

Jenkinson and Schellenberg: A Comparison

by **RICHARD STAPLETON***

In the English-speaking archival community, Sir Hilary Jenkinson (1892-1961) and Theodore R. Schellenberg (1903-1970) stand as the giants of their profession who sought to establish firm archival principles and techniques. As archivists continue to debate theories and practices today, it is worth pausing to compare the ideas of Jenkinson and Schellenberg on the nature of archives, the principles of provenance and its relation to arrangement and description, appraisal and selection, and the education of the archivist. Although it is well known that each was an outspoken critic of the other's ideas, the purpose here is not to judge their ideas, but rather to analyze their respective approaches to archives, identify their differences and similarities, and emphasize the consistency and continuity of thought that is evident in all their writings.

To understand their ideas, it is important to appreciate the context in which Jenkinson and Schellenberg began their careers for, as Hugh Taylor has noted, "Above all, they wrote from their own very different archival traditions and this should always be taken into account."¹ While both men took full advantage of the archival knowledge that had been accumulated in their own and other countries, it was through writing in response to their particular environments that their work achieved distinction.

Sir Hilary Jenkinson's illustrious career as an archivist spanned half a century and culminated in his term as Deputy Keeper, or chief administrative officer, of the Public Record Office (PRO) from 1947 to 1954.² After studying the ancient classics at Pembroke College, Cambridge, he joined the staff of the PRO in 1906 at a time when basic archival principles were still very much in their formative stages. (The influential Dutch manual by Muller, Feith, and Fruin had only appeared a few years

* I would like to thank Terry Eastwood and Terry Cook for their advice and encouragement during the preparation of this article.

1 Hugh A. Taylor, *The Arrangement and Description of Archival Materials* (Munchen, 1980), p. 9.

2 For a detailed account of Jenkinson's career, see "Memoir of Sir Hilary Jenkinson" in J. Conway Davies, ed., *Studies Presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (London, 1957), pp. xiii-xxx.

earlier, in 1898.³) Jenkinson's initial exposure to archives was through the handling of British medieval records, to which he made repeated reference in his *Manual of Archive Administration*, first published in 1922. Special knowledge and skills are required in order to work with medieval records, and Jenkinson busily studied the subjects of palaeography and diplomatic. His publications in these auxiliary sciences are so extensive that they rival his writings on archival topics in both number and importance.⁴ It is not surprising, then, that Jenkinson's archival writings concentrate on the development of rigid fundamentals with an emphasis on the legal character of archives. Moreover, Jenkinson's first years were free from the problem of dealing with huge masses of modern government records. Such a problem would not develop until later in the century when technological advancements and the business of fighting two major wars combined to produce a flood of administrative documents.

Theodore R. Schellenberg once referred to Jenkinson as an "old fossil,"⁵ thus stressing his opinion that Jenkinson's ideas were a hindrance to archivists working with modern records. In 1935, after studying history at Kansas State University and the University of Pennsylvania, Schellenberg secured a position at the newly established National Archives of the United States as one of several Deputy Examiners whose task it was to undertake a survey of the records of executive agencies in Washington.⁶ The following year he was involved in a similar project on a national scale when he served as Assistant Director of the Survey of Federal Archives. Schellenberg entered a work environment very different from that experienced by Jenkinson: there were no compact medieval holdings upon which to base archival theories and, upon its establishment, the National Archives had assumed responsibility for ten million cubic feet of records that had been accumulated over a period of a century and a half.⁷ Furthermore, programmes initiated during the Great Depression were resulting in the expansion of government services and an increase in the volume of records. This situation forced Schellenberg and other National Archives staff members to concentrate on reducing the volume of records by selecting only permanently valuable records for the Archives, in order to make them intelligibly available to researchers. Schellenberg carried these concerns with him throughout his career, as is evident in his many articles and two major works, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (1956) and *The Management of Archives* (1965).⁸

3 The first English translation of the Dutch manual appeared in 1940 under the title *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*. Jenkinson probably read the French translation which was published in 1910. Recent investigation into the archival climate of turn-of-the-century Europe can be found in Lawrence D. Geller, "Joseph Cuvelier, Belgian Archival Education, and the First International Congress of Archivists, Brussels, 1910," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983), pp. 26-34.

