

# *The Reclamation of Archival Description: The Canadian Perspective*

by **WENDY M. DUFF** and **KENT M. HAWORTH**

Traditionally, archives have existed to serve administrators wishing to preserve a record of transactions. As long as administrative transactions remained an informal process based on personal trust, there was little need for proof or evidence that the transaction had taken place. The need to document transactions and to communicate information about those transactions to others led to the invention of writing and the creation of archives. To retrieve the documents and to communicate information about them to users, archivists created descriptions which could serve as representations of the original transactions and related records preserved in their archives. Consequently, archives have evolved, together with libraries and other documentation centres, as an essential part of the chain of human communication.<sup>1</sup>

Even in pre-modern societies “the use of written texts for administrative purposes [stemmed] from the practice of having officials take turns in administrative responsibilities . . . [thus creating] the need for strict accounting and well-ordered archives.”<sup>2</sup> Improvements in the administration and use of archives became necessary as the volume of administrative records increased. To ensure the efficient retrieval of increasing volumes of records, archivists had to develop new methods of organizing them. At first, the archivist could exploit the physical arrangement of the records to locate and retrieve those required. But as Michael Cook has noted, to find records through their physical arrangement requires the handling of them.<sup>3</sup>

To improve retrieval, archivists in the ancient world created brief descriptions of the documents in their custody, including “an indication of the type of document found in the respective container or group of containers, together with information on the official responsible for the creation of the records; and . . . the inclusive dates.”<sup>4</sup> At first these descriptions were attached to the documents themselves, or to the containers that housed the documents. This enabled the archivist to browse the shelves without handling the documents. Subsequently, archivists progressed to preparing lists of their holdings by duplicating the descriptions they had affixed to the documents. However, these lists corresponded to the physical arrangement of the documents on the shelf. As a result, the archivists still needed to know how the documents were physically arranged on the shelf, or to scan their lists to retrieve documents. The next step in the evolution of description was to create descriptions that could be organized in ways that did not

always correspond to the physical arrangement of the documents they represented. At this stage, physical and intellectual access could be separated. Multiple descriptions of the same records could be created and organized in different ways, thereby improving access.

The use of the descriptions also shifted: descriptions originally prepared for use by archivists themselves eventually began to be used by others. Moreover, the uses to which archives were put also began to shift. Records originally created to document a transaction began to be used as much for their informational value as for their legal or evidential value. Therefore, to improve retrieval and to ensure that users understood the context in which the records were created, archivists developed new descriptive techniques.

Although archivists have always described the records in their custody, until recently standards for archival description did not exist. Different archivists in different countries, different institutions in the same country, and even different archivists in the same institution have recorded different types of information to describe their records. Rather than develop standards for description, archivists relied on manuals written by other archivists to guide their descriptive practices. These manuals tended to promote techniques developed by institutions to present a uniform format for the presentation of their finding aids. Archivists from large government record repositories, such as Jenkinson and Schellenberg, outlined the procedures for preparing descriptions to represent the records contained in their archives.<sup>5</sup> Others have written from the perspective of smaller archives. As Michael Cook points out, the authors of many of these manuals “described the work and materials they were accustomed to, added an analysis of the underlying problems, and a superstructure of theory, and produced the whole as a kind of complete and self-justifying system.”<sup>6</sup> This in no way diminishes the importance of these manuals, because they proposed a foundation of common practice on which the future development of standards and rules of description could be built.

During the 1980s archivists in Britain, the United States and Canada embarked on projects to develop standards and rules for archival description in their respective countries. These three projects, undertaken independently of one another, have produced differing sets of rules, each reflecting the distinctive archival traditions which have influenced their development.

