

Introduction

Sydel Silverman

Imagine a future anthropologist or historian of anthropology in, say, the year 2050. What will he or she have to draw on for an understanding of the course of twentieth-century anthropology, or for research on a particular society or culture that existed or had been studied during that century? There will be the published works by anthropologists of the time — assuming that we will have found ways of preserving rapidly deteriorating paper or transferring the information to other media. But as historians know, and as historical anthropologists know even better, the most valuable potential sources will not be the condensed and edited information contained in published form but rather the notes, correspondence, and other unpublished items generated by researchers in the course of their lives and work.

And what, in 2050, will be the basis for theorizing about human nature and variability: what information will the future anthropologist have on the range of known cultures, the different ways of being human? Many of the societies or cultures that have been studied by ethnographers or archaeologists will have long since disappeared or changed drastically. Some of what these scholars had learned will have been published; but how much of what had been in their notes will never have seen print, and how much of what had been published will demand reexamination against the primary records — if these are available?

For anthropology, the unpublished records of the past are of more than historical interest; they are more than resources for study of the history of the discipline. They constitute the primary data of all research — data that are unique and unrecoverable. Where they contain information on excavated or destroyed sites, societies that have been fundamentally changed, or cultural products that no longer exist, they represent a thin thread of linkage to knowledge that will otherwise be lost. Moreover, in anthropology perhaps more than in other disciplines, the "raw" data of research and the records of personal lives and social relationships are interlinked. Everything we have learned about the anthropological enterprise argues for seeing the professional and the personal as in mutual interaction (mutually constructed, we would now say) and for understanding them as a piece.

Yet much of this unpublished record of anthropology has been or will be destroyed, scattered, or left to deteriorate in the basement of a descendant. All anthropologists have a responsibility to the future of the discipline to ensure that as much of the record as possible is preserved, appropriately archived, and eventually made available to future generations. Efforts to begin to address this challenge have led to a series of initiatives, which are described in this book.

The Uses of the Anthropological Record

The personal and professional papers that are generated by practitioners of any discipline have potential value for future study of the history of that field and for the history of ideas in general. The research uses of the anthropological record, however, are at least threefold.

In the first instance, the record is of value as primary data, which are potentially relevant for anthropological research in the future as much as for the scholar who collected or generated them. In many sciences, data records are analyzed, interpreted, written up, and then may be discarded or treated only as "history." In anthropology, however, records such as field notes are never "done with," as William Sturtevant has put it. The first-hand records of cultures, sites, or languages are always irreplaceable and may be returned to again and again. Nor are such records ever to be relegated to history or treated only as a prior condition against which change may be measured. We know that change is the essence of all human activity, and that whatever is observed by an anthropologist is specific to its time and place. The primary data remain the basis of anthropological research and thinking as long as that enterprise continues.



Ikoi Unai (center) answers questions about photographs taken in 1922 by government anthropologist F.E. Williams in the Purari Delta of Papua New Guinea. These images are now kept in the National Archives of Australia. Anthropologist Joshua A. Bell went to the Purari Delta with these and other images as a way to talk about social transformation and history, and as a way to share museum collections documenting their traditions. These images became important touchstones for ways of life that only exist in the memories of elders such as Ikoi. Their collective viewing gave elders opportunities to share their personal experiences and comment on the past with their village. Photo by Joshua A. Bell 2001.

Second, the anthropological record is needed for the kind of historical understanding that permits proper interpretation of the primary data. This includes both the process of contextualizing specific data through records that reveal how they were constructed, and the wider ranging study of the history of lives, relationships, and institutions for the

purpose of better comprehending the work of the discipline. This use may be defined as the history of anthropology for anthropological purposes.

The third use of the record is to enable study of the history of anthropology as part of the history of science or ideas. This kind of disciplinary history may be pursued by anthropological historians or historians of science/ideas for a variety of purposes. With the historicizing of the social sciences, moreover, users of the record for historical research are as apt to be sociologists, psychologists, or others as professional historians. All three uses need to be kept in mind in any strategy for deciding what should be saved, where, and in what form.

