

BOOK REVIEWS

Jeannette A. Bastian, Editor

Museum Archives: An Introduction, Second Edition

Edited by Deborah Wythe. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, Museum Archives Section, 2004. 256 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. Resource Guide. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$45.00 members, \$62.00 nonmembers. ISBN 1-931666-06-7.

Exhibitions and expeditions; curators and collections; this is the unique and occasionally eccentric institutional context of the museum archives.

Deborah Wythe, archivist at the Brooklyn Museum of Art, is both editor of and contributor to the second edition of this volume. Contributions by fifteen other museum professionals comprise this sizable, comprehensive, and highly informative reference work. The first edition, thirty-five pages in length and published by SAA in 1984, was described by its author, William A. Deiss, as a "manual." It reflects the beginning of the museum archives movement, which is explicated in detail by Ann Marie Pryzbyla in the first chapter of the current second edition.

Much has changed in the twenty years between the two editions. Deiss wrote in his introduction that only a small number of the more than 6,000 museums in the United States had archives programs, and "the purpose of this manual is to encourage museums to preserve their historically valuable records, and to offer guidelines for the establishment of museum archives." Progress since that time can be seen in that four of the contributors to the second edition (including the editor) were hired to start up museum archives programs, and Peter C. Marzio, director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, who wrote the foreword to the volume, was responsible for starting archival programs in two of the institutions that he directed. The book was produced based on the efforts of the Museum Archives Section of SAA, which did not exist when the first edition was published.

A collaborative work of 256 pages, this new edition is composed of twenty-three chapters that cover the history and context of museum archives, advice on getting started, basic archival activities within the museum context (e.g., appraisal, arrangement), description, research use, ethics, and outreach, as well as a chapter on oral history. Like its predecessor volume, it addresses

records surveys and management, but expands the discussion to include disaster planning and specific material types; photos and audiovisuals; architectural records; electronic records; objects; field records; and scientific notebooks.

The last two chapters, both of which relate to the return of improperly or illegally obtained museum objects or artifacts, make up a separate section of museum archives issues. Sarah R. Demb, who worked as the archivist at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, and at the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, reviews the effects of the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Catherine Herbert, presently provenance researcher at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, talks about the difficult issue of restituting Nazi-looted art.

An extensive resource guide at the back of the book includes a list of archival and related professional organizations; continuing archival education opportunities; a selected bibliography; sample policies, procedures, and forms; Internet resources; funding sources; and selected archival vendors. The supplementary material also includes a copy of the Museum Archives Guidelines. Created by the Museum Archives Section of the SAA and approved by the SAA Council in 2003, these guidelines provide an excellent summary overview of what should be considered in establishing and maintaining a museum archives.

Wythe defines the context of the archives within the museum as one that, first and foremost, revolves around the object: its collection, preservation, exhibition, loan, and interpretation. Following the administrative progression of acquiring museum objects through their registration, conservation, and use for research, programs, and projects, she describes the complex organizational structure of a museum. She also discusses the dual role of a museum archives as a day-to-day administrative resource as well as a source of research material about the broader culture that the museum collects and in which it exists.

Whereas Weiss advocated for the establishment of museum archives, Wythe now defines the new edition's readers not only as experienced archivists "working in a museum for the first time," but also as "museum curators, photo and film librarians, digitization project managers and registrars who are interested in using archival techniques."

Arranging and presenting collections of objects (both museum and archival) in today's electronic and database environment, whether for internal museum records management or for public information, has, indeed, become the work not just of archivists but of information and museum professionals of all kinds. Museum curatorial departments are digitizing and making their holdings available on-line, sometimes adding contextual notes to the overall description. Collaborative efforts across institutions, such as the Resources Available in the Natural Sciences (RAVNS) project supported by RLG's Natural

History Steering Committee, seek to standardize descriptions for collections that can include both archival materials and specimen collection records.

But this expansion of archival arrangement must still be based on well-organized, well-preserved collections stored safely with proper intellectual access. No matter how much electronic access evolves, the basic organization and preservation of archival records (both physical and born digital) remain the same, and the basic information in this volume is not likely to become outdated anytime soon. It is a valuable reference and a pleasure to read, with illustrations from museum archives photo collections and sidebars with personal tales from the archives. Highly recommended.

BARBARA MATHÉ

American Museum of Natural History

Past Imperfect: Facts, Fictions, Fraud—American History from Bancroft and Parkman to Ambrose, Bellesiles, Ellis, and Goodwin

By Peter Charles Hoffer. New York: Public Affairs, 2004. 287 pp. \$26.00. ISBN 1-58648-244-0.

Historians in Trouble: Plagiarism, Fraud, and Politics in the Ivory Tower

By Jon Wiener. New York: The New Press, 2005. 272 pp. \$24.95. ISBN 1-56584-884-5.

The good news for historians in recent years is that they are increasingly recognized as important voices in public policy debates and that the most popular among them are becoming media celebrities. The bad news is that their conclusions and methods are increasingly subject to public criticism. As historians Peter Charles Hoffer and Jon Wiener point out, their colleagues' imperfections are getting them in trouble.

Although tackling the same broad topic, and even using some of the same incidents and sources, Hoffer and Wiener come to very different conclusions about what this all means. The contexts for their analyses of recent controversies provide different explanations of the ethics of historical work. For archivists, these glimpses into the inner world of a sister profession offer useful lessons.

Peter Charles Hoffer gives us an academic approach, placing controversies surrounding four prominent historians—Stephen Ambrose, Michael Bellesiles, Joseph Ellis, and Doris Kearns Goodwin—in the context of American historiography since the early nineteenth century. Part I begins with Jared Sparks and Peter Force, who compiled and published historical documents as a “record of facts, beyond cavil or doubt” (p. 20). George Bancroft, Francis Parkman, and others

relied on manuscripts and original sources to compile celebratory, nationalistic histories. The consensus history that dominated the nineteenth century presented the past as an unbroken chain of progress, unapologetically glorifying the white Protestant (male) elite. This was, Hoffer states, “winners” history written and read by the winners (p. 30). The scientific history promoted by the American Historical Association (AHA, founded 1884) continued to emphasize consensus and “merely camouflaged the prejudices” of historians (p. 34).

Progressive era historians expanded the cast of historical characters to include Indians, blacks, women, and workers. They emphasized social conflict and introduced relativism—the idea that “facts are not irreducible bricks” but arguments created from selected evidence (pp. 38–39). Consensus history returned to prominence during the Cold War, when Americans sought “psychological comfort in conformity” and social unity in the past (p. 48).

By the 1960s, the social ferment of Civil Rights, liberation struggles, and the antiwar movement led many historians to acknowledge the ideological basis for historical writing and to challenge its domination by the privileged classes. This “new history” featured “a quarrelsomeness, suspicion of pandering to the public, and demand for methodological sophistication that profoundly widened the divide between academic and popular history” (p. 61). As academic historians increasingly aligned themselves with the “new left” politically, their challenges to traditional values also led to emphasis on conflict and controversy in American history. They sought new research sources, such as census records, and developed new methods (or borrowed those of social science disciplines such as psychology and demographics) to focus on daily life and the stories of forgotten people.

