

HISTORIANS AND ARCHIVISTS, CONFERENCES AND BOOKS

James E. O'Neill and Robert W. Krauskopf (eds.), *World War II: An Account of its Documents*. Howard University Press, for the National Archives Trust Fund Board, Washington D.C. (National Archives Conferences, Volume 8), 1976. xix + 269 pp., 18 illustrations.

A review article by P. G. EDWARDS

This is Volume 8 of the National Archives Conference series produced by the National Archives and Records service (N.A.R.S.) of the United States. Most of the companion volumes have been reviewed in recent issues of this journal: in the last issue, the Editor suggested that these volumes, and the conferences on which they are based, might be worth emulating in Australia.¹ Since one of the main purposes of the conferences, as stated in the Introduction to this volume, is 'to effect a dialogue between archivists and historians', perhaps a historian may be permitted here, not just to review this book, but to use it to suggest how such a conference, and a subsequent book, might be arranged.

At first sight, the basic idea seems a good one. The N.A.R.S. arranges a conference on a subject of considerable interest to historians, in this case World War II. Papers are solicited from archivists and historians: distinguished overseas participants are invited as well as a strong home team. All the papers, plus a summary of the discussion at each session, are published as a hard-cover book. The N.A.R.S. is, as this reviewer gratefully acknowledges, an efficient, helpful and imaginative organization, responsible not only for the National Archives in Washington D.C., but the various presidential libraries as well, of which those of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower have a particular relevance to this volume. One's expectations are therefore high: the reader looks forward to a good discussion of the present state of the literature, intelligent comments on current problems, and informed suggestions of future fields of research that are likely to prove profitable, with historians pointing to questions worth asking and archivists referring to documentation that might provide interesting answers.

Perhaps these expectations were too high, but this reviewer found that the book only partially lived up to them. It is precisely because the idea is a worthy one, and because the book provides some classic examples of the strengths and weaknesses inherent in productions of this sort, that it is worthwhile looking at it at some length.

There are two basic points to be made at the outset. Firstly, the conference took place in 1971; the book was published in 1976. Quite simply some things worth publishing in late 1971 or 1972 are no longer worth publishing four or five years later. As we shall see, some of the papers have been published elsewhere in the meantime and to reprint them here is of questionable justification; others have been outdated or superseded by other publications that have appeared in

the interim; while yet others, such as discussions of access policy, have been rendered obsolete by subsequent government decisions. There is no explanation given in the book for the long delay. Anyone who has been involved with quasi-academic publication programmes within the confines of government will have every sympathy for the editors and others associated with this volume, but five years is too long a gap.

The second point is that what makes a good conference does not necessarily make a good book. This was undoubtedly an interesting conference. Anyone attending, from a young graduate student to a senior and well-published scholar, would have found much that was stimulating and informative. For a conference, that is sufficient, but in these days, when publishers are being distinctly more selective, a book requires more. It should at least attempt to cover its field in a moderately coherent and comprehensive way and display some sense of how it is seeking to expand scholarly knowledge. What this calls for, of course, is strong and skilled editing. American academic publishing has in the past been notorious for books which were in fact collections of articles or conference papers 'edited' by young academics seeking desperately to secure their tenure. All too often, they are the least well qualified for such ventures. What is needed is an established scholar, with the skill and authority to be able to exclude papers that were given at the conference and include others that were not, to direct some contributors to expand their papers and others to shorten theirs, in order to create a book which has some sort of unity and coherence. Drs O'Neill and Krauskopf would appear to have the necessary standing, for they are respectively the deputy archivist of the United States and the chief of the Navy and Old Army branch of the National Archives, but one must note with regret that they have chosen to include precisely what was said at the conference, without even rearranging the order of the sessions.

The book therefore begins, as did the conference, with a paper by Louis Morton, a highly distinguished American historian, surveying the historical debate over United States-Japanese relations before Pearl Harbor. It is — or was in 1971 — a useful piece and students would find the footnotes a mine of information; but it lacks any particular 'bite' or suggestions for further research. An expanded, and much more useful, version of this paper was published in 1972 in another volume:² it therefore seems unnecessary to publish this paper here.

