

Preserving Anthropology's Heritage: CoPAR, Anthropological Records, and the Archival Community

Nancy J. Parezo

Abstract

Unpublished anthropological records contain a vast array of information about historic and contemporary human diversity as well as information on the history of anthropology and related humanistic and scientific disciplines. The rapidity of worldwide socio-cultural change renders such information irreplaceable. This article describes the efforts of the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records—a group of anthropologists, historians, archivists, and librarians—to ensure that this singular body of information is preserved and made accessible to present and future researchers. It ends with suggestions on how the archival community can help anthropology preserve primary cultural knowledge of the world's peoples.

In 1915 Franz Boas, Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and anthropology's most famous ethnographer and theoretician, was very ill and thought he was going to die. Concerned about her friend, Elsie Clews Parsons, renowned anthropologist, sociologist, folklorist, and feminist, invited him to accompany her to the American Southwest on a summer and fall field

This article is based on a paper presented in August 1997 at the session "Digging the Treasure: Access to Anthropological Records," at the Society of American Archivists' annual meeting held in Chicago. The author would like to thank Mary Elizabeth Ruwell for inviting her to participate in that session. She would also like to thank Drs. Ruwell, Sydel Silverman, Willow Powers, and Don D. Fowler for commenting on the drafts of this article, as well as the thoughtful comments by the anonymous reviewers and the support and encouragement of the editor.

The ideas in this paper were developed through many discussions with members of the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records at several conferences sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research from 1993 to 1998, as well as through the author's own research experiences, her experience in bibliographic construction and the development of standardized thesaurii, her reading in the archival literature, and years of teaching museology. This article is presented, however, from the standpoint of the anthropological researcher.

trip to Zuni. For Parsons, fieldwork and intense periods of writing were antidotes for sickness, marital problems, disillusionment, or unhappiness. Boas was tempted, he wrote, but declined, noting "I must stick to my work. You know that I had a cancerous growth, which was removed last spring. As time passes I feel more and more sure that it will recur, but I feel it is my business to look out for my scientific collections and be prepared to leave them in such a state that they will not be lost."¹

Rather than collect new information, travel to new places, and meet fascinating new people—the "fun" part of anthropology—Boas assembled over twenty years of fieldnotes from Arctic and Northwest Coast communities so that they could be used effectively. In fact, he was so efficient that from these records he was able to pull together his extensive data and write two books, one on Kwakiutl social organization and the other on Northwest Coast mythology.²

Boas survived his bouts with debilitating illness and returned to ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork on the Northwest Coast. Later, he went with Parsons to the American Southwest where he worked for several years in Rio Grande Pueblo communities. He produced several thousand more pages of incredibly valuable ethnographic and linguistic records. Boas took the time to organize this irreplaceable information on social organization, daily life, religion, language, and oral tradition, so that others could use it after he retired. In 1924, still concerned about his intellectual legacy, he formally asked Parsons to serve as his literary executor. "My dear Elsie," he wrote, "I wanted to ask you, if you would permit me to state in my will that all my unpublished Manuscripts should be turned over to you, without any obligation on your part, but in the hope that you would try to put them in the hands of people who might use them to best advantage, either for publication or for study."³

Parsons agreed, but she understood that this was no small commitment. She had just acquired the incredibly rich unpublished Hopi diaries of nineteenth-century vocational anthropologist, Alexander M. Stephen, from anthropologist Stewart Culin of the Brooklyn Museum, and was preparing them for publica-

¹ Franz Boas to Elsie Clews Parsons, 24 Nov. 1915, in Parsons Papers, American Philosophical Society Library. Published in Desley Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons. Inventing Modern Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 155.

² Franz Boas, "The Social Organization of the Kwakiutl," *American Anthropologist* 22 (1920): 111–26; reprinted in *Race, Language, and Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 356–69; *Kwakiutl Ethnography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). These data were also used in *Primitive Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927). Later anthropologists and historians have also used these data fruitfully. They are today housed in the Boas Papers and Boas Manuscript Collection at the American Philosophical Society. See J. Stephen Catlett, ed., *A New Guide to the Collections in the Library of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1987).

³ Franz Boas to Elsie Clews Parsons, 12 June 1924, in Parsons Papers, American Philosophical Society Library; Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons. Inventing Modern Life*, 253.

tion. This was a task that was to take her several years.⁴ She also knew that, like herself, Boas was a pack rat, a researcher who saved almost everything he produced. Parsons took on these responsibilities because she recognized the value of all field data—whether produced by a discipline's esteemed “Great Men,” like Boas, or little-known but exceptional amateurs, like Stephen, who had spent years living with native peoples, systematically and painstakingly engaging in participant observation, formal and informal interviews, and the collection of linguistic information. She also knew that anthropologists place their observations and data in several document forms: correspondence, diaries, journals, teaching materials, fieldnotes, scraps of paper, systematized coding forms, photographs, interview forms, census forms, scrapbooks, genealogies, maps, and professional association records.⁵ Anthropologists also use a variety of media (from paper to index cards, from photographs to toilet paper or napkins, from film to Edison phonograph records). These different documents and forms are evidenced by seamless continuities between research plans, observations (or other forms of encounter with the focus of study), the recording of data, interpretation, and writeup. Boas knew it would take a fellow fieldworker like Parsons to help organize his documents because of the material's sheer volume and subject matter complexity. Her knowledge was especially important for cross-indexing by data type, research topic, language, and culture or ethnic community studied—information management categories that are critical for making anthropological records internally cohesive and useful to future scholars.

Boas and Parsons realized that raw data are as important as publications for a profession like anthropology, and that producing field records increases a practitioner's obligations to the discipline and to the host communities for

⁴ Stephen's journals contain some of the most important firsthand observations about the Hopi and the Navajo collected by a professional or vocational anthropologist. Stephen lived with the Hopi on First Mesa from 1882 to 1894. He became a voluntary collaborator (that is, an unpaid fieldworker) of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Upon his death, his diaries passed to trader Thomas Keam and from there to Culin and finally to Parsons. Parsons worked on the material from 1927 to 1934 extensively editing, arranging, and annotating it. Fred Eggan feels that this preservation activity is one of Parsons's greatest contributions to anthropology (Fred Eggan, Interview for the Daughters of the Desert: Women Anthropologists in the American Southwest Project, under the direction of Barbara Babcock and Nancy Parezo [New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1985]); Alexander M. Stephen, *Hopi Journal of Alexander M. Stephen*, edited by Elsie Clews Parsons, 2 vols., Columbia Contributions in Anthropology 23 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.) Other parts of Stephen's field materials were obtained by archaeologist J. Walter Fewkes and incorporated into his materials and published under his name. The raw data are now housed at both the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution (under Stephen's, Keam's and Fewkes's names) and at the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology Archives, Harvard University, as part of the Hemenway Expedition papers.

⁵ Records related to professional associations and institutions inevitably wind up intermixed in individual files and require someone with knowledge of anthropological politics to untangle them. For example, archaeologist Frederick W. Putnam, one of anthropology's founders and great institution builders, was actively involved in the American Association for the Advancement of Science. His voluminous correspondence contains several hundred letters dealing specifically with AAAS business as well as with the formation of the American Anthropological Association (Putnam Papers, Harvard University Archives).

whom they often symbolize the anthropological endeavor. Most anthropologists have worked in communities that have not historically utilized written documents. Thus, the information gained through systematic undertakings is recorded in documents that have value to the fieldworker and to the peoples from whom the information was obtained. These documents of changing ways of life and cultural continuity must be preserved, for they exist in no other written form, cannot be replicated, and are therefore unique. Unfortunately, caring for records and organizing them are time-consuming activities even though they are necessary for the health of the discipline and for the preservation of humanity's cultural heritage. Disciplinary rewards come from conducting new fieldwork or publishing, not from ensuring that fieldnotes are organized thematically or chronologically. Boas and Parsons were unusually ethical in their concerns for what would happen to irreplaceable data. They continued to spend a good deal of their time in what their colleague Clark Wissler, another well-known cultural anthropologist who was curator at the American Museum of Natural History, and many other practitioners, regrettably and disparagingly called the field's "housekeeping" activities.⁶

Parsons died unexpectedly in 1940, a year before Boas. Luckily, Gladys Reichard, Boas's former student and a professor of anthropology at Barnard College, assumed the literary executorship duties for both. She organized their documents, without extensive editing or triage.⁷ She also insightfully recognized the value of their extensive personal correspondence, for it is often in letters that anthropologists write down their field observations, crucial contextual information, personal reflections, and tentative interpretations and conclusions. These are critical materials that often provide keys to our subsequent understandings of how and why important anthropological theories were constructed. Reichard also received assistance from a professional archivist, who

⁶ Clark Wissler thought of any cataloging and recordkeeping activities as tiresome and time-consuming diversions that kept him away from the more productive activities of lecturing and writing. As Margaret Mead has said about their conversations in the hallways of the American Museum of Natural History, "Dr. Clark Wissler thought that museum work [cataloging objects, filing, and recordkeeping] fitted women because it was like housekeeping" (quoted in Jane Howard, *Margaret Mead: A Life* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984], 186). One of the problems with convincing anthropologists past and present to properly organize and care for their data and records is that housekeeping activities have generally been felt to be less prestigious than data collection, writing, or publishing. It is the latter activities that garner academic rewards such as tenure and salary raises as well as professional prestige (see Nancy J. Parezo and Margaret A. Hardin, "In the Realm of the Muses," in *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*, edited by Nancy J. Parezo [Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993], 270–93, for further discussion of this problem). This is a perspective that the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records is trying to change, but it will be difficult because it means challenging academic and professional reward structures as well as the mindsets discussed in later portions of this article.

⁷ Extensive editing of papers has been a major problem in anthropology. Margaret Mead went through Ruth Benedict's papers and eliminated any references, no matter how oblique, to her sexual preferences in order to protect her privacy. While this was a well-intentioned undertaking, it has created lacunae in Benedict's fieldnotes and professional papers. Many anthropologists, of course, have done their own self-editing, discarding papers, and also eliminating field information they felt might pose threats to the people with whom they worked.

helped her organize the materials in such a manner that the documents and manuscripts made logical series that were acceptable under archival organizational paradigms yet useful to anthropological researchers seeking information on topics as well as personalities.

Following several years of work, Reichard deposited Boas's and Parsons's papers in the archives of the American Philosophical Society Library. Boas's materials were placed in four separate manuscript collections: (1) correspondence (58,500 items, 59 linear feet); (2) papers, which includes more correspondence, diaries, reports, lecture notes, and field data (over 10,500 items, 10 linear feet); (3) field notebooks and physical anthropology data (3,000 items, 10 notebooks); and, (4) linguistic materials (over 55 linear feet). Parsons's materials were placed in two series of papers, over 1,200 items (12 linear feet) in the first and over 15,000 items (17 linear feet) in the second.⁸ These materials have been used extensively and continuously by scholars in various disciplines (including historians of science, other historians, linguists, folklorists, sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, literary critics, philosophers, geographers, regional and native American specialists, humanists, geneticists, bioanthropologists, and feminists) as well as by anthropologists and by members of the native communities with whom Boas and Parsons worked.

