

## THE REFERENCE USE OF ARCHIVES

Clifford K. Shipton

In this paper the archivist's obligations to his clientele; administrative, scholarly, and other will be discussed, and archivists will be warned of the pitfalls into which we in Cambridge have fallen.

There is no question that the bread and butter clientele of a university archive is the administrative officer. Recently there came to my desk, detoured by the congestion of the regular channels, a request for a certain folder from the Comptroller's files for the year 1962/63. We started a boy to the depths of our storage space while they started their office boy for our office. I trust that their paths intersected at the right time and place. This is, of course, records management, pure and simple, but it is the way in which we finance our archives. Some years ago President James B. Conant informed a meeting of administrators that the University budget would have to be cut, and said, "Taking the departments alphabetically, 'Archives'." At which two department heads whom I had never met personally spoke up and said, "You can't cut the Archives budget; it would cost us more to do the work which they are doing for us."

In most universities with which I am acquainted the archives program has obtained recognition and support only by offering records management service. To some historians, this seems to clutter up the fields of research. We once had a Director of the Harvard University Library who was a Pulitzer Prize winning historian, and, irritated at the demands of records management, he once told me that we should accept in the Harvard Archives only truly archival material, material worth permanent preservation. "All right," I said, "but you will have to inform all of these department heads that we can no longer service their records—they won't take it from me." He thought of that list for a moment, sighed, and said, "All right; how much space will you need for their records?"

We have tried various compromises to solve the space and service problem, such as giving keys to the storage space to the financial offices and telling them that they would have to service their records in our custody. That has not worked particularly well because, left to themselves, the administrative offices will send in their records in odd-shaped and slack-filled boxes which take up

---

The author is Custodian of the Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

entirely too much space. Our threat to repack their records at their expense has caused the worst offenders to reform. We are also thinking of charging the administrative offices rent for the shelving occupied by their non-permanent records in our custody. Faced with that proposal, I think that some of them will agree that the destruction schedules can be hastened.

Actually I should be very sorry to give over the records management service because of the opportunity which it gives me to observe the use of the material before I join in authorizing its destruction. To me there is something truly awful in having to make the decision as to what the historian of future generations is to know about this one. Obviously the decision should be made by someone with training and experience in historical research. I have known commercial records management services to recommend the destruction, as useless, of material of priceless historical value, actually protected by the statutes of the State. On the other hand, historians sometimes ask us to preserve material so bulky that any knowledge of records management costs demonstrates such a policy to be impractical.

Some university archivists have found their most serious problem that of convincing the administrative offices that they can be entrusted with confidential files. One university does not entrust its archivist with the minutes of its trustees, although they have in part been printed. In another university a dean is now proposing to destroy the student folder file because of the disciplinary material which it contains. If not destroyed, this file will be, a hundred years from now, the most frequently consulted segment of the archives.

So critical is this question of a student—and soon alumni—file in several universities that I am going to repeat what I have told a few of them of our experience at Cambridge. We have two files, each of which in theory contains a folder for every person who ever matriculated in the University. One is a public file of historical material which began in the alumni records office, and the other is a file of confidential records from the administrative offices. The public file contains ephemeral printed material, odd manuscript letters, and the fruits of clipping services. It certainly contains some odd material. In looking into the folder of a man of the Class of 1724 I found an annotation of the fact that 230 years after his graduation he had been sent a letter requesting that he verify his latest address.

The archival student folder file is quite another matter. When we set it up we found that over a period of twenty years some two dozen administrative offices had kept student folder files. On the average, every student in this period had folders in five different files—admissions, scholarships, the different deans, etc. So long as we kept these files intact as parts of the archives of the several

offices, servicing them was a troublesome matter. If, for example, a request came for the folder for a boy in the Class of 1914, we had to look on a chart to see which offices were keeping student folder files at that time. So we threw archival theory to the wind and combined all of these files into one.

Naturally, these archival student folder files are one of the most sensitive and confidential in our custody. I make a point never to look at the folder of anyone I know. No folder is ever delivered over the counter to the reading room. If an FBI agent asked to see one, I used to inspect it myself, answer his questions if reasonable, and in case of any doubt refer him to the Registrar. Of late years this subject has become so sensitive that we have referred all FBI questions to the appropriate administrative officers. One of these days we shall, without doubt, begin combining the older segments of these archival student folder files with the public alumni folder file. The most difficult decision which I ever had to make was in this field. Admission applications are, of course, a gold mine for historians. With their letters of recommendation and what is usually the first surviving literary effort of the applicants, they are most illuminating. However, at a time when our College was receiving ten times as many admission applications as it could accept, we had to decide that we could keep the records of only those who were admitted, and who came. It would have been just too costly to box and store the rejected applications until they could be made available to a generation of historians yet unborn. Without doubt an appreciable number of the biographical queries which come to us by mail could have been answered from this file, but we could not justify the cost of keeping and servicing this material.

