

The Collecting of Personal and Private Papers in Australia

Graeme Powell

Graeme Powell joined the staff of the National Library of Australia in 1967. Throughout his career he has been primarily concerned with the collecting and preservation of personal papers. He was the National Library's Manuscript Librarian from 1969 to 1975 and returned to that position in 1987. From 1979 to 1987 he was the Australian Joint Copying Project Officer in London, in which capacity he worked on many personal manuscript collections in British repositories. He has postgraduate qualifications in librarianship and history.

This paper looks briefly at the history of collecting of personal and private papers by libraries and archives in Australia. It then analyses the 3 153 entries for personal papers in the Guide to collections of manuscripts relating to Australia, as well as data in other guides and directories, and suggests some strengths and imbalances in the holdings of public repositories. It concludes with a few general comments on the value of personal papers and the formidable task faced by a relatively small number of collecting archives in documenting the major issues and activities in Australian society.

THE FIRST ARCHIVES ACQUIRED in Australia by either public institutions or private collectors were papers that had been accumulated by explorers, naturalists, pastoralists and other individuals and families. The earliest major acquisition by a library was an important group of papers of Sir Joseph Banks, purchased by the government of New South Wales in 1884 and eventually placed in the Public Library.¹ In the next twenty years libraries occasionally received papers either directly from the creators of the records and their families or indirectly from private collectors. In England collectors such as

S. W. Silver and E. A. Petherick purchased small groups of Australian papers, while in Sydney the greatest private collection of books, papers and manuscripts was assembled by David Scott Mitchell.

The Mitchell Library was opened in 1910, within the Public Library of New South Wales, and for the next forty or fifty years it was the pre-eminent collection of personal papers in Australia. The prestige of the collection attracted other good collections, while the Mitchell bequest enabled the Library to purchase outstanding archives, such as the papers of Lachlan Macquarie and Matthew Flinders.² A publication issued by the Mitchell Library in 1936 drew attention to the formidable range of its collections.³ It described the papers of governors William Bligh, Philip Gidley King and Sir George Arthur, the jurist Sir Francis Forbes, the politicians W. C. Wentworth and Sir Henry Parkes, the explorers Ludwig Leichhardt and Sir Thomas Mitchell, the churchmen Samuel Marsden and John Dunmore Lang, the writer Henry Lawson and the artist Sir Oswald Brierly. The Parkes Papers alone occupied 170 volumes, a greater quantity than the entire manuscript holdings of most other Australian libraries.

In fact, the other collections remained small until the 1950s. The Public Library of Victoria had been one of the great libraries of the British Empire, yet in 1956 its manuscript collections occupied only 120 boxes. The collections of the National Library were of a similar size. It had purchased personal papers as early as 1909, yet fifty years later it only had about a dozen collections that could be considered really substantial. Both libraries had magnificent individual manuscripts, but they had made only occasional attempts to seek the entire archives of individuals and families.

From the 1950s onwards the situation changed rapidly. The Mitchell Library came to be seen as a model, and occasionally as a rival, by the other State libraries and the National Library. Senior staff took a stronger interest in the preservation of historical sources and began to see the papers of 'great names' as status symbols. Some, such as the indefatigable collection builder Harold White, devoted a great deal of time and energy to pursuing and wooing the owners of papers. Manuscript sections were set up and also libraries within libraries, such as the La Trobe Library, the John Oxley Library and the J. S. Battye Library of Western Australian History. By the late 1960s there was little difference in size between the holdings of the Mitchell Library and the National Library, while those of the other State libraries and archives had all grown significantly. In addition, new general collecting institutions emerged, most notably the University of Melbourne Archives. More specialised bodies, such as the Australian Archives, the Fryer Memorial Library, the Australian

War Memorial and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Studies, developed important collections of personal papers.

After the 1960s the situation stabilised. Existing collections continued to grow at varying rates, but attempts to establish new collecting institutions foundered. It was not until the late 1980s that there was another upsurge in collecting. A number of the newer university libraries and archives began to collect personal papers. Some, such as the Australian Defence Force Academy Library, had a strong subject focus, while others, such as Charles Sturt University Archives and James Cook University Library, had a regional focus. Collections of personal papers were also acquired by a scattering of regional public libraries and church, school and museum archives.