In Britain, grants from the British Library Board and the Society of Archivists funded the establishment of the Archival Description Project at the University of Liverpool. The project report, *Manual of Archival Description (MAD)* proposed a descriptive standard for creating finding aids.<sup>7</sup> In developing their standard, the Archival Description Project rejected the use of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2)*<sup>8</sup> or any of its modifications as a standard for archival description. Despite the work of several American archivists in the early 1980s to adapt *AACR2* to accommodate archival description, Michael Cook took the position in Britain in 1984

that up to the present it has not been possible to produce a standard for archival description which is adapted from *AACR2* or any of its derivatives, and which has been widely accepted by archivists as a useful tool for ordinary purposes within repositories. The Archival Description Project which worked at Liverpool University during 1984-5 took this view, and suggested in its report that there would be scope for further research on seeking to develop an *AACR2*-compatible standard.<sup>9</sup>

Nevertheless, Cook did acknowledge the need to have standards for archival description that could be compatible with *AACR2* when he noted that “the increasing demand for international standards and provision for immediately accessible data bases makes it important for us to reach for solutions. It is not acceptable that library and archival standards for the description of their materials should continue to be so irreconcilable.”<sup>10</sup>

In the United States, automation was one of the forces driving the interest of archivists in the development of standardized descriptions of archival materials. Two competing database projects seeking the endorsement of the Society of American Archivists in 1977 caused the SAA to establish the National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) to study existing descriptive practices and to recommend a minimum set of data elements for archival description.<sup>11</sup> These objectives were modified somewhat in the course of the mandate of the Task Force; when it had completed its work it had produced, among other things, a comprehensive data element standard, applicable to both manual and automated systems.<sup>12</sup> The production of a data element standard eventually resulted in the development of a “Machine Readable Catalogue for Archives and Manuscript Control” (MARC-AMC), which was approved for use by the Library of Congress, the SAA and the cataloguing standards committee of the American Library Association in 1983.<sup>13</sup> Archivists in the United States thus had an automated data structure standard providing the elements that should be included in an archival description.<sup>14</sup> However, if the data structure standard was to benefit archivists they still required data content standards (or rules for archival description) to guide them in their descriptions, and thus ensure some uniformity in the way they described archival materials.<sup>15</sup> They also wanted to ensure that descriptions of archival material were compatible with bibliographic descriptions. As a result, American archivists developed a standard of archival description based on *AACR2*. In 1980, the Joint Committee on Specialized Cataloguing obtained a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to assist in the preparation of *AACR2*-based cataloguing manuals for archives.<sup>16</sup> The Library of Congress entered into an agreement with the Committee to enable Library of Congress staff to write the first draft of manuals for cataloguing archival manuscripts, graphic materials and moving images.<sup>17</sup> The emphasis of these manuals was on collective and item level descriptions. Emerging from the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, they also focused more on the description of “manuscript collections” in research libraries and historical societies, than on public records in government archives. In the United States, the historical manuscripts tradition influenced the development of descriptive standards. The historical manuscripts tradition had its roots in librarianship, since early manuscript collections were acquired by libraries and historical societies that were managed by librarians. The “public archives tradition,” on the other hand, had its origins in the national and state archives of the United States and was more influenced by European thought.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, some of the major research libraries that had established their own information systems were eager to input archival descriptive records into their automated retrieval systems.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, many government archives in the United States remained outside the mainstream of these initiatives.

By adapting *AACR2*, the authors of the cataloguing manuals emanating from the Library of Congress ensured the creation of archival descriptions that could be easily integrated into existing bibliographic databases. Steven Hensen, who was employed at that time by the Library of Congress, was given the task of adapting chapter 4 of

*AACR2* which dealt with Manuscripts. He found chapter 4 inadequate for the description of archival material because it overemphasized the cataloguing of items and underemphasized the cataloguing of collections. Clearly, the influence of the historical manuscripts tradition in the United States, rooted as it is in librarianship, prevailed over the public archives tradition in developing rules for the description of archival materials.

