Research Article

The Incunabula of Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: J. C. Fitzpatrick's *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts* and The Public Archives Commission's Uncompleted "Primer of Archival Economy"

ROBERT D. REYNOLDS, JR.

Abstract: In December 1913, when archival theory and practice in the United States was still in its infancy, the Library of Congress published a guide, *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts*, by a member of its manuscript division staff, John C. Fitzpatrick. The same month the Public Archives Commission's fifth annual conference presented chapter one and chapter five of its proposed "Primer of Archival Economy." The failure of the commission ever to complete and publish its primer had considerable impact on the direction of the archival profession in the United States as it grew to maturity.

About the author: Robert D. Reynolds, Jr., is an archivist at The George Meany Memorial Archives and is managing editor of its illustrated quarterly journal, Labor's Heritage. *He has an M.A. and a Ph.D. in American history from the University of South Carolina and an M.L.S. from the University of Maryland.*

WE IN THE UNITED STATES ARE an anniversary-celebrating people, with centennials and bicentennials commemorated and enshrined on everything from postage stamps to boxes of breakfast cereal. The National Archives and the Library of Congress (LC) have provided much of the fuel to light the bonfires of remembrances, but these shrines to Clio are by no means immune to celebrating their own births. In 1984 the National Archives proclaimed its half-century of existence, and in 1997 the Library of Congress will undoubtedly mark the one-hundredth anniversary of the Jefferson building, which in many ways was the real start of the institution. Yet, between these two landmark dates, 1988 passed unnoticed as a seventy-fifth anniversary touching both institutions—an anniversary not of brick and mortar but of written doctrine. For 1913 was the year in which both archival pioneers and manuscript caretakers attempted to articulate the basic tenets of their respective disciplines. The success of one group in producing a work that ultimately had several editions and the failure of the efforts of the other group would have long-term effects on the shape and substance of U.S. archives and manuscript repositories.

Early Influences on Fitzpatrick's Views

From our vantage point in the 1990s, with the technology of electronic information gathering and storage changing at an ever-increasing pace, the document-keeping methods of the turn-of-the-century gaslight era are hard to envision. The flood of paper generated by the invention of the typewriter had not yet reached the stage of being considered archival, and librarians and other custodians of "historical" material confronted only a relatively small body of handwritten documents. Stored in vertical, wooden, Woodruff file boxes, each item was folded several times, with its descriptive summary written on the back. Older documents often were tied together, stored in bundles. The Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress emerged into this world with its creation in 1897 soon after the new library building opened across the street from the Capitol grounds.

Because the Library of Congress did not fall under the Civil Service, John Russell Young, the new librarian, had no trouble employing his nephew-by-marriage, John C. Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick, one of sixty-five probationary appointments selected from almost three thousand applicants for jobs, had spent the three years since graduating from high school working on the staff of the U.S. government *Advertiser*, and he proved to be an inspired choice. He remained at the library more than thirty years and authored the library's *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts*, which was published in 1913.[1]

Fitzpatrick's future seminal work was influenced by another recent LC appointment. The head of the new Manuscript Division, Herbert Friedenwald, had received his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 1894 and had amassed his manuscript knowledge from research among the records of the Continental Congress stored at the U.S. Department of State.[2] A month after receiving his appointment to the new library, Friedenwald delivered a speech to the American Library Association meeting in Philadelphia, in which he set forth his philosophy of manuscript storage. He devoted about half the talk to considering the best ways to restore, mount, and bind individual manuscripts. Much more briefly he touched on classification, saying

[1]John Cole, *For Congress and the Nation: A Chronological History of the Library of Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1979), 62; "John C. Fitzpatrick," *Dictionary of American Biography*, vol. 11, supp. 2 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 191–92.

[2]David C. Mearns, *The Story Up to Now: The Library of Congress 1800–1946* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1947), 144.

it "permits of development somewhat on the lines of that of books."[3] He saw the process of cataloging in much the same way because, ideally, much of the material would be placed in bound volumes. Friedenwald concluded his talk by citing as self-evident the need to calendar collections and then to publish this information.[4]

Friedenwald soon set about implementing his theories with the collections under his care at the Library of Congress. He was confronted with thirty years of chaos, with the bulk of the holdings comprising material collected by Peter Force while compiling his *American Archives* a half century earlier. With assistance from Fitzpatrick, Friedenwald worked out a classification using Force's system as a guide. The result produced a system whereby collections and items were arranged geographically and chronologically as well as by record type. Individual persons, such as presidents of the United States, had an additional and separate grouping. Finally, provisions were made for "miscellanies," collections of all sorts under library-type subject headings.[5]

Fitzpatrick's work during this period under Friedenwald centered on calendaring the division's limited George Washington items, a project that would expand greatly in 1903 when the U.S. Department of State transferred to the library the records and papers of the Continental Congress and the personal papers of Washington, Madison, Jefferson, and others.

The momentous addition of this new material was shepherded into the library by Worthington C. Ford, who became head of the Manuscript Division in 1902. Friedenwald had resigned in 1900, and librarian Herbert Putnam sought out Ford, who had worked for him at the Boston Public Library. Ford's experience with documents was derived in part from serving as head of the Bureau of Statistics at the U.S. Department of State and later at the U.S. Treasury from the mid-1880s to almost the turn of the century. Although educated at Columbia University, Ford owed his historical training in large part to his father, Gordon Ford, who owned one of the largest manuscript collections ever held in private hands in this country. From 1889–93, while free from his work with the federal government, the younger Ford immersed himself in the study of George Washington and produced an edition of the first president's writings, as well as several satellite works on the subject. With the Manuscript Division's collections concentrated in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century material, Ford seems to have been a satisfactory choice to head the division.

As Friedenwald had earlier, Ford appeared in print with his views on how to catalog manuscripts. In 1904, the fourth edition of Charles Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* contained a brief three-page section by Ford, in which he explained that manuscripts lend themselves to three classes: separate volumes of distinct material, correspondence, and loose unconnected or occasional papers. The first group could best be treated much the same way as books, with separate listings for each item. Correspondence, the second group, would best be served by chronological arrangement and then calendaring. The final group, unrelated documents, should not be bound in most cases. Rather, either an alphabetical or chronological arrangement could be used, depending on the size of the collection. Subject classification of groupings of unrelated documents should not be necessary except with very large bulk.[6] Overall, Ford

[3]Herbert Friedenwald, "The Care of Manuscripts," *Library Journal* 22 (October 1897): 54.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Fred Shelly, "Manuscripts in Library of Congress 1800–1900," *American Archivist* 11 (January 1948): 17.

