Archival Issues

Journal of the

Midwest Archives Conference

Volume 29, Number 2, 2005

CONTENTS

MAC
Midwest Archives Conference

ISSN 10674993

Archival Issues

Journal of the Midwest Archives Conference

Volume 29, Number 2, 2005

CONTENTS

PUBLICATION REVIEWS

EDITORIAL POLICY

Archival Issues, a semiannual journal published by the Midwest Archives Conference since 1975, is concerned with the issues and problems confronting the contemporary archivist. The Editorial Board welcomes submissions related to current archival practice and theory, to archival history, and to aspects of related professions of interest to archivists (such as records management and conservation management). We encourage diversity among topics and points of view. We will consider for publication submissions of a wide range of materials, including research articles, case studies, review essays, proceedings of seminars, and opinion pieces.

Manuscripts are blind reviewed by the Editorial Board; its decisions concerning submissions are final. Decisions on manuscripts will generally be made within 10 weeks of submission, and will include a summary of reviewers' comments. The Editorial Board uses the current edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* as the standard for style, including endnote format.

Please send manuscripts (and inquiries) to Amy Cooper Cary. Submissions are accepted as hard copy (double spaced, including endnotes; 1-inch margins; 10-point or larger type), or electronically (Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, or .rtf files) via E-mail attachment or CD-ROM.

Publication Reviews

Archival Issues reviews books, proceedings, Web publications, and other materials of direct relevance or interest to archival practitioners. Publishers should send review copies to Publication Reviews Editor Jennifer Thomas. Please direct suggestions for books, proceedings, Web publications, other materials for review, and offers to review publications to the Publication Reviews Editor.

Subscriptions

Subscriptions to *Archival Issues* are a part of membership in the Midwest Archives Conference; there is no separate subscription-only rate. Membership, which also includes four issues of *MAC Newsletter* and reduced registration fees for MAC's two yearly meetings, is $30 per year for individuals and $60 per year for institutions. See http://www.midwestarchives.org/membershiptypes.asp for more information about memberships. Members outside of North America may elect to have the journal and newsletter mailed first class rather than bulk mail, at additional cost.

Single issues of the journal are available at $15, plus $1 shipping and handling.

Please direct inquiries regarding membership and purchase of journal copies to Greg Brooks, Administrative Services Liaison, Midwest Archives Conference, 4300 South U.S. Highway One, #203–293, Jupiter, FL 33477, E-mail: membership@ midwestarchives.org.

Advertising

Display advertisements in black ink are accepted at the following rates: full page, $250; 1/2 page, $150; 1/4 page, $75; 1/8 page, $50. These rates are discounted 20 percent for a one-volume (two-issue) commitment. Ads supplied via E-mail or on disk are preferred; camera-ready black and white acceptable. No bleed pages.

Archival Issues is pleased to consider exchange ads with other archival publications and with publications of other organizations that may be of interest to our readers.

MAC offers advertisers several easy and effective ways to market products, services, and announcements. These outlets include its newsletter, journal, annual meeting program, and Web site. For all advertising rates, please see the Vendor Rate Card at www.midwestarchives.org/MAC_advertising_rates_Full.pdf.

All invoices for advertising are handled by the Vendor Coordinator. Payment is due within 30 days of receipt of invoice.

For information concerning exhibits and sponsorships during the annual meeting, please contact MAC Vendor Coordinator Miriam B. Kahn, MBK Consulting, 60 North Harding Road, Columbus, OH 43209-1524, phone: 614-239-8977, fax: 614-239-0599, mbkcons@netexp.net.

Awards

A panel of three archivists independent of the journal's Editorial Board presents the Margaret Cross Norton and New Author awards for articles appearing in a two-year (four-issue) cycle. The Norton Award was established in 1985 to honor Margaret Cross Norton, a legendary pioneer in the American archival profession and the first state archivist of Illinois. The award recognizes the author of what is judged to be the best article in the previous two years of *Archival Issues* and consists of a certificate and $250. The New Author award was instituted in 1993 to recognize superior writing by previously unpublished archivists, and may be awarded to practicing archivists who have not had article-length writings published in professional journals, or to students in an archival education program. Up to two awards may be presented in a single cycle.

Margaret Cross Norton Award

The winner of the Margaret Cross Norton Award, given to the author of the best article published by any author in volumes 27 and 28, was Jeanette Bastian, for "In a House of Memory: Discovering the Provenance of Place," in volume 28:1 2003–2004. The committee commended Bastian's article as a fine addition to the literature on social memory, adding that the piece is "engagingly written and amply documented," and that she "demonstrates superbly that not only social/cultural historians, but archivists are eminently capable of seeing their work through a postmodern lens, and benefiting from that vantage point."

New Author Award

The committee selected two recipients for the New Author Award, which recognizes superior writing by previously unpublished archivists. Awardees are Mary Beth Gaudette for "Playing Fair with the Right to Privacy," in volume 28:1 2003–2004, and Doug Bicknese for "Institutional Repositories and the Institution's Repository: What is the Role of the University Archives with an Institution's On-line Digital Repository?" in volume 28:2 2003–2004.

The committee declared that Gaudette's article contributes significantly to the archival literature, and stated "through the force of its language and ideas [the article] compels the reader to think about the issues and to develop or refine his/her own strategies for balancing access and privacy rights." Bicknese's article was chosen on the strength of its thorough examination of a new topic, with the committee noting that "while many academic archivists are not yet aware of digital repositories, this article succeeds mightily as a tool for building such awareness."

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

MAC
Midwest Archives Conference

PROOF OF A LIFE LIVED: THE PLIGHT OF THE BRACEROS AND WHAT IT SAYS ABOUT HOW WE TREAT RECORDS

BY JENNIFER OSORIO

ABSTRACT: The case of the braceros, a group of Mexican immigrants who have been demanding repayment of pension funds from the Mexican government for work done in the United States from 1942 to 1964, illustrates issues faced by displaced groups in other situations and brings up a number of questions about the role of archivists and other record keepers in documenting cultural and ethnic minority groups. What role, if any, does our profession play in protecting the rights of future immigrant workers and ensuring that they are properly educated as to the importance of their records as evidence?

> "There's not an inch of land I don't know in these fields," said Espinosa, pointing at rows of corn and cotton near Los Banos. "But our money disappeared, and with it so did our dignity."
>
> —Jesus Espinosa[1]

Refugees in times of war and displacement often face the need to prove identity without access to the necessary documents and records, an issue that has been addressed before in the archival literature.[2] However, not much has been written about other groups that, while they may be less obviously persecuted, are also subject to the whims of government and bureaucracy as they attempt to establish identity, claim rights, and seek redress for wrongs done to them.[3]

This article addresses issues faced by such a population: a group of Mexican immigrants to the United States commonly known as braceros. It also explores how two governments and other institutions entrusted with documenting the braceros worker program failed a group of mostly uneducated, poor immigrants, denying them control over their own history and patrimony. The article also examines why governments fail to prioritize the maintenance of records whose safeguarding is in the best interests of their own citizens, and what role—if any—archivists and other record keepers should play in protecting the interests of specific populations and cultural groups.

The braceros, a group of some 4.6 million Mexican immigrants,[4] worked as farm laborers in rural America through a program run by the United States and Mexico from 1942 to 1964. A similar program for railroad workers operated from 1942 until the end of World War II. The braceros faced many problems during their time in America, including discrimination, abuse by border agents and their employers, and low wages. But the central issue that concerns surviving braceros and their descendants is the attempt to recover wages owed to them by the Mexican government in the form of a pension plan. The braceros' fight is illustrative of problems faced by other minority groups in gaining recognition and access to not only money or services owed them, but also to their own history and records. It also underscores the need to educate people about the necessity of maintaining their own records. The loss of these records emphasizes the importance of records as evidence, not just in the courts, but also as proof of one's history and of a government's accountability to its citizens. Finally, it raises issues of accountability over time and how intergovernmental cooperation can address this problem.

How the Braceros Program Began

During World War II, the United States found itself with a shortage of railroad and agricultural workers. Many American farm workers enlisted in the armed forces, both out of patriotic fervor and in search of better wages and employment opportunities. Outside the armed forces, many employment opportunities existed in large urban areas, where former farm workers found work producing war munitions and supplies. American farmers, in desperate need of workers to bring in the crops, pressured the U.S. government for help. The government's response, which became known as the Braceros (Spanish for "strong arms") Program, was based on a similar program the United States had sponsored during World War I.

Starting in 1942, the United States granted guest visas to select Mexican citizens to work in particular industries, mainly agriculture and the railroads. Initially, the workers had to be interviewed by the Mexican government before being allowed into the program, but eventually workers who entered the United States illegally could also join the program. American employers sent these workers back to the border, where U.S. Customs and Border officials processed their applications, issued them visas and allowed them to return to the United States. Neither the worker nor the employer had to pay a penalty officially, although many braceros tell of bribes paid to border officials.[5] Under the contract, the braceros were to be paid a minimum wage (no less than that paid to comparable American workers), with guaranteed housing, and sent to work on farms and in railroad depots throughout the country—although most braceros worked in the western United States. Throughout much of the program's span, the U.S. and Mexican governments garnished 10 percent of the workers' wages, with the stated purpose of giving them a nest egg for their return to Mexico; the plan also served as an incentive for the workers to return to Mexico, as many involved in developing the program were concerned that the workers would simply stay in the United States after their service term was over. The garnishment came to more than $32 million, which was deposited in American banks, mainly Wells Fargo. Those banks subsequently transferred the funds to Mexican banks, largely to BanRural (aka Banco Rural de Credito National, or National Rural Credit Bank), which was to hold the funds and any accrued interest, until the workers returned to Mexico and claimed it.

In 2001, a group of ex-braceros attempting to recover the money filed a lawsuit against Wells Fargo when the company found records confirming only that some of the money had been deposited.[6] The bank had no records of what happened to it afterward, including whether or not the money had actually been transferred to Mexico. The main Mexican bank, BanRural, had gone out of business in the intervening time and no record of deposits for braceros money could be found in its remaining papers—although an internal audit conducted by the Mexican government in 1947 found that bank officials had been using bracero money to fund day-to-day bank operations.[7] An investigation by the *Dallas Morning News* in 2002 showed that documentation kept by both governments in the 1940s provided ample evidence of what each bracero was owed and of complaints by braceros of missing money, but those records eventually disappeared.[8]

Many braceros never received the funds promised to them for a variety of reasons. Some of the workers stayed in the United States or could not return to Mexico to claim the funds. Other workers found that even when they tried to claim their funds in Mexico, banks claimed to have no knowledge of the money's whereabouts or to be unable to trace the funds. Eventually the main Mexican bank, BanRural, closed and the workers had even fewer places to turn. Some workers learned of the difficulties faced by their compatriots and never bothered to pursue the matter. Further, many of the braceros were unaware the withholdings had been made in the first place, or that they had a right to claim the funds later. While conducting an oral history project at California State University, Chico, in 2002, professor Paul Lopez found himself to be the first person to inform many of the twenty-five ex-braceros he interviewed about the pension plan and current attempts to recover the money.[9] Some experts have put the possible amount of wages owed, including interest, at more than $500 million (U.S. dollars) in today's currency.[10] Some workers, a small fraction of the number that are probably due remuneration, organized into several groups that jointly called themselves Proyecto Bracero (Bracero Project). In addition to suing in U.S. Courts, the members of Proyecto Bracero also lobbied the Mexican government.

Governmental Response

In general, the United States courts have sided with the United States government, if only because of technicalities. U.S. District Judge Charles Breyer, who heard the original 2001 lawsuit filed by the braceros, threw it out on the grounds that the statute of limitations had expired. He did uphold the claim that millions of dollars were stolen and that both the Mexican and American governments knew it,[11] but in a second ruling in September 2004, Breyer once again rejected the lawsuit on statute-of-limitations grounds. Another lawsuit by a different braceros group is still pending as of this writing.

Braceros in Mexico spent years lobbying the Mexican government for the return of their money. They held marches and vigils, protested at the President's residence and national government buildings, and presented their case in the media. Protestors representing the aging farm workers even stormed Mexico's Interior Ministry in August 2005 during a demonstration[12] and took over then-President Vicente Fox's ranch for a day.[13]

Braceros in the United States also participated in these protests by marching on Mexican consulates in Los Angeles and mounting letter-writing campaigns to the Mexican government. In 2003, President Fox granted the workers immediate health benefits and formed a special commission to study the issue. That commission recommended that a special fund be set up to pay each bracero approximately $10,000 as remuneration. But in a plan announced by the Mexican government in October 2005, this amount was reduced to a final offer of $3,500.[14] Additionally, the Mexican government also requires any person who takes a payout to renounce his or her right to seek further redress. The Mexican government has not officially apologized or recognized its errors; in fact, it says the money is intended as a "thank you" for the braceros' work. The money promised by Mexico is a small percentage of the money actually owed, but to the workers in their 70s, 80s, and even 90s, many of whom never stopped working in the fields, it is the difference between penury and a semicomfortable retirement.