The special nature of anthropological records also has implications for preservation strategy. Again, it is useful to think about field notes as the primary example, both because of their importance and because the problems they pose for preservation are apt to be more complex than those of other kinds of records. Field notes are not merely "raw data" generated by particular methodological operations. They are the product of intricate relationships between the personal and the technical, the anthropologist and the people he/she interacts with, the context and the content, as well as many other elements. All of this complicates the potential uses (and misuses) of such records and makes for multifaceted sensitivities. At the same time, it underlines the uniqueness of these records and the urgency of preserving them.

Anthropological records also have a special quality in that there is a seamless continuity between observation (or other forms of encounter with the focus of study), the recording of "data," interpretation, and writeup. There are further continuities with teaching, other professional activities, and more private arenas. In recent years, we have become increasingly aware of how each such activity (each generating its own records) is constructed by the others. If future scholars are to make sense of the research process, they will have to be able to recover all aspects of it and trace their interconnections.

As compared with the records of other disciplines, anthropology's are marked by an extraordinary range and diversity, corresponding to the range of its subject matter. The different subfields generate very different kinds of records, and all extend across the world geographically and over great spans of time. Moreover, the social organization of research varies by subfield and by theoretical or methodological approach within the subfield. Biological anthropologists and archaeologists often carry out their research in teams, frequently incorporating specialists from other disciplines, while ethnographers and linguists have tended (for the most part) to work as individuals or in pairs. The different organizational modes lead to different kinds of record sets and different patterns of retention.

The problems of locating, coordinating, organizing, and generally keeping track of this diversity and range might seem daunting. Yet anthropology by its self-definition regards the totality not only as an accumulation of miscellaneous records but, in principle at least, as an integral resource, to which the discipline must have access.



Photographer Joseph K. Dixon (left) and Ishi beside a Haida totem pole outside the University of California Museum of Anthropology, San Francisco, 1915. National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution. Inventory 01279200.

Whose Records Are They?

It is too easily assumed that unpublished materials are the property of the anthropologist who produced or collected them, and his/hers to dispose of at will. While this might be true of personal papers (if a distinction between the personal and the professional can be drawn), it is not the case for records generated in the course of research or other professional activity. Consider field notes. They may have been written by the anthropologist, but many parties contributed to their creation and may have interests in them: the people who provided information, the community or society that hosted the anthropologist, the agencies that funded the project, the institutions with which the researcher was affiliated, and others. While specific obligations might not have been incurred contractually, the anthropologist has at least a moral responsibility to consider the interests of all these parties.

Taking into account the multiple interests of diverse parties — and above all the interests of the people about whom information is contained in records — means that there are legitimate sensitivities about how these records should be handled. Such sensitivities are probably more complex for anthropologists than for other scholars holding records of historical significance, but they are not unique to anthropology. There are ways of dealing with all concerns that might (indeed, should) be raised about the potential misuse of records. It is vital, and also possible, to address the problem of materials containing confidential or sensitive information so as to ensure protection of those involved while also recognizing the need for access by researchers, by the social or cultural groups the materials pertain to, and by others with legitimate interests in them. Such concerns should not be taken as reasons for withholding or destroying materials or for downplaying the importance of preservation. They do, however, need to be incorporated into professional training as pertinent issues of ethics and scholarship.

There are also more fundamental responsibilities to be considered: to the anthropological enterprise in general, to scholars of the future, and to the descendants of those who are the subject of the research. As Donald Tuzin notes in his paper, his Arapesh friend drew a distinction between ownership and custodianship, and Tuzin applies the same distinction to the ethnographer who has acquired and controls cultural "mementos." In a more general sense, the anthropologist is always a steward of the records that contain cultural information. Understood in that light, instances of deliberate destruction of unpublished papers — and, to a lesser extent, negligence of care and denial of access — must be seen as a failure of professional responsibility.

