

Ephemera, Archives, and Another View of History

by **JIM BURANT**

In September 1992, I made a presentation on "Acquiring, Describing, and Making Ephemera Available at the National Archives of Canada" at the Society of American Archivists' Annual Conference in Montreal. It was part of a session on "Ephemera in Archives," with two other speakers who dealt with different aspects relating to ephemera; the first about dealing with users, and the second about using ephemera in exhibitions from an historian's perspective.¹ The session was lively and interesting, and provoked a certain amount of interest in a little-discussed topic. Since that presentation, I have thought a little more about the nature of ephemera, its definition and meaning within the larger context of archival theory and practice, and in relation to how archivists can attempt to define "records of enduring archival value." Comments and critiques made to me by two colleagues in the profession, George Brandak of Special Collections at the University of British Columbia, and Brian Murphy of the Manuscript Division of the National Archives of Canada, have also provided me with valuable insights, many of which are noted and included here. I would like, in the next few pages, to reflect both on the presentation I made in 1992, and to explore some ideas about ephemera and archives.

In the 14 March 1992 *Toronto Globe & Mail*, an article entitled "Stuff: History in a Dustbin" appeared, which offered fascinating insights into the world of ephemerists. It described the formation in 1975, in England, of the Ephemera Society by a few like-minded collectors, lead by a man named Maurice Rickards. Since 1975, the Ephemera Society has blossomed into a 1,000-member organization, operating monthly bazaars, publishing a quarterly newsletter called *The Ephemerist*, and generally championing the cause of ephemera collecting.² A separate entity, the International Ephemera Council, with links to spin-off societies in Australia, Canada, the United States, and elsewhere around the world, has also been founded. The Ephemera Society of America and the Ephemera Society of Canada, founded in 1980 and 1989 respectively, boast more than a thousand members; both organizations publish quarterly newsletters and hold annual conferences as well as authorized sales gatherings.

For certain kinds of ephemera, specialized organizations, each with its own publications, have developed. *The Postcard Collector*, a journal filled with an interesting range and variety of advertisements and articles about specific themes or subjects in postcard and other ephemera collecting, has been published for more than a decade. Postcard collectors have now dignified themselves with the title of “deltiologists.” There are also journals devoted to antique collecting by specialized groups with such interests as antique door-knobs, movie memorabilia, and other assorted varieties of ephemera. There are many such formal and informal groups of ephemera collectors throughout North America, such as the Ottawa Collectors’ Society, an amalgam of individuals interested in subjects from beer bottle labels and matchbook covers to railway timetables and political posters.

Barbara Rusch, president of the Ephemera Society of Canada, has explained the growing interest in ephemera: “All collectors of vintage ephemera are on a mission to make some sort of connection with a bygone age.”³ Maurice Rickards described it as an abiding curiosity in social history, and a new form of historical inquiry; in the *Globe & Mail* article he states: “We don’t collect just for the sake of it. We collect because ephemera casts a brilliant light on parts of social history that often get neglected.... History divides pretty neatly down the centre, between what you find on the library shelves and what you find in the wastebin.”⁴ For an archivist, the emphasis on a division between libraries and everything else is a painful one: what about our vaunted position as preservers of the collective memory of the past?

It is the development of attitudes such as those expressed by Rickards, Rusch, and other ephemerists that should concern the archival community. Collecting ephemera has become a very popular pursuit, in which people not only indulge their collecting manias, but ensure that a history with no connection to what they seem to perceive as an “official” history is carried forward. Archivists (particularly those who have developed their archives as “documentalists” rather than “record-keepers,” to use two Australian terms, but even those who are institutional records-keepers) must become more aware of the perception of exclusivity that has taken shape and form through the ephemeral. The ephemera movement represents an intellectual challenge to what I believe to be generally held concepts of what constitutes “essential evidence,” as well as a concern, in that public perceptions and attitudes towards, and confidence in, public record-keeping bodies appears to be changing--not necessarily for the better.⁵

As archivists, we must always remain aware of changing trends in the research and collecting communities. While most of us consider ephemera not worthy of our individual or collective attention, we are probably all ephemera collectors within our own institutions, and we have to come to grips with the fact. I would like to touch on several points in this regard: first, by attempting to define the term “ephemera” as it relates to archival fonds; second, by a brief review of archival literature to see if there is an archival approach to ephemera; and finally, by developing a philosophical and practical approach to appraising and acquiring archival records of an ephemeral nature.