Steven Hensen, in recounting the history of these initiatives, observed that

all of these projects approached the task of writing the manuals with two basic premises: first, that the respective chapters in *AACR2* on description (chapter 4: Manuscripts; chapter 7: Motion Pictures and Video Recording; chapter 8: Graphic Materials) failed to comprehend in some important way the essential “bibliographic” nature of material and thus provided inadequate prescriptions for its description; and second, that any revisions were nevertheless obliged to adhere to the basic thrust and structure of the whole of *AACR2* — most particularly that bibliographic records created under these revisions would be compatible with other *AACR2*-based descriptions.<sup>20</sup>

In writing the first edition of *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* Hensen remained consistent with the structure of *AACR2*, but he shifted the emphasis from item level cataloguing to the description of collections.<sup>21</sup> In addition, Hensen placed more emphasis on the descriptive areas relating to the content and analysis of the material and less on its physical aspects. *AACR2*, with its emphasis on describing the book or other material as an object, had taken the opposite approach. Hensen also altered the chief source of information from the manuscripts themselves (as in *AACR2*) to the finding aids prepared by archivists. Making the finding aid the chief source was justified, Hensen argued, because it “puts in proper perspective the pivotal role that these finding aids have in the archival descriptive process, in which the cataloguing is almost always derived from, and dependent on, the fuller detail they contain.”<sup>22</sup> In 1989 the Society of American Archivists (SAA) published the second revised edition of *APPM*, and in the same year they formally endorsed the manual as a standard for archival description.<sup>23</sup>

In Britain, Michael Cook and Margaret Procter mainly concerned themselves with developing standards and rules for the creation and presentation of finding aids.<sup>24</sup> The Americans, on the other hand, concerned themselves with developing standards for the creation of cataloguing records of their finding aids for entry into large bibliographic databases. Both efforts were primarily the work of a few archivists working independently. In Canada the process was very different.

In the early 1980s, efforts by the archival profession in Canada to elicit support for the development of standards for the arrangement and description of archival materials were accelerated when the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council granted to the Bureau of Canadian Archivists, representing the archival profession in Canada, \$97,250 to support a Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards. While some of the objectives of the Canadian Working Group were similar to the National Information Systems Task Force in the United States, the results of its work were considerably different.<sup>25</sup> Unlike NISTF, the Canadian Working Group had only one year “to produce a set of proposals for adoption by the Canadian archival community in the area of developing standards and guidelines for the description of archival materials.”<sup>26</sup> The Canadian Working Group wisely recognized that they could not produce descriptive

standards and rules in one year. Instead, their report, aptly titled *Toward Descriptive Standards*, placed before the profession recommendations, based on archival principles and reflecting the Canadian archival tradition, that could lead to the development of descriptive standards and rules if support for such complex work could be made available. Their recommendations eventually became the framework for a process of development of rules for archival description undertaken by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists with the financial support of the Canadian Council of Archives.

It was indeed fortuitous for the archival profession in Canada that just as the Canadian Working Group's report was published, archivists had been mobilizing support among the federal/provincial/territorial governments for a Canadian archival system. Their efforts were rewarded when the federal minister responsible for the National Archives of Canada approved the establishment of the Canadian Council of Archives (CCA). The CCA convened its first meeting in November 1985 and the Report of the Working Group, entitled *Toward Descriptive Standards*, was published the following month.<sup>27</sup> The recommendations contained in *Toward Descriptive Standards* were carried forward by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists to the CCA, representing archival institutions in Canada, with a request for funding to support the work of descriptive standards development. The passage of the *National Archives of Canada Act* (which replaced the *Public Archives Act* of 1912) in 1987 enabled the National Archives of Canada "to encourage archival activities and the archival community." For the first time the National Archives' role in supporting the development of Canada's archival community had a firm statutory basis.<sup>28</sup> With legislation in place that gave authority to National Archives, support of professional endeavours, it was able to direct funds through the Canadian Council of Archives to assist the profession in its expressed interest to develop descriptive standards for archivists in Canada.

