

Case Study

Getting the Lead Out: The Appraisal of Silver-Lead Mining Records at the University of Idaho

RICHARD CARTER DAVIS

Abstract: The application of Schellenbergian appraisal doctrine to nongovernmental records has been challenged on the basis that the dual classification of evidential and informational values is relevant only under the institutional mandate of the National Archives. This paper describes the appraisal portion of a project for the processing of 1,600 cubic feet of records of mining corporations in the University of Idaho Library and asserts that informational values depend for their validity upon the evidential values in the same records, that both kinds of value are logically related to the principle of provenance, and that these relationships are implicit in the works of T. R. Schellenberg and other traditional writers on the appraisal of public and corporate records. These values derive not from any particular institutional mandate but from the organic character of the records. It is futile to attempt appraisal of the informational value of records without considering their evidential value.

About the author: Richard Carter Davis is manuscripts-archives librarian at the University of Idaho. He holds the Ph.D. degree in history from the University of California, Riverside, and the M.L.S. from the University of Kentucky. As a writer and editor on archival and historical subjects, his principal works include *North American Forest History: A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio Press, 1977), which was recognized by the award of the SAA's Waldo Gifford Leland Prize in 1978; *Guide to the Cataloged Collections in the Manuscript Department of the William R. Perkins Library, Duke University* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio Press, 1980); and *Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History* (New York: Macmillan, 1983).

THE OWNERS OF THE HERCULES mining claim tunneled for twelve years beneath the ridge overlooking the settlement of Burke, in the Coeur d'Alenes of northern Idaho, before one of them on 2 June 1901 "broke into 'a cave of wire silver and lead carbonate'" and made himself and his partners the owners of a paying mine, eventually one of the wealthiest in the region.¹ By 1916 the Hercules was netting its owners as much as \$3.6 million annually from lead, silver, and zinc ores. These profits enabled the Hercules partners eventually to control some ninety mining enterprises, chiefly in the Coeur d'Alenes region. After World War II, Henry Day, son of the senior Hercules partner Harry Day, consolidated these diverse properties as Day Mines, Inc. Hecla Mining Company bought out Day Mines Incorporated in 1981, paying the then nearly 5,500 shareholders \$105.8 million in securities. The acquisition made Hecla for a time the largest silver mining firm in the United States.² In the philanthropic tradition of his family, Henry Day donated the accumulated records of Day Mines and its predecessors, along with personal and business papers of family members and associates, to the University of Idaho.

By 1985, the Day records had been trucked the 115 miles from the company's former office in Wallace, Idaho, to the university library in Moscow, Idaho, where they lay heaped on the basement floor, their contents unknown, their order unexplored. Their estimated 2,000 cubic foot bulk put them beyond the practical reach of the Spe-

cial Collections Department's normal processing staff, and Terry Abraham, the incoming department head, therefore asked the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) to support appraisal, arrangement, and description of these records, the largest and most complete collection of operating records of the mining industry in any archival repository in the country. I was employed to plan and supervise this work from the end of 1986 through 1988.³

As a result of this experience and its enforced reflection upon the appraisal process and the values appraisal is undertaken to preserve, I have concluded that more light is shed by the traditional concepts of evidential and informational values—often associated with the name of Theodore Schellenberg—than by some of the more recent writings on the subject. It furthermore became apparent that there is an implicit relationship between evidential and informational values more fundamental than is expressed even in Schellenberg's writings. This suggestion is dealt with in more detail in the text below.

The Collection

Appraisal was complicated by the records' diversity, their sometimes unfamiliar character, and their original disorder. Our problem, however, was simple compared

¹John Fahey, *The Days of the Hercules* (Moscow, Idaho: University Press of Idaho, 1978), 39. Fahey's eminently useful study of Hercules Mining Co. as a partnership, 1889–1924, is based largely on research in portions of Day family papers and Hercules records selected for him by Henry Day prior to their donation to the University of Idaho (see page 297).

²See the company history in "Inventory of the Records of Day Mines Inc." 12 October 1988, 7–8 (unpublished).

