

## Reviews

---

**Elisabeth Kaplan, Editor**

### **Leadership and Administration of Successful Archival Programs**

Edited by Bruce W. Dearstyne. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001. vii, 150 pp. Index. \$59.95. ISBN: 0-313-31575-2.

In our work with the long-term records of organizations, archivists continually see how strong leaders can shape institutional growth. We also know from our general awareness of archival institutions in the United States that successful growth is usually attributable to the work of an individual or a small handful of dedicated leaders. It seems ironic then that we have done so little to apply this knowledge to the improvement of our own institutions and our profession. *Leadership and Administration of Successful Archival Programs* is a new resource on this subject and a welcome addition to our professional literature. Its contention is that the archival profession has not paid sufficient attention to the importance of leadership, and its purpose is "to provide guidance on exemplary practices and programs" (p. vii).

Bruce Dearstyne is the editor and the author of two of the nine essays. Dearstyne has reflected on the importance of leadership through a productive career at the New York State Archives and Records Administration, as a teacher at the University of Maryland, and as a leader of the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators. The other seven contributors are archivists who have also proven themselves successful administrators in a variety of settings. Their essays describe practices, techniques, and strategies from their experiences that are likely to be useful to the rest of us.

Many of the basic tools and practices of leadership are common to any organization. All leaders, for instance, have to find ways of succeeding within the unique environments of their larger institutions. The authors of these essays have achieved success themselves by finding creative ways for their archives to support the mission of their parent institutions. Phil Mooney's assessment of corporate archives (Coca-Cola) and Lauren Brown's review of archives in academic settings (the University of Maryland Libraries) are especially valuable in speaking to this point.

Frank Burke, in addition to being a former acting archivist of the United States and executive director of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, was a manuscripts archivist at the University of Chicago and the Library of Congress and a teacher at the University of Maryland. His essay describes different types of archives and the techniques that may work in each. Burke reminds us as well that many of the basic tools for success in archives grow out of those human qualities that make for success elsewhere.

Lisa Fagerlund, the most widely traveled of the authors, offers a personal case study. She has worked in archives of the City of Portland (Oregon), the State of Utah, the World Health Organization, and the United Nations. In each new setting, Fagerlund faced the challenge of learning how to function effectively and of building a program to meet the needs of the larger organization. She reflects frankly on efforts she felt were successful and others that fell short.

Richard Cox worked at the Maryland Historical Society, the Baltimore Municipal Archives, and state archives in Alabama and New York before becoming a professor in the School of Information Studies at the University of Pittsburgh. In his essay on the relationship between archival education and leadership, Cox recognizes the importance of leadership and even emphasizes his view that leadership can be learned, but discourages efforts to add a component on leadership to graduate programs in archival administration because of his concern that the curriculum for these programs is already full. He does suggest ways archival educators can themselves show leadership and also how they can help nurture and provide support for prospective leaders.

Michael Kurtz offers a case study, an especially interesting and conspicuously visible one, on leadership initiatives at his institution, the U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Kurtz tracks strategic planning efforts within the Archives over the course of a decade. While noting that a complete assessment of the process's effectiveness can only be made later, he does emphasize both the value of strategic planning as an instrument of leadership and the importance of leadership involvement for successful planning.

Larry Hackman has also worked in a variety of institutions—from the Kennedy Presidential Library, to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, to the New York State Archives and Records Administration, to the Truman Presidential Library. Hackman's essay is an effort to distill his considerable experience into two broad sets of ideas. His "ways of thinking" are assumptions that have informed his efforts, such as: "An agenda with sound strategies is better than a detailed plan." His second set of ideas, eight "suggestions for acting," is as close to a recipe for leadership success as we are likely to find anywhere.

In the two concluding essays, Dearstyne first describes characteristics that tend to mark "well-led programs" and elements of leadership that help build those programs. The other essay is a compilation of statements regarding

different aspects of archival leadership taken from reports or position papers by a variety of archival organizations over the last five years.

As with most collections of essays, *Leadership and Administration of Successful Archival Programs* lacks the unity of a single, coherent voice, and at times the lists threaten to overwhelm the reader. On the other hand, one of the book's strengths is the range and variety of useful ideas and practices it presents. Perhaps even more important is the sense that emerges from all these essays of the authors' passion for and dedication to their work. A commitment to the institution's mission appears to be the wellspring of their leadership, and those who shoulder leadership responsibilities can learn from the authors' attitudes as well as from their practices. As a compilation of valuable ideas and a commentary on the importance of leadership, this work will be useful for the instruction of new archivists. It is also a work for emerging leaders and seasoned veterans alike to read and ponder, and perhaps later to read again.

