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Something New in Cataloging

Miss Haskins is head cataloger at the Harvard College Library. This paper was read at the Conference of New England College Libraries at Wellesley College, June 10, 1944.

In recent years much emphasis has been placed upon the cost of cataloging, with the result that catalog departments have become acutely aware of the problem and are always on the alert for new economies. How often an administrator will ask the question: How much does it cost you to catalog a book? or How many books can a cataloger do in a day? Margaret Mann, in discussing the subject, says:

"This question of cost belongs ultimately to the chief librarian, but the economies should be the concern and responsibility of the head of the catalog department who should constantly study ways and means for simplifying routines and records without impairing the service."

In considering costs and economies in cataloging there are several factors which must be considered. The following are those which are especially significant at the present time at Harvard College and which are causing a reconsideration of methods of work.

First of all, there is the competition for the time and services of the cataloger. Material is constantly pouring into the library in the form of monographs, serials, and documents received by purchase, gift, or exchange—all of which has to be handled by the catalog department. Unless the work is carefully organized, the department may become a bottleneck through which the work passes in an unsystematic fashion. As the material comes in, decisions have to be made as to what is to be handled promptly, what classes are to receive precedence, and what may be postponed for some time.

Some types of work are regularly competing for first place. The order department cries to have the purchased books sent along rapidly because its files are clogging up; or someone has asked if a certain title is on order, only to find that the book was received some time ago but that there is no record of it in the catalog. Certain books come through to be cataloged in haste. These may have been ordered for an individual or for some course. In either case the cataloger drops whatever she is doing and sends the books through as rapidly as possible. But it is not the time of just one person which is thus interrupted—it is the time of several all along the line through whose hands the books must pass. Similarly, the Library of Congress requests cooperative cataloging for a large number of the current titles received. In addition to taking at least the full time of one cataloger, this form of cataloging slows up the routine for these particular books because more detailed work is required for them.

Again, special requests for service come to the catalog department from various sources and vie with each other for priorities. The reference department has made contacts with an enthusiastic donor and

asks that precedence be given to his gifts, in order to please him by getting them on the shelves promptly or in order that photographs may be taken of them for a newspaper article. Too much cannot be done to remain on the good side of this friend of the library and keep him interested. Or, a special collection is given to the library, and the request is made that it be cataloged by a certain date in the near future. The material may be of such a nature that there will be little or no call for it, but the catalog department must organize its work in order to put it through in the specified time.

There is also the instance in which a professor is placed in charge of a new special library and is anxious to put the collection into working order as soon as possible; or in which another special library is in need of reorganization. The responsibility for the work falls upon the catalog department. In addition to all the above are the many little duties which are an accepted part of a cataloger's life but which prevent full time being given to putting books through. These consist of answering reference questions, searching for titles in process, conducting tours of the library for new staff members or guests, training new people, interviewing applicants, and so on.

**Space**

A second factor in considering costs and economies is the question of space. Dr. Osborn, in his paper on "The Crisis in Cataloging," says: "Far too little attention has been given in library literature to the organization of catalog departments, while in actual practice physical conditions have controlled matters to an undesirable extent."2 How many catalog departments have the space necessary for systematic handling of the material? At Harvard there are now adequate accommodations for the staff and a liberal amount of working space, but difficulties still arise when a large quantity of material suddenly arrives. Shortage of space complicates the method of handling large collections of books and often necessitates shifting them several times before they are finally disposed of. In addition, crowded conditions have a bad effect on the morale of the cataloger.

**Methods of Work**

Methods of organizing the material are a third determining factor in considering the question of costs. In most libraries books are cataloged in a piecemeal fashion; that is, each book is considered individually, as it comes up, from the author and title approach and often from the subject approach. There is little system possible in this method of working. Those books which cannot be handled in a day are set aside until finally a large accumulation results. Then the question arises as to the best way of working this off. Some libraries attempt to tackle it on a chronological basis by cataloging the books in the order of receipt, but this still means working by the piecemeal method.

**Organization of Work**

The last factor is the plan, common in catalog departments, of organizing from the subject point of view. This has much in its favor, but, according to the experience of several large libraries which have attempted to work out cost figures, it is the descriptive cataloging which is the more costly. Therefore, does it seem logical to plan the organization on a basis that favors the less expensive side of the work, namely, subject cataloging?

In March 1942 the Harvard catalog department moved into new quarters made possible by the building of the Houghton Library for the housing of the rare books.

---

Up to that time the department was organized by subject. There were many advantages in this organization, but it was very difficult to control the flow of work. One person would be swamped with work while another would be looking around for something to do, all depending upon the subjects with which each was working. Taking advantage of the shift and of more space, the department was reorganized on the basis of two groups—the one to handle material that can move along rapidly, such as titles for which Library of Congress cards are available, nonfiction which presents no difficulties, fiction, other editions, second copies, and books which may be sent directly to the New England Deposit Library; the other group to handle the more difficult material involving research problems, out-of-the-way languages, and so on. This second group is organized on the traditional subject and language basis. In such an organization the flow of work can be better controlled—the difficult books do not slow up the work on the easier books and the quantity of easy books does not prevent working on those requiring research.

**Cataloging Drives**

However, during the last two years, material poured in at such a rate that it was impossible to keep up with it, and finally all available space for storing it was filled. Most of it was acquired by the library through large-lot purchases. With the realization that this accumulation must be worked off before the end of the war, when there would be an influx of material from Europe, the first cataloging drive was organized in March 1943. A period of "total cataloging" was declared for nine weeks. All members of the department who could possibly be spared were drafted for either full or part time. This meant that the efforts of the entire department were concentrated on cataloging alone and that the variety of noncataloging duties which occupy so much of a cataloger's time were eliminated or suspended as far as possible. Four full-time people were delegated to handle the newly-purchased books and the cooperative cataloging.

The total number of professional people taking part in the drive proper totaled eighteen. They were divided into several groups for literature, nonliterature, and deposit library books. Serials, documents, and pamphlets were not treated. There was no arrangement of the titles within the groups; the cataloging was on the piecemeal basis. In this period of nine weeks, 19,858 titles and 22,183 volumes were put through. This represents an average of 367 titles cataloged per day or 25 titles per cataloger per day.\(^3\)

Just a year later working space was again filled to overflowing and the stacks were being used to store the thousands of books which had been acquired by the library. Another drive was inevitable. From experience gained in the first, it was realized that better preliminary arrangement of the material was necessary. This would result in less duplication and more systematic cataloging. Therefore, it was decided to arrange all the books alphabetically before starting to catalog them. Since there was not room enough to alphabetize all the books at once, the drive was divided into two parts: the first, on books for the deposit library only; the second, on books for the stacks. In April 1944 all available catalogers (seventeen, of whom nine were full time) were again drafted, but only for a two weeks' period. This time just two groups were formed, one for literature and the other for nonliterature. No current work was done during this period,

---

3 A few words of explanation should be made concerning cataloging as it is done at Harvard. This term covers only the actual descriptive and subject cataloging. All clerical processes, such as preliminary searching, typing, shelving, filing, etc., are quite separate and distinct from the work of the catalogers.
with the exception of haste books and cooperative cataloging. For each group the books were arranged alphabetically, with the result that many titles by a single author could be cataloged at one time. The final figures for this drive were 13,001 titles and 13,729 volumes. When broken down, these figures show that for this class of material a daily average of 1,083 titles was achieved, or 83 titles per cataloger per day. The books were sent along daily, by the hundreds, for the end processes of classification, stamping, and tagging. It was an impressive sight to see them come pouring in and at the same time to watch them being packed into boxes and shipped right out to the deposit library.

The fact that so many volumes were handled in two weeks is due in large part to the simplified cataloging which is used for the deposit library books. Since there is expected to be little call for the books sent to the deposit library, detailed description is not considered necessary and, therefore, a simplified method of cataloging them has been worked out. The principal difference is the omission of the entire collation with the exception of the volume statement. This single factor saves an immense amount of time. The transcription of the title is the same as for books in the stacks, but little or no time is given to establishing full names of authors, dates of publication, and so on. A minimum of research is spent on determining the authorship of anonymous books and on other bibliographical points. Only those notes are given which are essential in identifying a book in ordinary searching. There is no classification by subject; the books are arranged by size and are assigned running numbers within designated size groups.

Having thus disposed of thirteen thousand volumes, enough space was now available to arrange the rest of the books which were to be cataloged for the stacks. In June a third drive was held, over a period of two and one half weeks, but this time was interrupted by a holiday and irregular hours. The same organization was followed as for the previous drive, but since these books were for the stacks, more detailed cataloging was required and subject classification was necessary. During the drive descriptive cataloging and subject heading were done for all titles and classification for those titles to which notations could readily be assigned. The only titles which were completely put through, that is, shelflisted and sent to the stacks, were those falling in English and American literature. The rest were arranged by broad classes and were actually classified as soon as possible after the drive. In this way 7,848 titles and 8,342 volumes were cataloged, or 504 titles per day, each cataloger averaging 55 per day.

New Ideas on Organization of Work

The amount of work accomplished by means of these drives has led to the development of new methods of organizing the current work. Broadly speaking, the material coming into the library seems to fall into three classes, each of which can be treated in a particular way. As Dr. Madan a former librarian of the Bodleian, has said: "We have learnt not to regard books in a library as all equal in appearance and all to be treated alike, as if they were a rank of drilled soldiers. The lesser books must stand back, and the greater be brought into prominence."

The first class consists of those purchased and gift books which should be put through as promptly as possible. These have to be handled on the piecemeal basis, because they cannot be allowed to accumulate. From figures kept two years ago it

is estimated that a cataloger at Harvard averages about sixteen books a day for this type of material. This is an expensive method, but for this class it is unavoidable. Economies in cataloging these books will have to be worked out along the lines of simplification of records and routines rather than in the basic method of organization. Cooperative cataloging naturally falls here, but the same figures do not apply since more detailed work is required by the Library of Congress.

Gifts and purchases for which there is no pressure make up the second group of material currently coming into the library. If carefully selected, there is no reason why this class of books should not be allowed to accumulate for a short time. The period would naturally be determined by local conditions. At Harvard space is the chief factor which has to be considered. Since it is known, from experience on the drives, approximately how many books can be put through in a week, the plan suggests itself to allow the books to accumulate until that number is reached. A week's drive can then be organized to send the material along. During this period the books should be arranged alphabetically, in order that any title may be easily located upon request. They are then ready for systematic and economical handling when the time comes. It was this kind of material which was cataloged in the last drive.

The books which are kept for historical or bibliographical interest, but for which we expect there will be little call, make up the third and last type. To this class belong the books which Harvard sends to the deposit library. They are selected chiefly from incoming gifts and large-lot purchases, although occasionally an individually bought book may be included. There is no harm in accumulating such material indefinitely, but here again the length of the period is necessarily determined by the space which is available. Eventually these books also should be arranged alphabetically before they are worked on, but there is little likelihood of having to search for a particular title during the period of accumulation.

**Interpretation of the Figures**

Before summarizing the results of the cataloging done at Harvard on the three classes of material, several words of caution must be used. As with virtually all library statistics, the figures have no value apart from the set of local circumstances that applied at the time the work was done. To interpret the Harvard data a variety of factors must be considered: the quality and experience of the catalogers involved, the benefits that come from the system of preliminary cataloging, the amount of time spent on establishing names and dates, etc. Moreover, it is not to be expected that the same figures would necessarily hold in future work of this kind at Harvard. What can be said is that approximately 50 per cent more work can be done on books handled on a piecemeal basis if conditions of "total cataloging" exist; approximately three times as many books as normally can be cataloged under similar conditions if the books are arranged alphabetically for the benefit of the descriptive cataloger; and approximately five times as many Class III books can be cataloged as other books. In addition it must be stated that these averages hold only for concentrated work during a short period and could not be maintained over any extended length of time.

Class I material (consisting of books to be cataloged promptly) is handled piecemeal, and for this class it is estimated that a Harvard cataloger can average 16 titles

---

*This system is described in Currier, Thomas Franklin, "Preliminary Cataloging," College and Research Libraries 1: 235-40, June 1940.*
per day. In the first drive the books were cataloged on the same basis by the equivalent of fourteen and one-half full-time catalogers. Each averaged 25 titles a day, making a daily total average for the group of 367.

Class II (consisting of gifts and purchases for which there is no pressure) was cataloged in the third drive by the equivalent of eleven full-time catalogers, each averaging 55 titles a day, with a daily total of 504.

Class III (consisting of books for the deposit library) was cataloged in the second drive by thirteen full-time catalogers, with a daily average of 83 titles apiece and a total of 1,083. For this class simplified cataloging is used.

Therefore, if asked how many books a cataloger can do in a day, the following answer might be given: for Class I, normally sixteen, and on a drive, twenty-five; for Class II, fifty-five; and for Class III, eighty-three. It is also interesting to note that in one month the descriptive and subject cataloging was done for half as many titles as the total production for the year.

For the sake of emphasis, let it be repeated here that these figures have value only for crystallizing thinking about various cataloging procedures. They have no intrinsic value; they have no value for any other library. In other words, they are not norms.

Conclusions

There are certain conclusions which have been drawn, based on experience from these cataloging drives.

1. If the work is organized into the three classes just mentioned, adequate working space must be provided. It takes plenty of room (just as it needs an adequate staff) to arrange thousands of books alphabetically, but the resulting economy when they are finally put through should warrant the provision of both.

2. On the basis of such an organization, the number of factors competing for the cataloger's time will be reduced and the sense of pressure will be greatly lessened. Other departments in the library will be notified that the catalog department is organizing its work in this way, so there should then be no misunderstanding or criticism when the material is allowed to accumulate. The department will always be ready to change a book from one class to another if the treatment of a certain title is questioned.

3. An alphabetical arrangement of an accumulation of books results in economical and systematic cataloging. If the material comes in, in large lots, it will be advantageous to alphabetize the books before they are searched. Ordinarily, however, they will be arranged as they are added to the accumulation. In the end a second rapid sorting may weed out duplicates and allow a redistribution of some of the titles.

When they are put through, it takes much less time to catalog six books by one author at one time than to handle the titles separately six different times. In this connection also, the new Library of Congress printed catalog provides a distinct advantage. During the drives the catalogers were able to take the volumes to their desks and make the greatest use of the bibliographical information contained there. The books of a number of authors could be worked on from just one volume of the printed catalog.

4. The drives should be organized for short periods of time and held more frequently. This was very apparent from the figures of the first drive, which continued for nine weeks. The maximum production was reached in the sixth week, after which there was a decided slump, showing that the staff was tired.

5. As a mark of appreciation and for the welfare of the staff, it would seem proper to grant some time off after such concentrated work.

The major interest in these drives and in the ideas for organization that have resulted from them is not only the saving in cost, which would naturally follow a more systematic treatment of the work, but also the opportunity which may be afforded for (Continued on page 321)
Present and the Future of British Books

This paper, written by the librarian of Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Canada, while the European war was still at its height, pictures conditions which its author now intimates may already be somewhat relieved.

The underdevelopment of the British book trade has reached a stage at which it becomes the concern of its friends in all countries. "The whole publishing world is topsy-turvy," says an eminent publisher. More than a year ago the president of the board of trade placed a heavy hand upon books, apparently upon the assumption that there were plenty of books already in the country. The annual allocation of paper gave His Majesty's Stationery Office 100,000 tons; left 250,000 tons for the necessary newsprint (which even thus was woefully curtailed); allowed the War Office 25,000 tons; and gave the many periodicals published throughout the United Kingdom 50,000 tons. There remained an amount of 22,000 tons, and this was spared for books. Even the desperate measures that the publishers have taken in using thin paper and exiguous margins have not enabled them to produce a tithe of the prewar publications.

Also, as a result of the destruction of over twenty million stored books by German bombs in 1940 and succeeding years, there is a woful scarcity of the classic works that six years ago were to be found in every bookshop or to be obtained immediately from the publisher. A recent report from one of the largest bookshops in London records the present situation.

We are unable to offer any of the Oxford books of verse. We must refuse enquiries for any lives of Charles Lamb, or for his Letters edited by E. V. Lucas; we have no standard works of natural history, for instance, Witherby's Handbook of British Birds, or Thorburn's British Birds. The few bird books that we have are mainly the "shown to the children" variety. Wyndham Lewis's Pierre Ronsard and Gooch's Courts and Cabinets are sold out and unobtainable. (I note these as examples that may be many times multiplied.) It is almost impossible to obtain a new standard work on any subject; and, as the supply shrinks, the demand increases.

The secondhand book dealers are in a somewhat better position with regard to their immediate stocks. They can sell almost anything that has topical or literary value, but they are closely hedged by the circumstances of supplies that appear to be running amazingly short. Irish writers in the old days spoke admiringly of "the hosts of the books of Erin," and, before the war, a similar phrase might have been used by any British dealer in books. But now the hosts have either perished or have vanished underground. Private libraries come infrequently to market, although, ironically enough, the salvage drive to obtain worthless books for pulping brought out hundreds of volumes that secondhand dealers now would almost have given their right hands to secure.

With this decline in the number of ex-
isting books goes a similar reduction in what used to be substantial stocks of paper and of books in sheets. We are told that the number of new books sold by the publishers during the year 1943 exceeded the number printed by almost 50 per cent. With this fact goes another of additional depression—that still existing stocks contain an increasing proportion of books for which there is little or no demand. The publisher, therefore, is rapidly approaching a point at which the books he has in stock are unsalable and the books for which he is asked are unprintable. Thus the present situation is that paper and the prewar stocks of required books have been virtually exhausted.

At the same time, under the stimulus of war, many new voices have sounded in Britain demanding to be heard. There is a great increase in self-expression; there is a new confidence, a feeling that the country has proved herself, and that British ideas and the British way of life are worthy of consideration by the people of other lands. Both publishers and booksellers look out upon a future market that may be described as world-wide. The British dominions are a magnificent field for British books, but the tour of British publishers through Canada in 1943 showed not only that British editions were difficult—and in many cases impossible—to obtain but that the small type and wartime format forced upon publishers by present conditions had operated adversely to England and in favor of books published in the United States. Apart from the possibility of a cooperative agency or a distributing center for books, somewhere on the continent, it is evident that Canada will be swayed, in book purchasing, by her proximity to the United States and by the differences in time for the delivery of orders that are as yet inevitable. With the coming of the freight-carrying airplane after the war, this difference in time may not be so notable, and without doubt there will be a market both in Canada and in Australia for British books. The home market as yet offers demands that cannot be supplied. Books of great variety, in quantities that tend to increase, continue to be required by the armed services. Textbooks to meet the war situation, books for technical training, books for educational courses and for recreational use are ordered to meet an immediate demand. In this case the difficulty is not with paper but with labor. The workers left in the printing industry are almost all above the average age, and four years of war have taken a great toll of these elderly or infirm men. The calls made upon them for patriotic duties (i.e., home guard, civil defense, and firewatching) have further straitened their powers, and now the government is asked to allow a small number of men of military age to be deferred in calling up or to allow a release from military service of an additional few. Even here the severest pinch is not felt. It is in binding, where the shortage of women workers is already acute and has considerably reduced production. The number of learners entering the work is less than one-third of the prewar rate. Many have drifted into occupations which are assumed to be more essential, and now, with the decreasing proportion of younger women entering the limited number of binding firms engaged in book production, hundreds of machines are standing idle. In the first year after the end of hostilities about four thousand additional women workers will be required. Morale is still high and the increasing nervous strain is still being borne; but old age, family responsibilities, and the partial collapse that will come to many after the long strain is ended will seriously deplete the ranks of feminine labor in many industries.
Need for Educational Books

These labor difficulties in printing and binding have made the task of maintaining an even flow of supplies to the publisher impossible, and this again accentuates the exasperation of the bookseller when the orders that he knows are in hand appear to remain there indefinitely. In the educational field, also, the difficulties are deplored. In November 1943 H. A. Butler admitted that the shortage of textbooks was hampering the schools. Postwar education plans, already being shaped, called for immense supplies of new and progressive textbooks. Colonial governments are already sending to England for large supplies of schoolbooks to make up wartime shortages. The immense new educational projects for Africa alone, to take only one instance, stress the fact that the individual native is prepared to buy books. Schools in the Gold Coast, in Kenya, and in Sierra Leone, are indicating a demand that is very great, and, "generally speaking, a plan for local production does not exist."

The need for technical books of all kinds increases to desperation. With the end of the war in Europe, the need for books on building, on architecture, and on woodworking will become pressing. The demands for books on economics and sociology, for books on foreign languages (especially Russian), for books upon current trends in history and on postwar problems, for books on horticulture and country life, and, perhaps above all, for the Bible, prayer books, and hymnbooks, are and have been for many months unsatisfied and insatiable. The number of juvenile readers has enormously increased. Libraries throughout the country have been advertising "children's book weeks," and the heightening of normal demands in particular localities where these book weeks have been held is such that many publishers now refuse to accept orders for popular children's books.

It is perhaps necessary also to mention the shortage in the number of medical books. The demands of the state have greatly increased in this branch of publishing, but the publisher's quota of paper has not been increased to match.

The destruction of the special paper required in Bibles has also raised a problem that is yet insuperable. The present straw papers cannot worthily be used to print the book whose flawless production has so long been the pride of British publishers. The answer to this particular problem must be esparto grass, and one of the first recommendations of the Publishers Association is that steps be taken immediately to reorganize the collection of esparto in North Africa.

As no shipping is required for the production of the present papers, in which straw plays a large part, it is to be expected that the paper quota will soon be increased. This will allow larger editions to be printed and will enable the exports to be increased in quantity. This is not to assert that British publishers are satisfied with the present quality of papers, but that they are prepared to continue, insofar as their ability lies, to put their best foot forward in manufacture while hoping for a change in conditions that will enable the excellent prewar standard papers to be once more obtained.

The Trade Will Arise Again

The lifting of restrictions upon labor, the reintroduction of young women into the binding bottleneck, the abating of the Stationery Office demands—which now ride the printing trade like the Old Man of the Sea—such immediate measures will enable the publishing trade to regain its feet, if nothing more. The next step must be to turn into print books for which there is an assured demand, and then to register the workers in photolithographic book production. The replacement of machinery
must also be an immediate consideration.

There is no doubt that the afterwar organization of British publishers will have a strength, a unity, and a direction that was lacking in 1939. The book center which is now in existence, although it is used at the moment only by comparatively few publishers, will undoubtedly continue to attract more firms to its nucleus, since it can attend to all the packing, invoicing, dispatching, and distribution of various publications. In this center also is the reorganised firm of Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Co., Ltd., the long-established wholesale house, beginning a new and progressive life.

Even now many books are being published and many plans are being laid for the immediate resumption of a free and vigorous publishing campaign as soon as postwar conditions will allow it. This campaign will be directed, in the first place, to the satisfaction of demands that are certain to come from the continent of Europe. After 1918 British and American libraries contributed largely to place the more important continental French and Belgian collections upon a working basis. Again those collections have been destroyed, and again we must expect a hunger for books that will need to be assuaged. But now conditions prevail in England that were not felt at the end of the last war: the loss of over twenty million new books, the destruction of many old libraries by bombs, the great need for books that is felt by the English people—all will militate against the possibility of large and generously given assistance to Louvain and similar continental libraries. But British people will certainly expect, and British publishers endeavor to make, the offer of a contribution of some magnitude. The only method by which this contribution can be achieved is the issuing of new and well-printed editions of the great English literature and of European classics.

Beyond a doubt there will be a desire on the part of the peoples of Europe to read English books. The market is waiting, but the conditions that prevail at present in the printing and publishing businesses interpose a barrier of regulations and restrictions behind which publishers can only plan and fret. Whether the Canadian market also is recoverable appears to be in doubt. At any rate, markets there must be, and also a willingness on the part of United States publishers to “live and help live,” if the much-battered publishing trade of Great Britain, now on its feet, is to make real progress in a new day.
Who Does What: Unprofessional Personnel Policies

Mr. Williams, assistant to the librarian at Harvard College Library, has made use of American Library Association statistics and of other data gathered independently, to deal with certain aspects of the segregation of professional and clerical work in college and university libraries.

