In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of School of Library, Archival, and Information Studies

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date 10 September 1985
This thesis is an examination of the ideas of the eminent American archivist, T.R. Schellenberg (1903-1970), on the arrangement, description, and appraisal of archives. The formulation of these ideas is set in the context of the National Archives of the United States where Schellenberg was employed for more than twenty-five years. The National Archives was the first archival institution to attempt to deal with the problems created by large volumes of records. Accordingly, Schellenberg's writings—the most famous of which is the book Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques (1956)—are concerned primarily with finding solutions to these problems, especially with regard to arrangement, description, and appraisal. His skillful blending of archival theory and practice in the presentation of general principles and techniques is emphasized, as well as his important role in the modernization of the archival profession. Through a comparison with the writings of other archivists, it is concluded that Schellenberg's ideas have a continuing relevance for present day archivists.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

T.R. Schellenberg (1903-1970) was an American archivist of international reputation. In 1956, his *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* became the first archival textbook to be written by an English speaking archivist since Hilary Jenkinson's *A Manual of Archive Administration* (1922 and 1937). Schellenberg published one other book, *The Management of Archives* (1965), as well as numerous journal articles and publications for the National Archives, where he spent most of his professional career from 1935 to 1963. He was also active in the field of archival education and served as an archival envoy to Australia and Latin America.

Even though Schellenberg's works have been cited by numerous other writers, there exist, to my knowledge, only two articles which focus specifically on him. One of these, "In Memoriam: T.R. Schellenberg, 1903-1970" is a eulogy which appeared in the *American Archivist* in 1970 shortly after his death. The other, Jane Smith's "T.R. Schellenberg: Americanizer and Popularizer," published in the *American Archivist* in 1981, deals primarily with Schellenberg's life and career and does not treat his archival ideas in any detail.

The purpose of this present study is to concentrate on Schellenberg's ideas in the areas of arrangement, description, and appraisal of archives, which constitute the core of archival work. Schellenberg's name is still well known among present day
archivists, primarily in association with his book, *Modern Archives*. However, his actual ideas are almost certainly not as well known today. As present day archivists continue to search for improved approaches to arrangement, description, and appraisal, it is worthwhile to pause and reflect on the ideas of the past.

Schellenberg's ideas on arrangement and description are discussed in the third chapter of this thesis, while his ideas on appraisal are treated in the fourth chapter. In order to place Schellenberg in the context of his times, the second chapter is devoted to his career at the National Archives. For the most part, discussion is limited to public records of a textual kind simply because he wrote primarily from this perspective. However, his observations on the arrangement and description of private records, which he discussed in *The Management of Archives*, are considered briefly in the third chapter.

The richest sources of information for this study, of course, have been Schellenberg's publications. A microfilm copy of his private papers—the originals are housed at the Kansas State Historical Society in Topeka, Kansas—also proved to be valuable. Other important source materials included publications pertaining to the National Archives during Schellenberg's career there, and other major writings on arrangement, description, and appraisal, both past and present, which provide a context for discussion of Schellenberg's writings.
CHAPTER II

LIFE AND CAREER

Theodore Roosevelt Schellenberg was born on the 24th of February 1903 in Harvey County, Kansas. He spent most of his childhood in the small town of Hillsboro where his father, who had emigrated with his parents from southern Russia in 1879, was the editor of a German Mennonite newspaper. In later years Schellenberg remembered the inhabitants of Hillsboro as being "highly individualistic in their tastes, opinions, and morals. Their convictions, in fact, were so strong, that, if one were not aware of their sincerity, one would consider them opinionated; and their manners were frank to the point of bluntness." And of his father he wrote: "To his way of thinking there were no half-truths, for a thing was either true or false, and if it were true it was to be told, no matter how much the truth might hurt." Schellenberg could easily have been writing about himself as he seemed to acquire from his father and his Hillsboro neighbours a sense of stubborn individualism.

An early indication of this individualism came during Schellenberg's years as a student of history. When he was in his late teens the family moved for a short time to Texas where they operated a large farm. Schellenberg's boyhood love of outdoor life was soon replaced by an intense longing to attend university. This ambition was finally realized, and in rapid succession Schellenberg earned his B.A. in history from the University of Kansas in 1928, his M.A. from the same institution two years
later, and his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 1934. Schellenberg's area of specialty was European and American relations, especially with regard to the Monroe Doctrine. His publications in this field were noted for their fresh interpretations. Commenting on one such publication a classmate praised him for "leading our generation in showing up the fossils." While Schellenberg's historical interests would be of limited relevance to his work as an archivist, his willingness to challenge accepted traditions contributed both to the frustrations he encountered and the achievements he earned during his career. In his nearly thirty years at the National Archives, Schellenberg frequently opposed top management, especially during the decade of the 1950s when he held his highest administrative position. Despite his reputation for a certain contrariness, however, Schellenberg's penchant for the truth served him well in other areas, particularly in his writing and teaching which contributed significantly to the development of a distinct archival profession.

Despite this lifelong dedication to his profession, Schellenberg confided in 1961: "It is a profession into which I drifted after I finished my work at the University of Pennsylvania. It is not one I chose." In fact, he must have been delighted to be able to work at all during the Depression and New Deal years of the 1930s. In 1934 and early 1935 Schellenberg served as the Executive Secretary of the Joint Committee on Materials for Research, a project sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council and concerned primarily with the then innovative practice of microfilming. During the spring of 1935, he was
employed as a historian with the National Parks Service. Neither of these positions was stable, but the experience he gained from them certainly helped him to obtain his appointment to the National Archives as a deputy examiner in the division of accessions in June of 1935.

The National Archives, a late comer to the world archival scene, was established by the American government as an independent agency only in 1934. The initiative behind the move had come primarily from historians who deplored the fact that the proper care of government records had been repeatedly overlooked. It was the task of the National Archives to compensate for this neglect. The first Archivist of the United States, Robert D.W. Connor (1934-1941), and his staff turned to whatever sources of aid they could discover. From the study of Sir Hilary Jenkinson's *A Manual of Archive Administration* (1922), which was the only such work available in English at that time, Connor learned that archives proper are government documents only, are not collected but rather are drawn up in the course of regular business, and have remained in official custody. While this definition was cited by Connor in official publications, Jenkinson's further contention that archivists must simply receive records from government agencies without becoming involved in the appraisal process of determining which records qualified as archives was never accepted by the National Archives as part of its policy.

The National Archives also adopted the European principle of provenance. This principle stated that records should be identified with the agency that created them and should be kept together in the original order used by the administration.
Accordingly, the National Archives established a custodial division for each department of the government which transferred records to the institution. The custodial division did not carry out a wide range of archival functions but was responsible primarily for the preparation of detailed inventories of accessioned records. The other archival functions were assigned to the divisions of accessions, classification, cataloging, reference, and research, similar to the internal structure of a library. It is not surprising that the National Archives should copy this functional organization since some American libraries had established the practice of housing state archival records.

It was not possible, however, for European and American precedent to supply all of the answers for the National Archives. In order to make an assessment of the state of federal government records Connor launched two records surveys, the first in 1935 to focus on federal records housed in the District of Columbia and the second in 1936 to deal with records held in the rest of the nation. The results revealed that there were more than ten million cubic feet of federal records scattered across the country in various states of neglect and deterioration. Even if only 10 percent of these records were preserved, the new National Archives Building would have been filled to capacity. The appraisal and accessioning of such an enormous body of records spread across a large country created problems unique in the history of archives. Connor invited officials from government departments and agencies to submit lists of records proposed for transfer to the National Archives and lists of records proposed for disposal. These lists were perused and adjusted by deputy examiners, such as Schellenberg, and the disposal lists were
referred to Congress for approval. In this way the first
accessions were received by the National Archives, and, despite
the fact that the impetus for the transfer of records remained
largely with the departments and agencies, the role of the
archivist in the appraisal function became firmly established
for the first time. The problem of managing large volumes of
records has continued to dominate the attention of archivists at
the National Archives and to an extent the entire archival
profession.

The problems involved in gaining physical and intellectual
control over accessions rivalled the problems involved in
acquisition. It was soon realized that the various functional
divisions were carrying out repetitive descriptive work and that
these operations would have to be streamlined. It also became
apparent that early procedures for the classification and
cataloging of records were cumbersome and inefficient. In 1940,
Connor set up a finding mediums committee to look into these
problems. The recommendations of this committee resulted in the
abandonment of the library based organization of the National
Archives according to functional divisions. The custodial
divisions were given full responsibility for the complete
handling of the records, from the initial appraisal and
accessioning to the eventual arrangement, description, and
shelving of materials. Classification and cataloging were to be
replaced by the collective arrangement and description of
archives through the establishment of units known as "record
groups," which were established "somewhat arbitrarily with due
regard to the principle of provenance and to the desirability of
making the unit of convenient size and character for the work of
A record group would usually correspond to the records of a government agency but could also consist of the records of several small, related agencies. Records would be arranged within these groups according to their original order and would be described in inventories beginning with a general description of the record group and proceeding to more detailed descriptions of the component series. Thus, even though the record group concept was introduced as a practical means of dealing with large volumes of records, it also fully embraced the qualities of arrangement and description inherent in the principle of provenance. It remains the greatest contribution of the National Archives in the field of arrangement and description.

In 1941, Solon J. Buck succeeded Connor as Archivist of the United States. In the same year the United States entered the Second World War, and throughout the course of the war government bureaucracy churned out another ten million cubic feet of records, nearly equalling the total volume of records in existence when the National Archives was established in 1934. Compounding the problem was the increased reference service that the National Archives had to supply to government offices involved in the war effort. With practical foresight a records administration program was instituted by the National Archives in 1941 with no legal justification other than the right of inspection as outlined in the original National Archives Act. The intention of this program was simply to advise government departments and agencies on the orderly management and prompt retirement of their records and to aid the work of appraisal. However, because of the potential efficiency and economy offered by records administration
the Bureau of the Budget supported the program. Together, the Bureau and the National Archives drafted legislation which, when passed by Congress, introduced Congressional approval of records schedules, as opposed to disposal lists, whereby automatic destruction of scheduled materials could be carried out without further word from Congress. The legislation also brought into practice the drawing up of general schedules for records of common characteristics, such as housekeeping records, held by two or more agencies. These tactics met with considerable success, but the continued expansion of the American government did not allow archivists and departmental records officers to keep pace.

During these hectic early years Schellenberg contributed to the developments in the National Archives. In 1936, he was given a six month leave of absence from his duties as a deputy examiner to serve as the associate director of the second of the two federal records surveys. Thus, he quickly became aware of the serious challenge that faced the National Archives with regard to the appraisal of modern records. Less than two years later he was appointed chief of the National Archives' custodial division responsible for the holdings from the Department of Agriculture. In this, his first important administrative position, Schellenberg's accomplishments were many. In the area of arrangement and description his Staff Information Circular, European Archival Practices in Arranging Records, issued in 1939, clearly articulated his own view and the view of the National Archives that European techniques were not always applicable to the American archival scene. For example, he reorganized his division's holdings of the records of the Weather Bureau in order
to make them more serviceable to researchers by ignoring the
dictates of the principle of original order. Schellenberg also
served on the finding mediums committee of 1940.

With regard to the appraisal function Schellenberg assisted
the Department of Agriculture in the compilation of its Manual
on the Disposition of Official Records. His division was also
the first to develop schedules for the systematic disposition of
records. In 1945, he was appointed records officer at the Office
of Price Administration to help that emergency war agency
liquidate its holdings. Under Schellenberg's direction the
record volume of the agency was reduced from one million to ten
thousand cubic feet. Before returning to the National Archives
as Program Adviser in 1948, he achieved similar success at the
War Productions Board.

The bustling city of Washington was far removed from
Schellenberg's small town background, but he did his best to
settle into the environment. Schellenberg and his wife, Alma,
moved into an eighteenth century farmhouse in nearby Arlington,
Virginia, and over the years this homestead proved its worth as
a comfortable haven away from the pressures of work. But while
Schellenberg's private life showed signs of peace and stability
there were already signs of controversy on the job. He appears
to have been dissatisfied with the operations of the National
Archives and was reluctant to return there after his project
with the War Productions Board was completed. In reply to
letters received from Schellenberg in 1947, Emmett J. Leahy, a
former colleague at the National Archives, commented that he
could "well understand the reluctance of anyone to relapse into
the slough of ineffectiveness that is currently the National
Archives," and later added: "It is also encouraging that you will not be returning to the National Archives very soon, if ever." Unfortunately, copies of the letters which Schellenberg sent to Leahy are not available. Meanwhile, he considered working as an archivist with the Boeing company and as a professor of history with various American universities. The explanation behind Schellenberg's negative attitude and his sudden reappearance at the National Archives cannot be determined, but it is known that his feelings were largely reciprocated. In her article, "Theodore R. Schellenberg: Americanizer and Popularizer," Jane F. Smith states that Schellenberg's return to the National Archives in 1948 "was not greeted with unalloyed enthusiasm by either top management or his peers." Smith fails to elaborate but she does note that the intention behind Schellenberg's appointment as Program Adviser, a staff position, was to minimize his administrative power. It can only be assumed that Schellenberg's strong opinions and convictions had alienated some of his colleagues during his years as chief of the Agriculture Department Archives.

