

# *Professional Training: International Perspectives*

by MICHAEL COOK\*

Is training necessary for the development of an archive profession? From the experience of the New World, it might seem that it is not: clearly, it is not a prerequisite to getting *some* excellent work done. The catch is in the *some*: there has to be a way of establishing standards, for making sure that excellent work done in one place or at one time by a particular enthusiastic amateur is not out-balanced by a dozen other places where the work is non-existent or done to poor standards. The experience of the Third World shows this well. Indeed, archivists would do well to study the Third World, for there both the problems and achievements stand out starkly. Analysing these in the context of a developing country often provides a penetrating insight into conditions at home, conditions which are obscured by the complexity of institutions there.

There are two forms of training possible: academic or by means of apprenticeship. The trouble with apprenticeship, which may often but not always be equated with in-house training schemes by large organizations, is that it perpetuates the standards, and even more, the outlook of the dominant old hands. Traditional practices are all very well when they are actually sound, practical methods, but when they are themselves only half understood, carried out at a depressed rate of production, not well displayed, or are not successful when measured against objectives, their continuance is not to be encouraged. In any case, apprenticeship as a normal method of entry to the profession is often not available to archives institutions in the Third World, simply because they lack the long-established staff who would give instruction. If this is so, for example, in Africa, it is likely to be also in developed countries, though the true situation may be obscured. Wherever one-or-two-man archives services exist, and there is no external form of training, it seems likely that initial training is provided on the apprenticeship model.

The alternative is to have taught courses. When this is done, there must be teachers whose position must be, at least in regard to their teaching duties, academic. They have a commitment to study the subject, to understand and to

---

\* This article derives from ten years' experience in the training of archivists at the University of Liverpool, two missions to Africa, and one short mission to Southeast Asia. The first African mission, to Tanzania, was under the aegis of the Ministry of Overseas Development, London, and the last two were at the instance of UNESCO. Neither of these two organizations is responsible for any views expressed in the following pages.

test new ideas and innovational practices, and, through their knowledge of the practices of several different institutions, to try to set and publicise standards of practice. Innovation and experiment are the natural consequence, and the gradual achievement of uniform standards over the area of recruitment affected. Regularly established training schools are highly desirable and most people would agree that there should be more of them.

There are surprisingly few archival training schools in the world today, and one may broadly assume that the provision of trained archivists by national training schools is adequate in most countries of the Old World. (Some of the comments made by Edwin Welch in an earlier article in this journal should be qualified in this respect).<sup>1</sup>

In France, Germany, and Eastern Europe, the lengthy and elaborate training courses which were developed initially to cope with the interpretative problems posed by large accumulations of early manuscripts have on the whole responded well to the pressures of the modern world. Records management is taught, and there is a growing body of written material on the problems of the interpretation and organization of modern records, and there has been a response—as yet not sufficiently radical, it is true—to problems of indexing and information retrieval. Evidence suggests that there is now a better relationship between recruitment of students and the manpower requirements of the profession. Even in Britain, the five universities which now run permanently organized postgraduate training courses seem to have matched supply to demand, and here too there has been a considerable response in adapting these courses to the needs of the late twentieth century.

Elsewhere in the world the situation is not so satisfactory. There are organized training schools or regular courses available to Third World countries in London, New Delhi, New South Wales, Argentina, Senegal and Ghana. Three of these have been consciously established through international cooperation to satisfy the manpower needs of Third World countries. Three more schools have been projected for some years, but none of them has yet been set up. These training schools go only a small way in the direction of providing the number of students needed, but their experience is invaluable in showing what needs to be done and some of the major obstacles to success.<sup>2</sup>

Some of the incidental difficulties should be identified in passing. First, there is the problem of professional definition and status. All the training schools are committed, consciously or not, to a managerial viewpoint. They

