the head of a pin? Because the answer is subject to no objective parameters, there can be no objective answer. Samuel and others suggest that "adequacy of documentation" (that is, enough information) is not only knowable and definable, but reachable by following documentation strategy; a definition by consensus is presumed to arise out of the documentation group. On the contrary, each constituency represented in that group has a different set of priorities; the sum total of all their definitions of adequacy is guaranteed to be more than the resources available at the repository. We would argue, rather, that adequacy of documentation, like the existence, size, and the top-level preferences of angels, falls in the realm of faith and spirit, not in the realm of logic or even consensus. Worse, as musing on pinheads diverted theologians from grappling with matters of faith more relevant to the daily lives of their parishioners, the shallowness of adequacy of documentation diverts energy and attention from acquiring better documentation and making better use of repository resources.

As pragmatists, our goal is to improve documentation of twentieth-century business within the constraints of an overwhelming records universe, unrealistically grand repository goals and all too realistically limited resources, and an imperfect but educated understanding of the needs of varied users. To do this we have suggested analyzing extent documentation, considering the documentary universe as a whole before appraising its parts, establishing criteria (not universal, but variable, based on the goals and resources of any given repository) for prioritizing solicitation and accessions, and defining (when necessary) graduated levels of records appraisal to reflect the fact that some individual companies will have to be more thoroughly documented than others. As Edmund Burke said about economy, the true goal of archives "consists not in saving but selection". We have tried to produce a pragmatic method of selection to better document the economy. This may seem a modest goal on paper, but in practice it seems ambitious enough.
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