

Al Smith comes across harsh and hard—it is suggested that this style on radio may have cost him the Presidency in 1928—but we must not listen to yesterday with ears tuned to the low key of television. Radio has been described as a “tribal drum,” limited to one sense and stirring deeply and violently. Hitler knew this very well and his verbal discharge, all the more effective for being picked up in the United States from Danzig, rises clear about the static and the journalist paraphrasing “Mr. Hitler” in English. However that may be, the importance of radio is rightly stressed and so is the capacity of a recording to distort. President “Teddy” Roosevelt is much diminished by his piping voice, but what was his delivery really like?

There is a fascinating extract from an address by Charles Lindbergh following his transatlantic flight which reveals a dead-pan humour encouraged by the delighted reactions of the audience—an important dimension lost by the printed word. Will Rogers, as the beloved and privileged court jester, can tilt at one of North America’s most sacred images, the pioneer, and survive. As the dust of the 1930s began to blow he could describe the pioneer as simply “a guy that wanted something for nothing” who was prepared to rob nature and future generations to get it. An hilarious clip of an exchange between Jack Benny, Eddie Cantor and Gracie Allen on wartime rationing is my favourite and stands for all that brilliantly-skewed syntax that used to delight us as necessary relief from the heavy logic of patriotism. There are the old dependables: Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, some splendid corn from General MacArthur, all the more revealing in its sincerity, and a moving, breathy fragment by Carl Sandberg on the Gettysburg Address. Eisenhower and Kennedy do not have the same impact, perhaps because we are still in the penumbra of the events. In the span of history they are yesterday’s news.

The quality of the twenty-five recordings naturally varies a great deal and many of the recent ones are not as good as might have been expected. In music we have in particular been spoiled by high technical standards, and the historic occasion does not always compensate for thin tone. For the archivist, this is an excellent collage of American experiences preserved in the sound of the human voice (and one inhuman voice, the bomb). We are momentarily blinded and must rely on the richness of the overtones for additional perception. However, selections of this kind would be greatly improved by a set of images as a reminder to some and a revelation to others. Either slides or a brochure the size of the cassette would serve the purpose, and also allow for a little more background material to be included.

Hugh A. Taylor  
Public Archives of Canada

**Archive-Library Relations.** Edited by ROBERT L. CLARK, JR. New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1976. x11, 218 p. ISBN 0 8352 0770 6 \$15.95.

*Archive-Library Relations*, notwithstanding its promiscuous title, is hardly an exciting publication. Nevertheless, so far as archivists are concerned, the volume’s virtue rests on one highly pertinent—perhaps unintentional—inference: that the quality of archival or library service depends directly on the confidence built among professionals, a confidence enabling each to be united in purpose but separate arbiters of their routes.

A fistful of articles have appeared during the last thirty-five years dealing with the frontier separating archives and libraries, but this is the first compilation between the same hard covers to produce a cool-headed, clearly written, and competently documented appraisal of the inherent problems. Editor Robert Clark and contributors Frank Burke, Miriam Crawford, Frazer Poole and Robert Brubaker objectively scan the similarities and differences among the two professions in the United States. Clark plainly states the basis of the volume: “archives and libraries exist as cultural institutions for a common purpose: to collect, maintain and make available the written and graphic record of man’s intellect and

experience.” A tradition of bickering, uncertainty and fragmentation of resources is, they feel, gradually surrendering to understanding and cooperation—necessity above all being the mother of reason. Marietta Malzer claims that her annotated list of thirty-eight offerings on the archives-library theme demonstrates “a strong evolutionary trend from differentiation to cooperation.” Although broadly true, that smacks of a rosy optimism which circumstances too often belie. Indeed, the contributors generally fall over themselves to avoid giving collegiate offence, a habit which is disconcerting and sometimes suspicious. Behind the joint committees, information exchanges, and the declarations of mutual destination, what is the real situation?

It is only fair to emphasize the American experience behind *Archive-Library Relations*. Apart from mention in the Society of American Archivists’ 1974 training survey and a few quotations relating to acquisitions, Canada is quite properly, though perhaps curiously, left alone. Despite their acknowledged independence, many American archival operations and their staff are governed by library education, library management, and library habits. By asserting methodological distinctions and by weighing the pros and cons of administrative tie-ups, the contributors to this book bravely attempt to uphold equality and professional independence. Yet, distressingly, it seems to be an exercise in benevolent despotism: a paternalistic librarian patting the head of an almost prodigal archivist while offering the comfort that a return to the fold will put things right.