[6]C[harles] Lincoln [assistant in charge, Manuscript Division] to librarian [Herbert Putnam], 26 February

seemed to be tending to move away from Friedenwald's view of manuscripts as bound volumes to be arranged strictly by subject and to be moving toward a position that "general correspondence of a secondary interest . . . may be kept in a loose state" and that subjects should enter only at the collection level.[7]

In 1908, shortly before he left the library to work for the Massachusetts Historical Society, Ford's answer to an inquiry from the Historical Department of Iowa spelled out his division's policy on classification and the goals he hoped the system would achieve. He reiterated the policy of "strict chronological order" of an individual's papers, and the need for each document to be calendared alphabetically on note cards. He foresaw a system of cross-references by subject from one collection to another to allow researchers with a specific subject or time frame to go directly to the bound volumes of documents. Researchers who wanted letters from a specific individual could use the alphabetical card index.[8]

During Ford's tenure at the library, Fitzpatrick spent the bulk of his time calendaring, his most extensive project being the military correspondence of George Washington.[9] By the end of 1908, Fitzpatrick had been promoted to chief clerk of the Manuscript Division and had charge of its administrative duties.[10]

In 1909, shortly before Fitzpatrick completed the Washington calendar, Gaillard Hunt succeeded Ford as head of the division. Hunt had no college degree, but he shared with his predecessor strong ties to the U.S. Department of State, having served that agency for twenty-one years and being, at the time of his appointment, chief of the Bureau of Citizenship. According to historian J. Franklin Jameson, Hunt did not come to the study of history "through the conventional pathways of academic scholarship" but brought "the best fruits of the amateur spirit."[11]

Hunt had an impact on the accession policies of the division. His inaugural report to the Librarian of Congress, probably drawing on Hunt's experiences at the Department of State, stressed the importance of transferring "historical" government records to the library in order to make them safe from loss and accessible to researchers.[12] This disregard of provenance in order to preserve documents may be illustrated best by the creation in 1910 of a subject-based chronological collection of U.S. House of Representatives papers from selected unbound committee papers of that body. The library did not seek out the ma-

1901, Central File, Putnam Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. Lincoln notes in the memo: "In the second division has been gathered all manuscript material which it was thought that the Library might care to retain. A few bundles were transferred unopened . . . but in the majority of instances such a small portion of the original packages was considered valuable for Library purposes that the bundles were opened and examined, only the more valuable papers being put aside. . . . By far the larger portion of the material has been replaced in boxes and is ready for shipment from the Library." See also *Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1899* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899), 7.

[7]Worthington C. Ford, "Manuscripts," in Charles Cutter, *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 135–38.

[8]Worthington C. Ford to Alice M. Steele, Historical Department, Iowa, 25 April 1908. See also letters dated 1 May and 6 May 1908, Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, file no. 1066.

[9]In 1908 Ford estimated that a single worker could prepare about 7,000 calendar cards a year. When Fitzpatrick finished calendaring the George Washington material at the library in July 1910, it comprised more than 25,000 cards. Thus, that calendaring project alone occupied more than three years of Fitzpatrick's time. See *Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1908*, 21, and *Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1910*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), 36.

[10]Worthington C. Ford, Memo, 23 December 1908, Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, file no. 697.

[11]J. Franklin Jameson, "Gaillard Hunt," *Dictionary of American Biography,* supp. 5, 385.

[12]*Report of Librarian of Congress, 1909* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909), 26.

terial, but, having been given the opportunity, Hunt took full advantage and chose more than sixty feet of committee records that he considered "historical."[13]

The tradition of selecting for safe storage only some documents from the bulk of government records did not seem a desecration to its practitioners. Ford did speak out sharply against autograph collectors who had broken up a series of letters to gain a single signature, and he called for historical societies to act as "clearing houses of original material which had gone astray" by returning the items to the proper state or federal body. He nevertheless stressed the need for manuscript curators to rescue important public records from destruction if state or federal archival sources were not doing the job.[14]

Writing in 1911, J. Franklin Jameson applauded Ford for moving federal records from New Orleans to Washington, D.C., and lamented that a similar action had not been taken before the San Francisco material was lost in the earthquake. Yet Jameson went on to say that he did not wish to "embarrass" Hunt on this issue, adding that there are no easy answers and there is much "historical interest" in having federal records "made known to the people who live near them and could use them—interest independent of the transfer of the cream of them to Washington."[15]

Hunt did not remain ignorant of government archival theory during this period. He was a delegate to the International Congress of Archivists and Librarians held in Brussels in 1910, the same year he began serving on the Public Archives Commission. Unfortunately, he had no previous European experience and was not conversant in French, the language of the conference. He took the position that the U.S. archival and manuscript situation was unique, so that European methods did not always supply a solution to American archival problems.[16] Throughout this period Hunt was receptive to the idea of an archives depository, believing that the library did not have room for government records and that "they are not the character of material which it collects."[17] It is unfortunate that Hunt's acquisition statement did not match his holdings on Capitol Hill. The only explanation would seem to be that he distinguished between government records offered for necessary preservation and the abundant federal material relegated to inactive status each year.

Fitzpatrick's *Notes* Answers a Demand

The practices and thinking of Friedenwald, Ford, and Hunt molded Fitzpatrick's views. But because he never was in an official policy-making position, Fitzpatrick's own original input into the Manuscript Division's operations during these years is hard to measure. The fact that he had unbroken tenure from the division's inception might

[13]At the time of the creation of the collection, the Library of Congress already stored the bound House records. The unbound collection was added to several times over the years so that it continued to expand after Hunt left the Manuscript Division. See Robert D. Reynolds Jr., "The House of Representatives Collection of the Library of Congress." Unpublished paper, copy in House of Representatives Collection in National Archives, Record Group 233.

