

## ***An Archival Practitioner's Views on Archival Literature: Where We Have Been and Where We Are Going***

by VICTORIA LEMIEUX\*

### ***Where Have We Been?***

The amount of archival literature is growing at an exponential rate. Bibliographies, such as the ones produced by the Canadian Centre for Information and Documentation on Archives (CCIDA) and the Archives Library Information Centre (ALIC),<sup>1</sup> are burgeoning with citations of new archival literature. As further evidence of the growing body of archival literature, Volume 36 of *Archivaria* was so large that it should have been issued with a warning on the packaging to lift only with the legs, not with the back! The increasing number of archival publications can be viewed as an encouraging sign that speaks to the growing maturity of our profession. The question to be explored in this article is: Does the existing body of literature meet the needs of "working level" archivists; is it of use to the archival practitioner? I will address this question from my own perspective as a working level archivist and records manager.

What ought working level archivists expect of archival literature? What are its uses for archival practitioners? Above all else, working level archivists rely on archival literature to guide archival practice. What type of literature satisfies this requirement? Although one naturally might assume that the archival practitioner would find literature that takes a very pragmatic approach to archives administration to be most useful, my own experience suggests that writings of a more philosophical nature are equally useful. Let me pause briefly to define the terms theory, methodology, and practice. For the purposes of this article, the definitions that Terry Eastwood uses in his article "Nailing a Little Jelly to the Wall of Archival Studies" will serve. Eastwood defines theory as "the analysis of ideas" and archival theory as "the analysis of ideas about archives." He defines methodology as "ideas based on theory about how to

treat archival material and rules of procedure for their treatment.” Practice, he says, consists of the results of the application of methodology in the treatment of archival material.<sup>2</sup> Articles that address theoretical aspects of archives administration are useful to working level archivists in that they indicate what ought or could be done, while writings on methodologies for applying theoretical concepts or that are of a practical bent indicate how archivists can “operationalize” theories.<sup>3</sup> In addition to archival literature that serves to guide archival practice, working level archivists also benefit from writings that inspire. Archivists can become so caught up in the minutia of daily archival activity that they lose track of the larger questions, such as “why am I doing this?” Theoretical pieces that explore the boundaries of archival thought and challenge the archivist to look at matters from a fresh perspective are inspirational. Such inspirational literature gives the working level archivist a sense of the “big picture” that is essential not only to avoid archival burnout but to perform archival work effectively.

From my perspective, the current body of archival literature fails to meet the needs of working level archivists on several scores. It is particularly weak in terms of suggesting how to operationalize theories and methodologies. What follows are observations based on my own experiences with specific areas of weakness in the current body of archival literature.

### ***Electronic Records Management***

The management of electronic records has become an increasingly pressing issue for most working level archivists. Nowadays, many records for which archival practitioners are responsible are in electronic form. My own experiences have been no exception. While I worked for the City of Edmonton, the Office of the City Clerk installed word processing, spreadsheet, database, and electronic mail applications on a Local Area Network. Over time, the existing systems resulted in a buildup of data on various servers, difficulties in retrieving information, and unnecessary duplication. These problems presented me with an opportunity to develop a records management plan for the Office of the City Clerk’s electronic records and an environment in which to experiment with this plan. As I knew very little about managing electronic records, I scoured the available literature on electronic records management to learn more.