Primary responsibility for preserving and appropriately depositing records must rest with the individual anthropologist who holds them, but individuals cannot shoulder the task alone. The discipline as a whole, and the organizations and institutions that have specific charges within it, need to acknowledge this responsibility and place it high on their agenda. Too often, preservation has been relegated to low-priority status, something to be tended to later ("when there is time"), and too often those professionals concerned with archiving have been regarded merely as service providers for the "real" business of research. We now need to rearrange our priorities, to start to understand the intimate relationship between research and preservation, and to make effective stewardship of the anthropological record a component of all professional activity.

Devising Strategies

Anthropology as a discipline will need to develop a general strategy for identifying, conserving, and otherwise undertaking to preserve its unpublished records. In this effort, there will be roles for the professional societies, for archives, libraries, museums, and other repositories of anthropological records, and for various other institutions or organizations. A division of labor and coordination of efforts will be needed.

One of the first steps will have to be to gather information about the scale of the task and current options: information about existing facilities and collections, materials presently or potentially available for deposit, and preservation efforts already under way. A permanent clearinghouse will need to be established for collecting and disseminating this kind of information. The idea of a discipline history center, which is described in this volume, provides one model that can be instructive for anthropology.

The question of priorities presents itself at the outset. Is it possible to define priorities as to what materials should be preserved and in what form? It should be noted that existing anthropological repositories are not yet facing the need for "triage" choices; at present, the greater urgency is to save as much as possible of the record that is in danger of being irretrievably lost. However, that situation may soon change as anthropologists become more conscious of preservation issues. Moreover, the scale of the record is increasing apace as the discipline ages. The large numbers of scholars who came into the field with its rapid growth after World War II are now reaching retirement (or dying) without a concomitant expansion of archival facilities to accommodate their materials. At the same time, other kinds of records are multiplying, such as the papers of organizations and institutions important to the history of anthropology.

The issue of priorities has a different twist in anthropology than in other fields. Joan Warnow-Blewett describes in her paper the strategies followed by the physical sciences to preserve the documents of their history, noting that they proceeded by identifying the most significant figures and the most significant institutions (laboratories) in their disciplines. In anthropology, however, the most important unpublished items are not necessarily those of the most important people; the value of field notes, for example, may have less to do with who collected them than with the historical situation they describe, the scarcity of other accounts, and other factors. (In fact, the notes that were never written up for publication may have unique value even though the investigator may be little known.) Moreover, much anthropological research is carried out by widely dispersed individuals and small teams, often at some remove from institutional settings or, in the case of independent scholars, apart from any institutional affiliation. Locating significant materials is therefore a more complex matter than earmarking key scholars and institutions.

The criteria of "value" to be used in setting priorities need to be defined, in the first instance, by the potential significance of records for future anthropological analysis. Documenting the history of anthropology is important but — for anthropology — arguably a goal of second priority. It is also possible to differentiate between the records of direct observation, which most anthropologists would agree should receive the most urgent attention, and other materials generated in the course of professional life. Materials in this latter category can be further differentiated according to the richness and/or uniqueness of the information they yield. These points are not meant as conclusive value judgments, but rather to suggest that it is possible to establish bases for priorities as these become necessary.

Whatever steps toward a preservation strategy are taken by the discipline, ultimately the major responsibility will rest with individual anthropologists. At the very least, this entails making provision for the disposition of one's papers either at the time of retirement or in instructions for posthumous arrangements. Ideally, however, preservation should be a career-long concern. It should enter into the planning of research projects, into the choice of work materials, and into records management practices throughout one's professional life. The anthropologist should be in charge of his or her own future contribution to the historical record at every stage. For instance, even (or especially) at the dissertation stage, research notes recorded on a laptop computer should be preserved without delay in the form of a copy made onto a permanent storage medium (i.e., acid-free paper). Training in preservation issues and practices, and in the ethical use of the anthropological record, should become a standard part of graduate education along with training in research methods and other aspects of professional practice.