Until we became deeply involved in the records management program, about half of the material in our department was historical rather than archival, and was readily available to any one who walked in and filled out an ordinary library use slip. For the most part this public material was classed in typical library manner and distinguished from strictly archival material by call number. The large majority of the questions asked about the past of the University and about its graduates can be answered from this material located through a typical library card catalog.

We have, however, committed the great heresy of interfiling with this catalog, reference cards locating essentially every individual mentioned, or subject discussed, in the first two hundred years of our archival material. Thus the indices to our archives are interfiled with the card catalogs of our historical collection—which has proved to be an eminently practical arrangement. Thus if you are interested in Mr. X you will find in the card catalog references to books and articles about him, if he is known chiefly for his Harvard connection,

and to the theses and prize papers which he wrote while a student. You will find the references to him in the Corporation Records, and will be given a good hundred-year-old transcript to inspect. You will find references in the Faculty Records, and will be given photostats. But if you want to use the Overseers' Records you will be questioned a little more closely, because we have no transcript of those. So, in effect, you will have ready access to everything in the Archives relating to a man who graduated before the Civil War.

This raises the question of how deeply a university should go into the preservation of the biographical material relating to its graduates, their published works, manuscripts, and association material. Our rule is that we shall keep the manuscripts of, and printed material relating to, men known chiefly for their Harvard connection. Fugitive material relating to most men will be dropped into their alumni folder files, but not material relating to John Adams or John Kennedy. Association material is almost never kept. No large institution can afford the effort and space required by a collection of the works of its graduates. Modern universities are so diverse that such a collection has no more significance than a collection of books by, say, red-headed men. At Cambridge we long ago had to abandon the effort to keep up a collection of books written by professors.

The ephemeral publications of the Faculty, the reprints of articles and the like, are a troublesome matter. For years we asked Faculty members to send us two copies of all such pamphlets, which we boxed temporarily. When the authors died, we bound these pamphlets up in two volumes, one of which went with their papers in the Archives, and one of which went to the library concerned with the subject matter of their work. Recently the flood of reprints from the men of science has made us review this system as too costly to be worth while. After all, these articles can be located in their original places of publication by use of the standard indexes.

Returning from this digression to the question of serving the administrative offices, I would like to point out that some of the records are unwritten and some of the service unrecorded. As you and I well know, many of the most important decisions in the history of an institution never do get into the records. Probably all private universities have an unwritten policy of establishing admission quotas by race, religion, or geography. The last is sometimes avowed, the others, never. Incoming presidents and deans need to know the history of such policies. At Harvard the Corporation keeps, besides its minutes, a record of "agreements and understandings" which are not regarded as being binding votes. Usually the archivist has a better historical perspective of university policy than administrative officers serving for short terms, so his knowledge of unrecorded agreements,

or the reasons for recorded ones, can be very useful. And this means of course, that the archivist should have a faculty appointment so that he will be aware of the unrecorded winds of policy. In a small college it would be an ideal situation to have the archivist also secretary to the faculty and administrative boards, but of course these are full-time jobs in large universities. I have often thought that it would be desirable to separate the record-keeping function of the secretaries' offices from their other functions, and to designate the archivist to keep the records so that he may be aware of what is going on, but no one has warmed to the idea.

All academic bodies have a tendency to shatter into committees in which the most vital decisions are arrived at, and their records furnish the background of the bare formal votes of Trustees and Faculty. In Cambridge the committee records are a headache because of the habit of giving these bodies such ambiguous titles as Committee of Ten, or of Eleven, or of Twelve. The men who served on them will think the archivist stupid because he does not remember what a particular committee was about. This has forced us to distinguish between the records of standing committees and those of the ad hoc committees. The former are arranged alphabetically in the archives of their parent departments, and the latter, chronologically within departments. The fact that in our confused Cambridge system a dozen bodies can spawn committees on the same subject has driven me to considering placing all ad hoc committee records in one chronological order, but this is just too heretical.

