REAUTHORIZATION FOR THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, INFORMATION, AND TECHNOLOGY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 4, 2000

Serial No. 106–185

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

70–057 DTP WASHINGTON : 2001

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: (202) 512–1800 Fax: (202) 512–2250
Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
DAVID M. MCINTOSH, Indiana
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina
BOB BARR, Georgia
DAN MILLER, Florida
ASA HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
LEE TERRY, Nebraska
JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois
GREG WALDEN, Oregon
DOUG OSE, California
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin
HELEN CHENOWETH-HAGE, Idaho
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
DAVID A. KASS, *Deputy Counsel and Parliamentarian*
LISA SMITH ARAFUNE, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, INFORMATION, AND TECHNOLOGY

STEPHEN HORN, California, *Chairman*

JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
GREG WALDEN, Oregon
DOUG OSE, California
PAUL RYAN, Wisconsin

JIM TURNER, Texas
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York

EX OFFICIO

DAN BURTON, Indiana
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

J. RUSSELL GEORGE, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
HEATHER BAILEY, *Professional Staff Member*
BRYAN SISK, *Clerk*
DAVID MCMILLEN, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on April 4, 2000	1
Statement of:	
Blunt, Hon. Roy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri	41
Carlin, John, Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration	2
Cullen, Charles T., president, Newberry Library	22
Gilliland-Swetland, Anne, assistant professor, Department of Information Studies, University of California at Los Angeles	30
Newhall, Ann C., Executive Director, National Historical Publications and Records Commission	8
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Blunt, Hon. Roy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, prepared statement of	43
Carlin, John, Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, prepared statement of	4
Cullen, Charles T., president, Newberry Library, prepared statement of	24
Gilliland-Swetland, Anne, assistant professor, Department of Information Studies, University of California at Los Angeles, prepared statement of	32
Newhall, Ann C., Executive Director, National Historical Publications and Records Commission, prepared statement of	10
Turner, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, prepared statement of	66

REAUTHORIZATION FOR THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2000

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT,
INFORMATION, AND TECHNOLOGY,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 3:03 p.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Stephen Horn (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Horn, Biggert, and Turner.

Staff present: Heather Bailey, professional staff member; Bryan Sisk, clerk; Trey Henderson, minority counsel; David McMillen, minority professional staff member; and Jean Gosa, minority assistant clerk.

Mr. HORN. The hearing of the Government Management, Information, and Technology Subcommittee will come to order.

Since its formation in 1934, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission has contributed significantly to the Nation's effort to preserve its historic documents. In 1964, the Commission, affiliated with the National Archives and Records Administration, began funding independent archival projects through its grants program.

These awards are given to projects that help preserve records of non-Federal entities, including State, county, municipal, and tribal governments. The Commission also funds archival projects involving family papers, manuscripts and business records, including engineering drawings, motion pictures, and electronic records.

The Commission has been instrumental in preserving the historical works of such great American leaders as George Washington, John Adams, Henry Clay, and Martin Luther King, Jr.

In November 1999, the Commission awarded grants for 64 projects totaling $3 million. In addition, it proposed funding a 3-year, $1.8 million initiative to help raise the level of archival expertise in the rapidly changing area of electronic recordkeeping.

As National Archive's grantmaking arm, the Commission continues to provide an invaluable service to the Nation and to the maintenance of its history. Our witnesses today will discuss the Commission's many successes and the challenges that lie ahead. I welcome each one of you and I look forward to your testimony.

We have for today one panel, so I think I will swear you all in at once and any assistants that are going to buzz in your ear, get them to raise their right hand also. We have three assistants, four speakers, seven all told.

Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give this subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

[Witnesses respond in the affirmative.]

Mr. HORN. All seven nodded or affirmed. So the clerk will note that.

We are delighted to start with the distinguished Archivist of the United States, the Honorable John Carlin, Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CARLIN, ARCHIVIST, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARLIN. Chairman Horn, members of the committee, staff, thank you very much for this opportunity to testify in support of the reauthorization of the National Historic Publications and Records Commission.

Ann Newhall, the Executive Director of NHPRC, will provide a detailed description of the Commission's activities and plans. I would like simply to explain overall why the work of this relatively small program greatly matters.

When I became Archivist of the United States, I learned to my surprise that I was also the Chair of the NHPRC. The Congress, as you indicated, created the National Archives and the NHPRC in the same legislation, which directed as the head of the National Archives, Chair the Commission and provided for the NHPRC to be administered within NARA and provided for the NHPRC to be administered within NARA which it has been ever since.

Why? Because Congress recognized that the job of preserving this Nation's records required two national archives. One is today's National Archives and Records Administration which safeguards records of all three branches of the Federal Government. The other National Archives safeguards non-Federal records and consists of the combined holdings of the State and local archives, the university archivable and manuscript collections, and the documentary collections of libraries, historical societies and other cultural repositories, private and public.

As you well know, American history did not happen just in Washington. It has unfolded in every State and locality through private actions as well as those of the government. Unless we safeguard historical records widely, there will be gaping holes in our Nation's history.

It is not only history that we lose. Rights and entitlements of citizens depend on their ability to document their citizenship. I may live in the State of Maryland, but my citizenship may be documented by a birth certificate in a locality in Kansas or by a court decree in California, or by an INS record in Washington. Records created and maintained within each State are to individuals and institutions nationwide. Records everywhere are necessary for the credibility and accountability of institutions in a democracy, not just national institutions such as the White House and the Congress, but government institutions at all levels, as well as organiza-

tions in the private sector that have a great impact on American life.

The NPRC exists to stimulate the care and use of records that are beyond NARA's jurisdiction. It does that by encouraging documentary work outside the Federal Government with small grants to archivable, historical and cultural organizations throughout our country. Such records are needed even to document the Federal Government.

I understand this because when I was Governor of Kansas, I became well aware that many Federal programs were carried out at the State and local levels. Therefore, safeguarding records at those levels is necessary for the documentation of many Federal programs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that you too understand from a personal experience the need for documentary work far beyond Washington. I understand in writing your own books you have used materials in State archives as well as the National Archives and, in fact, you created an archivable program at the California State University at Long Beach.

You know even better than I that often an important work of scholarship will depend on resources reserved in multiple institutions. Through grants, working with State advisory boards, and through contributing to funding partnerships, NHPRC plays a critical role in promoting work to ensure that records of many kinds in many parts of the country will be safe and accessible for scholars and others who need them. As Archivist of the United States, as chairman of the Commission, and as a citizen concerned about rights, accountability, and history, I strongly request that NHPRC be reauthorized to carry on its important work.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Carlin follows:]

STATEMENT
by John W. Carlin
Archivist of the United States
to the
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology
of the Committee on Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
4 April 2000

Chairman Horn, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of the reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. Anne Newhall, the executive director of the NHPRC, will provide a detailed description of the Commission's activities, accomplishments, needs, and plans. But for just a few moments, I would like to explain overall why the work of this relatively small program greatly matters.

When I became Archivist of the United States, in 1995, I had a momentary surprise. I discovered that I was also chair of the NHPRC. The Congress created the National Archives and the NHPRC in the 1930s in the same legislation, directed that the head of the National Archives chair the Commission, and provided for the NHPRC to be administered within the National Archives, which it has been ever since.

Why?

Because the Congress recognized that the job of preserving this nation's records required *two* national archives. One is today's National Archives and Records Administration, which safeguards records of all three branches of the Federal government. The other National Archives safeguards *non*-Federal records. It consists of the combined holdings of all the state and local archives, all the university archival and manuscript collections, and all the documentary collections of libraries, historical societies, and other cultural repositories, private and public.

For as you well know, American history did not happen just in Washington. It has unfolded in every state and locality, through private actions as well as those of government. And unless we safeguard the entire range of historical records, there will be gaping holes in our nation's history.

It is not only history, however, that we lose. Rights and entitlements of citizens depend on their ability to document their citizenship. I may live in the state of Maryland, but my citizenship may be documented by a birth certificate in a locality in Kansas, or by a court decree in California, or by an INS record in Washington. Records created and maintained within each state are important to individuals and institutions nationwide. And records everywhere are necessary for the credibility and accountability of institutions in a democracy—not just national institutions, such as the White House and the Congress, but government institutions at all levels, as well as organizations in the private sector that have great impact on American life.

The NHPRC exists to stimulate the care and use of records that are beyond NARA's jurisdiction. It does that by encouraging the work of documentation outside the Federal Government with small grants to archival, historical, and cultural organizations throughout our country.

Actually, I quickly got over my surprise at finding myself chair of the NHPRC when I became U.S. archivist. That is because I already knew that government accountability and accurate history needed the documentary work of all the institutions that I have been calling, collectively, the non-Federal National Archives. In fact, I knew that records outside Washington were needed even to document the Federal Government. I understood that because as a former governor of Kansas I became well aware that many Federal programs were carried out at the

state and local levels. Safeguarding records at those levels is necessary for the documentation of Federal programs.

Non-Federal institutions obviously do not depend on the NHPRC for the bulk of the funding of their documentary programs. NHPRC grants are contributions that in many cases help those institutions attract funding from state and local governments, foundations, corporations, and other private donors. NHPRC is the Federal partner in the promotion of this country's documentary work everywhere.

The NHPRC in fact works in partnership with historical records advisory boards in the states. These state boards advise the Commission on state and local needs, and help NHPRC evaluate grant proposals for records preservation and access projects. Moreover, many of those grants support projects to develop plans, publications, tools, techniques, and training programs of value to archivists, historians, and others—projects that every individual institution could not cost-effectively undertaken just for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that you understand from personal experience that scholarship in such fields as history and political science requires documentary work far beyond Washington. I understand that in writing your own books you have used materials in state archives as well as the National Archives, and that in fact you created an archival program at the California State University at Long Beach. You know even better than I that often an important work of scholarship will depend on resources preserved in multiple institutions. NHPRC's encouragement, through grants, through state boards, and through funding partnerships, is critical for ensuring that needed documentation will be safe and accessible for scholars and many others. As Archivist of the Unites States, as chairman of the Commission, and as a citizen

concerned about rights, accountability, and history, I strongly request that NHPRC be reathorized to carry onward its important work. Thank you.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much for that summary.

I might add for all of you who have not been here before, the minute we introduce you, your resume goes in, your full testimony goes in and we would like you to summarize it because we have read the testimony. I did have the chance last night. So we would appreciate that if you would just put the high points orally so we will have more time for questions and answers.

Our next presenter is Ms. Ann C. Newhall, Executive Director, National Historical Publications and Records Commission. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF ANN C. NEWHALL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

Ms. NEWHALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with Archivist Carlin in thanking you for your sponsorship of the legislation to reauthorize the NHPRC. We are very grateful as well, to Representatives Turner, Blunt, and other co-sponsors for their support.

On behalf of the Commission, I want to thank you very much for this opportunity to speak about the NHPRC which is probably one of the least known organizations within the Federal Government but I happen to think one of the best.

I also would like to quickly thank a member of your staff. Heather Bailey has been most helpful in helping me prepare for this, my first experience in such an arena.

Mr. HORN. Thank you.

Ms. NEWHALL. The NHPRC's statutory mission is to ensure an understanding of our Nation's past by promoting nationwide the identification, preservation, and dissemination of essential historical documentation. The Commission is chaired by the Archivist of the United States and our offices are located in Washington, DC.

Our mandate is to look outward, to provide assistance to non-Federal agencies, associations, institutions, and individuals who are committed to the preservation and use of America's documentary resources. As such, the NHPRC is the only national grantmaking organization whose only focus is the American documentary record, whatever its format, whether it was created with a quill pen or on a computer, or anything in between.

Through its competitive grants, the NHPRC provides a kind of venture capital for the historical and archival world. Under our strategic plan, the NHPRC has three goals, three equal strategic goals. The first refers to the partial support we give for the publication of eight projects collectively known as the founding fathers or the founding era. This is to produce documentary editions of the papers of George Washington, John Adams, Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, papers that document the ratification of the Constitution, the First Federal Congress, and the early Supreme Court.

This is a time of diminishing resources for documentary editions but the NHPRC continues to recognize the inherent value in bringing together related documents, sometimes from archivable repositories all around the world, professionally authenticating them, transcribing them and through annotation, further enhancing the

reader's understanding of the context in which the documents were created.

Today, the Internet and other communications breakthroughs have made it possible for Americans of every age to encounter more and more and more information, but what is lacking and what will become ever more valuable as we move forward is authentication and context. These are provided by the documentary editions which are supported by the NHPRC.

Our second goal refers to our collaboration with State historical records advisory boards to strengthen the Nation's archivable infrastructure and to expand the range of records that are protected and accessible. I will skip for the moment this material to go on to our third goal.

Our third goal is to help archivists, documentary editors, and records managers overcome obstacles and take advantage of the opportunities posed by electronic technologies and to provide leadership, funding research, development on appraising, preserving, disseminating, and providing access to important documentary sources in electronic form.

Because the technology needed to access electronically created documentation becomes obsolete in a matter of years, this goal sums what is, without question, the greatest challenge facing the archivable world today—how to identify, preserve, and provide long-term access to electronic records having enduring historic value.

I should stress that the NHPRC devotes its support to records originally created in electronic form. In recent years, we have been much more aggressive and imaginative, I think, in funding several projects which Anne Gilliland-Swetland will describe today. We are also initiating the initiative that you mentioned to raise archivable expertise in the area of electronic records.

Much has been done but there are many challenges remaining in the electronic records area. It will be some time before and considerable work will be required before most non-Federal archivable institutions will be in position to handle comfortably, capably and as a matter of course, the long-term retention of and easy access to historically valuable electronic records.

NHPRC works very hard to provide vigorous, effective and imaginative leadership and at the same time to be open to the ideas and ingenuity of this Nation's archivists and historians and documentary editors and all those who care about American history.

We are grateful to you for this opportunity to talk about what we are and what we do. We ask that the National Historical Publications and Records Commission be reauthorized so that it might continue in this significant, noble, and enduring endeavor.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Newhall follows:]

Formal Statement of
Ann Clifford Newhall
Executive Director
National Historical Publications and Records Commission
before the
House Committee on Government Reform
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology

at a hearing on
Reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission

3 p.m., Tuesday April 4, 2000
Room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building

Mr. Chairman, I am Ann Clifford Newhall, the Executive Director of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the NHPRC. All of us join with John Carlin in expressing gratitude for your sponsorship of legislation to reauthorize the Commission. We are grateful as well to Representatives Turner and Blunt and the other cosponsors for their support. On behalf of the Commission, I thank you very much for this opportunity to talk about the work of the NHPRC, what it has accomplished, and the challenges that remain.

The NHPRC is the grant-making affiliate of the National Archives and Records Administration, created by Congress at the same time as the National Archives. The NHPRC was established by Congress in 1934 as the NHPC: the National Historical Publications Commission. In 1974, Congress passed the legislation that added the 'R' -- for Records -- to our name and expanded our mandate to encompass archival records, as well as documentary publications.

The NHPRC's statutory mission is to ensure understanding of our nation's past by promoting, nationwide, the identification, preservation, and dissemination of essential historical documentation. The Commission is chaired by the Archivist of the United States, and our offices are located in the National Archives building in Washington, DC, but *our* mandate is to look outward, to provide assistance to *non-Federal* agencies, institutions and individuals committed to the preservation and use of America's documentary resources.

