

NOEL GEORGE BUTLIN, 1921-1991

Michael Saclier

OBITUARY

Noel Butlin died on 2 April 1991 aged 69. Other obituaries having told his life in detail, there is no need to do more than sketch it here. The purpose of this essay is different, as will appear anon.

Born on 19 December 1921, Noel's early life was one of considerable hardship owing to the loss of his father in a hit-and-run accident when he was very young. His ability was apparent early. He received first class honours and the University Medal at graduation from Sydney University in 1942. He was snapped up by the Commonwealth and spent the rest of the war working first in London and then in Washington as an economic advisor.

From 1946 to 1949 he lectured in Economics at the University of Sydney where his brother was Professor and then spent two years as a Rockefeller Fellow at Harvard. In 1951 he accepted a Senior Research Fellowship in Economics at the Australian National University, thus beginning an association which was to last the rest of his life.

Becoming successively Reader in Economics (1954) and Professor of Economic History (1962) Noel Butlin proceeded to produce a series of major works which revolutionised a number of areas of historical and economic discourse. His *Public Capital Formation in Australia 1860-1900* and *Private Capital Formation in Australia 1861-1900*, together with his major book, *Investment in Australian Economic Development* (1964) rewrote the history of the Australian economy from the gold rushes. During the late 1960s and the 1970s Butlin pursued themes which had emerged in his earlier work, especially the economic role of the public sector, and published *Government and Capitalism* in 1982. He was also Director of the Botany Bay Project in the mid-1970s and edited its publications. This might have been his crowning achievement but never achieved its potential. It was one of the few sub-optimal results of Noel's career.

In the 1980s Butlin turned towards a re-evaluation of the Australian economy before 1850. It was typical that his articles and book — *Our*

Original Aggression (1983) — made major contributions in the area of Aboriginal history and gave rise to debate on a number of occasions. At the time of his death he was reworking this research into a two volume history of the Australian economy to 1850 which will be published in 1992.

On the day before his death the Queen gave special approval for the award of Companion of the Order of Australia.

Having said all that, one has sketched the outline of a distinguished academic career and commemorated a major intellect, but that is not my real (or at least not my only) purpose, as I said at the outset. Rather I wish to celebrate another side of Noel Butlin — that of the doer. Specifically, I sing in praise of our founder — ‘we’ being the Archives of Business and Labour, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

When research work in economic history began at the ANU in 1952, ‘the first step taken’ — and here I am quoting from an unattributed paper written in 1960, probably by Noel Butlin —

was to explore the resources of the National Library, the Victorian Public Library, and the New South Wales Public Library. This check showed that, except for holdings of the last-named library, covering the period up to about 1850, but not after that date, no significant basic material, other than conventional government records and newspapers were available in Australian libraries for purposes of research in economics or economic history at this or any other university.

They began by microfilming all extant unpublished government statistical records¹ (‘Blue Books’). This was followed in 1953 by the first approaches to firms in Sydney, Melbourne and Newcastle for the loan of records. Continuing to quote from the document already mentioned:

In the course of these approaches to firms, two important issues emerged. First, borrowing selected records was very inadequate . . . Secondly, a great deal of invaluable material of wide interest and almost entirely manuscript was being held by these firms and much was being destroyed . . . [I]t became apparent that business firms while conscious of the historical value of their records were unable to retain them and were willing to transfer them to the safe-keeping of the Australian National University. At the same time, no Australian library or university was actively attempting to preserve these essential research sources.

The first ‘indefinite’ loan deposit agreements were concluded in 1953 with certain Melbourne building and finance firms. In 1954 the first very large deposit was received from the Australian Agricultural Company covering its pastoral, mineral, land-owning and urban development interests, 1823-1914.² In 1955 Goldsbrough Mort and Co deposited its records 1850-1950. By 1957, the University had at its disposal the records of some thirty business firms.

In 1959 — perhaps partly in response to the growing unwieldiness of the mass of records which was being acquired, but probably more directly as a response to the awareness of the quantity of company records available, the School appointed its first archivist. The fact that Bruce Shields had no experience in archives indicates, I think, that Noel Butlin had not then realised that archival skills were something to be sought after. Rather, Shields was an ideal choice for the hunter-gatherer role which was required of him.

It was not until 1961, in fact, that the Archives got its first archivist with training and experience, in the person of Barbara Ross — but this is running ahead of the story a little.