Curiously enough, the most frequent use of committee records has been in connection with law suits, particularly over university property. As these cases tend to be recurring, we can usually amaze each new generation of university lawyers by instantly putting the desired information in their hands in exactly the form which they want. We have never failed to produce evidence wanted by the University lawyers.

Each university archive will be asked to furnish various catch-all services for the administrative offices, and it is usually easier to perform them than to convince the offices that these are not archival functions. We keep, for example, for the Treasurer's Office files of presumably worthless stocks and bonds, which of course were inherited and never purchased by the Treasurer. From these files he occasionally extracts triumphantly a certificate for stocks or bonds of a corporation which has experienced a resurrection.

Sometimes the administration offices get curious ideas of the scope of our services. One day the Building and Grounds department telephoned me and enquired, "If we drive a well behind Dunster House will we find water?" I flipped off the shelf behind me a volume containing a map of Cambridge in 1630, and found that it showed a pond

in the place where Buildings and Grounds proposed to search for water. So I told them to go ahead, and they did so, not realizing that this service was unusual.

Once the department in charge of repairing art objects called up the Archives and asked for instructions regarding the disposition of the portrait of Governor William Stoughton, one of the key pieces in the history of American art. So I said, "send it to the Archives," where it hangs, one of several fine works of art sent to us by departments which were confused as to our archival functions.

So far as physical problems are concerned, the most troublesome office to serve is that of Buildings and Grounds. In the end, we assigned them a segment of the archives and told them to keep their own plans in order. In fact, no order is discernible to an outsider, but they find things. They are grateful for even the small service which we perform because of their experience when after the last war the University temporarily took over most of the buildings of Camp Devens for off-campus student housing. These were beautiful, solid brick and concrete buildings, with nary a plan to show where wires or pipes ran.

Considering the whole picture of the use of the Harvard Archives by administrative offices, it is obvious that the greatest number of reference services is in relation to such uninspiring things as cancelled checks. The use of their really archival material in our custody is relatively rare, except for the minutes of the Corporation. These are so active that the keeping of the index up-to-date is a matter of significance. Beyond this, research by the administrative offices is most frequently to determine the precise terms of former gifts. There is relatively little use of departmental correspondence except by the museums, which seem to be constantly losing objects. However, the museums tend to keep their correspondence for a hundred years, so they have most of the service problem.

The university archive is much more concerned than is the business, or even the government, archive, with finding facts or affording means of research for the public. The necessity of good public relations for the institution, the tradition that the university is a source of information, and the fact that it has a great roll of graduates in whom descendants and scholars are interested, drives the archive to give public service. One university president of my acquaintance set up the archive as a sort of record vault to his office, with a private stairway leading down to it; but other demands soon forced his archivist into offering the wide public services normal for such institutions.

In Cambridge, the first question of the public use of the archives came in June, 1747, when the town of Dunstable asked the Harvard Faculty for a transcript of the record of a young man recently ex-

pelled for good reason. The town had a legitimate interest in knowing why the student had been expelled, for it was considering settling him as its minister. The Faculty refused the transcript, refused to show the records to the Dunstable committee, and resolved that "the affairs committed to Writing in this Book [are not looked upon] to be records in any Respect, but only an Account of Various Things, as So many Memoranda to ourselves." Here is a curious forerunner of the "agreements and understandings" volume now kept by the Corporation. When the Faculty said that its minutes were not "records" it had in mind the New England concept of a public record to which the public had an inalienable right of access.

The most recent vote of the Harvard Corporation in regard to the use of its archives was to resolve that they were not maintained for the use of Jack Horner's searching for Ph.D. thesis topics. The attitude of the Corporation has been made somewhat more charitable by the successful exploitation of the early financial records in the writing of economic history.

In spite of enunciated University policy, most of the use of the Archives for historical research has been by the public. Maynard Brichford, University Archivist, University of Illinois, in particular has raised the question of how far we should go in providing guidance and advice to these public users. No university archive was ever set up for this purpose, but no archivist can avoid the problem. It underlines the point that the archivist or the staff man making the contact with the public should have as much Ph.D. training as possible in order that he can give such advice. Frequently the archivist will have to decide that the would-be user may not have access to particular records. It may be because he is personally inadequate, as a school child wanting to use valuable manuscripts. Sometimes the scholarship of the would-be user is inadequate. Recently a man came in from another university, doing a Ph.D. dissertation on a subject on which, as I found by putting a few questions, he had not done the fundamental reading. There would have been no point in trying to help him, so I gave him the few items which he asked for, but refrained from telling him of masses of further material.