The collecting by libraries, archives, museums, historical societies and other institutions has been paralleled by collecting, on a much smaller scale, by private individuals. No other Australian collector has matched the achievements of Mitchell, but there have been a few determined collectors who assembled very fine collections. The Sydney businessman Sir William Dixon, the Sydney lawyer Sir John Ferguson and the London art dealer Sir Rex Nan Kivell each built up huge collections which, as well as single letters and other manuscripts, included extensive papers of governors, politicians, writers, missionaries and publishers. Most collectors have specialised on particular subject areas. Harry Chaplin persuaded writers and artists to give him their papers, E. A. Crome pursued early aviators who happily handed over their diaries, logs and letters, while Kenneth Hince collected papers of Percy Grainger and other musicians. Most such collections have been purchased by public and university libraries. Despite the growth of the manuscript market, the operations of contemporary private collectors appear to be quite circumscribed, with a strong emphasis on literary manuscripts and letters.

Some information about current collecting of personal papers by institutions can be gained by a close reading of the *Directory of Archives in Australia*, published in 1992. The *Directory* has entries for 458 archives. Taking into account a few notable omissions, such as the Newcastle Regional Libraries, it would seem that about seventy-five archives and other institutions collect personal papers. It is not a large number and it also needs to be borne in mind that very few, if any, collect only personal papers. Personal papers are housed together with organisational, corporate or government archives and it is evident from the descriptions that in many cases they form only a small proportion of the total holdings, both in number and shelf space. For this reason there is very little information about the size of holdings of personal

papers, except perhaps in relative terms. In 1992 the total archival holdings of the National Library and the Mitchell Library each occupied about 8 500 metres of shelving. The collections of three of the other State libraries averaged 3 000 metres of shelving. Nearly all the other institutions held less than 1000 metres of records and some of them had less than 100 metres. It seems probable that several of the institutions did not hold more than half a dozen collections of personal papers.

The only general union catalogue or directory devoted exclusively to private archives is the *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts Relating to Australia* (here after, the *Guide*). The first instalment of 300 entries was published by the National Library in April 1965 and the twentieth instalment appeared in December 1995.* It now contains 6 000 entries describing collections of private records in public repositories. The *Guide* never lived up to the original expectations of the archivists who conceived it.⁴ Its coverage of holdings of even the major repositories is extremely uneven and the quality of the descriptions is highly variable. Nevertheless, it always had the support of a small group of contributors and in the most recent instalments the representation of archives and libraries has improved considerably. While numerous qualifications need to be made, an analysis of the entries does give some indication of strengths and weaknesses in holdings of personal papers and suggest some patterns in collecting over the last thirty years.

A total of 3 153 collections of personal and private papers are described in the *Guide*. This figure includes collections which comprise a mixture of personal papers and business or official records such as the archives of some politicians, solicitors, small businessmen and pastoralists. Some descriptions are too brief to enable this distinction to be made, but if a collection seemingly consists entirely of ledgers, case files or stock returns it has been excluded from the following analysis. Single items, secondary works, artificial collections and microfilms and photocopies have also been excluded. These entries tend to appear in the earlier rather than the later instalments of the *Guide* and the fact that some of them appeared at all points to the difficulties encountered by the editors in dealing with fluctuations in contributions.

The *Guide* contains descriptions of personal papers received from fifty-seven libraries and archives. The principal contributors are listed in Table 1. It should be stressed that the figures refer only to personal papers; the Noel Butlin Archives, for instance, has contributed entries for hundreds of business and

* Reviewed by Meredith Lawn elsewhere in this issue. Ed.

trade union archives, but only a few collections of personal papers. The dominance of the National Library and the Mitchell Library is immediately apparent and without their contributions the *Guide* would certainly have collapsed long ago. The two libraries are probably over-represented, in that many of their early entries refer to small and often insignificant collections. On the other hand, some of their major collections have yet to be described in the *Guide*. The contributions of the other State libraries have tended to wax and wane and the State Archives of Tasmania has never contributed many entries. Considering the size and variety of its collections, Melbourne University Archives is also poorly represented. In recent years some of the newer repositories, such as the Australian Defence Force Academy Library and James Cook University Library, have been active contributors. The Australian Archives has also begun to submit entries. By 1995 it was probably true to say that at least some collections of personal papers held in every major Australian collecting repository had been described in the *Guide*.