On similar grounds the editors could well have excluded two further papers that doubtless enlivened the conference. They are not discussions of documents and interpretations but straightforward historical articles by Selig Adler and Russell H. Fifield on U.S. wartime policy towards, respectively, Palestine and Indo-China. Both are fascinating and eminently publishable: but the first appeared in the journal *Judaism* in 1972 and the substance of the other in Fifield's book *Americans in South-East Asia* in 1973.³ That is where they belong and where likely readers would expect to find them: there is little reason to reprint them in a volume ostensibly dedicated to problems of documentation.

The session on accessibility of sources now looks outdated for different reasons. It was, the book states, 'conceived of as a dialogue among an agency official, a non-government historian, and an archivist on the problems of making sensitive records or papers available for historical research' (p.125). The relevant issues are raised, but hardly as a dialogue. The chief historian in the Office of the Secretary of Defense points briefly to the sheer volume of Defense Department records to explain the delays in their release to historians. James E. O'Neill then gives an intelligent and witty survey of the archivist's problems under the regulations that applied in 1971, which was published in the National Archives journal *Prologue* in Spring 1972⁴ — and rendered obsolete by an Executive Order later that year, by which President Nixon established a revised system of security classification and declassification. In 1973 O'Neill published a further article on the new system:⁵ again one must ask why it was thought necessary to publish this once valuable, but now outdated, paper. He turns a nice phrase or two: readers of this journal may enjoy his description of the archivist as the man in the middle caught between government officials on the one side and historians on the other.

. . . [T]he archivist is no longer seen as a bold scout moving before the historical army to reconnoiter the way. No longer is he like Hawkeye or a Stephen Crane hero. He is more like the antihero of a John le Carre or a Len Deighton novel: the double agent whose loyalty is questioned by both sides. (p.132)

After this, it is apt that the paper on 'The Historian's Viewpoint' by Lloyd C. Gardner is aimed, not at the long-suffering archivist, but at the officials, especially those of the State Department: but again, many of the specific complaints have been outdated by the system introduced four years before this book was published. That is not to say that historians have no complaints about the current system: it is simply that this book does not assess the present situation.

Problems of comprehensiveness and co-ordination are raised by some of the other papers. The volume concentrates naturally on American sources, but there were also French, Soviet and British contributions. M. Henri Michel's paper on the archives of the French Resistance is an excellent example of what such contributors can add: by discussing the problems and techniques of historians of the Resistance, he not only raises questions of interest to both historians and archivists (indeed, one point is how historians are perforce transformed into archivists), but reminds the audience that they are looking at a world war, fought by other countries as well as the U.S. and by peoples as well as armies.

General Pavel Zhilin's paper, by contrast, is principally of value only as an example of the sterility of traditional Soviet scholarship, in which the answers are pre-ordained and the historian's job is merely to provide the evidence. Not all historiography from eastern Europe can be lightly disregarded, but Zhilin's boasts of the quantities of material published in the Soviet Union sound hollow and largely meaningless. The only redeeming note is his reference to many volumes by western historians being translated, published and critically discussed

in the Soviet Union: perhaps one day *détente* will lead to worthwhile exchanges of evidence and interpretations.

The British participant, Noble Frankland was invited to contribute, not to the same session as Michel and Zhilin, but to the final session, concerned with the writing of official war histories. Before him, Stetson Conn, of the U.S. Army's historical division, quickly surveys the writing of that body's massive and impressive series, in which he takes justifiable pride. Frankland, however, chooses not to give a complementary account of the British series, to which he was an important contributor, but to head off on a quite different tack, discussing the relationship between the archivist and the historian, having himself been both. It is an excellent little piece, drawing on a wide range of experience, but it hardly belongs here: it would more appropriately have come at the beginning of the book, as what the Americans call a 'keynote' address. As a conclusion, it leaves the whole exercise hanging in the air. For a conference that is no great problem, but for a book it is less satisfactory.

This evident lack of co-ordination leaves Michel's and Conn's papers as the sole worthwhile contributions in their respective fields. Granted that it is difficult to ensure that contributors will even give a paper on time, let alone on the subject for which they were commissioned, it is nonetheless remiss of the editors not to have attempted to fill the lacunae in the book, by requesting subsequent papers on complementary subjects.