EDWIN C. BRIDGES

*Alabama Department of Archives and History*

### **Appraising Moving Images: Assessing the Archival and Monetary Value of Film and Video Records**

By Sam Kula. Lanham, Md., and Oxford: Scarecrow Press, 2002. vii, 155 pp. Bibliography. Index. \$40.00 ISBN 0-8108-4368-4.

Archival literature on the appraisal of film and video is almost non-existent. Thus it is a welcome contribution to the field that Sam Kula, who is internationally recognized for his work in the field of moving image archives, has written a book on the subject. The current president of the Association of Moving Image Archivists, Kula started his career at the British Film Institute, then moved to the American Film Institute and went on to establish the National Film and Television Archives at the Canadian National Archives.

*Appraising Moving Images: Assessing the Archival and Monetary Value of Film and Video Records* is organized into five chapters, with a bibliography and index. The book opens with a brief history of moving image archives. As early as 1898, the Polish cinematographer Boleslaw Matuszewski recognized that films were historical documents and recommended that a worldwide network of archives be established to acquire and conserve films. But it was not until the 1930s that the pioneering work in this field was begun, most notably by Henri Langlois at the Cinematheque Francaises in Paris, Ernest Lindgren at the National Film Library in London, and Iris Barry at the Museum of Modern Art Film Library in New York. The International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) established

in 1938 and International Federation of Television Archives founded in 1978 have been instrumental worldwide in promoting and supporting moving image acquisition and preservation standards and policies.

A chapter on appraisal theory reviews archival literature on the appraisal of textual documentation and how it might be applied to moving image material. Kula's focus is on historical significance and evidentiary and information values, and it cites relevant writing on these principles by Jenkinson, Schellenberg, Boles, Young, Eastwood, Duranti, and others. The author points out that moving image archivists are not inclined to develop appraisal guidelines; if developed at all they tend to be institutionally specific and often unreasonably all-inclusive.

Kula states that moving images can "be categorized by provenance, function, and form" (p. 53). Form, as it pertains to moving images, concerns their structure and intended purpose, such as fiction versus nonfiction. Function concerns the circumstances under which a production was initiated and the reaction to that production. A chapter on appraisal policies and practices provides models of moving image archives' operations from around the world. The author covers the appraisal of textual documentation generated during the production process and the importance of these materials for potential re-use/re-edit and evidentiary value. An extensive chapter examines the importance and role of the archivist in appraising moving images for monetary value.

Despite the fact that film was introduced at the end of the nineteenth century and television in the 1930s, it was not until the latter half of the twentieth century that there was a general acceptance of the worthiness of moving images as a source material for study and collection. Nevertheless, Kula says there continues to be little systematic, intuitive, or opportunistic acquisition of moving images by archives and libraries or by the moving image industry itself. As a result, the earliest years of moving image history have been lost and the future preservation of our existing and growing film and television collections pose a significant archival challenge.

Kula does not pretend to present scientific "facts" on appraisal of moving images nor does he espouse philosophy, but rather suggests some guidelines for assessing moving images. He believes that the "analysis of the facts" about an acquisition is imperative. Specifically you need to know the "context and subtext" of a work or collection to determine if it will be of value to your archive. Accordingly, Kula writes, "you must know the work in context, in relation to other works and to the creators and the administrative unit that sponsored the work, and to the particular economic and social conditions and the ideological framework in which it was created and distributed" (p. 127).

While collecting strategies, appraisal theory and practice vary widely in the moving image archives community, there tend to be three major points of agreement. The first is that age—in and of itself—is an important appraisal criterion and requires vigilant attention to assure survival. Second is the con-

sensus that most, if not all, moving images have significant informational value. Third is the fact that as mass media, film and television will become part of the public record. There are appraisal principles that pertain specifically to moving images. Kula notes that the aesthetic principle, film as art, is both “subjective and transitory” (p. 43). Collecting film as art is prone to be influenced by what the users (film historians, critics, and others) consider to be the “canon.” Another principle is appraising moving images as part of the history of an industry and its production technology. Kula cites the principle of “universal retention.” This applies to the acquisition of all works of a particular producer, director, or other creative individuals recognized for their influence in the moving image art and industry world. Finally, and more controversial, is appraising moving images, especially feature film, based on their sociological or psychological impact. This has been applied to the collection of works dealing with the rise of Nazism in the 1920s and 1930s and the threat of nuclear war and the Cold War.

