

The Clock of History

G. L. Fischer

Archivist
University of Sydney

Author's note: This is a slightly modified version of the Presidential Address given at the Second Biennial Conference of the Australian Society of Archivists in Sydney on 19 May 1979. It is of interest that the points of historical service and records management were also discussed in the preceding session by Mr. Frank Strahan and Mr. Peter Crush.

The title I have given to this address comes from *Yardley Oak* by the eighteenth century poet, William Cowper. If only the ancient tree could speak, then, says Cowper

By thee we might correct, erroneous oft,
The clock of history — facts and events
Timing more punctual, unrecorded facts
Recovering, and mis-stated setting right.

When I saw these lines, on the title page of an 1859 collection of historical pieces from the journal *Notes and Queries*, it struck me that they applied more sensibly to the profession of archivist. However, I must admit that my address would be better titled *Some random thoughts on the profession of archivist in 1979*.

In deciding to include a Presidential Address in the programme, the Conference Committee also decided that, as is traditional with such addresses, there would be no discussion at its end. So however provocative or random my remarks may seem, I can feel safe in a secular version of what John McLellan used to refer to as 'coward's castle' — that is, the church pulpit, whose incumbent is always smug in the knowledge that there will be no searching criticism of even his most tendentious sermon. For anyone who may feel strongly about what I say, there are, of course, always the pages of our parish newsletter — the *Bulletin*.

Some of you will recall John McLellan; I began work as an archivist under him in 1950. He was the South Australian Archivist from 1948 to 1960, in succession to George H. Pitt who was appointed as far back as 1919, and who, I think, must be considered as Australia's first professional archivist. Other men, such as James Bonwick in the nineteenth century, and E. A. Petherick early this century, may have

carried the title Archivist with official sanction, but they were curious cases, almost sinecures, and neither man was responsible for any serious programme of custody and reference. McLellan died in 1966 and Pitt in 1972. The too early death of Peter Eldershaw apart, it is good to note that the other pioneers of Australian work in archives are still actively engaged in the profession or pursuing similar interests in retirement. In this regard I should mention particularly Miss Phyllis Mander Jones, in a sense the doyen of the profession and our first honorary member.

Perhaps the word pioneers is not the most apt term for those archivists who were beginning their professional careers in the 1940's and 1950's. But it is true that several of them — Ian Maclean, Mollie Lukis, Robert Sharman, Harry Nunn — all began archival operations virtually from scratch, as Pitt had done in 1919. And although all of them have written pieces for *Archives and Manuscripts* and elsewhere, about starting their offices, so far I think we have seen only one essay in archival autobiography — from Pitt who wrote “An archivist looks back” in 1967.¹ Of course, he was then *emeritus* — retired and full of years, the proper time for such essays, and I do not mean to imply that any of my contemporaries have reached this point in their careers. But the absence of archival reminiscences in Australia is one indicator of the short history of our profession here. And yet it cannot have escaped the notice of archivists of my generation that despite this short history, the Australian archival scene has changed much since those pioneering days, particularly in relation to the number of archival institutions and to the number of archivists. On this evidence it seems fair to predict that the archival profession in Australia will continue to expand and develop.

As a B.C. (before computers) archivist, I cannot guess what difficulties may lie ahead for the profession but I might just hazard that in the 1980's at least, as now, the professional standing of the archivist will still be a matter for concern. The existence of our Society stands as good evidence that the profession has established some degree of independence, notably in relation to librarianship. But we have been less successful, I think, in achieving a wider public recognition in a professional sense. I do not intend to discuss the latter issue in this address, but rather to deal with what I see as present threats to the profession of archivist and to offer some views on what I see as the nature of professional archives work. If I have any claim to speak on the subject it can only derive from the total experience of my entire adult working life. Work with archives has always been my profession and I owe it a great deal. I have not, contrary to a recent bibliography, had a varied career in librarianship and archives. The fact that I have sometimes chafed under the administratively imposed title of librarian will, perhaps, be observed to colour some of my later remarks.

I think that the profession of archivist is likely to be influenced from two general areas. Firstly, from the lay world, that is the general public, which includes employers of archivists or quasi-archivists. Secondly, from professional archives work itself and from those fields to which it is

immediately related — notably administration, information services, records management, and libraries.