³"Hard Rock Mining in the Coeur d'Alenes: A Report to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission," Grant No. 86-122, 30 November 1988. The present article is slightly revised from a paper read at the Society of American Archivists' annual meeting, Seattle, Washington, on 2 September 1990. It describes the results and draws some implications from processing the records of Day Mines Inc. and its predecessor firms, during a two-year project supported by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and directed by the author from 1986 to 1988. A subsequent grant from the U.S. Department of Education allowed an additional year's work, from March 1991 to March 1992, with Michael Tarabulski as project archivist. Processing of this large body of material was subsequently completed by Judith Nielsen, archives assistant.

with that facing archivists for ongoing institutions, as we were concerned only with the secondary values of a finite body of material.⁴ The appraisal proceeded first by careful study of the records of one firm, the Hercules Mining Company, which initially included about 300 cubic feet. The object was to identify each type of record, to learn its functions and its relationship to other records (whether extant or not), to determine its evidence on the structure and activity of the organizations that created it, and to learn what information it might contain for other research. Tentative appraisal guidelines based on this test study proposed the elimination of as much bulk as consistent with protecting that evidence and information.⁵

In February 1988 I circulated the guidelines and analysis to eighteen critics outside of the University of Idaho Library. These critics included historical researchers, subject experts (mining executives and engineers), and fellow archivists with prior

experience in the appraisal of business records. Although only eight of the total eighteen actually made substantive comment, their contribution was vital. They not only provided moral reassurance but also provoked some reconsiderations of the value of specific record types; I took seriously the judgments of those whose advice I invited. Furthermore, the invitation to review publicized the collection among a number of those most likely to appreciate its usefulness. As one of our expert critics remarked, "I read the report like a historian, prepared to complain about the discard of potentially meaningful materials, but find myself without any complaints of that sort."⁶

By the official termination of the NHPRC-supported project on 30 November 1988, we had identified virtually all of our Day mining records. They represented ninety-two mining firms, three corporations engaged in activities not related directly to mining, and ten Day family members and key associates. Materials date from the 1880s to 1984, but the great bulk comes from the period between the 1910s and the early 1950s. Records from each source were assembled, loose materials boxed, series identified and brought together, and a rough inventory drafted for each group. Of the total volume of about 1,600 linear feet, we eventually segregated for discard over 65 percent, leaving the completed collection measuring a little under 560 linear feet.⁷

⁴Nor were our records from bureaucratically complex organizations; within each mining company, administrative hierarchies were shallow. Even after the formation of Day Mines Inc., the Day organization prided itself on its small size and the flexible structure by which a permanent staff of about twenty-five key employees could control anywhere from one hundred to six hundred workers as needed. The implications of bureaucratic structure for appraisal are treated in JoAnne Yates, "Internal Communication Systems in American Business Structure: A Framework to Aid Appraisal," *American Archivist* 48 (Spring 1985): 141-58.

⁵As Theodore R. Schellenberg recommended, before seeking advice of outside experts, the archivist should "describe the various series to be appraised, indicating their form and volume, the types of information available in them, [and] their relation to other groups" (*Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956], 152). The analysis and guidelines referred to were revised as "Archival Appraisal of the Records of the Hercules Mining Company (and Associated Firms)," by Richard C. Davis and Gregory Eisenlein, and in abridged form published in *Day to Day: A Guide to the Records of the Historic Day Mines Group in the University of Idaho Library*, edited by Terry Abraham and Richard C. Davis (Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Library, 1992).

⁶Letter from Clark C. Spence, 28 March 1988.

⁷Thus the proportion discarded of the mining records is slightly higher than the 60 percent withdrawn before microfilming by the only other industrial records appraisal project reported in the literature in any detail in recent years, the Hannah, Lay, & Company records at the University of Michigan. Those records were a much smaller group than the Day material and that project differed from the project described here both in its priorities and its methods. Larry Steck and Francis Blouin, "Hannah Lay & Company: Sampling the Records of a Century of Lumbering in Michigan," *American Archivist* 39 (January 1976): 19. A comparative study of the goals, methods, and results of industrial records-appraisal projects seems to merit attention.

Space does not allow a comprehensive survey of mining record types and their disposition, but a few examples may suggest how decisions were made. In general, the mining records concerned the following:

- Policy making and administration
- Raising and returning capital
- Mine development and the production and shipment of ore
- Managing labor and supplies and other equipment

Policy and Administration Records.

