place the reproductions in context with a fine general commentary and more specific discussion of each document, which could make them good educational tools. Nevertheless, the ultimate goal of “Titanic”: The Official Story and The Titanic Collection may not be primarily educational. At about $35 to $40 Canadian these sets are obviously intended to capitalize on the existing market of hard core Titanic buffs and dilettantes with money to spend, and to generate revenue for their producers. Can archives learn anything from this? Perhaps they can. Packaging archival facsimiles for profit has been done before, but few institutions are able to ride the coattails of a world-wide pop culture phenomenon. These sets show that expensive, high quality archival reproductions can be marketed to a mass audience, but that opportunity may be rare. So, if your archives does not have the equivalent of a Titanic in its vaults you may be unable to use this approach. Even still, individual archivists may find other ways to use these collections in everyday situations. At the Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), I use Titanic reproductions to get the attention of students familiar with the Titanic disaster (or at least the movie), then move on to original documents relating to shipwrecks on Lake Winnipeg.

To answer Biel’s question, do we need more stuff like this on the SS Titanic? No, probably not, but if it had to be done, it is fortunate that it was done as well as it was by the creators of the “Titanic”: The Official Story, and The Titanic Collection. And hopefully, the person who starts by examining one of these collections under the Christmas tree, may, like the students at PAM, eventually progress onward into archival research and examining original documents at one of their local archives.

Brian Hubner
Provincial Archives of Manitoba


This book is a compilation of papers presented at the “Archives and the Metropolis” conference held in London, England, 11–13 July 1996. As the introduction by Derek Keene notes (p. 1), “The aim of the conference was to increase understanding of the role of these archives in metropolitan life and of the problems of providing for them. It was intended to explore the particular political, cultural, social, and economic contexts in which the archives have been created and maintained, throughout the world and from Antiquity to the present.” The papers go a long way towards achieving the goals of the conference – particularly for the City of London, the focus of nine of the twenty-six papers. While most of the remaining papers are from European sources, Brazil, Egypt, Japan, and the United States are also represented. And many of the
points examined in the nine relating primarily to London are echoed in the papers presented about other archives – European and otherwise.

Issues addressed by contributors from the archival profession include those of appraisal, record-keeping practices, description, preservation, organizational history (of the archives, city, or sometimes both), and the research potential of holdings. On the other hand, papers from historians, who make up roughly half of the contributors, focus more on issues like the status and role of archives in the larger metropolitan society, provision of reference services, and the study of urban history. The disparity in approaches by historians and archivists, rather than diffusing the issues, successfully combines the two viewpoints, creating a unified vision that provides a clearer image and broader perspective.

Perhaps most intriguing are the papers which explore the changing relationships through time between the records of the city (that is, the “public” administration) and those generated by non-municipal organizations (that is, records from business, religious, scientific, and private personal sources). London’s earliest surviving municipal records – rolls recording wills proved and private deeds registered in the Hustings court, described in Geoffrey Martin’s “Records and Record-keeping in Medieval London” (p. 75) – are complemented in other articles outlining nascent medical services, a port authority, urban archaeology, and London’s role in business and finance. The latter relationship is clearly echoed in Thomas Behrmann’s “Genoa and Lübeck: The Beginnings of Communal Record-keeping in Two Medieval Trading Metropolises.” Besides outlining the growth of the mandate and competence of city government, the papers found in this collection paint a surprisingly rich and detailed picture of what might be generally referred to as a “documentary heritage.”

The value to cities of archival records and repositories for urban or administrative renewal across the centuries and even, as well, for effective governmental accountability also emerges. Thus, some archival records in ancient Athens, as described in Rosalind Thomas’ “Archives in the Ancient World: Record-keeping, Documents and the ‘Stone Archives’ of the Greeks,” were inscribed in stone and set out in public places, lending a visible presence, a remarkable durability, and round-the-clock accessibility. These records were closely linked to religion and empire. Claudia Salmini’s “Buildings, Furnishing, Access and Use: Examples from the Archive of the Venetian Chancery, from Medieval to Modern Times” outlines a history of cycles of neglect and renewal through which the city’s archives passed. (Curiously, as with Athens, many Venetian records were linked, at least physically, to religion, being stored in St. Mark’s church.) Cairo’s archival heritage, outlined in Raouf Abbas’ “Cairo: Its Archives and History” is old, yet civic responsibility is young – a repository not being established by the city until 1829, under the modernizing and forward-looking government of Muhammed Ali. Perhaps the most recent example of the perceived value and role of archives and archival
facilities is found in Vladimir A. Manykin’s “Moscow: The Metropolitan Archive and Political Change.” Noting the increase in resources received by the Moscow Archives during the recent period of drastic political and economic change, Manykin, concludes his paper by observing that “during social collapse archives come out of the wings of social life” (p. 204). However, the experience of Budapest, outlined in András J. Horváth’s “Planning a New Home for the Budapest City Archives” is not yet as positive as Moscow’s as outlined by Manykin.

The papers reflect what must have been a highly successful conference, one which analyzed the archival endeavour in a variety of different settings and under a varying illumination, allowing one to consider old problems in new ways. For example, Clifton Hood’s paper, “The Fragmented Past: Archives in New York City, 1804–1996,” argues that because archives which emerged a century or more ago were sponsored by private resources which are now in decline, they may now require a transition to public funding for their survival. 

Conspicuous by its absence is the issue of electronic records. The challenges they pose were noted in one or two of the papers, but not addressed more fully in any of them. It may be that one or more presentations were made on this issue, but no papers were available for publication. Regrettably, the book does not contain texts of all presentations made at the conference, only those available at the publication deadline a year later. Most contributors added footnotes to their presentations, but other than that, the papers do not appear to have been significantly modified for publication. Many issues that emerge from these papers are relevant to jurisdictions other than the metropolis. For this reason, perhaps the greatest strength of the book is its breadth of scope, one of whose implications is to suggest that it may not only be possible, but useful to develop some sort of social theory of archives – one based on generally accepted principles of social relevance and administrative accountability.

Jim Suderman
Archives of Ontario


Private personal papers or corporate, including company, government, or other organizational records: what’s the difference? They are all archives and they are all acquired by major Canadian archival institutions. Over the past forty years, the prevalence of the “total archives” concept in Canada has tended to minimize any differences which archivists might experience in the acquisition and control of private papers and corporate records. At the National Archives