REVIEW ESSAYS

The Memory of the Modern. By Matt Matsuda. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1997. 262 pp. Illustrations, notes, and index. Softcover. $19.95.

Archives, Evidence, and Memory: Thoughts on a Divided Tradition

In archives, there is an unresolved tension between the concepts of evidence and memory. This dichotomy has fueled controversies in recent years that have divided archivists over such fundamental functions as appraisal and description; over approaches to such seemingly contentious issues as electronic records, documentation strategies, and reference and outreach activities; and, more basically, over the nature of archival education and thus the very characteristics of what makes an ideal archivist at the end of the century. This wonderful book by Matt Matsuda strikes me as a helpful jumping-off point for archivists to explore this tension of evidence and memory. Neither the book nor this review will relieve these tensions, but they may incline readers to approach them from a new perspective.

The central mantra of archives has traditionally focused on evidence. Listen to the great archival pioneer, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, describing the ideal archivist: "His Creed, the Sanctity of Evidence; his Task, the Conservation of every scrap of Evidence attaching to the Documents committed to his charge; his Aim, to provide, without prejudice or afterthought, for all who wish to know the Means of Knowledge...the good Archivist is perhaps the most selfless devotee of Truth the modern world produces..." Our central professional concepts of "respect des fonds," original order, and provenance, defined by the French and Germans in the nineteenth century, codified by the Dutch in their famous manual exactly 100 years ago, extolled by Jenkinson in 1922, and followed by every major writer since, were designed precisely in order to preserve records as evidence of the functional-structural context and actions that caused their creation. Following these core principles and related procedures, archivists hope to reflect or, where necessary, recreate, as transparently as possible, among records transferred to the control of an archives, the order and character of the records as they were with their original (and subsequent) owners. Such transparency, it is alleged, allows records to serve as trustworthy evidence of the facts, actions, and ideas of which they bear witness, for which they are, in short, the evidence. Strict adherence to these principles would allegedly also eliminate, or reduce to a bare minimum, any interference by the archivist in the evidence-bearing characteristics of archives, thus safeguarding the documentary "truth" of the modern world, as Jenkinson put it. In this emphasis on the

archival mission, the archivist is seen as neutral, objective, impartial, an honest broker between creator and researcher, working (again, following Jenkinson) "without prejudice or afterthought."

This focus of the archival pioneers also mirrored earlier concerns of writers on diplomatics, who devised rules of document analysis to detect forgeries masquerading as genuine records. But this emphasis on evidence does not rest solely with either the diplomatic roots or the pioneering texts of the archival profession. David Bearman entitled his 1994 collected essays "Electronic Evidence: Strategies for Managing Records in Contemporary Organizations," which included analysis of the landmark University of Pittsburgh projects on the functional requirements for record-keeping in an electronic world. The University of British Columbia electronic records project has as its central goal developing strategies for the preservation over time of "authentic" and "reliable" computer records, these being the twin watchwords of high-quality evidence, of trustworthy "records" as compared to decontextualized information or transient data. The recent Australian focus on accountability in record-keeping has a similar emphasis. And Governor Carlin's 1997 strategic plan for the National Archives and Records Administration bears the title "Ready Access to Essential Evidence."

But archives also preserve memory. Legislation, official mission and mandate statements, annual reports, and speeches of senior archives officials continually refer to the archival role in preserving the "collective memory" of nations, peoples, institutions, movements, and individuals; or they refer to preserving records of "significance" or "value" which, put another way, means preserving those worth remembering. Archives in this focus are a source of memories about the past, about history, heritage, and culture, about personal roots and familial connections, about who we are as human beings, and of glimpses into our common humanity. Yet memory is notoriously selective—in individuals, in societies, and, yes, in archives. With memory comes forgetting. With memory comes the inevitable privileging of certain records and records creators, and the marginalizing or silencing of others. Ever since Schellenberg faced the appraisal issue squarely in our century of massive volumes of over-documentation in all media, archivists know that they must determine the tiny sliver of records that will be preserved in an archives, and that they (usually) then grant explicit authority to destroy (or benignly neglect) the rest. Because of the resulting need for the archivist to research and understand the complex nature of the functions, structures, processes, and related contexts of creation and contemporary use, and to interpret their relative importance as the basis for modern archival appraisal (and then description), as well as for archivists' growing involvement in "up-front" computer system design to ensure that the properties of reliable evidence will even exist for key electronic records, the traditional notion that impartiality of the archivist as neutral guardian or objective keeper of evidence is no longer acceptable—if ever it was. Archivists inevitably will inject their own values into all such research and decision making, as they also will by their very choice, in eras of limited resources, of which creators, which systems, which functions, which programs, which activities, indeed, which records, will get full, partial, or no archival attention, from system design requirements to appraisal and acquisition, from description in all manner of finding aids to preservation and copying/ digitizing choices, from types of services provided to document selections for