While I do not intend to give a detailed review of all the sources that I read, I want to mention a few. Some earlier literature on the subject of machine-readable records--literature on the so-called first generation of computerized records emphasizing the management of large statistical or survey data files--was not relevant to my situation within an automated office.<sup>4</sup> However, the publication *Archival Management of Electronic Records*, edited by David Bearman, was helpful for the insights of its contributing authors on the nature of electronic records and the particular challenges to archival management that their nature poses.<sup>5</sup> Bearman’s *Archives and Museum Informatics Bulletin* also offered many useful contributions on current developments in the field of electronic records management. I recall one piece, in particular, summarizing a meeting in Rome to discuss the impact of electronic records on archival theory; the deliberations that took place at this meeting have since formed the basis of a recent publication edited by Charles Dollar.<sup>6</sup> This piece was of interest

to me because one task that I undertook in developing an electronic records management plan was to write an operational definition of electronic records. I needed a definition that would help electronic mail users decide which of the messages in their electronic in-baskets they should treat as record material. At the time, I would have found it very useful to have been able to refer to some archival text containing a ready-made operational definition of electronic records. However, as no such text was available, I turned to the literature I thought would provide me with some direction. In pondering this question, as well as many others, some articles have served as intellectual touchstones for me. Luciana Duranti's series of articles on diplomatics has been just such a touchstone.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, a more precise definition of electronic records--both nominal and operational--has proved elusive. To forge a more precise definition, archivists will need to build first upon a theoretical understanding of the nature of records and second upon a theoretical understanding of the nature of electronic records, whether different or similar to records in general.

Since I first began to ponder the nature of electronic records, much has been written on the subject. The publications *Archival Theory and Information Technologies: The Impact of Information Technology on Archival Principles and Methods*, edited by Charles Dollar, *Archiving Electronic Records*, by David Bearman, and *Electronic Records Program Strategies*, edited by David Bearman and Margaret Hedstrom, offer but a few examples.<sup>8</sup> This new crop of archival literature on the management of electronic records should enrich the discussion of the nature of the electronic record. With research agendas such as that advanced in the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) publication *Research Issues in Electronic Records* and that of the ICA Electronic Records Committee, more consistent views of the term electronic records should emerge.<sup>9</sup>

Part of the plan to manage the Office of the City Clerk's electronic records included developing retention schedules. For this task, the National Archives and Records Administration publication *Managing Electronic Records* was very useful because of the model retention and disposal guidelines it provides in an appendix.<sup>10</sup> Of the sources that I read, among the most useful were several handouts that I had received at a seminar on appraising electronic records conducted by Terry Cook and Jerry O'Brien, which presented a methodology for appraising electronic records.<sup>11</sup> What none of the literature offered me, and what I am still searching for, is a plan to operationalize the appraisal theories and methods espoused by various authors. For example, I was left wondering how, once I had decided which electronic records have value and documented their value in a retention schedule, should I go about implementing the retention schedule and transferring electronic records of long-term value to the archives? In a recent article on the control of electronic records having archival value, Candace Loewen makes a related observation, noting that "discussions of appraisal, and especially appraisal of the newest magnetic media abound, but few in the profession have addressed the issue of what to do once electronic records are inside archives."<sup>12</sup>

While I was with the City of Edmonton, I also became involved in designing system requirements for a proposed Office of the City Clerk document management system, which was intended to integrate work-flow software with imaging. One issue with which the design team (which included systems analysts and operational managers)

dealt was the risk of liability arising from information systems' data entry errors, processing errors, and use errors. Systems literature was not entirely applicable, however, archival literature sheds some light on this issue. Articles by David Bearman and Charles Dollar in recent issues of *Archivaria* offer useful insights into functional requirements for record-keeping systems and developing strategies to avoid liability.<sup>13</sup> It is not surprising that the application of the archival sensibility to the question of liability should prove fruitful given that both archival science and the law view the record as evidence of acts and facts (the concept of probative value). If the prognostications of authors such as Bearman and Dollar prove true and if my own experiences are any indication, archivists will increasingly find themselves involved in systems design as a regular part of their work. In that case, studies such as the one being conducted at the University of Pittsburgh on functional requirements for record-keeping systems will be quite useful to the working level archivist.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Access to Information and Privacy***

