

Reviews

BARBARA L. CRAIG, editor

The Records Continuum: Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years. Edited by Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott. Clayton, Australia: Ancora Press in association with Australian Archives, 1994. xiii, 236 pp. ISBN: 0-86862-019-X.

The Principle of Provenance: Report from the First Stockholm Conference on Archival Theory and the Principle of Provenance. Edited by Kerstin Abukhanfusa and Jan Sydbeck. Stockholm: Swedish National Archives, 1994. 207 pp. ISBN: 91-88366-11-1.

Jubilees at opposite ends of the globe have yielded two volumes of serious and, for the most part, disciplined essays. The volume from the Southern Hemisphere focuses inward in its deliberation over an Australian departure and distinction in archival theory during the past fifty years. The volume from Sweden attempts to probe multi-national variations on the history and current understanding of provenance, albeit primarily within the confines of the European continent. North American savants, such as Terry Cook and Terry Eastwood from Canada, and Margaret Hedstrom and David Bearman from the United States, are cited, but no author from North America is included except for Alf Erlandsson of the International Monetary Fund archives in Washington, D.C. Often a reference to North American archives is made as a point of contrast.

In the Australian volume, North Americans are criticized for their ignorance or uninformed misgivings about the Australian contributions to an understanding of the "records continuum." This term and its underlying meaning have gained credence internationally as a more sophisticated alternative to the now fatigued notion of the life cycle of records. Yet author Frank Upward is also highly complimentary of David Bearman, as "the only present day archivist consistently developing ideas across all three areas of study nominated by...Maclean." Ian Maclean is considered the patron saint for Australian archivists since it was his appointment in October 1944 as Archives Officer within the Commonwealth National Library that is considered the beginning of Australian archives and an independent theory. The sense of Australia's distance and distinction from archivists elsewhere is a theme running throughout this volume. The authors consistently and vigorously polish the sheen on their heritage as autonomous crusaders for a high theoretical discourse. This distinction is announced in the title of the publication and further discussed in the introduction to the series of contributions by practitioners and educators: "To the extent that Australians have made 'some real contribution to the sum of Archival Science,' we suggest it has been, as many of the writings in this publication demonstrate, through their engagement with records through the continuum of creation and use, particularly in the management of governmental records—and hence our title, *The Records Continuum*." The idea of "continuum," both as a practical tool and theoretical concept, like a precious gem, is turned over and over again by the authors who look at it through chapters with titles including "The Series System—A Revolution in Archival Control," "The Australian 'Series' System: An Exposition," "Adapting the Series System: A Study of Small Ar-

chives Applications,” and “Are Records Ever Actual?” The reader is given fair warning in the introduction that the content can be demanding. Frank Upward’s contribution, “In Search of the Continuum: Ian Maclean’s ‘Australian Experience’ Essays on Recordkeeping,” in particular fits the billing. But at the same time it is these chapters which warrant the most diligent study. Upward, for example, masterfully delineates the development of the Australian focus on the series level as a refined granularity for considering both conceptually and practically the essence of records systems producing archival fonds, with an emphasis on the process of recordkeeping rather than the physical artifacts of the records *per se*. What is at first a fascinating entree into a foreign history and evolution of archival theory becomes a compelling case for that theory’s enduring shelflife and high degree of relevance to an international discourse more newly arrived at by others. Upward claims an ongoing Australian leadership “in developing the continuum approach because of the success of the series system as a basic building block.” It is not enough for the reader to arrive at a general understanding of this notion of continuum and the central significance of the series. Author Sue McKemmish, in the final essay entitled “Are Records Ever Actual?” pushes her audience to engage in thinking about abstract relationships and multiple views “between functions and other entities in the system—record groups (ambient entities), agencies (provenance entities), and series (records entities).” Her contribution is both provocative and convincing, especially in an electronic era where the nature, origins, and function of records are so obviously complex and where, as she writes, “the record is always in a process of becoming.”

There is at least one irony for the North American reader of *The Records Continuum*. Already in 1966 the *American Archivist* presented the powerful Australian argument of series supremacy in an article by Peter Scott. As a twenty-seven-year-old linguist and archivist, Scott presented his maverick ideas that were alien to the prevailing orthodoxy of the record group. What the Australians now see as the foundation of their “revolution in intellectual control” started with shots fired across the pages of the *American Archivist*. Chris Hurley attributes some of the lack of application of Scott’s work, both in Australia and elsewhere, to its appearance twenty years too early: “Its practical applications still suffer from its pre-computer genesis.”

If the Australians are frustrated by an inadequate consideration of their analysis by archivists elsewhere, they do not exclude self-criticism from their celebratory volume. They recognize that complex and abstract notions of records creation and evolution may not translate neatly into archival descriptions for researchers. Minor criticisms aside, the authors generally elect to trumpet the tradition of the records continuum for their anniversary volume because, as they put it, “The continuum notion accommodates these blurred edges and connectivities through time. Its fluidity also avoids the straightjacket checklist appropriate to, say, a single volume textbook on keeping archives, enabling us to focus on areas not well covered elsewhere.”