Librarians have not formed the habit of striking for higher pay, but few of them, especially when they write on personnel, resist the temptation to hint that better salaries would be desirable. Rather than repeat old arguments or devise new ones on that subject, it may be useful, in an article that is to be read by librarians, to examine a situation that may help to explain the relative failure of the traditional propaganda for wage increases. This paper, therefore, will be concerned with the correlation, in college and university libraries, between the number of employees of various grades and the quantity of work of corresponding grades that is done. Two axioms are involved at the outset: first, that some of the employees of a library are professional, while the remainder are not; second, that some of the work in a library can be done adequately only by professional workers, while the balance need not be done by them.

The professional employees mentioned in the first axiom are defined, in the A.L.A. statistical report forms, as persons "performing work of a professional grade which requires training and skill in the theoretical or scientific parts of library work as distinct from its merely mechanical parts. . . . A professional position . . . requires the following educational background: (a) At least a bachelor's degree which includes one year of professional library education in the four years which lead to the bachelor's degree; or (b) An informal education considered by the librarian as the real equivalent of four years of college work, plus five years' experience in a library of recognized professional standing."

There is some room for variation in interpretation of the last section, and perhaps not all statistics reported by all libraries are completely accurate, but, subject to these relatively minor reservations, Table A, at the end of the present paper, shows how the personnel has been divided in fifty college and university libraries during recent years. This table, it should be added, includes all institutions for which the necessary statistics have been published for three or more of the past eleven years; the figures printed prior to 1932-33 cannot be used in this connection.

Percentage of Total Work

Much less information is available about the other percentage in question—the percentage of the total work that is of professional grade. An official definition of such work is lacking, though it is reported that an A.L.A. committee is at present listing and classifying, as professional or nonprofessional, the tasks performed in college and university libraries. It would hardly seem possible to make any position purely
professional; nothing more clearly calls for library training than reference work, yet nearly every reference librarian spends an appreciable portion of his time on questions that could be answered equally well by anyone who knows his way around the library building. Also, unless a “task” comprises only the most minute possible unit of work, a task that is professional in one library might, with a different organization of the work, become several tasks or portions of several tasks, only one of which might be professional.¹ While it may never be possible to sort and classify the work done in libraries as neatly as the personnel, it is nonetheless surprising that there appears to be no published record of any effort to arrive at even an approximation of the percentage of professional and nonprofessional work, either for college and university libraries in general or for any individual institution.

Is Correlation of Importance?

Before examining what can be discovered with regard to the correlation between personnel and work, however, it would seem prudent to decide whether or not such a correlation is of sufficient importance to warrant discussion. It would matter, obviously, if evidence were to be uncovered that, in many libraries, a higher percentage of the work than of the staff is of professional grade. If this sort of noncorrelation is not to be found, however, a pertinent enquiry is: Would it matter if the percentage of professional grade personnel should be discovered, in many cases, to be much higher than the percentage of professional grade work?

If noncorrelation in this direction is a danger, relatively little attention has been given to it in library literature, and surely its results could not be so clearly or immediately damaging as lack of correlation of the opposite sort. If its reference librarians, bibliographers, and catalogers are inadequate in quality or quantity, a library will give poor service immediately and will rapidly deteriorate in every respect; but, if all of the pages in a library were doctors of philosophy from the Graduate Library School, the service would not suffer and, indeed, the faculty might find it convenient to have these experts scattered through the stacks.

Still, there are at least two evident reasons for suspicion that noncorrelation of the latter sort would be undesirable. Economy is one consideration: the professional librarian, by definition, has training that the nonprofessional does not have, and a library must be wasting money if it is paying for skills that it does not use. The second consideration involves professional standards. It would seem difficult for librarianship to attract and hold desirable recruits if it were not making use of their abilities, and, likewise, extensive use of professionals for clerical work might not make it easier to improve salary schedules.

But the argument on the basis of economy, at least, cannot be accepted without question. Under war circumstances it often is easier to secure professional than clerical workers. And one might argue that there is, or will be when conditions return to normal, a surplus of trained librarians; that they do clerical work at least as well and as cheaply as non-librarians; that many of them are not good for much else anyway; and that they are easier to use because they do not require so much supervision or such careful organization and division of labor. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate that an administrator, if this is the situation, is not furthering the best interests of his library when he uses surplus profes-

¹ Probably the greatest opportunities for reorganization of this sort are in cataloging. A description of developments in this field at Harvard (for which the present author has neither the space nor the qualifications) ought to be published.
sionals for any sort of work that needs to be done.

Such a conclusion may be reasonable and even inevitable, but it can hardly be accepted without protest by one who is interested in the welfare of the profession. For one thing, it is doubtful that there is or will be, in the near future, a real surplus of professional skills. Few libraries are now doing all the reference work they would like to do or giving as much attention as could profitably be given to building up the collection or improving the catalog. Much more professional work could be undertaken if trained librarians were relieved of clerical duties.

**Vicious Circle**

Much more important is the realization that consenting to this situation means, in effect, accepting a vicious circle—or descending spiral—of personnel surplus, resulting in clerical grade work and low wages, both of which, in turn, mean inferior recruits. The latter, of course, help to insure continued low-grade work and low wages. One cannot reasonably hope that efforts at recruiting will improve the quality of library personnel as long as this condition prevails. High wages might reconcile some talented persons to work largely clerical, while really important and stimulating duties might attract some first-rate people in spite of low wages; but the fatal combination perhaps leaves librarianship only the appeal of a rather spurious gentility that may fail to attract much vigor or intelligence to the profession.

A comparison with medicine or teaching might make the point more clear: A surplus of personnel in those fields will force some doctors to struggle to make a living from a poor practice and some teachers to accept a few hundred dollars a year in country schools or fifth-rate colleges; but the doctor or teacher, however low his earnings, still has patients or pupils and can still make good use of the skills or talents he possesses for healing or teaching. It could hardly be maintained that a librarian reduced to filing or typing has a comparable opportunity to utilize his native abilities and his library training; efforts to improve his speed or accuracy will not greatly improve his mind or far extend his professional knowledge and competence. And it could be argued that, if this situation is accepted, a library school must be either very optimistic or not entirely conscientious when it attempts to recruit first-rate students.

The A.L.A. statistics, as noted, have made it possible to prepare a table showing the distribution of personnel in fifty college and university libraries. The percentage of professional staff members varies widely. In one group of libraries—which includes Harvard, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, Iowa State College, Oberlin, and Vassar—professional workers make up only from 30 to 40 per cent of the total staff; at the other extreme, with from 56 to 96 per cent professional, are Illinois, Michigan, U.C.L.A., Louisiana, Syracuse, Wellesley, Denver, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Arizona, Colorado State, Southern Methodist, and North Dakota. The average is very near 50 per cent, since exactly half of the libraries are above and half below that figure. There is clearly some tendency for the smaller libraries to have higher percentages of professionals.

**Work Differences**

The first question that naturally arises is whether or not the differences in percentages of professional staff members result, at least in large part, from corresponding differences in the work done in the various libraries. If one found, for example, that Illinois does twice as much professional and half as much clerical work...
as Harvard, it would be natural for it to have twice the percentage of professional personnel, and the difference in percentages would not imply any difference in the correlation between work and personnel.

If only a few librarians were to be imposed upon by a request for opinions on this and other questions arising in connection with the study, it seemed that the most light might be thrown on the subject by directing inquiries to administrators of a few of the libraries with the highest and lowest percentages of professional personnel. Replies came from directors or librarians of four of the "high percentage" and five of the "low percentage" libraries—to all of whom the author is grateful.

Each administrator was asked if he believed that the difference between the percentage of professionals on his staff and the percentage in libraries at the other percentage extreme resulted from differences in the work done or, at least in large part, from genuine differences in the extent to which trained librarians are used for clerical work. Three of the nine who replied (including two from "high percentage" libraries) indicated that, as far as they could see, the differences in personnel bore no relation to differences in the work done. None of the replies asserted that the differences were entirely accounted for in this way, but several factors were suggested as having some bearing on the problem.

Many Professional Members

Several replies pointed out that the library of an institution where classes are small and many undergraduates are engaged in independent study calls for a relatively large percentage of professional members on the staff: "The smaller library is often a teaching instrument even more than a collection of books, and this teaching function calls for professional people."

Undoubtedly there is merit in this contention, but it is surprising to discover that, in the four women's colleges to which this theory presumably might be particularly applicable, the percentage of professional workers runs from 38.1 at Vassar, through 58.2 at Wellesley, 72.3 at Mount Holyoke, and 83.9 at Smith. Smaller classes and independent study might help to account for the discrepancy between one of these colleges and some other institutions on the table, but the remarkable differences among the colleges themselves remain unexplained.

It was suggested that there might be some relation between professional staff percentages and the volume of annual accessions or of circulation, but careful examination of the statistics has failed to reveal any significant correlation with either item. The likeness that has been noted between the percentage and the size of the library might be expected, regardless of any difference in the percentage of work, since it would obviously be more difficult to divide professional from nonprofessional tasks in a library where there are very few employees per department.

A suggestion that at first glance seemed very promising, was that institutions with numerous special and departmental libraries would be expected to have larger percentages of professional workers, because a small separate collection may require professional supervision and yet not involve enough work to warrant a clerical staff. Fortunately, it was possible to obtain a breakdown by departments of the staff at Harvard, Texas, and Illinois, as shown in Table B. This indicates that, at least in the case of these three institutions,
the percentage of professionals in departmental libraries is close to the percentage of professionals for the whole library and, consequently, has no appreciable effect on the latter percentage. The same table shows that the difference between the percentage at Harvard and Texas on the one hand and Illinois on the other, runs all through the staff, department by department—which may be taken as another indication that policy plays a greater part than varying proportions of professional work in causing the difference.

Library School on Campus

The one obvious correlation revealed by the table is between a high percentage of professionals and the existence of a library school under the same administrator as the library. Denver, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, and Syracuse are all among the "highs." But the presence of a library school affects the availability of trained personnel and may influence personnel policy; no one asserts that it has a significant affect on the work load of the library.

Finally, all four administrators of "high percentage" libraries, whether or not they believed their high percentages to be desirable, stated that their professional staff members were doing a considerable amount of clerical work. It seems fair to conclude that a preponderance of evidence favors the view that work differences do not explain very much of the variations in percentage of professional employees shown by the table, and that these percentages do reflect, to a large degree, differences in the extent to which professional members are being used for clerical work.

One administrator argues that a high percentage of professional workers makes possible higher standards of service and implies higher ideals of librarianship. Consequently, it seems necessary to examine what evidence there is as to whether the most desirable situation, for the average library, appears to lie in the upper region of nearly 60 per cent or more professional people; toward the middle, around 50 per cent; or, perhaps, in the low area between 30 and 40. With this in mind, each librarian consulted was asked whether or not he was reasonably well satisfied with the distribution of his own staff as of 1940-41. Of the four "high percentage" libraries, one expects a rise in the percentage (due to a surplus of librarians who can be used for clerical work), and the other three hope for a moderate decrease—two of them to 50 per cent or a little more. This suggests something of a trend toward the average; but replies from the "low percentage" libraries do not bear this out, for one of the five wishes to remain about where it is, three desire to reduce their percentages still more, and only one would like an increased percentage of professional workers. If the average—50 per cent—is desirable, it is hard to see why one library is satisfied at present and four wish to go still farther from the mean. If the "high percentage" group is the best off and if it really does improve the service and raise professional standards to use trained librarians for much clerical work, it is surprising, at least, that four out of the five "low percentage" administrators want to stay where they are or go still lower.

Texas Time Study

Obviously, these administrators do not believe that they are forcing their non-professional staff members to do work of professional grade. The only objective evidence on this point, however, is provided by the results of a time study made at Michigan, the school is no longer under the director at the library, although it was until recently.

Indeed, the decrease desired at Wellesley will bring that library well below the average of the four women's colleges.
at Texas in 1939 at the request of the subcommittee preparing the A.L.A. classification and pay plans. Over a two-week period, each staff member indicated exactly how much time he spent on each of 127 listed tasks. A number of these tasks, unfortunately, cannot be definitely classified as professional or nonprofessional; but examination of the time sheets does seem to justify the conclusion that the professional staff at Texas, comprising 41 per cent of the whole staff at that time, was spending more than a quarter of its time on clerical tasks. This appears to justify the subsequent reduction of the percentage there to 30 or slightly less.

Unless this is in error, and unless administrators at Harvard, Texas, Iowa State College, and other “low percentage” libraries are mistaken, there are enough trained librarians in these libraries to do the professional work; consequently, the percentage of professional grade work in these libraries must be 30 or less. It follows that, if the proportion of professional grade work does not vary greatly from library to library, at least half the time of the whole professional staff at some of the other libraries listed in the table must be devoted to clerical tasks.

This does not imply that the “high percentage” libraries are in an undesirable condition from the standpoint of the public they serve; it has been pointed out that the public might not suffer if all pages were doctors of philosophy. It does not imply, as long as librarians are as cheap as clerical workers, that the “high percentage” libraries are being administered uneconomically. But there is good reason to fear, it has been seen, that the situation is undesirable from the standpoint of the library profession—clerical work for trained librarians is a part of the vicious circle that entails low salaries and inferior recruits.

Subprofessionals

It might be reasonable to expect that an administrator who wished to keep the percentage of professional members on his staff as low as possible would find it desirable to employ some nonprofessional persons of a higher grade than would be needed in an institution where librarians were doing much of the clerical work. This consideration suggests that attention ought to be drawn to the question of “subprofessionals.” The A.L.A. definition is not very satisfactory and, perhaps, is often interpreted rather freely; in the classification and pay plans mentioned above, the grade is omitted entirely on the ground that it is little used. It should be added that the term “subprofessional” is unsatisfactory. If “librarian” is to be included in the name of all professional positions, as recommended, then “assistant” might be proposed in place of “subprofessional.” In any case, the group in question must be composed of college graduates with some library experience. Mr. Coney suggests that the distinguishing feature should be that this group has responsibility for making decisions but in a narrower field than professional members have.

Perhaps the best indication that recognition of some such intermediate grade of service is of use, if one wishes to hold professional positions to a minimum, is the fact that all five of the administrators of “low percentage” libraries thought the subprofessional grade desirable, while all three
of the "high percentage" librarians who replied to the question were opposed to such a grade.

But wider acceptance of subprofessional workers, if desirable, is not a means of solving the basic problem so much as an expedient that would naturally accompany progress toward a solution. If a shortage of librarians could be created there would be reason to hope that the situation—low wages, clerical work, and inferior recruits—would change for the better. True, there is supposed to be a shortage at present and it does not seem to have reduced the percentage of professional people materially, but, as shown by one of the replies that was quoted, an even greater shortage of clerical labor, at least in some localities, more than counterbalances the shortage of librarians. If clerical labor were plentiful, while librarians were not, there can be little doubt that considerations of economy would force changes of personnel policy. In any case, there is little prospect of creating a shortage.

Suggested Procedure

No single administrator, of course, could change the situation throughout the profession, but it may be worth while to suggest a procedure that would, if followed by enough administrators, give promise of improving conditions. The suggestion, in brief, is that the administrator act as if he were going to face a shortage. If librarians were going to be strictly rationed, or to cost $20,000 each, the director presumably would go through his staff, department by department and person by person, and try to determine, by job analyses, time records, interviews, or other means, what percentage of the time of each professional employee was taken up with clerical work.

He might find, for example, that a department had twenty employees, of whom twelve were professional, each devoting a certain fraction of his time to nonprofessional tasks. If these fractions added up to three or a little more, it would mean that the department could operate with three fewer professionals and three more clerical employees. Then, when a professional member left the staff, his professional duties would be divided among the remaining professional ones, and a new clerical position would be created to take over the nonprofessional duties left unassigned by these shifts. After three librarians had left, all of the professional duties would be concentrated in nine professional positions, and these positions would be nearly 100 per cent professional in content. If funds were available and the work warranted it, the readjustment might be made more quickly by adding three clerical positions at once, thus releasing the equivalent of three full-time librarians for additional professional work, which, in most departments, could be used to advantage. In any case, the professional positions in the library would soon be almost purely professional.

If a shortage then really developed, the library would be ready to make the maximum use of its personnel resources. As long, however, as there was a surplus of trained librarians, there is no reason why unemployed professionals should not be hired for clerical positions—as long as it was not forgotten that the positions were clerical.

Results of Surplus

If the anticipated postwar surplus should materialize, trained librarians would then still be doing clerical work, and it might seem that little, if anything, had been gained by the careful segregation and classification of positions. The gain that is sought, however, would arise from the
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The fact that no one would then be deceived. The administrator would know that he was hiring trained librarians because they were available, not because he had to have them. The library school would know whether or not a real shortage existed; it would know just how many of its graduates were being placed in professional work and how many were able to get only clerical jobs in libraries. The individual, if he had to accept a clerical position, would know that he had not been "placed" and would not stay, unless some strong personal consideration warranted it, when he had an opportunity to secure professional work. Inferior products of the library schools would be weeded out in the process; indeed, general adoption of such a system might be an effective means of inducing the schools to do as much as possible of the weeding out themselves and ultimately reduce the surplus of librarians.

It will be much easier simply to continue traditional agitation for better salaries. The conclusion proposed here is unsatisfactory, too, because it amounts to little more than expression of the hope that library administrators will go to considerable trouble to do something that will not benefit their libraries very directly and certainly not very quickly. To be sure, the low percentages of professional employees reported by some libraries suggest that some administrators may already have done much of what is proposed, but other percentages hint that many more have not succeeded in doing it. Thoughtful librarians surely have always been aware of the basic problem that has been pointed out, and any facts that may have been presented here for the first time can scarcely do more than support conclusions that their own observations have already suggested.

An optimist would expect it to be less difficult to improve the situation in the future than it has been in the past.

### TABLE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College and Research Libraries</th>
<th>Average for all years reported</th>
<th>1940-41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Per Cent of Total Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per Cent of Total Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>146.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>146.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>124.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Seattle)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.L.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>No. Years Reported</td>
<td>Size of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint U. Ls.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn. State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (St. Louis)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Holyoke</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† All employees, including student assistants, reduced to full-time equivalents.
* Total hours worked during year by students not reported; figure based on estimate of hours as indicated
by rate paid and total expenditure for student help.
1. 1944-45: 28½ per cent professional.
2. 1942-43: 35 per cent professional.
3. 1944-45: 47 per cent professional.
4. 1942-43: 54 per cent professional.
5. 1942-43: 95 per cent professional (according to A.L.A. statistics); 1943-44: 58.2 per cent (reported by di-
rector).
6. 1942-43: 33½ per cent professional.
8. 1938-39: 81 per cent professional; no later report.
9. 1942-43: 69½ per cent professional.
### Table B

**Distribution of Staffs by Departments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Numbers of Employees</th>
<th>Numbers of Professional Employees</th>
<th>Per Cent Professional of Whole Staff of Each Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>63.19</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding*</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Colls.</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Libs.</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>153.75</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>201.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes photo-tat at Harvard.

1944 figures for Harvard and Texas; 1943 figures for Illinois.

---

**College Libraries in 1840**

College librarians associated with administrators and appropriating bodies who lack library consciousness may be interested in reading a forceful statement on this subject written in 1840 by William Capers. In lamenting the meagerness of a book collection of a college belonging to his denomination, this church paper editor and future bishop stated:

> This positively will not do. . . . A college with a library of "six hundred volumes!" Why it is a libel on a college library. . . . Better build cabins for recitation rooms, and cabins for dormitories, and a good large log cabin for a well-chosen library of 5000 volumes worth $15,000 to $20,000, and another for philosophical apparatus worth $10,000, and another inclosing a tower of brick for an observatory, better this for a college, than the most splendid edifice of brick or stone, without books.¹

C. H. Quenzel, Librarian

E. Lee Trinkle Library

Mary Washington College

of the University of Virginia

Fredericksburg

¹Godbold, Albea. *The Church College of the Old South*. Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1944, p.80. This quotation is used with the gracious permission of the Duke University Press.
By FREDERICK J. HOFFMAN

Research Value of the
"Little Magazine"

Some research resources which may not always be fully appreciated as seen by an assistant professor at Ohio State University.

In the past few years, scholars and critics who have interested themselves in problems of contemporary literature have been awakening to the great problem of finding adequate materials with which to work. They do not have the advantages which help the scholar of Elizabethan drama, for example—advantages which are the end product of years of painstaking research and careful accumulation and ordering of scholarly evidence. For the student of twentieth-century literature, adequate and accurate criticism, interpretation, and discussion are far more difficult than they are in matters which have been thoroughly explored and which are at least relatively settled. Indeed, this is one of the most effective arguments against the undertaking of research in contemporary letters: though there is a great sufficiency of "documents," these documents have no more order than their mere existence affords; they are neither adequately cataloged nor accurately classified; the wilderness of contemporary letters remains uncharted.

Criticism of modern literature has shown the sad effects of these conditions. Much of this criticism is impressionistic and tentative and is the result more of immediate intuition than of serious reflection. The abundance of materials has often proved more embarrassing than helpful. Much modern criticism of literature in the making is handicapped by two unfortunate circumstances: (1) the critic is constantly making over his opinion of a contemporary literary artist and his judgment is, therefore, seldom to be considered mature, since it is always subject to change of a sort trivial or profound. On Monday he may regard Mr. X as a brilliant interpreter of the mal de siècle; on Tuesday he has so altered his opinion that X becomes a poet of the avant-garde, an experimentalist, and therefore an artist whose merit is a huge question mark; (2) too often critics, embarrassed as they are by long publisher's lists and often by date deadlines for their reviews or essays, rely upon the publication in book form of any writer's work as the final and only statement. Much recent literary history suffers from this latter fault. With little if any awareness of a modern writer's esthetic biography, the critic seizes upon an author's books as the point of final reference, the basis of any and all judgment regarding his merit, his integrity, and his place in literary history. This is perhaps no more than fair and just. Once a writer submits to his publisher's good graces, he may be said to have given up any doubts about his own merit; and the critic is perhaps justified in assuming that publication in book form is an admission, on an author's part, that his work has reached a form of publishable maturity. But such an assumption, though valid in a majority of cases, is guilty of a fundamental error of omission. It neglects, altogether, a factor in all literary history which
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is extremely important—the problem of literary *genesis*—the means by which a literary artist grows and by which his work matures.

In view of both of these weaknesses in modern criticism, I should like to suggest that critical estimates of a great majority of twentieth-century poets and fictionalists will have to undergo a thorough revision in the years immediately ahead of us. This is, fortunately, a good time for this kind of reappraisal. We now see the second, third, and fourth decades of our century in some definite perspective—a perspective which is the product, not so much of chronology, as of major social, political, and economic events. We shall no doubt identify the years 1919-39 as a distinct and important "period" in the literary history of our century. We shall, in the future, be able to study those twenty years as a unit of time during which important events in the history of ideas paralleled those in other spheres of human endeavor. How go about this business of re-evaluation? Will the perspective which another postwar era will inevitably afford us be sufficient unto the needs thereof?

**Must Cover More Than Books**

The answer to these questions ought to be obvious enough. Literary history is more than a study of books published; it involves also a careful study and survey of the genesis of literary ideas and of the slow progress from tentative and halting adolescence to the final maturity of a writer's style and content. In order to make any reasonable judgment concerning the writers of our century, we shall have to study their work from beginning to end—and this task requires going to the "little magazines" in which so many of our most important writers made their first self-conscious and embarrassed bows before their reading public.

Scholarship and criticism will become more and more indebted to the little magazine for whatever they may need in the matter of revising estimates of twentieth-century literature. This is an important fact and one whose importance will grow larger and larger as little magazines become increasingly available to the scholar and the critic. But the criticism of writers living or recently dead is so much in its beginning phases that few critics know much about these little magazines. If they are aware of one or two of them, they fail to see the importance of a score of others. If they have read the few essays on little magazines which have appeared recently, they are still all but unaware of the highly significant part which these magazines have played in twentieth-century literature. What is needed more than anything else is a definition of the little magazine—a guide by which a scholar or a critic may identify the little magazine, and thus classify it.