exhibitions, publications, and Web site postings. Archivists have thus changed over the past century from being Jenkinson's passive keepers of an entire documentary residue left by creators to becoming active shapers of the archival heritage. They are, in Nancy Bartlett's happy phrase, "continual mediators between past, present, and future, between creators, records, and researchers." Archivists, with colleagues in museums, galleries, libraries, and historic sites, are leading architects in building society's memory.

These archival emphases centered around the concept of "memory" are not merely the reflections of those few archivists (happily growing in number) who recently have been exploring the implications of the postmodern revolution for their profession's mission in society. Nor is it, as some "pro-evidence" archivists like to imagine, another manifestation of that alleged archival aberration caused by the French Revolution, after which state archives abandoned their juridical calling and linked themselves with nationalism and national culture, Romanticism and its idealization of the past, and the nineteenth-century rise of history as a discipline. In reality, archives before 1789 were themselves hardly the legal-juridical enclave of lawyers jealously guarding evidence. Recent scholarship shows conclusively that archives in the Roman Empire, in Medieval church and state, and in Renaissance Europe were as much driven by the need to commemorate, to celebrate, to symbolize, to legitimize those in power, as they were by any need to preserve, without mediation or interference, transactional documents as complete and untainted legal evidence.

Evidence and memory. Memory and evidence. Perhaps they are the two sides of the archival coin, in creative tension, each worthless without the other despite the contrary implications they have for the archival endeavor. Without reliable evidence set in context, memory becomes bogus, or at least is transformed into imagination. Without the influence of and need for memory, evidence is useless and unused. Without acknowledging the mediation and intervention of the archivist in the construction of memory based on documentary evidence, the claims for that evidence of impartiality, objectivity, and mirror of "Truth" ring hollow at best. As presently defined, are memory and evidence reconcilable? The answer must be "no," or at least no more so than the possibility of reconciling the deeper postmodern and modern worlds they reflect. But perhaps Matt Matsuda may suggest new definitions.

In considering memory, Matsuda's book stands above a good many other recent works on the history of memory and commemoration, although like them, he rarely mentions archives and archivists, and never as a direct topic of analysis. Matsuda explores how memory as concept and social methodology changed radically in the era of modernism, taking 1870–1914 France as his case study. Since national archives with their cultural, historical, and collective memory orientation came to prominence, at least in the western tradition, during the modern era, Matsuda's work is particularly germane to archivists—and especially so since his analysis considers the changing view of evidence during this same era.

Modernism defined a new sense of memory, and in turn memory influenced the essential character of modernism. Matsuda agrees with most historians that "the modern" is characterized by several key themes: "urban civilization, rural depopulation, mass society, representative government, public education, a global market system, scientific rationality, ideologies of progress, changing gender roles, new technologies."

Modernism was certainly evident by the mid-nineteenth century in Europe and North America, although some locate its presence at 1789 or even 1492. At a deeper level, Matsuda asserts that "modernity is an awareness of time as an historical movement that is linear and irresistible, directed toward the future."

Memory itself was transformed to reflect modernity's Hegelian awareness in progress over time, but through the parallel organic metaphors of Darwinian biology. "The intrusion of this hereditary and species memory into the traditional [or classical] memories of rhetoric and languages is a defining characteristic of the late nineteenth-century mnemonic universe, and the biological-evolutionary reading of life [and societal] histories had ideological dimensions implicated in the degenerative and regenerative anxieties of the period. As memory becomes the inheritance of the organism," Matsuda continues, "questions arise: which memory 'inheritance,' which characteristics—moral, racial, sexual—would define the most progressive of groups, peoples or states?" Memory thus was "not a passive or reactive faculty of storage and retrieval" as in such ancient and medieval mnemonic devices as memory theatres and palaces, but rather something "acted," something organic and alive, something as much present as past. There are rich implications here for archives, when one reflects that they developed their classic statements of theory in the midst of this Hegelian-Darwinian excitement. Think how classic archival principles of provenance and "respect des fonds" are infused with Darwinian metaphors of natural accumulations of records, of references to the organic character of archives, to records as the lifeblood of organization.