[14]Worthington C. Ford, "The Massachusetts Historical Society," in *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1912* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915), 222–23, and Worthington C. Ford, "Manuscripts and Historical Archives," in *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1913* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 78–79.

[15]J. Franklin Jameson to Herman Ames, 14 December 1911, J. Franklin Jameson Papers, American Historical Association, Public Archives Commission, 1900–12.

[16]Waldo Gifford Leland, "The First Conference of Archivists, December 1909: The Beginnings of a Profession," *American Archivist* 13 (April 1950): 115. See also J. F. Van Laer, "The Work of the International Congress of Archives and Librarians at Brussels, August 28–31, 1910," in *American Historical Association Annual Report, 1910* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912), 282–92.

[17]*Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1914* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 57.

have helped provide a continuity of methods under changing leaders. Although calendaring took up most of his time, Fitzpatrick did make trips out of town to accession material during Hunt's tenure. In one notable case, he was sent to South Carolina to collect the John H. Hammond family papers. Showing great zeal for the assignment, he reported to Hunt, "We made a clean sweep and after young Hammond got the packing fever I believe he would have torn down the old four poster bed and jammed it in the trunk had I incautiously laid hold of the foot board."[18] After he left the division in 1928, Fitzpatrick claimed in a biographical statement to have been the central figure in the creation of the various systems of recording documents and the development of the classification system.[19] Whatever the influences, assignments, and innovations on or by Fitzpatrick at the Manuscript Division, the result was compiled into his *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts*, which was published in December of 1913.

Demand for such a work had existed for some time, particularly in the area of repair of priceless documents. There were, however, institutions that desired to know the LC scheme for classification of manuscripts. In 1912, the Newberry Library in Chicago particularly wanted a system that would "allow for future growth."[20] Repositories of state records also posed questions. In 1913, the Historical Department of Iowa, which five years earlier had asked for classification advice, now had indexer Ethel B. Virtue inquire into the feasibility of calendaring the 1,250,000 documents of the offices of governor, secretary of state, and auditor.[21] Thus, due to "numerous requests for advice," the Library of Congress decided to issue a printed guide to its policies and procedures, noting that "there seems not to be available in print a practical guide or aid to the treatment of archive material."[22]

Reclassification Becomes an American Approach

Fitzpatrick's pamphlet was divided into thirty-three paragraphs—some several pages in length—and covered eighty-four indexed topics. The subjects of arrangement and calendaring received the most space. After first offering advice on restrictions to access and safeguards against defacement of documents,[23] Fitzpatrick plunged into a delineation between official papers and personal papers, noting that at times the dividing line between the two is "often shadowy in the extreme."

Official papers almost always have their

[18]J. C. Fitzpatrick to Gaillard Hunt, 23 July 1911, Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, no. 697.

[19]J. C. Fitzpatrick, undated enclosure in letter to Dr. Guilday, 8 November 1928. J. C. Fitzpatrick Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. These statements by Fitzpatrick must be taken with caution, however, since his parting from the library was with great bitterness, and he thus might have been prone to exaggerate his achievement at the library in order to discredit those who pushed him out, especially librarian Herbert Putnam.

[20]W.N.C. Carlton to Gaillard Hunt, 15 March 1912, Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, no. 1230.

[21]Ethel B. Virtue to Gaillard Hunt, 4 September 1913, Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, no. 1066. See also letter of 15 September 1913, where she inquires about the cataloging of the subject-based "House of Representatives Collection" mentioned earlier.

[22]J. C. Fitzpatrick, *Notes on the Care, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913), 3. Worthington Ford's 1907 yearly summary pointed to great interest by state record keepers and historical societies in the methods used at the Library of Congress Manuscript Division, noting that a number of representatives have "visited the repair room and made a study." *Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1907* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907), 141.

[23]See Raymond H. Geselbracht, "The Origins of Restrictions on Access to Personal Papers at the Library of Congress and the National Archives," *American Archivist* 49 (Spring 1986): 142–43.

own arrangement and classification system, but Fitzpatrick saw this as only a tool—a very valuable tool, but nevertheless just a tool—to guide the archivist to a rearrangement that would better suit the needs of "students of history and economics." In Fitzpatrick's view, all administrative value ceases when the papers enter any type of archival depository. The historical and administrative roles of the material are totally incompatible.[24]

For the most part, Fitzpatrick defined personal papers in terms of letters and memoranda, and he spent considerable space warning against any hasty disturbance of the arrangement that existed when the collection ceased to grow. Rearrangement probably will be necessary, he said, but the "original order" provides clues to dating letters and other mysteries of the collection. Fitzpatrick's caution about initial disruption of original order is modern, but his narrow, historians-only, framework for both official and personal papers forced him to reclassify in almost any and all cases.

It is this reclassification and arrangement section of Fitzpatrick's manual that has provoked the most criticism. Although warning that the LC system of mostly Americana would likely not be applicable to other similar institutions, he gave a full explanation of it. Calling it a "chronologic-geographic" system, he listed the various miscellaneous groupings of the Western Hemisphere items and, within that geographic area, elaborated specific categories for U.S. material from the first settlements to the writing of the Constitution. The remaining post-1789 material was characterized as "United States miscellaneous," indicating the eighteenth-century and earlier focus of the library holdings. In his book on the history of archival theory, Fitzpatrick critic Richard C. Berner stated that because *Notes* concentrated on the control of miscellany instead of on what Fitzpatrick called "natural collections"—similar to today's "integral" or "organic" collections—attention was "diverted from attacking the central problem in the control of modern manuscripts collections—that is, the record series."[25] Berner also noted that, due to chronological coverage, "little if any attention was paid to provenance."[26] T. R. Schellenberg, in his book *The Management of Archives*, contended that the chronologic-geographic system "represents the extreme opposite of the archival principle by which records are kept according to their provenance, and led to the practice of tearing manuscript collections apart." And this he believed "immeasurably retarded the development of an effective control over the documentary resources of the nation."[27]

Although both Schellenberg and Berner recognized the fragmented nature of the eighteenth-century and earlier material that made up the bulk of the holdings of manuscript repositories in the first decades of this century, they may have overstated their case in the degree of destruction of provenance, at least insofar as Fitzpatrick is concerned. In 1929, just after resigning from the Library of Congress, Fitzpatrick expressed his outrage on hearing that the Benjamin Franklin Stevens unbound facsimiles and transcripts that had been together in the

[24]Fitzpatrick modified his stand slightly on this point in the second edition of the manual issued in 1921. Among one of the few changes he made in the work was to replace the word *never* with *no longer* in the following sentence: "Official papers transferred to the archive bureau should be papers whose administrative value has disappeared and are officially dead—papers that actual practice has shown are never consulted for administrative purposes." And in the next sentence he added the word *Archival* to start the sentence: "Control over such papers is undesirable. . . ." Fitzpatrick, *Notes,* 1913 and 1921 eds., 8.