Excision of some of these papers on the grounds of obsolescence or irrelevance would have left more room for expansion of the more productive sessions. Two papers in the middle of this volume should probably have come near the beginning, dealing as they do with the bread-and-butter topic of archival sources for the history of World War II. Krauskopf's own paper is on the material in the National Archives in Washington and its branch repository in Suitland, Maryland, while Benedict K. Zobrist presents a parallel paper, enlivened by relevant and humorous quotations, on sources in the presidential libraries. Taken together, these form a useful general guide, throwing out many suggestions for worthwhile and feasible research projects and providing an excellent starting-point for anyone approaching this field of study for the first time. There is, of course, a great deal of specific information about the contents of the archives that is not here, but that is a matter for the finding aids (listed in a separate bibliography) which one hopes are constantly revised.

A moderately successful section includes two papers on the problems of writing military biography. The first, by Barbara W. Tuchman on writing *Stilwell and the American Experience, 1911-1945*,⁶ does have some interesting comments, most beneficial perhaps to intending Ph.D. students (although one must wonder what they derived from a writer who boasts [pp.81-82] that, instead of putting everything in and making 'one of those 900-page jobs', she 'discarded or radically pruned' all she could, leaving a mere 551 pages.) This, too, has evidently been published elsewhere, but because it is directly related to the theme of the volume, its inclusion can be justified. The other contributor to this session was D. Clayton James, then engaged on Volume II (covering 1941-45) of his biography of Douglas

MacArthur.⁷ It was no doubt of considerable interest in 1971, but now appears largely superseded by the bibliography to that volume, which was published in 1975. This, incidentally, is the only point at which Australia is mentioned: James hands out bouquets to the official war histories but brickbats to the Australian War Memorial.

For a conference, two such papers were no doubt sufficient, but for a book a more comprehensive approach would have been justified. The editors might well have sought complementary papers from biographers who had worked on, say, Marshall, Eisenhower, Patton, Nimitz and King: then one would have had a broad guide to a major field of study and a feeling for the ways in which different historians approach the biographies of widely differing generals and admirals. Alternatively and perhaps preferably, the editors might have asked one biographer to address the general problems of military biography, not confined to his or her own work, to be followed by an archivist, pointing to categories of material, especially previously unexploited sources, that might be of use for later biographies.

The two most successful sessions of the conference follow this latter pattern. On science and technology in World War II, the historian's paper is perhaps too much a standard historical article, arguing a case, rather than a provocative survey of the literature: but the twin paper, by Meyer H. Fishbein on archival records on research and development, is a splendid example of its kind. It is a guided tour of the major agencies in the field and the state of their records which, as Fishbein justly claims, 'will prove suggestive for many studies' (p.179).

The other session of this type, concerned with non-military records, is an even better exemplar. A labor historian, Albert A. Blum, dispenses a number of stimulating ideas on persons and agencies worth studying, hypotheses worth testing and received views worth overturning. He is followed by an archivist specializing in this area, Joseph Howerton, who surveys the material available on each of the more important relevant agencies. There is a potential book or thesis in almost every paragraph.

One is left, then, grateful for much that is in the book, but with the feeling that it could have been considerably better. The essential point that emerges is that a conference should be seen, not as the conclusion of the exercise, but as one preparatory stage on the way to a good book. Is it too much to hope that a group of historians and archivists in Australia will take a hard look at this book and its companion volumes with the aim, not just of blind imitation, the Australian vice, but of doing better?

This would mean, firstly, selecting a suitable broad topic. Given the disparity between American and Australian scales of operation, something rather wider than these volumes would be advisable, perhaps 'Australians at War', or even one on 'Australia in the Nineteenth Century' and a successor on more recent times. A further possibility is some association with the 1988 Bicentennial History Project, currently being canvassed within the historical profession, whereby it is proposed to trace Australia's history by a series of volumes that would take as their starting-point an examination of Australian life in 1788, 1838, 1888, 1938 and 1988. If this original and stimulating concept is to

bear fruit, it will require more than usual collaboration between historians and archivists.

Whatever the topic chosen, the organisers would then have to choose historians and archivists to talk on selected aspects, discussing the current literature and potentially useful future research. Each pair (one historian and one archivist) would be given fairly specific directions and would be expected to co-operate in the preparation of their respective papers. After the contributions had been aired at a conference, the results would have to be edited ruthlessly, excising the irrelevant, no matter how distinguished the writer or how good the paper in its own way, and expanding the relevant into a cohesive and comprehensive volume of lasting value. One need not exaggerate the amount of effort necessary and quail at the prospect, but probably in these troubled times no single organisation would feel it had the resources. It would have to be a collaborative venture, drawing on archives and history departments across the country and perhaps requiring funds from outside sources. Certainly it would not be easy. The question now is, would it be worthwhile to make the effort?