The Principle of Provenance is the published report from the First Stockholm Conference on Archival Theory and the Principle of Provenance, held in 1993. It, too, is an anniversary publication, since the National Archives of Sweden celebrated its 375th anniversary in 1993. Although the Swedish archives can obviously claim a much longer lineage than the Australian Archives, the head of the national archives notes in his introduction that the principle of provenance was not formally introduced in Sweden until 1903. The renewed attention to the history of provenance in this volume exhibits the complexities and inevitable confusions in translating provenance from one time and place to another. Whereas the Australian volume refines through multiple views its most distinctive national

contribution to archival theory, the Swedish volume goes far afield to chart the international dissemination of provenance as the one idea "which best qualifies archival work." Authors represent Swedish, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Finnish, German, Danish, French, and British orientations to provenance. Some of the variation in their written deliberations is honest and important evidence in and of itself of indigenous requirements and preferences placed upon the concept of provenance over time. The Swedes correctly caution that the international archival community has "not always been especially careful" in its discussion of archival concepts. Several authors obligingly offer tales of local histories of the evolution of provenance. Dutchman Peter Horsman's essay, "Taming the Elephant: An Orthodox Approach to the Principle of Provenance," is a particularly insightful and appealing foray into one country's devotion to the principle. He writes not only about its introduction, warning correctly that "the influence of the French invention [of provenance] on the rest of Europe must not be overestimated," but also about its fossilized "dogmatic status." "Consequently," he writes, "in the Netherlands there was scarcely a climate for the further development of archival theory concerning the Principle. Many of the later authors on the subject were epigones, with little creativity, grubbing in the clefts of this rock of archival theory, picking lice from an elephant's skin. But they kept the heritage basically unchanged." His discontent is shared by other authors who search for a more nuanced history and current understanding of provenance.

A few essays drift too far from the discussion of provenance. Assumptions creep in as well. A more academic inclusion of detailed evidence would have helped bridge elliptical references. For instance, elaboration might have clarified the assertion that "the principle of provenance was first drafted by a team of German historians in Berlin in the early 1880s."

In the most fascinating consideration of a regional relationship to provenance, Angelika Menne-Haritz explores the alienation of German archivists from provenance in the twentieth century and the misunderstandings in Germany of its expatriate, Theodore Schellenberg. Her view from a foreign context is in effect a reintroduction of Schellenberg. Her contribution alone should alert readers to the powerful sway of archival theory and doctrine, either accepted or rejected, with proper translation its best defense. Selective sampling of the volume, with Menne-Haritz, Peter Horsman, and Maria Guerico as especially recommended reading, will reward the reader with intellectual nourishment.

NANCY BARTLETT
Bentley Historical Library
University of Michigan

Archival Theory, Records, and the Public. By Trevor Livelton. Lanham, Md. and London: The Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1998. Bibliography, Index. 177 pp. Index. ISBN: 0-8108-3051-5. ∞

Trevor Livelton, an archivist with the city of Victoria in British Columbia, has written a cogent treatise that attempts to define and clarify the concepts of "archival theory," "records," and "the public." In his introduction, Livelton states that his "primary aim...has been to gain a clearer view of the concepts involved in understanding the nature of public records" (p. 1). In doing so, Livelton recognizes the multiple juridical, political, cultural, and disciplinary definitions of the nature of public records and that such "different contexts generate different meanings" (p. 5). Indeed, his book is informed by

an impressive range of disciplinary perspectives, in addition to the work of Canadian, American, Australian, and European archival theorists.

The volume contains five major sections, an appendix, a selected bibliography, and an index. Each section also contains extensive notes. The first section explores both the common and the archival usage of the term "theory." Based on an analysis of the work of archival theorists such as Frank Burke, Terry Cook, Kent Haworth, John Roberts, and Fred Stielow, Livelton determines that there are three types of archival usage of the term "theory": (1) "archivists thinking about their work" with a view toward "achieving, understanding, or improving archival practice;" (2) archivists using an "understanding of the general identity and goals of archivists" for more focused direction of their archival work; and (3) referring to "ideas that describe and explain the facts available to archivists for understanding their distinctive field of scientific inquiry" (pp. 20-21).