Another of the issues that working level archivists increasingly seem to face is access to information and privacy. During the time that I was with the City of Edmonton, the Provincial Government of Alberta was in the throes of preparing a new *Municipal Government Act*. This draft piece of legislation--*Bill 51*--contained provisions on access to and privacy of information held by municipal government agencies.<sup>15</sup> Before *Bill 51* had cleared the order paper, the Provincial Government had drafted *Bill 61*, a separate proposed statute on access to information and the protection of privacy. *Bill 61* later became *Bill 1* and has since passed into law. The draft legislation potentially applied to municipalities as well as to provincial government departments and agencies, which is why I became involved in preparing various briefs and reports on this issue.<sup>16</sup> In doing so, I found Heather MacNeil's book *Without Consent: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information in Public Archives* and her article in *Archivaria* "Defining the Limits of Freedom of Inquiry: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information Held in Government Archives" extremely valuable for the review of the concept of privacy they included.<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, they offered me little in terms of the other side of the coin--access. Also of some help was Frances Fournier's article on the development of the City of Vancouver's Freedom of Information and Privacy By-law in that it provided me with a point of comparison with the Edmonton situation.<sup>18</sup> However, apart from these pieces there was little in the archival literature to guide me. This I find surprising, as I know of many archivists, in particular in Ontario and British Columbia, who have been involved in developing and implementing access and privacy legislation. Surely they have had to ponder these same issues; why are they not writing about their thoughts and experiences? Could it be that archivists do not view access to information and privacy as part of the archival mainstream, although at the federal, provincial, and now municipal levels they have responsibility for the administration of access and privacy legislation and policies? Whatever the reasons for such a dearth of archival literature relating to this subject, working level archivists would benefit from more writings of a theoretical, methodological, and practical nature on access to information and privacy.

### ***User Fees***

The question of whether to charge for the provision of government information and, more specifically, whether to establish user fees in the City's archives also arose during my tenure with the City of Edmonton. Governments are looking for new ways of generating revenue in order to balance budgets and avoid raising taxes. This was the case at the City of Edmonton, where there was a ground-swell of interest in revenue-generating enterprises after practically every City Council member read the book called *Reinventing Government*.<sup>19</sup> In this case a little knowledge proved a dangerous thing, as one member of Council quickly proposed that a twenty-five cent user fee be charged to every person using the City Archives. Although I was not directly involved in the preparation of the report responding to this Council motion, I too was grappling with the question of fees for information services, as the City Clerk's Office had been asked to look into this as a budget exercise and as part of the review of access to information policies. I found next to nothing in the body of archival literature that would help me address this issue, save for a Saskatchewan Archivists Society *Checklist* that printed an Internet exchange on this subject and some material on the National Archives of Canada's User Fees Policy.<sup>20</sup> Yet--again--I know that I am not the only archivist wrestling with this issue, so I wonder why there is not more in the way of archival literature on this topic. The literature in the library science field proved to be my main source of information on this subject.

In fact, I would even go further to argue that there is a relative paucity of literature generally relating to the management of archival institutions. There are some notable exceptions, such as Michael J. Kurtz's and James Gregory Bradsher's offerings in *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* and Richard J. Cox's *Managing Institutional Archives*.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, in support of the claim that there is too little literature on managing archives, I would offer an informal content analysis of the most recent ALIC bibliography in which the proportion of literature dealing with archival functions (as these apply to different record types and types of repositories) to literature dealing with management concerns, such as the formulation of policy, user fees, and organizational structure, is roughly seven to one.<sup>22</sup>

