

Microfilming Abroad¹

Dr. Born is special assistant on Microfilm Program, Library of Congress

UNDER this not too informative title (purposely not too informative, so that I might have complete freedom to move with the data which I have been able to assemble in the time available) I propose to speak briefly on several diverse but closely integrated matters which enter into any consideration of an extensive program of microfilming cultural materials. First, I should like to reiterate the several pronouncements of policy now in effect at the Library of Congress. Next, I should like to expand these statements with reference to current plans, and to make certain additions, including a word about cooperation. Thirdly, I should like to offer in evidence as supporting data for the above a brief résumé of activities up to this date. Next, I should like to refer briefly to the general problems inherent in microfilming projects and to the literature on the subject. And, lastly, I should like to add a very few words about the situation abroad with respect to microfilm facilities.

Policy Statements Reiterated

Just one year ago Dan Lacy, then assistant director for acquisitions, Processing Department, Library of Congress, appeared before this group and presented a series of provocative arguments together with a statement of the position already taken by the Library of Congress with respect to many of them.² On Sept. 6, 1949, Dr. Luther

H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, addressed the First Congress of Historians of Mexico and the United States at Monterrey, Mexico on "The Preservation of the Documentation on the History of the Americas."³ The common thread of argument in both papers is the urgent need for cooperation in cultural enterprises. The common pronouncement of the Library of Congress is a forthright statement of its willingness to cooperate, its willingness to offer leadership, its intention to take positive action. Neither of these papers reached the library world without warning. I have found, for example, a dittographed proposal entitled "Interlibrary Cooperation in Microfilming Significant Runs of Library Materials,"⁴ which is dated Nov. 2, 1944, and a development of those notes which is dated Dec. 20, 1946⁵ and covered by a letter of the same date from the Librarian of Congress to Paul North Rice, executive secretary, Association of Research Libraries (both mimeographed).

The keynote to any extensive program is found in the statement of Dr. Evans, that "now more than ever the great libraries in the relative safety of the Western World share a heavy responsibility to civilization for the very continuity of enlightenment. We of this generation shall not have met that responsibility until we have done our utmost to reproduce and store beyond the reach of destruction the irreplaceable cul-

Tool: Policies, Plans and Problems," *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, 6:8-17, May 1949.

³ Evans, Luther H. "The Preservation of the Documentation on the History of the Americas." *Ibid*, 7:3-8, November, 1949.

⁴ Prepared in the Library of Congress. 4p.

⁵ Interlibrary Cooperation in Microfilming Extensive Runs of Library Materials. 4p.

¹ This paper was read essentially in its present form at the Acquisition Department Heads of Research Libraries Round Table, A.L.A. Midwinter Meeting, Chicago, Jan. 26, 1950.

² Lacy, Dan. "Microfilming as a Major Acquisitions

tural resources of mankind."⁶ The policy is not merely a passive one of preservation, it is also an active one of security through understanding. "Because every nation's future is so intimately dependent on the rest of the world, it becomes a peculiar responsibility of libraries to enrich the resources upon which scholars may draw in furthering the understanding of all countries—the understanding not only of their contemporary problems and their immediate purposes, but of the deep currents of their history. We shall not have met that responsibility until we have done all that we can to place at the command of scholars in our respective countries the basic historical sources of all cultures."⁷

Obviously the assumption of this responsibility is no matter to be taken lightly. It will overtax the resources of even the greatest libraries acting singly. Little permanent good will be afforded by the institution which does less than an excellent job, and no credit will fall to the burden bearer who falters in his step. The objective has been stated clearly, the ways and means for accomplishment are at hand. There remains only one thing, the all important choice of method.

The only practicable medium through which to attack the problem is microphotography. (Whether the ultimate desideratum is microfilm or microprint is a secondary matter.) The technique of microphotography has already progressed to the point where we may, with complete realism, look forward to a national, a hemispheric, a global network of microfilming facilities. As stated by Mr. Lacy last year, the bases of effective cooperative effort in the field of microphotography are these:⁸ (1) A set of commonly accepted technical standards; (2) a clearing house of information concerning

major projects; (3) a planning committee to evaluate the need for microphotocopying materials and to afford a medium through which libraries would divide the spheres of responsibility; (4) arrangements for making available to other libraries the results of major projects; (5) acceptance of the principle of interlibrary loan as applicable to microfilms. To these criteria we should probably add a sixth; namely, the effective establishment of an international network of microphotographing enterprises.

