

# Reviews of Books

HENRY P. BEERS, *Editor*

*National Archives*

---

## DOCUMENTARY PUBLICATIONS

*The Papers of James Madison*, ed. by William T. Hutchinson and William M. E. Rachal. Vol. 1, 16 March 1751–16 December 1779. Vol. 2, 20 March 1780–23 February 1781. ([Chicago], University of Chicago Press, [1962]. lxii, 344, xix, 344 p.; illus., maps, indexes. \$10 each.)

James Madison and Thomas Jefferson were so closely associated during much of their public careers that historians have found occasion again and again to compare them, often to the disadvantage of the former. More recently writers have emphasized their collaboration in public life, and Irving Brant's multivolume biography has refurbished Madison's historical reputation as a statesman. Now, in presenting the first two volumes of Madison's *Papers*, Messrs. Hutchinson and Rachal have achieved a high level of historical editing worthy of their subject, even as they cite Boyd's edition of the *Jefferson Papers*, "whose volumes have set a standard of excellence which other editors of historical manuscripts use as their gauge."

The present editors are including "all extant writings of Madison which appear to have been wholly or in large degree the product of his mind" as well as "letters and other papers, addressed to him and known to have received his careful attention," and they do not exclude items "such as his speeches in Congress or almost contemporaneous accounts of his conversations, recorded by someone who heard him." Presumably the Madison-Jefferson correspondence will appear throughout this edition (it begins in Volume 2) as it does in Boyd's. The citation for letters from Jefferson to Madison is to the printed texts in Boyd; for Madison's letters to Jefferson it is to the original manuscripts; and scholars should consult both editions for the annotations.

The editors' introduction contains an illuminating historical sketch of the Madison papers before and especially after his death when Dolley Madison, like many another widow seeking to maintain a livelihood and to serve as literary executrix, found no satisfactory solution to her dual responsibility. Partly because of the extravagance of her son, John Payne Todd, she was less successful in maintaining the papers intact than was Thomas Jefferson Randolph in preserving his grandfather's. In both cases manuscripts were dispersed for personal reasons and sales to the Federal Government were not predicated on archival considerations. So, too, the resulting editions of Madison's *Papers* by Henry D. Gilpin (1840) and of Jefferson's by Henry A. Washington (1853-54) reflected no great credit on the Government by asso-

---

Books for review and related communications should be addressed to Henry P. Beers, Office of Civil Archives, The National Archives, Washington 25, D. C.

ciation through a committee of Congress. The task of the present editors has not been lightened by the existence of an epistolary register such as Jefferson kept from day to day. Although they have spread a wide net for Madison manuscripts, there will continue to be "discoveries" of letters in private hands for a long time to come.

In size, two volumes of *Madison Papers* equal one of Jefferson: 728 pages including introduction and indexes as compared with 737 pages with introduction and without index; the price, \$20 for two volumes of Madison, \$10 for one of Jefferson until Volume 16 (\$12.50). These first volumes cover nearly equal periods of their early lives: Madison to age 30 in 1781; Jefferson to age 33 in 1776. The total extant correspondence of each is nearly the same in quantity: 162 letters to and from Madison, 150 to and from Jefferson, the latter with a wider variety of persons. The correspondence between them began in March 1780 when Madison was a member of the Continental Congress and Jefferson was Governor of Virginia. Both held public office by their midtwenties and participated in the revolutionary events of 1776—Madison, not yet distinguished, in Williamsburg, Jefferson in a leading role in Philadelphia.

