**Note regarding "hybrid" "Riazanov-Google" scans for all of Volume 9, and eventually some or all of Vols 10, 11 and perhaps also other scans of International Socialist Review ("ISR") presented here:**

All of the scans for Volume 9 of International Socialist Review presented here are a mix of pages scanned by Google from original issues (in the case of Volume 9, from Harvard University's collection) and pages scanned by me, personally, from a bound volume of original isssues of Volume of ISR in the collection of Holt Labor Library.

Between 10% and 35% of the pages of each of these issues are scans made by me. The remainder are made by Google.

**WHY did I do this?**

Google's scans of pages containing just text were mostly quite decent. A bit marred by noise here and there, but overall it just did not seem to me worth the huge amount of time it would have taken me to re-do the 750 (give or take 100) pages of scanning for the relatively small impovement my more careful scanning would provide. Indeed, after showing test scans I made and scans of the same pages made by Google, for pages containing only text, some people whos opinions I respected (including two respected retired librarians who had worked at special collections libraries ... in one case a famous leftist special collection library) judged they liked the appearance of the Google-made scans better. Due to the somewhat bolder appearance of the text. [Which may have been a result of some sort of post processing of the text by Google, I speculate.]

Anyway, given the immense amount of work, and the fact that Google had already done the job more or less as well... if not better... than I could do it, I elected NOT to scan text only pages of this volume of International Socialist Review.

HOWEVER...

Google's scans of photographs tended to be poor. Poor in part because they were scanned at low resolution (300 dpi gray scale, compared to the 600 dpi gray scale I normally use) , but also more seriously flawed for other reasons:

**(a) distortions due to compression and/or other issues:**

Sometimes Googles use of great amounts of compression to the file resulted in ugly Moiré and other patterns appearing in the photos... patterns I ascertained were NOT merely an interaction of the image with the pixilation of my monitor, but were in fact IN the scan itself.

**(b) washed out grays in Google's gray scan imaging:**

Often Google's rendition of photos in ISR were washed out... lacking in contrast, and lacking in rendering black where black appeared in the photo.

**(c) inappropriate use of low res gray scale where high res single bit BW was the superior way to scan the image:**

In some cases Google's automatic scanning software, which incorporated a highly flawed algorithm to choose what scanning mode to employ, sometimes rendered what should have been black and white photos scanned using gray scale as images with shimmering, ugly, distracting false colors due to false triggering into full color mode, plus some odd ball misplaced other automatic processing.

For all these reasons, I judged Google's rendition of photos at best inadequate, if not at times frankly grossly incompetent. So I personally scanned all pages bearing photos in Volume 9 (from original issues) in 600 dpi 8 bit gray scale mode,and substituted these scans of those pages in Google's rendering of the issues.

I also found Google's rendition of graphic art in Volume 9 of ISR (political cartoons and other sketches) to vary between poor and grossly incompetent / truly awful. This in part because Google's wretched, incompetent automatic scan mode deciion software tended to render all graphic art in 300 dpi gray scale. This resulted in images that on the original pages consisted of solid pure black areas and lines and pure white areas being rendered in Google's mediocre scans in medium to light gray. It also resulted in blurred, washed out images of line-drawn sketches. I substituted scans of this material I personally made from originals, mostly in 1200 dpi single bit BW mode (with the exposure very carefully selected... sometimes after two or three tries to get it right). In one case... of a Socialist Party symbol that incorporated Karl Marx's injunction "Workers of All Lands Unite!", I used 2400 dpi.

There was a third general category of original material in the pages of ISR Vol 9 that Google did a poor to lousy job with in its scans. When Google's algorithm to select scan mode encountered very fine point (very tiny) text, it decided it was dealing with graphic art, and rendered it in 300 dpi 8 bit gray scale. Instead of rendering it as it normally was programmed to render text, at 600 dpi single bit BW. LOWERING the intrinsic resolution for ultra fine text is last thing you want to do! The results were crappy rendition of the text as blurry, gray text. All cases of this I re-did in 1200 dpi single bit BW scanning, which produced overwhelmingly clearer, superior images.

There were also problems in the Google scans somewhat similar to, and involving the same root cause as the problem last described: Google's automatic mode selection algorithm only worked with rectangular parts of the scan. Where the image was not rectangular, Google's algorithm would end up including text near photographs or other graphic art in the rectangle of gray scale rendition, resulting in weird-looking text portions that were party solid black and partly washed out gray. Where I noticed this, I re-did the scans, either all in high contrast 8 bit gray scale, or all in 1200 dpi single bit BW. Depending on which I found (often testing both) to be the better compromise.

In fairness to Google, not all of their scans of photos were bad. A majority were poor, but... again... not all. Indeed, in a few cases, comparing their rendition of a photo to mine, I found theirs... even in my (obviously biased toward my own work) opinion, to be as good or better. In most of those cases, I felt my scans were a bit over-contrasty. I suspect putting those scans I was less than totally pleased with into a photo editor and increasing brightness and/or tweaking down contrast might improve them. I just didn't have the time to re-do those. And after all, I and others still judged the great majority of my re-dos of the photos to be unequivocally superior to Google's renditions.

Anyway... all scans here that have in their file name the "flag" "riaz-gog" are hybrid Riazanov Library (made by me, Marty Goodman) and Google issue scans, with some pages scanned by one of us, and some by the other.

In most BUT NOT ALL cases you can tell which were done by Google because I left on them the "digitized by Google" "watermark".

**Front and Back Covers:**

The bound volume of original ISR issues for Volume 9 issued by the publisher that I was working with LACKED FRONT AND BACK ISSUE COVERS. At the time of making these "hybrid" scans, I did not have access to loose issues of Volume 9 with their covers. So I had to get the front and back issues' covers from the Google scans. For issues n01, 02, and 03 this was unimportant, for the covers were pretty boring pure text. However, for issues n04 thru n12, the covers had photos or even color graphic art. Google butchered these, failing to lay the issue flat so as to produce nasty shadows across parts of the page, or cropping of noticeable parts of the cover. There was little in most cases I could do about this, tho in some cases I tried to do partial / minor restorations on the front cover material, and in two cases did some restoration of text on back cover pages.

I did digitally remove from Google's scans the "sprayed on graffiti vandalism" done to some of the covers by the librarians at Harvard back in 1908 and 1909, who stamped their library ownership stamp right on the cover, across text and/or images. In fairness to those at my alma mata's library back then... and near all other libraries at the time... this practice was standard, and in part dictated (I am told by special collections librarians who worked at Tamiment Library and at the Hoover Library) by the combination of desire to prevent people tearing off covers bearing art, and stealing them, and in part by the reasoning that because there were lots of these things sold, marring just THEIRS in this fashion would not deprive the world of unblemished versions of the cover art. Both... for the time... I must admit not entirely unreasonable in their logic.

**re: Where to find my higher resolution scans among isues in Volume 9:**

There are simple graphics associated with recurring headers for various repeatedly-appearing sections in Vol. 9 of ISR. These include:

Editors Chair, International Notes, World of Labor, News and Views, and Publishers Department.

For the first two or three issues in which these headers appear, I re-did them in high resolution 1200 dpi single bit BW, and substituted them for Google's scan of the page in question. But after a few issues I elected not to bother re-doing the page in subsequent issues. So if you need a high resolution version of these scans, look for the first issue in which that page's header appears. When the graphic for the header changed, I of course again provided a high resolution scan.

---marty
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Director, Riazanov Library digital archive projects

May 2019 San Pablo, CA