1 Edwin Welch, "Archival Education", *Archivaria* 4 (1977): 49-59.

2 The development of Regional training centres can be followed in Morris Rieger, "Archives in Developing Countries: the regional training center movement", *American Archivist* 35, No. 2 (April 1972): 163-171. This should be supplemented by UNESCO reports: *Centre Régional de Formation d'Archivistes, Dakar: résultats et recommandations du projet*, 31 Dec. 1976; Michael Cook, *Establishment of Regional Training Facilities for Archivists in Southeast Asia*, 1973; E.G. Franz, *Creation d'un Centre de Formation des Archivistes, des Bibliothécaires et des Documentalistes: Liban*, 1974; B.F. Delmas, *La Formation des Archivistes: propositions pour un programme d'enseignement à l'école des sciences de l'information à Rabat, Maroc*, 1976; J.M. Menon, *La Formation en science et technique de l'information dans les pays arabes: problématique en vue d'une co-opération régionale*, 1976; V. Cortes Alonso, *Reorganización de la Formación de Archiveros y de las Estructuras archivísticas: Venezuela*, 1974; C. Crespo Nogueira, *Reorganización de la Estructuras archivistas-escuela nacional de biblioteconomía y archivonomía: Mexico*, 1974.

accept that there is an order of things in which a few people think out the objectives, programmes and processes needed by an archives establishment, and direct inferior persons in carrying out the work. They are, of course, not alone in making this assumption, and are responding to a world-wide climate of opinion (possibly not shared by the Chinese). Perhaps this assumption will be challenged on ideological or other grounds in the future. Indeed one may detect, even in the modern experience of large archival institutions such as the British Public Record Office, a growing tendency to allow professional duties to percolate downward from officers of the traditional Administrative grade (Assistant Keepers and upward) into the traditional Executive grades (originally conceived of as superior clerical workers). This inclination reflects the vastly increased supply of graduates for recruitment to these positions through the great expansion of university education experienced by all countries since the end of World War II. This blurring of the professional image likely will occur elsewhere in due course, provided that universities continue to expand.

Behind this tendency, which obviously is not seen in every archival institution, is a second development which is not yet widely recognized. This is the growing acceptance of the concept of archives administration as a managerial occupation rather than as a branch of interpretative scholarship, the traditional base of Franco-German training. Because documents exist in such large quantities, a management approach is needed to solve the problems dealing with them. The task of the archivist is to survey the situation, isolate the problems, devise strategies for their solution, and then to marshal the resources required to carry out these strategies. This is a classical definition of a management approach. The European training schools have partly and without reflection recognized this fact, and have consequently changed their syllabuses and viewpoint. It is a revolution whose course has largely not yet run. If one accepts the management viewpoint, when it is thought out, one also accepts the need for quite new types of disciplines to be taught to trainee archivists — large areas of the management sciences, for instance. The parallel experience with problems such as this of library schools, which have accepted management approaches much earlier than have archives, is the single most obvious reason for classing archival training schools with them, and not with departments of history or the like. Some archivists will not like this rational extension, but it seems unavoidable.

In short, training schools have accepted without argument the proposition that they have to train professionals who are members of a managerial class. The French-speaking training school for Africa at Dakar might appear to be an exception since it trains only intermediate personnel. Nevertheless, it does accept the underlying principle and plans to undertake training eventually at the higher level.

Associated with the notion of a professional class is that of its comparability with similar professional classes in the world at large. Here there are many serious problems of acceptance. In Third World countries of the British tradition, graduates of the training schools are usually assimilated to existing grades in the public service. So far as it goes, this is a good solution provided not only that the particular grades selected are truly comparable, but also that the government structure as a whole reflects those prevailing in the society of that country. There have been failures on both points. In some countries, ar-

chivists have not been placed upon truly comparable grades and in others, they have suffered from an erosion of the standards of government service in comparison with those of the private sector. In the latter situation, archivists are merely among those who are affected by the decay of government structures following the oil crisis of 1974, and simply share in the misfortunes of their countries. This is a global phenomenon which must be tackled on a much broader scale and at a higher level than in archives, or even in the agglomerated information networks represented by library/documentation organizations. In the former case, negotiation at the national level may be effective, but international standards and norms will play a necessary part. In both matters, therefore, the profession needs the intervention of interested international bodies and the international development of the group of disciplines which archivists practice.

What international pressures can be brought to support high standards of recruitment and professional status? Apart from the international, bilateral or national aid programmes which have at times focussed on this subject, such as the Commonwealth Secretariat, the German International Institute for Development, and UNESCO, the main remaining organization is the international association for professional purposes, the International Council on Archives (ICA). It has set up a training committee, an international development fund which is aimed largely at personnel formation, and has occasionally debated questions concerning standards and levels of operation. The ICA can hardly be said, though, to be an adequate forum for the discussion of these things, still less an effective pressure group.

