

The War of Independence of Archivists

by ELIO LODOLINI*

In 1970, Yves Pérotin contended that archives and archivists have been objects of contempt in the eyes of many members of the public;¹ indeed, he wondered whether his use of the term “mépris” might be overly optimistic, because society often treated them with complete indifference (“la plus totale indifférence”).² Comparing archives to libraries and documentation in general terms, Pérotin also contended that the status of archives is being reduced, that of libraries is being maintained, and that of documentation is being extended in all kinds of societies, whether new or old, socialist or liberal, advanced, or developing.³

Even if we cannot share our French colleague’s opinions — all the more so as some of them were made in the context of the civil turmoil in France in 1968⁴ — they are undoubtedly evidence of a sense of uneasiness which often exists among archivists and which in the past has called into question the value of archival work.⁵

According to a view rather widespread even among the so-called educated public, archives are often associated with libraries or considered a simple instrument of historical research. Consequently, archival science is either considered to be very similar to the study of books or library science, or it is included among the disciplines described as being “auxiliary of history.”⁶ The organizational structure of some countries joins the administration of archives with the administration of libraries on the basis of a supposed affinity between the two. I am not criticizing the bringing together of all the institutions which manage cultural properties (archives, antiquities and fine arts, libraries) under one government administration (ministry of culture or analogous agency), but I do consider it to be wrong to combine archives and libraries in one administration as a consequence of their special affinity, because, in the broad range of cultural properties, archives and libraries are, in my opinion, at opposite poles. I consider it to be even worse to include archival material or archival fonds among library materials or to subordinate archival institutions to libraries or even — which is very infrequently the case — libraries to archives.

Examples of the inclusion of archival materials and archival fonds among library materials occur to some extent everywhere. Sometimes, archival materials are given to the care of a library because no archival institution exists. For example, the preservation of the fundamental documents of the United States (the Declaration of

Independence, Constitution, and fonds of the Continental Congress, etc.) was entrusted to the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress and not given to the National Archives until 1952. In Australia, only in 1961 did the Archives Division of the National Library gain independence as the Commonwealth Archives Office, and the same happened to the archives of the various states of the Australian federation. In reference to the Australian situation, the American archivist and archival scholar, Theodore R. Schellenberg, observed in 1954 that "while libraries have often collected public archives, this practice is to be deprecated."⁷

In other places, the subordination of archives to libraries still exists or is even created *ex novo*. In Italy, for example, the regions have jurisdiction over libraries and museums of municipalities and other public bodies within their territory, but by law the national state asserts control over the archives of all Italian municipalities and other local public bodies. Some regions have recently avoided the consequences of the law by consigning their historical archives to the care of their municipal libraries! Another significant example is offered by the structure of the greatest international cultural organization, UNESCO, which has a department whose three segments are listed not in alphabetical order but in a hierarchical order of importance: Department of Documentation, Libraries, and Archives (DLA) or, in French, Département de la documentation, des bibliothèques et des archives (DBA, as also in Spanish).⁸ Moreover, from 1947 to 1978 its journal, *UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries*, treated archives under the heading of libraries.⁹ In 1979, the journal changed its name to *Unesco Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration*, but maintained the non-alphabetical order according to importance.

Yet another example may be drawn from what happened in Italy within the movement to bring about a unique ministry for the management of all cultural properties. Cultural properties had first been considered together in article 822 of the Italian Civil Code which came into effect on 21 April 1942. In the studies and proposals leading up to the establishment of the Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Properties in 1974, libraries and archives were constantly lumped together and kept separate from other cultural properties. As part of this process, the Commission for the Protection and Exploitation of the Historical, Archaeological, Artistic, and Environmental Heritage (La Commissione di indagine per la tutela e la valorizzazione del patrimonio storico, archeologico, artistico e del paesaggio), commonly known as the Franceschini Commission after its chairman, was established in 1964.¹⁰ The Commission was subdivided into eight task forces on as many subjects. One of these task forces treated the combined topic "Libraries and Archives" (again in order of importance, not alphabetically).¹¹ In his introduction to the survey of library and archival holdings, the coordinator of the task force observed that the connections between the two "are so evident that it seems idle and inappropriate to point them out."¹² However, he identified two points of commonality. First, the common medium shared by archival and library materials (a matter, I think, absolutely beside the point). The second is more serious. He observed that "each category of material gave birth in the course of time (a long time ago, at the time when the invention of writing determined a turn of incalculable importance in human civilization) to two kinds of institutions, archives and libraries. Although originally quite distinct, even chronologically, for we must consider that archives preceded libraries, these institutions more and more assumed similar forms, not only for the

internal, but also because of the external, character of objects they collect (writing and paper), and in many other ways inherent in the historical development of the objects (for instance, the influence of the manuscript or printed book on the archival register and vice versa) and of the institutions themselves (for instance, in the methods of arrangement and preservation)."¹³