From the vast universes of human records, are those tiny fragments preserved in archives perhaps then the survival of the fittest? But if so, as Matsuda says, "questions arise." Who determines what "fittest" means? With Jenkinsonian laissez-faire, and traditional appraisal strategies, the "fittest" would clearly be limited to, as historians are showing now in many past contexts, survival of the memory of the most powerful in society, of the official line, of the residue of juridical administration. Yet archivists know that society—even within the realm of government and institutional records themselves—consists of many other dimensions of human experience that should form part of our archival collective (rather than selective) memories.

Memory—ancient and modern alike—is always "a point of evaluation and choice and carried with it an internal logic of moral obligations. Mere remembrance fails where ethics and decisions are absent." Yet Matsuda also notes that if memory "was necessarily and problematically about judgment, it was also dramatically about speaking...Memory serves as a point of judgment not simply by recording [or preserving] the past, but by giving its re-speaking both language and gesture..." The archival parallels are apparent. In memory "judgment," we have the core of appraisal; in memory "speaking," the heart of description and all reference and outreach activities. Yet as Matsuda notes, such memory formation/creation/speaking is necessarily problematical; it raises questions indeed. "The past is not a truth upon which to build," he observes, in contrast to Jenkinson, "but a truth sought, a re-memorializing over which to struggle." This very struggle, this sense of contested meanings, of differing constructions of the past, of continual mediation and shifting foci of what is fit to survive, is the very center of postmodernist thinking. By implication, it rejects the

positivist, scientific rationalism that underpins classic archival theory, and shows such theory to be problematical, to say the least, in its traditional articulation and application.

Matsuda's study of memory is really a kind of second wave in the flow of exciting "memory scholarship" in the past decade. Most earlier books focused, as Matsuda puts it, on "memories preserved from an accelerating history." Historians followed the landmark work of Pierre Nora and took as their themes various groups and individuals engaged in creating memorial spaces, erecting public monuments, establishing commemorative occasions and holidays, building historic sites and affixing interpretive markers, in short, sanctifying "the paces of commemoration where memory anchors the past." The authors of these studies demonstrate that those (including archivists) who so assert control over the interpretation and memorialization of the past gain status and power in the present, and thus act accordingly. While not disputing the legitimacy of this approach of preserving memory from an accelerating history, Matsuda asserts that his subjects are "histories of accelerating memory, subjected to the dynamic rhythms of an age." Rather than capture a receding past per se, Matsuda's subjects engage in ways of remembering the present. This is less memory as monument than as animating spirit of the age, as the pervasive assumptions of how people thought and acted. It is less memory as a subject than as a means of living.

On this, Matsuda is sensitive to the changing role of recording media: tools, traces, and the expansion of technical means are defining characteristics of late nineteenth-century European memory. "Modernization"—here including the decline of oral traditions in villages, the rise of the popular press in cities, and the extension of compulsory public education everywhere—gave broad meaning for the first time to a civilization whose information and records were part of a "print culture," a memory of serial events in block texts printed by machines. More, radiographic technologies and photography served medical and police archivists in recording names, dates, faces. Phonographs inscribed musical traditions on wax and made them portable. Drama critics and technical writers argued that the newly invented cinema camera was a sort of memory machine par excellence which would capture, register, and preserve forever great historical events and the passing moments of the present. The machines did more than impress, inscribe, capture, and record posterity: they produced it.

Yet his analysis is not so much of these technologies per se, but of how they were used in many disparate situations—all connected by his analysis of their approach to memory, from (among others) the Paris stock exchange embracing "unsettling social and political amnesias generated by relentless buying and selling of the future" to mnemonic methodology literature developed for educational pedagogy, from neurological dissections to discover the brain's center of memory and language to social tracking by the state over unwelcome vagabonds through passport and identity card controls, from the nature of evidence and testimony in criminal trials and forensic studies to the "multiple nostalgias" at play in the Argentinian tango dance craze in prewar Paris.