Most of the braceros who qualify are expected to accept the offer. To make their claim, they will be expected to produce a whole range of documents, much the same way that the victims of Nazi looting have had to prove ownership with documentation that is almost impossible to produce. The workers must also have filed their claims in person in Mexico, which disqualifies a number of braceros who sent their paperwork from California and elsewhere. These men plan to continue to fight for a second round of remunerations.

Some braceros who protested in the United States did so with the hope that the American government would get involved because they trusted it more than they did the Mexican government. An article in *La Opinión*[15] quoted one ex-bracero in Los Angeles as saying, "If the money had been in this country, we would have received our checks by this time (si el dinero hubiera estado en este país, a estas alturas ya hubiéramos recibido los cheques)." Another ex-bracero in the United States said that if they could not resolve the problem in Mexico, they would lobby American legislators because "here there is more seriousness and in Mexico there is not (porque aquí hay mas seriedad y en México no)."[16]

Why is the American government perceived as inherently more trustworthy in how it handles records and why would a Mexican citizen not trust his own government to preserve his rights and return to him what is rightfully owed? The braceros, many of whom were indigenous or *mestizo* (mixed European and indigenous heritage) and almost all of whom were uneducated, were at the bottom of the social hierarchy not just in the United States, but also in their own country. The poor and the uneducated often face problems of access when it comes to government or bureaucracy, even in a country with a long history of democracy, like the United States. It has taken the braceros' sons and daughters, many of them born and educated in the United States, to awaken them to what they lost and the possibility of fighting for what is rightfully theirs.

Is a Solution in Sight?

Even given the agreement by the Mexican government to pay restitution of some 300 million pesos (approximately 26.5 million U.S. dollars), with further appropriations promised over the next four years, the braceros have run into Mexican bureaucracy and the need to provide accurate records to a government that did not bother to keep accurate records itself. In order to receive any money from the fund, participating braceros must provide the following:

- Registration on the government's list of former Mexican Bracero Workers (listado de ex Trabajadores Braceros Mexicanos) between April 7 and October 15 of 2004. No new registrations are allowed, even though less than 10 percent of eligible braceros are thought to have registered. Additionally, the Mexican government is now saying that registration must have been completed in Mexico, which leaves out many braceros who mailed their paperwork from abroad.
- Official identification proving their Mexican citizenship. This could be either a passport, a voter identification card, or a military service card.
- A work contract signed by the American employer for whom the bracero worked
- Pay stubs or other proof of payment for services rendered as part of the Bracero Program
- A consular registration card, issued by a Mexican consulate in the United States to Mexicans living or working here

Heirs of deceased braceros have to provide the following, in addition to the documents listed above:

- Official identification for both the deceased and the claimant
- If a widow, a marriage license
- If a child, a birth certificate with the bracero's name listed
- If a sibling, a court document establishing right of inheritance
- A death certificate for the bracero

Braceros and their heirs are being asked to provide five to eight items that prove they are entitled to money they should have received some four decades ago, by a government that has been unable to keep track of the $32 million in withholdings. Considering the itinerant nature of the work done by the braceros, it is highly unrealistic to expect many of them to be able to meet these expectations.

Additionally, a committee composed of high-level government secretaries and representatives from the Banco Nacional de Credito Rural, the same bank (now restructured and in business once again) that initially lost the money, will determine the eligibility of the braceros' applications.

The Role of Records as History and Evidence

> The dramatic case of the search for Nazi gold is an excellent example of the value of records not only in documenting historical facts but also in preserving essential evidence.
>
> —John W. Carlin, Archivist of the United States, in a 1997 letter to *Time*[17]

In many circumstances, records allow wronged parties to prove claims against those who injured them. This was the case with records of Holocaust-era assets kept by the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Since 1996, NARA has been providing researchers with access to the more than 20 million pages of documents about Allied activities in Europe at the end of World War II, activities that were aimed at finding and recovering looted gold and assets.[18] The program, code-named Safehaven, produced documentation not only of the looting done by Nazi Germany, but also of the assets taken in by or transferred to neutral countries toward the end of the war. The research done at NARA uncovered information that was later used to recover assets from Swiss banks, where a security guard caught bank archivists destroying their own records. Eventually, the Swiss government began cooperating to return assets to Holocaust survivors and their heirs. Many survivors of the Holocaust have thus been able to utilize archives in the United States and elsewhere to their benefit, whether to prove identity or to secure lost assets. In the particular case of Holocaust survivors, some archives have served as depositories of evidence and memory in a way that would have been impossible had all records been destroyed.

Unfortunately, in the braceros' case, archives have not provided workers with similar evidence that can be used to their benefit. Instead, they have experienced records only as something that can be used against them. Not only did records document their garnished wages, but those same records have been lost so that the braceros could not claim that money later without providing even more records. Records even penalized workers who entered the program and the United States through the legal route: these workers often had to pay fees and bribes to enter the Braceros Program,[19] but those who entered the country illegally were sent back to the border for the proper documentation, and many returned to work in U.S. fields without being penalized.

The Braceros Program ended in 1964, under pressure from two fronts. On the one hand, U.S. labor groups argued that the migrant workers depressed wages and increased unemployment among American workers.[20] On the other hand, civil rights groups and the Mexican government said the workers had often been abused, underpaid, and discriminated against. For one period early in the program, the Mexican government even refused to allow Texas farmers to participate in the program because of rampant anti-immigrant discrimination in the state; it later relented, and by the time the program ended, Texas was a part of it.

A New Migrant Worker Program

> The Bracero program is not simply old history, it is something that must be looked at closely in designing a future guest worker program. What happened to the braceros is both a tragedy and a disgrace. The devil is in the details: a close look at implementation and safeguards is essential to ensuring that workers are not exploited.
>
> —Harley Shaiken, director of UC Berkeley's Center for Latin American Studies[21]

In early 2006, U.S. President George W. Bush proposed a new guest worker program; he reiterated his desire for such a program in the 2007 State of the Union address, although any such program faces considerable opposition in Congress. The new program could be an expansion of the existing guest worker program, which has conditions similar to those of the Bracero Program: U.S. farmers anticipating labor shortages are allowed to recruit temporary foreign workers. It is estimated that fewer than one thousand of the approximately eight hundred thousand migrant workers in California alone are here as part of the federal guest worker program, which requires significant paper work and expenses on behalf of employers. Other proposals have ranged from providing amnesty to current undocumented immigrants to making the act of being in the United States without proper documents a felony.

A possible reason the Mexican government has agreed to pay the World War II–era braceros now is that it would like to promote the establishment of a new bracero program; having 80-year-old men protesting to the American government is not good publicity for such a program. Ex-braceros have been vocal in their desire to see the mistakes of the past corrected before any new program is instituted. Workers in several American cities and in Mexico have staged sit-ins and signed petitions not only over the lost wages from the Bracero Program, but also to call attention to the need for caution in any new guest worker program. They point to the fact that most proposals for the new bracero program do not allow for amnesty for existing illegal farm workers and that some even repeat the worst errors of the World War II–era program. One plan, proposed by Senator John Cornyn, even had a provision that would "withhold a portion of a guest worker's wages, to be returned to them on their return to their home country."[22] President Bush's proposal calls for requirements similar to the Bracero Program,[23] including incentives for workers to return to their home countries. However, because of post–9/11 concerns, his proposal does call for a more stringent paper trail to track the identities and whereabouts of any guest workers.

In order for this sort of tracking to work effectively, archivists and records managers will need to institute short- and long-term plans for records retention and recall. There are a number of possible pitfalls in a program of this type, many related to privacy. In addition, there is a likely possibility that any new guest-worker program would include wage garnishment as one of the incentives for workers; responsibility for documenting this process will also fall to record managers, both here and in the workers' home country. These issues raise the fundamental question, What is the likelihood that a pension program will work as an incentive for guest workers? It did not work the first time, when many of the workers remained in the United States after their permits ran out, and now any new workers would have the example of the unkept promises from the Braceros Program as a disincentive. Well-planned, publicized, and trustworthy record-keeping practices would mitigate the distrust sure to be felt by many potential workers. These practices would also serve to document the community for historical and evidentiary purposes. Education of temporary guest workers as to their rights and responsibilities would also fall to archivists and records managers. Without these steps, history could very well repeat itself.

What Can Archivists and Other Record Keepers Do?

American archivists and records managers should ask themselves a number of questions. How far are they willing to go to ensure the representation of cultural minorities in the archives? Is the role of the archivist to be a documenter or a witness? In the case of the Bracero Program, it seems there were no archivists or records managers filling either role. Although traditional archival practice may preclude taking an active part in searching out documents to represent particular communities, how valuable is the historical record as a whole when we are leaving so many people out? If and when a new bracero program is established, what part can the archival profession play in ensuring that the historical record of this program is maintained to a level sufficient to provide evidence of the actions and transactions involved? This will be particularly important for government archivists, who need to constantly examine the line between being a government representative and being an activist for the record. A viable, long-term records management program would be essential for any new braceros program, particularly if it involves delayed wages crossing national borders. And finally, what opportunities are here for international cooperation between archivists and records managers?

That something should be done seems clear. Braceros had children here, lived and died here, and fought for their rights here. Many of them saw themselves as members of the war effort, as soldiers who stayed here to keep the country fed while others went to the front. Like other immigrants, both documented and not, they became a part of the fabric of American life. Archivists and record keepers, in their role as agents of accountability and keepers of the historical record, can do much to help maintain the evidence of these people's lives and rights.

***ABOUT THE AUTHOR*:** Jennifer Osorio received her M.L.I.S. from UCLA in 2006. She is currently pursuing a master of Arts in Latin American Studies, also at UCLA. She is interested in issues of identity and collective memory, and how these are preserved in archives.

NOTES

1. Garance Burke, "Labor's Lost Legacy: After Lifetimes in the Fields, Braceros Seek the Pensions They Were Promised," *Sacramento Bee*, 22 August 2004, sec. A1.
2. Judith Roberts-Moore, "Establishing Recognition of Past Injustices: Uses of Archival Records in Documenting the Experience of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War," *Archivaria* 53:2 (2002): 64–75.
3. Marek Sroka, "The Destruction of Jewish Libraries and Archives in Cracow during World War II," *Libraries & Culture* 38:2 (2003): 147–165.
4. Philip Martin, "There Is Nothing More Permanent Than Temporary Foreign Workers," Center for Immigration Studies, April 2001, http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back501.html (13 March 2006).
5. Migration News, "The Bracero Program," Australia Immigration Visa Services, April 2003, http://www.migrationint.com.au/ruralnews/tahiti/apr_2003-13rmn.asp (14 November 2005).
6. Pamela Belluck, "Mexican Laborers Sue for Deducted Pay: Brought to U.S. in WWII, They Say Millions of Dollars Never Returned," *New York Times*, 29 April 2001, sec. A1.
7. Alfredo Corchado and Ricardo Sandoval, "Braceros Want an Old Promise Met," *Dallas Morning News,* 27 January 2002, sec. 1A.
8. Ibid.
9. Francince Gair, "The Braceros: An Untold Story," *Inside Chico State* 33:8 (12 December 2002).
10. Belluck, *New York Times*, sec. A1.
11. Burke, *Sacramento Bee*, sec. A1.
12. Morgan Lee, "Mexican Braceros Storm Government Offices, Demanding Retirement Payments," *Associated Press*, 17 August 2005.
13. Witness for Peace Mexico, "Ex-Braceros Invade Ranch of President Fox," *WFP News, Noticias, and Saludos*, February 2004, http://www.witnessforpeace.org/sites/mexico/update04_feb.html (13 October 2005).
14. Mark Stevenson, "Mexico Sets Payment for Ex-Guest Workers," *Associated Press*, 28 October 2005.
15. Ruben Moreno, "Ex Braceros Piden Tiempo para Empadrinarse; Miles Cuentan Fuera del Pardon Mexicano; 'Es Cuestion de Tiempo para el Pago, Dice Capiz'," *La Opinión*, 28 February 2005, sec. A1.
16. Jorge Morales Almada, "Ex Braceros Buscan Visa para Recuperar Ahorros, Afirman que Politicos Mexicanos No Han Logrado Resultados y Pediran Ayuda a los Estadounidenses," *La Opinión*, 27 August 2004, sec. A1.
17. John W. Carlin, "Letters," *Time*, 17 March 1997.
18. Greg Bradsher, "Searching for Records Relating to Nazi Gold, Part I," The National Archives and Records Administration's *The Record,* May 1997, http://www.archives.gov/research/holocaust/records-and-research/searching-records-relating-to-nazi-gold1.html (16 November 2005).
19. Philip Martin, "There Is Nothing More Permanent."
20. Philip Martin, "Economic Integration and Migration: The Mexico-U.S. Case," *United Nations World Institute for Development Economics Research (Wider) Conference*, September 2002, Helsinki.
21. Tyche Hendricks, "Bush Guest Worker Plan Recalls Bracero Program; Thousands of Mexican Workers Were Defrauded of 10% of Pay," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 16 January 2004, sec. A19.
22. K. Cobb, "Bracero-Era Hardships Cast Doubt on Guest Worker Plan," *Houston Chronicle*, 3 August 2004, sec. A1.
23. George W. Bush, "President Bush Proposes New Temporary Worker Program," the White House, January 7, 2004, http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/20040107-3.html (24 January 2007)-

TEXAS-SIZED PROGRESS: APPLYING MINIMUM-STANDARDS PROCESSING GUIDELINES TO THE JIM WRIGHT PAPERS

BY MICHAEL STROM

ABSTRACT: This article describes the application of minimum-standards processing guidelines to a large collection of congressional papers. These guidelines, recently put before the profession by Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner in their article "More Product, Less Process," prescribe making practical changes in the way we process material to increase processing rates. The author explains why this collection was particularly well suited to minimum standards processing, details the techniques used to process the collection, and summarizes the processing rates achieved by using those techniques.

