

J

ournal for the
Society of
North Carolina
Archivists



**Journal for the Society of North Carolina
Archivists**

Published by

Society of North Carolina Archivists

J-SNCA Editorial Board

Courtney Bailey, *Editor*

State Archives of North Carolina

Jodi Berkowitz, *Copy Editor*

Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Jennifer Coggins, *Copy Editor*

Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Kate Collins, *Photograph Editor*

David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript
Library, Duke University

Keith Gorman, *Editor*

Martha Blakeney Hodges Special Collections and
University Archives, University of North Carolina
Greensboro

Gene Hyde, *Editor*

University of North Carolina at Asheville

Nancy Kaiser, *Editor*

Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Cat S. McDowell, *Editor*

Kristen Merryman, *Managing Editor*

North Carolina Digital Heritage Center

Katie Nash, *Editor*

Williams College

Genya O’Gara, *Editor*

VIVA, George Mason University

Nikki Thomas, *Publications Chair*

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Matt Turi, *Editor*

Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

ISSN 1945-8533

Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists

Volume 14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Page 2** **Bringing Dolmen Press Printing
Blocks Further into the Light**
Stephanie Bennett
Craig Fansler
- Page 13** ***2017 Gene J. Williams Award Winner*
A Responsibility for Tomorrow: The
Role of Archives in the History,
Memory, and Identity of Groups
Victimized by Genocide and Other
Human Rights Abuses**
Nicole T. Pawleski
- Page 29** **Reviews**

About the Cover

Photograph depicts the Near East Relief Society's Working Boys' Home in Cairo, Egypt and was taken in the late 1920s or early 1930s. The photograph is one of two surviving of the author Nicole Pawleski's paternal grandfather, Simpad Tavitian. He is in the second row from the top, almost evenly beneath the "W" in the sign. Photograph courtesy of author Nicole T. Pawleski.

Bringing Dolmen Press Printing Blocks Further into the Light

by Stephanie Bennett and Craig Fansler

Abstract

Wake Forest University's Z. Smith Reynolds Library Special Collections and Archives holds the Dolmen Press Collection, which documents the history and work of Liam and Josephine Miller's Irish press. Part of the collection is a number of printing press blocks, many of which are images found in the Dolmen's publications. Artifacts are often not used for their primary purpose, but at ZSR, they are printed for a variety of projects. Preservation Librarian Craig Fansler and Collections Archivist Stephanie Bennett examine the ways in which the collection has been described, iteratively improved over time, and the possibilities for future description and access.

One hazard of working in libraries and archives is falling in love with your collections. This happened to preservation librarian Craig Fansler in 2003 while doing preliminary sorting and inventory of printing plates from the Dolmen Press Collection. The printing plates numbered in the hundreds and were stored across a number of large, heavy artifact boxes.

The Dolmen Press has a storied history. It was founded by Liam and Josephine Miller in 1951 in Dublin, Ireland, and was described by Irish poet Thomas Kinsella as being "the first time an Irish writer could have a professional primary publisher in Ireland."¹ Dolmen focused on publishing Irish poets and artists. In a 1981 radio interview, Liam Miller said:

I grew up in a generation of Irish people where the young writer had to look to London for publication. Going through college with these people made me conscious of the fact that some of them didn't have a chance in London. I wanted to do something about bringing them out in their own country because I believed that the publication of a writer from Ireland in Ireland was an important thing, to give him a sense of identity with his own country.²

Liam Miller had no background in editing poetry or in printing; instead, he studied architecture and worked

designing sets in several theaters. Nevertheless, Miller hand-built his first press, which he stored under his bed. Miller also was active in a number of artistic areas: he founded Dublin's Lantern Theatre; served as president of the Irish branch of PEN, an international literary group; and acted as founding president of the Irish Book Publisher's Association, CLÉ, among others.³

A forerunner and model for the Dolmen Press is a press that began in Ireland in 1906, the Cuala Press. Cuala was founded by William Butler Yeats' two sisters: Elizabeth Corbett Yeats, known as Lollie, and Susan Mary Yeats, known as Lily. In many ways, the Cuala Press set a precedent for the Dolmen Press. Cuala was a craft based business that designed and created weavings and letterpress-printed cards. It grew out of the Arts and Crafts Movement in England and was influenced by William Morris; Lily Yeats worked in William Morris' weaving shop at Kelmescott. In addition to the similarities, a few direct lines connect the Cuala and Dolmen presses; one is Dolmen artist Leslie MacWeeney. In addition to creating artwork for the Dolmen Press, she worked with Anne Yeats, the daughter of William Butler Yeats; MacWeeney assisted Anne in archiving the work of her uncle, artist Jack Butler Yeats. Dolmen also published many works about William Butler Yeats, due to Liam Miller's lifelong interest in Yeats. A notable difference between the Cuala and Dolmen presses was that all the work from the Cuala Press was done by women. The Cuala staff, all women, printed and hand-colored cards with Irish poems or sayings. They attended craft shows in Ireland to sell works, which included the cards, poetry broadsides, painted fans, and weavings. Many of the poems were by poets who were friends of the Yeats family: Susan L. Mitchell, Katharine Tynan, Padraic Colum, and of course, W. B. Yeats. Lily Yeats oversaw the weaving work at what was known as Cuala Industries, while Elizabeth oversaw the printing. Liam Miller wrote a 1973 book, "*The Dun Emer Press, later the Cuala Press*," chronicling the history.⁴

In its early years, the Dolmen Press printed books on Miller's small handcrafted press and then assembled the finished books by hand. These first books were small poetry chapbooks with a few linocuts as illustrations. Many of the

early titles sold out, encouraging the Millers to go on. After a short time in production, Dolmen became a starting place of publication for many Irish poets and artists. The Dolmen Press ended operation with the death of Liam Miller in 1987; the collection was acquired by Z. Smith Reynolds (ZSR) Library at Wake Forest University in 1987 and some initial processing work was done in 2004.

Preliminary sorting and inventory of the Dolmen Press Collection printing press plates and blocks was done along with an inventory of the rest of the collection. The collection was arranged into seven series: Administrative (1890-1986), Design and Printing (1955-1987), Financial (1942-1986), Liam Miller Personal Papers (1937-1987), Oversize Materials (1950-1980), Printing Blocks (circa 1908-1987), and Publications (1945-1987). All together, the collection comprises approximately 260 linear feet and 190 boxes of various sizes, from document boxes to hefty artifact boxes.

In the literature, artifacts are most often addressed as items for outreach. Increasingly, and with good cause, artifacts are being used to teach primary sources in the "classroom," whether that classroom is set in an elementary school or a bar.^{5,6} One of these settings is more focused on learning objectives and pedagogy than the other, but all such events exercise the value of archival items and objects for their storytelling abilities. These exercises focus on what Schellenburg referred to as secondary values of an item, in this case artifactual or informational, rather than the primary value of the object, the work it was created to do.⁷

And yet, though archivists provide access to our holdings for people to do research or create new knowledge, often that work is not necessarily based on a collection's intrinsic value. Even in museums where artifacts are engaged for aesthetic or intellectual reasons, objects are not always necessarily used to their original purpose. London's Victoria and Albert Museum has an extensive collection of wrought iron gates that can tell a tactile story of places and people in ways documents could not;⁸ however, the gates are not being used for their original purpose, whether that was to act as a moveable barrier for castles, or to decorate a churchyard as

an ornament crafted to showcase in the glory of God, seen in any number of cathedrals around the world.

