

AUSTRALIAN ARCHIVES THROUGH A LOOKING GLASS

Colin Smith

This paper reviews an account by Terry Eastwood of 'the evolution of an archival system' in Canada. It asks why such a development is retarded in Australia. Four reasons are suggested:

- *a lack of understanding and support from historians;*
- *a lack of a sense of urgency about 'safeguarding' archives;*
- *the failure of the Australian Archives to unequivocally endorse the preservation and use of archives as its primary aim, and to foster such work at large, as provided for in its Act;*
- *a lack of debate of philosophical and organisational issues.*

The Australian situation is illuminated by comparisons with the Canadian. There is some reference to other countries as well.

Terry Eastwood has been a leading protagonist in the recent development of a Canadian archival 'system'. He told the story in a recent paper.¹ I shall identify some parallels and divergencies *vis a vis* Australia, and suggest some reasons for the latter.

First, the parallels. The number of archives in Canada increased by 150% between 1960 and 1975. Most, however, had been 'established desperately', 'from the commitment of a single person or group of persons inspired to preserve historical documents rather than from a purposive commitment on the part of the creators and logical sponsors . . .'. Being 'financially insignificant', they had 'almost no resource to plan and develop their own programs or coordinate their efforts with other institutions'.² 'Local government records and other archival materials of local significance were especially sorely neglected'.³ Despite 'a strong tradition of government support of cultural and heritage endeavors',⁴ archives lacked a funding body of their own.⁵

Associations of archivists and archives had emerged. There was a 'ferment of a profession beginning to recognize and realize itself'. However, 'basic problems' were still 'addressed in a virtual political vacuum'.⁶

And so to the divergencies. 'What began as an exercise in describing the state of archives and their need for greater financial support slowly evolved into a search for a structure in which to set about planning the orderly development of hitherto isolated and often primitive institutions all across the country'.⁷ The Public Archives of Canada (PAC—now National Archives of Canada—NAC) started extension funding—'the less-well-to-do were awarded \$2,105,800 . . . in the period 1981-84'. Meanwhile, 'the archives question' was 'pressed . . . onto the agenda of a meeting of provincial—territorial ministers responsible for cultural and heritage affairs in September 1983', and they resolved 'to encourage and facilitate the evolution of an archival system in Canada'. By 1986 there were 'provincial/territorial councils, formed from representatives of all archives in the jurisdiction', and 'a national advisory council on the archives system (Canadian Council of Archives)' representing these, the professional associations and the PAC. More money followed.⁸

In attempting to explain why we are still far from any such developments, I shall focus on four Australian deficiencies:

- (1) a lack of understanding and support from historians;
- (2) a lack of a sense of urgency about 'safeguarding' archives;
- (3) a lack of support from the Australian Archives;
- (4) a lack of debate of philosophical and organisational issues.

(1) A lack of understanding and support from historians

Canada's transformation began with an historian's chapter on archives in a report on Canadian studies (the 'Symons Report'—1975).⁹ The debate which followed convinced Symons 'that another, more searching analysis of the situation of archives was needed'.¹⁰ This was the 'Wilson Report'—written by a consultative group including five historians, on behalf of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.¹¹ Its appearance in 1980 led directly to the 'system' of 1986.

Our answer to Symons' chapter is some reference to archives in a report of the Committee to Review Australian Studies in Tertiary Education (CRASTE)¹²—twelve years later and a weak echo indeed. Where Symons had opened with a declaration that

'No single subject . . . is of greater importance to the future of Canadian studies than the state of our country's archives . . . Canadian archives are the foundation of Canadian studies'¹³—

CRASTE could manage nothing more forthright than an observation that

'the retention or destruction of current records will influence future research trends'.¹⁴

History may help to explain this difference. Where the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA) began as a section of our Library Association, Canada's equivalents derive from the Canadian Historical Association – a body with which 'many archivists had strong ties'.¹⁵ 'A shining image in the Canadian scene has been the intimate relationship for more than half a century between the historical profession, manifest in the . . . CHA . . . and archivists brought up and employed as historical researchers, most particularly at the PAC', writes Gordon Dodds.¹⁶ In fact, he would prefer more distance – having the same yearning for liberation as Australian archivists feel regarding librarians.