This may all sound like utopian counsels of perfection, based upon an unduly harsh review of a modestly successful book: but these comments are offered solely in the hope that Australians might go beyond imitation and actually improve upon our overseas mentors.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For reviews, see *Archives and Manuscripts*, Vol. 6 No. 1 (November 1974), pp.26-27; Vol. 6 No. 3 (May 1975), pp.96-97; Vol. 6 No. 4 (August 1975), pp. 131-34; Vol. 6 No. 7 (August 1976), pp. 303-06; and Vol. 6 No. 8 (February 1977), pp.366-70. For the editorial, see *ibid.*, Vol. 6 No. 8 (February 1977), pp.323-24.
2. Ernest R. May and James C. Thomson (eds.), *American-East Asian Relations: A Survey* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).
3. Selig Adler, 'American Policy vis-a-vis Palestine in the Second World War', *Judaism*, Vol. 21 No. 3 (Summer 1972), pp.265-76; Russell H. Fifield, *Americans in Southeast Asia: The Roots of Commitment* (New York, 1973).
4. James E. O'Neill, 'The Accessibility of Sources for the History of the Second World War: The Archivist's Viewpoint', *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives*, Vol. 4 No. 1 (Spring 1972), pp.21-25.
5. James E. O'Neill, 'The Security Classification of Records in the United States', *Indian Archives*, Vol. 22 (January-December 1973), pp.35-45.
6. New York, 1971.
7. *The Years of MacArthur*, Vol. II, 1941-1945 (Boston, 1975).

A BRIEF GLANCE AT THE PERSONAL PAPERS QUESTION

Robert Clark (ed.), *Archive-Library Relations* (R. R. Bowker Company, New York and London, 1976). £stg.11.75.

A review in part, by MICHAEL PIGGOTT

I first saw Clark's *Archive-Library Relations* shortly after Chris Hurley had circulated his reply to Graeme Powell's article on the arrangement of personal papers,¹ and scanned it to see if any of the contributors mentioned *registraturprinzip* or took sides, as it were, in this debate — or discussed personal papers at all. They are discussed

in fact, but the treatment is far from satisfactory. As I understand from the editor of *Archives and Manuscripts* that in time this book will be reviewed in full, what follows will be confined to an explanation for this contention.

Personal papers are discussed principally in Section Two, 'Similarities and Differences', by Frank G. Burke.² Burke begins with an implicit assumption that to canvass distinctions between archives and personal papers (used synonymously with 'manuscripts') one is thereby making significant distinctions between archives and libraries. It is apparently unnecessary to admit that numerous archives include personal papers in their holdings and that equally common are library manuscript collections containing archives.

The discussion of libraries and archives in this section is divided into (1) Materials and methodology; and (2) Education. Under 'Materials' Burke sees four basic differences between personal papers and archives. They are: Purpose of creation; Ownership; Legal provision for access; and Legal standing. Later a fifth factor is introduced in a comparison of the ways manuscript curators and archivists deal with non-textual material. None of the very brief explanation of these differences is beyond criticism. For example under the first difference, purpose of creation, Burke lists four sets of circumstances in which personal papers are retained (although he says 'created'), and then writes, 'Records on the other hand are created and retained for corporate purposes' (p.32). One could equally have argued that personal papers and archives are similar from that viewpoint. In both cases the creator retains 'papers' for subsequent reference and the successors (e.g. descendants) or designated retainers (e.g. libraries or archives) maintain them for continued reference and, in some cases, the public as well. Or take the access difference. One could argue that personal papers and archives are similar because in both cases their creators and sometimes their successors decide the conditions covering their use. Exceptions such as the unilateral imposition of access conditions can apply to both, for example in the case of bought collections, inherited records and captured records.

I do not of course entirely hold with either above counter argument. The point to make is simply that in any discussion of similarities and differences one should be aiming at identifying the real distinctiveness of personal papers and archives, and then offer a thorough-going argument in support. Chalk and cheese after all both begin with 'ch'.