As early as 1957 Butlin's activities had attracted the disapproving attention of Harold (later Sir Harold) White, Commonwealth National Librarian. White sought to put a halt to the collecting activities of the ANU by persuading Sir Keith Hancock, soon after his arrival as Director of the Research School of Social Sciences, that the 'Public Libraries' (i.e. the State and National libraries) should have a 'monopoly of collection and deposit' justifying the proposition on the basis of avoiding waste by establishing an 'agreed national framework'.³ To this Sir Keith demurred, pointing out that overseas experience was against such a monopoly and that, in some areas such as business records the very idea of state rights was a dubious one. Hancock told White that he intended to 'keep a completely open mind' and that 'it would probably take me considerable time to familiarise myself with the issues he had raised'. The notes of this conversation (Document I) were sent to Butlin with a request for comments.

To this Butlin replied with a seven page justification of his work (Document II) which contains some classic swipes at the library establishment. Printed elsewhere in this issue, it encapsulates not merely a flavour of the young Butlin but a view of the world of libraries and proto-archives which a generation later it is salutary to reflect upon. He sent it to Sir Keith with a covering letter which reads in part:

There is . . . a general implication arising out of Mr White's points about which I feel more than merely annoyed . . . Mr White's complaints about our collecting implies a demand that we await his pleasure in carrying on our research and that we accept conditions of place and convenience prescribed by him in carrying out our research. This I am not prepared to tolerate.

There then follows a statement which has an eerie quality about it in that it might serve as a clarion call for the embattled ANU of today.

This university has been criticised a good deal. It is fashionable to criticise it for doing things and for failing to do things. I have come to feel very strongly that we must go ahead with a positive aim which we believe to be fair and reasonable and particularly which is likely to achieve an effective, high-grade research programme. If we are criticised for this (as White now criticises me), we can afford to take it.

And Noel had his way. The University toughed it out, aided by the unreasonableness of the National Librarian's claims.

This tension between the Library and the Archives continued at a relatively low level for several years, erupting again in 1960 over the issue of collecting trade union records — an initiative which Noel Butlin approved of and supported. This dispute involved the ACTU, the Councils of the Library and the University and a formal agreement, before it was finally settled in 1961.

Butlin continued (with some intermissions) to be a major protagonist in the development of the Archives throughout the 1960s and 1970s as chairman or member of the Archives Committee. During that period he oversaw much of the growth and development of the Archives in both staff and material terms. He was deeply involved in the effort to acquire the Archives' present accommodation in Action Underhill and the formal opening of the new building in 1981 was probably his last significant interaction with the Archives.

He was not always an easy man to deal with. He could be domineering and intimidating. He could be abrasive and infuriating. He could be wrong. He could also be kind, warm, amusing. He was human.

Although I was never close to Noel and would not presume to claim friendship I admired his great qualities and I shall miss him. Inevitably, his writings will be superseded in the normal course of academic life. His students and colleagues will age and pass away and



Professor Noel Butlin, March 1990. (Photographer: Darren Boyd, ANU)

so his memory will fade from the public memory. I would like to think of the Archives remaining as a longer-term memorial to this great Australian.

FRAGMENTS OF A PROTO-ARCHIVAL INCIDENT

Introduction

Sir Keith Hancock took up his position as Director of the Research School of Social Sciences in February 1957. The post was to be his academic swan song, bringing him home to Australia after a brilliant career spent mostly overseas.

At that time the School was housed in the 'temporary' buildings now known as the 'Old Administration Buildings'. A generation later, it may be added, some of these buildings are still providing shelter to various sections of the University, but that is another story.

It was to Sir Keith's office in those excessively modest buildings that Harold (later Sir Harold) White, Commonwealth National Librarian, came in late March 1957. The notes which Sir Keith made of that conversation (as was his habit in any matter of significance) were passed to Noel Butlin for his comments.

Butlin sat down at his typewriter and pounded out seven pages of commentary in righteous fury. Both documents are reproduced here partly because the second is not to be understood without the first, partly because they are both worth reading.

First, they paint a picture of the archival and library (and indeed of a corner of the academic) milieus of the time which it is salutary to consider. Second, they represent the view from a corner of academia overlooking those environments — and there are lessons to be drawn from that viewpoint. Third, they respectively give a flavour of two great men in their prime.