This brief story about Parsons, Boas, and Reichard illustrates how preservation should work: anthropologists taking responsibility to protect for posterity the data and information-carrying documents they have produced, working in conjunction with archivists who recognize the importance of anthropological records for the preservation of the world's cultural and intellectual heritage. Anthropology is a holistic discipline touching on all aspects of human life, past and present. Based in museums and universities, it came to be recognized as a distinct scholarly undertaking during the late nineteenth century. Anthropology has been called the most presumptuous and amorphous of all the social sciences since it includes four main subdivisions (archaeology, linguistics, biological/physical anthropology, and socio-cultural anthropology) and an expanding number of research specialties (such as architecture and housing, art, demography, economics, ethnobiology, ethnohistory, ethnomusicology, folklore, genetics, historic archaeology, kinship, law and culture, material culture, medical anthropology, nutrition, politics, psychological anthropology, paleo-anthropology, primatology, technology

⁸ Information from the Manuscripts Guide at the American Philosophical Society's library website, available at <<http://www.amphilsoc.org/library.htm>>. In addition to the materials Reichard organized, there are several other collections of Boas's and Parsons's documents in the archives. In addition, field data and other materials produced by both Parsons and Boas can be found in manuscript repositories around the country as separate document collections and also embedded within the papers of other anthropologists (e.g., Robert Lowie, Alfred Kroeber, Frederick Putnam), government agencies (e.g., Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of American Ethnology), universities and institutions (e.g., Columbia University, American Museum of Natural History), and associations (e.g., the American Council of Learned Societies and the American Anthropological Association).

and material sciences, to mention but a few) reflecting its essential interdisciplinary nature.⁹

Anthropology systematically studies human cultures and societies in all times and in all places and attempts to link both sides of human nature, the biological with the cultural. As a systematic field of inquiry, practitioners use a wide variety of qualitative and quantitative methods and techniques to record and explain cultural similarities and differences. And most practitioners rely on fieldwork, that is, living in an indigenous (often rural) community using methods such as participant observation, interviews, recording, and oral histories, the survey and excavation of archaeological sites, or the observation of primates in their natural settings. Sister disciplines use anthropological records, just as anthropology uses their information. Anthropology also has always had an important applied aspect, through which anthropological understandings and methods are brought to bear on social and cultural problems around the world. Thus, archivists can expect that anthropological records placed in their repositories will be eclectic and used for a wide variety of basic research projects and for other purposes, including current policy debates on relevant social issues such as land claims, economic development, and race relations.

But we do not live in an ideal world. Many irreplaceable anthropological documents have been lost because of practitioner ignorance or neglect. Others that have been saved may seem to be inaccessible because potential users do not know where the papers are housed or there is no finding aid for users to consult. Because of this situation, a group of concerned anthropologists, historians, archivists, and librarians formed the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records (CoPAR) in 1992 in order to increase awareness of the problem and find possible solutions. The following sections of this article are meant to inform the archival community about the goals and activities of CoPAR, identify some of the barriers to our ideal world (where important data are saved and researchers use acid-free paper from the start), and ask the archival community to be aware of the issues and help CoPAR preserve these irreplaceable materials that document the world's cultural diversity and the collective memory of the discipline.

The Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records

CoPAR is a voluntary, nonprofit organization of dedicated individuals and representatives of anthropological associations. It was founded, in cooperation

⁹ Different subfields generate distinctive types of records, in part because of their distinct methodologies and techniques, and in part due to their social organization. Biological anthropologists and archaeologists tend to work in teams on longitudinal projects, while ethnographers and linguists generally have worked individually and in pairs on series of synchronic and independent projects. These differing organizational modes lead to distinctive kinds of record sets and different patterns of retention.

with the archival and information science communities, to encourage anthropological practitioners and anthropological organizations to work to preserve unpublished anthropological field records. CoPAR is designed to function as an informal clearinghouse and disciplinary catalyst, rather than as a disciplinary center or a manuscript repository.¹⁰ The general purposes of CoPAR are: to identify and locate primary anthropological data, texts on which conclusions and interpretations are based, and supporting materials; to encourage preservation; and, to foster the use of documentary records with anthropological value. This concept of value is very broadly defined since anthropology is a holistic and multidisciplinary endeavor. It minimally includes criteria that are used by archivists to assess the value of a potential donation: enduring intellectual, historical, or research significance.¹¹ Since anthropology is concerned with the study, documentation, and understanding of human cultural, linguistic, and biological diversity, its records contain primary data and provide the basis for continuing research on human diversity and the histories of the world's populations, as well as on the history of the discipline, the social-behavioral sciences, and the humanities.¹² Anthropological records thus represent a unique and irreplaceable segment of human knowledge.

¹⁰ At their first two conferences, CoPAR members originally explored the idea of a disciplinary manuscript repository and disciplinary center organized on the lines of disciplinary history centers in many of the sciences. Joan Warnow-Blewett, Associate Director of the Center for History of Physics, helped us discuss this dream of a center that would facilitate and coordinate future anthropological preservation efforts. Warnow-Blewett explained the nature of centers, how they are organized, and the types of programs typically undertaken by disciplinary historians (Joan Warnow-Blewett, "Disciplinary History Centers in the Sciences," in *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., edited by Sydel Silverman and Nancy J. Parezo [New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1995], 47–60). Unfortunately, we soon recognized that anthropology, as a poorer and numerically smaller discipline than physics or chemistry, would not be able to command the level of resources that such a center would require. We also realized that anthropology lagged behind other disciplines in its concerns for the fate of its data and for the accumulation of materials that would enlighten histories of science. In addition, our timing was bad; the American Anthropological Association had recently reorganized and was not in a position to discuss permanent funding of a center through membership dues, a strategy successfully followed by all major scientific disciplines. Obtaining financial support for an independent center would also be a problem since many practitioners mistakenly think of the National Anthropological Archives, a division of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, as the field's disciplinary center, something it is not organized to be (Mary Elizabeth Ruwell, "The National Anthropological Archives," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 17–22). CoPAR members came to the conclusion that programmatic aspects of the model could be realized in a variety of ways, depending upon the funding available and other circumstances, without a disciplinary center.

¹¹ It does not, for purposes of definition, include other criteria that archivists use to decide whether to accession records, such as quantity, age, and physical form. As a non-archivist I have relied on the following readings for my basic understanding of archival appraisal and organizational theory: Harrison Eiteljorg, II, "Archiving Archaeological Data in the Next Millennium," *CRM* 21, no. 6 (1998): 21–23; Margaret MacLean and Ben H. Davis, eds., *Time & Bits: Managing Digital Continuity* (Santa Monica, Calif.: The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1998); Frederic Miller, *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1990); James M. O'Toole, *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1990); Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, *Preserving Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1994); and Theodore Schellenberg, "The Appraisal of Public Records," *National Archives Bulletin* No. 5 (1956).

¹² CoPAR thus considers as anthropological many record sets that are also labeled historical, geological, biological, and artistic. The key factor for us is the systematic collection of field-based information in research

One of the reasons that the concerned individuals participating in this effort originally met at the first conference in 1992 was frustration.¹³ Over the last two decades, several anthropologists have noticed that it has become increasingly difficult to locate original anthropological data known to have been placed in some repository and that a distressing number of anthropologists were discarding their fieldnotes rather than preserving them at the ends of their careers. For example, cultural anthropologist Hortense Powdermaker burned her field records on African cultures before her death in the 1960s because she feared they might be misused. All participants at the conference had heard similar stories or statements about triage intentions from their colleagues, or had spent time in fruitless searches for primary data in archives only to “locate” it after they had completed a project when an acquaintance who had read their articles said, “Oh, you know that there is some good material on your project at repository Z.”

These were disturbing trends. Anthropology is an intellectual endeavor that requires the accumulation of primary data (both old and new) in forms that may be constantly referred to, unlike the physical sciences where new theories and paradigmatic changes mean that new data replace the old. In anthropology, “old” field observations are always “active” data. As Smithsonian curator and cultural anthropologist William Sturtevant has said, field data are “never done with.”¹⁴ Europeanist and historian of anthropology Sydel Silverman has expanded on this observation: “The first-hand records of cultures, sites or languages . . . may be returned to again and again. Nor are such records ever to be relegated to history or treated only as a prior condition against which change may be measured. We know that change is the essence of all human activity, and that whatever is observed by an anthropologist is specific to its time and place. The primary data remain the basis of anthropological research and thinking as long as that enterprise continues.”¹⁵

subject communities; that is, in natural settings. For example, the records of the U.S. Geological Survey in the National Archives contain a great deal of primary data produced by anthropologist-natural scientists, including ethnographic observations of Native American communities and surveys of archaeological sites. Many records with anthropological content are also found in historical societies where local community members describe daily life or record information on festivals and special events that document and illuminate American culture in different periods of time. As such, many of the points made in this article are applicable to other systematic and observational data sets in manuscript repositories.

¹³ The first conference met at Ranch Santa Fe, California, from February 28 to March 4, 1992. It was organized by Sydel Silverman (President, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research) and Nancy J. Parezo (Curator of Ethnology, Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona). Its goal was to begin to assess the status and problems of records preservation in anthropology. Seventeen individuals who could speak to the issues from a variety of perspectives attended: anthropologists who produce and use the records, scholars from all the major subfields, representatives of professional organizations that are tackling preservation problems in the humanities and the sciences, professional archivists, potential funders, and other individuals with special expertise.

¹⁴ William Sturtevant, quoted in Sydel Silverman, “Introduction,” in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 2.

¹⁵ Silverman, “Introduction,” 2.

Recognizing an impending crisis in the field, and also that native communities had begun to voice their desires for access to records of their histories, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research funded a series of conferences and workshops on the theme "Preserving the Anthropological Record." The first conferences brought together individuals who identified preservation issues; evaluated overall disciplinary and archival needs and priorities, and searched for commonalities and possible points of contention; reviewed preservation efforts currently undertaken by individuals and institutions; discussed the nature of the anthropological record and its uses; identified ethical and legal considerations of record acquisition, retention and use; and examined various archival models. The results of the early discussions were the intellectual assessments of the problem published in *Preserving the Anthropological Record*.¹⁶ Another outcome of the first conference was the creation of CoPAR and the development of a series of goals and strategies to make anthropologists more aware of how to preserve their intellectual legacy.

An initial activity of CoPAR was fact-finding. Don D. Fowler, CoPAR co-chair and professor of anthropology and historic preservation at the University of Nevada, Reno, conducted a mail survey of 644 anthropology departments and institutions that were known to currently hold anthropological records in order to discover the status of their holdings, their electronic database capabilities, and what they saw as the major problems of preservation and access. (Over 125 of these questionnaires were returned.) CoPAR members also talked informally to numerous practitioners, archivists, museologists, information specialists, and native peoples to gain an understanding of the scope of the problem, their perspectives on preservation issues and the value of anthropological data, and their present and long-term needs. Other members conversed extensively with anthropologists who regularly use archival materials in their research to identify points where they have had problems in locating and gaining access to anthropological documents preserved in repositories. Since CoPAR's goal is to encourage communication and raise awareness, one of its most important undertakings has been to outline and assess the nature and extent of such problems; in short, discovering where problems, issues, and barriers to preserving the anthropological record occur, enhancing its present and future accessibility, and ensuring that data and contextual materials are preserved and utilized in such a manner that the rights and concerns of all interested parties are addressed.