**For Publishing Work of Merit**

A little magazine is one which has been established primarily for the purpose of publishing work of some artistic merit. This work is usually unacceptable to the commercial periodical for one or another of the following reasons: (1) its author is completely unknown and is therefore not a good "risk," for his work will not increase the circulation of the magazine; (2) the work may be written in a form unconventional and not immediately intelligible to the commercial magazine's public; (3) it may also violate one or several of that public's notions of polite moral, social, or esthetic behavior, and may, therefore, be frowned upon or forced to retreat from the formidable battlefield of popular preference. In view of these objections to new and often startling work by new and untried writers, the little magazine has ap-
peared in twentieth-century literary history as the answer to a definite need. Its editors often proclaim, with considerable seriousness and with great fervor, that the little magazine is vital to the health and growth of literature. It is needed to prevent absolute stagnation in the history of modern letters. But these editors are almost always amateurs and, like most amateurs, they possess enthusiasm and energy but have little, if any, knowledge of the great difficulties encountered in keeping a magazine alive. Suppose we try to draw a "composite portrait" of the little magazine editor or contributor. There is an abundance of material to draw from for this experiment in characterization. We might look back upon the careers of Ezra Pound, William Carlos Williams, Eugene Jolas, Edward J. Walsh, and Samuel Putnam. These men differ widely in their personal tastes and beliefs, but their activities in editing and contributing to little magazines have enough in common to give us some opportunity for generalizing about them. An editor of a little magazine, or a contributor to one (they are more often than not one and the same person), usually begins his career in a state of discontent—whether with the constraints of his world or with the irritating negligence of publishers (their exasperating indifference to work of merit)—at any rate, with something he considers unjust, boring, or even ridiculous. He views the world of publishers and popularizers with contempt, sometimes with despair. If he wishes to begin his career as a writer and finds that the only openings are those in the commercial magazines, he is faced with the prospect of abandoning certain unorthodox aesthetic or moral beliefs. Often he is rebellious against the doctrines of popular taste and sincerely believes that our attitudes toward literature need to be reformed, or at least made more liberal. More than that, he generally insists that publication should not depend upon the whimsy of conventional tastes and choices.

Spirit of Revolt

Certainly one of the great values of the little magazine, for scholars and critics who are anxious to know more about the cultural history of their century, lies in its spirit of conscientious revolt against the guardians of public taste. Freedom from such control often leads to confusion. We can have little hope, therefore, for a simple clarification of our age from the little magazine, especially since editors are many and quarrels frequent. There is a tangled but delightful sense of contradiction in the total picture. One gets the impression that many writers, neither having had nor desiring the formal schooling which a calmer age grants somewhat pompously, were at the business of making up their minds and liking it very much. The great seriousness with which some of the little magazines pronounce the dawn of a new cultural synthesis is forever being disturbed by an annoying spirit of dada which animates certain others.

Because of the urgent conviction that he has something to say but is prevented by commercial publishers from saying it in his own way, our little magazine editor must search for some means of publication outside the limits established by commercial periodicals. He finds, or is misled into believing, that the resources for beginning a magazine are available—though he often does not see clearly beyond the publication of the first issue. Generally, he is deeply absorbed in the importance of what he has to say; but his interest in establishing and illustrating his own esthetic beliefs leads him to neglect such matters as might insure either a wide distribution or a reasonably long life for his magazine.
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We ought to have guessed by this time that the wisdom of little magazine editors is generally confined to matters of the art of writing itself. Only occasionally do they show wisdom, or even competence, in practical matters. In fact, many of them pride themselves on their lack of such competence. They are genuine amateurs in the profession of publishing. Their amateur status is an indispensable accompaniment and a rather unfortunate result of their esthetic integrity—unfortunate because these magazines are the despair of both the bibliographer and the librarian. To say the very least, the editorial habits of little magazine personnel are eccentric. Its editors usually live an issue-to-issue existence; their concern is primarily for the present issue, not for any intelligible continuity of sequence or contents which might make the scholar's task the easier. The little magazines often pursue a perilous career, steering their courses uncertainly and erratically. Apparently the only certainty about them is the probability of early collapse.

Morton Dauwen Zabel, reviewing the then current literary magazines in the March 1933 issue of Poetry, remarks that "it becomes apparent that the multiplication of these periodicals atones for their individual impermanence; that despite their varying shades of policy and opinion, their functions are ultimately identical and their activities continuous." This is to say that though many die, many more are being born, and that this will continue to be true as long as there are young writers with courage, disregard for the requirements of the "dignified press," a few dollars in their pockets (or an interested friend or two who can pay the bills), and, finally, an abundance of sheer nerve. What makes the magazines "little" also insures their appearing everywhere and at any time—and disappearing without apparent cause.

**Proving Ground for Writers**

But all of this might be no more than an interesting little side excursion into the history of literature were it not true, also, that the little magazines of the twentieth century are the proving ground for a great majority of our writers. It is in these magazines that the professor, the scholar, and the critic will find source materials for all of their studies of modern literature. Charles Allen, of Purdue University, in a study he has made for The Sewanee Review, estimates that about 80 per cent of our most important modern critics, poets, and fictionalists first appeared in little magazines. We find Ernest Hemingway's first work in The Double-Dealer, a New Orleans little magazine of the twenties; William Falkner's first appearance in the same magazine; T. S. Eliot's first appearances in Others and Poetry; and John Malcolm Brinnin's first showing in a Detroit magazine, Prelude, of which he was also an editor. Hart Crane's first published poem appeared in Bruno's Bohemian, one of several magazines put out by Giordano Bruno in the Greenwich Village of the second decade; most of his "juvenilia" appeared in Joseph Kling's Village magazine, The Pagan.

In these facts—and the list of such appearances seems endless—resides the final importance of the little magazine for the scholar and the research worker. Though we must always work in the interest of establishing critical standards by which we can select the best of any writer's work and ultimately prove the justness and validity of our selection, the task of the scholar goes beyond that. He ought to make his study of any writer inclusive. He cannot afford to dismiss evidence before he has seen it. For this reason, he will have to go to the little magazines for a study of a writer's early work if he wishes to present that
writer's total product as a unit of literary biography or to make from it a wise selection of what might endure.

Take, for example, the problem of forming some estimate of the poetry of Hart Crane. Crane is a conspicuous product of little magazine policies. His writing went into the pages of little magazines for years before he was accepted as a representative modern poet and his poems were published in book form by a commercial publisher. Some of these poems are not republished at all in the version of his *Collected Poems* which appeared in 1933 under the Liverright imprint. It is true that the poems—most of them early efforts—that are not in the collected edition are absent for a good reason. They are badly written—halting, ineffective efforts—scarcely recognizable as the product of the same pen which wrote *The Bridge*. But for the scholar, these poems ought to be studied; and the only place where they can be found is in the little magazines themselves. No critic of Hart Crane's work can consider that work satisfactorily examined until he has seen those issues of *The Pagan* in which so many of the "juvenilia" were published. He may not consider any of these poems as worthy of grouping with *The Bridge* (indeed, I should regard him as a poor enough critic if he did). But he will be guilty of violating a cardinal principle of research if he does not examine each one of them.

**Writings in Original Form**

Another fact which makes the little magazines important to the scholar: it is in them that he will find important writings in their original state. Magazine publication often bears the same relationship to book publication as does manuscript itself. The writer, contemplating the appearance of his work in book form, will want to study that work as it has appeared in little magazines and, perhaps, to revise it. The scholar will often, therefore, have two or three versions of a single work, and he can study the development of a writer's craft by considering each in its turn.

Finally, the little magazines are of fundamental importance to the student and professor of twentieth-century literature because they are a mine of information about the intellectual habits and predispositions of our day. For the editorialists, the manifestoes, the pronunciamentos, the controversies, are all there. Very few little magazines fail to give the student an opportunity for examining the *raison d'être* of modern writing. Most of them argue and defend their contributions to literature at great length. It is an interesting experience—that of following the editorial careers of modern writers—as their work proceeds from issue to issue, from magazine to magazine, accompanied by the editorial rhetoric and invective of their sponsors. Not only do we get the writing of our century in these magazines; we find out what the writers themselves think of it. Our century has been characterized by an elaborate and insistent self-appraisal. Few are the poets who are not also critics—of their own work and of that of their contemporaries. Much of this self-appraisal is to be found in no other place than in the little magazines. It has never been published elsewhere. We should be poor judges indeed who did not allow the defendant a chance to speak before we either consign him to oblivion or suffer him to remain in the histories of our literature.

**Source Materials of Scholarship**

The little magazines are of inestimable value for the scholar and the critic because in their pages we find the source materials of the only scholarship worthy of the name. There is no doubt of this fact, and it will be recognized with increasing readiness in the years to come. How can libraries and
university departments of literature prepare themselves for the studies of twentieth-century literature which will inevitably appear in the future? It is my opinion that no university library can consider itself adequately equipped for research in modern literature unless it has complete files of at least fifteen important little magazines. Without them, the graduate student will have to be satisfied with only a partial view of his subject or he will have to travel to one or another of the libraries which have these magazines. The following may be considered as the fifteen most important little magazines of our century: The Little Review, Transition, Poetry, The Seven Arts, The Double-Dealer, Broom, Secession, Others, The Masses, The Fugitive, The Partisan Review, This Quarter, The Reviewer, Story, and The Midland. It is hard to set a limit to such a list; I am sure that there are several others with just claims for inclusion.

For the rest, a university library may follow one of two courses: (1) it may, if it has a large surplus of funds, attempt to collect complete files of a much larger representation—let us say a hundred titles; (2) it may wish to complete its holdings of the magazines which published a single writer, or those which represent a single tendency in modern literature or a single region. Whatever its wishes are, the student of modern literature probably will be grateful for such assistance. But, above all, the "indispensable minima" of important magazines cannot be ignored in planning for research in modern literature.

One other suggestion should perhaps be made here, which may appear presumptuous in a nonlibrarian to discuss. Those who have worked with little magazines in this early, pioneering stage of their history have sometimes been handicapped in their work because there has been no separate classification of little magazines in library files. It would be of great value to both student and professor to refer to a separate catalog of little magazines in the library's files. It is of some assistance, but not much, to have these little magazines given a special designation, even though they are grouped with other magazines in the periodical card catalog. A separate shelf-list or card file of them would of course be a tremendous help. Before such a file can be made, some adequate definition of the little magazine must be made as a guide in selecting the titles which belong in the file.

It is with the academic needs of the immediate future that this article is most concerned. Perhaps the groundwork for scholarship in twentieth-century letters needs yet to be laid, before competent study can be done with some measure of convenience. It is not too early for that preliminary work. In fact, it is a necessity to modern scholarship. Undoubtedly, the scholarly equipment needed for a re-evaluation of twentieth-century literature will be provided in the early future.
The Readers’ Division Chief

Mr. Jesse, librarian of the University of Tennessee, and Mr. Towne, librarian of Michigan State College, have collaborated in the portrayal of an administrative development which is claiming increased attention.

The recent appointment of an assistant director for readers’ services at Columbia University appears to have had the effect of crystallizing the thoughts of a considerable number of college and university librarians concerning the administrative answer to the old problem of a need for coordinating service to readers. Actually, the position is not a new one; the duties encompassed are the same as those already assigned to certain individuals in other institutions, and even the title has been used before. But the recognition of the problem at Columbia, and the announcement of the solution determined there, has given impetus to what had already assumed the aspect of at least an incipient trend.

When divisional forms of higher education were adopted at a number of institutions in recent years, one type of readers’ division chief grew out of a recognition of the problems involved in attempting to serve semiautonomous divisional libraries having similarity in objectives rather than out of a recognition of the necessity for coordinating such form divisions as circulation, reference, departmental libraries, etc. In tracing the beginnings of the coordinating agency under discussion, proper recognition has to be given to such positions as the assistant in charge of branch libraries and the assistant in charge of total reference services.

At Columbia University it has now been felt that the units of the library system which serve the reader directly have a common purpose, and these are listed as the reference department, circulation departments, and “various special reading rooms—such as the periodical room, the browsing room, the lending service library, as well as the various college, school, and departmental libraries.”

In a “Memorandum” issued over his signature on June 30, 1944, Director Carl M. White enumerated certain major duties for the new “assistant director: readers’ services,” which may be summarized as (1) duties in connection with collections, such as promoting a strong and rounded development of library resources, drawing upon bibliographic knowledge of the university staff, passing upon questions of duplication and acceptability and location of material, and passing upon such matters as storage and reader access; (2) duties in connection with services to readers, involving comparisons of departments, promotion of coordination and mutual understanding, interpretation of university policy, and compilation of records and other information; and (3) “line” duties, entailing linking the authority of the director and the heads of departments, gathering data regarding the library system as a whole, planning with assistants, approving recommendations for appointments, and exercising “veto power” on appointments within the division.

It is essential that the responsibilities,
objectives, and authority of the readers' division chief be clear, and the further the definition extends beyond typical line administration, the better. Properly understood and properly executed, the position of readers' service chief can be the most effective device for accomplishing the ultimate in college and university library service: total understanding of, and accord with, all educational objectives, as ascertainable from the faculty both individually and collectively. The authors wish to stress at this point their conviction that much of the success which the venture may expect to attain will depend upon the clarity with which the broad aims and the detailed needs of the teaching faculty are understood and interpreted. The quest for this clarity will occupy much of our division chief's time and, conceivably, the majority of it during his first year of service. Actually, he need spend in the library proper only as much of his weekly schedule as is necessary to make his findings known to the staff and to be sure that he grasps the limits in personnel, physical plant, book resources, etc., so as not to place the library in that anomalous but recurring position of trying to catch up in service with what the public relations man has promised. The authors are not unaware of the difficulties to be encountered in trying to ascertain the objectives of the faculty or of the rarity of any situation which might be described as "total accord," but are convinced that one can at least come to grips with the problem, if it is approached with proper respect.

Be Properly Accoutered

Before the readers' division chief is sent out into the world to seek the golden fleece of "total accord," it is highly desirable that he be properly accoutered. One university librarian recently described the position in a prospectus: "For practical purposes the position should be such as to allow for entree about the campus and for executing without further authority all but major policy-forming duties in the assigned field. Salary and status will have to be fitted to the man, but in order to fit into the present library staff pattern, the position should carry the title of assistant librarian in charge of the readers' division and be accompanied by the appropriate faculty rank." The key word is "entree," and entree has social as well as academic and administrative prerequisites. Naturally, there will be no dragon-slaying even if the finest suit of armor in the land is buckled around a lightweight.

It was asserted earlier that the installation of a readers' division chief presented the aspect of a recent trend. This statement needs to be amplified and qualified. Harvard University has for a long time had an assistant librarian in charge of reference and circulation. The University of California defines the duties of the associate librarian as being responsible for the divisional agencies of loan and shelf, rental-reserve, reference, documents, and branch libraries. The Washington Square Library of New York University had a chief of the readers' department as early as 1926. Brown University developed this idea in connection with its subject-division form of library service adopted in 1939. The assistant librarian at the University of Nebraska was specifically in charge of the readers' division several years ago. The University of Illinois has appointed an assistant university librarian for public service departments. Recent conversations and correspondence with other college and university librarians show that the trend remains largely potential, however, by reason of the unavailability of qualified personnel.

The library schools are apparently already aware of the interesting possibilities
in recruiting and training for this type of position but, of course, have been more or less helpless to do anything about it during the war. The authors are inclined to encourage a slight deviation from recruiting for library schools in the usual sense and to urge that it be attempted at a higher academic and professional level than has ordinarily been thought feasible. The potentialities of the position of assistant librarian in charge of readers’ services have been discussed with a number of young instructors and assistant professors at various institutions, and a certain number of them could be brought into library work at a level which would constitute a promotion in rank and a better opportunity for the approach to higher education in its broadest sense. The status, duties, and salary should attract men of precisely the same caliber as those who are interested in such positions as assistant dean, assistant registrar, etc. If there ever was, or ever will be, a position in the library which is tailored to fit the young professor who is dissatisfied with overspecialization and who aspires to embrace the total educational program, it is that of the readers’ division chief. The self-assigned recruiting officer is going to find it much easier to interest well-qualified candidates by being able to hold out the promise of something a little more appealing than the financial and educational sacrifices once proffered.

**Yeoman Service of G.L.S.**

The Graduate Library School has apparently done yeoman service in breaking down the idea that the university library can be an effective educational instrument as a one-man, one-professor, and one-salaried institution. The handful of young zealots who in the past decade have gone out from the institution which stands on Chicago’s Midway have fought many battles and have lost many but have apparently so affected the thinking of the faculty and administrations of their respective universities that some of us are now finding it relatively easy to establish secondary and even tertiary administrative and professional positions of a nature to attract something more than mere martyrs.

An older and quieter school of thought has long surrounded the chair of librarianship with a certain aura of dignity and learning. With exceptions in a few very large research libraries, however, this type of thinking nonetheless too often resulted in the one-salary library, producing a situation which the authors feel can no longer make for satisfactory service.

There are undoubtedly those who will say that the functions of the position under discussion, as stated or implied, are no more than those which have been urged either by, or upon, head librarians for a long time. “Are not these functions and duties precisely those which the librarian himself should attempt to undertake?” The answer is yes, but in most medium-sized and large libraries the librarian has not undertaken them and he probably never will, because there has never been, and there probably never will be, time enough to escape from the innumerable outside contacts which he is expected to maintain. These are continual and may range all the way from chairing the program committee of a local luncheon club to going to China for a year or more.

The readers’ service chief, therefore, becomes the right arm of the librarian, reaching into the campus to help solve a hundred problems which the librarian could never find time to attack. (A parallel case might be drawn up here for the librarian’s left arm, that is, a chief of the technical processes, but, some opinion contrariwise, it is not felt that there must necessarily be such a parallel, even though it does look well on paper.) (See chart on page 320.)
It is impractical in an article such as this to attempt to list in detail the duties of the readers' division chief, for they will vary greatly with each institution and will even fluctuate within an institution. Two illustrations are offered to show the type of project that can be undertaken by the readers' chief, which it would be impossible for the librarian of a large university to attempt. Except for the chance luncheon companion, the irate professor who carries his complaint all the way up, and a handful of close personal friends who form the habit of dropping in on the librarian, it is very difficult for the librarian to come to know individual faculty members well enough to get at their bibliographical problems. Whether or not he desires it, because of the demands upon his time, the librarian will gradually come to depend more and more upon university line administration and will end by dealing almost entirely with deans, directors, and department heads. The readers' division chief, if he is at all personally qualified for the position, will soon find that most of his lunches will be followed by thirty-minute extensions in the faculty club lounge, dealing with the specific book problems of some individual faculty member who may be, for example, simply a history instructor who has "been thinking for a long time" of the feasibility of a small office collection of certain specialized works to pass out informally to his confreres. This is, of course, a type of service which, in many instances, should not be refused by the library. Rarely indeed will there be found the university librarian who can spare thirty minutes after he has finished his lunch. That he should, is readily admitted; that he ordinarily does not, is inevitable.

Through the above approach, particularly to the lower academic ranks, it was learned by one recently appointed university librarian that, in a number of teaching departments on his campus, the book fund allotments were being hoarded for special subjects so undemocratically and so unsatisfactorily, by the heads of instruction, that many of the members of the faculty knew of no way to get a book ordered for the library. Yet library allotments to those departments were extremely liberal and in some cases actually generous! This is the sort of abuse which will come more promptly to the attention of the library administration if there is a readers' division chief.

**Assistant to Librarian Positions**

About ten years ago there appeared to be a trend toward the creation of the position of assistant to the librarian. This new
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The projected organizational pattern which is being used for discussion at Michigan State College has the aspect of a balanced scale:

![Organizational Chart]

**Librarian**

- **Assistant Librarian in Charge of Readers' Service**
  - Circulation
  - Reference
  - Assigned Reading
  - Documents
  - School Libraries

- **Assistant Librarian in Charge of Technical Operations**
  - Order Department
  - Catalog Department
  - Periodicals
  - Continuations
  - Serials
  - Binding
functionary was supposed to cure 'many of the librarian's headaches while occupying, from the library school's point of view, an especially attractive post—a post in which to place promising young men who, understandably, wanted to become librarians by short-cutting the generally accepted methods. In some cases this worked out, and is still working out, in a manner satisfactory to all concerned, but the idea has never progressed beyond the trend stage. It is possible that the number of actual appointments of readers' division chiefs may remain a mere trend and never reach the proportions of a movement.

However, the two positions are not analogous because of the potential markets. The most casual consideration of the placement possibilities for the post of assistant to the librarian shows the demand circumscribed by the number of very large libraries—the only ones that can afford to carry the extra cost of a relatively high-salaried staff member whose duties will be, at best, policy interpretation of a high degree. But in the case of the readers' division chief, the potential market may be said to include every college and university library where it is recognized that a close relationship between the faculty and staff is desirable and is worth paying for and where it is also recognized that the librarian himself cannot find time to act as a complete liaison officer.

Small libraries should and will depend upon the librarian and the department heads. Some of the larger libraries will want to employ a sort of supercirculation chief or superreference chief. In such cases the supercirculation or superreference chief will, in many instances, be a readers' services chief with merely another title. Except as one of the already heavily stressed accouterments for entree, the actual title of assistant librarian in charge of readers' services is not advocated here because of any inherent magical quality in the combination of words.

Other and better solutions will undoubtedly present themselves or be discovered later for a proper medium of readers' service coordination and library-faculty cooperation, but for the time being, in college and university libraries, the authors suggest unification of readers' service under a readers' division chief.

Something New in Cataloging
(Continued from page 296)

doing the many things a catalog department always wants to do but for which it never has the time.

If several drives of a week's duration are planned, the bulk of the work for the year will be compressed into about two months. This should mean that during the remainder of the year the cataloger will not be under pressure and will be free to work on a number of matters which normally have to be set to one side waiting for a better day which never seems to come. This will provide a variety and interest in the cataloger's program which is now often lacking.
Suggestions for Statistical Records, II

A discussion begun in the June 1945 number of College & Research Libraries is concluded in the following pages.

By FAR the weakest category in the Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education is the rubric headed "Number of Photostats or Microfilms," which is broken down into the number made for other libraries and the number obtained from other libraries. This figure is as useless as though the Boston fish market were to lump together the daily totals of lobsters and mackerel.

We need to start over again in keeping records of this extremely important branch of modern library science. While it was still relatively undeveloped when the Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education was taking shape, it is nevertheless a service which might well become the most important single library activity within the foreseeable future; and, accordingly, it deserves better treatment than it has been receiving from most libraries. In the first place, we need precise information as to the nature of the equipment in each library and what personnel is available to operate it. A description of the equipment might fit into the suggested quinquennial issues of the statistical handbook previously mentioned. Annual records of work done should be noted under the following headings: number of microfilm exposures, number of microfilm prints, number of photostatic exposures, number of photographic negatives, number of contact prints, and number of enlargements from microfilm. A very large laboratory, such as that maintained by the Library of Congress' Photoduplication Service, needs additional figures on such items as color transparencies, lantern slides, projection prints, blueprints, Ozalid prints (square feet), multilith (copies). Figures on materials received from other libraries are needed for microfilm prints, photostatic exposures, and contact prints. Microfilm can be expressed either in feet or in numbers of exposures.

It should be noted that photographic services are intimately related to interlibrary loan. To a large extent, we in America are supplanting certain types of interlibrary loan with photostats and microfilms. While the European librarians assiduously collect statistical records of international interlibrary loan and of interlibrary loan of manuscripts, we refrain from gathering this information simply because the services themselves are negligible, due to our policy of discouraging such loans in favor of photographic work and because our holdings of papyri, 22 U.S. Library of Congress. Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress . . . 1940-41. Washington, Library of Congress, 1942, p. 66. These items, of course, should be included in an annual report at the discretion of the individual librarian and not put on a general form.

26 Marcel Godet's complaint in his "Le Prêt International des Livres et Manuscrits" (Der Schweizer Sammler 85-96, 113-23, 1937) that international interlibrary loan statistics are neglected, can be answered by American libraries merely by listing in separate categories figures for photographic work done for libraries and individuals abroad.