### ***Communicating With Resource Allocators***

Often during my career in archives I have been in the position of having to convince resource allocators to spend scarce resources on an archival programme. At these times I have had to respond to the question "why should our organization spend money on archives?" It has been a particularly tough question to answer because the literature focuses more on the "what" questions about archives than the "why" questions. While there are monographs and articles explaining, in the minutest detail, what archivists do, authors often fail to address why archives are important. Again, I will use my informal content analysis of the latest ALIC bibliography as an indicator of the state of affairs concerning archival literature on the meaning and value of archives. There were only 76 entries on this subject as compared with 456 entries dealing with the various archival functions as they relate to different record types and types of archival institutions.<sup>23</sup> Until recently, archival literature, in North America at least, has been rather prosaic. With but few exceptions (for example, the writings

of Hugh Taylor), archivists have not pondered the more philosophical questions; there has been no espousal of a philosophy of archives.<sup>24</sup> I can merely speculate as to the reasons for our “nuts and bolts” literary legacy, although, I disagree with John W. Roberts that we have had few pieces of a philosophical nature because archival science is “much ado about shelving.”<sup>25</sup>

I see the situation changing with respect to this type of literature, as evinced by a growing body of works that are more philosophical in tone. Some recent examples include Theresa Rowat’s “The Record and Repository as a Cultural Form of Expression” and Brien Brothman’s pieces on “deconstructing” archives.<sup>26</sup> Theoretical works like Brien Brothman’s are, above all, good for the archival soul. One needs, once in awhile, to leave behind the fustiness of “the site of dead certainties” to take a wild intellectual romp in search of “live possibilities.”<sup>27</sup> It is good medicine for the archival practitioner now and then to accept a challenge from Hugh Taylor and respond to the question implied in his writing: “What’s your fallacy?”<sup>28</sup> Of the literature that addresses the nature of archives and archival work, I recall coming across one article in the *American Archivist* by Andrea Hinding in which she likens archivists to termites. The article is an interesting commentary on the process of building a collective memory, although I could not quite envision myself using her termite imagery in a presentation to resource allocators.<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, I think theoretical pieces of this ilk are important to the practising archivist for their ability to inspire and give pause for thought. They are reminders that all disciplines, including our own, derive from philosophy and seek to answer the essential questions about man’s nature and place in the universe. We need to write about this much more.

Such literature is not entirely lacking utilitarian benefits. Understanding our purpose as archivists is important to the practising archivist because the more clearly this is defined by archival theorists the easier it will be to develop operational rationales for archives’ existence. The practising archivist can use these rationales to express the importance of archives to resource allocators better. It should be noted that not all of the extant archival literature on the nature and value of archives is esoteric; I have found the chapter entitled “Why Institutional Archives are Important” in Richard J. Cox’s book *Managing Institutional Archives* quite practical and useful.<sup>30</sup>

### ***Appraisal***

Appraisal is never an easy task for the archivist, and the practising archivist often carries it out intuitively. When asked to explain the process of appraisal--how I arrive at my appraisal decisions--I have frequently relied on the standard typology of values first espoused by Schellenberg as much because it is a clearly defined methodology that is easy to communicate as for any theoretical validity it has. But, in doing so, I have probably done myself and the archival profession a disservice, because such typologies oversimplify what we know to be a very complex process and portray the archivist as a mere classifier of the obvious. It is encouraging, though also confusing, to see the array of recent archival literature advancing new appraisal theories. We have moved from “crayons to perfume,” from literature that recommends a methodology of appraisal based on a typology of values determined by assessing the contents of records to appraisal theory that suggests that the archivist’s focus should be the context of the records.<sup>31</sup> What I long to see, as an archival practitioner, is some

research, and subsequent writings, on how to operationalize these new theories so that their mettle can be tested. Interesting ideas remain interesting ideas if not developed further.

### *Archival Description*

About five years ago David Leonard and I decided to compile a guide to sources of genealogical interest in Alberta's archives.<sup>32</sup> We did this with the traditional objective of providing information about sources to researchers. The first draft of *Rules for Archival Description (RAD)* had just been published and we decided to try to use the rules as the data content standard for the guide.<sup>33</sup> This proved easier said than done, as he and I quickly found out.