The first, most general category concerned the selection of company leadership and the formation of policies, such as directors' and stockholders' minutes; incorporation, meeting, and election documents; annual reports and operating statements; monthly financial statements; general correspondence; patents, deeds, contracts and other legal documents. These records have been (or will be) weeded of duplicates but otherwise kept intact.

Financial Records. The central accounting records were also general in nature in that they described all parts of company operation, but they proved amenable to the traditional practice of keeping cumulative records and discarding the relatively voluminous raw material.⁸ Most companies used bound voucher registers to record minimal information on transactions (number, date, and other party to the transaction). The vouchers (i.e., paid and filed invoices) from which this information was taken, as well as the retained copies of the company's purchase orders, included also identification of the actual items purchased or sold. Voucher registers for many mining companies contained useful information in

the form of a distribution of expenses and income among accounts, thus revealing the structure of the accounting system and corporate organization. This structure could be constructed from the journals and ledgers, but that process would be a tedious one. To keep the registers and discard the vouchers meant discarding some specific information on the supplies and equipment required to run a mining company. Fortunately, the voucher registers for some companies were supplemented by several slim volumes we have termed "invoice registers," which were compiled on receipt of the invoices and recorded the same transactions as the voucher registers. Invoice registers do identify specific purchases (although they do not include a distribution of accounts). The invoice registers were obviously hastily written and intended to be preliminary. But they complemented the voucher registers nicely, while occupying only a tiny fraction of the shelf space filled by the vouchers. The decision was to keep both invoice registers and voucher registers but to discard orders and vouchers.⁹ In just two companies, the Hercules and the Tamarack & Custer, this saved more than 135 feet of shelving.

We paused thoughtfully over Michael Lewellyn's advice in the *Georgia Archive* that "when the organization centralizes all data and summary information in the ledger, the archivist may elect carefully to destroy all entry documentation *and journals* in favor of an indexed ledger."¹⁰ But Dennis

⁸Arthur H. Cole, "Principles for the Selection of Materials for Preservation in Collections of Business Records," *Archives and Libraries* (1938): 179; Robert Lovett, "The Appraisal of Older Business Records," *American Archivist* 15 (July 1952): 234-35; Harold T. Pinkett, "Identification of Records of Continuing Value," reprint from *Indian Archives* 16 (January 1965-December 1966): 59-60.

⁹Howe would keep vouchers "if their contents are not recorded in registers." See "The Appraisal of Business Records," *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 11 (October 1937): 44. Fortunately, the few instances where this situation existed among the mining records all involved small numbers of vouchers in the records of lesser companies. Vouchers usually consisted of the supplier's invoice stamped "paid," numbered, and filed, sometimes with a cover sheet. Some vouchers included lists of up to one hundred or more pages of items purchased.

¹⁰Michael V. Lewellyn, "The Yellowed Square of Paper: Archival Appraisal of Accounting Records,"

Meissner said the opposite in an article in the *Midwestern Archivist*: the "value [of a general journal series] as the only complete chronological listing of transactions requires that it be permanently retained."¹¹ The fact that only monthly totals were forwarded from the voucher registers to the general journals made me dubious, but one adviser, a historian of accounting, clarified the matter: discard of journals, even though ledgers might cover the same years, would be "a terrible mistake," he explained. "Journals and ledgers work as a set. Accountants need both to reconstruct the financial history of a company. . . . It would be extremely difficult or perhaps impossible to reconstruct the general journal from the ledgers." He added that some types of transactions may be found only in the general journals.¹² Our decision was for keeping ledgers and journals intact.

As accounting journals and ledgers work together to provide both a chronological and a name or subject arrangement to financial data, so capital stock journals and stock ledgers similarly provide dual access to information on changes in ownership of the corporation. It was an easy decision to keep both stock journals and stock ledgers, but the same information found on stock certificates (and on the stubs from which certificates were separated when issued) seemed redundant. The space saved by discarding the many volumes of canceled certificates, pasted back to their stubs, proved enormous: Those for the Tamarack & Custer

alone filled 10.5 feet of shelving. Handsome, sometimes beautiful, stock certificates are sought by collectors; they may also have philatelic value because of the affixed revenue stamps. But, forcing to mind Thornton Mitchell's aphorism that archivists "are concerned primarily with information and only incidentally with pieces of paper," we discarded certificates except those few, like the single volume for the Hercules, that had related correspondence, wills, and other legal documents glued or stapled to them.¹³