The fact that this book is limited to anthropology in the United States is a tactical choice, to make a start on the problem of preservation. The anthropological record, of course, is global, and the problem will need to be confronted through international strategies. It is hoped that the progress that may be made within the American context — or steps taken by other anthropological communities dealing with the problem — will encourage efforts elsewhere, and that it will be followed by collaborative activity through international professional associations.

Because the nature of the record changes over time, so also must approaches to preserving it. No set of guidelines will remain appropriate indefinitely. For example, the uses of correspondence — long the staple fare of historians — have changed dramatically, much of the information once contained in letters having been lost to ephemeral media, first the telephone and now electronic mail. The age of the computer will require fundamentally different thinking about preservation — not so much from the promise of technological solutions as from the threat of loss of information recorded in machine-readable form, as Robert V. Kemper describes in his paper. The devising of preservation strategies is not a one-time task but a matter for continual attention by the discipline and its individual practitioners.

The First Steps

As an initial attempt to assess the status and problems of records preservation in anthropology, the Wenner-Gren Foundation sponsored a symposium, "Preserving the Anthropological Record: Issues and Strategies," co-organized by Sydel Silverman (Wenner-Gren Foundation) and Nancy J. Parezo (Arizona State Museum and the University of Arizona) and held February 28 to March 4, 1992 in Rancho Santa Fe, California. This conference brought together seventeen people who could speak to the issues from a variety of perspectives: anthropologists who produce and use the record, scholars from all the major subfields, representatives of professional organizations that are (or should be)

tackling preservation problems, professional archivists, potential funders, and other individuals with special expertise.

The results of the conference were published in the first edition of this book. Chapters in the volume, which are reprinted in the present book in revised form, were contributed by: Mary Elizabeth Ruwell (the two papers included here), Joan Warnow-Blewett, Donald Tuzin, Don D. Fowler and Douglas R. Givens, John van Willigen, Thomas H. Wilson (co-authored with Parezo), Robert V. Kemper, and Shepard Krech III and William C. Sturtevant, as well as the conference organizers. In addition, Parezo and Nathalie F.S. Woodbury were joined by Ruth Person, who was not at the conference, in co-authorship of a paper.

Several other individuals participated in the conference, presenting papers and/or contributing to the discussions. George F. Farr, Jr., Director of the Division of Preservation and Access of the National Endowment for the Humanities, reported on NEH's programs of support for preservation, while John E. Yellen, Program Director of the Anthropology Program of the National Science Foundation summarized other federal support for anthropological records preservation, including the Systematic Anthropological Collections program at NSF. Annette Weiner, then the President of the American Anthropological Association, spoke to the AAA's potential involvement in preservation strategies. Bonnie Wright, Chair of the Anthropology-Sociology Section of the American Council of Research Libraries, addressed ethical and legal aspects of archiving. (Jane Buikstra was expected to participate as a representative of biological anthropology but was unable to attend.)

The terms in the conference title were chosen advisedly, condensing the specific purposes and assumptions of the organizers. "Preserving" was intended to address more than physical conservation and technical handling of materials; it includes the broader goals of identifying, locating, and selecting records and repositories, and making them appropriately accessible. The term was meant to reflect the discipline's responsibility for saving the record for future generations. "Anthropological" pointed to the inclusion of the entire discipline, taking in all subfields and all varieties of anthropological practice. It also focused on the special qualities of the records produced and used by anthropologists, in contrast to other kinds of historical documents. "The Record" (rather than "records") conveyed both the wide range of materials that must be taken into account and the potential interdependence among different kinds of records, thinking of them as a totality that anthropology will draw upon for its future work. The term also underlined the conference's primary focus upon documentation (rather than artifacts) and on unpublished items of all kinds.

"Issues and Strategies" expressed the organizers' goals for the conference: to articulate the need for preservation; to think through the problems and possibilities; to share that thinking with the discipline as a whole so that others may build on it; to consider what efforts are already under way, both within anthropology and in other fields; and to work toward developing future strategies for the discipline.