What is ephemera? The Oxford Dictionary defines the term “ephemera” as “short-lived” or “transitory.” The Fall 1991 *Ephemera News* provided a more formal definition in an article about an exhibition arranged by the Friends of the University of Iowa Libraries: “any item which was printed to represent a specific enterprise or to announce a specific event, satisfying a short-lived purpose.”⁶

The Association of British Columbia Archivists' *Manual for Small Archives* gives yet another definition:

Ephemera are those everyday, impermanent items produced irregularly and designed to use and then throw away. Pamphlets, brochures, tickets, programmes, published reports, handbills, menus, advertisements, posters, and other miscellaneous printed or published items are all considered ephemera.⁷

To this list should be added such items as political buttons and commemorative medallions; coins and tokens; trade, greeting, and postcards; movie memorabilia; and flyers such as those used in political demonstrations--all of which can be found in many archival holdings. Brian Murphy has added lamppost notices and garage sale signs to my lists, arguing that such documents reveal popular attitudes to recycling, the past, and the economy.⁸

I believe that ephemerists are right to consider ephemera important in delineating and describing certain areas of popular thought and culture that may not be captured in other media and formats; to this extent, ephemera should have a place in cultural repositories, including not only archives, but also museums, galleries, and libraries. Ephemerists, however, have been debating among themselves not only the merits of collecting ephemera, and their role as keepers of such material, but also the role played by public institutions, for a number of years. In 1990, the president of the Ephemera Society of America asked his members two questions: "Do exceptional pieces belong in institutions as opposed to private collections?" and "Should collectors make their collections available to researchers?"⁹ While the responses were inconclusive, the important point was not the nature of the answers, but the fact that such questions were being asked in the first place. In effect, ephemerists tend to view themselves as guardians of the past, new keepers of what Barbara Rusch has referred to as "the legacy of knowledge to be handed down to future generations."

As an example of how this thinking might appear in the public mind, one might consider a session on "Ephemera as archival document" held at the 1990 annual conference of the Ontario Association of Archivists. Two presenters came from the heritage field, one being an archaeologist discussing computerized applications to recording artifacts at urban site digs, and the other an archivist discussing the use of ephemera in outreach programmes. The third speaker was a man named Syd Charendoff, whose business card indicated that he was the owner of a private "archive." A collector, author, and dealer specializing in World War II memorabilia, Charendoff made an enthusiastic but relatively unstructured presentation about his archive, claiming to possess unique, immensely valuable ephemera from the period, including war saving stamps, Victory Loan games, posters, calendars, and cards produced by the Canadian government's Wartime Information Board. This agency's records, however, are preserved, along with all of its printed products (in multiple copies in many cases) at the National Archives of Canada.¹⁰ While an archivist from the National Archives would have been able to clarify the claim to "uniqueness" made by Mr. Charendoff, what would other, less knowledgeable audiences have thought about this man's "archive"? Archivists have to be aware that such misconceptions arise for various reasons, and should learn to respond to such problems within the field of ephemera collecting.

Ephemera is not a particularly well-recognized phenomenon in archival literature, as a search for literature on the subject has found. In 1972 the American Association for State and Local History produced an eight-page publication, *Cataloguing Ephemera: a Procedure for Small Libraries*; Chris Makepeace's *Ephemera: a Book on its Collection, Conservation and Use*, although an excellent summary of how to approach such material within museums and libraries, does little for archivists.¹¹ In many of the major texts on archival practice and theory, the word ephemera simply does not appear. The Australian manual, *Keeping Archives*, discusses ephemera in one paragraph; the Archives Association of British Columbia's *Manual for Small Archives* has a somewhat larger (3 1/2 pages) section that includes some useful examples of arrangement and description. While the various Ephemera Society newsletters contain many articles, little is written from an archival point of view. One of the better articles on an archival approach to ephemera, albeit in a library setting, was published in *Provenance* in 1987¹²; a case study of Northwestern University Library's Women's Collection, which had originally been presented at the 1986 SAA Annual Conference as part of a session on the "Archivist as Activist Revisited." Several other articles that touched upon ephemera without dealing with it in a specific manner were published in the same issue.