The new Archivist of the United States, Wayne C. Grover (1948-1965), had other problems besides the temperament of T.R. Schellenberg to occupy his attention. It was no great secret that something had to be done about the tremendous volume of records being created by government offices. This situation was being examined by the Task Force on Record Management, one of several task forces created by the First Hoover Commission to investigate the efficiency of the executive branch of the federal government. Leahy, who like many former National Archives employees had entered the burgeoning field of records.
administration, was the chairman of the task force, and his report formed the basis of the recommendations put forth by the Hoover Commission.

The Commission suggested that the National Archives become a part of the General Services Administration (GSA), a new office set up to look after the "housekeeping" functions of the executive branch. It was also recommended that a comprehensive records administration, or records management, program be introduced into each department of the federal government. By 1950 legislation was enacted creating the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) as a part of the GSA. The administrative framework of NARS included the National Archives Division and the Records Management Division. With the exception of the work of records management, the National Archives Division maintained the same responsibilities as the old National Archives. The directors of both divisions reported to the Archivist who in turn reported to the Administrator of General Services.

Oliver W. Holmes of the National Archives staff provided an excellent analysis of these developments in an article which appeared in the *American Archivist* in 1949.\(^\text{13}\) He noted that in any government hierarchy the nonprofessional superior usually takes over at some level, with the superior delegating power back to the professional. Holmes also felt that the duties of the National Archives as an agency of government had necessitated the involvement of the National Archives in records administration and that this had led naturally to the inclusion of NARS in the office which dealt most closely with record keeping. (As a matter of interest, NARS again became an independent agency in 1984 reporting directly to the President of the United States.)
The Records Management Division of NARS made remarkable progress in the first five years of its existence by saving the federal government more than thirty-four million dollars in operating costs. Nine records centers were set up throughout the country. They soon housed one and a half million cubic feet of records which were no longer needed in government offices. Record scheduling also proved its worth. By 1954, there was a decline in the volume of federal government records in existence for the first time since statistics were kept.  

In the meantime, Schellenberg was appointed head of the National Archives Division as Director of Archival Management in 1950. It is uncertain why Grover and his advisers changed their minds about giving Schellenberg an administrative role, but it was not long before a conflict arose. Schellenberg appears to have been accused of power seeking and felt inclined to write a "statement made...in defense of my plans of administering the National Archives," in which he claimed his preference for administering on "the basis of education or persuasion" rather than on "an authoritative basis." There is little to document the specific cause of the problem or its extent, but it is clear that the disagreements between Schellenberg and Grover had just begun.

Nevertheless, Schellenberg was certainly well qualified to serve as the Director of Archival Management and he worked tirelessly to improve every aspect of the division's operations. The National Archives had never been able to recover from the turmoil caused by the extension of its services during the Second World War. There was a backlog of materials in the National Archives that required both reappraisal and arrangement and
description, and the number of staff positions had not reached the pre-war level. In this context, Schellenberg's pamphlet, The Disposition of Federal Records (1949) outlined the steps involved in efficient records disposal. A year later, he and his staff undertook a reappraisal program and by 1955 the volume of records in the National Archives was reduced from in excess of 900 thousand to just under 750 thousand cubic feet. From the further experience gained through this program Schellenberg wrote the highly acclaimed National Archives bulletin, The Appraisal of Modern Public Records (1956), which remains one of the most enlightening monographs on the subject of appraisal.

Schellenberg the author was also busy providing his staff with other guidelines in the form of a procedures manual and two Staff Information Papers, The Preparation of Preliminary Inventories (1950) and Principles of Arrangement (1951). With these sources at hand the work of the National Archives was accomplished with greater uniformity. Numerous inventories were produced and the holdings in the building were rearranged according to accepted principles. Ernst Posner, the noted archival writer and teacher, was very impressed by the internal publications of the National Archives and observed that "nothing quite comparable exists in any other country." Schellenberg further increased the morale and productivity of his staff through the introduction of a training program for junior archivists in 1953. One of the members of this first class, James B. Rhoads, became Archivist of the United States in 1968. The training program was just the beginning of Schellenberg's passionate interest in the education of archivists, and the duration of his career was highlighted by his achievements in
Schellenberg's growing reputation as an archival leader was not limited to his work at the National Archives. Ever since the Second World War international communication between archivists had been increasing steadily, and the National Archives assumed a leadership role on the world stage. In response to a request from Australian archivists, the National Archives, with the support of a Fulbright scholarship, commissioned Schellenberg to undertake a lecture tour of Australia in 1954. Schellenberg was delighted with the prospects of the adventure, and Grover was probably relieved to see him go. Despite the difficulties between the two men Grover assured the Australians that Schellenberg "is qualified and experienced both in the field of archival administration and of records management, and is by all odds the best possible candidate. He is one of four or five key people in this country who, during the past seventeen years, have done most to develop and apply the knowledge we have in these fields."  

Schellenberg enjoyed the six months that he and his wife spent in Australia, though he was not without his criticisms. He complained to a friend: "I'm tired of being diplomatic, of praising everything that is praiseworthy while receiving criticism of American things whenever criticism can possibly be made." But, for the most part, he found the Australian people to be "a fine lot" and, he had to confess, "I like the attention they've given Alma and me, almost rolling out the rug for us." In contrast to his attitude towards the National Archives, Schellenberg felt appreciated in Australia and he responded to this warmth in a personal way, leaving behind, in the words of
Australian archivist Ian Maclean, the impression of "a relaxed, amiable and above all, humourous man." The tour was a tremendous success. Schellenberg met with archivists and government officials throughout Australia, gave lectures, and hosted seminars on both archival and records management topics. He also spoke at numerous Rotary Club meetings, delivered a national radio broadcast, and was consulted by several private corporations regarding the handling of their records. H.L. White, the Commonwealth National Librarian, described Schellenberg's influence as "important and enduring," while David S. MacMillan, University of Sydney archivist, was even more emphatic in hailing the visit as "the single most important event in the recent history of archival development in Australia." Largely because of Schellenberg's influence various archival institutions in Australia were spurred into action, in some ways abandoning the traditional allegiance to the British archival system in favor of their own original thinking and the adoption of American techniques, especially with regard to records management and appraisal.

Perhaps the greatest result of the Australian trip was Schellenberg's writing of the book, Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques. While in Australia Schellenberg stated in a letter:

I'm tired of having an old fossil cited to me as an authority in archival matters. I refer to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, former Deputy Keeper of Records at the British Public Record Office, who wrote a book that is not only unreadable but that has given the Australians a wrong start in their archival work.

With his characteristic willingness to challenge accepted traditions and with the motivation he received from receptive Australian audiences Schellenberg decided to use his Australian
lectures as the basis for a new textbook to replace Jenkinson's *Manual*. Schellenberg succeeded in writing most of the manuscript while in Australia and even wrote some of it during the return trip to the United States. The publication of the book in Australia and the United States in 1956 marked a milestone in archival history, as it was the first full length work in English to deal with the modern archival situation. The topics covered in the book included brief histories of archival institutions in Europe and the United States, an updated definition of archives, an examination of the nature of the archival profession, and discussions on records management, appraisal, arrangement and description, preservation, reference service, and publication programs. Even though the archival and records management principles and techniques outlined in the book were based on Schellenberg's experiences at NARS they were presented in a general way that could be understood by all archivists, and so represented a plea for a standard methodology for the profession. The book was highly successful. The first printing of *Modern Archives* was sold out within six months and it was translated into several languages, including Spanish, Portuguese, German, and Hebrew. In a review article, Lester J. Cappon wrote that it is "replete with wisdom, reinforced by experience; it is concentrated fare, devoid of empty phrases. It surveys the whole field of public archives with unity and logic and provides a satisfactory source for continuous reference." A decade later, Oliver W. Holmes stated that *Modern Archives* is one of four books "that all archivists should know and read frequently."22 The entire Australian experience gave Schellenberg a new outlook on his career, and after his return to the National
Archives he became very involved in archival education and international affairs. In the field of education, he introduced seminar conferences for senior archivists at the National Archives as an expansion of the training program offered to junior archivists. From 1955 to 1961, he was a lecturer and later adjunct professor in archival management at the American University in Washington, where he followed in the footsteps of Ernst Posner who had been involved in the program since 1939. Beginning in 1957, Schellenberg spent part of his summers as the Director of the Institute on the Preservation and Administration of Archives, co-sponsored by the American University, NARS, the Library of Congress, and the Maryland Hall of Records. In 1958 and 1959, he even provided training for records centers staff throughout the country.

Schellenberg was equally active in the field of international affairs. From 1955 to 1960 he served as chairman of the Society of American Archivist's Committee on International Relations and frequently represented the State Department in numerous cross-cultural and educational programs with Latin America. The culmination of this involvement occurred in 1960 with Schellenberg's visit to seven South American countries, which led to the founding of the Inter-American Council on Archives.

Schellenberg's achievements did not go unnoticed. In 1957, the GSA awarded him the Meritorious Service Award, particularly in recognition of the publication of *Modern Archives*. When the Divisions of the National Archives and Records Management became Offices in 1956, Schellenberg's title was changed from Director of Archival Management to Assistant Archivist, National Archives.
To some extent, at least, Schellenberg seems to have used his teaching, writing, and travel as means of escape from the frustrations he encountered at NARS. Throughout the 1950s Schellenberg's relations with Grover and Grover's deputy, Robert H. Bahmer, deteriorated steadily. Grover and Bahmer viewed Schellenberg as a power seeker who, in his frustration at not getting his own way, neglected his administrative duties through the pursuit of his personal interests. On the other hand, Schellenberg viewed Grover as an incompetent administrator who by failing to delegate authority left him with no choice but to become involved in outside activities. Schellenberg was particularly sensitive to what he deemed to be Grover's lack of interest in his accomplishments as an archival theorist.

While it is not fruitful to dwell on the personal conflict between Schellenberg and top management it is useful to investigate one of the chief elements of that conflict, namely, the operations of the records management program at NARS. The problem caused by the volume of records had not disappeared with the creation of the Records Management Division in 1949. Bureaucracies the size of the United States government do not operate with mechanical precision, and government offices did not maintain a consistent interest in proper records management. Records centers were filling up, and because of inaccurate scheduling and imperfect classification it was not always possible to determine which materials in the centers were to be retained permanently. This situation was not easily remedied despite the work of the Second Hoover Commission in 1954 and 1955 and the subsequent efforts of NARS to emphasize the control of the creation of records and not only their disposal.
Schellenberg was especially concerned about these intractable problems. He believed that the Office of Records Management had not properly established its priorities. In later years he wrote:

It is in respect to the basic problem of classification that the Office of Records Management within NARS has made the least contribution. The Office has become preoccupied with peripheral problems: with the design and control of forms, directives, and reports; the management of mail; automation; and the like.25

Schellenberg greatly appreciated the intimate relationship which had to be fostered between the records management and archival professions. His writings reveal a holistic view of the entire life cycle of records and an awareness of the need to coordinate and integrate all record-keeping practices in order to bring about efficiency. Given Schellenberg's careful thinking through of the archival-records management relationship, he must have been quite perturbed when the operation of NARS did not achieve his ideals.

Schellenberg was also dismayed by the apparent abuses made of government records centers. He pointed with bitter satisfaction to a report commissioned by the GSA which reported that "there is some evidence that the availability of record center facilities at no charge has encouraged the postponement of agency decisions to dispose of records." Grover disagreed with this statement which only heightened the animosity between the two men.26

Perhaps Schellenberg's chief complaint was that the inefficiency of the Office of Records Management existed despite its preferential treatment. He observed that Grover "has constantly made arrangements whereby archival considerations are being sacrificed to the records management program."27 There is
statistical evidence to back up this claim. In his book, *Records of a Nation*, H.G. Jones points out that between 1949 and 1968 the monetary appropriations for NARS increased by more than 1,000 percent while the appropriations for the National Archives during the same period increased by less than 400 percent. Jones also notes that the number of staff at the National Archives rose by only 50 percent in those years while the entire staff at NARS grew by 500 percent. It must be remembered, though, that NARS operated within the realities of government financing. Despite the overall appropriation increases Grover faced several budgetary cutbacks especially in the late 1950s. In difficult financial times the Budget Bureau was more willing to invest funds in the potential money saving records management program than in strictly archival operations.