Burke devotes a single sentence to his fourth difference, Legal standing. Here 'continuous possession' turns out to be a dividing factor between 'personal papers or records alienated from their originator' and those which are not. It is a pity that this point is not developed. One might then have been led via the inevitable consideration of the lack of impartiality of the evidence in either sort of material to a discussion as to whether the nature of the evidence in personal papers is a basic difference irrespective of the line of custody. What conclusions can one draw for instance about the impartiality of information in diaries whose author intends to make them available to researchers in two or three years time? Robert Sharman made a related point in his article 'The

archivist and the historian' in referring to the absence of an 'inbuilt process of verification' during the creation of personal papers.³

The last difference Burke discusses under 'Materials' is equally unsatisfactory. Archivists keep records together 'as a unit intellectually in a descriptive device used for their control', even though the record may comprise a variety of physical forms and thus be separated for shelving and conservation reasons. On the other hand, non-manuscript items in manuscript collections 'for the most part' are also physically separated but here the accessions register is the only evidence that the principle of provenance may have been observed. Burke thus discounts the evidence to the contrary of Berner and Bettis⁴ and the implication of his later point that the elements of the archivist's Inventory and manuscript curator's Register are 'very similar'.

In discussing 'Methodology', Burke identifies common ground between curator and archivists under Reference service and use, and in Acquisitions makes the generally accepted point about librarians collecting and archivists retaining and disposing. His treatment of Processing however is certainly not the place to turn to for a third opinion on the Powell-Hurley original order debate. As I understand him, Burke suggests that if collections of personal papers are already 'arranged' or 'well-organized', leave well alone. If they are not, create form series and suit yourself about the internal arrangement. The number of times one would find the second alternative unavoidable—the basis of the original order debate in my opinion—is not adequately discussed. Two quotations will suffice to indicate the level of generalization employed:

. . . the manuscript processor proceeds to arrange the collection. This process is invariably required with personal papers, although the amount of arrangement necessary varies from case to case. Sometimes it means only placing well-organised correspondence in boxes, followed by diaries. At other times it means examining every letter, determining if it is personal or business in nature, separating the two, matching outgoing with incoming, and deciding whether an alphabetical or chronological order is preferred. (p.40.)

In summary, the librarian describes material by analysis, but classifies it into a prearranged universe according to a pre-established scheme or rules. The archivist uses external evidence, such as corporate or government structure to determine the proper arrangement and description of records. The manuscript curator uses logic, often individually arrived at, after analyzing the papers in question, to provide an arrangement and description. (p.45.)

The processing of personal papers is then clearly regarded as different from archives. How far Burke thus accurately summarises the practices of curators in general is impossible to say, although I suspect that in the second statement quoted he is basically correct for Australia. A final difference noted in the same section, namely that archives contain a higher proportion of duplicates than personal papers, is easier to accept, despite the fact that neither difference is supported by evidence. My main disappointment however is the failure to relate the differences in arrangement with the other differences Burke claims for personal papers — a failure I would regard as the essential weakness of the overall discussion.

The book as a whole includes three further sub-sections relevant to personal papers, namely Access and Confidentiality; Collection building and acquisition policies; and The Society of American Archivists and the American Libraries Association. I want to end with a short reference to the third, also by Burke.

Here an outline of the history of relations between the two associations is sketched, including mention of the expansion of the Association of College and Research Libraries' Rare Books Section into the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section and of the attempts in the late 1960s to form a manuscripts group within the A.L.A. Both events were apparently prompted by manuscript curators who felt that their problems were special enough to warrant an identity separate from the S.A.A., and who were eventually partially appeased by the establishment of a Joint S.A.A.-A.L.A. Committee on Archives-Library Relationships. Burke's final contribution to *Archive-Library Relations* gives a sobering example of the sorts of counter-measures one country's association of archivists took to avoid the splintering of its membership born of a one-sided emphasis on the differences between manuscript collections and archives. Despite my reservations about Section Two, Clark's book is an admirable example of redressing the balance.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Graeme T. Powell, 'Archival Principles and the Treatment of Private Papers', *Archives and Manuscripts*, Vol. 6 No. 7 (August 1976); and C. Hurley, 'Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles', *Archives and Manuscripts*, Vol. 6 No. 8 (February 1977).
2. Burke is well qualified to write on the topic. Currently Executive Director of the United States National Historical Publications and Records Commission, he was formerly with the National Archives and Record Service's Office of Administration and Technical Services, and up to the beginning of 1967 was Head of the Preparation Section of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. His writings include 'Manuscripts and Archives', *Library Trends* Vol. 15 (1967), pp.430-45.
3. See *Archives and Manuscripts* Vol. 4 No. 6 (February 1972), p.12.
4. See R. Berner and M. G. Bettis, 'Disposition of nonmanuscript items found among manuscripts', *American Archivist*, Vol. XXXIII No. 3 (July 1970), pp.275-81.