Current Plans, Extension of Policy

Last year Mr. Lacy announced some active plans, some projected plans.⁹ In the field of domestic operations, the Library of Congress continues its project to film great metropolitan daily newspapers the files of which are in danger of deterioration or actual disintegration because they were printed on wood pulp paper. The projected plan to acquire out-of-print books and serials in microfilm form as a substitute for the expensive search-and-purchase of these desiderata has not yet been adopted.

In the general field of acquisitions through microfilming, it has been stated that the Library of Congress has an obvious responsibility: (1) to microfilm abroad unpublished materials which relate to the national history of the United States; (2) to microfilm legal materials, whether printed or manuscript, of which no copies exist in the United States.¹⁰ It may also be added that the Library of Congress is eager to exploit fortuitous opportunities to microfilm *in extenso* large bodies of cultural materials not hitherto available or likely long to remain available. Examples to the point are the current projects for the microphotographing of records in the Japanese Foreign Office, and of a large number of manuscripts at Jerusalem and Mt. Sinai invaluable for the

⁶ Evans, *loc. cit.*, p.3.

⁷ Evans, *loc. cit.*, p.4.

⁸ Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.9-12.

⁹ Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.13 and 16.

¹⁰ Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.13.

pursuit of research in Biblical exegesis and the history of art.

The Library of Congress recognizes its responsibility to assist in the performance of such major tasks in the general interest of American scholarship and the better understanding between nations. This point begs a very serious question: Albeit the Library of Congress recognizes this responsibility, and in the cases just cited has acted promptly, how could the Library of Congress have achieved communal advice, how could the Library of Congress have achieved speedy cooperative action under existing conditions? It is therefore believed essential that there be created at the earliest opportunity an advisory committee on the cooperative planning of extensive microfilm projects which will be representative of the interests inherent in the philosophies of research libraries, professional associations and composite groups devoted to the advancement of human knowledge. Without such a committee even the best intended and most meticulously executed plans will always be subject to the possible criticism that they do not reflect the national thinking, that they do not represent most effectively the national interests.

But to return to the story of the Library of Congress and its announced plans. It has likewise been stated¹¹ that the Library of Congress should try to aid in the establishment, at one or more centers in each of the major countries of the world, of microfilming facilities adequate to serve the needs of American institutions and American scholarship. The degree of aid, the nature of the aid will necessarily vary from country to country. In some it will largely be stimulus to a broader point of view, in others it will necessarily be the physical importation of equipment, the training of operators, the complete operation, at least at

first, of these outposts of aids to scholarship.

The next point relates to the scope of any independent or cooperative large scale microfilming project. While magnificent work was done by individuals and by institutions to make safe against modern war the cultural heritage, much has been lost. While conscientious and often spectacular work was done by the officers and men of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives units in the field, combat is no environment in which to safeguard or rescue cultural materials. What then? The War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials in Britain, as described by Dr. W. J. Wilson, "while designed incidentally to serve American scholars, was thought of from the start as an attempt to rescue from possible destruction certain of the literary treasures of England."¹² The plan had been much broader in its inception; namely, to photocopy the basic cultural treasures of a documentary nature in all Western Europe. The outbreak of active combat on the Continent forced the limitation of the plan to Britain. Whether it would have been practicable no one can say. Even a selective list of manuscripts and rare printed items required much time to film.

A far more ambitious program has been planned by the Committee on Documentary Reproduction of the American Historical Association, as you know, through the medium of its numerous subcommittees, each of which is responsible for the plans relating to a specific country. The fulfilment of the plans of all these subcommittees would result in the availability in the United States of entire series of the most important cultural source materials of all the accessible countries of the world. The cost of such a program is staggering, even in a world accustomed to 10-figure budgets. The Finnish Committee of the A.H.A., for example,

¹¹ Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.15.

¹² Wilson, W. J. "Manuscripts in Microfilm." *Library Quarterly*, 13:218, July 1943.

estimates at least one year's work with a two-camera team for this comparatively small archival source. In France, on the other hand, there are at least 26 classes in the Archives de France, each of which would probably require the services of a two-camera team for one year. And remember this estimate disregards all libraries in Paris, and repositories of all types elsewhere in France.¹³ To the basic cost of such a filming project must be added the cost of processing, editing, and servicing the completed rolls of films.