4 A complete bibliography of Jenkinson's publications is provided in Davies, *Studies Presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson*, pp. 480-94.

5 Jane F. Smith, "T.R. Schellenberg: Americanizer and Popularizer," *American Archivist* 44 (Fall 1981), p. 319.

6 Schellenberg's career is documented in Smith, "T.R. Schellenberg" and in the multi-authored "In Memoriam: T.R. Schellenberg, 1903-1970," *American Archivist* 33 (April 1970), pp. 190-202. For detailed treatment of the state of the National Archives during Schellenberg's time there, see H.G. Jones, *The Records of a Nation* (New York, 1969); and Donald R. McCoy, *The National Archives* (Chapel Hill, 1978).

7 Jones, *Records of a Nation*, p. 18.

8 A bibliography of Schellenberg's publications can be found in "In Memoriam," pp. 201-2.

Both Jenkinson and Schellenberg, then, were greatly influenced by the circumstances surrounding themselves in the important formative years of their careers; an appreciation of this context helps in understanding their opposing viewpoints. This is not to suggest that Jenkinson was unaware of the problem of bulk or insensitive to the needs of researchers, or that Schellenberg was not interested in archival fundamentals and the legal significance of archives, but rather that their differences were more often ones of emphasis. There is, however, at least one common feature that must be mentioned. Both archivists state that archives are accumulated in the course of regular business activity, whether public or private. Implicit in this statement is the notion of natural accumulation. Jenkinson stressed this point most emphatically:

Archives are not collected: I wish the word 'Collection' could be banished from the Archivist's vocabulary, if only to establish that important fact.... They came together, and reached their final arrangement, by a natural process: are a growth; almost, you might say, as much an organism as a tree or an animal.⁹

Schellenberg obviously agreed with Jenkinson on this point as he cited this very passage in his *Modern Archives*.¹⁰

Despite this common starting point, the ultimate definitions of archives formulated by the two archivists are very different. Jenkinson believed that only materials preserved for the creator's own information and in his own custody could be considered archival.¹¹ This quality, combined with natural accumulation, forms the basis for the "impartiality" and "authenticity" of archives. According to Jenkinson, impartiality rests on the fact that "the Research ends which Archives may be made to serve ... will not be the purposes which were contemplated by the people by whom the Archives were drawn up and preserved."¹² Similarly, responsible custodianship means that the "forgery or falsification" of archives is "altogether exceptional," thus ensuring their authenticity.¹³ And the archivist's chief duty is to serve the record by continuing the line of unbroken custody — only secondarily will the needs of researchers be served.

Jenkinson further believed that the elements enumerated in his definition were absolutely essential, and that this definition was universally applicable over time, despite changes in physical form. This rigidity is understandable in light of the context of Jenkinson's career. His work with medieval legal records seems to have affected his concept of the nature of archives for, while impartiality may be applicable to medieval records, it is unrealistic to extend this characteristic to modern records. Yet even though Jenkinson's definition cannot go unchallenged, it remains relevant today. While most archival institutions now possess holdings that would not conform to Jenkinson's ideal, he has provided archivists with a firm foundation from which to examine the disparate materials under their care. Hugh

9 Jenkinson, "The English Archivist: A New Profession" (1947), in Roger H. Ellis and Peter Walne, eds., *Selected Writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (Gloucester, 1980), p. 238.

10 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago, 1956, 1975), p. 19.