As such, Mr. Chairman, the NHPRC is the *only* national grantmaking organization, public or private, whose *only* focus is the American documentary record – whatever its format – whether created with quill pen, or on a computer.

The Commission itself is a group of fifteen members, chaired by the Archivist of the US, and consisting of representatives of the President of the US, the Supreme Court, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Departments of State and Defense, the Library of Congress -- and representatives of the leading professional associations of archivists and historians: the Society of American Archivists, the National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators, American Association for State and Local History, Association for Documentary Editing, Organization of American Historians, and American Historical Association. Twice each year, in May and in November, the Commission meets to consider project proposals and determine which of these proposals to recommend to the Archivist for funding.

The NHPRC receives its administrative support from the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), and for this we are very grateful. NARA provides office and meeting space, supplies, travel funds, meeting expenses, and salary and benefits for the Commission's staff. The staff is the NHPRC component with which a great number of the Commission's applicants and grantees have the most contact. From the beginning, the NHPRC has been blessed with an actively engaged, highly professional staff. The NHPRC has come to be known as the granting agency of choice for small and first-time applicants because of the help the staff provides to prospective applicants prior to the deadline in planning more successful projects. Because we respect our applicants and recognize that their time, like ours, is valuable, the staff will inform applicants if their projects require more planning, or if their projects would be a better 'fit' with another or better-funded agency. Many grantees have told me that the help and guidance they received from NHPRC staff before and during their projects were as valuable -- in other ways -- as the money they received from the Commission! The staff continually expands and augments its expertise, in order to be educated assessors of the needs of the professions the NHPRC supports, and fair and knowledgeable evaluators of proposals. We make an effort to attend numerous professional meetings, where we meet with potential and current grantees, and provide advice (often by teaching workshops) on how to plan successful projects and prepare competitive proposals for Federal assistance.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

Beginning in FY 1999, in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act, the NHPRC began applying performance measures to the projects it funded. The NHPRC takes very seriously its role as a steward of public funds, as our applicants and grantees will attest.

On October 1, 1998, NHPRC's Strategic Plan went into effect. Therefore, I would like to structure the remainder of my testimony along the outline the NHPRC's Strategic Plan provides for our work.

The Plan instructs the Commission to concentrate its efforts and its resources on three equal strategic goals within its broader mission:

Founding Era Projects

Goal # 1: *the NHPRC will provide the American public with widespread access to the papers of the founders of our democratic republic and its institutions by ensuring the timely completion of eight projects now in progress to publish the papers of George Washington, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and papers that document the Ratification of the Constitution, the First Federal Congress, and the early Supreme Court.*

For these projects, the NHPRC provides partial support for the collection, transcription, annotation and publication of the documents.

Collected from many sources, published under rigorous scholarly standards, these collections reach beyond the academic setting, directly affecting curricula at the secondary school level and offering rich sources for genealogists and local historians. This is not second-hand history; these documentary collections provide first-hand testimony, first-person accounts, and primary source material of enormous value.

In this time of diminishing resources for documentary editions, the challenge is to help these projects to structure themselves so that they can work as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible; to share best practices that have developed within some of the projects, realizing at the same time that all editing projects differ (as do the individuals or groups with whose papers they work.) For this reason the NHPRC has begun discussions with the Association for Documentary Editing regarding a conference of editors we might support, to be held late next year, to look at these and other questions facing documentary editions in this new century. For our part, the NHPRC provides some assistance to projects by locating documents housed in the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and other nearby facilities. This enables individual projects to request less funding for research staff and, on occasion, documents sought by one project will be discovered during a search for documents requested by another project.

A big challenge confronting the Founding Era and other documentary edition projects is the possible lessening of support by other funders. Should this occur, the NHPRC cannot measurably increase the amount of its own support for documentary editions, which already receive the lion's share of the Commission's annual appropriation. The NHPRC is concerned that valuable projects not go under, simply because they are headed by excellent editors who are terrible fundraisers, or that completion of the projects be further delayed because of the projects' need to devote additional time and resources to the fundraising effort. Since funders already give such great credence to projects able to win the Commission's endorsement, one solution may be a return to an expanded role for the NHPRC's good offices to leverage more support from the private sector.

At the same time, the Commission is conscious that its creation arose from the recognition of the value of documentary editions. The NHPRC continues to recognize the inherent value in bringing together related documents – sometimes from archival repositories in other nations, professionally authenticating and transcribing them, and,

through annotation, further enhancing the reader's understanding of the context in which the documents were created.

Today, the Internet has made it possible for the American people – of all ages – to have access to unprecedented amounts of information. What is lacking, and what will become ever more valuable as we move forward, is *authentication* and *context,* both of which are provided by the documentary editions supported by the NHPRC. In fact, the audience and the need for editions documenting the Founding Era and other aspects of this nation's history may be greater than ever in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of apartheid in South Africa. There appears to be an enormous foreign interest in learning how other nations, particularly this one, have developed. There is a vitally important role here for the documentary editions the NHPRC supports, particularly the Founding Era projects.

State Board Projects

Goal #2: *The NHPRC will promote broad public participation in historical documentation by collaborating with State Historical Records Advisory Boards (SHRABs) to plan and carry out jointly funded programs to strengthen the nation's archival infrastructure and expand the range of records that are protected and accessible.*

Because of the scope of the records program and the principles of Federalism inherent in our system of government, the NHPRC has chosen to work through the state board mechanism. Within the state board program can be seen a clear articulation of such basic NHPRC tenets as the encouragement of collaboration on many levels, the reliance upon jointly funded programs, the importance of planning, and the necessity of broad participation for the success of a sustainable national program.

The governor of each state and territory desiring to participate fully in the NHPRC grant program appoints a State Historical Records Coordinator, who serves as the central coordinating officer for the historical records grant program in the state. The Coordinator is not an official or employee of the Federal government and receives no Federal compensation for this service.

The next step is the appointment of the State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB.) This is a citizen board comprised of keepers and users of records and consisting of at least seven members, including the Coordinator, who are representative of public and private archives, records offices, and research institutions and organizations in the state. The members of the State Board, too, serve without Federal compensation or employment status.

The State Board serves in a number of capacities:

- as the central *advisory* body for historical records planning and for Commission-funded projects developed and carried out within the state,

- as a *coordinating* body to facilitate cooperation among historical records repositories and other information agencies within the state,
- and as a state-level *review* body for NHPRC records grant proposals that originated in their state.

The NHPRC works with the SHRABs by providing:

- grant funding, not to exceed $20,000 over two years, for some of their administrative activities;
- grants to survey historic records within the state and to develop a statewide strategic plan for their long-term preservation and access; and,
- grants to implement the statewide strategic plan, often in the form of regrants, money (matched by the state) which the state then sub-grants to small projects within the state.

These smaller 'regrant' projects help to establish or develop archival and records-management programs; they assist in the preparation of records retention schedules, the production of finding aids for archival records, the preservation microfilming of historically and genealogically valuable records, the arrangement and description of records materials, and the preservation of endangered collections. Other regrants are used to share current professional knowledge and practice within the state archival community (which includes archivists, allied professionals such as librarians, town clerks and museum curators, and volunteers), and for sharing the importance and use of archival records with public users, especially teachers and students at every level.

A recently completed regrant project in South Carolina illustrates the impact of the combining state funds with the NHPRC's regrant funds to help implement state plans. To quote the South Carolina SHRAB's Final report which is available on their Web site at http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/rgrnt2final.htm , "...a great deal of significant archival activity has occurred throughout South Carolina supported by this SC SHRAB regrant project. Overall, the project resulted in the arrangement and description of nearly 1,200 cubic feet of records, the microfilming of over 170 cubic feet of records, and the preservation of more than 100,000 photographs and negatives. In many cases, the regrant funds rescued and stabilized important records that were at risk. By requiring recipients to have (or develop) basic collecting and disaster policies and, in the case of processing projects, to employ MARC-AMC format in archival description, the Board continued its efforts to expand familiarity with and employment of standard archival practices...most of the projects funded by this, as well as the previous regrant, were for small and medium size institutions and organizations, often providing seed money to starting up archival programs. Though this is an important development, it should be noted that neither of the SC SHRAB regrant projects has addressed the problems and needs of the state's larger institutions in a truly significant way. This is because the needs of the small and medium size institutions have been more than anticipated and that the amount of funds available for grants have been barely enough for those types of institutions. An important side benefit of the two SC SHRAB regrant projects has been the development of ongoing

mentoring relationships between archivists in the larger institutions and those in the smaller or new archives."

Boards also use NHPRC regrants and other grant funds to conduct workshops in practically every phase of records keeping and archival preservation, to publish manuals on archives and record keeping, and to produce and publish plans to prevent or recover from disasters. Texas, Florida, and Wisconsin have all had board grants to support training. To quote the project summary of a recently completed project in Wisconsin which appears on the Wisconsin Board's Web page at http://www.shsw.wisc.edu/archives/whrab/bpdesc.htm, the project "strengthened partnerships between the Wisconsin Historical Records Advisory Board and three statewide organizations of records creators and keepers ... the Wisconsin Council for Local History (WCLH), the Wisconsin Association of Public Librarians (WAPL), and the Registers in Probate Association (RIPA)...." Together the board and these organizations identified their critical needs for information on managing historical records; compiled guidelines of best practices; held three workshops (one for each organization) based on the guidelines; and created curriculum packets which would allow each organization to teach additional workshops after the project period has ended.

An important aspect of regrants, as with all other aspects of the NHPRC's program, is the manner in which Commission funds leverage additional dollars. State legislatures and other sources of funding have provided additional funding for regrants, ranging from 50 percent to 147 percent of the NHPRC's grant funds.

Through the regrant program, Federal funds are reaching a large number of institutions responsible for historical records. This program brings together groups within a state to share and build upon the lessons learned in preserving historical records and making them accessible for greater use. Also, it reflects both the NHPRC's partnership with states and its continuing commitment to repositories of every size and type.

The NHPRC also has supported the development of the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators (COSHRC), which is made up of the historical records coordinators in the states and territories. The NHPRC provides funding for the state coordinators to meet as a group, to conduct important nationwide studies and to develop a variety of projects. The upcoming National Forum on Archival Continuing Education, to be held in Decatur, Georgia at the end of April is a COSHRC project that we are funding.

Today, 40 states have active State Boards; of these,

- 37 have developed statewide plans for historical documentary work; and Illinois and California are currently working on plans;
- roughly half have created statewide programs or projects to implement these plans;
- 21 states have conducted regrant programs, with Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Maine among the most vibrant; with encouraging new programs in

Massachusetts, New Mexico and Nevada; and solid participation in Vermont, Florida, and Texas.

- In the past five years NHPRC funds totaling $3,781,021 have been regranted through the states to 600 projects.

Challenges

There remains so much to be done within the states. One of our major concerns right now is to continue to provide sufficient assistance to those state archives that need assistance, particularly in the area of electronic records, and while also being able to help implement the historical records agenda in the rest of the state; and to encourage interaction and cooperation between these two areas of need.

The NHPRC also has been examining in depth the question of why the state board mechanism works – and flourishes – in so many states, while in ten states it has failed to develop or to survive. The reasons (which include geography, demographics, political considerations, leadership and money) vary as much as the states themselves do, but we are attempting to develop innovative and effective ways to assist these states. We are watching closely a current project involving two state boards to see whether multi-state or regional projects might be more viable in some cases.

The NHPRC remains firmly committed to its State Board program, in no small part because of its almost staggering potential to involve greater and greater numbers of individuals, organizations and professions in a concerted effort to safeguard the nation's records.

Electronic Records Projects

Goal #3: *the NHPRC will enable the nation's archivists, records managers, and documentary editors to overcome the obstacles and take advantage of the opportunities posed by electronic technologies by continuing to provide leadership in funding research-and-development on appraising, preserving, disseminating, and providing access to important documentary sources in electronic form.*

Without question, the greatest challenges facing the archival world today are to identify, preserve and provide long-term access to electronic records having long-term historical value.

The technology needed to provide access to electronically created documentation becomes obsolete in a matter of a few years. We are, indeed, having to cope with changes as fundamental as those faced by our ancient archival forebears when records creators began the shift away from carved tablets, but we don't have the luxury of centuries to get it right.

NHPRC support in the area of electronic records is devoted to records **originally created in electronic form,** not the conversion of documents originally created in paper form to

electronic form, i.e., digitization. The Commission articulated this decision in November 1999 in its Statement on Digitization Projects: "The National Historical Publications and Records Commission generally regards projects to preserve endangered records, to provide basic access to significant historical materials (e.g., to arrange and describe the materials), and to compile documentary editions as a higher priority than projects to convert materials and existing finding aids to electronic form or projects whose main purpose is to make digitized materials available via the Internet. At this time, therefore, the Commission prefers not to spend its limited funds on projects that primarily involve digitization activities."

Under the aegis of the Commission, a research agenda on electronic records issues was developed and continues to shape and inform the efforts of archivists attempting to come to grips with the seminal records problem of our time. Since the publication of these questions in 1991, in a report entitled *Research Issues in Electronic Records*, the NHPRC has awarded approximately $4.2 million for electronic records projects.

Recent NHPRC-supported electronic records projects have been taking an aggressive stance in addressing one of the key questions in the NHPRC Electronic Records Research Agenda: *How can software-dependent data objects be retained for future use?*

The NHPRC awarded $425,000 to support the non-Federal portion of the US Team involved with the InterPARES project, which is an international effort to determine the archival requirements for long-term preservation of authentic electronic records. The InterPARES Project is collaborating with information technology experts to devise the methodologies required to implement these requirements. In fact, members of the InterPARES Project Team are collaborating with information technology experts working on another NHPRC project at the San Diego Supercomputer Center.

The NHPRC awarded $300,000 to the San Diego Supercomputer Center for its project entitled, Methodologies for Preservation and Access of Software-dependent Electronic Records. This research builds upon previous work that the applicants have done for the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and other sponsors. This project will extend the work the applicants have done previously and will specifically look at the scalability and usefulness of the technology they are developing for maintaining and providing long-term access to electronic records in archives other than NARA.

NHPRC grants also support a variety of institutions, including state and local government archives and universities, to develop best practices and test out the results of previous research on the identification, retention, preservation, and research use of electronic records and to support the establishment of electronic records programs and policies.

Finally, at its November 1999 meeting, the NHPRC issued a call for proposals for a special 3-year, $1.8 million initiative designed to broaden the base and raise the level of

archival expertise in the area of electronic records throughout the nation. This call for proposals was developed in response to the recognized need to increase the number of archivists who are equipped to work with electronic records. The NHPRC has allocated up to $600,000 of its annual appropriated grant funds for the next three fiscal years (2001-2003) toward the call for proposals designed to enhance archival expertise at a number of different levels and in a multitude of venues. The press release announcing this call for proposals is attached to my testimony.

Challenges

Many challenges remain in the electronic records research area. Although there has been substantial progress in some areas, considerable work needs to be done before most non-Federal archival institutions will be in the position to handle comfortably, capably, and as a matter of course the long term retention and easy access to electronic records. Many of these archival institutions and programs need to effect changes in their structures, practices, and skill bases to build programs capable of addressing electronic records issues.

Electronic records research can be very costly. As with our San Diego project we hope to support more electronic records projects that build on previous research, with a focus on issues facing non-Federal archives, or involve other funding partners.