In the second section, Livelton discusses distinctions that can be made between archival theory, methodology, and practice; and also between theory and other kinds of archival knowledge, such as scholarship. Livelton views archivists as "both thinkers and doers, professionals involved in an applied field of work" (p. 26). He looks at both normative and descriptive approaches to archival theory. By "normative," he means a programmatic approach involving an evaluation of how theory guides archivists in their activities; and by "descriptive" he means understanding and explaining the nature of archival activities and materials. Livelton places this definitional discussion in the context of archival studies, which he defines as comprising archival science, both pure and applied; and the archival discipline, encompassing theory, methodology, and scholarship. In this section, Livelton also alludes, unfortunately all too briefly, to how the use of theory can benefit archival practice, scholarship, and education.

In the third section, Livelton examines common and legal usage and distinctions between the concepts of intelligence, information, documents, and records; and then between definitions of records and archives. In doing so, he bases much of his work on an analysis and comparison of the writings of T.R. Schellenberg and Hilary Jenkinson. Livelton refines his arguments further in the fourth section by narrowing his discussion from records to public records and focusing on a provenance-based concept of the person "who" performs the action that leads to the distinctions between the "thing" (i.e., records, documents, information, and intelligence). Continuing his analytical method in the fifth section, Livelton examines common, legal, and archival definitions and usages of the term "public," and then goes on to look at distinctions between public and private records. Livelton considers public records not only from the viewpoint of government records, but also from that of records that are open to the public. Livelton concludes that "public records are best considered as documents made or received and preserved in the conduct of governance by the sovereign or its agents" (p. 142). In a brief appendix entitled "Access to Information," Livelton contemplates the implications of freedom of information legislation on notions about public records and who should be granted access to them.

This book grew out of Livelton's 1991 master's thesis, "Public Records: A Study in Archival Theory," for the Master of Archival Studies Program at the University of British Columbia (UBC). The thoroughness of this work is testimony to the quality and depth of the theoretical education at UBC as well as to the insight of the author. Such work by master's and doctoral students in North American archival education programs represents a major under-tapped resource of potential contributions to the archival literature, and it is commendable to see the Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press publishing it in the United States.

It is unfortunate, however, that this volume has taken so long to be published and distributed. As a result, Livelton has not really had the opportunity to address some of the recent definitions and redefinitions of terms associated with recordkeeping practices that have been emanating from American and Australian work with electronic records. Livelton himself acknowledges the need for a more extensive examination of the nature of records, especially those being created in electronic environments (p. 91). Moreover, while his work clearly shows the evolution of archival theory regarding public records up until 1991, Livelton's analytical framework does not give him much of an opportunity to project into a technological future where confusion will be rife over shifting definitions of the very terms with which he has been concerned in this book. The final chapter of Livelton's book leaves one with the impression that he rather ran out of steam, and the work would have benefited from a stronger concluding section that addressed some of these emerging issues.

Livelton's philosophical approach comes through clearly in his reasoning, and the articulation of his arguments is further elucidated through the use of some excellent graphics that would be highly useful in archival education settings. Indeed, the entire volume would be appropriate for use in archival education, particularly in the areas of policy, theory, and research methodology. Readers who are looking for precise, practical definitions that can readily be applied in everyday archival settings will be disappointed, however, since this is not the aim of the book. Nor should readers approach this work expecting novel insights. Rather, this book contains a systematic analysis of archival theory as a container for organizing archival ideas and conceptual knowledge, and is not concerned with laying out new theoretical precepts.

Livelton has written a highly intelligent, but somewhat ponderous work. The book would have been better were the author less of an apologist for his work. This reviewer hopes that Livelton will continue to write with increasing confidence in this area. Using Livelton's own bifurcation of archival studies, it would be fair to say that while this volume contributes only indirectly to the "science" of archives, the "discipline" of archives needs more such works of reasoning.

ANNE GILLILAND-SWETLAND

*Department of Library and Information Science
University of California, Los Angeles*

Documenting Localities: A Practical Model for American Archivists and Manuscript Curators. By Richard J. Cox. Lanham, Md. and London: Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, 1996. Index. Illustrations. 200 pp. ISBN: 0-8108-3043-4. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$35.50, Members; \$43.50, Non-Members. ©

Documenting Localities: A Practical Model for American Archivists and Manuscript Curators divides itself into four major components. The volume begins with an argument regarding the continued importance of locality for archivists. It then asserts that documentation strategy is the best available method through which archivists can preserve local history. Having made the case for documentation strategy, the book then addresses the "practical" aspects of the model by outlining, in a step-by-step manner, how archivists in a particular area would go about initiating a documentation strategy. The volume ends with a discussion of how appraisal should be taught to students currently taking graduate courses in archival education.

I would judge three of the four component parts of the volume to be carried through in a relatively successful manner, but these successes are outweighed by a broader failure

to be convincing on the core of the book, the importance of documentation strategy itself. More troubling, the volume also incorporates a definition of archives that is disruptive to the overall well being of the community responsible for documenting society. These are critical flaws that compromise the book in fundamental ways. Despite these critical flaws, there are components of the book that may prove useful for some audiences.