One wonders, however, if Dodds would exchange his experience of historians as intrusive foster-parents for the common Australian perception of them as indifferent, exploitive strangers. Archivists complained to CRASTE about 'the lack of interest shown by academics in the question of conservation and preservation of archival resources'.¹⁷ One has written that, in general, 'interest in archives on the part of the Australian scholar is a manifestation of his early struggles . . .' 'the archivist can very rarely call upon professors and other leading academics in his campaign for better archival facilities . . .'¹⁸ Another told historians last year that 'archivists are somewhat surprised that historians as a group have been slow in pursuing assiduously the preservation and description of archives which must be the fundamental resource of their profession'.¹⁹

The attitude is not so surprising, however, if one considers that, where Canada had its 'shining image' of PAC nurturing archivist/historians, we had the 'access policy wrangle' of 1965-1975.²⁰ The Commonwealth Archives Office (CAO – now Australian Archives – AA) was caught between an impatient public and a cautious bureaucracy – committed at short notice to 'detailed screening of records totalling millions of pages' in order to meet a government commitment to make them immediately available²¹ – and 'highly unpopular, especially in academic circles' for its inability to do this despite the recruitment of 20 extra staff.²² The result was estrangement where we needed alliance in pursuit of shared objectives.

Historians came to see 'access' as the only archival problem, and archivists as obstructors rather than facilitators of it. At one of W.K. Lamb's seminars – conducted in the course of his enquiry toward reform and upgrading of the AA – 'historians were much in the majority, and . . . "access" was almost the only topic'.²³ The AA was urged to 'recognize that the purpose of archival custody is public use'.²⁴ And it hardly seemed to matter to anyone that AA priorities were being distorted in favour of a crash program of access clearance – when the really urgent need was to ensure that significant records survived for use by someone someday. Which leads to the next point . . .

(2) A lack of a sense of urgency about ‘safeguarding’ records

‘In the first place . . . [the archivist] . . . has to take all possible precautions for the safeguarding of his Archives and for their custody, which is the safeguarding of their essential qualities. *Subject to the discharge of these duties* he has in the second place to provide to the best of his ability for the needs of historians and other research workers. But *the position of primary and secondary must not be reversed*’.²⁵

Thus Jenkinson (with his emphases). I would rather put it – that the two duties are our *sine qua non* and *raison d’etre* – the former pointless without the latter but the latter impossible without the former – the former urgent; the latter long-term, and deferrable if necessary.

A truism, surely. Yet the Australian Bicentennial Historic Records Search (ABHRS) set out to achieve the latter without the former – the aim being ‘not to collect . . . material but to register it for students, historians and generations to come’.²⁶ A ‘shopping list for [mercenary] collectors’, some of us cried.²⁷ ‘And what’s wrong with that?’ one of them asked.²⁸ It seemed that they had simply failed to realise that the ultimate survival and integrity of unpublished material cannot be taken for granted.

Canada’s Symons took nothing for granted. ‘Records and papers survive by chance’, he wrote, ‘having somehow escaped wastebaskets, rats, fire, disintegration, and house-cleaning. Many people believe either that, on the one hand, their papers or those of individuals in their family have no value or that, on the other, their papers may be too sensitive to expose to the eyes of posterity. In either case, their papers are committed to the garbage or the furnace. In short, archival records are an endangered species’.²⁹

American reports also have this emphasis. One opens with the sentence, ‘The United States is in danger of losing its memory’³⁰ – another with a warning ‘that many records of long-term interest are not kept at all, disposed of either through neglect or through shortsighted policies. The total situation is dangerous . . .’.³¹ And the SAA’s ‘Goals and Priorities’ report identifies three ‘Goals’ – the first two being to do with the ‘Identification’, ‘Retention’ and ‘Preservation’ of ‘Records of Enduring Value’, while ‘Availability and Use . . .’ takes third place.³²

Our CRASTE, however, apparently set out believing that the survival of archives could be taken for granted, and that the problem was mainly that archivists buried them. An early questionnaire asked about holdings, finding aids, acquisition and access policies, use-promotion, data-networking and surveys of users.³³ And although CRASTE came to see that ‘emphasis on the availability and use of primary resource materials should not be at the expense of conservation of the cultural record for future generations’³⁴ its attention remained fixed on ‘the physical decay of *collections*’. (my emphasis – ³⁵) CRASTE apparently did not realise that

material in collections is the ‘good’ news, because it is at least protected from that worst of threats—uncaring human beings.