The conflict between Schellenberg and Grover reached its peak between 1958 and 1961 over the issue of the structural organization of NARS. Grover and Bahmer proposed a functional organization whereby certain archivists would be assigned to one archival function, such as appraisal, and other archivists would be assigned another function, such as arrangement. Schellenberg preferred the more traditional organization of subject matter specialization in which the same archivists would deal with all archival functions, except technical ones, such as conservation or microfilming. When the question first arose in 1958 Schellenberg condemned Grover for being "bamboozled by the accomplishments of a records management program" and for wanting "to impose the physical routines of records management on the intellectual work of an archival institution." In other words, Schellenberg felt that the statistical way of measuring the
success of a records management program—such as "how many records are moved from one place to another, how many filing cases are emptied, how many cubic feet of records are destroyed"—had so impressed Grover and Bahmer that they wished to impose the functional organization of records centers on the National Archives. According to Schellenberg, such a move "would be a big step backward"—that is, back to an organization similar to the one which had been in place in the 1930s—"and would render the institution sterile from a scholarly point of view." 29

For the moment little was done about the matter, and with the passage of time Schellenberg probably thought that the whole idea had been abandoned. Then in December of 1961 it was announced to Schellenberg that a reorganization of the Office of the National Archives was to take place immediately. The Office was to be replaced by three new Offices—Civil, Military, and Records Appraisal, the latter to be headed by Schellenberg. Schellenberg was understandably shocked and infuriated. Despite the fact that the appointment was an affirmation of his expertise in appraisal, the plans had been finalized without his knowing about them and his administrative role as head of the National Archives had been taken away. Schellenberg considered retirement but then changed his mind and approached the new job with his usual dedication and capacity for hard work. He directed his new office in the preparation of retention plans, as opposed to disposal documents, thus emphasizing the positive element of preservation rather than the negative element of destruction. But Schellenberg quickly came to the sad conclusion that his purpose was "to bail out the Office of Records Management for an ineffective records disposition program." 30 Schellenberg's diary
entries up to his retirement in 1963 grew increasingly bitter, and he harboured intense ill feeling towards NARS until his death seven years later.

It is only too easy to condemn Schellenberg for his negative attitude, but he was standing up for what he believed to be the truth and his opinions were often justified. For example, a report by Martin Elzy in 1973 confirmed Schellenberg's earlier judgment of the failure of scheduling practices. As Elzy's report puts it:

The General Accounting Office found government agencies at fault either for placing records in the [records] centers without setting a definite disposal date or for keeping them for unrealistically long periods. The National Archives and Records Service was criticized for permitting these practices on the part of agencies and for failing to destroy records promptly when retention periods expired.31

Some appraisal and records management problems have their origins in inefficient administration, and it was issues such as these that frustrated Schellenberg during his last years at the National Archives.

Questions naturally arise regarding the impact of the National Archives on the archival ideas of Schellenberg, and vice-versa. Some might criticize Schellenberg for simply rationalizing administrative decisions rather than developing archival principles and techniques independently. Certainly, no archival theory develops in a vacuum but rather is influenced by practical circumstances. Schellenberg reflected National Archives policy but he made it his own. His personality was too highly individualistic and opinionated, and he disagreed with the institution's policy often enough to show his aptitude for original thinking. And the very simple point must be made that Schellenberg published his ideas in a quantity and quality that
most of his contemporaries did not equal.

After his retirement, Schellenberg remained active in archival affairs, despite the comfortable distractions of his Virginia home. The most significant development of these years was the publication of *The Management of Archives* in 1965, in which Schellenberg made another strong plea for standardization. The work has been criticized for its misleading title because it deals primarily with the arrangement and description of both manuscript collections and public archives. Schellenberg's original working title, *Arrangement and Description of Private and Public Records*, would have been a more accurate depiction of the book's contents, but the publisher insisted on the change.

Nevertheless, *The Management of Archives* became widely known, and for two main reasons. First of all, Schellenberg lent his influential support to the growing number of archivists and manuscript curators who felt that the archival principles used in the management of public records could be applied to the care of private papers. This was an important American issue because in the absence of archival institutions private papers had become the concern of libraries and historical societies. In many other countries archival institutions often housed both public and private materials.

The most controversial comments contained in *The Management of Archives* were those regarding the education of the archivist. Schellenberg stated bluntly that library schools are "the proper places in which to provide archival training." Schellenberg put these words into action by teaching in the library schools of several American Universities. Other archivists, such as
H.G. Jones of North Carolina, upheld the view that the training of archivists belonged in university history departments. This led to a debate between Schellenberg and Jones at the Society of American Archivists conference of 1966 and publication of the papers they read in the *American Archivist* in 1968.\(^{35}\) Schellenberg certainly did not dispute the fact that archivists must have a thorough historical education. Because of his concern with methodology, however, he felt that the actual archival training would be best provided in library schools.

He further contended that archival principles and techniques "can and will be standardized," but he was not at all naive about the extent of this standardization. He wrote:

> The more any given line of work is concerned with the manipulation of physical things as distinct from a concern with purely intellectual matters, the more it is necessary to follow precise methods of doing things. The reverse of this statement is also true. The more purely intellectual an activity, the less it is possible to impose on it anything more than general principles of action.

Consequently, "the archivist's methods are less precise than are those of the librarian, for methods relating to technical work can be defined far more precisely than those relating to analytical work." On the other hand, the historical profession "is concerned with the use of documentary material, not with its physical handling as is the archival profession."\(^{36}\) Even though archivists have much to learn from library and historical methodologies, Schellenberg never stated that archivists should be librarians or historians, but rather that archivists must develop their own unique profession.

Despite this discussion of standardization and education, the main focus of *The Management of Archives* is arrangement and description. It was to be "a textbook for beginners," and
Schellenberg's main purpose was "to provide simple and clear instruction on how to arrange and describe public and private papers." He had started writing it in 1957, just one year after the publication of Modern Archives, and it was intended to be "a companion book to the first one."  

Schellenberg planned another companion book to Modern Archives to be written in collaboration with former colleague Everett O. Alldredge and to address records management and appraisal. This work never materialized, largely because of Schellenberg's lingering hostility towards Grover and Bahmer, who had succeeded Grover as archivist in 1965. In 1968, Schellenberg wrote to Alldredge: "I do not wish to risk publishing anything so long as the present archivist, and his predecessor, dominate the archival profession." As a result, Schellenberg's publications on appraisal are not as numerous as his publications on arrangement and description. 

Despite the personal animosities that Schellenberg encountered throughout his career, it is a tribute to his contribution to the development of archival principles and techniques that he is remembered primarily for his dedication to the profession. After his death in 1970 he was eulogized in the American Archivist by six of his fellow archivists as a world archival leader of great intellect, industry, and originality who gave dignity to the work of the archivist. Indeed, Schellenberg played an important role in the development of the archival profession. More than any other archivist at the National Archives, he popularized the modern American archival procedures. His writings reveal a wealth of wisdom and experience gained through more than thirty years of archival work. In his
attempts to define and standardize archival principles and techniques and to provide these principles and techniques with a theoretical and intellectual basis, he has left the archival community with a valuable body of literature that has filled an important need and that can be used as part of the basis for further developments. It is fortunate for all archivists that Theodore Roosevelt Schellenberg "drifted into" the archival profession, that he was willing to challenge old traditions, and that he did so much to enhance the dignity of those whom he called "guardians of the truth."
CHAPTER III

IDEAS ON ARRANGEMENT AND DESCRIPTION

In the archival profession arrangement can be defined as the process by which physical control over records is achieved through their organization according to accepted archival principles, most notably the principle of provenance. The principle of provenance consists of two elements, namely, respect des fonds and respect pour l'ordre primitif, though in current usage the term provenance is often used to refer to the first element only. Accordingly, respect des fonds, or simply provenance, means that the records created or held by an agency must be kept together as an integral unit in an archival institution. Respect pour l'ordre primitif, or simply original order, means that the records must be arranged in the same sequence used by the agency that held the records. These principles were developed in Europe in the middle and late nineteenth century at a time when record volume was relatively small and record keeping practices, most notably the registry system, were becoming highly developed. Provenance and original order received their most eloquent expression in the so called Dutch manual by Muller, Feith, and Fruin in 1898.¹ The first English account to become well known was Sir Hilary Jenkinson's Manual of Archive Administration, published in 1922.²

In the United States the term "arrangement" came into common use after the National Archives' introduction of the record group concept in 1941. This concept was based on the principles
of provenance and original order and was designed to deal with the immense volume of government records. Gradually, the notion was developed at the National Archives that these records could be controlled through their progressive arrangement at various levels, beginning with a general arrangement of large bodies of records and proceeding, step by step, to more specific levels of arrangement within each body.

The most famous and, perhaps, the best account of archival arrangement as it was practised at the National Archives is Oliver W. Holmes' "Archival Arrangement--Five Different Operations at Five Different Levels," published in the American Archivist in 1964. According to Holmes the first level of arrangement is the repository level in which the complete holdings of a repository are broken down into a few major divisions for administrative purposes. The second and most important level is the record group and subgroup level where the records of each group are kept together as integral units. A record group usually corresponds to a large agency within the government, such as a department, and a subgroup to a branch or office of that agency. These first two levels of arrangement pertain to provenance, while the final three levels relate to original order. The third level is that of the series. A series can be defined simply as an entity based on filing, such as a correspondence series, and each record group or subgroup is usually made up of several series. The series, in turn, consist of filing units, the fourth level, and the filing units are made up of individual documents, the fifth level. Often the arrangement process does not reach these final two levels. The last step in arrangement is the boxing, labelling, and shelving
of records.

Just as arrangement achieves physical control over archives, description achieves intellectual control through the creation of finding aids. The two functions cannot really be separated. Description follows naturally from arrangement and is dependent upon it. The best modern example of this is the archival inventory, introduced by the National Archives at the same time as the development of the record group concept. Records are described in the inventory first at the record group level and then at the series level, with the series listed under the appropriate record group or subgroup. Arrangement and description, then, are at the center of archival theory and practice. Richard Berner, a former pupil of Schellenberg who recently retired as head of the University Archives and Manuscript Division of the University of Washington Libraries, has noted that arrangement and description "are uniquely archival. They represent a body of practices that are coherent and are derived from a unique perspective in regard to material that is the subject of no other profession's attention."^5

The writings of Theodore Schellenberg hold a place of eminence in the literature of arrangement and description. Holmes, in the article cited above, placed Schellenberg's Modern Archives and the Staff Information Paper, Principles of Arrangement, in the company of the manuals of Jenkinson and the Dutch trio. Indeed, before Holmes' article appeared, Schellenberg had already produced five publications for the National Archives, four articles in learned journals, and one book, all dealing in whole or in part with the subject of arrangement. The following discussion begins with Schellenberg's view of provenance and
original order, proceeds to his account of the levels of arrangement, includes a brief look at his attitude towards the arrangement of records of private origin, and concludes with a summary view of his general approach to description.

Regarding the principle of provenance Schellenberg's opinion remained constant throughout his career. In his first major archival publication, *European Archival Practices in Arranging Records*, he referred to provenance as "a first principle of archival economy." Writing more than twenty-five years later, he stated that "the principle of provenance is basic and inflexible and relates to a matter of the highest importance to the archival profession." He went on to say that it was not enough to accept the principle simply because it is generally recognized as valid in the archival profession, but that it should be accepted for specific reasons. These reasons are worth investigating.

The most obvious and the most common reason for the widespread acceptance of provenance is that it enables the archivist to deal with records collectively, thus facilitating both arrangement and description. Schellenberg also discussed two other reasons. First of all, he stated that "the principle serves to protect the value of evidence in archives." Elaborating on this point, he wrote: "The content of individual documents that are the product of activity can be fully understood only in the context with other documents that relate to the same activity. The way they were brought together is therefore significant." Secondly, he noted that the principle takes into account the unique nature of archival material. That is, since records "are usually produced to accomplish some
purpose, some activity"—unlike publications which are produced "to elucidate some subject"—they should then be arranged according to the manner in which they were created and not according to the subjects to which they pertain.

There is nothing surprising in these comments since they reflect the widespread acceptance of provenance throughout the archival world. In some ways, especially with regard to the value of evidence in archives, Schellenberg's comments can be seen as a restatement of the views expressed by the Dutch trio and by Jenkinson. The former stated that the "various documents of an archival collection throw light upon one another." Jenkinson, whom Schellenberg cited in his discussion, observed that records have "a structure, an articulation and a natural relationship between parts, which are essential to their significance.... Archive quality only survives unimpaired so long as their natural form and relationship are maintained." Schellenberg was able to bring together ideas from various sources and to reduce the principles and techniques of the archival profession to their essentials. His comments on the reasons why provenance must be observed are good examples of this.

In his discussion of original order, Schellenberg stepped outside the bounds established by his European predecessors. In the Dutch manual and in Jenkinson's writings, original order was upheld on the same level as provenance. After just four years in the archival profession, Schellenberg was as critical of the principle of original order as he was supportive of the principle of provenance. Writing in 1939 he made the following observations:
While the greater proportion of records developed by European governments are organized in registry offices before their release to archival institutions, the greater proportion of the records of the Federal Government of the United States are left in a disorganized state. This is true because in the course of our national history records were not organized with the view to their transference to an archival institution, since no such institution existed.... The basic condition, therefore, is generally lacking by which the principles of the German and Dutch archivists concerning the preservation of the original order created by a registry office can be made to apply.  

He concluded that "no archival principles should be 'ridden to death,' literally to become fetishes which will prevent a common-sense arrangement of records designed to promote the research needs of scholars and government officials."  