Compared with other kinds of archives, collections of personal papers are usually small and many of them are very small. If a personal collection exceeds 200 standard archive boxes it is usually a sign that it is a semi-official or semi-business archive, in which case many of the papers were created, accumulated and used by secretaries and employees rather than by a particular individual. Even family archives are seldom of this size. In fact, as Table 2 indicates, most collections of papers described in the *Guide* occupy fewer than ten boxes and a large number hardly fill a box. There is no correlation between size and value: plenty of large collections are full of dross, while some collections comprising a few diaries or a small group of letters attract generations of researchers. Nevertheless, a small collection cannot document the full life of an individual, the range of their activities, their personal relationships, and the changes in their ideas and attitudes over the decades. The entries in the *Guide* suggest that very few Australians have preserved their personal papers in a systematic and comprehensive way over their lifetime. Instead, the papers in libraries and archives are relics which only document certain phases, events or aspects of their lives. Some have been deliberately kept because they were valued, such as legal documents, wartime or travel diaries, certificates, letters of congratulation or condolence, cutting books and photographs. Others survived by chance, stored in obscure cupboards and boxes.

Many of the small collections cover only a small period. Table 3 indicates that in a significant number of cases the papers that have survived are limited to no more than seven or eight years, perhaps a tenth of the person's lifetime. In many such cases, the papers document a single event: emigration to

Australia, a journey of exploration, wartime service, a romance or the writing of a book. This can also true of large collections. Some of the huge political collections in the Australian Archives or the National Library document in exhaustive detail ministerial and other activities covering a few years, but do not contain a single document on the rest of the person's life. Imbalances of this kind can pose great problems for biographers. For example, Brian Fletcher wrote, 'The popular image of [Governor] Darling derives mainly from what is known of a mere seven of his eighty-six years'.⁵ Fletcher was able to achieve a better balance, but many other researchers are defeated by lack of sources, especially on the early years of their subjects.

Table 3 also suggests the spread of personal archives over the last two hundred years. The figures are at best an extremely rough indicator. The date ranges in *Guide* entries can be deceptive, as the extreme dates often refer to a few isolated documents and the bulk of the records are confined to a much shorter period. Some collections straddle 1850, 1900 or 1950, so placing them in one half century rather than another becomes arbitrary. There are only a handful of personal archives in Australia that hold important groups of pre-1800 records and it appears that very few nineteenth century immigrants brought with them older family records.⁶ The table suggests that the period 1900–50 is best documented by personal papers, though it should be noted that the large number of World War I diaries and letters has inflated this figure. The collecting trend away from colonial records to contemporary records is hardly surprising, but conceals considerable variations between institutions. For instance, recent acquisitions by regional archives include many older collections of papers of farmers and businessmen, some extending back into the last century. In contrast, the literary papers collected by the Australian Defence Force Academy Library almost all date from the last fifty years.

Figures on gender representation also need to be treated with great caution. As Table 4 shows, most *Guide* entries are entered under the names of men. The bias is undeniable, but the descriptions often indicate that within these collections are important groups of letters written by women. This is even more true of family collections. There is a sharp increase in the representation of women in the final four instalments of the *Guide*. However, as with earlier instalments, many of these women are writers and, to a lesser extent, artists and musicians. Women in many other walks of life remain poorly documented. The papers of some notable feminists and leaders of women's organisations are recorded, but very few professional or business women. There are relatively fewer family archives than can be found in many British or European

repositories. Rural families seem most likely to maintain some sort of family archives, especially if they have large homes which remain in the family for two or more generations. Even so, they bear little resemblance to the great country house archives of Britain, which extend over centuries and contain records of numerous family members.

Finally, an attempt has been made in Table 5 to group the personal collections in the *Guide* under occupational headings. This division is somewhat rough and ready and the figures should only be considered as approximate. It is often not possible to label families in this way and the descriptions of papers of individuals sometimes give no clue about their background. On the other hand, some individuals could have been included under several headings.