Furthermore, CRASTE apparently picked up this collection-myopia from the submissions of archivists and conservators—all urging the needs of records on their hands and inclined to shut their minds to the fate of unknown quantities still at large. In this regard, ironically, the ABHRS served a very useful purpose—by exposing ‘the tip of that iceberg’³⁶ of undiscovered, non-current records at risk. Maybe it also did something, by public education, to reduce that risk.

CRASTE, too, deserves some bouquets with the brickbats. Considerable progress was made—thanks to the willingness of archivists to make submissions, and of CRASTE to respond. CRASTE convened a seminar. The point was made that the proposed ‘Cultural Resources Management’ ‘need not be narrowly focussed on objects and sites alone but on the nation’s entire stock of cultural resources including archival materials’.³⁷ The ASA subsequently made a submission to a Working Party of the Cultural Ministers Council as part of ‘action aimed at establishing a National Review of Archives’.³⁸ It was submitted that archivists were ‘the preservers of the essential authentic documented record of culture [in the broadest sense]’.³⁹ CRASTE’s report, *Windows onto worlds*, appeared to have opened at least one. Maybe we attained, in 1988, about the position of the Canadians in 1978.

A discordant note was struck, however, when the Director-General of the Australian Archives informed the CRASTE seminar ‘that it was not appropriate for his agency to be viewed as a heritage body’.⁴⁰ This introduces our third problem . . .

(3) A lack of support from the Australian Archives

The Director-General went on to argue that

‘Equating archival material with cultural heritage involved selecting one set of users as a target, and the broad charter of an agency such as Australian Archives precluded this . . .’.⁴¹

However, the AA policy surely represents a retreat from its ‘broad charter’.

That charter is set out in the *Archives Act* 1983. It includes responsibilities:

- ‘to ensure the conservation and preservation of the existing and future archival resources of the Commonwealth;’
- ‘to encourage and foster the preservation of all other archival resources relating to Australia;’

- ‘to encourage, facilitate, publicise and sponsor the use of archival material;’ and
- ‘to develop and foster the co-ordination of activities relating to the preservation and use of the archival resources of the Commonwealth and other archival resources relating to Australia;’⁴²

These purposes—*preservation, use and fostering*—are all to the fore in the policies of the National Archives of Canada. The National Archivist, introducing NAC’s 1986-87 report, refers to a ‘threefold mission’, ‘to acquire and conserve . . . records . . . and make them accessible’; ‘to provide federal departments and agencies with advisory and operational services related to records management; and . . . to offer support to the Canadian and international archival communities’.⁴³ The following chapters deal in turn with ‘Preserving our National Heritage’ (13 pages); ‘Serving the Nation and the Public’ (promotion of use, and fostering/coordination of archival work at large—5 pages); and ‘Managing the Records of the Government of Canada’ (7 pages).⁴⁴

The AA’s report for 1987-88, however, puts forward ‘MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS’ as its entire program—the objective being ‘To ensure that the body of records generated by Commonwealth agencies from Federation to the present day is managed effectively and consistently in order to promote administrative economy and efficiency and to satisfy the needs, rights or interests of agencies and the public.’⁴⁵

Obviously, the difference here is partly semantic—the AA interprets a vague phrase broadly while NAC uses it narrowly. But there is also a substantive difference, in that the explicit emphases of the AA objective are not preservation, use and fostering—but *economy, efficiency and consistency*. How far can these emphases—and emphasis on ‘management of government records’ itself—be reconciled with the AA’s own Act, and with generally accepted archival values?