11 See the definition of archives in Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration* (London, 1922, 1965), p. 11, and the definition of document, pp. 6-7.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 12.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

Taylor has noted that Jenkinson's defence of archives "is most bracing and valuable today in the light of what can happen to records by way of falsification or destruction, not simply from neglect but also from malice."¹⁴

Schellenberg was very critical of Jenkinson's definition of archives. He contended that, in conjunction with natural accumulation, the second essential characteristic of archives is their preservation "for reasons other than those for which they were created or accumulated."¹⁵ Thus, in his definition, Schellenberg emphasized reference and research use. He also discounted Jenkinson's stand on custody on the grounds that the volume, complex origins, and haphazard development of modern records made "futile any attempt to control individual documents."¹⁶ Finally, Schellenberg did not support an inflexible definition, insisting instead that perceptions varied from country to country and from time to time. In particular, he stated that the modern archivist, as opposed to an archivist like Jenkinson who worked with older records, "has a definite need to redefine archives in a manner more suited to his own requirements."¹⁷

On this last point, Jenkinson was especially concerned. He feared that widespread acceptance of Schellenberg's idea would make international communication between archivists "suggestive of the Tower of Babel,"¹⁸ and to an extent Jenkinson was right. Schellenberg can certainly be criticized for failing to accept a final definition of archives but, in fairness to him, his approach is readily understandable. Schellenberg pointed out, in a manner similar to the method employed here, that all archival concepts had been influenced by the circumstances under which they had been developed. It is also natural that Schellenberg should have stressed the useability of archives, considering the American attitude — and his own strong feeling — that public records are, indeed, public property.¹⁹ Perhaps his advanced training in history helped to increase further his concern for the researcher. Today, useability is of crucial concern to archivists as the community of researchers has grown far beyond the creator of the record and a handful of historians and antiquarians. While Schellenberg's approach seems to lack the substance and permanence of Jenkinson's towards the nature of archives, it must be seen as a realistic attempt to deal with the sometimes terrifying accumulation of modern government records. Even though Schellenberg stressed useability and Jenkinson emphasized duty to the record, neither of them denied the importance of the other activity.

In considering their approach to the issue of provenance and its relation to arrangement and description, it is convenient to concentrate on the component elements of provenance, namely *respect pour les fonds* and *respect pour l'ordre primitif*. The first of these elements, which refers to the grouping of holdings according to creating or controlling agencies, was readily accepted and defended by both archivists. Jenkinson referred to *respect pour les fonds* as "the fundamental rule

14 Taylor, *Arrangement and Description*, p. 11.

15 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, p. 13. Also see his definition of archives, p. 16, and the definition of record, also p. 16.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

18 Jenkinson, "Roots" (1960), in Ellis and Walne, *Selected Writings*, p. 369.

19 See Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, pp. 122-25.

of arrangement,” while Schellenberg observed that provenance, a term which he employed in the capacity of *respect pour les fonds*, “is basic and inflexible and relates to a matter of the highest importance to the archival profession.”²⁰

In observing *respect pour les fonds* in arranging archives, they both recognized the necessity of breaking down the holdings into manageable units, but there were important differences in their perception of this basic unit. Jenkinson made reference to an “Archive Group” and defined it as “the archives resulting from the work of an Administration which was an organic whole, complete in itself, capable of dealing independently, without any added or external authority, with every side of any business which could normally be presented to it.”²¹ This definition conveys the closed group concept, using as it does the past tense and emphasizing administrative independence. It is in keeping with Jenkinson’s involvement with medieval records, but he did question whether or not there was anything in modern archives that should prevent a similar approach. On this last point, perhaps Jenkinson did not carry his observations far enough. Taylor has noted that “increasingly fluid functions and ministries after the second world war put a strain on his precepts concerning ‘archive groups’ which he may well have modified in the light of this experience.”²²

Schellenberg, in referring to the basic unit of arrangement, used the terms “record group” and “archival group” synonymously. The “group” was based on organizational origins, but it also took into consideration the fluidity of modern government administrations. Accordingly, Schellenberg pointed out that at the National Archives “record groups were established for records of administrative units of varying status and authority in the government hierarchy. The administrative units ... need be neither complete nor independent administrative units, as in England.” Furthermore, concern over the volume of modern records meant that “other factors than provenance may also have to be considered in establishing record groups.” In particular, these other factors included concern for the size and number of the groups.²³ In today’s archival world, Schellenberg’s comments remain applicable to the reality experienced by many repositories.

