SUMMER 2003
Volume 2, No. 1

Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists

Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists
Published Semiannually by
Society of North Carolina Archivists

The *Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists* seeks to support the theoretical, practical, and scholarly aspects of the archival professions by publishing articles and reviews related to curatorial issues (e.g., collection management and development), technical services (e.g., cataloging, processing, digital collections, EAD, preservation, conservation, etc.), and public services (reference, instruction, outreach) for special collections and archives.

The *Journal* accepts a range of articles related to research, study, theory, or practice in the archival professions. All members of the archival community, including students and independent researchers, are welcome to submit articles and reviews. Contributors need not be members of SNCA or live in the state of North Carolina. The *Journal* will not reprint or republish articles submitted to and accepted by other publications.

Submissions should be no longer than thirty pages or 7500 words, including citations. On the cover page, please provide a title for the article as well as the author(s)'s names, position(s), institutional affiliation(s) and business address(es). If the article was presented at a conference, please supply the name and date of the conference on the cover page. On the second page, please provide a title, a brief abstract of the article, and a brief biographical statement for the author(s). Please do not put author(s)'s name(s) on the third and subsequent pages. Please number all pages of the manuscript. All citations should follow the text on a separate page(s) (i.e., endnotes). Digital images, tables, and charts are welcome, but please note that the *Journal* is published in black and white. All accepted manuscripts' citations will conform to Chicago Manual of Style 14th edition. Please consult the Chicago Manual for citations, capitalization, abbreviations, numbers, and other grammatical uses.

Please submit three hard copies of the machine-printed manuscript to the managing editor: Laura Clark Brown, CB# 3926, Wilson Library, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514-8890 Electronic copy will be requested for accepted articles.

Non-membership subscriptions to the *Journal* are $15.00 per year, and individual issues are $5.00 plus postage. Please contact the Managing Editor, Laura Clark Brown for subscription information at ljcb@email.unc.edu.

ABOUT THE COVER

Donna Baker

A black and white photograph of a sea rescue near Orient, taken by Aycock Brown in 1969. In the photograph collection at the Outer Banks History Center in Manteo, North Carolina.

David Stick, a businessman and historian residing at the Outer Banks, donated his private collection of North Caroliniana to the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources in 1986. Recognizing the importance of this regional collection, the department built the Outer Banks History Center in Manteo to house the Stick Collection. The research facility opened in October 1988. The holdings of the Outer Banks History Center (OBHC) include manuscripts, books and pamphlets, photographs, maps and charts, and a variety of other media on historical, cultural, economic, governmental, and scientific topics pertaining to the immediate region and the state.

All the material included, both the expected and the unexpected, will be useful; however, the picture drawn by this collection of forms is of a very traditional archives and records management program. Although it was nice to see guidance on selecting records management software, overall, the needs of electronic records are not addressed adequately by this collection. Even the sample document called "Electronic Records Policy Statement" really only deals with email, not general policies for handling all electronic records. The preservation section has detailed procedures for cleaning moldy books and a form for inspecting microfilm, but there is nothing provided for tracking a digitization project or the refreshing or migration of electronic media.

Overall, I believe that *Sample Forms for Archival and Records Management Programs* will be a lifesaver (or at least a timesaver) for many archivists, manuscripts librarians, and records managers struggling to figure out how to do something new to them. Its logical layout, ready-to-use perforated pages, and compact disc of all the forms support its goal of providing a practical tool to help build a traditional archives or records management program, although I would have liked to see what my colleagues are using to manage their electronic records as well. In addition to its obvious purpose, this book also provides an interesting view into the inner workings of other institutions' procedures, making it worth a peek for anyone.

Meg Phillips
California

Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists

Volume 2 July 2003 Issue 1

Contents

Archives at One Hundred

Dr. Jerry C. Cashion

On March 13, 2003, Dr. David Olsen delivered this paper on behalf of Dr. Cashion in the opening plenary session of the Society of North Carolina Archivists Spring Meeting in Raleigh, North Carolina.

I would like to spend a few minutes doing what a historian does best, look back. Look back to the origins of the State Archives and to mention just a few of the events that occurred during the formative years of the agency.

The first secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission, R. D. W. Connor, wrote that "the creation of the . . . Commission was not the result of a sudden conversion; it was the result of evolution, the culmination of more than a century of effort."[1] Then he added, "But what is a century or two among historians." There were a number of earlier efforts by dedicated Tar Heels to collect and preserve the records of North Carolina's past—François Xavier Martin, Archibald D. Murphey, John Hill Wheeler, and David L. Swain come to mind. These personal efforts were laudatory, but were just that, "personal." To be successful, institutional support was needed—what better institution to preserve the state's records than the state itself?[2]

It was William L. Saunders who pushed and shamed public officials into action.[3] His publication, from 1886 to 1890, of the *Colonial Records of North Carolina* was a watershed event.[4] Likewise, at this time there was the growth of a new interest in documenting our past as the antiquarian was joined by the first generation of the professionally trained historian. Almost overnight after the publication of the *Colonial Records* there was a flurry of well-documented monographs on North Carolina's colonial past.

One of the first professional historians in the state was John Spencer Bassett.[5] Bassett threw down the gauntlet at the organizational meeting of the newly formed North Carolina Literary and Historical Association in 1900. He said, "as long as history is the production of some man's preconceived notions, there will be no need of keeping records. When history becomes the recording of facts and dates, then will be felt the absolute necessity of storing and keeping those records. We must have a State archivist and a fire-proof building for the storing of the archives, as well as a law to compel officials to store their own records."[6] At a subsequent meeting, the association passed a resolution calling

Dr. Jerry C. Cashion is Chairman of the North Carolina Historical Commission. Prior to his retirement he served as Research Supervisor for the North Carolina Office of Archives and History and as Adjunct Assistant Professor of History at North Carolina State University.

ble." (p. xv) You may need to keep this reality check in mind when you see the number and level of detail of these forms all together. However, the book is organized in a simple and intuitive way. It is divided into two main sections, records management forms and archives forms. Each section is then divided into chapters by the broad function the forms included support, such as "Records Center/Records Control," "Records Destruction," "Arrangement and Description," and "Preservation." Each chapter begins with a brief introduction to the function that is performed through the forms that follow.

The book's physical construction suits its practical purpose well. The book is designed to be used as a tool, not read in a leisurely way, and it includes many features that would make it easy for a user to quickly find a relevant form. For example, each chapter of the book sits behind a tab labeled with the chapter heading. The tabs in the first half of the book on records management are yellow and the tabs in the second half on archives are green, allowing the user to flip to the appropriate section. Since each page consists of a camera-ready form the pages are not numbered, so once you get to the right section you have to flip through to find the form you want. Once the user has identified a form that is a good match for her needs, she has several easy options. Every page of the book is perforated, making it a snap to simply remove it, photocopy it, and start using the form exactly as it is. Even more significant, though, is the compact disc containing all the forms in Microsoft Word 97, rich text format (RTF), and portable document format (PDF), organized according to the layout of the book. The user can modify the electronic copy to reflect the exact needs of her institution, customize the name of the organization, contact information, and so forth, then either print the form or distribute it electronically.

The content of *Sample Forms for Archival and Records Management Programs* consists of a wide variety of documentation, often in multiple versions. Although forms are indeed the main focus of the book, there are samples of other useful kinds of documentation as well. For instance, the section on micrographics contains filmable targets for background density, start and end, best copy available, and others. In another section, there are lists of "Questions for Paint Manufacturers" intended to help you identify safe, stable materials for archival exhibits and other uses. There are "Guidelines for Storing Photographic Materials" and a sample of "Policy and Procedures for Loan of Records." All this is in addition to the kinds of things I expected to find in a book of sample forms: records inventories (with samples from both a records management and an archives point of view), records retention schedules, records destruction authorizations, appraisal worksheets, accession forms, processing forms, and archives research applications. (No attempt is made to provide a model finding aid.)

erence especially when the online tag library is not available. Those converting to EAD 2002 will be a bit stymied in their effort to find all of the new features. However, as a first introduction to the tag library for EAD 2002, this edition documents the new DTD well, and its overall organization is easy to understand. Certainly this book has limited value, when considering the hyperlinking capabilities of the online tag library but there are some additional merits including the discussion of attributes, the crosswalk encoding, and the sample EAD 2002 finding aids. Besides, our profession is all about the physical item, and it is just not the same to curl up in bed with a wireless laptop.

Joshua McKim
United Kingdom

Ginn, Mary Lea, consulting editor. *Sample Forms for Archival and Records Management Programs*. Lenexa, KS, and Chicago, IL: ARMA International and the Society of American Archivists, 2002. 264 pp. (ISBN 1-931786-00-3)

Sample Forms for Archival and Records Management Programs is a compilation of forms and other tools that archivists, manuscript librarians, and records managers can use to build or expand their programs without having to design all of their tools from scratch. The forms were compiled from real samples submitted by a wide variety of institutions; they are not ideal forms designed especially to be used as models. The book includes several variations of most forms, so the user can choose the one that comes closest to meeting his or her needs. I suspect that this book will be most useful to archivists and records managers who are starting up a new program or expanding to offer a new service and are looking for models to follow. Followers of archives and records management email lists will know that participants often send out desperate pleas for examples of policies and tools from colleagues. This book now provides an alternative source for this kind of information, already collected from multiple sources and ready for our use. Although *Sample Forms for Archival and Records Management Programs* will be invaluable for professionals in that situation, I also found it interesting just because it allowed me to compare the procedures of the institutions where I have worked to what other well-organized archives and records programs are doing.

The introduction to the book as a whole includes a telling passage: "This manual should not be seen as an endorsement of using as many forms as possi-

for the establishment of a state historical commission.

Through these early efforts by the Literary and Historical Association a bill was written by W. J. Peele of Raleigh, and the North Carolina Historical Commission was authorized by legislative mandate on March 7, 1903. The commission was "to have collected from files of old newspapers, from court records, church records, and elsewhere valuable documents pertaining to the history of the State."[7] Connor later noted that Peele, the author of the law establishing our state archives, had a small room as his office "with a old fashioned wood stove sitting in the middle of it, and his method of filing anything was to throw it in the corner and let it lie there for fifty years . . . but he knew where he could put his fingers on anything he wanted."[8]

The following year, 1904, the twenty-six-year-old Connor resigned as principal of Wilmington High School and moved to Raleigh.[9] His replacement as principal was a young chap named Joseph Grégoire de Roulhac Hamilton, later destined to be the father of the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina.[10]

Connor was employed in Raleigh by the superintendent of public instruction while he worked gratis for the Historical Commission. Then in 1907 he received a full-time job and a salary as secretary of the commission. Connor noted that once the legislature went home, he set up shop in the senate chamber: "I got an old unpainted rickety pine table . . . and I had a chair and a pencil and a pad, and that was the equipment of the Historical Commission."[11] Things were up and running. Connor went to work gathering the state's records, which he noted were "thrown helter-skelter here and there, in leaky attics in various parts of the city."[12] The next year, 1908, Connor attended the American Historical Association, and in 1909, the first Conference of Archivists.[13] The school principal was becoming a professional archivist.