Later in his career he stated that while an archivist should normally observe original order, "he should have no compunction about disturbing the original order" if such a move improves researcher access to the records. "The test here is a very practical one, that of usability."  

For example, as we have seen, this test of usability led Schellenberg to rearrange the records of the Weather Bureau held at the National Archives.  

Schellenberg was not the first to challenge the principle of original order and he cited several examples of similar challenges which arose in Europe in the 1930s. On the American scene, however, his observations of the differences between European and American record keeping practices provided a practical reason for the development of unique American archival techniques. He also epitomized the growing concern of the archivist for the researcher. His willingness to overrule absolute observance of original order continues to be appreciated by archivists down to the present day. In an article on the subject of original order written in 1982, Frank Boles cited Schellenberg extensively in his call for arrangement based on
usability. Today, most archivists follow the general rule of observing original order when it is practical to do so and of rearranging materials when this is considered necessary. Increasingly, though, this rearrangement is being carried out on paper, something that neither Schellenberg nor his contemporaries realized to its fullest potential.

Schellenberg took great care to think through his archival ideas from beginning to end. Not only do most of his ideas remain consistent over time, but they also reveal a cohesive interrelationship. For example, part of his definition of archives, to be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, states that archives are records preserved "for reference and research purposes," thus emphasizing the role of the researcher and adding further support to the statement that original order should be observed only when it meets research needs. Another more complex example relates to the relationship between Schellenberg's thoughts on the classification of current records, outlined in *Modern Archives*, and his attitude towards provenance and original order. He reasoned that the classification of records in the agencies which created them should be based on function, which he defined as "all the responsibilities assigned to an agency to accomplish the broad purposes for which it was established." In such a system, unique file headings would be determined through a consideration of these functions and their related activities and transactions, rather than according to a predetermined system of classification—such as the library-styled Dewey decimal system—which had been adopted by many offices for the classification of their records. Schellenberg observed that records "are the result of function;
they are used in relation to function; they should, therefore, be classified according to function." Another possible means of classifying agency records was to base the classification system on the hierarchical breakdown of the agency into offices and branches. Schellenberg opposed this system and argued that such classification often reflected a functional breakdown anyway because each office or branch would be responsible for specific agency functions. But if this were not the case, given the fluidity of modern government, organizational classification still should not be observed.

Relating these statements to provenance and original order, he stated that the principle of provenance "should also be applied in arranging public records for current use." If records were classified "according to their provenance in activity," that is, according to the functions that led to their creation instead of according to predetermined subject lists as was common in Schellenberg's time, they would be much more revealing of the programs and policies of the creating agency. Such classification would also have a direct bearing on the archivist's observance of original order. If records are conscientiously arranged while in current use, then this would increase the number of times that the archivist could maintain the same arrangement.

Schellenberg, like many of his contemporaries at the National Archives, was trying to create a system of record control that would give the archivist a head start in the work of arrangement and description, similar to the advantages of the European registry system. Such control has not been fully achieved even though new developments in records management have
occurred, including the consideration of functional analysis in the establishment of classification systems. Perhaps absolute control over records will never be achieved, but the elimination of the dichotomy between the work of the archivist and the records manager may have an effect in bringing it about. The question of when records become archives is losing its relevance as society's documentary output continues to increase and archival holdings become more and more current in scope. Despite his hostility towards the records management program at NARS, Schellenberg can be seen as a transitional figure in the changing role of the archivist from the servicing of older records for their use by historians to the growing concept of information management.

Archival ideas and practices, then, do not remain static. They evolve over time, and this can be seen through a consideration of the arrangement of archives at the various record levels. For the sake of convenience, the five levels of arrangement as outlined by Holmes will provide the structure for the following discussion of Schellenberg's ideas, even though Schellenberg did not necessarily identify arrangement at each of the five levels.

Schellenberg did not specifically talk about arrangement at the repository level. However, he did state that record groups should be allocated to appropriate branches within the archives, representing broad subject fields such as defense, industry, and natural resources, and this amounts to the same thing as Holmes' discussion of the first level of arrangement. Both men agreed that there is nothing exceptional about arrangement carried out at this level. It usually becomes a routine matter once an
archival institution has established its program. Within each of these administrative units, archivists are involved in more detailed work of appraisal, arrangement, description, and reference service. Schellenberg was very supportive of this kind of administrative organization, and it was the suggestion by Archivist Grover that this subject matter specialization be replaced by a functional specialization that contributed significantly to the hostility between the two men. Most large archival institutions in North America continue to follow the subject matter organization, particularly in the treatment of traditional textual records.

For both Schellenberg and Holmes the record group was the basis of the arrangement and description process, even though the major weaknesses of the record group system were well known. The use of the phrase "established somewhat arbitrarily" in the National Archives' definition of record group posed obvious difficulties. But the problems were offset by the immediate advantages of the system, especially the ability to arrange and describe large volumes of records collectively. The sharpest criticisms of the use of the record group as the basis for arrangement and description did not occur until the late 1960s in such articles as P.J. Scott's "The Record Group Concept: A Case for Abandonment," published in the American Archivist in 1966. By that time Schellenberg's active interest in archival matters was waning, and so he did not comment on the opinions presented by Scott. Indeed, his writings on the record group concept serve largely to reflect National Archives policy, though it must be remembered that, given his position within that institution, he would have influenced that policy.
In Modern Archives Schellenberg defined record group by quoting the "Directions for the Preparation of Finding Mediums" as issued by Archivist Connor in 1941. Schellenberg's only criticism was the choice of the term. He observed:

It is a curious anomaly that in England where the archival institution is called a record office the record units should be called 'archive groups,' whereas in the United States where the archival institution is called an archives the record units should be called 'record groups.' Accordingly, in Management of Archives he preferred the term "archival group," though he also continued to make use of the more traditional term. In this later work he reduced the definition of record group to a useful simple level, stating that record or archival groups "are established by a consideration of their organizational, as distinct from their functional, origins." 

Regarding the arrangement of record groups in relation to each other, Schellenberg's instructions always contained the same two elements. He maintained that record groups should be arranged "in an organizational or a functional relation to each other," preferably the former, and that record groups "should be maintained as integral units." Perhaps what is most interesting to the present day archivist in the attitude of Schellenberg, Holmes, and their contemporaries towards the arrangement of record groups is their preoccupation with the physical arrangement of the record groups in the stacks. This involves keeping all the records of a record group together in much the same way as in a library all of the books on a particular subject are shelved together, implying that room must be left in the stacks for future accessions. One of the main tasks that Schellenberg faced as head of the National Archives
division in the 1950s was the rearrangement of the holdings in the stacks. Most modern archives, particularly large ones, make use of consecutive shelving whereby new accessions are shelved in the next available space with the location indicated in the appropriate inventory. This is a further example of paper arrangement and is, perhaps, an adoption of the similar procedure used in record centers, just as the old method can be seen as an adoption of library methods.

Arrangement at the subgroup level, according to Holmes, is included along with the record group as forming part of the second level of arrangement. Holmes, however, hardly addressed this difficult topic and did not even offer a definition of subgroup. Schellenberg, on the other hand, dealt with the subject in great detail and his ideas became better focussed as the years went by. For the sake of clarity it is easier to look at his later opinions first. In Management of Archives he stated that the subgroup "is comprised of records created by an organizational subdivision of the public agency that created an archival group." These organizational subdivisions could be any one of the following: existing administrative units; units that had been superseded or discontinued; field offices of the parent agency; or, the records of each unit that make up a collective record group, that is, a record group "consisting of records of a given class of organizations." As with the arrangement of record groups, subgroups would be kept as integral units and would be arranged in an organizational relation to each other. This is in accord with most present day perceptions of the subgroup.

In his earlier writings Schellenberg stated that series
could be grouped together according to factors other than organizational origin, and that each of these groupings would constitute a subgroup. The organizational method was to be preferred, but other suggested means of creating subgroups were through the functional method or through such methods as type of record, chronological periods, or geographical areas. The last three methods of grouping series are straightforward. The functional method requires some elaboration. Schellenberg wrote:

Frequently agencies for which record groups have been established have passed through so many organizational changes that the records accumulated by many superseded or discontinued units within them have lost their administrative identity. The functions of the agencies may have remained unchanged though the units that performed them may have been altered or abolished; and the records pertinent to the functions may span many such units without any clear breaks to distinguish those that were produced by the successive units. In such cases, the subgroups are established in relation to functions.

Since these alternate means of subgrouping do not correspond to the organizational method, and given the earlier definition of series as an entity based on filing, it appears that Schellenberg confused subgroups and series. Despite the confusion, however, the means of arrangement described above are valid. To explain this point, it is useful first to elaborate on the importance of organization based subgrouping and then to compare this method with the alternatives offered by Schellenberg.

Richard Berner has developed an arrangement and description program at the University of Washington Libraries that relies heavily on subgrouping by organizational subdivisions only. According to Berner, if series are assigned to their appropriate subgroups during the arrangement process, then the subsequent
description becomes easier and more precise. If this is not done, "the series of the particular subgroup will be scattered among the general series of the parent agency," in which case a request for information on a particular subgroup would entail the detailed analysis of each of the general series of the parent agency. When subgrouping by organization is carried out, "the kind of content analysis required of each general series for the subgroups it contains becomes unnecessary: it has been taken care of without such analysis by having first arranged the records into subgroups."  

This is a good and workable system though it has been criticized for the rearrangement that often takes place which may jeopardize a meaningful original order. Another major weakness is that it is a very work intensive system. As better classified records of more recent origin are transferred to archival institutions, organizational subgrouping may become easier. But in the subgrouping of record series, it is obvious that there are many instances where the original organizational subgroups cannot be determined. This would especially be true at the National Archives of the 1950s when huge volumes of old and disorganized records were being arranged and described. In such cases the functional method of grouping series, along with the other alternatives suggested by Schellenberg, are perfectly valid. The only real point of issue is that such groupings of series cannot be referred to as subgroups since subgroups, by definition, must be based in an organizational subunit of an agency. If these general groupings of series require a name at all, they can be referred to simply as series, with the component series referred to as subseries. Schellenberg never used the
term "subseries," but he continued to instruct that series could be grouped according to the alternate methods of function, chronology, geography, or record type. He simply refrained from designating such groupings as subgroups. In fact, he did not give these groupings any particular name at all.  

In the archival profession the term "series" is one of the most difficult to define. With difficult concepts it is often the simplest definitions that prove the most useful. In Management of Archives Schellenberg offered a concise definition of series to correspond with his updated definition of record group. Just as record groups are established "by a consideration of their organizational, as distinct from their functional, origins," so series are established "by a consideration of their functional, as distinct from their organizational, origins." Useful as this definition is, it cannot stand on its own. Schellenberg always maintained that there were three factors on which the establishment of series could be based. The preferred factor is that of "the arrangement given records" within an archival or record group. He wrote:

Each of the files organized according to a particular filing system should be treated as a record unit.... It does not matter what filing system is followed--whether an alphabetical, a numerical, a subject, a classified, or some other--the important consideration is that all records organized according to an integrated filing system should be regarded as one unit. Nor does the quantity of records matter, for a series may be large or small.

The second preferred factor is that of record type, including letters, reports, directives, or special forms, such as applications or questionnaires. The final factor that could be used in the establishment of a series is the taking into account of "the relation of records to activity," that is, the arbitrary designation of a lot of records as a series "on the ground of
their relation to a specific transaction or matter of business."37 This latter category can be called an artificial series. Schellenberg's explanation of the term "series" covers all possible means of identifying and creating series and is a detailed extension of his own simple definition and of the definition of series as an entity based on filing.

With regard to the arrangement of series in relation to each other, Schellenberg noted that series could be placed "in any conceivable order without adversely affecting their organic quality."38 As Holmes observed, an agency "almost never established a sequential arrangement for the many different series it created."39 In other words the principle of original order does not apply to organization of series because the originating office usually does not arrange its various series according to any specific plan. The arrangement work carried out at this level forms the most creative work of the archivist. Once again, Holmes hardly addressed the issue, making instead a general reference to the Dutch manual for help in these matters. Schellenberg tackled the problem directly.

