

causes unnecessary problems for the editor, does not help the researcher, and may lead to hurt feelings among the staff members of archives listed as "Miscellaneous" (this being a rather charged word to many archivists.) Alphabetical order, or a completely random order, would be equally helpful to the user and would save time and effort for the editor.

One other suggestion might be made, and that concerns the title itself. Would it not be more accurate to use a title such as "TAAG: A Guide to Member Repositories" or something similar? The helpful introduction by Jane Nokes describes the terms of reference of the project, and it might be useful to have the title correspond more closely to these terms of reference.

Altogether the *Guide* contains main entries for 40 repositories, and the appendix lists 26 more. Many of these have never before been listed in a published guide. The information in this booklet is pertinent, the lay-out of entries is sensible, and the proofreading appears to have been well done. The preparation of a guide such as this is, I feel, one of the most useful projects that a regional archivists' group can undertake, and the Toronto area archivists are to be congratulated for their very fine work.

Grace Maurice  
Public Archives of Canada

**The National Archives and Foreign Relations Research.** Edited by MILTON O. GUSTAFSON. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1974. Pp. 292. \$10.00.

In 1967 the United States National Archives and Records Service inaugurated a series of conferences for the exchange of ideas and information between archivists and researchers, more specifically, to increase contacts and improve relations between the scholarly community and the National Archives. The conference dealing with foreign relations research was held at the National Archives building in Washington in June, 1969. During the course of two days twenty-three formal papers were delivered at ten sessions designed around separate aspects of American relations with specific countries and areas, and two major wars of the 20th century, domestic influences on foreign policy, administrative history, the publication of diplomatic documents, and the archival sources relevant to each of these topics. This volume consists of both the papers and the discussions that followed each session.

The opening session of the conference was taken up with the presentation of papers by various members of the staff of the National Archives relating to records on foreign relations in their custody. The records of the State Department, totalling 17,000 cubic feet, were described and filing systems explained for the benefit of researchers by the conference director, M.O. Gustafson, who is the chief of the Foreign Affairs Branch of

the National Archives. He also described briefly the other eleven record groups relating to foreign affairs, and commented on some of the problems in accessioning and microfilming State Department records. Other members of the staff presented papers on the other pertinent sources. The voluminous records of both the War and Navy Departments contain much valuable documentation on American foreign affairs. The War Department's involvement in the affairs of other nations increased after 1898, and since the Revolutionary War, naval affairs and foreign affairs have been interdependent upon each other on many occasions. This naval-diplomatic collaboration has been of a personal character on one hand, whereas, at the policy level, naval strength has been consistently used to support foreign policy objectives. The records of these two departments are arranged in several record groups, and those of the Office of the Adjutant General alone total more than 60,000 feet of material.

Robert Wolfe described the foreign records captured at the end of World War II and pointed out that, in addition to their obvious value, how useful these records are for the study of the relations between the United States and non-enemy countries. For example, U.S. — French relations between the two world wars, of great interest to Germany, can be researched from captured German Foreign Office files on the subject, whereas the French diplomatic archives for the same period are inaccessible. The indispensable documentation created by the presidents and their officials in the various presidential libraries was commented on, as were the non-textual records (motion pictures, photographs, sound recordings, maps, and so forth) on foreign affairs in the National Archives. The discussion that took place at the end of this session focused mainly on the question of access to the records in the Archives and in the creating departments and agencies. As is the case in so many other countries, the major complaint of researchers was the difficulty experienced in gaining access to classified records and the reluctance of bureaucrats to declassify their files for research purposes.

In his paper on the domestic influence on foreign relations in this century, Wayne S. Cole, University of Maryland, drew attention to the fact that the research in the area of 20th century foreign affairs has barely scratched the surface and that one of the obstacles hindering research on domestic influences has been the tradition and ease of producing old-fashioned, conventional, diplomatic history. The diplomatic historian has been attached to the older, conventional research methods, but "if knowledge and understanding of domestic influences on foreign affairs are to be increased substantially, historians need to retool and explore imaginatively the possible contributions and limitations of new research methods, including quantitative and behavioral methods and the insights provided by other disciplines" (p. 112). Diplomatic historians must, in future, widen their horizons and be prepared to revise their thinking — in other words, emulate the diplomats and politicians.

The remainder of the sessions pertained to such topics as American participation in war and peacemaking, United States relations with Europe, Latin America, East Asia, the Middle East and Africa. Most of the participants commented on the vastness or the paucity of available source material, the lack of adequate guides and finding aids to records relating to their areas of research, the inability to gain access to records in foreign archives, the shortage of scholars with a knowledge of foreign languages, the amount of documentation not available on microfilm, and so on. They, on the other hand, were assured by their hosts that archivists are indeed aware of these and other problems facing researchers, and that was one of the reasons for organizing such a conference.

Scholars who are researching in the area of Canadian-American relations will find this publication of particular interest because of the information it contains on United States diplomatic sources at the National Archives. Also of great benefit to Canadian diplomatic historians would undoubtedly be a similar conference on the available sources relating to Canada's diplomatic relations. Several papers given by archivists, historians, retired diplomats, and government officials would substantially improve research methods on diplomatic history in Canada. Such institutions as the Departments of External Affairs and National Defence, Canadian International Development Agency, university history departments, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, the Public Archives of Canada, and other interested groups, should give serious consideration to convening such a conference in the near future.

J.W. O'Brien  
Public Archives of Canada

**Panoramic maps of Anglo-American cities: A checklist of maps in the collections of the Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division.** Compiled by JOHN R. HÉBERT. Washington: Library of Congress, 1974. Pp. 118. \$2.20.

Few documents in cartographical collections have as wide and immediate an appeal as does the bird's-eye view. More explicit than the city views which preceded them, more striking in their artistry than the aerial photographs which followed, these non-photographic representations of urban centres from approximately 1870 to 1920 are now beginning a second career. Originals are as a consequence being "found" in private and public collections, reproductions are appearing as illustrations in books, and facsimiles of about one dozen have already been produced.

At the Library of Congress in the United States, John Hébert's interest led him to concentrate on building up that institution's collection of bird's-eye views. In 1970 he issued a checklist of views located to date; in