Pretty soon a movement was underway to obtain more adequate quarters. Let Connor tell the story: "We had a bill introduced in the legislature of 1913. One man who gave us a great deal of trouble was the Commissioner of Insurance. . . . He had very inadequate quarters, and he pointed out that his agency was bringing in a revenue to the State and here they were going to provide a handsome building for just keeping those old worthless records that ought to be burned up anyway. . . . Fortunately for us, the Speaker of the House that year was a man named Connor who came from Wilson, and he was sorta kin to me—my oldest brother, so it didn't hurt us any. . . ."[14]

The building, now the Court of Appeals Building, was to house the Supreme Court and the State Library as well as the Historical Commission. The new accommodations also housed the Hall of History (later the Museum of History), which was brought under the administrative umbrella of the commission. Connor sent out Colonel Fred A. Olds, the founder of the hall to gather documents from some of the older counties.[15] Colonel Olds took literally his title of "collector." Not only did he bring back county records, but also a great deal of other stuff.

Feeling that the Historical Commission was on firm footing, Connor resigned and went to Chapel Hill as Kenan Professor of History and Government in the fall of 1921.[16] He looked forward to spending the rest of his life researching and teaching, but it was not to be.

Connor's replacement in Raleigh was an administrator at North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, D. H. Hill, Jr., son of one Confederate general and nephew of two others, Rufus Barringer and Stonewall Jackson.[17] Hill was sick during much of his two years as head of the state's historical agency. Upon his death Robert Burton House succeeded him.[18] House, a World War I veteran, served as the collector of war records from 1919 to 1924. In all, he collected well over 100,000 official and personal documents. Two years later, in 1926, he returned to his beloved Chapel Hill, where he spent the remainder of his long life teaching generations of young Tar Heels that they had an obligation to serve their state. I consider myself very lucky as an undergraduate to have had House as a professor.

Upon House's return to UNC, Albert Ray Newsome, a professionally trained historian, left the history department at Chapel Hill to head the state historical commission.[19] Newsome, a meticulous researcher, soon realized the need for what we would later call arrangement and description.[20] He employed a UNC graduate student to assist him. That student from Kinston, named Joseph Carlyle Sitterson, was later a professor of history and chancellor at UNC.

One of Newsome's colleagues noted that "he built an already good Historical Commission into an outstanding one. The excellence of his archival and editorial work soon attracted national as well as local attention."[21] Newsome also hit upon a plan to appoint county historians to locate and preserve manuscripts. He published a records guide for public officials and was able to cajole the legislature into passing a public records law in 1935.[22] This law not only defined a public record but also gave oversight to the Commission. It required public officials to deliver all public records to their successors and to allow access and produce copies upon demand. Newsome served as President of the National Conference of Historical Societies and chaired the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association. He also played a key role

source for new and converting encoders. There are many examples and references to help encoders understand the context of each element within EAD 2002. As with the attribute section, it would be helpful to acknowledge new or revised elements.

Appendix A covers crosswalk encoding between EAD 2002 and *MARC 21 Concise Formats* (Library of Congress) and General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)). The authors plainly state that the crosswalks are only between clearly equivalent data elements. I am sure that some catalogers will still find fault with the equivalencies stated but any attempt to further the conversation about this critical facet of EAD is welcome. Additionally, a crosswalk between EAD and Dublin Core would be helpful for the electronic file information, and it is curious that this standard has been omitted. Dublin Core, although very generalized information especially when unqualified, is useful for relating EAD documents with the wide variety of information produced online.

Appendix B lists "obsolete" elements and attributes (those that were not valid in EAD 1.0) and "deprecated" elements and attributes (those that are not valid for EAD 2002). Along with explanations for the reasons behind these designations of "deprecated" and "obsolete," the authors have helpfully moved a full description of these elements and attributes from their places in the previous sections to this appendix. This will help EAD converters understand more fully how to update their encoding to the new standard. This appendix could also have been an alternative location for a short list with page references for the new or revised elements added to EAD 2002.

Appendix C contains two finding aids encoded in EAD 2002. The first is a relatively simple EAD document that demonstrates a minimum-level valid implementation. The second document incorporates many more attributes and demonstrates a more intensive encoding interpretation. The authors are quick to point out that neither interpretation is normative, which follows the common understanding that EAD 2002 is an open standard. Each institution or consortium will need to decide what is its "optimal level of markup." The authors could have made the changes to EAD 2002 more obvious by highlighting or bolding these areas of the finding aid. Although a potentially challenging exercise, this would have made the similarities and differences between the two EAD versions more clear.

This book is a worthy successor to the first edition of the tag library, although, as it lacks much implementation information, its use is now more reference in nature. New users of EAD will find it informative for reading and refneed for this publication and how best to read the information within. The preface, written by Kris Kiesling, explains the reasons for the changes to EAD and places the changes within a national and international context. The tag library conventions act as a key to understanding the layout of the EAD elements section. In the previous edition, much more information about the structure of EAD and how to implement it was included. With the subsequent publication of the *EAD Application Guidelines* the authors probably thought it unnecessary to republish the information in this edition. What would be a useful addition to this section is a guide to other sources that will help new users to implement EAD. For many, using EAD 2002 will be their first exposure to EAD. The tag library alone is not sufficient information for these new implementers. For experienced encoders, the preface and conventions are worth a glance to refresh and reinvigorate.

The changes to EAD 2002 involve attributes as much as elements, so the first chapter should not be overlooked. This section begins with an excellent explanation of the component parts and values of attributes. Perhaps this will be more information than an encoder wants about how attributes work within EAD, but it is important information nonetheless. As highlighted earlier, the most significant change to the structure of attributes in EAD 2002 is the introduction of NMTokens for creating semiclosed lists of valid attribute values. At the least, a mention of where to go for more explanation about NMTokens would be helpful, although more instruction on how to setup these semiclosed lists is what is needed. How do institutions or consortia decide what terms are included in these semiclosed lists? Do we actually change the EAD 2002 DTD to enforce these lists through validation or is there some other way? Without this information this book becomes much less useful to both potential audiences. The rest of this section divides all attributes into either general, linking, or tabular display attributes. Most entries include a brief description of the attribute and occasionally the descriptions include examples or ISO numbers that help the encoder know how to set attribute values. For those updating to EAD 2002, some sort of nomenclature for identifying new or changed attributes (like bolding or an asterisk) would accelerate the learning process.

The “Elements” chapter is organized alphabetically by tag name and consumes more than 75 percent of the publication. Although I may be splitting hairs, since the tag library conventions included in the introduction apply only to the “Elements” chapter, it would make more sense to start this section with that very useful key. As it is, the transition is rather abrupt. Although a list of elements arranged alphabetically does not lend itself well to the process of encoding, the amount of information on these pages concerning the rules of element and attribute use and related encoding equivalents is indispensable. In any event, this book is not meant to be an encoding guideline but a reference

in the establishment of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) and served that organization as its first president—and I believe the only person to serve three terms as president of the SAA.[23]

Next there occurred an episode that is reminiscent of Abbott and Costello’s “Who’s on first.” President Franklin D. Roosevelt was agreeable to the establishment of a national archives. This was in response to a long crusade by the American Historical Association (AHA). He asked the AHA for a recommendation. The Public Archives Commission of the AHA, chaired by Newsome, endorsed R. D. W. Connor. Connor, head of the Department of History at UNC, resigned to accept Roosevelt’s offer. Newsome resigned as Secretary of the Historical Commission to become head of the history department at Chapel Hill. Hugh T. Lefler, the first Ph.D. employed by North Carolina State College, went to UNC to take over Connor’s courses, and a young assistant professor at UNC named Christopher Crittenden moved to Raleigh as head of the Historical Commission.

After his appointment as the first national archivist, Connor found himself in a situation that was not altogether unfamiliar to him. He commented, “I thought, well, what the thunder have I got myself into now? Here again I had a job. I did not have an office, no equipment, nowhere to hang my hat, and I was rather somewhat depressed, to tell you the plain truth.”[24]

When Crittenden took over in 1935 the operating budget was down by approximately 67 percent. The Great Depression hit North Carolina and the Historical Commission very hard. The agency was saved by the infusion of New Deal funds and personnel. Ansley Wegner notes that the influx of federal dollars was five times greater than the state’s appropriation. This allowed the agency to undertake such projects as the county records survey, indexing the marriage bonds, and the pre-1913 graves index.[25]

Success generated growing pains, so in 1939 the Commission moved into what was described as new and modern quarters in the Education Building—the old Education Building. Primitive efforts at humidity and temperature control were attempted for the documents, but not for the patrons. Climate control in the search room consisted of deflectors on the windows to keep the breeze from blowing documents about the place as tobacco smoke wafted from the nearby offices.

Christopher Crittenden dominated the agency for thirty-three years. He has been called “a giant among state historical leaders.” He helped organize and later served as president and fellow of the Society of American Archivists. This group in 1964 awarded Office of Archives and History the first Distinguished Service Award given by the society. Crittenden was a founder and first president of the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH). He assigned a member of his staff to start and edit the AASLH magazine, *History News*. That staff person was a young William S. Powell. Crittenden also helped lay the groundwork for what would later become the National Trust for Historic Preservation.[26] In 1943 he was instrumental in having the legislature change the name of the agency from the North Carolina Historical Commission to the State Department of Archives and History. Subsequently, the title of the agency head was changed from secretary to director.[27]

An agreement was made with the Genealogical Society of Utah for the microfilming of our public records. Even microfilming could not keep up with the ever-enlarging amount of paper generated by state government. As Ms. Wegner noted: "no longer preserving only the old records of historical value to researchers, [the archives] had to tame the modern paper tiger." In 1953 a warehouse was built at the corner of Lane and McDowell Streets to house a records center. State Archivist H. G. Jones and Admiral A. M. Patterson edited the first county records manual in the country.[28]

With space at a premium, a new home for the Office of Archives and History was opened at 109 East Jones Street in 1968. Once the move was complete, Crittenden resigned and was replaced by Jones. When planned, the structure was to be used entirely for Archives and History, but the State Library of North Carolina was located there temporarily until its quarters could be built. The State Library remains. Then, with the creation of what would become the Department of Cultural Resources in 1971, the space allocated for administrative offices of the Department of Archives and History were taken over by the newly created cabinet level secretary. Archives and History was reduced to division status. Its executive board once again took back its original name, the North Carolina Historical Commission.[29] Fearing the agency would be open to increasing political pressure and direction, Jones resigned in early l974, and, carrying on an earlier tradition, he moved to Chapel Hill—to head the North Carolina Collection—and I moved from UNC to head up research at Archives and History.[30] When Jones resigned, Thornton W. Mitchell, the state archivist, took on the added duties as acting director until a replacement could be found. It was during this time that Mitchell laid the groundwork for the landmark case of *State v. B. C. West, Jr.*, the modern precedent for replevin.[31]

Space continued (and continues) to be a critical problem for the Archives as the demand for archival services increased. No longer was genealogy just the avocation of maiden ladies of ancient vintage; also many baby boomers were

REVIEWS

Encoded Archival Description Tag Library, Version 2002, prepared and maintained by the Encoded Archival Description Working Group of the Society of American Archivists and the Network Development and MARC Standards Office of the Library of Congress. Chicago, Ill. : Society of American Archivists, 2002. vi, 308 p. (ISBN 1931666008)

The long-awaited release of the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) 2002 Document Type Definition (DTD) has finally occurred. To accompany it, the Society of American Archivists has published the first technical guide for understanding the new DTD in *Encoded Archival Description Tag Library, Version 2002*. While other new and revised publications about EAD 2002 are sure to follow, this volume provides us with a first glance at the foundation of the revised DTD, namely the elements and attributes. Perhaps the most significant change in this new edition is the focus on a new EAD audience. The back cover clearly states: "An essential tool for [those] . . . learning EAD for the first time or converting their finding aids from Version 1.0 to EAD 2002." Members of the first group are new implementers of EAD who will therefore use this book as their authority for how to use EAD elements and attributes. Members of the second group are those who have already implemented EAD and are wondering how the new DTD will affect previously encoded information and how to integrate the changes to the DTD into their processes of encoding new finding aids. This review will keep both user groups in focus.