Introduction

The Fall/Winter 2005 issue of *American Archivist* includes an article by Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner in which they advocate revising processing practices and goals.[1] Citing ever-increasing backlogs and the problems associated with unprocessed materials, most notably the lack of access for researchers but also angry donors and unimpressed administrators, Greene and Meissner call for a new set of arrangement, description, and preservation guidelines that emphasize getting collection materials into the hands of users as soon as possible. According to Greene and Meissner, "We need to articulate a new set of arrangement, preservation, and description guidelines that 1) expedites getting collection materials into the hands of users; 2) assures arrangement of materials *adequate* to user needs; 3) takes the *minimal* steps necessary to physically preserve collection materials; and 4) describes material *sufficient* to promote use [italics in the original]."[2] These guidelines include limiting arrangement and description to the series level in most cases and ending the practice of item-level preservation, specifically the removal of metal fasteners and refoldering material in acid neutral folders. Greene and Meissner contend that, while certain collections, or portions of certain collections, may justify attention at the item level, in most cases the traditional amount of time spent on arrangement, description, and preservation serves only to satisfy the archivist's fastidiousness and sense of duty and is not warranted given the current backlogs in most repositories. To maximize user accessibility to collection material, they propose setting a goal of processing a foot of material in four hours or four hundred linear feet per processor per year.

While Greene and Meissner provide the most recent call to implement practical steps to increase processing rates, they are not the first. More than 20 years ago, Helen Slotkin and Karen Lynch conducted a study of processing techniques designed to address growing backlogs. They implemented procedures based on the assumption that "the ideal level of processing is not the same for all collections" and considered a collection "'processed' whenever it can be used productively for research."[3] Around the same time, Megan Desnoyers reached much the same conclusion and warned archivists against their tendency to "strive for an ideal that may not always be practical or appropriate."[4] Instead, she advocated that processing be viewed as "a range of choices along a continuum for each of the four essential processing activities: arrangement, preservation, description, and screening."[5]

The sheer size of congressional collections, combined with the homogeneousness of much of the material within them, makes them particularly well suited for a minimum-standards processing approach. In fact, given these characteristics, it would seem safe to assume that those who work with congressional collections would have been ahead of the rest of the profession in terms of implementing many of Greene and Meissner's suggestions. However, a review of the professional literature weakens this assumption. In a survey conducted by the Society of American Archivists' Congressional Papers Roundtable in 1990 and 1991, duplicates were routinely discarded in 52 percent of the collections. While not an overwhelming majority, the percentage is still surprisingly high given the time and effort required to weed duplicates from such large collections. Traditional methods of preservation were in evidence in the same survey, with 19 of 26 institutions reporting that they refoldered materials, while 22 reboxed.[6] Processing techniques described in some journal articles indicate item-level attention. The author of a study of the processing rates of senatorial papers estimated that "[r]efoldering and alphabetizing accounted for approximately 80 percent of the total time spent on each accession."[7] Another author, in describing a processing project that included detailed appraisal, admitted that the "luxury of having time dedicated to item-level processing … is one that comes infrequently."[8] The point here is not to criticize any individual or repository—at 3.8 hours per cubic foot, the reported statistics far exceeded many processing projects (and meets the goal proposed by Greene and Meissner) despite the refoldering and alphabetizing, and the item-level review of the collection described in the other article resulted in an admirable appraisal effort—rather it is to point out that, collectively, we are not processing congressional collections as closely to the minimum-standards processing model as we may think. The tendency to focus on item-level appraisal, arrangement, and preservation persists, in spite of the size of these collections. With this in mind, one wonders how many repositories can afford to commit the resources necessary to process to this level collections containing, in many cases, a great deal of material of marginal research value.[9] This is not meant to denigrate congressional collections; documenting congress has been and will continue to be an important endeavor. However, many of the current processing practices are causing frustration among researchers who are trying to access large, often unprocessed collections and the archivists attempting to process them. Patricia Aronsson summed things up perfectly when she wrote, "When archivists employ traditional methods in their handling of congressional collections, no one's needs are adequately met."[10] The time has come for more aggressive implementation of new processing techniques such as Greene and Meissner's minimum-standards processing guidelines.

Texas Christian University has recently applied the minimum-standards processing guidelines put forth by Greene and Meissner, hereafter referred to as "minimum standards," to the Jim Wright Papers, a large collection of congressional papers.[11] The staff at TCU measured its progress during the processing of the two biggest series, one consisting of constituent correspondence, the other of subject files kept by Wright and his staff. Following is a description of the archives at TCU, the techniques used to process the Wright Papers, and a summary of the processing rates.

Special Collections at Texas Christian University and the Jim Wright Papers

The situation at TCU is similar to that at many smaller university repositories, with archival material and rare books grouped together in the Special Collections department. During the processing of the Wright Papers, the staff consisted of four full-time employees and one part-time. The archives included approximately 3,500 linear feet of university records and manuscript collections, the vast majority unprocessed and without catalog records.

The Jim Wright Papers arrived at TCU during the summer of 1989. TCU is in Fort Worth, the heart of Wright's congressional district, and the school had contacted him earlier that year inquiring about his papers. Discussions did not progress, however, due largely to Wright's busy schedule and his apparent preference that his papers go to the University of Texas at Austin. All that changed quickly when Wright resigned as Speaker of the House in late May of 1989. Soon after his resignation, a member of Wright's staff contacted TCU, offering the papers and suggesting that representatives from the school be dispatched to Washington, D.C., as soon as possible. The school had no archivist on staff at the time, meaning that no one with archival experience, let alone experience with congressional collections, was on site to appraise the material. To make matters worse, the nature of Wright's departure placed added pressure on Wright and his staff to vacate their offices. As a result of these circumstances, TCU accepted everything offered. Wright served in Congress for 34 years, and approximately 2,400 linear feet of material documenting his career found its way to TCU. These consisted of roughly 1,800 linear feet of paper records, 300 linear feet of audiovisual material, 200 linear feet of memorabilia, and 100 linear feet of books.

The Wright Papers immediately became TCU's flagship collection and served as the justification for hiring an archivist in 1990. The donor agreement called for a Jim Wright room to be built, complete with an attendant to watch over the memorabilia on display. While the room never came to be, there is a permanent Wright exhibit that starts at the front door of Special Collections and winds its way down the hallway toward Mr. Wright's current office, a space carved from the department when he himself arrived on campus in 1990. To this day, the sign next to the front door announcing that the Jim Wright Collection resides at TCU dwarfs the department name stenciled on the door itself.

Appraising and Processing the Wright Papers

The first step for the Special Collections staff was to appraise the collection. The professional literature is rich with ideas and strategies for appraisal of congressional papers. Patricia Aronsson is the most ambitious, recommending that, in order to properly and thoroughly appraise congressional papers, archivists should research Congress and the particular senator or representative, become involved with the office staff as soon as possible, be aware of the materials in the papers and also those present in the papers of his or her contemporaries, and coordinate appraisal efforts with other repositories that hold congressional collections.[12] Others agree with Aronsson that the earlier the archivist can become involved with the congressperson's staff the better, even before the congressperson leaves office, if possible.[13] The major issue with congressional collections is size, and the literature is full of well-grounded suggestions and warnings to pare them down. The detrimental effects of insufficiently appraised collections on both repositories and researchers are well documented.[14]

Unfortunately, the situation with the Wright Papers made many of these strategies unusable. As mentioned above, the papers arrived on campus before TCU had an archivist in place, they are and will remain the only collection of congressional papers housed at TCU, and the Special Collections' connections with other repositories in the region that hold congressional papers do not exist. In addition, the gift agreement requires permission from Wright before anything can be separated from the collection.

In an effort to avoid appraising the collection at the item or folder level, the appraisal strategy adopted for the Wright Papers focused on document types. For example, the staff removed the academy files and published House committee reports from the constituent correspondence and legislative material in series I. For the most part, the rest of the series went untouched. In series II, accepted and declined invitations were the major separation, although in order to save time, staff separated invitations only when the entire box consisted of them. This means that some invitations, when in a box with other types of records, remain in the papers. We separated 90 feet of material from series I and II combined. Included in the separations were 40 feet of invitations and 35 feet of books, largely bound volumes of the public papers of various presidents, *Foreign Relations of the United States* and *Congressional Records*. The collection will further decrease in size over time. The case files—records of constituents asking Wright to intercede on their behalf in a matter concerning a government agency—are still closed and therefore remain untouched. When the time comes, they will be sampled and trimmed considerably from their current 250 linear feet. Eventually, the memorabilia will be offered back to Wright or his family, and most unclaimed items will be separated from the collection. In addition, many of the books will be added to the library's general holdings.

Despite the progress made, I would have preferred a different method of appraisal for the Wright Papers. Dealing with material that should never have been accessioned, challenged by a complicated donor agreement, and thwarted by the university's desire not to offend the donor, the staff must manage a collection that is still much too large. In particular, I would have liked to have sampled the constituent correspondence.[15] Unable to be bold, we stayed conservative and carried out appraisal as quickly as possible.[16] In so doing, we remained safely within the comfort level of those at the school. However, if TCU ever resumes processing the Wright Papers, it will be because space issues have forced further appraisal.

Slotkin and Lynch's premise that "the ideal level of processing is not the same for all collections" guided the general arrangement and description strategy for the Wright Papers.[17] With a collection of its size, the staff applied that philosophy series by series.[18] The constituent correspondence in series I is seldom used, and the arrangement and description of the series reflects this. The portion of the series that had been arranged before the implementation of minimum-standards processing remains untouched, sorted by Congress, divided into four subgroups and, from there, arranged alphabetically by committee name and chronologically within each folder. While this arrangement undoubtedly increased intellectual control over the material, the immense amount of work necessary to impose it could not continue to be justified. For the remainder of the series, the staff created a box-level inventory using the descriptions Wright's staff had written on the boxes. The archival staff did not arrange, rehouse, refolder, or relabel the material, instead they left it in the same folders and Federal Records Center boxes in which it arrived. The TCU staff also undertook no item-level conservation or appraisal, spending just a few minutes on each box to verify that the contents matched the description written on the boxes and folders, that the records were not seriously damaged in some way, and to note the date range.

Series I of the Wright Papers is 488 linear feet. The staff processed the remaining unprocessed portion, 353 feet of the series, using the minimum-standards procedure described above. It took 80 hours to complete this section—including entering the box listing in the finding aid and labeling the boxes—for an average of a little over four linear feet per hour. The box listing for all of series I is only five printed pages. Admittedly, this is spartan, but fair considering the material and how little it has been used over the past 15 years. The finding aid, the box listing, and a series description that provides an overview of the material and explanation of the two systems of arrangement within the series, give researchers enough physical and intellectual access to explore the series while not assuming the responsibility of leading them through it.