In this rich welter of varied explorations, Matsuda provides the intellectual framework of modernism and memory within which classic archival concepts were articulated and first practiced. Anyone seriously interested in the history of archival ideas and, indeed, of the archival profession and its institutions should therefore start here.

One only wishes that Matsuda had chosen to explore archives directly as society's formal and foremost memory institutions. In developing this framework, Matsuda concludes that the modernist conception of memory was not something static, not something in the past, not a synonym for "history," and certainly not fixed categories to aid in memorization or factual recall. Rather, modern memory is an organic dimension of living, an animating series of tools humans use to make sense of an accelerating present. In this he demonstrates that evidence, testimony, witnessing, and records were not inanimate and neutral repositories of acts and facts which a fickle and varying memory subsequently uses. Evidence, testimony, and records were equally social and political constructs, each subject to mediation, interpretation, and bias. Evidence and memory are not polar opposites, therefore, but friendly cousins. And that for archivists changes everything.

Terry Cook
Archival Studies
University of Manitoba
(and Archival Consultant)

Research and the Manuscript Tradition. By Frank G. Burke. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997. 320 pp. Index and bibliography. Hardcover. Available from the Society of American Archivists. $47.50 members/$52.50 nonmembers.

Contributions and Contradictions: Reflections from a Career in Two Traditions

In his introduction, Frank G. Burke states that this volume is neither a text nor a manual, but is, rather, a "professional reflection on using manuscripts for research, [and] practical advice for administering manuscript and archival collections and institutions." Twelve chapters touch on topics ranging from the nature of research sources, the rationale for manuscript collections, locating manuscript collections for research, building manuscript collections, describing them (both with traditional and new tools), arranging manuscripts, the role of deeds of gift, security and physical access, documentary publications, law and ethics, and speculations on the effect of electronic records creation on the future of keeping personal papers.

Although the book is "based on what was learned during more than 20 years of teaching a course on manuscripts administration at the University of Maryland, College Park," Burke intends it not for archivists or curators, but offers it to fill a gap for researchers, especially for the "beginning researcher—academic, professional, or amateur." He promises "a tour behind the scenes of a manuscript repository, explaining what is done and why" so that the researcher can understand and evaluate the sources found in manuscript repositories.

In many ways, it is a good tour, lively, informative, and interesting. It is, however, an archivist's tour, not a tour developed from the questions researchers might ask. Chapters seem to be essays developed from well-worked lectures for students in archival education programs, updated inconsistently and unevenly. Further, in the classroom, a teacher assumes students are reading the assigned literature, so that the lectures and discussion notes can be used to comment and annotate. But without the professional literature for background, these essays are ungrounded, especially for the novice researcher. The beginning researcher requires a well-marked road map, but the intellectual organization of the book is not clearly set out in the introduction, in the chapter titles, or in guideposts within the chapters. The elegant chapter titles resonate for experienced archivists, and pay homage to Burke's own teachers, but I suspect that they are not meaningful to the novice.

The essays are insightful but uneven. Useful information for researchers is scattered throughout several chapters, not always in predictable contexts. For example, a discussion of physical arrangement appears in a section on digital imaging in a chapter on security titled, "The Cultural Crypt." Unfortunately, the index is not successful in bringing scattered conceptual references together. A researcher seeking a clear discussion of how arrangement, description, indexing, and reference services function together to find and evaluate manuscript sources will not discover it here. The footnotes are

wide-ranging, but do not always point to the best or most relevant literature on the subject at hand. The bibliography is also selective and unannotated.

Burke, like many archivists, laments that graduate students are not taught how to do research in primary sources, noting that every elementary school child is taught to use library resources. He offers no solution to this very real problem. He suggests, somewhat apologetically, that archival systems are "not very sophisticated by library standards." It would be more useful to researchers to move from library research methods that they know to the archival research methods that they do not know. Updating the useful little book, *Research in Archives*, by his contemporary Philip Brooks, would be helpful to researchers.