This second edition is organized much like its predecessor with introductory material, lists of attributes and elements, and appendixes. Each section has its own strengths and weaknesses that can only begin to be covered here. The introductory material does well to explain to these overworked audiences why the changes to EAD were necessary but lacks references to other publications or online material about EAD, which is a weakness evident throughout. The attributes and elements sections are excellent compendiums of information on these key aspects of EAD. However, they do not explicitly acknowledge the differences between EAD 1.0 and 2002, leading to confusion about how these changes affect encoders and how to implement the changes. For example, in the attributes section NMTokens are introduced. It is explained well why this change was necessary, but there is little effort to reveal how this affects the encoder. The appendices include some more information about the change between EAD 1.0 and 2002, but are not complete or explicit either. In light of the stated focus on EAD 1.0 to 2002 converters, a more comprehensive discussion of the changes is expected.

The Tag Library begins with a preface and a conventions section that details the

Hackett, John, and Sherrill Gibson. "Getting Ready for Electronic Implementation." Powerpoint slide presentation. Triangle ARMA Meeting, April 6, 2001.
Kwasnik, Barbara H. *The Influence of Context on Classificatory Behavior*. Ph.D. diss., Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey, 1989.
McDonald, John. "Managing Records in the Modern Office: Taming the Wild Frontier." *Archivaria* 39 (Spring 1995): 70-72.
Malone, Thomas W. "How Do People Organize Their Desks? Implications for the Design of Office Information Systems." *ACM Transactions on Office Systems* 1/1 (January 1983): 99-112.
Ross, Seamus. *Changing Trains at Wigan: Digital Preservation and the Future of Scholarship*. NPO Preservation Guidance Occasional Papers. London: National Preservation Office, 2000.
Sheridan, Thomas B. "Designing Complex Technology: Understanding It as of, by, and for People." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 36 (1989): 89-97.
Sutton, Michael J.D. *Document Management for the Enterprise: Principles, Techniques, and Applications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1996.
Thibodeau, Kenneth. "Building the Archives of the Future: Advances in Preserving Electronic Records at the National Archives and Records Administration." *D-Lib Magazine,* February 2001. [Online serial] 7/2. www.dlib.org/dlib/february01/thibodeau/02thibodeau.html.
Underwood, William E. "Analysis of Presidential Electronic Records: Final Report." September 1999. [Online]. http://perpos.gtri.gatech.edu/
Wallace, David A. "Recordkeeping and Electronic Mail Policy: The State of Thought and the State of the Practice." SAA 1998 Annual Meeting presentation. www.mybestdocs.com/dwallace.html.

in graduate history programs. In order to inform the public about the resources of the archives and how to use them, a number of workshops were organized. A new records center, completed in l975, was only a stopgap measure.

Now, I am getting pretty close to contemporary events. There are two events associated with the later years of the archives that I should tell you about since I was involved. One concerns the establishment of the Outer Banks History Center and the other has to do with this organization.

Early in the 1980s, David Stick let it be known that he was trying to decide what to do with his extensive collection of North Caroliniana. Bill Price, then Director of Archives and History, sent me down to look over the collection and to meet with Stick. I had known David for about twenty years and he had a well-deserved reputation for being a man of great determination and strong opinions. I spent two days viewing the holdings and was pleasantly surprised at their depth. Indeed, David's early Carolina cartographic collection was unmatched. Each night we talked into the early morning hours. Stick expressed his wish to keep his collection intact and his determination to keep it in Dare County. If this could not be done, then book and manuscript dealers would be called in and the collection would be sold piecemeal. I visited the only two institutions on Roanoke Island that could possibly merit consideration as repositories. The Dare County Public Library could not handle such a specialized collection. The mere suggestion of the possibility reduced the library staff to tears. The National Park Service at Fort Raleigh was interested, but could offer no assurances that in the future the material would not be culled, sold off, or even removed from Dare County.

I made my report, and in true government fashion, a committee was formed to study the situation. The committee, which I chaired, advised acceptance by Archives and History and that the collection be placed under the administration of the Archives and Records Section. Half of our suggestion was followed. Stick signed a contract of gift, and the Outer Banks History Center (OBHC) was opened in the fall of 1988. After more than a few bumpy years, the OBHC was transferred to the Archives and Records Section, where it should have been all along.

Now a few words about your organization. In 1981, I was appointed by Governor James B. Hunt to the North Carolina Historical Records Advisory Committee. We received a grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. The purpose of this grant was to study the State Archives and Records programs as well as other historical repositories throughout the state. Meetings were held from New Bern to Boone. Information was solicited from state and local government agencies as well as all known manuscript repositories. Before we commenced the study we were aware of many of the problems. However, as we progressed it became obvious that archivists across the state had no forum in which to share problems and discuss solutions. Plain fact was you folks did not talk to each other. Thus, one of our recommendations was that "a statewide archival organization ought to be formed to bring together and foster the exchange of ideas among professional archivists, librarians who bear responsibilities for historical records, and other persons involved in the care of manuscripts."[32] The State Archives was to take a lead in forming such a group. The Society of North Carolina Archivists was organized on March 9, 1984. And you folks have been talking to each other ever since.[33]

It is easy to recount the achievements of an agency. Certainly our archives takes a back seat to no other state archival agency in that respect. But we sometimes fail to remember that the Office of Archives and History has served in another capacity—as a nursery, a training ground. A lot of young kids got their start in the archives over the years: Carlyle Sitterson, Bill Powell, Herb Paschal, John Woodard, Don Lennon, Maurice Toler, Michelle Francis, Cathy Morris, Bob Anthony, Gene Williams, Rusty Koonts, and many others could be named, but you get the idea.

Everyone here today is keenly aware of the economic situation that grips us all. We in state government and at the Office of Archives and History are particularly aware of shrinking budgets and the curtailment of services. A year ago the Historical Commission was told of the gloomy prospect of pending budget cuts. I took advantage of the occasion to express my views on the situation and to voice my concern to the administration. If we do not plant flowers this year at the historic sites, then perhaps we can plant them next year. If we do not cut the grass, frost will solve that situation. Elective archaeology can wait. But if we do not take care of the documents, save the documents, if we lose the documents, then they are gone forever. This must not happen. Not on my watch!

customization, and user education throughout the process if such systems had a chance of being successful. "Getting Ready for Electronic Implementation." Powerpoint slides.

[9]John D. Gould, Stephen J. Boies, and Clayton Lewis, "Making Usable, Useful, Productivity-Enhancing Computer Application," *Communications of the ACM* 34/1 (January 1991): 75.

[10]Thomas B. Sheridan, "Designing Complex Technology: Understanding It as of, by, and for People," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 36 (1989): 91.

[11]ARMA International, *Guideline for Managing E-mail*. (Prairie Village, Kans.: ARMA International, 2000), 4.

[12]John McDonald, "Managing Records in the Modern Office: Taming the Wild Frontier," *Archivaria* 39 (Spring 1995): 70-72.

[13]Wallace, "Recordkeeping," 1.

[14]While appraisal has traditionally been an archival function, the ease with which users can delete documents and the need for them to actively preserve digital files in light of hardware and software obsolescence, makes users de facto appraisers.

[15]Michael J.D. Sutton, *Document Management for the Enterprise: Principles, Techniques, and Applications* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1996), 100.

[16]Wallace, "Recordkeeping," 2.

[17] North Carolina Public Records Law www.ah.dcr.state.nc.us/sections/archives/rec/.

[18]Government Records Branch, NC Division of Archives and History, "Electronic Mail as a Public Record in North Carolina: Guidelines for Its Retention and Disposition," August 2002, p. 10. http://www.ah.dcr.state.nc.us/sections/archives/rec/email.htm

[19]Ibid, 10-11.

[20]Ibid., 11-12.

[21]Ibid., 12.

[22]Reported on the Australian Archivists (aus-archivists) listserv on March 31, 1998. Cited in Wallace, "Recordkeeping," 2.

[23]It is not unreasonable to envision state records laws changing in light of the findings from this study.

[24]Seamus Ross, *Changing Trains at Wigan: Digital Preservation and the Future of Scholarship*. NPO Preservation Guidance Occasional Papers (London: National Preservation Office, 2000), 13.

[25]The present and projected state budget shortfalls may well prohibit the acquisition of ERM software in the near future, but our findings, because they are based on user information conceptualizations, needs, and behaviors should remain viable for some time to come. For the near term, our recommendations to optimize user records management behaviors through guidelines and enhanced, targeted educational opportunities may prove the most important aspects of this project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARMA International. *Guideline for Managing E-mail*. Prairie Village, Kans.: ARMA International, 2000.

Barreau, Deborah K. "Context as a Factor in Personal Information Management Systems." *Journal of the American Society for Information* Science 46/5 (June 1995): 327-339.

Barreau, Deborah K. & Bonnie A. Nardi. "Finding and Reminding: File Organization from the Desktop." *SIGCHI Bulletin* 27/3 (July 1995): 39-43.

Fertig, Scott, Eric Freeman, & David Gelernter. "'Finding and Reminding' Reconsidered." *SIGCHI Bulletin* 28/1 (January 1996): 66-69.

Gould, John D., Stephen J. Boies, and Clayton Lewis. "Making Usable, Useful, Productivity-Enhancing Computer Application." *Communications of the ACM* 34/1 (January 1991): 74-85.

