

ties will not only pay for what an author has written but what he has tried to throw away; his note-books, correspondence, false starts; they will sort it all out for him with copies and even resident facilities for writing his autobiography. . . . He can look the milkman in the eye. It is probably the best thing that has happened to writers for many years."

New Zealand libraries cannot hope to purchase the papers of people like Graham Greene or Edith Sitwell and even if they could, they might have difficulty justifying why they should. With regard to acquiring the papers of writers of their own country it seems the justification might now have to be that so little has been done in the past. From now on an active programme will require staff, money, and enthusiasm. It is a fair guess that the latter requirement is there already and waiting only to be used, but that staff and money might only be supplied at the expense of responsibilities already incurred unless untapped sources are exploited.

Some writers, like Henry Miller, will be pleased to give their papers. Others will welcome the prospect of their heirs being able to turn the accumulated papers of many years into cash; few are the writers' families who have not had to pay in one way or another for the literary activities of their spouse or parent. Then there will be the writers who will wish or need to sell in their lifetime. The problem I shall mention now is likely to exist more amongst the latter people than the others, although it might be found amongst them too, and this is the self-conscious creation of archives. It is most likely to occur in the preservation of letters. It is easy to imagine a ruthless disposal or editing policy being carried out with inwards letters which do not show the recipient in the light he likes to see himself. Similarly people might be wary about the sort of letter they will write to a person who is known to be committed to disposing of papers to an institution for preservation and future consultation. Moreover the creator of the archives himself, particularly if he believes his own letters are worthy of carbon copies, might be tailoring his letters for posterity as much as he is writing them to the addressee. One of the basic values of archives lies in their being a *product* of an activity rather than a deliberate creation. Broadly speaking the more an archival collection is "created", the more it is spoiled. On the other hand the fact that papers are worth money might be an effective way of ensuring preservation. Much depends upon the character of the creator of the archives, on his vanity, honesty, wealth, humility, even his tidiness.

Ray Grover