

Correspondence

The Editor,

I should like to make two points relating to my *Guide to Records Relating to Science and Technology in the British Public Record Office: A RAMP Study*, and Barbara Reed's review of it in your June issue.

First, the statement at the beginning of the *Guide* that it was prepared photographically from the the author's typescript is incorrect. A number of the faults of which Ms Reed complains were introduced during revision of the typescript in Paris. This includes the egregious error on the title page to which she refers. I was not consulted about these revisions, nor was I aware of them until after the *Guide* was published. Indeed, I did not receive a copy of the published *Guide* until after it had been widely distributed. When I saw the errors I asked for an erratum slip to be distributed. Ms Reed has clearly not received one.

Second, the *Guide* was produced at UNESCO's request, as a RAMP study in the General Information Programme. UNESCO wanted two guides to scientific and technical records in national archives and a guide to such records in the Indian National Archives was published in 1982. Attempts to get another national archive to produce a similar guide proved abortive, however, until the PRO was asked to do so late in 1982. The *Guide* was produced, and took the form it now does, because that is what UNESCO wanted.

M.J. Jubb