When and how do archivists and preservationists discuss how to honor the original purpose of an object through use? This question is often engaged by thinking about ways in which digital surrogates diverge from the objects that they represent rather than discussing artifactual and primary use. Users, and so archivists, consider the "look and feel" of a different type of representation, for example, as explored by Hedstrom, et al., in "'The Old Version Flickers More': Digital Preservation from the User's Perspective."⁹ As they write, "Archivists and curators recognize the need to consider the contexts of purpose and use when choosing preservation strategies, including who the users will be and what they will need."¹⁰ Emulation is relegated to discussions of digital surrogates, but how would emulation for the physical world work? With improving imaging of all kinds, including 3D scanning, and 3D printers, true-to-life reproductions for printing blocks and all types of artifacts are a possibility, though the likelihood that archival institutions will be able to leverage that technology at affordable rates seems unlikely.

Consider also: what would an object need? In the case of a printing press plate, is one such need actually being used in a press? Arguments could be made either way: archivists may not want to change the nature of the plate as it was received, original users' ink intact, or – plates were not made to be admired as physical art necessarily, but to be printed and have the resulting version serve its purpose: art, literature, messages conveyed via ink and paper. Do archivists honor our holdings more via thoughtful digital stewardship than we do in caring stewardship of physical items? Are there ways to use objects for their original purpose without obscuring the all-important research use? William Joyce said in 1984 that "archivists best promote use of their holdings by directly linking research applications of collections to the needs of users of whatever interest."¹¹ Perhaps using artifacts to their original purpose is another, equally "best" way, to engage possible or future archives users.

At Wake Forest University, there was never any question that the plates would remain as part of the collection, and

very little hesitation in applying them to their original purpose. Almost immediately after receiving a letterpress printer in 2013, Fansler realized that he now could print the Dolmen plates. So he did, after some training by the letterpress's previous owner and through trial and error experimentation with printing on his own. These objects convey the work of Dolmen employees—typesetting pages, placing artwork within that—as well as the artistry of the people involved: not just Liam and Josephine Miller but the artists who created the plates. Some are quite elaborate and all are unfamiliar to many of us, especially students passing through our institution who are children of the touchscreen publishing age. In addition to the plates' artifactual and informational values, their primary value is leveraged since we have the good fortune of having the tools and the expertise on staff to actually turn these from artifacts into workhorses.

Some institutions may make a different choice with their printing plates, to display them as they are rather than use them on a press in projects that may or may not be directly related to the Dolmen collection. The plates have been used in class, though as artifacts rather than working objects. In 2010, Fansler and Audra Eagle Yun used the printing plates as a component of information literacy instruction; their course asked students to craft a small exhibit using a printing block.¹² This use may be due to the course occurring before the letterpress arrived on site, but it is worth nothing that the blocks now more often show up in a blog post or on a broadside. Given the letterpress's home in the preservation lab, Fansler's deep interest in the collection, and his abilities with the letterpress, it seems fated we would make use of them as printing objects. Over time, the metal plates would likely begin to corrode without use; on the other hand, some of the linoleum prints are not mounted on a block and are so delicate that they cannot be printed. Use is a double-edged sword, but archivists know that already.

In fact, the majority of the Printing Blocks series plates were designed to be printed on a letterpress. Many of these printing blocks had been created by Irish artists in the form of linoleum cuts, wood engravings, and metal plates. The bulk are either linoleum cuts mounted on wood blocks or

wood engravings carved in wood blocks that are what is referred to as "type high" (0.918 inches) in order for them to make contact with the paper when placed on a letterpress printer. Some of the blocks were created mechanically from artwork, but most of these fascinating images were created by each artist's hands.

Initially, the blocks had very little organization. They were packed into boxes with no obvious context. As a novice to



A series of Dolmen Press books and the printing plates associated with the imagery for each one. (Top-Druid Craft (1971) by Michael J. Sindell et. al., art by Jack Coughlin; bottom left- The Rough Field (1972) by John Montague, art by John Derricke; and bottom right- The Circus (1974) by Juanita Casey, art by Juanita Casey).

the Dolmen Press's large and varied bibliography, Fansler had to do research on the Dolmen's book list and the artists who illustrated the works in order to even attempt to match each block with a publication, artist, or other identifying information. Some blocks were unidentifiable at that time – many remain so – and one box consists solely of type.

After this initial round of identification and arrangement, a preliminary inventory of the Dolmen Press Collection's

Printing Blocks Series was put online (<https://wakespace.lib.wfu.edu/handle/10339/28090>) alongside description of the collection's other six series and the whole collection (<https://wakespace.lib.wfu.edu/handle/10339/27836>). These documents offer some description of the collection and, in particular, information about the content of the blocks, arranged into three subseries: illustrations by artist, illustrations by title when an artist could not be identified, and the dreaded "Miscellaneous." While some artists, titles, or even subject matter were identified, many remain undetermined in all three of those arenas; abstract images are difficult to describe meaningfully from an archival perspective. The initial inventory and descriptive information are incomplete, as well; for example, the extent of the series is said to be fifteen boxes, but sixteen box numbers are provided in the inventory listing.

Unfortunately, the Dolmen Press Collection is weighed down by copyright issues. Due to the variances in Irish copyright laws and the wide array of artists and poets who were published by the Dolmen Press, putting materials online is not an option currently. So access to the collection cannot be provided via a digital collection or other online project. Around 2008, a selection of printing plates and blocks were scanned and put online to be searchable by subject, author, or title, in the Dolmen Press Printing Block Series digital collection (<https://wakespace.lib.wfu.edu/handle/10339/46/browse?type=author>). Since these are the artifacts themselves rather than prints, we judged that they could be put online. Staff, interested in exploring digital projects in the early days of digitization at ZSR Library, created minimal metadata for these images. However, a decade later, it does not meet our more robust and uniform standards; for example, only two blocks were assigned the subject "Dolmen Press" and more than 200 were given the subject "miscellaneous," not a meaningful term for curious art-seekers.

In order to bring these otherwise inaccessible printing plates to life, the preservation librarian and letterpress guru Fansler worked to create imprints of all the plates except the type. ZSR received a letterpress printer in 2013; it lives in the ZSR Preservation Lab and Fansler oversees its use for library

bookmarks, poetry broadsides, the occasional cards for special occasions, and now the Dolmen images as needed. These printing plates had been sitting dormant for 30 years after the Press's dissolution in 1987, but now sprung back to life one imprint after another. Fansler made letterpress prints and also printed on a smaller proof press as necessary. The physical blocks and the prints were both numbered by box. Though the prints cannot be made widely available online, these prints are now reference copies that Special Collections can provide access to in the research room for the Dolmen Press Collection's many researchers.

We are also working to improve the metadata about the printing blocks. In consultation with Collections Archivist Stephanie Bennett, Library Fellow Sophie Leveque worked to create metadata for every block printed--again, not the type, due to the large amount of type as well as its uniformity. The metadata contains as much information as possible about each plate: artist; originating publication with page number, year of publication, and call number; description of the plate's materials and construction; and uniform descriptions constructed with a template and employing the Getty Research Institute's Art and Architecture Thesaurus and other controlled vocabularies as needed.