Taking the lay world first, I want to speak mainly about the rather fast and loose use of the words ‘archivist’ and ‘archives’. I shall not attempt to define these words, but rather look at the way they have been and are being used. It is, I suggest, the mark of an established and accepted profession that the word used to denote its practitioners is limited by convention, and sometimes by law, to those practitioners. I cannot call myself a barrister, architect or plumber, unless I have fulfilled certain academic, practical and legal requirements. No such limitations apply to our profession — anyone may describe herself or himself as an archivist, and employers can, and do, lay down what their ‘archivist’ will need by way of qualifications and do by way of duties. Such a *laissez faire* attitude can only give rise to anomalies — even to absurdities.

Speaking only for Australia, and without searching very diligently for examples, I have noted that the word ‘archives’ was at least used here by the early 1860’s — when its meaning was, it seems, already a somewhat library-oriented one. In 1862, when Queen Victoria presented a copy of the Prince Consort’s printed speeches to the University of Sydney Library, the Chancellor directed that the book be placed “amongst the archives of the University”. Whatever else these ‘archives’ included, they were clearly administered by the University Library.² In 1862, Henry Hussey, while engaged in writing a history of South Australia, asked for access to official records in government offices of that State, a source he later described as archives. I have already referred to Bonwick, the copyist of letters, who was Archivist in New South Wales in the 1880’s, and to Petherick, the book collector, who was given a similar title by the Commonwealth Government in diplomatic contradistinction, it appears, to the Parliamentary Librarian with whom he had differences. F. M. Bladen, urging the Commonwealth Government in 1903 to establish an archives office, seems to be advocating the copying and transfer of records from other places. G. C. Henderson, the historian, in a report to the South Australian Government in 1914 used the word archives to include printed and illustrated material of historical interest as well as government and private records. Judging from recent proposed archives legislation, part at least of Henderson’s view may be finding some little favour again, but it was, I recall, not very popular in Australian archival theory and practice in the 1950’s. In the public’s mind today, I think it is Henderson’s broad view that is held, exasperating as this may be to professional archivists.

But there are also some more curious uses of the words today. For example, I have a prospectus of a Sydney business called *Archive College of Australia*, which displays a coat of arms appropriately quartered with a quill, a kangaroo, a scroll, and an hour glass. This enterprise, however, is not in competition with the Diploma Course in Archives Administration at the University of New South Wales but is interested in history of an artifactual kind and last year offered for sale replicas of the

King Edward the Martyr Millenium Loving Cup. Also in the business world is the Brisbane firm Commercial Archives of Australia. With such a name, one might be forgiven for thinking them in the business of selling archival documents whereas in fact they are suppliers of storage and conservation materials for archives.

There are other interesting examples of usage closer to home. Within the University of Sydney there is the John Anderson Archive. Anderson was Challis Professor of Philosophy from 1927 to 1958 and had a great influence in Sydney. Some years ago a number of his colleagues and students brought about the formation of the 'archive' which comprises Anderson's own papers, together with additional material which refers to his life and work, particularly notes of his lectures as taken down by his students. This last aspect of the project causes me some concern, for, even though the student lecture notes can be segregated from Anderson's own papers, it does mean that widely scattered and important groups of personal papers from which the notes have been taken will exhibit dismemberment. In this matter I am clearly in a little conflict with a well-meaning and practical notion of the word 'archive'. Imitations of the Anderson Archive are likely to become widespread I should think, and probably on a more notable scale; indeed, I am surprised that we have not already seen in Australia some local version of the Presidential Library idea. In a way it has already happened in subject areas with the collection of scientific papers in the Basser Library in Canberra and the rather oddly named Sydney Opera House Archives of Theatrical Memorabilia. There is also the notion of an 'archive' based on form, notably in the National Library with its National Film Library, one part of which is the National Film Archive whose aim is 'to represent every facet and period of Australian film and television production'. It contains much more than motion picture film — stills, posters, scripts, slides, and all kinds of records associated with motion picture film making. Furthermore, the National Film Archive is a full member of the International Federation of Film Archives — so the terminological problem is global, you might say.