Clark adopts this attitude especially toward the close of his preface when writing of the American Library Association-Society of American Archivists Joint Committee on Library-Archives Relationships created in 1970. He rightly praises the mutual interests of the relationships and emphasizes that the Committee must be employed to benefit the user of materials, not the two professions. Yet archivists will surely have their teeth set on edge by the following and only really partisan departure from the delicate balance maintained elsewhere:

The establishment of these relations will ultimately aid in the standardization and formalization of archival courses in library schools. This development will bring the professions even closer together in purpose, theory and fact. For this to happen, librarians must realize the kinship of archivists and share their experience in standardization and legislation. Archivists must realize that their numbers are limited, and cooperate, communicate and work with the library profession for the advancement of their own ideas.

Perhaps one of the main reasons for such a patronizing view of archives is bound up in Frank Burke’s critical summary on “Education.” His first point is four-square: “I hesitate to use the term archival ‘education’ because in the true sense there is none. . . .” There is only training in others’ hands. Burke condemns the fact that “archival courses, by their very nature, are training grounds for the least professional activities of the archival profession” and laments that they “lumber along, occasionally being innovative and inspired, but more often being a recitation by practitioners of ‘this is the way I do it in my shop’.” Canadian archivists should note with concern that the Society of American Archivists’ Committee for the 1970’s actually reported in 1972 on “the non-professional nature of much of archival work and the inadvisability of attempting to establish archival training as a degree-oriented program.” The trauma resulting from the Society’s Education and Professional Development Committee’s consideration of even a modest proposal toward accepting guidelines for graduate archives programmes is indicative *inter alia* of the bare backsides which archivists turn so naively to the darts of more adroit brethren. And Burke, sharpening the point of his dart, unerringly draws blood with his final comment on archival training: “Its most grievous shortcoming is that such training is not a requirement for being hired as an archivist.” Was that a librarian laughing behind the arras?

Burke deftly exposes another touchy issue with his acute observations on acquisition policies, or lack of them. Canadians will no doubt squirm before a quotation from one of their

colleagues who, Burke claims, in "agonizing over the method of dividing up the manuscript universe, devised a formula worse than the disease." Burke's experience again comes through unequivocally in the acquisitions section of his piece on "Materials and Methodology." There he compares the collecting procedures for books, manuscripts and records and draws a distinction between librarian, manuscript curator and archivist based on the dimension of records control from origin to fate. He neatly hurls the bolts of an argument which disrupts many a gathering of the archival clans:

It could be argued that if the entire range of archival responsibility is not being exercised, then the person performing archival duties is not a fully functioning archivist. Just as complete library service has to include determining acquisition policy, acquisitions, cataloging, and reference service, so complete archival service has to include prearchival records activities. Without that function the archivist foregoes primary control over the appraisal, retention, and disposition process, since such decisions can be made by others, prior to sending corporate records to the archives.

The rest of *Archive-Library Relations* contains a good deal of common sense. Even given the highly politicized atmosphere of American public life, the great emphasis upon the lobby and the image, the power of law and of litigation, and the constant vivacity of movement and talk, the Canadian archivist cannot but be impressed by efforts being made in the United States toward cooperation in the information fields. Whatever the unbounding optimism south of the border, the principle on which the book is predicated cannot be dismissed by Canadians. Miriam Crawford's chapter on "Social Responsibility" sounds a welcome note by showing that "a sense of responsibility to society is one of the distinguishing marks of a professional." She naturally points to issues of prime archival concern, such as the ownership of papers of public officials and access to personal records and classified information sources, while interestingly and very properly dealing with social responsibility in terms of competitive collecting and depository distribution. As for an archives under library management, surely that is undesirable by any yardstick, even accepting Clark's belief that "the success of this arrangement depends to a large extent on the attitude of the library administrator." Broad remarks on professional communication across the disciplinary frontiers can only be greeted as motherhood and apple pie.

If Canadian archivists see their reflection in this pool of American tradition and faith, they should not be altogether surprised. The library hegemony here is not generally as strong outside universities, but the main issues are exactly the same as indeed they are in the United Kingdom and most other British-influenced nations. The Association of Canadian Archivists' vigorous embrace of archival education and of national issues affecting the use of archival materials ought to allay the kind of criticism brought of his American colleagues by Frank Burke, and confirm the new directions addressed by Miriam Crawford. Perhaps Robert Clark may be confounded in Canada if librarians will in future stand alongside archivists rather than lean over them.

Gordon Dodds  
Archives of Ontario

**Records Retention.** WILLIAM E. MITCHELL. Rev. ed., 10th printing. Evansville, Ind.: Ellsworth Pub. Co., ©1976. 74 p. \$10.00. (Available from the publisher, Box 3162, Evansville, Indiana 47731, U.S.A.)

*Records Retention* by William E. Mitchell, a Certified Public Accountant, is a reference manual on scheduling and disposition of records generated by American businesses. It is designed to serve as a practical guide for the disposition of records common to most