Government Records Branch, North Carolina Division of Archives and History. "Electronic Mail as a Public Record in North Carolina: Guidelines for Its Retention and Disposition." August 2002.

future purchase and customization of records management applications on campuses and throughout the system.[25]

REFERENCES

[1]In 2001, Hackett and Gibson (Getting Ready for Electronic Implementation) reported at the Triangle ARMA Meeting that over 600 billion email messages were sent each year, that a white-collar worker received about forty each day, and that only one in seventeen messages was kept for some period of time.

[2]We are exploring user behavior building on the work of researchers studying personal workspaces and conceptual, organizing behaviors [e.g., Deborah K. Barreau, "Context as a Factor in Personal Information Management Systems," *Journal of the American Society for Information* Science 46/5 (June 1995): 327-339; Deborah K. Barreau & Bonnie A. Nardi, "Finding and Reminding: File Organization from the Desktop," *SIGCHI Bulletin* 27/3 (July 1995): 39-43; Scott Fertig, Eric Freeman & David Gelernter, 'Finding and Reminding' Reconsidered," *SIGCHI Bulletin* 28/1 (January 1996): 66-69; Barbara H. Kwasnik, "The Influence of Context on Classificatory Behavior." (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1989); Thomas W. Malone, "How Do People Organize Their Desks? Implications for the Design of Office Information Systems," *ACM Transactions on Office Systems* 1/1 (January 1983): 99-112] and the guidelines for electronic recordkeeping systems and electronic records management systems NARA produced as part of the Fast Track program: www.nara.gov/records/fasttrak/ftprod.html.

[3]"Desktop" is a convenient metaphor but our research includes use of mobile computing and information environments such as personal data assistants (PDAs) as well.

[4]We do not know exactly how many people our mailing reached as Duke University does not have a centralized email management system that reconciles multiple accounts for the same individual. Thus, we believe some Duke employees may have received our mailings multiple times. Without access to the confidential mailing list we could neither eliminate duplicates nor ascertain the exact number of employees reached.

[5]See, for example, the "Functional Requirements for Evidence in Recordkeeping Project" at the University of Pittsburgh, www.lis.pitt.edu/~nhprc/ [now only at www.waybackmachine.org] and subsequent work at Indiana University following this model. For the latter, see Philip Bantin's presentation at the 2000 ECURE Conference, "Strategies for Managing Electronic Records: Lessons Learned from the Indiana University Electronic Records Project" (http://www.asu.edu/it/events/ecure/ecure2000/bantin-presentation/index.htm). See also Bantin's, "Developing a Strategy for Managing Electronic Records—The Findings of the Indiana University Electronic Records Project," *American Archivist* 61/2 (Fall 1998): 328-64 and "Strategies for Managing Electronic Records: A New Archival Paradigm? An Affirmation of Our Archival Traditions?" *Archival Issues* 23/1 (1998): 17-34. See also the recent NHPRC-funded project at Cornell University (www.cornell.edu/p2k/overview/overview.html).

[6]While at some universities and colleges records schedules may cover many documents academics handle each day, it is presumptuous to believe these employees are following these directives without evidence to this effect.

[7]See, for example, William E. Underwood, "Analysis of Presidential Electronic Records: Final Report," September 1999. http://perpos.gtri.gatech.edu/ and Kenneth Thibodeau, "Building the Archives of the Future: Advances in Preserving Electronic Records at the National Archives and Records Administration," *D-Lib Magazine* 7/2 (February 2001). www.dlib.org/dlib/february01/thibodeau/02thibodeau.html

[8]David A. Wallace. "Recordkeeping and Electronic Mail Policy: The State of Thought and the State of the Practice," SAA 1998 Annual Meeting, p. 31. www.mybestdocs.com/dwallace.html. At the April 6, 2001, Triangle ARMA meeting, John Hackett and Sherrill Gibson, who are involved in deploying the CIA's "PERM" ERMS, stressed the need for understanding users' needs, system

REFERENCES

[1] R. D. W. Connor, 1921, Director's Correspondence, North Carolina Historical Commission, State Archives, Office of Archives and History, Raleigh.

[2] H. G. Jones, *For History's Sake: The Preservation and Publication of North Carolina History 1663-1903* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966), 129-210.

[3] Jones, *For History's Sake*, 212-226; *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography*, s.v. "Saunders, William Laurence" (hereafter cited as *DNCB*).

[4] William L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina*, 10 vols. (Raleigh: State of North Carolina, 1886-1890).

[5] *DNCB*, s.v. "Bassett, John Spencer."

[6] Jones, *For History's Sake*, 275.

[7] *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1903) c. 767.

[8] Transcript located in the North Carolina State Archives. Copy provided by Michael R. Hill. Subsequently printed as Michael Hill, "Present at the Creation: R. D. W. Connor Reminiscences, 1948," *Carolina Comments* 51 (April 2003): 53.

[9]Ainsley Herring Wegner, *History for All the People: One Hundred Years of Public History in North Carolina* (Raleigh: Office of Archives and History, North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 2003), 3.

[10] *DNCB*, s.v. "Hamilton, Joseph Grégoire de Rhoulac."

[11] Hill, "Present at the Creation," 56.

[12] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 4.

[13] James B. Rhoads, "The North Carolina State Archives," in *Public History in North Carolina, 1903-1978*, ed. Jeffrey J. Crow (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, 1979), 19 (hereafter cited as Rhoads, "State Archives").

[14] Hill, "Present at the Creation," 56.

[15] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 9-10.

[16] *DNCB*, s.v. "Connor, Robert Digges Wimberly."

[17] *DNCB*, s.v. "Hill, Daniel Harvey, Jr."

[18] *DNCB*, s.v. "House, Robert Burton."

[19] *DNCB*, s.v. "Newsome, Albert Ray."

[20] Rhoads, "State Archives," 22.

[21] *DNCB*, s.v. "Newsome, Albert Ray."

[22] *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1935) c. 265.

[23] Rhoads, "State Archives," 24.

[24] Hill, "Present at the Creation," 58.

[25] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 17-22.

[26] Frontis W. Johnston, "The North Carolina Historical Commission, 1903-1978," in *Public History in North Carolina, 1903-1978*, ed. Jeffrey J. Crow (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, 1979), 7 (hereafter cited as Johnston, "Historical Commission"); *DNCB*, s.v. "Crittenden, Charles Christopher."

[27] Johnston, "Historical Commission," 10.

[28] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 26, 29-30.

[29] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 38, 40, 52.

[30] Johnston, "Historical Commission," 12-14.

[31] Wegner, *History for All the People*, 68-69.

[32]North Carolina Historical Records Advisory Committee, *Archives and Records Programs and Historical Records Repositories in North Carolina: An Analysis of Present Problems and Future Needs* (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Records Advisory Committee, 1983), 55.

[33]"Statewide Archival Organization Projected," *Carolina Comments* 32 (January 1984): 10; "Society of North Carolina Archivists Formally Organized," *Carolina Comments* 32 (May 1984): 53-54.

Archives, The Next 100 Years: or, The Past Through Tomorrow

Timothy D. Pyatt

On March 14, 2003, Mr. Pyatt delivered this paper in the closing plenary session of the Society of North Carolina Archivists Spring Meeting in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Introduction

I am honored to be asked to speak today, but also somewhat intimidated. It feels presumptuous to try and tell you about the future of our profession. Predicting our future is a difficult topic, but also one I had fun with. I consider myself too young for this type of experiential exploration with only seventeen years in the profession. Yet in those seventeen years, the changes have been remarkable. I have seen changes such as:

- transition from the typewriter to the personal computer (remember hand-typed catalog cards and inventories?);
- the introduction of fax, shared catalogs, and the Internet (especially email);
- and actual standards for archival description.

We have progressed from calendared collections, card-based inventories, Historical Records Survey (HRS) worksheets, and local databases in obsolete software—all with their own formats and terminologies—to controlled vocabularies and encoded archival description (EAD).

As an organized profession, we archivists are still rather young. When I first started out, archivists were predominately white males with a background in history. We were lumped together with librarians in the public conscience, if the public was aware of us at all. With "Marian the Librarian" from the *Music Man* as the stereotype for librarians (all female, of course), our stereotype would be her male counterpart, the shy, pipe-smoking historian "puttering" with papers in the stacks. I decided to measure the popularity of our profession using that twenty-first-century litmus test, a Google search. While I found numerous hits for librarian jokes, I found none for archivist jokes. People do not even make jokes about us while librarians have been the butt of jokes for years! For example:

- How many reference librarians does it take to change a light bulb? (with a perky smile) "Well, I do not know right offhand, but I know where we can

Timothy D. Pyatt is the Duke University Archivist.

interviews on the two campuses, we can preliminarily say that most UNC and Duke employees are not following sound practices for archival preservation of the electronic versions of these or any of their personal messages and files that so often intermingle with work-related materials. We have found very few individuals who consistently print out email messages that might be considered records, with most people printing only the most important items and others never printing email messages unless they need to take a copy of the information away from their computer. Only a small percentage of people have email filing schemes that mirror the schemes they use for the other electronic documents or print files, let alone records schedules. Even fewer employees at UNC Chapel Hill report having been trained regarding electronic preservation of email messages or other files. Clearly, many records are at risk, as are state agencies both in legal and historical respects. While Duke University does not function under the Public Records Law, records are open to discovery in lawsuits and other legal activities and the historical record of the university is at risk.

Compliance with state public records laws is, however, only part of the picture. Preservation of scholarly work and a record of the academic enterprise are arguably equally important, if not legally imperative. The most likely answer for the development of sound policies and subsequent compliance to state laws,[23] and the effective and efficient management of electronic information in general, would appear to be user education based on an understanding of user needs and behaviors within the context of legal, fiscal, scholarly, and administrative requirements. Seamus Ross argues that digital preservation needs to be proactive. If digital materials are to be preserved over the long-term, "preservation features need to be incorporated into them" and made an "integral element of the initial design of systems and projects."[24] For this to happen in the desktop environment, the document creators and those receiving files from others must recognize and assume appropriate roles in the records management and archiving continuum.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Desktop computing has emerged as a powerful and pervasive information technology that has a profound impact on the daily lives and operations of most knowledge workers, yet we know very little about how people manage the flow of information through these systems. Understanding how people use email and manage generated and transmitted documents is not only essential to optimized use of this technology, it is also fundamental to sound, legal records management policies and procedures. Understanding how people use the array of email software deployed throughout the UNC System and at Duke will serve as the basis of developing realistic guidelines and assistance for individuals in managing their digital files and will help in forming recommendations regarding any that "if email is retained electronically, administrators need to ensure that their system (client server, mainframe computer in or outside their agency, or office personal computer) accommodates email retention for the required period of time." [18] For those messages that have "permanent, archival value as part of a series of records listed in an approved records retention schedule," the guidelines state that

- The email messages must be clearly identifiable as part of a distinct series of records listed in an approved records retention schedule, and that series must be archival.
- The email messages must be organized in a system, so that one may determine the general topic to which the messages relate. In other words, a large number of email messages in an undifferentiated mailbox or folder and lacking organization and identifying characteristics will not be accepted.
- Messages transferred to the Division must have metadata concerning the email and its related electronic records recorded on the Division's electronic records inventory form.[19]

Arguably, there is no such thing as digital preservation today. We neither know how to effectively or efficiently migrate or emulate electronic files for use in the future nor do we know how much such processes will cost. The guidelines note that "the practice of storing email messages with long-term value on machine-readable media such as CD-ROM, 3480 tape, or digital linear tape presumes that the hardware and software required to read the data will exist into the future." Moreover, the Office of Archives and History reserves the right "to accept into the State Archives email stored only on those media it has the ability to read" and that it "may delegate the responsibility of long-term maintenance and preservation to the creating agency."[20] The guidelines further require that "users of email must understand the ways in which email has changed workflow and business practices in recent years" and they "as well as information technology (IT) professionals who will be asked to preserve it over time, must receive training regarding the issues outlined in these guidelines."[21]

For North Carolina state employees, preserving the content of electronic materials, including electronic mail messages and associated attachments, requires either filing each item of long-term value in a system according to retention schedules for those materials or storing them in either an electronic or print format. Despite the presence of this law, it is unlikely that many state employees effectively retain important records while deleting unessential materials. Rick Barry, a consultant who specializes in electronic records management, reports that up to 80 percent of email creators state that they do not "have a clue" when email messages constitute official records.[22] After more than eighty

look it up!"
- Why did the librarian slip and fall on the library floor? Because she was in the non-friction section.