So powerful, it seems, is the appeal of the word 'archive' to describe the historical nature of collections of special materials that it is not hard to imagine a multiplicity of these national 'archive' archives — sound recordings, music, sport come readily in mind.³ The ultimate confusion might be the notion of a national archives system itself, of which we heard a good deal a few years ago, though just what this implied for the general work and profession of archivist in Australia was never made clear.⁴

Of course we cannot stop the private and specialised use of the words 'archivist' and 'archives'. Indeed, it might not be desirable even to think of limiting the use of the word 'archivist' — at least at present. But in a few cases we might be able to suggest that some other word be used for some of these special collections and their custodians. Though just what words to use instead will be difficult since related professions will be as

jealous of their nomenclature as we are of ours. But the widespread, inexact, use of the words 'archives' and 'archivist' can only re-inforce a popular catch-all and amateur conception of our profession with obvious consequences to professional employment and standing.

A more immediate problem for the Society may be to deal with offers of professional employment where, either through ignorance or artifice, employers discount or ignore professional qualifications and work. Since its formation the Society has tried to point out the error of the ways of some employers, on occasion to good effect. But this vigilance will have to continue so long as our standing falls short of that recognition given to doctors and lawyers. Recently a State museum advertised for an archivist requiring as qualifications: "Degree or equivalent . . . in librarianship". True, it was only a temporary position but there is clearly a gross misunderstanding in that museum about the nature of professional archives work. There was a more remarkable case where a municipal authority advertised for a person who would be responsible for the administration of archives — *and* public relations, sporting and community affairs!

Some advertised appointments demand qualifications of a professional kind perhaps not easily accommodated to our Rules. An Australian anthropological institute called for a 'Film Archivist' and required the person chosen to work "in conformity with recognised archival procedures" but at the same time preference was to be given to applicants with "a knowledge of and experience in Film Archival Procedures". I wonder if the two sets of procedures are professionally compatible?

Avoidance of professional qualifications in appointments made by small societies or institutions is perhaps more excusable, since it is unlikely that they could afford to employ a professionally qualified archivist on a full-time basis. So we accept a situation in which a librarian or committee member is named 'archivist'. Yet even in these cases it might be possible through discussion to suggest some other title, that is, a title less suggestive of professional qualifications.⁵ But in some other cases stronger powers of persuasion may have to be used. If some member of, say, the heart-transplant surgeons' association has accepted the post of archivist to his association and calls to ask whether in the space of an hour or so you will tell him how to 'catalogue' the association's records, you can always make your co-operation dependent upon his readiness to tell you on a subsequent occasion how to do a heart transplant.

Our degree of toleration of the promiscuous use of our professional standing and name will vary according to our knowledge of the circumstances of each case: we understand, even as we try to correct, the well meaning attempts of small organisations and we reserve whatever influence we may have for the large business that appoints a retired staff member instead of a professional archivist.

The profession of archivist may also be threatened from a reverse situation where a professionally trained and certificated archivist never actually handles any archives as, traditionally, one imagines him or her doing. It is not necessary to press this physical involvement with records to the extent of Pitt's experiences in his early days when he helped drive the cart-loads of government records through Adelaide streets to the Archives Office. But, the larger archival offices become, the further some of the professional staff are removed from the traditional role; instead, they are busy making policy decisions — not to say more archives in the process — but never getting so much as a whiff of methyl-bromide, removing a rusted glider clip, or receiving a bluff kind word from an historian. For the administrative work they do, much of their archival training may in fact be quite unsuitable.

Bureaucracy itself — that is, larger, more centralised and complex archival offices — presents another danger to the profession of archives, especially to the notion of the independent institutional archivist. The bigger an administration is, the bigger it seems it must, or wants to be, and it does not much like the idea of things outside its direction. Phrases like 'economies of scale' and 'desirable uniformity' are likely to be employed, backed by considerable top-level influence which may be difficult to resist. Some archival agencies will need to be large and complex but I hope there will always be plenty of room for small independent offices — indeed, I think their establishment should be actively encouraged, not least for the fertile ground they offer for archival innovation.

Unfortunately, there still remains the unhappy position of some archivists who are officially designated as librarians. This denial of professional standing seems to be made on the administrative excuse of negotiating salaries in an institution where both librarians and archivists are employed. Public Service authorities are said to be 'difficult' if asked to deal with a dual-professional situation. The internal promotion structure of the whole institution may have something to do with it also, and so long as libraries continue to administer archival operations the problem will be a matter of concern both to librarians and archivists. Perhaps a reasonable approach to directors of libraries might bring about a change of heart — and nomenclature.