These early *Madison Papers* have a broad range of subject matter, local and national, as the young politician becomes more widely known in public life. The diligence of the editors in performing their task has rendered the documentary texts of maximum use; and, if they seem overzealous at times in supplying detailed factual information to supplement the manuscripts (*e.g.*, 1: 122, 128, 156-157, 183), this service extends quite properly beyond the needs of scholars. Some of the documents consist of official records of governmental agencies on whose deliberations Madison as a member doubtless brought some influence to bear. In deciding what documents to include as representative or as historically important, no two editors would agree. In the judgment of the present reviewer the excerpts from the Board of Admiralty records are excessive, and less so those from the Virginia Council of State. Furthermore, such selected documents demand additional explanatory notes that at times become almost irrelevant to Madison's ideas and actions as the chief reason for publishing his *Papers*. The editors, however, have provided an excellent essay or "editorial note" on the Council of State (1: 214-216) and they have illuminated likewise other pertinent subjects—*e.g.*, the Motion regarding Western Lands (2: 72-77) and the Commission of John Laurens and Amendment to His Instructions (2: 256-259).

Large editorial undertakings that are inevitably projected into the distant future, uncertain of both longtime personnel and financing, must soon justify themselves by the high caliber of their published work if they expect to find continuing support. Editors Hutchinson and Rachal have achieved this first goal with distinction. Scholars will look forward to the publication of subsequent volumes in their handsome format with confidence that the Father of the Constitution is in skillful editorial hands.

LESTER J. CAPPON

*Institute of Early American History and Culture*

*Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, With Related Documents, 1783-1854*, ed. by Donald Jackson. (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1962. xxi, 728 p. \$10.)

The publication of original historical documents takes the time and effort of many historians, and this volume is but one more of a growing body of "original source material." Like its predecessors it is designed for reading and study by mature scholar, budding student, and amateur alike. It contains documents relating to the Lewis and Clark expedition gathered from libraries, archives, and other sources. Some of the documents have been available in partially satisfactory form in earlier publications. People who live in the Far West will find this to be an exciting book. It shows the influence of Sir Alexander Mackenzie's earlier expedition across the Rockies to the Pacific. It contains many significant scientific observations made by the explorers, and it documents the equipment and methods they used. It even includes a "new" document to add to the argument about the time and place of the death of Sacajawea.

This book should not be belittled, for it makes a great contribution to historical knowledge. The archivist, however, will want to appraise and discuss its editorial procedures. "Several departures" from the original text are "based on common sense and the current practices of scholars." It seems to this reviewer that the time has come for the reproduction of documents as exactly as possible—with no changes, either accidental or intentional. On the premise that documents should be presented as written, some of the practices illustrated by this volume should be abandoned by all editors. Anyone familiar with the law is aware of the significance of punctuation to meaning; because of the possibility of creating some sort of new historical myth no one should take liberties with the original document. Why supply missing periods, supplant with other punctuation dashes terminating sentences, use commas if no other end punctuation is present, and omit "superfluous" dashes after periods that often to the writer were a means of emphasis or of separating ideas in an unparagraphed document? Why standardize abbreviations—ignoring Jefferson's "U.S." and Lewis' "U'S."—when they are basic characteristics that help identify unsigned writings? It is obvious that some writers have more than one style of capitalization or of forming their small letters and that this peculiarity cannot be easily handled in letterpress. Every editor who expects his documentary publication to be used by critical scholars should develop charts of capitalization used by the writers of the documents and should reproduce this capitalization, even though a man like William Clark was inconsistent in its use. Moreover, many documents of historical importance, because they revealed defects in the writers' education, have been suppressed and destroyed by later generations. If editors reproduced the true character of the writings of all great men, as well as lesser, perhaps we could overcome such needless scruples and preserve a little more of the significant materials of the past.

This reviewer also objects to the omissions of endorsements (which record the history of the document concerned), of addresses (which illustrate the

nature of the postal service or prove the means of delivery), and of complimentary closings (characteristic of each generation). Endorsements, addresses, and closings are all difficult to reproduce in letterpress in the pattern in which they were written, but uniform rules ignoring spacing can be adopted without sacrificing the meaning that each of these features might convey to the critical scholar.