We hope to use this metadata from Leveque to correct the finding aid description for the Printing Blocks series and its item inventory in the future, as well as improve upon the metadata for the existing digital collection of a portion of the blocks. Additionally, Leveque is working to create a subject guide about the collection that contains links to relevant resources as well as a database of all the prints, with support from ZSR Library faculty who are skilled users of the platform. Again, due to the copyright complications of the Press's work, the database will only be available internally, but we hope it will be valuable to Dolmen scholars and other enthusiasts who are able to visit our Research Room. All these newly generated points of access--the internal database and subject guide, physical prints of each block, and reorganized printing blocks--support improved reference and user access.

We now have a visual record to exist in the stacks and in the virtual world, alongside the physical Dolmen Press Collection.

Craig Fansler is Preservation Librarian for the Z. Smith Reynolds Library at Wake Forest University, where he has worked for 24 years. He regularly teaches book repair workshops in North Carolina for the North Carolina Preservation Consortium and the North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources. Fansler holds an MLIS from University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Stephanie Bennett is the Collections Archivist for Wake Forest University, which is also her alma mater. She is currently serving as Chair for SAA's Collections Management Tool Section, on Issues & Advocacy Section's Steering Committee, and as Education Committee Chair for the Society of NC Archivists. Bennett holds an MSLIS with an Archives Management concentration from Simmons College.

NOTES

1. Maurice Harmon, *The Dolmen Press: A Celebration* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 2001), 16.
2. Maurice Harmon, *The Dolmen Press: A Celebration* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 2001), 31.
3. Maurice Harmon, *The Dolmen Press: A Celebration* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 2001), 15.
4. Liam Miller, *The Dun Emer Press, Later the Cuala Press* (Dublin: Dolmen Press, 1973), 55.
5. Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, Yasmin B. Kafai, and William E. Landis, "Integrating Primary Sources into the Elementary School Classroom: A Case Study of Teachers' Perspectives," *Archivaria* 48 (Fall 1999).
6. Erin Lawrimore. "Hop into History: Engaging Community through Archives and Beer," *Archival Outlook* (September/October 2017).
7. Theodore Schellenberg, "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," (1956) reprinted in *A Modern Archives Reader* (Washington, 1984), 57-70.

8. "Room 113: Ironwork," Victoria and Albert Museum, London (2016). Accessed at <http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/galleries/level-3/room-113-ironwork/>
9. Margaret Hedstrom, Christopher Lee, Judith Olson, and Clifford Lampe, "'The Old Version Flickers More': Digital Preservation from the User's Perspective," *The American Archivist*, Vol. 69, No. 1, (Spring/Summer 2006), 159-187.
10. Ibid.
11. William Joyce, "Archivists and Research Use," *The American Archivist*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Spring 1984), 124-133.
12. Craig Fansler and Audra Eagle Yun, "Inside the Box: Incorporating Archival Material into Undergraduate Information Literacy Instruction," *Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists*, Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall 2011. Accessed at <http://www.ncarchivists.org/journal-of-the-society-of-north-carolina-archivists-j-snca/vol-9-no-1-fall-2011/>

2017 Gene J. Williams Award Winner

The Gene J. Williams Award, presented annually by the Society of North Carolina Archivists, recognizes excellence for a paper on an archival topic written by a North Carolina graduate student for a graduate level course. This award honors the late Gene J. Williams, archivist at the North Carolina Division of Archives and History and at East Carolina University and charter member of the Society of North Carolina Archivists.

A Responsibility for Tomorrow: The Role of Archives in the History, Memory, and Identity of Groups Victimized by Genocide and Other Human Rights Abuses by Nicole T. Pawelski

I have only two photographs of my grandfather from his childhood. In one, he is posing with his younger brother. In the other, he is about 15 or 16 years of age, surrounded by the other boys living in the American Near East Relief Working Boys' Home in Cairo, Egypt. Growing up, I knew that my grandfather was an orphan, an Armenian born in eastern Anatolia, and that something terrible had happened to his family. It explained why this man with the kind eyes rarely spoke more than a handful of words whenever I saw him. He always had this aspect of never being really present; his silence was his armor against the ghosts of the past. But the silence intrigued me. How could I find out what the past held if no one wanted to talk about it? How could I learn anything if my only documentary evidence was two photographs?

Now fast forward a few decades. With the advent of the digital era, researching no longer necessarily requires a trip to another state or another country in order to gain access to information. With the click of button, anyone can search for anything, and you might actually come up with relevant information. In my case, it brought me to the Near East

Relief Digital Museum, which according to their website (<http://neareastmuseum.com/about/>) "commemorates America's historic response to the Armenian, Assyrian, and Anatolian Greek Genocide by preserving, reconstructing, and sharing the rich history of the relief effort."¹ I researched the collection, and contacted the archivist. Through her, I learned that the seemingly conflicting narratives of my grandpa's childhood (he was rescued by American aid workers in Aleppo, Syria, but the photograph clearly states that he resided in a home in Cairo, Egypt) were probably both accurate. Young children like my grandfather and his brother would have been housed in an orphanage in Aleppo. When they reached their teenage years, they would have been transferred to what was called a "working home," where they would learn a skill that they could practice in adulthood and be matched with an adult Armenian in the local diaspora community for mentoring and apprenticeship. This would explain how my grandfather learned tailoring and how he was eventually sponsored for schooling in Paris at the Sorbonne. At the same time, I was able to contribute the photograph of my grandpa at the working home to the digital museum, as it was not one that they had in their collection.

My experience led me to consider the role of archives and modern technology in the formation of memory and identity in marginalized and displaced communities, many of which have been victims of human rights abuses and even genocide. This topic has (unfortunately) much significance for 21st century researchers. The mass destruction of Christian minorities that took place in the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and the end of World War I was the first, but by no means the last, mass annihilation of an ethnic or religious minority by a totalitarian regime during the 20th century. The term "genocide," coined by the Polish Jewish lawyer Raphael Lemkin, refers to this destruction in a modern context, outside of a colonial framework. According to Peter Balakian, Lemkin's readings about mass killings, including that of the Armenians, and the experiences of his childhood led him to develop this concept, which he wrote about as early as 1933. In 1948, after the near extermination of the Jewish population of Germany and Eastern Europe, he introduced a three-part concept of genocide that the United Nations adopted in a truncated version in 1948 when it

enacted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Though the Convention acknowledges the first two parts, physical existence and biological continuity through procreation, it ignores the third part: spiritual or cultural expression. In fact, the destruction of spiritual or cultural property and heritage would not become a war crime in international courts until 2016.

Balakian believes, however, that Lemkin felt that the destruction of cultural heritage was in fact an essential concept in his understanding of genocide. He first acknowledges Lemkin's upbringing: "Jewish cultural memory in eastern Poland was inseparable from histories of violence. Even in Lemkin's childhood some seventy or eighty Jews had been killed in a pogrom in nearby Bialystok in 1906, and so his coming of age could not fail to be marked by an acute sense of membership in a threatened minority."² He goes on to quote Lemkin:

Cultural genocide can be accomplished predominately in the religious and cultural fields by destroying institutions and objects through which the spiritual life of a human group finds its expression, such as houses of worship, objects of religious cult, schools, treasures of art and culture. By destroying spiritual leadership and institutions, forces of spiritual cohesion within a group are removed and the group starts to disintegrate. This is especially significant for the existence of religious groups. Religion can be destroyed within a group even if the members continue to subsist physically.³

In other words, the cultural touchstones of a community, such as its libraries, archives, museums, schools, and houses of worship, contain and embody the core of its identity. A community without its cultural heritage is like a body without a soul; the very things that make it valuable and unique no longer exist. Even if members of that community should survive, they have very few options for sharing their values and history with future generations.