Would the archivist/librarian situation be helped in general, I wonder, if a more pragmatic attitude prevailed on either side? People who at present work in library manuscript departments are styled manuscripts librarians, but most of them we would accept as professional members of our Society and indeed some of them are. Since manuscripts librarians are really engaged in much the same sort of work as archivists, might they not well be called archivists?⁶ If they do sometimes deal with items bought or collected, I do not think this invalidates my contention. And the situation would be no more odd than it would be for an archives to employ one or more specialist people called librarians. I do not imagine that we would frown on such a situation, though it must be said that our

present *Rules* definition of an archivist is dependent on the same *Rules* definition of an archival institution. In view of this, I might be forgiven for asking what is holding up the tortoise of the archival institution that is holding up the elephant of our definition of an archivist that is holding up the world of our professional competence? And if that elephant were ever by chance sent to the zoo by some zealous disciple of Jenkinson, would our profession be in danger of collapse?

So far, it will be apparent that my remarks have been largely in defence of the individual professional archivist and archives against the assaults of the outside world. I want to speak now about a second area of concern — the trends, pressures, influences arising within the profession itself and from the immediately surrounding areas that affect that profession. But before I do this I should declare my position about the nature of the profession of archivist. So far I have only skirted this issue and taken for granted that in the practical, I might almost say industrial, aspects that I have considered, the need for definition has been unnecessary. Industrial solidarity in the face of the outside world is natural enough but theoretical agreement inside the profession is quite another matter.

The end purpose of preserving archives permanently must surely be historical — governments and other authorities can have no other excuse for the expenditure of money and resources on the storage and service of large quantities of records for which there is no further administrative need. From this it seems to me to follow that the role of the person in final custody of these records — the archivist — is, in principle, to serve historical research, even if this service is rather mealy limited to the creating agency itself.⁷ And while I believe that the main area of historical research will be in cultural fields, I recognise that there may also be some research of a practical kind — legal or scientific, for example. Archives offices are, I believe, primarily cultural institutions, an admission that may have some of you reaching for your revolvers. And I also believe that the archivist's service to historical research is at least as important as his custodial role, since there is little point in preserving records that are never consulted.

There is some support for this view in the opinions of Jenkinson. In his address *The English archivist*, given in 1947, he mentions twice that the research use of archives constitutes the *raison d'être* of the archivist. I do not know how popular this view is in Australia today, but the opposite, that the archivist serves the administration first, particularly through records management programmes, seems to me to turn the archivist into an administrator — or, even worse, a bureaucrat. How many archivists, I wonder, have chosen their profession with the idea of office administration as a major part of their work or have equipped themselves for administrative work? Usually the favoured area of studies has been the humanities, particularly history. Most dedicated archivists are, I believe, historically inclined, a characteristic that leads them in turn to consider archives work as a profession.⁸ Furthermore, it is from the area of historical scholarship that much of the impetus has come for the

establishment of archival services in Australia. Henderson's role in South Australia is well known, and, according to C. E. W. Bean, the Australian Archives owes something to John Curtin's concern for literary and historical studies. It is of interest, too, that in opening the new Archives Office of New South Wales earlier this year, the Premier commented particularly on the idea of historical archival service — including greater access for genealogical searchers.

The deflection from this early policy of historical archival service into growing concern for records management has, I think, been brought about largely by archivists themselves. Behind this deflection was a proper and serious concern for the better preservation of records, and also, perhaps, a concern to display professional attributes distinct from librarianship in particular. That distinction needed to be made but, now that we have established a degree of independence, perhaps the emphasis that is still being placed upon records management might be reconsidered. I recognise that it is essential for the archivist to be closely involved in the management of the transfer and destruction of records but I think that any additional involvement with creating agencies should be limited to consultation. Where an archives endeavours to be an integrated part of an administration, the archivist may find his role in serving historical research a difficult one, for administrations — especially those of government — are usually conservative about research access. In general, I feel that it is not easy for a cultural archival service to operate comfortably and successfully within a bureaucratic situation.⁹

The archivist in an 'integrated' archives may also have problems in deciding priorities; indeed, the degree of administrative involvement as opposed to research service may well decide the issue. An administration will no doubt be pleased to have an archivist store and fetch and carry its files but I cannot believe that that is what professional archives work is all about. For purely administrative purposes, current and intermediate records can be well serviced by administrative and clerical officers. There already exists a class of professional people called records managers, who have this kind of work as their express objective; they have their own professional society, perhaps no stronger though a little older than ours, and there is tertiary teaching on the subject. The objective of the archivist, however, is — or should be — serving historical research.