Part I concludes by examining a series of highly publicized controversies: the Columbus Quincentenary celebrations, the Smithsonian’s *Enola Gay* exhibit, the ideological struggle over National History Standards for schools, and the impeachment of President Bill Clinton. Each of these media spectacles shows the ideological rift between academic and popular historians, the growing suspicion of academics by the public, and the demand that history celebrate American achievements rather than reflect (in Lynne Cheney’s words) “the gloomy, politically driven revisionism” common on college campuses (p. 109).

Part II focuses on charges of fraud made publicly against Bellesiles, Ambrose, Goodwin, and Ellis. As a former member of the AHA Professional Division, which investigated suspected wrongdoing by historians, Hoffer examines these cases in relation to the AHA’s ethics code, the 1987 *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct*. The core of this code emphasizes professional integrity: awareness of one’s own bias, carefully documenting sources, not misrepresenting evidence, avoiding plagiarism, and not concealing errors. Based on his own research in the writings of these four authors, news stories, and investigative reports by other groups, Hoffer concludes that each author was guilty of ethical violations.

- In *Arming America* (2000), Michael Bellesiles kept sloppy notes and falsified his research on early American gun ownership. Hoffer calls this the “most egregious” recent case of historical falsification and a “high-wire act of arrogant bravado” (pp. 142–3).
- Stephen Ambrose shared a nineteenth-century belief that facts are facts and thus failed to indicate when he took primary source quotes from other historians’ writings or when he paraphrased secondary sources without acknowledgment (p. 181).
- Whereas Ambrose continued to deny charges of plagiarism, Doris Kearns Goodwin in 1989 made payment to another author whose words and ideas she had “purloined” (p. 199) in *The Fitzgeralds and the Kennedys*.
- Joseph Ellis fabricated stories about his service in Vietnam to make his class lectures on the war more immediate and compelling. Hoffer discovered that Ellis had also used his “power to invent truth” in several of his books, to allow the reader to “enter the mysterious closed spaces where the document does not go” (p. 219). Ellis even chose topics for which there are extensive published collections of documents so that there was “no need to race about to archives and libraries to find manuscripts” (p. 221).

Hoffer concludes that these public controversies caused little more than “embarrassment and anger” for these four individuals, who had cut corners to become successful popular historians. The underlying problem, as he sees it, is the AHA’s “hypocritical refusal to enforce ethical precepts” (p. 238). Faced with legal and logistical problems in enforcing its *Statement on Standards*, AHA in May 2003 discontinued hearing complaints. In doing so, Hoffer charges, AHA allowed “misconduct to hide itself behind the veil of popularity” (p. 239).

Whereas Hoffer explains these controversies within the context of historiographical conflict between “new history” and consensus history, Jon Wiener provides a decidedly political explanation. Wiener covers the four historians profiled by Hoffer and adds eight more examples of ivory tower politics. “Why do some cases become media events while others remain within the confines of scholarly settings?” Wiener asks. “The answer briefly is power—especially power wielded by groups outside the history profession” (p. 2). Thus Wiener focuses not only on the merits of the cases that get historians in trouble but even more on the political climate. He concludes that “the right has much more power than the left to define the meaning and significance” of charges brought against historians (p. 6).

Wiener thus groups his dozen case studies not according to the alleged offenses, but by their political contexts. Three cases involve historians nominated to influential positions by President George W. Bush, and three others (including Michael Bellesiles) are historians “targeted by the right for [their] politics” (p. 5).

Two cases involve misdeeds that did not become media spectacles, while the cases of Ellis, Goodwin, and Ambrose are grouped—with a professor accused of concealing a prior conviction for sexual abuse—in a section called “Other Media Spectacles.”

In emphasizing the eight cases in which left-right politics seem prominent, Wiener clearly sides with the left, defending those historians accused by the National Rifle Association, conservatives, and the media, and denouncing those appointed to prominent positions by President Bush despite charges previously brought against them. Because the cases of Ellis, Ambrose, and Goodwin do not fit this political framework, Wiener appears most neutral in discussing them. They did bad things and were punished (but not enough).

The case of Bellesiles, however, points up the differences between Wiener and Hoffer. Whereas Hoffer severely criticizes Bellesiles, Wiener mounts a spirited defense. The investigating committee “found ‘evidence of falsification’ only on one page,” Wiener reports (p. 77). He was careless in his documentation, but he “did not invent documents.” Wiener concludes: “That’s error, not fraud” (p. 86). Yet Bellesiles became the only one of the twelve people Wiener studied whose career ended “because of problems in his scholarship” (p. 212). By contrast, the media virtually ignored the research fraud of economist John Lott, whose *More Guns, Less Crime* (1998) was based largely on fabricated evidence and dishonesty. The major difference in these two cases, Wiener states, was that the NRA and the gun lobby pressured Emory University to fire Bellesiles but remained silent about the pro-gun Lott.

Several of the cases presented by Wiener concern archives, archival research, and questions of documentation and note taking. For example, a careful reviewer who examined the original documents on which Edward Pearson based his *Designs Against Charleston: The Trial Record of the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy of 1822* (1999) discovered that the volume was riddled with errors and drew conclusions that were opposite the truth of the events it depicted. In defending David Abraham from charges that he had misdated and mistranslated several documents in his study of the rise of Nazism, Lawrence Stone made unintentionally revealing statements about the difficulties of archival research. “When you work in the archives,” Stone told Wiener in an interview, “you’re far from home, you’re bored, you’re in a hurry, you’re scribbling like crazy. You’re bound to make mistakes. . . . Archival research is a special case of the general messiness of life” (pp. 95–96). Archivists (and researchers) take heed!

For archivists, the most interesting of Wiener’s case studies concerns the nomination of Allen Weinstein as Archivist of the United States. Based on several articles dating back to 1992 in which Wiener criticized Weinstein for “buying exclusive access to restricted [KGB] archives” and “his withholding of archival materials from other scholars” (p. 33), this chapter was written as the nomination process slowly moved forward in summer 2004. Wiener even added

a two-page “Update” on the nomination (as of August 2004) at the end of the volume. Having been a critic of Weinstein for more than a decade, Wiener played an active role in seeking to block his nomination as Archivist. Charging that Weinstein worked for a private think tank “with distinctly conservative politics” (p. 210), Wiener argues that his withholding of documents was “politically motivated” (p. 36). Thus, he concludes, “with Allen Weinstein, the right demonstrated far more power to reward its historians—with White House nominations” (p. 57).

Like Hoffer, Wiener criticizes the AHA for its weakness in enforcing adherence to its own *Standards of Professional Conduct*. However, he frames the problem in political terms. “A strong and independent profession might be able to stand up to the pressure of organized political groups with their own agendas,” Wiener concludes (p. 204).

For archivists, these two volumes provide insights into how historians view archives, archival research, and the relationships between the two professions. The difficulty of interpreting, administering, and enforcing professional ethics codes becomes, ultimately, the enduring lesson of each volume. Archivists have also grappled with these concerns in recent years. The recently revised SAA *Code of Ethics* had to delete the commentary and examples of previous codes to avoid limiting the interpretation of broad (and, frankly, rather bland) statements of archival ethics. In today’s litigious and politically charged atmosphere, it becomes increasingly difficult to establish and enforce ethical practices. This is a challenge that we must face. Our professional integrity as archivists may be at stake. We do not want to see a sequel titled *Archivists in Trouble*.

RANDALL C. JIMERSON
Western Washington University

Describing Archives: A Content Standard

Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004. xxi, 269 pp. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$35.00 members, \$49.00 nonmembers. ISBN 1-931666-08-3.