It would seem from internal evidence that Butlin not only responded to Sir Keith's report of his conversation with White but that he saw this as part of an ongoing confrontation with the National Librarian. Although he stuck very closely to the points enumerated by Hancock (which is remarkable given the unedited and uncorrected nature of the document) mention was made of earlier conversations with White and reference was made in the covering memo to White's criticism of Butlin for collecting business records although Hancock made no explicit mention of this in his note.

In any event, for those who are aficionados of righteous spleen, who like to see sacred cows demolished, or who simply like a well-turned phrase — read and enjoy.

Document I

**Note of Discussion with Mr. H. L. White, Commonwealth
National Librarian
28th March,
1957.**

Mr. White discussed with me to-day certain library and archival problems. He said that he had been thinking a good deal on two subjects:

1. **"Bibliographical Control"**.

A unit for this purpose was being set in the National Library with the purpose of discovering and listing what materials were available in what libraries in Australia.

2. **Identification and Collection of Source Material for Australian History.**

Under this question, he said that there were two questions which needed to be answered —

(a) Whether Public Libraries (as distinct from University Libraries or other private institutions) should have a monopoly of collection and deposit.

(b) How the spheres of interest in collecting and holding source material should be demarcated between the National Library and the State libraries.

As regards both (a) and (b) above, there has, I understand, been a good deal of recent discussion between Commonwealth and State Librarians.

As regards (a), I got the impression that the Commonwealth Librarian thought that the Public Libraries should have the monopoly. As regards (b) there appears to be a strong feeling among the State Librarians that materials which they consider belong to their sphere should not pass to any foreign jurisdiction (whether it be Commonwealth Library or any other body outside the boundaries of the State concerned).

On the above assumptions, the recent activities of this University in collecting Business Archives would be doubly unpopular — both as infringing the monopoly desired by the Public Libraries and in acquiring materials which some State Library might have wanted to collect for itself.

Mr. White referred to the Business Records' [sic] Councils recently set up in New South Wales and Victoria. I gathered from him that these are not State branches of an Australian Council but two separate

autonomous Councils which have professed the desire to co-ordinate their work.

Mr. White expressed the opinion that the work of collecting and depositing could be done most economically and efficiently within an agreed national framework. In this way, the waste of competitive and overlapping enterprise would be minimised. He referred to the great resources of the Mitchell Library and said that once its sphere of collection was clearly defined there would be no financial barrier to its acquiring what existed within its sphere. Similarly there would be no financial barrier to the Commonwealth acquiring material within its sphere once this was defined.

I told Mr. White that I was interested to hear his story. I said that I appreciated the force of his argument for minimizing the waste of competitive and overlapping effort; however, apart from this, I intend to keep a completely open mind. I pointed out that in some countries, for example the U.K. and the U.S.A., it would seem very strange indeed for Public Libraries to claim the monopoly of collection and deposit. Again, a lot might possibly be said against too strict an assertion of state rights in historical material. This principle, for example, might do more harm than good in this sphere of business history.

I added that it would probably take me considerable time to familiarize myself with the issues he had raised.

Before we parted, he raised another matter, namely, the supply of archivists and cataloguers. He said that in recent years, the National Library had lost eight well qualified persons for this work. In his library there was a great backlog of source material to be handled and he saw no way of getting the work done without the aid of post-graduate students who might be switched to it while they were working for their degrees. I expressed some scepticism about the possibility of doing this, though I thought that some post-graduate students might, as a by-product of their research, sometimes do bibliographical work which the Public Libraries would find useful. They might even from time to time play a small but useful part in the collecting processes.

Document II

Comments on Mr White's Visit to Director.

1. Collection of Business Records by A.N.U.

This university has not obtained its collection of business records by competition with Mr White or any other established library. Without wishing to indulge in heroics, we have secured this material for very simple reasons. Two or three of us in this university have approached the executives of a number of important firms (about forty throughout Australia), made contact by personal interview, made a very simple

proposal with no attempt to be “clever”, have known what we were looking for and have been prepared physically to look for it and then have been prepared to undertake the extremely heavy and unpleasantly dirty task of loading and driving trucks and of loading, sorting and shelving collected documents. NO FIRM HAS PROVIDED US WITH ANY FACILITIES. I have, myself, driven fully laden trucks over a distance of 1800 miles. Dr Barnard, Mr Purcell & I have manhandled 28 tons of Goldsbrough, Mort records around four floors or their Melbourne building, loaded semi-trailers, driven straight back to Canberra and unloaded trucks. Mr Bailey, Mr Sinclair and I have laboured with huge Pit Wages Books in rooms inches deep in coal dust for days on end. Dr Gollan has been literally ill from the effects of dust at Humes Store.