[25]Richard C. Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 1983), 19.

[26]Ibid., 20.

[27]T. R. Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), 39.

library from about 1904 were now being broken up and their contents placed in various other collections. He noted, "It is . . . like tearing up volumes and distributing chapters."[28] Writing to the new manuscript chief, J. Franklin Jameson, he strongly advised at the very least recording the number of original containers and saving one box of each group as labeled so as to facilitate return "to their original arrangement some day out of regard for the fundamental principle governing such things." He concluded that the scattering of the material "has future consequences involved, beyond that of a mere administrative decision."[29]

This defense of Fitzpatrick does not imply that he did not participate in scattering some collections, especially the Peter Force material. But the presence of the Stevens items in the library since about 1904 would seem to suggest that the "scattering" philosophy declined after the departure in 1900 of Friedenwald and his strict library cataloging of material. For Fitzpatrick, any changes always centered around chronological arrangement within collections, and the breakup of government-document provenance by the library at this time seemed to be dictated mostly by the need to preserve a segment of threatened "historical" records from destruction.

The second half of Fitzpatrick's manual touched on storage, covering the idea (now taken for granted) that manuscripts should not be stored folded.[30] Turning to the next topic, cataloging, he explained that a library card entry should be created for each item, and he spent several pages explaining the proper format for such entries. But it is in the discussion of calendars that Fitzpatrick showed true affection for something he considered an art. Although admitting that calendars are costly and time consuming to produce, he emphasized their importance by devoting almost one fourth of the manual to an explanation of calendaring. He defended his position by stressing that a correctly produced calendar's "fullness of description reduces the unnecessary handling of the manuscripts to a minimum."[31] Fitzpatrick closed his pamphlet with a section on repairs and another on mounting and binding. The advice probably represented the best available information on the subjects at the time.

The Call for Archival Theory Based on European Traditions

In his essay in the Manuscript Division section of the *Report of the Librarian of Congress*, Gaillard Hunt boasted that Fitzpatrick's "brochure" had been "received with interest by archivists in this country and abroad." He went on to declare, "It has been accepted as authoritative, and the merit of the methods it describes has not thus far been questioned."[32] Yet at the very time Hunt issued this statement, a group of his co-workers on the Public Archives Commission were working to produce another archival manual, a far more ambitious work that would provide a different approach in a number of areas and would bring the theories of European archivists to a wide audience in the United States, forcing a distinction to be drawn between the archivist and the manuscript curator.

Leland proposes a manual; a subcommittee is formed. The leading figure in the

[28]Undated and unsigned note on John C. Fitzpatrick letterhead [ca. February 1929], J. C. Fitzpatrick Papers.

[29]J. C. Fitzpatrick to J. Franklin Jameson, 23 February 1929, J. C. Fitzpatrick Papers.

[30]Fitzpatrick, *Notes,* 21–25.

[31]Ibid., 29. Morris L. Radoff in "A Guide to Practical Calendaring," *American Archivist* 11 (April 1948: 123), spoke out against what he considered "a certain snobbishness" which developed at the Library of Congress about just who was qualified to do calendaring.

[32]Gaillard Hunt, "Division of Manuscripts," in *Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1914* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 56.

call for archival theory based on European traditions was Waldo Leland, a historian with degrees from Brown and Harvard. Under the leadership of Andrew C. McLaughlin, the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., decided its first project would be publishing a survey of federal records. Together with Claude Van Tyne, a teaching fellow at Brown, Leland compiled the *Guide to the Archives of the Government of the United States* (1904); three years later, Leland alone revised and expanded the book. He continued to expand his archival knowledge by serving as the Carnegie Institution's head of historical missions in Paris. While overseas, he became familiar with European archives and archival theory, especially a manual of arrangement and description drawn up by The Netherlands Association of Archivists in 1898.

Meanwhile in the United States, the Public Archives Commission, having been established in 1899 under the sponsorship of the American Historical Association (AHA), concentrated on establishing and inventorying state archives. Under the leadership of Herman V. Ames, who became chairman in 1902, the commission began to create a growing interest in archives, especially among the Southern states. The real turning point, however, occurred in 1909, with the holding of the first Conference of Archivists in conjunction with the annual meeting of the AHA. Leland later claimed authorship of the conference idea, saying it was inspired by his work in Paris.[33] Whatever the origins of the conference, there is no doubt that Leland ushered in a new approach to American archival thought at the conference with his paper, "American Archival Problems," which stressed the principle of provenance and nonlibrary approaches to classification and cataloging. He concluded his talk with a call for conference members to join together to produce a manual of archival practice "similar to that of the Dutch archivists."[34] In summarizing the conference for the AHA *Annual*, Ames noted the call for a manual and listed proposed subjects such as classification, indexing, calendaring, methods of filing, as well as repairing and mounting documents.[35]

Although little progress was made during the next two years on Leland's suggested manual, his call for European methods received much attention at the second archival conference in 1910, held shortly after the Brussels archives and library meeting that he, Gaillard Hunt, Dunbar Rowland, and Arnold J. Van Laer had attended. Dutch-born Van Laer, of the New York State Library, helped publicize provenance, but he and the profession in general turned their attention to preservation problems after a major fire damaged records at his Albany library.[36]

During this period, the idea of an archival manual was kept alive in large measure by commission member Victor H. Paltsits of the New York Public Library. In March 1912 he submitted an outline of a proposed

[33]"Reminiscences of Waldo Gifford Leland," 24 May 1955, Oral History Collection, Columbia University, 17. See also Rodney A. Ross, "Waldo Gifford Leland: Archivist by Association," *American Archivist* 46 (Summer 1983): 265–66.