Leaving aside the statement that archives and libraries were created as distinct institutions and then became more and more similar (in fact exactly the opposite is the case, as Arnaldo d'Addario points out¹⁴), I cannot accept either the concept that archives "collect" materials (a collection of documents has nothing in common with an archives) or the conclusion that methods of arrangement of archives and libraries ever influenced one another. The method of arrangement of archives has not and cannot have anything in common with the organization of materials in a library.

Furthermore, at a meeting of archivists and librarians that took place on 15 November 1965,¹⁵ the same coordinator of the task force on archives and libraries said that the Franceschini Commission bore the substantial distinctions of the two sectors in mind. However, he added, "it is clear that the affinity is undeniable as appears even more clearly from their [archives' and libraries'] comparison with other sectors of cultural properties, like archaeology, monuments, and environmental properties."¹⁶ To my mind, on the contrary, a comparison should reveal the affinity between archival and archaeological properties and monuments, and the differences between archival and library properties. I pointed this out many years ago in an article directed to library colleagues.¹⁷ But, long before, the practitioners of the disciplines of archival science and archaeology were coupled together by Benedetto Croce in his well-known, contemptuous phrase "archivists and archaeologists, truly inoffensive and beneficial little animals."¹⁸ At least archivists were put in good company!

After the creation of the Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Properties, the government created two commissions, one interministerial and one parliamentary, to prepare the legislative text for organization of the Ministry. In both commissions, the same forceful arguments were made about the existence of a stronger affinity between archives and libraries than between archives and other cultural properties. A famous jurist even stated that a property can be designated as being library or archival depending solely on whether it is preserved in a library or archives.¹⁹ Unfortunately, it is true that archival documents and fonds are preserved in libraries, but, because of this circumstance, they do not stop being archival and become library property, just as the literary manuscripts of a library nature preserved in archives do not thereby become archival properties. In either case, we are confronted with properties which are not preserved in their proper place. It should be noted that this can happen in Italy only by a breach of a precise law which prohibits the practice.²⁰ The breach of one article of a statute law cannot modify the status of the properties to which it refers. The problem of repatriating to archives and libraries the materials which rightfully belong to them is not only a matter of putting things in their proper place, but also one of adopting the proper methodology for each type of material.

The methodological mistake of joining archives and libraries or, even worse, of considering archives as part of libraries is officially described and codified in the most commonly used library classification systems in the world.

One of the two main versions of the decimal classification, invented by the American Melvil Dewey in the late nineteenth century, is the Dewey Decimal Classification. It subsumes archives and archival theory under the headings for libraries and librarianship. In the Dewey Decimal Classification,²¹ zero indicates general works. Archives and archival science come under classification 020, "Library and information sciences." To designate archival science in this way reduces it to a mere subset of another discipline.²² Even more disturbing is the organization of the sub-headings of this classification. Sub-heading 025.1 is "Administration" (of course, of libraries) which is further subdivided in 025.17 as "Treatment of special materials." Among library special materials, 025.171 indicates "manuscripts, archival materials, rarities," and 025.171 4 is "archival materials." Under the heading "rarities" (025.171 6), there is the cross-reference "class treatment of rare archival materials in 025.171 4," which clearly ignores even that archival material is never "rare" but always "unique" by definition. In the index of the Dewey classification, the entry for 025.171 4 shows "archival materials library tr[eat]m[en]t,"²³ which gives the false impression that archival materials must be handled according to the principles of library treatment (and this would lead to the destruction of archives) and that archives are part of libraries.

Other facets of archival science are included under other headings. The index entry for "archives law" refers one to class number 344.092, which is "Libraries and archives." Works about the archives of public administration would appear to come under 350.714, but in fact it becomes clear that what is referred to is records management or the management of what in Italy would be called current archives. To add to the confusion, works on records management are assigned to class number 651.5. Subheadings of "records management" are "storage of original documents" (651.54) and "storage of inactive files" (651.56) with the note "original documents in permanent (dead) storage." Part of archival economy (bindings, conservation facilities, equipment, etc.) may be found under 690.515 ("archival buildings") and 725.15 ("archival architecture").