All this is merely to indicate that we have been prepared to do what neither the firms concerned nor the relevant libraries have been willing to do. The response from libraries has been the reaction of White and Metcalfe. Several of the firms have reacted very differently indeed. Goldsbrough, Mort have already made a useful financial gesture towards the university’s work; and have been helpful with other firm’s particularly in the direction of physical assistance with records.

We have done this, not to take records from Mr White, but to save them from the furnace. We have literally rescued from the furnace the records of the A.A. Co., Goldsbrough, Mort, Elder Smith, Squatting Investment, James Paterson, the Modern Permanent Building Society and the Newcastle Coal Mining Co. If we have been “infringing any monopoly” or “acquiring materials which some State Library might have wanted to collect for itself”, the situation might have been different. It might even have been the case that records of Richards, of Holdens, of John Darling, of N.Z. Loan & Mercantile, of Briscoes, of Buckley & Nunn’s and many others might be available to research workers in libraries, instead of having been destroyed and available to none.

Finally, we did not pass these records to other libraries for three simple reasons. First, we wanted them for research purposes in projects already afoot. My own view is very strongly that this university must be, in some degree, determined to provide itself with the means of carrying on its research. Secondly, I am well aware of the fact that no State or Commonwealth Library has the space to house business records on this scale. I have already contributed substantially [to] the holdings of the Mitchell Library, in persuading them to accept the records of the N.S.W. Bankruptcy Court (these were transfer[r]ed in 1949 and have been inaccessible ever since) and in locating the records of the N.S.W. Arbitration Court at Windsor N.S.W. (these were held for some years at Sydney University and subsequently, under Metcalfe, shifted to “the tinder box” at Shea’s Creek). Indeed, the real argument

on the side of expense is entirely on the side of A.N.U. simply because we have buildings to spare. Thirdly, in many cases, firms were not willing to surrender confidential records to a "public" library while they were prepared to pass them over to a restricted access repository at a university. Indeed, in some cases, we received many documents which no library institution could possibly have got near. This point should be spelt out. Our State libraries have not been very adept at making approaches to firms or similar institutions. In the Mitchell, e.g., there is a very strong tendency to petticoat government and this atmosphere extends to outside contact. I know of several institutions, most particularly in the trade union world, but also in the business community, which would not tolerate the thought of the Mitchell receiving their records.

Finally, I would say that this university can and should collect because it has

- (i) buildings
- (ii) research staff with the knowledge and authority to discover material, select and arrange documents
- (iii) commitments to carry on a worthwhile research programme.

2. The Competence of the Public Libraries to Collect and House.

The National Library attempts to carry on a number of functions and it may be that many of my comments derive from the fact that it is too complex for one man to handle. The Archives Division is primarily concerned with government archives with a very tiny private documents section. The whole work of this Division is overwhelmed by government archives and I believe that M[a]cLean's views on the collection of private records may well differ from those of White's. This Division seems to be doing an extremely good job on government archives and certainly, from the research workers' point of view, is probably much the most helpful library institution in Australia.

In carrying out its work on government archives, this Division has been confronted with a number of business or business-type collections and has looked to us for help. This help has been sought not merely at the research level of types of material which might be given priority, but at the elementary level of, e.g. the distinction between journals and ledgers. There is no one in the Division who knows anything about economics or accounts and I have advised them frequently on collections of Treasury documents, War Debts files etc. etc. This has meant, on one occasion in particular, going through an entire large collection, file by file, in order to work out relations between accounting documents not only for preservation but for orders of arrangement. The weakness of the Division, at this level, showed up in dealing with the large collection of foreign business records of the

Enemy Property collection. The Senior Archivist, Gib[b]ney, told me that some 300 crates of records were assembled in Sydney and it had been decided to reduce this to 30 crates by a blanket formula. He showed me an article in an American journal which had suggested to him a scheme for American companies which he proposed to apply to Japanese companies operating [in] Australia. His specific plea was that the Division had no space. It happened when he was urged strongly not to proceed as he proposed that the whole collection could be held in some additional space leased in Sydney from the Department of Supply.