Some impulses exist which support the consolidation of professional status. One of these is the growing tendency for university education to conform to international norms. Universities are by nature internationally conscious, and are increasingly accepting a structure of teaching at basic (first-degree) and higher (master's and doctorate) levels inspired by the American example. When questions are posed about the status of the professional training offered by universities in, say Southeast Asia or Africa, the answer is to point to a level on the scale of American degrees. To be specific, the norms of the British-influenced world (largely the British Commonwealth) are that postgraduate Diplomas are to be equated with the American degree of Master of Library Science. This sentence was conceived before an interesting new development in Britain, which reinforces the argument, became known: there is now a specific proposal, likely to be passed into practice within two years, for converting the traditional Diploma in Archives Administration to the degree of Master of Arts. This development goes some way, perhaps a long way, toward setting an international indicator of the status, comparable with the products of other training courses, of graduates of archival training schools at the point where they begin careers in professional posts.

Below the professionals, who are recruited almost universally from graduates, there is a large body of sub-professionals. Although these people are generally not graduates, they are in practice asked to do jobs which are specifically professional: arranging and describing archives, controlling the passage of records into the archives and, through the processes therein, directing the procedures of records management. They need a training, which is much more

practical and specific than that of the higher grade; they also ought to have a career expectation which includes promotion in response to ability and experience. It is difficult to provide both of these because an archival training encompassing, for example, subjects such as appraisal, must assume an ability based upon the student's general education and his membership in the research community. Professional courses also tend to have a management approach. In addition it is difficult to provide a career structure which dilutes what is, pretty uniformly throughout the world, an all-graduate profession. The resulting dilemma mirrors the experience of other professions including librarianship and teaching. In librarianship there has been an evolution through three stages. During the first, professional librarians were scholars; in the second, new entrants to the profession were given a general education simultaneously with their technical training, bringing several first-degree courses in librarianship into existence. In the third phase, this approach fell into some degree of disrepute, and professional training tended once again to concentrate on post-graduate levels. This line of development still leaves unsolved the problem of recruiting, training, and giving a career to the sub-professional who has only school-leaving academic qualifications.<sup>3</sup>

Looked at world-wide, there are many more sub-professionals active in records management and archives administration than professional archivists. In some countries, sub-professionals run entire archives services which means that, although a fund of commonsense may be tapped, there is increasing alienation from the scholarly community research world, and that retention and disposal is controlled largely by persons with little or no understanding of research values. This is a cause for concern.

Archivists in Europe and America may not realise the full extent of the demand in all countries for sub-professionals to manage archives as part of an administration—in government, industry, banks, public utilities, the armed forces, and even in universities. Records management imposes urgent demands which can be met only by rapid recruitment and crash training of those most easily and cheaply available—the school-leavers. Perhaps the need for international standards for status and norms for these grades are more urgent than those of the professionals themselves.

At the technical level, the need for conservationists and other technicians, in reprography for instance, is so great that it is often not fully realized even in the developed countries. There is hardly a country where there is an adequate training for conservationists or where the necessary scientific knowledge would be available if courses were to be offered. However, this is a rather separate problem and this article does not attempt to do more than draw attention to it.

A problem not yet mentioned is that of financing students at suitable courses. Rarely have archival institutions successfully adopted a pre-training practical period or an in-service training term for staff. Generally speaking, library services have eliminated this problem by having at least a conceptual and administrative structure for solving it. This is another matter in which ar-

---

<sup>3</sup> The Regional Training Centre for Archivists at Accra has a proposal for an intermediate Diploma in Archival Studies.

chivists must swallow their pride and learn from library practice. The main difficulty is that if the scholarships or bursaries for archives students at a training school are to come from the school or from an aid agency supporting the school, then an artificial demand is created. Whoever provides a bursary for study somewhere also at the same moment creates the thought in someone's mind that he might apply for it. The true cost of providing training at the level of real need is then totally obscured. On the other hand, if bursaries are not provided by or through the schools, the real need for training is obscured by lack of funds. There is no doubt that archival institutions ought to be seeking funds, either through their normal financial channels or through aid agencies (which they can themselves administer), to allow newly recruited members of staff to go for lengthy periods of training. Of course, many archives services do this, but it is not yet usual except in developing countries. Until the habit becomes general, archives schools will not be able to plan their development, or the profession its proper growth.