As regards ‘*management of government records*’, there is some explicit basis under two heads of the charter—though it is flawed. One item gives the AA ‘custody and management of Commonwealth records, *other than current Commonwealth records*’ (my emphasis). The other refers to ‘management and preservation of records and other archival material’—but is both broader in not restricting the function to government records, and weaker in calling on the AA merely to ‘conduct research’ and ‘provide advice’ in this regard.⁴⁶

Consistency is not mentioned in the charter—though it is obviously implicit in the attempt to regulate disposal of records by means of disposal schedules, and implicit also in the Act’s concern with the AA’s role in regulating public access. The latter is mentioned in the charter⁴⁷, and is the reason for some 20 of the Act’s 42 pages being devoted to access control procedures. The ‘problem of inconsistencies’ in granting of public access

has obsessed the CAO/AA and its masters for decades⁴⁸, and continues as a preoccupation. The AA apparently does about four times as much detailed access examination as NAC.⁴⁹ It devoted 9 tables in its 1987-88 report to statistics of access operations, where NAC disposed of such statistics in 1986-87 in 3 lines.⁵⁰

Economy and efficiency figure in the third item of the charter—‘to promote, by providing *advice* and other *assistance* to Commonwealth institutions, the keeping of *current* Commonwealth records in an efficient and economical manner . . .’ (my emphases). However, this is clearly a peripheral, facilitative involvement. Also, the statement continues—‘. . . and in a manner that will facilitate their use as part of the archival resources of the Commonwealth’⁵¹—thus presenting the function as—in part at least—a mere means to an archival end.

As regards *preservation, use and fostering*—one must ask if they are implicit in ‘management of government records’ as defined. *Preservation and use* certainly are. They become, indeed, quite explicit in much of the achievement reported in the body of the report—even if the general tone does bring to mind an earlier description of an AA announcement, as having ‘all the warm spontaneity of an undertaker’s handshake’.⁵²

Fostering of archival work at large, however, is quite excluded. Where the NAC—still awaiting a new Act which would ‘broaden the Archives’ mandate, particularly with respect to support of the archival community’⁵³—emphasises what it is already doing in that regard, the AA—having such a mandate already—ignores it.

Two extreme views are possible. On the one hand, the AA may look better when judged by its deeds rather than its words, and the NAC may be found to be strong on expansive and liberal image but short on substance. On the other hand, it may be that submergence of archival purposes in a mere commitment to manage government records has a deeper significance—that the ethic of the records centre—legitimate and necessary but subsidiary, narrow and inadequate—has taken over. It may be that the AA is still—as someone put it to W.K. Lamb—‘a collection of records centres in search of an Archives’.⁵⁴

I believe there is some truth in the first view. The AA invented a radical context-control system which Canadians seem so far to have envied but not emulated. The AA now has a network of world-class repositories, and reserve space, while NAC attributed a reduced intake in 1986-87, in part, to ‘limited storage space’⁵⁵, and complained that ‘all of the collections are stored in buildings woefully lacking in environmental controls, plagued by water leaks . . . and with questionable security . . .’⁵⁶ AA resources and intakes are now proportionately comparable to those of NAC—despite its comparatively unlucky and recent origins.

But there is also much truth in the second view. Indeed, it could be

argued, not only that the AA falls short with regard to fundamental archival purposes—but that a firmer commitment to those purposes would promote more economy, efficiency and consistency. That argument, however, is beyond the scope of this paper. My present purpose is merely to observe how seriously the AA has *neglected its duty of 'fostering' the profession*.

This neglect becomes obvious when one compares the record of PAC/NAC which—convened the Dominion, Provincial and Territorial Archivists' forum in 1971;⁵⁷ participated in the writing of the Wilson Report;⁵⁸ took the initiative in establishing a grant program to give effect to that Report;⁵⁹ established the Canadian Council of Archives;⁶⁰ and set up a new division 'to maintain a permanent secretariat for the CCA and to provide advisory services and technical assistance to the Canadian archival community'.⁶¹

The AA has taken no such steps. While there is an Australian Council of Archives, it was established on the initiative of the ASA; has no connection with any funding scheme; and lacks a salaried secretariat. The AA, in fact, has contributed less to ACA's work—not only relatively, but absolutely—than have several very small archives.