Today I am pleased to inform you that we, as archivists, are making progress. I have heard an archivist joke and it goes something like this:

- How can you identify an extroverted archivist? The archivist looks at someone else's shoes while talking!

A Sci-Fi Story?

We are not alone in pondering our future, especially in these uncertain and changing times, although when has that phrase not been true? One of my favorite literary genres has extensively explored the future and I will use the work of a noted author to help frame my talk. I must confess that I am a closet science fiction fan, right down to the flashlight under the sheets as a teenager reading Arthur C. Clarke, Larry Niven, Damon Knight, and James Blish long after my Mom told me to turn off the lights. Now that I am an adult I have to admit that I have finally grown beyond that. My wife lets me leave the light on and read.

On my nightstand right now is Robert A. Heinlein's short story collection, *The Past Through Tomorrow,*[1] which would be a good subtitle for this talk. However, while composing this talk I was reminded of the Isaac Asimov short story "The Feeling of Power."[2] First published in 1957 (before I was born, by the way), the story is a futuristic metaphor for losing our way. Asimov's central question is: "If society grows more and more computerized, what happens if human beings forget how to do simple arithmetic?" I cannot help but substitute archival practice for arithmetic. To paraphrase Asimov: "As society grows more and more computerized, what happens if we forget how to do basic [archival work]?"

I used this question as my central thesis as I considered what I believe will still be core to archives even as the transmission of information evolves and transforms over the next one hundred years.

Archival Practice One Hundred Years Ago

I know that I am supposed to talking about the future, but being an archivist, I have to include a look at the past. What would our counterparts (if they existed at all) think if they saw us now? Would these pioneers of our profession recognize us or understand the work and issues we face today? Will archivists one hundred years from now ask these same questions about us? Let's examine the state of our profession in 1903.

- No real profession at all (only fledgling historical commissions and archives in some states—Mississippi, Alabama, and North Carolina);
- No descriptive standards (just lists, ledgers, and maybe cards);
- Archival education was limited to apprenticeship, learning on the job, and simply "making it up" (or more politely, trying to invent the profession);
- Records custodians in 1903 had a narrow view of which records were worth collecting (primarily those of dead white males of high social standing or political prominence);
- There was only a fledging start at a professional association. In 1895, the American Historical Association appointed a Historical Manuscripts Commission which, in 1909, would become a Conference of Archivists and ultimately lead to the formation of SAA in 1936;
- The archivist of 1903 was a "gatekeeper"—the archivist decided who could use the collections and what could be seen. Without description, researchers could not ask for documents that they did not even know existed;
- The "turning point" for our profession was still in the future. The Works Progress Administration's Historical Records Survey (HRS) really created the profession as we know it. However, the HRS did not start nationally until 1935 and would not get started in North Carolina until 1939;
- And most importantly (at least to me), in 1903 the word "archives" was still a noun—not a verb—and was used to refer to either a building or a records group!

What were the core functions of an archivist in 1903? The archivist identified and collected significant historical records, although formats collected were limited primarily to papers and photographs. A greater emphasis was placed on publishing the record for public access than on what we today consider arrangement and description for researcher access. The use of primary sources for teaching and scholarship was only beginning to become part of the educational process. North Carolina would produce several proponents for collecting primary sources, not the least of whom was J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, founder of the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Appraisal (the evaluation of intellectual content) was performed more at the provenance level (i.e., who to collect) rather than at the record level.

Archives Today, 2003

Now let's look at those same areas of the profession as they are today.

- In 2003 we are a strong and growing profession. Archives have been a

cation with the transmittal message?

- Do they save the files in their own word processing system?
- Do they save them in both systems?
- Do they print them out?
- If transferring to word processing, do they save the file in the temp folder or in a subject-oriented one?
- Do they rename the file when they save it or use the sender's file name?
- Do they "archive" the sender's file and make changes to new versions that they copy from the original?
- And, most fundamentally, why do they save some files and delete others?

The Digital Desktop Project seeks to understand what people are presently doing with electronic records and files and ultimately provide them with training and tools to manage their digital assets better.

Public Records

David Wallace[16] discovered that in most state governments, universities, and other organizations with email policies, printing out messages of potential long-term value is the recommended or required retention practice. Like telephone conversations, however, email exchanges are fundamentally different from traditional print correspondence if in nothing else but volume. Even printing just those messages of long-term value is viewed as too much of a burden by many. Few email retention and disposition policies, however, reflect this perception and other realities that end users face everyday.

As is common throughout the United States, North Carolina law (General Statutes, Chapter 132) sets forth specific retention and disposition procedures and schedules for all public records held in state agencies. Irrespective of format, state employees must retain originals or "preservation duplicates" of essential records that are "durable, accurate, complete and clear." Section 8.2 notes that "such duplicates made by a photographic, photostatic, microfilm, micro card, miniature photographic, or other process which accurately reproduces and forms a durable medium for so reproducing the original shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as the original record whether the original record is in existence or not."[17] While the law does not explicitly state that public records must be kept in either print or microfilm versions, at this time these are the most durable media. The North Carolina State Archives guidelines for "Electronic Mail as a Public Record in North Carolina" explain

Information Management Literacy

Guideline for Managing E-mail (2000) from Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA) lists several factors that are fundamental to the development of effective email policies and procedures. Looming large among these is the fact that "the end user manages electronic mail."[11] John McDonald has noted that

> Office workers can create and send electronic messages and documents to whomever they wish. They can store them according to their own individual needs and delete them without turning to anyone else for approval. There are no rules of the road.[12]

Wallace notes that electronic mail is "profoundly shaping the nature of organizational documentation,"[13] yet despite its impact, information professionals have little or no idea how individual workers appraise,[14] organize (file), or preserve the glut of mail messages, and just as importantly, the associated attachments they receive each day. For example, do they:

- Print everything of any importance and then delete the original email?
- Save everything in their inboxes?
- Use an elaborate set of files for the electronic storage of their messages?
- Use the same filing scheme and file names as in their paper files?
- Delete everything in a panic when the inbox is too full?
- Maintain attachments with email messages?
- Save attachments separately from email messages?

Despite its current and projected impact on worker productivity and records management programs, most people have never been "taught" how to use email beyond how to send, open, and delete messages. Even individuals with well-developed print records management skills are often unsure as to which email messages to keep and in what format—electronic, print, or both. Michael Sutton observes that email has become a "black hole" in many organizations where "records are doomed to the electronic dustbin or obscurity,"[15] being deleted to save disk space if for no other reason. There is no reason to believe that an ERMS would automatically make the "Is this a record?" or "Should I keep this?" decisions any easier without some user training or context-sensitive prompts.

Attachment management muddies the waters further. Attachment questions include:

- Do people save word processing attachments only in their email appli-

significant area of growth for libraries and other related organizations;
- We have improved access to collections with finding aids published on the web and more standards for description (USMARC and EAD);
- We have more opportunities for archival education and training with public history and library science programs now incorporating archival education. The profession offers more workshops and continuing education opportunities;
- Archivists receive substantial professional support from organizations like the Society of American Archivists, the Society of North Carolina Archivists, the American Library Association, and many other more specialized groups;
- Archivists today have a broader view of sources for records and seek materials documenting minorities, women, and ethic groups. We no longer target just the social elite;
- We provide greater access for researchers, champion public records laws and the ethics of equal access, make finding aids available on the web, etc;
- However, in 2003 I am sad to report that "archive" has become a verb! Stolen by information technology (IT) and web jockeys, "archiving" does not mean the same thing to them as it does to us. When an IT person has your system "archive" something, it rarely means preserving it or placing it in a digital repository for future access. "Archiving" in the IT world is merely a means to free up server space.

So what are the core functions of an archivist in 2003? Identifying and collecting significant historical records remains a primary function, but we define the historical record more broadly. We collect from a broader social spectrum and receive a greater volume of records in a wide mix of formats, not just paper and photographs. The profession also has recognized that collecting and preserving records in electronic format is a primary concern, but we have not found the solution yet to their care and management. Appraisal, arrangement, and description are core functions of the archivist in 2003 with dissemination, ideally through MARC records and encoded finding aids, our goal. Researcher access is more likely to be in our reading room or perhaps through documents on the web, rather than through publication. Email has become the prevalent medium for remote inquiries, outnumbering letters and onsite users in many repositories.

The Future: The Archivist in 2103

What will our profession be like in 2103?

- Electronic records and formats not yet imagined (virtual reality archives?) will be the primary formats collected;

- Archivists in 2103 will need more help [metadata] from records creators to determine content;
- Archivists will serve as mediators (matchmakers?) between the records creator and the end user—will the traditional reading room be a thing of the past?
- The definition of "records ownership" will change. When digital records can be copied identically without loss of content, what is an original? Will we enter more of the "library" mode with digital data repositories? This is a central question of today's International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) project.[3]
- Will artificial intelligence programs help archivists with appraisal and records management of electronic media?
- I also predict that archivists, after a mighty debate with IT professionals, will reclaim "archive" as a noun! We would not allow it to further degenerate into an adjective or an adverb!

What will the core functions of an archivist be in 2103? I hope that our successors will still be involved in the process of identifying and collecting historical records as a primary function, but I feel this definition will change again. While I believe that the descriptive standards we use today have been crafted in such a way that they will endure, I also think they will continue to evolve and be modified and changed through time. For reasons I will explain more thoroughly in a few minutes, I believe that the role of appraisal will become even more important as the volume of information created continues to expand like the universe!