The Universal Decimal Classification,²⁴ although similar in name, has departed considerably from Dewey's work. Here under class 02, "Librarianship," there is a sub-class 025.17 (which is analogous to the Dewey 025.17, "Treatment of special materials") dedicated to "Treatment of special materials (manuscripts, documents, cuttings, etc.)," terms all of a general nature, it may be noted. Archival material is not specified.

Archives is instead assigned to class 65, "Management and Organization of Industry, Trade and Communications," where 651 is "Office Management. Office Practice. Office Work" and 651.5 is "Office Records. Arrangement and Storage of Records. Dossiers. Files and Filing" (which is comparable to Dewey 651.1 for "records management"). Its subclass 651.56 is for "Systematic recording of archival information. Permanent files, archives" (Dewey's 651.56 is for "storage of inactive files"). Finally, 651.565 is for "Distinction between permanent and temporary records. Current and closed or dead archives." Remember that all this comes in the class for industry, trade, and communication.

In class 72, "Architecture," there is the subclass "Buildings for Educational, Scientific, Cultural Purposes" where 727.8 is for "Documentation, library and archive

buildings.” In the French version, 725.15 brings together “Palais de justice. Tribunaux. Archives” (Dewey’s 725.15 is for “archival architecture”).

Archives also appears in class 93, “History,” where 930 is “Science of History. Ancillary Historical Sciences” and 930.2 is “History: methods of study based on written sources, records, inscriptions,” 930.25 is “Archivistics, Archives (including public and other records),” 930.251 is “Archival techniques and organization. Establishment and administration of repositories,” 930.253 is “Archive repositories and their contents,” and, finally, 930.255 is “Archive lists and catalogues.”

Therefore, in the Dewey system, archival science is part of library science, and in the Universal Decimal Classification it is part of historical methodology. Neither of the two classifications consider archival science as autonomous.

Books in libraries are catalogued on the basis of these two systems. In Italy, the *Bibliografia Nazionale Italiana*, a monthly journal published by an agency of the Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Properties, uses the Dewey system. One of my books which treats only archives and archival legislation was classified by this journal under library science,²⁵ to be precise in sub-class 025.171 which I have already mentioned.²⁶

Of course, as archives and archival science are considered a sub-species of libraries and library science, state archives in particular are considered a sub-species of state libraries. The *Bibliografia Nazionale Italiana* classified the general guide to Italian state archives²⁷ under state libraries (027.5),²⁸ despite the fact that the guide was published by a separate division of the same ministry. Many other such examples could be given.

After all, we must remember that the Dewey system was created in the United States, where as long ago as 1912 a pioneer of American archives, Waldo G. Leland, could point out that a gap existed between an avant garde library science and an archival science still in its infancy in his country.²⁹ In the United States, archival science was long dependent on library science — and in large measure still is. In 1965, Theodore Schellenberg’s well-known *The Management of Archives*³⁰ was published in the “Columbia University Studies in Library Science” series, and devoted its first chapter to the subject, “Development of Library Methodology.” There are two other examples. In England, Sir Hilary Jenkinson gave the inaugural archival course at University College in London in the School of Librarianship in 1947, which in that year became the School of Librarianship and Archival Administration.³¹ Even in some recent international treaties, like the modification of the concordat between Italy and the Holy See signed on 18 February 1984, archives and libraries are inexplicably considered one thing.³²

Archivists have never doubted the difference between their work and librarians’ work. Indeed, Giorgio Cencetti dedicated a specific study to the distinction between the two as early as 1939.³³ The basic difference between archives and libraries — and therefore between the kinds of work and professional education of archivists and librarians — derives from the fact that archives are an organic complex of documents created in the course of a legal-administrative activity, or at least a practical activity, and therefore those documents are tied together by a necessary, primary, and determined bond (a document by itself, to repeat, has no autonomy). The very

circumstance that archival documents were created for legal or administrative purposes and not cultural purposes gives them a special cultural value. In contrast, a library is an aggregation of books, each of which was voluntarily created by the author in order to communicate to people either information and knowledge or to express feelings or for a general cultural purpose. A library is a collection of books (each of which is fully autonomous and complete) and which was brought together on the basis of some judgement or interest or according to some arbitrary criteria of evaluation. An archives is the antithesis of a collection; it is involuntarily created by some source as a natural consequence of its existence and operation, and mirrors the administrative mandates, the way of functioning, and the bureaucratic practices (and their changes) of the creating source.