Finally, there is the question of broad infrastructures. Librarians in Third World countries have realized that general literacy and widespread recognition of the value of the written word are prerequisites to successful library practice. This infrastructure is really required even for university and research libraries. Librarians have accepted that they must interest themselves in the general education of the nation, and provide, so far as they can, resources in its support. Here, archivists have a good record. In most countries, prompted by the initial lack of public interest, archivists have adopted outreach programmes. Archivists usually accept that they have a need to educate their users, but they have not yet gone far enough along this road. The beginnings of educational expertise and the schools-relations programmes that are now being pioneered by certain archives may point the route ahead. It will be a difficult and thorny way, if only because the running of a workable educational programme using archives requires the acquisition of many of the skills and values of the teaching profession. Archivists who have delved deeply into schemes for using archives with school students ultimately have to recognize that they must to a great extent submerge their own identity as archivists under a common identity with other workers. Museum curators provide the model which underscores that for such projects to be really successful there has to be a high degree of integrated working with other disciplines. This is yet another blow to the traditional archivist, who in the past has fought to secure recognition for his discipline by a determined independence from the parallel ones.<sup>4</sup>

So far, problems peripheral to the establishment of training schools have been the subject of discussion. What of those involved in the design of a training institution?

Traditionally, archive training schools have belonged either to history departments of universities, to library schools or to large archive institutions. The last of these provides the best model available to us, but for reasons connected with their self-perception, the major archives services of the Western World have refused to foster academic training schools linked to themselves. Even in France, the classical model of the government-sponsored central

---

<sup>4</sup> Michael Cook, *Archives Administration: a manual for smaller and intermediate organisations and for local government* (Folkestone, England, 1977) chapter 12.

national archives service, the *Archives Nationales* has not directly set up a training school. It is particularly noteworthy that neither the British Public Record Office nor the National Archives of the United States (nor, for that matter, the Public Archives of Canada) has set up training schools. They have, either institutionally or through members of their staff, taken an interest in professional training, but that is another matter. Partly in consequence, no doubt, there is no observable tendency in newer countries to examine this possibility. One might, indeed, go further, and say that these developed institutions have turned away from organized external training for staff, pinning their faith instead on in-house or apprenticeship types of training. The result is bad for those wishing to preserve archives work as a distinct and independent professional area outside the precincts of the national archives. In any case, of course, there are few countries where the national archival institution has the size or human resources to undertake systematic training, however much they might accept its desirability. (Perhaps it should be added once more that nothing is known of Chinese methods).

Of the alternatives, the history school and the library school both deserve a close and dispassionate look: neither deserves the wholesale condemnation received from some commentators in the archive world. Both, for example, have shown an unexpected flexibility in the face of pressing modern problems of recruitment and technique. Their response is shown at its best (making some allowances, perhaps) in the Intergovernmental Conference on the planning of national Documentation, Library and Archives Infrastructures held by UNESCO in 1974, and in the important and unfortunately little-known papers presented to this meeting.<sup>5</sup>

Flexibility aside, to put an archives training school into a history department indicates a belief that archives belong essentially to the research industry. This is right as far as it goes. Maynard Brichford said in another context: the archivist is the representative of the world of research in the world of administration.<sup>6</sup> We would all agree with the concept behind this formulation: if we did not, we would resign records management to non-archival professionals. To represent the world of research, one must be a member of that world, skilled in its techniques, aware of its trends, and acquainted with its personalities and their work. This membership cannot be acquired except by formation in a research institution accepted by the world of scholarship. Of course, it is true that it no longer purely historical scholarship, and definitely no longer just medieval scholarship, which is in question. Research in this context must naturally encompass many disciplines, including those using scientific method and statistical tools. Ultimately, the archivist and the scholar must together formulate standards for retention and for utilization of archival resources. Sadly, looking at the world as a whole, this liaison has failed to come about, and this despite the scholarly training many individual archivists have had. Nothing seems more universal than the lack of effective liaison or even mutual understanding between archives services and universities; it is a feature common to both the developed and the developing world. Incidentally, this means

---

<sup>5</sup> The most important of these is P. Havard Williams and E.G. Franz, *Planning Information Manpower* (Unesco, 1974).