The NHPRC believes that there is an urgent need to broaden the base and increase the level of archival expertise in the area of electronic records. Our recent call for proposals is evidence of this.

The archival profession needs to collaborate with other information professionals in attempting to address electronic records issues. A recent NHPRC grant to the Association of Research Libraries and the Coalition for Networked Information, enabled them to develop and test workshops which brought together teams of archivists and information technologists to explore electronic records issues. We have received extremely enthusiastic reports from participants, indicating that it was very useful in opening the lines of communications with other stakeholders in their institutions and in developing projects to begin to address electronic records issues. We need to do much more along these lines.

The NHPRC sees a need to test the results of electronic records research in a wide range of organizational and technological settings.

We hope to continue to fund innovative projects that help archivists to move from the theoretical to the practical; that identify and publicize best practices; that test out and help to implement practical solutions that will work for smaller, non-Federal institutions; and that foster and facilitate a dialogue with other information professionals and users in order to acquaint them with the concerns of the archival community.

The NHPRC has been at the forefront in supporting archival electronic records research and development and has had a remarkable impact on this work, given the limited funds we have been able to provide. We intend to continue to be a leader in the search for answers to the challenges inherent in the long-term retention of historically valuable electronic records.

"Other" NHPRC Projects

The NHPRC's Strategic Plan also provides that, *The Commission will commit up to 60% of its appropriated funds each year to grants for soundly conceived projects of value in reaching these goals. The Commission will reserve at least 40% of its appropriated funds each year for grants for other projects eligible for support within the Commission's statutory mission, including projects to protect and otherwise make accessible historically significant records, to publish documentary editions other than the eight founding-era projects judged to be of critical importance, and to improve the methods, tools, and training of professionals engaged in documentary work.*

These "other" NHPRC ACTIVITIES include:

- documentary editions other than the Founding Era projects;
- archival preservation and cataloging projects focusing upon papers, photographs, sound and video recordings, architectural drawings, etc.;
- programs for the professional education of archivists and documentary editors through internships, fellowships, the development of training manuals, and the Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents. It is expected that the upcoming National Forum on Archival Continuing Education, funded in response to calls from archivists within all kinds of archival organizations and at the specific prompting of the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators, will result in an informed and focused agenda for future NHPRC assistance in the area of continuing education of professional archivists, allied professionals, and volunteers.
- projects focusing upon the documentation of under-documented groups, e.g., Native Americans, African Americans, Pacific Islanders, ethnic and interest groups, social and political movements, women, etc.
- the establishment of archival programs within such non-profit institutions as colleges and universities, museums,
- projects supporting good archival management (e.g., development of plans for disaster prevention and response.)

To date, the NHPRC has helped with the publication of over six hundred volumes of these documentary editions and over nine thousand rolls of microfilm "other" than the Founding Era editions, which have included the Papers of Jane Addams, Jefferson Davis, W.E.B. DuBois, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Thomas Edison, Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation, Martin Luther King, Jr., The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, George Catlett Marshall, John Marshall, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, Robert A. Taft, and Booker T. Washington, to name a very few of the

projects. The NHPRC continues to support documentary editions other than those of the Founding Era. If this nation were unchanged today from the way it was as the eighteenth century drew to a close, it would make sense to stop with the Founding Era editions. But, the United States of America was not, as an archivist might say, encapsulated in mylar at that point. Therefore, the NHPRC has long supported and endorsed documentary editions focusing upon people and institutions and groups coming after – and before -- the Founding Era.

Over the twenty-five years since the Records Program began, the NHPRC has awarded approximately $40 million for archives- and records-related projects, many of which fell into this "other" category. With the assistance of the Commission, an astonishing range of American historical documentation has been identified, preserved and made physically and intellectually accessible.

A key part of what the Commission has done has been to support the development of archival and editing professional organizations and through assistance to them to assist measurably in the establishment and promulgation of canons of good professional practice.

Challenges

All the traditional problems in archives: preservation, backlogs of uncatalogued papers, continuing education for archivists and the proper training of those who are charged with handling historical records, and so on, haven't gone away.

The educational needs of archivists – and I can attest from experience – are ongoing. The specific demands of particular collections and institutions change and so much the expertise of the archivist. Continuing education is a particular concern as mid-level archivists begin to move up within their profession, as members of the 'baby boom' generation, who have long been prominent in both the archival and the documentary editing communities, begin to retire. Next month's Forum on Archival Continuing Education will address the archival side of this question. A number of suggested NHPRC initiatives should emerge from it.

CONCLUSION

Through its competitive grants, the NHPRC provides a kind of venture capital for the historical and archival world, through which solutions to electronic records questions can be discovered and begin to be tested; and new initiatives and new projects – in state and local government records, private archival institutions, and documentary editions -- can be launched and given vital support. NHPRC funding alone will never be sufficient to support many of these projects. But, the expertise of the NHPRC staff, the level of scrutiny to which our projects are submitted, the professional standards which the NHPRC not only upholds but helps to establish, are well known and documented.

Mr. Chairman, the NHPRC is continuing to work very hard to provide effective leadership and, at the same time, to be open to the ideas and ingenuity of this nation's archivists, documentary editors and all those who care about this nation's history. We take very seriously our role as the only national grantmaking organization whose only focus is the American documentary record, and we build daily on what we learn in discharging that responsibility.

We are so grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, to this committee and to the Congress for your support of the NHPRC and for this opportunity to share the work of the NHPRC and the challenges it faces in this significant, noble and enduring endeavor.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much.

We are delighted to see Charles T. Cullen as president of the Newberry Library. It is one of the world's great depositories of rare books and manuscripts. The reputation of the library precedes you. I am sure you are nursing it along to even greater heights.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES T. CULLEN, PRESIDENT, NEWBERRY LIBRARY

Mr. CULLEN. Thank you, sir. I am delighted to be here today.

I thought I might mention that I have come in this noontime and I will leave immediately after to go back to Chicago. I have done that primarily because of the importance I attach to the reauthorization of the NHPRC, so that I was prepared to change my schedule to come and appear before you today.

I am enjoying the present position as the head of the Newberry Library in Chicago but I came to it 14 years ago after spending some period of time as an editor of some of these editions. Twenty-five years ago I was the editor of the papers of John Marshall and for a period in the 1980's, I was editor of the papers of Thomas Jefferson. So I speak from experience as an editor and a historian who has worked with these materials both as a scholar, as a user, and now as head of a research library that is very heavily used by teachers at all levels and one that is open to the public. I see people from the public—school teachers and people who are not engaged in any particular remunerative exercises coming and using these materials to learn more about our Nation's history.

Last Friday, for example, the recently retired CEO of one of our Nation's leading electronics companies was in the Newberry Library to learn more about the effects of the Scottish enlightenment on the ideas of the founding fathers. He was using some of these materials that the NHPRC has made available.

Such interest is much more widespread, I believe, than many of us realize, more widespread among the general public. I also participated last week in a colloquium down in Florida. A group of retired people, about 50 of them, came together once a week for a month to study the Declaration of Independence and the ideas that contributed to it.

There was heated discussion about the meaning of the Declaration and the ideas that we find in the papers of the founding fathers so that they can study them and see what was really thought. That was what they wanted to know, what was the truth and what the facts were. These materials make it available and I think the availability in the original state, or at least in original source materials, is of fundamental importance in a democratic society.

The NHPRC provides seed money for more than 40 projects working to make significant American documents accessible to everyone who can read in print and increasingly in electronic form so that accessibility has spread worldwide. Slightly more than $2 million per year attracts much more money from sponsors drawn to this work by its initial endorsement and continuing support from the NHPRC.

The Commission's grants program is a highly successful leverager. The results have been very impressive. Over 700 vol-

umes and almost 10,000 rolls of microfilm now are available from these NHPRC-sponsored projects to inform those who are interested in our Nation's history.

They have revolutionized the study of American history. One of the Nation's leading historians has called this work the most important and lasting work of the 20th century, the most important work in American history of the 20th century.

Others have used these materials to write monograms. Stephen Ambrose's "Undaunted Courage" couldn't have been written without the publication of the NHPRC-sponsored project to publish the journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. TV documentaries depend heavily on these. Ken Burns has told me himself that he couldn't have done three of his projects without the editors supported by the NHPRC.

With NHPRC help, projects have shared information and skills among each other to take advantage of improvements in technology and in ways of disseminating these important materials. They have served as resources for our Government, for the press, and for civic groups in addition to scholars and interested citizens.

In sum, this small government agency is a mouse that roars. It is one of the biggest bargains in the U.S. Government budget it seems to me. I urge its continuation through congressional reauthorization and I thank you again for giving me a chance to express these widespread sentiments. I would be glad to answer any questions when the time comes.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Cullen follows:]

Testimony of Dr. Charles T. Cullen, President,

The Newberry Library, Chicago, IL

in support of

Reauthorization of the Grants Program of the

National Historical Publications and Records Commission

April 4, 2000

House Subcommittee on

Government Management, Information, and Technology

Good morning Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and your colleagues on this committee for the opportunity to testify and lend my enthusiastic support to the reauthorization of the grants program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). I am Charles T. Cullen, President of the Newberry Library in Chicago, Illinois, and a member of the NHPRC. On the Commission I represent the Association for Documentary Editing, but I also feel confident that I can speak for those who use the products of NHPRC grants—historians, political scientists, attorneys, genealogists, teachers, and students to name just a few—both now and in the future.

A key concept in our society today is accessibility. I would submit that the NHPRC was focused upon accessibility as a goal long before it became a fashion and a buzzword. Its reason for existence is to be a partner with the federal government in a nationwide effort to preserve the records that document our past and to encourage efforts to make those documents more accessible. The vast majority of NHPRC funded projects, whether they preserve at-risk documents or photographs, create finding aids for collections, publish volumes, or put documents up on the Web, focus upon making the historical record more available and usable—not just for the present, but long into the future.

Today I want to focus on the goal that has been unchanging since the NHPRC came into existence: the publication of the historically significant papers of the most important individuals and institutions of our national experience. Let me offer merely a sampling of the numerous editions, many of them completed, that have been funded with assistance from the NHPRC: the correspondence of all of the major founders of our nation (Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Franklin, and Hamilton); the documents relating to the history of the Ratification of the Constitution; the First Federal Election; the First Federal Congress; the first ten years of the Supreme Court; the papers that document landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted's

development of New York City's Central Park; Thomas A. Edison's drawings and descriptions of his inventions; the correspondence between women's suffrage activists, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton; the letters of such African-American leaders as Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglass, and Martin Luther King, Jr.; and the correspondence of key Civil War era players such as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, and Ulysses S. Grant. Another NHPRC funded project, the Freedom History Project, takes what historians today call a "bottom up" approach, using only a tiny percentage of the massive federal records documenting the federal government's interactions with freed slaves during and after the Civil War to document the story of emancipation.

Having made available in books, microfilms, CDs or Web sites the most important of the primary sources for the study of American history, twentieth century documentary editions have been credited with causing a revolution in our nation's historical scholarship. Far reaching accessibility has been achieved by bringing documents together and publishing them with annotation, editorial aids, indexes and all the other tools that make them easier to use and understand. This in turn has had an enormous impact upon historical research and publication. Many an award-winning monograph has been based upon sources found in published editions. For example, Stephen Ambrose's much acclaimed bestseller, *Undaunted Courage*, drew heavily upon the NHPRC funded edition of the journals of the Lewis and Clark expedition. It takes awhile, but eventually even textbooks are affected.

The federal government, through the NHPRC, deserves an enormous amount of credit for its encouragement of and support for the creation of this impressive research infrastructure. This revolution in accessibility and historical scholarship would not have been possible without federal funding. It is the "carrot" of federal funding that makes it possible to leverage the support of host

institutions and attract private support from foundations, organizations, corporations, and individuals. The imprimatur of NHPRC support with the funds Congress provides helps sustain other support that makes possible the assembling of the talent and expertise that such work requires. Without the federal funding most of these projects would be at risk for losing their host institution's support and would either not survive or be severely limited in what they could accomplish. The importance of the federal support cannot be exaggerated

Documentary editions may seem to be intended only for the serious scholar, but the entire American public potentially benefits in numerous ways. First, the original sources are available in highly accessible formats to individuals writing the monographs, articles, and textbooks, which work fosters increased reliability on these resources. Second, all of these editorial projects act as research centers on their subjects. For example, the editors at the George Washington Papers and the Margaret Sanger Papers receive hundreds of inquiries every month, primarily from students of all ages doing research. The Washington Papers Web site not only contains answers to the most frequently asked George Washington questions, but also has an online exhibit featuring topical information such as how this nation mourned the death of Washington 200 years ago last December. During the period of the Constitutional bicentennial the editors of the *Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution* produced a weekly column for newspapers and programs for radio stations to increase public awareness of the issues raised and the important documents surrounding the ratification process. In recent years they have held numerous workshops on constitutional history for federal judges. Portions of *Free at Last*, a reader drawn from *Freedom: the Documentary History of Emancipation*, have been adapted for a dramatic performance seen around the state of Maryland. The editors of the *Documentary History of the*

First Federal Congress, 1789-91, have put up an online exhibit which provides an overview of the work of and issues confronted by that most important and productive Congress in U.S. history. That exhibit soon will be accompanied by an online teacher's guide. The producers of the highest quality documentary films consult the staffs of these editing projects and often use them in their productions along with documents and other artifacts suggested or supplied by the projects. C-SPAN's 1999 series on the American Presidency regularly featured documentary editors. Editors cooperate with teacher training institutes, give talks on their projects and subjects, answer numerous inquiries, and host researchers who come to use their files. The goal of increasing accessibility inspires their work.

The work of bringing a documentary edition to fruition is long term. I would argue that this is because editions are products that are not ephemeral, as so many products are today, but virtually eternal. Editors are responsible for producing volumes, or other publications, that are so highly reliable that future scholars will not have to retrace their steps. How many other products today are created to last hundreds of years? The enduring value of these editions will make their contents useful to students of our history and culture for generations to come. And, they have an international value too—the United States Information Agency has chosen 100 of these volumes to be placed in libraries in countries around the world.

Today's technology has the potential to open the doors to our past as never before. Historical resources are being presented in many creative new ways. But there is also a risk involved. Individuals and institutions are "putting up" documents at an ever increasing pace. Many of these documents come from printed sources that were not done to the high standards required of NHPRC funded editions. The situation is rather chaotic with no way for a user to know whether or not the

document text he is using is authentic and reliable.

The Commission is well aware that it is essential that NHPRC editions be part of this technological revolution. We have already funded the ground breaking "Model Editions Partnership" in which seven of our sponsored projects, working with top consultants in the field of electronic texts, explored the issues involved in putting highly reliable and intellectually accessible editions up on the Web. They have now launched a site which makes available discreet portions of their work. Another phase of the Model Editions Partnership has now begun. In addition we have received an exciting proposal that would involve us in a project that would present a substantial portion of the documentary record relating to Eleanor Roosevelt's work on both domestic and international human rights on the Web. The potential to vastly increase access to the documents already published by putting those volumes onto the Web excites us—there will be additional costs but the worldwide access will be a great achievement.

Since the beginning of its existence the NHPRC has been the leader in promoting wider access to our documentary resources. The opportunities presented by new technologies are enormous, but the basic work of historical scholarship that underlies these editions and the goal of creating a research infrastructure that will endure far into the future remain the same. The annual investment of $10 million recommended in this legislation is a very modest one. A nation that is an example to the world has a responsibility to do at least this much to make its historical documentary heritage accessible. Thank you for your work on this legislation and the opportunity to be heard in support of it.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much, Mr. Cullen. We appreciate that.