The Canadian Working Group made several recommendations, which included the appointment of committees, subsequently established as working groups, to develop standards of description for textual archives, architectural drawings, photographic and other graphic material, moving image material, sound recordings, and machine readable archives. This focus on the development of rules for all media is consistent with Canada's "total archives" tradition, characterized as an institutional strategy that, unlike many European or United States archives, permits archives to "actively acquire both the official records and extensive range of private materials in all documentary media bearing on the life of their institution or region."<sup>29</sup>

The Canadian Working Group also recommended the development of authority files, the use of *AACR2* rules for the formation of personal, geographic and corporate names, and the investigation of issues and problems related to the subject indexing of archives. At its last meeting, the authors of the Report recommended to the Bureau that a Standards Committee be established to ensure that their specific recommendations be carried out, and to direct generally the work of descriptive standards development on behalf of the profession in Canada.

The Standards Committee's membership were comprised of two representatives from the Association des archivistes du Québec (AAQ) and two representatives from the Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA). At its first meeting in January 1987 the members of the Committee agreed to expand its membership to include the Secretary-General of the Bureau and a representative of the National Archives of Canada as an

observer. At the same time the Committee also changed its name to the Planning Committee on Descriptive Standards (PCDS) more properly to reflect its mandate as a planning and coordinating body. Since that time it has established, or will establish, several working groups based on the various media found in archives: for example, graphic materials, machine readable records, architectural drawings, textual records, sound recordings, moving image materials — to draft rules for the description of their respective media at the fonds, series, file and item levels. The first two chapters of *Rules for Archival Description* (General Rules for description and rules for the description of multiple media fonds) were published in October 1990.

The different approaches to the development of descriptive standards in Canada, Britain and the United States have resulted in quite different products, and reflect the different archival traditions of the three countries. The PCDS and its Working Groups have conducted their work by analysing archival description and certain fundamental principles, or “common assumptions” as they were labelled in *Toward Descriptive Standards*, upon which archival description is based.

When considering standards and rules for description it is essential for archivists to understand what archival description is. The descriptive process commences after accessioning and arrangement are completed.<sup>30</sup> Accordingly, a fonds can be represented accurately by portraying context and the relationships of its parts after the archivist has discerned its arrangement. Therefore, archival finding aids should resemble structural representation files, as Michael Cook has characterized them.<sup>31</sup> In other words, accurate description should present to users both a description representing whole to part relationships and a means of achieving, as efficiently and independently as possible, access to the information they require. As a result, an accurate archival description will represent the structural manifestations of a fonds.

To complicate matters, the nature of archives, unlike most published materials found in libraries, prevents us from fixing forever, or at least until a fonds is closed, a complete description of, for example, the physical extent and outside dates of the fonds. When rules for archival description are developed, the fluid, organic nature of the materials which archivists arrange and describe must be considered together with those archival principles that govern our descriptive practices. Today, this is no easy task for archivists in the struggle to manage the records of complex bureaucracies and the overwhelming volumes of information being generated. Nevertheless, it is essential for archivists to be mindful of the organic nature and structure of the fonds and its parts, which is determined by its arrangement. The description must reflect that arrangement.

Having established the purpose and place of the descriptive process in the management of archives, the archivist must consider those archival principles which govern the way a fonds is arranged and described. Observance of these principles will perforce determine the rules for the description of a fonds and its parts.

One principle, often referred to as **respect des fonds**, holds that records created or accumulated by one records creator must be kept together and not intermixed with the records of other creators. It is this fundamental principle upon which the rules in *Rules for Archival Description* are based.<sup>32</sup> A second principle follows from the observance of **respect des fonds**: the way archives are described depends on their arrangement. Implicit in the archivist’s respect for provenance is the assumption that the way a creator “automatically and organically accumulates records” will affect the way archivists

arrange a fonds. Accordingly, a fonds cannot be described until it has been arranged. Similarly, levels of arrangement will determine the level of description, and accurate descriptions should represent the relative levels of arrangement, for example, fonds, series, file and item. Archivists in the United States, on the other hand, have not fully developed rules for description that reflect multiple levels of arrangement. Rather than being based on arrangement, levels of description are based on "provenance or physical form."<sup>33</sup> By structuring our rules on principles governing the nature of archives, Canadians have followed more closely a structure similar to that developed by Michael Cook and Margaret Procter in Britain.<sup>34</sup>

Another principle governing descriptive practise that should be examined requires that all descriptive work must proceed from the general to the specific.<sup>35</sup> In order to place the description of a series that is part of a fonds in context, one must have a description of the fonds of which the series is a part. Users must know the context in which the records they are consulting have been created. It is incumbent upon archivists, therefore, to have intellectual control of their holdings first at the fonds level, before proceeding to lower levels of description. These archival principles have informed the drafting of rules for archival description in Canada.<sup>36</sup> As a result, their application will ensure the accurate representation of a fonds to users.