The grouping of series according to considerations of organizational origins, function, chronology, geography, or record type have already been outlined under the discussion of subgrouping. Within each of these groupings, stated Schellenberg, the series should be arranged in a logical way. (It is worth repeating here that arrangement at any level can more easily take place intellectually in the inventory rather than physically in the stacks.) The arrangement within the final three groupings is straightforward. Regarding arrangement by record type, "types whose contents are general, such as correspondence," would
precede "types of specific content, such as contracts."
Geographical and chronological arrangements are even simpler,
the former often in alphabetical order, perhaps by state and
then by counties within the state, and the latter simply by
date.40

When it comes to the arrangement of series that have been
brought together because of functional similarities, he changed
his mind over the years. In Principles of Arrangement he stated
that such series "should be arranged so far as possible in
relation to the organizational units of the agency that performed
the functions."41 This is a very weak statement since the
functional grouping of series was usually to take place in those
situations where the originating agency was difficult or
impossible to determine. In Management of Archives the more
sensible suggestion is made that series which relate to more than
one activity within the function should precede those that
relate to only one activity, and that the arrangement of series
should reflect the order in which a function was performed.42

Regarding series brought together because of their common
organizational origins, Schellenberg suggested only a general
means of arrangement. In Principles of Arrangement he stated
that such series "should be arranged in relation to the functions
performed by the administrative units that created them."43 This
is certainly the preferred method, but in Management of Archives
he did not give his full attention to the question. He stated
that series should normally be arranged in order to "reflect the
hierarchical levels within an agency, such as the bureaus,
divisions, and sections, and the hierarchical relations between
central and field offices." In other words "series of the larger
administrative units" should precede "those of the smaller." This, however, is more a statement on the arrangement of sub-groups rather than of series. He merely implied that the component series of each administrative unit should be arranged according to functional, chronological, or geographical schemes, or according to record type, as outlined above.

Holmes referred to the arrangement of series as "the heart of archival work...because the inventory and all other finding aids merely reflect this level of arrangement and are keyed into it." Schellenberg certainly agreed, and the inventory, based on the record group or subgroup with a description of the component series, has remained the basic archival finding aid in most large institutions. P.J. Scott's article, cited above, is noteworthy because of its recommendation that the series replace the record group as the basis for archival arrangement and description, a practice that was carried out in the national archival institution of Australia where Scott was employed. In his words:

If the series becomes the primary level of classification [or arrangement], and the item the secondary level, (a) items are kept in their administrative context and original order by physical allocation to their appropriate series, and (b) series are no longer kept in any original physical order in a record or shelf group...but simply have their administrative context and associations recorded on paper.

Series are registered as they are accessioned, and an elaborate scheme of indexes and inventories indicating all possible relationships of series to each other and to their creating or controlling agencies completes the system.

Scott's series system marks an attempt to overcome the weaknesses of the record group concept. Changes in an organization, its functions, its filing systems, the transfer of
records to another organization, and the possible existence of predecessor organizations can make it exceedingly difficult to allocate archival holdings to the appropriate record group. Schellenberg never fully considered these difficulties. It is only natural that no major criticism of an operating system will appear until that system has been utilized and written about for a number of years. Schellenberg wrote of his experiences at the National Archives. It was up to the next generation of archivists to offer the criticisms and the alternatives.

It is interesting to speculate on how Schellenberg would have reacted to ideas such as those proposed by Scott. It is unlikely, though, that he would have abandoned his view, and with good reason. The major weakness of the record series system is that it is quite complex and requires a great deal of work in order to make it functional. This weakness is offset by the main asset of the record group system, its relative simplicity. Using the record group system it is possible to arrange and describe accessions quickly with a limited staff, depending upon the level of control that is desired. This is especially important in an institution the size of the National Archives where the number of series is so great that series description often amounts to nothing more than the listing of series titles. Also, it has been estimated that three-quarters of record series can be attributed to a single creating agency. For this reason alone, the record group system is likely to be around for a long time to come. In estimating the relative values of the record group system and the record series system, it must be remembered that the question is one of practicality and not of theory. Provenance and original order are upheld in both systems.
Arrangement at the final two levels is straightforward and hardly needs mentioning except to bring this discussion to its conclusion. The most remarkable observation to be made regarding Schellenberg's comments on this matter is that he referred to only one level of arrangement, discussing at once the arrangement of both filing units and documents. He designated the final level of arrangement as the "filing unit" in his earlier writings and as the "record item" in Management of Archives. Regardless which term was used, his definition remained the same, namely, "a single document or many documents that were brought together, usually in the course of their current use, into volumes, binders, folders, or other containers."48 It is at this level that the principle of original order is most significant. As Schellenberg noted, for those series established on the basis of the arrangement given the records while in current use, the original order of the items should be respected. For series that were established because of physical type or subject activity, a chronological arrangement of the items usually suffices.49 Schellenberg's omission of a separate level of arrangement for individual documents is not significant since even Holmes commented that arrangement at the final level is rarely carried out unless flattening or microfilming of the items is required.50

The major drawback to Schellenberg's account of the levels of arrangement is that nowhere are all of his ideas presented in one publication. His later writings on the subject, particularly Management of Archives, are much more keenly focussed than his earlier writings, but even in Management of Archives it is necessary to jump from place to place in order to discover everything that he has to say. His writing style also leaves
much to be desired as it is often dogmatic and unimaginative. This is unlike Holmes' article which is well organized and well written and covers the entire topic in just twenty pages. However, while Holmes' presentation of the general outline of arrangement is the better of the two, Schellenberg did cover all of the same ground and even added more detailed information. Taken as a whole, Schellenberg's views on the arrangement of archives are as relevant today as they were when he first stated them, and considering the vacuum in which the ideas of Schellenberg and the National Archives were conceived, his writings take on an even greater prestige.

It would be unfair to examine the views of Schellenberg on the subject of arrangement without considering his comments with regard to manuscript collections. As mentioned in the first chapter, manuscript collections in the United States were usually held by libraries and historical societies and were often arranged and described according to library subject classification rules. Gradually, however, manuscript curators became aware that some archival principles and techniques could be applied to their situation. When Solon J. Buck left the National Archives in 1948, he went to work for the manuscript division of the Library of Congress and brought with him ideas formulated in archival practice. As Lester J. Cappon put it in an article published in 1956, "numerous bodies of historical manuscripts are really archival records under an assumed name." However, it was left to Schellenberg to draw all the pieces together. After Management of Archives was published in 1965, Schellenberg was hailed as "the foremost advocate of the applicability of archival methods to manuscripts." In the preface to this
important work he wrote: "the principles and techniques now applied to public records may be applied also, with some modification, to private records, especially to private manuscript material of recent origin, much of which has the organic character of archival material." In particular he stated that archivists "should observe the principle of provenance in arranging all organic records regardless of their origin."

Schellenberg distinguished helpfully between three types of collections. First, there are so-called organic collections, or those which are most similar to archival groups. Artificial collections consist of papers that are "brought together by collectors...after the actions to which they relate have occurred, not concurrently, and that are derived from many sources, not a single source." Collections of miscellany are created by the manuscript curators themselves and include "single record items or small groups of record items, acquired from various sources, that are formed into a collection in a manuscript repository." Unfortunately, despite such distinctions as these, there still exists no widespread common usage of terminology to specify the different types of manuscript collections of private origin.

With regard to the arrangement of collections, Schellenberg deplored both arrangement by subject classification or arrangement in alphabetical order by title of collection, both of which had been commonly used in the United States. He maintained that, like archival groups, each collection should be maintained "as a separate and integral unit," but, unlike archival groups, collections should be shelved "in the order in which they are accessioned." Regarding this last comment, it might be wondered why Schellenberg did not apply this rule to record
groups as well. But the prevalent attitude was that no special relationship exists between collections, which come from various sources, while a special relationship does exist between record groups, all of which have a common source, namely, a government. Therefore, the physical arrangement of collections need not be as carefully executed as the arrangement of record groups.

Series could easily be established and arranged in organic collections as they are in archival groups. Unless series had already been established in artificial and miscellaneous collections, however, the archivist "should keep all items in such a collection as a single series." The arrangement of record items was considered separately for each type of collection. For organic collections it was, once again, a matter of directly applying archival principles and techniques. For artificial collections the original order was to be preferred whenever possible, with alternate arrangements to be chronological or alphabetical, depending on the nature of the materials. Items within collections of miscellany, because they are often not directly related to each other and usually are not well arranged originally, are to be arranged in simple numerical order with an accompanying index or catalog.

In 1966 two other important books were published on the subject of the care of manuscript collections, Ruth B. Bordin's and Robert M. Warner's The Modern Manuscript Library, and Lucile M. Kane's A Guide to the Care and Administration of Manuscripts. Both works are straightforward, practical, and emphasize the importance of keeping collections intact and of avoiding subject classification in their arrangement. Of the two, Kane's Guide is the superior. Kane seems to have a firmer
grasp of the principle of provenance and does not overemphasize the merits of chronological arrangement, as do Bordin and Warner. When considering only the practical matters of running a repository, Kane's well presented, step by step approach is even better than Schellenberg's *Management of Archives*. Schellenberg's discussion of the arrangement and description of manuscript collections is often overshadowed by his lengthy commentaries on the history, development, and relevance of archival theory and practice. This account of the adaptability of archival principles and techniques to the care of manuscripts was his most important contribution to the latter discipline. For the most part, however, Schellenberg's area of expertise always remained the field of public archives.

The subject of the description of archives has already been touched upon. It has been noted that description follows naturally from arrangement and that the best example of the close relationship between the two activities is the archival inventory. Description serves the needs of both the archivist and the researcher. Schellenberg was always very aware of the important role of the archivist in the description of his institution's holdings. He observed: "The servicing activity is doubtless the most important of all activities performed by an archivist. It means furnishing archives, reproductions of archives, or information from or about archives to the government and the public."^61

According to Schellenberg, description involved two actions: "the first is to identify the record unit that is to be described, and the second is to enumerate its essential qualities or attributes."^62 Regarding the enumeration of essential
qualities, he differentiated between structural, or physical, attributes and substantive attributes. The same attributes would be considered regardless of the record unit being described, from the record group or manuscript collection all the way down to the individual document.

Structural characteristics encompassed record type, composition, volume, and form. Record type, in turn, was broken down into general and specific. General types included records, or "material produced by corporate bodies or government agencies," papers, that is "material produced by persons," and manuscripts, or "the unprinted version of a book or an extended writing, such as memoir, autobiography, essay, sermon, oration, or the like." Specific record types included letters, reports, diaries, and so on. The term "composition" was used "to refer to the way records were brought together when they were originally created or accumulated. They may have been brought together into volumes, file units, and files." Schellenberg added that information on composition was important in description "only in special circumstances." Record volume has an obvious meaning. By record form, Schellenberg meant whether the records were originals or reproductions.

Substantive attributes included the provenance of the records, their functional origins, the time and place of their production, and the subject matter with which they deal. Time and place of production are obvious, and subject matter will be discussed below along with cataloging and indexing. Regarding provenance, Schellenberg noted that "a certain amount of meaningful information" can be provided about records, papers, and manuscripts simply by identifying the agency or individual
that created them. He added: "The more precise the information on their producer, the more precise is the information on their content." 65

Earlier in this chapter it was noted that Schellenberg preferred the classification of records by function rather than by library styled classification lists. He had the same view with regard to the description of archives. He wrote: "the subject matter of records can actually be revealed much more clearly by taking a functional, rather than a subject, approach in analyzing their content." In describing the functional origins of a record unit, the archivist would enumerate "the activities or transactions that resulted in its production." Indeed, the proper classification of current records would greatly facilitate their subsequent arrangement and description in archival institutions. 66

In the practical application of these attributes to the description of archival groups and manuscript collections, Schellenberg followed two separate approaches. For public records the best means of enumerating the substantive and structural characteristics was in the form of the inventory, and such a practice could also be applied to manuscript collections of an organic nature. This traditional means of description has been discussed already in this chapter.

For all manuscript collections, Schellenberg also advocated the use of the card catalog in which the title of the individual collection constituted the main entry. The cards themselves would then be arranged by subjects, both personal and topical, and by chronological periods and geographical areas. It must be pointed out that Schellenberg rightly felt that catalogs and
inventories were perfectly capable of coexisting. The use of one did not exclude the use of the other. It was simply a matter of practicality and need. A special relationship exists between record groups because their origins are from the same body, while for manuscript collections artificial relationships had to be established through the creation of a catalog. Schellenberg also noted that the number of collections in manuscript repositories is usually much greater than the number of record groups in archival institutions, and so cataloging is needed to keep the numerous collections under control.\(^6\) The importance of cataloging manuscript collections continues to be recognized, and the use of the archival-styled inventory for each collection is also becoming more common in manuscript repositories.

Schellenberg was especially sensitive about the distinction between catalogs and indexes. In his diary he vehemently criticized Archivist Grover, complaining that "he does not know the difference between an index and a catalog."\(^6\) In Management of Archives he wrote:

> Indexes are designed merely to point the way to subject content, to indicate where information on subjects may be found in records. They are not designed to describe records, as are catalogs, but only to identify them in relation to subjects. Indexes are thus locating media; catalogs are descriptive media, though they too, obviously, may be used to locate information.\(^6\)

The advantages of indexes are that, since records are only identified in them and not described, "they can be prepared more easily than can other types of finding aids," and therefore they are the best means of providing information on the subject content of record units, including individual items, but only when such detailed description is required.\(^7\)
A major controversy arises over the question of the headings to be used in the catalogs and indexes. Schellenberg preferred a system which made use of headings based on broad subjects and personal and corporate names in combination with chronological and geographical considerations. Regarding the selection of subject headings, it has been mentioned that Schellenberg preferred the functional analysis of records rather than the subject analysis. This was not a point of contention for most archivists, though his support for the use of broad subject headings as opposed to more detailed headings was highly criticized. In an attempt to understand the reason for Schellenberg's stand on this matter, Richard Berner made the following observation in a letter to his former teacher: "I feel that our basis of difference lies in the fact that my emphasis is upon local or on-site bibliographical control, while you are concerned with national media for coverage." Unfortunately, if Schellenberg commented on this observation, his response is not available. However, Berner's reasoning seems to be valid. Given Schellenberg's career at a large national institution, it is only natural that he should be concerned with the broader outlook of subject access.