Problems for a novice researcher begin with basic definitions in Chapter 1, "Yuan Shih-Kai, Harriet Monroe, and the Manuscript Tradition." Well-chosen examples from personal letters are lost in definitions shaped by archival concerns, not researcher needs. Burke does not step far enough outside our professional context to consider the world view that a novice researcher brings to the complexities of research in manuscript sources. The distinctions that Burke draws are quite subtle and presume familiarity with professional controversies of the last century. Burke has written elsewhere more successfully about the meaningful distinctions between the creation of library materials and archival materials. He strains for distinctions that are probably opaque to a novice researcher. He follows conventional definitions to distinguish between archives as corporate records, and manuscripts as personal papers, but frequently does not retain the distinction, since it is cumbersome to repeat "manuscripts and archives," and "curators and archivists." Therefore, he frequently uses "archives" and "archivists" as umbrella terms for documentary resources and their keepers. If researchers try to remember the initial distinction, this inconsistency is difficult, even though archivists know that we do this all the time.

Chapter 3, "Opening the Doors to Scholarship," attempts to help researchers find manuscript collections for research. The structure of the chapter follows the hierarchy of control, a concept familiar to archivists, but not explained to researchers. Arrangement is not considered formally until Chapter 7, "Organizing A Life." Burke simply states that, "The logical place to begin a search is at the repository level," which may be true for archives in the narrow sense, but is not true for manuscript collections. He describes the *Directory of Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the United States* (DAMRUS), now out of print, but available for subscription through ArchivesUSA. The evolution of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* (NUCMC) is discussed, and a sample of other specialized guides is noted. The *National Inventory of Documentary Sources* (NIDS) is introduced (although finding aids are not defined until Chapter 5) and its availability through ArchivesUSA is noted. Burke discounts automated catalogs because he finds them difficult to use. This chapter concludes with an introduction to the reference interview, because the archivist "stands between the source (the automated or paper finding aid) and the records" and "the curator becomes the ultimate finding aid." Indeed, reference archivists are "the tour guides to the historical treasures of the past."

Chapter 4, "Gathering the Evidence," discusses collecting policies and the procedures that curators follow in soliciting and acquiring collections. Burke again

recommends DAMRUS as "a good starting place for researchers looking for institutions that collect in their area of interest." The subject of collecting and how it may affect the researcher is considered again in Chapter 8, "Good Deeds Do Not Go Unrewarded," which considers the process of the creation of personal papers and the elements of the deed of gift.

Chapter 5, "Mapping the Roads to the Past," returns to the subject of locating research materials, in this chapter within the record group/collection level. Using the hierarchy of control, again without the signposts that would aid the researcher, Burke defines an archival record group without explaining the concept of a manuscript collection, noting in a footnote that manuscript curators use the term "provenance" differently from archivists. After defining the archival inventory, he discusses its application to the manuscript register. Two pages on "the intervention of automation" offer only a passing reference to the concept of the "two-stage look-up" so fundamental to archival description and indexing. This interruption is followed by lengthy instructions for writing series descriptions.

Indexes are lumped with calendars and other item formats. Although he has pointed out the value of NUCMC indexes and NIDS indexes in Chapter 3, Burke does not discuss what Australian archivists call "bridging tools" that merge indexes from inventories and registers to provide the first step in locating relevant collections. This is the role filled by the national bibliographical databases. He recommends instead that curators report collections to journals, since "many researchers do not have ready access to the national automated databases," even while lamenting that journals are declining to carry such notices. Researchers do need to understand descriptive traditions for archives and manuscripts because most repositories have inherited a wide variety of finding aids, but they will be confused by this presentation.

Burke perpetuates the misconception that curators cannot standardize descriptive practice as librarians have done, because "Manuscript collections are too diverse in their content to be confined to such limits." He does not note two decades of just such standardization at the collection level, first in NUCMC, which led to the MARC record. The MARC record provides a structure for information about archives and manuscripts, and allows for interinstitutional exchange of information about all forms of documentary resources, including books. Nor is *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* (APPM) noted, which provides the same level of standardization as the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACRII) provides for librarians. He admits, in passing, that the Encoded Archival Description, (the "Berkeley project") "has accomplished something that no one else has to date—an interinstitutional (and, indeed, intrainstitutional) descriptive standard," without noting that it is entirely compatible with other standards, such as MARC.

Chapter 6, titled "Tradition Confronts Technology," warns that "This chapter will self-destruct in 1999. After that date use for historical consumption only." It is difficult to write about the applications of information technology, but Burke complicates his task by mixing discussion of data structures, data contents, and data values with the problems of implementing particular automated systems, without clarifying many of the real problems in providing intellectual access to manuscript collections. Description and indexing are intellectual challenges, whether in manual or automated systems.