One of the work's valuable components is the author's argument that locality matters, whether that locality is defined by geography or through a community based on shared characteristics, such as ethnicity, religion, viewpoint, or some other distinguishing characteristic. Locality remains a critical way of thinking about the documentation process. Documenting a community, whether physical or intellectual, is what most archivists do and what the volume rightly suggests we continue doing.

The book challenges archivists to think proactively rather than reactively in the whole field of documentation, and it outlines a series of practical steps to establish a common understanding of what needs to be documented in a particular community. The practical aspects of this section are largely drawn from the author's experience in attempting to create a documentation strategy in western New York. Although there are other ways to develop cooperative documentation efforts, and one could certainly quibble about some of the details, in broad concept it is hard to object to proactive archivists implementing a series of steps that draws together interested parties, attempts to identify and qualitatively evaluate existing bodies of documentation, and compares what documentation already has been preserved against whatever aspects of the community should be documented.

Indeed, one of the highlights of this volume is found in this section. The author takes a comprehensive topical list of human fields of endeavor that has been used in other archival projects including the western New York project, and links this topical list to various relevant pieces of published literature. This linkage helps create an important context through which archivists can better understand "labor," for example, or any of the other knowledge areas found here.

The concluding section of the book deals with education. The section seems out of place in a book about documenting localities and, were I the volume's editor, I would have advised that this section of the volume be put aside for another publication. Ignoring, however, the wisdom of publishing the argument in this book, I can agree with the broader point that is made in the section: that insufficient knowledge about appraisal among archivists hinders the profession from performing this critical task. The volume's call for better teaching about appraisal is one that the archival profession needs to take to heart.

Despite these many good points, I believe the book fails in its advocacy of documentation strategy as the principal and best means to document localities. The simple fact is that a decade or more after it was first proposed as a theory, there have been no successful applications of the documentation strategy in practice. The practical ineffectiveness of the strategy can be seen in the case studies presented in the book. The first case study, like so much of documentation strategy itself, is a hypothetical construct; Helen Samuels and Philip Alexander's oft cited "The Roots of 128: A Hypothetical Documentation Strategy." Although an interesting piece, Samuels and Alexander's work is of marginal value to a book which includes in its subtitle the promise of "A Practical Model."

The western New York project is the other major case study cited in the book. This is the "real world" example that should validate Samuels and Alexander's think piece. However, as the author notes, the project never developed a full documentation plan; and the New York State Archives, which funded the experiment, eventually lost interest in it.

This loss of interest is unconvincingly explained to have resulted from "broad documentation approaches hav[ing] receded from the priorities of this premier state government archives" (pp. 99–100). Perhaps, but far more damning is a possibility left unexplored in the book: apparently no one in western New York thought the effort of sufficient importance or had sufficient means to continue the project.

My supposition that no one in western New York considered the documentation strategy project successful enough to continue is supported by the results of an effort in Milwaukee, funded by the NHPRC and mentioned in Cox's work, to implement a documentation strategy. As Tim Ericson notes in the abstract of an article about the Milwaukee documentation strategy project that will soon be published in *Archival Issues*, "The documentation strategy did not fulfill any of its original goals due both to a lack of incentives for cooperation and an infrastructure that was too weak to support the work of the project." Ericson subsequently draws a comparison between the fad for round barns that swept the Midwest in the beginning of this century and documentation strategy. Round barns, like documentation strategy, looked good in theory, but neither proved themselves to be worthwhile in practice.

Why, when faced with such evidence, does *Documenting Localities* argue so strongly for the practical value of documentation strategy? This puzzle can perhaps be resolved if one understands the author's commitment to documentation strategy to be a tactic used to accomplish a broader agenda, rather than simply a stubborn refusal to see the obvious.

Indeed, this book does forward many agendas that go far beyond documenting local communities. In a few areas, some of which I have already pointed out, the agenda addressed by the author throughout this book are issues about which I share his enthusiasm. However, where I part company from him, and where I believe this book does a grave disservice to the profession, is in the author's conceptualization of what archivists document and how that documentation will be accomplished. The author states that the object of appraisal "is not to collect materials for historians or other researchers, but it is to identify and preserve the transactional records that best document a specific activity or function, organization, event, or the like. It [appraisal] is first for the records creators and then to benefit others" (p. 150). The author further develops this theme by adding that the responsibility for the identification and maintenance of archival records rests with, "institutional records creators, not collecting historical manuscript repositories. The archival profession should primarily be in the business of fostering the development of institutional archives" (p. 151). Although the author does concede that it is possible to diverge from these strictures "when public interest demands us to do so," the thrust of his argument harkens back to the writings of Hilary Jenkinson, draws on the more contemporary arguments of Luciana Duranti, and essentially repudiates much of the American experience of archives.