Other groups which are grappling with the same gigantic problem are less sanguine of accomplishment on so grandiose a scale. For example, the Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies reported just one year ago:

The destruction of libraries and archives in Europe during the last war has taught us a sad lesson. It is the duty of responsible scholarly organizations to help protect the irreplaceable materials in such collections against the hazards of the future. A complete microfilming of entire collections of records or of manuscript books is not feasible on account of the extent of the European collections, for it would entail not only a very large expenditure on the making of the microfilms but an even larger one on their cataloging and administration. It is important to select those pieces which are really important and irreplaceable. Such a selection requires time, much preliminary information, and the expert knowledge of many scholars in different fields. . . . The preliminary information needed consists primarily of catalogs of the manuscript collections, preferably printed catalogs. . . . As an interim solution, the handwritten inventories preserved on the spot should be microfilmed and thus made accessible to scholars, preferably in the Library of Congress.¹⁴

The authors of the report, William A. Jackson and Paul O. Kristeller, then go on

¹³ These estimates are based upon studies made by the A.H.A. Sub-Committee for Finland and for France.

¹⁴ Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, conclusions, dated Jan. 17, 1949. 2p., mimeographed.

to say that "although present circumstances suggest that much of the initiative and funds should come from this country, co-operation with European governments, institutions, libraries and scholars should be emphasized and would be mutually advantageous. European countries should be encouraged to develop their own microfilm deposits, in addition to the ones built up in this country. In this way, the plan will not present itself as an act of interference on the part of American scholars, but as a kind of Marshall plan in the world of scholarship."¹⁵

Coincidentally with the announcement of the above report Mr. Lacy announced that the Library of Congress believed its most useful contribution toward a solution of this great dilemma would be to undertake to microfilm such unpublished (or inaccessible published) bibliographies, guides, inventories, calendars and other finding aids.¹⁶ In this past calendar year the Library of Congress has already taken several constructive steps toward the fulfilment of this self-imposed responsibility. As is coming to be appreciated more fully, even the limited objective of establishing facilities for satisfactory operations, and of securing and promulgating the knowledge of the materials which exist is a task of no small compass.

In May 1949, after a period of preliminary negotiations carried on by correspondence, the Library of Congress sent two representatives to Italy to carry on personal negotiations in that country. These representatives were accorded a friendly personal reception wherever they went—the Vatican Library, the Vatican Archives, the private archives of Prince Doria Pamphili, the Archives of the State in Rome, and the central office of the state library system. In many of these places there was a gratifying grasp of the importance of the project, and an expressed desire to see it furthered. It

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p. 15.

was, however, necessary to present the proposal in formal terms to the Italian government through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This formal presentation laid great stress upon the mutual benefits to be derived from the proposal. Again, you see, cooperation is at the core of the project. Inasmuch as this proposal was conceived of as a pilot project, it may not be without interest to quote the opening paragraphs here.

In the interest of historical research and scholarship not only in the United States but also in the entire civilized world the Library of Congress proposes to the Italian Government a project, which could be operated under the guidance of the appropriate agency of the Italian Government, for microfilming the significant source materials, largely unpublished, which are in the archives and libraries of Italy. If this broad proposal is acceptable to the Italian Government it is intended to develop the project in Italy as a pilot project on the basis of which similar broad proposals may subsequently be made to other governments. The Library of Congress has thus far restricted its microfilming activities in other countries largely to reproduction of materials bearing on the history of the United States.

The proposed plan contains many features which should prove advantageous to both governments. From the point of view of the United States the proposed project would serve three purposes: (1) It would increase the bibliographic resources of the Library of Congress; (2) it would enable individual scholars to select with precision particular manuscripts, documents and rare books which they require; and (3) it would establish a medium in Italy through which the Library of Congress might obtain microfilms of required items under favorable local auspices. The advantages of these points to scholarship in the Western Hemisphere in general can hardly be exaggerated.

The advantages to the Italian Government from the approval and successful implementation of the proposed project would certainly include those enumerated herewith: (1) International good will; (2) a second depository, located in another hemisphere, for the important records of the Italian cultural heritage as protection against total loss; (3) an assured

source from which microfilm or paper copies subsequently may be procured to replace in regular use original material endangered or damaged by excessive handling or normal deterioration; (4) increased knowledge throughout the civilized world of Italian historical and cultural source materials; (5) a firm basis for the Italian archives and libraries to initiate requests for exchange or microfilming of materials relating to Italian history which are located outside Italy; (6) demonstrated leadership in the present efforts (e.g., those being made by Unesco) to liberalize the understanding between nations and therefore of providing a firm basis for a lasting peace.