Nor is Canada the only country where things are otherwise. A New Zealand colleague remarked that their National Archives 'has been reciprocally supportive of the Association [of NZ archivists] in a way that the Australian Society of Archivists might envy'.⁶²

Perhaps the AA would defend its attitude by arguing that it faces the same situation as PAC did—on the one hand, suspicion of 'every . . . move outside its normal realm'—on the other, being expected 'somehow to show leadership and provide support services . . .'.⁶³ It might claim that there is little hope of Australian archivists 'slowly reconcil[ing] themselves', as the Canadians have done, 'to accept[ing] the leadership of the major government archives'.⁶⁴

Certainly, some resolute fence-mending would be needed. One has heard it said that the AA regards ACA as an annoyance and the profession at large as an embarrassment; that it seeks to minimise contact of its Advisory Council with any source of archival advice other than itself; that it instructs its officers to say nothing about controversial issues at ASA meetings; and that its avoidance of the words 'archives' and 'archivist' is tantamount to a denial of our legitimacy as a profession.⁶⁵

However, the profession has sought consistently to make common cause. We gave sustained support and constructive criticism throughout the long gestation of the Archives Act; have repeatedly urged erection of the long-delayed national building; accorded the AA a guaranteed place on the Executive of ACA; and sought to strengthen the AA's arm over the destruction of census records. We continue to believe that we need a

national archive—that such a body has strengths, resources and potential no other sort of body can achieve. And we genuinely appreciate much that the AA has accomplished, knowing that it has not been easy.

To which the AA might respond—that it would have been quite impossible, had scarce resources been diverted to work other than that directly incumbent upon it—that its best service to the work at large is to cement its own position—that what is good for the Australian Archives is good for Australian archives.

Such an argument can hardly justify, however, a substantial refusal even to communicate. One is struck by the tradition that AA Directors/General *never* appear at ASA proceedings, and by the generally poor representation of AA in voluntary professional activities. The 1987 ASA conference in Perth, for instance, was attended by some 120 archivists—but only 18 of them were from the AA which employs some 50% of us. Furthermore, of the 21 persons who then made up the AA's central executive and regional leadership, none were present. Indeed, only 5 of those 21 were professional members of the ASA at the time—two others being associates.⁶⁶

Most AA participation is low or middle level, and on the entire initiative of the individual. Only one really senior officer of the AA (now retired) has regularly attended ASA meetings. The readiness of some AA officers to not only participate, but take on onerous, unpaid office, is the more to be applauded in the circumstances, and provides a tenuous link between the two halves of our divided community. However, the situation is really quite unsatisfactory.

Again, Australian archivists must be astounded to learn that *Archivaria* is resented by some Canadians as a 'well-heeled, glossy publication . . . usually coming forth from Big Brother PAC'—'ACA's journal . . . virtually only in name'.⁶⁷ We do not enjoy the luxury of being able to complain in such terms about undue influence on *Archives and Manuscripts*. As admirers of *Archivaria*, we would rather encourage Gordon Dodds in his contention that accepting 'direction by a small cadre of PAC archivists . . . and substantial indirect assistance from the PAC . . .'⁶⁸ is a small price to pay for such a quantity, quality and depth of published information and debate. Which leads to my final point . . .

(4) Lack of debate of philosophical and organisational issues

In 20 numbers of *Archivaria*, 1978 to 1988—there are some 35 items dealing extensively with philosophical and organisational issues. Subjects have included 'total archives'; 'the historical shunt'; Bolotenkoism versus Cross Nortonism; and the various reports and developments recapitulated by Eastwood. Short, opinionated responses are a constant feature. Some 15 persons stand out as frequent and substantial contributors. (Nor have they all worked at PAC/NAC.)

A review of 16 years of *Archives and Manuscripts*, 1972 to 1988, reveals a rather different situation. Not only is the total quantity of paper and print produced in that longer period much less, but it also contains a much smaller amount of archival reflection. There are only 20 items that could—often rather charitably—be put beside *Archivaria's* 35 as addressing philosophical and organisational issues. There is only one debate of any substance (Hurley v. Powell). We have even left it to foreigners to write and publish much of the more significant information and comment about CAO/AA's context-control system. And we have just despatched the major question of a 'records commission' with hardly any public airing of the issues.⁶⁹

The newly-established 'Agora' section may stimulate more broad-view opinion and debate, to counterbalance narrow-view reports of what we have done and how we did it. We remain, however, remarkably myopic and fragmented in our vision—focussed on particular practicalities—apparently uninterested in the big picture.