A distinctive feature of the rules for archival description being developed by Canadian archivists is that they do not define or prescribe products, that is, the Canadian rules do not dictate finding aids of any particular type to institutions. Instead, the rules prescribe only the contents of a variety of data elements that can be used in description. No communications formats or data structure standards are endorsed or recommended, as the Americans have done, to exchange information about archival holdings. Nevertheless, the automated machine readable catalogue known as the MARC format, used by librarians, can certainly accommodate archival requirements because *RAD* is based on the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBDs).<sup>37</sup>

Both Canadians and Americans, in the process of developing standards and rules for the description of archival materials, have disproved the belief among archivists that the idiosyncratic nature of archives defies their description in a standardized format.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, the means by which Canadians and Americans have chosen to accomplish the same ends are decidedly different. At the same time, the presentation of *RAD* has also challenged the assertion by the authors of *MAD2* that the application of *AACR2* "is not appropriate to the description of archives."<sup>39</sup>

Much work remains to be done, particularly at the international level, to coordinate the development of descriptive standards and rules. Some would argue that the "principles" upon which *RAD* is based are really only assumptions because there is, as yet, no formal unanimity among archivists about their universal nature. This points to the need for an international congress of archivists to produce a Statement of Principles such as those endorsed by librarians in Paris in 1961.<sup>40</sup>

Several countries have developed, or are in the process of developing, national systems to control and make available information contained in archives. At the national and provincial level, Canadian archives have made conscious decisions to postpone the development of automated systems until professionally agreed upon rules for archival description are in place. Experience has shown administrators that the development costs for automated systems are considerably reduced if standards are in place before, rather than after, automated systems are implemented.

Beyond the Canadian scene, there is a growing interest in the development of sharing information in archives internationally. The reservations which apply to the development of local and national automated linked systems are equally relevant to the international arena. Here the International Council on Archives is playing a leadership role in drawing the attention of archivists to the importance of discussing and achieving consensus on the general purposes of archival description, and the principles upon which archivists base their descriptive work. This is an essential first step in any international initiatives that may be taken in the development of standards, rules and common applications.

The International Council on Archives has already taken the initiative in this process by inviting a consultative group to Paris in December 1989 "for the purpose of planning a long-term international action for the development of descriptive standards for archives."<sup>41</sup> This group agreed that before any international descriptive standards development could take place a statement of principles with respect to archival description should be drafted. Subsequently, the ICA established an Ad Hoc Commission for the Development of Descriptive Standards to prepare internationally applicable rules for archival description. The Commission, with representation from Portugal, Sweden, Spain, Malaysia, Britain, France, Canada, the United States and Germany met from 28 to 30 October 1990 in Höhr-Grenzhausen, Germany, to begin this work. The Commission agreed to work toward the writing of rules for archival description, but concluded that if rules were to be accepted by the international community, archival descriptive standards must be based on solid and mutually agreed upon theoretical principles. Therefore, a Statement of Principles respecting archival description was drafted first, to provide a foundation on which to proceed with the drafting of rules. It is intended that this draft Statement of Principles will be circulated to the archival community for comment during the first half of 1991.