In February of 2005, the SAA Council approved *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACs)* as an official SAA standard, replacing the second edition of *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts (APPM)* as the nation’s content standard for archival description. *DACS* is the next logical step in the evolution of archival descriptive standards in the United States. It moves us away from a standard based on bibliographic rules and designed for creating catalog records and toward a truly archival standard that can be applied to full finding aids. The authors of *DACS*, leaders in the field of archival description, include *APPM*

author Steve Hensen, Encoded Archival Description (EAD) experts Michael Fox and Kris Kiesling, and the other U.S. members of the Canadian-U.S. Task Force on Archival Description (CUSTARD), Lynn Holdzkom, Margit Kerwin, Bill Landis, and Lydia Reid (p. vi).

With *DACS*, they have developed a set of clearly written content guidelines for creating archival descriptions that can be expressed in EAD, MARC21, and other formats. They have also created a standard that is harmonious with the *General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G))* and the *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ISAAR(CPF))*. Consistency with these standards is necessary to fulfill the potential for mechanisms such as EAD that allow us to easily share archival descriptions internationally.

Archivists using the standard should not pass over the volume's introductory section. Kiesling's preface provides valuable context for the experienced and novice archivist alike, reviewing the history of the CUSTARD project that generated *DACS*, the relationship of *DACS* to other standards, and a comparison of *DACS* and its predecessor, *APPM*. The Statement of Principles draws upon the findings of earlier groups that studied archival description, on existing national and international standards, and on an understanding of professional practice in the United States. The individual concepts presented in these principles are not new, but gathered together they provide a foundation for arrangement and description that processing archivists will want to revisit regularly. The Overview of Archival Description discusses access tools and access points, which archivists will need to use in conjunction with *DACS* when building access systems. The authors state that formalized access points should be included in all types of descriptions, but treatment of the subject is rather abbreviated. Although I agree with the authors that selection of access points is a matter of local practice, a consideration of the decisions faced in selecting access points or references to additional resources on the topic would be helpful.

The standard itself is organized into three parts that cover description of archival materials, description of creators, and forms of names. Part 1, Describing Archival Materials, begins by outlining use of the standard. A chapter on descriptive levels provides requirements for minimum, optimal, and added value descriptions for both single-level and multilevel descriptions. This flexible approach will support the needs of a variety of repositories and descriptive situations and ease the transition to a more standards-based approach than many archivists may be accustomed to. The bulk of this section delineates the standard's twenty-five elements, including the purpose and scope, exclusions, sources of information, rules, and encoding examples for each. They are organized into seven sections: identity, content and structure, conditions of access and use, acquisition and appraisal, related materials, general notes, and description control.

Part 2, Describing Creators, includes guidelines for identifying and describing creators of archival materials. This section also contains a chapter on creating archival authority records based on *ISAAR(CPF)*. Separating rules for describing materials and describing creators may seem unusual to many American archivists, but it brings *DACS* into accord with international standards and provides for more flexibility in recording and sharing information about records creators. The guidelines support both the traditional practice of including information about records creators directly in finding aids and the use of separate archival authority files for this contextual information. The authors introduce their audience to the concept of archival authority files and provide a concise enumeration of the potential advantages of this practice. Given the current efforts to develop Encoded Archival Context, a standard structure for exchanging information about the creators of archival materials, it is clear that there is interest in implementing archival authority records within the archival profession. Part II of *DACS* provides a content standard for those interested in creating such records.

Part 3, Forms of Names, includes chapters that detail the rules for formulating names of persons, families, corporate entities, and geographic entities that are part of corporate bodies. This is one area where, like *APPM*, the authors chose to closely follow the structure and rules of the corresponding chapters of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR2)*. *DACS* does, however, provide rules for forming family names; *AACR2* does not. It is appropriate that this section and all those dealing with records creators emphasize the need to use existing authority files such as the *Library of Congress Authorities*.

The appendices are invaluable references for those implementing *DACS*. They include a glossary, a list of companion standards, crosswalks, and encoded examples. The list of companion standards includes content standards for specialized formats, thesauri for access points, and data structure standards for encoding *DACS*-compliant descriptions. This is particularly useful for archivists interested in more specific rules for graphic materials, sound recordings, and the like, but there are no references here to general digital library standards that archivists are using more frequently as we publish our finding aids, encoded texts, and digitized images, sound, and video on-line. Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS) is mentioned in the text (p. 8) as one form of a single-level description, but is not listed as a companion standard.

Crosswalks between *DACS* and *APPM*, *ISAD(G)*, *ISAAR(CPF)*, *EAD*, and *MARC* will help archivists transition from *APPM* to *DACS*, understand the relationship of *DACS* to international standards, and make encoding decisions for their *DACS*-based finding aids. The encoding examples will also assist those interested in applying *DACS* in conjunction with *EAD* and *MARC*. They include finding aids and catalog records for a variety of collections, and each example includes references to the corresponding *DACS* rule alongside the encoded description. In addition, there is an example of an item-level *MARC* record.

For the most part, archivists adopting *DACS* will find the standard easy to use. The authors provide clear, detailed guidance on the content and application of each element. Examples, presented in both narrative and encoded form, also help to elucidate the rules. *DACS* elements are mutually exclusive, and the list of exclusions for various related elements will help archivists choose exactly where specific information should and should not be included. This will make it easier for researchers to find specific content, as it will eliminate elements that contain mixed or muddled information.

Users of *APPM* will find that the organization of *DACS* more closely follows an archival perspective and that the numbering of the rules is less confusing. Guidelines for each element are easy to read, since they follow a standardized format and use headings to clearly identify various sections. The guidelines in *DACS* are also more thorough than those presented in *APPM*, since they are designed to support full descriptions rather than abbreviated catalog records. In *DACS*, the authors also include encoded examples directly within the text at the end of each element, alleviating the need to flip between the text and appendices to view the application of a rule.

There is some room for improvement in *DACS*. First, the lack of an index can make use of the manual frustrating. The table of contents lists each element, but more specific rules within the individual elements have no easy access point. In particular, archivists will likely turn to the section on forms of names as a reference in very specialized situations, and an index would make this type of use much easier. Second, although the authors attempted to include thorough examples, a few small issues crop up here as well. Some sections include examples of a given element at various hierarchical levels (rather than simply at the collection level), but these could be more widespread. EAD examples included within the text don't always correspond with the crosswalk or encoded examples found in the appendices. For example, <bibliography> and <prefercite> are given as examples within the text (pp. 76, 79), but are not listed in the crosswalk. An index would also make these examples easier to find.

Regardless of these few criticisms, the impact of *DACS* on archival descriptive practice in the United States cannot be underestimated. It will inform the work of those with established arrangement and description programs and provide needed instruction for those without a written processing manual. *DACS* is an essential resource for any repository and for archivists at all levels. It eliminates our dependence on a solely bibliographic model and moves us into harmony with international standards. Most importantly, although most of our researchers will likely be unaware of the existence of *DACS*, it will support their work by resulting in more consistent and therefore more easily usable archival descriptions.

KELCY SHEPHERD
Five Colleges, Inc.

The Passport: The History of Man's Most Travelled Document

By Martin Lloyd Stroud, U.K.: Sutton Publishing, 2003. vi, 282 pp. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$12.00 members, \$20.00 nonmembers. ISBN 0-7509-2964-2.