[34]Waldo G. Leland, "American Archival Problems," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1909* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), 348.

[35]Ibid., 341. Earlier, Leland, in proposing the project to Public Archives Commission chairman Ames, had envisioned a manual of about two hundred pages. Waldo G. Leland to Herman V. Ames, 29 May 1909, American Historical Association Papers, Secretary File, Correspondence.

[36]See Arnold Van Laer, "The Work of the International Congress of Archivists and Librarians at Brussels, August 28–31, 1910," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1910,* 282–92. See also Arnold Van Laer, "The Lessons of the Catastrophe in New York State Capital at Albany on March 29, 1911," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1911,* 331–36.

manual to Ames, and the two men, together with Leland, formed a subcommittee and presented their plans for a manual at the annual year-end conference. Their proposal signaled a major change in the direction of both the American Historical Association Public Archives Commission and the Conference of Archivists.

"The Manual of Archival Economy" is planned. At the fourth annual Conference of Archivists in December 1912, Ames gave his farewell report as chairman. In it, he announced that much of the commission's work on encouraging the inventorying of records on a state-by-state basis had been completed and, as a result, the commission in future would focus its energies on producing a manual to impart "a more rational and scientific treatment of archival material."[37]

Paltsits, the incoming chairman, submitted the subcommittee's plan for a "Manual of Archival Economy." He listed twenty proposed chapters and then outlined the direction each topic should take. After an introduction, the initial chapters would define archival relationships to government bodies; the following chapters would cover various architectural and housekeeping problems and solutions, as well as staff policies and procedures. The second half of the work would include sections on accessions, cataloging, classification, and repairing. The final six chapters would touch on supplies, loans of material, publications, exhibitions, a bibliography, and, finally, a full index. Of all the topics, Paltsits devoted the most space to explaining the importance of provenance to classification, and he pointed to the use of the system recently introduced in the public archives of Iowa.[38]

Leland followed Paltsits's presentation with his own talk on archival principles. Many of his points directly contradicted the policies of the Library of Congress. For example, Leland stressed that European and American conditions did not differ fundamentally; that there should be no selection from certain documents that are supposed to have overriding historical interest; and that legal custody of archival material should never remain with those who no longer possess the documents. Possibly to keep peace in the commission family, he closed by listing and declaring correct Gaillard Hunt's rules for governing access of the public to archival material.[39]

The 1912 meeting concluded with a paper by Dunbar Rowland, director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Brussels participant, and a former member of the commission. Similar in scope to Leland's presentation, Rowland's paper differed somewhat on methods of classification. Although he denounced the idea of any library system of subject classification and advocated the preservation of the continuity of the records of each state office, his call for arranging documents by chronological method to "tell the story in an historical way" was permeated by a faint whiff of the LC system.[40] It was clear that some sections of the proposed manual might be confronted by a lack of uniformity of opin-

[37]"Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference of Archivists," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1912,* 251.

[38]Victor Paltsits, "Plan and Scope of a 'Manual of Archival Economy for the Use of American Archivists'," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1912,* 253–63. William Birdsall, who has studied the attempt to produce the manual, concludes that Paltsits was strongly influenced as to manual content by Melvil Dewey's 1892–93 handbook of library economy. See William Birdsall, "The American Archivists: Search for a Professional Identity 1909–1936" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1973), 88–89.

[39]Waldo G. Leland, "Some Fundamental Principles in Relation to Archives," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1912,* 264–68.

[40]Dunbar Rowland, "The Adaptation of Archives to Public Use," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1912,* 269–72. In his study of the history of archival theory, Richard C. Berner points to Worthington C. Ford's influence on Rowland. Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice,* 13–14.

ion within the archival community. Fleshing out the bones of Paltsits's outline would be no easy task.

High ideals confront too little money and time. Paltsits envisioned the manual or primer to contain at least twenty thousand words covering approximately one hundred pages; each chapter would be authored by the individual most knowledgeable on the topic.[41] Throughout the life of the project, both ideals had to be compromised—money to print the manual and time for experts to write the material seemed always in short supply. Complicating the birth of the manual was the fact that Leland, one of its midwives, had to spend much of the following year in Paris, which made discussion difficult and quick decisions impossible.[42]

As a result of these considerable problems, only two noncontroversial sections were written during 1913. Charles M. Andrews, a colonial historian with intimate knowledge of the British Archives, produced "Archives"—the introductory chapter of the proposed manual. In it he reiterated many of the general points made by Leland and others about provenance and *respect des fonds,* but his overview of archives is for the most part addressed to the needs of the historical profession: "All archives are historical manuscripts, but not all historical manuscripts are archives."[43] Paltsits wrote the other noncontroversial section, which was expected to be the fifth chapter of the proposed work. Entitled "Fixtures, Fittings, and Furniture," it bore the mark of the recent Albany disaster in its stress on fireproof office equipment.[44]

The manual becomes a primer. As the date for the 1913 archivist conference approached, Leland suggested postponement of the manual until 1914, but he emphasized that at least one of the three controversial topics (classification, cataloging, and legislation) be written as soon as possible because each would require long discussion during at least two conference meetings.[45] His first point, postponement, was a foregone conclusion that had the support of Ames, Andrews, and others. His second point was not acted on until the following year, a delay that would have far-reaching consequences for the fate of the manual. Of even more significance in November 1913, the executive council of the AHA told Paltsits that his plan for the manual was too extensive and expensive. The council was still in favor of the project but recommended that he reduce the scope to that of a primer. At the fifth annual Conference of Archivists held in December, Paltsits presented an outline of the primer having fifteen chapters—down from the twenty of the manual—each to contain from three hundred to five thousand words. Andrews and he then read their proposed chapters to the audience. Unfortunately the expected three-hour program had to be condensed to one hour, leaving almost no time for discussion of the completed chapters or the proposed ones.[46]

[41]Victor Paltsits to Waldo G. Leland, 22 February 1913, American Historical Association Papers, Secretary File, Correspondence. The word *Primer* was used in the letter.