Sometimes the archivist who is a knowing historian can see that a proposed book cannot be written because the requisite material is not available. Surely he cannot refuse to give this warning. There have been times when the applicant shrugged off my warning, and I then felt that I had to refuse to make the material available because to do so would have been to waste the time of our staff. I do not think that any archivist is appointed just to be a vending machine, handing out whatever is indicated by the user. He has, I think, been appointed to exercise his discretion and to make use of his knowledge as an archivist. It is not an easy thing to make these unpleasant decisions

against applicants, but such a policy of discrimination is absolutely essential. The policy of offering service to the public can sometimes become costly for the archivist's employer. From time to time friends of mine teaching in other parts of the country will send their graduate students to New England to write their theses, and instruct them to look me up. The students show me their plans, and I say, "A good subject, but because the available source material is much greater than your professor thought, too wide for a thesis." Then I cut down the topic and area of research, and wind up guiding a Ph.D. dissertation which has nothing at all to do with my employer. I have greatly enjoyed these contacts, but I feel guilty about them.

Our general rule for making material available to the visiting scholar is as follows. If the number on his call slip is for an item in the historical collection attached to the archives he is shown it without question. If the call number is for archival material more than fifty years old, he fills out a special form for my eventual approval, but, subject to the discretion of the reading room attendant, he is immediately given the file which he wishes to see.

Correspondence for the period since 1909 is a special case. There are many applicants to use the correspondence of Presidents Charles W. Eliot and A. Lawrence Lowell particularly. Most of these requests are reasonable, but a few have the purpose of sensational, and distorted, exploitation of the material. The doubtful requests we sift out by insisting that the applicants record the purpose of their research on the application form. We get an occasional visitor who obstinately refuses to tell us why he wants to use the material, and him we must turn away.

Often we can save the applicant's time by ourselves looking at the files of restricted correspondence to see whether or not there is anything of interest to him. If there is, the applicant submits a formal request which, if I approve, is passed on to the Secretary to the Corporation, or to the literary heirs, as the case may be. I do not remember that any request which I approved professionally has ever been turned down. Sometimes when an incompetent person asks to use recent departmental archives, the department head gives me a sign that he wishes that I would find an archival excuse for turning down the request, since he does not wish to hurt the person's feelings. We never give anyone permission to make a general search of such collections of papers. Sometimes we tell the readers that we trust them not to read beyond the point already approved. Reasonable copying is allowed, but permission must be obtained to publish any quotation from this recent material.

The majority of the users of our reading room come to consult doctoral dissertations. As you know, the ancient theory in regard to such theses holds that the dissertation is the contribution to human knowledge by which a scholar has earned his degree, and is the

university's proof that he earned it. Obviously the thesis must be "published," in the sense of being made available to the public, to accomplish these purposes.

In my university a couple of the largest departments have the reprehensible habit of assigning the candidates topics which will take a lifetime of research, and of accepting as dissertations what are no more than preliminary studies of these topics. Obviously these theses cannot be made available to the public without running the risk of injury to the author's literary rights. Of course this prospect of injury is greatly exaggerated. Many a young author, fully believing that the library is full of lurking scholars ready to steal and publish his ideas, thus forestalling the publication of his Great Work, demands that we sequester his dissertation. Actually, such sequestration is usually more harm than protection to the authors. There are in Cambridge a few departments which play along with these shy authors by ruling that the theses cannot be consulted without the author's permission for a period of five years. This is a point on which authors are so sensitive that we do not make exceptions even when college presidents come in examining theses as a step in the hiring of the writers. There seems to be a certain fatality which dictates the fact that when some young Ph.D. disappears into the jungle, a college president immediately wants to see his thesis.

Many of the dissertations really are sensitive. Among those on our shelves are ones dealing with living politicians in foreign countries, and others reporting most unflattering surveys of American cities. One of these really got me into trouble, and I report the experience as a warning to other university archivists.