This issue remains one of the greatest challenges facing present day archivists. Richard Berner has written extensively about one system that has been developed to deal with the problem of subject access. He maintains that cataloging and indexing based upon an analysis of the records themselves requires too much work. He favours a subject index that directs the researchers not to the records themselves, but to the inventory for that particular body of records. In this
integrated system, then, it is the inventory that is being indexed and not the actual records. This method is gaining in popularity in the archival world. Schellenberg never conceived of such a system as he always stated that indexes would point the researcher directly to the records. However, Schellenberg's popularization of functional analysis can be seen as a forerunner to Berner's integrated system in that both Schellenberg and Berner took full advantage of archival principles as opposed to library methods. For Schellenberg the functional approach recognized the unique nature of archival materials, that is, that records were drawn up in relation to functions and not in relation to subjects, while Berner's integrated system is firmly rooted in provenance.

Any discussion of description usually leads to a discussion of standardization. With regard to the standardization of descriptive practices, all factors indicate that there is still a long way to go in this matter. A recent study undertaken in Canada shows that most repositories do not make use of in-house controls in the creation of their finding aids. What, then, of Schellenberg's prediction that archival principles and techniques "can, and will, be standardized"? Agreement on specific descriptive questions, such as the standardized entry of descriptive elements, is part of the distant future. Computerization will not necessarily aid standardization at this level since various hardware and software will be used from one institution to the next. On a more general level, however, such as the standardized use of terminology in the naming of finding aids and, perhaps, agreement on the best overall descriptive plan for an institution, steps towards standardization are more
immediately possible. It is also possible that Schellenberg was aiming for this general standardization since, as noted in the previous chapter, he acknowledged that archival techniques could never be as precisely defined as those of the library profession. With this broader view of standardization, Schellenberg's general statements on description, particularly the separation of structural and substantive attributes and their components, provide all archivists with a solid basis for description no matter which method is used.

Standardization does not only refer to descriptive techniques, however, but also to archival principles, especially as they pertain to arrangement. In this regard the archival profession has a firm foundation, and Schellenberg played an important part in bringing this about. The archival community in the United States was in great need of basic archival literature, to which Schellenberg's publications made a great contribution. He investigated the prevalent archival principles of Europe and helped to adapt them to situations peculiar to the United States as typified by the National Archives. In so doing, he gave archival principles a strong theoretical basis and yet maintained the flexibility necessitated by the numerous practical exceptions to the rule. In a profession which relies heavily on both theory and practice, Schellenberg's writings will always hold a place of eminence.
CHAPTER IV

IDEAS ON APPRAISAL

Archival appraisal is the process of evaluating records in order to decide which records warrant permanent preservation in an archival institution. The corollary of this statement is that those records not chosen for permanent preservation are to be destroyed--either immediately or after temporary retention, usually in a records center. Thus, the execution of the appraisal function represents a very serious responsibility for archivists.

As noted earlier, the first time that appraisal work was conducted by archivists on a large scale was at the National Archives in the 1930s. Through its continued efforts to deal with the problem of record volume, the National Archives soon became recognized as a world archival leader, and, more than any other individual American archivist, T.R. Schellenberg popularized the archivist's new role in records appraisal. It is useful, then, to look at Schellenberg's defense of the archivist's involvement in appraisal, including an examination of his definition of archives and of the relationship between appraisal and records management; examine his study, The Appraisal of Modern Public Records, in which his actual appraisal guidelines are set forth; and, finally, place his views in the context of the recent developments in records appraisal.

In order to appreciate the need for Schellenberg to defend the archivist's appraisal work, it is necessary to reflect on
the European archival situation prior to the 1930s. In Muller, Feith, and Fruin's *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, the subject of appraisal is not even discussed, not—as the title seems to suggest—because the authors wished to consider only arrangement and description, but simply because appraisal was not an important issue at that time.\(^2\) The prevalent attitude was that an archival institution should preserve the entire documentation of an administrative body, though it was understood that an agency would destroy a portion of its records through the regular execution of its business. This was a realistic approach to archival management at a time when record volume was relatively small. In the twentieth century, however, the growth of governments and the development of new technologies led to the drastic increase in the volume of government records. It soon became apparent that a greater portion of the documentation had to be destroyed. Some European archivists, particularly H.O. Meissner of Prussia and Gustaw Kalenski of Poland, published articles dealing with the new subject of appraisal, but their work did not immediately become well known outside their respective countries.\(^3\)

In England, Sir Hilary Jenkinson was adamantly opposed to the archivist's involvement in appraisal. According to Jenkinson, archives included, by definition, all documentary materials "drawn up or used in the course of an administrative or executive transaction" and "subsequently preserved in their own custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors." The impetus for preservation was to rest with the administrator, and any appraisal carried out by archivists would
destroy the very integrity of the archives. This was the predominant point of view among most English archivists for the first half of this century.

Schellenberg was sharply critical of Jenkinson's views on appraisal. He realized that the very different archival situation in the United States meant that a different approach would have to be taken towards the appraisal issue. As he put it:

American archivists are concerned with an overwhelming mass of documentation. They must reduce this mass to make it usable. They realize that not all records can be preserved, that some of them have to be destroyed, and that a discriminating destruction of a portion of them is in fact a service to scholarship. They know that a careful selection of the documentation produced by a modern government is necessary if they are not to glut their stacks with insignificant materials that will literally submerge those that are valuable. American archivists believe that this selection should be made by those most cognizant of the interests of scholarship, namely the archivists who are familiar with research interests and research needs.... American archivists, in their concern with the selection of documents, have given more thought to appraisal standards than have their European colleagues; and in this respect I believe they have something worthwhile to contribute to archival thinking.

This was not a theoretical consideration, but rather a matter of practical response to a very pressing need. Just as Schellenberg had advocated that the principle of original order need not be observed in every circumstance in the arrangement of archives, he similarly challenged the tradition that archivists should not be involved in appraisal.

If archivists were to work as records appraisers, then definitions of archives such as the one offered by Jenkinson could not be accepted. Schellenberg countered by refining the definition of archives so that the element of selection became the cornerstone. In Modern Archives, he stated:

...there is no final or ultimate definition of the term
"archives" that must be accepted without change and in preference to all others. The definition may be modified in each country to fit its particular needs... The modern archivist, I believe, has a definite need to redefine archives in a manner more suited to his own requirements. Since the major problem of the modern archivist is to select archives for permanent preservation from among the mass of official records created by public (or private) institutions of all kinds, the element of selection should be implicit in the definition of archives.

Accordingly, archives were defined as those "records... which are adjudged worthy of permanent preservation for reference and research purposes and which have been deposited or have been selected for deposit in an archival institution." In turn, he defined records as all documentary materials "made or received by any public or private institution in pursuance of its legal obligations or in connection with the transaction of its proper business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that institution or its legitimate successor."8

This definition of records, with its emphasis on the natural accumulation of records and their preservation in official custody, is strikingly similar to Jenkinson's definition of archives. It can be stated, therefore, that Schellenberg's definition of archives is an extension of earlier definitions through the inclusion of the statement on selection. The definition does not specify that it is the archivist who must carry out this selection, but neither is it implied that such an action would be contrary to archival principles. While redefinition to suit the circumstances is a practice that could prove to be very dangerous to the stability of any profession, in this instance Schellenberg's refining of the definition of archives must be seen as a means of providing a firm intellectual basis for a very necessary practice.

As we have seen, the records management profession was first
developed at the National Archives partially in response to appraisal needs. Thus the relationship between records management and appraisal is very important, especially regarding the disposition of records which have lost their current administrative value. Schellenberg stressed this point in Disposition of Federal Records when he observed:

The primary objective of a disposition program is to control the outflow of records from an agency as methodically as their inflow is controlled, thereby systematizing the management of records from their beginning to their end.... Under such programs records that have to be retained temporarily should be retired periodically either to inactive files or to records depositories, and, after their current usefulness has been exhausted, they should be destroyed periodically; while records that have to be retained permanently should be held in an orderly manner within the agency that created them until they have become noncurrent and then should be transferred periodically to an archival agency.10

He added that the "selection of records for preservation is the positive aspect of the problem of records disposition; the disposal of records is the negative one."11

In Modern Archives, he dwelled on the relationship between records management and appraisal in the chapter entitled, "Archival Interests in Record Management," in which he emphasized that archivists and records managers must cooperate in the disposition of records. Earlier in Modern Archives he addressed the issue of cooperation on a more specific level by stating that the disposition of records would be facilitated if records were properly classified while in current use. He wrote:

Classification...has a direct bearing on disposal practices. Records need not be preclassified with a view to their disposal.... Records should be classified primarily to facilitate their current use, and only secondarily to facilitate their removal and disposal. But if records are properly classified in relation to function they can usually be eliminated in relation to function, for they derive much of their significance from their relation to function.12

Schellenberg's concern with the classification of current records
has already been examined during the discussions of provenance, original order, and description.\textsuperscript{13} The point to be made here is that classification—a records management function—has a direct link with the disposition of records, which in turn is affiliated with the archival function of appraisal. Thus Schellenberg's writings reveal the importance of recognizing and acting upon the interrelationship that exists not only between archival and records management functions but also between the respective archival functions of arrangement and description and appraisal. The coordination and integration of all record keeping practices is the only way of bringing about efficiency in archival institutions.

The Appraisal of Modern Public Records deals almost exclusively with the criteria upon which archivists can base their appraisal decisions. Very little American appraisal literature preceded its publication in 1956. However, in order to appreciate the intellectual context of Schellenberg's bulletin, it is useful to consider two earlier publications written by National Archives staff members. In his article, "The Selection of Records for Preservation," published in 1940, Philip C. Brooks distinguished between the value of documents for the originating agency and their value for research purposes.\textsuperscript{14} Determining the value of the first kind was an administrative concern, of the second kind an archival concern. In making appraisal decisions, he emphasized the importance of understanding the history and functions of the agency and the relationship between the records under consideration and other administrative records. He also stated that archivists must be aware of changes in research interest and of the uses made of records already preserved.
These are valid suggestions which would aid any archivist in appraising records, but they are discussed only summarily by Brooks. Indeed, they form only a small portion of the content of Brooks' article, which was concerned primarily with the "life history" of a record from its creation to its eventual disposition.

In 1946, the National Archives issued the Staff Information Circular, *The Appraisal of Current and Recent Records*, by G. Philip Bauer. Asserting that "stern and true cost accounting is a prerequisite of all orderly appraisal," Bauer concluded that it was not the money saving reduction of records that required justification but rather their expensive preservation. He envisioned the eventual development of rigid appraisal criteria based upon financial considerations that would reduce drastically the holdings of the National Archives. Bauer was criticized by his colleague, Herman Kahn, for viewing appraisal in "a purely commercial light." Kahn was further opposed to the introduction of strict appraisal guidelines because "the lack of an extremely rigid definition of policy makes possible experimentation, independent thought, change--and change means life." Schellenberg, as the chief administrator of the National Archives Division in the 1950s and as head of the Office of Records Appraisal in the early 1960s, was well aware of the financial side of records appraisal, and so he recognized the need for practical appraisal guidelines. However, he was also familiar with the need to appraise records with research and cultural needs in mind--needs which are constantly changing--and so he realized that absolute appraisal standards could never be realistically achieved.
The Appraisal of Modern Public Records, like most of Schellenberg's writings, is rigidly structured and reveals a great deal of analytical thinking on the part of the author. This is especially apparent in the careful development of the various types of value that records may possess, proceeding from the general to the specific. Definitions of terminology also play an important part in Schellenberg's presentation. He began by distinguishing between the value that records might have "for the originating agency itself" and their value "for other agencies and private users." He called these values "primary" and "secondary" respectively. This preliminary distinction is similar to the one made by Brooks and represents no new line of thought. Schellenberg then stated, as did Brooks, that archivists are concerned only with the secondary values, and the rest of the bulletin is devoted to a consideration of these.