Ten papers presented at the conference were published in 1992 as the first edition of this book. The book was distributed by Wenner-Gren, free of charge, to over 3,000 anthropologists in the United States and around the world.

At the conclusion of the conference, the participants adopted the following Resolution on Preserving Anthropological Records:

WHEREAS, unpublished anthropological materials contain primary information needed for understanding the cultures and histories of the world's peoples past and present;

WHEREAS, these materials are irreplaceable and essential for future research and education;

WHEREAS, these materials are unique resources for studying the history of anthropology and its contributions to the development of the sciences and the humanities;

AND WHEREAS, anthropologists have a professional responsibility to serve as stewards for these materials for use by future generations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT,

1. anthropologists should take steps to care for the unpublished materials in their possession and to make arrangements for the appropriate disposition of those materials;
2. professional organizations and institutions should adopt policies to (a) insure that their own unpublished materials be systematically preserved and (b) take the lead in implementing strategies for the documentation and preservation of the anthropological record.

To clarify the intended meaning of key terms in the resolution, the following explanatory notes were added to accompany the resolution:

Anthropology:

By anthropology is meant all four fields of anthropology — archaeology, linguistics, socio-cultural, and physical — as well as ethnohistory, anthropological folklore, anthropological museology, and any other specialized subarea that contributes to anthropological knowledge. Also included in this definition are applied and practicing anthropology as well as academic anthropology.

Anthropological materials:

By unpublished anthropological materials is meant all items that are produced by anthropologists throughout the course of their careers. While particular attention is given to primary and secondary data produced during the course of research projects,

the materials involved in pre-project preparation, the legal paper work from projects, materials produced during analyses, post-project materials, and the published and unpublished products of the research endeavor are considered of fundamental importance. Also considered as anthropological materials are records that focus on other aspects of careers, which provide information that will be useful for understanding the intellectual development of the discipline, the underlying rationale for projects, research agendas, and the history of the discipline. Included also in this definition is the "gray literature" of anthropology and the materials produced by professional organizations and associations that document the development of the discipline.

The final discussions at the conference attempted to define possible courses of action that anthropology might take to implement the goals contained in the resolution. Guiding these discussions was the idea of a discipline history center that could facilitate and coordinate future preservation activities. While the center serving physics, described in this volume, represents one model, it was recognized that anthropology is unlikely to be able to command the level of resources that such a center would require. It was also recognized, however, that aspects of the model could be realized in a variety of ways depending upon the funding available and other circumstances. It was felt that the immediate need was for creation of a structure that would encourage various anthropological organizations, in association with the archival community, to work together in future planning.

After the conference, the resolution and the recommendations drawn up were submitted to the presidents (or other officers) of all associations or societies that were considered appropriate participants in this effort. It was urged that the following steps be taken:

- (1) Submit the resolution to your membership and request its adoption at the earliest opportunity.
- (2) Appoint a Standing Committee on Preservation and History within your society, with a designated Chair to serve as liaison in future discipline-wide efforts.
- (3) Submit to your Standing Committee the Recommendation for a Board of Advisors, for its consideration.

The Recommendation for a Board of Advisors was spelled out as follows:

The various anthropological associations are urged to consider the idea of a disciplinary preservation and history center that will serve as a coordinating institution, but not a repository for anthropological records. In order to do this an advisory group needs to be formed.

It is anticipated that during the first year the Board of Advisors will function as a task force that reports back to the Council of Presidents and the Executive Boards of the constituent

anthropological societies. If the idea of a disciplinary center is ratified, the Board will then become the permanent Board of Advisors for the Center. Their function at that time will be to serve as the policy making instrument for the center.

Tasks of the Board of Advisors would include, initially: (a) to define the role and function of a Disciplinary Preservation and History Center; (b) to review the idea of a consortium of repositories and archives, identify those that should be included in this consortium, and consider how working alliances can be developed and maintained; (c) to identify a home base for the Center; and, (d) to discuss additional feasibility issues for a Center, including development of a financial plan (for both start-up costs and core funding needs) and identification of possible sources of funding.