As Richard Berner noted in his classic study, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States* (1983), America has long supported two often unconnected and in some ways opposing views of archival mission, labeled by Berner as the Public Archives Tradition (PAT) and the Historic Manuscripts Tradition (HMT). The PAT is primarily rooted in a legal framework and stresses the importance of the record for the primary creator. The HMT flows largely from a scholarly framework that acknowledges the primary creator's interest in archives but emphasizes using records for secondary research. In the American experience of archives both traditions have their place.

The view of archives put forth in this volume elevates the PAT to a much greater importance than the HMT and seemingly gives the PAT exclusive rights to the very word

“archives.” Taken literally, this view virtually runs out of the profession those individuals who continue to find inspiration in the HMT and those collecting agencies that spring from this tradition. Reserving broader comment on the proposal that the PAT “owns” archives, a proposition I strongly disagree with but which deserves a fuller discussion than can be undertaken in a book review, let me suggest here that such a narrow definition of archives represents a grave tactical mistake that could fatally divide an already very small professional community.

To assign precedence and perhaps exclusivity to the PAT’s claim on “archives,” is as dangerous, ill-timed, and wrongheaded as the foolish distinctions that led to the secession of “records managers” from “archivists” forty years ago. That bit of intellectual foolishness haunts both communities to this day by creating a profound disconnection between the creation, active use, and archival retention of records. To avoid a second repetition of this type of pragmatic disaster, I believe the term “archivist” should be used inclusively to incorporate all those who deal with documentary heritage recorded through some representative process rather than exclusively to create an ideological admissions test for “archivists.”

“Archives” as I wish to define it, is the big tent in which there is room for those whose intellectual roots spring from the PAT, the HMT, our long-separated colleagues in records management, our new friends in the computer sciences, and anyone else whose job includes recording, selecting, or preserving information that will be needed for a long time. Archivists, in this viewpoint, seek to understand, appreciate, and work harmoniously among intellectual traditions. This is, I believe, how the profession has generally defined itself over the last thirty or so years, and it is my hope that the archival profession will continue to accept this pluralistic definition of archives rather than the more narrow one offered in this book.

FRANK BOLES

Clarke Historical Library
Central Michigan University

Archive Buildings in the United Kingdom, 1977–1992. By Christopher Kitching. London: HMSO for the Commission on Historical Manuscripts, 1993. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. vii, 144 pp. ISBN: 0-11-4402442.

Archive Buildings in the United Kingdom, 1977–1992 makes an important contribution to the literature about archival buildings and building requirements, and gives a close-up view of changes in archival practice resulting from recent consideration of the nature of archival buildings. Christopher Kitching, secretary of Britain’s Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, is knowledgeable about archives buildings in general, and he has drawn on the considerable experience of Commission visits to British repositories. The book provides information about standards for archives buildings built or substantially renovated in Britain after the introduction of British archives building standards, discusses problems, celebrates achievements, and promotes improved standards.

Happily, the book is not just a series of glossy photos of successful building projects. More than half the book is an excellent presentation of key archival building issues from a British perspective, including a capsule history of post-World War II archives buildings in Britain, and an introduction to B5454, the British archives building standards (introduced in 1977 and revised in 1989), which are not compulsory, but recommendations of best practice.

The discussions are a judicious blend of description of actual practice, careful explanation of the rationale behind recommended practice, and pragmatic possibilities for compromise. Throughout the book there are concrete examples, pointed suggestions, and thorough but concise discussions of diverse considerations. The book is particularly interesting to North Americans as an accurate summary of recent and current European realities, of which many of us are often unaware. The situation and sensibilities in that continent are very different from those in North America although we share a common search for secure and responsible custody of our archival holdings.

A formal recommended national standard for archives buildings is an unfamiliar idea to most North American archivists, and *Archive Buildings* provides an interesting introduction to the process. A *programme type* or model for archives buildings was developed in France in the 1960s, and in 1966 Michel Duchein's *Les bâtiments d'archives* was published. It was the first book on archival buildings (later translated into English and published by the International Council on Archives as *Archives Buildings and Equipment*), and it included the rationale for the recently developed norms, which were then considered best practice in France. Although the standards in France and those later introduced and revised in Britain are not obligatory, public subsidy of archives building projects in France was (and still is) tied to compliance with the recommended standards. Thus, the standards have had a great impact on building design. As both new and substantially renovated archives buildings flourished in Europe in the post-World War II period, practice began to change as a result of the new dialogue and the developing European standards. Serious consideration was given to how an archives building should be constructed or renovated, not only to accommodate documents, staff, and researchers, but now also to ensure the protection of the archival documents. In 1986, the Direction des archives de France published the book, *Bâtiments d'archives: vingt ans d'architecture française 1965–1985* which presented case studies (including excellent photos and illustrations) of French archives buildings built between 1965 and 1985, showcasing buildings with many of the norms that were in the model. The British book is patterned somewhat after its French antecedent but makes its own distinctive contribution.