This poses distinct problems from an archival perspective. The first is legal in nature and involves the archive as secure repository for authentic, reliable records. How can justice be

secured for victims of human rights abuses when any legal documentation might be destroyed or suspect? And even if the perpetrators go to trial, what role do trial-related documents play in the writing of history and the reconciliation of peoples? The second involves memory and cultural identity: How do victims of genocide and human rights abuses reclaim their lost heritage? How does that heritage change as they attempt to come to terms with what they have suffered and lost? Finally, from a broader perspective, can archives and archivists help prevent human rights abuses and make sure that the voices of the marginalized aren't lost to history? Traditionally archives were kept by those in power in order to secure and protect that power. The role of the archive has changed over time, especially in response to the massive amounts of documentation that exist in the modern world, which makes the archivist's role in appraising, preserving, interpreting, and providing access even more important. Should the archival profession stay fixed in its historically neutral role as keepers of the record, or should it encourage its members to take a more active approach in appraisal, description, and even creation of records where none may exist? Following are some different perspectives on these three questions of law, memory, and the role of the archivist.

The Armenian Genocide is widely considered the first modern genocide. After the end of World War I, when the rest of the world began to hear about the atrocities committed against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire at the behest of the ruling Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), Britain, France, and Russia called for justice by threatening the crumbling Ottoman Empire with international legal action. Since the Empire had been under martial law since 1909, several military tribunals were formed in Istanbul to determine guilt in the case of the massacre of the Armenians. These trials were complicated by political developments in the Ottoman Empire, with the Ottoman government in Istanbul increasingly at odds with the growing nationalist movement based in Ankara. Public opinion in the country sided more and more with the nationalists. The military tribunals were unpopular, and the proposed Treaty of Sèvres firmly pushed the majority of the Turkish people into the nationalist camp. According to Gabrielle Simm, the Treaty of

Sèvres "required the Turkish Government to hand over persons suspected of war crimes or crimes against a national of the Allied Powers and persons responsible for the massacres for trial by the Allied military tribunals" and "to cede territory in central Anatolia, considered by Turkish nationalists to be the heartland of a future Turkish state, to create the new independent state of Armenia."⁴ It is interesting to note that the Treaty would have also required the Turkish government to turn over "all documents and information of every kind, the production of which may be considered necessary to ensure the full knowledge of the incriminating acts, the prosecution of offenders and the just appreciation of responsibility."⁵ However, by 1922, the nationalist government in Ankara was running the country, and Treaty of Lausanne "which contained an amnesty for all crimes committed between 1 August 1914 and 20 November 1922 and no mention of an Armenian state" replaced the unpopular Treaty of Sèvres.⁶ To complicate matters further, the nationalist Republic of Turkey denied, and continues to deny, that the genocide ever occurred. In addition, Simm notes

Evidence from government officials, Armenian survivors, and government documents sheds light on the record-keeping practices of the Ottoman government and constitutes an archive on which later assessments of historians are based. Issues of the official journal reporting on the trial, including the plan to exterminate the Armenian people, had disappeared by 1922, leaving later researchers to piece together records from newspaper reports.⁷

Was justice served for the Armenian victims of the Genocide and their descendants? That notion is still being debated one hundred years later. The role of archives in this matter is both crucial and complicated. The Republic of Turkey continues to claim that its archives are open, complete, and accessible, yet we know that archives have historically served as keepers of the "official" record of a society and that the "official" record reflects the judgments of those in power. Any research and historical analysis based on these archives, then, can be considered (whether intentionally or not) biased. This tension between politics and history is one of the main subjects of debate in the legal questions related to archives

and genocide. According to Simm, the term "genocide" itself is "more a legal term than a historical one, designed for the ex post facto judgments of the courtroom rather than the historian's attempt to understand events."⁸ This narrowness of the legal perspective can be problematic. Pok Yin Chow asserts that

courts and tribunals are particularly unsatisfactory venues to establish history; not necessarily because of what legal procedures they seek to establish, but for what they tend to dismiss...A full and public disclosure of truth through judicial processes is necessarily partial and fragmentary from a historical point of view.⁹

This has led marginalized groups to seek alternative avenues for writing their own versions of history. The Paris Peoples' Tribunal, which convened in France in 1984, is one example. This was not a state-based court but a civil proceeding requested by three non-governmental organizations in order to investigate whether or not the massacre of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire is considered genocide and what the implications might be.¹⁰ Because the Tribunal took place 80 years after the genocide, there was no question about justice being served to the perpetrators who were long since dead. However, it brought the Armenian question back into public consciousness and allowed alternative documentary evidence (such as foreign diplomatic records, records of humanitarian organizations and the testimonies of their workers, and the oral and written narratives of survivors) to be entered into the public record. As a result, Researchers now have another perspective on what continues to be a contentious topic, both politically and historically.

Sometimes a criminal trial can combine both narratives: those of the political establishment and those of its victims. This is the case with the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). The war crimes court based in The Hague spent two decades gathering evidence about human rights violations and genocide during the Balkan Wars of the early 1990s. The documentation amassed is massive and varies in both type and perspective. According to David Kaye:

It is a repository of testimony, analysis, judgment, opinion, dissent, contempt, imagery, and memory.

Its archives hold the stories of those who suffered through the siege of Sarajevo, the massacres around Srebrenica and in Vukovar, the numerous rape camps Bosnian Serb forces set up around Bosnia in the early 1990s, ethnic cleansing in the Krajina, and much more. It gives voice not only to the victims but also to the accused, those who, like Serb President Slobodan Milošević, repeatedly rejected the Tribunal's authority in lengthy disquisitions before the bench. The Tribunal stores the assessments of diplomats, military officers, international analysts, journalists, and others who brought experience and expertise to the ICTY's work. In videos and transcripts stored on terabytes of servers, prosecutors make motions, defense counsel object to them, judges decide them, and a small army of clerks read evidence into the record that may support or refute them.¹¹

While the depth and breadth of documentation (judicial, non-judicial, and administrative) is impressive, it is also a double-edged sword. The first problem relates to appraisal: what will the UN do with all of this material? Kaye quotes the UN as estimating that "the total of its physical records by the end of 2010 will require 3,704 shelf metres and that its electronic records will increase by as much as 8,000 terabytes or more (which will require specific server rooms)."¹² Careful and thorough appraisal will be essential to establishing an accessible post-trial archive.

The second problem related to this material is future use. The UN sees it as a source for promoting reconciliation in a post-conflict society, but Kaye believes that this definition is too limited. The Tribunal itself has been divisive in the Balkans and it is unlikely that it would be less so in the secondary use of its archives. Thus, its efficacy in promoting reconciliation between communities is doubtful. At the same time, these multiple perspectives could potentially make the archives a rich source for researchers. Kaye says that such an archive not only has the power of openness and rationality behind it, but it also has the authority of reality. ((The ICTY will be making as much of the records publicly accessible as possible, apart from those subject to individual witness protection and other

legitimate claims to confidentiality, and there is simply no central figure in the Tribunal or broader UN universe with the authority or power to verify one particular narrative over another, apart from (perhaps) the final judgments of the appellate chambers)).¹³

Disparate narratives thus allow for a broader, nuanced view of the events related to the Balkan Wars and their historical contexts.