The survey of *Guide* entries suggests two possible but contradictory conclusions. There is a great variety of occupations represented in the personal papers held in Australian repositories: philosophers, gold-diggers, governors, dancers, entomologists, storekeepers, missionaries, sports figures, diplomats, immigrants, folklorists, museum directors, circus performers, foresters, even one or two murderers. To that extent, it can be argued that the collections document a very broad range of Australian society over the last 200 years. On the other hand, there is clearly a preponderance of a small number of occupations: writers, politicians, soldiers, officials, historians, journalists, church figures, pastoralists, businessmen. It could therefore be equally argued that the collections, taken as a whole, are unbalanced and that many groups in society, both past and present, are represented in only the most meagre way.

Novelists, poets, playwrights and other creative writers appear to be in a class of their own and their over-representation in Australian collections is not especially surprising. The State and National libraries have long accorded them high priority and other specialised repositories, like the Fryer Library and Australian Defence Force Academy Library, were set up very largely to collect literary papers. Writers create papers as part of their trade, they use libraries and often study other writers' papers, they usually value and sometimes overvalue their manuscripts and other papers, and they are aware of the interest of libraries in papers and of the monetary value attached to some papers. If they are not approached by libraries, they tend to take the initiative and approach the libraries, sometimes at a relatively early age. As a result of this high level of collecting over the last fifty years, it has become quite hard to identify the papers of many writers of note whose papers are *not* held in a library or archive. The same cannot be said of any other social or

occupational group. One consequence of the active pursuit of papers of writers has been the splitting of collections. Several writers have more than one entry in the *Guide* and Thomas Shapcott has the dubious distinction of having placed his papers in four different repositories.

The other groups that figure prominently in Table 5 are in general less conscious of the long-term value of their papers and are less inclined to offer their papers to archival repositories. However, individuals such as lawyers, clergymen, journalists, public servants and academics tend to value the art of writing, they produce written records in large quantities, and they have some awareness of the importance of recordkeeping, at least in the short-term. Historians share these qualities and their experience in using personal collections in libraries and archives often (though not always) lead them to consider the preservation of their own papers. The high figure for soldiers is anomalous, as most of the entries refer to World War I diaries rather than collections of papers. Other individuals, such as graziers, business leaders and politicians, may not see themselves as writers, but they are accustomed to keeping records of various kinds and their wide networks result in the accumulation of large bodies of correspondence and other papers. They may not have much interest in archives, but because they belong to elites, whether at the national or local level, they are often approached by archivists seeking to strengthen their collections.

Many other individuals and families are less likely to assemble and retain papers and are less likely to be approached by archivists. The survey of *Guide* entries suggests that there are far fewer collections of papers of musicians, artists, photographers, actors, dancers and film makers than there are of writers. Farmers, doctors, teachers, economists, social workers and political activists are not as well represented as pastoralists, lawyers, university academics, journalists and politicians. There are occasional entries for shearers, cattlemen, waterside workers, nurses, factory workers, Aboriginal activists, housewives and European immigrants, but they form a very small proportion of the total.

This survey of personal and private collections recorded in the *Guide to collections of manuscripts relating to Australia* can be extended a little by looking briefly at the small number of catalogues of the holdings of Australian manuscript repositories and archives published in the last ten years or so. In most cases they overlap with the *Guide*, but they do provide a good deal of additional information about the strengths and weaknesses of collections of personal papers held in public institutions.

Since its establishment in 1960 the University of Melbourne Archives has been one of the most active collectors of personal papers. It has been a sporadic contributor to the *Guide*, which only has entries for forty-two of its personal collections. However, in 1983 the Archives published its own guide to its collections, which contains summary information about 200 personal collections.⁷ About eighty of these collections comprise papers of academics, administrators and students associated with the University of Melbourne. The other 120 collections, dating from the 1850s to the present, are extremely diverse. Some of the collections comprise papers of politicians, pastoralists, writers and others who figure prominently in the *Guide*. Others belong to occupational groups who do not seem to be so well represented in Australian archives generally: engineers, financiers, teachers, architects, solicitors, trade unionists and left-wing political activists. A few of the collections, such as the papers of the industrialists Essington Lewis and Maurice Mawby, are very large. They are quite exceptional; about 90 per cent of the personal collections occupy no more than half a dozen boxes.