Records of Mine Development and Ore Production. Records of ore milling and shipment and sales of ore to smelters—the only extensive category really unique to mining records—were yet another case where cumulative records justified elimination of much raw material. Bound volumes of ore records allowed discard of 33 feet of assay reports and certificates from six companies. This discarded material comprised freight bills, lot advices, and ore settlements, all of which concern the details of sales and shipments of ore to smelters. But the Hercules ore records begin only in 1911; similar information is provided earlier by the overlapping shipment assays record from 1905 to 1917. Even earlier is the ore shipment record, from 1901 to 1903, which contains weights and types of ore in the Hercules's first 215 lots but lacks analysis of ore contents or value. Because of this lack, Hercules ore settlements and assay certificates were kept for the early years of production, though it would be a

Georgia Archive 7 (Fall 1979): 23–31 (italics added). While stopping short of actually recommending their discard, David L. Lewis in 1969 even suggested that archivists pressed for space might "take a hard look" at ledgers. See "Appraisal Criteria for Retention and Disposal of Business Records," *American Archivist* 32 (January 1969): 24.

¹¹Dennis E. Meissner, "The Evaluation of Modern Business Accounting Records," *Midwestern Archivist* 5 (Spring 1981): 80. Hower, "Appraisal of Business Records," 44, gives similar advice.

¹²Letter from Glen Vent, 2 June 1988.

¹³Cole, "Principles for the Selection of Materials," 355–56, says to discard stock certificates. One mining historian consultant stated that canceled stock certificates were "of value for research." However, the small additional value found in the certificates seems hard to reconcile with their bulk when stock journals and stock ledgers are complete. The Thornton W. Mitchell quote is from his "New Viewpoints on Establishing Permanent Values of State Archives," *American Archivist* 33 (April 1970): 169.

tedious task to assemble from them such information as later is found easily in the ore records.

Labor and Logistical Records. Records of the major companies contain a great deal of documentation on the work force. The employment cards, existing from 1916 through most of the 1920s, designate such information as birthplace, marital and family status, age, previous injuries, employment experience, and languages spoken.¹⁴ Payrolls, covering all classes from muckers to executives, give more specifically work-related information, such as jobs held; shifts worked; pay rates; and withholdings for board, hospital insurance, and "orders," or payments to local merchants. There are also totals in each category for each part of the operations of larger mines and for each of the firms and persons to which the deductions were credited. Following passage of Social Security legislation in the 1930s, the payrolls were supplemented by compensation records, which arrange the same data, chronological in the payroll, into separate accounts for each employee. These records also provide additional personal information, such as had been recorded for an earlier period on the employment cards. The compensation records sometimes can be used to trace a career as a worker moved from one company to another, and the alphabetical arrangement tends to bring family members together. All of these records bulk large, and some of the payrolls are on sheets so large that handling is awkward. But all were kept.

Historians' Use of Mining Records

In search of a sense of the sources found useful in mining history, I took a cursory

look at a variety of recent monographs. Most either avoided unpublished sources or concentrated on scattered individual manuscripts, public records, or records of labor unions. Even among about a dozen sources that listed company records in their bibliographies, most used only correspondence or other narrative materials, with occasional exceptions used as illustrations.¹⁵

There have been apparently few uses by mining historians of the rich variety of record types such as exist in the Day collections. Ronald Brown, in *Hard Rock Miners*, cited employee time slips of the BOB Mining and Milling Company of New Mexico (for discussions of wage stability) and leases and minute books (for property holdings and development). More recently, Clark Spence, in *The Conrey Placer Mining Company*, used among other records accounting journals (for property purchases, maintenance costs, and capital investments), expense accounts (for freight and equipment costs), sales orders (for equip-