¹⁶ Sydel Silverman and Nancy J. Parezo, eds., *Preserving the Anthropological Record* (New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1992); Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d. ed. (New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1995). To date over seventy individuals have attended these invitational conferences and workshops. Attendees have included scholars from all major subfields of anthropology, as well as linguists, social scientists, and historians, representatives of professional organizations concerned with preservation and access problems, native practitioners, professional archivists, librarians, museologists, conservators, and computer and information specialists.

From CoPAR's research, it was readily apparent that the problem of preserving the anthropological record was greater and more complex than our members had expected. New issues, especially those falling under the rubric of intellectual property rights, informed consent, and privacy issues, are redefining preservation and access on an almost daily basis. While anthropological data may have been written by a practitioner, many parties contributed to their creation and have vested interests in them: the individuals who provided the information, the community or society that hosted the anthropologist, the agency that funded the project, the institutions with which the researcher was affiliated, and the American Anthropological Association, which supports professional activities, including the production of new knowledge. Much of CoPAR's discussions to date have dealt with identifying the ethical and moral responsibilities of records creators and users. As ethnographer Donald Tuzin has noted, anthropologists are the stewards, or custodians, of records that contain cultural information. This is especially the case when the fieldnotes are the only written record of a way of life in small, isolated cultural groups living in places that are "rapidly changing in response to increasing involvement in political and economic relationships with the world outside their boundaries."¹⁷

As CoPAR discussions continued, it also became apparent that anthropological information is contained in a daunting wealth of research documents, personal papers, and other unpublished documentary materials. These are scattered among anthropological practitioners, the institutions in which they work, professional organizations and associations, museums, historical societies, manuscript repositories, corporations, government agencies, and native communities around the world. The reasons for loss and the barriers to preservation were likewise more complicated than originally anticipated. One major reason is a lack of financial support. For example, agencies that fund research pay for field expenses, but not for data organization or preservation activities. Nor are there any funding opportunities for post-project organization or the proverbial "cleaning up a lifetime's worth of research." In addition, archives and manuscript repositories that preserve anthropological data are virtually all understaffed and underfunded, reflecting both the increase in paper and electronic records produced by modern society and the short-sightedness of those who undervalue cultural preservation and research. CoPAR members realized that preserving the anthropological record must not become a further burden on the archival community, but could only become a reality with their support and assistance.

¹⁷ Donald Tuzin, "The Melanesian Archive," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 25.

Problems and Issues in Preserving the Anthropological Record

CoPAR is currently working toward solutions to the problems caused by three basic barriers: lack of knowledge about preservation and archival procedures by practitioners; lack of understanding about the nature of the anthropological record by practitioners, information specialists, and members of research subject communities who want access to the data; and a lack of finding aids and databases on records and their locations. These barriers were identified by CoPAR members during their conferences and substantiated by the institutional survey mentioned above as well as by anecdotal information. The first barrier is created by anthropologists themselves in the normal course of their professional and personal lives. It is probably a common problem for researchers in all the social sciences.

Barrier 1: A lack of knowledge on the part of anthropologists about why and how to properly preserve and organize their records

Most anthropologists have little awareness of preservation issues or information control when they are producing data-carrying documents and do not think about their field records or the chaos in their offices until they are sick, retire, or have to move. From informal interviewing that CoPAR members have conducted, this seems to be the norm (except for the most compulsively organized individuals who never seem to sleep). While individuals may have good intentions, something more pressing always takes precedence and the piles of documents continue to grow.¹⁸ This means that practitioners leave the burden of saving their research evidence and organizing their professional and

¹⁸ A personal example can illustrate the problem and how it catches anthropological practitioners, and probably any other research scholar in any discipline, unaware. As I was writing the first draft of this paper, the university planned to demolish and rebuild one of the walls in my office over Christmas break to remove a boarded-up window that no longer met fire and safety guidelines for corridors. The office would also be made smaller because the policy guidelines now stated that corridors had to be bigger. This meant that I had to move over thirty shelves of books, and eight file cabinets of teaching materials, journals, photographs, and field records, and that when the construction was completed it would have to fit into one third less space. I sat and stared at this career accumulation for days and didn't know where to start or how to prioritize—what to eliminate because “I don't need it anymore,” and what I might need two years or twenty years from now. Some things made sense to move. For example, I had five file boxes of organizational records from an old project on the history of women in Southwestern anthropology that could go into our institutional archives but we have almost no space in our museum archives. These were fairly well-organized, but I needed to find funding for student help to put them in archival-quality folders and produce an inventory. Then there were my unique field records that took up one file cabinet and four bookshelves, and the thirty notebooks of administrative materials from the various universities, professional, state, and federal committees I have been on. I was not arrogant enough to think that my field notes are as important as Parsons's or Boas's nor will I ever be a “Great Personage,” but people will probably use my data again, I hope in a responsible way. But I was not sure about the administrative records and I eventually had to throw them out, especially after the ceiling fell in twice and covered everything with asbestos dust.

personal papers to others; generally family members, professional friends, and archivists. If an archivist, especially one who has training in anthropology, is called upon to inventory or process a professional's papers, there is the assurance that organizational schemes will meet professional archival standards. But reliance on archivists with such specialized anthropological knowledge is burdensome for an overworked archival community. In addition, organization by archivists without anthropological training can lead to access problems for future researchers. Most archivists are not familiar with the cultures or time periods with which anthropologists deal, the idiosyncrasies of anthropological thought patterns and changes in terminology over time. They tend to treat the materials like those generated by historians, ignoring the observable differences, the internal complexities of the material, and the critical features mentioned earlier, while emphasizing their commonalities with other materials produced by professional humanists. In addition, no one called in after a creator has passed on has any way to identify unlabeled slides, recognize a foreign language written in phonetic notation, or mark records with the appropriate sensitivity restrictions (such as confidentiality or esoteric information) that the researcher may have promised field respondents. To leave the task to heirs who are grieving or to overworked archivists is also a poor solution.

The best person to organize field records is the creator.¹⁹ CoPAR is mounting an educational campaign within the discipline to eliminate unthoughtful discarding or neglect of records, by redefining professionalism to include respect for the entire intellectual legacy of individuals and research teams. Preservation should be a career-long concern and included in the planning of research projects, the choice of work materials, and records management practices over a lifetime. CoPAR's goal is to ensure that archivists and heirs will not be beset with researcher's unwitting mistakes, that researchers are committed to preserving the materials in their own possession. The anthropologist, or any other scholar, should be in charge of his or her own future contribution to the historical record at every stage of the research, preservation, and dissemination process. This is not an easy task, however, because of past disciplinary practices. In order to accomplish it several issues must first be addressed.

First, anthropology needs to eliminate its "feet-of-clay syndrome." Boas and Parsons wanted their raw data as well as their books and articles to be part of their intellectual legacies, because they recognized that field records were as important as publications. They had enough confidence in the rigor and systematic nature of their field recording methods that they had few concerns about other people consulting their data. As anthropologist Jean Jackson has noted in her insightful essay "I Am a Fieldnote," however, this is an uncommon stance; ethnologists are generally possessive yet ambiguous about their field

¹⁹ This statement is, of course, self-evident to archivists. But it has proven to be an extremely difficult concept to convey to some anthropologists.

records.²⁰ Jackson, who questioned seventy cultural anthropologists about their data and how they were produced, discovered that fieldnotes evoke strong memories and emotions, for they reveal much about the person who wrote them. Because the identity of the researcher is intimately encoded on every page, some researchers are defensive about their field records for fear that their field techniques might not live up to some imagined, and constantly changing, standard. Data are private and esoteric; recording and understanding observations of human behavior, in fluid situations that require cross-cultural interpretation, is an idiosyncratic and subjective process.

Fieldnotes are also very complicated record sets. They are never random samples, and they are rarely highly organized, unlike the highly standardized research texts produced during experiments in laboratory or clinical settings. As theoretician and cultural anthropologist Roger Sanjek has noted, observational fieldnotes contain bits and pieces of qualitative and quantitative information, text fragments, partial drawings and diagrams, half-formed ideas and interpretations.²¹ Fieldnotes are thus part of the searching process rather than the interpretive and summation processes of the anthropological endeavor. This means that contextual information (which is generally located in diaries or correspondence rather than the fieldnotes per se) is needed to reuse them effectively. There is a paradox in this; in a very real sense, fieldnotes were never meant to be public when they were produced, yet they must be shared for the entire research endeavor to be validated. In the process of sharing, they become "valuable," in a sense that archivists use the term, because they are unique research documents. Together with contextualizing records, fieldnotes carry information that cannot be replaced or replicated, since they deal with specific times and places. They can be reused with care, following rigorous standards of scholarship that ensure appropriate recontextualization and periodization of information—not an easy task. They can also be misused, inappropriately decontextualized, or used by others to make the original researcher look stupid, unethical, deviant, or deficient in some way.²² Some anthropologists

²⁰ Jean Jackson, "I Am a Fieldnote: Fieldnotes as a Symbol of Professional Identity," in *Fieldnotes: The Making of Anthropology*, edited by Roger Sanjek (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 3–33. This attitude is less true for archaeologists, linguists, and biological anthropologists and for individuals who work on team projects. For an additional discussion on these topics see Nancy J. Parezo, "The Formation of Anthropological Archival Records," in *Learning From Things: Method and Theory of Material Culture Studies*, edited by W. David Kingery (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996), 145–74.

²¹ Roger Sanjek, "Fire Loss and the Sorcerer's Apprentice," in Sanjek, *Fieldnotes*, 34–46; "A Vocabulary for Fieldnotes," in Sanjek, *Fieldnotes*, 92–138.

²² The most famous case of this type of debate about professional standards of data collection and interpretation is the Freeman-Mead controversy. As historian of anthropology and linguist Regna Darnell has noted about fieldnotes, they are an individual's claim to professional authority. Other professionals "require that particular evidence be adduced for particular claims. Such evidence both adds verisimilitude to the 'having been there' and attests to the scientific character of the relationship between evidence and interpretation, method and theory, experience and inference" (Regna Darnell,

discard their data because of this fear and also a feeling, as several senior individuals have told me, that students today are not being properly trained in the use of archival records.