T.R. Schellenberg devoted a chapter of his *Modern Archives*, published in 1956, to the differences between archives and libraries as to holdings and methods (Chapter 3). George S. Ulibarri observed in 1961 that the differences between archives and libraries have been created by progress: "the differences between libraries and archives have grown in proportion as the archival profession has refused to remain subordinated to the library profession."³⁴ In 1976, Frank G. Burke underlined two differences between archives and libraries: the fact that the guide to the work of arrangement of archival fonds is the administrative structure of the source agency, and the difference between methods of research in archives and libraries.³⁵

In a review of the volume in which Burke's essay appeared, Urszula Rayska observes that the authors "fail to answer the problems which the subject raises," and adds, "The historical fact that archives were often collected in libraries before archive repositories existed does not mean that the practice of archive administration is just another form of librarianship." She speaks of "an inferiority complex from which archivists have suffered for too long," and concludes: "it is certainly time for archivists to abandon their defensive positions and to show that the differences between archives and libraries are more than those between open and closed stacks. Archive-library relations will best be served by the recognition of the separate characteristics of the two disciplines and not by librarians overstressing the similarities or by continuing apologia from archivists on both sides of the Atlantic for the non-existence of their legitimate ancestors."³⁶ It seems obvious, however, that writing began as the writing of practical documents and not of books, and that archives therefore antedate libraries, appearing first in the Near East in the 4th millennium B.C., then in Greece and Rome. There is no doubt, therefore, that archivists have "legitimate ancestors" much more ancient than those of librarians. I quote the above sentences of Rayska because they seem very interesting — like those of Pérotin — even if they come from premises quite different from those with which we are familiar.

In this vein, I recall Leland's statement to which I have already referred [n. 29]; I take note of the common American habit of using the term "manuscripts" to cover all private archives (a usage which can cause confusion with the generic meaning of the word "manuscript," which simply means handwritten), and I also point out the lack of a specific professional qualification for archivists in Great Britain until 1929.³⁷

In the Anglo-Saxon world, in spite of differences at the beginning, the distinction between archives and libraries and their related personnel is now well understood and considered desirable by archivists. Nevertheless, in Italy, there is a remarkable

bibliography on the subject of the relationship between archives and libraries (with a lesser reference to the relationship between archives and museums).³⁸ It is difficult to understand why many librarians argue for the existence of a special affinity between archives and libraries and between the education of the personnel of the two types of institution.

Opinions which associate archives with libraries or with historical research are also reflected in the structures of professional education for archivists. In the conclusion to his study of schools and courses for archivists in the Americas, Aurelio Tanodi³⁹ pointed out in 1975 that there are three primary tendencies. One is to entrust archival education to a special school for the purpose. An example is the *Escuela de Archiveros* of the National University of Cordoba, Argentina, founded and directed by Tanodi himself, and in 1972 named by the Organization of American States the Interamerican Center for the Education of Archivists. The other two tendencies attribute archival education to schools for librarians and to history programmes.

An analogous dualism — between keeping archival education distinct and merging it with library or historical education — can be found in a report published in 1985 by UNESCO. In a section dwelling on records management personnel, it is stated: "The dichotomy between history and the social sciences versus library and information sciences as appropriate graduate education for archivists has been a subject of discussion, particularly in the United States, where records management and a pragmatic approach to institutional concerns tend to overshadow traditional archival attitudes. Both have their place, however, and should receive due recognition, depending on the focus and needs of the organization concerned."⁴⁰ This position is a direct consequence of an earlier statement to the effect that "archival education as a separate discipline has as yet no constituency of its own."⁴¹ This is an unacceptable conclusion. In Italy, for instance, for a long time archival science has been an autonomous discipline taught in the universities. Eugenio Casanova began teaching archival science at the University of Rome in 1925. Moreover, Italian state archives began instruction in archival science as an independent discipline at the beginning of the nineteenth century. By contrast, Italian libraries do not yet have schools of library science, although there are some [the earliest in the 1960s — ed. note] in the established universities. Librarians in Italy have wanted for a long time to create independent schools in the libraries. For more than a century, the diploma of a school of archival science, acquired only after the first degree, has been mandatory for Italian state archivists and, since 1939, the same qualification has been mandatory for various categories of archivists of non-state agencies. In contrast, librarians are not required to have any special postgraduate qualification. The Italian situation is therefore completely the opposite of that described by the UNESCO study. The Italian situation is not an isolated case, because courses and schools of archival science have existed in many European countries since the last century and the teaching of archival science has acquired full autonomy.