The Italian government referred the proposal to the Superior Council in the appropriate ministries. Because the summer months intervened the matter was first put on the agenda for September at which time, in the Ministry for Public Instruction, it was referred to a committee which was instructed to report in December. At this time I do not have that report. The Library of Congress, however, has not allowed itself to become discouraged by these delays. It believes that the experience so far gained will be invaluable for the future, and it is convinced that by appealing to the spirit of cooperation it has tapped a wellspring of international good will which will do much to relieve the odium attached to American wealth of resources.

The second step forward taken by the Library of Congress during the past year was to create on the staff the position of Special Assistant on Microfilm Program, and to place that position in the Office of the Assistant Director for Acquisitions in the Processing Department. The basic responsibility of the incumbent of this position is to plan for the photoreproduction of materials for addition to the collections of the Library of Congress. He is concerned with the professional, as opposed to the technical, aspects of the execution of projects. He will represent the Library of Congress in dealing with other libraries, foundations, and similar

institutions with respect to the establishment and execution of photoreproduction projects. Of necessity, a large proportion of his time will be spent outside the continental limits of the United States. The headquarters for foreign activities probably will be located in Paris. The exact address will be announced later.

An important feature of the program will be the accumulation of information regarding foreign depositories, their unpublished bibliographical tools, and photoreproduction equipment existing abroad. The Library of Congress will endeavor to develop the means of aiding American scholars and other American institutions in obtaining photoreproductions of materials abroad through the medium of the information detailed just above; by aiding in the negotiation of permissions to film; by aiding in the establishment of services supplementary to those already (inadequately) existing abroad; and, within the limits of its resources, by any related means which contributes to the wider dissemination of knowledge. The Library of Congress will develop standard practices for the editorial and bibliographical aspects of photoreproduction, particularly as regards archival and other manuscript material, and will prepare statements of procedures for publication.

In addition, the Library of Congress plans to publish sales catalogs for the materials microfilmed under this expanded program so that interested individuals or institutions may know what has been made available and may be enabled to order positive microfilm copies for their use. Information on projects in progress, on recent acquisitions of microfilm received but not yet ready for service, and general news in connection with these activities will be reported from time to time in such obvious media as the *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* or *Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*. In order that this goal of expeditious processing

of information and of microfilm may be achieved, the Library of Congress plans to allocate to this task the full time services of an editorial assistant who will work in close liaison with the Chief of the Photoduplication Service and with the Special Assistant on Microfilm Program.

*Résumé of Photo Activities*¹⁷

As early as 1905 the Library of Congress had arranged for the hand-copying abroad of documents relating to the history of the United States. Occasional photographic reproductions were made, usually by privately owned camera. About 1910 the use of the photostat was introduced. Between 1905 and 1927 some 300,000 folios had been copied by one means or another. In 1927 Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. granted funds which eventually totaled \$490,000 and which were expended over a period of seven years. During that time the Library of Congress acquired through this means more than 2,500,000 pages of manuscripts. In 1925 the Library of Congress had received an endowment from James B. Wilbur the income from which was to be expended continuously for the acquisition of materials abroad relating to American history. In 1923 the Modern Language Association undertook to secure for American scholars individual items by photoreproduction outside the United States. The Library of Congress received these on deposit and provided the servicing of the collection.

The activities of the War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials have already been mentioned in passing. In 1942 the work came to a temporary stop, but since 1947 the unfinished work has been resumed. Since the end of the war filming of source materials on American history has also been resumed in England, France and Spain. In November 1948 the

¹⁷ This section is based upon data assembled, but not published, by Mrs. Marlene Wright of the Library of Congress.

Library of Congress assumed responsibility for the management and operations of the microfilm laboratory of the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City which is filming for the Library of Congress, and any other American institutions which place orders, materials relating to the United States.

The most recent development is that which has already been mentioned in passing; namely, the decision on the part of the Library of Congress to further the dissemination of knowledge by cooperating in the filming of specific bodies of materials when unique opportunities present themselves to film materials of extraordinary value or importance. The projects currently in progress at Jerusalem and Mt. Sinai have already been mentioned. So has the project of filming for the Department of State the records of the Japanese Foreign Office. At the same time, the Library of Congress is securing microfilm copies of numerous serials available in the library of the National Diet of Japan. Closely associated with this enlarged point of view is the sub-publishing of certain materials which would not otherwise be generally available. An example of this from the foreign field is the recent collection on microfilm of all the prime editions of Ronsard to which will be added, in the film, critical notes prepared by an American scholar.