<sup>6</sup> I am obliged to Professor Maynard Brichford for a sight of his circulated lecture notes, in which this phrase occurs.

that if archivists are interested in enlisting the support of academics in maintaining their independence from the advancing tentacles of the information world, particularly of libraries, they have little prospect of success at present.<sup>7</sup>

What of the alternative? To assimilate archival training into that of librarians, and of documentalists, implies a declaration that archives belong rather to the information industry. Again, so far as this goes, this is right. Archives are specialised data banks. They are distinguished from other data banks by important differences in methodology and areas of speciality, and these must of course be maintained against illegitimate encroachment. Nevertheless, they hold and should utilise important stocks of information-bearing material which must contribute to the national stock of knowledge: they must increasingly use methods of retrieval and exploitation which are held in common with other branches of the industry; most important of all, they must examine their objectives and their performance in the light of increasingly scarce public resources.

There is now a situation in many parts of the world where the main archives services, originally set up rather slavishly because they seemed to be standard in the metropolitan countries, can no longer continue to expect a proper allocation of resources unless they can prove themselves effective. Professional orthodoxy and a successful campaign to stay independent of the central library and documentation services are not useful elements in this proof. If the archives does not in fact control all important non-current public records from its parent government, including the most sensitive; if it cannot provide a control point for access to recent as well as to remote archives; if it has such a large backlog of unlisted accumulations that enquirers are habitually sent away unsatisfied, then it may be said that the service is not justifying its existence. Generally, places like this will betray their condition by the empty spaces on their staffing list and by the air of somnolence which surrounds them. The demand for access to archival documents is so great that if the archives service cannot provide for it, another service will. This may be the documentation service, not prevented by its traditions from applying modern methods of information retrieval, and able, possibly, to find short cuts to coping with large backlogs.

The recent experience of the United States of America is very important as an example of an independent archives service which has largely overcome these kinds of difficulty. Elsewhere, traditional methods of archival acquisition and management have shown that in many ways they cannot cope within their allocation of their resources, even where active schemes of records management are mounted. This is a very dangerous situation for the archives profession, and ought to be taken seriously both by traditionalists and by innovators.<sup>8</sup>

The way forward is undoubtedly to adopt some of the methods, equipment

---

7 O.L. Burnette, Jr, *Beneath the Footnote: a guide to the use and preservation of American historical resources* (Madison, New York, 1969), p. 33 and *passim*. On the construction of retention standards, see M.H. Fishbein, ed., *The National Archives and Statistical Research* (Athens, Ohio, 1973), p. 126.

8 Michael Cook, "On being an archivist in a developing society", *ECARBICA Journal* 3 (1977): 3-29.



and outlook being developed by the other information services, wherever they seem to fit the needs of archives. If this is to be done, a radical reassessment of the content and structure of archival training must be carried out under professional (and not other) auspices, to determine exactly which of the modern information structures and methods are applicable, and to teach these. Archivists in training must see themselves for the first time as close colleagues of librarians and documentalists. They have resisted this position for a long time, and it will be difficult in many quarters to overcome ingrained resistance to the idea. It should go without saying, however, that co-operation and common action is not the same as subordination to library methods and approaches, nor does it mean that archives services should be placed under the control of either librarians or administrators.

Whether or not these observations are accepted, it is common ground that an accomplished archivist must dispose of a battery of techniques and knowledge that is very difficult to acquire in a training institution of limited size. Perhaps one should suggest a single very large international training school where the numbers of students involved would be great enough to employ the necessary teaching staff. This solution, impractical as it is, would not be satisfactory. A feature of archives work is great involvement in the administrative and cultural traditions of the country. Because of this, international ventures in training can never be really satisfactory for they would always involve further training and experience on home ground, and there is a limit to the amount of training that can in the present state of things be given. In practice, one full year is the limit to the duration of a postgraduate course in training.<sup>9</sup> What are the alternatives?

To answer this question, the content of an archival training course should be examined in the light of some models which have been proposed recently. These tend to favour common core syllabuses to be used in conjunction with the training courses of libraries and documentalists. The model offered to UNESCO in 1974 unfortunately dodges this issue by proposing common core structures which are similar in nomenclature but dissimilar in content. It should be discarded, and a new formulation sought.<sup>10</sup>

In this model would be three streams of subject teaching:

1. professional studies;
2. the study of records;
3. a combination of administrative history with research method.