One can't steal what isn't there. Modern-day identity theft would not be possible without the proliferation of documents and records (passports, ID cards, credit cards, etc.) that bear standard, replicable sorts of information about us. Described as a means of enabling safe and unobstructed passage in earlier times, or easing our ability to move about for work and leisure today, the passport has always also been a technology to manage our mobility, a means of tracking the flow of individuals across borders internationally as well as within countries, and a tool of state control. Current discussions of the Real ID in the United States raise questions of privacy versus security and of individual rights versus a defensible polis—and make *The Passport* a topical work.

Martin Lloyd elegantly narrates a scattered and restless story that resists linear telling: the history of the passport is made up of many rivulets emerging from societies all over the world and taking different courses. The passport and its precursors evolved in countries whose boundaries shifted with war and other territorial redesigns, and *The Passport* takes us back to its earliest incarnations in Egypt and the Roman Empire. Until recently, passports took the form of letters of introduction, military leave passes that urged easy, unobstructed passage, sometimes commending their bearers to far-away hosts. Throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance, indeed well into the eighteenth century, agendas for issuing passports varied depending on the needs of the traveler as well as the issuer's whim and power. Many individuals, whether endowed with authority or wealth (e.g., kings, lords, landowners), issued *laissez-passer* of their own definition and design. Granting free passage was easy, but travelers always ran the risk that their grantor's authority might not be recognized at any point in their travels. Lloyd attends to the types of passports that emerged with different purposes in mind: a country at war resisted allowing its nationals (e.g., British "subjects") to leave its soil; passports were more readily issued to improve commerce, for example, in times of peace. Passports early on were typically issued to ships or garrisons and, only later, to individuals. Passports have been issued by states to their subjects or by the very states where the traveler wishes to move freely. Lloyd provides abundant examples of these themes.

But just as passports document our identities and our nationalities, they also record our travels across borders (in some instances, within borders). As a record of our identities, nationalities, and travel, passports function both practically and symbolically. One of the delights of Lloyd's treatment of passports is the effective use he makes of tales of forgery and fakery, an approach

that yields layers of irony at the heart of using falsified documents. In that vein, we learn, for example, that Queen Marie Antoinette and King Louis XVI were traveling as the maid and valet of a certain Baroness de Korff, as they sought to escape the wrath of the French people, trying to reach the Austrian Netherlands' border. They might have met a different fate had the king not (in a moment of carelessness or uncontrollable curiosity?) poked his head out of his carriage. A retired soldier recognized the king and chased the royal cortege on horseback to Varennes, near the border, where this story of identity theft and attempted escape ended. Unfortunately left untold is the part of the story that created havoc at Varennes—and that interests the student of records and documents—how does one recognize a passport as authentic and valid if what it must contain is unknown, erratic, or idiosyncratic? There were few standards at the end of the eighteenth century; and, in this case, the king's obligatory signature was, rightly and ironically, deemed insufficient proof of authenticity. What else might have warranted positive authentication?

Since that time, we recognize a pattern in the emergence of the issuance of passports as both symbolic and symptomatic of newly independent nations. Lloyd offers a story: in designing the passport that the first United States legation in Paris (established in 1777) would issue, Benjamin Franklin, then the minister plenipotentiary in France, resorted to imitating the existing French passport and “printed [passports] upon his own press at his house in Passy, Paris” (p. 72). Early U.S. passports resembled contemporaneous ones. They were printed on single sheets of paper large enough (some 12 inches by 18 inches) to have to be folded, and they bore engravings and “descriptions of their holders and a stated duration of validity, usually three or six months” (p. 71). Newly independent African countries in the 1960s rushed to design and issue passports, as did long-standing nations that had previously had no use for them; Japan began issuing passports with the advent of the Meiji Restoration (1868), enabling travelers to venture more easily in and out of its doors.

The passport as a travel technology grew apace of the Industrial Revolution into its modern incarnation during the nineteenth century. The West's imperial trade goals meant a surge of both business and leisure travel, resulting in sharp increases in the numbers of passports issued. By the 1880s, the visa, too, in its contemporary guise as permission for foreign nationals to travel within the authorizing country, had emerged in the United Kingdom. Attention to the passport and its attendant technologies—authenticity markings and stamps, photographs, embossings and watermarks, security papers and covers, and so on—generated evermore refinements in the manufacture of passports.

By World War I, the history of the passport becomes the story of how to keep the document as tamper-proof as possible—how to protect its authenticity as recording identity, nationality, and mobility. As Lloyd's account makes clear, getting to this point in the history of the passport is a jumble of idiosyncratic

moves. Following World War I, however, in an anxious and unsettled era, it becomes much clearer that cooperation among nations, at least at the administrative level, was necessary for a passport *system* to work effectively and efficiently. In 1920, the League of Nations' Provisional Committee on Communications and Transit convened an International Conference on Passports, Customs Formalities and Through Tickets precisely to resume controlled travel and set the world back on a course of economic recovery. A far-reaching resolution emerged from this conference: signatories "should agree on a uniform style of passport issued to identical standards" (p. 121). The international passport's characteristics were, as Lloyd's page-long description begins, "that it should contain thirty-two pages, all numbered. It should be in at least two languages—the national language and French. Its size should be 15.5cm by 10.5cm. It should be bound in cardboard. . . ." And the fully redesigned passports would replace existing passports within some eight months, by July 1921. Countries accepted these standards with varying degrees of goodwill or adverse nationalism. Even today standardization is hardly the norm, strictly speaking, nor are countries any more willing to readily give up the nationalism embodied in their passports' design—witness the amount of negotiation, dissent, and cajoling around the European Union's common passport.

Still, for the system of passports (including tourist and working visas, identity cards, diplomatic passports, etc.) to work internationally, the passport needed to be made inviolable—and, with time, more and more refinements engineered to forestall forgeries and fakes were introduced: color photographs (United States, 1958), perforated passport covers (United States, 1961), and digital photographs (Japan, 1992). With each of these new debates, material and symbolic costs and risks must be weighed. Unfortunately, Lloyd does not address these debates in detail.

In December 2004, for example, the European Union called for regulating standards for security features and biometrics in its passports. In May 2005 in the United States, there were three versions of Bill H.R. 418 (The Real ID Act) before the 109th Congress that may ultimately introduce to Americans the most technologically advanced national identity card yet devised. With a greater urgency since 9/11, technological enhancements are redefining the passport's look and feel. Embedding biological information, retinal scans, DNA, fingerprints, and so on will selectively and carefully be introduced in varying ways by different countries, but these technologies, as they make information at once available to machines but invisible to the human eye, threaten to be used to track the movement of their bearers in both predictable and unforeseen ways.

Chapter headings such as "Murder at the Opera," "Without Let or Hindrance?" and "Flog the Peasants Again" betray this book's whimsy and style—and its narrator's pleasure in sharing the surprises buried in the anecdotal

details. But *The Passport* will not satisfy readers seeking a tightly chronological or geographical treatment, and it contains no categorization or taxonomy of types of passports or passport-granting conditions and policies. *The Passport* is not about policies, international relations, or immigration, although all of these topics and many others are suggestively sprinkled throughout Lloyd's rich tales. His *Passport* does not reveal the stakes that have always mattered to those who, for whatever reasons, were not entitled to passports; nor does it speculate on the future of the passport after 11 September 2001. For a greater sense of the historical and current impact of the passport on politics and society, readers will need to turn to works such as John C. Torpey's *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State* (2000) or even the U.S. Passport's Office own outdated, but valuable, publication, *The United States Passport: Past, Present, Future* (1976).