27 Muszkowski, J. "Interlibrary Loans in Poland." Publications of the International Federation of Library Associations 5, 1934—Actes du Comité International des Bibliothèques, 6ème session, Chicago, October 14, Avignon, Nov. 13-14, 1933, p. 196, argues that photography will not take the place of international interlibrary loan as much as "it cannot be recommended to reproduce all pages of a thick volume, if the borrower is especially interested in one or two pages only." A careful scholar will usually have an exact page or leaf reference or can give directions for ascertaining it readily.
ancient, medieval, and renascence manuscripts are, relatively, far smaller.

Interlibrary loan figures called for on the Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education tell us only how many volumes are borrowed and how many are lent. Possibly because these figures mean so little they were omitted from the published tables in College and Research Libraries. Certainly their chief virtue is a negative one—they are expressed in terms of volumes rather than in terms of "packages" or "shipments," which some libraries have used. Still, the simple figures of books borrowed and lent have some value as a means of ascertaining trends and determining the true growth of a library as reflected in its ability to supply its own readers adequately without having to request loans from the outside. For example, twenty years ago the Iowa State College Library borrowed far more books than it lent; but, after two decades of carefully supervised book selection, its "balance of trade" in interlibrary loan is almost exactly reversed.

In the first place, it would seem desirable to treat interlibrary loan statistics just as any other circulation statistics (infra) and to analyze the books lent by classes. In the second place, it would be useful for research libraries to divide materials lent and borrowed into manuscript theses, periodicals, and books. A medium-sized public library with a few voracious readers in fairly specialized fields may borrow more items than a college library with many active research workers. But the public library will borrow popular books, whereas the college library is more likely to borrow periodicals and dissertations. Similarly, the University of Illinois, as a tax-supported institution, will probably lend far more books than the John Crerar Library, for every public library and high school library in the state of Illinois will feel that the state university is duty bound to lend it out-of-print books. On the other hand, it is likely that both of these libraries will lend about the same number of scientific periodicals to other research libraries which will locate these publications through the Union List of Serials.

Many libraries merely give the total number of institutions from which books are borrowed and to which books are lent. This practice is not wholly satisfactory. It would be preferable for the average college or university library to divide institutions from which books are borrowed into (a) Library of Congress, (b) other college and university libraries, and (c) other libraries; and institutions to which books are lent into (a) other college and university libraries, (b) public libraries, and (c) school libraries. These figures would be of considerable value as a guide to qualitative evaluation of the significance of interlibrary loan in a particular institution. There can hardly be any serious objection to compiling these figures when many institutions consider it worth their while actually to list all institutions to which they lend books.

Another type of figure on interlibrary loan is represented in a table constructed by Constance M. Winchell giving "Statistics Showing Location Found for Books Requested for Interlibrary Loan at Columbia":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1927-28</th>
<th>1928-29</th>
<th>1929-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of requests</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located through records at Columbia</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located by letter</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total located</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In passing, it might be noted that many a reference librarian has dreamed of his secret
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weapon as statistical records of bibliographically incomplete requests.

Perhaps the most difficult of all statistical records to collect are those on reference work. From almost any angle that one approaches the problem, it seems so. The *Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education* asks for the number of general questions answered, the number of search questions answered, and the number of bibliographies compiled. The “Daily Statistical Record” and “Monthly Statistical Record” used by the library of Teachers College, Columbia University, classifies reference questions into “location,” “easy,” and “requiring time.” While many defects may be found in the categories used by both of these forms, no better solution can be offered here at present. Nevertheless, this matter deserves careful study and would seem to be well worth a master’s essay from one of our library schools.

Counting attendance in the main reading room or in the entire library is rather futile except in such institutions as the J. Pierpont Morgan or Henry E. Huntington libraries, where all readers are known to be in the library for a serious purpose. The New York Public Library Reference Department follows an interesting procedure for counting readers in the main reading room. The number of books used by means of the submission of signed call slips is divided by an arbitrary figure, varying from 2.07 to 2.38, depending on the time of the year. This figure is based on figures accumulated over a period of many years, at a time when the number of readers in the main reading room was recorded by a check of the signatures on the call slips day by day.

This procedure is not without significance for university libraries, especially those which have large reading rooms confined to special disciplines and in which circulation is confined to the building. But if indiscriminate attempts are made to count total attendance, such a large number of factors—weather, examination periods, puzzle contests, and even fraternity initiations—must be considered, that the results will be hopelessly confused.

Before approaching the problem of circulation statistics, it might be pertinent to repeat a delightful story, told by Henri Lemaître, about the methods of an elderly French librarian who was instructed to keep circulation statistics. “It’s very simple,” he explained. “The first time they asked me for this figure, I calculated it something like this: every day I issue about ten volumes, and since I am open 250 days a year, the result is 2500 volumes circulated. In order to appear a spot more exact, I put the figure at 2467. Since then I have increased it discreetly every year.”

Value of Present Methods

The question before us is not whether the incorrigibly inexact old Frenchman should have adopted more scientific procedures but whether our methods presently in use are much better than his. Today we may be grateful to the *Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education* for having set forth several definitions and rules regarding circulation records which are distinct advances over categories used in other reports and collective compilations.

Amount of Use of the Reference Department of the New York Public Library, *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 40:900, November 1936. This entire article, consisting of p. 907-25, may be highly recommended as an example of practical use of statistical records. Recently, samples of actual attendance have been taken in the main reading room of the New York Public Library to ascertain whether these “arbitrary figures” are still valid. It will be interesting to learn whether they are still valid.

in recent times. The treatment of renewals, definition of "volume" as applied to circulation, rules on counting, and regulations for recording loans from one agency to another within the same system, are of greatest value. However, no system of reporting circulation statistics from a large number of libraries has ever yet been devised which takes into due consideration such factors as varying periods of loan, restrictions on the loan of certain classes of books, effect of hours of opening, varying types of departmental collections, use of outside libraries by students, and local conditions ad infinitum. Carl M. White has stated the whole problem of circulation statistics quite accurately: "The story that circulation statistics tell us is incomplete and, to a certain extent, unilluminating. Incomplete because confined strictly to recorded circulation; unilluminating because confined to results, with no clue as to what produced them." 34

A good example of why circulation figures are not comparable is furnished by the statistical records of two institutions which are comparable in other respects and whose libraries are known to keep dependable statistical records. We learn from the U. S. Office of Education's College and University Library Statistics, 1939-40 that, in 1939-40, Duke University reported total library holdings of 600,235 volumes, an enrolment of 3,238 undergraduates and 298 graduates, and a circulation of 72,549 volumes for home use and 144,820 reserved books. The University of North Carolina, an institution with similar aims and purposes as far as the instructional program is concerned, reported a total of 386,390 volumes in its stacks, an enrolment of 3,180 undergraduates and 569 graduates, and—perhaps, for all the uninitiated might know, in revenge for a decade of humiliating football defeats by Duke—a circulation of 368,071 volumes for home use and 173,006 reserved books. Somewhere in the administrative records of these two libraries there is a clear explanation for this fantastic discrepancy in their circulation figures, but this doesn't help the student of library administration who wants to compare and tabulate these figures to solve some problem of library use.

Comparable Figures

Even though it may never be possible to collect absolutely comparable circulation statistics, it is possible to classify circulation by subject and thus to study the comparative circulation of books in various subject fields within one particular library. This is no new idea, but it is a good one. While William F. Poole recommended it in the Special Report of 1876, few libraries have followed his advice except by segregating circulation of fiction and non-fiction. The New York Public Library's splendid statistical reports are particularly valuable for their excellent analysis of circulation by the various subject fields. An especially convincing plea was made for information on library use by specific departments in colleges by E. W. McDiarmid, who pointed out its value in ascertaining the extent to which students in each department use the library and in apportioning the book fund. 36
A particularly important problem is the question of delivery service at the circulation desk. American compilations of library statistical records shed no light on this most important subject. Some individual libraries do record this information, and the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken* gives it for German libraries. In the *Jahrbuch* there is a column for the total number of call slips submitted in each library, followed by four columns giving the following disposition of call slips, together with the percentile relation of each type of disposition to the whole: (a) delivered, (b) in use, (c) not available, and (d) not in the library. The latter category is valid only for European libraries, where the public does not have access to the catalog. The third category is inexcusable. A book may be “in bindery,” “missing since ___,” “in process,” or even in the “inferno”; but it should never be “not available” to the appropriate reader at the appropriate time.\(^{37}\)

The significant points are to show (a) average and possibly also median time needed for delivery, as taken from representative samples, and (b) books not delivered, why not delivered, and time consumed before readers receive answers, also based on representative samples. The land-grant college survey used a highly suggestive form to secure this information.\(^{38}\) Here are data from which we can hazard some kind of comparison of library service and draw some definite conclusions as to openings for improvement.

A final delinquency in the statistical records of circulation in American libraries is that we don’t know who uses the library. The *Library Statistical Report for Institutions of Higher Education* requests information on loans to faculty, students, and others; but, since the results obtained from this question are never printed, it is not possible here to state just how many libraries fill it in. The *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken* lists the number of instructors in each German university who use the library and the number and percentage of students in the theological, legal, medical, and philosophical faculties why do so. The practice of ascertaining student and faculty use of the library is almost sixty years old in the German universities. It was first used in statistical reports for the universities of Würzburg, Halle, and Breslau in the 1880’s.\(^{39}\) The only example of this which has thus far come to light in America is in the *Annual Report of the Director of the Stanford*
University Libraries, in which the readers in the Hoover Library are analyzed into the following categories: staff and research workers, faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, and visitors. Even though it is not practical to ascertain the relative amount of student and faculty use of a library as a whole, it may be determined for special collections with separate reading rooms.

There has been considerable attention paid to the problem of undergraduate use of the library. An investigation of this matter should give special attention to reserve book loans, noting (a) the number of withdrawals and (b) the number of titles withdrawn. The proportion of books placed on reserve, which are actually used, is also revealing in this connection.

**Cataloging Statistics**

For some reason virtually all compilations of statistical records and most annual reports of libraries choose to ignore cataloging statistics. Somehow or another, librarians seem to be very reluctant to give out these figures. They will describe in glowing detail some handsomely printed catalog of incunabula which they have just published, but are reluctant to divulge the total number of more commonly used books which have been made accessible to the public. Perhaps they feel that the recent admirable studies on library cost accounting, particularly as applied to cataloging, obviate the need for cataloging statistics. But statistical records are a matter entirely different from cost accounting. The former are actually the source for the latter; although the latter, when complete, may often reveal delinquencies in the former. Nevertheless, it was suggested as early as the Saratoga Springs, N.Y., Conference of the A.L.A., in 1924, that a uniform system of cataloging statistics be set up.

It is very difficult to draw up tables of cataloging statistics in which the records of one library may be fairly compared with those of another. A quarter of a century ago, J. C. M. Hanson made some notes on a few of the points to be considered in comparing cataloging statistics. Is one or more than one catalog maintained? What sort of questions is the catalog presumed to answer? Are new titles distinguished from added copies? And replacements? Are recataloging and reclassification distinguished from new cataloging and new classification?

At the present time, due to the lack of any detailed studies, it is difficult to state precisely what figures on cataloging activities would be desirable in a statistical table or a handbook to be used for comparative purposes. A few suggestions as to items which might be considered are: number of titles classified and cataloged (an interesting figure to compare with the number of volumes accessioned), proportion of books for which printed cards are available and pro-
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40 The more significant studies are noted in chapter 2 ("How Much Do Undergraduates Use the Library?" ) of Branscomb, Harvie. Teaching with Books, Chicago, A.L.A., 1940. Especially important is McDermid, E. W. "Conditions Affecting Use of the Library." loc. cit.

41 See Hurt, Peyton. The University Library and Undergraduate Instruction; An Analysis of Their Relationship, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1936, p. 15.


45 Dornin, op. cit., p. 82, reports that "replacements and added copies are carefully tabulated by ten libraries, but the remaining thirty-eight count them simply as added volumes." (From a survey covering forty-eight libraries.)

46 At the Iowa State College Library, where nearly a fourth of the total holdings have been recataloged and reclassified in the last quarter of a century, it was found that recataloging and reclassifying was more expensive than processing new books. First the old cards must be pulled, and then the volume to be recataloged is treated like a new book.
portion for which original cataloging is necessary, number of old cards to which additions are made, number of subject headings assigned, number of analytics prepared,\(^47\) numbers of cards (or possibly numbers of inches of cards) filed in public, official, depository, and special catalogs, and arrears (if the library has no reason to hide them).

It is probably unnecessary to observe that figures of enrollment in colleges and universities are frequently heavily padded. The librarian does not make his own count of students but, rather, gets it from the registrar’s office. Any study of a university library’s statistical records in relation to student enrollment is open to question. It is hardly logical to figure out library expenditures per student by dividing the total enrollment into the library appropriation when, in an enrollment of 12,000, some 3,000 may be correspondence students and some 4,000 short course enrollees. The college or university which pads enrollment figures is only working to its own disadvantage. When such figures as per capita expenditures, number of instructors per student, number of volumes in the library per student (in some respects, but not all, a rather futile figure), are compiled in attempts to ascertain an institution’s essential excellence, it comes out far worse than it otherwise would have.\(^48\)

**Conclusions**

Most of the conclusions which can be drawn from this brief critique of statistical reporting in libraries of higher institutions are already apparent. Above all, it is obvious that the *Library Statistical Report* for Institutions of Higher Education needs revision.\(^49\) But no amount of collecting information will be of any value unless there is adequate provision for its organization and publication in a form as complete as possible. As for the statistical categories themselves, the most immediate needs are for revision of definitions (e.g., of terms relating to acquisition and book counting), more detailed breakdowns of figures already gathered (e.g., of binding and inter-library loan), and adoption of additional devices which can give more adequate conceptions of both quantitative (e.g., measurement of holdings in linear feet) and qualitative (e.g., analysis of holdings by subject field) aspects of a given library.\(^50\)

It might also be noted that library statistics also show certain general deficiencies in common with other government data.\(^51\) In spite of the efforts of the A.L.A. to act as central headquarters for the collection of statistical data, there is no central source yet, since there seems to be no general policy as to where the responsibilities of the A.L.A. and the U.S. Office of Education in gathering data begin and end. Except for a few isolated cases, such as James A. McMillen’s *Statistics of Southern Colleges*...

\(^47\) Or the time spent on analytics by the cataloger (Dornin, op. cit., p. 85).

\(^48\) Ellsworth, Ralph E. “Trends in University Expenditures for Library Resources,” *Library Quarterly* 14:8, January 1944, notes that university administrators are even more backward than librarians in collecting and publishing certain types of statistical records.

\(^49\) Furthermore, certain points are mentioned in this article which are pertinent for large public libraries serving research workers as well as the public at large and which might be reviewed in any revision of the “Public Library Statistical Report” (U.S. Office of Education. From 8-071, 1940) which may be undertaken.

\(^50\) Burgess, op. cit., p. 92-95, notes the advantages of using such refined statistical devices as logarithmic graphs (Hawkins, E. R. J. “Logarithmic Graphs.” *Library Association Record* 39:257-60, June 1937) and index numbers for expressing serial statistics with long years of continuity, such as the A.L.A. statistics. He is also very enthusiastic about the use of punched cards as a means of technical implementation (p. 95-96), a device which may be an answer to the objection of many librarians that they are already spending too much time collecting statistics. An amusing example of unnecessary work caused by ignorance of sampling techniques may be seen in “Die Benutzungswise der öffentlichen Bibliotheken,” in Körösi, Joseph, ed. *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Stadt Pest* 1353-56, 1873 (also carried as Vol. 7 of Pest, Sz. K. Pestváros Statisztikai hivatal ának közleményei. *Publications des Statistischen Bureau der Stadt Pest*).

\(^51\) Burgess, op. cit., p. 79-82, lists these deficiencies as based on categories set up in Gray, Edward R. “Deficiencies in State and Local Government Data.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 207:194-204, January 1940.
and Universities (1927-28 to date, except 1930-31 and 1931-32), there are few data for libraries of specific types or in one geographical area. There are no data for certain types of library activities such as recataloging and photographic work. Some librarians collect certain data of questionable value; for example, the number of times a catalog is used (Cassel) or the number of magazines on a certain table at a certain time of day (Kiel). There is a confusing variety in the scope of published data and in definitions attached to the same sources by different agencies or by the same agency in different years (A.L.A. statistics do not seem to be guilty of this delinquency). Indexes to sources of library statistical data are inadequate. Finally, virtually all publications giving statistical data, with the outstanding exception of the A.L.A. tables, are so late as to cancel much of their immediate practical value.

Tendencies toward Improvement

There have been a few signs which indicate general tendencies toward improvement of statistical records of libraries in recent years. Particularly encouraging has been the definite professional interest as revealed in the creation of the Library Service Division in the U.S. Office of Education, in the addition, in 1934, of a statistical assistant to the A.L.A. Headquarters staff, and in the activities of the various A.L.A. committees which have concerned themselves with statistical reporting. Certain publications, notably Louis Round Wilson's Geography of Reading, have clearly revealed the need for more and better statistical records, with a resulting increased awareness of this need on the part of the profession at large.

The desirability of a statistical handbook of North American libraries has already been noted. The idea occurred to George F. Winchester a third of a century ago when he was attempting to collect certain figures for his private use. His proposal was for the A.L.A. Publishing Board to issue a statistical annual containing as much data on libraries in the United States as could be brought together. This proposal is still waiting for an answer. It is a task which will require the cooperation of all types of libraries in order to represent the interests of each as fully and completely as possible.

But who is to sponsor it, and how is it to be published? What will be the form of its arrangement, and what topics will it cover? How will the source data be gathered, and who will be responsible for editing it? What will happen to the already existing media for gathering statistical data? How can we prevent our handbook from petrifying and failing to keep pace with current changes in administrative practice?

The following suggested answers are purely speculative. They must be carefully checked and rechecked by a group of standing committees representing (a) college and university libraries, (b) large public reference libraries, (c) smaller public libraries, and (d) school libraries. Each of these committees would be responsible for revising currently used statistical report forms for its own type of library. It would decide what items of statistical information are pertinent for each type of library, and how the various categories are to be defined.

Special care should be exercised not to permit the forms to become cumbersome by the inclusion of categories which are of little or no significance for the particular type of library concerned. Membership on these committees should include representatives of acquisition, circulating, cataloging, and reference departments. The present A.L.A. Committee on Statistics might be reorganized to form a higher control committee which would have less to do with the technical details of collecting and tabulating statistical records than with the actual publication of the statistical handbook.

The handbook should be published in a separate series such as that formed by the consecutive issues of the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken*. The Office of Education might be in a position to include it as a subseries of its *Bulletin*, if federal funds were available. Preferably, however, it should be published by the A.L.A. because the editing must be done by librarians and because it will probably ultimately turn out that the only means of financial support will be contributions from libraries or librarians. Possibly the financing of the publication might be secured by making its purchase compulsory with institutional membership in the A.L.A. It is much easier to justify expenditures for collecting, compiling, and publishing statistical records to librarians than to legislators.

Most important, however, is to have one central office for the collection and publication of statistical data, thus avoiding duplication of work and making all statistical records available at one source. Preferably, that office should be somewhere within the framework of the A.L.A. and should include on its staff at least one individual from each type of library for which statistical records are collected. From the standpoint of library administrators, a central source would be particularly welcome, for it would eliminate the necessity of answering a dozen or more questionnaires each year. The figures on university libraries published for many years by James Thayer Gerould and, presently, by Lawrence Heyl, of Princeton; the figures on southeastern college and university libraries, published by McMillen; the few items of statistical information published in the *American Library Directory*; and many statistical publications of state library agencies and even of the Office of Education, would be rendered unnecessary by an exhaustive annual statistical handbook.

**Handbook's Inclusions**

The handbook should include at least as many libraries as the Office of Education compilations and at least as many categories on each of them as the A.L.A. tables. The peculiar advantages of the Princeton and Louisiana figures, in presenting a particular type of library or geographical sector, could easily be duplicated by appropriate organization of information at the central statistical office. However, the advice of those who have had prior experience in compiling statistical data on libraries should be fully utilized by placing them on the committees suggested above.

If a statistical annual is undertaken, it should be done with a view to publishing it promptly and permanently. For all their other faults, the one great virtue of the A.L.A. statistics is that they can show almost two decades of continuity in their present form. They also are published promptly every year within about eight months of the end of the fiscal year, for most of the institutions they cover. The present wide distribution of the A.L.A. statistics could almost be duplicated if all
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institutional members of the A.L.A. received copies of the statistical handbook. If wider distribution is deemed necessary, it would not be too serious a duplication of effort and space to publish pertinent abstracts in the A.L.A. Bulletin and in College and Research Libraries.

Ultimately, the greatest hazard to any publication of the nature of the proposed statistical handbook is the danger of petrifying or falling into the control of individuals who are unwilling to subject it to alterations as changed conditions may require. Our statistical handbook must be capable of any addition or deletion, and there must be appropriate administrative organization for expediting and facilitating such changes whenever they are suggested and deemed worthy of adoption. Its contents and arrangement should be carefully reviewed every year or so by the higher control committee.

Above all, constant study of the problem of statistical records is necessary. We need specialized studies of what statistical records are necessary for each library department and for each type of library—in classifications even more detailed than college and university, small and large public, and school libraries. We need studies of the type of library statistical information needed for specific regions. We need particularly some group which can set up minimum standards for statistical content of annual reports of libraries. If this form of literature, which is so basic for all research studies in librarianship, is subjected to detailed and continuous investigation, the results may easily be far out of proportion to the effort expended.

Cutter Classification

Because of recurring requests for revision of the Cutter Expansive Classification, the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification has appointed a committee to make a thorough investigation of the need for such a revision. The first step is to get the names of all libraries, of every kind and size in the United States and Canada, using this classification or a modification of it. It would also be helpful to know what libraries have changed from Cutter to some other classification and how recently. If your library falls in either class, or if you can give any information that might be helpful, please address Dora Pearson, Cutter Classification Committee, Public Library, Washington 1, D.C.
New Periodicals of 1945 - Part I

Miss Ulrich here offers the first section of her annual review, the second half of which is scheduled for publication in the April 1946 number of College and Research Libraries.

Out of the past momentous months, when the country’s war efforts have been centered on scientific research and experimentation, has come the realization of some peacetime developments. In this connection, it is pleasant and encouraging to report five new periodicals in the field of literature which, in addition to other merits, are an interesting contribution to the art of the format of periodicals.

From the library of Indiana University comes a distinguished publication, the Indiana Quarterly for Bookmen, which "reviews and describes the interests of Indiana collectors and which provides for an exchange of news" of important and unusual collections. While the policy for the future is broad—the pages being open for scholarly papers, lighter efforts, descriptions of libraries, matters of opinion, collecting adventures, and bibliographical interest—the introduction states that the early issues will contain articles "by persons at the university, to describe collections in which they have a collectors' pride." Full-page reproductions of special items are a desirable feature. The Arizona Quarterly, published by the University of Arizona, is similar to the New Mexico Quarterly, emphasizing creative writing and including some Southwestern folklore tradition. The first issue includes critical essays by Yvor Winters, M. R. Schneck, and Desmond Powell, and poetry by Wallace Stevens, Randall Jarrell, and Genevieve Taggard. Pharos is also dedicated to creative writing. "The magazine will be published intermittently, each number being devoted to an important piece of writing too long for inclusion in the other literary magazines, or to the work of a single writer." The play, Battle of Angels, by Tennessee Williams, with a note on the play by Margaret Webster and an account of its production in Boston by the author, constitutes the first issue. The Emory University Quarterly aims to express the intellectual and cultural life of its university and to stimulate this interest both on the campus and in the wider community. In the issue of the first quarter the articles are by members of the faculty and are accompanied by full-page illustrations. The Alberta Folklore Quarterly, a modest magazine published by the University of Alberta, Canada, states that it "aims to print authentic firsthand accounts interpretative of the region and its people; to encourage the collection and preservation of the traditional materials of Alberta; and to help foster a literature indigenous to this part of the Canadian West."