Our last presenter is Anne Gilliland-Swetland, assistant professor, Department of Information Studies, University of California at Los Angeles. Glad to have you here.

STATEMENT OF ANNE GILLILAND-SWETLAND, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for inviting me here this afternoon to present testimony with regard to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission efforts to preserve historical documents and electronic records, and to support the bill to reauthorize the Commission.

While the implementation of electronic recordkeeping technologies is fundamental to activities such as electronic commerce, electronic government, and academic and industry research, it also presents society today with one of its greatest technological challenges, how to guarantee the long-term preservation, trustworthiness and accessibility of vast quantities of electronic records in the face of continual and rapid obsolescence of computer hardware and software, vulnerable and impermanent storage media, and manipulable electronic systems.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is the only national funding agency that is directly addressing the challenges posed for recordkeeping and records preservation. With the articulation and implementation over the past 9 years of its vitally important electronic records research agenda, the Commission has singlehandedly been responsible for most of the knowledge gains and development activities that have occurred in the United States in this area in the past decade.

This agenda has resulted in concrete outcomes such as the development of model electronic records programs as well as sets of functional requirements, mathematical-data schema, best practices, and industry standards for electronic recordkeeping.

I want to briefly discuss two NHPRC-funded projects currently underway. These projects exemplify not only the extensive and complex nature of research and development to date in the area of electronic records that has been funded by the Commission, they also exemplify how the Commission has worked to ensure interaction between complementary projects, the relevance of its agenda to a range of research communities, and its ability to facilitate projects that strategically leverage additional funding sources. Without the Commission's electronic research agenda and its funding program, such research simply would not be possible.

In June 1999, the NHPRC funded American researchers to participate in the International Project on Permanent Authentic Records and Electronic Systems, known as InterPARES. This year, the Commission funded the San Diego Supercomputer Center's methodologies for the long-term preservation of and access to software-dependent electronic records project.

The two projects are working closely together because of the interdependent nature of their research. InterPARES is generating

theoretical, technical, policy, and educational requirements for the preservation of authentic records based on an analysis of records in a wide range of organizational and jurisdictional settings.

The SDSC project is designing information architectures that will buildupon these requirements and that will be scalable to situations other than very large archivable repositories such as the National Archives and Records Administration.

InterPARES brings together an interdisciplinary team of researchers and an industry group representing the global biocomputer and pharmaceutical industries, together with the National Archives and several countries in North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia.

In addition to funding from NHPRC, major funding for InterPARES has also been made by Canada's Social Science and Humanities Research Council and the Italian National Research Council.

The San Diego Supercomputer Center is the leading edge facility for the National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure. SDSC's project builds upon its experience working with the National Archives on the ongoing NARA/DOCT Electronic Records Management Project. The NHPRC funded project will allow SDS researchers to take what they have learned from working with NARA as well as from the work of InterPARES and other recent and ongoing NHPRC-funded projects and develop and test prototypes and tools for preserving and making accessible software-dependent records in ways scaled to the needs and resources of different kind of institutions such as State and local governments and universities.

Important and exciting as these projects and others currently underway are, they address only certain key issues and there remains an immensely important role for NHPRC to play with regard to furthering research and development in the area of electronic records management and preservation.

I would like therefore wholeheartedly to support the reorganization of the Commission.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Gilliland-Swetland follows:]

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES UCLA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
P.O. Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

Anne Gilliland-Swetland
Assistant Professor, Department of Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles
Before the Subcommittee on Government Management and Technology
of the U.S. House of Representatives
Washington D.C.
April 4, 2000

Introduction

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for inviting me here this afternoon to present testimony with regard to the National Historical Publications and Record's Commission's efforts to preserve historical documents and electronic records and the bill to reauthorize the Commission for five years. I am a professor in the Department of Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. My research, publications and teaching focus on the archival management of electronic records--those records that are electronically generated and or maintained by computers--and on digital archives development. I am particularly engaged with issues relating to the preservation of, and public access to trustworthy records in the digital environment. I am the co-Director of the NHPRC-funded InterPARES Project, an international project that is developing theoretical, technological, policy, and educational requirements for the preservation of permanent records created by electronic systems. I am also a member of the archival advisory board for the NHPRC-funded Methodologies for the Long-term Preservation of and Access to Software-dependent Electronic Records Project underway at the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC). This latter project is building prototypes of information architectures that can be used to preserve software-dependent electronic records in a variety of institutional settings.

The Electronic Records Challenge

Many records generated by society in the course of its activities need to be preserved permanently as critical instruments of accountability, as means of protecting individual and corporate rights, and as sources of information for research and study. The ubiquitous implementation of rapidly evolving information and communications technologies means that almost all contemporary records that will require permanent preservation have an electronic component, often with no paper counterpart. This implementation is also re-shaping traditional bureaucratic structures and affecting record creation and record-keeping processes in ways that we do not, as yet, well understand. While the implementation of information and communications technology has obvious advantages for activities such as electronic commerce, electronic government, clinical

practice, and academic and industry research, it also presents society today with one of its greatest technological challenges—*how to guarantee the long-term preservation, trustworthiness, and accessibility of vast quantities of electronic records in the face of continual and rapid obsolescence of computer hardware and software, vulnerable and impermanent storage media, and manipulable electronic systems?*

As a society, we must now address the fact that, unlike with paper records, our present lives and activities as well as our future cannot tolerate even a small amount of benign neglect when it comes to electronic record-keeping and electronic records preservation. The moment when technological and fiscal support for electronic records is withdrawn within the organization that created them, electronic records instantly start to decay, sometimes disappearing almost immediately. Moreover, a single break in the chain of custody for electronic records or a mistake in backup or other media handling (to say nothing of security breaches and deliberate damage) can leave the integrity of electronic records as trustworthy sources open to challenge--a critical issue for anyone who must depend upon records.

A number of specific issues are particularly critical, and many of these have been at the center of the electronic records research projects funded by the NHPRC:

* *Identification of records:* Two of the most basic questions all organizations face in the electronic environment are *what is the record today?* and *how do we identify it for archival preservation?* As technological capabilities evolve and systems become increasingly networked, it is becoming increasingly difficult to establish what actually comprises electronic records. Organizations create, manipulate, and store operational data (e.g., geological data, market profiles, scheduling projections); associated transactional metadata (e.g., audit trails, use statistics); and strategic information (e.g., annual reports, committee documentation, executive correspondence, product designs, formulae and patents) within highly distributed networked record-keeping and information systems. The task of the records manager and the archivist is to determine which aspects of these system contents comprise "the record." Another complication is that the life-cycle of records in the digital environment is being affected by organizational knowledge management activities. Fewer records (especially operational data and transactional metadata) are likely to be systematically retired and sent to the archives because of their potential for being used in more than one way, or by more than one group of users. Electronic records are being re-used for projects other than those with which they were originally associated (e.g., data warehousing), analyzed and cross-compiled in new ways for management purposes (e.g., data mining), and re-tooled into information products (e.g., re-purposing, multi-versioning).

* *Evidential requirements:* meeting legal requirements for the admissibility of records as evidence sets the bar for record-keeping and preservation requirements at a higher level than that for any other kind of information. For example, it must be possible to demonstrate that records have been created and maintained appropriately in the course of daily activity, throughout both their active and their archival life. In order to understand how records were involved in decision-making and other business activities, it must also be possible for preserved records to be "rendered" in eye-readable form in the same way that they were presented to the records creator.

* *Juridical diversity*: organizations create electronic records for which inadequately-defined or even competing legal, regulatory, and professional requirements and standards exist. Moreover, not all organizations are subject to the same, or all records and record-keeping laws or regulations. Indeed, as electronic commerce and research activities becoming increasingly international and collaborative, electronic records will be created that must meet the requirements of multiple legal and regulatory jurisdictions.

* *Institutional diversity:* not all organizations creating electronic records have the same kinds of records, mandate, needs, users, or resources. We do not yet fully understand what is the same and what is different about electronic records creation and management in diverse organizational contexts, and, therefore, which electronic records management and preservation models can be applied and which not.

* *Technological diversity*: government, clinical, academic, industry and many other types of organizations employ multiple, constantly evolving, and frequently incompatible computer systems and operating environments to create their records. A major record-keeping system may migrate to a new software-hardware configuration as frequently as every three years, making it difficult or impossible to access and read records created on previous configurations.

* *Technological dependency*: due to the inherent characteristics of increasingly prevalent electronic media forms, it is no longer viable to consider preserving most records in non-electronic form, since to do so would result in the loss of critical information as well as an equally critical diminution of evidential value. Examples of complex record forms include:

  • *Multimedia:* systems that integrate multiple digital media simultaneously such as still and moving images and sound, often created as non-linear documents connected by a series of hyperlinks (such as World Wide Web pages).

  • *Smart documents:* contain embedded pointers to external sources of information that can be automatically accessed when a document is called up.

  • *Virtual documents and database views:* virtual documents that do not necessarily have any physical or long-term existence and are created through the juxtaposition of several different pre-existing discrete pieces of data pulled together by of a set of relations or pointers.

  • *Geographic Information Systems:* bring together maps and data regarding natural, demographic, and cultural resources in any number of layers to display data visually. For example, a database of addresses which can be converted into location points on a map; lines on a map indicating traffic volume on a highway; or demographic data such as ethnicity displayed as shaded polygons (shapes) on a map.

  Not only is it difficult to convert such materials into paper of software-independent form, it is often strategically undesirable for the parent organization, whose knowledge management requirements may demand that as much organizational information (including records) as possible is maintained in searchable, interoperable, and collocatable electronic form.

* *Trustworthiness:* while trustworthiness is often a transparent quality of records, an overt effort has to be made both to ensure and to demonstrate the trustworthiness of electronic records, whether active or archival. Trustworthy records are critical in the present for accountable government, e-commerce, and for research; and in the future as accurate recorded memory. For electronic records to be trustworthy, they must be reliable and they must be authentic. Reliability is guaranteed by ensuring that appropriate record-keeping, security, and file maintenance practices and policies are in place and implemented for active records. Authenticity requires that it can be demonstrated that the physical and intellectual integrity of the records has not been compromised at any point during their life, including their archival life.

* *Awareness of records creators:* there is still very little awareness among records creators of electronic records issues, resulting in practices that are hazardous to the continued existence of the records, as well as to their evidential integrity. Many records creators are unaware that these documents and databases they are creating might be records that are subject to disposition requirements. Many activities that create electronic records, such as collaborative projects, have not identified which party should be responsible for the long-term management of the project's electronic records. Also hindering the development of an electronic records consciousness has been a lack of cost models and implementable systems requirements for preserving electronic records, and the necessary human expertise in electronic records management and preservation.

* *Public access:* counter-intuitively perhaps, very few preserved electronic records have yet to be made available online to the public, and this must surely be one of the next areas for electronic records research and development. Few archival organizations are yet sufficiently far advanced with their electronic records programs to consider making the records available online, and if they are, there is a dearth of models for them to follow in doing so.

* *Expertise:* one of the most pressing issues for the preservation of electronic records is the critically small pool of archival expertise currently available—perhaps no more than a couple of hundred individuals worldwide. It is critical that robust university and continuing education programs be developed that not only prepare current and future archivists to work with electronic records, but that also prepare a new generation of archival educators who are able to teach and conduct research in this area.

The Evolving Role of the Archivist

Responsibility for ensuring the preservation, authenticity, and accessibility of records that must be preserved permanently lies with the archival profession. New information and communication technologies, however, have not only transformed how business is conducted and the nature of the resulting record, they are also transforming the practices associated with archival management. The archivist is no longer a passive recipient of inactive or historical records, but a proactive advocate for the records who also:

- participates in the development of overall information policy and organization;
- provides archival input during the design and implementation stages of electronic record-keeping systems;

- devises strategies to communicate archival needs effectively to the resource allocators, systems designers, creators, managers, and end users of electronic records systems;
- conducts education and training programs in electronic records management and preservation within his or her organization; and
- identifies procedures for ensuring long-term preservation of electronic records.

The NHPRC Role in Addressing the Electronic Records Challenge

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is the only national funding agency that is directly addressing the issues I have outlined above. With the articulation and implementation over the past nine years of its exciting and vitally important electronic records research agenda, the Commission has single-handedly been responsible for most of the knowledge gains and development activities that have occurred in this area in the past decade. This agenda, which addresses some of the most complex and resource-intensive technology-related issues that the archival and historical professions, records creators, and society as a whole have to face, has resulted in concrete outcomes such as the development of electronic records programs and pilot projects in many state and university settings, as well as sets of functional requirements, metadata schema, and industry standards for electronic record-keeping.

Another major outcome of NHPRC's electronic records research agenda is that it has attracted the kind of multi-disciplinary expertise and state-of-the-art research and computational resources that are necessary to tackle electronic records management and preservation in the most substantive ways. It should also be mentioned that the Commission has an admirable track record in program development and advocacy in the area of electronic records. The Commission provides archivists and related professionals with advice and expertise on developing and carrying out projects, and serves as a clearinghouse for information on electronic records activities. It also strives to build synergy between complementary electronic records activities. The NHPRC's new to broaden the base of archival expertise in the area of electronic records addresses the important area of translating research outcomes into practice by building awareness, understanding, and expertise in electronic records management and preservation in the archival and record-creating communities.

I want briefly to discuss two of NHPRC-funded projects that are currently underway. These two projects exemplify not only the extensive and complex nature of research and development to date in the area of electronic records that has been funded by the NHPRC. They also exemplify how the NHPRC has worked to ensure interaction between complementary projects, its relevancy to a range of research communities, and its ability to facilitate projects that strategically leverage additional funding sources. Without the NHPRC's electronic records research agenda and its funding program, such research would simply not be possible.

The InterPARES and SDSC Projects

In June 1999, the NHPRC funded the International Project on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES). In January 2000, the Commission funded the San Diego Supercomputing Center's Methodologies for the Long-term Preservation of and Access to Software-dependent Electronic Records Project. The two projects are

working closely together because of the inter-dependent nature of their research. InterPARES is generating theoretical, technical, policy, and educational requirements for the preservation of authentic electronic records based on an analysis of a wide range of organizational settings and legal and political jurisdictions. The SDSC Project is designing information architectures that will build upon these requirements and that will be scaleable to situations other than very large archival repositories such as the National Archives and Records Administration.

The InterPARES research project, is a three-year project examining issues relating to the long-term preservation of electronic records in ways that maintain and demonstrate their authenticity. An inter-disciplinary team of researchers drawn from archival science, preservation management, library and information science, computer science, and electrical engineering, and an industry group representing global biocomputing and pharmaceutical industries, are working together with the national archives of several countries, including the United States National Archives and Records Administration to identify and model the form, function, and structure of records contained in electronic systems in a variety of organizational and social contexts. Participating countries include the United States, Canada, Italy, The Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, France, Portugal, England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, China and Hong Kong. In addition to funding from the NHPRC, major funding contributions have been made by Canada's Social Science and Humanities Research Council, the National Archives and Records Administration of the United States, and the Italian National Research Council. Universities and national archival institutions in participating countries have also committed financial and research resources to the project.