Every prospective editor will find in this book examples of the problems discussed above. Mr. Jackson has reproduced selected documents in facsimile between pages 106 and 107, and it is therefore possible to appraise the results of his editorial practices in detail. Document 14, the British passport issued to Lewis, is reproduced from its only extant copy, a French version from the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. Why was a translation in English substituted in the letterpress text of this book? It is a translation from the French version of the English original and is therefore twice distorted from the lost original. Document 55 is actually the texts of a number of financial documents in the National Archives. The one illustrated in facsimile was emasculated when printed. It included a receipt evidently written in the same hand at the same time as the rest of the claim, and yet this part of the document was reproduced in a footnote as if it were a separate endorsement at a later date. Such a practice is most misleading. Document 79, from the records of the War Department in the National Archives, bears upon its face a significant file number, which must have referred to the original file of letters received; yet this number does not appear in the notes to the printed text. In the filerooms of that period, registers of letters received and sent were kept, and these registers contain significant endorsements and identify related documents in files of documents received. One wonders if similar significant file information was omitted elsewhere in this publication. The facsimile of Document 110 is from the Missouri Historical Society, but that document is not reproduced in the text; instead, the original draft in the War Department archives is printed. It would have been better to print the text of the document received. Differences that can be determined without a facsimile of the War Department draft are as follows: the date as written has been reversed; at least two commas have been added within sentences affecting the text; & is printed *and*; and the complimentary closing has been materially shortened. Is this really, then, a satisfactory text to be used and quoted by succeeding generations of scholars and students?

One major problem not handled successfully in this book is the identification of insertions or afterthoughts. Documents 144, 145, and 209 all contain such insertions—and yet the insertions are identifiable only through comparison with the facsimiles. Deletions are successfully handled in the text through the use of italics and pointed parentheses, but nothing is done to show the other changes. Since they illustrate the thought pattern of the writer they should be shown, and some means should be devised to identify these changes for the reader. Some presses have on hand fonts of type that is lined through, and the use of such type to show deletions would free italics for use to show insertions. The pointed parentheses would not be needed, and underlined

items in the original text could be so printed. If this or some other device were adopted that would not interfere with reading, the needs of both the scholar and the amateur would be met.

From this discussion of the practices of editors as illustrated by this volume, there arises a question that must be considered by all archivists. We are all glad to see our sources in print, where they may survive should the originals perish. On the other hand, if the printed edition is inadequate or questionable because of editorial standards or because of the cost of letterpress, then perhaps we should insist that all publication of our holdings must be in facsimile—by microfilm, offset, or engraving.

DAVID C. DUNIWAY

*Oregon State Archives*

Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Bundesministerium fuer Gesamtdeutsche Fragen. *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik, III Reihe, Band 1, 5 Mai bis 31 Dezember 1955*, bearbeitet von Ernst Deuerlein unter Mitwirkung von Hansjürgen Schierbaum. (Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1961. lxxi, 883 p. 39 DM.)

The purpose of this publication is to present, in chronological order, the most important materials dealing with the German question, particularly those relating to the problem of German unification. The materials used are treaties, diplomatic notes, declarations, conference reports, parliamentary reports, press communiques, speeches, interviews, articles, and commentaries published previously in France, East and West Germany, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The documents fall roughly into two categories: those pertaining to the origins and continuation of the division of Germany and those dealing with plans, recommendations, discussions, and projects for its unification.

The publication project is planned to cover the period from 1941 to the present in four series. Series I will deal with the years 1941 to June 4, 1945; series II from June 5, 1945, to May 4, 1955; series III from May 5, 1955, to November 9, 1958; series IV from November 10, 1958, to the present. Series III is being published first and will be followed by series II, IV, and I. The publication is intended primarily for government officials and scholars.

In this and many similar projects, the task of selection and arrangement is a formidable one. In this particular case the difficulties are probably greater even than usual. So as to give as comprehensive a picture as possible, the editor and his assistant did not limit their selection to diplomatic documents but included a variety of official, semiofficial, and even private documents. Of the last type only a few are being printed, and these mainly for illustrative purposes; e.g., the article, "Collective Security and Reunification of Germany," from the publication *Einheit* (p. 736-740).