As there is no common element between archives and libraries, other than their belonging to the general category of cultural properties, so there is no common ground between the curriculum of studies of archivists and librarians. In order to undertake archival studies, it is necessary to know beforehand history in general and legal and administrative history in particular, whereas the basic knowledge of a librarian can be diverse. Even more divergent are the subjects of specific training of the two professions.

In this vein, it is remarkable that archival authors do not insist on the necessity of knowing not only history but also law before starting specific studies of archives. To have juridical knowledge, in addition to historical knowledge, has been indispensable for scientific activity in the field of archives, at least since the nineteenth century when the principle was established according to which archival fonds must be arranged reconstructing the original order of the component documents. As early as 1919, Antonio Panella observed: "Classification by subject can embrace many different branches of knowledge; respect des fonds, that is the preservation of archival fonds in the order in which they were formed, implies only one, that of the law, because, after all, each ministry, each magistrature, office, or corporation is nothing other than a juridical organism."⁴² This statement is valid not only for the archivist who arranges the archival fonds, but also for the researcher: "in the use of the material one cannot help but refer to the history of the organisms, or better, of the activity of the state in which they operated."⁴³ Even in the United States, where the phenomenon of union of archival and library or historical studies is most common, William J. Orr has advocated the independence of archival education from the other two sectors,⁴⁴ and Ruth W. Helmuth has observed that only "archivists should teach archivists."⁴⁵

In the field of historical study, it is common to conceive of archives as simple instruments of historical research. Without searching any further, it suffices to note that according to a ministerial report on the existing law governing the treatment of archives in Italy, state archives should become "institutions dedicated to the science of history."⁴⁶ On the other hand, I feel that archival institutions, whether of the state or otherwise, should foster only the science of archives.

I believe that, from the examination of the relationships between archival science and history, we can conclude that they are two distinct sciences, even if reciprocally useful (it would be unthinkable for an archivist to ignore history or law,⁴⁷ and also for a self-respecting historian to be unaware of how to do research in archives). The pretension of some historians who consider archives to be a simple instrument for their studies and archival science an auxiliary discipline of history seems doomed to decay.

I started this essay by quoting the undoubtedly pessimistic opinion of Yves Pérotin. I would like to conclude with a quite different quotation: the insightful observations of Virginia C. Purdy, who describes not only the causes but also the cure of what she calls "archivaphobia," a malady widespread among "colleagues in the historical profession,"⁴⁸ (I would rather say among the most unprepared of them, for no serious historian has ever suffered from this disease) who would like to find archival fonds arranged on the basis of the subjects of their research — that is, hoping for an antihistorical regression of two centuries with a return to arrangement by subject typical of the eighteenth century — and provided with indexes or even catalogues like those in a library. The cure of archivaphobia is very simple. First, one must understand archival science and particularly the fact that a fonds must be arranged according to the original order of the documents, that is, according to the administrative structure of the source agency. Secondly, and as a consequence, research in archives carried out by a scholar of history or any other discipline must be done not by looking in finding aids for the subject that one wants to study, but by starting from a preliminary knowledge of the offices competent for

that subject and of the administrative procedures adopted by them, according to the well-known principle that in archives one must not look for subjects but for institutions creating records bearing on the desired subject.⁴⁹

The statement that the purpose of the work of the archivist is not to allow the scholars of other disciplines to find documents useful to their research was first suggested in the famous manual of the Dutch archivists Muller, Feith, and Fruin at the end of the last century.⁵⁰ This idea was sanctioned in Italy in the law in 1911.⁵¹ It is fully confirmed by Eugenio Casanova in his manual of 1928.⁵²

I have many times stated that the archivist must not consider the interest (or, I might say, the supposed interests) of the scholars of other disciplines, but must exclusively follow the dictates of archival science, which is a science complete in itself and possessing dignity equal to that of any other discipline.⁵³ Therefore, in spite of the "mépris" of public opinion (Pérotin) and the "inferiority complex" of archivists themselves (Rayska), for this author, calling himself archivist is an act of pride.