While the nature, purpose, and value of production-related textual documentation is covered, this chapter lacks a thorough discussion of film and video production elements—the various pieces of film and video that make up a master or finished program. The elements mentioned are interviews and trailers, but many archivists will find themselves confronted with a vast array of production media elements and no idea of their value, place or importance in the production process. A discussion of such items as answer prints, B-rolls, camera rolls, conversion masters, core-offs, iso reels, mix elements, trims, and work prints would have been helpful. While there is discussion of the DVD (Digital Video Disc) with film director’s cuts, there is no real focus on the purpose and uses of television production elements that warrant retention by archives.

My only overall criticism of this work is that it focuses on film at the expense of television, with the emphasis on the finished master film rather than collective entities of the production process. This point is becoming critically important as moving image archivists move into the digital film and television production arena. As Howard Besser has written, moving image archivists need to “shift from a paradigm centered around saving a completed work to a new paradigm of saving a wide body of materials that contextualizes a work.”<sup>1</sup> We should be more proactive in identifying ancillary production materials that may have historical, institutional, and commercial value. Indeed, as always, another tough appraisal conundrum.

MARY IDE  
*WGBH Educational Foundation*

<sup>1</sup> Howard Besser, “Digital Preservation of Moving Image Material?,” *The Moving Image* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 44.

**Trophies of War and Empire: The Archival Heritage of Ukraine, World War II, and the International Politics of Restitution.**

By Patricia Kennedy Grimsted. Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2001. xlvii, 749 pp. Appendices. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$19.00 members, \$25.00 nonmembers, soft cover. ISBN: 0-916458-76-8.

Reviews that begin by describing a work with superlatives such as “a tour-de-force” or “a stunning intellectual achievement” might well inspire skepticism in the critical reader. Yet it is difficult to characterize Patricia Kennedy Grimsted’s *Trophies of War and Empire: The Archival Heritage of Ukraine, World War II, and the International Politics of Restitution* in more prosaic terms. As a senior research associate at Harvard University’s Ukrainian Research Institute and a coordinator of ArcheoBiblioBase, a directory of library and archival institutions and sources in Ukraine and the Russian Federation, Grimsted is uniquely positioned to analyze the current archival situation in the Russian Federation and its fourteen successor states. She brings over thirty-five years as an authority on Soviet and post-Soviet archives to this meticulously researched and documented work, which Charles Kecskeméti, Secretary-General, emeritus, of the International Council on Archives, credits with “open[ing] a new chapter in the history of archival literature” (p. xii).

*Trophies of War* consists of two distinct but vitally interconnected sections. The first examines the literature of archives and international law to consider issues related to the devolution of archives in successor states. Ukraine serves as the focus for this discussion, but the descriptive typology that Grimsted develops for identifying and defining the Ukrainian archival heritage abroad is a model that could be adapted for use by other successor states (Grimsted notes that she has adapted this typology from her previous efforts to identify the Russian archival legacy abroad). The second part of *Trophies of War* traces the displacement of archives and other historically significant materials, including books and works of art, during World War II and the subsequent efforts of European nations to regain important portions of their archival legacies. Utilizing historical analyses and archival sources in countries including Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Poland, the former Soviet Union, Ukraine, and the United States, Grimsted paints a fascinating picture of the extent of archival displacement resulting from World War II. The ongoing alienation of many of these archival and cultural resources from their countries of origin continues to have significant intellectual, social, and political impact on diplomatic relations among European countries.



While these two portions of *Trophies of War*—devolution of archives from predecessor states to successor states and the restitution or return of archives following war—are discrete issues, Grimsted demonstrates that “they have become intertwined in the public mind and in politics” (p. 489); in practical terms they remain separate only on a theoretical level.

Much recommends *Trophies of War* to the archival community. It provides an absorbing account of archives in Ukraine—a history complicated by frequent shifts in boundaries and political control across the centuries. Grimsted also chronicles the development of the modern archival profession in Ukraine, tracing the difficulties of the country’s current archival situation to the politicization of archives and the purges of archivists under Stalin in the 1930s. She summarizes the effects on archives of the Stalin era as follows: “The tragic consequences of the liquidation of a generation of professionally trained historians and archivists were inadequate reference work in the archives and, perhaps more importantly, that no one was left to train younger specialists. The suppression of professional archival standards thus had a multiplying effect on subsequent generations of Soviet and present-day archivists” (p. 9). Grimsted emphasizes the underdeveloped system of archival description in Ukraine, noting that not a single finding aid for Ukrainian archival sources was published in the decade following independence and citing this weakness as a major obstacle to the country’s attempts to reconstitute its archival heritage.