First, we were using *RAD* to describe material from many different institutions with varied descriptive practices, none of which conformed to the principles of *RAD*. For example, frequently sous-fonds and series had been described without reference to the fonds of which they formed a part. *RAD* was so new then that there was no archival literature to which we could turn for guidance on how to resolve this difficulty. *RAD* was of no help because the rules stated up front that they "assume that the material has been examined, arranged, and the information necessary for description compiled."<sup>34</sup> We were left wondering whether we should abandon our efforts to use *RAD* as a standard or do the work necessary to develop retroactive descriptions of material in the various repositories. In the time since we first set out to compile the guide to genealogical sources, there has been a great deal written by those who now have experience with implementing *RAD*. I recently came across an article by Chris Hives and Blair Taylor describing their experiences with using *RAD* on a project similar to the guide to genealogical sources, the production of a union list in British Columbia.<sup>35</sup> It was comforting to know that others had faced the same dilemmas as we had. Articles such as the one written by Hives and Taylor are extremely valuable for the archival practitioner in that they outline the kinds of issues the archivist is likely to face in undertaking a descriptive project using *RAD* and possible approaches to implementation.

Our second challenge arose from the fact that *RAD* does not prescribe any particular presentation format for the elements in a given descriptive entry. We were on our own in deciding how the descriptive entries in the guide would look. On this occasion, as on many others, I have wished for a compendium of examples on how *RAD* has been applied in different circumstances. This would definitely be a useful tool for the working-level archivist and my hope is that it will someday be developed.

### *Where Are We Going?*

I want to return now to the earlier observations that I made about the uses of archival literature for working level archivists and to make some generalizations about where I think archival literature should be heading. Based on my own experiences, I maintain that the archival practitioner benefits from archival literature of a theoretical or methodological nature by virtue of its power to inspire and inform archival work. As a practising archivist, I find myself, in many ways, on the archival front line in the

sense that I am often in the position of defending and justifying the existence of archives and explaining to non-archivists--hopefully in a meaningful way--what it is that archivists do. However, it is difficult to do this unless the conceptual foundations of our field are solid. This is why we must continue to push back the intellectual frontiers of our discipline, and refine and hone our theories and methodologies. In order to do this it will be necessary for archivists to continue to research and write about new theories and methodologies. I have suggested some, but hardly all, of the areas in which we might continue to develop our theoretical and methodological concepts.

I also maintain that working level archivists need more practically-oriented literature as well. In stating this, I am not suggesting that we return to the days when archival literature consisted of descriptions of "how we do it in our shop." We have matured since then. Archival literature, which used to be literal, shows signs of professional maturity in its greater emphasis on abstract ideas. Rather, I am suggesting that archival literature of a practical nature is needed by the archival practitioner to operationalize and test the validity of theories and methodologies. My own experiences lead me to conclude that there is too little archival literature to guide the archivist in the practical application of principles and processes. New theories and methodologies abound, but exactly how these should be or have been implemented remains to be written about to a large extent. Similarly, many of these new theories and methodologies are relatively untested. Archival practitioners here and there may have experimented with them and have published anecdotal accounts of their results, but--largely--they have not tested these ideas in any systematic way. Consequently, many ideas in current archival literature remain speculative, rather than demonstrable and useful to the archival practitioner.

In order to be in a position to write more about the practical application of theories and methodologies, we need to conduct more applied research. Recently, this kind of scientific approach has fallen out of favour somewhat. For example, in his essay in *The Archival Imagination*, Terry Cook asserts (echoing Hugh Taylor) that archival activity should be an intellectual discipline based on philosophical study of ideas, not an empirical discipline based on scientific study of fact.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, Candace Loewen has written that "many of the roots of an objective and mechanistic approach to science and archives, and of our current environmental dilemma and its connection to science and technology, can be found in the world-view arising out of the seventeenth-century Scientific Revolution, of which Descartes has become the leading symbol."<sup>37</sup> While I understand that these assertions are, partly at least, a reaction against the previously overly literal approach to archives and archival literature, I think Cook and others swing Foucault's pendulum--to borrow a phrase from Umberto Eco--too far in the opposite direction.<sup>38</sup> I think we need to both continue the philosophical development of ideas about archives (theory) and to become more systematic in trying to carry out empirical testing of these ideas against consensual (I will not speak of objective reality lest I am accused of being a positivist) reality.<sup>39</sup> This interplay between theory, methodology, and practical experience is an essential ingredient for the vitality of our discipline.