Certainly, however, archivists will not fail to recognize in Lloyd's meandering story of the passport how much his professional knowledge (according to the book's back flap "he spent 23 years in H.M. Immigration Service") is infused with a collector's sort of fondness for artifactual detail and a passion for sharing his knowledge. Lloyd takes leave of his reader with a single-sentence paragraph that begins with "and," as if fondly quieting another telling tale: "And despite and because of all their qualities and faults, you know. . . I rather like passports."

PATSY BAUDOIN

*Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Simmons College*

Archival Appraisal: Theory and Practice

By Barbara Craig. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2004. x, 224 pp. Index. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$99.50 members, \$119.50, nonmembers. ISBN: 3-598-11538-5.

I read Barbara Craig's *Archival Appraisal* while I was in the midst of teaching my graduate course on this important archival function. At every page, I found myself wishing that this book was one of the texts in my course, although for reasons I will discuss later I won't be able to use it in this way. Craig, a professor at the University of Toronto, has given the archival community a seminal writing, one that every archivist ought to read, providing one of the best single-volume orientations to archival appraisal. Though not without flaws, *Archival Appraisal* will engage everyone who has ever struggled with the challenges posed by this function. Craig criticizes the appraisal literature as being "uneven and lopsided" (p. 113), and her book, which includes an interesting bibliographic essay, moves

to smooth out the bumps and holes of this literature. I suspect that it will be the starting point, if not inspiration, for many who tackle archival appraisal in new and innovative ways.

This is not a basic manual. Nothing in it has the characteristics of a “how-to” guide. Craig states that its “objectives . . . are to introduce the concept of appraisal—its foundations and presumptions—the purposes it serves in records and information management within organizations and in archives programmes, and its historical development, leading to a discussion of the points that are generally agreed today about doing archival appraisal” (p. 2). The latter half of this sentence reveals the strength of *Archival Appraisal*. Craig reiterates at a number of key points in the volume that she is digging for the common ground of what now passes for such archival work. She says that the book “endeavours, as far as is possible, to expose the underlying ideas or presumptions for appraisal in the context of making and keeping current records for business purposes and selecting material for archival purposes” (p. 3). Craig states that she is looking for the common aspects of this archival function in the “diversity of appraisal methods and practices” (p. 5). She argues that if we are ever to be able to evaluate appraisal work, then we must search for these common elements across organizational types even while acknowledging that appraisal generally must serve the needs and match the mission of any particular institution. Craig succeeds in teasing out some of the most salient aspects of appraisal work, believing that “there is surprisingly wide consensus, some of it silent, about procedure, participants and process” (p. 107).

One of the best attributes of this book is Craig’s deft review of the history of appraisal by comparing all the diverse traditions and schools of thought that make up the professional knowledge supporting appraisal. Craig builds from an understanding of why people create *and* select records—“Each of us is tied to the world and to remembrance in some way by documents and records” (p. 9)—to the ways and means organizations generate and maintain their documents. She assesses the origins of Jenkinson’s and Schellenberg’s appraisal ideas, nicely tying their views to their own professional experiences. She contrasts their notions to the appraisal concepts later compiled by F. Gerald Ham, showing how appraisal shifted from concerns of records creators to those of society at large. Craig is even better when she describes and compares various appraisal approaches, such as macro-appraisal, documentation strategy, and the Minnesota Method, providing the best road map to these well-known appraisal methodologies. And, along the way, Craig is not afraid to assess their strengths and weaknesses. She is quite supportive, for example, of those approaches with some focus on “functions” and the “functional relationships of documents to people and group memory” because “focusing on the web of relationships may help restore the unity to the documentary world that appears so fractured by competing technologies, formats and systems” (p. 95).

While Craig is working her way through the various archival appraisal concepts and models produced over the past half-century and more, she also argues strenuously at every turn that she is not searching for the perfect archival appraisal approach. Craig states, “No process is infallible: no rule-making will embrace fully the complexity and diversity of needs for records in the future whose purposes and questions cannot be known before hand.” So, she “recommends methods and ideas for consideration, not for obedience” (pp. 20–21). Craig asserts that appraisal cannot be reduced “to a series of technical tasks guided by criteria that apply to all—that would not be appraisal but a denial of it,” the essential reason why she is not striving to write a basic manual (p. 42). Later, Craig argues that “no single textbook discussion of appraisal or standard of practice, or agreed benchmarks can be used as a technical manual to guide mechanical tasks or for rote application. Appraisal must be a live procedure which recognizes the nuances of situation and timing, and caters for the constraints of resources” (p. 130). In other words, while there may be some common elements in the multitude of appraisal approaches, appraisal best functions in the parameters of real life and real organizations.

While not a basic manual, *Archival Appraisal* is a kind of report on a quest to develop an “appraisal architecture” (p. 5) allowing for the archivist to be accountable to future generations of archivists. Craig suggests benchmarks in most organizations—basic glossaries, mission statements, and policies on acquisition, appraisal, and access—form a “powerful battery of documents that drive work along a well-marked highway” (p. 121). These and other procedures “comprise a working frame for on-going and self-regulating appraisal” (p. 122). What she is arguing for, among other things, is building a foundation for developing a real knowledge about appraisal. Craig contends, “Surprisingly, the evident continuing interest in appraisal has yet to be reflected in empirical research into the work as it proceeds” (pp. 111–12). And, more importantly, archivists “do not have ways of measuring what constitutes a successful appraisal nor do we have a calculus for evaluating any given process save that provided by the terms it creates” (p. 113). Craig is advocating that archivists document their own appraisal work: “Appraisal decisions need to be declared and visible in some way so that they can be audited and their outcomes revisited many times, perhaps in anticipated reviews of achievement, . . . and perhaps as recorded experience to be used in developing measures to be used in evaluation” (pp. 130–31). Of course, it is in this very aspect of appraisal that archivists have been less than stellar in their practice (but one can always hope).

I wish that Craig had tried to craft a model appraisal report and lay out some advice for how archivists should work to share appraisal case studies. *Archival Appraisal* is weakened by the lack of such an effort. Several appendices include a description by Nancy Marrelli of the appraisal of audiovisual records at Concordia University, but Craig does not describe what this report

represents. In fact, its inclusion looks like an afterthought, since in the introduction Craig states that her book “does not focus on either special supports or media for records and communications, on particular problems such as case files, or on a type of archive, identified by its scope, theme or authority” (p. 4). Craig also provides copies of the mandate, appraisal policy and procedures, and appraisal report of the City of Toronto Archives but, again, these documents hang on the book and look more like filler. Given Craig’s reasoned and generally excellent discussion of appraisal, it is a shame that she did not tackle a discussion of what a model appraisal report should look like and how it should be shared.

Another glaring weakness is Craig’s avoidance of describing how archivists should share appraisal case studies. This is a curious omission. Near the end of her text, she writes, “Plurality of views allows many needs to be heard in appraisal. Different decisions may not be building chaos, as one might assume, but rather a healthy plurality of perspectives that are more in tune with the emergent hybrid societies of the future” (p. 133). One might expect Craig to then tackle how information about divergent appraisal decisions could be shared, but she avoids this except for references to the published appraisal literature. Why couldn’t archivists systematically post appraisal reports and decisions on their Web sites and some group or particular archives take responsibility for building a clearinghouse to the case studies? The absence of the model appraisal report and some discussion on the possibilities of professional sharing of appraisal experience makes me long for one more chapter from Craig to replace the present appendices.