Inland Seas, a delightful and well-illustrated quarterly bulletin published by the Great Lakes Historical Society, offers, besides historical events, much of interest regarding the early steamboat days.

On the postwar horizon plastics rise prominently, and there is so much valuable material appearing in various publications that the Plastics Index, which gives brief summaries of articles, is a timely reference
In the initial issue 102 magazines and newspapers are indexed. Foreign publications are represented, the entries are by subject, and an annual accumulation is included for the subscription price. *Modern Metals*, a light metals journal, states as its primary purpose wartime cooperation. Beyond that the journal will promote new uses for the light metals, through which increased employment will be created in peacetime. The general policy is toward free exchange of information among competitive industries. The content is similar to that of *Aluminum and Magnesium*, mentioned in the summary of new periodicals in the March 1945 number of *College and Research Libraries*.

Through the expansion of scientific investigation during the war years, Washington, D.C., has become a center for scientific research, and the aim of the *Washington Scientist* is to give to scientists a wider knowledge and understanding of the advancement in scientific research in vastly different fields of endeavor. *The Journal of Aeronautical Meteorology* will make available to meteorologists, pilots, and others interested in the subject, information vital to the safe operation of aircraft. *World's Poultry Science*, international in scope, "will deal with practical, semitechnical, and technical problems pertaining to every branch of the poultry industry, including production, marketing, and consumption problems" within each country. An interesting feature which the industry presents is a world-wide rehabilitation plan to emphasize the importance of eggs and poultry in diets.

*Medical Science*

Two interesting phases of medical science are represented by two new publications which are both timely and important. *Epidemiological Information Bulletin* presents official information regarding health committees, commissions, conventions, and their functioning. The purpose is to bring together important information for the prevention of diseases likely to become epidemic. *The Journal of Clinical Psychology* is dedicated to the advancement of the clinical method in psychology and aims to foster its promotion as an applied science. The journal is scientific and contains illustrative charts and book reviews. In a similar field of science is the *Biometrics Bulletin*, appearing six times a year and published by the American Statistical Association. It is designed primarily for biologists who see in statistics a potent tool for their work, and, in addition to stimulating research, it encourages contacts among biologists concerned with problems of statistical information.

Studies of statistical analysis of securities and industries, grouped under seven headings and including techniques, data, market averages, annual reports, terminology, professional standards, and government regulations, are given as the scope of the *Analysts' Journal* published by the New York Society of Security Analysts.

*Higher Education*, a semimonthly publication of the U.S. Office of Education, states in the first issue that the plan is a medium of communication with American colleges and universities. "The new publication will include information concerning federal activities related to higher education, reports of statistical and other studies of education made by staff members of the office, and materials from the colleges and universities and from educational organizations and associations."

New foreign periodicals from Europe, Mexico, and South America deserve mention. *The War and the Working Class*, a fortnightly journal, is published by the newspaper *Trud*, Moscow, in two editions, one printed in English and one in Russian. Students of labor will find in this journal,
covers the interests and promotion of the industry. *Antologia*, from Argentina, is an interesting, illustrated monthly review of literature, art, and science. Music and drama are also represented and book reviews are included. *Ciencia e Investigación*, also published in Argentina, covers the general development of the sciences, and *Gaceta del Libro* is a monthly useful in book selection. Reviews and discussion are given of books, both recent and standard, from Argentina and the Americas generally. *Universidad Nacional de Colombia*, a quarterly review of modern culture representative of the academic world, is scholarly and impressive, publishing articles in the humanities, pure and social sciences, and, in fact, practically every field of human endeavor. In the field of chemistry is the *Revista Colombiana de Química*, which adds another periodical to the rapidly growing list of scientific journals coming from South America.

**Periodicals**


*Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Científicas* of the Universidad de Nuevo Leon, which presents articles on scientific research in many fields—medicine, geology, and chemistry, among others. Desirable illustrations, charts, diagrams, and comprehensive bibliographies are included. *El Café de Nicaragua* is the organ of a cooperative association of leading coffee growers and merchants which, looking toward the re-establishment of prewar status, was started in 1942. v. 1, no. 1, January 1945. Monthly. $10.

*Ciencia e Investigación*. Asociación Argentina el Progreso de las Ciencias. Apartado Especial 175, Buenos Aires, Argentina. v. 1, no. 1, January 1945. Monthly. $11.

*Cuadernos de Arquitectura*. Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de Cataluña y Baleares. Folio in size and fully illustrated, it ranks with our leading architectural magazines and will find a place wherever architecture is studied. An outstanding scientific publication from Mexico is *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Científicas* of the Universidad de Nuevo Leon, which presents articles on scientific research in many fields—medicine, geology, and chemistry, among others. Desirable illustrations, charts, diagrams, and comprehensive bibliographies are included. *El Café de Nicaragua* is the organ of a cooperative association of leading coffee growers and merchants which, looking toward the re-establishment of prewar status, was started in 1942. v. 1, no. 1, January 1945. Monthly. $10.

*The Emory University Quarterly*. Emory University, Ga. v. 1, no. 1, March 1945. Quarterly. $1.50.


*Journal of Aeronautical Meteorology*. Air Transport Association, 10 Richards Rd., Kansas City 6, Mo. v. 1, no. 1, October 1944. Quarterly. $2.

*Journal of Clinical Psychology*. Medical College Bldg., University of Vermont, Burlington. Quarterly. $4.


*Phoros*; *A Magazine Dedicated to Creative Writing*. Box 215, Murray, Utah. no. 1-2, spring 1945. Irregular. $2.


By LOWELL MARTIN

Shall Library Schools Teach Administration?

Mr. Martin, assistant professor at the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, treats the problems which confront library schools in one perplexing sector.

The library schools are caught neatly in the pincers movement of those who call upon them to produce administrative leaders for the profession and those who contend that administrative leadership cannot be developed in the classroom. The schools meet this situation as they have the many little crises in their history: they camouflage by adding a few instructional units or changing a few course names and somehow elude the closing pincers. Then an armistice is declared in which the schools agree to produce administrative leaders at such time as the libraries will create positions for them and the libraries agree to create positions of administrative leadership at such time as the schools provide qualified candidates. This settlement enables the library schools to retain their tried-and-true methods for producing library technicians and clears the field for another pincers movement—this time, perhaps, from those who request that library school cataloging courses implant the principles of organizing and describing materials for use and from those who demand catalogers able to take over a job in a specific catalog department.

The net result of the minor tempest is to rock the library school instructor's boat. He doesn't know what the profession wants and he appears opinionated if he knows what he wants. The instructor's reaction is a counterpart of the school's defense: he steadies the boat and goes on paddling in the way that has carried him through course credits before.

The particular fate of the course in administration is that it often remains a course in library economy, which in practice means those techniques that are not treated elsewhere in the curriculum. Charging systems, order routines, statistical records, physical preparation and care of materials—these are sometimes the main content of the course. Obviously, such a course no more deserves the title "administration" than does the work in cataloging. Occasionally library school courses in administration have advanced to a second stage of development—that of library management. In this stage the elements of management—the topics or subjects with which a library manager deals in the course of a day—are emphasized. Careful attention to buildings and equipment exemplifies this level.

This paper advocates advancement into a third stage of development, in which the teaching of library administration is built around the administrative process.

The present quandary concerning instruction in library administration underlines the need for a new orientation. Small wonder that nonlibrarians are appointed to important positions in college and university libraries and elsewhere; small wonder that proposals are made in all seriousness.
for short programs in library schools to produce "ninety-day wonders" for executive positions—there is little in the customary curriculum that prepares for the judgment and responsibility of administration. The weakness of the first-year curriculum as a means for preparing library administrators becomes apparent when we think of recruiting young people with proved executive ability from among demobilized military personnel and subjecting them to the usual library school course.

Content of Instruction

Discussion of the question whether administration can be taught in a classroom can readily become sterile. It is like discussing whether logical thinking, civic responsibility, appreciation of beauty, or any of the other objectives of education over and above pure subject knowledge can be taught in a school. The answer is not a categorical "yes" or "no." Group instruction, if it goes beyond formalism to reality and if it is directed at individuals on the threshold of understanding in the field concerned, can initiate the student into the methods of analysis, the emotional reactions, and the responsibility of decision in such nonsubject areas. In a sense, the law school does not "teach" the lawyer how to convince a jury nor does the medical school "teach" the doctor a bedside manner, but in each case formal training facilitates later performance.

This viewpoint suggests an approach to instruction in library administration. If there are common situations faced in managing a department store, a factory, and a university library, and if common principles or proved modes of action can be formulated for resolving such situations, the teaching of library administration would have a foundation which would be sound and a viewpoint which would be refreshing. The course embodying it would then have a base broader than itself, in the same way that the course in book selection reaches out toward the psychology and sociology of reading or the course in reference toward broad subject fields.

Have the principles or modes of action in administration been formulated in a way that is useful in library school classrooms? Or are they buried as yet in such documents as David Lilienthal's *TV A; Democracy on the March*, Tom Girdler's autobiography, *Boot Straps*, and the annual reports of industrial corporations? One needs only mention such names as Gulick, Sorrell, Urwick, and Reeves in the area of general administration, and White, Mosher, and Gaus in the area of administration of public enterprises, to bring a considerable literature into focus. An interesting example of the use of generalized material for instruction in a specific service enterprise is the course in administration given by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for its junior executives.\footnote{U.S. Department of Agriculture, Graduate School, *Administrative Management: Principles and Techniques*. Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster Press, 1938.}

The concepts and methods developed in the new study of administration are not entirely theoretical nor are they necessarily alien to library operations. On the contrary, most of the encouraging recent developments in library administration have been derived from generalized methods growing out of management in quite diverse enterprises. Position classification, cost analysis, service ratings—these are out of the book of administration. Similarly, the developments that may prove useful to libraries in the immediate future are also part of the new formulation of administrative principles.

Understanding of administration should go beyond such specific devices to the administrative process itself. Administration
is not static but dynamic; it is concerned with an everchanging organization, not with a cross-sectional situation. The essential tasks of management in any enterprise are (1) to break down the total operation into specialized jobs filled by qualified individuals and (2) to coordinate specialized workers so that total production adds up to the objectives of the organization. The breakdown into specialized jobs is done in order to take advantage of differences in skill and temperament. Characteristic of its products are mass production and the assembly-line technique. Certainly, specialization of tasks plus coordination of specialists in industry has resulted in higher levels of skill, increased production, and reduced costs. American genius in this area has been a prime factor in the winning of the war to preserve democracy. When administration is viewed in this light one begins to see the foundations of a genuine course in library administration.

It may well be argued that such an analysis may apply to the General Motors Corporation but not to the average library. There is a certain justification in this, for most library units are so small that they cannot take advantage of specialization of tasks. Furthermore, since specialization is more applicable to the production of fabricated articles than to the rendering of service, this and other general administration concepts must be used with caution when applied to libraries. Yet one needs give only a moment’s attention to the clerical-professional problem in libraries, for example, to recognize it as a problem in specialization of jobs, or to the “crisis in cataloging” to recognize it as a problem in administrative coordination rather than of professional competence, as has sometimes been assumed. The principles of administration do not apply as precisely to libraries as they do to industry, but they apply today far more than they did two decades ago and they are likely to apply still more two decades hence. Several analyses of library problems in terms of general managerial concepts have already appeared in print.²

The foregoing analysis of the administrative process is obviously fragmentary. At one end it neglects that reconciling of philosophy and expediency which we call policy making and at the other it ignores that balancing of results and excuses which we call measurement. The purpose of the statement was to illustrate the freshness of approach that occurs when one starts from outside the library in the objectives and experiences of administration. It is in the direction of general administrative principles and methods—from accounting to zoning—that the content of a course in genuine library administration can be found.

Methods in Teaching Library Administration

Every teacher has moments when he understands Henry Adams’ remark to Santayana: “It isn’t really possible to teach anything.” Many a day the instructor starts for his class thinking: I have only one or two propositions to convey today, and, if I had the gift of words or if the students had the gift of understanding, I could write the propositions on the blackboard in two dozen well-chosen words. Instead the instructor describes, explains, discusses, illustrates, cajoles—saying the same thing in ten different ways—and still only a fraction of the students really comprehend. Many students report that such concepts as unity of management and limited span of control did not come alive

for them until they found themselves in situations where these conditions were lacking.

Misgivings of this nature are inevitable in teaching administration. The words and concepts in the field are not abstractions of reality which can be verified in concrete situations but are abstractions of experience. There is little point in learning the principles as dogma, for they are only guides to action and may actually be dangerous if one does not know when to violate them. There is even less point in committing the principles to memory because they lack close interrelation and one would not know which to apply in a given situation.

Visual devices are helpful in conveying certain parts of the field of administration. This applies not only to the physical artifacts of buildings and equipment but to some administrative methods and processes as well. Analytical motion pictures showing books passing through the acquisition and preparation divisions of libraries and their use in the service program would be effective in demonstrating the unity of the library's task if constant attention were given to the relationship of function and technique. The human factor in administration might be introduced into the classroom by motion pictures of actual personnel interviews and staff meetings in libraries.

Directed observation of libraries in operation may also be used to good purpose. This approach has its counterpart in the clinic of the medical school. Directed observation should be distinguished, on the one hand, from brief library visits by students, which readily become superficial in character, and, on the other hand, from practice work by students, which may have the effect of emphasizing the segmented job rather than the over-all process.

But the various improved methods beg the main question. There still remains the tendency for the classroom to become an exercise in intellectual irresponsibility. Even if the content is administrative rather than technical, it is likely to exist in a vacuum. Faced with administrative problems, students make offhand decisions which will never catch up with them. The brighter students delight in generalizing particular situations into theories, to which they will be slaves for the rest of their lives.

In this connection the case method of teaching library administration may have its place. This does not mean using working situations deductively as illustrations of points made or principles expounded—a technique now used widely. It means inductive use of case studies to lead the student to his own discovery of underlying principles—a kind of forcing of experience. Law schools use this approach almost exclusively; they do not give the student a definition of justice and then have him study cases for illustrative purposes, but they use cases as records of experience out of which the student builds his own concept of the law.

The Graduate Business School at Harvard has used the case method extensively in administrative instruction. The Harvard example underlines two requisites of this approach: complete and substantial cases are required, which may necessitate use of field workers to obtain all the facts and conditions in a case; and the instruction period is a lengthy one. Nonetheless, the method has the decided advantage of facilitating self-discovery on the part of a student, and in the end this may be the only effective way of teaching anything.

The case study approach is a step in the right direction. But if complete integration of the theoretical and practical aspects of education in administration is to be accomplished, the preparation of library administrators must be recognized as a joint
responsibility of library schools and libraries, just as the preparation of doctors is the joint responsibility of medical schools and hospitals. A comprehensive program for training executives would start in the library school and end within the walls of libraries. To accomplish this, the former must revise their administration courses and also perhaps their curriculums, while the latter must provide an administrative career service within and between libraries.

This in no way relieves the library schools of the first responsibility; nor does it give license to the library administrators' particular brand of irresponsibility, which is to disparage the preparation of administrators in the classroom while making no provision to produce such individuals themselves.

Placing the Teaching of Administration

If library schools are to embark on a program of training administrators, a new series of questions immediately arises. Shall all students be trained as administrators? If not, who will select the “elite,” and on what basis? Are first-year students able to handle general administrative material and, if not, does this mean a second year of education for administrators?

This carries the discussion into the general area of the library school curriculum. The fundamental problem of the library school curriculum is that, while it is basically a training program for imparting technical skills, it has graduate, professional, and administrative aspirations. Technical skill as used here does not refer to cataloging, reference, or other professional tasks as such. It refers to skills which require special training and presuppose normal agility and accuracy of mind but which do not require a general college education or professional judgment, either in learning or execution. Such skills are found in most courses in the library school curriculum. The circulation and order type of material in the administration course has already been mentioned. In cataloging such matters as physical format of cards, simple descriptive entry, and filing fall into this class, and in reference the use of various bibliographic tools and quick reference books belongs here. A surprising amount of time in the library school is devoted to training at this level.

Several schools have reasoned that the elementary character of the technical courses and the graduate quality of library students should permit a compressing of technical training into a shorter time span. The time saved is then devoted to new types of intellectual content, in new courses and additions to regular courses. This trend holds promise and indeed in some instances has progressed to the point where the content of education for librarianship is definitely at the graduate level. To date, however, it has not resulted in a new and integrated curriculum but in a dual curriculum made up of separate parts. Perhaps we are trying to create a professional or administrative program by making adjustments in a technical program—as though a medical school could be set up by adaptations in the training program for nurses or an engineering school by adaptations in the training program for draftsmen.

At this point in the discussion of the library school curriculum, the realist is likely to recall everyone to earth by citing the demands from libraries for skilled technicians. Such demands are perfectly natural. The hiring librarian has certain technical positions for which he pays good clerical salaries, and he turns to the training agencies for qualified candidates. Once he gets the technicians, he will identify individuals of unusual background and potentiality and by means of informal internship develop his top-flight professional
and administrative personnel.

This situation outlines the basic problem of education for librarianship. The student prerequisites, the academic placement, and parts of the curriculum of the library school are at the professional level. Other parts of the curriculum, the usual native quality of recruits, the salaries for which graduates are hired, and the work they do when hired, are at the skilled technical level. The production of administrators, subject specialists, and guidance and organization librarians will occur more frequently in library schools at such time as the responsibility for training library technicians is deflated to its appropriate level in the academic scheme—perhaps in junior college terminal courses.

Any practical program for training administrators in library schools must fit into the present pattern, no matter what its peculiarities. If the prevailing library curriculum were entirely at the graduate level, it might be possible to start the preparation of administrators in the first-year school. The first-year student, who would specialize in administration in the same way that other students stress subject or guidance library work, would go out into a year of administrative internship in a library and then into a second year of education or into a minor administrative position. The question of whether youthful students at the first-year level can understand concepts of management confuses rather than clarifies the issue, for it fails to take account of differences in individuals. The person with definite administrative potencies will profit from introductory administrative training at the postgraduate level in the same way that other persons with other potencies will profit from training in organizing or in interpreting materials. At a comparable age, a law or medical student is approaching the end of his formal education and will stand before the bench or at the bedside at no more advanced years than the young librarian at his junior executive desk.

But there are several reasons why it would be a mistake to undertake to produce administrators within the framework of the first-year curriculum as constituted at present. As agencies for technical training, library schools naturally recruit young people interested in such training. They do not recruit young people as potential administrators, except in the case of rare individuals who consciously decide to acquire the technical training as a step along the prescribed road toward an administrative career. Moreover, the substance of the curriculum being technical in nature, any attempt to incorporate training for administration into it is likely to result in two inarticulated segments of education. Administrative content, like other new forms of content, can find a place in the first-year curriculum only by "muscling in" on the basic technical material.

This does not mean that the first-year curriculum should have no course called "library administration." As members of service institutions, library school graduates should understand the government and organization of those institutions and have a sense of financial and personnel conditions and problems which affect them as individual workers. This is needed for reasons of both morale and public relations. The technical worker also needs an understanding of how the whole organization works toward common purposes. A course in administration in the first-year curriculum can stress the relation of jobs to functions and thus counteract the segmented viewpoint that may result from specific courses. But the objective of a course at the first-year level would not be the development of administrative attitudes and judgment.

(Continued on page 345)
Reorganizing a Library Book Collection - Part II

This is the second of two articles on problems of reorganization, the first having appeared in College and Research Libraries for March 1945.

In their attempts to solve problems involved in reorganizing book collections, librarians have established routines which are intended to meet the needs of users and staff members. It has been found necessary, if the work is to flow smoothly, to reach decisions early concerning (1) the order or procedure of reclassification, (2) aspects of recataloging and current cataloging practices, (3) the disposal of new acquisitions, and (4) the routinizing of activities on an efficient basis.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss these four problems and to suggest possible approaches.

The order in which materials are reclassified presents an interesting pattern of variation in college and university libraries. Generally, this variation is due to differences in book collections, the caliber of previous classification and cataloging, the future purposes of the libraries, the physical arrangements of the buildings and the placement of materials in the stacks, and the personnel available for reorganization. The aggressiveness of certain faculty members and the opinions of the librarian and other staff members also have influenced the basis of reclassification in some libraries. Table I shows the ranked order of the bases for reclassifying materials followed in sixty college and university libraries changing to the Library of Congress system.

The decision to reclassify the "most-used" classes first seems entirely reasonable. Usually in libraries following this policy the records of the circulation department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By &quot;most-used&quot; classes ...............</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whole classes (in order of notation)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By location ................................</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By poorly classed sections ...........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By special order ......................</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By special subject ...................</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By recency of material ..............</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By appearance of L.C. schedules .....</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By reference collections .............</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By fastest growing classes ...........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By departmental libraries ...........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ....................................</td>
<td>70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ten libraries noted more than one procedure.

are consulted for data concerning the use of materials. The opinions of the circulation department staff in this respect are helpful, since the approach of the user is kept in mind. The circulation attendants are in a position to say which classes are causing the most difficulty to users, through delays in locating books or through particularly troublesome arrangements in the stacks. In large libraries consultations with

1 For a list of these libraries, see Tauber, Maurice F. "Reclassification of Special Collections in College and University Libraries Using the Library of Congress Classification." Special Libraries 35:139, April 1944.
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the stack supervisors reveal information of this type. It should be apparent, however, that the adoption of a policy to reclassify according to major use implies that a considerable speed is necessary in the process. Otherwise, confusion may arise just when readers are most anxious to use certain materials.

The foregoing procedure seems more effective than the method second in prominence—that is, to reclassify a whole class in order of notation. In changing from Dewey to the L.C. classification, this would mean reclassifying all the books in the 000's, then the 100's, the 200's, and so on. When this procedure is adopted, the new accessions are sometimes placed with materials in the old categories until the particular class is undergoing reclassification. This practice, however, does not necessarily follow. The contention has been made that the users of the stacks are less confused by reorganization, class by class, particularly if new accessions are not broken up into small units by placing them in the new classification. However, the amount of time to be taken to complete the task is a factor to be considered in selecting a procedure.

Some explanation may be made of the motives for other procedures listed in Table I. The location of the stacks, or of departmental and school libraries, has been a motivating factor in determining which class should be reorganized first, second, or third. It is apparent, first of all, that reclassification involves considerable utilization of work room. In order to prevent unnecessary shifting, librarians have justifiably reclassified materials within departmental or school libraries without transferring the materials to the general cataloging department. In some libraries those sections of the collections which would cause least confusion in movement have been reorganized first.

Other things being equal, however, "use" rather than "administrative convenience" should be a primary motive for introducing a certain method or process. Generally speaking, to reclassify the "badly classed" sections early in the operations is keeping in line with the goal of doing first the work which has the greatest benefit to the users, either directly or indirectly. It is possible, of course, that a certain section of material, although badly classed, does not warrant any better treatment, since use of it is meager.

Such procedures as reclassifying by "special subjects," "recency of material," and "fastest growing classes," all are governed by the conditions of use. The special subjects are frequently reorganized first because of pressure from faculty members or departmental heads of libraries. There is usually a close correlation between reclassification of special subjects and use. Sometimes reclassification of a special subject has been used as an experiment for the purpose of determining whether or not a whole collection should be reorganized, although certain subjects might prove to be false guides.

Mention should be made of the policy of reclassifying "in no special order." This practice usually indicates that the process of reclassification has not been carefully analyzed nor has a time limit been set for the completion of the task. Reclassification under these conditions becomes a fill-in job and is generally unsystematic.

Recataloging

Earlier it was pointed out that the need for recataloging has frequently been a primary reason for reclassification. But recataloging may mean a number of things, such as eliminating obsolete main and sub-

---

ject entries, revising descriptive information on cards, abandoning the use of one subject heading list for another, introducing a new system of cross references and information cards, and subdividing subjects which have grown rapidly. It may also refer to such activities as eliminating odd-sized cards for standard-sized cards and replacing handwritten and worn cards with typed and printed ones. These activities are usually present in a general recataloging project which may have as its goal a complete editing of the catalog.