There is, perhaps, a little threat to the profession of archivist through the growth of information systems. We might easily be caught up, however slightly at first, in the larger network of libraries under ALBIS or some other scheme. Already it is clear that we are being observed. From a recent article in the *Australian Library Journal* it seems that the old library-archives nexus could re-occur in a new form. The idea of an information network is said to require that libraries, documentation and archives services be "fully integrated into a national plan for education, science, culture, economics, communication and public administration". The Library Association of Australia even seems to be considering some

political action on the question of “co-ordinating the use of both library-based and other information services”. We can be sure that *someone* will be trying to do something about all this information co-ordination — governments, information scientists (who seem to reject both library and archival professions), or even the proposed Council of Australian Library and Information Services (formerly AACOBS) on whose national council, ominously perhaps, our Society was refused representation.¹⁰

In a world full of nonsense jargon it may be dangerous to offer, even in satiric vein, a bit more. Nevertheless, I venture to offer you the theory of the irrelevance of perfected institutions. Stated more clearly, this implies that by the time a desirable institution has been established its general context has so changed that the appropriateness and need for that institution are immediately open to question. All of which makes me wonder a little about ourselves. Our professional independence secured, suddenly the whole scene is changed, and it is no longer a question of wanting to get out of something but rather agonizing over what it will be best to get into!

The last area of concern to the profession of archivist is quite a revolutionary one — the paperless office, the world of electronic technology. Will it make us schizophrenic? In the current affairs of this Society we already have an indication of the problem where, on the one hand, we had candidates for office asserting the vital need for the archivist to be able to cope with the new technology and, on the other, a resolution before us that we urge the wider use of permanent-life paper and inks. It does seem very likely that computer storage and the visual display unit will replace much of present routine record-making processes — some institutions are already so equipped or designed with this in view. Newspapers and journals are everywhere promoting the efficiency and economy of the paperless office. The assault on our faithful old dog-eared multi-part file seems invincible and he will have to be put down. Though I jest about such changes, I do not underrate their significance to the archivist. Storage requirements and record production in archives could change vastly; in my opinion, it is not inconceivable that some degree of archival specialisation of a divisive kind will occur because of this.

Perhaps I have spoken in an alarmist way about assaults and threats to our profession and you may regard some of my instances as mere spectres. But that there will be changes affecting the profession of archivist I think we can be sure. It will be well, therefore, for the professional archivist to consider just what his special competence is, for if it is not a useful and specialised calling he may find his professionalism in tatters. So I shall conclude with my own view of the nature of professional archives work which sees the archivist as rather more than a filing clerk or historical guide.

In our 1977 Conference I was in a panel discussion on the role of the archivist titled “One profession or many?”. For my part I was trying to

arrive at the essence of professional archives work by rejecting the roles an archivist must play but which are not unique to his work, roles which might well be done better by others — for example, as conservator. The simple notion of custodianship went out, along with records management. So far as I suggested any essential quality at that time, I saw it as arising from the way the archivist handles and lists archives, and that this, combined with his knowledge of his archives, made him something of a scholar as well as archivist. I might have said 'scholarly archivist' if I had dared; from my coward's castle now I will do so. The scholarly aspect is, of course, concerned with service to history and is not to be confused with the scholarship of the historian. Along with Jenkinson, I will allow that the archivist may pursue private historical interests of a scholarly kind. However, his archival scholarliness is something else again and it is directed in the interests of history for others, both now and in the future. And that, incidentally, is a sobering thought, for of all professions that of archivist is bound to be weighed seriously in the future for what she or he does, or does not, preserve and elucidate now.

Archival scholarliness is exercised first in the appraisal and acquisition of records of all kinds — the point where our professionalism really begins. Not only is there much to be done in this area in a practical way, but more needs to be studied and written about the whole exercise in Australia — which fields are being over-cultivated, which neglected? What kind of background reading should an archivist pursue and what kind of relation should there be with all areas of academic scholarship?