How can we ensure the future development of our discipline and its body of literature? I have two suggestions based on the premise that there is naturally a close

link between research on archives and archival literature. The first suggestion came to mind after I read the NHPRC publication *Research Issues in Electronic Records*, which sets out to identify issues relating to electronic records management, describe research opportunities, and determine priorities for projects.<sup>40</sup> My suggestion is simply that we develop a plan, a framework of the kind of theoretical and empirical research that needs to be conducted. I maintain that a research plan will allow us to become more systematic, which we need if we are to fill in the blanks in the body of archival literature as well as attract funding for projects. My second suggestion has to do with how we might encourage more systematic empirical research: we should use our research plan to attract funding to establish fellowships in applied research that would be carried out under the auspices of universities and larger archival institutions such as the National Archives of Canada. Why do I think we need such fellowships when--it might be argued--practising archivists can and should be using their repositories as laboratories and be the ones to conduct experiments relating to new ideas, as has been the practice in the past? I would argue that research fellowships in applied science are needed because the efforts of practising archivists to use their archives as laboratories have tended to yield anecdotal accounts and sketchy research. If our discipline is to mature, we should apply ourselves with greater concentration. In addition, empirical research on electronic records management often requires the use of specialized software, which financially pressed archival institutions often do not have and cannot afford to obtain on their own. Under these conditions, discoveries about how to manage electronic records more effectively cannot be made. Further, the time to carry out the background research necessary to test a theory successfully and the luxury of devising a methodology for testing it may not be at the disposal of a working level archivist.

The answer to the question posed at the beginning of this paper--does the existing body of literature meet the needs of the working level archivist?--is: not entirely. There are many subject areas with which the archival practitioner increasingly must deal that are not well-represented in current archival literature. More needs to be written about how to operationalize existing archival theories and methodologies, not only to guide the practitioner but to test these theories and methodologies. Applied research may fuel more of this type of writing. Although we have seen more literature of a theoretical nature of late, much more should be written. This is not to suggest that we will ever completely fill all the gaps in the body of archival literature; it will always be a work in progress because "one feature of a mature science is the cumulative character of its development. This means that the discoveries made by individual investigators combine together into an ever more coherent descriptive and theoretical picture...."<sup>41</sup> I believe the archival profession is beginning to show the signs of maturity in its growing body of literature. Now let us work to deepen our wisdom.

### Notes

- \* Article based on a presentation at the Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Archivists, Ottawa, 27 May 1994.
- 1 See Canadian Centre for Information and Documentation on Archives, *Archival Science Bibliography: 1986-1988* (Ottawa, 1991) and Archives Library Information Centre, "Writings for Archivists, 1990," *American Archivist* 56, no. 1 (Winter 1993), pp. 84-120.