Secondary values were further divided into two major categories—"evidential" and "informational" values. In order to understand the bulletin at all, it is essential first to understand Schellenberg's definition of these terms. Evidential values were defined as "the values that attach to records because of the evidence they contain of [the] organization and function[ing]" of the originating agency. He was careful to divorce this term from a similar one used by Jenkinson to refer to "the sanctity of the evidence in archives that is derived from 'unbroken custody,' or from the way they came into the hands of the archivist." As Schellenberg explained: "The quality of the evidence per se is thus not the issue here, but the character of the matter evidenced." Informational values were defined as "the values that attach to records because of the
information they contain" on "persons, or things, or phenomena." The term "persons" referred to "either individuals or corporate bodies," the term "things" to "places, buildings, physical objects, and other material things," and the term "phenomena" related to "what happens to either persons or things—to conditions, problems, activities, programs, events, episodes, and the like." He added that the separation between evidential and informational values was made "solely for purposes of discussion. The two types of values are not mutually exclusive."18

The terms evidential and informational values represent distinct concepts that simplify the archivist's intellectual approach to appraisal. One of Schellenberg's observations regarding the nature of the work of arrangement and description can also serve to illustrate the importance of this simple distinction. In his view, the

...very process of analysis is one of separating anything, whether an object of the senses or of the intellect, into its parts. By this process it is possible to distinguish each of the parts separately, and to understand their relation to each other and to the whole.19

Schellenberg deserves the credit for popularizing these meaningful terms that have since become widely used in the archival profession.

He then proceeded to discuss at length the particular elements of evidential and informational values. While the concept of evidential values may be more difficult to grasp than that of informational values, the actual application of the test of evidential values is the simpler of the two. As Schellenberg noted, the test

...can be applied by all archivists, for no archivist is
likely to question that evidence of every agency's organization and functioning should be preserved. Differences of judgment will arise only as to the completeness with which such evidence should be preserved. The test of research value, on the other hand, brings to view records on which judgments are bound to differ widely. In deciding upon evidential values, he stressed the importance of basing such decisions on "a knowledge of the entire documentation of an agency; they should not be made on a piecemeal basis." All appraisal decisions were to be based on careful study. A demand for a knowledge of the entire documentation of any agency is very intimidating, but it is not as impossible as it might sound. This simply underlines the point that appraisal archivists should be very experienced and very familiar with the history and operation of the agency under consideration. Such experience and familiarity can best be gained if the archivist carries out a variety of archival functions rather than specializing in one particular function, a point that Schellenberg fully supported.

In summarizing Schellenberg's account of appraising records according to evidential values, it is possible to extract three basic rules. The first is obvious and relates directly to the definition of evidential values, namely that certain records which illustrate the organization of the agency should be preserved along with other records which illustrate the functions of the agency. Records bearing on the organization of the agency are obvious and usually few in number, including such types as organizational charts and records documenting the origins of the agency. It is with regard to records illustrative of function that the second and third basic rules apply. The second rule is that the functions of an agency can be divided between the substantive, or the major functions, and the
facilitative, or the more routine functions such as those pertaining to personnel and supply. Certainly the substantive functions would be the more important and, therefore, records relating to these would have a greater value than records relating to facilitative functions. Records of the former type would include annual reports, agency histories, policy and procedural issuances of numerous kinds, and records relating to major legal and budgetary matters. The importance of records relating to substantive functions is a point with which all archivists would agree.

What is presented here as Schellenberg's third basic rule is contained in these words:

In appraising the evidential values of public records an archivist must be particularly conscious of organization, for these values largely depend on the position of the office that produced them in the administrative hierarchy of the agency. In general, the records of offices decrease in value as one descends the administrative ladder of an agency.23

At first it may appear that this is too sweeping a statement. Meyer Fishbein, for example, has noted several instances where records of field offices have possessed more archival value than the records of the parent offices.24 In defense of Schellenberg, however, it must be emphasized that he was speaking about evidential values and not about informational values, and this distinction must be kept clear when reading the bulletin. Records of higher level offices would certainly have more value with regard to documenting the organization and functions of the entire agency than would records of subordinate offices. Schellenberg was merely stating what should be the obvious, but he did qualify his statement by adding that if the administrative responsibilities of the agency were decentralized or if the
various field offices were disparate in character, then the
records of such lower level offices would assume a greater
evidential value.  

In his article, "No Grandfather Clause: Reaccessioning
Accessioned Records," Leonard Rapport has criticized Schellenberg
for tending "to overvalue the evidential." As a result, says
Rapport, too many records having evidential value have been
retained. In support of this criticism he cited Schellenberg's
statement that records having evidential value "should be
preserved regardless of whether there is an immediate or even
a foreseeable specific use for them." Rapport's statement is
unfair because he quoted Schellenberg out of context. It is
obvious from the summarization of Schellenberg's account of
determining evidential values that records having such a value
would be relatively small in volume and that only the most
important of such records would be preserved. Indeed, in any
archival institution, as Schellenberg himself pointed out,
records possessing informational value are generally much
greater in volume and are looked upon as having more research
importance than records possessing only evidential values.
Finally, it must be remembered that evidential and informational
values are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and so records
which contain evidential value actually may have been preserved
because of their informational value.

Frank Boles and Julia Marks Young have also criticized
Schellenberg's handling of evidential values by claiming that
such values are not relevant to institutional archives "whose
primary goal is to document other organizations or subject
areas." However, this statement is misleading. Consideration
of evidential values is certainly irrelevant to the appraisal of records pertaining to subject areas which fall outside the usual acquisitions policy of an archival institution simply because such an appraisal is concerned with informational values rather than with evidential values. But concerning the appraisal of records of organizations other than the sponsoring institution of the archives, consideration of evidential values remains important. If an organization is to be documented properly, some records should be kept which reflect its structure and functions.

Regarding informational value, Schellenberg stated that records preserved for this reason would have to meet the tests of uniqueness, form, and importance. The first two of these terms have specific but multiple meanings. The term "uniqueness" refers, first of all, to "the uniqueness of the information," meaning that "the information contained in particular public records is not to be found in other documentary sources in as complete and as usable a form." This implies a knowledge of "all other sources of information on the matter under consideration," which again emphasizes the need for experience and careful study and extends the archivist's responsibility to include not only a familiarity with the agency's documentation but also an awareness of any related outside documentation, whether published or unpublished. A second meaning of uniqueness refers to "the uniqueness of the records that contain the information," that is, whether or not physical duplicates of the records have already been preserved, in which case the materials under consideration lose their value. 29

The term "form" also has two meanings. The first pertains to "the degree to which the information is concentrated.... In
general, records that represent concentrations of information are the most suitable for archival preservation, for archival institutions are almost always pressed for space to house records." The second meaning has to do with the physical form of the records—whether or not their physical condition or arrangement would prevent their being used by researchers. Both of these meanings represent important considerations for the archivist. However, while the term "form" readily conveys the idea of the physical condition and arrangement of the records, it is a poor term to use to try to convey the idea of the degree of concentration of information. Schellenberg can be faulted on occasion for utilizing a vocabulary lacking in precision. In fairness to him, though, at least he went to great lengths to define all such terms of dubious meaning. He seems to have been trying to present the difficult concepts of appraisal in the simplest possible manner.

The tests of uniqueness and form are straightforward in comparison with the test of importance. As Schellenberg observed: "In applying the test of importance, the archivist is in the realm of the imponderable, for who can say definitely if a given body of records is important, and for what purpose, and to whom?" Accordingly, he stated that before applying the test of importance, the archivist should first ensure that the records meet the tests of uniqueness and form since they "relate to ponderables—to matters that are capable of being appraised on the basis of ascertainable facts." In other words, the tests of uniqueness and form invite greater objectivity than does the test of importance. Appraisal based on the importance of the information contained in the records provides archivists with
their greatest challenge. More records are preserved for this than for any other reason, and it is here that the experience and knowledge of archivists are most needed and most severely tested. No rigid rules can be applied to the determination of the importance of the information contained in records, but Schellenberg provided some sound advice. He stated that the archivist should consider the needs of the government before considering the needs of researchers; that with regard to researchers, priority should be given to the needs of history and the social sciences rather than to geneological and antiquarian needs; and that decisions should be made for collective bodies of records, such as series, rather than for individual documents. These statements might sound somewhat overwhelming, but given Schellenberg's experience at a large public archives they are readily understandable and valid.

Most of the remainder of the bulletin deals with the application of the tests of uniqueness, form, and importance as they relate specifically to information on persons, things, and phenomena. (This includes a brief account of the sampling of records as an appraisal technique, which will be discussed later in this chapter.) It is with regard to the more specific appraisal tests that Schellenberg's comments become less important for many present day archivists. There are two main reasons for this. First of all, the examples he used, not surprisingly, were taken from his experience at the National Archives, and many archival institutions would not be faced with the same kind of specific appraisal problems. Schellenberg himself made this point in the conclusion of the bulletin when he wrote: "Archivists of different archival institutions may...
use different criteria in evaluating similar types of records, for what is valuable to one archival institution may be valueless to another." A second reason is that Schellenberg was obviously neither concerned with subsequent research developments in such areas as the history of science and technology, nor with the appraisal of machine readable records. As a general observation, then, it can be stated that Schellenberg's comments on general appraisal criteria are extremely valuable, while his comments on specific criteria are of less value.

Regarding the type of training that archivists should have to prepare them for the task of appraisal, Schellenberg was supportive of a background in history. When discussing the application of the test of evidential value, he wrote:

> It involves an objective approach that the modern archivist is especially trained to take; for his training in historical methodology has taught him to look into the origin, development, and the working of human institutions and to use records for the purpose.

Later in the bulletin he observed:

> Since most records that come into the care of an archivist are relatively old, the interests of historical research are most important to him.... Modern archivists are generally trained as historians, and it may therefore be assumed that they are competent to appraise the value of public records for historical research.

He added that "if his analysis does not yield the information that is needed in the appraisal of records, the archivist should seek the help of experts" from other disciplines. It should not be assumed that Schellenberg was saying that archivists should not come from these other disciplines. Also, it must be reiterated here that Schellenberg was not saying that archivists should be historians in disguise. He was simply making the observation that most archivists do, indeed, have a background
in historical methodology, and that this methodology, through its analysis of primary source material, is particularly relevant to the archival function of appraisal.

The concluding paragraphs of the bulletin are filled with sound common sense. Schellenberg stated that appraisal criteria "cannot be reduced to exact standards. Our standards can be little more than general principles." It follows from this that appraisal criteria "need not be applied with absolute consistency.... Complete consistency in judging informational values is as undesirable as it is impossible of accomplishment." These comments call to mind the similar ones made by Herman Kahn in criticism of G. Philip Bauer's demands for rigid appraisal guidelines. More importantly, however, the comments reveal Schellenberg's own attitude towards his bulletin. It was not a work intended to give archivists a set of strict appraisal rules, but rather a set of guidelines within which the archivist could work flexibly. In analogous terms, the bulletin has greater similarity with a student's guide on the basic manner of writing essays than with a student's guide on the rules of grammar and punctuation. Once again we see that Schellenberg's approach to the standardization of archival principles and techniques was often very general in scope. And in the carrying out of appraisal, there was to be no replacement for in depth research analysis. He cautioned that "appraisals of records should not be based on intuition or arbitrary suppositions of value; they should be based instead on thorough analyses of the documentation bearing on the matter to which the records pertain. Analysis is the essence of appraisal."35

Schellenberg's final statement in his appraisal bulletin
represents both a warning and an encouragement to archivists.

He wrote:

An archivist dealing with modern records realizes that not all of them can be preserved, that some of them have to be destroyed, and that, in fact, a discriminating destruction of a portion of them is a service to scholarship.... He must call attention to the fact that a government has only a limited amount of funds for the preservation of its documentary resources and that these funds must be applied judiciously for the preservation of the most important of these resources.36

The warning comes from the use of the word "destruction," as archivists are reminded of the finality of their appraisal decisions. It should be recalled here that Schellenberg did not want records centers to be used as a means of putting off these decisions.37 The encouragement comes from the use of the word "preservation," as archivists are reminded of the value and necessity of their work. This is a fitting conclusion to the bulletin as it brings to the fore Schellenberg's basic idea that archivists must be involved in the appraisal of records.

Over the past thirty years, archivists have continued to wrestle with the problem of appraisal. No modern archivist would seriously challenge the necessity of the appraisal function, nor the archivist's involvement in it. In Canada, for example, this theme was expounded throughout the 1960s by the Dominion Archivist, W. Kaye Lamb, and his successor, Wilfrid Smith.38 Meanwhile, English and European archivists did not linger unduly over their aversion to the archivist's involvement in appraisal. For example, the Grigg Commission, which sat from 1952 to 1955, did for Britain what the Hoover Commissions did for the United States. As the problem of modern record bulk became a concern for European archivists, they responded by bringing a great deal of original thinking into records appraisal.
Some archivists have built upon the ideas established by Schellenberg. The best example of this is Maynard J. Brichford's *Archives and Manuscripts: Appraisal and Accessioning*, published in 1977 as part of the Society of American Archivists basic manual series. This is the only major work in English on the subject of appraisal that has appeared since *The Appraisal of Modern Public Records*. Most of Brichford's guidelines are basically the same as Schellenberg's. He made use of the terms "evidential" and "informational" values and cited Schellenberg a total of thirteen times in a manual that is only twenty-three pages in length. In fact, the manual is not remarkable for how it differs from Schellenberg's account of appraisal, but for what it adds to it. For example, Brichford directly discussed the relationship between records management and appraisal, whereas Schellenberg approached the subject indirectly and did not mention it at all in the bulletin. Brichford addressed the question of the appraisal of non-textual records and the monetary appraisal of manuscripts. While Schellenberg did not mention non-textual records specifically, it can be assumed that his guidelines would be relevant on a general level to the more traditional non-textual records. And since he was concerned only with public records, there was never any reason to consider monetary appraisals of private archives. Brichford also included a most useful appendix entitled, "Functional Categories of Records Grouped by Relative Importance," in which the relative importance ranges from records that are "Usually Valuable," such as diaries and minutes, down to records that are "Usually Without Value," such as duplicate copies. The inclusion of a similar table would have further enhanced the
usefulness of Schellenberg's bulletin.