A second problem is that anthropologists differ a great deal in how they treat their record sets once they finish each research project. For some, field records are sacrosanct; for others, all but worthless. Ruth Bunzel, an ethnographer who worked at Zuni Pueblo in the 1920s and 1930s, discarded her fieldnotes after she completed each book, even though she had not published all her observations or fully utilized her raw data. She felt that she had written all she had to say, and no one else would find her field diaries useful. She also felt no one would be interested in them because she was not a “famous” anthropologist. This was not true. Social anthropologist Fred Eggan, one of the field’s outstanding practitioners from the 1930s through the 1980s, once said that Bunzel was the best field ethnologist in all of anthropology, in part because she was so shy, humble, and unassuming. She was a good listener and a careful recorder. As a result of her decisions and assessments of her own worth, all that remains of Bunzel’s Zuni research are her published books and the plates of her books that are at the National Anthropological Archives. Bunzel’s triage decisions have meant a tremendous loss not only to anthropology but also to the Zuni people, for Bunzel had collected economic information that would have been useful to the Zuni in recent water claims cases.²³

Third, while anthropologists’ fieldnotes are their unique creations, reflecting their personal observations and generated through their original, creative activities, they are in another sense joint or collaborative products. They contain information found in no other written form and are often of great import to the people from whom the data were obtained. As mentioned in the previous example, fieldnotes can be significant for their potential to help in current equity and sovereignty struggles, but they also may be dangerous if the information contained therein was never meant to be public or recorded other than in an oral form. Some, but by no means all, native peoples feel that in certain cases the knowledge recorded in field interviews is proprietary and can endanger users

“Documenting Disciplinary History,” in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 73–84; quotation is from page 73. This evidence is found in fieldnotes.

²³ Ruth Bunzel, Interview for the Daughters of the Desert: Women Anthropologists in the American Southwest Project; Fred Eggan, Interview for the Daughters of the Desert: Women Anthropologists in the American Southwest Project. When I helped the University of New Mexico Press reprint two of Bunzel’s works on Zuni religion, the Zuni requested that the informants (i.e., the individuals from whom she had obtained information) be identified in order to assess the accuracy of the recorded prayers. I was only partly successful in this because of the lack of field records. Nancy J. Parezo, “Introduction. Ruth L. Bunzel at Zuni: The Search for the Middle Place,” in Ruth L. Bunzel, *Zuni Ceremonialism: Three Studies* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992).

who are not ritually prepared to access it.²⁴ Access, publication, and reuse issues, which are increasingly being discussed under the rubric of intellectual property rights and in debates over the ownership of knowledge and the right or responsibility to speak about certain topics, are analogous to copyright pertaining to published materials as well as to matters of human remains and cultural patrimony. While a book or paper record is copyrightable, the facts contained therein are not; sensitive cultural materials may never have been meant to be freely shared and may carry responsibilities for the guardianship and use of the information in them.

One of the goals of CoPAR is to make the anthropological community aware that it must take responsibility for the information that professionals record and, working in collaboration with native practitioners, should note any sensitivity issues before records are deposited in a repository. It is unethical and unreasonable to expect the archival community to guess which fieldnotes contain sensitive information and what are reasonable use restrictions.²⁵ Similarly,

²⁴ This is an emerging ethical issue, often listed under intellectual property rights and privacy rights, and is much too complex to go into in detail in this article. There are important cross-cultural differences related to written records and photographic images and the information contained in records has complex meanings for subjects, producers, collectors, holders, managers and users. An inherent meaning may not be self-evident to members outside a community of stakeholders or may be in conflict with the meaning held by another community in any specific instance, especially with regard to religious knowledge. For example, what constitute data to be shared as part of the public domain by a researcher may be conceptualized as cultural appropriation by a native individual when published without his/her consent. The Hopi may not want photographs of kachinas dancing in public spaces published, nor do they want the locations of sacred sites made available to nonqualified users. The Cocopa, who have a cultural rule against speaking the name of the dead, do not want the name of individuals depicted in photographs written in a finding aid that family descendants may use; this may require that two finding aids be made available in a repository, one with and one without identifications. It will be important that anthropologists and archivists communicate closely with native communities about these delicate issues regarding use. A group of archivists from tribal archives and interested institutions met informally in 1998 to discuss these issues and another group met at the Newberry Library in August 1999 at a CoPAR sponsored conference organized by Willow Powers and Joe Watkins.

For excellent introductions and analyses of these issues, see Keith Aoki, "Intellectual Property and Sovereignty: Notes Toward a Cultural Geography of Authorship," *Stanford Law Review* 48 (1996): 1293–1355; Ronald V. Bettig, *Copyrighting Culture: The Political Economy of Intellectual Property* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1996); Elizabeth A. Brandt, "On Secrecy and the Control of Knowledge: Taos Pueblo," in *On Secrecy: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, edited by Stanton K. Tefft (New York: Human Sciences Press, 1980), 123–46; Michael F. Brown, "Can Culture Be Copyrighted?" *Current Anthropology* 39, no. 2 (1998): 192–222; Stephen B. Brush, "Indigenous Knowledge of Biological Resources and Intellectual Property Rights: The Role of Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 95 (1993): 653–86; Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, ed., *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991); Candace S. Greene and Thomas D. Drescher, "The Tipi with Battle Pictures: The Kiowa Tradition of Intangible Property Rights," *Trademark Reporter* 84 (1994): 418–33; Heather McNeil, *Without Consent: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information in Public Archives* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1992), 103–25; James D. Nason, "Native American Intellectual Property Rights: Issues in the Control of Esoteric Knowledge," in *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*, edited by Bruce Ziff and Pratima V. Rao (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 237–54; Willow R. Powers "Images Across Boundaries: History, Use and Ethics of Photographs of American Indians," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 20, no. 3 (1996): 129–36; Elizabeth Sandager, "Ethical Implications of the Documentary Record," *New England Archivists Newsletter* 21, no. 2 (1994): 4–6.

²⁵ Access has become an important topic in recent years and there is a growing literature in law, medicine, social and behavior science, philosophy, and ethics on the topic. See for example, Paul S. Appelbaum, Loren H. Roth, and Thomas Detre, "Researcher's Access to Patient Records: An Analysis of Ethical

native communities are recognizing that the creators and holders of original anthropological data have a claim on how these materials are preserved and used and that records that have in the past been available to people democratically can not be suddenly or arbitrarily destroyed, repatriated, or closed to any but the members of a specific culture, ethnic group, clan, or organization. There are still places for disagreement and spaces for negotiation; what is needed is open and frank communication. No one person “owns” descriptive cultural records; many people have a stake in their generation and have ethical obligations to ensure their proper retention, preservation, and reuse. This situation should be guided by principles of stewardship and guardianship outlined in both anthropological and archival codes of ethics. CoPAR members have worked extensively with the Society for American Archaeology and written policy statements on these issues for the association’s new principles of stewardship.

Fourth, it is important that those who generate data avoid potential problems resulting from their choice of recording materials. The records of many professional and amateur practitioners have not survived intact because of a failure to understand the nature of the recording media. For example, the Ektachrome slides of Navajo artistic sandpaintings that I took in trading posts in 1977 had faded to the point of being unusable by 1990 because I did not know that Ektachrome fades immediately. To make my data last, I should have duplicated each slide immediately using Kodachrome or Fuji film and never projected them during lectures. As a result of my ignorance, it will be difficult for other researchers to conduct reanalyses of the materials or use my data as a cultural or artistic baseline, as I had always intended.

An even more critical problem facing researchers in all disciplines, presently and in the future, is the practice of not producing permanent field records on acid-free paper and thinking of a computer as a long-term solution to mounds of paper documents. Too many practitioners are storing irreplaceable data only on their computers, using them for data preservation as well as data collection and analysis. Record creators need to be continuously warned that computers are not preservation devices and that data stored on disks are ephemeral. Depositing disks containing data in a repository without the accompanying software is like depositing nothing at all. Students need to be warned

Problems,” *Clinical Research* 32, no. 4 (1984): 399–403; R. L. Beals, *Politics of Social Research* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969); Thomas L. Beauchamp, ed., *Ethical Issues in Social Science Research* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, “Informed Consent in Anthropological Research: We Are Not Exempt,” *Human Organization* 53, no. 1 (1994): 1–10; Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, ed., *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991); John Kultgen, *Ethics and Professionalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988); Laurie Price, “Ethics in Anthropology: Ethnographic Fieldwork in HIV/AIDS,” *AnthroNewsletter* 35 (April 1994): 29; Rodney Sprague, “The Preservation of Written and Printed Archaeological Records,” *Northwest Anthropology Research Notes* 16 (1982): 200–211; C. Warren and B. Laslett, “Privacy and Secrecy,” *Journal of Social Issues* 33 (1977): 43–51; Valerie R. Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publication, 1994).

about these issues in graduate training programs. My colleague, ethnoarcheologist Carol Kramer and I, now include a module in our graduate professionalism, ethics and research methods courses, often using horror stories as a teaching tool. Several other anthropologists are doing the same, but all anthropology graduate programs do not yet include such critical training.²⁶

Fifth, anthropologists (in consultation with archivists and the communities studied) need to create a new ethic on how archival data will be used responsibly. Fear of unethical conduct and of inadequate research techniques or intentional misinterpretation on the part of future researchers, including potential "invasions of privacy," is a major reason why anthropologists discard their field records, as mentioned earlier. The same is true for heirs. Alfred Kroeber's heirs destroyed parts of his correspondence with Elsie Clews Parsons because they thought they were too personal. While it was certainly their right to take such actions, it is a loss for the history of anthropology. Kroeber's half of the conversations are intact in Parsons's papers; Parsons's reflections, which would shed light on how she developed her ideas, are gone.²⁷

Finally, many anthropologists and their non-practitioner heirs have simply placed papers in storage because they did not know what to do with them, or how to contact an appropriate repository. Consequently, many useful records now sit in attics and basements. Occasionally these materials surface and are transferred to new homes; a large batch of Parsons's papers were recently rediscovered by her grandchildren and deposited in the Rye County Historical Society, where they were recently used by Desley Deacon for her excellent intellectual biography of Parsons.²⁸ In another recent case, a woman in her late-seventies contacted one of the CoPAR librarians about some materials in her possession. She had taken one of Americanist ethnographer Robert Lowie's last courses at the University of California, Berkeley, and he had given her one of his field notebooks from his residence on the Cheyenne reservation in the early 1900s for her to use for her thesis. She wanted to know what to do with the materials, which had been in her attic since the 1940s. This material related to objects that Lowie had collected for the Field Museum of Natural History as well as his work on kinship. Now housed in an appropriate archives at the University of California, Riverside, Cheyenne cultural historians who are writing a tribal history and conducting a study of past collecting activities among their people have already used the "previously missing" material.

²⁶ CoPAR members periodically remind educators of their responsibility in this regard. In May 1999 CoPAR, the Historic Preservation Program of the University of Nevada, Reno, and the National Park Service held a training program for government employees and researchers that included such information. There are plans to continue this program with training sessions held at national anthropological association meetings.

²⁷ See Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., for further examples. The information on Kroeber comes from Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons. Inventing Modern Life*.

²⁸ Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons. Inventing Modern Life*.