¹⁵The following volumes list mining company records in their bibliographies but, except for illustrations, cite almost exclusively correspondence or other narrative records in notes: Russell Elliott, *Nevada's Twentieth-Century Mining Boom* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1966); Joseph Cash, *Working the Homestake* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1973); Richard E. Lingensfelder, *The Hardrock Miners* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974); John Rowe, *Hard-Rock Men: Cornish Immigrants and the North American Mining Frontier* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1974); Duane A. Smith, *Colorado Mining: A Photographic History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977); John Fahey, *The Days of the Hercules* (1978); Mark Wyman, *Hard Rock Epic* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); David and Brenda Stone, *Hardrock Gold: The Story of the Great Mines That Were the Heartbeat of Juneau* (Juneau, Alaska: Juneau Centennial Committee, 1980); Michael P. Malone, *The Battle for Butte: Mining and Politics on the Northern Frontier, 1864-1886* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981); James W. Byrkit, *Forging the Copper Collar: Arizona's Labor Management War of 1901-1921* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1982); Stanley Dempsey and James E. Fell, Jr., *Mining the Summit: Colorado's Ten Mile District, 1860-1960* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).

¹⁴Also called identification cards. W. H. Charlton in *American Mine Accounting: Methods and Forms Employed by Leading Mining Companies* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1913), 111, calls similar cards in use by a Minnesota copper mining company "pedigree cards."

ment and conditions of shipment), specifications books (for quality and design of equipment), and deeds and patent notices (for acquisition of claims).¹⁶

Clearly, past research use of similar material provided little guidance for appraisal decisions—but then, no such large and comprehensive collection of mining corporation operating records has heretofore been available in a repository. Archival literature was more helpful, both in solving specific problems and in providing a general intellectual framework.

Mining Records and the Theory of Appraisal

Some years ago Richard Berner labeled the development of “a body of appraisal theory . . . perhaps the most pressing need in the archival field.”¹⁷ Berner’s book provided a historical view of the divergence between the “public archives tradition” and the “historical manuscripts tradition” and the efforts, primarily of Theodore Schellenberg, to merge these traditions. Until very recently, the theoretical basis of appraisal developed almost entirely within public archives. In 1889 the U.S. Congress authorized disposal of federal records lacking “permanent value or historical interest.” No more specific standards for preserving records were stated in federal law until 1943, when deliberations within the new National Archives led Congress to define records as materials preserved because of their “evidence of the organization, functions, poli-

cies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the government or because of the *informational* value of the data contained therein.”¹⁸ These twin concepts of informational and evidential values received their major statements from Schellenberg in 1956. Although concerned specifically with public records, Schellenberg gradually came to the belief that “most private records have the organic quality of public records and are therefore archival in character.”¹⁹

The strength of Schellenberg’s theory is shown by the convenience with which it can comprehend the treatment of records of business corporations, even when the curators of such materials avoid describing their work in theoretical terms. Ralph Hower, editor of the *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, in 1937 wrote an essay on business records, claiming that “the general administrative and managerial policies are usually the most interesting and important aspects of a firm to anyone who wishes to obtain a real understanding of its

¹⁸*Statutes at Large* (1943), 57, p. 380, emphasis added. In 1912 the Congress did provide for review by the Librarian of Congress and after 1934 by the Archivist of the United States prior to disposal. See Emmett J. Leahy, “Reduction of Public Records,” *American Archivist* 3 (January 1940): 28–29. Donald R. McCoy, *The National Archives: America’s Ministry of Documents, 1934–1968* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1978, 147–58) describes the origins and impact of the 1943 legislation.

¹⁹Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 140, 148; and *Appraisal of Modern Public Records*, *Bulletins of the National Archives*, no. 8 (October 1956), 17. The quote is from Schellenberg, *Management of Archives*, 65. For the application of archival theory to historical manuscripts, also see Lester J. Cappon, “Historical Manuscripts as Archives: Some Definitions and Their Application,” *American Archivist* 19 (April 1956): 101–10; Schellenberg, “Archival Principles of Arrangement,” *American Archivist* 24 (January 1961): 12; and Robert L. Brubaker, “Archival Principles and the Curator of Manuscripts,” *American Archivist* 29 (October 1966): 506–14. Berner attributes the “metamorphosis” in Schellenberg’s perception of historical manuscripts as archives to his having “responded dramatically” to Cappon’s article (Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice*, 47ff).

¹⁶Ronald Brown, *Hard Rock Miners: The Intermountain West, 1860–1920* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1979); Clark C. Spence, *The Conrey Placer Mining Company: A Pioneer Gold Dredging Enterprise in Montana, 1897–1922* (Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 1989).