In printing each document the editors established the original text and noted the source. In the case of a non-German document both the source of the official German translation and the non-German source are cited. In the case of United States documents, it is interesting to note, the editors preferred,

as a source, *Documents on American Foreign Relations 1955*, edited by Paul Zinner (New York, 1956), *Documents on International Affairs 1955*, edited by Noble Frankland (London, 1958), or the Department of State's *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955; Basic Documents* (Washington, 1957), to the Department's *Bulletin*.

The present volume, the first in series III, starts with May 5, 1955, the day the occupation status of the western zone was abolished, and ends on December 31 of the same year. During this period the Federal Republic of Germany was established, a new West German army was created, and West Germany was admitted into the West European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The summit conference took place in July. Chancellor Adenauer visited Moscow in September, and the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers met from October 27 to November 16. All these events are documented most adequately, without editorial comment but with references to additional literature in footnotes.

The volume has been carefully edited and will provide an indispensable source for historians and researchers. It is to be hoped that future volumes will maintain the high standard of scholarship of the present one.

GEORGE O. KENT

*Department of State*

#### MANUALS AND STUDIES

*Manual de Archivología Hispanoamericana; teorías y principios*, por Aurelio Tanodi. (Córdoba, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 1961. x, 285 p.)

This manual has the distinction of being the first of its kind to be written in Argentina. The author presents with great success the basic archival information that is of interest to South American archivists. It is being used as textbook by students in the School for Archivists at the University of Córdoba.

The manual is divided into four lengthy chapters. The first contains a discussion of the history and importance of archival institutions with explanations and definitions of key archival terms; the second discusses the relationship between archivists and members of related professions such as librarians, historians, and paleographers; the third explains the differences between current records and archives, traces the development and establishment of national archives in Latin America, and discusses church, business, and private archival repositories; and the fourth is devoted to the important problems of training archivists and includes recommendations for the creation of an association for professional archivists and for the establishment of a Spanish language archival journal.

This work is intended for students beginning the study of archival science. None of the topics covered are treated fully and exhaustively, but enough information is provided to enable a student to acquire a good and solid foundation. The author provides a useful bibliography of works written in Spanish, English, French, Italian, and German. It has been enriched by numerous

references to the writings of internationally known archivists such as Adolf Brenneke, Wolfgang Leesch, Emilio Casanova, Henri Bouillier de Branche, Robert-Henri Bautier, T. R. Schellenberg, Hilary Jenkinson, and Miguel Bordonau.

This manual is an important contribution to the systematic diffusion of the principles of archival science among Spanish-speaking readers. Aurelio Tanodi is a European-trained archivist, author of numerous articles on archival topics, and one of the most distinguished members of the archival profession in Latin America. At present he is Director of the School for Archivists at the University of Córdoba.

GEORGE S. ULIBARRI

*National Archives*

Canada. [Report of] *The Royal Commission on Government Organization*. 1. *Management of the Public Service*. (Ottawa, The Queen's Printer, 1962. 646 p. \$6.)

One of Mr. Diefenbaker's promises before he became Prime Minister of Canada in 1957 was to appoint a royal commission to survey government operations. The model clearly was to be the U. S. Hoover Commissions. The commission appointed consisted of J. Grant Glassco, a chartered accountant of Toronto and vice president of the Brazilian Traction Co., as chairman, along with a Montreal businessman (of French descent) and a retired auditor general of Canada. In the short span of two years the commission has already published three volumes, with two more to come. Mr. Diefenbaker has moved to implement the report by naming M. Wallace McCutcheon, formerly of the mammoth Argus Corporation, to spearhead the action.

Report 4 of Volume 1 (pages 471-629) is entitled "Paperwork and Systems Management." It is the work of an exceptionally able task force headed by Tom Tyson of the Urwick consulting firm. The American reader and the Canadian reader will almost certainly read this report differently. The Canadian reader probably will center his attention on the recommendations, asking himself if they would remedy the deficiencies pointed out by the Glassco group. The American more probably will center his attention on the extent to which the statement of program content coincides with that held by American government leaders.