Series II consists of subject files about both local and national issues, which were maintained by Wright's staff, along with a variety of other materials, including Wright's speech files and correspondence from other members of Congress. This is the largest series in the collection, 540 linear feet, and contains the material most used by researchers. Because of its popularity, the staff described the series to the folder level while employing the same general principles used in series I. Wright's staff labeled nearly every folder and those labels were used whenever possible, with bracketed statements added when necessary to provide more information about the contents of a folder. The TCU staff did not refolder or rebox the material. Special Collections staff did not refolder or rebox the material and did not arrange the material or conduct item-level conservation. We combined folders dealing with the same topic into a one-line description whenever possible but went into greater detail when necessary. For example, I decided that a run of correspondence with Wright's colleagues in the House deserved to be listed by the last name of each correspondent rather than under the general heading of "correspondence." The inventory for series II is approximately three hundred pages, an indication of this series' perceived research value compared with that of series I.

Student assistants performed the majority of the work on series II. Freed from their previous duties of photocopying and sorting constituent mail, the students added folder titles to the inventory. Rather than relying on the archivist to produce work for them, they assumed an active role in the process. The archivist interceded only when material was loose or in an unmarked folder and therefore needed to be identified, or when certain types of documents (for example, academy files or case files) appeared in the folders. Student assistants entered a folder-level inventory for 540 linear feet of material in roughly the same number of hours. The additional 60 hours the staff spent reviewing the inventory, answering the resulting questions, and labeling boxes dropped the average processing time to just below one linear foot per hour.

Summary of Processing Rates

Using minimum standards, the staff at TCU processed a total of 893 feet in 680 hours for an average of .76 hours, or 45 minutes, per foot. Finding processing metrics for congressional collections for comparison is difficult. In the study previously noted, which was conducted at the University of Washington in the mid-1980s, Uli Haller reported that staff there processed four accessions from two collections of senatorial papers at a rate of 3.8 hours per cubic foot.[19] In his article, Haller reported that refoldering and alphabetizing accounted for approximately 80 percent of the time spent on each accession. If the time spent refoldering and alphabetizing is subtracted, the University of Washington processed at the same rate as TCU, or 45 minutes per foot. When Haller notes that "[t]he relatively low percentage of appraisal and arrangement time is no accident since most of that work was done at the box and folder levels," the similarities in processing rates are no surprise, given the similarities in processing procedures.[20] While Washington's processing rate was excellent, the comparison to TCU's rate helps quantify how much time TCU saved by not refoldering or alphabetizing.

Conclusion

It is hard to overstate the positive effects that making substantial progress with the Wright Papers has had on the Special Collections department at TCU. Before the minimum-standards project started, the staff thought of the papers as an albatross, the collection that would take many lifetimes to process. Now, having processed the first three series (series III consists of personal papers), the department is able to turn its attention to other collections in the backlog. Equally important, the finding aid has provided access to the papers. Reference requests have increased and reference service has improved. Although portions of the finding aid lack the detail many traditional finding aids have, to concentrate on what the finding aid is not does it a disservice. The staff may retrieve more boxes and spend slightly more time on reference requests in the future, but these are small sacrifices considering the amount of time saved during processing. Faced with a huge collection and a large backlog, TCU decided to do enough to provide access to the collection and no more. The state of the archives as a whole will benefit greatly from this decision over time.

Given the nature and the magnitude of the change that minimum-standards processing calls for, it is understandable that the profession would debate its merits. However, when user access is given top priority, as it should be, the question must be asked: What is more detrimental, loosening our grip on traditional processing practices or keeping collections hidden in our backlogs? It may be too much to expect the profession to feel liberated by Greene and Meissner's assertion that "[t]he archivist's job is simply to represent the materials sufficient to affording acceptable access," but it should not be threatened by it either.[21] Given their size and other unique characteristics, many of the minimum processing guidelines are undoubtedly already being employed in the processing of congressional collections. It is time to fully embrace the guidelines to maximize the processing efficiency of these large and ever-growing collections.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Michael Strom is senior archivist at Texas Christian University. Prior to his appointment at TCU, he worked in Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University, where he specialized in processing legal collections. He has an M.L.I.S. from the University of Texas at Austin and an M.A. in history from Central Washington University.

NOTES

1. Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *American Archivist* 68:2 (2005): 208–263.
2. Greene and Meissner, "More Product, Less Process," 212–213.
3. Helen W. Slotkin and Karen T. Lynch, "An Analysis of Processing Procedures: The Adaptable Approach," *American Archivist* 45:2 (1982): 156–157.
4. Megan Floyd Desnoyers, "When Is a Collection Processed?" *Midwestern Archivist* VII:1 (1982): 6.
5. Megan Floyd Desnoyers, "When Is a Collection Processed?" 8.
6. Mary Boccaccio, "Processing and Maintaining Congressional Collections: The Congressional Papers Roundtable Survey," *Provenance* X (spring/fall 1992): 57–64.
7. Uli Haller, "Variations in the Processing Rates on the Magnuson and Jackson Senatorial Papers," *American Archivist* 50:1 (1987): 104.

8. L. Rebecca Johnson Melvin, "The Appraisal of Senator John Williams's Papers," *Provenance* X (spring/fall 1992): 45.
9. According to Richard A. Baker, historian of the Senate, "Those who have worked extensively in the papers of recent former senators readily agree that as much as 80 or even 90 percent of a given collection is of marginal value." Richard A. Baker, "Managing Congressional Papers: A View of the Senate," *American Archivist* 41:3 (1978): 295. While it may not be safe to assume that those percentages apply to all congressional collections, it is reasonable to expect to find significant portions of any given collection to be of marginal value.
10. Patricia Aronsson, "Appraisal of Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections," in *Archival Choices*, ed. Nancy E. Peace (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1984): 83.
11. The finding aid for the Jim Wright Papers is available at http://libnt4.lib.tcu.edu/SpColl/wright.htm (18 April 2007).
12. Aronsson, "Appraisal of Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections," 82–84.
13. For examples of how this has worked in the past, see Lauren R. Brown, "Present at the Tenth Hour: Appraising and Accessioning the Papers of Congresswoman Majorie S. Holt," *Rare Books and Manuscripts Librarianship* 2 (fall 1987): 95–102, and Susan Goldstein, "Appraising a Retiring Senator's Papers: A View from the Staff of Senator Alan Cranston," *Provenance* X (spring/fall 1992): 27–34.
14. Mark Greene succinctly states the problem for repositories: "Unless archivists can develop appraisal guidelines to significantly reduce the size of Congressional collections, overall documentation of Congress will suffer because fewer collections will be preserved." Mark A. Greene, "Appraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society: A Case Study," *Archival Issues* 19 (1994): 33. Lydia Lucas effectively describes the problem an overly large collection presents to researchers: "If researchers perceive a collection *as a whole* to be overwhelming, then the whole of that collection is likely to remain unused [italics in the original]." Lydia Lucas, "Managing Congressional Papers: A Repository View," *American Archivist* 41 (1978): 280.
15. For an example of a project that sampled constituent mail, see Eleanor McKay, "Random Sampling Techniques: A Method of Reducing Large, Homogeneous Series in Congressional Papers," *American Archivist* 41 (1978): 281–289. McKay and her staff removed 80 percent of the constituent mail from a congressional collection. According to the author, "Stacks glutted with constituent correspondence of questionable value preclude repositories from accessioning other collections of more certain research value." McKay, "Random Sampling Techniques," 285.
16. Of the material separated from the collection, only the approved invitations would be the slightest bit controversial.
17. Slotkin and Lynch, "An Analysis of Processing Procedures," 156.
18. This approach is not revolutionary. In her overview of the Congressional Papers Roundtable survey, Mary Boccaccio mentions that many institutions reported processing and describing different series at different levels. Boccaccio, "Processing and Maintaining Congressional Collections," 61. See also Greene and Meissner, "More Product, Less Process," 243.
19. Haller, "Variations in the Processing Rates on the Magnuson and Jackson Senatorial Papers," 102.
20. Haller, "Variations in the Processing Rates on the Magnuson and Jackson Senatorial Papers," 104.
21. Greene and Meissner, "More Product, Less Process," 247.

COLLEGE STUDENT AS ARCHIVES' CONSULTANT? A NEW APPROACH TO OUTREACH PROGRAMMING ON CAMPUS

BY ELLEN D. SWAIN

ABSTRACT: Archivists agree that documenting student culture requires an understanding of student experience, current campus issues, and extracurricular activities. Yet few consult and partner with students in planning and implementing their documentary programs. This article illustrates how the use of student "consultants," through a class survey project and as part of a permanent archives student advisory committee, can cultivate successful outreach and collection-development programs.

Over the past thirty-five years, archivists have taken an increasing interest in the value of student documentation. Student scrapbooks, minutes, publications, and photographs offer a unique glimpse into campus life, grass roots movements, societal issues, and national events. Archival scholarship extols the research potential of these documents and outlines strategies for capturing student experience more fully. At the same time, it ignores the role students can and should play in planning and implementing any documentary program related to student life and culture.

This article illustrates how the University of Illinois' Student Life and Culture Archival Program (SLC Archives)[1] has enlisted "student consultants" in its outreach programming to ascertain student perceptions of the archives and to determine how students document their extracurricular activities and institute their record-keeping practices. Through two small-scale projects—a survey project of classes that visited the SLC Archives in the fall of 2003 and a student advisory committee that provided input and feedback on archival programming—the SLC Archives has made first steps in establishing a responsive, informed, and student-centered documentary program.

Studying Students: The Value of Student Documentation

Archivists first began actively documenting student life and culture in the late 1960s in response to a new social history research movement that focused on the "under-documented" of society. Instead of examining university presidents or professors' roles in higher education as in the past, historians and others began to look at student experience and the extra-curriculum.[2] Historical studies such as Calvin Lee's *The Campus Scene, 1900–1970* (1970) and later, Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz's *Campus Life* (1987), are notable products of this movement. More recently, Lewis Mayhew, Patrick Ford, and Dean Hubbard have written of the importance of student "out of class room" experience as "one of the most potent educational forces affecting the student's development."[3] Scholarship concerning student culture has informed not only historical understanding but also student administration practices and curriculum development.

Archivists slowly responded to this interest in student extracurricular life by implementing collection-development activities. Before the late 1960s, extracurricular life largely had been ignored, since many archivists believed such documentation was unimportant or outside their collection scope.[4] By the mid-1970s, archivists such as Harley Holden and Timothy Walch discussed the significant research potential of student documents. Others discussed the legal ramifications of providing access to students' personal records in light of the Buckley Amendment of 1973.[5] By 1978, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) proclaimed that "from both a research and an administrative standpoint, institutions of higher learning have a special obligation to preserve the records of individual students, student organizations and campus life."[6] Over the past 27 years, this assertion has continued to gain supporters. In 1992, SAA's college and university archives manuals highlighted the value of student documentation for historical research.[7] A few years later, two masters theses confirmed that archivists valued student organization and extracurricular documentation. These authors also reported, however, that few archivists had time to actively collect student material and none had records management programs for student organization records.[8]

Documenting Students: A Look at Archival Scholarship

If archivists value student documentation, why aren't they devoting more attention to these materials? Most likely, it is because student experience is a difficult and time-consuming subject to capture. Constant turnover in the student population, the frequent founding and dissolving of student organizations, student organization name and officer changes, and the diversity of student body activities are but a few notable problems. Those who have written on the challenge of documenting student experience have stressed the importance of outreach in addressing students' transient existence by suggesting such strategies as working with student administrators to document organizations, contacting student leaders about the archives, speaking at student meetings, posting exhibits in highly visible areas, and creating handouts and brochures to distribute at events.[9] Interestingly, although archivists in earlier studies have confessed to having little time to actively document student culture, a 2002 survey of SAA's College and University Archives Section members found that academic archives' outreach efforts were overwhelmingly directed toward the student population.[10] Perhaps these efforts were aimed at improving use, rather than acquiring student materials.[11] Nevertheless, this finding supports the assertion that students are an important outreach target.

Largely missing from archival research on student documentation is the notion that students can and should be active participants in the archives' documentary program. Only a few archivists have written about this consultative approach. In 2001, The Ohio State University (OSU) Archives hosted a one-time meeting of honors students to gather suggestions for creating a greater archival presence among the student body. Although some of the students' suggestions were unrealistic, the OSU Archives received valuable feedback about its current programs and useful ideas for greater visibility.[12]

In 2003–2004, Chris Prom and the author examined student organizations' record-keeping practices in a study funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). In addition to analyzing the informational value of students' Web sites and offering best practices guidelines for long-term capture, they also surveyed students regarding their record-keeping practices. Students provided valuable information concerning the types of records the groups saved, the formats they used, and how they stored them.[13] The projects described in the following paragraphs build on and expand the scope of these efforts and studies.