MANUSCRIPTS IN THE HAYES COLLECTION

Margaret Brennan, Marianne Ehrhardt and Carol Hetherington (eds.), *Catalogue of Manuscripts from the Hayes Collection in the University of Queensland Library*. St. Lucia, University of Queensland Library, 1976. 249 pages. Hard cover copies \$22.00, paperbound \$17.00 ISBN 0 9500969 8 9

Reviewed by J. R. THOMPSON

In 1967 the University of Queensland was singularly fortunate to receive as the gift of the Venerable Archdeacon Leo Hayes a magnificent collection of Australiana comprising printed books, pamphlets and periodicals, manuscripts, printed ephemera of various kinds, photographs, bookplates and a collection of Aboriginal weapons and other artifacts. The Hayes Collection, as this gift has come to be known, was described in a handsome brochure published by the University of Queensland Library in 1970. Six years later, as further

proof of its great appreciation to Leo Hayes, and as part of its desire to make the resources of the Collection better known to a wider community of scholars, the University of Queensland Library has produced a *Catalogue of Manuscripts from the Hayes Collection*, an admirable and efficient guide to a considerable resource of Australian literary material, the extent of which was not fully appreciated when the original Hayes brochure was published in 1970.

Quite apart from the skill its compilers have shown in putting this guide together, congratulations must be extended to the administration of the University of Queensland for its foresight in setting funds aside to ensure that cataloguing of the Collection could take place, and to the University of Queensland Library for providing the necessary expertise for the demanding job of arranging and listing to be carried out against the demands of other projects. All too frequently, guides to important collections of papers receive only the most limited circulation outside the four walls of the institutions which produce them, a situation which places considerable difficulties in the way of scholars anxious to survey the resources available in specific subject areas. The *Guide to Collections of Manuscripts relating to Australia*, as useful as it is in alerting scholars to the existence of collections of personal and institutional records, can provide only the barest summary of the content of collections. The University of Queensland Library has shown now what can be done when a concerted effort is made to produce and to publish a catalogue of an individual collection. The manuscripts in the Hayes Collection are notable for their literary interest, particularly in relation to people such as A. G. Stephens, Mary Gilmore, John Howlett-Ross and F. W. S. Cumbrae-Stewart. Father Hayes' own wide interests in a number of specialized subject fields are also represented and there is also revealed through the Collection something of the texture and colour of Hayes' life as a parish priest.

Few will argue with the method the editors have adopted in listing the contents of the Collection. The arrangement of the catalogue is alphabetical with biographical details (dates of birth and death) being provided in the case of Australian and New Zealand writers. There are two indexes: a name index which is predominantly a list of correspondents; and a subject index which includes places, institutions, names of periodicals and personal names where the person is the subject of a letter. With a collection so large it would be unreasonable to have expected the editors to have provided an evaluation of the manuscripts listed in the catalogue. Certainly, many of the letters listed will be of little more than autograph value, but it is altogether better in compiling a working tool of this kind to aim for comprehensive listing rather than to attempt the subjective task of deciding on the merit or otherwise of individual manuscripts. The inclusion of any greater detail in the descriptions of individual items would only have led to an embarrassment of riches and may ultimately have prevented the appearance of the catalogue. At 249 pages, it is already a substantial publication and, even in these days of expensive books, a highly priced one.

By implication, the editors in their preface apologise for the style of typography, but this reviewer feels that the selection of I.B.M.

Courier 12 and Courier 12 Italic using the I.B.M. Magnetic Card Selectric Typewriter and Nashua MS150 Word Processor has, together with production by means of offset printing in the University of Queensland Printery, produced a clean and satisfactory result. Elegance may not have been achieved, but there is no doubt that the Hayes Collection is well-served by the honest, workmanlike efficiency of the vehicle which has been chosen to present the resources of the Collection to scholars throughout Australia and elsewhere.

A small blemish must be recorded. The editors refer in their preface to the fact that sources of biographical information used throughout the catalogue are acknowledged in the bibliography. Unfortunately, this reviewer could not find that a bibliography had been included — an unfortunate omission since a bibliography would certainly have added a final measure of authority and polish to an otherwise creditable and pleasing piece of work.