From the domestic field we may cite the project which was started in 1941 under the joint sponsorship of the Library of Congress and the University of North Carolina and which has been carried out under direction of William S. Jenkins. Its purpose is to assemble and organize systematically, for the early period, the statutory, constitutional, executive, administrative, judicial, and legislative records of all the colonies, territories and states. Editorial annotations are a part of the film. At the present time the project has resulted in

1,200 rolls of film 100 feet in length containing approximately 1,440,000 exposures and 2,880,000 pages of text.¹⁸ Also from the domestic field we may cite the current project to microfilm for purpose of preservation important American newspapers, and for that reason as well as for reasons of general research, the project to microfilm, in cooperation with the Committee on Negro Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, early Negro newspapers.

Because of its significance, it should be noted again that the Library of Congress has established in the Union Catalog Division a clearing house for information regarding extensive microfilm projects which relate to newspapers, serials, and manuscript collections. The purpose of this clearing house has been to bring together in one place data from scattered sources on microfilming projects which are being considered, which are in progress, and which have been completed. The ultimate in service will be achieved when this clearing house can also provide information on all materials currently available through photoreproduction in this country.

*Literature on Microfilming*¹⁹

This brief section is presented with some hesitancy lest its nature be misunderstood. It is, to state the obvious, no attempt to give a critical evaluation of the existing literature on the manifold problems posed by the preservation of library materials on microfilm. It is rather an attempt to indicate how muddied are the waters, and to suggest explicitly and implicitly the need for such a critical evaluation.

Even a cursory examination of the 77 titles listed in the most recent bibliography,

¹⁸ Jenkins, William S. "Records of the States of the United States." *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, 6:3-7, May 1949.

¹⁹ This section and the following section were omitted in the oral presentation of the paper so as to keep the time required for presentation within the proper limits.

"Microfilm and Microcards: Their Use in Research. A Selected List of Recent References,"²⁰ reveals the continued struggle with the new medium. It reveals the attempt to compile bibliographies based on the medium rather than on the materials filmed; to explain new equipment; to establish the legal status of materials which appear in the form of microfilm; to prepare subject lists of materials available; to process and service the acquisitions in film form. It also contains much on the philosophy of the new mechanized aids to research scholarship. Other matters are those of union cataloging, already mentioned; the question whether or not film should or can be cataloged; the special problems posed by the fact that most of the materials which constitute the text on the frames of microfilms is manuscript; the uncertainty of form: roll film, flat film, microcard, microprint.

The speed of mechanical progress in this century leaves the scholar and the librarian, as well as the layman, somewhat breathless. For that reason, the fundamental papers on microphotography which were presented only a little more than a decade ago²¹ already seem as outmoded as do early motion pictures when compared with the technically perfected contemporary examples. While the *Manual*²² of Binkley will always be the classic in this field, so much has happened since its publication that one must supplement its fact-finding pages with references to periodical literature,²³ and its visionary pages with such papers as Tate's.²⁴

²⁰ Library of Congress, General Reference and Bibliography Division, Nov. 29, 1949. 9p. Typed. A revised and enlarged edition is now being prepared.

²¹ Ranev, M. Llewellyn, ed. *Microphotography for Libraries: Papers Presented at the Microphotography Symposium at the 1936 Conference of the American Library Association*. Chicago, A.L.A. 1936. xi, 138p. Idem, *Microphotography for Libraries, 1937*. . . . Chicago, A.L.A., 1937. ix, 89p.

²² Binkley, Robert C. *Manual on Methods of Reproducing Research Materials: A Survey Made for the Joint Committee on Materials for Research of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies*. Ann Arbor, Edwards Brothers, 1936. xiv, 207p.

²³ For example, Daniel F. Noll. "From the Microphotographer's Mail." *American Archivist*, 11:238-45, July 1948.

It may not be amiss, however, to quote a few passages from the first chapter of the Binkley *Manual*, "The Setting of the Problem of Reproducing Research Materials."