This dearth of literature represents not an inability to deal with ephemera, but rather the fact that few archivists have given the matter much serious thought.¹³ Brian Murphy has pointed out that most archivists look at ephemera with something akin to disdain, because it is difficult to appreciate, appraise, locate, catalogue, and make accessible--particularly, as George Brandak has put it, if the archives emphasizes the acquisition of records of the sponsoring institution, in opposition to the concept of a "total archives."¹⁴ Yet, as Murphy points out, if we look at the broad definition of "ephemera," much of what we acquire as institutional records can fit comfortably within both a definition of "archivally significant" and "short-lived":

Handbills, labels, flyers, and posters, tickets, programmes, advertising are as ephemeral as most of the files in the 3,292 boxes of Cabinet Ministers papers the NA accepted from the outgoing government [in 1993]. The two types of ephemera are differentiated by the social context in which they are created. We take the records of big important offices, and ignore small, original eclectic, powerless social processes. We miss the origins of movements, and we miss the alternatives to "Nationally Significant" groups.¹⁵

Taking another approach, if archivists regarded ephemera not as inconsequential and short-lived documents, but, for example, as commercial art, advertising or marketing tools, then the objects become more than ephemera. Rather they reflect the growing societal trends of visual awareness and the power of marketing. As Murphy states, "What are the images, symbols, and myths that motivate people? and How [do] advertisers and label makers use and define them? Some of the finest minds in our society are designing chocolate bar labels. We should pay attention to them."¹⁶

Within the National Archives of Canada, for example, there have been few examples of conscious decisions made to ensure that such trends are documented and developed. The NA does hold thousands of nineteenth-century trade cards, which, acquired individually, in small groups, and as part of larger collections, can be viewed or read in the greater context of the explosion of cosmetics marketing that struck North

America in the 1890s, and as an example of the changing nature of symbol and representation. Two exhibitions organized by colleagues in the mid-1980s made some effort to explore such themes: Diane Tardif-Côté's *Painters of Canada Series Exhibition of Christmas Cards*, presented first at the NA in 1983 and subsequently at more than ten other venues across the country, explored the commercial art of the Group of Seven and other Canadian artists in the 1920s and 1930s; and Lydia Foy's *In the Best Style of the Art: Commercial and Fine Art Prints in Canada 1850-1950*, presented at the National Archives of Canada from 7 to 22 May 1984, examined commercial printmaking using the holdings of the Picture Division, in what is perhaps the only exhibition of its type ever produced in this country. As Lydia Foy's show demonstrated, virtually every trade card tells a story. The same is true of almost any piece of ephemera; one article published in *The Ephemeraist* noted that "an item of ephemera is essentially a form of time capsule, a crystallization of another time and place."¹⁷ The better the context provided with a single item of ephemera, however, the easier it is to understand; it is here where archivists should see a starting-point for their own attitude towards ephemera.

In the area of acquisition especially, archivists face particular problems. The traditional approach to ephemera must be based on provenance or respect des fonds. *Keeping Archives* points out the importance of acquiring ephemera "if it has an integral link to the papers being appraised": it must "be appraised with the remainder of the collection and measured against the dual criteria of the acquisition policy and the appraisal checklist."¹⁸ In this regard, few institutions have both acquisition policies and appraisal guidelines, and even those that do are unlikely to be reviewing them on an ongoing basis; few archivists try to keep track of the prices and trends in the ephemera market.

A more activist approach to acquiring archival material in general (a so-called "documentalist" approach) has been dealt with by the Society of American Archivists on three occasions, during its annual conferences in 1976, 1986, and 1992. In Canada, active versus passive approaches to acquisition were the subject of several talks at the ACA's 1991 Annual Conference in Banff, but not all of these presentations have been published. The basic manual of Canadian archival practice, the AABC *Manual for Small Archives*, takes a very activist approach to acquiring ephemera, advocating the creation of specialized ephemera fonds; discussing the acquisition of individual pieces of ephemera, such as "copies of brochures or publications from community meetings, political or social meetings, theatre productions, or other events;" and suggesting "joining mailing lists for regular bulletins, newsletters, and other publications." Such an activist approach is applied unevenly in Canada, most usually in the domain of "social action" archives, where traditional records are not necessarily created or accumulated. While some American institutions may do this, I am most familiar with the Australian models, where several State Libraries actively pursue ephemera. For example, the Manuscript Division of the State Library of Victoria has regularly sent out archivists to the grounds of Parliament during political demonstrations to gather hand-outs and leaflets, which are then accessioned according to the subject of the protest. The State Library of New South Wales maintains a specialized Legal Deposit and Ephemera Librarian, whose job is to hunt out ephemera in an effort to provide a sample of all available material relating to the people of New South Wales. NSW's collections are broadly divided into theatre and concert

programmes, book jackets, posters, government publications, book pamphlets, and political, sporting, and cultural ephemera.¹⁹ This approach to the acquisition of ephemera is especially important in the area of special interest/social action groups, where the movements are likely to be short-lived or informally organized. One of the most interesting articles about this approach is Sarah Cooper's "The Politics of Protest Collections: Developing Social Action Archives," published in *Provenance*. One of Cooper's statements is particularly interesting in relation to how archivists see ephemera:

...protest collections started in university libraries in the 1960s. Many of these had little archival material, but at least attempted to collect the ephemera of the emerging student protest movements. In recent years, once the staff who started the collection left, holdings were often deaccessioned and sent to other archives.²⁰

How has such material been acquired by the National Archives of Canada, for example? Usually most items that we might consider "ephemeral" have been acquired as part of larger private manuscript fonds or government record groups, and are treated exactly as *Keeping Archives* has recommended. Three of the largest holdings of ephemeral material familiar to me derive from larger fonds. The first, an institutional or government fonds, is the Wartime Information Board collection,²¹ which I have already mentioned. The second is the Molson Archives,²² donated by the company to the National Archives in 1976, which includes corporate records, photographic, film, and art collections, as well as an interesting component consisting of numerous albums of labels for all of the beers produced by the company from 1786 onwards, as well as of products from companies that Molson's took over, and of rival firms in Canada and the United States. There were also groups of labels from overseas companies, apparently exchanged over a period of years. While the corporate records have supported serious scholarly research, the ephemeral material has also been heavily used both by Molson's and its advertising agency during the company's 200th anniversary celebrations in 1986, and by specialist scholars who have drawn upon it for their publications on the brewing industry, since there are few extant records for many of the companies whose names are known only through their beer labels.²³

A second major private fonds is the Andrew Merrilees Collection.²⁴ Merrilees, a Toronto collector and businessman, was fascinated by transport and printing history, and acquired by a variety of means, a huge amount of material of all types, including photographs, art work, books, pamphlets, railway schedules, and manuscripts. When he died in 1979, the collection was donated to the National Archives, where the richness of the material gradually has been revealed. One of the most interesting parts was a collection of thousands of nineteenth-century trade, greeting, and novelty cards as well as collections of cigar box and tinned fruit labels from a variety of Canadian and American companies. Much of the material is unorganized, and in recent years, the assistance of the community of researchers whom Brian Murphy has labelled "folk historians" has been actively sought by the NA in order to provide better descriptions, inventory lists, and finding aids, particularly for the parts of the collections relating to trains and steamboats.

Much of the material that forms part of the "ephemera" holdings of the National Archives of Canada,²⁵ however, has arrived in smaller groups or as individual items,

sometimes as transfers from larger fonds, but occasionally as a discrete donation. The NA has an uneven record when it comes to its acquisition and its subsequent treatment of ephemera, which occasionally brings into question the quality of archival decision-making that took place. In the past, such material has first been acquired in large quantities, often with little or no documentation on provenance, and then has been deaccessioned and transferred elsewhere, with no provision to ensure continuity of ownership.²⁶ Little or no intellectual control has been exercised over such collections: to this day, the relationships between such material and other collections still under the National Archives' control remains unknown or uncertain. Although such practices have been largely eliminated as archival theory and practice developed in the 1960s and 1970s, I had at least one experience as a reference archivist in 1980, as I tried to follow a paper trail for immigration pamphlets that had been removed from a government record group (RG 76) and transferred to the Archives Library's pamphlet collection, which has in turn now been transferred to the National Library of Canada.²⁷ Although I knew that the pamphlets had come from files in the records of the Department of Immigration, I could not locate the specific file references. In spite of a tremendous effort to replace the original pamphlet with a photocopy into the original file to indicate that something had been removed, notations to indicate its disposition were not consistently added. The pamphlet itself, after being transferred to the Library collection, was not always annotated with its original file number. Nor were all of the pamphlets and posters always removed from the Immigration files; some remained in the files, while others did not. The only way of determining if something had been removed was to compare a microfilm copy of the pre-existing file arrangement with the file that had been culled of posters or pamphlets--if such a copy was available. The questions that arise are what will happen when recopying in another format such as optical disc takes place? Does one try to reconstruct the original record? Such an example remains as good an argument as ever for respect des fonds and original order.