On the issue of the second element of provenance, *respect pour l'ordre primitif*, or the observance of original order in the arrangement of archives within the group, the difference of opinion between Jenkinson and Schellenberg is even more obvious and is directly attributable to their attitudes towards the nature of archives. For Jenkinson, the primary duty of the archivist to the records themselves meant that the original order had to be respected at all costs. Where rearrangement appeared to be necessary, he was “in favour of refusing to do more than to re-arrange on paper.” Any archivist who considered rearrangement in any other capacity was “taking a very grave responsibility.”²⁴ Conversely, Schellenberg, in keeping with his definition of archives, related original order “mainly to use or convenience.” He observed that original order would usually produce this desired end, but if it did not the archivist

20 Jenkinson, *Manual*, p. 102; Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives* (New York, 1965), p. 104.

21 Jenkinson, *Manual*, p. 101.

22 Taylor, *Arrangement and Description*, pp. 10-11.

23 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, pp. 182 and 188.

24 Jenkinson, *Manual*, p. 114.

“should have no compunction about disturbing the original order.”²⁵ In assessing these opposing viewpoints, it seems that Schellenberg’s advocacy of flexibility may have some justification on practical grounds, especially in dealing with non-textual records. Jenkinson’s insistence on absolute observance of the rule is, however, more fundamentally acceptable. Except when the original order is manifestly bad or is simply not discernible, that original order should be respected, for once lost it can never be reestablished. Rearrangement should, as expressed by Jenkinson, only be carried out on paper.

Both felt that description should reflect arrangement, and the actual descriptive elements they regarded as essential were basically the same. They also believed in the possibility of organizing national finding aid systems.²⁶ Their differences, however, centre around the motivation for the implementation of descriptive programmes. Jenkinson emphasized that the first purpose of finding aids was to enable the archivist to gain control of his holdings, and only secondly were these aids to become available to the researcher. Schellenberg agreed that the archivist needed to control the materials before provision could be made for the researcher, but he strongly emphasized the secondary activity: “The servicing activity is doubtless the most important of all activities performed by an archivist. It means furnishing archives, reproductions of archives, or information from or about archives to the government and to the **public.**”²⁷ Schellenberg further contended that the principles which guided arrangement and description could also be applied to historical manuscripts. This issue was more relevant to the American experience where historical manuscripts, as distinct from government records, were often housed in libraries and historical societies. It was common for British institutions to house both public and private materials, and Jenkinson only became concerned if the private materials did not conform to his identifying elements of archives.

In concluding this discussion of the two basic archival principles and their relation to arrangement and description, it must be pointed out that once again, as in the case with the nature of archives, the main differences between Jenkinson and Schellenberg were largely ones of emphasis. Both observed the principle of provenance, but the degree of this observance varied. Jenkinson, who rigidly endorsed provenance, grouped the activities of arrangement and description under the general heading of the “Moral Defence of Archives” by which he meant the protection of archives from the human failings of the archivist.²⁸ This is consistent with his notion that archives exist in their own right and that the archivist’s devotion to the sanctity, the unviolated integrity, of these materials is paramount. This attitude may appear unreasonable to some critics, but Jenkinson has certainly provided archivists with a compelling, almost missionary sense of their professional duty. Schellenberg too accepted the archivist’s devotion to the record as a prime duty, but his preoccupation with the volume of records and service to the research community encouraged him to bend the principles. His practical approach must be reassuring to many archivists, but it should be stressed that his contention was with specific exceptions to the principles and not with the principles themselves.

25 Schellenberg, *Management of Archives*, p. 105.

26 See Jenkinson, *Manual*, p. 119, and Schellenberg, “A Nationwide System of Controlling Historical Manuscripts in the United States,” *American Archivist* 28 (July 1965), pp. 409-12.

27 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, p. 119.

28 Jenkinson, *Manual*, pp. 83-84.

The two archivists expressed opposing opinions on the subject of appraisal or selection and, once again, these differences can be traced to their views of archives in general. Basically, Jenkinson felt that since archives were, by definition, preserved for the creator's own use, it was the creator's responsibility to decide which records should be kept. Ideally, all records would be preserved and the archivist would merely be a passive recipient. Schellenberg, whose definition stressed user access, felt that it was the archivist's duty to scholarship to enter actively into the appraisal arena. This was also a practical means of reducing record volume.