Fostering Archives and Student Engagement: Two Projects

Based on the author's experience, a student documentation project should address three significant issues. First, it is critical to investigate how students perceive the archives. Students' lack of understanding about the archives and its role at the university is one of the most challenging and important issues for the archivist to address. Most students' views are formed by the stereotypes presented in films, the news media, and popular publications. The archives is generally depicted as a dark, dusty, isolated room, usually in a remote area, that contains forgotten and unimportant mementos of times past. It is a place of noncurrent, cast-off materials managed by quiet individuals who revel in the past. These stereotypes and inaccurate assumptions hinder archivists' ability to administer students' programs. Students will not value the mission and activities of the archives if they do not have a keen understanding of what archivists do and why they are important.[14]

The second question to consider in program planning is the way in which students document their own activities and lives. What role has technology played in student organizations' record-keeping practices? What types of materials are these organizations producing and who is in charge, internally, of documenting their activities? Students at the beginning of the twentieth century created elaborate scrapbooks to memorialize their college experiences. How are students in the twenty-first century representing their extracurricular culture? Some are using blogs (Web diaries), personal Web pages, or on-line social networking services such as MySpace or Facebook, to express their thoughts and connect with friends. Student letters to family and friends, which in past decades have been so valuable for tracking student daily life, now have been replaced with E-mail and phone conversations. The archivist must understand how students document and save their campus culture in order to plan an effective archival documentation strategy.

Finally, it is necessary to ask the question, What would motivate a student or student organization to transfer materials to the Archives? What tangible benefits can the archivist offer—better access to the group's records, "free" storage of inactive materials, assistance with student organizations' celebrations or anniversary events? Can we simply convey to students that their culture is an integral part of the university's historical tapestry that elicits research interest? Most often, students do not know that their records are important beyond their own use and are surprised to learn someone is interested in them.

To address these issues, the SLC Archives initiated two projects, a student class survey and an archives student advisory committee.

Student Class Survey Project

In November and December 2003, the staff conducted a survey of seven classes that had visited the SLC Archives that semester for instruction concerning a range of topics and assignments. The survey addressed students' perceptions about the archives before and after the class visit, use of technology in everyday life, and record-keeping practices (see appendix 1). Staff distributed surveys to students during a class period after the archives visit. All students signed consent agreements that outlined the research purpose and voluntary nature of the survey and stated that participants' confidentiality would be maintained.

The classes involved in the survey included one section of Rhetoric 101: College Writing I, two sections of Rhetoric 103: College Composition I, and two sections of Rhetoric 105: Principles of Rhetoric, which are the mandatory, introductory freshman rhetoric courses.[15] Also included in the survey were two upper-level classes: English 381: Theory and Practice of Written Composition and Anthropology 199: Ethnography of the University. During each class's archives visit, the SLC archivist provided an introduction to the archives, including a discussion of the definition, purpose, and collection scope of the archives, a comparison of archival vs. library research strategies, information about finding and accessing archival materials, and archival database instruction. In addition to this overview, the SLC archivist outlined ideas and resources for the specific assignment at hand. Assignments included a short paper and presentation on a subject of student or university history (Rhetoric 105), an examination of a "conflict zone" on campus, such as a protest, debate, etc. (Rhetoric 103), a final paper project that examined forms of student writing outside the classroom (English 381), an essay comparing and contrasting the student experience of any alumnus with that of the student (Anthropology 199), and an essay on a personal artifact that represented the student's life as a student (Rhetoric 101 and 103).[16] Each class viewed a number of archival materials that represented samples of the types of information and sources found in the archives—student rules and handbooks, student personal correspondence and scrapbooks, publications by and for students, etc. Of the 96 students who completed the survey, 68 were freshman, 2 were sophomores, 1 was a junior, and 24 were seniors.[17]

It is important to note that this survey group represents a typical semester of class use in the SLC Archives. It does not represent a sampling of the UI student body, which had an enrollment of 38,870 students (graduate and undergraduate) in fall 2003.

Archives Student Advisory Committee

In addition to the survey project, the SLC Archives also established a Student Advisory Committee to solicit student views and ideas about archives' programming, identify student documentary activities, introduce students to the archives, and assist the archives in collecting student materials (see appendix 2). Composed of student leaders from a number of representative student organizations—fraternity and sorority leadership groups, student government, religious and social action groups, athletic clubs, and cultural organizations—the committee serves as a sounding board for new programs and provides input into the ways in which the archives can better reach and serve the student body. In addition, these leaders can promote the archives to their peers and encourage other groups to transfer and use records and documents in the archives.[18]

The director of registered student organizations supported the project by attending meetings and promoting the importance of the committee to the students who were involved.

In collaboration with the director, the archivist invited student leaders from a variety of organizations—including service, political, social, professional, and recreational groups—in order to insure representation of diverse experiences. In addition, leaders represented groups that previously had deposited records with the Archives and those that had had little or no contact with the SLC program. Highly visible, well-connected, and historically "important" organizations—such as Illinois Student Government and the Illini Union Board—were also invited. Finally, the archivist invited a few umbrella groups such as the Greek Councils, whose members were involved in other related organizations.

Although these projects have resulted in invaluable advice and information for developing outreach and documentary programming, it is important to re-emphasize that survey project participants and advisory committee membership represent a small fraction of the total student population on campus. There are more than one thousand registered student organizations on campus and an uncountable number of informal groups and clubs. These projects, which are discussed in the following paragraphs, are first steps in gaining an understanding of student culture on campus.

Project Findings

Student Perceptions of the Archives

Section I of the class survey addressed students' awareness and perceptions of the archives. The first group of questions focused on the archives' visibility on campus. Survey results indicated that 7 freshman (10.2% of all freshman in the study) and 6 seniors (25% of all seniors in the study) had heard of the SLC Archives or University Archives prior to attending the class visit. Overall, 13.5% of the total number of students in the survey had prior knowledge of the archives.[19] Of these, however, only 3 seniors and 1 freshman had used the Archives prior to class. Although these statistics are low, it is important to remember that first-semester freshmen, who had had little time to encounter the archives, comprise 70.8 % of the survey population.[20] In positive terms, the freshman rhetoric classes' visits offered the SLC Archives the opportunity to introduce students to the archives early in their college careers. As expected, the number of seniors who had heard of the Archives is higher (25% of all seniors in the study) than that of freshman.

Part I of the survey also addressed students' perceptions of "an archives" before and after their class visit. Before the visit, students envisioned that the archives was much like a library or museum but with "old documents, books, and artifacts of years past" or "big stacks, of paper just filed away like folders in a doctor's office." One student expected an archives to contain "a bunch of old stuff in a dusty old room from past students." Two students thought of the archives in terms of a video game they played frequently. One student explained, "a James Bond video game was the only exposure to the word 'archives' I have ever had." Another was surprised the archives wasn't in the basement. Overall, students described the "imagined archives" with stereotypical words—old, dusty, antique, and "museum-like."

When asked whether their perceptions of the archives changed after their class visit, 49 of 92 students who completed Section I of the survey responded yes (53.2%), 37 responded no (40.2%), and 6 (6.5%) responded "yes and no" or stated that they had no perceptions prior to the visit. Most students whose perception changed emphasized their surprise that the archives contained personal materials written and saved by ordinary students, such as beanies, "dance invites," scrapbooks, and diaries. A couple of students were surprised that student life materials were not automatically placed in the archives, but instead she or he "now realize[d] that librarians and students have to actively seek archival material." One student responded that before the visit he or she thought of archives in terms of a "holding facility" but after the visit, "thinks of it in connection with documentation and information."

Unfortunately, those students whose perception did not change after the visit did not expound on the reasons, except to say that the archives looked like a library or a museum. On the other hand, students who didn't have a perception of the archives prior to the visit, came away with a positive experience. One student explained, "I felt as though it was extremely useful, and almost captivating because it is amazing to see the history of U of I in something, aside from newspaper articles. I never had a perception but now my perception is a good one."

The final question in Section I of the survey required students to list what they liked and disliked about the archives or the visit. Overwhelmingly, comments were positive. Students responded with words such as "interesting" and "fascinating." They cited "helpful staff" and listed certain items (such as scrapbooks) they enjoyed. Among freshmen, comments included: "I liked it all. I don't like learning history and the reproducing on a test, but I really enjoy just looking through things like the archives." Others said, "I liked getting to see all of those old things from my school's past" and "I liked that the archives had so many unique information sources." One student responded, "I liked seeing old pictures and reading old articles about my sorority. The visit opened my eyes to the wonderful aspects of the archives and its respect for history." A senior commented, "I liked how everything is collected and documented. I loved looking through authentic pieces (like letters and scrapbooks). I disliked how no one knows about it."

The most common "dislikes" about the archives were the distance of the archives from the main campus (a twenty-minute walk) and confusion about how to find and access materials in the archives. A few students stated that they would prefer to use books or magazines as resources. One student expressed that the archives had an "old museum feeling to it" which he or she thought was a "bad" thing.

These students' comments may seem predictable. Certainly, their attitudes reflect larger society's misconceptions of archives. That said, few researchers have asked students about their perceptions of the archives. Their responses provide useful clues for improving archives-student interaction.

Student Documentation Practices

Section II of the survey concerned students' documentation practices, specifically use of technology, extracurricular life, and personal record-keeping practices. Not surprisingly, 83.3% of students who completed Section II use a cell phone on campus. Table 1 and Table 2 outline the means with which students communicate with friends on campus and friends and family out of town. As seen in Table 1, most students used phone, E-mail, and on-line chat several times a day to communicate with friends on campus. Of these, phone use, several times a day, is the favored method of communication. Not surprisingly, phone use and E-mail were also favored methods for communicating with friends and family out of town (Table 2). In both Table 1 and Table 2, students indicated that postal mail was infrequently used.

Table 1: Students' Communication with Friends on Campus (*N*=96)

Means of Communication and Frequency of Use	Don't Use (%)	Once a Week or Less (%)	Few Times a Week (%)	Daily (%)	Several Times a Day (%)
Phone	3.1	7.3	20.8	18.8	50
E-mail	9.4	15.6	21.9	26	27.1
On-line Chat	28	4.2	14.6	17.7	35.4
Other*	88.5	3.1	2.1	3.1	3.1

*Most students left this category blank, which registered as "don't use." One student answered with an "X" instead of a number, with the comment: "I usually see them day to day."

Table 2: Students' Communication with Friends or Family Out of Town (*N*=96)

Means of Communication and Frequency of Use	Don't Use (%)	Once a Week or Less (%)	Few Times a Week (%)	Daily (%)	Several Times a Day (%)
Phone	6.3	13.5	30.2	25	25
E-mail	18.8	26	21.9	22.9	10.4
Post	49	46.9	3.1	1	0
On-line Chat	36.5	11.5	12.5	16.7	22.9
Other	96.9	1	0	0	2.1

The survey also inquired about students' use of computers for personal reasons. As seen in Table 3, nearly half of the respondents (45.9%) spent more than five hours of personal time on the computer each week.

Table 3: Students' Use of Computer per Week for Nonacademic Reasons (*N*=96)

Time on Computer per Week	Less than One Hour (%)	One to Five Hours (%)	Five to Ten Hours (%)	Ten to Twenty Hours (%)	More than Twenty Hours (%)	Left Question Blank (%)
Responses	13.5	38.5	19.8	14.6	11.5	2.1

In addition, of the students completing Section II of the survey (*N*=96), 20.8% had personal Web sites, and 6.3% maintained personal blogs. Only 1% had both a Web site and a blog. Those who did maintain Web sites and blogs used them to discuss a variety of subjects, as shown in Table 4. Students were to mark all categories that applied. Students who marked the category "other" listed such topics as: personality, career/résumé, philosophies, eportfolio, feelings, and campus life. One student commented, "I show dogs, dog related stuff: shows, food, genetics." When students were asked if they read Web sites or blogs written by other students, 36.5% answered yes and 63.5% answered no.

Table 4: Topics of Student Web Sites and Blogs (*N*=24)

Topics	Responses (%)
Social Life outside the Classroom	41.7
Politics and Current Events	12.5
Entertainment, Music, Popular Culture	20.8
Sports	12.5
Coursework or Academic Topics	50
Other	25

Finally, the survey inquired about the types of materials students saved to remember their college days (Table 5). Again, students were instructed to mark all categories that applied. Interestingly, photo albums or scrapbooks received the most marks, followed by course notes and materials, letters, electronic photos, E-mail, newspapers or flyers, and other hard copy and electronic documents. Within the "other categories," students listed: "anything I've written," booklets by departments and organizations, eportfolio (portfolio for education program), memos from Bridge/Transition (summer academic program for incoming freshman who need extra academic assistance), "notes from friends and cards received from various people," student publications, and "ticket stubs to things I attended."