Two other university archives have also issued guides to their collections. The guide to the Archives at what is now Charles Sturt University at Wagga Wagga, published in 1984, indicates that its personal collections are greatly outnumbered by organisational archives.⁸ About twenty-five personal collections are recorded, including a number of Riverina politicians and pastoralists. The political collections are invariably large, but most of the others are quite small. The Noel Butlin Archives Centre at the Australian National University was set up to collect business and trade union records, but in the last decade has diversified its collecting considerably. Its 1993 catalogue has entries for over ninety collections of personal papers, only seventeen of which are recorded in the *Guide*.⁹ The largest group are academics and researchers, followed by trade unionists, socialists and other left-wing activists, feminists and journalists. A small number of company directors and public servants are also represented.

The oldest university archives, the University of Sydney Archives, has not published a guide, but it issues a regular bulletin, *Record*, which contains lists of accessions. They suggest that its collecting of personal papers has been very largely restricted to individuals closely associated with the University. This seems to be true, in varying degrees, of most of the other fifteen or so university archives. Altogether, the papers of academics are more likely to be preserved than those of any other major occupational or social group, with the single exception of writers.¹⁰

There are two thematic guides which reinforce some of the conclusions drawn from the survey of the *Guide*. In 1991 the Australian Science Archives Project produced the *Guide to the archives of science in Australia; records of individuals*.¹¹ This valuable publication is very wide-ranging, both in terms of individuals represented (it is by no means confined to professional scientists) and types of records covered. About 680 of the entries refer to collections of personal papers, as distinct from official records, oral histories and letters found in other collections. There is a considerable overlap with the *Guide to collections of manuscripts relating to Australia* and the institutional representation is not dissimilar. The Mitchell Library has by far the largest number of entries (139), followed by the Basser Library at the Australian Academy of Science (85) and the National Library (82). The University of Melbourne Archives, the University of Sydney Archives and the La Trobe Library each have over forty entries. There are entries for personal papers held in several university libraries, museums, herbariums, research institutes, learned societies and professional societies, none of which had been covered by the *Guide to collections of manuscripts* . . . The *Guide to the archives of science in Australia* demonstrates that the papers of botanists, geologists, physicists, ornithologists and other scientific groups have not been neglected by Australian collecting institutions, while at the same time revealing that many important collections remain in private possession.

In 1991 there appeared another thematic guide, but with a much narrower focus, entitled *Parliamentary voices in history*.¹² Compiled by Carmel McNerny, it provides summaries of papers and oral histories of Federal parliamentarians. McNerny located 356 collections of personal papers in twenty-eight archives and libraries, with the bulk of the entries coming from the National Library and the Australian Archives. Many of the entries describe semi-official collections which are very large and yet may cover only a short span of years. This is especially true of modern collections. Older collections are often quite small, including those of prime ministers such as J. C. Watson, Sir George Reid, J. H. Scullin and John Curtin. Of the 748 Federal parliamentarians who were no longer living in 1991, 531 appear to have left no papers at all. No survey has been done of papers of the thousands of State politicians, but judging from the *Guide* and other sources, libraries and archives hold the papers of a very small number.

By far the largest source of information on non-governmental archives in Australian institutions is not the *Guide* or any other publication, but the Australian Bibliographic Network (ABN). It contains about 20 000 entries for manuscript material, including all the collections described in the *Guide*. Many

of the other entries comprise single manuscripts or microfilms and at this stage ABN sheds little additional light on the collecting of personal papers in Australia. Only three institutions, the National Library, the Australian Defence Force Academy Library and the University of Central Queensland Library, appear to have systematically supplied entries for their holdings of personal papers and all three are already well-represented in the *Guide*.

Further research on the collecting of personal papers in Australia would require detailed examination of the catalogues and finding aids in individual institutions. This is especially true of some of the State libraries and archives, which have been collecting papers for quite a long time but which have contributed only erratically to the various published guides. Nevertheless, a few tentative conclusions can be made on the basis of this survey.

Forty years ago there were only about ten libraries and archives collecting personal papers, mostly in a modest fashion. Since then the number has grown to about seventy-five and the range of papers collected is much more diverse. At the same time, only a small proportion of those institutions are primarily concerned with personal papers and have assembled substantial collections. The remainder may hold individual collections of importance, but the quantity is very small and new acquisitions are infrequent. Over the years, as archivists have shifted their attention from nineteenth century to modern records, there has been a tendency for collections of papers to become larger. Nevertheless, the average collection remains quite small in comparison with most other categories of archives. In addition, there has been a heavy concentration on a few powerful or influential groups such as writers, academics, pastoralists and businessmen, while many other groups in Australian society have been neglected. Of the many millions of people who have lived in Australia, probably only a few hundred have left substantial personal archives of great value. They are the collections that range over a whole lifetime and which record not only a person's day-by-day activities, but also their thoughts, motives and ideas, their changing emotions, attitudes and aspirations and their family and social relationships.