Barrier 2: A lack of knowledge on the part of the archival community about anthropology's research value, special research features, and archival needs

Unfortunately, on a few occasions anthropologists and their heirs have found that an archivist contacted and offered anthropological fieldnotes has failed to see the material's value because of a lack of understanding of the nature and historical import of anthropological data. I once picked some records out of a garbage can at the home of an anthropologist's heir who had become discouraged by several archivists who had said that her father's papers were worthless because he was not a "Great Man." One had even told her that her father was unimportant because he was not included in a *Who's Who* he had consulted. The materials were not worthless, but were valuable; the heir simply did not know how to offer them to an archivist, nor how to explain their research value when archivists told her her father was not famous enough to warrant preserving his work. In anthropology it is the quality of the data, rather than the reputation of the individual, that is of primary importance. This gentleman's linguistic and ethnographic observations of over ten years are now well cared for in a New Mexico manuscript repository and have been used in a recent dissertation.

In spite of such occasional problems in transferring records, numerous anthropological records have made it into manuscript repositories where they are well cared for by professionals. But there is, nevertheless, a lack of understanding in some repositories, museums, and libraries about the nature of anthropological records, past and present research practices, as well as the conceptual frameworks of anthropology (including how anthropologists ask for relevant materials), and the changing uses to which anthropology and other concerned communities are putting these records.²⁹ Unfortunately, while the field of anthropology has expanded exponentially in size and complexity, there has been no concurrent growth in records management programs for anthropological documents, nor has there been the designation of a set of repositories (either regional or topically oriented) dedicated to preserving the unpublished records of the discipline.

As noted above, one of the most important features of anthropological documents is that the records are always active. Like several other disciplines, anthropology is simultaneously a cumulative science and a humanistic undertaking; new data do not replace the old as knowledge grows and understandings change. As anthropologist Walter Goldschmidt has astutely observed, "The

²⁹ This is probably a predicament for all systematic research endeavors, but I only have information for anthropology, folklore, oral history, and sociology, so will not run the risk of overgeneralizing. Part of the problem may be the cultures with whom anthropologists work, especially non-North American groups, because people are unfamiliar with them and may not see how information on them has relevance for their lives, American society, or their repositories.

special quality of anthropology is holism, contextualization, the preserved sense of the human scene as exquisitely complex and intricately articulated.”³⁰ Unlike the perception of data generated by the hard sciences and many of the biological sciences that are laboratory based and where research is designed to replicate, overturn, or replace established understandings with new theoretical revolutions, field records produced by anthropologists do not end their usefulness at the completion of a research project but are returned to throughout the course of a career, because of holism and the complexity of social life.³¹ They may also be used repeatedly by later practitioners, and increasingly, they are consulted by the communities from which the information was obtained. Cultural anthropologist Morris Opler, for example, repeatedly used the fieldnotes of Grenville Goodwin from the 1920s and 1930s as well as the fieldnotes of fellow students from a 1931 Laboratory of Anthropology field training program led by Columbia University professor Ruth Benedict, in all his later work with several Apachean groups. A generation later, ethnographer Keith Basso reused the same materials and others for his community-based studies of Cibecue, Arizona (a San Carlos Apache community) and also published Goodwin's data on hunting. Western Apaches today often consult both Opler's and Goodwin's

³⁰ Walter Goldschmidt, “The Cultural Paradigm in the Post-War World,” in *Social Contexts of American Ethnology, 1840–1984*, edited by June Helm (Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society, 1985), 172.

³¹ I am making an important distinction here which I have found many people in the archival community do not understand. To the archivists with whom I have discussed this issue, anthropological data are “active” because historians of science can use them to understand the history and intellectual development of a field. This is obviously the case with all disciplinary records, regardless of whether they are based on observational fieldwork or laboratory experiments. However, there is a distinction with regard to current theoretical issues and how data is used in different disciplines. These issues have been widely discussed in books dealing with the epistemology and philosophy of science, natural science, and the behavioral sciences. Data in fields like chemistry, medicine, physics, or microbiology can become outdated and no longer used as methodologies and techniques change. The current debate on whether to save a small sample of smallpox or to eradicate it is part of this wider debate. Data in observational fields like astronomy, evolutionary biology, taxonomy, geology, and anthropology tend to remain active and useful even following paradigm shifts. Much of this difference is, of course, perceptual but does connote a difference in how quantitative laboratory-based data and qualitative observational data are viewed and retained. In addition, government regulations on scientific conduct and research subject rights to privacy, as interpreted by university human subject review committees, is increasingly calling for the destruction of data following a stated period (usually five years) after the close of an experiment. The mindset of such regulations is that data are no longer needed or useful at the conclusion of an experiment, and this mindset is extended to other types of data.

For more on issues like this, see Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970) as well as Howard Becker, *Tricks of the Trade* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); A. L. Epstein, ed., *The Craft of Social Anthropology* (London: Social Science Paperbacks, 1967); H. Russell Bernard, *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 2d ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1994); Albert Hunter, ed., *The Rhetoric of Social Research: Understood and Believed* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Bruce Jackson, *Fieldwork* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987); Mary Ann Kenworthy, et al., *Preserving Field Records: Archival Techniques for Archaeologists and Anthropologists* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, University Museum, 1985); George E. Marcus and Dick Cushman, “Ethnographies as Texts,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11 (1983): 25–69; P. J. Pelto, *Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry* (New York: Harper, 1970); Charles Ragin, *Constructing Social Research* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1994); Sanjeck, *Fieldnotes*; Aaron B. Wildavsky, *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work* (New

fieldnotes that are housed in the Arizona State Museum.³² Anthropological information and the primary documents that carry this knowledge are thus always active and current, constituting primary data for continuing chronological research. To refer to them in a repository is increasingly becoming part of the standard and expected methodology of anthropology in all subfields.

Anthropological data, like the materials generated by other behavioral or social science disciplines, can never be duplicated. Records relating to excavated or destroyed archaeological sites, to societies that have fundamentally changed, to life histories of individuals who have passed on, to languages no longer spoken, to cultural materials that no longer exist, to texts of oral renditions of historic events and statements of world view, all constitute a tenuous (and sometimes the only) link to knowledge that is otherwise irretrievable. Unfortunately, CoPAR members have been told that some repositories do not accept anthropological field data or journals even though they will accept practitioner's correspondence or that archivists do not know how to inventory cultural data adequately because anthropology records are so diverse and complex. I once helped a gentleman who had worked in Africa find a home for his materials upon his retirement; he had been discouraged because his university's archivist had said she did not want his data because she had never heard of the peoples referred to in the material. She therefore assumed that no one would ever use them. We eventually found a repository in which other Africanists had placed their papers and where researchers would logically look for them.

Archivists need to understand the importance of preserving the various complementary forms of anthropological data (notebooks, site maps, survey forms, questionnaires, still photographs and slides, artifact descriptions, analytical summaries, diaries, field journals, coding sheets and observational forms, audiotape recordings, transcripts, scrapnotes, typed notes, linguistic slips, laboratory notes, daily logs, charts, diagrams, graphs, genealogies, texts, lists, and drawings), even though some are cumbersome and may appear superficially to be redundant. These basic materials are generally supplemented by information in administrative documents, secondary analytical records, reports to agencies

Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1993); Kurt Wolff, "The Collection and Organization of Field Materials," in *Human Organization Research*, edited by Richard N. Adams and J. Preiss (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1960), 240–54.

³² The students in the field training session included several famous anthropologists who went on to work in other areas of the world: John Gillin, Jules Henry, Regina Flannery Herzfeld, and Sol Tax. Their fieldnotes are now incorporated in Opler's records. See Morris Opler, ed., *Grenville Goodwin among the Western Apache: Letters from the Field* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1973) for an example of incorporating fieldnotes and Keith Basso, ed., *Western Apache Raiding and Warfare: From the Notes of Grenville Goodwin* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1971) for an example of reuse of data in archives. Most anthropology monographs dealing with research sites that had been the place of study by earlier researchers list in the acknowledgment section thanks for the use of old research materials and fieldnotes.

or contractors, curriculum vitae, class notes, lectures, scrapbooks, and grant proposals. In their papers for *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, several noted anthropologists summarized the special features of records produced by anthropology's different subfields as well as the ethical issues that may affect their reuse. For example, Victor Golla noted that linguistic materials often include lexical lists, compilations of vocabularies, wordlists, and dictionaries of particular languages, and extensive sound recordings on wax cylinders or audiotapes, while Don Fowler and Douglas Givens discussed how archaeologists produce data on maps, site profiles, survey forms, still photographs, and specimen provenience catalog cards.³³

In some cases the preservation needs of anthropology may differ from established archival practices and priorities. For example, while archivists might not save all the unpublished reports a donor amassed over the course of a career, the fugitive nature of much of applied anthropology's "grey literature" warrants saving these rare documents with the rest of a practitioner's documentary corpus. Changes in nomenclature that reflect increases in knowledge are also important considerations for all disciplines involved in any form of information management. Archivists will need to refresh their basic understandings of anthropological terms periodically (for example, ethnicity is replacing culture as a central concept), particularly those terms that designate languages, communities, societies, cultures, ethnic groups, and places. Native American communities are now increasingly referring to themselves by band rather than tribal designations, for example, and will ask for photographic materials using *their* names for themselves. This increasingly important issue will require active collaboration of archivists, anthropologists, native peoples, and librarians in order to build appropriate concordances. The usefulness and appropriateness of these concordances will have a direct bearing on solving a third barrier facing researchers: trying to use documents already in archival custody.

Barrier 3: A lack of extensive, systematic, and user-friendly finding aids and databases to help researchers identify extant anthropological materials and use them effectively

It is not easy to locate anthropological records, except by word of mouth. Primary documents are found in anthropology departments, research centers, private and public museums, specialized federal facilities, university archives

³³ Victor Golla, "The Records of American Indian Linguistics," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d. ed., 143–57; Don D. Fowler and Douglas R. Givens, "The Records of Archaeology," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 97–106. Sometimes past practitioner activities create preservation problems, in addition to those mentioned above. These can include researchers trying to deposit raw material only on computer disks, regardless of whether there is a computer available to read it anymore.

and special manuscript collections, libraries, medical facilities, and corporate archives; in federal, state, and local public and private manuscript repositories; and in local historical societies. (They are also in private offices, basements, garages, and attics.) Unfortunately, many institutions holding critical documents have no trained archivist: frequently a departmental secretary, graduate student, or laboratory technician manages records in addition to his/her regular duties. Rarely are there collection-level inventories or finding aids. Because of this highly scattered situation, no one knows the extent of the anthropological record, what exactly is in it, or where it is.

Knowledge of the locations of existing documents, like artifactual collections, is confined to a small community of scholars and archivists. This knowledge must be obtained anecdotally through professional networks: one person tells another he is working on a certain project, he asks colleagues if they know where relevant papers are housed, and so it goes. The situation makes it even more difficult for native peoples, who are not part of this informal professional network, to locate records relevant to the histories of their communities. There is no clearinghouse or general union catalog that covers the field, nor is there an existing database to help researchers locate pertinent data. There are some useful finding aids that describe individual collections or the corpus of collections in a particular institution. The basic problems, however, are not knowing where to begin a search and not knowing if one has found all pertinent materials. Scholarship suffers as a result because word-of-mouth is haphazard, unnecessarily inefficient, and never thorough.