¹⁷Richard C. Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983), 7. Berner limited his study to arrangement and description of archives, omitting consideration of appraisal theory because, he said, of “the primitive nature of its development” (see page 6).

operations. . . . The governing principle in selecting and preserving business records for historical purposes, is to choose material which will yield accurate and reasonably complete information about every phase of business—production, distribution, management, finances, personnel, accounting, and plant.”²⁰ To Hower, the historical use of business records seemingly meant the reconstruction of the history of the firm. Thus his essay suggests only the evidential half of the values theory Schellenberg would later develop. Curators at Baker Library of the Harvard School of Business, however, criticizing Hower as attempting to save impractical volumes of material,²¹ turned attention toward reduction of bulk through understanding the research usefulness of particular record types and their relationship to sources of similar information, keeping summarizing materials and discarding duplicates and fragmentary series, and employing nonstatistical sampling.²² They also recognized broader research values, such as those needed for studies of business cycles, immigration, and wage trends. The Baker curators’ emphasis seems parallel to the informational side of Schellenberg’s theory, while virtually disregarding the evidential.²³

Underlying resemblances to both parts of the values theory appeared in the report of an appraisal of lumber company records at the University of Michigan in the 1970s.

Larry Steck and Francis Blouin stated as their goals “to provide a good overview of the structure and scope of Hanna Lay and Company . . . [and] a sense of the complexity and importance of the company.” That was the evidential side. The informational appeared implicit in their explanation of the design of their sampling scheme (inspired by the earlier experience at Baker Library), which recognized that records selected at decade intervals “could be matched with available census data for larger studies of specific individuals or locations. Given the importance of the company in the development of the . . . region, information in the collection . . . would be useful for topics other than a history of the company.”²⁴

By the 1980s, however, some archivists outside the federal service expressed resentment that “informational values are regarded [as] in some sense subordinate to the ultimate purpose of archives, which remains the preservation of structure, procedures, and policies as reflected in the files.” Such priorities, they believed, did not meet the needs of the “New Social History.”²⁵ The most cogent expression of this reversal of priorities came from Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young, who described evidential values as “only information about the parent organization.” The evidential-informational dichotomy had been based, they said, on the particular administrative mandate of the federal archives: The real and full meaning of evidential value lay in the requirement that the government “doc-

²⁰Hower, “Preservation of Business Records,” 29, 43.

²¹Cole, “Principles for the Selection of Materials,” 355. This criticism is repeated in Francis Blouin, “An Agenda for the Appraisal of Business Records,” *Archival Choices*, edited by Nancy E. Peace (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1984), 66.

²²Arthur H. Cole, “Business Manuscripts: Collection, Handling, and Cataloging,” *Library Quarterly* 8 (January 1938): 97–108; Lovett, “Appraisal of Older Business Records,” 233–38.

²³Lovett, “Appraisal of Older Business Records,” 233–34; Arthur H. Cole, “The Accumulated Development of Unsolved Problems,” *Journal of Economic History* 5 (May 1945): 44.

²⁴Steck and Blouin, “Hannah Lay & Company,” 18–19. On page 17 of that article, Steck and Blouin said that in sampling they had found “no apparent precedent to turn to.” However, Blouin later acknowledged that they had “adapted Lovett’s sampling techniques” (“An Agenda for the Appraisal,” 67).

²⁵Frederic M. Miller, “Social History and Archival Practice,” *American Archivist* 44 (Spring 1981): 119. See also Dale C. Mayer, “The New Social History: Implications for Archivists,” *American Archivist* 48 (Fall 1985): 388–99.

ument itself." That was merely "a matter of public policy as defined by law," and hence carried no necessary validity outside the National Archives. Evidence about the organization and the functioning of the body that created the records was "only one informational topic that can be addressed through the use of the records." Evidential value was thus reduced to a subset of the informational value contained in a body of records.²⁶

These criticisms miss the logic of the traditional values theory, which derives from the organic character of archival materials and thus has validity without relevance to either the legislative mandate of the repository or the public or private character of the organization that created the records. As sources for his values theory, after all, Schellenberg cited not only the Records Disposal Act of 1943 but also the writings of German and British archivists.²⁷ A little reflection on provenance suggests two further salient points. First, although the principle of provenance is usually regarded as a principle of arrangement and not of appraisal, it is directly dependent upon a recognition of evidential value. Second, and perhaps less obviously, informational values in archives derive their validity from the evidential aspects of the same records.