Since he has not successfully described traditional finding aids, the innovations of technology are confused. He discusses at length the interface problems particular to OCLC and RLIN without describing the MARC record underlying them, or explaining why there are two national bibliographic systems, or why it is necessary to use both to do a full search. While noting that many researchers do not have access to OCLC and RLIN, he enthusiastically recommends ArchivesUSA, which I suspect is even less available.

Reference services are discussed in several contexts, from description to security, but are not noted in the index. The reference interview is discussed in Chapter 3, "Opening the Doors to Scholarship," in Chapter 6 in the context of mediated database searches, and in Chapter 9, "The Cultural Crypt." Here Burke says that a finding aid is "...an aid to finding material within the collection," but goes on to say that:

> Although the existence of finding aids outside the repository is helpful to researchers planning their research strategies, there is really no substitute for discussing research problems with the repository staff...One would not expect a researcher engaged in studying the Chinese Revolution of 1911 to look in the Monroe papers but the staff at Chicago should be aware of the small cache of letters hiding out in the collection, under the innocuous title, "Personal Correspondence."

The existence of an important body of materials should not be left to the chance that the researcher will get to the repository and that the staff will think to tell the researcher, when it can be noted in the finding aid, indexed in the repository indexing system (whether manual or automated), incorporated in an authorized subject heading in a MARC record, and reported to the national bibliographic system, so that it can be found by any researcher anywhere, and equally important, found by later staff in Chicago. Burke's admonition to the staff at Chicago contradicts his previous statement that "a mediated search is only a partial learning experience for the researcher" and that any intermediaries are site specific and time specific.

If the researcher has not lost hope by now, Burke notes that:

> We have no comprehensive studies to inform us of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of indexes, finding aids, catalogs or other guides...Curators are trying to produce good road maps to the past that will ultimately be used by researchers who are known to travel their routes largely by dead reckoning.

He does not discuss or cite user studies that we do have, which may be understandable since he intends the book for researchers. More troublesome, however, is that the book does not reflect what historians, genealogists, archivists, or librarians have written about the research process and how it relates to archival arrangement, description, or reference services.

Chapter 10, "Not by Vaults and Locks...," reviews the tradition of documentary reproduction that began in the eighteenth century, and reminds both archivists and

researchers of the utility of documentary publications. Chapter 11, "Law, Curatorial Ethics, and the Researcher," is a useful compilation for both researchers and archivists. Burke outlines the significant elements of the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, and the National Security Executive Orders, although he notes that these laws do not apply to personal papers, ostensibly the subject of this book. Particularly informative is the discussion of four recent copyright cases that affect fair use of manuscripts. The concluding chapter, "Personal Communication in the Electronic Age," is a personal reflection on the relationship between communication tools and resulting documentation. As with other topics in this book, Burke has written more thoughtfully about it elsewhere.

The book succeeds, but not as Burke intended. It offers insight into the evolution of a professionalizing vocation in the last 30 years and into the contributions and contradictions of one of the leaders of what has been called the second generation of professional American archivists. Like most of his generation, Burke was trained as a historian and moved from the discipline of history to work in manuscript repositories and archival institutions. He educated the third generation through his professional leadership at the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and the Society of American Archivists. He concluded a distinguished career as an archival educator, teaching a fourth generation of information professionals at the University of Maryland.

His examples are lively, his eye for detail sharp, his anecdotes instructive. Students in archival education programs, rather than novice researchers, will find this book interesting, primarily because it communicates the passion and love of the work that has sustained this distinguished career. The book can instruct new generations in joys of a life spent in service to the archival mission. Burke quotes his mentor, David Mearns, about the value of the manuscript tradition:

> "It is as original sources for the reconstruction of the past, for the interpretation of parallel experience, for the impeachment of false or mistaken or perverted testimony, for the clarification of blurred report, for the detection, identification, and dismissal of fable, and the recovery of reality that [manuscripts] are sought and brought together."

Mary Jo Pugh
Supervisory Archivist
San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park

MIDWEST ARCHIVES CONFERENCE
C/O BARBARA FLOYD
UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
2801 W. BANCROFT
TOLEDO, OH 43606

NON-PROFIT
U.S. Postage
PAID
Peoria, IL
Permit No. 969