In the Australian section, there is certainly no one at all who could possibly begin to handle businessmen or business records or know where to look. This is a very weak section, though I have found it helpful enough on the bibliographical side, with neither drive nor direction. The complaints Mr White makes, of losing several good archivists and cataloguers, are partly to be explained by the fact that people are not permitted to go out into the field and that proposals for collection are firmly the preserve of the Librarian and his deputy. Indeed, his bibliographical [sic] control project is described [sic] at this level as a scheme for 'cataloguing catalogues' to be done by people who were taken on with the understanding that they might see something of private records.

One could go through others of the Australian libraries and archives, with similar comments. The Oxley Library, e.g., with a large and expensive microfilming equipment intended to preserve Queensland records, uses its camera to copy documents carefully preserved in the Mitchell while other documents rot or are burnt in the country towns. Or the Victorian archivist who recently permitted the Registrar-General of Victoria to burn his complete collection of all the public and private company reports and balance sheets could be similarly cited.

(All these comments on the State libraries reflect, of course, on the history and economics departments of the State Universities. The economics people at Sydney and Melbourne are now stirred up about business records. What about the historians? But the weaknesses in the libraries are, I think, fundamental ones.)

Not only is the personnel ill-suited to work in business records, but the space situation is now very difficult indeed in the State cities and in the National Library. These two factors combined, of space and personnel, help to explain the tendency for these libraries to concentrate on private non-business collections. Although diplomatic problems may be more serious in the case of non-business records, private holdings are usually small, less likely to be extremely dirty and often can be delivered physically by the owner.

I cannot understand White's claim that, if its sphere of operation were defined, the Mitchell would face no financial problem. It has no

adequate building. It is housing large masses of invaluable records in old grease-soaked wooden wool stores and a large sum of money would be required merely to house its present holdings adequately. But, in addition, how does it attract staff? I have already talked to White on this point and suggested that he might think of appointing people as research officers rather than cataloguers to act as collectors and to understand the material collected. He has not responded. Clearly, there would be serious salary problems. And both these problems of buildings and appropriate staff apply to every library in Australia.

All these comments are not intended to argue, on the other side, that the universities should have a monopoly of business records — or any records — collection. They are, to me, strong arguments why the universities should be stirred to enter into the business of collection. For it is in the universities that one might hope to find the skill and the interest to undertake this work. And there is the faint hope that the libraries, faced with competition, might stop talking and do something.

3. The Library Cartel.

There has, for many years, been lip-service paid to the idea of a market-sharing cartel. Mr White first told me about it three years ago when he was very pleased that we had obtained the A.A. Co's records (presumably because they were in Metcalfe's territory?). In the same conversation, he also told me that he had just returned from a trip to Camden, inspecting some Macarthur papers which he hoped to get (which were certainly in Metcalfe's territory).

As I understand it, the formal view is that each library has its own State boundary to define its area of operation, with two qualifications. The Mitchell is entitled to documents dealing with foundations of Australia; and the National Library can claim documents of national scope and importance, particularly referring to periods after 1900. There are, no doubt, subtleties beyond these points. But the agreement is generally known to be an attempt not to share with all libraries but to demarcate the White and Metcalfe Empires. As such, I can only quote White himself who informed me, a propos the A.A. Co papers, that the agreement didn't work.

If this really were an attempt to provide that the two big libraries played fair with the smaller ones, there might be very much more sympathy felt for it. But even if it were, there are many difficulties in the way of accepting it, especially in the field of Business records.

It seems to me impossible to conceive of any State library or group of State libraries possibly wanting to monopolise all the business records of significance within the State borders. The bulk of business records is the most dismaying feature and any sensible approach would urge

participation by all who felt moved to join in the business of preservation.

A second important objection is purely a research issue. The records of firms of purely local significance may frequently enlighten a very much wider area. For instance, the records of local Melbourne importers can throw light on the movement of wholesale prices throughout Australia as a whole. Again, firms may interlock and amalgamate in all sorts of ways to make local firms attain a stature which they fail otherwise to achieve. The Bodalla Co is important in giving us the first real source of information on dairying history in Australia. But it is also a vital link in the building-up of an Australia-wide empire by Goldsborough & Mort. I do not think that a bureaucratic library rule which permitted research workers access to [one] firm should deny access to the other. Here it seems to me that the chances of universities seeing eye to eye are much greater since the research people are much more likely to know or to grasp relationships of this sort.