Notes

- * Publication kindly authorised by the journal *Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique*, where this article first appeared in Italian with the title "La guerra di indipendenza degli archivisti," in Vol. LVII, No. 1, 2 (1986), pp. 269-293, an issue entitled "Miscellanea Carlos Wyffels." The article was translated into English by Professors Luciana Duranti and Terence Eastwood of the School of Library, Archival, and Information Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Some passages primarily of interest to an Italian readership were eliminated with the author's concurrence.
- 1 Yves Pérotin, "Les archives et le mépris," *La gazette des archives*, 68 (1970), pp. 7-23.
 - 2 *Ibid.*, p. 14, footnote.
 - 3 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
 - 4 Pérotin describes a visit he paid to L'École des Chartes: after speaking with two professors, "I asked for ... a meeting with the student council. I was amiably received by young people who were good students and intelligent (I emphasize that because it's important). I listened to them and they listened to me. The results of our discussions were so negative that I refused to carry on. I had discovered with stupefaction: first, that the whole ambition of these young aspiring archivists was to become professional researchers, a term designating for me "des érudits-nègres," people who do work which is difficult, thankless, and poorly paid in order to allow grand masters to build their brilliant syntheses; second, that even in this perspective — which, I firmly disparage whereas they themselves think it is most noble — they hardly see the value of archival education. If I have understood them, they would accept, if absolutely necessary for survival of the School, teaching of that sort as an appendix to their studies (in the form of a supplementary year or professional school) for those who, being of feeble mind, decide, for want of something better, to become bureaucrats, that is to say, archivists." *Ibid.*, p. 13. In conclusion, Pérotin says, "I understand ... (1) that the archival profession is no longer interesting even to people who seem to be attracted to it; and (2) that, even and above all, if they consider themselves future historians or 'researchers', our young 'chartistes' have no interest in archives." *ibid.*, p. 14.
 - 5 Elio Lodolini, "Il lavoro dell' archivist," *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique* XLVI, 1-2 (1975), pp. 151-58.
 - 6 Undoubtedly, every discipline is "auxiliary" of those which make use of it and, reciprocally, uses them and other disciplines. From this angle, the statement of Antonino Lombardo, that for an archivist arranging an archival fonds history is auxiliary to his task, is quite logical. Antonino Lombardo, "Scambi internazionali tra gli Archivi o sul metodo delle ricerche archivistiche in campo internazionale," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* XVIII, 1 (1958), p. 107.

- 7 T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 20.
- 8 However, I had — together with other colleagues — a personal confirmation of the poor knowledge of archives within UNESCO. When the organization convened a meeting of ten archivists in May 1970 as consultants to define the main lines for the development of archives, the consultants had a hard time making the representatives of the organization understand that archives are something entirely different from libraries.
- 9 The meeting referred to in the previous footnote is mentioned in *Bulletin de l'UNESCO à l'intention des bibliothèques* XXIV, 6 (1970), pp. 374-75.
- 10 The results of the survey undertaken by the Franceschini Commission have been published in three volumes entitled *Per la salvezza dei beni culturali in Italia* (Roma: Casa editrice Colombo, 1967).
- 11 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 567-672.
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 572.
- 13 *Ibid.*
- 14 Arnaldo d'Addario, "Archivi e biblioteche: affinità e differenze," *Archivi, biblioteche ed editoria libraria per la formazione culturale della società italiana* (1978), pp. 65-80.
- 15 *Per la salvezza*, Vol. II, pp. 435-508.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 456.
- 17 "The activity most similar to that of the archivist ... seems to be that of the archaeologist The individual documents can tell us very little — if not even deceive us — while, once the bond which originally connected the documents is reconstructed, from them we get a perfect and complete view of the world, period, events to which the documents are bound. Exactly the same happens in the archeological field, as, for instance, in the case of many stones casually found or removed from their place. They are nothing other than stones, with very little interest or value. But, if these stones are left where they originally were, or if their original position can be reconstructed, we do not any more have a heap of stones but the foundations of a temple, arena, or town. The stones provide us with direct and immediate evidence of civilization, tell us of their history, and evoke the organization and life of a population.
The same can be said of a vase, a statue, a weapon, generally of an archaeological find clandestinely excavated, in which case it is no longer possible to establish its provenance. It becomes a simple curiosity like an autograph, an illuminated paper, a seal detached from the related document (cases which each of us has unfortunately encountered many times) and therefore having very little scientific interest. But if a find is part of a series of finds, if the place where it was found is known, if it is possible to connect it with other finds, it becomes higher evidence of a civilization, history, or cultural or commercial exchange. All the finds as a whole assume a scientific value immeasurable as compared to that of the sum of single pieces. And this is exactly the value of the document with respect to a whole archives." Elio Lodolini, "Biblioteche e archivi storici dei Comuni," *Accademie e Biblioteche d'Italia* XXVI, 5 (1958), pp. 5-6.
- 18 Benedetto Croce, *Teoria e storia della storiografia*, 9th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1966), p. 23. The first German edition of this book was in 1915; the first Italian edition was in 1917.
- 19 Massimo Severo Giannini, "I beni culturali," *Rivista trimestrale di Diritto pubblico*, XXVI, 1, p. 28.
- 20 Article 1 of the Decree of the President of the Republic (DPR) of 30 September 1963, no. 1409, prescribes that Italian state archives preserve the fonds and documents of the state, that is *all* the documents and *only* the documents owned by the state. Therefore, neither archival fonds nor individual documents owned by the state can be preserved by libraries, museums, etc. Previous laws also prescribed that archives and libraries had to exchange material due to the other category of institution and improperly kept in custody. This having been done, the 1963 law omitted reference to exchange of material, probably because it was considered superfluous.
- 21 *Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index*. Vol. 2: *Schedules* (Albany: Forest Press, 1979).
- 22 "The value of each individual piece of information varies according to the kind of document in which it is contained." Luigi Londei, "Problemi e metodi della ricerca negli archivi," *Bollettino di Numismatica* 1 (1983), pp. 225-229.
- 23 *Dewey Decimal Classification*, Vol. 3, *Relative index*.
- 24 *Universal Decimal Classification*, International Medium Edition, English Text, FID publication No. 571 (London: British Standards Institution, 1985). Part 1: Systematic tables.
- 25 Elio Lodolini, *Organizzazione e legislazione archivistica italiana dall'Unità d'Italia alla Costituzione del Ministero per i Beni culturali e ambientali* (Bologna: Patron editore, 1980).
- 26 *Bibliografia nazionale italiana* XXIII, 10 (October 1980).