Institutions must recognize that better acquisition strategies and appraisal criteria are needed to deal with all types of documents including ephemera. In turn, an overall acquisition strategy on a local, regional, provincial, and national basis could lead to agreements with other institutions about the respective mandates in acquiring such items as posters; to decisions about the active pursuit and purchase of collections such as postcards, buttons, medals, and other ephemera; and to the re-evaluation of every donation or transfer of ephemeral material that now occurs. Moreover, as has been argued by my colleagues in their comments on my initial presentation, archives and archivists have to clearly determine the nature and extent to which they are attempting to document the broad spectrum of social life within their particular communities, and whether in fact, traditional archival record-keeping and records management approaches are an adequate response to an alternative way of organizing individual lives and society as a whole.

In terms of ephemera, there is finally the intangibility of the collector. What is becoming evident from my own survey of the ephemera markets is the monetary and historical value that ephemerists attach to objects that many of us might consider of little value. Traditional disposal/destruction decisions made by archivists in relation to ephemeral objects may have to be reconsidered in light of the development of tangible markets for such material, and possible protests by such collectors who

might discover the destruction of that which they deem valuable for their own reasons. In fact, many archives, constrained by increasingly tight budgets, could profit from such growing interest and market values. A great debate in the American museum community arose over the question of deaccessioning and selling objects from collections in order to maintain the operation of the institution. However, in an archives where such ephemeral objects as posters, flyers, brochures, timetables, and postcards may exist in multiple copies, and may have no inherent archival value in and of themselves, perhaps institutions could raise funds through such sales. A recent *Maine Antiques Digest* (May 1995) contained an advertisement for the William Clements Library at the University of Michigan, announcing its duplicate sale, labelled as "the best yet!" and featuring "hundreds of lots of Books, Maps, Prints, Broad­sides, Newspapers, Ephemera, and Autograph Manuscripts."²⁸ How long will it be before archives will or must follow suit?

Finally, there is the other side of the coin. Many ephemerists, having now achieved a goal of amassing a collection of items which they consider to be, in Barbara Rusch's words, "a more reliable witness of social life than other more self-conscious records," may soon (if they have not already) begin to approach archives with such collections. Can or should these collections be accepted as is? Should they be appraised in the same way as more traditional fonds, that is, for their evidential, informational, historical, or archival value? What about the market value for ephemera? Do these collections fit into the traditional concepts of fonds? Where do they fit, in the end?

Ephemeral collections may have a place in archives, depending on the institutional approach (record-keeping versus documenting). However, a great deal of effort, as well as a different social perspective, is necessary to ensure that proper decisions on acquisition are made, and that appropriate research is done to ensure their context in an overall acquisition strategy. Even if such materials are acquired, archivists will have to face the problems that will arise in arranging and describing them, in offering access and providing public service, and in using such material in institutional outreach programmes. Perhaps what can or should be rejected is material that is not contextual, is not considered of significance to the institution, or does not have enough intrinsic, informational, historic, or evidential value to justify its long-term retention. Ephemeral material should not be actively pursued, with the notable exception of those records that form part of an institution's mandate. Archivists should be conscious of the fact that society's understanding of its institution's activities derives not only, or primarily from, existing policy or administrative documents (such as Annual Reports or Budgetary Estimates), but from short-term, and often short-lived advertising and promotion campaigns, where posters, flyers, and brochures of an ephemeral nature play a key role in delivering the institutional message. Such material is not always considered and saved in the higher level macro-appraisal approaches used in records management and acquisition programmes, although a greater consciousness of this point is now developing within the archival community.

In conclusion, looking at how ephemerists view the world is not necessarily a good thing in itself. It does, however, provide a different definition of "significance" to archivists as they continue to develop their appraisal and acquisition strategies. While different archives have different needs and requirements in acquisition (depending on the institution or part of society that they are serving, their mandate and policies,

size, and the nature of the records they are attempting to save), I think that ephemera must be considered as important as any other more traditional document: questions as to its acquisition should be asked in the same way as one considers a set of minutes, a hand-written letter, or a policy case file. An active approach is useful for organizations that are themselves ephemeral, unorganized, or short-lived; a coordinated approach is also necessary when considering who else might be acquiring the same or similar types of ephemera. We must learn to be aware that there is a public that values ephemera--sometimes for different reasons than we may have as archivists--in order to ensure our own continuing relevance in the public perception of the past.