This book clearly shows that recommended best practice in Britain has beneficially influenced archives building projects. Both the discussion of the norms and their rationale, and the illustrated case studies (twenty-nine cases with plans and black and white photos) contribute to the ongoing dialogue on how archives buildings should be constructed. *Archive Buildings* is an excellent introduction for those unfamiliar with British archives buildings, and the case studies, presented warts and all, provide interesting details to anyone interested in archives buildings. North Americans may feel there is insufficient discussion of access for the disabled, and U.S. readers may have to do some conversion of metric measures. The discussion around low-tech solutions will be unfamiliar to many North Americans, and it makes very interesting reading!

The book is clearly written, concise, easy to read, well laid out, and well footnoted. The material is well organized, and the wonderful bibliography of readings related to buildings has an international orientation. This book is required reading for anyone interested in archives buildings or involved in a major site renovation or construction.

NANCY MARRELLI
Concordia University Archives

Protecting Your Collections: A Manual of Archival Security. By Gregor Trinkaus-Randall. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1995. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. vi, 84 pp. ISBN: 0-931828-83-X. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$25.00, Members; \$30.00, Non-Members. ©

Gregor Trinkaus-Randall has been involved in library and archival preservation for many years and is eminently qualified to write about archival security. He is currently the Collections Manager/Preservation Specialist at the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.

The SAA imprint leads one to expect that this is an update of Timothy Walch's *Archives & Manuscripts: Security* (1977), now out-of-date, but part of the original SAA Basic Manual Series, and one of the few monographs written on archival security. But *Protecting Your Collections: A Manual of Archival Security* is not part of SAA's current Archival Fundamentals Series. Trinkaus-Randall's concept of security is very broad, and this publication includes not only security, but all manner of protective measures. Despite the title, he sets out to introduce the reader in a broad and sweeping way too much of the territory of archival preservation.

The author identifies six elements as archival security/protection issues: deterrents to theft; identification of missing items; environmental controls; disaster prevention, planning, and recovery; exhibition and loan; and insurance.

As useful as discussions of disaster planning, holdings maintenance, and the environment may be, I believe they are misplaced in this volume. They have been treated in depth elsewhere. When the Walch publication appeared in 1977, little had been published on prevention and mitigation of disasters in archives, and Walch properly included a section on it. Happily, there are now many excellent publications that deal with the subject in great detail. The environment is a complex and controversial topic in preservation these days, and much has been and continues to be written as we grapple with the clashes between diminishing resources, our growing understanding of the needs of traditional and modern media, older concepts of "ideal" conditions, and the development of management tools to assist rational decision making. The subject does not lend itself to a short discussion. Publications such as Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler's excellent *Preserving Archives and Manuscripts* (1993), part of the SAA Archival Fundamentals Series, present detailed and current information about preservation management, holdings maintenance and care and handling. The reader wonders why the author has stretched the protection concept to present such thin information on all of these topics, thereby diminishing the focus on security. In doing so, he has shortchanged the topics about which we see so little in the archival literature—theft, vandalism, insurance, etc., and how overworked archivists can effectively juggle security needs with diminishing resources.

All the same, Trinkaus-Randall has thought a good deal about archival security. He understands clearly the implications for the practising archivist, and in this slim publication he shares valuable information about security in archives, stressing that it is an essential archival function. The book includes a good discussion of policies and procedures in reading rooms (including a sample registration form), good ideas about preventing theft and vandalism, and important warnings about providing access to unprocessed collections. There is excellent information about what to do if a theft occurs. We get up-to-date information about locks, sensors, alarms, magnetic switches, and surveillance equipment, including helpful illustrations. There is detailed discussion of security assessments. Useful additions would have been a model security assessment and concrete suggestions about

integrating security concerns into existing procedures for facilities assessments and preservation assessments. There is also a good discussion of insurance, a complex and important topic which has been so neglected that most archivists would benefit from even more detailed information than is provided here to help us make informed decisions. The bibliography is current and thorough, although a sharper focus on security issues might have been more useful since sources for broader topics are available elsewhere. The appendices include Timothy Walch's original "Repository Security Checklist," the valuable "Information to Gather During a Background Check," and much other helpful information.

The book brings us up-to-date on security issues and presents some practical solutions to problems of archival security in the 1990s, but it would have benefitted from a more focused and directed approach and rigorous editing. Despite these reservations, the book makes a real contribution to the literature on this important and neglected subject.

NANCY MARRELLI

Concordia University Archives

Advocating Archives: An Introduction to Public Relations for Archivists. Edited by Elsie Freeman Finch. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1994. Index. 185 pp. ISBN: 0-8108-2935-5. ∞

This volume is part of the fine work that grew out of the Society of American Archivists' Task Force on Archives and Society that David Gracy and James Fogerty chaired in the 1980s. The SAA Committee on Public Information, chaired by Fogerty, Karen Benedict, Kathy Marquis, and the editor labored over this book during the course of half a decade. The result is this practical and useful collection of essays.