A third difficulty stems from a different structural question, particularly affecting Melbourne. So many Head Offices are in Melbourne that it is impossible to say which is national which is local or which belongs to a State outside Victoria. For instance, the Australian Estates Ltd is a big financial enterprise in Melbourne, with its main proprietors in Aberdeen. All its assets are in Queensland and it owns some forty very large Queensland stations. This sort of problem can be extended to contrast the physical location of a firm in a particular area with the fact that it may frequently sell products, maintain agencies etc all over Australia and overseas. There is no line of demarcation except at the narrowest level applying to a very small range of firms.

4. The State Universities and Business Archives Councils.

My own view on the waste of competitive enterprise is that, within limits, competition gets the job done while agreements within a national framework have so far stultified, if they have done anything, effective action. I am inclined to agree with White that intelligent cooperation is important, but far from cooperating in the sense of informing other institutions what we would agree not to collect we might think of actually taking steps to help other institutions get what we agree they may have. To be specific, I look to the universities, not the libraries to get the business records job done. I think that, with some margin for disagreement, the universities could agree, in the light of prospective research projects and of physical capacity, on a collection programme. This collection programme might or might not depend on some association with the State or National libraries. I am fairly confident, from my contacts in Sydney and Melbourne, that it

would not be unduly difficult to raise the money from firms to meet the cost of modest structures. I, for one, would be happy to spend some considerable time in both places not only looking for research material for ourselves but also helping these universities acquire records.

I think that this could most satisfactorily become our role in relation to the Business Archives Councils in Sydney & Melbourne. Although Birch started his Council ambitiously as a N.S.W. Branch, I think Woodruff prefers, at this stage, to think of his as a State organisation. Woodruff's view was, I think, influenced partly by a desire to keep White out of the Victorian organisation (and possibly, though he is naturally reticent on this, to deal with us!) Birch some time back invited me to join his Council; and Woodruff recently asked me to accept nomination for the executive of his. I have declined both offers. In Birch's case, the invitation came on the understanding that all material was to go to the Shea's Creek depot and under Metcalfe's control; the Sydney Council has since altered its arrangements and no longer channels material to Metcalfe. In Woodruff's case, the offer was made ostensibly on the grounds that he wanted someone "to deal with the White problem".

In general terms, I have felt that we have more to contribute at this stage by remaining independent of these organisations — both as persons or as representatives of an institution. Certainly, I do not believe that we should enter into formal relations until we have decided how far we propose to go in actual collection and preservation at A.N.U. But I think we have a fairly heavy responsibility to reach this decision as soon as possible and to set about cooperating with and helping the State Universities in this field.

5. National Library Supply of Archivists & Cataloguers.

As I understand it, the National Library fails to keep its people because White insists on archivists doing ordinary library training, leaving them badly paid and requiring them to stay within the four walls of the library cataloguing when those with ability and interest want to go out in the field. This is an insoluble problem while archives and the Parliamentary Library are joined together. If the proposals to separate the two go on, it may be easier to find a way out.

On this point, I would like to suggest that, instead of letting students catalogue the National Library holdings, we might have an occasional Ph.D. thesis which concentrated on a critique of historical source material for some important region or subject, i.e., involving [sic] both library and field work. Mr White might be invited to support some of his trainees in applying for such a scholarship through the Public Service Board.

ENDNOTES

1. A project, by the way, which had an interesting echo in 1989 when the Australian Bureau of Statistics published a comprehensive microfiche edition of colonial statistics.
2. As an aside, Noel Butlin's version of the Australian Agricultural Company accession was that, walking in Newcastle one day, he became aware that he was passing the office of the company and, on impulse, stepped in off the street to enquire of the Secretary whether they had any records — to be told that as a matter of fact they had a whole shedfull on the wharf 'out the back'.
3. Sir Keith Hancock, 'Note of discussion with Mr. H. L. White . . . 28th March, 1957'. ANUABL file, *Papers concerning foundation of Archives 2A1*, and the source for both Documents I and II.