I sense that our author might have struggled with her publisher as well, as seen in the key readings and the book’s price. The inclusion of key readings at the end of each chapter, arranged in no order whatsoever, appear to have been endnotes pulled from their normal citation format. Besides, Craig’s interesting bibliographic discussion at the end of the book could have accommodated these readings and eliminated the need for a separate display in each chapter. “Key” readings need to be better arranged or discussed. This problem, those with the appendices, and some omissions make *Archival Appraisal* look like an unfinished book. Yet, such problems as these pale in comparison to the cost and availability of this book—a reason I shall not be able to use it in my class. While it is available from the Society of American Archivists for \$99.50 for members and \$119.50 for nonmembers, those prices will deter even most university libraries from acquiring the title, and a good and valuable book risks being ignored by the profession because of limited availability. (The K. G. Saur Web site also offers *Archival Appraisal* as an e-book for €88.00—even pricier than the hard-copy edition!) I only hope that somehow this book gets into the hands of as many archivists as possible; if the book goes out of print and the copyright obstacles can be negotiated, perhaps Barbara Craig could mount the text on

the Web or find another publisher, make some improvements, and re-issue the book.

RICHARD J. COX
School of Information Sciences
University of Pittsburgh

Imagining Archives: Essays and Reflections by Hugh A. Taylor

Edited by Terry Cook and Gordon Dodds. Lanham, Md. and Oxford: Society of American Archivists, Association of Canadian Archivists, and Scarecrow Press, 2003. vii, 254 pp. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$29.95 members, \$35.00 nonmembers. ISBN 0-8108-4771-X.

Hugh Taylor, who passed away on 11 September 2005, retired from archival work in the early 1990s. Though he began his career in England, he spent the better part of it in Canada, where his prestige is illustrated by being named to the Order of Canada, the country's highest civilian award. A working archivist or archival administrator from 1951 through 1982, Taylor then spent ten years as a consultant, primarily teaching archival studies. Though one of the few non-Americans to serve as president of the Society of American Archivists, and though he published some of his best writing in *American Archivist*, it is fair to say Taylor is much less well known in the United States than in Canada, where, as the editors of this volume note, he was the "much-admired mentor for an entire generation of archivists." If this compilation of selected essays serves to introduce (or reintroduce) Taylor to a U.S. audience, our profession will be the better for it.

In "Information Ecology and the Archives of the 1980s," one of the better-known essays in this volume, Taylor critiques what he calls the "historical shunt" of the archival profession (p. 93ff). By this he does not mean to suggest that archivists shun interest in the meaning or information contained in records and instead hew only to structure, context, and evidence. Rather, his complaint is much narrower, that archivists became the handmaidens solely of academic historians, rather than embracing the full scope of the humanities or social sciences. But neither does Taylor eschew records management, information science, or diplomatics for a purely humanistic conception of archives. For him there is no contradiction in stating that archivists must be "capable of supervising archives and records management, forms analysis. . .and information management" (p. 98) and simultaneously of "creative nonalignment" among the disciplines and professions that together seek to comprehend the "aggregate of all consciously apprehended and communicated experiences" (pp. 54, 59). Taylor envisions archivists equally at home as mediators of content and culture and as masters of process and context.

Yet this book of essays is not a careful, studied effort to balance two streams of archival philosophy. While Taylor reaches for a complex, nuanced synthesis, it seems apparent that the weight of his conviction falls toward a conception of archives that is not only humanistic, but also pragmatic, user-centric, and even mythic. (“Humanistic” is used here not as the antonym of “religious,” but in its older meaning of embracing the humanities.) In the hands of a lesser writer, this collection of essays could be esoteric and even off-putting, particularly to U.S. archivists who continue to gravitate toward the down-to-earth rather than the conceptual. But Taylor’s synthetic approach to archives blends (among other things) the roles of intellectual and practitioner. As Terry Cook writes in his introductory essay, “the dreamer could always bring things down to the ‘coal-face’ (as he liked to call it) of workplace reality” (p. 18). Specifically, in this regard, U.S. archivists may find Taylor a congenial and accessible guide to the complexities and relevance of postmodernity for archival thought and practice.

But while postmodernism is perhaps the single strongest thread across the essays in this volume, Taylor’s writing contains substantive discourses on documentation, appraisal, archival professionalism, electronic records, audio and visual materials, the evolution of recordkeeping, whether archives is an art or science, even the role of spirituality in confronting the modern “technological imperative” (p. 226). The choice of the book’s fifteen articles was a collaborative effort by the editors with Taylor himself. The editors state that “Our final decision has been to include those essays that are, to us, the most stimulating, that reduce duplication in themes across essays between those chosen and not chosen, and that give a sample of the several phases and breadth of Hugh’s career” (p. x). It would have been gratifying to see an extended discussion of why certain choices were made: as is inevitably true for any selection of articles from a prolific and substantial author, the specific choices about what to include and exclude can be questioned (though never rebutted conclusively). Particularly in assessing someone’s life work, the specific decisions of editors would help illuminate the oeuvre.

In any event, the essays are presented in chronological order, with no editorial intervention beyond the introductory essays, but each with a brief “Reflection, 2000” from Taylor, looking back on every piece. The volume concludes with a longer afterword from Taylor, looking across his career. What will jump out at most readers, in addition to matters of style—for example his ability to appear at once erudite and unprepossessing—is the ease with which he finds myriad intersections between traditional, perhaps it is fair to say insular, archival discourse and the wider world of which we are a part. He was an early (1984) proponent of the idea that “there is in reality no break between the ‘current’ and ‘archival’ record” (p. 100) and that therefore “archivists. . . be present at the creation of documents” (p. 96). For most archivists writing in the past fifteen years, such aggressive records management concepts would

be incompatible with notions that archivists develop a closer “relationship with museums and art galleries” as well as libraries (p. 98), because the former concept identifies archivists with structure and context while the latter aligns us with meaning and content.

For Taylor there is no contradiction. He urges on archivists the study of art as documentation, which “will not only help us extend our range, it may also enable us to develop the faculty of the artist to program effects and recognize new patterns within an information environment. . . .” (p. 87). Thus, comprehending art assists archivists both in subjective mediation of culture and also in grasping the nonlinear structure of automated recordkeeping. Yet his affinity is more for archival humanism than archival technocracy. “In public records, do we keep too much that is evidentiary, too little that is informational? A great deal may be just bureaucrats talking to each other to very little purpose” (p. 58). And he is skeptical of our profession becoming too narrow and rigidly specialized: “because, essentially, we practice a craft, we must seek to preserve our oral tradition of instruction, our empiricism and flexibility, and our holistic approach to the archival scene, so that we enter the whole information field from a position of strength and not as a desperate leap onto the bandwagon of information science” (p. 55).