These points seem implicit in almost any explanation of the provenance concept. For instance, in Waldo Gifford Leland's statement to the Fourth Annual Conference of

Archivists in 1912, he said of archives that "only by arranging them so that they reflect the processes by which they came into existence can they be made intelligible."²⁸ That is, only when arranged according to their origins can they have values for research.

Schellenberg accepted this connection between arrangement and evidential (if not informational) value in a 1961 essay, in which he remarked that one of the principal things that "should be accomplished by arranging records . . . is to preserve their evidential values," and again in his *Management of Archives*, in which he decreed that "the principle [of provenance] serves to protect the value of evidence in archives."²⁹ Did he also accept a connection with informational value? In *Modern Archives* he apparently denied such a link when he said that, in appraising the value of information, "we are not concerned with the source of the records . . . [which are to be] judged solely on the basis of their content and not on their relation to other records produced by an agency."³⁰ But in *Appraisal of Modern Public Records*, published only a few months later, he perhaps admitted otherwise, softening the above statement to say that in this context "the archivist is not greatly concerned with the source of the records."³¹ Schellenberg came even closer to recognizing that informational value may depend on provenance and thus on evidential value in *Management of Archives*, where he approvingly paraphrased Hilary Jenkinson's opinion that (as Schellenberg expressed it) archives "have a quality that is derived from the way they

²⁶Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young, "Exploring the Black Box: The Appraisal of University Administrative Records," *American Archivist* 48 (Spring 1985): 123. Some archival writers have misunderstood the theory in other ways, reading—or misreading—evidential value as value to the government; see, for example, Susan D. Steinwall, "Appraisal and the FBI Files Case: For Whom Do Archivists Retain Records?" *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 61–63. Others have criticized both evidential and informational values as merely "for the benefit of historians," in disregard of other interests, such as those of administrators; see Mitchell, "New Viewpoints," 165.

²⁷Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 135–38.

²⁸Waldo Gifford Leland, "Some Fundamental Principles in Relation to Archives," *American Historical Association Annual Report, 1912* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1914), 267.

²⁹Schellenberg, "Archival Principles of Arrangement," 12.

³⁰Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 148.

³¹Schellenberg, *Appraisal of Modern Public Records*, 22 (emphasis added).

came into being, a quality that makes their evidence on *matters to which they pertain* unusually valuable.”³² Jenkinson, writing in 1922, did not use the terms *evidential* and *informational* as Schellenberg would later use them. He did, however, imply a separation of the two values, deliberately referring to the information within archives “on a range of subjects” as distinct from their usefulness for administrative history, when he declared that, “provided . . . the student understands their administrative significance [archives] cannot tell him anything but the truth.”³³

Jenkinson’s insight into this particular relationship may have been greater than Schellenberg’s.³⁴ One example from the Day

mining records will illustrate how informational values in archives depend on the evidential aspects. Payrolls, documenting the costs of labor to the company, surely possess evidential value. That value alone might be insufficient to save these bulky records permanently, given that the company’s labor expense is documented more succinctly in other places, such as the voucher register, general ledger, and financial statement. The justification for keeping the payrolls lies in their informational value regarding the work force both as social classes and as individuals. But why are payrolls *prima facie* reliable sources for social and economic history and for genealogy? Why would payrolls be presumed more accurate than similar information that might be found elsewhere, in newspapers, letters, or memoirs, for example? This presumption of accuracy stems from the mining company’s purpose in creating the documents—its need for a correct administrative and managerial record. If the evidential foundation of records were not preserved, information contained in archives would have little more validity than what could be found in a random heap of newspaper clippings.

³²Schellenberg, *Management of Archives*, 92 (emphasis added).

³³Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 12.

³⁴In his discussion of evidential value in *Management of Archives*, Schellenberg commented on the “Jenkinsonian sense of its meaning,” thus recognizing that as something different from his own. In the next few sentences, he discoursed on the role of arrangement in protecting “evidence on their source” of archives (see p. 92). He had momentarily brushed the thought that provenance, evidence, and information were intertwined, but he seems not to have articulated that concept in his published writings.