Table 5: What, if anything, are you saving to remember your college experience? (*N*=96)

Type of Document	Positive Responses (%)
Photo Albums or Scrapbooks	59.4
Electronic Photos	32.3
Letters	40.6
E-mail	30.2
Newspapers or Flyers	27.1
Course Notes or Materials	55.2
Other Electronic Docs	5.2
Other "Hard copy" Docs	13.5

The SLC Archives' student advisory committee also provided information concerning record-keeping practices, but from the standpoint of student organization leaders. At its November 2003 and March 2004 meetings, committee members outlined the types of materials they kept, how these materials were maintained, and what problems and issues student organization leaders faced in keeping records. Not surprisingly, student organizations favored electronic communication. Several of the leaders distributed minutes, reports, newsletters, and event notices via E-mail or through their organization's Web site. Others saved their records on CDs. Many did not know whether members in their groups were saving these documents in paper form after they were sent or posted. Overall, no one in the group had a systematic method for keeping their records. While some stored files in their assigned cubicles in the Union, other group leaders reported that individuals in the organization keep active records in their own files. In addition, some groups had an assigned "historian" or an academic advisor who helped with record keeping. Most groups dumped "unneeded" records at the end of each semester, especially at the end of the school year.

Committee members in the November meeting expressed their frustration with the amount of information lost with each frequent leadership turnover. One student joined the archives committee specifically to find answers to this problem. She hoped the Archives could outline the types of records that had long-term importance and provide advice on transferring records and information from one student leader to another.

Motivation for Transferring Records: Selling the Archives to Students

The Student Advisory Committee in March 2004 specifically addressed ways in which the Archives could connect with students about its programs. Committee members provided advice about what programs or activities would work, and voiced skepticism about other project ideas introduced by the SLC Archivist. The Archivist described some of the projects the SLC Archives had undertaken in the past, including: an annual mass E-mailing to student organization presidents (more than a thousand) about the archives and its interest in student organizations' records, an archives booth at Quad Day (student organization fair at the beginning of fall semester), distribution of an SLC Archives brochure at the Registered Student Organization (RSO) Office, Archives' hosting of student organizations for tours and meetings, and a history project with social fraternities and sororities on campus.

It became clear from the discussion that two issues should guide student outreach programming in the archives. First, the Archives should target individual groups rather than the whole student organization population, and second, the Archives should make it as easy as possible for students to transfer records to the Archives. Committee members were not surprised that the SLC Archives mass mailing to all registered groups resulted in 12–15 responses each year. They explained that because student leaders receive so much E-mail from campus groups, the RSO office, and other student leaders, they do not spend time reading through those that require no action. Instead, members suggested targeting student groups who had transferred records to the Archives in the past. Most agreed that an organization would be interested in what the Archives had concerning that group and that this introduction would enable the Archives to pursue more material on a regular basis. Committee members stressed that asserting "student history is important" would not impress students. Showing students how their particular organization's history has been saved and can be saved in the future would be more effective. Members felt that once the Archives had established relationships with several targeted groups, other groups would show an interest too. In addition, instead of mass E-mail blasts, members suggested that the Archives create a colorful letter with photographs to send to targeted groups via campus postal mail. One member remarked that she loved getting postal mail (and she paid attention to it) since it came so infrequently! E-mail was too routine.

The second issue to consider when promoting the archives to student leaders is that they are extremely busy and, for the most part, cannot or will not go out of their way to arrange their records for the Archives or drive to the Archives to transfer them. Committee members suggested that the most effective means of acquiring student organization records is to go to the student organizations. One member advised that at the end of each semester, the Archives should install an "archives bin" next to the trash cans in the student organization suite in the Union. By the bin, the Archives should place empty boxes and envelopes for students to fill with their organization's records and label with the student's name and contact information. In addition, the Archives should accept digital information, since students would not take the time to print out paper copies. Other suggestions included placing colorful archives posters in places where students would see them: the Union, Student Affairs Office, and the Levis Center (where the office for prospective visiting students is located).

Impact on and Implications for the Archives

The survey and advisory committee findings point to ways in which the archives can and should reach out to students to better document extracurricular life on campus. Not surprisingly, survey findings illustrate that students connect with the archives best on a personal level. Most students in the class survey indicated that they enjoyed looking at the scrapbooks, diaries, and artifacts of past students, even if their perception of the archives after the class visit was unchanged or if they were confused by general principles and policies of archival arrangement and access. Student organization leaders said as much when they suggested that the Archives target individual groups by introducing them to their own historical documents and personal history in the Archives.

Survey and committee findings concerning student documentary activities underline the importance of electronic methods of communication in extracurricular culture. However, students in this study also indicated that traditional correspondence, newspaper articles, scrapbooks, flyers, posters, and other paper-based documents are very much part of their culture.

Advisory committee members' suggestions for encouraging students to transfer their records to the Archives illustrate a gap in how the SLC Archives and student leaders view outreach practices. Instead of introducing student groups to the Archives through on-site tours and meetings, committee members suggested that the Archives take its message to the Union, the Student Affairs Office, and other student organization meeting places through a drop-off box and colorful posters. They advised the Archives to focus more narrowly on impressing targeted organizations with their own historical archival documents, and then work its way out to other groups, rather than implementing global outreach efforts through mass E-mails or mailings.

Finally, committee members expressed that archivists were not alone in their frustration with the transient nature of the student body. The short terms of student organization leadership positions, coupled with annual membership turnover, left leaders struggling to find information about past years' activities and events. The Archives can fill an important need by promoting the usefulness of the Archives for preserving organizational knowledge and history, which can in turn make student leaders' job easier.

In the end, how viable are these suggestions? Archivists wear many hats, balance multiple responsibilities, and manage limited funds. Do they really have time to develop personal contacts with organizations and their leaders and become involved in student activities? It's important to remember that this undertaking is a step-by-step process without deadlines. By targeting student organizations whose records are held currently by the archives, the archivist can narrow the list of organization contacts significantly. Word of mouth among student groups and the advisory committee's public relations activities will provide more awareness of the archives' program, without direct involvement of the archivist. Creating posters to hang in student-centered areas on campus, establishing an archives drop-off location in the student services building, and producing a flyer for distribution in student mailboxes are doable projects that can net great results.

Although the SLC Archives has not implemented all of the students' ideas, this study has changed the way staff thinks about approaching and documenting students on campus. Most helpful have been the students' insights on global vs. targeted outreach strategies. The SLC Archives "targets" specific groups whose records it holds in order to add to or update these holdings. Staff members develop personal contacts with disbanding student groups, fraternities celebrating centennials, and other groups gathering for homecoming and reunions. To document student culture "globally," the Archives works with the Registered Student Organization Office to capture student organizations' Web sites. This hybrid approach has worked quite well.

Advisory committee members insist that because students will not flock voluntarily to the Archives, the staff should create an archival presence in the students' environment (i.e., the Union, student organization offices, etc.). On the other hand, class survey results show that those students who are required to come to the archives for a class or organization visit, find the experience meaningful and interesting. The SLC Archives has emphasized class use in its outreach work. By increasing the number of students who set foot in the building and use archival sources, the staff is making connections with student leaders and organization members who can see the value of their student records firsthand.

Student culture is dynamic; it must be examined, engaged, and explored regularly. The process of documenting student life and culture on campus requires the archives, therefore, to understand, as best as possible, students' record-keeping needs and practices, activities, and experiences. Consulting with and engaging students on these important issues will enable the academic archives to provide a richer, more complete historical record of student culture for years to come.

Appendix 1

Archives Survey

Male/Female (circle one) Age ______ Major ________________

Academic Year (circle): Freshmen Sophomore Junior Senior

Section I: Archives Visit

Before your class visit to the Archives, had you ever heard of the Student Life and Culture Archives or the University Archives?

YES NO

If yes, had you used either Archives for any reason prior to your class visit this semester?

YES NO

Before your class visit, what was your perception of "an archives"? What did you think an archives did, looked like, or contained?

____

____

____

Did this perception change after your class visit? If so, how?

____

____

____

What did you like or dislike about the archives and your visit?

____

____

____

Section II: Communication and Use of Technology

For each of the following methods of communication, rank how often you use it to communicate with **friends on campus**:

0 = Don't use | 2 = few times a week | 4 = several times a day
1 = once a week or less | 3 = daily

_____ Phone
_____ Email
_____ Online Chat (e.g. ICQ, AIM)
_____ Other (please describe) ______________________________

____

For each of the following methods of communication, rank how often you use it to communicate with **friends or family out of town**:

0 = Don't use | 2 = few times a week | 4 = several times a day
1 = once a week or less | 3 = daily

_____ Phone
_____ Email
_____ Postal Mail (writing letters)
_____ Online Chat (e.g. ICQ, AIM)
_____ Other (please describe) ______________________________

____

Do you use a cell phone at the UI?

YES NO

How much time do you spend using a computer, per week, **for non-academic reasons**?

_____ Less than one hour
_____ One to five hours
_____ Five to ten hours
_____ Ten to twenty hours
_____ More than 20 hours

Do you have a personal website or blog (weblog or online diary)?

_____ Website
_____ Blog/Online Diary

If yes, please provide the URL (optional):

____

Which topics do you discuss on your website or blog (check all that apply):

_____ Social activities, discussions of life outside the classroom
_____ Politics and current events
_____ Entertainment, music, popular culture
_____ Sports
_____ Coursework or academic topics
_____ Other (Please describe) ____

____

Do you read websites or blogs written by other students?

YES NO

What, if anything, are you saving to remember your college experience (check all that apply).

_____ Photo albums/scrapbooks
_____ Electronic photos
_____ Letters
_____ Email
_____ Newspapers/flyers
_____ Course notes or materials
_____ Other electronic documents (please describe below)
_____ Other "hard copy" materials (please describe)

Appendix 2

Student Life and Culture Archival Program
University of Illinois Archives
Student Advisory Committee

The Student Advisory Committee for the University of Illinois Archives' Student Life and Culture Archival (SLCA) Program is composed of 10-12 representatives from a diverse range of student organizations. Meeting once or twice a semester, the group serves as an advisory panel or "sounding board" for archives staff concerning student activities and issues, and archives programming. Committee members also serve as archives "ambassadors" by raising student body awareness of the archives and its services through day to day contact on campus.

Advisory activities:

- Provide creative ideas to enhance visibility of the archives and its services among students and to effectively meet student organization's needs.
- Provide archives staff with understanding of issues facing students on campus and information regarding current activities
- Provide archives staff with information concerning how student organizations operate and how they document their activities (web vs. paper, who keeps the records, whether records are maintained/destroyed); identify student organization needs

"Ambassador" activities:

- "Talk up" the archives and its activities, when opportunities arise, in conversation with other students
- Provide students with archives brochure and information
- Suggest organizations deposit their records with the archives

SLCA Program Background:

The UI Archives' SLCA Program was established through an alumnus' endowment in 1989 to document student culture and experience nationally and at the University of Illinois. In addition to maintaining the country's largest collection of national fraternity materials and other national student organization records, the Program actively documents student life at UI through the collection of student administrative office records, student related publications, alumni personal papers, and importantly, student organization records.

These materials are heavily used by researchers—undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, and genealogists—to study the social fabric of the university. Student organization records also are used by the organizations themselves for administrative purposes.

SLCA Program Activities:

In order to document student activities on campus, serve students' research needs, and raise awareness of the archives' programs among the student body, the SLCA Program currently:

Provides an online holdings database which includes an inventory list of student organization records
Provides assistance with research paper topics and assignments
Conducts tours of and hosts meetings at the Archives Research Center
Highlights student organization activities and collections in monthly exhibits at the Main Library
Conducts oral history interviews with alumni from specific time periods
With outside funding, sponsors a program to compile chapter histories for all UI social fraternities and sororities
Provides archives information at student events such as Quad Day and Homecoming

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Ellen D. Swain is the archivist for Student Life and Culture at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she administers the University Archives' Student Life and Culture Archival Program. She is an active member of MAC, serving on Council (2004–2007) and a number of other committees.