Notes

- 1 The two other speakers at Session seventy-five on Tuesday, 17 September were Myrna Williamson of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, "For the User: Meeting the Challenge of Ephemera," and Amy Henderson of the National Portrait Gallery, Washington, "Ephemera and Exhibitions: A Historian's Perspective."
- 2 Carl Honore, "History in a Dustbin," *Globe & Mail* (Toronto, 14 March 1992).
- 3 Barbara Rusch, "Message from the President," *Ephemera Canada* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1992), p. 3.
- 4 Honore, "History in a Dustbin."
- 5 My colleague Brian Murphy has placed ephemerists in a category that he has termed "folk historians," who "have found value in objects which archivists have missed or disdained." He also includes military enthusiasts, train and ship lovers, philatelists, collectors of all kinds, and genealogists, and comments that "these interests--these usages of the past--have found a place in archives only grudgingly." Personal communication from Brian Murphy, 21 September 1993.
- 6 This definition was cited in an *Ephemera Canada* newsletter, the reference of which I am unable to locate at the present time.
- 7 Donald A. Baird, chair, and Laura M. Coles, writer, *A Manual for Small Archives* (Vancouver, 1988), pp. 146-49.
- 8 Murphy, 21 September 1993.
- 9 Rusch, "Message from the President," p. 3.
- 10 Many of these items were presented in a commemorative exhibition entitled *Victory Bonding* presented at the National Archives of Canada from 22 June 1995 to March 1996.
- 11 Chris E. Makepeace, *Ephemera: a Book on its Collection, Conservation and Use* (Aldershot, Eng., 1985).
- 12 Sarah Sherman, "A Case Study: The Archivists as Activist at the Northwestern University Library's Women's Collection," *Provenance* V, no. 1 (Spring, 1987), pp. 31-38.
- 13 This may be changing. I have incorporated many comments made by my colleagues George Brandak in a letter of 30 September 1993 and Brian Murphy in a letter of 21 September 1993. Both provided thoughtful commentary on my original paper. Brandak in particular has pointed out that although little theoretical work had been done, manuscript archivists, particularly those working within special collections, tended to be more accepting and understanding of ephemera generally, and to catalogue and make it more readily accessible than other archivists.
- 14 George Brandak, personal communication, 30 September 1993.
- 15 Murphy, 21 September 1993.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 "A Present from the Present," *The Ephemerist* (June 1990), p. 340.
- 18 Anne Pederson, ed., *Keeping Archives* (Sydney, 1987), pp. 103-104.
- 19 An excellent article about the Australian approach, and about ephemera in archives generally, is Michael Organ, "Ephemera in Archives: What to Do? (A Possible Solution from the University of New South Wales Archives)," *Archives and Manuscripts* 15 (November 1987), pp. 105-118.
- 20 Sarah Cooper, "The politics of Protest Collections: Developing Social Action Archives," *Provenance* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1987), pp. 8-16.
- 21 The Wartime Information Board's activities are documented as part of National Archives of Canada, RG 36 (Boards, Offices, and Commissions, 1896-1972), Part 31; as well as in the VSA Accession No. 1983-30.

- 22 The Molson Archives are part of the National Archives of Canada's Manuscript Division as MG 28 III 57.
- 23 For example, in the National Archives of Canada exhibition and catalogue, organized by Neil Forsyth, *The Molsons in Canada: The First 200 Years* (Ottawa, 1986), as well as Ian Bowering's *The Art and Mystery of Brewing in Ontario* (Burnstown, 1988).
- 24 The Andrew Merrilees Collection is part of the National Archives of Canada's Manuscript Division as MG 31 A 10; and as part of Visual and Sound Archives Division as Acc. No. 1980-49 (Photos) and Acc. No. 1983-37 (Artwork).
- 25 Here I would include such items as postcards, posters, trade cards, placards, certificates, illustrated letterhead paper, greeting cards, tokens, and trade dollars, all of which form part of the art holdings of the National Archives of Canada. The NA is not alone, however, in having such material in its holdings either as part of larger fonds, or as single item collections.
- 26 The two major examples of this are the Coin Collection, deaccessioned in 1958, and now forming part of the Bank of Canada Currency Museum, and the Medal collection, which was amassed by the NA, split in 1966 with military medals going to the Canadian War Museum and everything else going to the NLC, and then returned to the NA's control in 1976.
- 27 This transfer is the result of a 1995 agreement between the NA and NLC on issues of mutual concern in relation to holdings rationalization.
- 28 *Maine Antiques Digest* XXIII, no. 5 (May 1995), p. 18-D.