the author states that with the purchase of a gas system too expensive for the Society, he preferred a wet standpipe (fire hose) over the sprinkler system the fire marshal insisted be installed. I find this position disturbing for several reasons. All the evidence and studies I am familiar with, clearly demonstrate the superiority of an automatic fire suppression system, (sprinklers, gas diffusion etc.) over the use of a manual system (wet standpipe). An automatic system does not require the presence of people to put out a fire. Even if people are in the structure when a fire starts, it is questionable whether it will be detected and a response made in sufficient time before the fire is out of control. Moreover, archivists are not trained fire fighters. Not only might the records suffer considerable more water damage by using a fire hose manned by archivist(s), but far more important is the real possibility of injury or death to the archivist(s) because of lack of training and proper equipment.

I think in the future more and more older structures will be adapted as archival repositories, and Mr. Haymond's article clearly demonstrates the advantages and problems involved in the reuse of older buildings. I would hope, however, that future discussions of archival facilities, whether new or adaptive use of older structures, will include a

Careful and comprehensive discussion of fire prevention measures for archives/records repositories. Fire prevention is too important a subject for archivists to be discussed in any other fashion.

FREDERICK L. HONHART
*University Archives &
 Historical Collections
 Michigan State University*

AUTHOR'S RESPONSE:

IN RESPONSE TO THE LETTER from Frederick L. Honhart and in defense of my statement on fire protection at the Utah State Historical Society in the Winter 1982 *American Archivist* article "Adaptive Reuse of Old Buildings for Archives," may I say that the rules are not clear not instructions authoritative when it comes to fire protection for archives. A number of factors must be considered: kind of material being protected, method of storage, type of storage equipment, storage space dimensions, smoke detection equipment, availability of organized fire protection, availability of remedies for water damaged paper, etc.

I agree with Mr. Honhart that automatic fire suppression equipment is the best if a halon gas system can be installed, but when the options are limited to sprinklers or a manual system the choice becomes less obvious. Different record materials and storage arrangements are affected differently by fire protection provisions. High ceilings and high stacks make sprinklers less effective than sprinklers in a standard size space with standard material to protect. Shelves can protect the fire just as an umbrella protects someone from the rain. With some archives using high stacks fire protection methods other than sprinklers need to be studied. The

threat of accidental flooding from malfunctioning sprinkler systems (we have had one incident already, though no records were damaged) make stand-pipe equipment look like a good option according to my source, a former University of Utah architect now in private practice. Records stored in close order are not immediately available to air (oxygen) and fire; at least the rate at which such material reaches the point of burning is low (again my source). With good smoke detection equipment triggering alarms, fire departments can be on the scene quickly and deal with a fire before any archivist has to handle a hose in an emergency. Our fire fighters can be in front of the building in 2.25 minutes, by their tests. Other situations may demand other choices. The complexity of these problems were reiterated in a recent conversation with Mr. Charley Zimmerman, a fire protection engineer employed by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). He suggested two booklets published by NFPA that may be helpful: NFPA 910 for library fire protection and NFPA 911 for museum fire protection costing \$6.25 each. Write to National Fire Protection Association Publications Department, Batterymarch Park, Quincy, Mass. 02269 or phone (617) 328-9290.

When upgrading or changing fire protection equipment, it is essential to analyze each situation for its own problems and then find out what the ordinances are. To do this, go to the local fire marshal and see what options are available.

JAY M. HAYMOND
*Utah History Library
 Utah State Historical Society*