Those who are most comfortable with specific case studies and formalistic analysis will be frustrated. Taylor writes under the axiom “let us not be afraid of broad canvasses” (p. 126), and that breadth gives his essays continuing relevance. He continuously strives to ask the big questions and knows he can only sketch the outlines of answers. But he is never too far from the pragmatic. Take his contemplation on the “the loss of the automated record which is, at present and proportionately, so much higher than is the loss of paper records” (p. 113). He asks whether that concern is a vestige of the age of paper and whether, even then, it was the wrong concern. Rather than worry about the proportion of material preserved, should we instead be asking, “What do we really need?” (p. 114) and pursue the implications this might have on appraisal? Here and elsewhere Taylor relies on a wide context of archival and nonarchival writing, and, still unusual in archival writing, a persistent and practical appreciation for the role our users play (or should play) in how we approach our profession.

Some readers will find Taylor disconcerting when he speaks of archivists as “tribal” “shamans” who “prophetically” select and keep “the permanently valuable” (pp. 69, 87)—this is metaphor, to be sure, but calculated to convey his conviction that our profession should be, at its core, transcendent of specific formats and media, of all other fields (whether information science or history), of wholly rational and scientific definitions, and of the dispassion of bureaucrats and technocrats. Fundamentally, he sees the archival mission in

rather mythic terms. This is in no small part because Taylor's understanding of communication and organization in human history strongly links the current "postliterate" computer age with the preliterate era, the tribalism of the "global village" with the ancient tribal communities. "To perceive, by projection, the future patterns of our documentary galaxy, and to act in the light of this knowledge, must be our awesome task" (p. 87). If disconcerting to some, in Taylor's hands these ideas have weight and substance enough to invite reckoning with.

The volume does not succeed in all respects. The absence of editorial intervention is occasionally annoying, as when Taylor begins one essay by alluding to previous work that is not identified. Similarly, though even more frustrating, the book does not include a complete bibliography of Taylor's work, against which to set the selected essays. The editors note that a much earlier festschrift for Taylor (Barbara Craig, ed., *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A. Taylor*, Association of Canadian Archivists, 1992) did include a full bibliography, but that is insufficient rationale for omitting it here, since the two works are completely independent. Most noteworthy and disappointing, Taylor's short "Reflections" after each piece generally are superficial and unsatisfying. Fortunately, his longer afterword is more substantial and serves as a fitting conclusion. Though these weaknesses are not trivial, they do not undermine the fundamental worth and enjoyment of the book.

In *Imagining Archives*, Taylor provides us with an eclectic, optimistic, and stimulating perspective on our role and our work. He is, as he says of a favorite seventeenth-century recordkeeper, "a man of unquenchable spirit and enthusiasm" (p. 61). While he does not shy from the frustrations and unknowns of the computer age, he believes in the ability of the archival imagination to overcome them. "Archivists and librarians alike are swimming for their lives in a sea of symbols, and technology is only of limited help. We must design our own rafts from the riches of humanism and a new cosmology which, for Matthew Fox, consists of 'a scientific story, our psychic response to the universe, and art which translates science and mysticism into images'" (p. 178). It is this complex but stimulating creativity that Taylor sees at the heart of our profession. "If we fail to use our imagination in what we do, then we will lose our sense of the full magnitude and possibilities of our professional task. . . ." (p. 249). Taylor offers a challenging and evocative vision to a profession that continues to seek definition for itself in the twenty-first century.

MARK A. GREENE
American Heritage Center
University of Wyoming

Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory

Edited by Richard J. Cox. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004. vii, 234 pp. Illustrations. Index. Available from the Society of American Archivists, \$35.00 members, \$45.00 nonmembers. ISBN 1-931666-07-5.

When Herman Melville died in 1891, *Moby Dick*—along with Melville's other works—was largely forgotten. Many nineteenth-century critics had found *Moby Dick* disappointing and its sales were far from robust. The centennial of Melville's birth in 1919 initiated a *Moby Dick* revival as critics such as Carl van Doren and Raymond Weaver articulated the novel's significance in American literature. Just as Van Doren and Weaver reintroduced Melville to the public, Richard J. Cox attempts to reintroduce Lester J. Cappon to archivists in *Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory*. Cox, professor of archival studies at the University of Pittsburgh, presents the archivist and historian to us through an introductory essay, along with twelve essays that Cappon wrote from 1952 through 1982. Cox organizes the essays in sections on archival theory, archival collecting, archivists and historians, and archivists and documentary editors.

Although Lester Cappon played a critical and active role in the evolution of the archival profession in the United States during the mid-twentieth century, he has largely been forgotten by archivists since his death in 1981. Melville was forgotten because his writings were ahead of their times. *Moby Dick*, for example, anticipated many elements of modernism, and the novel needed to wait for its development in the twentieth century—along with the horrors of the First World War—before it could be fully appreciated. Cappon, on the other hand, has been largely forgotten because he and his writings were very much of their time. During his career, most archivists were trained as historians and often considered themselves historians as much as archivists. Cappon was clearly an archivist of this tradition. During his career he worked as a historian, a historical editor, and an archivist. Cappon was an archivist and a professor of history at the University of Virginia. He moved on to Colonial Williamsburg serving as its publications editor, director of its archives, and eventually director of the entire institution. He spent the last twelve years of his life as a research fellow at the Newberry Library in Chicago. He also served as president of the Southern Historical Association, the Society of American Archivists, and the Association of Documentary Editors. Throughout his career, Cappon consistently argued that archival theory had a firm grounding in history and that an education in history was the foundation of a good archival education. He did not see this as a one-way relationship but also urged historians “to be more archival-minded” (p. 130).

Over the past thirty years the archival profession has distanced itself from the historical profession. This is most noticeable in archival education, which has largely shifted from components in history departments to programs in schools of library and information science. But this trend should not allow us to fossilize Cappon as an example of a mid-century historian-archivist. Cappon's essays in this book can still actively engage us on a number of current issues, particularly the nature of the archives profession.

The shift from history to library and information science leaves many questions about the nature of the archival profession. Are we a subfield of librarianship? Are we information professionals? Many archivists still get graduate degrees in history, so are we still historians' kindred spirits? Does the recent emergence of PhD programs in our field signify that archives has truly become an independent profession? Cappon dealt with issues of professional identity throughout his career. He was an archivist during the early years of the profession in the United States, witnessing the establishment of the National Archives and the Society of American Archivists, and he thought critically about the development of the profession and the close relationship between archival work and historical scholarship. In his 1958 essay, "Tardy Scholars Among the Archivists," Cappon argues that archivists are at heart scholars and that their scholarship is in the field of history. Although the last point may no longer be necessarily true, "Tardy Scholars" helps us understand the role that new doctoral-level archives research and new scholarship on the nature of records, records creation, and archives history may play in the profession.

Cappon's essays should appeal to those interested in the development of the National Archives, archival appraisal and collecting, and the history and nature of documentary editing. His 1969 paper "The National Archives and the Historical Profession" offers a good review of the development and early work of the National Archives and laments its underutilization by historians. Although Cappon's 1978 essay "Why Presidential Libraries?" has been partially superseded by more recent scholarship and political developments, it still provides relevant insights into the problems with presidential libraries. "Walter R. Benjamin and the Autograph Trade at the Turn of the Century" (1966) and "The Archivist as Collector" (1976) provide a history of the noted American autograph dealer and arguments about the nature of archival appraisal respectively. The four essays in the "Archivists and Documentary Editors" section delve into the history of documentary editing in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America, the state of documentary editing in the U.S. during the mid-twentieth century, and the education and training needed for documentary editing.