Advocating Archives: An Introduction to Public Relations for Archivists is aptly named, for Freeman Finch argues strongly and persuasively that public outreach programs are central to what we must do as archivists. Use, she says, "is our reason for being. And if archives are properly explained and made reasonably accessible, they will be used and likely be funded." Thus public relations must be a core function of the archives, just as much as description and reference. In the first essay Freeman Finch and Paul Conway make the additional point that the quality of management decisions and public service are the means by which an institution is measured by its many publics. What we do every day, as seen by our users, affects our public relations. Bringing users and records together is central; we must make "the reference room rather than the loading dock" the hub of our work. Every decision we make as archivists needs to be measured by this focus on the user and access.

Since I share Freeman Finch's philosophy here, I can only urge that archivists read her introduction and opening chapter to absorb this holistic approach to outreach. The rest of the volume is more pedestrian, but very helpful, with an additional reading list following each chapter. Judy P. Hohmann discusses private sector fundraising in lieu of federal grants. Her focus on an institutional development committee and private foundations seems to me not applicable to most archivists who are buried several layers beneath the institution's development wizards. I believe a chapter on grant writing, cultivation of individual gifts, and means to command the attention of development officers would have been more effective here. More attention to the composition of case statements would have helped as well. Megan Sniffin-Marinoff provides a very effective guide to media relations that gives examples of what to publicize and how to court the press.

Philip F. Mooney's chapter on marketing I found the least effective in the book. I encountered nothing exciting in his prescription that archivists should do publications, mount exhibitions, produce audiovisual productions, and write press releases. Tim Ericson develops a host of ideas for "The Archivist's First Law of Outreach: Human beings are unable to resist celebrating any anniversary divisible by twenty-five." Audray Bateman Randle suggests some very helpful ways to utilize volunteers and friends organizations effectively, although, given my own experiences, I would have liked more on the ways to manage the latter group. Her excellent volunteer planning model includes recruitment, training, management, evaluation, and recognition elements. James and Julie Bressor indicate how archivists must be prepared to manage crises, from assessing risks in advance to responding to unanticipated events. They present two contrasting press releases for the same disastrous event that demonstrate how important good public relations can be.

The book concludes with three case studies by Matt Blessing (about a disgruntled politician's papers), James O'Toole (how a diocesan archives supported planning for the pope's visit to Boston), and Michael F. Kohl (on Clemson University's centennial) which are descriptive analyses of what each archivist did, but hardly in the tradition of the case study method as used by educators. There are a number of helpful appendices with sample press releases, newsletters, flyers, media plans, fundraising guidelines, special event planning guides, and volunteer application forms.

This work suffers from many of the problems of multiple authorship. There is much repetition, inconsistent quality, and no cross-references to other articles. For instance, when Ericson mentions the press kit in passing, the detail about how to do one in Sniffin-Marinoff's contribution should have been cited. While there is an index, it is very brief and I could not find a number of technical terms in my notes when I compared them to the index terms. Similarly, the very useful checklists, figures, and samples in the appendices are neither indexed nor listed in the table of contents.

My biggest disappointment is that the book as a whole did not measure up to Freeman Finch's vision of public relations as central to all we do. There was little attention paid to the fact that one of our most important publics is the administration we serve and that we need to educate it. The authors overlooked the importance of statistical data collected on users and how that data can then be employed to inform financial supporters, resource allocators, funding agencies and our own decisions about increasing access. In sum, this is a very practical volume that should be on every archivist's bookshelf, but it is not the sweeping reshaping of the archival paradigm that Freeman Finch envisions.

While I wished for more, I was particularly impressed by Freeman Finch and Conway's description of three models for the archivist's relationship to users: the gatekeeper (and we have far too many of these in our profession), the servant (who does all the work for the researcher), and the partner (who teaches the researcher to function independently). They argue for the latter approach, and in a sense that is our larger role as well, educating everyone we can reach about the importance of what we do.

BEN PRIMER
Princeton University

Revelations from the Russian Archives: Documents in English Translation. Edited by Diane P. Koenker and Ronald D. Bachman. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1992. Index. xxv, 808 pp. ISBN: 8444-0891-3. ©

This volume reproduces 343 translations of documents selected from the formerly secret archives of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. The documents

were first displayed in an exhibition mounted at the Library of Congress in June and July 1992. The exhibition grew out of General Secretary Mikhail S. Gorbachev's policy of glasnost. In Gorbachev's words: "Broad, up-to-date, and honest information is a sign of trust in people, respect for their intelligence and feelings, and their ability to make sense of developments." Archivists who believe that access to records is the right of all citizens and essential to holding governments accountable for their actions can take pleasure in the new openness that made the exhibition and the publication of this book possible.