- 2 Terry Eastwood, "Nailing a Little Jelly to the Wall of Archival Studies," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 232-34.
- 3 The term "operationalize" derives from the concept of operationalism first advanced by P. Bridgman in *The Logic of Modern Physics*. The concept is based on the idea that theories must be defined in terms of the operations employed in applying them. Operationalism distinguishes between the formal and the empirical. For example, a sentence might be analyzed on the basis of its logic and syntax (formal elements) as well as on whether there is a concrete procedure for determining its truth or falsity (empirical aspect) (Dagobert D. Runes, *Dictionary of Philosophy* [New York, 1983]). I use the term throughout this article as a short-form for literature that sets forth concrete and performable processes or operations whereby theories and methodologies can be implemented and tested.
- 4 I believe it was Terry Cook who coined the expression "first generation" in reference to these early machine-readable records and the first archival literature dealing with their management in his review article, "Easy to Byte, Harder to Chew: The Second Generation of Electronic Records Archives," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 202-16. Examples of the first generation literature are: Harold Naugler, *The Archival Appraisal of Machine-Readable Records: A RAMP Study with Guidelines* (Paris, 1984); Margaret L. Hedstrom, *Archives & Manuscripts: Machine-Readable Records* (Chicago, 1984); Sue A. Dodd, *Cataloguing Machine-Readable Data Files: An Interpretive Manual* (Chicago, 1982).
- 5 See in particular the article by Kenneth Thibodeau entitled "To Be or Not to Be: Archives for Electronic Records," and the article by David Bearman entitled "An Indefensible Bastion: Archives as a Repository in the Electronic Age," in David Bearman, ed., *Archival Management of Electronic Records, Archives and Museum Informatics Technical Report* 13 (Pittsburgh, 1991).
- 6 "Conference Reports: Impact of Electronic Records on Archival Theory," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 5, no. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 6-8.
- 7 Luciana Duranti, "Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science, [Part I]," *Archivaria* 28 (Summer 1989), pp. 7-27; (Part II), *Archivaria* 29, pp. 4-17; (Part III), *Archivaria* 30, pp. 4-20; (Part IV), *Archivaria* 31, pp. 10-25; (Part V), *Archivaria* 32, pp. 6-24; (Part VI), *Archivaria* 33, pp. 6-24.
- 8 Charles M. Dollar, *Archival Theory and Information Technologies: The Impact of Information Technologies on Archival Principles and Methods* (Macerata, 1992); see also Terry Eastwood, "Review of Charles M. Dollar, *Archival Theory and Information Technologies*," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 283-84; Margaret L. Hedstrom, ed., *Electronic Records Programme Strategies, Archives and Museum Informatics Technical Report* 18 (Pittsburgh, 1993); David Bearman, *Archiving Electronic Records, Archives and Museums Informatics Technical Report* 19 (Pittsburgh, 1994).
- 9 National Historical Publications and Records Commission, *Research Issues in Electronic Records* (St. Paul, 1991).
- 10 National Archives and Records Administration, *Managing Electronic Records* (Washington, DC, 1990).
- 11 Handouts received at the workshop on archival appraisal of electronic records conducted by Jerry O'Brien and Terry Cook for ARMA Edmonton Chapter, 20 May 1992.
- 12 Candace Loewen, "The Control of Electronic Records Having Archival Value," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), p. 66.
- 13 David Bearman, "Record-Keeping Systems," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), pp. 16-36. This article reports on the work of a University of Pittsburgh Project to develop functional requirements for record-keeping systems. See also Charles M. Dollar, "Archivists and Records Managers in the Information Age," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), pp. 37-52.
- 14 Bearman, "Record-Keeping Systems."
- 15 The Legislative Assembly of Alberta, *Bill 51, The Municipal Government Act*, 4th Session, 22nd Legislature, 42 Elizabeth II.
- 16 The Legislative Assembly of Alberta, *Bill 61, Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, 4th Session, 22nd Legislature, 42 Elizabeth II.
- 17 Heather MacNeil, *Without Consent: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information in Public Archives* (Metuchen, 1992) and "Defining the Limits of Freedom of Inquiry: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information Held in Government Archives," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), pp. 13-144.
- 18 Frances Fournier, "Freedom of Information and Privacy: The Story of Vancouver's By-Law," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), pp. 198-203.
- 19 David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector* (New York, 1993).
- 20 Saskatchewan Archivists Society, *Checklist* 8 (April 1992), pp. 7-9; letter from Sam Kula, 6 October 1992, with enclosures relating to the National Archives of Canada User Fee Policy.
- 21 See Michael J. Kurtz, "Archival Management," and James Gregory Bradsher, "Archival Effectiveness,"