The recommendations call for (1) central governmentwide guidance from the Treasury Board level, (2) a uniform paperwork program in each department and agency, (3) legislation to govern responsibility for public records and their disposal, (4) an electronic data processing center, and (5) periodic external surveys to review how well the paperwork programs are functioning. Since the reviewer is an American, he will not attempt to pass on the validity of these recommendations.

For its delineation of what paperwork management is, Part 1 of the report does a masterful job. Program content is broadly defined, covering reports, directives, forms, correspondence, mail management, files, records disposition,



office equipment, clerical work measurement, and quality control. The relationships between these pieces of a larger managerial whole are spelled out superbly. The concepts are unfolded with clarity and a fine understanding. The benefits to be derived from a comprehension of the concepts, and an adherence to them, are ably analyzed. The operational support these management services provide has not been described better. All of Report 4 is crisply and succinctly written.

Part 2 of Report 4 is what might be classified as appendix material. Here are the findings in detail and the methodology used to uncover facts—tables, charts, case studies, and exhibits. The professional may well find this more interesting than Part 1, as well as more illuminating, since this “back-up” data is the crux of how well the summaries in Part 1 can be defended. Part 2, in turn, is a boiled down version of the report of the paperwork task force (known as Project 3). Although the project report is not being made public, as we understand it, our judgment is that most of the findings have been caught up in the Part 2 section.

This is a volume every American records manager will want to have in his office. It can be read many times with growing appreciation and profit.

EVERETT O. ALLDREDGE

*Office of Records Management  
National Archives and Records Service*

*Archives: Records Schedule; the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.* (Greensboro, N. C., 1962. 35 p. \$1.)

Archives are records of enduring value, and the archivist is a conservator. One of the first duties of the archivist is to find the answer to the question “Where are the records of this institution and which of them have enduring value?” For the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina this question is admirably answered in the publication under review.

The Woman's College is a State-supported institution. Its records are public records by law and come under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Archives and History. When that department offered its staff to inventory the records of the college, Charles M. Adams, Librarian and Archivist of the college, enthusiastically accepted, and Memory F. Blackwelder and Elizabeth C. Moss were assigned to the task. The chancellor of the college, in turn, appointed an advisory committee to assist these ladies.

Before an adequate inventory can be taken certain preliminary steps are necessary. For example, a brief historical chronology of the institution should be prepared. Here we find, on pages 1 and 2, a “Brief History of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina,” from 1891 to date, well documented by legal citations.

Another preliminary step is the preparation of a list of the offices, departments, and schools whose records are to be inventoried, arranged in the order in which they are to be examined. Such a list appears here on page 4, in which 26 entities are listed under functional headings: I. Administrative Af-



fairs; II. Academic Affairs; III. Student Affairs; IV. Business Affairs; V. Public Relations Affairs; and VI. College Archives. This list, with the appropriate page numbers added, serves as a table of contents of the inventory.

Each item of the inventory is concerned with a particular series of records; in all, 281 series were examined. Each item includes a description of the series, its location, and a schedule of appropriate disposition agreed upon by the college and the State Department of Archives and History and thus made legal. Here is a typical item taken from the inventory of the chancellor's records:

6. Consolidated Council Minutes, 1951—. 0.1 cu. ft. Carbon copies of the minutes of the President's Cabinet. Copies of these minutes are preserved at Chapel Hill but also need to be kept here for reference as to policies and procedures adopted or amended by the President's Cabinet.

*Location:* Chancellor's Office.

*Schedule:* Retain in office as long as of administrative value and then transfer to College Archives for preservation.

As a result of the inventory the State Department of Archives and History gained considerable insight into the documentation and record practices of the college, and has included, on page 3, some thoughtful recommendations looking toward their improvement. The department recommended, for example, that all documents be dated; that copies of certain types of documents, such as college minutes and documents printed by the college, be sent to the college archives when issued; and that certain important series be microfilmed for security.