Greatest Fears for Archives of the Future

Thus far I have presented a mostly rosy picture for archivists in future, i.e., that our profession will continue to be relevant and supported. But before I talk about the role of appraisal for future archivists, I would also like to share some of my "greatest fears" about how things might turn out. I would like to call this first fear the vanity factor. I worry that future archivists will look upon our present collection access work like we now view "calendared" collections—nice to have that all of that collection information, but how did they ever have the time and resources to do that level of description? Did they have REAL work to do? And how can we convert that legacy data, meaning the EAD finding aids of today, into the preferred format of 2103?

Will electronic records continue to be a lasting problem without a clear solution? Will we need an HRS-type project to gain control of electronic records and will the records even survive long enough for such a project to rescue them? John Carlin, Archivist of the United States, recently stated in a report

> When electronic recordkeeping systems are developed and deployed, they will have to do so in specific reference to the recordkeeping context in which they reside. It is quite unlikely that such systems will be easily integrated into organizations in absence of customizations accounting for the various functions, terminologies, and series evident in organizations across society. There are no magic bullets, only context-sensitive desktop and system level implementations.[8]

While such systems may work well in corporate and governmental settings, we simply do not know enough about the information, specifically the evidentiary records, that many university employees, especially faculty and administrators, create, nor the information management behaviors that they employ, to make sound judgments regarding the acquisition and customized optimization of such systems at this time. Indeed, for some positions, such as associate dean, we do not even know all the "business processes," let alone the documents produced in the course of conducting them.

Understanding user needs and behaviors is essential to improving desktop data management. Gould, Boies, and Lewis detail a usability design process that involves four elements: early focus on users; integrated design; early—and continual—user testing; and iterative design. They point out that "several lines of evidence indicate that this usability design process leads to systems, applications, and products that are easy to learn, contain the right functions, are well liked, and safe. The process is now well known; nearly all human factors people endorse it."[9] Thomas Sheridan, in *Technological Forecasting and Social Change,* argues that design of complex technologies should be seen as being "of, by, and for people." He notes that

> With regard to the for preposition, it should be evident to any thinking, feeling human being that technology is applied *for* the benefit of people. It should also be evident that effort to elicit and accommodate the preferences of various affected parties will support this ideal.[10]

Knowledge of user information management behaviors and needs is essential to making informed decisions concerning the design, selection, and deployment of an ERMS. More fundamentally, an understanding of users and the materials they produce and exchange is essential to developing best practice guidelines and educational experiences to help all university employees to organize their electronic information and be more productive if an ERMS is not deployed in their environment. The Digital Desktop Project is exploring ERMS technology in light of current decentralized information management practices on the targeted campuses.

puting environment, find document management a secondary task at best, and generally lack secretaries or other assistants to help them organize and maintain the information they receive, use, generate, and share with others. Additionally, few, if any, have training in document or information management.

The freedom of the university environment is ideal for the growth of thought and the enrichment of the mind, but it is a records manager's, and ultimately an archivist's, nightmare. While there are large campus information systems linked to specific business practices such as those found in student records, the bursar's office, and payroll, that can be made compliant relatively easily with records management principles and practices, the route to sound records management for the individual faculty member, administrator, and even staff person is far more problematic and essentially unexplored at this time. Almost all electronic records management research conducted in the higher education domain has focused on the core business processes and records systems to support them.[5] We still know very little about the records that the professor, the associate dean, or the department chair create, how they manage those records and communicate them to colleagues and staff, and how they decide which records to preserve and which to delete.[6] Managing the Digital University Desktop seeks to understand how the full array of university staff and faculty manage their electronic information.

The University and Electronic Records Management Systems

Technology promises much to assist with desktop records management. Experimental automated document categorization systems[7] and commercially available electronic records management systems (ERMS) that prompt users to categorize documents manually from applications such as email, word processing, and presentation software, may one day be part of the answer for universities, but right now neither their role nor the specific characteristics these systems must possess if they are to be useful and accepted within academic environments are clear. While institution-wide ERMS can improve desktop management, few universities presently employ them. Unlike typical email applications such as Outlook, Netscape Messenger, and Mulberry, ERMS guide or force users into disposition and file management decisions at the point of reading a message. David Wallace's strongest conclusion from his study of email policies is the "glaring absence of electronic recordkeeping systems." But even when funds for these systems and the will to implement them are present, deployment is only part of the battle. Widespread adoption across an organization and overall success of such systems depends on customizations to meet the needs of the specific user population. Wallace argues in the tradition of Rogers that

on redesigning the National Archives and Records Administration's (NARA) Records Management program: "With our current way of doing business, we just do not have the resources to cope with the growing volumes of both electronic and paper records."[4] If present day NARA, with its impressive resources cannot keep pace, who will able to in the future?

I also fear that there will be an alternate scenario for managing electronic records. "Archiving" (i.e., IT wins and we lose archive as a noun) is handled by IT staff and the end user without our involvement. This is already happening in 2003 to some extent, and the historical record will suffer because of it. IT solutions tend to place systems operations as their first priority. Preservation, access, and contextual data are not among IT priorities as they stand now.

With so much personal data imbedded in digital data, I have substantial concerns about the loss of personal privacy and confidentiality. While we as archivists make records available, we also protect third-party privacy rights by restricting or weeding personnel records, teacher recommendations, medical records, and similar materials. A good example of this work is the heroic effort that the State Archives recently made to make the records of North Carolina's Eugenics Board publicly available while protecting the identities of the individuals affected. Given the volume and prevalence of electronic media, would this type of effort even be possible in the future? A current gasoline company advertisement campaign gives a chilling indication of the potential uses of this embedded personal information with their "We know you" commercial spots. It is how they know me that scares me—by creating profiles using purchase data gathered from credit cards or consumer cards. I do not want them to "know me" that well. Who manages that data—their corporate archivist or their systems manager? What will happen to those grocery purchase records captured when we use our customer cards? How are they used and how secure is that information? Will the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996 really insure the privacy of our medical records? Do the professionals managing that data have a code of ethics (and hopefully not the one that Enron execs followed)? My point is not to denigrate IT professionals, but to emphasize the growing, and mostly unplanned, convergence of our two professions.

I have grave concern for diminished government support of archives and libraries in the future. We have evidence of this today. The governor of Florida (and brother of our President) proposes to eliminate the state library and greatly reduce the staff of the state archives, which he will place under the department of the environment. Does this mean archivists in Florida will both process the records of the governor and then feed the animals in the zoo? Governor Bush is working to insure that the Florida state archives run as smoothly as

Florida elections. While I joke about this, I cannot help but wonder if other states are watching Florida to see how this works and if they will follow its lead? Will our President, who has already shown a strong disdain for public access to presidential records by his executive order to restrict such access, take a similar look at our federal library and archival system?

Not all of these scenarios are out of our control. We can do much to shape our future. Let's look at some of the common elements from the past, the present, and potential future (not unlike Dickens's three Christmas ghosts).

Common Elements: Past, Present, and Future

Whether the year is 1903 or 2103, the following issues have been guiding elements for archivists and ones that I hope will endure.

- Preservation of records, regardless of format. We are doing a great job with paper and photographs; we still have some work to do with audio and moving image formats; and we have lots of work to do with electronic formats.
- Importance of access and professional ethics. As recent events show, we can never let down our guard. From the attempts to privatize the records of the governor of Texas to those of the mayor of New York, we as archivists must be strong advocates for the people's right to see THEIR records of their elected public officials.
- Appraisal, appraisal, appraisal. As the volume of records ever increases, our role in helping to decide what is retained will become only more important.

Future Appraisal Issues

For years I have tried to debunk the myth that we, as archivists, want to save everything. When introducing myself as an archivist, I have often added the phrase—"I'm trained to know what to throw away!" This is particularly true with modern paper-based collections. The ease of copying fills these collections with numerous duplicates and other extraneous materials. We appraise and weed these collections using our training and experience, as well as the wealth of numerous articles and books to support and inform this practice. But will these same time-tested techniques apply to future formats? I have already seen that the same appraisal techniques used for paper records do not readily apply to audio or moving image materials. For example, if you come across an unlabeled folder in a box of records, you can scan the contents and quickly arrive at some idea of what the folder contains. If the other folders around it are labeled, you may also be able to use their titles to place the unlabeled folder in context to determine content.

asking for participation either through a Web form or by returning the attached survey by email. Discounting any responses that we could not link to specific employees, we closed the response period in October 2002 with 2,936 valid responses across the two campuses.

The survey was designed to assess "the lay of the land," regarding email management by asking respondents questions such as "What email software package do you use?" "How many messages do you typically receive each work day?" "What percentage of emails do you estimate include attachments?" and "What concerns do you have regarding your use of email?"

Building on the findings from the survey, we are conducting approximately one hundred in-depth interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators at the two campuses. These are probing how individuals manage and organize both their email messages and other electronic files. In the summer of 2003 we will complete these interviews and begin intensive data analysis. Concurrent with the end user data collection and analysis we will be interviewing a number of information technology policymakers and staff across the campuses during 2003. The last eighteen months of the project will involve creating best practice guidelines; creating Web, print, and in-class instructional modules regarding electronic information management; assessing the potential role and optimized configuration of ERMS for the campuses; and disseminating findings through conference presentations and scholarly publications.

The University and Digital Desktop Management

Universities are wondrously chaotic, eclectic institutions that at their best foster diversity of participants, thought, and practice. Creativity, innovation, and scholarly advancement spring from intellectual freedom and the challenging of prevailing ideas as well as from extensions and elaborations of previous research and scholarship and collaboration with colleagues on campus and around the world. In keeping with this atmosphere, universities tend to be loosely tied federations of schools and departments in which each cherishes its own autonomy and vision. Within each unit, faculty generally see themselves as independent contractors, working for the university but doing their own research that enhances both the university and their own personal reputations. Most faculty view their research efforts, and often their teaching products beyond course syllabi, as their own intellectual property that they "take with them" if they move to another institution. Unfortunately, they may take the same approach with documents that constitute official public records without giving the status and disposition of those documents much thought. At the same time that they exist within this free-flowing, often laissez-faire setting, faculty and administrators are frequently overwhelmed with information, work long hours with a distributed, desktop com-

Managing the Digital University Desktop Project

The Managing the Digital University Desktop Project, funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), is a collaborative effort of the School of Information and Library Science and the Academic Affairs Libraries of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University Libraries. This three-year project is studying the desktop computing environments and behaviors of faculty, administrators, and university staff at UNC Chapel Hill, Duke, and throughout the UNC System.[2] We are attempting to understand how individuals manage electronic files, especially email, so that we can compile, devise, and disseminate best practice recommendations and learning modules regarding desktop document management.[3] We are seeking the user and context-sensitive data and insights necessary for any successful future deployment of an Electronic Records Management System (ERMS) and, failing the feasibility of implementing such systems, the information necessary for any personal records management training program. Underlying this project is the observation that in order for people to adopt "best," or at least "better," practices regarding information management, the guidelines, tips, tricks, hints, and suggestions proffered must not be too far afield from their current practices. Thus, this project seeks first to understand how people are managing their electronic files and email then to build on this insight to provide guidelines and instruction that will make them more effective and efficient information managers while preserving and eliminating materials following records law and prevailing archival theory and practices.