A request for the interlibrary loan of a certain thesis came via the President's office. Only this curious course caused me to look at the thesis. I found that it had to do with the habits of a certain social group in the South, and that its circulation had been originally restricted by the then head of the Department of Sociology. This restriction had run its five year course, but the professor who had placed it was not available to advise me. Since the loan request came from the president of a southern university, it seemed to me to be discreet to report that the thesis was restricted. The college president was not so easily discouraged, however. He flew up to Cambridge, walked into our reading room, asked for the thesis, and was handed it by the attendant, who noticed, correctly, that the restriction had run out. The president read the thesis, rubbed his hands gleefully when he had finished, and told the reading room attendant, "I'm going straight home and fire the author; he is one of my professors." And so he did. And so the author of the thesis threatened that he was going to sue me for having published it.

Had the author done so, it would have been an interesting case, for we inform all doctoral degree recipients that the University reserves the right to make available to the public, and to copyright, any thesis or prize paper still unpublished five years after the date of its acceptance. It is our custom to tell would-be poachers that the University reserves the copyright on all theses and prize papers, and, at times, fear of the University lawyers has thus protected this literary property.

For those of us handling this kind of literary property, the Copyright Law Revision Part 2. Discussion and Comments on Reports of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law just issued, offers little encouragement.<sup>1</sup> Apparently the doctoral candidate will still have to rely on Justice Joseph Story's definition of literary property, and his own reservation of copyright, or else have two extra copies of his thesis made to deposit for copyright registration. The law is anything but clear, so a university archivist may well find himself spending more time on the problem created by doctoral dissertations, if these are within his purview, than on any other one segment of his duties.

Indeed, the dissertations begin to trouble me before they are written. As the candidates think up new questions, we are called upon to revise the regulations for writing of theses. The dean's office long ago gave up trying to answer questions as to suitable paper, satisfactory methods of reproducing the texts, and even the kind of paste to be used in attaching the illustrations. Frequently a student will argue that the ribbon copy of his thesis must be destroyed in the duplicating process, and he will often maintain that only a certain, usually non-permanent, process, can be used for this or that reason. We find it very useful to have some very strict rules in print so that we can make a great point of concession when we want to distract the candidate's attention from some really important rule which we are enforcing. One mistake which we have made has been to permit the candidates to submit various kinds of electro-print copies for the first, or record, copies of their theses. We have found by sad experience that good microfilm copies cannot be made from many of these substitutes; that there is nothing like the first ribbon copy of a manuscript for making reproductions.

The specifications of the kind of paper on which dissertations are typed have given us great trouble. An examination of the theses which arrive in any lot show every kind of variation in the paper stock, most of them, I believe, honest errors made by the students in their interpretation of our specifications. The one way to obtain the use of a uniform paper of good quality is obviously to require the candidate to use a particular brand and weight, but no widely obtainable commercial brand has permanence, good folding strength,

and proper surface qualities. Last year the representative of the Crane Company of Dalton, Massachusetts, over the last century the most important manufacturers of bank note paper, suggested that they box a suitable standard paper for dissertations, and so label it. We agreed that the idea was good, and had their sample tested for acidity. The report shocked and horrified them. Protesting that we were making too much of acidity, they went to work and made up a special batch of thesis paper for us. Sent to Richmond for testing, this sample soon had the excited experts on the telephone, reporting that the paper was actually alkaline as well as having the best folding strength of any typewriting paper they had ever seen. I have used all of the commercially produced typewriter papers recommended by this laboratory, and Crane's new paper is much the best. It is not as erasable as Ph.D. candidates could wish, but the more erasable papers have much more serious drawbacks. Our present thinking is to have this paper marketed under the trade name Crane's Thesis Paper. Presumably any university can have its stock labeled with its own name.

The ordinary administrative office uses permanent and expensive paper for its letterhead, and any cheap and highly acid paper for the carbon copies to be kept in its own files. Our Harvard purchasing agent has several times told the departmental offices that it has good second sheet material available for them, but apparently many prefer to do their own purchasing and buy the second sheet stock on the basis of color. In our university, no one wants to issue orders, but I can see no other solution to the problem.

The inquiries which our Cambridge office receives by mail from the general public take up a great part of our time. All of the offices of the University have become accustomed to forwarding to us to answer all questions relating to the past of the University, to its graduates, and to American history. This is a significant public relations service on which office secretaries used to waste hours of time because they did not have the necessary knowledge and the tools to find the answers. So many of the questions are recurring that we keep an index relating to the most popular ones. We have developed a vast attic of odds and ends of irrelevant historical fact from which we can sometimes produce information with what appears to the uninitiated to be miraculous efficiency. I remember that once when Perry Miller chanced to remark that he could not find the correspondence of an obscure non-Harvard man on whom he was working, we remembered that it was printed in a rare genealogy. We gracefully accepted his lyrical published praise of our efficiency without telling him that this was just one of those happy accidents.