NOTES

1. The University of Illinois Archives' Student Life and Culture Archival Program was established in 1989, with an endowment from the foundation of alumnus Stewart S. Howe, to document student life and culture nationally and at the University of Illinois. Beginning in 1992, the endowment provided for a full-time archivist and an operating budget.
2. Frederick Rudolf, "Neglect of Students as an Historical Tradition," in *The College and the Student*, ed. Lawrence Dennis and Joseph Kauffman (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1966): 53, 47.
3. Calvin B. T. Lee, *The Campus Scene, 1900–1970: Changing Styles in Undergraduate Life* (New York: McKay, 1970); Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1987); Lewis B. Mayhew, Patrick J. Ford, and Dean L. Hubbard, *Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s* (San Francisco: Jossey-Ball Publishers, 1990): 96.
4. See Nicholas C. Burckel, "The Expanding Role of a College or University Archives," *Midwestern Archivist* 1 (spring 1976).
5. Harley Holden, "Student Records: The Harvard Experience," *American Archivist* 39 (October 1976); Timothy Walch, "Student Correspondence: A New Source for the History of Higher Education," *Midwestern Archivist* 1:1 (1976). For discussion about the Buckley Amendment (or the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act [FERPA]), see Charles Elston, "University Student Records: Research Use, Privacy Rights and the Buckley Law," *Midwestern Archivist* 1 (spring 1976).
6. Marjorie Barritt, "Appraisal of Personally Identifiable Student Records," *American Archivist* 49:3 (1986): 271.
7. William J. Maher, *The Management of College and University Archives* (Metuchen, NJ: Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, 1992): 246; Helen Willa Samuels, *Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities* (Metuchen, NJ: Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, 1992).
8. Thomas K. B. Cherry, "Academic Archives and Student Organization Records," (masters thesis, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, January 1995): 22; and Lynn E. Pritcher, "Archiving the History of Higher Education: Records Management and Student Organizations," (masters thesis, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, July 1997): 31, 40.
9. See John B. Straw, "From Classrooms to Commons: Documenting the Total Student Experience in Higher Education," *Archival Issues* 19 (1994); Marjorie R. Barritt, "Documenting Students at Colleges and Universities in the United States: Academics, Alumni, Athletics and Much More," *Janus* 2 (1998); and Ellen D. Swain, "Connecting Students of the Present, Past and Future: An Activist Approach to the Collection and Use of Student Documents in the University Archives," *Journal of Archival Organization* 1:1 and 2 (2004). Tamar Chute discusses outreach to students in her article, "Selling the College and University Archives: Current Outreach Perspectives," *Archival Issues* 25:1 and 2 (2000).
10. Tamar Chute, "What is in a Name: Outreach vs. Basic Services: A Survey of College and University Archivists," *Journal of Archival Organization* 1:2 (2003).
11. For studies concerning students and use of archives, see Mark A. Greene, "Using College and University Archives as Instructional Materials: A Case Study and An Exhortation" *Midwestern Archivist* 14:1 (1989); and Laurie L. McFadden, "Making History Live: How to Get Students Interested in the University Archives" *College and Research Libraries News* 59:6 (June 1998).

12. Tamar Chute, "The Unremembered Country: Connecting to Undergraduate Students and Their Organizations at OSU," (paper presented at the Midwest Archives Conference Spring 2000 meeting, Chicago, Illinois, May 4–6, 2000).
13. Christopher J. Prom and Ellen D. Swain, "From the College Democrats to the Falling Illini: Identifying, Appraising, and Capturing Student Organization Web Sites," *American Archivist* 70:2 (forthcoming).
14. I discuss this at length in "Connecting Students of the Present, Past and Future." See also David B. Gracy II, "Archivist, You Are What People Think You Keep," *American Archivist* 52 (winter 1989): 73, and Sidney J. Levy et al, *The Image of Archivists: Resource Allocators' Perceptions* (Society of American Archivists: Chicago, IL, 1984): 2–3.
15. Rhetoric 101 and Rhetoric 103 form a two-semester course sequence for students who tested lower on the placement test. Rhetoric 105 covers the material in one semester.
16. The teaching assistant for one section of Rhetoric 101 and two sections of Rhetoric 103 asked students to write about an artifact that represented their life or experience as a student. The sections visited the SLC Archives to view types of materials students had saved from their college days in years past.
17. Ninety-six students participated in the survey; one student didn't provide his/her class year on the survey form.
18. The SLC Archives Student Advisory Committee was inspired by a similar committee established for the University of Illinois Library by the university librarian. In addition, the Archives is following the lead of The Ohio State University Archives' one-time meeting of honor students that provided useful information for its program. See note 12.
19. Although 96 students participated in the survey, only 92 students completed Part I. Four of the students did not attend the class trip to the SLC Archives. Therefore, compilations for Part I are calculated with 92 as total population (N=92).
20. All but the two sections of Rhetoric 105 visited the SLC Archives in September, October, or November of 2003. The Rhetoric 105 sections visited during the first week of December, 2003.

Photographs: Archival Care and Management. By Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler and Diane Vogt-O'Connor, with Helena Zinkham, Brett Carnell, and Kit Peterson. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006. $84.95. $59.95 to SAA members. 440 pp. Appendices and glossary. Hard cover.

This volume is an essential tool for repositories of any size with photograph collections. The authors have long experience in working with large photographic collections, principally at the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration, but the advice given is applicable for smaller collections as well, and there are frequent suggestions throughout for how to work with limited resources. All of the 13 chapters in this work are comprehensive, clearly written, and rich in detail and examples.

The Society of American Archivists' *Archives and Manuscripts: Administration of Photographic Collections* was published in 1984, and this new volume is much more than just a revised edition of the earlier work. It is greatly expanded, and the sections on appraisal, arrangement, description, and legal issues have been rewritten by new authors. There are also additional chapters concerning researching photographs, digitization, reference, and outreach. Although the first two chapters introducing the history and technology of photography are substantially the same as in the original edition, they have been updated as well, with "History of Photographic Processes" now including a short description of digital photography.

Diane Vogt-O'Connor's chapter titled "Appraisal and Acquisitions" is thorough and contains clear explanations of the characteristics and differences between evidentiary, informational, artifactual, associational, monetary, and usage values. It concludes with several useful appendices, including a sample records schedule, a sample collection-development policy, and a cost-benefit rating for appraisals.

"Accessioning and Arrangement," by Brett Carnell, demonstrates the interrelatedness of archival procedures by discussing the value of acquisition information in accessioning. He stresses the importance of conducting a preliminary review of a collection and then developing a processing plan before proceeding with arrangement. He provides an overview of different types of arrangements and points out the risks that can arise from errors in arrangement, chief of which is the loss of information but also can include the choice of inappropriate housing and surrogates, mislabeling, and misinterpretation. This chapter is also enriched by a number of sample forms.

The chapter "Description and Cataloging," by Helena Zinkham, continues the emphasis on the interrelatedness of archival procedures by recognizing the role of work done during appraisal and arrangement in the writing of descriptions. While description is a vital necessity for any archival collection, Zinkham focuses on the description of photographs specifically, giving practical advice on how to describe them and the importance of multiple access points. In this she builds on the advice from her earlier chapter, "Reading and Researching Photographs." Additionally, she provides information on different kinds of finding aids, as well as a helpful list of steps for building them. The section on guidelines and standards includes a useful table of standards for content, data structure, and data values, with explanations and examples.

At the center of the volume are the two chapters by Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, "Preservation" and "Integrating Preservation and Archival Procedures." "Preservation" describes various causes of deterioration and makes specific recommendations for environmental conditions and housing. Ritzenthaler then discusses how best to preserve a variety of photographic formats. The chapter on integrating preservation into archival procedures details how preservation should be involved in all archival activities from appraisal through description, reference use, and exhibitions. Ritzenthaler also wrote this volume's chapter on copying photographs, in which she surveys use and reproduction policies, fees, the types of copying that may be done, how to copy problematic formats, and preservation concerns during the copying process.

Vogt-O'Connor's chapter titled "Reference Services and the Research Room" is an excellent overview of the particular problems and challenges of helping researchers locate the images they need, while safeguarding the materials. She describes the types of researchers who commonly use photographic materials, suggests the level of service that can be given, and offers advice on setting up and running a research room. Later in the volume, she extends the concept of reference service in "Outreach: Public Programs, Public Relations, and Fund-Raising." Vogt-O'Connor describes 15 key outreach possibilities as diverse as conferences, exhibitions, marketing programs, educational collaborations, and publications featuring photographs.

"Legal and Ethical Issues of Ownership, Access, and Usage," also by Vogt-O'Connor, is especially helpful because it offers much more than a discussion of copyright matters. Other issues reviewed include privacy laws, obscenity, national security, endangerment of protected resources, and sacred objects and ceremonies. The sample legal forms in the appendices provide models for use by other repositories, and appendix 10-H, in particular, is well worth studying by anyone working with researchers who use photographic material. This document, titled "Copyright and Other Restrictions Which Apply to Publication and Other Forms of Distribution of Images: Sources for Information," is issued by the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress.

Kit Peterson takes up digitization, a new topic since the first edition of this volume. After summarizing the benefits of digitizing photographs and the uses that can be made of the digital images, Peterson explains the steps that should be taken in planning a conversion project. She also discusses guidelines for digital images and ways to manage and preserve the images, and also suggests a number of resources for learning more about the topic.

The volume ends with a number of appendices on a variety of subjects, including supplies and equipment for the care and storage of photographic materials, setting up a workstation for examining and housing photographic materials, and funding sources. It also features a glossary and an extensive bibliography arranged by chapter.

Photographs: Archival Care and Management, despite its somewhat steep price of $85.00 (for non-SAA members), is well worth every cent. It is an invaluable resource for every aspect of administering photographic materials and is certain to be required reading for all who manage repositories holding such collections.

Becky Cape
Head of Reference and Public Services
The Lilly Library
Indiana University

Political Pressure and the Archival Record. Ed. Margaret Procter, Michael Cook, and Caroline Williams. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005. $42.00. $29.95 to SAA members. 345 pp. Index. Soft cover.

This collection of 20 essays resulted from the international conference "Political Pressure and the Archival Record" held at the Liverpool University Centre for Archive Studies in the United Kingdom in July 2003. Only two of the essays have been published previously. Margaret Procter's introduction provides the parameters that guided the conference and influenced the contents of this volume: "All governments keep a variety of records on their citizenry. The political aims and ambitions of those in charge of record keeping can influence the nature of the record and its intrusion into the lives of the people most affected. In turn, archivists responsible for these records work within the environments shaped by the political needs of these regimes."

This is an especially timely volume, in that some of the essays reflect current topics, such as the impact of the U.S. Patriot Act on the administration of higher education. In addition, the volume brings up issues that resonate in long-term archival practice: records creation and retention, access, and ethics. The volume illustrates not only national and international ramifications of political pressures and records but gives compelling examples on a much smaller scale as well.

Political Pressure and the Archival Record is divided into six sections that include the historical legacy of the subject, access and the public interest, ethical dilemmas in public service, governments under pressure, records and international conflict, and modeling the future. The array of authors is impressive, ranging from the former interim archivist of the United States to heads of other national archives. Corporate and university archivists, records managers, and teaching faculty associated with archival programs and other disciplines make up the majority of authors represented in this volume.

More than half of the essays deal with case studies specific to countries other than the United States. These essays provide a good introduction to some of the issues being dealt with by those interested in the historical record in other parts of the world. Masahito Ando's essay, about the wide-scale loss of information through blunder and blatant destruction of records associated with the Japanese in occupied territories during World War II, illustrates the far-reaching effects. Missing documentation has made it impossible for individuals to seek reparation and, on a larger scale, the loss of records has been used to "deny and distort" the activities of the Japanese. Some of these distortions are now depicted in textbooks used by Japanese children.

An essay by Astrid Eckert deals with records of the Nazi Party and the struggle between German and Polish activists to access these documents in the years following World War II. Records of the government and the Nazi Party were taken by the Americans and the British in April 1945. In the years following the war, the Allies began returning these records contingent upon open access. Eckert examines the interpretation of the policy of access by the Political Archive of the German Foreign Ministry. Ultimately, policies reflected political motivations and resulted in less access to the returned records. Even as greater numbers of these records have been returned to Germany and opened, the return of all records continues to be an ongoing process.

While many of the historical events described in these essays will be familiar to readers, the case studies focus on the political issues surrounding the documentary evidence—a refreshing perspective for archivists. Tywanna Whorley's article on the Tuskegee Syphilis Study provides a provocative overview of the issues surrounding the records associated with this unethical government-sponsored study and the issues of access, privacy, and the right to know. The essay by former acting archivist of the United States Trudy Huskamp Peterson on the seized records of military conflicts breaks new ground in bringing together a series of issues and questions regarding how to handle records acquired through warfare.

While the volume is international in scope, the Midwest figures prominently in Dwayne Cox's essay, "Title Company v. County Recorder: A Case Study in Open Records Litigation, 1874–1918." His essay focuses on questions concerning access to local governmental records at the turn of the last century. He cites examples that occurred in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Illinois. Supreme Court decisions in many of these states settled questions about reasonable fees, privacy issues, and access when governmental units, court personnel, and business interests collided. Archivists dealing with governmental records continue to grapple with these same questions today.

Several of the essays provide suggestions for dealing with political pressures and archives. Rick Barry's essay about records-keeping violations cites numerous examples, including the Union Bank of Switzerland, the New York City Mayoral Records, and the British American Tobacco Australian Services. His examples are compelling and sometimes the conciseness of his descriptions leaves the reader wanting more information. He focuses, instead, on corrective actions, such as teaching ethics and the role of appropriate professional associations. Similarly, Chris Hurley's essay, "The Role of the Archives in Protecting the Record from Political Pressure," spells out an archivist's responsibilities clearly. There must be public record of public activities. The record has to be useable and it must be protected and preserved.