Who We Are

Dr. Helen R. Tibbo, SILS professor, and Timothy Pyatt, Duke University Archivist, serve as co-principal investigators of the Digital Desktop project. Other team members include Kimberly Chang, co-Project Manager; Ruth Monnig, SILS Ph.D. student and co-Project Manager (2002-2003); Megan Winget, SILS Ph.D. student and co-Project Manager (2003-); Janis Holder, UNC Chapel Hill University Archivist; Frank Holt, UNC Chapel Hill Records Service Coordinator; Russell Koonts, Director, Duke University Medical Center Archives; and Paul Conway, Director of Information Technology, Duke University Libraries, Project Consultant. Susan Ballinger, UNC Chapel Hill acting University Archivist, contributed to the project until Janis's arrival in February 2003.

What We Are Doing

In September 2002 we administered an electronic survey regarding basic email behaviors to the entire faculty and staff populations at UNC Chapel Hill and Duke University. We sent announcements of the project and invitations to participate to all faculty, administrators, and staff who were accessible by university mass mailings at the two institutions[4] followed a few days later by a message

Now, take that same box and fill it with unlabeled audio tape. Assuming you can identify the format, how can you tell what it is or if it is even worth saving? Basic appraisal of an unidentified audio tape requires playback equipment and some knowledge of the format as well as the subject matter. Is this an original recording or just a copy of a commercial recording? Can the original tape be safely listened to in order to assess its content without damaging it? Is the content worth the cost of preservation transfer? Can we make it accessible once it has been transferred? Compare this scenario to the unidentified file folder. Appraising the unidentified audio tape, which could be only one of dozens in the box, could take more than an hour—IF you have knowledge of the format and the appropriate playback equipment. Assessing the file folder could potentially be done in 60 seconds and no special equipment is needed, except perhaps reading glasses for some of us.

What if that box contained electronic files (assuming they came in a box)? Appraisal gets more difficult by another factor. A Hollinger box filled with electronic data could represent the information equivalent of one hundred boxes of paper records. An unlabeled disk presents a whole host of issues to resolve before appraisal can begin. Assuming you have a personal computer with a drive that can read the disk, you have to determine which operating system formatted it, which types of documents are stored on the disk, and which software (and version) was used to create it. Clearly the appraisal techniques used for our unlabeled file folder do not readily apply. Issues that we need to consider for the appraisal of future formats include:

- Sheer volume of data. For electronic records, disk space is cheap. The default for most organizations seems to be, when it doubt save it all.
- The need for increased document creator input. We cannot just "eyeball" most formats for content.[5]
- The need for us to be more proactive with creators. We must "train" document creators to add metadata to their documents. This is already happening with Web-based documents, but not on the desktop. One of the early findings of the joint UNC and Duke Digital Desktop study is that email subject lines cannot reliably serve as metadata for message content.
- "Weeding" electronic records. How do we separate non-permanent, restricted, and open records? Again, email is a perfect example. What is it? A memo, a letter, a phone call, a report, all of the above, or worse for us, all of the above combined in one message? With the volume of data being created so high, how can we extract the "permanent" part and discard the non-permanent when it is all one message? Especially when it may mean reviewing tens of thousands of messages? And even if we did extract the "permanent" portion, do we lose the authenticity of the document by alter-

ing it? Remember the concept of “intrinsic value” from your introduction to archives class? We are back to the focus of the InterPARES project and the question of how do we process these records and retain authenticity.
- Which leads to archaic formats—Will a Wordstar document on a 5 ¼ inch disk be looked at like a stone cylinder written in a long dead language, if it is even that accessible? Will it lose intrinsic value if migrated to modern formats?

If archivists can solve these and other appraisal issues in the coming years, we will more than insure the value of our profession in the future.

Conclusion

The Danish physicist Niels Bohr once said: “Prediction is extremely difficult. Especially about the future.”[6] I am at that the point in my talk where I need to try and come up with a conclusion. So, therefore, I predict that one hundred years from now:

- The role of archives and archivists will change, but remain important (an obvious statement—would I address a bunch of archivists and say we would be unimportant?).
- We need to develop new models for managing new formats; traditional appraisal and processing models do not and will not fit.
- There will be a transition period—not paper or plastic, but both paper and digital. We will struggle with version control and the double work of managing both paper records and their electronic versions simultaneously. This overlap of technologies is not unlike the transition from card catalogs to online catalogs when both were maintained. I also believe that the early data migration protocols of the present era will raise authenticity questions about such data in future. Perhaps this will be our twenty-first-century version of the nineteenth-century practice of “fair” copies, which autograph collectors once left in archives as replacement for the original documents.
- The key for our survival will be to remain flexible and appraise the content, not the format.
- We must support grassroots training. We need to get more folks involved in the archival enterprise and expand education opportunities to include volunteers and other archival “lay persons.”
- Finally, we need to build on our past and use it to inform our future decisions. I will end my talk with an illustration about how the past guides us and our efforts today and, hopefully, tomorrow.

Last week the work of the North Carolina Historical Commission, founded in

Managing the Digital University Desktop: Understanding and Empowering the Individual; Preserving the Public Record and Institutional History

Dr. Helen R. Tibbo

“The end-user manages email.”

-ARMA Guideline for Managing E-mail (2000), p. 4.

The Situation and Challenge

Ubiquitous, diversified, distributed, networked computing is an omnipresent feature of academic life today. Such desktop computing is a two-edged sword. It allows users to gather, create, and transmit large numbers and a wide variety of documents and other information with a few keystrokes, but it does very little to help users name and organize their materials, retrieve them easily in the future, or identify those items that should be maintained for specific lengths of time or archived for posterity, even when records management schedules exist. The ease with which users can create, copy, and distribute electronic information to others exacerbates the traditional challenges of records management. Digitally transmitted documents—electronic mail (email) and all manner of associated attachments—are particularly problematic.[1] Even people who have great skill in organizing the files they create may have difficulty with the daily flow of email and attachments created and named by others and saving them in appropriate locations. Indeed, none of the typical desktop applications such as word processing, email, or presentation software, have electronic records management (ERM) features, so users lacking any records management training or even instruction in filing are left to their own devices.

Much like former Speaker of the House Thomas “Tip” O’Neill’s dictum, “All politics is local,” the success of desktop records management and the subsequent archiving of material created in the university environment presently depends on the individual and his or her specific information management behaviors. At this point very little is known about these behaviors and even less about how to optimize them to serve the historical, legal, financial, instructional, and scholarly requirements of higher education.

Dr. Helen R. Tibbo is an Associate Professor in the School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

But, if you choose well and are reasonably successful, we end somewhere near where we began. You have gotten to know, even developed a relationship with, a fascinating creative spirit, and you have been able to share that connection with many others through the papers, and, since this writer is still with us, in the flesh as well!

REFERENCES

[1] Of the eight novels by Walker Percy, I recommend especially *The Moviegoer* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961); *The Last Gentleman* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 1966); and *The Second Coming* (New York, Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 1980). See also *Lanterns on the Levee: Recollections of a Planter's Son*, by William Alexander Percy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941).
[2] Brian, Friel, *Give Me Your Answer, Do!* London: Penguin, 1997.

1903, was celebrated. Its first Secretary, R. D. W. Connor, would go on to be the first archivist of the United States. The Commission led to the founding of the State Archives, supervised the work of the HRS, and helped start the archival profession in North Carolina. Its modern counterpart, the State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB), gave the Society of North Carolina Archivists its start in 1984. I believe that history moves in cycles and that there is a modern event that has the same potential as the founding of the Historical Commission in 1903. In 1999 the North Carolina Library Commission founded the Access to Special Collections Working Group (ASCWG). Their work has lead to North Carolina's Exploring Cultural Heritage Resources Online (NC ECHO). NC ECHO staff have identified over 700 cultural heritage repositories and are providing the type of support to these institutions that the original HRS workers did for archival repositories in the 1930s. SNCA's poster session was orchestrated by NC ECHO and shows the wealth of repositories our state has to offer. NC ECHO's effort to give these repositories a web presence is not unlike the work of the HRS as they published repository guides in the 1930s and early 1940s.

Given the parallels with the impact of the 1903 Commission, I hope that archivists one hundred years from now not only celebrate the bicentennial of the North Carolina Historical Commission, but also the centennial of NC ECHO. NC ECHO's collaboration and grassroots work represents what is best about our profession and I, for one, feel it will endure and serve as a guiding light for our future. To paraphrase Isaac Asimov once again, "It might be the job of [archivists], someday, not to discover, but to re-discover."

NOTES

[1]Robert Heinlein, *The Past Through Tommorrow: "Future History" Stories* (New York, Putnam [1967]).
[2]Isaac Asimov, "The Feeling of Power," *The Edge of Tommorrow.* (New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 1985), 33-43.
[3]The InterPARES (International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems) Project is a major international research initiative in which archival scholars, computer engineering scholars, national archival institutions, and private industry representatives are collaborating to develop the theoretical and methodological knowledge required for the long-term preservation of the authenticity of records created in electronic systems. The InterPARES Project is based in the School of Library, Archival and Information Studies at the University of British Columbia. http://www.interpares.org/
[4]John W. Carlin, "Users Assist in Finding a Solution to the Challenges of Electronic Records." *Archival Outlook* (January/February 2003), 23.
[5]"Managing the Digital Desktop" is a National Historical Publication and Records Commission (NHPRC) grant project to study computer file management practices in academic units and administrative offices here at UNC-CH, across the sixteen -campus UNC System, and at Duke University. www.ils.unc.edu/digitaldesktop/
[6]"Niels Bohr Quotes," www.cp-tel.net/miller/BilLee/quotes/Bohr.html

Authors as Donors:
Some Challenges, Reflections and Suggestions

Walter C. West

This essay is a slightly revised version of a paper presented at both the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section annual pre-conference in 2001 and the Society of North Carolina Archivists conference in October 2002.