The department also recommended the appointment of a full-time archivist; the air-conditioning and humidity-control of the archives area; the provision of durable folders and better containers for archives material; and the arrangement of the records in the archives for more convenient use by filing them flat in folders.

Finally, the department, recognizing the difference between library and archives material, recommended that a "college collection," established in the library in 1942 to gather information for the 50th anniversary of the college, be treated as "one and the same" as the college archives.

This publication should serve as a helpful guide to colleges that aspire to establish a modern system of archives administration.

HELEN L. CHATFIELD

*American University*

*Guide to Microreproduction Equipment*, ed. by Hubbard W. Ballou. (Annapolis, Md., National Microfilm Association, [P. O. Box 386], 1962. 2d ed.; [vi], 519 p. \$10; member rate \$7.50.)

How does an archivist—having decided his institution should add microreproduction or photoduplication facilities—know what to buy? A few years ago his predecessor, facing the same problem, probably would have bought a

Photostat machine, made a choice between a Graflex and a Recordak microfilm camera, installed a darkroom, and hired a man with a rubber apron. He would then have been in business.

The training and experience of today's archivist in photography are perhaps as limited as his predecessor's. Moreover, he has a wider variety of machines from which to choose the ones he needs, and he must consider photo-reproduction processes that did not exist a few years ago.

Our archivist-turned-buyer, from reading manufacturers' literature, becomes aware that each new process or device is advertised to do practically anything anybody could ask of it. He learns from demonstrations or at photo-equipment shows that these machines almost never have breakdowns or stoppages and that their operation is simplicity itself. He arrives at the happy conclusion that any number of devices on the market will meet, with near-perfection, all his requirements; and the only question is, how does he go about choosing among them?

One answer might be that (besides developing a bit of skepticism) our prospective buyer seek advice from some of the people who for years have been involved in all aspects of archival photography—from such "old pros" as Harry Baudu and Tom Bailey of the National Archives or Hubbard Ballou of Columbia University. And our buyer might look into Mr. Ballou's *Guide to Microreproduction Equipment*.

It is only fair to warn that after the airbrush art and the cheerful promises of brochures this *Guide* may be dull reading. Here, one after another, are four dozen microfilm cameras, each described with a photograph and, on the facing page, such information as the date it was introduced, film width and length, maximum frame and copy size, kind of lens and shutter, power requirements, whether it has a footage indicator, kinds of automatic warnings (if any), accessories available, and much more of the same. And there follow applicable comparative data for 63 film and card readers, 7 hand viewers, 29 film processors, 18 contact printers, 24 enlargers, more than 100 items classified under "accessories & miscellaneous," and, under "specials," a dozen unclassifiables.

A point in favor of a prospective buyer's giving the *Guide* some study is that in getting the wrong equipment one can lay an expensive egg. The microfilm cameras list from several hundred dollars to \$16,000; enlargers from under \$200 to \$72,000; microfilm readers from \$50 to \$2,600; film processors from less than \$50 to more than \$37,000; and contact printers from about \$35 to \$25,000. Even in the "accessories & miscellaneous" there is, among the splicers and spools and film dryers, a gizmo listed for \$40,000 and in the catchall "specials" there is a retrieval unit for \$114,500.

This *Guide* will not tell our archivist what is his correct or best "buy." It will, however, open his eyes to the variety of devices available, and it does offer him a means of making a close comparison, on paper, of these devices. The true believer will find it easier to ignore the *Guide* and to base his buying on a rereading of his favorite brochures or on his recollection of the most

persuasive of salesmen's pitches. All others might first want to do some comparison shopping.

LEONARD RAPPORT

*National Historical Publications Commission*

#### FINDING AIDS

*The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, 1959-1961*, compiled by the Library of Congress. (Ann Arbor, Mich., J. W. Edwards, Publisher, 1962. viii, 1,061 p. \$9.75.)