Conclusion

Perhaps this is because we find that big picture just too discouraging, and retreat to a level at which we have power to achieve something. Certainly, our achievements at that level are quite creditable—and our collective production of an excellent archival textbook would seem to crown them quite fittingly. The Canadians, however, have begun to shape such achievements into a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts, while our work is diminished in its impact and prospects through the lack of such a coordinatory 'system'.

Why are we unable to advance, as Canada has, to the stage of 'national planning'?⁷⁰ Eastwood's account brings out the importance of

- the initiative of historians and the 'cultivation' of these 'allies';⁷¹
- the sense of 'a collective mission to promote the broadest possible preservation of the country's archival record';⁷²
- 'the leadership of the major government archives'—despite resistance;⁷³

and

- sustained debate regarding 'the directions archives should take';⁷⁴.

'One suspects', concludes Eastwood, 'the same currents of change course through other countries' archival communities. The Canadian experience suggests that archivists can play a vital role in directing those currents in positive ways'.⁷⁵ The Australian experience, however, is that the currents are set in vicious circles of bad relations and narrow, muddled purposes, which drag good ideas under and cast them up again in stagnant backwaters.

Notes

- (i) A sequel is in draft entitled 'The Australian Archives through a looking glass'. This develops further the propositions put in (3) above. Reaction

to the present paper may indicate whether its publication would be helpful or not.

- (ii) In view of the ongoing problem of arrangements between my employer, CSIRO, and the AA, it may be as well to state that CSIRO is in no way responsible for the views expressed.

REFERENCES

1. Eastwood, T. 'Attempts at national planning for archives in Canada' *The Public Historian*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Summer 1986.
2. *ibid*, p. 81.
3. *ibid*, p. 84.
4. *ibid*, p. 89.
5. *ibid*, p. 79.
6. *ibid*, p. 76.
7. *ibid*, pp. 74, 75.
8. *ibid*, pp. 87-89.
9. Symons, T.H.B. 'Archives and Canadian studies' in Vol. 2 of *To know ourselves. The report of the Commission on Canadian Studies*, Ottawa 1975.
10. Eastwood, *op. cit.* p. 78.
11. SSHRCC *Canadian Archives* Ottawa 1980.
Historians are similarly active in the USA, being well-represented on the committees which wrote the following:
 - Elliott, Clark A. (ed) *Understanding progress as process. Documentation of the history of post-war science and technology in the United States. Final report of the Joint Committee on Archives of Science and Technology* Chicago 1983.
 - Committee on the Records of Government *Report* Washington DC 1985.
 - Society of American Archivists *Planning for the archival profession. A report of the SAA Task Force on Goals and Priorities* Chicago 1986.
12. CRASTE *Windows onto worlds. Studying Australia at tertiary level* Canberra, June 1987.
13. Symons, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
14. CRASTE, *op. cit.*, p. 200.
15. Eastwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 76.
16. Dodds, G. 'Canadian archival literature: a bird's-eye view' *Archivaria* 17, Winter 1983-84, p. 18.
17. CRASTE *op. cit.*, p. 207.
18. Sharman, R. 'The archivist and the historian' *Archives and Manuscripts* Vol. 4, No. 6, 1972, p. 16.
19. Crush, P. 'Archives and historians' *Archives and Manuscripts* Vol. 16, No. 1, May 1988, p. 19.
20. Saclier, M. 'The Lamb Report and its environment' *Archives and Manuscripts* Vol. 5, No. 8, August 1974, p. 200.
21. Lamb, W.K. *Development of the National Archives. Report* Canberra 1974, p. 21.
22. *ibid*, p. 23.
23. Smith, C.V., Unpublished paper on AA problems, held by me—written 1977—