[42]Leland saw his travel in a positive light and stated: "Any writing that I may do well enough abroad—indeed better than I could here, for I shall have more material at hand. . . . " Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 13 February 1913, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archives Commission Files, 1913–17.

[43]Charles M. Andrews, "Archives," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1913,* 263.

[44]Victor Paltsits, "Fixtures, Fittings, and Furniture," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1913,* 265–67. See also letters to Paltsits from such companies as General Fireproofing Company, Metallic Furniture, and others received in August 1913, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17.

[45]Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 29 September 1913, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17.

[46]Victor Paltsits, "Pioneering for a Science of Archives in the United States," in "Society of American Archivists—Proceedings 1936–37," (Unpublished copy, National Archives Library), 45.

Even with all the apparent setbacks before and during the conference, December 1913 can be considered an important date in the archival-manuscript field. Within days of each other, Fitzpatrick's *Notes* went to press and the Conference of Archivists introduced the first chapters of a reduced but focused "Primer of Archival Economy." A national consensus on practices and procedures for both branches of the profession seemed on the horizon.

Although Leland's continued residence in France during 1914 slowed progress, Paltsits and he were able to produce a dummy of the primer. A letter from Leland to Paltsits, dated 31 May 1914, outlined plans for the dummy. Chapters two through four (housing, heating, and fire protection) were in Leland's view technical and could be researched by sending questionnaires to various architects. For chapters six and seven (regulations and legislation), he suggested model rules and regulations as well as a model law to be drawn up from replies to questionnaires sent out to conference and commission members. Skipping over chapter eight (accessions), Leland offered advice on the critical chapter on classification. He mentioned several people, such as Cassius C. Stiles, the Iowa archivist, or Dunbar Rowland, but considered Arnold Van Laer the best candidate because he "has absorbed the Dutch manual, and I doubt if three people in the United States, beyond ourselves, have ever seen it."[47]

Leland volunteered himself for the cataloging chapter because he had the necessary European perspective, and he suggested that John C. Fitzpatrick should lead the discussion of his paper at the forthcoming conference. Mentioning Fitzpatrick's LC pamphlet, Leland also proposed the manuscript librarian as one of the best qualified to write the chapter on repair and restoration. He believed that the remaining chapters, twelve through fifteen (exhibitions, reproduction, clerical supplies, and a dictionary of archival terms), posed no problems and could be quickly constructed without any extensive debate at the conference.[48]

If followed, Leland's plan would have given the archival profession just what it needed: a theoretical plan based on the Dutch model. Van Laer and Leland clearly understood European methodology better than anyone else on this side of the Atlantic. Equally important would be having someone like Fitzpatrick act as chief critic, helping to resolve some of the overlapping ambiguities between archival repositories and manuscript libraries, especially in the cataloging area. Thus there would be two manuals, with clear-cut distinctions as to theory but a united front in technical areas, such as Fitzpatrick's thoughts on repair.

The wave crests. Although a dummy existed, the primer never had a chance. Paltsits spent a great deal of time trying to get someone to write the vital classification chapter. After exhausting all of Leland's choices, in November 1914, Paltsits was finally able to get Ethel Virtue, who was with the Historical Department of Iowa and worked closely with Cassius Stiles, to handle the subject. In many ways she was a strong choice. Although Virtue and the Iowa Historical Department had sought advice from the Library of Congress on classification and calendaring public documents, the state of Iowa had adopted the idea of provenance and *respect des fonds* for its records. In her search for information in 1913, she had also written to Paltsits, saying that Iowa was ready to begin the catalog or index of its archives and would like to use "the latest and best information upon the subject" from the proposed manual.[49]

[47]Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 31 May 1914, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17; also copy in Secretary Files, Correspondence.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Ethel B. Virtue to Victor Paltsits, 19 July 1913;

Paltsits's problems were not confined to the classification chapter; he had an equally difficult time getting Leland to stick with the cataloging chapter. Although Leland returned to the United States in October of 1914 and suggested someone else for the job, Paltsits wrote to him in November, saying "you cannot be spared." Leland delayed starting work on the project until a few weeks before the 1914 conference.[50]

Compounding Paltsits's problems was the general lack of support from J. Franklin Jameson and the American Historical Association. Early in the year, Jameson turned down Paltsits's request to have a public session on the primer as part of the historical society's formal program independent of the conference. A few months later, Jameson also rejected the idea of beginning each report or chapter on a right-hand page in the association's *Annual Report*. Paltsits requested this printing device because it allows each report to stand as an independent entry that can be reprinted and distributed to the profession and the public. Finally, in December the AHA cut the commission's budget in half, to $150.[51]

In many ways, the 1914 Conference of Archivists marked the crest of the primer wave. Although Leland's hope for the participation of Van Laer, Fitzpatrick, and certain others did not materialize, Virtue triumphed with her paper, "Principles of Classification for Archives." Drawing on the statements of Van Laer and Leland as well as on her experience with the Iowa archival situation, she presented a detailed outline of the Iowa system. Virtue cited Benjamin F. Shambaugh's 1906 "Report on the Public Archives" and included the subdivision ideas of C. C. Stiles, superintendent of Iowa's classification department. Overall, her effort pointed to a practical system in use; she did not dwell on the theory behind the system, a consideration Van Laer might have adopted if he had done the presentation.[52]

Although Leland followed Virtue to the podium and discussed the different kinds of catalogs, he apparently had no time to prepare a written presentation and so spoke informally. In a summary of his speech that appeared as a short paragraph in the AHA *Report* for 1914, Leland expressed the view that the cataloging rules for historical manuscripts and archives differ. He explained that catalogs for official purposes should vary according to the material, whereas catalogs for historical purposes should start with a checklist, expand to a descriptive catalog, and culminate in a calendar.[53] Unfortunately, Leland's inability to spare the time to complete a formal essay left a huge gap in the progress of the project. At this point, only three chapters of the primer existed. The timetable for completion would get worse.