- 27 Ministero per i Beni culturali e ambientali, Ufficio centrale per i Beni archivistici, *Guida generale degli Archivi di Stato italiani*, 3 vols. (Roma, 1981, 1983, 1986).
- 28 *Bibliografia nazionale italiana XXIV*, 12 (December 1983).
- 29 Robert L. Clark, ed., *Archive-Library Relations* (New York: Bowker, 1976), p. xi, recalls that Leland observed that the United States was much superior to other countries in the disciplines related to libraries and much inferior in archival disciplines.
- 30 New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.
- 31 Hilary Jenkinson, "The English Archivist: A New Profession," in *Selected Writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1980), pp. 236-259.
- 32 Article 12, para. 2 refers indiscriminately to the conservation and availability of the "archives of historical interest and the libraries" of ecclesiastical bodies.
- 33 Giorgio Cencetti, "Inventario bibliografico e inventario archivistico," in *Scritti archivistici* (Roma: Il Centro di ricerca editore, 1970), pp. 56-69.
- 34 George S. Ulibarri, "Puntos comunes y diferencias entre Archivos y Bibliotecas," *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación [Venezuela]* LV (1965), p. 17.
- 35 Burke believes that one can learn to use a library in a few minutes without even consulting a librarian. By contrast, he paints quite a different picture of a researcher's use of archives. The main source of information about archival holdings is the archivist himself, with whom the researcher often extensively consults before identifying archives bearing on his subject. The archivist explains the broad outline of the history and organization of the source agency and, consequently, the way in which the documents are arranged. From this consultation, a series of choices of direction, inventories, and finding aids develops, leading ultimately to materials of interest to the subject of research. Frank Burke, "Similarities and Differences: Materials and Methodologies," in Clark, *Archive-Library Relations*, pp. 46-47. We might only add that one of the tasks of archival schools is to educate users of archives.
- 36 In *Archives: The Journal of the British Records Association* XIII, 58 (1977), p. 102.
- 37 "Until 1929 the clerks of the Public Record Office were recruited from the register of Civil Service Commission, regardless of their having any special qualifications for their future work." Ernst Posner, "European experiences in training archivists," *American Archivist* 4 (1941), pp. 26-27.
- 38 Without considering the less recent literature, we can cite: Giulio Battelli, "Archivi, biblioteche e musei: compiti comuni e zone d'interferenza," *Archiva Ecclesiae* V-VI (1962-63), pp. 62-75; Armando Petrucci, "Sui rapporti fra archivi e biblioteche," *Bollettino di informazioni* IV (1964), pp. 213-219; Arnaldo d'Addario, "Archivi e biblioteche: Affinità e differenze," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* XXXVI (1980), pp. 217-230; and Maria Antonietta Quesada, "Due istituti a confronto," *Biblioteche oggi* III, 3 (1985), pp. 11-15.
- 39 Aurelio Tanodi, "Unas consideraciones sobre la enseñanza archivística latinoamericana," *Boletín interamericano de Archivos* II (1975), pp. 7-23.
- 40 Marie Charlotte Stark, *Development of Records Management and Archives Services Within United Nations Agencies: A RAMP Study with Guidelines* (Paris: UNESCO, 1983), p. 42. (PGI-83/WS/26)
- 41 *Ibid.* This sentence is even stronger in the French version. It reads: "L'archivistique n'a pas encore accédé au rang de matière d'enseignement autonome."
- 42 Antonio Panella, "Le Scuole degli Archivi di Stato," in Antonio Panella, *Scritti archivistici* (Roma: Ministero dell' Interno, 1955), p. 72.
- 43 *Ibid.*
- 44 William J. Orr, "Archival Training in Europe," *American Archivist* 44 (1981), pp. 27-39.
- 45 Ruth W. Helmuth, "Education for American Archivists: A View From the Trenches," *American Archivist* 44 (1981), p. 302.
- 46 Ministero dell' Interno. Direzione generale degli Archivi di Stato. *La legge sugli archivi* (Roma, 1963), p. 72. The same legislative text (article 36) allows the state to declare archives to be of "notable historical interest" and determine their care. The previous law of 22 December 1939, no. 2006, art. 22, was much more flexible. It provided for a declaration of "particularly important interest," an interest which could be archival and not necessarily historical.
- 47 Many archivists, besides being scholars of archival science, which, because they are archivists, ought to be the only guide to their scientific activity, are also scholars of other disciplines such as history, law, economy, paleography, diplomatics, heraldry, etc. on their own time. Many such people in Italy are ex-archivists who have become university professors not only of archival science (these are in a minority because of the few positions in archival science in the universities) but also of history, history of law and institutions, history of economy, paleography, diplomatics, etc. in faculties of law, political science, economics, arts and philosophy, etc. Furthermore, many