The profession's focus on the development of descriptive standards, in Canada and internationally, over the past five years has caused archivists to re-examine their descriptive practices. While description has always formed a substantial portion of the archivist's activities, that descriptive activity has focused for the most part on the description of accessions or the compilation of extensive folder or box lists.<sup>42</sup> The description of a fonds and its parts, based on widely accepted principles such as **respect des fonds**, and the means of representing those descriptions in a standardized format for the benefit of users, have until recently not been given the same measure of attention. The development of descriptive standards and rules has refocused attention on the descriptive traditions, and principles that govern archival description. Archivists are now beginning to reassess and reaffirm those principles which must guide their descriptive practices, and in the process they are reclaiming their responsibility for the accurate description of archival materials for users of archives.

### Notes

- 1 A.C. Foskett, *The Subject Approach to Information* (London, 1977), 3rd edition, p. 1.
- 2 A. Leo Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1967), p. 30.
- 3 Michael Cook, *The Management of Information from Archives* (Brookfield, VT, 1986), p. 103.
- 4 Ernst Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 60.
- 5 Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration* (Oxford, 1922). Therein, see particularly pp. 17-19 (Standardization of Method) and his discussion of arrangement under the "Primary Duties of the Archivist," pp. 66-106; T.R. Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives* (New York 1965). In the same category could be included S. Muller, J.A. Feith and R. Fruin's manual for the *Arrangement and Description of Archives*, 2nd ed. translated by Arthur H. Leavitt (New York 1968).
- 6 Michael Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 1.



- 7 Michael Cook, op. cit., p. 12.
- 8 Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler, eds., *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2ns ed. (Ottawa, 1978), hereafter cited as *AACR2*.
- 9 Michael Cook, op. cit., p. 122.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- 11 Richard H. Lytle, "A National Information System for Archives and Manuscript Collections," *American Archivist*, 43, 3 (Summer 1980), p. 429.
- 12 Richard H. Lytle, "An Analysis of the Work of the National Information Systems Task Force," *American Archivist*, 47, 4 (Fall 1984), pp. 362-3.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 363 and Steven L. Hensen, "Squaring the Circle: the Reformation of Archival Description in AACR2," *Library Trends* (Winter 1988), p. 542.
- 14 Lisa Weber has characterized the difference between the approaches of the United States and Canada to the development of descriptive standards in this way: "... the Americans dove headfirst into the pool and only in mid-air realized that there was no water. The Canadians are first filling the pool." Lisa Weber to Kent Haworth, 22 June 1990.
- 15 David Bearman, "Strategy for the Development and Implementation of Archival Description Standards," Paper presented at Invitational Meeting of Experts on Descriptive Standards (Ottawa, 1988), p. 3. In addition to data structure and data content standards, Bearman includes data value standards (terminology lists, e.g., subject heading lists, thesauri, etc.) as another standard that needs to be developed for descriptive purposes. This construct has been articulated in much greater detail in the Report of the Working Group on Standards for Archival Description, "Archival Description Standards: Establishing a Process for Their Development and Implementation," pp. 28-31. This report and several background papers have been published in *American Archivist*, 52, 4 (Fall 1989).
- 16 "Report of the Working Group on Standards for Archival Description," *American Archivist*, 52, 4 (Fall 1989), Chronology of Key Developments in the Evolution of Standards for Archival Description, pp. 441-449.
- 17 Elizabeth Betz, *Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original Items and Historical Collections* (Washington, D.C., 1982), and Wendy White-Hensen, *Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual* (Washington, D.C., [1984]).
- 18 Richard Berner, *Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis* (Seattle, 1983), pp. 1-2.
- 19 In his introduction to the first edition of *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts*, Steven Hensen states, "A fundamental and compelling rationale for this attempt to reconcile manuscript and archival cataloguing and description with the conventions of AACR2 lies in the burgeoning national systems for automated bibliographic description." Steven L. Hensen, comp., *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries* (Washington, D.C., 1983), p. 1 (hereafter cited as *APPM*).
- 20 Hensen "Squaring the Circle . . .," p. 542.
- 21 *APPM*, pp. 1-2; Lisa Weber, "Archival Description Standards: Concepts, Principles, and Methodologies," *American Archivist*, 52, 4 (Fall 1989), p. 510.
- 22 Hensen, p. 545. Patricia Cloud has pointed out the pitfalls of this approach in her study of the cost-effectiveness of converting traditional archival descriptions into a bibliographic data-base when the chief source of information is an archival finding aid. Her study of several repositories involved in reconversion projects revealed that "... the existing finding aids proved inadequate in a significant number of cases . . ." because "critical information such as date, language, and extent" were missing from the finding aid. Patricia Cloud, "The Cost of Converting to MARC AMC," *Library Trends* (Winter 1988), pp. 576-77. *RAD* establishes the chief source of information at the fonds level as the fonds itself in order to avoid the perpetuation of faulty archival descriptions.
- 23 Steven L. Hensen, *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts, A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies and Manuscript Libraries*, 2nd ed. (Chicago 1989), hereafter cited as *APPM2*; Society of American Archivists Council Meeting Minutes, St. Louis, Missouri, 24 October 1989, published in *American Archivist*, 52, 4 (Fall 1989), p. 570.
- 24 Michael Cook and Margaret Procter, *Manual of Archival Description*, 2nd ed. (Brookfield, VT 1989), p. xii, hereafter cited as *MAD2*. It should be noted here that *Rules for Archival Description* (Ottawa, 1990), unlike *APPM*, does not adopt the finding aid as the chief source of information, as is stated in *MAD2*, p. xiii.
- 25 Terry Eastwood, "Improving the Retrieval of Information in Archives," *Archives, Automation & Access* (Victoria, 1985), p. 49.