The annual Conference of Archivists was not held in 1915. Instead, a conference was held in Washington, D.C., planned by members of the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, and the American Political Science Association, at which the issue of a national archives building was addressed.

see also Johnson Brigham to Victor Paltsits, 9 November 1914, and Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 13 November 1914, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17.

[50]Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 5 October 1914, 13 November 1914, 19 November 1914, and 10 December 1914, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17. Also Victor Paltsits to Waldo G. Leland, 15 November 1914, Secretary Files, Correspondence.

[51]James Westfall Thompson [Chairman of Program Committee of the AHA] to Victor Paltsits, 14 April 1914, and J. Franklin Jameson to Victor Paltsits, 10 August 1914, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17. Also Victor Paltsits to Waldo G. Leland, 11 December 1914, Secretary Files, Correspondence.

[52]Ethel B. Virtue, "Principles of Classification for Archives," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1914,* 373–84.

[53]"Cataloguing of Archives," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1914,* 384.

Earlier in the year Leland had protested the postponement of work on the primer, and he had stressed that Washington was filled with men with archival experience who could give valuable information to a formal archival conference.[54]

Indian Summer

Confidence seemed to be restored in the "Primer for Archival Economy" during the early part of 1916. Among the new members of the Archival Commission, Solon J. Buck seemed especially eager to continue the project.[55] Fitzpatrick, another new commissioner, agreed to help William Berwick of the Library of Congress Repair Section prepare a paper on "Binding, Repairing and Restoration" to be included in the forthcoming manual.[56] Prospects for a successful meeting seemed encouraging, with two additional chapters scheduled to be presented: "Some Considerations on the Housing of Archives," by Louis A. Simon of the Office of the Supervising Architect in the United States and a somewhat peripheral topic, "The Problem of Archive Centralization with Reference to Local Conditions," by Theodore C. Pease of the University of Illinois.

The following year, the seventh annual Conference of Archivists opened in Cincinnati, Ohio, on 27 December 1916. As fate would have it, Chairman Paltsits, as well as some members of the executive council and others, were marooned in Cleveland due to train delays. The original program had to be considerably revised, and unfortunately only the Pease article—already peripheral—was read in person by its author. No one was able to present Berwick's article because Paltsits had the only copy, and he was stuck on the shores of Lake Erie. Needless to say, this truncated conference did not help gain support for the primer.[57]

During 1917 the problems continued to grow. The Archival Commission's budget shrank again, to a yearly total of $50, and America's entrance into World War I threatened to divert the attention of the archival and historical profession from manual writing to war-document collecting.

The lone commission member to speak out in favor of continuing the past work of the conference, and by implication the primer, was Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick acknowledged the value of ensuring that the U.S. military effort was well documented and agreed that time should be devoted to discussion about the best methods to accomplish this, but he suggested that the forthcoming conference "should endeavor to stimulate the continuance of the usual work, and even 'put on a little more steam' because of war conditions."[58] Fitzpatrick lost the argument, and the papers given at the eighth annual Conference of Archivists were directed to archival issues relating to the war in Europe, with the centerpiece being "The Archives of the War," by Waldo G. Leland.[59]

[54]Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 21 July 1915, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17. Among the people he mentions in Washington, D.C., is J. C. Fitzpatrick.

[55]Solon J. Buck to Victor Paltsits, 17 June 1916, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archives Commission Files, 1913–17.

[56]Victor Paltsits to J. C. Fitzpatrick, 30 June 1916, and J. C. Fitzpatrick to Victor Paltsits, 3 July 1916 and 22 November 1916, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archive Commission Files, 1913–17. Berwick was the author of a book on the subject.

[57]"Proceedings of Seventh Annual Conference of Archivists," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1916,* 141–42. Berwick's article, which was later printed in the AHA annual, contained much of the material covered by Fitzpatrick in his pamphlet but in much greater detail. William Berwick, "The Repairing and Binding of Archives," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1916,* 154–61.

[58]J. C. Fitzpatrick to Victor Paltsits, 19 September 1917, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archives Commission Files, 1913–17.

[59]Waldo G. Leland, "The Archives of War," *American Historical Association Annual Report, 1917,*

The health of the "Primer of Archival Economy" did not improve in 1918, when the nationwide influenza epidemic caused the AHA to call off its annual meeting and related programs, including the archival conference. In 1919 the AHA met but had no archival agenda except a reorganization of the Public Archives Commission. At that meeting, Leland and Paltsits were appointed as a special committee on resurrecting the primer. This would have taken a real miracle to accomplish, as no funds were available—the commission itself had not received any appropriations since 1917.[60]

Without funds or friends, publication of the primer was impossible. Leland and Paltsits, always busy men, moved on to other projects. The commission never held a formal burial, and from time to time the primer emerged like a zombie refusing to remain neglected in its grave. In 1924, for example, Jameson instructed incoming commission chairman John W. Oliver of the University of Pittsburgh about the future work of the Archival Commission, but he had to follow up with a second letter because he "quite forgot about" the primer and did not know "in what stage that remains."[61] Jameson had never embraced the idea of an archival manual with the zeal he exhibited toward the founding of a national archival building or the publishing of guides and inventories to individual states. In fact, insofar as the historical profession was concerned, he felt comfortable with Fitzpatrick's pamphlet. On at least one occasion, he requested that the author send a copy to the new state historian of South Dakota because that individual "wishes to know his duties more thoroughly."[62]

Fitzpatrick's Notes Win by Default

Due to the failure to publish the "Primer of Archival Economy," Fitzpatrick's *Notes* remained until the 1930s the only publication in this country readily available as a national guide to the care, arrangement, and cataloging of documents; the Library of Congress received from eighty to one hundred inquiries a year about obtaining the pamphlet.[63] Overseas, the writing on the subject of archival theory and practice moved forward with the 1922 publication in England of Hilary Jenkinson's *A Manual of Archive Administration*. This first English-language, book-length look at European archival principles somewhat filled the void left by the lack of the American primer. Jenkinson's manual was an important work and had wide influence in the United States.[64] Yet, it did not greatly stimulate

230–34. See also Waldo G. Leland to Victor Paltsits, 9 October 1917, American Historical Association Papers, Public Archives Commission Files, 1913–17.