Part of the difficulty in establishing location is that the records of practitioners are not always housed where one would expect them. Ruth Benedict's papers are little known and underutilized because they are at Vassar College, her alma mater, rather than the more likely Columbia University where she worked; the same is true for the papers of Clark Wissler, Eleanor Leacock, and hundreds of other practitioners. It is also common for an individual's papers to be deposited in several repositories. For example, archaeologist Sylvanus Griswold Morley's records are in the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, in the files of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, which have been relocated to the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, and in the correspondence files of his numerous colleagues around the world. Likewise, in Frederic W. Putnam's Papers at the Harvard University Archives are some of archaeologist George Pepper's notes on Navajo weaving from 1900. Pepper's papers are housed at Tulane University. Thus, researchers must know historic friendship patterns, institutional histories, the personnel on research expeditions, and the social networks of anthropologists in order to locate relevant materials.

It is also not uncommon for small parts of an individual's fieldnotes to become separated from a researcher's central corpus and end up in different repositories because professors often give raw data to their students and protégés

who then fail to return them, as was noted earlier with the example of Robert Lowie's fieldnotes. In order to effectively discover relevant data, the user must know the history of the discipline and who studied with whom. In addition, the papers of an individual may become embedded in the papers of another anthropologist, often without proper identification, forcing researchers to recognize distinctive handwriting styles to establish attribution. This can happen with or without the knowledge of the record generator. Sometimes, record users incorporate someone else's data into their own materials by transferring them from institutional files in repositories to their own data. For example, in the early 1980s, I was working in the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, studying the collecting behavior of early anthropologists and its effect on Southwest Native American material culture and art. I spent almost a year looking for Bureau of American Ethnology expeditionary papers, particularly naturalist-geologist James Stevenson's 1881 inventory of artifacts he had collected at various Pueblos. This list should have been in the museum's accession files, where I had located the inventories of Stevenson's other collecting trips. The day before completing my postdoctoral fellowship, an archival technician processing the John P. Harrington papers presented me with a list of pottery, which was not in Harrington's handwriting. It was the inventory I needed, and I was quite thankful that she had remembered my search. When the inventory became mixed into Harrington's papers, and why he felt he needed it since he did not study Pueblo pottery, is unknown; but he had taken the inventory from the museum's institutional files for his own use and it became part of the corpus of his materials, which were subsequently bequeathed to the archives upon his death. The inventory, upon reentering the Smithsonian Institution, was not returned to the museum accession records where it belonged.

As we looked at more of Harrington's papers, I also noticed that many of the notes on the Northern Rio Grande pueblos were not in his handwriting. Recognizing the handwriting, I discerned that the fieldnotes were actually those of Stevenson's wife, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, the first woman to conduct ethnographic work in the American Southwest. These were materials that had been "officially" missing for years, so marked on the empty manuscript folders in the archives. They also were materials for which I had been looking, and I was glad to finally locate them. Personally, as a frustrated researcher, I would have liked to have seen the Stevenson materials removed from the Harrington papers and placed back in Matilda Stevenson's files with notes placed in the Harrington papers as to their location. I even suggested this to the archival technician, but she insisted that they had to remain as they came into the institution, that is, as part of Harrington's corpus, regardless of whether Harrington had taken them out of the museum's institutional files. This technician told me, that, as the "more important" anthropologist, Harrington now had precedence. Her decision was made not only for expediency, but also with the idea that

transfer of the notes would reflect Harrington's use of the materials by showing how he had cut up Stevenson's data and interspersed it with his own. This practice did make the Harrington data set something new and different from Stevenson's and gave it additional evidential and historical value. One could argue, however, that it was Harrington's raiding of Stevenson's material after her death, when the materials had been accessioned into the Bureau of American Ethnology's manuscript repository that had been the violation of provenance. From my standpoint as a researcher, the reconstruction of the original data was of primary importance, because the integrity of the raw data had been compromised by Harrington and his appropriation was reified by standard archival procedures. To keep Harrington's record group intact made the documents less valuable for me. Similarly, it is extremely difficult for members of northern Rio Grande communities who would like to see Stevenson's data to locate and use it; but it has made research easier for people looking into Harrington's life work.

This situation shows that there will always be competing interests and that these affect how data are organized and later how they can be accessed or underutilized. To the archival processor, to keep a record group intact in the order in which it had been acquired showed respect for the integrity of the collection. The important chronological point on which to base integrity occurred when the material entered (or in the Harrington example reentered) the archives. To anthropological researchers, the prime reference point is when the information was originally generated; in addition, integrity for the records requires contextualization materials to properly interpret the fieldnotes, which in the above example were still with Stevenson's papers. While the decision to leave the documents with Harrington's papers is understandable in terms of archival processing, it has meant that Stevenson's fieldnotes have been scattered, her contribution diminished, and a researcher's ability to locate and use her information compromised.³⁴ Thus, the situation of the Stevenson and Harrington materials serves as an illustration of how researcher paradigms and use needs do not always coincide with established archival frameworks and practices.

Even when researchers know where certain record sets are located, difficulties are encountered in accessing them. Anthropologists are far less likely than historians to receive training in the effective use of documentary materials and can find working in repositories frustrating, in part because there are no cross-indexes by cultures, time periods, or research topics. Anthropologists generally approach research projects through a topic or a culture, (e.g., they

³⁴ It should be noted that I am engaging in researcher "wishful thinking," not criticizing or singling out the NAA per se. It is one of the best repositories in which to conduct anthropological research and I go there whenever I can. What is brought up for discussion here is the fact that a central principle of archival procedure has become so reified from a researcher's standpoint that no other possibilities are being considered. Any organizational principle should be open for discussion.

are interested in Crow social organization), yet material must be accessed in terms of a donor or record creator (i.e., Robert Lowie) and more occasionally a titled research project. The problem is greater when the records were generated by less well-known practitioners. Thus at the moment it is almost impossible for a researcher to use archival materials for a study of Navajo health in the 1930s, Pomo water rights as they have changed over time, or Crow social organization. This situation is compounded by the fact that the descriptive categories and organizational schemes generally used by information specialists are not always those of greatest use to contemporary anthropological researchers or native peoples. Extant subject headings dealing with anthropology are generally ineffective (just as they are under the Library of Congress system, which splinters the field) or outdated. For example, the "Chippewa" are now called by their own cultural designation "Anishinabe," but all finding aids list them as "Chippewa" or "Ojibwa." Similarly, the Tohono O'odham are referred to in informational resources as "Papago," a derogatory term that is generally thought to mean "bean eaters and fartars." The Library of Congress subject headings are not only too broad to be useful, they are often incorrect for most native groups around the world. As a result, collections are inadequately described and fail to meet researcher's needs, thereby making the materials underutilized.³⁵

Because of the dearth of institutional-level guides that tell where relevant materials are housed and cross-indexed finding aids for specific collections that contain critical anthropological information, it usually takes an anthropologist much longer to conduct archival research than to compile data in a field location. The reverse should be the case. Thus, there is a critical need to: (1) produce institutional finding aids that include anthropologically useful categories by topic, time period, and culture; and (2) disseminate information about the scope and location of already accessioned materials via the Internet using a sophisticated search engine and metadata that utilizes these same categories.

CoPAR's Current Focus

Based upon our understanding of the three broad issues discussed above, the members of CoPAR have initiated programs in four thematic areas: awareness and education, locating and accessing extant records, advocacy for repositories already preserving anthropological records, and consulting and technical assistance.

³⁵ For a further discussion of this issue, see Nancy J. Parezo, "The Challenge of Native American Art and Material Culture," *Museum Anthropology* 14, no. 4 (1990): 12–29.

• *Awareness and education*

CoPAR's main function is to foster awareness of the importance of records preservation through educating the various communities which generate, preserve, and use anthropological documents. This includes: (1) educating the profession of anthropology (both individuals and organizations) about preservation needs, ethical and legal issues, and new developments in information management and access; (2) encouraging discussion about these issues and disseminating information on them through the promotion of conferences, workshops, symposia, and relevant publications (articles, books, and a website); (3) educating students as future records creators and users so as to preclude preservation problems; (4) informing preservation and information specialists about the organization, goals, and methods of anthropology and how these can produce unique features in anthropological records (including subdisciplinary distinctions), and the immediate and long-term needs of disciplinary and native users, as well as stressing anthropologist's commonalties with other disciplinary intellectual undertakings; (5) establishing networks and working relationships with other social science and humanities disciplines, and with interested nonacademic communities who use anthropological documents; and, (6) communicating the value of archival materials to policymakers for application to policy and social issues.

To date, CoPAR has concentrated its efforts on educating anthropologists. CoPAR has published and distributed two editions of *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, made available free of charge with the support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, to several thousand anthropologists. (It is now being used in classes, and interested archivists can obtain a copy from the Wenner-Gren Foundation.) We have also developed a brochure and other reference materials designed to help individual anthropologists, as well as academic departments and other institutions holding anthropological records, properly preserve their materials. The most important of these publications are a series of bulletins written by archivists, anthropologists, and librarians on such issues as how to organize field records, how to contact a repository, how to work with a literary advisor, and similar topics that anthropologists have written to CoPAR members about asking for advice.³⁶ These bulletins will be made available shortly on the CoPAR website

³⁶ The current bulletins are: No. 1, *Why Preserve Anthropological Records?* by cultural anthropologist Sydel Silverman; No. 2, *Easy Steps for Preserving Your Anthropological Records*, by archivist Mary Elizabeth Ruwell; No. 3, *Creating Records that Will Last*, by librarian Myra Appel; No. 4, *Locating Archival Quality Supplies*, by Mary Elizabeth Ruwell; No. 5, *Electronic Records: The Upcoming Dark Age*, by archaeologist Don D. Fowler; No. 6, *Photographs and Audiovisual Materials*, by film archivist and NAA director John Homiak; No. 7, *Some Ethical Issues to Consider When Depositing Your Records*, by cultural anthropologist and linguist Catherine S. Fowler; No. 8, *Taking Stock of Your Records*, by biological anthropologist Michael A. Little; No. 9, *Organizing and Transferring Research Records*, by librarian Ruth J. Person; No. 10, *Appointing a Literary Executor, Trustee, or Advisor*, by archaeologist and lawyer Thomas H. Wilson; No. 11, *Finding a Home for Your Records*, by librarian Lynne M. Schmelz; No. 12, *Saving Association Records*, by cultural anthropologist Nancy Parezo; No. 13, *The Special Nature of Linguistic Records*, by linguistic anthropologist Victor

<<http://archaeology.la.asu.edu/COPAR/default.htm>> and in published form, distributed at associational meetings and by mail. In addition, archivist Diane Vogt-O'Connor has written an extremely useful article, "TIPS on How to Research in an Archives," that is appropriate for use in training curricula.³⁷