Just before I began working in archives, I became a fan of the novels of Walker Percy and got to know the work of his "Uncle Will," the writer William Alexander Percy, who helped raise him. I was intrigued both by the stories these men had written and by the Percy family itself, full, as it seemed, of frequently suicidal but also immensely creative Deep South thinkers and leaders. Imagine my excitement when it turned out that I would be going to visit Walker Percy himself at his family's home in Covington, Louisiana, to retrieve some of his papers, since he was not willing to ship them to UNC Chapel Hill, where I was working. I eventually visited three times and went back twice after his death to consult with his widow, whom I had gotten to know. They fixed me dinner in their home one night (a big salad with iced tea, as I remember, while we watched the news on television), and Dr. Percy took me out to lunch on one visit. In addition to talk about possible restrictions on his collection, what he was and was not including in it, how its monetary value could benefit his children, etc., I got to hear about his practice of Catholicism, his weekly routine, and his life with Uncle Will. I even got to drink his bourbon and experience his family life a little. And then I got to drive away with his papers! Every relationship with an author-donor, of course, does not work out this satisfactorily, but the chance for that kind of connection with truly remarkable people is, I submit, one very good reason to work with living authors.[1]

The most important and, really, the underlying challenge in literary manuscript collecting, it seems to me, is keeping in mind **why** we do this work. If we lose sight of this, something that is easy to do in the midst of all the details and demands of our daily work lives, the rest becomes pretty arid. There are many possible reasons why we do this work with authors, but they must all involve the imaginative literary expressions themselves. I think a major challenge is for the collector to maintain a lively personal connection with these creative products. With this connection in place, the rest of the work will have some **heart** in it and stand a good chance of making a difference.

Walter C. West is the Director of Collection Development at Duke University Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library.

point, and some explanation along these lines may sometimes help to settle or expand an acquisition.

Another point you might make with a prospective donor is that all materials in the papers will be available for use only under the "fair and educational use provisions" of U.S. copyright law. This means that the reproduction of anything beyond very brief quotations will require the permission of the writer of the work (i.e., the copyright holder). If this is not enough to relieve concerns, you might offer to develop a special form to be signed by those who want to see these items. By signing it, researchers promise not to quote or cite material at all without the donor's permission.

Part of the contribution we make to our local communities in collecting literary papers is the relationship that can be built between donors who are creative writers and those on campus or in the area with literary interests—those who teach and study literature, as well as students and others who aspire to become fiction writers and poets. As arrangements are made for an author's papers, groundwork can be laid for an ongoing connection with this particular living writer.

How to maintain this relationship between writer and host community? There are a number of possibilities. Introduce the writer to as many literary types in your community as possible. This can be through informal gatherings, dinners, or receptions. Or it can be through more formal events, such as readings and other occasions featuring the author. Arrange for your authors to visit periodically and meet with classes. I have found that creative-writing teachers are usually happy to expose their students to widely read practitioners of their craft. They can assign a story or some poems by the author for students to read before the writer appears. They can talk about this work beforehand and, afterwards, about what the writer had to say. They can even ask students to visit special collections and observe the writer's techniques by examining successive drafts of a story, novel, play, or poem. The fact that you are dealing with a living donor is an opportunity to extend the value of having the manuscripts, expanding it into active person-to-person interactions that can have effects that the papers by themselves usually do not have.

From the other direction, stay in touch with the writer-donor. This can be through newsletters, maybe an annual letter to donors, or occasional email contact. It is a lot like taking on a new friend who lives at a distance. So, again, be cautious about whom you approach! It can be a real chore to keep up with someone you dislike or do not much respect.

a sustained effort to stay in touch with the writer, this arrangement usually will result in the desired full collection in the end. Things can get more complicated—and expensive—for the collector when the author works through a dealer or agent, though a dealer sometimes can also facilitate matters.

Another issue involves the kinds of materials that will actually constitute the collection. A special concern I have with the papers of living writers is that the author will withhold most of the juicy stuff. It is easy to see that successive drafts of literary works and correspondence that is clearly literary should be included in the collection. It is not as obvious to most writers that more personal documentation may also be appropriate. What about family letters, scrapbooks, candid photos, diaries? This can be a sticky, difficult, and understandably conflicted point. Writers do not often really want to expose their personal lives to public scrutiny. J. D. Salinger, the famously reclusive author, may seem to be an extreme case, but his resistance to exposing himself through his correspondence is really not all that exceptional. The public and the critics can be fascinated with authors' lives beyond the strictly literary, and not just for sensationalist reasons. This kind of material, along with professional correspondence, in my experience, draws at least as much research interest as do the notes, drafts, and galleys.

So, how do you argue for keeping at least some of the more personal items in the collection? A few strategies seem worth considering. More personal materials can be closed for a time, perhaps even for the lifetime of the writer or of certain relatives or friends. The author can take time to consult with friends and relatives represented in the materials about what will be included before finally deciding. And you can even try a little encouragement along the lines of "the duties of good citizenship for highly esteemed writers." I think there's a good argument to be made, respectfully, for being more inclusive.

Restricting use and copying is another area where authors differ widely. At Duke, we have one author-donor who is quite comprehensive in what he sends us and yet will not hear of restrictions of any kind. Call him about something that a processor found in a recent accession that appears a little shady, and he seems almost upset you have bothered him with such a trifling matter. Another writer, on the other hand, has closed all correspondence and much else in his collection until after his death. Yet another will allow no copying from drafts of works, published or unpublished. We stress that we strive to make material as openly available as possible, yet understand that some selective restricting may be appropriate. If the material has high research value, it is better to have it preserved in our building, even if it will not be available for many years, than to leave it vulnerable to loss or destruction. A writer may not appreciate this

In this essay, I will briefly consider what I see as some of the other important challenges involved in collecting the papers of living authors, hoping that my reflections might stimulate readers to reflect usefully on their own related work.

To begin, how do you decide whether or not to pursue the papers of a particular living author? A sound and flexible collecting policy can help focus your work. Are you collecting writers from a specific geographic area, those who concentrate in a certain genre, or those of one gender or from one ethnic group? Beyond that, though, you still have to be selective. Writers can be especially high-maintenance donors, so substantial amounts of trouble and angst on the part of the archivist, not to mention money, are only warranted if the chances are good that the papers involved really will have a payoff for the repository and its users. Often you will be considering authors whose value is not yet quite clear. Will there be an interest over time in studying a writer whose literary significance is not firmly established? You might even need to read a few novels or some poetry on **work** time to help figure this out! Follow critical scholarship as much as possible, and stay in touch with faculty specialists and knowledgeable colleagues. Then it comes down to trusting your growing literary/archival judgment. A prioritized want-list can guide your proactive efforts and serve as a hedge against getting bogged down with writers who may seem interesting but really are not likely to have useful papers or fit your collecting profile. We all make mistakes; the object is to minimize them.

Authors vary widely in how they value their papers and in how much they value them. Writers' feelings in the matter may involve literary status, financial considerations, or concerns about the papers' preservation. These factors, of course, can be mixed in varying proportions.

The nature and intensity of a writer's feelings matter greatly during negotiations for the papers. Those with a marked ego investment (and there is almost always **some** of this) respond well to hearing that their papers will be featured in press releases, opening receptions, and exhibits. They also respond well, unfortunately, to offers of lots of cash that may concretely represent your level of esteem for their work.

I enjoyed an entertaining presentation of these dynamics at a conference in 1999 at the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin. The proceedings included a dramatic reading from Irish author Brian Friel's 1997 play "Give Me Your Answer, Do!" The answer sought is whether a novelist will sell his manuscripts to what is referred to in the play as "that university in Texas." (It is also a play in which a field archivist is referred to as "The Great Assessor" at one point, "that agent chappie" at another, and "Mister God himself" twice!) The connection between literary ego and archival offer is made in the play when one character comments after the price of her husband's papers has been set, "So now his real worth is established . . . the substantial confirmation, the tangible evidence" is in. This theme is extended in the play by comparisons of the size of the offers made to two novelist-friends. Best to steer things away from such comparisons, of course.[2]

The writer who is more interested in the money than he or she is driven by ego needs likely will deal with your offer more straightforwardly, sometimes by flatly rejecting it, claiming much more is being offered by others. Maybe it is, or maybe it is not. (An author once told me that another repository had offered him exactly **ten** times as much as we were suggesting—a claim I had a hard time fully believing.) This author with a mainly financial interest may care little about how you handle the papers once they are transferred.

The writer who values the papers as papers, on the other hand, may not require too big a check from you. He or she, though, may want lots of reassurance about processing, description, and preservation plans.

And, finally, you may encounter an author who is unaware that the papers have any value to anybody. He or she may demand the least of you, at least at first. In my experience with authors, though, money almost always eventually comes up.

So, what about money and the actual financial agreement with an author? One important factor is the Internal Revenue Service code stipulating that self-created works are not eligible for fair market-value deductions. When it comes to an author's own papers, this makes gifts, as opposed to sales, much less likely. One variation that sometimes helps is called a "bargain sale" or a gift-purchase agreement. In this arrangement, after an outside, professional appraisal, the ownership passes to the repository for something less than the appraised value. The author thereby makes a gift of part of the collection, perhaps a particularly newsworthy part, out of affection for the institution or for the prospects of good press, or both. If any part of the collection is not self-created, that part can become the gift and the donor may well be able to take a tax deduction for it.

Sometimes, a straightforward sale is the only possibility. In my experience the seller is often reluctant to suggest a price, so that it is left to the buyer, i.e., the archivist, to do so. In some cases an appraiser can help to set a mutually

agreeable price based on his or her sense of market value. This also tends to simplify negotiations by transferring any assignment of judgment of the author's literary value from the archivist to the appraiser.

On rare occasions, when there is some special affection in the writer's heart for the institution seeking the papers, an outright gift may be a possibility. One novelist whose papers are coming to Duke says, "Selling my papers would be like selling my blood. And I could never sell my blood; I could only give it." This is not the typical attitude!

One other option involves the writer depositing the papers, retaining ownership while physically placing the papers with you. In my opinion, deposits like this are to be avoided except as a last resort. They make rehousing, processing, and cataloging chancy investments, since the papers may be taken away at any time. And there have been plenty of cases where this has happened. They also can make for awkward relationships between you and the author. But, if the material is especially valuable, it looks to be physically vulnerable in the author's care, and you can predict that, after a reasonably brief period of deposit, ownership will pass to the repository, a deposit, with its risks and headaches, may be worth it.

There are other challenges that seem to me to pertain particularly to living authors. First, the matter of possible future transfers must be addressed. Your goal will be to take in what is being offered now as a first step in building a comprehensive collection over time. You will want to cover this matter in the initial agreement you sign with the author. The best option, from the repository's point of view, to cover explicitly in the initial agreement all materials that will ever be donated. This is not likely to be acceptable to many writers, but it is worth proposing since it has the virtue of simplicity and avoids the unpleasantness of periodic haggling.

Another possibility is to pay only for what is coming immediately and to agree on a separate price to be paid when additions are made in the future. One Duke author-donor exchanges annual additions of correspondence, drafts, etc., for a standard amount of money that is stipulated in the agreement signed years ago. His wife, who handles arrangements for him, says she will not try to renegotiate the amount, "at least not until he wins the Nobel Prize."

Yet another approach is to agree initially that the donor grants the repository the right of first refusal of any additional materials. When combined with a statement of mutual intent to build a comprehensive collection over time, something that I think it is easy to argue is in everyone's best interest, and with