However, this book should be the most engaging for those interested in understanding the nature of our profession and its evolution in the United States during the twentieth century. These issues permeate all of the essays in this book, although they are most prevalent in the three essays in the "Archival

Theory” section, in “The Archivist as Collector” (1976), and in “The Archival Profession and the Society of American Archivists” (1952).

Cox states in the introduction that researching Cappon and creating this book has been like having an ongoing conversation with him. Cappon’s “The Archivist as Collector” (1976) and “What, Then, Is There to Theorize About?” (1982) are rebuttals to two articles written by members of the following generation of archivists, F. Gerald Ham’s “The Archival Edge” and Frank Burke’s “The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States.” Together these essays represent a passing of the archives profession from one generation to the next. But they also represent a conversation between professional generations. Include Cox’s introductory essay, and we can see a conversation and engagement that spans three generations of archivists.

The Society of American Archivists has published this book of collected Cappon essays as part of its Archival Classics series. In the past few years, SAA has republished the works of Ernst Posner, Margaret Cross Norton, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, T. R. Schellenberg, and Muller, Feith, and Fruin. This publishing effort endeavors to reinvigorate the debate and conversations between generations of archivists. Ironically, for a profession that is focused on facilitating conversations between generations by preserving the words and actions of past individuals and institutions, we have not been very good at keeping up our own conversation with past archivists. Solidifying a base of classic professional literature will help rectify that.

The question still remains: Do the writings of Lester Cappon belong in that body of classic archival literature? Cox clearly feels that they do—that they move beyond merely being interesting historical examples of past archival scholarship. But the opinion of one archival scholar does not make a classic. Being a member of a canon takes the consensus of a community. In his introduction, Cox points out the extent to which the archival community has forgotten Cappon. If Cappon’s writings on archives are to become true classics, then the archival community must engage with them in current debate. Will the publication of this book transform Cappon’s works into archival classics in the same way that the 1975 publication of collected essays by Margaret Cross Norton solidified their “classic” status? That question will take several years to answer. But remember, these kinds of questions take time—it took *Moby Dick* over seventy years to become a member of the canon.

ELIOT WILCZEK
Tufts University

Preservation and Conservation for Libraries and Archives

By Nelly Balloffet and Jenny Hille. Chicago: American Library Association, 2005. xix, 214 pp. Illustrations. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. \$125.00. ISBN 0-8389-0879-9.

The authors of *Preservation and Conservation* are not only practicing book and paper conservators, but also hold MLS degrees and have taught workshops on various preservation subjects and conservation techniques for a dozen years. Their love of paper materials, familiarity with archives and libraries, and, most of all, eagerness to teach are readily conveyed to the reader. The result is an instructional reference work, which is clear, concise, and practical. Its focus is paper-based materials, which still comprise the bulk of most archives and library collections. As the title implies, roughly half of the text is dedicated to preservation, “steps that address the overall safekeeping of all the holdings,” and the other half to conservation, “hands-on treatment” (p. xvii). While some of the material covered is inherently technical (e.g., discussions of relative humidity, light, pH, etc.), the authors avoid inundating the reader with formulae and equations; instead they opt for simple sentences that get to the point.

The layout makes this book particularly useful as a reference. In addition to the standard table of contents, each chapter begins with an outline and explanatory introduction. The simply titled sections and subsections are clearly indicated, allowing the reader to jump to the relevant section. Occasionally, information is repeated in more than one section so that the reader does not miss a particularly important point (e.g., information on determining grain direction is covered in “Getting Started” and in “Paper Conservation Techniques”). The index is another easy entry point. This work should be reviewed at first for general instruction and then kept on the shelf for reference.

The book’s tone is calm. Balloffet and Hille discuss common problems such as torn documents, broken bindings, or mold bloom. Then, they describe possible causative factors and move on to instructing the reader on how the problem can be remedied and prevented from reoccurring. Most topics are coupled with simple illustrations (line drawings or black-and-white photographs), cross references to other parts of the book, and further recommended reading.

The chapter “The Basics of Preservation” covers a laundry list of topics: environment, with a subsection titled “Coping with Old HVAC Systems”; staff and patron education, with recommendations for flyers, posters, or bookmarks encouraging appropriate care and handling; disaster planning and response, which gives brief guidelines on writing a plan without being overwhelmed by details; and storage methods and furniture. These are all topics worth reading about, both for those of us who have become complacent about preventive

preservation techniques and for those seeking an introduction to this subject matter.

The chapters on setting up a work space and simple preservation techniques are equally useful. The authors give advice on what to consider if planning a new space—whether it is eked out within administrative office space or is a dedicated preservation workshop. Considerations include access to water (sinks), office climate control (temperature, RH, light, etc.), and security, as well as furnishings and equipment (cutters, presses, hand tools, etc.). The recommendations are thorough and allow the reader to make informed decisions and appeals to administrators. “Simple Preservation Techniques” covers just that. In fewer than twenty pages, an intern, new part-time employee, student, or volunteer can learn how to make basic decisions about rehousing, how to order and select archival supplies, what “archival supplies” means, safe-handling procedures, and even how to make simple enclosures.

The conservation sections of the book begin with succinct overviews of the characteristics of Japanese and Western papers as well as bookbinding structure and terminology. These are extremely useful terms for archivists and librarians to know in order to speak knowledgeably about collection materials (damaged or not). The supplies needed to conduct paper and book repairs are described at length. The instructions for repairs are detailed and well illustrated. For paper conservation, the reader is reminded to prepare materials by removing fasteners, surface cleaning, and relaxing/flattening paper. The necessary steps for conservation and repair are described in such a way that this book could serve as a training manual. The repair techniques covered are mending tears, holes, corners, and foldout maps; attaching hinges; and guarding. The section regarding book repair describes techniques intended for research collections, and the authors strongly state that “rare or valuable books should not be repaired in-house by these methods” (p. 107). The book repair techniques covered include simple repairs to the case and text block, as well as pamphlet binding and care of children’s books. Although more attention is given to book repair, the section on paper is not lacking; in fact, it covers more than most archivists are equipped or have time to do.

Balloffet and Hille know that most archives and libraries are under pressure to exhibit materials, so they dedicate a chapter to the topic. “Small Exhibitions” provides guidelines for designing an exhibition, includes sample condition report forms, and covers installing and closing the show. The reader is instructed in all aspects of framing paper materials and supporting books. The section on book supports is well done and allows for custom-made book cradles without a burdensome expense.

A series of appendices complements *Preservation and Conservation for Libraries and Archives*. The first, “Care of Photographs,” is nine pages long and covers handling, rehousing and appropriate storage enclosures, environment,

B O O K R E V I E W S

kinds of damage, and conditions for display. This is a good review for those familiar with photographs and a sound introduction for those just starting out. The next two appendices are listings, first vendors of supplies, conservation binderies, and salvage companies and then "Sources of Help and Advice." The lists are annotated and include addresses, telephone and fax numbers, and URLs. Hopefully, the inclusion of so much information will help the lists stay current. The five-page glossary section includes a sampling of technical terms, but would be more useful if defined words were italicized within the text so that the reader knew to consult it while reading.

I recommend reading Balloffet and Hille's *Preservation and Conservation for Libraries and Archives* is from cover-to-cover, keeping it as a reference resource, and using it as an instruction manual for staff. The tone of the book respects the materials for which archivists and librarians care. It also empowers archivists and librarians themselves by teaching us practical ways to protect our holdings.

AMY BRAITSCH

Historical Society of the Town of Greenwich (Conn.)