Jenkinson, in his *Manual*, began the discussion on the question of destruction with an assessment of medieval records and, not surprisingly, concluded that there were no grounds for destruction. For modern records, since he did not approve of the archivist's involvement in appraisal, Jenkinson advocated treating the symptom before it became an illness, "to try to prevent the accumulations occurring at all; to deal with the matter before documents come to the Archive state and the Archivist's custody."²⁹ He envisaged a central registry for each administrative office that would control "every stage of the distribution and transit of every official document,"³⁰ and, thus, in one facet at least, he foresaw the implementation of scheduling. Because Jenkinson related his definition of archives to the selection activity, he naturally emphasized the primary value of the record to the creator. With regard to the value of the record to researchers, he wrote that "the final scrutiny before they pass into Archives is the only point at which the consideration of historic interest might possibly intrude, and for this reason is to be employed only with due precaution: in most cases it would probably be best to omit it."³¹ Thus, Jenkinson not only cast aside the role of the archivist in selection, but also the potential role of the archivist as historian.

Jenkinson's strong stand on appraisal can only be understood by relating it to his concern over the impartiality of archives. For Jenkinson the integrity of the record had to be protected above all else, although he was not averse to making practical exceptions. Early in his career, Jenkinson realized that some custodians of archival materials, particularly librarians, were being forced to make appraisal decisions, and he felt the need to provide advice. He suggested that selection be based on an examination of groups of holdings rather than of individual documents, that records should be preserved for the value they possessed during their active use and not for sentimental reasons, and that, when in doubt, the advice of the previous custodian of the record should be sought.³² Later in his career, while commenting on the Grigg Report of the 1950s, Jenkinson conceded that "this ultimate intrusion of selection based on the interests of research is inevitable," but he remained adamant that the archivist should have little to do with the "pruning process."³³

At the opposite extreme, Schellenberg was not at all reluctant to engage in the appraisal of archives, and it is no coincidence that the first records disposal schedules

29 *Ibid.*, p. 152.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 171.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 184.

32 Jenkinson, "The Choice of Records for Preservation: Some Practical Hints," *Library Association Record* 41 (November 1939), pp. 543-44.

33 Jenkinson, "Roots," p. 378.

at the National Archives were prepared in his division.³⁴ He viewed appraisal as an opportunity to reduce the volume of records and to serve the needs of scholarship. Schellenberg was also concerned with the disposition of records because archival functions are determined by the way in which records are handled while in current use. Accordingly, he devoted an entire section of his *Modern Archives* to the topic of records management.

Schellenberg's stance on appraisal in *Modern Archives* and in his *Bulletin* for the National Archives has become justifiably renowned. In these accounts, Schellenberg differentiated between the primary value of records, which should be the concern of the record officer, and the secondary value of records, which should be determined jointly by the archivist and the record officer, although the former "should have final responsibility" and "should be empowered to review all records that government agencies propose to destroy."³⁵ This is the first of two major points where he differed from Jenkinson, and it is readily understandable in light of Schellenberg's definition of archives. Schellenberg concentrated his discussion on the secondary value of records, which he divided into evidential and informational value. Records possessing evidential value, which document the organization and functioning of the creating agency, are "indispensable to the government itself and to students of government." The archivist "must know how records came into being if he is to judge their value for any purpose."³⁶ Informational (or research) value pertains to information contained in records "about particular persons, situations, events, conditions, problems, materials, and properties," and records of this type make up the "greater portion of modern public records" preserved in archival institutions.³⁷ This is the second point of difference from Jenkinson, namely Schellenberg's consideration of the uses that would be made of archives by individuals other than the creator.