It is important to keep in mind the distinctions between history, memory, and archives. Chow lays out an example of this in his discussion of memory laws v. archive laws. Archive laws exist to protect documents and records from willful destruction. Memory laws, however, exist to prevent the discussion of disparate narratives. Chow notes that

memory laws are legislated in France to criminalize denials of the Holocaust and the Armenian Genocide, as well as to officially recognize the slave trade and slavery as crimes against humanity (while outlawing contrary contentions). Another, more controversial, law requires education programs to teach the 'positive role' that France played in its history of colonialism.¹⁴

These memory laws raise important ethical issues: should we criminalize a certain narrative if we do not agree with it? We may find it morally reprehensible to deny the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide, or the international slave trade, but does that reprehensibility outweigh the ethical importance of considering all narratives and giving voice to all perspectives? As a future archivist, and the granddaughter of Armenian Genocide survivors, I have to say that it does not. Only by making sure that all voices are heard can we achieve the broadest possible interpretation of truth.

This brings up a related question: if documentary evidence has been destroyed, if cultural heritage has been razed to the ground, if people have been murdered and survivors silenced, then how can the voices of a marginalized group be heard? What happens when you only have two photographs and a legacy of silence? This question can best be understood not in terms of documentary evidence but of memory and identity. How do you make sense of the unspeakable, the

incomprehensible? There are no easy answers, nor is there only one answer. Different groups, even different individuals within the same group, process traumatic experiences in unique ways.

Marie-Aude Baronian sheds light on one perspective in her consideration of the filmmaker Atom Egoyan, a Canadian of Armenian descent:

mass media and visual technology possess the capacity to make images and to share images available of the past and, in doing so, work to produce 'prosthetic memories' which, as Alison Landsberg has argued, are memories we did not experience as such but to which we can feel intimately connected.¹⁵

Though the children and grandchildren of survivors may not have literally experienced these events, they become part of familial and cultural identity. *Ararat* is Egoyan's best-known work related to the Armenian Genocide. Its use of the "film within the film" technique is very effective. As Baronian says, "The intention of *Ararat* is not to conclude or close down by presenting a singular narrative, but rather to open up and complicate our approach."¹⁶

She says that

Each character tries to make sense of the genocidal past and heritage by interacting with visual media: there is 'the film within the film' (everyone from filmmaker to actor to the film's producer, driver and consultant is confronted with the denial of the genocide), a painting by Arshile Gorky and an (amateur) video by a young Armenian man. Each visual medium permits, even if artificially and partially, a coming to terms with the traumatic past.¹⁷

Though a work of fiction, the film becomes archival in the sense that it contributes to the cultural heritage of the Armenian people, whose history of suffering and loss has become embedded in their collective memory.

Another approach to memory and trauma comes from the Bosnian community through the work of Hariz Halilovich, who has documented the stories of survivors of the Balkan Wars. These oral histories often begin with some sort of

documentary evidence of a past life: photographs, school certificates, even audio and video footage. One family that he interviewed, a mother and her children now living in Australia, had the horrifying experience of seeing video footage (provided by the ICTY) of an execution on their local news channel and of recognizing their lost husband and father in it.¹⁸ One of the most heartbreaking stories that he recounts is that of Hida, "a mother who lost her son Senad at Srebrenica and who lacks almost any material evidence about her lost son. She uses her imagination to create what Gilliland and Caswell (this volume) call an 'imagined record' to help her cope with her loss."¹⁹ Halilovich visited Hida a number of times; eventually the Missing Persons' Institute identified a femur and a piece of cranium as belonging to her son. Hida adapted what she learned from this forensic evidence to construct her own story about his final moments:

They found him in a paddock, not far from Srebrenica [...] He must have got lost as he didn't know the area. His body was not in a mass grave [...] He didn't get into their [Serb] hands alive. No, he didn't. He was hit while trying to escape. Maybe it was shrapnel? Fifteen years of rain and snow moved away his bones.²⁰

In interpreting this story, Halilovich states: "By selectively blurring facts with fiction, and infusing them with sadness, affection and intimacy, Hida is effectively creating an alternative, a more humane and more bearable, narrative about what might have happened to her Senad. In that regard, she does not differ from other archivists involved in (re) creating historical narratives."²¹ In this case, Hida (as archivist) is not interested as much in creating historical accuracy as in creating a memory of her son that she can hold with the least amount of pain possible in such circumstances. It will not bring back Senad, but it will allow her to continue to live with his absence.

If the films of Egoyan can be considered cultural memory, and the oral narratives collected by Halilovich personal memory, then the work of South African archivist Verne Harris embodies both. In his article "Antonyms of our Remembering," Harris highlights some of the problems that face human rights archives and archivists within the framework of transitional justice. He quotes the legal scholar

Adam Sitze who identifies the "need by particular global interests to have experts who can claim a social scientific ability to conjure new democratic life from the corpses of authoritarian polities without giving any space to revolutionary transformation."²² This discourages the difficult work of reconciliation by replacing it with archives of memory work that, in their remembering, allow forgetting. He talks about the struggle of "those engaged in post-conflict and post-oppression memory work" who "wrestle with structures of power resistant to meaningful societal transformation, with discourses that feel worn-out if not oppressive, and with a weariness at personal levels that is the product of long periods of exposure to pain and to stress."²³ It is within this context that I would like to consider the role of archives and archivists as they relate to human rights abuses, reconciliation, memory work, and marginalized communities.

Michelle Caswell uses the context of community archives to frame these issues. She presents a flexible framework based on community archives discourses that can be adapted for any situation. As she notes,

Different types of communities may experience a variety of issues that will necessitate divergent and creative solutions; what works to document police brutality against a transgender community in Los Angeles, for example, may or may not work for survivors of state-sponsored violence in Syria, and vice versa.²⁴

Community archives tend to be less rigid about the types of material that they collect. This brings both material and cultural diversity to collections, as "openness to multiple formats reflects an attention to cultural difference that many mainstream repositories have historically ignored; by recognizing oral, visual, and kinetic ways of knowing, community archives reflect the culture, epistemologies, and values of their communities."²⁵ This leads into archival activism, for Caswell believes in the importance of breaking "the traditional (but admittedly eroding) archival boundary between records creator and archivist by actively documenting...communities through oral history, photography, and video projects."²⁶ One can see parallels with the ICTY archive, which allows the narratives of

victims to stand side-by-side with the testimony of perpetrators. But ultimately archival activism goes further: "the creation of community archives can be seen as a form of political protest in that it is an attempt to seize the means by which history is written and correct or amend dominant stories about the past."²⁷ Finally, reflexivity refers to self-reflection. As quoted by Harris above, memory work can be exhausting and disheartening. It is hard work, heavy work. Archivists in this environment must be aware of the multiple, and sometimes conflicting, perspectives that make up the archive and the community and must be willing to engage in difficult dialogue and come up with creative solutions to problems that occur.²⁸ Archives in this framework are not static but continually evolving institutions.