Certainly Ukraine’s complex history presents daunting challenges to any efforts to reclaim its archival legacy. These endeavors must incorporate the examination of records not only in the Russian Federation, but also “in the bordering states and former imperial capitals of Poland, Austria, Hungary, the now separate Czech and Slovak republics, Romania, and Turkey—that is, in all the successor States to the major powers that earlier governed the lands that now constitute Ukraine” (p. 12). According to the archival principle of provenance, Ukraine has legitimate pretensions for the return of records created within its territories and now held in other countries; however, in many cases these records of Ukrainian provenance have become so entwined with fonds in other countries that they have become records of joint heritage. In such cases—and in cases where records are of pertinence to Ukraine (that is, related to, but not created in, Ukraine)—Grimsted advocates an economically impractical solution—that the repository housing the archives in question should make available good quality microform copies of the originals at an affordable price.

Much of Ukraine’s success in reconstituting its archival heritage, of course, relies on the cooperation of the Russian Federation, which views itself as the rightful successor state to the Soviet Union and as such has nationalized the entire archival holdings of the U.S.S.R. into a single Archival Fond of the Russian Federation. Early hopes—engendered by a 1992 agreement among the Russian Federation and the other members of the Commonwealth of

Independent States in 1992—for the smooth and timely transfer of records to the appropriate successor states did not materialize; only one private transfer to Ukraine had taken place by the time this book went to press. This lack of progress is due in part to the Russian Federation's preoccupation with issues related to international pressure for the restitution of cultural materials—many of which had long been thought lost—looted by the Soviet Union during the Second World War. While the other Allies pursued policies for the restitution of displaced cultural materials in the years following the war, Stalin adopted a policy of seizing them as a form of reparations. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the scale of this looting was exposed for the first time. Unfortunately for the cause of cultural restitution, these revelations took place during a period of increasing nationalization in Russian politics, which culminated in the 1998 passage of a “spoils of war” law. This legislation nationalized all seized cultural materials as the property of the Russian Federation, making negotiations for restitution extremely difficult, as each individual case would require a special act of parliament. The result of this legislation has been the Russian Federation's “renewed ‘Cold War’ on the cultural front with the European Community” (p. 422).

As interesting as Grimsted's case study of Ukrainian archival heritage and her analysis of World War II restitution issues are, the chief contribution of *Trophies of War* lies in her call for the development of international standards and principles to govern the devolution of archives to successor states and their return or restitution following periods of war and occupation. Grimsted surveys discussions about the return of dispersed archives that have taken place under the auspices of the International Council on Archives, the United Nations, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in recent decades and the resolutions that have emerged from these meetings. (Helpfully, the texts of several key documents are provided as appendices, and URLs for others are provided in footnotes.) While there is international agreement that each nation has an inalienable right to its archival heritage, existing resolutions are inadequate for the purposes of assisting in the recovery of displaced archival resources. Thus, Grimsted argues,

What is needed on the international front today is not more resolutions or another agreement that provides for more bilateral discussions and bilateral agreements. Realistic guidelines and mechanisms should involve more precise attempts to define in principle, and with concrete examples, the nature and types of archival materials that might be legitimately subject to claim in terms of their provenance, and additional data regarding the circumstances of migration (and/or alienation from the homeland) that might substantiate these claims. (p. 81)

The international politics of restitution is an extremely complicated and evermore high-profile business. It is imperative for the archival community to



take an active and continuing role in this arena, unless it wishes to abdicate responsibility for alienated archives to lawyers, diplomats, and the court of public opinion. Grimsted's call to action is especially timely in light of recent history (conflicts and reorganization of the Balkan States, the new regime in Afghanistan, and so forth) and current events, such as the ongoing military action in Iraq.