Schellenberg did not consider evidential and informational values to be mutually exclusive, but he did list specific criteria by which each of these values could be determined. On a general note, Schellenberg stated that "analysis is the essence of archival appraisal." When appraising the evidential value of records, this meant that "the archivist must take into account the entire documentation of the agency that produced them," while for informational value analysis it meant that "the archivist must take into account the entire documentation of society on the matter to which the information relates."³⁸ The archivist should also employ "moderation and common sense" and thus keep "neither too much nor too little."³⁹ While acknowledging the possibility of some valuable records being destroyed, Schellenberg contended that the "diverse judgments" which would be enacted by the various archivists "may well assure a more adequate social documentation."⁴⁰ After all, "a discriminating destruction" of a portion of the records "is a service to scholarship."⁴¹

34 Smith, "T.R. Schellenberg," p. 316.

35 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, pp. 30 and 32.

36 Schellenberg, *The Appraisal of Modern Public Records* (Bulletin No. 8 of the National Archives, 1956), p. 8.

37 *Ibid.*, p. 22.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 45.

39 *Ibid.*, p. 44.

40 Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, p. 149.

41 Schellenberg, *Appraisal*, p. 46.

The weakness of Schellenberg's account is its vagueness, for he leaves us with no concrete set of rules by which to transform his theory into practice. Yet perhaps this is less an indication of Schellenberg's failure than it is a reflection of the complexity of the problem, for despite this weakness archivists the world over have praised Schellenberg's appraisal technique, especially its emphasis on materials to be preserved rather than on materials to be destroyed.⁴² It is difficult to imagine a present-day archivist working with modern public records who would deny the necessity of the archivist's involvement in appraisal, and Schellenberg's thoughtful, well-presented treatise remains the standard work on this subject.

The forceful opinions of Jenkinson and Schellenberg on the nature of archives, arrangement and description, and appraisal were complemented by their views on the type of education that would produce the best archivists.⁴³ Jenkinson taught archival administration at the University of London, while Schellenberg taught at the National Archives and also undertook lecture tours of Latin America and Australia. Jenkinson spoke of a "Jack-of-all-trades" profession⁴⁴ which, not surprisingly, concentrated on servicing the records themselves. He insisted on technical training with the physical care of the archives in mind (in fact, he devotes forty pages of his *Manual* to a discussion of the "Physical Defence of Archives"), and believed that increased specialization in the future would see more archivists with a scientific, rather than a humanist, background.⁴⁵ This is consistent with Jenkinson's well-known statement that the archivist must not be a historian, but his position should not be overstated. Jenkinson himself had an affinity with the historian through his work in palaeography and diplomatic, and he also considered the study of administrative history by the archivist as "a matter not of choice but of necessity." The archivist "not only needs it as a background but must from time to time engage himself actively in extending it for the immediate purposes of his own work; and I do not think the date up to which this remark applies can be limited."⁴⁶ Jenkinson was not as intolerant of the historian as is often suggested, but merely wished to distinguish the role and activities of one profession from the other.

Schellenberg's suggestions for an archival studies curriculum included the principles and techniques of archival methodology, technical training, and auxiliary education in records management and library science. It is worth elaborating on Schellenberg's attitude towards library science as he believed that library schools were natural places for archivists to be educated, for such schools "are concerned with methodology, and they are the only place in which attention is likely to be given to methodological training."⁴⁷ He also admired the librarian's "attitude of service to the public" and added that librarians "have followed the practice of unstintingly making available the material in their custody. In regard to their holdings, they have

42 James B. Rhoads, "An Archivist of Intellect and Industry," in "In Memoriam," p. 194.

43 The issues of archival education and the state of the profession have been recently addressed in George Bolotenko, "Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983), pp. 5-25; and Tom Nesmith, "Archives from the Bottom Up: Social History and Archival Scholarship," *Archivaria* 14 (Summer 1982), pp. 5-26.

44 Jenkinson, "The English Archivist," p. 253.

45 Jenkinson, "Roots," p. 379.

46 *Ibid.*, p. 373.