This book covers complex ethical and legal questions. Though the essays have been grouped by theme, none has a direct relationship to the others. Some readers may find it easier to digest the volume on an essay-by-essay basis, beginning with their immediate areas of interest. Archivists and anyone interested in the political nature of records will find something of value. This volume should be included in graduate-level courses in archival administration because of the case study approach and the relevance of the topics that are broached. It would provide the basis for meaningful and lively discussions in and out of the classroom.

Sharon Carlson
Director
Archives and Regional History Collections
Western Michigan University

Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays of Ernst Posner. Archival Classics Series. Ed. Ken Munden. With a new introduction by Angelika Menne-Haritz. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006. $49.00. $35.00 to SAA members. 215 pp. Soft cover.

In one of his essays in *Archives and the Public Interest,* Ernst Posner points out that archivists "have little to show, in writing, of our appreciation of the founding fathers and leaders of our profession." Based on the dearth of information available on the history of the archives profession in current literature, Posner's writings are as necessary today as they were when originally compiled and published almost 40 years ago.

Posner's essays and speeches date from his forced emigration from Germany in 1939 until his retirement from American University in 1960. His writings, published originally in 1967, are based on his work with archives in Europe and the United States. The new edition includes the original foreword by Herbert E. Angel, an introduction by Paul Lewinson, and a bibliography of Posner's publications. Also included are an index and a new introduction by Angelika Menne-Haritz that reflects on Posner's classic text. Menne-Haritz provides some background on Posner's life that places his writings in context, and she successfully illustrates the significant role he played in the archives profession in Europe and the United States.

The book is arranged in six parts: basic principles (including the development of the profession since the French Revolution and the origin of provenance); archival training in Europe and the United States; the European influence on the archives profession in the United States; the American archival experience (including the origin of the National Archives, the unique issues facing college and university archives in the United States, and Posner's musings on the characteristics of the American archivist); archives in wartime (including the effects of changes of sovereignty and military occupation on archives, and access to and protection of public records during war); and a postscript by Posner on archivists and international awareness.

Posner's writing style is informal, easy to read, and at times humorous. Written in the first person, the essays offer his unique point of view as a European evaluating the emerging archives profession in the United States. In some ways, Posner's contributions to the profession were aided by his impeccable timing—he arrived in the United States only five years after the National Archives was first created, at just the right time to observe the manifestation of the profession in this country and provide advice to his American colleagues on archival theory and practice in Europe. Posner had also worked on the staff of the Prussian Privy State Archives at a crucial point in archival history in Germany. There he observed firsthand the enormous increase in records pouring into the archives after World War I as public agencies were dissolved. He was able to see how this overabundance of records affected appraisal theory and practice for the profession, observing how the Prussians' refined the archives profession between World War I and World War II. Posner never allowed his personal views relating to his forced emigration or the effects of war on his life and homeland to filter into his writings; it is easy to see why his colleagues in America and abroad respected him. There is, however, a recurring theme in his writings that historic records must be protected in order to endure as evidence, even after the civilizations and governments that created them cease to exist.

Of major interest to archivists today is Posner's thorough description of the development of the theory of provenance and how the Prussian archivists defined it. Posner's description of archival education in the United States, along with his views on what should be included in an archivist's education, also remain relevant today. His comments on archival education and training are well founded. At the time his essays were first published, he had served as a professor teaching courses on the history and administration of archives at American University since 1939, and had later directed the summer Institutes on Archives Administration for 16 years. Posner effectively argues for the need to balance theory and practice in archival education, an issue still being addressed today.

Posner not only played a crucial role in the American archives profession by educating new archivists on European archival practice and traditions, but he also educated his European colleagues on the progress and issues facing the profession as it emerged in the United States. Menne-Haritz refers to him as a builder of bridges between the professions in the United States and Europe, and indeed the underlying thesis of his compiled essays is that there is much that different countries can learn from one another about administering archives.

Posner's comments about historians and librarians working as archivists still resonate. He illustrates why historians may make excellent researchers but are not necessarily qualified to arrange and describe archival records, preserve them, or understand the legal statutes that apply to their use. At the same time, he acknowledges the debt the archives profession owes to historians, pointing out that the archives profession in the United States grew out of the American Historical Association's creation of the Public Archives Commission in 1899. Posner also makes a point of stating that archives in America are different from those in Europe, in that the United States' archival tradition developed out of the needs of historical scholars.

Most American archivists are not as aware of the origin of their profession as they should be, nor are they aware of the vast European influence on their work. Yet Posner's writings do not only address the history of the profession, they also outline major issues requiring consideration by the profession since the 1930s. Archivists continue to address many of these issues today; technology has encouraged the profession to change and grow in many ways, but some aspects of archival work have been slower to change. Even in his criticism of certain aspects of archives work in the United States and abroad, though, Posner remains diplomatic and objective. He points out that initially the National Archives needed to rely on historians to administer its archival agencies, due to a lack of training programs and experienced archivists in the country. However, Posner implies that this is not the ideal situation. It should still resonate within the profession that although there are a wealth of educated and well-trained archivists from whom to hire today, NARA persists in hiring historians to do archives work. Posner also points out the hazards of assigning archival responsibility to librarians—they may understand organization and classification, but without the historical context, the knowledge of archival theory and practice, the respect for the record as evidence, and a thorough understanding of records creation, record keeping, and historical research, they will likely emphasize organization by subject matter over provenance and original order, and be unable to assist patrons in effectively using archival materials.

Even as he points out differences in the profession in different countries, Posner always manages to show the relevance and importance of learning from foreign colleagues and building a common knowledge for the good of the archives profession. Considering the youth of the American archives profession compared to that of other countries, it is clear that there is still a great deal to be learned from our foreign colleagues. Indeed, this is perhaps Posner's most recurring theme—that international cooperation and discussion to understand our differences and to learn from them will forge ties that will ultimately benefit the profession overall. Through international cooperation, archivists can expand on new methods and techniques relating to preservation, technology, and the design and equipping of archival repositories.

In addition, as we become more aware of the significance of accountability of the archives profession, in order to ensure public trust in and understanding of what archivists do, this volume should be considered essential reading for all archivists. We must be able to understand the importance of our own theory and practice and be capable of explaining it clearly and succinctly to those outside the profession—not just to scholars, who likely already have some awareness of what we do, but to members of the public who cannot value archives appropriately until they understand fully what they are and why they are critical to their way of life. We must understand and articulate, as Posner does, the ways in which politics affect archives work. We must educate the public effectively, through nonpartisan arguments, on their rights as citizens to the information that documents the workings of their government. Finally, we must be knowledgeable about the creation of our profession, and why it filled a crucial need that still exists today—preserving and providing public access to the records of our government and our society. Posner's essays are a plea for archivists to show our relevance to society, the ways archives benefit the public, and the role archivists fill every day to ensure governmental accountability and citizens' rights. We must also emphasize why trained archivists are the only ones with the knowledge, skills, and authority to play the essential role of protecting and providing access to our cultural heritage. After all, as Posner puts it so well, "preservation of the Nation's record is a task of national importance" and "it is the archivist who holds the keys to the historical kingdom. It depends largely on him whether a true history of mankind can be written."

Sammie L. Morris
Assistant Professor of Library Science and Archivist
Archives and Special Collections
Purdue University Libraries

Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records. By Waverly Lowell and Tawny Ryan Nelb. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006. $62.00. $59.95 to SAA members. 250 pp. Appendices. Hard cover.

The title of this volume might cause some archivists to skip along to another review, confident in the knowledge that their collections do not include architectural records. The authors, however, lift the topic beyond a simple consideration of building blueprints, broadening their study into a comprehensive manual that includes all types of "design records"—everything from professional architectural and landscape designs to engineering and construction manuscripts, from the built environment and town plans to design materials in the furniture, maritime, and manufacturing industries.

The authors are particularly well positioned to contribute a definitive text on this topic. Waverly Lowell is curator of the Environmental Design Archives at the University of California, Berkeley, and received SAA's 2002 Coker Award for her work on a standards publication for descriptive terms used with architectural and landscape design records. Tawny Ryan Nelb has worked as an independent consultant with architectural design records for more than two decades and is also widely published on the topic. Together, Waverly and Nelb have co-instructed SAA's effective Managing Architectural Records workshop.

Architectural Records takes a holistic approach to understanding, collecting, and preserving design records. For too long, the authors note, these records have been the poor stepchildren to cartographic records, with design tracings and blueprints being lumped in with other oversize manuscript material. Sadly, the traditional item-level attention paid to map records often masks the importance of using comprehensive documentation strategies for design records. Because such materials are inherently project based, a full understanding of graphic design items is greatly enhanced by contextual records, including project and job correspondence, financial records, and the personal and professional papers of designers themselves.

The volume contains eight chapters, each attributed to one of the authors. But the chapters work well together, returning to and building on the authors' central themes. Nelb opens with a very readable summary of Western architectural practice, providing a good historiography of how design, particularly architectural design, has developed through ancient and modern times and how the business of design became more formalized (and technological) in more recent centuries. Nelb's footnotes form one of the best bibliographies on the history of design records and record keeping.

The next two chapters provide details of the process and products of design. In the first, Waverly examines the creative design process, providing a primer on the organizational planning and paperwork necessary in a modern design office. Sections on office records, graphic items, and personal papers embrace the breadth and complexity of material produced during the design process. A holistic approach provides context and meaning to individual record types, which Nelb examines in the accompanying chapter. The author's inventory of document types is of immense value to the archivist's bookshelf, detailing everything from photographs to models, from drawing types to textual records, that archivists will encounter as they work with modern design records.

Chapters on appraisal and arrangement and description include perspectives for institutions of all sizes, regardless of budget, staffing, or storage space. Inclusion of examples and illustrations is a plus, particularly an "appraisal grid" for retention and disposal decisions, a simple rubric for series and subseries descriptive terms, and a sample EAD-encoded project index. Moreover, the authors hope to demystify the "specialness" that archivists often ascribe to design drawings, encouraging the application of aggressive appraisal methodology in a fashion consistent with other document types. "When architectural students process architectural collections," Lowell observes, "they often have an easier time suggesting [what few] project records should be considered permanent. ... [T]hey realize that a drawing is no more precious than a page of text is to an archivist."

The two chapters on preservation are well illustrated and of immense value to any institution collecting design material. Sections provide detailed descriptions of original design media types and their physical composition, with specific handling, storage, and environmental considerations described for the varying formats. A handy timeline is helpful in identifying print types (everything from Van Dykes to "sticky-backs"). Probably most interesting to this reader were the numerous techniques for the humidification and flattening of rolled material, as well as the physical storage of oversize items. These chapters also include discussion, albeit limited, of the use of computer-aided design software (CAD) and other increasingly complex issues relating to electronic design records.

A final chapter on research and use is somewhat rudimentary (reflecting the authors' effort to make the volume of use to both novice and experienced archivists), but does include some useful suggested practices for providing access to specific types of oversize design records. Of most value, perhaps, are sections on reproduction and copyright, which tackle some niggling issues associated with the ungainly size of some print material, as well as the enhanced rights that some designers maintain over their manuscript material.

This volume will be of immense use to repositories with any sizeable collection of design records, particularly blueprints and other line drawings. It is a necessary read for any archivist considering his or her first accession of design records, with its encouragement to examine these materials in their project context, and to consider more holistic documentation strategies, as well as its realistic cautions about the challenges inherent with these sorts of materials. Most collections hold some type of design records—whether archivists recognize them as such or not—so this volume should be considered a valuable addition to any departmental reference collection.

Architectural Records is a handsome volume, too. Hardcover with glossy pages, the book is illustrated with nearly two hundred photographs, line drawings, and other illustrations that prove critical to the text. In addition, a gallery of 40 color illustrations reminds the reader that design is rarely a monochromatic activity—a fact requiring additional consideration from the archivist. It is the kind of book you might leave on your coffee table to impress upon family and friends that manuscript collections often include very stunning visual material.

Erik Nordberg
University Archivist
MTU Archives and Copper Country Historical Collections
Michigan Technological University

MIDWEST ARCHIVES CONFERENCE
4300 SOUTH U.S. HIGHWAY ONE, #203-293
JUPITER, FL 33477

NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION
AUTOCR
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PEORIA, IL
PERMIT NO. 969

6*2****ALL FOR ADC 50091
506050
DAVID MCCARTNEY UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
MAIN LIBRARY
IOWA CITY IA 52242