Membership of the Board of Advisors might consist of: (a) Chairs of the Standing Committees on Preservation and History from each society; (b) representatives from the Society of American Archivists, the Association for Research and College Libraries, and other pertinent groups who specialize in archives; and, (c) other liaisons as may be deemed appropriate.

As of this writing, the resolution has been approved by the governing bodies of the following organizations:

American Anthropological Association (and its units)
American Association of Physical Anthropologists
American Ethnological Society
American Society for Ethnohistory
Council for Museum Anthropology
Section H, American Association for the Advancement of Science
Society for American Archaeology
Society for Applied Anthropology
Society of Ethnobiology
Society for Historical Archaeology
Society for Medical Anthropology
Society for the Study of Indigenous Languages in America
Society of Professional Archaeologists

A number of other organizations, whose membership deals partly (but not primarily) with anthropological records, were identified for involvement at a later stage.

Following their acceptance of the resolution, several associations appointed standing committees on preservation and history. A number of the societies that are constituent members of the American Anthropological Association have formed special committees to deal with their association records and to facilitate their transfer to the National Anthropological Archives.

The enthusiasm with which this initial effort was received suggested that there was a widespread recognition in the profession of the need for preservation and a willingness to work together toward that end.

Accordingly, Wenner-Gren sponsored a second conference to define further courses of action. This conference, with Nancy J. Parezo and Don D. Fowler as co-organizers, was held May 6-9, 1993 in Mt. Kisco, New York.

Participants in this conference included representatives designated by anthropological organizations: Lucy M. Cohen (Society for Medical Anthropology), John M. Cornman and Sue E. Estroff (American Anthropological Association), Catherine S. Fowler (Society of Ethnobiology), Patricia Galloway (American Society for Ethnohistory), Douglas R. Givens (Society for American Archaeology), Victor Golla (Linguistic Society of America), Robert V. Kemper (American Ethnological Society), Michael A. Little (American Association of Physical Anthropologists), and John van Willigen (Society for Applied Anthropology). Parezo also represented the Council for Museum Anthropology. In addition, Mary Elizabeth Ruwell represented the National Anthropological Archives, Ruth Person the American Council of Research Libraries, Lynne M. Schmelz-Keil the Tozzer Library, Joan Warnow-Blewett the Center for History of Physics, and Sydel Silverman the Wenner-Gren Foundation.

The major result of this conference was a plan for founding the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records (CoPAR), which is described in the final chapter of this book.

The decision was also taken to publish a revised and expanded edition of *Preserving the Anthropological Record*. New chapters were subsequently solicited to cover subfields omitted from the original edition (biological anthropology, linguistics, and medical anthropology) and to expand on the ethical issues that emerged in discussions. Following a panel presentation of the conference results at the 1993 AAA meetings, Regna Darnell agreed to contribute a chapter on the specific topic of personal papers for biographical/historical research.

This collection begins with four papers that report on existing institutional resources, repositories available to anthropology or providing models for future preservation strategies. The National Anthropological Archives of the Smithsonian Institution, which has served as both a home for records and an informational clearinghouse for American anthropology, is described by the Director of the Archives, Mary Elizabeth Ruwell. Ruwell discusses both the potential role of the NAA in a disciplinary division of labor and the limits on it.

Donald Tuzin, who created the Melanesian Archive at the University of California at San Diego, describes this area-based center for preserving anthropological records and other cultural texts. One of the key features of this Archive is its systematic dissemination of copies of these records to institutions in Melanesia.

Museums are among the most important repositories of anthropological records, but their archival materials have tended to be neglected and undervalued. Thomas H. Wilson, Executive Director of the Southwest Museum, and Nancy J. Parezo, Curator of Ethnology at the Arizona State Museum, describe the potential role of museums in a preservation

strategy for anthropology and the special challenges that museums confront in preserving their records.