CoPAR members have also been presenting papers on the intellectual aspects of the initiative at anthropological and archival meetings annually since 1993. Also we have begun discussions about ethical issues that affect record production, management, preservation, and reuse and expect to continue these discussions through workshops and training programs in the coming years.³⁸ The first CoPAR three day training workshop was held in conjunction with the National Park Service and the University of Nevada, Reno in May 1999 for government employees who deal with anthropological materials. Organized and led by NPS archivist Diane Vogt-O'Connor, it attracted over three hundred participants. Plans are being made to incorporate this short course into the University of Nevada's historic preservation program and to present versions of the course at anthropological association meetings. Archivist and historian of anthropology Willow Roberts Powers and archaeologist Joe Watkins have recently held a workshop at the Newberry Library with Native American scholars and tribal archivists in which issues of access, ethics, and protocols for consultation were discussed. Future projects include developing daylong training workshops for practitioners and curriculum modules on preservation issues for graduate research design and methodology classes. Again, the goal is to make preservation a concern while records are being generated, and further the groundbreaking initiative that archivists Mary Anne Kenworthy, Mary Elizabeth Ruwell, and their colleagues began at the University of Pennsylvania in 1985 with the publication of *Preserving Field Records: Archival Techniques for Archaeologists and Anthropologists*.³⁹

CoPAR members have also worked extensively with anthropological associations and helped them develop record retention schedules. We have also endeavored to make preservation a disciplinary priority that has a place in the strategic plans of all organizations (associations, museums, university depart-

Golla.; No. 14, *Ethical Use of Anthropological Records*, by Catherine S. Fowler and historian Steven Crum; No. 15, *The GAR, Guide to Anthropological Records*, by archaeologist and computer specialist Peter McCartney; and No. 16, *Understanding Anthropological Records: Archivists/Librarian Alert*, by archivist and historian of anthropology Willow Roberts Powers. Anticipated future bulletins include issues on the special nature of biological and medical anthropology records. CoPAR encourages members of the archival community to contribute to our efforts to educate record producers by preparing other self-help pamphlets.

³⁷ Diane Vogt-O'Connor, "TIPS on How To Research in an Archives," Special Theme Issue. Archives at the Millennium, *CRM* 22, no. 2 (1999): 10–11. Another useful article is Hugh O'Connor, "Using the Electronic Information Ecosystem for Research," Special Theme Issue, The Information Ecosystem, *CRM* 21, no. 6 (1998): 7–9.

³⁸ The first CoPAR publications on these topics are Catherine Fowler, "Ethical Considerations," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 63–72; Fowler, *Some Ethical Issues to Consider When Depositing Your Records*, and Fowler and Crum, *Ethical Use of Anthropological Records*.

³⁹ Kenworthy, *Preserving Field Records: Archival Techniques for Archaeologists and Anthropologists*.

ments, government agencies, and private contract firms). All anthropology associations now have preservation as part of their strategic and action plans and record retention schedules and agreements with respected archives to preserve their past and future records. In addition, CoPAR has lobbied to ensure that obituaries, which are critical for locating surviving fieldnotes, remain part of major association journals, such as the *American Anthropologist*.⁴⁰

The Wenner-Gren Foundation has also initiated a funding program for individuals who need assistance in preparing their materials for transfer to a repository. Grants of up to \$10,000 are available for holders of records, provided that a repository has agreed to accept the materials. Funds may be used to purchase archival quality preservation materials, hire professional assistance to organize the records, produce an inventory or finding aid, or any other reasonable expenses related to the transfer of records to a repository. The assumptions of the program are that the best person to organize the materials and note any sensitive issues in them is the person who gathered and produced the records and that cooperation between the record holder and the archival repository is essential to a successful transfer and future use. Several grants have already been awarded in this innovative program.⁴¹

• Locating and accessing extant records

A second goal of CoPAR is to gather information on the location of anthropological documents in order to encourage their access and use. To do this, CoPAR has reviewed preservation and access initiatives undertaken by related disciplinary groups with the aim of eventually facilitating coordination among these programs, many of which now exist in isolation. A more ambitious project is to survey anthropological materials already housed in repositories in order to produce and maintain a database and search engine at the metadata level of collections and record unit information by repository. This database will also assist potential donors in locating an appropriate repository for their own papers.⁴² Gaining control over the “grey literature” (in-house published reports

⁴⁰ With the costs of producing disciplinary journals escalating, the editorial board of the *American Anthropologist* eliminated obituaries in the early 1990s, in order to have more room for book reviews and articles. This was a critical mistake since it effectively eliminated part of the intellectual legacy of practitioners. Fortunately, the executive board of the American Anthropological Association recognized this following extensive educational efforts by CoPAR members and the new editor has reinstated intellectual obituaries of anthropologists as well as retained death notices in the *Anthropology Newsletter*. This will help future anthropologists locate anthropological data in repositories.

⁴¹ Information on this program and a list of recent awardees is available from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc., 220 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10001.

⁴² Eventually, CoPAR wants to conduct a survey to discover what has not been preserved in archives but should be—the rich data that is languishing unprotected in people’s attics, basements, and garages as well as in anthropology department offices. This will be a very long-term endeavor and one in which anthropologists will need the active help of the archival community.

with limited distribution that are increasing in developmental anthropology and archaeology) in conjunction with the impressive undertakings of the Society for Applied Anthropology, published in issues of *Practicing Anthropology* and *Human Organization*, the National Park Service's in their National Archaeological Data Base (NADB) <<http://www.uark.edu/d.cast/nadb.html>>, and the Center for the Study of Architecture's database <<http://csaws.brynmawr.edu:443/web1/csa.html>> is a third CoPAR fact-finding endeavor. CoPAR is dedicated to maintaining the results of these surveys as a series of up-to-date information resources on its website.

Peter McCartney of the Archaeological Research Institute, Arizona State University, has created the pilots for the central search engine and database as well as CoPAR's website. The *Guide to Anthropological Records (GAR)* will be a national search engine, master descriptive database and reference tool that will focus on repository locations for collection level entries. (It will not describe materials at the item level or contain any primary data, but will consist of meta-data about collections.) CoPAR's goal is to identify the locations of anthropological records (by providing links to repository on-line finding aids whenever possible) and to systematically describe major record groups using access points common in both anthropological research *and* archival information management schemes. Thus, there will be information on the Franz Boas papers at the American Philosophical Society as is standard in archival information schemes, but there will also be cross-indices that state that the fieldnotes deal with Cochiti, Kwakiutl, oral history, mythology, kinship, anthropometry, migration, race issues, racism, and the like.

GAR is intended to be a user-friendly union guide of anthropological materials in archives, manuscript repositories, and eventually papers in private hands, in North America at the archival collection level, similar in scope to Andrea Hinding, Ames Bower, and Clark Chamber's guide to women's resources in the United States.⁴³ It will have user interface for use via the Internet and telnet protocols. The Web interface will include Map Viewer with zoom and hide capabilities, place marks, and variable display capabilities. The average descriptive record will be in a data query form and will include fields such as archival collection title, accession number, principle investigator/collector, temporal context of the data, dates of the collection, medium, and volume. Information on the research topic of the practitioner's field records will be searchable by keywords cross-indexed by concepts used by practitioners: culture, time period, language, geographic location, and topic (for example, Navajo health concepts during the 1930s or collections containing information on Mimbres archaeological sites).⁴⁴

⁴³ Andrea Hinding, Ames Sheldon Bower, and Clark A. Chambers, eds., *Women's History Sources: A Guide to Archives and Manuscript Collections in the United States* (New York: Bowker Press, 1979).

⁴⁴ For more information on this project see Diane Vogt-O'Connor, "Council for the Preservation of the Anthropological Record and the World Wide Web," *CRM* 18, no. 9 (1995): 34-35.

CoPAR will be slowly building appropriate thesauri for language control over the next few years, since existing thesauri are inadequate for anthropological data. In many ways this is the most daunting task of this project, as archivists well know. Fortunately, Peter McCartney has built the search engine so that it is inclusive: one can request ceramics and one will also obtain information on pottery, pots, or clay, thereby minimizing the language problems that plague data searches. This will also enable the incorporation of new terminology as the field progresses. The CoPAR web master will be able to add new theoretical concepts periodically as well as the preferred names of native groups (for example, Diné as well as Navajo). These entries will be supplemented by an alphabetic list of repository information, which will help researchers contact archivists to discuss holdings in more detail.⁴⁵

• *Advocacy for repositories preserving anthropological records*

CoPAR is endeavoring to serve as an advocate for the health and continued well-being of repositories with significant anthropological collections, such as the National Anthropological Archives (NAA). In May 1997 CoPAR sponsored a workshop to discuss ways to increase the visibility of the NAA within the Smithsonian Institution and to ensure its fiscal viability. The workshop included members of CoPAR, individuals from the Smithsonian's anthropology department, the provost's office, and representatives of other archives and museums in the Smithsonian, including Edie Hedlin, past president of the Society of American Archivists and archivist at the Smithsonian, and the NAA's director John Homiak, a visual anthropologist. The Secretary and Provost of the Smithsonian have received the workshop's report favorably and are acting upon its recommendations. To date, these have included increasing professional and support personnel to replace individuals whose positions have been lost due to retirements and federal budget cuts, providing funds for specific preservation projects, providing off-site space for little used materials to decrease the overcrowding in the current area, and the hiring of an archivist for the new Museum of the American Indian who will work in consort with other Smithsonian and NAA archivists. In the future, CoPAR hopes to serve a similar function for any other centers that are dedicated to, or specialize in,

⁴⁵ It is anticipated that the pilot for this project will be available by December 1999 for comment. In addition CoPAR project anthropologists and archivists will work on thesauri and category refinement during 2000 and 2001. We hope that archivists will comment on GAR, its data collection protocol and data quality control measures, and its categories to ensure that the database will be user friendly and useful for both disciplines. While data will be entered during the next several years, users will be able to utilize GAR as soon as it is made public. Individuals wishing more information on this project can contact archivist Mary Elizabeth Ruwell or Peter McCartney, Information Manager, Archeological Research Institute, ANTH Tempe Center 821, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 85287, or peter.mccartney@asu.edu.

the preservation of anthropological materials and that may need the support of their constituencies.

• *Consulting and technical assistance*

CoPAR's fourth area of effort is to provide consultation with and technical assistance to professional and vocational anthropologists about the basics of records transfer, bequests, and other aspects of the preservation process. Specifically, we intend to: (1) help individuals and organizations locate and properly preserve their records through the development of guidelines and advice on repository selection; (2) offer assistance on preservation and repatriation issues to a number of communities; (3) provide referral service for oral histories of practitioners; (4) encourage oral histories concerning major disciplinary developments, institutional histories, and individual careers; and, (5) advocate increased research and publication on the history of anthropology and longitudinal and ethnohistoric research that utilize preserved field records.

Preserving the Anthropological Record: A Collaborative Effort

Immediate and long-term collaborative efforts on the part of anthropologists, the archival/information science community, and relevant native communities are needed to save the anthropological record. This will ensure that these crucial documents relating to the peoples of the world, their histories, and the history of anthropology are preserved and made accessible for the benefit of current and future generations.