In most recataloging programs attention should be given to such matters as (1) the type of catalog to be maintained, (2) the methods of ordering L.C. printed cards, (3) the use of L.C. printed cards, (4) procedures regarding L.C. assignment of class numbers and subject headings, (5) main entry assignments, (6) added entries, (7) analysis of series, and (8) routines concerned with catalogs, cards, and filing. Attention will be directed here only to those problems which have not been discussed elsewhere.3

The following suggestions, based on experience in reorganizing libraries, are offered in connection with decisions which are necessary to carry on controlled operations:

1. Librarians should consider seriously the possibilities of types of catalogs other than the dictionary form (e.g., divided or period).
2. Large-scale ordering of printed cards by number may be done through the use of a depository catalog (also of the Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards).
3. Printed cards are not essential for certain types of material, such as fiction, textbooks, juvenile works, etc.
4. L.C. class number assignments should be generally accepted4
5. A definite policy regarding the acceptance of L.C. subject headings and added entries should be made at the outset.
6. Few variations should be adopted in main entries.
7. Series which are adequately indexed should not be analyzed.
8. Such tools as authority files, shelflists, and union catalogs of materials in all libraries of the system should be made.
9. A policy should be established for rules for cataloging books for which there are no printed cards.
10. A decision concerning the filing code should be made at the outset.

11. Other things being equal, it is probably more effective to begin a new catalog during reorganization. This procedure should reduce errors to a minimum and aid in catching all untraced items. The presence of the two catalogs—old and new—makes it desirable to provide explanatory guides to aid patrons.

Disposal of New Acquisitions

Some libraries have followed the procedure of doing a single class at a time, placing the new acquisitions in the old classification—usually with penciled call numbers—until the whole class is worked upon. During the process of reclassification, therefore, the user within the stacks does not have to consult two places each time he searches for material on a subject; that is, except in the case of the class that is in process at the moment. Another assumed advantage is that relationships are seen to exist which are not observed when individual books are reclassified. While this may be true, it appears that if the Library of Congress classification—which was developed from books on the shelves—is being applied, the need to see all books at once is not important.

The consensus, based on experience, holds that if reclassification is once decided upon

---

3 Tauber, Maurice F. “Subject Cataloging and Classification Approaching the Crossroads.” College and Research Libraries 3:155, March 1942.
4 For another point of view see Boisen, Harold L. “A Venture in Reclassification.” College and Research Libraries 6:67-72, December 1944; see also Tauber, Maurice F. “Special Problems in Reclassification and Recataloging.” College and Research Libraries 4:49-51, December 1942.
it is less costly and, in the long run, more convenient to most users of the library to place all new acquisitions in the new classification immediately upon receipt, than it is to place them with the old materials in each class until the entire class is changed. The re-marking of books and the withdrawal and retyping of cards are thus eliminated. By judicious arrangement of the newly classified materials, they may be made accessible without serious trouble to the clientele using the stacks. For example, if the education collection is being re-classed there is no reason why the "L" books could not be placed adjacent to the 370's (if the change is being made from Dewey).

Mechanical Routines

Reclassification and recataloging involve several mechanical routines concerned with the markings on the books and the cards. To discuss these mechanical minutiae of reorganization may seem unnecessary, but hesitation to do so is brushed aside when data reveal that such matters are often serious obstacles to the satisfactory completion of the task. Moreover, among practicing librarians such matters as the practical mechanics of an operation often loom as annoying administrative problems which directly affect the users.

Markings on exteriors of books. In order to change numbers, librarians have had to contend with various markings on books, such as gold leaf or black ink stamping or lettering, markings by stylus, and lettering with white and black ink on paper or cloth labels. It is in those libraries in which books are stamped with gold leaf that the mechanical aspects present greatest difficulties. None of the several methods of librarians to black over the gold stamping or to remove the old call numbers by an electric stylus or eraser or by a sharp instrument have met with complete success. The use of the electric stylus or eraser obtains more permanent results than other methods, although risk of injuring the binding exists. Generally the gold markings are moistened before erasing. In order to remove labels or inks which have been shellacked, it is necessary to use varnish remover (e.g., ethyl acetate) first. Labels may then be removed, and inks can be washed off with water. It is usually necessary to shellac over the space of the old marking before the new class numbers are placed on the books.

Markings on inside. An electric eraser used to remove the numbers from bookplates and from the insides of the back covers of the books usually results in rubbed patches which cannot be marked upon again. Sometimes new plates have been placed over the old ones. Obviously, this procedure results in a cleaner job. Soaking off each bookplate is a tedious task. The librarian faced with the re-marking of a large collection of books may well reconsider whether or not all previous markings were necessary.

Re-use of old cards. One question which is relatively important is whether the old cards are to be erased and re-used or whether new cards are to be ordered. In catalogs of some libraries which have half-sized or handwritten cards, the latter procedure is necessary. However, the only valid reason for discarding old cards is the presence of data revealing that it is cheaper to order all new sets. The costs of ordering new cards and of typing and revising all subject headings, added entries, and changes on the cards, represent relatively large expenditures when thousands of items are considered; and available evidence shows that it costs approximately twice as much to recatalog and reclassify a volume by ordering new sets of cards than it does to re-use satisfactory old cards. Hence, the experience of librarians indicates that
it is better to use old cards when possible. This is particularly true if L.C. subject headings and added entries have been accepted in most cases.

Experience has shown that from the standpoints of speed and final appearance an electrical eraser is probably the most effective tool for removing the old call numbers from cards. A clerical assistant with a little training can take off such numbers at the rate of from two to five per minute. The final procedure should show a smooth surface at the spot on the card where the new call number is to be typed; otherwise, fingering by users of the card catalog will dim or remove the retyped figures and letters.

In recapitulation, three points may be made. The decision in regard to the order of reclassification should rest on the criterion of use, unless conditions are such that some other order cannot be avoided. In the disposal of new acquisitions, the user of the stacks must suffer somewhat by the recommendation that accessions be placed with the new classification rather than with the old numbers, until the whole class is rearranged. If the reclassification is planned definitely as a speedy process, an exception to this rule may be made. In regard to the various routines for carrying on the mechanical work of reclassification, the aim should always be the establishment of those activities which insure a free flow of material through the technical department. Such a procedure will reduce the costs of operation as well as give maximum service to users during the process.

Shall Library Schools Teach Administration?

(Continued from page 340)

Under the present scheme the real administrative program must be delegated to the second year of library training. At this level, some students are recruited for administrative potentialities, the curriculum has the requisites of time and flexibility, and the administrative content will be compatible with the professional and research content. The approach might well be in terms of the basic managerial principles and concepts mentioned earlier, built around the administrative process, and applied to libraries by means of adequate case studies.

For the present, this seems best placed in the second year of study. In the future, it may be just as appropriate in the first year; and, indeed, much of the administrative and professional material in the second year may eventually be found in the first year when the purely technical material is removed from that level. But, in either case, the library school is potentially able to supply the junior executives which the profession needs. We will move in that direction, both in content and method, once we decide actually to teach administration in the library school.
American Agricultural College Libraries, 1862-1900

Mrs. Thurber, who is an archivist and the reference consultant in the Division of Veterans’ Records at the National Archives, gathered the material for this article from “college catalogs, college and regents’ reports, agricultural yearbooks, and reports of the commissioners of agriculture and education.”

The libraries of the agricultural colleges receiving funds from the Federal Land-Grant Act of 1862, with which this article deals, had their precursors in those of certain agricultural societies of the eighteenth century. One of the first of these societies was organized in 1785 in Philadelphia, then the national capital, and had such esteemed names as those of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Timothy Pickering on its honorary roll. Others were founded later throughout the fringe of states bordering the Atlantic Coast. Not only did the members of the societies interest themselves in the study of agricultural subjects, but they published articles and bulletins of interest to the farmers throughout the community and devoted their meetings to reports and discussions of agricultural investigations.

Schools for the study of agriculture were a natural development from the agricultural societies. New York led the way in proposing state aid for such schools, and, after efforts in 1819, 1838, and 1849, a loan was extended for agricultural instruction to what formerly had been Ovid Academy. This institution survived only until 1860, but, meanwhile, agencies for agricultural education had been promoted with state help in Maine, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. Also, private agricultural schools grew up in various parts of the country and agricultural courses found their way into existing college curricula.

It was not until 1857, however, that an agricultural college was actually established by a state. This happened in Michigan, pursuant to a specific provision in the state constitution of 1850 and in a legislative act of 1855.

On Dec. 14, 1857, soon after the opening of the Michigan school, Congressman Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, introduced the first bill for federal financial assistance to agricultural education. The measure failed then and again in 1859. It finally was passed, and signed by President Lincoln, in 1862. Under this Federal Land-Grant Act each state received thirty thousand acres of land for each Senator and Congressman representing it. There followed, in some states, the founding of agricultural colleges and in others the addition of schools, departments, or courses to colleges already operating. This last tendency sometimes was resisted on the ground that the industrial classes, comprising the majority of citizens and taxpayers, desired to build up institutions devoted primarily to their own needs and concerns.

As interest grew, and as agricultural colleges multiplied, more funds were required. Mr. Morrill again supported the cause, and a federal bill which was passed...
in 1890 and amended in 1907 ultimately provided $50,000 per year per state. Parallel with all this, the claims of research were asserting themselves. In 1887 Congress allowed each state $15,000 to initiate an experiment station in connection with its agricultural college, and by 1911 each such station was receiving $30,000 a year from the same source.

**Libraries Established**

Hand in hand with the gradual growth of agricultural societies and colleges went the publication of books and periodicals dealing with agricultural subjects and the establishment of agricultural libraries. As early as 1814 the first noteworthy volume in this field, entitled the *Farmer's Assistant*, a book arranged alphabetically and carefully indexed, was written by John Nicholson. This was followed in 1819 by the *American Farmer*, the first periodical devoted entirely to agricultural topics; and the *Farmer's Library* by Leonard E. Lathrop was soon published, bearing the imprint date 1826-27. Agricultural societies began early to collect books and papers on agricultural subjects and to obtain bulletins by exchange, both in this country and abroad. And some of the societies not only had libraries in their local organizations but established branches in country schools, with the schoolmasters as secretaries or librarians. By 1859 holdings of the agricultural society libraries varied from 253 volumes in the Michigan State Agricultural Society in Detroit, to 2300 volumes owned by the New York Agricultural Society of Albany. Then, as the state-supported agricultural colleges began to make their appearance with their more bountiful resources, the agricultural libraries became more complete.

But it was not until the expansion of agricultural education, following the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, that large libraries became available to the students of agriculture. This, in spite of the facts that colleges which were struggling to exist and were willing to give up their names and charters in return for financial aid and that universities in which schools or colleges of agriculture were made a part of the university, often had large, well-selected general libraries; and that, in addition to the books in these college libraries, the students had access to the libraries of the literary societies. These student literary societies, it may be noted, had a strong influence on the life of the colleges and universities, and often their libraries contained as many or more volumes than did the college libraries.

As may have been inferred, in some states the attempt to divert the lands of the Land-Grant Act of 1862 to the state university or to some already established college was resisted. This was done on the ground that the industrial classes comprised the majority of the people and taxpayers of the states and desired to build up institutions that would be devoted to their interests. Many of these independent, self-sufficient institutions began with one building which housed everything from the recitation rooms, chemical laboratories, armory, chapel, and library, to rooms for the president. Sometimes dormitory space was also provided in this building. And, in anticipation of the future need for more space, the buildings were so constructed that they could be easily enlarged.

To their credit, the founders of the agricultural colleges considered books and libraries as indispensable requisites of an educational institution. It was their desire that the libraries be the chief attraction for all the better class of students. The educators felt that they should not be mere circulating libraries, filled with the
transient literature of the day but "should contain the most rare and most precious productions of past ages, as well as the best thought of the present," and should "be a place for study and for writing, with every accommodation for those purposes." Often the new president or some professor, anxious to see the college progress or desiring to share his collection with his fellow-workers and students, turned over his library to the college. In some instances, the local board of agriculture was made a board of overseers of the college, with the privilege of transferring its library to the new institution. College publications were distributed to sister institutions in exchange for their bulletins. Agricultural colleges were designated as depositories for government documents, and complete files were obtained through the efforts of Congressmen. By 1873 the value of the libraries of colleges receiving land-grant aid varied considerably. That in the older, well-endowed colleges which added the land-grant fund to their generous budgets, ran from sixty thousand dollars at Cornell University to twenty-five thousand dollars at Rutgers College. In the same year, that at the new agricultural college libraries was as little as three thousand dollars at Kansas State College and twenty-five thousand dollars at the University of Nebraska.

Inadequate Financial Resources

Agricultural colleges with inadequate financial resources did not hesitate to make direct appeals to the people of their states for books. These requests were inserted in the annual catalogs or in the reports of the presidents or boards of regents. Sometimes a loyal friend of the college or some member of the faculty made personal efforts to secure books and periodicals for the college library. A collection of nearly three thousand volumes was accumulated in this way at Kansas State Agricultural College through the efforts of the Honorable I. T. Goodnow, who wrote hundreds of soliciting letters to Eastern publishers, philanthropists, and personal friends. It is true that many of the books acquired in this manner were not the most suitable for a library of that type. Greek and Latin dictionaries and commentaries, religious monographs, old and poorly printed fiction, and sermons frequently found their way onto the shelves, only to be discarded as the library grew and money could be obtained to replace them with more appropriate books.

Library budgets of the new agricultural colleges were pitifully small, even for that early period in educational expenditures. Until about 1868 the colleges had a hard struggle to equip their laboratories and to provide professors and buildings to carry on the work of the few courses which were offered. Little money was left for the library, and what was used for this purpose could ill be spared from other departments. The sums appropriated for books and periodicals by these struggling colleges often amounted to less than a thousand dollars a year. A plea for greater financial appropriations was general all over the country. In 1871 Kansas Agricultural College, through its regents' report, expressed the need for additional appropriations in view of the fact that the library was peculiarly deficient in books on agriculture and the classics and was entirely destitute of important works in each of these departments. The University of West Virginia, in its biennial report of 1884-86, mentioned that unless some of the books were not soon rebound they would become entirely useless and that an appropriation of three hundred dollars was needed for the year 1887 for this purpose, in addition to the sum of one thousand
dollars for new books. That library, too, lacked a "vast number of standard works in literature and science which ought to be on the shelves of every good library," since the appropriations had been "entirely inadequate to allow the purchase of even a small proportion of the books that are annually produced."

**More Generous Appropriations**

As the colleges became stronger financially, the annual appropriations for books became more generous. In the various libraries the number of volumes pertaining to agricultural subjects increased materially each year. In 1872 Kansas State Agricultural College added only 70 volumes on agricultural matters and in 1888 the same library increased such holdings by 667 volumes. The Missouri Agricultural and Mechanical College purchased only 50 volumes in this field in 1872, and sixteen years later its library was able to increase its agricultural collection by 100 volumes; while Iowa Agricultural College, which added 100 volumes on the subject in 1872, tripled its agricultural accessions in 1888 with 352 volumes. However, with the growth in financial strength, came also enlarged needs for books for new courses. A new, separate department like botany would be established, and at once it claimed its share of whatever money was available; and, since the income unfortunately did not increase in proportion to the demands, the appropriations for the older departments suffered. Thus, the necessity for additional money for books and periodicals was an ever pressing one.

In the meantime, the universities and colleges which had added the study of agriculture and the mechanic arts to their curriculum and were receiving money from the Land-Grant Act had comparatively liberal appropriations for library expenditures. Many of these institutions, founded in the late eighteenth or in the early nineteenth century, were endowed and had passed the first years of want and deprivations. At the time the struggling agricultural colleges were receiving two, three, and eight hundred dollars as their annual appropriations for library purposes, the older institutions were spending from two to five thousand dollars.

Toward the latter part of the nineteenth century, some of the libraries were materially aided by benefactions from private citizens. These gifts were sometimes for the erection of new library buildings, while at other times they came in the form of choice collections accumulated in years of study and travel by the owners. Among the notable donations of this period were the Billings’ gift of $150,000 to the University of Vermont and that of Mrs. Sophia Astley Kirkpatrick, of $50,000, to Rutgers College, both for new library buildings. The Colorado Agricultural College received material aid from the Annia Jones, Louis B. France, and Barton O. Aylesworth gifts. The University of Vermont came into possession of the famous library of the Honorable George Perkins Marsh—a collection of twelve thousand volumes of rare value and interest—and the munificent sum of $100,000 for the erection of a library building suitable to house such treasures. The library structure was completed in 1885 at a total cost of $150,000 and was one of the most notable of that period. Sometimes the bequests were left with the provision that the money was to be used in the purchase of books, which proved of great assistance in removing deficiencies.

**Experiment Stations**

The Hatch Act of 1887, which provided for the establishment of experiment stations, brought financial aid to many of the
agricultural college libraries. In the institutions where the station libraries became a part or branch of the college libraries, the consolidated financial resources materially increased the appropriations for books. In such libraries there was no need for duplication, and the combined budgets permitted the purchase of a greater variety of titles and periodicals than would have been possible on a single budget. Even when the experiment station was separated from the agricultural college, the station library usually confined its buying to agricultural works—such as bulletins, periodicals, and standard agricultural reference volumes—while books on general subjects and sciences related to the study of agriculture were purchased by the agricultural library. The privilege of interlibrary loan or exchange increased the collections available to both libraries.

Thus, in effect, by 1893 the experiment stations were adding a considerable number of volumes to the agricultural libraries. During that year the experiment station in Michigan gained 501 volumes, the one in Kansas 200 volumes, and that in Connecticut 365 volumes. Partly through the resulting release of funds, by 1899 many of the agricultural college libraries had large collections. Michigan Agricultural College had a library of 19,380 volumes, 9,000 of which were on agriculture. Rutgers University at the same time had a total collection of 40,000 volumes, of which the agricultural books numbered 12,855. Some of the Western agricultural college libraries, however, were still comparatively small: Utah Agricultural College had a total of 7,201 volumes and listed only 364 as dealing with agriculture; and South Dakota, at the same time, had 4,974 books, of which 585 were on agriculture.

By 1900 many of the agricultural libraries had acquired excellent collections, not only in agriculture, but in engineering, mechanical arts, and science. The scientific periodicals included the best published in the United States, as well as many from England, Germany, and France. Whenever possible an effort was made to complete the files of the more important periodicals and to have them bound for permanent use. The reference collections, too, contained the most recent dictionaries and encyclopedias. In addition to acquiring scientific collections, some of the librarians in the new states realized the importance of accumulating local history material. To this end newspapers, official documents, letters, and bulletins which touched upon the history of the state were acquired, often by solicitation through the college catalogs.

Development of Policies

Policies concerning cataloging, the number of hours the libraries were open, the privilege of borrowing books, interlibrary loans, and the reserving of books gradually developed in the agricultural college libraries, as in all college or university libraries during that period. As a means of increasing the resources of the libraries, the practice of interlibrary loans was a natural expedient, especially between the older and better equipped libraries of the East. At first, accurate records of the loans were not kept and there were no rules governing the procedure; the practice grew without plan or program. In the biennial report of the University of California in 1886, Mr. Rowell, the librarian, commented that "from private sources of information I note a growing liberality as regards the use of books in eastern libraries—one library making loans to another at a distance. Such action is not often mentioned in the annual reports because as yet rules covering the cases of this kind have not been adopted." But the advantages of interlibrary loans soon became apparent, and there was an increasing readiness on
the part of all libraries to cooperate.

As the agricultural colleges were established, the office of librarian was usually an added duty of an overcrowded faculty member. The most scholarly members of the faculty were put in charge of the libraries—men who were full of enthusiasm and in sympathy with the students—for it was felt that "the youthful student needs assistance in his selection of reading matter; and a good librarian is his best adviser."

Sometimes this position, as well as that of clerk, accountant, registrar, and instructor, was assumed by the president. Since the academic duties of the busy faculty member permitted him to devote only Saturday and an hour or two a day to the routine work of the library, students often were called upon to assist in the library while the professor's attention was directed toward classroom work. It was not infrequent that a student assistant became actively interested in library work and, after graduation, was appointed librarian of his alma mater.

To acquire the knowledge of library technique before assuming his new duties, a student sometimes spent the summer months studying the most approved methods for the arrangement and classification of books in the larger libraries.

**One Person for Librarian**

A faculty member who was attempting the dual task of librarian and professor soon realized that the library required one person's undivided attention. It needed someone who could give his entire time to the purchase of books when it was most profitable to obtain them and to the cataloging and classifying of the library. In 1894 the professor-librarian at the University of Illinois informed the regents of that university that it was "imperative that a trained librarian should be employed, and that catalogers should be placed at his direction," and, he concluded, much care should be taken that the man selected could work harmoniously with the library committee.

Salaries of librarians during this early period were comparatively meager. In 1876 a Midwestern agricultural college fixed the librarian's salary at two hundred dollars per year. The previous year the rate of compensation had been increased from seven to nine cents per hour.

The increased book collections, made possible by the more liberal appropriations, required scientific methods of cataloging and classifying. As already implied, it was not uncommon for a student assistant to attempt the classification of the books or for an enthusiastic faculty member to undertake the task—only to find his twofold responsibilities so arduous that the cataloging had to be discontinued until an assistant assumed the routine duties of the library.

A shelflist was the first tool prepared by every librarian as a means of inventory, for if a book happened "to be lost or stolen the fact could not be detected without infinite labor and trouble." And with the distribution of the Library of Congress cards, toward the latter part of the century, the dictionary catalog came into general use. Pennsylvania State College was among the libraries which changed from a simple author catalog to a dictionary catalog, "which would have been impracticable with the assistance available had not the library been authorized to subscribe for the cards printed by the Library of Congress." The subscribing libraries found the expense of the cards "but a fraction of the cost of the additional labor required to print them by hand."

**Hours Open**

With a limited staff, it was possible to keep the libraries open only short periods of time. Often a busy faculty member could devote but an hour or two in the morning...
and the same length of time in the afternoon, or a few minutes at the beginning and close of class periods, to the duties of the library. But, as the number of students increased, the library became a center of study and the hours were lengthened from eight in the morning to five in the afternoon; occasionally the opening hour was as early as seven o'clock. It was some time before it was felt necessary to permit use of the libraries at night. However, as the demand increased, the students were permitted to use the library a few nights each week, and finally many of the libraries not only remained open every night but a few hours on Sunday as well.

Access to the books was often prohibited in an attempt to keep the collections intact. Alcoves containing the book stacks were separated by an iron railing or by some other method, and only the more advanced students were permitted access to the stacks. Likewise, freedom in borrowing books was frequently restricted. As late as 1870 the Illinois Industrial University readily loaned books to the teachers of the university, but loans to students were made to a very limited extent—each book so taken being charged to the librarian or to some teacher.

With the increased number of books and greater use of the agricultural college libraries, students were gradually permitted access to the stacks; and then came the problem of lost books. During the two-year period, 1885-86, the University of California lost twenty-four books, and the librarian could see no means of preventing this as long as the students enjoyed unrestricted access to the shelves. The pupils were immature and lacked recognition of the rights of others, while demands made upon the books offered "strong temptation to unrecorded borrowing." During the five-year period, 1893-98, the same library lost 342 volumes, and the cost of replacement was estimated at $414.43. As a protection, numerous books were reserved during the course of the year and were charged for library use; and at the same time, consideration was given to closing the stacks for the good of the students themselves.

The character and manner of agricultural college instruction experienced decided changes during the last half of the century, and this change was nowhere more felt than in the library. A visit to the library of almost any agricultural college in the sixties would have found it the resort of professors or occasionally of the more ambitious students. During the later years of the century a new conception of the functions of the library had taken place. Books and periodicals had multiplied, and those in authority had wisely concluded that the library was not simply a storehouse or a mausoleum for preserving literary memories but a place to house books which were to be used. Students were allowed greater liberty in consulting the books, even to free access to the shelves; and the librarians endeavored to improve the methods of cataloging, indexing, and classifying, so that the resources of the libraries were made available. With the changed attitude concerning the functions of the library came a change in library architecture. The dim cloistered rooms were flooded with light, and the rooms were enlarged or more space was provided for the library, so that there was latitude for readers who wished to browse and consult the books. And the librarians, too, became something more than turnkeys or sextons. They were expected to know something about books, to be able to suggest lists of books to be added to the various departments, and to act as guides to the students in the selection of reading matter. By 1900 the agricultural libraries had become adjuncts of the regular work of instruction, as well as centers of general student education.