archivists have held temporary appointments in universities while they worked in archives, thereby giving a precious contribution to archives and universities, as in the cases of Eugenio Casanova and Antonio Panella. Unfortunately, an absurd law in 1980 has prohibited temporary appointments and other valuable traditions like voluntary teaching and assistantships. Now the archivist will not be able to volunteer his services to teach archives, nor other scholars to do the same in their disciplines. As in many other places, laws or regulations which devalue professional competence have been drawn up and adopted.

- 48 Virginia C. Purdy, "Archivaphobia: Its Causes and Cure," in *Prologue* 15, 2 (1983), pp. 115-119.
- 49 Francesco Bonaini first made this observation in a report dated 23 March 1867 published by Antonio Panella, "L'ordinamento storico e la formazione di un archivio generale in una relazione inedita di Francesco Bonaini," *Archivi II, III* (1936), pp. 37-39 and republished in A. Panella, *Scritti archivistici* (Roma, 1955), pp. 215-218.
- 50 S. Muller, J.A. Feith, and R. Fruin, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, translation of the second edition by Arthur H. Leavitt (New York: H.W. Wilson Company, 1940). As is well-known, the original Dutch of this precious volume has also been translated into German (1905), Italian (1908), French (1910), and Portuguese (1960). As the manual puts it, "in the arrangement of an archival collection the interests of historical research should receive only secondary consideration." (p. 65) In the formulation of German scholars, it is said that "archival considerations take precedence over historical ones."
- 51 The program of examination for promotion of state archivists in Italy to "First Archivist" includes the subject "secondary importance of the interests of historical research in the arrangement of archival fonds" (tabella c, allegato 3, lettera B, Regolamento per gli Archivi di Stato italiani, R.D. 2 ottobre 1911, n 1163).
- 52 The purpose of the research "must never have an influence on the arrangement of an archival fonds." Eugenio Casanova, *Archivistica* (Siena, 1928), p. 153.
- 53 Only as a consequence of the adoption of the rules of archival science can one fully serve and facilitate the research of other disciplines. I treat this matter in my *Archivistica: Principi e problemi* (Milano: Franco Angeli editore, 1984). Second edition, 1985, third edition, 1986. See also my article "Ordinamento dell' archivio e ricerca storica [arrangement of archives and historical research]" *Storia in Lombardia* V, 2 (1986), pp. 169-81.