While anthropology's needs and resources are to some extent particular to the discipline, there is much that can be learned from the experience of other fields. The physical sciences have made strides in devising strategies for preserving the records of their histories, particularly in the development of discipline history centers. Joan Warnow-Blewett, who is Associate Director of the Center for History of Physics, reviews how that center evolved and how it works.

The next three papers deal with general issues in the preservation and use of cultural materials. Catherine S. Fowler of the University of Nevada, Reno, reviews a number of potential ethical problems that anthropologists should be cognizant of and offers, if not solutions, ways of approaching them. Regna Darnell of the University of Western Ontario discusses the present status of archival materials available for the study of the history of anthropology and the importance of preserving the personal papers of anthropologists. She emphasizes the interdependency between primary data records and personal/biographical documents in understanding disciplinary history. A third paper in this section considers the uses of ethnographic records from the viewpoint of two scholars who have drawn heavily on such materials in their own research. Shepard Krech III of Brown University (and long-time editor of *Ethnohistory*) and William C. Sturtevant of the National Museum of Natural History of the Smithsonian, make a special plea for saving field notes and other documents of primary observation.

The next section is devoted to the specific preservation issues confronting different fields of anthropology. Don D. Fowler of the University of Nevada, Reno, and Douglas R. Givens of Saint Louis Community College, write about the records of archaeology and the special problems created because of the volume of documentation, the involvement of federal agencies, and effects of legislation. They also review the efforts begun by the Society for American Archaeology to deal with the issues through a Committee on the History of Archaeology.

Biological (or physical) anthropology faces its own challenges, deriving from the range of subject matter it covers and particular threats to the survival of its data. Michael A. Little (Binghamton University, State University of New York), Jane E. Buikstra (University of Chicago), and Frank Spencer (Queens College, City University of New York) underline the potential research uses of both existing records and those still to be preserved.

Of all anthropological specialties, medical anthropology probably has the most difficult ethical and legal problems to consider in dealing with its records. Sue E. Estroff, who is in the Departments of Social Medicine and of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, probes the complex issues involved. She concludes that despite the special constraints upon medical anthropologists, responsible preservation is essential.

Applied anthropology shares some of the concerns of medical anthropology and of archaeology, as fields in which nonacademic practice is significant. John van Willigen of the University of Kentucky, who has organized the Applied Anthropology Documentation Project housed at that institution, underlines the special considerations that affect the disposition of records resulting from contract research, including the "gray literature."

Preservation issues in anthropological linguistics are discussed by Victor Golla of Humboldt State University, focusing specifically on the records of American Indian languages. These records are particularly valuable because many of the languages have (or will soon) become extinct. Golla also raises the important issue of the need for training of future users of the archival materials.

A series of papers follow that deal with concrete problems of preserving records and propose guidelines. Nancy J. Parezo and Ruth J. Person of the University of Missouri-St. Louis, an archivist and former librarian, offer a collaborative paper — an example of the partnership between anthropologists and archivists that will be needed to address preservation issues. They review the various aspects of records management and disposition for individual anthropologists and suggest ways of approaching the task. Sydel Silverman, Lucy M. Cohen (Catholic University of America), Eluned Schweitzer (a research associate at Catholic), and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury draw on their combined experience in nonprofit organizations and professional societies to discuss the issues and guidelines that pertain to dealing with organizational records.

The next two papers in this section deal with technical aspects of preservation. Mary Elizabeth Ruwell reviews the problems of the physical hazards to records in different media and proposes measures that can be taken to prevent or deal with those problems. She emphasizes that the most important measures are the choices made before the records are produced. Robert V. Kemper of Southern Methodist University then takes up the question of how computer technology can be used to address different preservation needs. Kemper considers the pitfalls as well as the potentials of this technology, and sounds several cautionary notes.

The final paper reports on progress made toward implementing the goals articulated in this book. Don D. Fowler and Nancy J. Parezo, co-chairs of the Council for the Preservation of Anthropological Records, describe the creation of CoPAR, the initiatives it has taken thus far, and prospects for the future.