Libraries and archives that have collected personal papers have been driven strongly by the needs of researchers. This is particularly true of university archives, some of which were conceived and set up by academic researchers, but it also applies to the National and State libraries, museum archives, and special libraries such as the Basser Library. While other types of archives have a mixture of legal, administrative, business and research functions, the only real justification for spending public money to acquire personal papers is to make records of long-term documentary value more widely available to the

whole community. Potential research value is the criterion generally used in collecting and archivists are concerned and will be disappointed if, as the years pass, collections receive little use. The importance traditionally placed on acquiring political and literary papers is partly due to the fact that political and literary historians have always been conspicuous in reading rooms and have worked closely with librarians and archivists.

The 'value-through-use' approach has been challenged in recent years by North American writers such as Helen Samuels, Joan Warnow-Blewett and Terry Cook. They have argued that, instead of concentrating on voluminous by-products, namely the records, archivists should be identifying 'the most important societal structures, functions, records creators, and record-creating processes, and their interaction, which together form a comprehensive reflection of human experience'. Samuels has called for a multi-institutional documentation strategy to ensure that major ongoing issues and activities, or life in a particular geographical area, are permanently documented. The strategy is necessitated by 'the abundance of materials, the scarcity of resources to care for them, and the decentralised nature of contemporary society and its records'.¹³ Cook has noted some weaknesses in the documentation strategy approach and has suggested that, with its emphasis on themes or functions rather than structures, it is most appropriate for the world of private manuscripts rather than government or institutional records.¹⁴

Australian libraries and archives have sometimes undertaken special acquisition projects aimed at strengthening their holdings of particular categories of personal papers. The groups that have been targeted have included politicians, environmentalists, writers and immigrants. Such projects tend to be occasional. Most archivists readily admit that their collecting of personal papers has been relatively passive, with the initiative usually taken by the owners of papers or interested researchers rather than by the archivists. The suggestion that collecting archives should actively and cooperatively ensure that contemporary Australian society, in all its complexity and variety, is permanently documented would probably horrify many archivists and manuscript librarians. It is undoubtedly a daunting responsibility. As the survey of the *Guide to collections of manuscripts* . . . has shown, documentation, in the form of personal papers, of the last 200 years is uneven in the extreme and without much greater resources it is hard to see the situation changing. Nevertheless, it will be interesting to see if in the next decade Australian archivists follow American and Canadian precedents in using the documentation strategy approach to the collecting of personal papers and other kinds of private archives.

Table 1 *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts: Personal Collections:*

Principal Contributors

Instalment	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	Total
National Library	212	142	227	210	162	953
Mitchell Library	166	259	192	253	46	916
Mortlock Library	70	51	42		40	203
La Trobe Library	64	17	34	45	22	182
ADFA Library					97	97
State Archives of W. A.	26		6	3	40	75
Basser Library		29	14	20	8	71
Royal Historical Society of Victoria			51	9	8	68
Oxley Library	12		35	2	13	62
Fryer Library			9	33		42
Melbourne Uni. Archives	22				20	42
Uni. of Tasmania Archives	16	3	22			41
Australian Archives					30	30
South Australian Museum		28				28
Barr Smith Library				11	15	26
Sydney Uni. Archives			3		20	23
Fisher Library	5	1	12			18
Archives Office of Tasmania	16			2		18
Newcastle Region Libraries		2	2	11	2	17
Noel Butlin Archives	1		2	1	13	17
James Cook Uni. Library					16	16
Archive of Aust. Judaica					15	15
Powerhouse Museum					13	13
Performing Arts Museum					11	11
Newcastle Uni. Archives				10		10

Table 2 *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts: Size of Personal Collections*

Instalment	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	Total
Small (1 box or less)	369	407	398	220	132	1526
Medium (2-10 boxes)	183	106	220	296	316	1121
Large (over 10 boxes)	40	29	74	120	230	493

