a single journal, any article on the topic, especially a lead article, must be considered frivolous in the extreme. To accentuate one’s irritation, Dodds’ contribution, when it is not self-congratulatory or vindictive, is, one can only assume, simply wrong when he asserts, for example, that comment critical of Archivaria has been kept out of the journal by “the eye of the editor.” If this was true of the Dodds era I am optimistic enough to believe that it is not true of Archivaria’s present policy. I remain confident that the “editorial portcullis” will not be lowered upon this particular piece of unsought criticism.

Dr. K.E. Garay
Division of Archives and Research Collections
McMaster University

Gordon Dodds Replies

Kathleen Garay is perfectly entitled to express her opinion on the merits or otherwise of my article. I do, however, resent most strongly the imputation that it sprang from any wish to aggrandize myself. Even more offensive do I find her assertion that I have been vindictive towards anyone, especially Hugh Taylor whom I have known for twenty-five years. My respect for his archival contribution to Canada is well recorded and my admiration for his fertile mind, with its leaping imagery, is undiminished.

Gordon Dodds
Provincial Archives of Manitoba

General Editor Replies

While Dr. Garay’s opening words about Archivaria 17 are pleasant to read, her subsequent attack on Gordon Dodds’ lead article as a “navel-gazing piece of self-congratulation” must be challenged.

Before defending the article’s lead position, I want to question several of her assumptions for, if they are correct and the piece was thus indeed only “self-serving” of its author, I would never have published it. Is it true, as Garay asserts, that Dodds’ article really “consists of nothing more than a survey of sixteen issues of a single journal” and that even this slim offering contains a “particular concentration on the role played by one Gordon Dodds in steering the archival flagship”? A breakdown of Dodds’ twenty-one pages reveals the following: eight on the early history and evolution of the archival profession and the important role of The Canadian Archivist; eight on Archivaria (despite having twenty times the material of The Canadian Archivist); one on Hugh Taylor’s book; almost two on the Wilson Report and the proceedings of the Kingston Congress on Archives; and almost three pages of conclusions dealing with such central concerns as the search for an archival identity, archival education, and the needed development of a corpus of archival theory.