The earlier cited article by Leonard Rapport contains not only criticisms of Schellenberg but also some observations which can be seen as extensions of ideas put forth by Schellenberg. Rapport argued that not all of the holdings of an archival institution need be permanently preserved, but rather that the holdings should be subject to periodic reappraisals in order to determine if their preservation should be continued. It will be recalled that Schellenberg was involved in the reappraisal of accessioned records in the 1950s, but this was necessitated by the backlog of work that had accumulated during World War Two and did not constitute regular procedure. What is most interesting about Rapport's argument is that it means that archives would no longer be defined as records deemed worthy of permanent preservation, but rather as records deemed worthy of continued preservation. This is obviously different from Schellenberg's definition but, more importantly, it is in keeping with Schellenberg's statement that archivists of different times and places would have to redefine archives in accordance with their unique environments.

Another recent development in the appraisal of records has been a growing interest in the techniques of sampling. Sampling can be defined as the selection of a small number of records to serve as an example of a larger body of records. The object, of course, is to keep the fewest number of records necessary to reflect the contents of the entire body. No archivist, past or present, has advocated widespread use of sampling, but it has been recognized as a possible means of preserving information contained in large homogenous bodies of
records without preserving all of the records. Schellenberg discussed sampling in his bulletin, but his ideas are now largely outdated. He believed that records pertaining to everyday contemporary social and economic matters should be preserved according to the "principle of special selection." This meant that "a few records" would be preserved

...because they contain data that are representative or illustrative of the whole, because they deal with an important or significant event or action, or because they contain data that are considered adequate for a study of particular social or economic conditions.

He did not elaborate on the actual sampling procedure, but he did state that the method of special selection was preferable to statistical sampling for a number of reasons. He wrote:

The archivist preserves records for unknown uses; the statistician must know in advance the particular ways in which his samples are to be used. The archivist selects records that have characteristics illustrative of the whole; the statistician, in accordance with well-defined mathematical formulae, selects a sample that presents information of measurable reliability on particular characteristics of the universe from which it is taken. A statistical sample is more exact than the representative or illustrative body of records preserved by the archivist.  

This aversion to statistical sampling was in keeping with the thought of Schellenberg's day. In one of the earliest and best known accounts of sampling, Paul Lewinson, a colleague of Schellenberg's, also displayed suspicions regarding statistical sampling, though he did not rule out the possibility that "some day a statistical, mathematically based sample of known reliability may be considered worth drawing for preservation."  

The most intensive study of sampling to date is The Use of Sampling Techniques by the English archivist, Felix Hull, in 1981. Hull distinguished between four types of sampling--"the example," which requires "the selection from an ephemeral series
of papers of one or more specimens to illustrate administrative practice at a particular date;" the method of "purposive sampling," which takes place "when a selection is made on a preconceived set of criteria, the intention being to retain the most significant or important records of a class or series;" selection according to "systematic sampling," which "depends upon the establishment of a particular pattern of selection in that either every nth file is preserved, or else all the papers for a particular month, year or other chronological unit;" and finally, "random sampling," which "implies that every unit in a series has an equal chance of representing that series" and cannot therefore be carried out "without some sophisticated elements," in particular "a random number table." The first two types of sampling are similar to Schellenberg's special selection, while the last type is similar to Schellenberg's and Lewinson's view of statistical sampling. Hull acknowledged that each of the four methods has particular merits, but he tended to dismiss the example and purposive methods because of what he saw as their large subjective element, and, not surprisingly, tended to favor the random method whenever possible because of its relative objectivity. 46 It is obvious, therefore, that Schellenberg's account of sampling does not contain the sophistication of more recent accounts.

Random sampling, with its emphasis on objectivity, is indicative of the recent trend, especially among European archivists such as West Germany's Hans Booms, to derive an objective theoretical approach to appraisal. Unfortunately, none of the relevant literature has yet been translated into English, though some commentaries on the work of Booms are available.
According to the American archivist, Nancy Peace, the thrust of Booms' argument is that the most commonly known approach to appraisal, such as the one outlined by Schellenberg, is overly subjective and speculative. Peace noted that Booms has argued for "an objective evaluation method that flows from the value system of the information universe that the archivist is responsible for transmitting." She elaborated:

Booms noted that this methodology assumes that the evaluation of what will be transmitted will proceed in a total social environment, requiring that archivists no longer make their evaluations solely on the basis of, or only within, their own archival environment.... According to Booms, by following the new methodology, archivists will not speculate on what future historians may want, but will create a record that reflects today's values. The archivist's job, he asserted, is to document society in all its multiplicity and to transmit to posterity a manageable account of records.47

From these comments, there is little to suggest that the adoption of Booms' proposals would result in more objectivity, or even that his proposals are innovative. The statement that evaluations should be based on a consideration of the "total social environment" is similar to Schellenberg's assertion that archivists must be familiar with the entire documentation relevant to the records being appraised. Similarly, Booms' preference for evaluations based on a knowledge of present research interests rather than on speculations about future research needs is not controversial.

The Swedish archivist, Ake Kromnow, in his article "The Appraisal of Contemporary Records," made the following observation: "In this discussion of the problems of appraisal, two main lines of development can be distinguished: a strong belief in experience-based judgment of the archivist, and a desire to find more objective criteria for appraisal and destruction."
The former line of development is similar to Schellenberg's view of appraisal, while Kromnow identified the latter line of development with Booms. Kromnow concluded that "both lines of development contain a great deal of truth," and while archivists should strive for greater objectivity it should also be recognized that a "certain amount of subjectivity...cannot be avoided." Since subjectivity cannot be eliminated from appraisal, it is therefore arguable that a degree of appraisal objectivity greater than that obtained by Schellenberg might never be achieved. In his bulletin, Schellenberg stressed time and again that analysis is the key to effective appraisal. Therefore, the difference between good and bad—or objective and biased—appraisals would be the same as the difference between good and bad academic research papers, namely, that the superior use of research techniques would result in the better job.

Regarding the appraisal of machine readable archives, Meyer Fishbein has noted that because of the fast search capabilities of computers, archivists "must reject the idea of the volume of information deterring research." Fishbein was certainly speaking about a possible future development, not a present reality. Schellenberg never addressed the subject of the appraisal of machine readable records. His last publication on appraisal—an obscure article from the Caribbean Archives Conference of 1965—added nothing new to his more famous bulletin except for a brief statement that private papers can be appraised in a manner similar to public records. Technological advancements may one day permit archivists to preserve all available computerized documentation, but that day is a long way off. In the meantime, appraisal remains a chief concern of
archivists.

It is unfortunate that Schellenberg's planned book on records management, to be written in conjunction with Everett O. Alldredge, never materialized, since he may have addressed some of these recent appraisal issues. But Schellenberg's existing writings on appraisal are of unquestionable importance. He challenged the tradition that archivists were to be mere recipients of administrative records, stating instead that archivists must be involved in appraisal. This position is now accepted by archivists the world over. Thus Schellenberg played a key role in the modernization of the archival profession. He was the first to write in detail about appraisal guidelines, and his breakdown of the values of records into evidential and informational provides the appraisal of archives with a theoretical basis. He also affirmed that appraisal techniques will probably never be absolutely standardized. This means that knowledge and careful analysis are the keys to successful appraisal, and that archivists must be willing to take full responsibility for their appraisal decisions. Responsibility is the bottom line of appraisal. Schellenberg was not one to hedge on making decisions, and perhaps this is the quality that enabled him to be the greatest appraisal archivist of his era.
Theodore R. Schellenberg was the most renowned spokesman for the National Archives of the United States throughout the 1950s and early 1960s. The National Archives had been the first archival institution to carry out any sustained attempt to deal with the problems created by the large volumes of public records produced by modern governments. In the 1940s, an arrangement and description program was developed based on the record group concept and the archival inventory, while in the area of appraisal the role of the archivist as appraiser became firmly established. Schellenberg certainly reflected National Archives policy, but it must be remembered that he played an important part in formulating that policy. Furthermore, his publications, though not well written from a literary point of view, reveal a combination of independent research, analysis, and thought.

It can be said that Schellenberg personified the modern archivist. He was concerned primarily with serving the researcher who found himself faced with a plethora of documentary materials. As a result, he skillfully blended archival theory and practice. If the practical application of the theory helped to deal with research needs and with the processing of large volumes of records, then the theory would be upheld. Otherwise, the theory would be overruled and sometimes even changed. Since the principle of provenance provided archivists
with a means of arranging and describing records *en masse*, it was accepted by Schellenberg. Observance of original order sometimes means that researchers are impeded in their work, and so Schellenberg advocated abandonment of the rule in these circumstances. And since modern record volume necessitates the preservation of only a portion of the records in existence, Schellenberg challenged the tradition of the archivist's non-involvement in appraisal and supported this challenge by refining the definition of archives in order to include the element of selection.

He represented the modern archivist in other ways, too. He was concerned with the interrelationship between all record keeping practices, including the essential relationship between archival and records management. If records are handled properly while in current use, their subsequent appraisal, arrangement, and description for archival purposes is greatly facilitated. He was also interested in the standardization of archival principles and techniques but recognized that such standardization would never achieve the precision of the library profession. Schellenberg was a great advocate of the uniqueness of the archival profession as distinct from the history and library professions. He was one of the first American archivists to be a scholar of his own profession and by doing so he enhanced the dignity of the work of the archivist. At the present time, some archivists feel that the scholarly archivist must be one who writes history based on the records under his or her care.¹ Schellenberg's example teaches otherwise.

Despite his important contributions to the modernization of the archival profession, at least some of Schellenberg's ideas
are now outdated. In the area of arrangement and description, his insistence that records must be physically arranged in the stacks in the proper relation to each other has been replaced by the idea of having this ideal arrangement recorded on paper when its maintenance in the stacks is impractical. Furthermore, the recent practice of indexing inventories is an improvement over Schellenberg's scheme of indexing the actual records, while in the area of sampling the recent techniques are more sophisticated than in Schellenberg's era. These points are not intended as major criticisms of Schellenberg but rather to show that he was a product of his time, and that the archival profession, like any successful profession, does not rest on past accomplishments but rather continues to seek new answers to both old and new problems. Schellenberg was very much a transitional figure between the archival ideas of the nineteenth century and those of today.

The fundamental archival principles and techniques, however, have changed very little over the past two or three decades. As Schellenberg himself noted regarding the possibility of a national automated archival network, "the use of modern gadgetry cannot supplant the use of proper techniques and principles."² It is with regard to the fundamentals that Schellenberg's writings make their greatest contribution, but it is possible that many present day archivists are unaware of the extent of this contribution. Holmes' article on the five levels of arrangement is well known, but many would be surprised to learn that Schellenberg discussed these levels as ably as and in more detail than did Holmes. Regarding description, Schellenberg's name is hardly known at all and yet his breakdown
of the descriptive elements into substantive and structural attributes provides archivists with a procedure that can be employed in any situation. In the area of appraisal, his bulletin is now often overlooked as archivists seek the ideal of objectivity. For example, Felix Hull began his study of sampling with a brief historical account of archival appraisal in which he mentioned Schellenberg only as an early advocate of the archivist's involvement in appraisal. The bulletin was not even mentioned, though Hull did include it in his bibliography. Ironically, Hull summarized an article written by an English archivist in 1979 which put forth the same basic appraisal guidelines as did Schellenberg, even to the point of identifying "evidentiary" and informational values.  

Schellenberg's appraisal guidelines, as outlined in his bulletin, are of continuing relevance. The division between evidential and informational values simplifies the appraisal process, and the emphasis on analysis suggests that this is the only sure way to approach objectivity in appraisal.

Perhaps the reason that Schellenberg's achievements in arrangement, description, and appraisal are presently neglected is that his most famous legacy, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, contains relatively little detail on the actual practices that make up these functions. It is necessary to examine his other writings in order to discover this detail. Regarding appraisal, it was just mentioned that his bulletin is perhaps being forgotten in the recent surge for more objective appraisal criteria. In the area of arrangement and description, his Staff Information Paper, *Principles of Arrangement*, was not widely circulated, while *The Management of Archives* has become
known primarily for its statements that archival principles and techniques can be applied to private records and that library schools are the best places for archival studies to be taught. Schellenberg's contributions in the areas of appraisal, arrangement, and description deserve a wider recognition. His extensive coverage of the basic approaches to these archival functions would be of considerable value to new archivists and students of archives, but it is likely that only the experienced archivist would fully appreciate the depth of Schellenberg's knowledge.
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