[60]Victor Paltsits, "An Historical Résumé of the Public Archives Commission from 1899–1921," *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1922,* 158–59. See also Birdsall's dissertation, "The American Archivists," 91–94, which devotes considerable space to the funding question from 1912–18.

[61]J. Franklin Jameson to John W. Oliver, 29 January 1924, J. Franklin Jameson Papers, American Historical Association, Public Archives Commission.

[62]J. Franklin Jameson to J. C. Fitzpatrick, 4 October 1920, J. Franklin Jameson Papers, Office File. See also Jameson's comments about the commission and conference following Paltsits's "Historical Résumé" speech, in which Jameson neglects even to mention the manual, *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1922,* 160–63.

[63]See Dorothy V. Martin, "Books on Cataloging of Manuscript Material," *American Archivist* 11 (January 1948): 42–44. Her bibliography appeared without update in a 1955 article in the *American Archivist.* Lester J. Cappon, in "What, Then, Is There to Theorize About?" *American Archivist* 45 (Winter 1982): 22, notes the influence of Hilary Jenkinson's *A Manual of Archive Administration* (London: Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922) on the American archival profession. Memo from J. C. Fitzpatrick, 21 April 1921, folder no. 1708, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Records Pre-1925, file no. 1708. Material in file nos. 1708, 1464, and 2032, among others, shows that copies of *Notes* were sent to manuscript libraries and public archives in such places as Russia, Canada, and the Philippines as well as to various repositories in the United States. See also letters of 1 June 1931 and 27 September 1934 in the J. C. Fitzpatrick Papers.

[64]See, for example, Theodore C. Pease's review of the second edition of Jenkinson's *Manual* in the *American Archivist* 1 (January 1938): 23.

progress in U.S. archival practices, and many people trained and semi-trained in dealing with historical records and manuscripts still undoubtedly believed that there was a strictly American way of doing things.[65]

The overall influence of Fitzpatrick's *Notes* on the profession for good or ill has been discussed in a number of works. Champions of the archival tradition, such as T. R. Schellenberg and Richard C. Berner, contend that the ascendancy of the archival approach was hampered by the influence of the LC pamphlet, and they point to various universities and libraries that adopted the geographical-chronological system based on Fitzpatrick's recommendations.[66]

Would a successful effort on the part of Waldo G. Leland and Victor Paltsits in creating a manual for archives have made a difference? At first glance it would seem unlikely; when Paltsits created and arranged the manuscript division of the New York Public Library in 1914, he adopted Fitzpatrick's ideas, not those of the manual he himself was trying to create. Paltsits clearly considered public archives a separate science, as did Leland.[67] Yet, an archival guide produced in 1913 or 1914 would have had an impact, maybe not on the historians and manuscript curators who tried to develop it, but on the emerging profession in the 1920s and 1930s—a time when Fitzpatrick's work stood alone in this country.

In recent years there has been argument over the reality of an archival theory.[68] Whether one considers the failed "Primer" theoretical or practical is irrelevant; the fact remains that the profession needed some guidelines in order to make judgments and stimulate further thought on various archival subjects. That the guidelines would be imperfect is also somewhat beside the point. This country needed a standard of some sort to build upon, without having to search through overseas publications or scattered regional literature on the subject. In his study of the archival profession from 1909 to 1936, William Birdsall correctly says that Leland's foresight into what archivists needed was there. But Birdsall probably is incorrect when he says the effort was premature because of the immaturity of the profession.[69] The very youthfulness of American archives called out for information, especially to give credibility in this country to the still-emerging European tradition. With the primer, the U.S. archival profession could have constructed an earlier American version of the manual Jenkinson ultimately produced for an English audience. The "Primer of Archival Economy" could have served as a cornerstone, to be modified and enlarged in the next two decades, ultimately providing a foundation for theory and practices for the National Archives, ready when the concrete was poured for the building itself.

Additionally, the historical manuscripts tradition, as it moved further into the twentieth century with its mountains of paper, would have been more fully aware of public records methods and solutions and might also not have been so quick to cater only to historians when confronted with records that fell into the gray area between "archival" and "manuscript."

Could the primer have been published? Hindsight suggests that, given the limited

[65]One student of the subject has stated "Archival theory and practice in the United States thus made no discernible progress during the two decades after the outbreak of World War I." Frank B. Evans, "Modern Methods of Arrangement of Archives in the United States," *American Archivist* 29 (April 1966): 249.

[66]Schellenberg, *Management of Archives,* 39–40, 349–50; Berner, *Archival Theory,* 20.

[67]Schellenberg, *Management of Archives,* 39.

[68]Frank G. Burke, "The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States," *American Archivist* 40 (Winter 1981): 40–46; Cappon, "What, Then, Is There to Theorize About?" 20–24.

[69]Birdsall, "The American Archivists," 94.

resources at their disposal, a short manual might have been possible if Leland and Paltsits had concentrated their efforts only on the chapters concerned with arrangement and description—areas they always viewed as the most important and controversial.[70] Jameson's support might have been more forthcoming had he believed that the AHA was being asked to commit only to a short guide not to a several-hundred-page project. Also the timing was wrong—the delay past 1914 hurt the project as the association's overall funds diminished with the approach of the war years.

In 1937, at the first meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Victor Paltsits stated that the pioneering days of the science of archives in the United States were over, and the new archival body "builds upon the foundations already laid."[71] It is unfortunate that those foundations were more of steel and concrete than of theory and practice and that Jameson and others did not have the foresight to see that creating a national archives building was only part of the task. The Library of Congress continued to remain preeminent in dispensing document advice with its reprinting in 1934 of the 1928 third edition of John Fitzpatrick's *Notes*. As for the "Primer of Archival Economy," Paltsits, speaking of the new age at the SAA meeting, pulled the remains of the primer from his briefcase to show to the audience—an unknown artifact from the infancy of the profession.

[70]Berner says that "The focus of this book, as in most books and articles on archival theory, is arrangement and description, in inseparable combination. All else in the archival world, except appraisal, is a matter of philosophy and attitude, or is part of a body of theory from another field." Berner, *Archival Theory,* 5.

[71]Victor Paltsits, "Pioneering for a Science of Archives in the United States," 45–46.