- 26 *Toward Descriptive Standards, Report and Recommendations of the Canadian Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards* (Ottawa, December 1985), pp. 2-3.
- 27 *The Canadian Archival System: A Report on the National Needs and Priorities of Archives*, Summary Report, August 1989 (Ottawa, 1989), pp. 3-5.
- 28 Statutes of Canada, 35-36 Elizabeth II, c. 1, sec. 4.
- 29 *Canadian Archives: Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada by the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives* (Ottawa, 1980), p. 63.
- 30 *RAD*, Rule 0.2.
- 31 Michael Cook, *The Management of Information from Archives*, p. 104.
- 32 *Rules for Archival Description* (Ottawa, 1990), Rule 0.22, hereafter cited as *RAD*.
- 33 *APPM2*, Rule 0.12, p. 5.
- 34 Michael Cook, *The Management of Information from Archives* (Brookfield, VT, 1986) provides the theoretical foundations for *MAD2*, and their companion, *MAD User Guide* (Brookfield, VT, 1989).
- 35 T.R. Schellenberg, "Archival Principles of Arrangement," in *A Modern Archives Reader* (Washington, D.C., 1984), p. 149. See also Jacques Ducharme, who refers to this principle as the "principle of universality," in Carol Couture and Jean-Yves Rousseau, *The Life of a Document* (Montreal, 1987), p. 199.
- 36 *RAD*, Rule 0.3.
- 37 For an explanation of the place of the ISBDs in bibliographic description and of their purpose, see *Toward Descriptive Standards*, pp. 20-21.
- 38 Lytle, "An Analysis of the Work of the National Information Systems Task Force," p. 365; *Toward Descriptive Standards*, p. 78.
- 39 *MAD2*, p. xiii.
- 40 The Paris Principles, an international agreement among librarians, represented the culmination of two hundred years of history in the development of cataloguing standards and rules for the description of published materials. They were a statement of principles related to, among other things, the functions and structure of the library catalogue. See *Statement of Principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles* (Paris, 1961), annotated edition with commentary and examples by Eva Verona (London, 1971).
- 41 Hugo L.P. Stibbe to Working Party on Descriptive Standards, 5 July 1990. The National Archives of Canada's Office of Archival Descriptive Standards has agreed to coordinate the international effort by serving as the ICA Secretariat for international descriptive standards initiatives.
- 42 Terry Eastwood has pointed out that "the very conception of archival description and its connection with the organic nature of archives has conspired to impel archivists along a course strewn increasingly with relatively meaningless, because inaccessible, lists." "Improving the Retrieval of Information in Archives," op. cit., p. 56.