Taking advantage of the new policy, Rudolf Pikhov, chief archivist of Russia, began work in August 1991 to make formerly secret documents generally available for research for the first time. A cooperative project with the Library of Congress led to the exhibit of selected documents at the library in Washington. Materials from the exhibition, additional documents not seen in the exhibition, and photographs selected from the Party Archives make up this book. The volume was edited by Diane P. Koenker, professor of history and director of the Russian and East European Center at the University of Illinois, and Ronald D. Bachman, Polish/East European Area specialist in the European Division of the Library of Congress. Bachman supervised translation of the documents for the exhibition and the book.

The book is organized in two sections: "Internal Workings of the Soviet System" and "Soviet Relations with the United States." Material within each section is organized by topic; the first section includes: "The Apparatus of Repression and Terror," "Intellectuals and the State," "The Communist Party Apparatus," "Economic Development," "Religion," "Chernobyl," and "Perestroika and Glasnost." The section on U.S.-Soviet relations comprises: "Economic Cooperation," "Communist Party U.S.A.," "Wartime Policies and Wartime Alliance," "Prisoners of War," "Cold War," "The Cuban Missile Crisis," "Peaceful Coexistence and Détente," and "Afghanistan." Short explanatory texts precede each section. Individual documents are identified with a descriptive title and date. The editors have also included short biographies of the persons represented in the documents and a list of abbreviations used in the translation to help readers who are not Soviet experts.

While the book will be of most interest to Russian specialists, many documents are accessible to nonspecialists. For example Document 60, Beria's report to Stalin, May 8, 1944, on the number of cases examined by the Special Commission marked "Top Secret" includes: "Comrade Stalin, I hereby report that on May 6, 1944, on the number of cases examined by a Special Commission of the NKVD of the USSR examined the cases of 438 individuals and sentenced 3 individuals to be shot and 435 individuals to various terms of punishment." Document 68, NKVD regulation, June 25, 1919, on supply transport for labor camps says: "Now that the matter of the urgent organization of forced labor concentration camps has been resolved, the department entrusted to me is now faced with the very difficult problem of organizing regular supplies and transport for all the camps....[W]e need an emergency appropriation of funds to acquire the following items to provide transport for the camps; 3 horses, 2 summer drays, 2 sledges, 2 sets of harness." A final example from a letter from Lenin to Gorky on September 15, 1919, about the arrest of intellectuals belonging to the Constitutional Democratic Party reads: "The intellectual forces of the workers and peasants are growing and getting stronger in their fight to overthrow the bourgeoisie and their accomplices, the educated classes, the lackeys of capital, who consider themselves the brains of the nation. In fact they are not its brains but its shit" (<<http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/atte.html>>).

The purpose of the exhibition was not to present a complete history of the Soviet Union but to “choose core samples of the types of documents that are now accessible to research.” This approach resembles the packets of documents that archivists put together for teachers to use in their classrooms illustrating accepted tenets of history rather than encouraging students to draw new conclusions from documents. Likewise readers of *Revelations from the Russian Archives: Documents in English Translation* should not expect to learn new facts about the workings of the Soviet system from the documents since most of the information has been available in other sources. Rather, the documents will confirm the reader’s knowledge in a real and immediate way.

The “reality” experienced by reading these or other pre-selected documents is determined by what the curators and editors choose to present. For example, it is interesting to compare *Revelations from the Russian Archives* with a second exhibition mounted by the Library of Congress, “American Treasures of the Library of Congress,” which is available on the Internet at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/treasures>. Like the Russian exhibition, “Treasures” is presented in topical sections, grouped into the categories “Memory,” “Reason,” and “Imagination,” and each section contains historical and contextual notes. The documents selected for “Treasures” are largely laudatory, giving visitors a sense of pride in and enjoyment of the American way of life. For example, the exhibition includes Thomas Jefferson’s recipe for vanilla ice cream: 2 bottles of good cream, 15 yolks of eggs, and ½ lb. sugar (<<http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/treasures/tri034.html>>).

The inference one may draw from these two exhibits is not that the curators chose badly or with a political agenda in mind, although that is certainly within their power. It is rather that as exhibitors and teachers we present a preselected point of view, and as viewers and researchers we must remember that we are seeing a limited perspective. As the editors of *Revelations from the Russian Archives* suggest, and as archivists we hope, exhibitions of selected materials will inform and excite viewers to delve more deeply into archival collections. As archival institutions begin to present more and more samples of their holdings on-line, the nature of selection is an important concept to keep in mind.

A subset of *Revelations from the Russian Archives* is available at <<http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/intro.html>>.

MAXINE TROST
Massachusetts Archives