Many of these questions have no relation to Harvard at all, but we are in the best position to field inquiries relating, for example, to

witches and signers of the Declaration of Independence. Many people write to the President of Harvard University as a sort of historical oracle, asking questions on the most diverse subjects. Usually we can satisfy them. In our own offices we keep a small reference collection containing such commonly used works as the alumni catalogs of other universities and the publications of the New England Historic Genealogical Society, the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. On the floors below our offices in the Widener Library building are the collections of American genealogy and history from which we answer many questions quickly and painlessly. A few years ago when it was proposed to move the Harvard Archives to a building of their own some blocks away, I said that it was a fine idea from an administrative point of view, but that I would resign if it was carried out, because I would not want to have to give up the general reference service.

The most frequently asked of these mail-order questions is, "Did my grandfather go to Harvard?" Sometimes by asking for further information on grandfather, we can identify him as the graduate of another institution. Often we are asked to provide legal proof of citizenship, as in cases where a widow is trying to qualify for a pension. As birth records were not kept in some states before 1890, our admissions records have been most useful. Government offices and insurance companies have never refused to accept as legal evidence photostats of autograph documents in which a student recorded his date and place of birth and his parentage. Sometimes a graduate's correspondence with his class secretary has been used to establish his mental competence at a particular time.

Requests by relatives for student grades of a century ago call for considerable translating on our part to establish their significance. Requests for grades less than fifty years old we refer to the proper administrative office so that they can evaluate the legal responsibility involved. Sometimes when old grads ask for their own grades in order to impress later generations, they are shocked and deflated.

Scholars frequently ask for the records of the use of the library made by the men in whom they are interested. It is certainly a request which deserves service, and it can be met without too much difficulty for the period when the library was open for only a few hours a week, and the charging records were kept in a book. With the advent of charging cards, this type of material became too voluminous, so we authorized its destruction. If such records were available, we would have to duplicate the list of books charged out by John F. Kennedy.

For the early period of our history, we sometimes have requests for the costs of a student's education, or a statement as to who paid the bills. Although this kind of material is often significant for

seventeenth and eighteenth century graduates, I hope that this does not encourage you to inquire as to the cost of Henry Thoreau's education, certainly a legitimate question.

Questions relating to the history of the University, and as to the state of knowledge on curriculum subjects, are all legitimate, and can be classed only as reasonable, or unreasonable, possible, or impossible. We cannot, for example, undertake to discover the first impact of a book or of a particular concept in physics. When such requests require more research than we can put into them, we can usually satisfy the inquirer that this is so. In regard to the questions that have no relevancy to Harvard, we answer them if reference to one or two books in the general collection of the University Library will supply the answer. Actually, a majority of such questions are so easily answerable by anyone well acquainted with the source material and reference works of American history that it would be unreasonable not to put in twenty minutes or so of research.

Of course it is often difficult to draw the line between reasonable and unreasonable. One lady who was writing a club paper on the history of universities asked for a thumbnail sketch of mine. I replied, courteously I thought, referring her to a readily available source, but she replied in anger that all of the rest of the archivists had sent to her synopses of the histories of their universities, so she had simply omitted Harvard from the history of American higher education.

A particularly annoying group of requests come from grade school students who have been encouraged by their teachers to do research by writing in for general information on leading American figures. My staff, thinking that I am discourteous in throwing such letters in the wastebasket, now regularly intercept them and answer them politely. More troublesome are the professors in distant universities who assign to the members of their classes such topics as the speech-education of various nineteenth century literary figures. Of course such research could be carried out only in the archives of the universities in which those literary figures were educated. It would consume far more time than we would devote to even important queries.

We are sometimes asked by other university archivists what reference use statistics we keep. The answer is simple, practically none. We have kept them for short periods to see how we spent our time, but in general we have found that the useful information which we needed could be combed from charge slips and use-permission applications.

So far as I personally am concerned, there are two joys in the life of an archivist. The first is the bringing order out of chaos. After that, except for making decisions as to preservation, the work

of the archivist would be dull routine were it not for the function of finding the answers to the amazing questions asked sometimes by our administrators, but usually by the public.

## REFERENCES

1. U. S. Copyright Office. Copyright Law Revision Part 2. Discussion and Comments on Reports of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U. S. Copyright Law. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.