

I find myself in agreement with Professor Osborne's sentiments, but unable to escape Mr. Rees' facts and logic. If, indeed, "the general public" is our "true sponsor," where is its money?

Professor Osborne dismisses too easily the old adage that "Whoever pays the piper calls the tune." We cannot expect that corporate sponsors will support archives work that goes far beyond their narrow and immediate management service needs. (It is usually difficult to persuade them to do even that much!) It is inevitable, if the corporate sponsor has to find all the money, that, as Professor Osborne fears, "Public user access must be qualified, if not excluded, while such questions as historical significance, social responsibility and heritage become esoteric luxuries".

The benefits of an archives project should accrue to both the corporate sponsor and the general public. If this is to happen, however, we must have a system of public subsidy of the corporate sponsor's archival work. And to bring that about, we need pressure and resources, in particular, from academe. Universities and colleges support libraries and laboratories as essential aids to their research. Their support for archives, both on campus and beyond, must be raised to a comparable level.

Colin Smith
CSIRO
Dickson, Australia

Archivists' Lib: A Response to "Whose Handmaiden?"

Don Page's "Whose Handmaiden?: The Archivist and the Institutional Historian" in *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983-84) espouses the virtues and values of institutional historians, and suggests that archivists are ignorant about the functions and benefits of such historians. He displays an equal ignorance about the functions and benefits of archivists.

Once archivists were the handmaidens of historians just as advertising was the handmaiden of business. As the corporate archivist of a major advertising agency, I can attest to the fact that neither notion remains true today. Corporate archivists make their archives work for the company. Page admits our primary users are senior management, lawyers, corporate public relations departments, and clients, not the occasional historical researcher. He, nevertheless, seems to think we are waiting for historians to pick out bits and pieces of information for the archives to "inherit." Neither he nor I would last long in a corporation if we operated in such a fashion.

Historians and archivists venturing into the corporate world must recognize some major differences between a private and public institution. Corporate archives or history departments, rarities in North America, are of recent vintage and generally sparsely staffed. They offer great opportunities for an aggressive person who has good communication skills as well as the necessary experience and training. A history background is not enough. Anyone entering such a corporate job is a pioneer, creating a new function that has not been defined adequately by either employer or university. One must be a team player as well as a salesman. The job exists to serve the institution, and it is up to historians and archivists to prove their value. Mumbling about historical heritage does not work.

Page recognizes that neither historians nor archivists are present at the creation of corporate records. It is the archivist's responsibility, not the institutional historian's, however, to develop a collecting strategy and procedures by which to identify and transfer on a systematic basis those records of continuing value. Moreover, the legal, fiscal, and administrative value of records carry as much weight as their historical worth. An institutional historian may be one of the many users of these archival records, and even be one of the advisors in selecting certain archival materials. The historian's purpose, goals, and functions, however, are different from those of the archivist and I for one think an historian, by training and experience, is unsuitable to assume my role in the corporation.

If the corporation wishes the services of an historian to do research, write, and conduct oral history interviews, hire one a year or so after the establishment of the archives. An archives comes first.

Cynthia G. Swank
 Archivist
 J. Walter Thompson Company
 New York, N.Y.

No Anglo-Saxon Monopoly in Canadian Archival Tradition

As a practising historian-scholar as well as a professional archivist, I have followed the debate raised by George Bolotenko's article "Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well" in *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983), with more than a passing interest. My purpose here, however, is not to address those intellectual monads (or is it *manqués?*) who so blithely cast aside the coils of history and scholarship only to hang themselves in the noose of their new-found sense of professional identity as archivist *non plus ultra*. Rather than waste my time with those who exult in their role as mindless garbage-pickers in the trash heaps of Canadian history, I shall try to confine myself to the utterings of Gordon Dodds for whom I have the highest professional and personal regard (see his "Canadian Archival Literature: A Bird's-Eye View" published in *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983-84)).

As one who also holds a doctorate in "[Finno-]Russian and European history" and is "now an archivist in PAC's Manuscript Division," I am curious why an otherwise thoughtful article should have seemed to have singled out Bolotenko almost as though to dismiss his ideas solely on the basis of his personal attributes, to wit:

Yet, in George Bolotenko's opening article, the old spectres of archivist and historian did stalk the pages of Canadian archival literature once more, with renewed fury. A student of *Russian* and *European* history, now an archivist in PAC's Manuscript Division, Bolotenko roundly dismissed the *Canadian* search for professional archival *identity*....
 [Emphasis added]

Given the apposition of so many "loaded" cue-words in the passage, I am immediately reminded that there is an underlying exclusionary force or habit persistent to the behaviour of the "mainstream" in Canadian society and its