*Trophies of War* is indeed a landmark achievement, remarkable for its depth and breadth. In addition to its appeal for archivists, it will be a must-read for those involved in cultural restitution issues, an invaluable resource for scholars on Eastern Europe, and pure enjoyment for historians and history buffs everywhere. It is impossible to do justice to this thoroughly researched work of scholarship in a brief overview. Readers will find that the true pleasure and value of this volume is in the details—in the precedents cited as the author outlines the archival heritage of Ukraine and in the recounting of specific cases of World War II plunder and restitution. More generally, *Trophies of War and Empire* draws attention to the significance of archives by placing them, as Charles Kecskeméti notes, “in the very heart of 20<sup>th</sup>-century politics, wars, cold wars, and power games” (pp. xii–xiii). And for that, the archival profession can be profoundly grateful.

JENNIFER A. MARSHALL  
*University of Pittsburgh*

### **A History of the Farmington Plan**

By Ralph D. Wagner. Boston: Scarecrow Press, 2002. xii, 454 pp. Bibliography. Index. Cloth, \$69.50. ISBN 0-8108-4259-9.

To the extent that archivists know anything about the Farmington Plan, it's probably from brief exposure to it in one of their courses in library school. What they likely remember is that it was a failed attempt at early library cooperation spawned by an effort to collect “[a]t least one copy of every book published anywhere in the world following the effective date of the agreement, which might conceivably be of interest to a research worker in America.” Freelance writer Ralph Wagner's dissertation-turned-monograph provides a more nuanced and thoughtful story of the Farmington Plan from conception to closure.

The Farmington Plan takes its name from the town in Connecticut where, in the fall of 1942, an advisory committee to the Librarian of Congress met to discuss cooperation among the research library community of North America. Within six years the plan became operational—a cooperative foreign acquisitions program with assigned responsibility for various subject areas—under the aegis of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The list of luminaries

involved in the project is both long and impressive—Princeton librarian, historian, and editor of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Julian Boyd; Harvard librarian and author of the standard text on library buildings, Keyes Metcalf; poet laureate and Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish; American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) director and former SAA president, Waldo Gifford Leland; University of North Carolina librarian and scholar, Robert B. Downs; and a host of others. Philanthropy from the Rockefeller Foundation, ACLS, and the Carnegie Corporation, along with support from the Council on Library Resources and the American Library Association, and the sponsorship of ARL helped launch and sustain the program in its early years.

Author Wagner argues that the history of the Farmington Plan is really three histories: 1) of the 1942 proposal, 2) “of the specific foreign acquisitions programs instituted by ARL to achieve the goals,” and 3) “of the term itself and the various connotations that have been attached to it since its inception.” To sketch these histories, he exhaustively examined the relevant published and archival sources, especially archival sources at Harvard, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Library of Congress, and the New York Public Library. Rather than use these sources to construct a traditional chronological narrative, Wagner opts for a social scientist’s approach, using Herrington Bryce’s text on strategic management for nonprofit organizations as his organizing framework. While imaginative in its conception, it fails to deliver more than would a standard historical treatment and leads to repetition and unnecessary length. Careful editing might have shortened the volume by a quarter without compromising the reader’s understanding of the Farmington Plan, its origins, and its outcome.

At a time when library cooperation and collaboration are seen not just as velleities, but as necessities in an increasingly fragmented world in which evanescent digital information can be easily copied, transmitted, corrupted or lost, does an autopsy of the Farmington Plan have relevance today? What caused the plan’s eventual discontinuation and transformation? One daunting aspect was the sheer ambitiousness of the plan—collecting and cataloging from around the world at least one copy of any book with conceivable research value! Today, OCLC is the closest we’ve come to a world catalog, but even collectively the research libraries in North America do not have the resources to collect comprehensively. But Farmington foundered for mundane reasons as well—unreliable foreign book jobbers, the exclusion of important works in various subject areas, lack of uniform agreement about selection parameters, and the failure of research libraries to catalog acquired material in a timely manner. Behind all these lurked the nemesis of many voluntary cooperative ventures that plague the archives/library world today and that frequently drive resource allocation decisions—shifting local priorities and competition among participating institutions.

## R E V I E W S

It is fitting to give Wagner the last word in this review:

[T]he Farmington Plan's failure was almost dictated by the nature of its central concern. Marginal library materials are and will remain politically marginal. They are the concern of scholars working in obscure fields, who are unlikely to unite in support of a concept of collecting the marginal. They are today's legacy to tomorrow's scholars, whose assessment of them may be dramatically different, but who have no voice in today's decisions.

A good lesson for archivists and librarians alike.

NICHOLAS BURCKEL  
*Marquette University*