Archival and manuscript repositories are doing an extraordinary job of saving the world's cultural heritage and history by preserving anthropological records. This is being done in an era of tight and diminishing budgets through the efforts of overworked and underpaid personnel. CoPAR wants to see support for these repositories increased and will try to advocate for increased budgeting and a higher prioritization for anthropological records in these repositories. CoPAR also plans to advocate for the creation of a series of consortia through which existing archives and libraries will be affiliated regionally, building up a network of institutions committed to preserving the anthropological record. The first such consortium has been formed in 1999 by the libraries of the Arizona State Museum, the Museum of Northern Arizona, and the Heard Museum, with a focus on the heritage of Southwestern anthropology. This incipient consortium will accept field records that relate to the peoples of the Greater Southwest, and the members will work together in the future to develop

joint finding aids.⁴⁶ CoPAR hopes to encourage the formation of many more such consortia. Since anthropology is an eclectic field and its records are varied, we envision repositories dedicated to certain geographical areas, like the Melanesian Archives established at the University of California at San Diego, as well as sets of institutions in particular regions, which will work together on a variety of preservation projects.⁴⁷

To accomplish CoPAR's four main goals will take the combined effort of groups of archivists and anthropologists. Representing the needs of the anthropological community and researchers who will utilize anthropological documents, CoPAR has identified six basic steps that archivists can take to make the anthropological record more useful and accessible through a series of collaborative efforts.

• *Begin incorporating cross-index concepts by culture and subject matter in finding aids*

Topical data are more crucial and of greater importance to anthropologists than the individual who generated the data. It is almost impossible at the moment for a researcher to determine where data on Lakota kinship, Creole language, specific archaeological sites such as those in the Tonto Basin, or Oaxacan agricultural practices are located in repositories and museums. There is as yet no mechanism to discover where relevant materials on individual tribes, cultures, ethnic groups, indigenous communities or societies, locales, time periods, or research problems are held.⁴⁸

CoPAR does not suggest that any repository reorganize their holdings in a particular manner, nor necessarily change the organizational techniques to be applied to materials that will be accessioned in the future. We do encourage archivists to expand their descriptive schemes to add subject reference categories that reflect the ways scholars and native community members think about, and want to access, anthropological data to their inventories and finding aids. Such categories would include information on culture, site, time period, geographical region, subject matter, and specific research topic (for example, archaeological sites with evidence of irrigation for the Hohokam in the classic period or nineteenth-century rice cultivation in Borneo). The most

⁴⁶ For more information on this initiative, contact Mary Graham, Librarian, Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721. We anticipate that this will be a model program for the sharing of disciplinary and regional interests.

⁴⁷ See Donald Tuzin, "The Melanesian Archive," in Silverman and Parezo, *Preserving the Anthropological Record*, 2d ed., 23–34. For more information on the Melanesian Archive, contact Dr. Donald Tuzin, Department of Anthropology, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92093.

⁴⁸ The situation is compounded by the fact that anthropological materials are frequently associated with other disciplines, especially history and sociology.

critical is culture, knowing that the data originated in Ashanti, Black Seminole, Cherokee, Farsi, Hottentot, or Tsembaga communities for ethnographic, biological, and linguistic materials, and place and time period for archaeological data. Research subject communities have expressed similar needs; many have indicated they would like photographs listed by culture and topic (i.e., housing, clothing, religious ceremony, pottery manufacturing) as well as the name of the photographer. These additions will go a long way toward connecting frustrated users with the wealth of resources already available.

This is not an easy undertaking and is another of the most ambitious parts of CoPAR's agenda. While there are some good thesauri for art history (the Getty's *Art and Architecture Thesaurus*) and for anthropological literature (the Tozzer Library catalogs and the thesauri of the Human Relations Area File), no shared controlled vocabulary list exists for anthropology in archival settings.⁴⁹ To build such a thesauri, one that can be dynamic to meet the changing needs of the field, will require a great deal of hard work and the input of all concerned users.

• **Accept the field records of less well-known professionals and vocational anthropologists**

Many archivists evaluate anthropological records on the models of other disciplines, and thus tend to think of saving primarily the core materials and correspondence of the major practitioners in the field. Because of this hierarchical paradigm of value, it has been difficult to convince some archivists that the papers of anthropology's "Great Men and Women" (i.e., the theoreticians who have worked in major research universities, and who originated grand theories or wrote synthetic works), are not necessarily the most important documents from the standpoint of anthropological research. While these materials certainly have value for understanding western intellectual history, the most valuable records containing anthropological information are those of the great field-workers—the data gatherers. These individuals are often not well known even

⁴⁹ See David Bearman, "Archives and Museum Data Models and Dictionaries," *Archives and Museum Informatics Technical Reports* No. 10 (1990); James R. Glenn, *Guide to the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, 1992); Avra Michelson, "Archives and Authority Control," *Archives and Museum Informatics Technical Reports* No. 6 (1988); George Peter Murdock and Timothy J. O'Leary, *Ethnographic Bibliography of North America*, 4th ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Human Relations Area Files Press, 1975); Toni Peterson, Director, *Art and Architecture Thesaurus*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); D. Andrew Roberts, *Terminology for Museums* (Washington, D.C.: Museum Documentation Association, 1990); Helen R. Tibbo, "The Epic Struggle: Subject Retrieval from Large Bibliographic Databases," *American Archivist* 57 (Spring 1994): 310–26. The need for updated cultural designations and subject matter categories is also a problem in other humanities and social science disciplines (see Constance C. Gould, *Information Needs in the Humanities: An Assessment* (Report prepared for the Program for Research Information Management of the Research Libraries Group, Inc., Mountain View, Calif.: 1988).

inside the field, in part because of biases in how an anthropologist's work is evaluated and the long-standing neglect of certain categories of individuals (such as women, applied practitioners, and teachers in small colleges) by historians of anthropology as well as the academy.⁵⁰ This problem becomes even greater when the field worker is a vocational practitioner, not a professional. Ironically, such individuals are well known and highly respected in the communities where they worked because of the long time they spent "in the field." Thus, we hope that the archival community will broaden its definitions of "important," "great," and "anthropologist" and think in terms of the value of the anthropological information, not only the reputation of the document generator.

• ***Help CoPAR locate where preserved anthropological data are housed***

Almost all anthropologists who conduct research that utilizes previously generated data now have to rely on word-of-mouth to discover where relevant data are, and they need to know the name of the researcher (or the donor) in order to determine from the archivist whether the material is actually in the repository. This process is not efficient. We hope that archivists will provide the data needed for our project, the *Guide to Anthropological Records* (GAR), as well as basic information on their repositories that will enable CoPAR to link its database and search engine to the archivist's Web pages. CoPAR archivists will be contacting many repositories in the next few years to ensure that the information in GAR is accurate.

• ***Designate regional repositories that will agree to dedicate some space to anthropological materials and help to develop consortia***

Anthropological data are not appropriate for every archives or manuscript repository. Therefore, CoPAR envisions a number of consortia or regional repositories across North America, and eventually around the world, that will house records relating to the peoples and cultures of each region. These consortia could consist of groups of established repositories housed in museums, historical societies, and universities and repositories being established by native communities. Designated regional repositories would accept documents with information of anthropological value, regardless of the generator's institutional affiliation or vocational status, as well as duplicates of relevant original materials

⁵⁰ See Nancy J. Parezo, "Anthropology, the Welcoming Science," in Parezo, *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*, 3–38, for an analysis of systemic bias in this area. However, it should be noted that some great theoreticians are also great data gatherers.

housed in distant repositories. Such duplicated materials would particularly be of value to researchers from native communities, who do not have the funds to conduct extensive archival searches but need the information for their cultural preservation initiatives.

Important benefits of this regional approach will be that research projects will be accomplished more quickly and that anthropologists and their heirs will have appropriate repositories to which to transfer their papers for preservation. CoPAR would like to compile a list of institutions that will accept anthropological documents, with descriptions of their collections' scope and policies, and make this information available to the anthropological community. CoPAR members will be contacting repositories to compile and publish such a listing.

• *Help CoPAR convince anthropology departments to transfer records to professional repositories with trained archivists*

In CoPAR's survey of American anthropology departments, we discovered that many important records are in danger, crammed in closets, in boxes under desks, and even in bathrooms. CoPAR needs the help of the archival community to convince anthropology departments to release these papers to repositories that can properly care for them. While many department heads feel that the institutional archives in universities should care for such materials, in some cases this may be neither possible nor desirable. Nevertheless, we would encourage university archivists and librarians to contact anthropology departments, assess their document situation, and help them transfer data to appropriate repositories.

• *Help train anthropologists to recognize that their unpublished data are as important as their published materials; that their information-carrying documents are their professional immortality*

We must engender in the profession the attitude that data once generated or collected are important enough to be preserved, unless proven otherwise. Such data are irreplaceable—to our society and to the peoples from whom the information was obtained. To do this we need to develop curricula to teach future anthropologists how to use quality materials in the first place, to understand the instability of computer disks, how to organize files, and to flag sensitive materials that in special cases the archivist may need to restrict. We must also train anthropologists how to use archival materials. This training is sorely lacking in methodology courses, and archivists will be needed to help design the modules.

A Final Thought

CoPAR has an ambitious agenda for the next few years. It is multifaceted and ambitious because we realize that the problems are complex and not easy to solve. But, like archivists who have devoted their lives to preserving valuable information, we feel the undertaking will be worth the effort. Anthropological records are one of America's largest hidden and underutilized cultural and intellectual resource. It is also likely that there will be an explosion of research that relies heavily on anthropological documents in the coming years, conducted not only by anthropologists but also by other humanistic scholars, social scientists, native scholars, and community members.⁵¹ Future researchers will increasingly rely on preserved documents and will turn to archivists for help in understanding the structure of fieldnotes. As the number of scholars increases, research subject communities will establish their own repositories and codify their own use procedures. One key to this increased demand will be the elimination of frustration with regard to location and access and the elimination of preservation problems before they become the problem of information specialists.

Anthropology is not unique in this trend. It will be common in all the social-behavioral sciences and the humanities. And as interdisciplinary work increases, the demands for field data and related contextualizing documents will increase as well. Working together, archivists and anthropologists can save the anthropological record and make it an incredibly valuable resource for the exciting scholarship that will come in the next century.

⁵¹ There are several reasons why demand for anthropological records is likely to increase. Anthropology is changing and traditional field sites are drying up in the sense that anthropologists do not conduct research in small scale, rural communities. In some venues, such as parts of China, original research is no longer permitted. People who want to work in the area, especially those who have already invested time and effort in fieldwork there, are working on archival materials. There is also a growing interest in the history of anthropology and its role in colonialism and the modern world, and in issues of globalization. Finally, native communities are hiring anthropologists to conduct research for them. They want to have cultural histories and need to use fieldnotes for their construction. Likewise, recent laws like the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act require looking at original fieldnotes in order to establish cultural patrimony, sacredness, and the like.