352 COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES
Harold L. Leupp, Administrator

Harold Lewis Leupp is one of the last of a noted array of librarians who have retired from the active administration of university libraries during the last ten years. During this period, most of the larger university libraries have seen the appointment of new leaders. The list includes such outstanding university libraries as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Chicago, Missouri, Northwestern, Illinois, Indiana, Purdue, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and now California. To this list might be added a number of research libraries not connected with universities, such as the New York Public Library, Library of Congress, and the Newberry Library.

It is too early to evaluate the services to scholars and students which these librarians have rendered. The group includes some who were graduates of library schools; others who came into the profession without special training—but who have made notable contributions; many who were productive scholars in their own right; others who had a clear understanding and appreciation of scholarship but whose chief contributions were in the development of services—present and potential—which their libraries rendered to the faculty and students, to scholarship, and to research.

During the period of activities of this group, research libraries increased in size almost to the point of embarrassment. Services were greatly developed but still failed to keep pace with increasing demands. Many problems, not fully solved, such as photographic reproduction, policies of cooperative acquisition, and new types of buildings, had their origins in studies and experiments made by librarians who have now retired. Possibly the chief contribution of this group was the increased services rendered, together with major emphasis on use rather than on routines. During this period, the Association of Research Libraries and the Association of College and Reference Libraries were organized.

Against the background which is barely touched upon in the preceding paragraphs, can be outlined the services of those who, in far different ways, have made exceptional contributions. Harold Leupp is primarily an administrator, although he has an exceptionally clear understanding of scholarship and research. He makes no claims in his own behalf of productive scholarship, insofar as publications are concerned. He did administer and develop a great research library—one which stands among the three or four great university libraries of this country, if the comparison is based on the services rendered.

In a study of the holdings of scientific periodicals as ascertained by a check of the Union List of Serials, the library of the University of California was found to be among the three or four outstanding libraries in this country. The collections at Berkeley will serve scholars for many decades to come and will stand as an enduring monument to the accomplishments of Harold Leupp.

The most important feature of the library of the University of California is not in the size and completeness of its holdings, however, but in the exceptional use made of its facilities. The library has been administered with special emphasis on the needs of its faculties. Harold L. Leupp
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clientele and the methods by which such needs could be satisfied.

Some years ago a scholar who had been surveying the services of university libraries stated in personal conversation that the faculty of the University of California was receiving a higher standard of service from its library than any other university he had yet visited. He also added that the faculty at Berkeley did not appreciate that fact. The contributions made to the war effort in the use of the library by government agencies on the West Coast may not be described at present. In the opinion of the writer, they were far greater than the services rendered by any library during the First World War, with possibly one or two exceptions.

California was one of the first to organize a photographic laboratory on a large scale. This laboratory has been consistently self-supporting. In 1942, at the time of my latest visit, I was astonished to find that the equipment at California was more complete and the volume of output was greater than similar installations and output at any library I had seen, with the exception of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. Incidentally, this laboratory is responsible for much of the very considerable service California has rendered to war agencies.

My association with Harold Leupp commenced in 1904, when he graduated from the New York State Library School and became assistant reference librarian at the John Crerar Library. The friendship which originated in those years in Chicago has never lessened. Harold was so consistent that his reactions could be predicted with fair certainty. We knew he would join the Army in 1917, and he did. In a year he was promoted from the rank of second lieutenant to the rank of captain. His great disappointment, as any of us would have guessed, was that he was considered too valuable in the training program to be sent abroad. His appointment in 1910 as associate librarian at the University of California was followed by his appointment as chief librarian in 1919.

Harold Leupp is direct, arriving at the heart of any situation without involving himself in ramifications. His straightforward, frank approach has at times proved disconcerting to those of his colleagues who dislike to have their lack of logic and slowness in thinking made apparent. On the other hand, this approach has enabled him to solve many questions of administration which are still disturbing some of us.

Harold is incisive; he is perfectly willing to pick flaws in a person's logic and to point out inconsistencies in others as well as in himself. This ability has resulted in close friendships with a few who can take as well as give. Harold Leupp is not an appeaser; neither has he been a publicist in a journalistic sense.

These virtues or faults, however one may regard them, may account for the intense loyalty of his friends. His personal qualifications were best described, in my opinion, by Arthur Low Bailey, a colleague who wrote me many years ago: "Harold Leupp approaches about as close to my idea of a gentleman as anyone I have ever known." Would that we had more like him!

CHARLES H. BROWN

Herbert S. Hirshberg in a New Field

The announcement of Herbert S. Hirshberg's retirement as director of libraries at Western Reserve University recalls his many contributions in the library field. In a library career covering four decades, he has served in many capacities in libraries of the East and Midwest. Specifically, he is known for his leadership in Ohio where he has served various institutions for thirty-seven years.

It is difficult to cite Mr. Hirshberg's contributions in the order of their value, but he seems to have been drawn to positions requiring pioneer efforts. From service on the Cleveland Public Library staff, he went to Toledo in 1914 as head librarian. Here he is remembered for his excellent job of selling the library to the community. He put on the first library week held in Toledo, in cooperation with the advertising club and the Chamber of Commerce. The community accepted his development program, and library service in Toledo greatly expanded.

The pioneer in Mr. Hirshberg's character was best illustrated when in 1922 he was given the opportunity to become Ohio's state librarian. He was the first trained librarian...
the state library had had in the 105 years of its existence. In view of this it is remarkable that the professional staff he organized is considered one of the strongest the library has ever had. He became well known, too, for the reorganization and efficient execution of the various state library functions, and directed his efforts especially towards removing libraries from political control. He strongly urged libraries of the state to change to school district library units. At that time most of the public libraries of the state were municipal libraries, with boards appointed by the mayors. Appointments to such boards were often made on a partisan basis, and this was carried through in the selection of the library staff. Under the school district type, board appointments are made by the board of education and partisanship usually does not enter into them. Ohio is benefiting from this policy today, for the majority of its libraries have come to be of this kind and are relatively free from politics.

Mr. Hirshberg carried the knowledge and experience gained at Columbus to Akron, as its librarian, and then to the deanship of the library school of Western Reserve University where he imparted it to graduating students—students now dispersed over the country. At the university he also held the position of director of libraries.

As dean he attracted into the profession more men than had enrolled in the school in its entire previous history. Under his direction the curriculum was revised; courses in administration and reference were broadened, the latter to include an intensive study of government documents. His daily work in these courses stimulated the idea of a new approach to the use of reference material and resulted in his compilation of *Subject Guide to Reference Books*, published by the American Library Association in 1942. This work is a contribution which will be useful to the profession for many years.

As director of university libraries, Mr. Hirshberg developed a central university library where previously there had been only libraries of the various colleges. Likewise, he moved the library school into the university library building, providing mutual benefit to students of the school and to the staff of the library.

Throughout his years of library work, Mr. Hirshberg was concerned with library architecture and building planning. Branches in Toledo, various libraries in the state which he helped plan when state librarian, and the centralized and remodeled library building of Western Reserve University stand to his credit. One of his contributions to library literature stems from experience in this field.

In 1930 he wrote *Elements of the Library Plan*, which was published by the American Library Association as one of its Manuals of Library Economy. Later he prepared a paper for the 1933 Chicago A.L.A. Conference entitled “Four Library Buildings,” discussing subject versus conventional arrangement of large public libraries. In the *Children's Library Yearbook* No. 1 he wrote an article on the interrelation between juvenile and adult departments. He presented a paper at the 1926 American Library Association conference on “Personnel Standards for Small Public Libraries,” which was reprinted in the Classics of American Librarianship. At present he is working on the “Subject Guide to U. S. Government Publications” (coauthor, Carl Melinat), which is to be published in the fall. He is an inventor, too, having designed a mechanical counter to aid circulation assistants in computing overdue fines.
Mr. Hirshberg has been active in national and state association affairs. He was president of the Ohio Library Association in 1917-18 and has been vice president of the American Library Association and a member of numerous committees of the latter.

Kindly and dignified, Mr. Hirshberg has made his way through the library field, breaking a path for others to follow. He leaves the active field of librarianship, but it is certain that benefits will still come to the profession from work in his new field.

WALTER T. BRAHM

The Record of F. L. D. Goodrich

Frederick Lee Dewey Goodrich retires this summer as librarian of the College of the City of New York. Leaving New York at the end of June, he temporarily will be curator of printed books in the William L. Clements Library at Ann Arbor.

Born in Manchester, Mich., in 1877, Mr. Goodrich is one of three brothers who appear in Who's Who in America. In 1897 he completed the four-year course in education at Michigan State College, which nearly forty years later gave him the honorary degree of master of education. Thus, to natural aptitude he added professional skill as a teacher and expositor. In 1903 he earned the bachelor of arts degree at the University of Michigan and in 1916 attained its M.A. degree. He earned his B.L.S. degree in 1906 at the New York State Library School.

After a year as assistant reference librarian at the John Crerar Library in Chicago, he became assistant librarian of the University of Michigan (1907-20) and held its associate librarianship from 1920-30. His training there came chiefly from the late Theodore W. Koch. In 1917-19 he was granted a leave of absence and organized three camp libraries in the South. After the armistice he did still more interesting work at Paris and Beaune, France.

For several years Mr. Goodrich gave summer courses at the University of Michigan on such topics as library buildings and special collections. Besides many articles in professional periodicals, he wrote, with William M. Randall, Principles of College Library Administration. The volume has been a standard text in library schools, having appeared in two editions. Mr. Goodrich also was chairman for several years of the important American Library Association Committee on Fellowships and Scholarships.

At City College he has been a colossus of helpfulness, good nature, and patience for a dozen years. Although working with a mixed student body he has been able to maintain friendly relations with all elements. When the faculty was perplexed by publicized economic agitations, Mr. Goodrich kept to the golden mean. In a library so crowded that thirty thousand volumes had to be packed away in cases, he never gave up hope of an adequate municipal grant for the enlargement of the building, which now rates A-I in postwar priority.

Senior among the head librarians of the four borough colleges supported by Greater New York, Mr. Goodrich has been their wise leader. He is a true and beloved benefactor of the intellectual life of the metropolis. When he leaves, he will be accompanied by the affectionate regards of student and faculty and, last but not least, the warm wishes of his fellow-librarians in the numerous professional associations in which he served.

WILLIAM W. ROCKWELL
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Charles Martel, 1860-1945

Too prone to assume the development of a library science as peculiarly American, we must at times admit our inaccuracy. It is a truism that many of our early library leaders—those who in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries forged the framework of the young profession—were adopted from Europe.

Such a leader was Charles Martel, who died May 15, 1945. A Swiss by birth and education, at the age of nineteen he exchanged the University of Zürich, where he had studied after leaving the Gymnasium, for the Midwestern University of Missouri. Evidently he liked us, for he remained to make his life here. After completing his studies and engaging in other work for a time, he went to the Newberry Library in Chicago in 1892. There he became the friend and coworker of J. C. M. Hanson, who soon departed for the Library of Congress and shortly asked Martel to join him.

In 1901, at the crucial time when Herbert Putnam was reorganizing the Library of Congress services and beginning to offer printed cards for sale, Martel became chief classifier. In this capacity he began the greatest work of his career—directing the development of the L.C. classification schedules. Although the work was based in part on the Cutter Expansive System, it was planned from the start as a practical disposition of a specific book collection, not as a theoretical organization of knowledge. Martel carefully explained his thesis to the many librarians who sought information and schedules. Yet the popularity of the classification system grew rapidly, in spite of the fact that not all schedules were completed until a few years ago.

In 1912 he was made chief of the Catalogue Division, a position he held until 1930. A highlight of this period was his work in the winter and spring of 1928 with William Warner Bishop, J. C. M. Hanson, and Monsignor Tisserant in organizing the vast collection of the Vatican Library in Rome.

When he reached retirement age in 1930, he was relieved of his many administrative duties but was asked to remain as bibliographical consultant, that the library might continue to profit from his wide background and deep knowledge of bibliography and European languages. On Mar. 5, 1940, a surprise luncheon was given at the round table of the Library of Congress in honor of his eightieth birthday. Close friends toasted him and presented an appreciation volume of 237 letters from all over the world.

He was a gifted scholar, a progressive librarian, and a beloved administrator. His loss is felt not only in Washington but by the entire library world.

Velva J. Osborn
Appointments to Positions

Luther Harris Evans

On June 16, 1945, President Truman announced that he was sending to the Senate his nomination of Luther Harris Evans as Librarian of Congress. The appointment was confirmed on June 29. While the appointment was generally expected, it is nonetheless gratifying to librarians to have this assurance that the splendid leadership of Archibald MacLeish will be continued by the man who has served so ably as Mr. MacLeish's lieutenant.

Luther Evans graduated from the University of Texas in 1923 and received his M.A. degree in political science from that institution the following year. While serving as an instructor in the problems of citizenship at Leland Stanford University, he continued his studies and received his Ph.D. degree in 1927. He was then on the faculties successively of New York University, Dartmouth, and Princeton.

The library world first came to know Dr. Evans when he became national director of the Historical Records Survey of the Works Progress Administration in 1935. The Historical Records Survey probably received more commendation and less criticism than any other part of the W.P.A. It may well have been the successful administration of this task that convinced Archibald MacLeish, soon after assuming office, that Dr. Evans was the man to appoint as director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

A report on the Historical Records Survey, made by Dr. Evans to a Senate committee on Mar. 1, 1938, includes a statement about libraries which shows how much he appreciated their possible contribution even before he had become a librarian. He said:

"It is so generally recognized that one of the greatest civilizing influences developed in America during the past century is the library system of the nation, that we seldom have occasion to realize how terribly handicapped we would be without it. I think it is safe to say that no large and important agency of government in this country, no matter what its purpose and functions may be, and no large business and philanthropic enterprise, could do its work satisfactorily without utilizing the library resources of the nation."

No other position in the Library of Congress has closer relations with the government than that of director of the Legislative Reference Service, and from the beginning Dr. Evans showed an unusual ability in satisfying the library wants of the Senators and Congressmen. Martin A. Roberts, chief assistant librarian, died in June 1940, and on November 1 Mr. MacLeish appointed Dr. Evans to that position. By that time the reorganization of the Library of Congress had progressed to the point of setting up three departments: the Administrative Department, the Processing Department, and the Reference Department. Luther Evans, as chief assistant librarian, was director of the Reference Department.

During his five and one-half years as chief assistant librarian, Dr. Evans repeatedly assumed the duties of acting librarian in the absence of Mr. MacLeish. He has seen eye to eye with Mr. MacLeish in his desire to make the Library of Congress serve not only the government but the libraries of the whole country. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the publication of the Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards under the auspices of the Association of Research Libraries. He advocates the division of responsibility by the greater libraries, to assure that all important foreign books are secured by some American library.

During the past few years the staff at the Library of Congress has been considerably strengthened. Dr. Evans was the enthusiastic choice as the new chief of the librarians who had worked under him. The newspapers have asserted that he was one of the three men recommended to the President by the American Library Association. As Luther Evans assumes the most important library position in the country, it should be a satisfaction to him that he does so with the approval of his fellow staff members at the Library of Congress and of the many librarians in university and public libraries throughout the country who have felt the warmth of his interest in general library progress.

Paul North Rice
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Donald Coney

Donald Coney, the new librarian of the University of California at Berkeley, first became interested in librarianship when he was a student at the University of Michigan. Except for two years (1932-34), when he was supervisor of technical processes at the Newberry Library, he has directed his energies towards university librarianship. He was a circulation assistant and a departmental librarian at the University of Michigan (1920-27), librarian at the University of Delaware (1927-28), assistant librarian at the University of North Carolina (1928-31), and librarian of the University of Texas from 1934 until his recent appointment at California. In addition to his library positions, Mr. Coney has also served on the faculties of the library schools of the universities of Chicago, Illinois, and North Carolina.

As an administrator, Mr. Coney has been alert to new developments in university librarianship and in related fields. Not infrequently he has been an innovator and experimenter. He has been an outspoken exponent of placing the university library in its correct relation to students, faculty, and scholars generally. To him, the building of a collection pertinent to the needs of a clientele and the distribution of that collection to individuals requiring its use, are the two important aspects of library activity.

In the building of collections, Mr. Coney recently has had approved at Texas a project for creating a faculty fellowship in bibliography, under which a member of the faculty would spend a semester each year studying the library's resources in a given subject area, evaluating them, and outlining plans for their improvement. He also has studied methods for apportioning book funds in the university library and has evolved an experimental index plan which goes beyond the present unsystematic procedures.

In connection with a projected building program for the University of Texas Library, Mr. Coney has proposed an improved division of material and of service. A step toward this is the recently created west reading room of the library, which handles the most frequently used current periodicals, open-shelf reserves for undergraduates, and a popular reading collection for recreational purposes, thus providing a starting point for under-
its inception, having been a member first of
the faculty committee to study the need for
such an agency and later of the executive
committee of the institute. This association
led to his article "The Materials of Intel-
lectual Interchange," published in Inter-
American Intellectual Interchange (Institute
of Latin-American Studies of the University
of Texas, 1943).

Wyllis E. Wright

Wyllis E. Wright, the new librarian of the
Army Medical Library, began library work
as a page in the Lowell, Mass., Public Li-
brary at the age of twelve and, with the ex-
ception of one year, has been in library work
ever since. He was a student assistant in
the Williams College Library throughout his
course there. After receiving his B.A. degree
from Williams in 1925, he remained on the
library staff for two more years, meanwhile
receiving an M.A. in 1926.

While in the Williams library he became
interested in cataloging and classification and
served as cataloger during the absence of the
regular cataloger. He also prepared a classi-
fication for the Williamsiana collection.

From 1927-30 he was in the Preparation
Division of the New York Public Library,
and he obtained a B.S. degree from the School
of Library Service, Columbia University, in
1928. From 1930-33 he was librarian of the
American Academy in Rome, where he as-
isted in the complete recataloging of the
collection. During this period he was also
interested in the preparation of a union
catalog of materials relating to Rome and
Roman studies, undertaken by the Instituto di
Studi Romani. In 1933 he returned to the
New York Public Library as chief classifier
and in 1936 become chief cataloger.

His interest in cataloging processes led to
his appointment on the Cooperative Catalog-
ing Coftmittee and the Advisory Committee
on the Union List of Serials. He has also
served on the A.L.A. Catalog Code Revision
Committee. At the New York Public Library
he has introduced simplification in cata-
logging practices, in line with the current con-
ception of what is needed in the preparation
of a catalog for a large reference library.

Mr. Wright has taken an active part in
the Victory Book Campaign, and at present
he is a member of the Joint Committee on a
Book Campaign for Devastated and Other
Libraries in War Areas of the Council of
National Library Associations. He has also
been the chairman of the A.L.A. Special Ad-
visory Committee on the Union List of Serials
Supplement. He has contributed many arti-
cles and reviews to professional journals.

J. H. Lancaster

On June 1, 1945, J. H. Lancaster became
librarian of the Peabody College Division of
the Joint University Libraries, Nashville,
Tenn., and a member of the Peabody College
faculty. Besides administering the library,
Dr. Lancaster is to teach courses in the li-
brary school and in the college dealing with
library service and with methods of research
in education.

Dr. Lancaster brings to his new posts a
background in both librarianship and teaching.
After graduating with the degree of bachelor
of science at Ohio Wesleyan University in
1920, he spent seven years as a teacher and
administrator in schools of northwestern
Ohio. He then became director of student
teaching at Heidelberg College. From 1939
to 1943 he was librarian at Heidelberg and,
in addition, in 1942-43 he managed the
university bookstore. For a year and a
half in 1942-43 he also supervised night
school courses held at Heidelberg in the
E.S.M.W.T. program of the University of
Toledo College of Engineering. Since 1943
he has been assistant professor of library
science at the University of Illinois Library
School and has also taught physics in the

In the period covered by his Heidelberg
connection Dr. Lancaster continued study,
receiving the degree of master of arts at
Ohio State University in 1926; that of doctor
of philosophy at Teachers College, Columbia
University, in 1941; and that of bachelor of
science at the School of Library Service, Co-
lumbia University, also in 1941. His master's
essay dealt with school library laws of the
various states and his doctoral dissertation
with the use of the library by student
teachers.

The change of fields on Dr. Lancaster's
part in recent years came about as a result
of an increasing interest in the library as a
means of education and as a source of instruc-
tional material and of ideas for student
teachers. He has been active in organizations
of librarians and in 1942 was elected vice
president of the Ohio Library Association.

Dr. Lancaster served as a second lieutenant in the United States Army in 1918.

Charles M. Adams

Charles M. Adams assumed his duties as librarian of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro on September 1. He received his A.B. degree from Amherst College in 1931 and his B.S. from the Columbia School of Library Service in 1933. In 1942 he completed his work for an M.A. in the department of English.

Mr. Adams was born in 1907 in La Moure, N.D. There he assisted in gathering and organizing the town's first library. At Amherst College he worked as a student assistant in the library. During the first three years after college he was an instructor of English at Athens College, Greece. While in Europe he traveled and attended summer courses at the University of Toulouse and the University of Strasbourg, receiving instruction in hand bookbinding in the latter institution. Later, at the New School for Social Research in New York, he followed up his interest in bookmaking by taking a course in hand printing under Joseph Blementhal. In the School of Library Service, Columbia University, during the summer sessions of 1939 and 1942, he taught the course on the history of books and printing and during the summer of 1941, that on the care of books in special collections.

At the information desk and in the reserve room of the New York Public Library from 1934 to 1938, Mr. Adams became acquainted with the varied reading and reference needs of the general public and of mature research workers. During his seven years at Columbia he was in charge of the department of special collections, represented the director in the administration of the Low Memorial Library, and played a significant part in developing the collections of rare books and other special materials for the university through gifts and purchases. As assistant to the director of libraries, he participated in planning and working out solutions to a number of administrative problems concerned with personnel, building arrangements, and resources.

Mr. Adams was also in charge of exhibition work at Columbia. In 1940 the exhibition in celebration of the 500th Anniversary of the Invention of Printing from Movable Type was arranged and a catalog prepared. Other catalogs were compiled in connection with exhibitions for the Edwin Patrick Kilroe collection of Tammaniana and for the Isidore Witmark collection. In 1944, in collaboration with the English Graduate Union, an exhibition and program were arranged in celebration of the 300th anniversary of the printing of the Areopagitica.

A contributor to publications of the Typophiles, to the News-Letter of the American Institute of Graphic Arts, and to the Bulletin of the New York Public Library, Mr. Adams is also a former editor of the New York Library Club Bulletin. He supervised the compilation of the reports of the resources of Columbia for inclusion in Downs's Resources of New York City Libraries (1942). He completed the final reading and supervised the publication for the Columbia University Libraries of Edward Epstein's translation of the History of Photography by Josef Maria Eder (New York City, Columbia University Press, 1945).

Paul M. Angle

Paul M. Angle, recently appointed to the librarianship of the Chicago Historical Society, brings to his new position thirteen years of experience acquired as state historian of Illinois and director of the Illinois State Historical Library.

Mr. Angle, who holds a bachelor's degree from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and a master's degree from the University of Illinois, was secretary of the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield for seven years before assuming charge of the Illinois State Historical Library. During his directorship of the latter institution, its book collection grew to approximately eighty thousand volumes, which represents an increase of about 30 per cent, and its manuscript and newspaper collections doubled in size. The collection of Lincoln autographs increased from fifty or sixty to more than four hundred, and many of these are of first importance. Last year the library acquired one of the five holograph copies of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which was purchased by the school children of Illinois, aided by Marshall Field III. The library has received other notable benefac-
tions—in particular, the fine Lincoln collection of Alfred W. Stern of Chicago. Much of the expansion of the Illinois State Historical Library in recent years can be traced directly to the excellent public relations established by Mr. Angle and to his ability to select and guide a capable staff.