- in James Gregory Bradsher, ed., *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* (Chicago, 1988).
- 22 ALIC, "Writings for Archivists, 1990."
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 For a complete overview of the writings of Hugh Taylor see James K. Burrows and Mary Ann Pylypchuk, "The Writings of Hugh Taylor: A Bibliographic Review," in Barbara L. Craig, ed., *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A. Taylor* (Ottawa, 1992).
- 25 I refer here to his article, "Archival Theory: Much Ado About Shelving," *American Archivist* 50, no. 1 (Winter 1987), pp. 66-74, in which he argues that the theoretical aspects of archival "theory" derive not from archives but from historiography and, further, that the calls for developing a body of archival theory derive more from an emotional need of archivists for greater professional acceptance than from any objective need. See also John W. Roberts, "Archival Theory: Myth or Banality?" *American Archivist* 53, no. 1 (Winter 1990), pp. 110-20.
- 26 Theresa Rowat, "The Record and Repository as a Cultural Form of Expression," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), pp. 198-204; Brien Brothman, "Order of Value: Probing the Theoretical Terms of Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), pp. 78-100 and "The Limits of Limits: Derridean Deconstruction and the Archival Institution," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), pp. 205-20.
- 27 A phrase coined by Simon Schama and quoted in Brien Brothman, "The Limits of Limits," p. 208.
- 28 Back in the days when I was a MAS student, I recall Hugh Taylor bringing to class a caricature of Marshall McLuhan. The caption read: "What's Your Fallacy?" Hugh Taylor's articles and lectures always seemed to me to echo this sentiment.
- 29 Andrea Hinding, "Of Archivists and Other Termites," *American Archivist* 56, no. 1 (Winter 1993), pp. 54-61.
- 30 Richard J. Cox, *Managing Institutional Archives: Foundational Principles and Practices* (New York, 1992), p. 5. The article quoted by Cox was written by Robin G. Kierstead.
- 31 Recent works that emphasize a more contextual approach to appraisal include Richard Brown, "Records Acquisition Strategy and its Theoretical Foundations: The Case for a Concept of Archival Hermeneutics," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 34-56; Terry Cook, "The Concept of the Archival Fonds in the Post-Custodial Era: Theories, Problems, and Solutions," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 24-37, and "Mind Over Matter: Towards a New Theory of Archival Appraisal," in Barbara L. Craig, *The Archival Imagination*, pp. 38-70. For recent literature on electronic records management which advises appraising electronic records on the basis of metadata versus appraising the content of electronic records, see, for example, David A. Wallace, "Metadata and the Archival Management of Electronic Records: A Review," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), pp. 87-110.
- 32 Victoria Lemieux and David Leonard, *Tracing Your Ancestors in Alberta: A Guide to Sources of Genealogical Interest in Alberta's Archives and Research Centres* (Edmonton, 1992).
- 33 Planning Committee on Descriptive Standards, *Rules for Archival Description* (Ottawa, 1990-).
- 34 Ibid., p. 0-2.
- 35 Christopher Hives and Blair Taylor, "Using Descriptive Standards as a Basis for Cooperation: The British Columbia Archival Union List Project," *Archivaria* 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 71-85.
- 36 Cook, "Mind Over Matter," p. 43.
- 37 Loewen, "The Control of Electronic Records Having Archival Value," p. 88.
- 38 Umberto Eco, *Foucault's Pendulum* (New York, 1989).
- 39 A term borrowed from Clarissa Pinkola Estes, *Women Who Run With the Wolves: Myths and Stories of the Wild Women Archetype* (New York, 1992).
- 40 NHPRC, *Research Issues in Electronic Records*.
41. S. Nowak, *Methodology of Sociological Research* (Boston, 1977), p. 10.