47 Schellenberg, "Archival Training in Library Schools," *American Archivist* 31 (April 1968), p. 164.

emphasized use, not possession.”⁴⁸ Schellenberg’s admiration of librarianship, however, was not completely without qualification. He expressed a fear that “librarians will become so engrossed with method that they will lose sight of the scholarly aspects of archival work. The more any given line of work is concerned with the manipulation of physical things as distinct from purely intellectual matters, the more it is possible to follow precise methods of doing things.... Archival work cannot be governed by precise rules.”⁴⁹ Finally, Schellenberg believed that the “best basic training that an archivist can have ... is thorough training in history.”⁵⁰ Any affiliation with library science would be secondary.

Neither Jenkinson’s nor Schellenberg’s stand on the training of the archivist was, therefore, one-sided. They both recognized that archivists could borrow from other disciplines but, most importantly of all, they held the conviction that archives represented a profession in its own right. Jenkinson stressed the necessity of establishing “Archives as a separate subject” of study, and Schellenberg foresaw the day when “archivists will create their own profession” with “well defined” techniques and principles.⁵¹ Perhaps the ultimate direction that will be taken in the area of archival education will be determined less by individuals within the profession and more by the demands imposed by the nature and volume of modern records, and by the need of institutions for trained staff.

The theme of this analysis has been a projection of the consistency and continuity of the ideas of two internationally renowned archivists. Jenkinson began his career at a time when the types and volume of archives were relatively stable, and as a result he developed all-embracing ideals. There are perhaps exceptions to some of the statements made by Jenkinson, but it must be realized that the application of ideals to reality is never made without difficulty. In practice, the archivist must react to the situation at hand, and Jenkinson has attempted to provide him with a set of fundamentals that transcend all situations. As Roger H. Ellis has noted, “the statements of principle contained in the *Manual* have remained valid, and Jenkinson’s definition of Archives, and his exposition of the concept of Custody and of the duties of the Archivist, have remained fundamental to archive thought in the English-speaking countries.”⁵²

Schellenberg entered the archival profession at a time when the increasing volume of records was a new and major problem. While he accepted the importance of archival theory and principle, Schellenberg preferred, for the most part, to push on to the analysis of concrete problems. Accordingly, his writings exhibit a practical bent with a reevaluation of the definition of archives which includes modern records and their potential use for research. Perhaps Schellenberg’s most significant and lasting contribution is his discourse on appraisal, but his insistence that private collections could be handled in the same manner as public records and his call for cooperation between archivists and librarians should not be forgotten. All archivists must admire and appreciate Schellenberg’s willingness to face the problem of bulk in modern records and his success in doing so.

48 *Ibid.*, pp. 164-65.

49 *Ibid.*, pp. 162-63.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 158.

51 Jenkinson, *Manual*, pp. 123-24; and Schellenberg, “The Future of the Archival Profession,” *American Archivist* 22 (January 1959), p. 58.

52 Roger H. Ellis, “Introduction to the Re-issue of the Second Edition” of Jenkinson’s *Manual*, p. xi.

It has also been noted that the differences between the two archivists were often ones of emphasis rather than of principle. The polarization of their ideas should not be carried to extremes, for that would make it too easy to lose sight of their positive achievements. While Jenkinson stated that the primary duty of the archivist is to the archives themselves and only secondarily to researchers, he also referred to students as the archivist's "raison d'être," and while Schellenberg dwelt on research needs, he also stated, with regard to appraisal, that the archivist's "first obligation is to preserve records containing information that will satisfy the needs of the Government itself."⁵³ Jenkinson spoke of the archivist's aim "to provide, without prejudice or afterthought, for all who wish to know the Means of Knowledge," and Schellenberg referred to archivists as "guardians of the truth."⁵⁴ It is comforting, then, to conclude on a note of fundamental agreement. Archival theory and practice in the English-speaking world does not begin and end with Sir Hilary Jenkinson and Theodore R. Schellenberg, but they have contributed greatly to the maturation of the profession. If for no other reason than this, their ideas deserve to be reviewed over and over again.

53 Jenkinson, "The English Archivist," p. 255; and Schellenberg, *Appraisal*, p. 25.

54 Jenkinson, "The English Archivist," p. 258; and Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, p. 236.