Professional studies, which would comprise the fields generally known as archive administration (or archivistics, a technical word is badly needed), records management, and information management. The main developments in the last of these three are largely held in common with librarianship and include such matters as automatic data processing, information retrieval, indexing, and abstracting and dissemination techniques. There should be some

---

9 One full year is proposed as an alternative to the thirty weeks mentioned by Welch in "Archival Education", *Archivaria*, p. 58. This duration has already been adopted by the Accra Centre.

10 Williams and Franz, *Planning Information Manpower*, p. 19.

study of the management sciences as well, much of which is also in common with students of library studies.

The second principal field, called the study of records, is the most difficult to define and is essentially independent of library training. It is here that the interpretative sciences belong: in countries where they are necessary, palaeography and medieval diplomatic (these are, in those countries, necessary studies and should not be abandoned, not the studies ancillary to them such as Latin or other obsolete languages). A considerable area of technical interpretation of modern records (modern diplomatic) opens out from this as a research development, and in the area of academic, but professional skills, this offers itself as the profession's main contribution to the scholarly side.<sup>11</sup> With this should be included the skills and concepts of documentary editing and publication.

The third main field, administrative history, presents the most problems. It should be taught in an academic way; that is, with careful attention not only to specific facts which should be relevant to the situation of at least most of the students (thus Canadian administrative history to Canadians, and so on) but also the methodology and scientific method. Here, rather than under professional studies, might appear the techniques of bibliography and the use of research materials. The inclusion of these has been criticised, but in fact is the systematic teaching of the research method. Ideally this approach should be associated with the technical training in research design and methodology given to research students. It is a strange fact that over much of the world, research students in the humanities are not given such training, at least not systematically.<sup>12</sup> A useful contribution to knowledge could be made if archive schools were to provide this additional subject both for researchers and for students archivists.

As if this were not enough, two additional features cannot be forgotten any more than they can be omitted for library students. One is general education, including languages. The responsible post of archivist should not be occupied without an understanding and involvement in the intellectual movements and debates of the nation, or those of the international sphere. The other, merely mentioned here, is the technical knowledge needed to manage conservation programmes, and to plan their development as well, if possible, as their research development.

This is a formidable programme because it needs teachers of academic competence and respectability in a wide range of subjects. Perhaps the professional subjects might be handled by one or two academically minded archivists backed by teachers of genuinely common core subjects. But the study of records and administrative history with research methodology both need close association with research schools in the social sciences or history. We therefore return to the unresolved problems suggested above: the choice between the broad fields of history and information. When one adds the element of general

---

11 C.N.L. Brooke, "The teaching of diplomatic", *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 4, no. 1, (April 1970): 1-9.

12 Walter Rundell, Jr., *In pursuit of American history: research and training in the United States* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1970).

education and involvement in the intellectual life of the nation, it is clear that only integration with an established university can provide the answer.

The archives school is not likely to be able to provide teachers from its own resources for all courses demanded, for instance, in management studies, palaeography, administrative history of a colonial regime, editing, micro-photography, automatic data processing. Such few examples give a glimpse of the wide range of subjects to be handled. If these kinds of subjects are to be included on the course, other departments or schools must be approached for help. They are often willing to accept student archivists, and even to go to great length to fill the gap, but essentially, the guest students must accommodate themselves to the teaching structure of the host department, and this is rarely a very satisfactory or long-lasting solution. It is hard to say whether the situation would be eased if there were larger numbers of students. If the numbers are large enough, they justify independent classes, but this hardly helps if there are still not enough students to lead to the financing of an independent teaching staff. Smaller numbers can at least be assimilated into other people's classes if this is really what one has to do.

The ideal, no doubt, is for the archives school not only to have its own staff but also to sponsor research into the subjects to be taught. There is usually a clear demand for it. Administrative history is a good example. Despite the widespread acceptance of institutional and other forms of history based on research into archives, administrative history itself has developed only slowly and patchily since the interwar period. The advantage of sponsoring research is that the school can thereby also mount a publication programme which will be tailored to its own teaching needs as well as to the needs of the profession in the region.

Altogether it is hard to visualise a successful all-round archival training being arranged without access to the fairly devoted participation of less than five specialists or groups of specialists. This is a large number, and the size of the student body and hence of the recruiting area, is clearly a vital factor. The programme as stated cannot really be carried out. Awkward choices have to be made between the library-based approach via the information sciences, and the history-based approach with emphasis on research methodology. Either is viable, but neither is complete.