Next there is the area of arrangement and listing of records. This has attracted some Australian writing and there are some notable practical examples issued by the Archives Office of New South Wales. But generally there is not much published evidence of Australian archival holdings. One result of this vacuum is that other people, not archivists, tend to step in and do, if not a professional archival piece of work, at least a useful survey. I find this situation professionally disappointing, for I see all forms of listing — subject based as well as series or group based — as part of the archivist's professionalism. Who has better knowledge of the records being described than the archivist working in the repository? Furthermore, lay projects tend to be 'once-only' jobs, so that any knowledge or expertise gained will be lost when the work is done. But an archivist, like any professional person, will be building continuously from one task to another.

The very exercises of arrangement and listing themselves offer much scope for scholarly archives work. The archivist's task is to elucidate records for general use and he can bring to this his knowledge of related materials of all kinds, as well as his particular academic training — legal, scientific, literary. The opportunity to handle the whole of the arrangement and listing of records must also be part of his scholarliness which he will not achieve in a horizontal or fragmented approach. The scholarly archivist, too, should be a specialist in certain areas or kinds of

records and should make his knowledge freely available in a consultancy way with readers. Indexing and calendaring of records are also scholarly tasks and they should not disdain the help that computer technology can give them.

We should also look at some of the more specialised aspects of our professional scholarly competence. The study of diplomatic and palaeography would seem to have very little practical use in Australian archives work but I wonder if nineteenth-century handwriting and formal documents are really all that well understood? Certainly they seem to be little studied. Legal forms and the records of certain professions and businesses are probably little understood in their own context or for the general historical information they might yield. And there is also the specialised control and listing of illustrations — especially photographs — which again by professional default may be taken up as lay projects.

Publication of archives is also another proper area for professional archival scholarliness, not only because of the archivist's background knowledge of the records, but because publication assists the objective of preserving records. Apart from the landmarks of *Historical Records of New South Wales* and *Historical Records of Australia*, most record publishing has been of the anthology kind, such works often reflecting the prejudices of the compiler. Archival publication avoids bias in a special way, as was noted in a recent review by Sir Paul Hasluck:

The standard of truth to be sought ultimately in the publication of archives is that the collection truly and fully gives the contemporary record and also presents it in the terms and in the sequence in which it was made. It reveals without interpreting.

It is, perhaps, rather disappointing that Australia has not yet established some kind of record publishing commission, as in Great Britain or the United States of America, to co-ordinate the resources and professional skills of our archival offices.¹¹ More house journals from archival institutions would provide a partial answer to this lack and an outlet for scholarly articles by archivists.

Through all these professional activities the archivist can make scholarly contributions to the service of history and not the least pleasant feature of them is that they are usually enjoyable occupations in themselves.

The study of history is an abiding one. It therefore seems to me to be the one sure element on which the archivist should base his professionalism. A profession for all seasons, as it were. I know that usually we will all be so busy putting records into boxes and answering genealogical enquiries that the scholarly service to history that I advocate will seem impossibly remote. Still, I think that we should never abandon the view that scholarly historical and cultural service is our professional aim, and seize every opportunity we can to make our contribution to it.

FOOTNOTES

1. *South Australiana*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1967, 3-14.
2. A similar view was taken by the Vice-Chancellor sixty-three years later in 1925 when sending a photograph of historical interest to the University Librarian — “you may care to have it for the library archives”.
3. The Australian War Memorial established in 1925 sets a very strong precedent.
4. For anyone fascinated by even greater flights of archival fancy there is the absorbing prospect of international, or multi-national, archival management.
5. In rare cases it is possible that a professional archivist will accept honorary appointment — an ideal solution.
6. It would be a more apt title since Australia really has no manuscripts libraries in the sense of collections of handwritten books.
7. The oft-quoted example of the bridge that cannot be safely altered without the archivist’s help is, perhaps, a bit of an old chestnut.
8. In passing it might be noted that Australia’s most senior archival post is occupied by a former academic historian.
9. The argument for an archives conducting records management services for a whole administration is very persuasive and I have, myself, been influenced by it. However, the American experience of loss of autonomy in pursuing such a programme is even more salutary and continues to agitate people concerned about the status of NARS.
10. The ASA is at least represented on the Commonwealth Government’s Information Technology Council.
11. With publication in microfilm form the archivist’s scholarly editing will perhaps be even more important.



ASA Biennial General Meeting, Sydney, May 1979. (l. to r.) Gerald Fischer, President; Doreen Wheeler, Secretary; Robert French, Treasurer.