In dealing with the problem of research materials, three interests are to be distinguished: those of the scholar as a producer, of the scholar as a consumer, and of the library as a custodian. The scholar as a producer wants to see his manuscript set up in type, printed on good paper, bound in buckram, and distributed in as large an edition as possible. . . . The consumer interest is that of the man who is using a library. All the documents of which he makes use are for him "materials for research." He does not care whether they are printed or typewritten or in manuscript form, whether durable or perishable, whether original or photostat, so long as they are legible. . . . The custodian's interest has to do with the demands of future generations of scholars. The growth of each library must be so directed that its present acquisitions dovetail with past and future acquisitions. The custodian must also undertake to gather items for which there is no present demand on the part of the "consumer;" he may seek especially to care for the unique things which are nowhere else collected and preserved. . . .

In the distribution of books, that is to say, in the formulating of library acquisition policies, the consumer and custodian interests clash. . . . In the attempt to meet the need, library funds are turned this way and that, regardless of long-term policies, to supply the research requirements of the man who happens to be on the ground. But this interferes with the distribution of fields among libraries, which is necessary if the total resources of scholarship are to be used most efficiently in collecting and preserving materials.

An inquiry into the techniques of reproducing research materials is called for at the present time because there are coming to light new processes and devices which, taken in their entirety, promise to have an impact on the intellectual world comparable with that of the invention of printing. . . . A few more inventions along the present line of technological development may result in rendering "re-printing" a kind of simple addition to the func-

²⁴ Tate, Vernon D. "From Binkley to Bush." *American Archivist*, 10:249-57, July 1947.

tions of a library, as photostating has come to be.²⁵

Only 10 years later it could be said that "the photostat and a number of other devices for full-size reproduction of library materials will undoubtedly continue to be used for some purposes in the future. They do not, however, offer the great economies in production of extremely small editions and in storage space that are presented by microfilm; neither do they raise the problems involved in library handling of a medium that requires reading machines for its use. . . . Microfilm and microprint [are] methods of reproduction that seem to have the greatest possibilities for further development."²⁶

In 1942 Dr. W. J. Wilson, who is now chief, History of Medicine Division, Army Medical Library, prepared for the American Council of Learned Societies a report "the motive of which was to furnish a factual and logical groundwork for administrative decision." This report analyzed what had been done with the films received at the Library of Congress from the War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials in Britain, what had been done at the Library of Congress in handling similar projects, and what had been done there and elsewhere with respect to the basic problem of cataloging manuscripts. It also attempted some analysis of the principles of such cataloging. The report likewise discussed the classification, numbering, and storage of microfilm. The materials of this report, except for the sections last mentioned, have been published in two articles.²⁷ Even after a lapse of seven years this probably is still the best general analysis of the problems.

²⁵ Binkley, *op. cit.*, p. 1 and 2.

²⁶ Williams, Edwin E. and Noble, Ruth V. *Preliminary Memoranda . . . for the Conference to Discuss International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges, Princeton University, 25-26 November, 1946. Sponsored by the International Relations Board and the Board on Resources of the American Library Association.* Cambridge, Mass., 1946. 195p. Mimeographed. The passage quoted is from Chapter IV, "Photographic Reproduction," p.43.

Microfilm Facilities Abroad

This last brief section, like that which immediately precedes it, serves primarily a negative function. In spite of the excellent facilities which are available at a very few large centers such as London and Paris, and the temporary excellent (U.S.) facilities in Mexico City, apparently the best generalization that can be made about microfilm facilities throughout the world is that they do not compare favorably with those in the United States either in geographical distribution, quality of equipment, efficiency of operation, and pricing.²⁸ But it must be remarked at once that detailed information on facilities in the many countries of Europe, Central and South America, not to mention the Near East and Asia, Africa, and the Pacific areas is either very fragmentary to date or nonexistent. A list is being prepared by the Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureau for Great Britain, a list is already available for the Netherlands, and, so I am told, the International Federation of Documentation is about to undertake the preparation of a general list. Whether or not this list proves to be inclusive or selective, the Library of Congress will be in a position to annotate it from time to time as the result of its foreign program.

From this brief summary of the policies already announced, of the plans and extended policies just announced, from the illustrative example of problems ahead, and from the statement of work already done I hope that I have presented a telescopic view of the field of microfilming projects as seen by the Library of Congress.

²⁷ Wilson, W. J. "Manuscripts in Microfilm." *Library Quarterly*, 13:212-26, July 1943; *ibid*, 13:293-309, October 1943.

²⁸ Prewar information, based upon first-hand acquaintance with microfilming facilities in the large libraries of Europe in the period 1934-1940, is summarized in the article of Adele Kibre, "Microphotography in European Libraries." *Journal of Documentary Reproduction*, 4:158-63, September 1941.