Table 3 *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts: Chronological Balance*

Instalment	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	Total
Short date range (< 7 years)	128	158	192	69	83	630
Pre 1850	125	51	60	23	16	275
1850-1900	219	120	184	107	73	703
1900-1950	239	301	333	298	254	1425
Post 1950	22	63	104	214	335	738

Table 4 *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts: Gender Balance*

Instalment	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	Total
Men	496	452	565	526	525	2564
Women	55	49	40	48	104	296
Families	63	37	76	68	49	293
Total	614	538	681	642	678	3153

Table 5 *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts: Main Occupational Groups*

Instalment	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	Total
Writers	70	58	85	103	165	481
Politicians	42	26	53	50	56	227
Soldiers	11	82*	47*	13	11	164
Clergy	35	23	38	25	25	146
Pastoralists	38	18	26	18	22	122
Historians	14	19	21	29	24	107
Officials	19	15	29	14	24	101
Businessmen	20	15	18	17	23	93
Journalists	17	9	21	19	18	84
Farmers	24	9	16	12	11	72
Lawyers	12	13	15	16	10	66
Artists	5	6	11	19	11	52
Naval officers	16	9	13	9	1	48
Doctors	9	3	8	10	16	46
Immigrants	12	11	13	4	5	45
Governors	12	7	7	9	5	40
Explorers	16	10	6	2	2	36
Anthropologists	5	13	2	5	6	31
Geologists	2	8	5	9	6	30
Seamen	9	7	3	7	3	29
Architects	3	1	4	12	6	26
Aviators	7	7	1	4	5	24
Engineers	3	3	5	5	8	24
Actors	2		3	9	9	23
Composers		4	7	10	2	23
Political activists	1	2	4	5	10	22
Surveyors	7		5	4	6	22
Botanists	7	3	3	3	4	20

* Figures inflated on account of large number of entries for World War I diaries

Endnotes

1. The acquisition of the Banks Papers is dealt with in Louise Anemaat, 'The "Banks on CD-ROM" project at the State Library of New South Wales', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 23, no. 2, November 1995, pp. 260–73.
2. Mitchell left a bequest of £70,000 for the further development of his collection. See Anne Robertson, *Treasures of the State Library of New South Wales; the Australiana Collections*, Collins, Sydney, 1988.
3. *The Mitchell Library, Sydney; Historical and Descriptive Notes*, Public Library of New South Wales, Sydney, 1936.
4. The history and problems of the *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts Relating to Australia* are dealt with in Graeme Powell, 'The exchange of archival information in Australia', in *The National Register of Archives, an International Perspective, Essays in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the NRA*, ed. Dick Sargent, Institute of Historical Research, London, 1995, pp. 44–54.
5. Brian H. Fletcher, *Ralph Darling; a Governor Maligned*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1984, p. xiii.
6. Like the *Guide*, the *Australian Historic Records Register* contains very few entries for records pre-dating the establishment of the British colonies in Australia.
7. *University of Melbourne Archives; Guide to Collections*, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1983.
8. *Riverina College Archives and Records Service; a Guide to Collections*, Riverina College of Advanced Education, Wagga Wagga, 1984.
9. Noel Butlin Archives Centre, *Australian National University; List of Holdings as at December 1993*, Canberra [1994].
10. Other guides have been issued by the National Library (1992), Australian Archives (1994), Newcastle University Archives (1982) and the Royal Historical Society of Victoria (1985).
11. Gavan McCarthy (comp.), *Guide to the Archives of Science in Australia; Records of Individuals*, Thorpe, Melbourne [1991].
12. Carmel McInerney (comp.), *Parliamentary Voices in History; a Guide to the Location of Federal Parliamentarians' Personal Papers and Oral History Interviews*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1991.
13. Helen W. Samuels, 'Who controls the past', *American Archivist*, vol. 49, Spring 1986, p. 114. See also Helen W. Samuels, 'Improving our disposition: documentation strategy', *Archivaria*, no. 33, Winter 1991–92, pp. 125–40.
14. Terry Cook, 'Mind over Matter: towards a new theory of archival appraisal', in *The archival imagination; essays in honour of Hugh A. Taylor*, ed. Barbara L. Craig, Association of Canadian Archivists, Ottawa, 1992, p. 48.