Stacy Wood, Kathy Carbone, Marika Cifor, Anne Gilliland, and Ricardo Punzalan approach the role of archives and archivists as they relate to human rights abuses, reconciliation, memory work, and marginalized communities within the context of traditional archival principles, such as respect des fonds, and practices, specifically description. They acknowledge that there has been "an unrelenting focus in a life cycle approach to archival description on a sole authoritative provenance, on hierarchical description that submerges the 'little people' involved in organizational activities, and on the research needs of preferred clientele such as scholars and bureaucrats."²⁹ They present as a case study the ethnographic photographs of the Philippines taken by Dean C. Worcester in the early 20th century. Worcester was an American member of the Insular Government, a provisional colonial government in the Philippines. The dissemination of his collection to various institutions in the United States and Western Europe, and the conflicting attributions of creation and ownership therein, underscore the problem with traditional ideas of provenance and description. First, no one knows whether Worcester himself took all of the photographs; one source cites that he demanded that those beneath him in the chain of command turn over their photographs to him. He himself bequeathed his images in his possession to several institutions, while his children, collectors of his images, and one of his colleagues all had images in their possession, and each of them distributed the images to different places with different attributions. And

this doesn't even take into account the nameless native Filipinos who are the subjects of the photographs. As Wood et al. conclude:

Rethinking provenance and its relationship to ownership even in order to allow mutability would still be inadequate without the application of a human rights framework. The provenance of these photographs as it stands represents the elaborate and massive colonial networks and infrastructures that enabled their creation as well as the erasure or de-emphasis of their subjects. Attempts at building in understandings of structural constraints, power asymmetries and exploitative research agendas must occur as interventions to archival description practices.³⁰

To summarize, the role of archives in the context of memory and identity in marginalized communities, the documentation of and prevention of human rights abuses, and international law is complex and varied, but all are crucial in our global society. Randall Jimerson underscores its importance in a single phrase: "A Responsibility for Tomorrow."³¹ He goes on to say, "the weight of the archivist's responsibility surely lies more with the future than with the past. It is the promise of future usefulness that justifies the archival enterprise."³² The world's archives are privileged to hold the stories, narratives, records, documents, knowledge, opinions, and ephemera of the past; the archivists that work with them have the power to shape the future. Appraising and describing, advocating and facilitating, and providing access and education can help ensure that every story is told, and every voice is heard.

Nicole Tavitian Pawelski is a Master's student at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

NOTES

1. Near East Relief Foundation (2017). *About*. Retrieved from <http://neareastmuseum.com/about/>
2. Peter Balakian, "Raphael Lemkin, Cultural Destruction, and the Armenian Genocide," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 27 no. 1 (2013): 58.

3. Ibid, 60.
4. Gabrielle Simm, "The Paris Peoples' Tribunal and the Istanbul trials: Archives of the Armenian Genocide," *Leiden Journal of International Law* 29, no. 1 (2016): 255.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid, 256.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid, 265.
9. Pok Yin Chow "Memory Denied: A Commentary on the Reports of the UN Special Rapporteur in the Field of Cultural Rights on Historical and Memorial Narratives in Divided Societies," *International Lawyer* 48, no. 3 (2015): 9.
10. Simm, 245.
11. David Kaye "Archiving Justice: Conceptualizing the Archives of the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia," *Archival Science* 14, no. 3 (2014): 382.
12. Ibid, 388.
13. Ibid, 392.
14. Chow, 9-10.
15. Marie-Aude Baronian, "Image, Displacement, Prosthesis: Reflections on Making Visual Archives of the Armenian Genocide," *Photographies* 3, no. 2 (2010): 207.
16. Ibid, 213.
17. Ibid.
18. Hariz Halilovich, "Re-Imaging and Re-Imagining the Past after 'Memoricide': Intimate Archives as Inscribed Memories of the Missing." *Archival Science* 16, no. 1 (2015): 88-89.
19. Ibid, 86.
20. Ibid, 87.
21. Ibid.
22. Verne Harris, "Antonyms of our Remembering," *Archival Science* 14, no. 3 (2014): 216.
23. Ibid, 217.
24. Michelle Caswell, "Toward a Survivor-Centered Approach to Records Documenting Human Rights Abuse: Lessons from Community Archives," *Archival Science* 14, no. 3 (2014): 309.
25. Ibid, 313.

26. Ibid.
27. Ibid, 314.
28. Ibid.
29. Stacy Wood, Kathy Carbone, Marika Cifor, Anne Gilliland, and Ricardo Punzalan, "Mobilizing Records: Re-Framing Archival Description to Support Human Rights," *Archival Science* 14, no. 3 (2014): 401.
30. Ibid, 404-407.
31. Randall Jimerson, *Archives Power: Memory, Accountability, and Social Justice* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2009), 234.
32. Ibid.

REVIEWS

Geof Huth, Megan Barnard, Gabriela Redwine, Erin Faulder, Michael Shallcross, and Christopher J. Prom. *Appraisal and acquisition strategies. Chicago: Society of American Archivists. 2016. 185 p. Appendixes. \$29.95 (nonmember); \$24.95 (member).*

The latest volume in the Society of American Archivists' "Trends in Archives Practice" takes on various life-cycle phases of managing digital collection materials, devoting individual modules to appraisal, collection development, and accessioning. The verve, specificity, and approachable intelligence of these writings do a lot of heavy lifting in terms of explaining how collecting digital materials can and *should function more effectively. Appraisal and Acquisition Strategies continues this series' tradition of presenting mindful commentary and lucid breakdowns of complicated systems.*

Michael Shallcross's brisk preface succinctly lays out what the modules provide, tossing the phrases "best practices" and "essential procedures" and "sufficient workflows" into the field of play. Shallcross utilizes these sometimes generic terms in a genuinely respectful and resonant way--he knows that what these authors detail in their modules is not just aspirational, but much more imminently achievable because of their detailed step-by-step directives, illustrative case studies, and abundant resource lists. Shallcross sets the expectations for readers pretty high, but as it turns out, the writing that follows is more than up to the task.

The concept of an interdependent digital ecosystem, set up by Geof Huth in his module "Appraising Digital Records", is so richly and densely described that I found myself going back to these first pages over and over again as I made my way throughout the book, using his ideas as a touchstone. Let me share a few snippets that I keep mulling:

Life is messy, archives mirror life, and the practice of archives is governed by multitudinous options and circumstances. (10)

So it is the archivist's responsibility to appraise records with a clear eye and serious analysis. Otherwise the archivist is apt to create a landscape primed less for creating knowledge than deaccessioning past mistakes. (10)

Beyond fecundity, lies biodiversity. (11)

Essentially, the creation and passage of information within and between institutions is equivalent to the passage of nutrients and energy between interrelated ecosystems. (12)

First off, Huth's non-archivist life as a poet keeps sliding into the language here and it's lovely, to be honest. Secondly and more to the point, what Huth sets up is a vision of archival interdependence and how appraisal plays such a crucial role in maintaining some semblance of balance. Understanding why an archive has something and what it actually is seems like the most bedrock, entry-level bit of knowledge to acquire when working with collections. We need texts like this to hammer home, again, why active, engaged, and iterative appraisal must exist in the archive. Huth patiently sets out how archivists must proactively develop appraisal procedures and guidelines that identify a plethora of parameters. He then shows how these processes must be deployed at every level, throughout a record's entire existence from creation to destruction. Building on his excellent narrative of necessary functions, he presents us with a particularly helpful appendix (among many in this volume) containing an "archival and technical appraisal checklist" that effectively distills Huth's information into actionable bullet points. This isn't just a checklist that will help work get done; it will help justify the work that *needs to be done to a supervisor, to a hiring manager, or to an institution that assumes an archivist's instinct and goodwill are more than enough to cover all the bases.*