While such research models are now commonplace in some other disciplines, InterPARES is the first example of a collaborative, multi-funded, multidisciplinary project emanating out of the archival community. The model was adopted because the research would be tackling issues that are of critical concern to governments, industry, and archival institutions worldwide, but that have failed to be satisfactorily addressed unilaterally by any of those sectors. This approach has allowed InterPARES to:

- bring diverse disciplinary perspectives to bear on resolving seemingly intransigent questions;
- have enough scope, granularity, and depth of expertise to parse large research questions into smaller constituent questions, and thus divide the research into more manageable, yet synchronized components; and, equally importantly,
- generate the high profile for the research and its results that is required to get the attention of policy makers, standards developers, resource allocators, academicians, and others who play key roles in translating the outcomes of the research into practice and ultimately into the fabric of daily life.

The broad goal of the InterPARES Project is to develop the theoretical and methodological knowledge essential for the permanent preservation of records generated electronically, and, on the basis of this knowledge, to formulate model policies, strategies, and standards capable of ensuring their preservation. American InterPARES researchers are also focusing on the systems design implications of InterPARES by translating the resulting theoretical models, templates, and typologies into systems design requirements and metadata models for implementation in different organizational, social, and national domains, and across different types of electronic records.

The Project has been broken down into four domains: I. Conceptual Requirements for Preserving Authentic Electronic Records; II. Appraisal Criteria and Methodology for Authentic Electronic Records; III. Methodologies for Preserving Authentic Electronic Records; and IV. Framework for Developing Policies, Strategies and Standards. One additional group has been established that is developing a multi-lingual, multi-national glossary of terminology used in the project. One issue that any multi-disciplinary electronic records work faces is that the same terms are often used completely differently in different communities (e.g., archival and computer science usage of the terms "records" and "archives").

As part of Domain I., the project is in the process of conducting and analyzing extremely detailed case studies of electronic records systems of diverse types in a range of organizations (for example, complex databases, geographic information systems, laboratory records, and interactive Websites in government agencies, universities, banking, biocomputing, and museum settings). From this analysis, we are deriving an understanding of the nature of the electronic record and the extent to which its intellectual, if not its physical form remains the same as that of traditional records. We are also building a typology of elements within different kinds of records that are crucial to the establishment and maintenance of the authenticity of that record while it is still current and when it becomes historical. This typology will then become the basis of the technical and policy requirements for preservation management systems and strategies. Domains II and II are using modeling techniques to describe the components of the appraisal and preservation processes, and also to analyze different methods and strategies currently in place or being developed in archival institutions. Domain IV will take the results of the work conducted in the other domains, and address policy and standards implications.

The San Diego Supercomputer Center is the leading edge facility for the National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure (NPACI). SDSC's Methodologies for the Long-term Preservation of and Access to Software-dependent Electronic Records Project, which has just commenced, builds upon its experience working with the National Archives and Records Administration on the ongoing NARA/DOCT Electronic Records Management Project. The NHPRC-funded project will allow SDSC researchers to take what they have learned from working with NARA, as well as from the work of InterPARES and other recent and ongoing NHPRC-funded projects, and develop and test prototypes for preserving and making accessible software-dependent records in ways that are scaled to the needs and resources of different kinds of organizations such as state and local givernments and universities. The SDSC project will also include the creation of useful tools for archivists to use to preserve and provide access to electronic records over time.

Conclusion

Important and exciting as these projects and others currently underway are, they address only certain key issues, and there remains an immensely important role for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to play with regard to furthering research and development in the area of electronic records management and preservation. Every organization in this country creates records, and very soon, some part of almost all those records will be electronic. Moreover, electronic commerce, as well as electronic government will need to rely heavily upon the trustworthiness of those records. There are many critical areas that still need to be addressed—translating research outcomes into practice through the development of basic and affordable software tools, the design and

implementation of multi-faceted education programs for archivists and records creators, and the building of models for widespread access to archival electronic records, to name but a few.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. However, I would be pleased to answer any questions you or Members of the Subcommittee may have.

Mr. HORN. Thank you. At this point, we will begin questioning. Mr. Blunt has not made it here. He is probably in a hearing just as we have been.

I will now yield for 5 minutes to the vice chair, Ms. Biggert, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for questioning the witnesses.

Ms. BIGGERT. Thank you.

This is for Mr. Carlin and Ms. Newhall. What are some of the biggest challenges that face the Commission in the next few years? That is a pretty broad question.

Mr. CARLIN. One that quickly comes to mind obviously deals with what we have shared here today and that is the challenge of electronic records for a whole long list of reasons. You have heard testimony on a great deal of the detail but the bottom line, in a practical way, is that unless we can continue the work being done dealing with electronic records and all that remains, there are going to be huge record gaps in our documentation of what has gone on. I fear the gaps exist already. I am just hoping the work we are proceeding on can allow us to limit that gap as much as possible and proceed toward the kind of recordkeeping we need for accountability in government, for the protection of individual rights and yes, ultimately a history.

Ms. BIGGERT. If you have documents on the Internet, for example, how accessible will those be for both users of the Internet but also non-users of the Internet?

Mr. CARLIN. We certainly intend to make maximum use of the Internet to communicate. I think back to my tenure of 5 years, and 5 years ago we didn't talk much about Websites and their importance to reach out and make contact. Today it is a necessity for us to communicate the progress we are making both internally as far as the Federal Government in many ways this research will impact as well as for State and local government and the private sector. Communicating through Websites is absolutely essential to make sure we are reaching out so that the investment that is made gets maximum return to the benefit of anyone who can make use of the progress.

Ms. NEWHALL. I think another challenge, an enormous one facing NHPRC and the archival world is the question of continuing education for archivists. Being an archivist requires a lot of very specialized knowledge. You have to know a lot about history, a lot about library techniques specifically oriented toward handling millions of individual pieces of paper as opposed to bound volumes, a lot about the chemical aspect of the deterioration of papers, a lot about electronic records, and a fair amount of law. These develop according to the type of collection you are working with and it changes, you don't know it all when you graduate from graduate school.

This is a particularly worrisome situation for us because the archivable world has been pretty top heavy with baby boomers. As they begin to retire, we see there is a lot of professionals who have been kept in mid-level positions in a lot of archivable institutions who are now going to be wanting to move up. They will require more and different kinds of perhaps management training than they have had in order to head large organizations. Once they get the position, they are going to have specialized knowledge they

need. This is one of our areas of real concern now, continuing education for archivists.

We also are looking at restructuring or looking at the concerns of how we can most efficaciously speed up the work of some of the documentary editions.

Ms. BIGGERT. Mr. Cullen, I am also from Illinois, so I am very proud of being in the State where your library is located. It is a wonderful monument in Chicago and we are very proud to have that there.

Can you tell me what the future for printed editions is? We seem to be looking ahead to the electronic documentation. Will printed editions be growing or shrinking with the onset of electronic publishing?

Mr. CULLEN. It is impossible to say that people are going to use printed editions in the future as much as they have in the past because there will be this other accessibility. My experience is and most of my colleagues see happening having things available in electronic form is increasing the use of other materials, bringing more people to libraries to dig further.

I think the future of these editions is good, at least their use is good. Many are midway or near finishing their printed editions. There are people who if they are looking for one reference, they would find electronic accessibility more desirable.

If they want to read and explore, as I mentioned this retired CEO was Friday, and see what comes from the material, they preferred the printed version. There will always be, I think, the need for print on paper, as well as putting this material on the Internet for those who have access to it that way and prefer that.

The work has to be done. You have to take the documents you are trying to edit and whether they have to be sent to a printer to be put on paper or filed on a Website someplace, the work is already done. How they are disseminated doesn't matter a great deal to the editor. Whoever will use it or how they want it is what is sought.

Mr. HORN. We will have another round. I see Mr. Blunt is here and Members are busy, so Mr. Blunt, feel free to make your statement or if you can stay with us, we would love to have you.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY BLUNT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. BLUNT. I don't think I can stay, Mr. Chairman, but I am pleased to be here to advocate the renewal of the National Historic Publications and Records Commission. I have submitted testimony for the record that I will briefly summarize.

I was pleased with the testimony I was able to put together because I have had some substantial personal experience with NHPRC. One of those experiences is having served for the last two Congresses as the Member of the House on the Board that determines the allocation of those resources allocated through grants. That board includes myself, one Member of the Senate, one member of the Supreme Court, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and a number of individuals from the historic community. Those resources are allocated, many through that board after careful review.

There are a number of different ways NHPRC has worked. I mention those in my testimony. Some specifically go back to the two terms I served as the Secretary of State in Missouri where the State archives and the records responsibility for State and local government was part of the Secretary of State's office.

In the last 20 years as I mention in my testimony, NHPRC has awarded more than 25 grants totaling $800,000 just within the State of Missouri. One project was one I visited not too long ago the Southwest Missouri Labor Records Project, a number of records that otherwise would not have been saved, would not have been seen in the part of the State I represent if it hadn't been for the preservation of those documents to really tell the story of the labor movement in southwest Missouri and the impact it had on the development of the community.

When I was Secretary of State, the NHPRC allowed the State Records Board, through a grant, to do a statewide survey of the options before State and local government to help preserve records. As an offshoot of that project, we put in place a model local records program for the country. The State of Missouri through a fee collected with recorded documents in courthouses has given over $3 million in grants to over 600 grantees since 1992, all as a result of that $25,000 investment made by NHPRC. So $25,000 from NHPRC turned out to be over $3 million to date invested in over 600 different projects.

As the States, as part of those projects, work with local governments, documents that weren't known to be in existence have been uncovered and publicly shared. There were documents related to Merriweather-Lewis, to William Clark, to both Frank and Jesse James, the first known short biography of Harry Truman written as part of a court case he was a party to as a young man still farming in Grandview, MO, none of which were known to be in existence until they were discovered as part of projects that related out of those grants that were initiated because of a very small investment at the Federal level.

In my testimony I have suggested a number of different experiences in States. As I look through my testimony, neither Illinois or California are listed but I am sure that is an oversight and there have been in Florida, Minnesota, Ohio, North Carolina, Michigan and Vermont specific initiatives that were created because of the NHPRC efforts. This is the place where the Federal Government, with very little money, has been able to encourage significant efforts in retaining and preserving our history, both at the government level and the third area that really has just begun to blossom in recent years, the area where these grants have been made more available to nongovernmental groups who because of the determination at the Commission level were thought to have a significant repository like the Ozarks labor union records, the southwest Missouri labor union records, of our history, our culture, our development as a country.

Certainly I am hopeful that your committee, as I believe it will, provides the leadership to take this legislation to the floor, get it passed and continue this worthwhile program.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Roy Blunt follows:]

Draft of Testimony for Congressman Blunt

RAC/03/29/00

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Turner, I want to thank you for holding this hearing on the reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the NHPRC. I am very pleased to join my colleagues as an original cosponsor of HR4110. And, I thank you for this opportunity to speak today on behalf of the NHPRC, on which I sit as the representative of the House of Representatives. But, when I speak of the importance of the NHPRC, I speak not only as a member of the Commission, but also through my previous personal experience as Missouri's Secretary of State, as a grant partner, and as State Historical Records Coordinator, working with Missouri's Historical Records Advisory Board, the NHPRC's state affiliate.

The NHPRC exists to carry out its statutory mission to ensure understanding of our nation's past by promoting, nationwide, the identification, preservation, and dissemination of essential historical documentation.

This is an enormous task. As a 1996 NHPRC-funded report observed, "The records of our nation's past are as diverse as its geography and as numerous as its people."

Despite its small size, it has undertaken this mammoth mission, but it has done so realizing that in our American system we all share stewardship for our nation's past, whether we are acting as individual citizens, private organizations and associations, or governmental institutions or agencies.

That is why the Congress, in authorizing the NHPRC, wisely charged it with four broad duties and functions: planning, cooperating, educating and informing, and granting.

I want to talk particularly about the first three of those functions, which the Commission largely carries out by granting to partners all across the country who are engaged in this important work.

With that in mind, I want to focus on how the Commission cooperates with, assists and encourages "...State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, societies, and individuals in collecting and preserving and, when it considers it desirable, in editing and publishing papers of outstanding citizens of the United States, and other documents as may be important for an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States."

I will use examples from Missouri, but I can assure you that similar examples exist is most if not all of the states.

In the last twenty years, the NHPRC has awarded Missouri institutions more than twenty-five grants, totaling a little over $800,000. These funds contributed directly to preserving and making available rare documentary records on many subjects, including African American and Native

American communities, labor and business enterprises, art and architectural history, and the records of religious societies.

The relative modesty of this sum is misleading, however, for these awards did much more. Not only did Missouri institutions put up matching money at the time the grants were awarded, but also the majority of the grants provided the seed money for start up funds for ongoing commitments to historical records by local institutions year after year. In Missouri, national support has attracted far more local money than the cost of the federal government's (i.e., NHPRC's) investment.

Let me illustrate with a recently completed project to arrange and describe 18 of the most important collections from the Ozark Labor Union Archives at Southwest Missouri State University. It is a project I have had the opportunity to visit. As David Richards, Head of Special Collections at SMSU points out in an article in NHPRC's newsletter *Annotation,* the traditional view of the Ozarks is as a region that is rural, pastoral, and largely agrarian. This view, however, leaves out part of the region's story: its industrial development, the existence of trade unions, and the lives of the workers who participated in them.

Neal Moore, a retired union printer and publisher of the Springfield, Missouri, *Springfield Labor Record,* co-founder of OLUA, began working over twenty years ago to document labor's heritage in the Ozarks. He was assisted by the late Dr. J. David Lages, a Professor of Economics at Southwest Missouri State University (SMSU). As David Richard notes in his article, "A survey of OLUA's collections determined the need for an intense, focused processing project to correct several years of collecting, but little in the way of access." OLUA applied to NHPRC for grant assistance and received $58, 620.

Richards summarizes the project's accomplishments: "Besides preserving and improving access to OLUA's collections, the grant attracted media attention, which garnered additional support from the labor community. OLUA's outreach efforts were strengthened, inquiries regarding holdings increased, contributions to the OLUA endowments grew, and the grant enabled SMSU to invest in a permanent, full-time archivist position. Administratively, the project served as a model for how OLUA will perform its mission. Professional archivists will now promote and provide access to the collections, continuing the efforts of Neal Moore and Dr. J. David Lages to preserve the often-overlooked story of workers in the Ozarks."

The NHPRC's financial support of the Missouri Historical Records Advisory Board's efforts has allowed the Board to serve as an important catalyst for change, underwriting its ability to provide consultation and planning assistance to the state's hundreds of archival institutions. This has proved especially important for institutions and small historical societies that are run by people with enthusiasm, but limited budgets and limited access to professional training. This work continues on a systematic basis. Recently, Missouri's Board, with NHPRC assistance, conducted a formal survey of the state's archival institutions to assess their needs. The Board also conducted statewide hearings to help develop a strategic plan for the future preservation of the state's historic records. That plan is now being implemented.