62 AUSTRALIAN ARCHIVES THROUGH A LOOKING GLASS

- recollection of my observation at the seminar—p. 10.
24. Report of demands presented at a meeting of historians with the Director-General of the AA in *ASA Bulletin* No. 9, August 1976.
 25. Jenkinson, H. *A manual of archive administration* London 1922-1966, p. 15.
 26. *Bicentennial Bulletin, ACT & Island Territories* No. 5, September 1987, p. 2.
 27. *ASA Bulletin* No. 70, December 1986, p. 9.
 28. Recollection of discussion at ASA Biennial Conference in Perth, April 1987. The point was taken, however, to the extent that ABHRS issued a leaflet on 'Caring for your historic records', and cooperated with reputable institutions seeking to acquire or copy material unearthed.
 29. Symons, T.H.B. 'Archives and Canadian studies' *Archivaria* 15, Winter 1982-83, p. 59.
 30. Committee on the Records of Government, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
 31. Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
 32. SAA, *op. cit.*, p. iii.
 33. Letter dated 12 March 1986 on my 'CRASTE Li' file.
 34. CRASTE, *op. cit.*, p. 199.
 35. *ibid.*, p. 208.
 36. Crush, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
 37. Crush, P. 'From the President' *ASA Bulletin* No. 74, August 1987, p. 1.
 38. *ASA Bulletin* No. 77, February 1988, p. 2.
 39. *Ioc cit.*
 40. CRASTE *Report on Archives Seminar 4 August 1987* p. 2. A copy is held on my 'CRASTE Li' file.
 41. *loc cit.*
 42. *Archives Act*, No. 79 1983, section 5 (2) (a), (b), (h) and (l).
 43. *NAC Annual Report . . . 1986-1987*, Ottawa 1987, p. 6.
 44. *ibid.* The report being bilingual, page-counts are based on the English text.
 45. *AA Annual Report 1987-1988*, Canberra 1988, p. 1.
 46. *Archives Act*, section 5 (2) (e) and (k).
 47. *Archives Act*, section 5 (2) (j).
 48. Smith, Clive D. 'The Australian Archives' *Archives and Manuscripts*, Vol. 8, No. 1, June 1980, p. 36. This paper is a useful account of the development of the AA and the objectives that have been pursued in that development.
 49. The estimate of relative effort relies on a comparison of AA's figures in terms of metres with NAC's in terms of pages, assuming that 1 metre equals 8000 one-sided pages.
 50. There are a further 10 pages in the AA report, of appendices summarising access decisions. The NAC pages are 54 and 68.
 51. *Archives Act*, section 5 (2) (c).
 52. Saclier, *op. cit.*, p. 204.
 53. NAC, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
 54. Lamb, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
 55. NAC, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

56. *ibid*, p. 78.
57. Eastwood, *op. cit*, p. 75.
58. SSHRCC, *op. cit*, p. 1.
59. Eastwood, *op. cit*, p. 86.
60. NAC, *op. cit*, p. 50.
61. *ibid*, p. 10.
62. Editorial 'A divided profession?' *Archifacts* 1986/1, March 1986.
63. Eastwood, *op. cit*, p. 84.
64. *ibid*, p. 90.
65. This was the *bete noire* of archivists who attacked AA internal changes at an ASA meeting in 1981. There are signs, however, that the word is being restored. In fact, NARA and NAC don't use it much either!
66. Sources for these figures are:
 - 'List of delegates—ASA 6th Biennial Conference'—copy in my 'ASA Li' file.
 - *Commonwealth Government Directory* Vol. 1 1986, p. 67.
 - *ASA Membership List 1986-1987* March 1987.
67. Dodds, *op. cit*, p. 37.
68. *ibid*, p. 38.
69. The matter was raised at ACA and ASA, where it received equivocal approval, but hardly any of the sort of discussion and criticism necessary for the development of a viable concept. It was then taken up by the ASA President, who raised the idea through the *Bulletin* (No. 79, June 1988, p. 1). It was subsequently announced, however, that it had been unanimously rejected (*Bulletin* No. 81, October 1988, p. 4). The basis and extent of this unanimity is unclear.
70. Eastwood, *op. cit*, p. 76.
71. *ibid*, p. 89.
72. *ibid*, p. 74.
73. *ibid*, p. 90.
74. *ibid*, p. 76.
75. *ibid*, p. 91.