Only one clear statement can be made, and this is hardly controversial: professional training courses should be regularly established, should occupy broadly comparable amounts of time (not less than one post-graduate year), and should be at comparable levels. Entry to the profession should as far as possible be planned by professional bodies.

A point which has already been made by several writers is that the key to the situation is provided by the question of validation. Many countries have experienced the process whereby the validation of existing courses (or, to put it another way, the establishment of registrable norms) is provided by national or international bodies. A proposal that the ICA should recognize, and hence by implication validate, one of the regional training courses, was planned for the VIII International Congress at Washington in 1976, but for various and mainly local reasons was not in the end put to the Congress. It is too much to

hope that the long-established training courses of Europe will voluntarily seek such recognition, but these are the courses which least need the guidance so provided. There should be an initiative from international sources to provoke applications for such recognition, or to offer it unsolicited to the courses now existing or to be developed in the Third World.

An academically respectable training school which does not have an ongoing research is hard to imagine. Some of the subjects which are open for research have been mentioned already. For this reason, it is impossible to expect that the professional or other elements in the training could be given by busy practitioners who have no full-time commitment to the academic profession of their subject.

Sometimes it is desirable to teach practical subjects by asking appropriate practitioners to give part-time lectures. In this way one can capitalise on the great experience of such people, but it is still a form of training by apprenticeship and is therefore not suitable for the development of a serious profession in modern times. In fact, it is probably necessary for an archives training school to establish retraining or updating courses which senior archivists can attend. We must therefore probably evolve a group of full-time academic archivists whose only business is the teaching of professional subjects and conducting research into related questions. The idea has often been mooted, but has not yet received the full backing of any professional association in archives. In fact, in Britain, where there are definite signs of the appearance of such a group of academic archivists, the present constitution of the Society of Archivists actually excludes them from membership.

This article has tried to survey the training scheme and to point out some dilemmas which, though inherent in the situation from the beginning, are now beginning to demand that choices be made. There is a need for organized training schemes leading to entry into the archives profession. This need is world-wide, and the capacity of existing training institutions is not enough, even though several new ones have been founded recently. When training schools are established, they at once find themselves enmeshed in problems of defining or raising professional status, and by the career structures prevalent in their regions. They also find that they are under pressure to turn out sub-professionals, and that they must conform to increasingly standardized forms of university courses. A major reason for the slow growth and uncertain prospects for archival training schools is the lack of financial support, of students—a lack which to some extent springs from poor support from organizations which will employ the students after training.

In some of the countries of central or eastern Europe, training schools attached to large archives services have, at least in the past, offered a satisfactory solution to the problems of entry into the profession. Outside these areas, such schools do not appear to be developing. Trainers of archivists must therefore choose between two attachments: to schools of history or to library schools. Each of these choices can be justified by professional requirements—commitment to scholarly research on the one hand, and to technically efficient information work on the other. To attach a school firmly to one or the other of these traditions, however, is to build-in a bias which will have important and

probably stultifying longterm effects. Yet, since the variety of subjects which must be taught does not match the relatively small number of students available, a choice must inevitably be made. It will be necessary to take measures encouraging the appearance and support of a body of full-time academic professors of archival studies, and to bring about a much more substantial degree of control over training processes by the professional bodies.

It is not really possible, in the end, to propose a scheme which will overcome all the difficulties. The one thing that can be said, though, is that any solution adopted will have to include a readiness to take a radical look at techniques and attitudes which have been common in archives work, as well as at the relationships which archivists have experienced with members of parallel professions. The first-rate, and not the third-rate, programme<sup>13</sup> must be the ultimate goal.

---

13 Welch, "Archival Education", *Archivaria*, p. 52.

## Résumé

L'éducation en archivistique continue à hanter les archivistes sans qu'aucune solution précise ne soit perceptible. L'auteur présente l'expérience des nations du Tiers-monde où la formation et l'éducation adaptées aux besoins professionnels modernes semblent beaucoup plus faciles à faire accepter que dans les pays développés où les traditions sont fortement enracinées. Il affirme que les archivistes ne peuvent se permettre de choisir de façon absolue entre l'érudition et la gestion mais il insiste sur le fait que le seul endroit où une éducation professionnelle en archivistique peut être donnée est dans un milieu universitaire multi-disciplinaire.