The assessment initiative follows an effort by the board that occurred during my service as Secretary of State. The NHPRC awarded a $25,000 grant to the Missouri Board to analyze the current condition of historical records in the state, identify problems, frame potential solutions, and outline actions that can be taken. That project resulted in a study of entitled, "A Future for the Past." Among other recommendations, this report called for the creation of a local government records preservation program, funded through a modest fee on records of permanent value filed in county recorders' offices. The result has been a statewide program that began in 1992. It has currently awarded more than $3.3 million to 602 grantees, funded a documentary conservation lab, and provided free archival assistance to every county and many cities and towns within the state. The Missouri Historical Records Advisory Board reviews and evaluates these competitive grants, as the Board does for NHPRC applications. More importantly, local communities match grant funding up to fifty percent of the project (and never less than thirty percent). These community projects have turned up records related to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, Frank and Jesse James, and Harry Truman, to cite only a few popular names. But as exciting as it is to discover national history in local records, more important has been the tremendous number of people recovering the history of their communities. Over the course of the last decade, several thousand Missourians have worked as volunteers on these projects, giving their time freely and happily.

Missouri's Local Records Program is one of the best of its kind in the nation and now serves as a model for other states. Yet without the NHPRC's initial support, it is questionable whether any of this would have taken place.

Every state's experience with the NHPRC is going to be a bit different. The NHPRC provides the flexibility for each state to relate to the Commission as best fits their individual circumstance. In some cases this will mean helping finance important electronic records projects. I am following and supporting the work NHPRC is helping undertake both at the national and state levels to resolve the problems posed by electronic records. In other states, the state has chosen to support basic educational programs. This flexibility helps to insure the broadest possible participation at the same time that it focuses precious resources on both national and state priorities.

Today, 40 states have active state boards. Since 1993, 37 have developed current statewide plans for historical documentary work. Of course plans are fine, but as we well know it's the results that tell the tale. In other states as well as Missouri, these plans do bring results. Roughly half the states have undertaken statewide programs or projects to implement these plans. Here are some of the other collaborative ventures resulting from the state planning process and the work of NHPRC with its SHRABs:

- The Florida Board's partnership with the Florida Records Management Association;
- Minnesota's collaborations with more than 20 rural and Hispanic community organizations; a cooperative project involving the North Dakota and Minnesota boards and how best to meet the challenge of documenting recent rural American life;
- Ohio Board's work with the State Library of Ohio, the Ohio Public Library Information Network, the Western Reserve Historical Society, the state Department of Administrative Services and other state agencies;
- Partnerships with the Society of North Carolina Archivists and the North Carolina African American Archive Group;

- An agreement in Michigan between a university archive and the state archives on working with the governor's office on public and private gubernatorial records;
- and in Vermont, work with land surveyors on land records, and with museums and galleries on collections care.

21 states have conducted regrant programs in their states, partially funded by the Commission, where funds are subgranted in smaller grants to organizations throughout the state. Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Maine are among the most vibrant programs receiving recent support; with encouraging new programs in Massachusetts, New Mexico, Nevada and Montana; solid participation in Vermont, Florida, and Texas, and important efforts also in Hawaii, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. New York, Kentucky, Virginia, and Delaware, in addition to Missouri, sustain state grant programs that had their origins in NHPRC projects.

The smaller grants made through the state historical records advisory boards, or "SHRABS", provide the grass roots assistance to establish or develop archival and records programs, do preservation microfilming, share the importance and use of historical documents and the story they tell with students and the wider public and provide of professional expertise across a broad spectrum of records keepers both in government and in private, non-profit organizations. In the past five years NHPRC funds totaling $3, 781,021 have been regranted through the states to 600 projects.

The NHPRC 1990s planning initiative is encouraging State Historical Records Advisory Boards, and the state archives that lead them, towards taking responsibility for statewide coordination of archival planning. The NHPRC also provides support for the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators, an organization composed of the state coordinators and deputies from each of the states and territories to encourage collaboration among the states, the exchange of best practices and to undertake special national projects. A 1998 Council study, *Where History Begins* reported on more than 3500 nongovernmental repositories in 26 states that care for some of the nation's records. This report followed two earlier studies of state and local government records and archival programs.

A 1999 report by the Council to the Commission stated, "This work along with the work of the state boards offers the potential of creating an archival planning and support system that extends from the national level to the smallest community. This is particularly important in an era when all seem to realize that large archival repositories will never be able to collect, preserve and provide access to all of the important records created in the nation. Many of those records—some documenting corporations and individuals of national significance—will remain in the hands of volunteers, librarians and others not trained as archivists." The report went on to conclude, "The NHPRC's efforts to leverage a relatively small federal grant program into something that touches historical records throughout the nation is commendable and remarkably successful."

The National Forum on Continuing Archival Education is the current project of the Council, in partnership with the American Association for State and Local History, and funded by the NHPRC. The conference will bring together representatives of the states and more than 30 national and regional organizations that currently provide continuing education to those caring for historical records or whose constituents are potential consumers of such services. The resulting collaborations and cooperation can begin to bring some consistency, order, and comprehensiveness to archival continuing education and can help all concerned make substantial progress toward improving educational opportunities for records keepers of all kinds and, ultimately, improve the care and availability of our nation's historical resources.

But whatever the specific need or project, all the states have benefited—and more to the point—the nation and America's citizens have benefited as our documentary heritage has moved from

our basements, attics, and vaults, into our minds and hearts, enabling us to know better who we are by learning where we have been.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I urge the reauthorization of the NHPRC. Thank you.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much for that excellent statement. I was fascinated when I read last night about the discovery of those labor papers in the Ozarks, economic development and this kind of thing that comes from it.

Were they involved in political organization also?

Mr. BLUNT. They certainly were and they were involved in some pretty heated strikes, including a major streetcar strike. All of those records would have been lost. They were literally in a situation where they had been salvaged one time on the way to the trash pile and were being saved by a person who just realized they had great potential. In the storage space he had available, there is no way they would have survived that individual's life if this program hadn't made it possible to reach out and categorize those records. They will be available at Southwest Missouri State University from now on as an important part of the heritage of both the labor movement and certainly as it related to our part of the State.

Mr. HORN. That is great progress.

Mr. BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HORN. Thank you.

Let us continue some of the questioning between Ms. Biggert and myself.

Mr. Carlin, what are some of the collaborative projects being worked by both the Commission and the National Archives?

Mr. CARLIN. The principal area would be in the electronic records field. We have a huge interest and involvement, for example, with the San Diego Supercomputer Center and other partners in the Federal Government. The NHPRC plays a key role in two areas, one in the theoretical aspect of authenticity and then the scalability with the recent grant that went as well to the San Diego Center. In that sense, NHPRC has played a very significant role in a broader challenge that we have as an agency for taking care of the records of all three branches of the Government.

What we are working on here with the NHPRC being a significant partner is of benefit to the entire world, public and private, all sizes have wondered and worried for a number of years as technology continued to grow and expand and as new generations of technology kept coming faster, what were we going to do to provide access in the future several generations later. The work we are doing now, not just theoretical but in the applied stage where we have a comfort level, we now have the answer. We have time to work on that applied research but we feel we can really respond to that challenge. NHPRC has played a significant role in that overall effort.

Mr. HORN. What you have in electronic records, is that subject to hackers crashing into it, changing things around?

Mr. CARLIN. I think everyone involved with electronic records has been concerned about security. Certainly one of the challenges we face and other panelists I believe can speak more specifically to that, when we talk about authenticity, when we talk about the reliability of that record, we are talking about avoiding hackers being able to go in and change that record in any way, shape, or form at whatever stage.

As this overall project develops, I can assure you the aspect to which you refer and question is a key part of how we proceed. For

us as archivists, it goes to the heart of our responsibility. We are not the only ones concerned about that. The pharmaceutical industry, for example, has been a key partner in all this. They likewise have long range interests in records, the authenticity and security of those records.

Mr. HORN. That is an interesting collection. Is that for checking Presidential health over time or what?

Mr. CARLIN. I think they are more concerned, but I could be corrected, with their formulas, being able to protect themselves 20, 30, 50, 100 years later in the development of progress in the health industry, defend themselves in many cases, but also be able to keep records for future use and future development, further research down the road that is depend on what has gone before.

Mr. HORN. Is that the pharmacist group that has that wonderful little building at the end of Constitution Avenue?

Mr. CARLIN. I am not aware of that direct connection.

Mr. HORN. The story is that is the tomb of the unknown pharmacist. It looks very much like the one at Fort Myer. [Laughter.]

I have been fascinated by that since I was a little boy and I think the doors are open and one of these days I am going to go in and see what is in there.

Mr. CARLIN. You might find the pharmacist that is working on this project. With the Internet and e-mail, you never know where the person is.

Mr. HORN. Let me ask you about the 42,000 disks that had a little disturbance these last few weeks. What have we found at this point?

Mr. CARLIN. The 43,000 to which you make reference goes back to last summer over a weekend in which one of the backup responsibilities was not carried out by a contractor. What we have learned is that in this particular case a little more redundancy is valuable and that you cannot be over confident that everything is secure without a great deal of redundancy built into the system so that you back up the backups to make sure if there is a situation and there will be a loss. There will be deletions, breakdowns, electrical problems, and so forth but the key is making sure you have backup systems that protect those records.

Mr. HORN. Do we know what was on those records? Where did they come from? Who deposited them?

Mr. CARLIN. The records were primarily in the archivist's office and support staff and 43,000 seems like a lot but it is really very little considering all of the exchanges that now take place routinely.

Because of our system of printing out and not depending on recordkeeping, we are not aware of any loss in terms of actual records. Certainly it has made us even more aware of the challenge.

Mr. HORN. What do you think caused it? Did someone have a big magnet in the area or what?

Mr. CARLIN. To be honest, we really don't know.

Mr. HORN. Whose office were they in, yours or someone else's?

Mr. CARLIN. No, no.

Mr. HORN. This was in the Maryland facility?

Mr. CARLIN. In the Maryland facility. Nothing happened in terms of an individual office. It was where the mainframes are, where the

contractor works to do the backup on a regular basis that somebody pressed the wrong button or did something of which we're not aware at this point exactly what it was.

Mr. HORN. Where did those records come from?

Mr. CARLIN. Records from my staff to myself, from myself to my deputy, routine conversations during the day that would take place that we use e-mail for.

Mr. HORN. There were roughly 42,000 disks?

Mr. CARLIN. No. We are talking individual e-mail messages, many redundant messages, repeated to many other offices outside the circle where this particular deletion took place. For example, any communication my deputy and I had with the general counsel, would be on this system.

Mr. HORN. You are saying this was strictly archival records from the U.S. National Archives?

Mr. CARLIN. No. We are talking strictly within our internal operation. It had nothing to do with Federal records we are responsible for taking care of, only the immediate operational records within our system. For example, it could have been hypothetically a communication between Mr. Constance and myself reminding me that the hearing you have set up for July 15 is at 2 p.m.

Mr. HORN. That is within the Archives?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes.

Mr. HORN. Are you saying that is what all these records were, they were the internal administration of the Archives?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes, absolutely, unequivocally.

Mr. HORN. I take it there were not any White House records there?

Mr. CARLIN. Absolutely not, no, no.

Mr. HORN. We have one room over, a full committee, including me, what have these people done because they were playing a lot of games without question on wiping out. We are looking for what happened and some of it had to do with the Presidential library, memos were floating around as to saving some of the e-mail and some of it was you have a memory problem, get rid of some of the e-mail. We are just curious enough to want to know what those e-mails that presumably provided memory were going to do.

Anyway, you are assuring me under oath that there are no White House records in there?

Mr. CARLIN. Absolutely, unequivocally.

Mr. HORN. In terms of what your Commission does, Ms. Newhall, what is the typical edition of the books that are under your tutelage? How many copies do you have a publisher publish? Is it 250, 2,500, what is it?

Ms. NEWHALL. More like 700. It also varies according to the edition itself. The first volumes of a set, they will produce more than Volume 27 of the same person's papers just because interest slacks off.

Anything having to do with the Civil War seems to have a greater audience than other periods of time. So they do vary according to the topic.

Mr. HORN. With the Jefferson papers and others, is that the typical number of copies made?

Mr. CARLIN. It is. The importance of these as reference materials has to be emphasized. They are used in libraries primarily. It takes a very dedicated Jeffersonian to buy every volume that comes out. There are now about 28 volumes, plus maybe 5 others the project has produced.

Most people would expect to go to a library and use them. That is why the print run is not greater because it goes to libraries and that is about the number of libraries would buy these.

Mr. HORN. I thought we could get a lot of this done but we are going to have to recess to vote. Then Ms. Biggert is entitled to at least 10 minutes of time on her questions. We will recess for about 15 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. HORN. The recess is over.

We have Ms. Biggert for questioning for 10 minutes.

Ms. BIGGERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Gilliland-Swetland, have there been similar projects to the InterPARES in the past and if so, what were the results?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. There has never been a project similar to this before, both in terms of the subject of the work and also the scope and the international dimensions.

Ms. BIGGERT. Did you have any models to look at?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. In terms of structuring the research project, it is structured very similarly to big, collaborative research projects that have been going on in other areas where technology is a point of interest, and also facilitators of collaboration.

The content of the research draws upon previous research that has been done, research done in Canada but also research done in the United States and Australia, and some in Europe also.

Ms. BIGGERT. Could you tell us the goals you and the Commission have for the InterPARES Project compared to the current preservation methods that we have today that have been used in the past?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. The focus of InterPARES is specifically on records. The preservation of any digital data is problematic as we know at the moment, especially if you have to maintain that data with all its dependencies to the hardware and software that created it.

When we want to preserve records, we are concerned also about the evidentiary requirements. It is considerably more difficult to preserve records than just plain information. Therefore it sets a very high bar for us to have to jump over.

Our goals are to identify exactly how we can define a record in this environment. If you want to think about very simple environments we deal with all the time like the World Wide Web, not simple but common. In order to be able to define the boundaries around any particular Web page, where it begins, where it ends, what part of it might be a record, we want to be able to come up with requirements for identifying that. We want to see which pieces of any record are necessary to be maintained exactly as they are into the future in order to preserve the authenticity of the record, to keep its integrity intact.

If it does not have its integrity intact, it is no longer reliable. As a record, we cannot trust it and therefore, for many purposes, it is

useless in the future. We do not understand very well yet what those requirements are.

Having isolated those requirements, we are then weighing all existing preservation mechanisms to see how many of those requirements are met by an array of preservation strategies available at the moment to see if any of them satisfy all the needs or whether some satisfy some of the needs, and then to develop blueprints for optimal preservation strategies in a variety of settings because preservation strategies are going to be different in different settings, with different kinds of records.

Ms. BIGGERT. Is there testing being done of all the ways to preserve? We thought our photographs were going to last forever and probably, looking back, some of the historic photographs taken in the late 1800's or early 1900's, that I have of all my family seem to have lasted a lot longer than a lot of the kodak pictures I took of the kids when they were young. Is this something you test in different environments to make sure these will last?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. Testing is done in two places. It is done by industry that develops the media and the technologies and there are longevity prognostications that come out. It is not necessarily in the interest of industry to have materials that stay around forever. Places such as Eastman-Kodak do a lot of this testing themselves and publish their own results.

National archives in several countries have been doing this for quite a long time. However, what they have looked at more is the media rather than the records on the media. Right now we are really interested in a way to maintain the records, those intellectual entities themselves because we know the media is going to turn over and they will continue to turn over.

Ms. BIGGERT. You envision having to transfer these periodically?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. Undoubtedly. This is why the project NARA is involved in with the SDSC, the San Diego Supercomputing Center, is so important because they are trying to develop ways they can maintain software-dependent records independent of media and specific information infrastructures.