The first in what is intended to be a series, this volume reproduces cards for nearly 7,300 manuscript collections that were printed by the Library of Congress during the period 1959-61. A grant received from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., in 1958 enabled the Library to undertake the compilation of a National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections. The cards were prepared in the Manuscripts Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division of the Library from data sheets and copies of catalog cards supplied by some 400 cooperating repositories and from the published guides to their collections.

The catalog covers both manuscript and archival materials. The entries describe personal or family papers and records of associations, banks, businesses, churches, colleges, farms, hotels, industries, organizations, plantations, railroads, schools, societies, trade unions, and universities. Private manuscripts in archival repositories and archival materials not actually in archival repositories are included. The archives include those of Federal, State, Territorial, and local agencies, and some of foreign countries. Collections consisting entirely of photocopies and transcripts are not included unless the repository holding the originals does not regularly admit researchers or when copies were made from original manuscripts scattered in several repositories. The materials described relate not only to the United States but also to Canada, Latin America, Europe, and other parts of the world.

The entries resemble those for published books appearing in other catalogs of the Library of Congress. The main entry is the name of the person, family, government agency, institution, etc. that created the manuscripts or records, or the name of a collector or of a repository. If such an entry cannot be made, the collection is entered under the title by which it is known or one that is supplied by the cataloger. If the collection consists of personal papers, the dates of birth and death of the person and information as to occupation or profession are given. The physical description is in number of items, or linear feet (if over 1 foot) and rolls of microfilm, or feet of microfilm if less than a roll. If the manuscripts are not originals the form is indicated. The name of the repository is given but not its location. The description of contents indicates the types of papers and documents present; the names of correspondents or of persons, families, or agencies; and subjects they concern. Titles of published or unpublished finding aids and compilations in which the papers are published, data on restrictions on access, literary rights, and provenance

follow. Entries are arranged in the catalog in the order in which they were printed (serial number order) so that the printing of the pages and the indexing could proceed while work was still being done on the latter part of the volume. The index comprises three parts: a name index containing 30,000 names, a subject index of over 3,000 headings, and a repository index containing lists of entries reported by each repository.

This volume and its successors will be of great use to researchers on any aspect of American life. Covering as it does many repositories for which there are no published guides, the catalog yields data about many collections not described elsewhere. An alphabetical or classified arrangement might have been preferable, but the provision of the index overcomes this deficiency. The descriptions of the contents are sometimes disappointingly brief or incomplete. Some entries are far too general and should have been broken down into several separate entries. Serial 61-3140 describes Confederate records at the University of Texas Library; each element of this entry should have been given a separate entry under the name of the person or government agency that created the papers or archives. The catalog would be more useful if revisions of such general entries could be included in future volumes. The entries for family papers would be more helpful if they regularly included the names of the members of the families who are represented in the collections. The descriptions would be better if dates were given for the different types of manuscripts or archival series in collections. Mirabeau B. Lamar not only preserved his own papers but collected and preserved those of other persons connected with the history of Texas; yet the entry for his papers contains no description of these or the title of his published papers. In many instances there was sufficient information available to enter the collection under the name of the agency or institution that created it. Such entries are useful for describing collections of similar items, but should be used sparingly. Archival materials are not always properly identified by agency of origin. Photographs and drawings are mentioned without details and maps appear to have received little attention. A sampling of the subject index indicates that it is not complete; there are many more collections relating to the Confederate States of America, for instance, than are entered in the index under that heading. Some typographical errors were noted. More careful proofreading would have prevented "E." in J. E. B. Stuart from being rendered "Ewell" and "Elwell" in successive entries on the same page and with varied spellings on other pages. A consolidated index is easier to use than separate indexes and saves space.

HENRY P. BEERS

### *National Archives*

### HISTORIES AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

*The Archives of the University of Cambridge; an Historical Introduction*, by Heather E. Peek and Catherine P. Hall. (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1962. viii, 91 p. \$5.)

This is the first complete account of the Archives of the University of Cambridge and, indeed, one of the first full-length studies of a university archives. It will be of interest to archivists who contemplate similar studies and, more broadly, to students of educational history.