"Collecting Digital Manuscripts and Archives" is the book's next section and it benefits from the energy of Huth's running start. This module gives Gabriela Redwine and Megan Barnard space to really delve into the nitty gritty of creating inclusive and forward-thinking collection development policies that benefit institutions, as well as

donors and creators. They start things off with a list of terminology, which turns out to be a crucial element. The authors' rationale for including the list is efficient and direct:

Archivists, selectors, and others involved with collection development should be mindful of their word choice when interacting with individuals outside their field and should do their best to find common ground and not privilege their own specialized vocabularies. (73)

Words are powerful, and terminology will undoubtedly influence and shape a repository's interactions with the people and organizations whose records it seeks to collect. (73)

Laying a bedrock of communicational clarity should extend to every part of our professional practices certainly, but that imperative seems especially pertinent when confronting the digital divide and the trappings of archival jargon, which often obfuscate exactly what we're trying to do and how we're trying to do it. Moreover, the value in this sort of digital work can get lost. Barnard and Redwine wisely illuminate this struggle by moving from a clearly defined vocabulary to an extended analysis of how to construct broader avenues of understanding with the creators of digital records and with your colleagues and institution about the work being done with digital archives. They also present guidelines for good stewardship of digital material in multiple realms including copyright, privacy, and consistent documentation of actions taken. The case studies that round out the module are just as thoughtful as the preceding text; they cement the incredible need for articulate precision and transparency at every phase of this work, whether it's developing a policy to be followed, explaining to a donor what will become of her old computer files, or integrating workflows with colleagues handling more traditional, manuscript-centric archival materials.

Erin Faulder's module on "Accessioning Digital Archives" focuses on the frontlines of shepherding material into a repository. Accessioning is a pivotal flashpoint for all archival material and Faulder makes this point early on, noting that:

It marks the repository's formal receipt of content and assumption of legal custody, and it helps the archivist to establish basic intellectual and physical control by documenting how much of what type of content exists where. (121)

Digital materials, due to their often-complicated multiplicity and tendency for technical obsolescence, present a whole roster of issues to dissect and Faulder does it with a gently methodical tone. Concepts like integrity, authenticity, and legality are broken down alongside carefully laid-out examinations of Open Archival Information System (OAIS) and Producer-Archive Interface Methodology Abstract Standard (PAIMAS). These models seem daunting in theory, but Faulder does a really excellent job of making more abstracted systems into specific steps that prioritize a stem-to-stern approach to managing digital materials conscientiously. Bonus: the sample accessioning workflows included here are ready to crosswalk right into local practices everywhere.

Frankly, archivists of all stripes can benefit from the information contained in this slim volume, whether or not they're working with digital archives. The connective threads between these modules are 1.) the necessity for agile procedures for archivists and institutions and 2.) the active cultivation of more deeply informed relationships between creators and archivists. Returning to an elegant statement from Michael Shallcross's preface: "An essential point in each module is the continuity of practice between the acquisition of 'traditional' materials and digital content" (3). And this truly is the crux of these writings. Continuity of practice, integration of methodology, a deconstruction of the silos that separate digital from physical materials--what these authors are striving to do here is provide entry points for making more considered, contextual, holistic decisions when it comes to the collection and care of digital materials. It's accessibly well-written, optimistic and realistic in the best ways, and vitally practical in a professional sense. These writings don't shy away from detailing the labor that needs to be done. Likewise, none of us in the field should ignore that we have both the capacity and the responsibility to be better stewards of the materials entrusted to our care. Let this book help you take first steps or next steps. Onward.

Rosemary K. J. Davis
Accessioning Archivist
Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library
Yale University

Allen Foster and Pauline Rafferty, eds. *Managing Digital Cultural Objects: Analysis, Discovery and Retrieval*. Chicago: ALA-Neal Schuman. 2016. 256 p. \$88.00 (members)

This recent publication can be broadly characterized as a reader on theoretical and practical issues in digital curation and useful for students as well as practitioners in museums, archives, libraries, and similar institutions. In response to this diverse audience's needs, the content is a mix of introductory material and advanced technical case studies. All in all, I found it to be a successful book-length publication in digital media studies whose core information will retain its usefulness for some time, even in an environment of constant change.

The editors, Pauline Rafferty and Allen Foster, both on the faculty of Information Studies at Aberystwyth University, U.K., have brought together thirteen international contributors to write about digital curation. They include library professionals, software developers, computer scientists, preservation specialists, social historians, media technicians, digital humanities faculty, and experts on the organization of knowledge and information. The resulting unique and collaborative articulation of theoretical, cultural, and practical approaches to digital curation was for me the most interesting aspect of this work.

The book is divided into three parts. The first contains three chapters that lay out the foundations for understanding the creation, interpretation, and management of digital objects. Rafferty provides a very well-written introductory chapter on cultural studies, semiotic theory, social tagging, and the semantics of data – topics that rarely play a part in discussions on digital curation, even though they are essential to understanding digital collections and communities as cultural phenomena.

From this theoretical introduction, one dives straight into the second chapter, a substantial overview by Sarah Higgins on digital curation and metadata. An archivist and expert in the life cycle of digital collections also at Aberystwyth, she covers all the basics of digital object and metadata creation and management, as well as larger issues such as the semantic web and linked data. This is also the chapter that introduces all the possible acronyms you'll encounter in digital curation: NISO, TIFF, MPEG, JPEG, METS, MODS, XML, URI, LOD, RDF, OAIS, and VIAF. Don't worry, they appear as they are needed and in a coherent context. If any of the chapters is a must-read, this would be the one.

The first part of the book is capped by a third and equally interesting chapter by German information specialist Katrin Weller on social media and user-generated tags and content. She describes in depth communities such as Twitter, Flickr, Wikipedia, and discusses the issues they raise of authorship, authenticity, and history; through her extensive bibliography, she introduces us to current scholarship on these communities, and to strategies to preserve these ephemeral and crucial sources of history.

The second and shortest part of the book seems a bit out of place, as it interrupts the flow of research narratives to jump to a set of three (or really two) specific case studies; the third section then continues the discussion of digital curation and social media issues introduced in the first part (and also includes case studies). The third case study is actually a brief yet informative overview of digitizing analog audio content. The first case study examines a fascinating new approach to digital humanities research in which computational tools are created and applied to large datasets derived from visual artworks. The project team at the National Library of Wales seeks to use complex computational analyses of brush strokes and other texture, edge orientation, and color characteristics to estimate the year of production for undated paintings by a Welch artist. Overall, the authors Dee, Hughes, Roderick, and Brown offer interesting technical descriptions (be prepared for matrices, equations and histograms!) as well as an interesting discussion of changes in traditional scholarly analysis, and how collaborative teams of humanities and computer experts can be brought to bear

on a large and complex goal. In the second case study, Pennock and Day, digital preservation experts at the British Library, share their institutional strategies to incorporate preservation into every aspect of their digital curation workflows, from appraisal, to ingest, to long-term storage. The authors manage to convey in a too-brief space the most important aspects of their short-term workflows and their long-range digital collections program, which extends their institution's vision to 2030. The third case study is actually more of a guide to digitizing audio – both analog and legacy digital formats. Prentice, Head of Technical Services at the British Library's Sound and Vision unit, includes in his overview a history of digitization standards for audio, as well as metadata requirements and the need for attention to these analog and digital media formats. The final and third section returns to three research articles that center on photographs, moving images, and audio. In the first, Jörgensen, an information specialist from Florida State University, examines digital image communities and the history of description (indexing) and retrieval web-based digital images, then moves to an exploration of the impact of social media and tagging in particular, and the latest research on image retrieval.