Ms. BIGGERT. Ms. Newhall, your current funding request for fiscal year 2001 is $6 million but the authorized level in the proposed reauthorization is $10 million. Do you foresee growth to that authorized level and how do you propose planning the growth in the most responsible way?

Ms. NEWHALL. Just before the November 1999 meeting of the Commission, the chairman, Mr. Carlin, requested that the NHPRC develop a plan addressing that very question, determining what our potential needs would be, working on the assumption that there would be a requirement of additional funds and how we would proceed, at what level, to responsibly use those funds.

This plan is to be presented to the chairman at the May meeting next month. At this point, it is premature for me to speak since this plan hasn't been approved by the Commission members. I think it is safe to say that it would involve utilizing any additional funds to implement our strategic plan more effectively and more aggressively.

Ms. BIGGERT. Maybe one other quick question. How has the Commission kept its employee skills for the new technology? Have

you had to bring in new employees to address the new technology or is everyone up to speed?

Ms. NEWHALL. Yes to both questions. We have a new member of the staff who is Mr. Mark Conrad who was brought in to fill the then vacant position of Director, Technology Initiatives. That position has been created and occupied previously, it just happened to be vacant at the time of my arrival at the Commission. I think we are very fortunate in having someone with Mark's both archivable and technical understanding, and his wonderful ability to work with grantees, applicants. He is able to talk to people who are rocket scientists as though they are like me and he is able to talk to me as though I am a rocket scientist. It is very fortunate for us.

At the same time, the rest of the staff, we do work to maintain basic technical skills, not just having to do with new technology but to remain up to speed on all the areas we need to know about the historical and documentary editing and particularly the archivable fields. There are many changes that occur all the time. We attend meetings, both to meet with potential and current grantees but also to learn ourselves from the sessions so we can be knowledgeable assessors of the project proposals that come into us.

Ms. BIGGERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HORN. Let me proceed with a whole range of questions. I am sorry the recess sort of took us off kilter.

What information is put in the Presidential documentary editions for the founding fathers? Give me an idea. Is it mostly their letters primarily or newspaper articles that they made when they were selling the Federalist to the New York Packet so they could educate the people of New York?

Ms. NEWHALL. Again, I think it varies from one individual to another. The papers that people produce vary just like their personalities. The attempt is to publish what was produced by these individuals. It tends to be heavily on correspondence, if there is any sort of diary, some news accounts if that is the only source we have of a particular event, particularly if it has a speech, the words of the individual.

Mr. HORN. Have you got cartoons of the period?

Ms. NEWHALL. Yes, it can include that. Also, such things as someone like Washington or Jefferson who was very involved in his home. There can be very interesting material about the weather, about agricultural methods in those days. So there is quite a range.

Mr. HORN. Do we need the groundhog anymore after looking at those documents of the founding fathers?

Ms. NEWHALL. I think we always need the groundhog.

Mr. HORN. I hope so.

Let me get back to the printed editions because I wasn't quite clear. Was it 700, 800? I haven't had a chance to look at those books; I will after the hearing is over but what are the number of the volumes in the edition that goes out or is it available?

Ms. NEWHALL. I believe this varies according to the particular edition. I would like to come back to you with the correct answer.

Mr. HORN. That is fine and without objection, that will be in the record at this point in a letter.

The reason I asked is I happen to be a collector and I am looking at rare books from 1789 up and my back was turned, I was busy

as President of the University and I didn't realize one of my mentors, not directly although I did meet the man when I was 10 years of age, was the great Hiram Warren Johnson, the Senator from California and much to my surprise one day, I walk into the University library and there is the seven volumes of his correspondence to his children. He wrote them and it is just marvelous.

I immediately phoned the publisher. He only did an edition of 250 of those sets. I have an earlier Senator, John Quincy Adams and I have 1 of the 250 of those sets. That is the 1830's, 1840's and 1850's. Now is now and I just can't believe libraries aren't willing to put those sets in their collections, let alone the poor individuals that are similarly interested.

What do you do? It seems to me they all ought to have Jefferson's and Washington's papers, and this kind of thing in the good university library or the good city library. What is your thinking on that? Have they discussed this, how large an edition ought to be?

Ms. NEWHALL. Yes but my understanding is that this is the sort of estimation that is done on the part of the publishers who tend to be non-profit university presses and this their area of particular expertise, not mine, I have to say.

Mr. HORN. This was Garland that did the Senator's papers.

Ms. NEWHALL. We would be happy to put you on our mailing list for all of our future endeavors.

Mr. HORN. That is fine but what do we have, 3,000 colleges in this country. In our State, we have 107 community colleges, there are liberal arts colleges that are very small. They are great public State universities. Unless somebody is watching all this stuff, the faculty, often the specialists in American history, it is overwhelming unless you sort of put the heat to them to say I really need this and I want it on the reserved book room or something.

Ms. NEWHALL. I have been in this position for just about 20 months now and my primary concern besides learning the ropes in general, was to focus on the questions having to do with electronic records because I thought they were the most urgent.

We are intending in the coming year to really make a great focus on the documentary editions. One of my concerns I have been raising with the publishers is the question of not so much the numbers that were published, although I will now, but about what they do to market the books. It is my sense that they seem to put considerably less energy and effort into this for later volumes than for the first one or two of a series.

We have been making an effort to list as many of the editions as we can through Amazon.com. Also, I have been talking to the publishers about working harder for greater distribution in the rest of the world. Also, we have begun talks again with the Department of State.

Several years ago, for the USIA, whatever the name is now, they purchased several hundred of our editions, volumes of our editions to be distributed in libraries and universities in foreign countries. I think the time is ripe for another round of this and other areas.

As I stated in my written testimony, I feel very strongly that there is a great interest and need for the kinds of information that is available in the documentary editions in the rest of the world,

in certain areas in particular. This is an area of special interest to me that I will be pursuing in the coming year.

Mr. HORN. I don't know how many years ago it was but I remember the marvelous job you did in the archives on the Thomas Jefferson papers that looked like the papers. That is how good it was, so that students could feel it and see the great hand and all the rest of it. Have you done any others of those? I think you did the women's suffrage, didn't you, after that?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes, and then we are working on one for the congressional records at the current time.

Mr. HORN. I was very impressed by that. I suggested, this might have been before your time, that maybe every member sort of like a West Point cadet, we ought to be able to give them to some high school or tell you which were the main academic high schools because I would think that would turn a lot of students on about Jefferson, about American history. We frankly have done a lousy job on American history.

I think of those UCLA professors by the way, they must be absolute idiots in terms of what should be an American textbook. I don't know if you are familiar with that one?

Ms. NEWHALL. Yes, I am.

Mr. HORN. I hope someone finally looked at their background or something. It was nonsense. That would turn kids on. I go to about 100 classes a year in the high schools, the community colleges, and the university, so I am very sensitive to the materials we need to get people interested again in our heritage. I thought what you were doing there was magnificent.

Mr. CARLIN. It is amazing what technology can do in creating a facsimile copy. To the lay person, it is almost impossible to tell the difference between the facsimile copy and the original.

Mr. HORN. Can you scan in those now or how do you do that?

Mr. CARLIN. I would not pretend to try to tell you exactly how that is done but there is a machine and our fine folks in the legislative archives have made the best use of that machine in providing various services to Members of Congress of facsimile copies of key records.

Mr. HORN. That is great because I remember when I first came here in 1993. Don Anderson, who knows more about the Capitol than anybody since Fred Schingle, was here. He had the original journal of 1789 in the conference in New York. I guess it was on loan from the Archives and when Speaker Gingrich came in, he didn't want the responsibility for it, so it went back to the Archives. When you looked at those papers, they were absolutely like it was sort of bolded and minted and written on yesterday. That was so fascinating to see the ones that Don would say come in and look at this. That kind of thing I think would have the same impression.

Let me ask, has the Center for Jewish History in New York presented the Commission with a proposal for spending some of your money? What is the story on that?

Ms. NEWHALL. We had previously agreed with the Center that we would extend the deadline for submission of their proposal for the use of the remaining money appropriated to them to April 17. We considered that the departure of the individual who had been

functioning as their project director for our project, the installation of a new CEO for the Center, and also the uncertainty that was injected into the process by the complete and then partial rescission of the funds during the appropriations cycle last fall, all constituted legitimate causes for a delayed submission.

However, we have been in close touch with them and a member of the staff and I paid a site visit a couple of weeks ago. We are satisfied that they are operating well and on track with their proposal.

Mr. HORN. We heard Mr. Blunt's comment and others about the leverage the Commission does. I think there is a lot to that, the same with the humanities and the arts and their various operations. Do you find that over time you have invested the right resources in particular projects? There have been some cases where they wrote a good proposal but nothing much happened. How many do you have like that?

Ms. NEWHALL. Again, I haven't been with the Commission long enough to be able to draw upon years of knowledge of every year going back, but I think it is true that there is always going to be the disappointing project.

One of the hallmarks of the NHPRC is the amount of work we put in with potential applicants and the amount of work we expect them to input in preparation. I think this is the result of the evolving knowledge of the staff in the Commission responding to projects that were disappointments and building on the strengths of projects that were good ones. It is hard to mistake the fact that the more planning and thought that goes in, the more they prepare for a project, generally, it is going to be better and often better lasting.

One thing we try to do as a consequence of our lessons we have learned is whenever possible to extract a promise, for instance if a position is created for the length of the grant, to get the organization to commit to continuing to support that position with their own funds after the end of the project.

Right now, we are making a more concentrated effort to measure the performances of our projects certainly in compliance with the GPRA but also from my own experience, I had intended, coming into the Commission, to implement such measures. I had previously worked in a very large foundation and was very aware of the efforts they took to conduct such reviews.

It helps to recognize warning signals that projects are in trouble. We really want to look at those projects that are not just good but the huge successes and trying to figure out how much of that can be replicated in the future. We are new at this but we are really working to use this to result in much better and longer lasting projects.

Mr. HORN. Is some of that oral history? Some of the projects, are they oral history, not just documentary one century ago but people now?

Ms. NEWHALL. Right.

Mr. HORN. That don't leave written records but they speak them. I remember being fascinated by the Library of Congress operation in the 1930's, going in and capturing all of the I guess in California we would have called it hillbilly music but it was music that went

back several centuries in the mountains of West Virginia. Thank heavens we have those on records in the Library of Congress.

Do you feel there is a need for that in the Archives and if so, what are we doing on it? Do we leave that to the Library of Congress?

Mr. CARLIN. Aside from NHPRC for the moment, we put a lot of emphasis on oral histories related to Presidential libraries. They work this very significantly.

I might also add in terms of your previous question, because I just sent you a report, this percentage comes up to my memory bank. We set a goal in our strategic plan that NHPRC would be successful 85 percent of the time with projects that would accomplish their goals. This last year was 89 percent, the actual that came in. I remember seeing that as I went through our final report we shipped to you. I think we are basically on target to achieve what is realistic.

They are not all going to come through but I think this demonstrates an excellent oversight work on the part of the staff to monitor, follow through, and to assist projects to be successful almost 90 percent of the time.

Ms. NEWHALL. To answer your question about oral histories, the only projects we support to collect oral histories, to conduct oral history interviews at the present time is for Native Americans because this is not only a way of collecting history but in many ways, it is a way of preserving their language as well, and because their histories are often based on an oral tradition.

We do not currently support projects from other groups to collect oral history but we will pay for the cataloging of already completed oral history interviews. This is an area I would love to be able to have the ability to expand. I personally have a great deal of experience with oral history, particularly as a way of filling in gaps when there are gaps in the documentation. If you can especially find one or two or at least three in order to triangulate, three individuals involved in the same incident, event, or time period, I think it is a wonderful way of filling these gaps.

It is not as good as documentary history because the memory is faulty but you get such flavor from it that the paper can't convey. At present, we don't really have the means to support other than Native American oral history projects.

Mr. HORN. I am delighted to hear that. When I was vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I met with all the Indian chiefs of New Mexico. Let me tell you, that was a moving experience. A chief in his 80's came in full regalia and we discussed a number of different legislative proposals. He was up on all of them and he brought feelings of two centuries of work to the table. To have that on film or on an oral audio tape would be really great for years to come.

I would hope we could work out something so that we can get things like that done by either you or the Library of Congress. I don't know how to work it out, do we flip a coin or what, but that needs to be done. We have about 300 tribes in this country. Not all are on the reservation, just a few dozen, but that should be done before too many moons, shall we say.

Ms. NEWHALL. We have had a Native American initiative that began several years ago and have made a real effort to work with Native American recordkeepers with varying degrees of success I will say, but it is a huge effort. I think it is probably most successful with the oral histories because of the oral traditions but now with more contemporary times and younger members, we have a number of Native American archivists who are fully trained.

Mr. HORN. On your training of archivists, I think we all would agree on a liberal education and the more you know about history, anthropology, sociology, and all the rest, the behavioral sciences, if you will. What else do you feel archivists should learn and are we funding some of this at the State level or do you have in the archives regional sharing of information where you invite all archivists, one way or the other, either city archives which are very interesting in some places, and the State archives?

Ms. NEWHALL. I am not sure I understand your question.

Mr. HORN. I am just wondering how you are handling the development of the next generation of archivists.

Mr. CARLIN. Let me comment, first of all, from the agency point of view. We are very much involved with the profession in looking at the future as to what the educational requirements should be, what is a professional archivist, how it has changed dramatically. Historically speaking, you go back and NARA trained their own people because there were not archivists produced by the system. Now archivists are being produced. With the change in technology taking place, it is important that those of us responsible at the end of really delivering work to the educational community to make sure the standards, directions, and curricula are appropriate.

Ann will make some comments in terms of specifically how the NHPRC has funded some grants but I would add, as you are well aware, we are all across the country and we try, as an agency, through our regional system to work with colleagues across the board, State and local in whatever way when we offer training, for example, and it is not exclusively for Federal. We are very interested in being supportive and in sharing what we have learned and developed. Ann has some specifics.

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. I just wondered if I might say also that there are graduate programs for archivable science that the new generation of archivists are coming out of masters programs in the universities across the country. There are not nearly enough of these programs and they are also facing a critical shortage of faculty. There are many faculty positions open but there are not many qualified faculty. Education of the next generation of archivists is a critical issue that NHPRC is working on and the universities are working on as well.

Mr. HORN. How many library programs at the graduate level exist in campuses across the country and do you work with them?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. Yes. The program I am in, there are probably about 10 library and information science schools with major programs and probably another 3 or 4 history schools with major programs. Of those, there are maybe five substantial programs in the country. Those all now have doctoral granting programs.

Mr. HORN. Besides UCLA, what are they? I know you have a very good program there.

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. There is a program at Michigan, one at Pittsburgh, one at Maryland, one at Texas. Those are probably now the major programs in the country.

Mr. HORN. And they have the ability to use modern methods?

Ms. GILLILAND-SWETLAND. Yes. They are all short of faculty, particularly faculty with the technology expertise.

Ms. NEWHALL. If I might add, one of the concerns we have is that professionally, graduate-trained archivists alone are not the only people who handle historical records. As a consequence this is part of the focus of the National Forum on Archival Continuing Education which the Commission is funding to be held at the end of this month.

It is targeting three groups of people, continuing archival education for three groups—one, the professionally graduate-trained archivists but another what we call the allied professionals, the public librarians, the museum curators, the city clerks who, as part of their professional responsibilities, have responsibility for historical documents, but they don't have the same kind of graduate archival background.