The first part of the book is devoted to the growth of the archives at Cambridge from its beginnings in the thirteenth century to the present. The authors describe the earliest methods of preserving the seal, charters, and other valuable records in the "Common Chest," and the vicissitudes of fortune suffered by the valuable records. The important role of the archives in the administrative structure of the university through the centuries is carefully recorded by the authors.

The second part of the volume surveys the university archival holdings and shows how they reflect the institution's administrative practices, ceremonies, and business. Special attention is given to the following groups of documents or subjects: the charters of privilege; statutes; records of university administrations; records of matriculation and degrees; financial affairs; endowments; university officers and their records; records of university courts; records of the university jurisdiction in the town of Cambridge; privileged persons; public health and amenities; charities; the relations between the Crown and the university; and other university institutions and their records.

The appendixes cover three areas: (1) a brief list of classes of manuscript sources in the archives, (2) "Muniments of Title Relating to University Property," and (3) a select bibliography. Sixteen illustrations of historic documents in the archives embellish the book.

Heather Peek and Catherine Hall have made a valuable contribution to a neglected field of archival literature.

PHILIP P. MASON

*Wayne State University*

*African Libraries, Book Production, and Archives: A List of References*, compiled by Helen F. Conover. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1962. vi, 64 p. 60c.)

This list is a revision of a compilation prepared in 1960 as a reference paper. Owing to increased interest in Africa it has been issued recently as a Library of Congress publication with more significant references than those of the former compilation. It is one of several bibliographical publications prepared by the Library's African Section, which was established in 1960, in the General Reference and Bibliography Division.

Parts I and III, which present references concerning the steadily increasing library and archival facilities of Africa, comprise the major portion of the list. They include subdivisions for reference tools, bibliographical sources, general references, and writings for particular regions of West, Central, South, and East Africa. To confine the list to "desired proportions" Miss Conover has omitted references to the Arab world of Egypt and North Africa. Part II deals with varied publications concerning book production. Here one notes a considerable body of material concerning literature bureaus

recently established to print reading matter for new literates in the emergent national states. Most of the works cited are in the Library of Congress and other American libraries.

The references, though useful to archivists and librarians, are of considerably uneven merit. Most of them lack annotation and many are citations of very brief articles or reviews. The usefulness of the list is enhanced, however, by citations of abstracts and digests of some of the most significant references.

HAROLD T. PINKETT

*Office of Records Appraisal*

*National Archives and Records Service*

**“. . . imperfect, fragmentary, and utterly inadequate . . .”**

Naturally, archive records are here as elsewhere to be regarded as the foundation of history; but in this case these records must be sought from a variety of sources, of which the archives proper—that is, the documents preserved in government keeping at Santa Fé, and cited by me as *Archivo de Sta Fé*, MS.—are not the most fruitful or important. The earliest records, those preceding 1680, were almost entirely destroyed in the revolt of that and the following years. The bulky accumulations of 160 later years, never adequately cared for in Spanish and Mexican times, were most shamefully neglected under U. S. rule. Hundreds of documents were lost or destroyed from time to time, until about 1870, during the rule of Governor Pile, when the remaining archives were removed from the *palacio* and sold for wrapping-paper, only about one fourth being recovered. . . . After several years more of neglect and ruin, the fragments were at last gathered up, properly cared for, and roughly classified in 135 pasteboard boxes, by Judge Samuel Ellison, who has been their keeper as territorial librarian since 1881, and who has kindly afforded me every facility for consulting the treasures in his care. Thus it will be seen that the *Arch. Sta Fé*, though immensely valuable in the aggregate, and containing many important documents, is very imperfect, fragmentary, and utterly inadequate to the forming of a complete record of the country's annals in any phase. . . .

— HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT, *History of Arizona and New Mexico, 1530-1888*, p. 19 (*The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*, vol. 17; San Francisco, 1889).

**PLAN NOW TO ATTEND—**

**THE 27TH ANNUAL MEETING**

**SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS**

**Raleigh, N. C.**

**October 2-5, 1963**