Following this, a chapter on audio analysis by Italian computer engineer Orio introduces the reader to concepts and technologies applied to efforts to more easily discover and classify duplicate and near-duplicate audio in massively large digital audio collections. Resembling the project to analyze stylistic changes in digitized paintings, this article in fact may have had a better home in the case studies section, as it summarizes the trajectory of an experimental project using a specific music collection.

Finally, the last article presents an overview to the discovery and access of web-based moving images (video and film). LaBarre, a specialist in information organization and access at the University of Illinois, and Cordeiro, expert in visual culture and the classification of images, begin by discussing strategies for access and retrieval, then move to a very brief case study of five streaming services, also indicating possibilities for future research.

In putting together this publication, the editors asked contributors to include additional information in the form of substantial bibliographies, notes, and lists of projects and websites, found at the end of each piece. These resources are one of the most valuable aspects of the book, providing many leads for expanded reading and future research topics. Readers may encounter a few broken links even a year after publication, but this should come as no surprise.

I found myself learning something new in every chapter of this book. Readers may find themselves skipping very basic introductions to topics, or perhaps the occasional extremely technical content, but in between there is a large but digestible banquet of information to learn from and mull over, especially for those interested in digital media collections. The international flavor of the book is a definite plus, and the authors generally use a universal vocabulary that reaches across national boundaries. For extended readings in any one topic, the publishing arm of the American Library Association has other titles of interest, but this volume is an excellent start to a broad understanding of digital curation issues.

Paula Jeannet Mangiafico
David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscripts Library,
Duke University

Jeannette A. Bastian, Megan Sniffin-Marinoff, and Donna Webber. *Archives in Libraries: What Librarians and Archivists Need to Know to Work Together*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists. 2015. 144 p. \$69.95 non-members (Soft cover/PDF), \$49.95 members (soft cover/PDF)

Archives in Libraries: What Librarians and Archivists Need to Know to Work Together by Jeannette A. Bastian, Megan Sniffin-Marinoff and Donna Webber is a quick overview of the differences between the archives and librarian professions and the future of the two professions. This guide is published by the Society of American Archivists and focuses not only on the distinct histories of the two, but also the future and overlap. The topics in the book are relevant to archivists and librarians in different institutions of various sizes including public and academic libraries. The preface of

the book addresses that there is a gap in knowledge between archivists and librarians on both sides.

This book is divided into three parts with three different chapters in each part. There is a brief appendix that contains a few pages of archival standards. This gives the reader more information without disrupting the flow of the book. Additionally, in Chapter 2: “Finding Common Ground – Language,” there is a list of unique archival terminology, about twenty terms, that is a good reference point for librarians. The introduction of *Archives in Libraries* states, “maintaining their individual values while integrating services, both physically and virtually, is the contemporary information challenge for both archivists and librarians” (2). Fifteen archivists and eight library directors were interviewed for this book and these interviews help provide context in the book.

Archives in Libraries is extremely easy to follow with each chapter focusing on a specific goal or part of the profession. The chapters have a clear focus, while incorporating vignettes and quotes from different professionals. These snapshots are really informative and help provide real life context to the concepts explained in each chapter.

In the beginning of the book there is a brief history of both archives and libraries. The National Archives was established in 1934 whereas the Library of Congress was established in 1800. The author explains that library is a long embraced term, whereas archives is a less understood term. This history is not a long portion of the beginning chapter; however, it can seem a little dull at times. Additionally, in a later chapter, a longer explanation is provided about the history of education within each profession. Similarly, to the history of each profession, reading this can be a little tedious. These sections about the history of the professions, as well as the history of education within the professions may be better served if they were grouped together in a separate section or appendix of the book.

While the histories of both professions are clearly explained, the more helpful part of the book is the explanation of the differences between the two professions. This is a major

theme throughout the book and it is interwoven in a very clear and concise manner. For example, the authors explain that librarians take a bottom-up approach, often cataloging materials at the item level. Whereas, archivists take a top down approach, typically arranging and describing materials at the collection level. This is a practical, tangible example of the differences between the two profession that readers can comprehend.

Throughout the book there were also several charts used to compare the two professions. At times the placement of these charts disrupted the flow of the text, but more often than not they were a helpful visual representation of a given chapter or section. There is a chart in the book that is a side by side comparison on what materials academic archives and academic libraries collect; this clearly illustrates how different the collections acquired by each profession is. A major focus of the book is how materials are acquired. The chart illustrates that there is a distinct difference between the two professions whether located in an academic institution or public library. This theme is clearly conveyed and the reader is left with an understanding as to how this impacts the collection as a whole.

Chapter 6, “When a Library Starts an Archives” - is the most practical part of the book. This chapter provides clear concise examples for the professions to work together moving forward. In order for an archives to be successful, a formal mandate must be established at the highest level of the institution (79). Along the same lines, the placement of an archives in the organization hierarchy is essential to its success, meaning the archives cannot be an afterthought within a library to be successful. The authors state that it is essential for a new archives to have set defined policies and procedures to help with any future challenges.

Section III of the book, Considering the Issues, focuses on different ethical issues surrounding archives including digital access and digitization. It is evident that the increase of digital items presents a challenge and has been detailed in great depth in other professional materials; however, this book provides a simple brief overview of the complicated nature of digitization and born digital materials. For

example, “the digital info revolution has created unprecedented access, but also fueled an unprecedented demand for access” (108). This statement illustrates that technology has opened more doors to access; thus, causing more demand. Policies need to reflect both hardware, software, and reformatting issues moving forward. It is important that the authors addressed the often daunting realization of digitization and born-digital materials, while not providing too much detail to make it overwhelming.

The authors of the book do an excellent job explaining the differences between the professions. “It may be even more important today to continually remind ourselves – archivists and librarians – of our shared commitments and of the values and passion that unite us” (120). This book provides a sufficient overview for both librarians and archivists and the specific examples from archivists and librarians really help to paint a complete picture of the challenges these professionals face at institutions. This book may be most useful to library directors looking to integrate or expand an archives at their libraries. This book is not only helpful for librarians looking to incorporate a new archives into their institution, but also to increase the awareness of a current archives within a library setting.

*Pam Calfo
Technology & Marketing Librarian
Baldwin Borough Public Library (Pittsburgh, PA)*

Submissions and Subscriptions

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. Full manuscript submission requirements can be found at: <http://www.ncarchivists.org/publications>.

The Journal is open access and can be viewed at <http://www.ncarchivists.org/journal-of-the-society-of-north-carolina-archivists-j-snca/>. For additional information concerning *J-SNCA*, please contact the Publications Chair at publications@ncarchivists.org.