In fact, a third group are what we call the grassroots level. This can be volunteers in historical societies, what we might call nonprofessionals working within government offices or even historical societies.

So we are looking in this forum this month at the three groups and what kinds of needs they have, where do they overlap, and where are they different.

Mr. HORN. That is very worthwhile, I think. You think of all those courthouses, about 3,600 counties or so in this country and all the marvelous records that are there in terms of deeds, cases in the court, and this kind of thing. I am going through about 30 years of one newspaper in a very small county and you see all sorts of things that are happening there. It is amazing.

The question is, when the new group says, who wants those old dusty records, throw them out. As I remember in one Illinois town place or county place, they found a few that Abraham Lincoln signed the particular documents there as a young lawyer, whatever it was.

So I would commend you for that because I don't know the degree to which we know nationally where county papers are, were they dumped, are they in the State archives? Everybody has a problem with space, I know that, but we need to be helpful in some way.

Ms. NEWHALL. If I could address that question briefly, what I left out of my verbal remarks because of lack of time was the program we have with the States which is designed to work with State board, State historical records advisory boards and we fund projects whereby they can assess exactly that. They do surveys of what historical records there are within a State, what kind of condition they are in, how many are in imminent peril, and then we fund thedevelopment of a statewide strategic plan for preserving and increasing access to these records.

Then finally, through a series of what we call "regrants," which are projects where HPRC money is matched by State money and then subgranted by the state board to sometimes dozens or hundreds of small projects within the State to go in and work with those records. This is a program exactly designed to address that worry. Where are the records and what can we do to save them.

Mr. HORN. I think with the geology craze, that might have a few sales in terms of what kinds of records are hither and yon.

Let me yield for such time as she wants to consume to the vice chair, Ms. Biggert.

Ms. BIGGERT. Thank you.

I don't think I have anymore questions but I must say when the chairman goes to a field hearing, he heads directly to the antique book stores first to check out what is there.

Mr. HORN. That is true.

Ms. BIGGERT. He is truly a scholar.

Mr. HORN. I only have 3,500 counties to go.

Ms. BIGGERT. I yield back.

Mr. HORN. When my son was 10 and we drove across America, he said, Dad's idea of fun is to go to the county courthouses along the way and he has become a political scientist, so it wasn't all lost on him.

Let me ask a few tough ones and a few easy, soft balls which I have a tendency to give to this group.

I am told that a substantial portion of the Commission's appropriation went to a single organization. I was curious, what is the group and why was that the case? Is it better to just spread it out? I know with small budgets—I have been with agencies with small budgets.

Ms. NEWHALL. Of its appropriated funds?

Mr. HORN. Yes. I understand that a substantial portion of the Commission's appropriation went to a single organization. Is that true?

Mr. CARLIN. It would have to be the Jewish History directed grant. That is the only one that comes to my mind. The grant which Anne Gilliland-Swetland made reference to with the InterPARES project was one of the largest but it was in the $450,000 category which is very, very large for us but I would have to assume you are making reference to the directed?

Mr. HORN. I don't know. The question came up and I don't know who was for it or with it or whatnot.

Mr. CARLIN. Almost without exception, the grants we give are small.

Mr. HORN. Do you have any variable formula that in some cases you say, we will give it to you but you are going to have to produce 75 percent or 50 percent?

Mr. CARLIN. The staff is always working on some kind of a matching possibility because we don't have the funds to give to everybody whatever number they come in with, to push them back down to prioritize, to make the most of the investment we are committed to.

Mr. HORN. Let me get to the loss of records and any criminality that is involved. To what extent do you believe the archives have

had people that can pilfer various manuscripts out of the archives? Have you ever had that problem?

Mr. CARLIN. Unfortunately, the answer is yes. It is not frequent, not routine. We certainly take our responsibility very seriously to protect the records and researchers are checked in and out. No one leaves with a briefcase without the briefcase being checked to make sure there are no records.

Mr. HORN. But if they have it inside their shirt or something?

Mr. CARLIN. That is correct, we do not do strip searches on exiting during research at our facilities. It has always been a balancing issue. It is the same with security in general. We pride ourselves on access and we want the image of access. How much security do you provide both for the physical as well as the records themselves.

Unfortunately, it happens. When it does happen, we take that very seriously. We pursue any lost records aggressively. There have been examples where we have found records that were lost to the custody of the Federal Government, changed hands several times. In some cases, where the records are being preserved and are made accessible rather than go through what might be a very expensive and time-consuming legal process, we arrive at an arrangement where they can be left in some exceptional cases. For the most part, we aggressively pursue Federal records. We take our role very seriously and yes, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, it does happen.

Mr. HORN. When you have some great manuscripts like the Louisiana Purchase and all that, obviously if that came up on auction, you know where it came from. Say the papers, for want of something, George Washington, is there any way in modern technology either by some sort of chemical in a corner or some sort of alarm that would set it off by having something they could do to the actual records—I realize that is heresy but I would rather see them there and not stolen. I am just wondering has anyone thought through what you can do to have sensors at the door which would set off the alarms?

Mr. CARLIN. That has been discussed. In fact, strictly by coincidence I had an e-mail today—I don't know why I go back to e-mail given our earlier discussion—from my Inspector General on the subject. He has raised the issue himself as to whether this would be something viable to check into.

One thing I can assure you is that the most obvious intrinsically valuable records are not accessible to researchers on a routine basis. When you make reference to say the Monroe Doctrine, for example, those are records we keep in vaults with very limited access.

There are valuable records and the degree varies but we wouldn't keep the record if it didn't have a value that can and does occasionally leave our custody.

Mr. HORN. Your reading room, and I don't know how many you have, when I was doing the work on the Cabinet in Congress back in the late 1960's, there were maybe three of us using it. Now every seat is taken I am told. The question is, when people are using these documents, can your people monitor that in case someone is slipping it out or is there videotape that can just run all day or something like that which might catch someone doing it.

Mr. CARLIN. We try, to the best of our ability, staff, to the extent that we can monitor researchers. Interestingly enough, one of the issues that came up on the renovation project with our main building downtown was the potential location of a research room where we had the pillars. We ended up with my full support staying in the historic research room where there are no problems in terms of sight from observers to researchers.

That issue came up and we discussed the possible alternatives. One of the major objections to the alternative was someone could operate behind a pillar or if one was going to avoid that issue, it would be much more expensive. We would have to have many more monitors and maybe go electronically to monitoring the rooms, although that has been considered, as well.

Mr. HORN. Let me move to a more positive one. Before we finish that, have we had anyone indicted for stealing archives at all?

Mr. CARLIN. First of all, the answer to your question is we are not aware of anyone that has been indicted. In most cases, we retrieve and unfortunately, the retrieval is usually from an innocent party and tracing back to the person who actually took the document is sometimes impossible because it has passed through so many hands.

My staff has reminded me as well that we now operate what we call clean research rooms. When someone checks in to do research, we have lockers and they do not take briefcases, suitcases, or whatever into the research room. They leave their attache case or whatever in a locker and go into the research room. In addition to that, as they leave, whatever they are leaving with, we check.

Mr. HORN. It used to be in the university library profession that when your rare books room was attacked, they would never say anything about it. Then they changed where, by George, they tell everybody.

I know some of the things that were stolen out of the Long Beach Library, stolen out of the Harvard Library, stolen out of the Yale Library, it turned out to be the same guy. With us, they either dropped them out the window or whatever to some accomplice on a long rope as it got dark and nobody was looking. I remember, I would look for that thing for years in book catalogs. It was Captain Cook's journals or something this guy walked off with, which was a rather precious series. They caught him but that is because they changed their attitude and admitted they had a problem to see if people could help them.

I know people have found some of these people and they have 10,000 books or something in their bedroom in the middle of Ohio and they are working both coasts and this kind of thing. So I just wondered if we have anybody we can nail on that?

Mr. CARLIN. I am not aware that we have had quite the extent of the problem that libraries have had but we are aware it does happen from time to time. The one thing I can assure you is we take that as a very serious problem. When the individual cases do come up, we aggressively pursue resolving it in an appropriate way.

Mr. HORN. Let me get to a more positive thing. We passed a bill through here and it is over in the Senate on improving the Presidential transitions and providing the money for it through Mr.

Kolbe's Appropriations Subcommittee. So whoever is the President as a result of the November elections, they would have funding to educate and get people of knowledge to work with the Cabinet, a couple of dozen, then the Deputy Secretaries, other key people. There is roughly, as you know, 3,000 Presidential appointments. You can get that down to 300 pretty fast when you leave it with agency heads and some of their key people, assistant secretaries and all that.

I guess I would ask you are there things that Archives could help in terms of educating some of these people because every President is going to want his Presidential library going and if they are smart, they will start on day one and have an archivist in the White House that knows what they are doing and knows the records can be kept, although if we keep subpoenaing everything around there, maybe they will all burn them to start with. That is the risk we all take.

Do you have any thoughts on how to educate the 30 top people that work around the President and the various agencies and what might you tell them?

Mr. CARLIN. I can assure you that we are aware of your proposal and the success you have had getting it through the House. My staff has been involved in answering questions and commenting and participating because quite frankly we are very interested in the transition. We are very, very aware of the importance of records management being a part of day one transition, so the answer to your question is yes, we have and we will welcome any opportunity to further our involvement in any transitional project.

I would say with all due respect to everyone who has held the Office of President of the United States, we are still waiting for the first President to be there day one. I can assure you it is one of my goals and objectives. I would quickly add for the record that the criticism probably first and foremost comes back on us as an agency in not being aggressive enough. We are going to change that and if it doesn't work the next time, it won't be because we are not making the effort.

It is particularly true and important in the age of electronic records. Your point and your interest has always been there and valuable for any transition. In the era of electronic records, it is essential that we be there and work with to set up the systems in a correct fashion so that we can avoid the millions of dollars that have had to be appropriated to go to backup tapes to try to recreate records that should have been dealt with appropriately in the first place.

Again, that is not a criticism. We dealt with this in the Reagan administration, the Bush administration, and now the Clinton administration. It is an internal problem that needs to be dealt with and you have made a significant contribution. We welcome any way to partner to make that the success you want it to be.

Mr. HORN. If you could give us a good case on that fairly succinctly because Presidents-elect aren't going to have much time. I would like to get a series of options that they could pick from. Obviously it is up to the President ultimately and some of his close advisers as to who they want to listen to and who they don't. I personally think they ought to be listening to the Archives. That is

why I bring up the question that between the Archives and my other favorite entities are the Inspector Generals, the General Accounting Office, the Budget Examiners over in BOB.

I have told people when they have been nominated by Presidents in both parties what you ought to learn before you go to the Senate because they will get big briefing books from the agency they are going to run but often they don't tell them very much. They protect and pretend the bureaucracy isn't there.

If you start asking the IG and the people in the General Accounting Office and the Budget Examiners, they will tell you the truth often of what you are going to get into. Somebody might just throw a question at you about that. So we would love to have the Archives in on that too.

Mr. CARLIN. We would be very happy to participate and make sure through staff that we respond in an appropriate, succinct way to fit the message.

I would quickly add we intend to be very aggressive. We started during the last few years, trying to make up for lost time. I tried to reach at the Cabinet level and push down, so there is support at the top for records management. It is too late for the transition but there are still records being created and mistakes being made that are going to be costly. So we have had some success, we are making progress but partnering with you will certainly give us a greater opportunity to be successful in the next administration.

Mr. HORN. On the Commission, what is the situation in terms of your resources, do you feel, if we were able to up the authorization, that kind of thing? Don't be shy.

Mr. CARLIN. She is in a little bit of shock because she has not heard upping the authorization language in her tenure. Quite seriously and I will let Ann comment as well, the whole resource issue is one we are looking at in a variety of ways. As Ann indicated earlier, she and a lot of folks, as well as outside interests, are taking a look at where the program is today and its needs, as well as the future.

As you are well aware right now, we have an authorization of $10 million and an appropriation of $6 million, so we have some room to grow within the existing authorized figure. I would tell you that you should expect in coming years that number of $6 million to go in terms of requests to get closer to that $10 million in the relative near future given all the challenges we face in electronic records as well as other documentary needs.

Mr. HORN. Do you have an actual cost on the electronic records situation? Is it $2 million, $4 million increase, or what?

Mr. CARLIN. In terms of NHPRC?

Mr. HORN. Yes.

Mr. CARLIN. No, we do not have a number at this time.

Mr. HORN. Is there any way we can get a number or is it just impossible?

Mr. CARLIN. No, it is not impossible to get a number but we are not far enough along in terms of the study that is taking place to give you a number at this time. Obviously consistent with the history and the way NHPRC operates, it will be relatively speaking to the total need, a modest figure leveraging other resources publicly and privately at all levels. Certainly the NHPRC is not going

to come forward with a number to solve the problems. It is very helpful to have NHPRC with the resources to partner, to leverage, to be used as they have so successfully on many, many electronic records problems and issues and projects that have produced very valuable information and uses for all levels of government outside the Federal Government.

Mr. HORN. I don't want to keep you any longer. Are there any questions we should have brought up that we were too dumb to see and if so, what are they?

Mr. CARLIN. I would not suggest, certainly for the record, that there would be any possibility that you have missed anything.

Mr. HORN. Remember you are under oath.

Mr. CARLIN. I understand. [Laughter.]

I would tell you, on behalf of the entire Commission, and all the endless beneficiaries of NHPRC, we very much appreciate this committee's interest and particularly your strong leadership in providing support, in challenging us, in raising tough questions because you have an appropriate role and it is a role we want to work with. Bottom line, we want to deliver and you are of great assistance to that bottom line delivery.

Mr. HORN. You are a very able political figure and you sort of follow my friend and one of my late part-time mentors when I was on the Hill, Senator Dirksen in his back office would say, "We can win more with honey than we can with vinegar." A lot of people around here still need to learn that but that was the way Dirksen was a great leader and got things done. He would leave his office at 9 p.m., he is in the back seat, flips on the light and he is reading bills. He knew more than the author of the bill at the time it came up in the Senate.

Those who know something thanks to Archives and libraries get things done.

Thank you for coming and we appreciate it. You are doing good work and keep doing it.

Mr. CARLIN. Thank you.

Mr. HORN. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[The prepared statement of Hon. Jim Turner follows:]

Statement of the Honorable Jim Turner
GMIT Hearing on Reauthorization of the National Publications and Records Commission
4/4/00

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is the grant-making affiliate of the National Archives, and is charged with the very important role of preserving non-federal records. Each year grants are made to state and local universities, libraries, historical societies, and other nonprofit institutions for the purpose of identifying and preserving important historical documents for generations to come. The Congress created the NHPRC in the 1930s, because it recognized that American history also takes place outside of the Beltway.

We are here today to discuss the NHPRC's efforts to preserve the nation's history and the future challenges that the Commission will face. I want to welcome my colleague Congressman Blunt, as well as Governor John Carlin who in addition to the outstanding job he does as an Archivist of the United States, also does great work as chair of the NHPRC.

Proper and accurate historical documentation is essential to our democracy. The NHPRC has an important job, and I was pleased to cosponsor legislation that would reauthorize appropriations for the Commission through ~~2006~~ 2005. The papers, manuscripts, and other artifacts preserved by grants from the NHPRC define who we are as a people and as a nation. I commend the Chairman for his focus on this issue and look forward to the witnesses' testimony.

○