Since 1932, when Mr. Angle went to Springfield, he has edited the Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society and the society's other publications and, after its inception in 1940, the Abraham Lincoln Quarterly. He has written and published a history of Springfield in Lincoln's time, worked with Carl Sandburg on Mary Lincoln, Wife and Widow, and edited a new edition of Whitney's Life on the Circuit with Lincoln. He has written a number of articles on historical, bibliographical, and library subjects, and frequent reviews.

Jerome K. Wilcox

Jerome K. Wilcox became librarian of the College of the City of New York September 1. He has been in the library profession for over twenty years, having begun his career as a student assistant while working for his B.A. degree at Wesleyan University. After graduation in 1926, he attended the University of Illinois Library School, where at the same time he was also an assistant in the order department of the library. After receiving an M.A. at Illinois in August 1928, he entered the John Crerar Library in Chicago as assistant reference librarian, where he remained until 1935. Under his editorship at the Crerar Library, the irregular Staff News became a quarterly publication known as the John Crerar Library Quarterly. He was also instrumental in establishing the John Crerar Library Reference List, to which he contributed many bibliographies. While in Chicago Mr. Wilcox was president of the Chicago Library Club and chairman of the club's committee which produced the 1933 Directory of Libraries of the Chicago Area.

He went to Duke University in 1935 to become chief of the acquisitions division, where he reorganized and systematized the business records. In August 1937 he became assistant librarian of the University of California at Berkeley and in 1940 was promoted to associate librarian. While at California he organized the documents division and was the administrative officer of all the public service units of the library. In the documents division he set up a union catalog arranged by issuing agency, for all documents held in any of the libraries on the Berkeley campus. At the University of California he also conducted a seminar in bibliography and research methods for graduate students in the political science department.

Mr. Wilcox was chairman of the A.L.A. Committee on Public Documents from 1936 to 1938 and again from 1941 to date. He has contributed many papers concerning document problems at the annual meetings of the committee.

In 1937 he was instrumental in securing passage of H.R. 5471 by the U. S. Congress, which brought to depository libraries, for the first time, the Congressional hearings. In addition, passage of this bill again allowed depository libraries the privilege of securing Senate and House journals and public bills. He is the author of numerous articles and publications pertaining to public document use, among which are: U.S. Reference Publications, 1931, with a 1932 supplement; Guide to the Official Publications of the New Deal Administration, 1934, with two supplements, one in 1936 and one in 1937; Unemployment Relief Documents, 1936; Manual on the Use of State Publications, 1940; and most recently, Official War Publications, in nine volumes, 1941 to 1945. For several years he has also contributed annually "Recent Aids and Guides to Public Document Use" in Special Libraries.

As chairman of the California State Document Committee of the California Library Association, he has sought to secure better distribution and indexing of California state publications. With this goal in mind, his committee introduced into the California state legislature in January 1945 a Senate bill which passed both houses unanimously and was signed by the Governor. This act makes California the first state to have a depository system for the publications of the state.

Thomas R. Barcus

On June 1 Thomas R. Barcus assumed his new duties as chief of the Gift and Exchange Section of the Library of Congress. Mr. Barcus is a native of Plainview, Tex., and
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has an A.B. degree from Southern Methodist University, a bachelor's degree from the School of Library Service at Columbia, and a master's degree in library science from the University of Michigan.

Mr. Barcus has had a variety of library experience prior to his going to the Library of Congress staff. From 1929 to 1934 he was an assistant in the library extension service at Michigan, where he compiled reading lists and assisted in the editing of Alumni Reading Lists. In 1934 he was placed in charge of the departmental library which covered the subjects of economics, mathematics, insurance, and geography. Two years later he assumed charge of the history and political science reading room.

For five years, 1938-43, Mr. Barcus worked with William Warner Bishop at the central book purchasing office sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation. He was directly concerned with buying books, maps, music, pictures, journals, and phonograph records for the colleges in the United States that received grants for their libraries from the Carnegie Corporation. In order to carry on the work, he visited and reported on a number of college libraries of various sizes and kinds which were under consideration for grants. The record of this work is included in his publication, The Carnegie Corporation and College Libraries, 1938-43.

In 1943 Mr. Barcus went to Canada as librarian of the University of Saskatchewan. In his two years there he has been successful in solving several administrative problems: he succeeded in enlarging the size of the staff, increasing the budget, raising salaries of personnel, lengthening vacation periods, supervising the preparation of a library handbook for students, and placing a lecture on the library in the freshman week program. A special appropriation to clear overdue binding was also obtained, and changes were made in circulation, order, and cataloging routines. During the spring term of 1943, he taught reference at the University of Michigan.

At the present time Mr. Barcus is a member of the A.L.A. Committee on Boards and Committees, the Membership Committee, and the Canadian Library Advisory Board. He has been active in the programs of the American Library Association and of various Canadian library associations. In addition to the publications noted above, he has written a dozen or so articles for various library and other periodicals. Mr. Barcus is a devotee of chamber music and "le jazz hot," and has a personal collection of about a thousand records of the latter.

Alexander Moffit

Alexander Moffit, who succeeds Donald Coney as librarian of the University of Texas, is from Iowa, having taken his bachelor's degree at the State University of Iowa in 1926. After three years as a private secretary for a business firm in Chicago, he went to the University of Illinois Library School, receiving the professional bachelor's degree there in 1931 and the master's degree in 1935.

For five years Mr. Moffit held various positions at the University of Illinois Library, first as assistant in the exchange division, then as a reference assistant, and finally as librarian of the chemistry library. In 1936 he went to Texas as associate librarian. There he assisted in the reorganization and integration of the technical department and latterly in the direction of the library's public service units. Like his predecessor, he has been especially interested in the adaptation of business machines to library operations. He has been active in library association work and has written several articles for periodicals.

Arthur M. McAnally

Arthur M. McAnally became librarian of the University of New Mexico in July, after several years' experience in college and university libraries of the Southwest and Middle West. Mr. McAnally was educated at the University of Oklahoma, where he received the library science degree and B.A. and M.A. degrees in English, and at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago. His doctoral dissertation, now in preparation, concerns standards of support for liberal arts college libraries.

His early experience was in the Edinburg, Tex., Junior College and at Northwestern University. As assistant librarian at Knox College, Mr. McAnally worked extensively with the Friends of the Knox College Library and made a detailed analysis of student reading. While librarian at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, he helped secure a new library.
building and concentrated on improving the usefulness of the library. He also instituted a faculty survey of library resources and did considerable exploratory work in adapting the quick-training principles of the War Manpower Commission to the training of nonprofessional library personnel and in applying motion and time study techniques to the improvement of library processes. As librarian of the Wisconsin State Teachers College in Milwaukee, he approached the problem of library use by analyzing the varying needs and teaching methods of instructional departments and developed systematic plans for the improvement of library service to each.

He has held office in the Texas and Illinois library associations and is at present a member of the Subcommittee on Postwar Planning for College and University Libraries of the A.L.A. and the Association of College and Reference Libraries and of the A.L.A. Subcommittee on Job Evaluation and Training.

Mr. McAnally also takes to the University of New Mexico a durable interest in the Southwest as a region, a belief that the library must participate actively in the expansion of the college or university as it becomes a regional service agency, and nonlibrary interests in the effects of the frontier on American literature and in competitive tennis.

---

British Museum Catalogue—Original Series

The Association of Research Libraries has decided to issue a photographic reprint of the original British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books issued between 1881 and 1900. The paper of this invaluable tool has begun to disintegrate so rapidly and so seriously that it is perfectly evident that the new Catalogue cannot possibly overtake the destruction of the old. A photographic reproduction is absolutely needed to enable libraries to keep up their use of what is without question the most useful single catalog in existence.

Owing to the paper shortage it is not yet possible to compute prices. A prospectus inviting subscriptions will be issued about Oct. 1, 1945, and it is hoped that printing can begin by Feb. 1, 1946. The price will be kept as low as possible and will depend on the number of subscriptions. The book will be decidedly reduced from the size of the original issue but will be entirely legible for rapid consultation.

The Trustees of the British Museum have given their permission for the reproduction and have kindly waived copyright. The committee of the Association of Research Libraries having the project in charge is composed of Warner G. Rice, Paul North Rice, and William Warner Bishop, chairman. The printing will be done by Edwards Bros. of Ann Arbor, Mich. The price will run between $400 and $225, depending on the number of subscriptions.

Advance subscriptions may be sent to the secretary of the Association of Research Libraries, Paul North Rice at the New York Public Library, to the chairman at the University of Michigan Library, or to the publishers.

William Warner Bishop
June 1, 1945
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General Milton E. Lord, chairman of the Joint Committee on Books for Devastated Libraries, in a communication of May 1, 1945, calls attention to the appeals libraries, publishers, learned societies, and individuals are receiving for books and periodicals to be sent to institutions in devastated areas. The Joint Committee on Books for Devastated Libraries is seeking to coordinate all such efforts through a national book and periodical campaign. In connection with this an American Book Center for War Devastated Libraries is being set up with the assistance of representatives of the various countries and interested organizations. He recommends, therefore, that libraries and individuals continue to hold books and periodicals destined for overseas until further information is available. Similar advice is offered to institutions receiving requests that exchange publications held since the war began, be forwarded to certain representatives of foreign countries for distribution. It seems advisable that all of these publications be held until it is clear that delivery can be made directly to the institutions for which they were specifically intended.

East The Bassett Jones Libris Polaris was purchased recently by the Columbia University Libraries. This collection, devoted to arctic and antarctic explorations, contains several thousand items. Books, periodicals, maps, newspaper clippings, photographs, autographed letters of explorers, and souvenirs furnish much useful material for the historian. There are a number of rare early items included.

The University of Pennsylvania Library has developed its Chinese collection to the point where it now contains about six thousand titles in approximately thirteen thousand volumes. These titles are distributed among the four traditional categories: classics, history, the philosophers, and belles-lettres, being strongest in the first three divisions. The work of cataloging the collection should be completed by the end of 1945.

On April 9 Governor Dewey of New York state signed the Olliffe Bill, which increased the mandatory minimum salary of library assistants under the jurisdiction of the New York City Board of Higher Education and increased the mandatory increments to ten instead of six annual ones.

Members of the staff of the Sullivan Memorial Library, Temple University, Lucy E. Fay, acting librarian, have completed a survey of the book collection which will serve as a guide for the faculty in adding to the library's holdings in the various subject fields.

South Among the four publications to be issued by the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia during 1945 is a facsimile of the 1828 catalog of the University of Virginia Library. This catalog, which describes the collection brought together by Thomas Jefferson, will be issued as No. 6 in the University of Virginia Bibliographical Series and will have an introduction by William H. Peden.

The library of the College of William and Mary has received the Joseph Bryan collection of Southern Americana, comprising some 1500 titles, which was presented by John Stewart Bryan in memory of his father.

The library of the College of William and Mary has received a collection of letters and documents collected by the late Hon. Robert M. Hughes and his father, Judge R. W. Hughes, of Norfolk, Va. The papers range from the middle eighteenth century to 1933 and consist principally of letters written by such well-known literary, political, and military figures as James Madison, James Monroe, George Wythe, Robert E. Lee, John Randolph of Roanoke, Woodrow Wilson, Robert Southey, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Washington Irving, and Benjamin Watkins Leigh.

Middle West A survey of the Wheaton College Library by a faculty planning committee has resulted in a program for the development of this library over a period of several years. Among the recommendations made was the appointment of an administrator to coordinate the library and the curriculum.

The University of Illinois Library, Robert
B. Downs, director, is building up a special collection of house magazines. Twenty-eight hundred industrial and other firms have been asked to place the library on their mailing lists to receive their publications. The collection includes magazines that are circulated among employees and those used for distribution to customers, dealers, stockholders, and others.

The first number of The Librarian's Occasional Letter to the Faculty was issued in April by Lawrence Clark Powell, librarian of the University of California at Los Angeles. The progress of building plans, activities of the library in wartime, and a proposed survey of the book collections are among the topics covered. It is an informative letter that invites reading.

Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., has presented to the Huntington Library a de luxe edition of Mein Kampf which came into the possession of the Third Army troops last April near Weimar. The volume is bound in parchment-covered oak boards and measures sixteen by twenty-one inches. General Patton sent it as a tribute to the memory of his father, who was a member of the board of trustees of the library from its creation in 1919 until his death in 1927.

The University of Wyoming Library, Mary E. Marks, librarian, has acquired several important collections of books and manuscripts relating to Wyoming and the cattle industry. The Wyoming Stock Growers' Association has deposited its minutes and proceedings from 1873, its file of Wyoming brand books, and early correspondence, pictures, photographs, and clippings about pioneers of the cattle industry. The papers of Senator Warren consist of letters, clippings, letterpress books, and ledgers about the Warren interests in the cattle and land industry, as well as about the Senator's interest in other industrial projects of the state. The Charles B. Penrose papers from 1892 to 1936 contain letters and clippings dealing with the Johnson County cattle war. The L. A. R. Condit material includes letters, bills, ledgers, and newspapers which tell the story of ranch life in the early days. Through the acquisition of these and other collections of similar importance, the University of Wyoming Library's holdings of source material on the history of the state and its principal industry are greatly strengthened.

The library committee of the University of Southern California issued the first number of The Library Bulletin in April. The new publication, which will appear irregularly, is addressed primarily to the Friends of the Library and is a medium through which gifts will be acknowledged and Friends will be informed of the library's progress.

The University of California Library has acquired a collection of approximately twenty thousand theatre programs and handbills for the period 1800-1900.

Several West Coast libraries lent volumes for the Conference Library of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, which was under the general supervision of the Library of Congress. Among those making substantial loans were the University of California, Stanford, Mills College, and the San Francisco Public Library.

Alice M. Humiston, for two years acting head cataloger of the University of California at Los Angeles, has been made head cataloger.

Neal Harlow has joined the staff of the University of California at Los Angeles Library as librarian, senior grade, in the acquisitions department. His duties will include the planning of a new division of rare books, manuscripts, and archives.

Ralph Hagedorn, research bibliographer and chief of the Reference Department of the University of Alabama Library, has been appointed assistant librarian in charge of the Acquisition Department of the University of
Wisconsin Library, Madison.

Martha A. Connor has resigned as reference librarian of the Sullivan Memorial Library, Temple University, to take a new administrative position in the library of Swarthmore College, Charles B. Shaw, librarian.

Mary Fox Clardy has been appointed librarian of the Bethel Woman's College, Hopkinsville, Ky.

Although Carl M. White's trip to China on behalf of library interests had to be abandoned because of conditions in the Orient, he has continued in the service of the State Department and on May 19 left for London to act as a consultant on library matters in connection with undertakings of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education. He expects to return to the United States in September.

Kenneth Boyer, who has been assistant librarian of Bowdoin College, has been made librarian.

Mary D. Herrick became librarian of Nasson College, Springvale, Me., on Aug. 1, 1945.

Paul S. Ballance, for the past two years librarian of the Texas Engineers Library at Texas A. & M. College, has been made acting librarian of the college.

David H. Clift, assistant to the director of libraries, Columbia University, now with the Office of Strategic Services at Washington, has been appointed associate librarian of Yale University, effective upon his return to civilian life.

Frances Clayton, who has been assistant librarian of the College of Mines and Metallurgy, El Paso, Tex., has been appointed librarian. She succeeds Hilda Cole, acting librarian since June 1943, who has resigned to go into hospital library work.

Fina Ott resigned as librarian of Washburn University, Topeka, Kan., early in 1945. Elizabeth Elbright has been appointed acting librarian.

Robert M. Trent has been appointed chief of technical processes at the Louisiana State University Library, Guy R. Lyle, director. Before his appointment was made Mr. Trent spent several months surveying the acquisition and cataloging activities of this library.

Raymond W. Holbrook has been appointed associate director in charge of technical processes and acting head of the catalog division in the University of Georgia Library, Wayne S. Yenawine, acting director. Mr. Holbrook has just completed a two-year appointment as supervisor of recataloging at Georgia. He was formerly a member of the library staff of the College of the City of New York.

Barcus Tichenor, librarian at Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind., since 1921, has resigned, effective July 13, 1945.

Leslie Dunlap, until recently assistant librarian and head of the Acquisition Department of the University of Wisconsin Library, has been appointed assistant chief of the L.C. general reference and bibliography division.

Richard S. Angell, librarian of Columbia University Music Library, has been appointed a fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. He is preparing a book on the organization of music libraries.

Orlin C. Spicer, librarian of Monticello College, Godfrey, Ill., has been appointed head of the circulation department and assistant to the librarian of the University of Missouri.
Review Articles

A New Guide


There could be no better proof that the college library as a factor of education is coming of age than the growing volume of significant literature on the subject. It is encouraging that the last dozen years have seen the publication of several excellent books in the field, beginning with William M. Randall's descriptive study of the library in the American liberal arts colleges. Brown and Bousfield then analyzed circulation work in college and university libraries; Randall and Goodrich gave to the profession the most lucid exposition of the principles of college library administration that we have; Douglas Waples described better ways of evaluating the college library; Blanche Prichard McFarland revised and expanded her well-balanced estimate of standards for a college library; B. Lamar Johnson told how he had vitalized library service at Stephens College; and, finally, Harvie Branscomb considered critically the task of teaching with books. Along with these major writings went a tremendous amount of interpretation and description of modern college library work, presented in the form of periodical articles. At first sight, therefore, the publication of Guy R. Lyle's stout new volume might appear rather superfluous. But a careful reading of the book will show that it actually fills a very important gap and that we owe to the author a considerable debt of gratitude. The thanks of the profession are to be extended also to his three collaborators, Paul H. Bixler (whose chapter on book selection and acquisition is especially praiseworthy), Marjorie J. Hood, and Arnold H. Trotier. Their contributions fit in so well that the reader gains the impression of having before him the work of one mind.

Lyle, who combines rich experience in college library work with teaching in library schools, is the first writer in this field who thinks primarily of the needs of the young student. Not that previous authors had neglected them, but they had other audiences more on their minds, usually either the college librarian and his staff or the college administrator. For this very reason, they did not feel obligated to give a complete picture of all aspects of college library work. This led to the uncomfortable situation that syllabi for library school courses in college library administration had to include a wide variety of selections from books and periodicals in order to cover the ground. But anybody who has ever taken such a course knows that it is practically impossible for the beginner to absorb in a limited period a large measure of widely scattered and sometimes repetitious material. Therefore, it was a splendid idea to present the newcomer to the profession, or to this particular branch of library work, with an introduction that gives him a well-rounded picture of all the pertinent problems involved in it and that concentrates on college library administration exclusively.

Lyle has a clearer and more appealing style than have many other textbook writers among librarians; he is more down to earth than most of them. Even a library school student completely lacking in professional experience will grasp from this text the larger issues at stake. If he wants to dig more deeply, he can do so easily, thanks to Lyle's usually rather full list of references.

However, not only the library school student, but also the college librarian and his staff, will find the book rewarding. For the author does not just rehash what he read somewhere but gives his public the benefit of his own wide observations and the results of questionnaires, correspondence, and visits. His findings are set forth without any intent of arousing controversy. He deserves appreciation for well-balanced judgment and for fair presentation of both sides where there is argument on an important topic. This writer feels that there is hardly a single statement on the whole six hundred pages to which he would wish to take exception, even though naturally he might here and there
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have put emphasis on different aspects of a problem.

It is to the author's credit that he starts his book with an excellent chapter showing the ties that bind the college library to the changing trends in college instruction. There is nothing that a beginner needs more badly than to see this close interrelationship. Throughout the volume Lyle continues to stress this educational aspect. He speaks of the necessity for the college librarian to be in constant touch with the administration and to keep alive the interest of the college president in his department of his institution. College librarians ought never to be satisfied with hearing the library praised as the "heart of the college" by their superiors on solemn occasions; they should labor day by day to gain and preserve the sympathetic understanding of the educational significance and the future needs of the college library on the part of the president.

Certainly, Lyle's remarks on the relation between faculty and librarian are also very much to the point. The general principle, he states, must be simply "that the library can function effectively only as a part of the whole instructional unit." In this connection, the present writer would like to put forward again his thesis that in the smaller liberal arts college there is hardly a need for a faculty-library committee. The librarian will get better results if he is not hampered by the predilections and ambitions of a few professors who more or less accidentally have been appointed members of such a committee. Its mere existence may easily become, in a small college community, an impediment for the librarian who wants to work as closely as possible with every single instructor, regardless of rank, and who wishes to minister to his particular needs. If the librarian desires moral support on campus for some worthy purpose, he will find it more easily from those library-minded scholars on the faculty who believe in his work than from any committee. Naturally, these remarks do not apply equally to the situation in large colleges, where a faculty-library committee will be inevitable; however, readers of Jacques Barzun's recently published brilliant book on The Teacher in America know that even in big institutions committee meetings may not always be profitable.

It has been often stated that as librarians we can expect to command the respect of the faculty only if we are meeting them on even terms. That raises once more the question of proper training for the college librarian. Lyle believes it impossible for him to be a scholar in the sense of an eminent specialist or research man: "His work allows him no time for the continuous application to a single subject which is essential for the specialist." But Lyle agrees that the college librarian certainly must have the instincts and sympathies of a scholar and should be familiar with the methods of research. He also stresses repeatedly the necessity of possessing a broad academic background.

This reviewer for one is convinced that the college librarian of the future ought to master thoroughly one field of knowledge; it will depend on the individual case, whether or not he should take a Ph.D. degree in that subject. This full scholarly preparation, combined with proper professional training, would assure the college librarian a strong position among his teaching colleagues on the faculty; they would have the feeling that any day he could join them in the classroom instead of interpreting the book collection of the library to the college community. There is also food for thought in the criticism which Lyle reports, that chief librarians often lack the vision and ability to play an active part in the formulation of college policy.

Lyle offers some pertinent suggestions regarding personal contacts with students: "The successful librarian is at the service of each student who needs help in his studies, guidance in outside reading, or advice on personal problems. . . . The quality of sympathy is the least dispensable." This point deserves stressing, since Barzun in his thought-provoking book complains "that a love of administration together with something like a defensive attitude, has conspired to make the librarian's relation to students rather less satisfactory than it could be. Librarians doubtless develop through their training a passionate love of books. But need it be so possessive?" Certainly, most of us will agree that a college librarian who spends his time thinking about new rules and regulations, instead of planning for making books more freely accessible, has missed his calling. We do not need red tape!
Many other points that Lyle raises would also deserve comment. Space does not permit discussing here, however, various questions that have vexed many a college librarian, be it the desirable size of the open-stack book collection, the usefulness of browsing rooms, or the educational value of departmental libraries. Suffice it to say that the forward-looking college librarian will do well to buy not only a copy of Lyle's book for the library but to add another to his private collection. It is one of those fairly rare volumes of our professional literature that warrants re-reading.—Felix E. Hirsch, librarian, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.

The Eleventh Catalogers’ Yearbook


This, the eleventh number of the Catalogers’ and Classifiers’ Yearbook, represents a resumption of the series (the tenth number appeared in 1941) after the plans for a quarterly journal were at least temporarily abandoned. Sponsored, as in the past, by the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the A.L.A. and under the general editorship of a special committee of which Margaret Oldfather, of Ohio State University, is chairman, the volume closely follows the pattern and format of its predecessors.

The first six contributions to the symposium were presented originally at the Milwaukee Conference in 1942. That their publication has been so long delayed seems not in the least to have diminished their usefulness—a virtue which may be either attributed to the timelessness of their contents or to the eternal repetitiousness of library literature, depending upon one's point of view. To these have been added two special papers by Robert B. Downs and Herman H. Henkle and the text of the report made at the close of 1943 by the Library of Congress to the General Education Board concerning the status of the cooperative cataloging project. The compilation concludes with a listing of the officers and committees of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, and the entire work is dedicated to the memory of J. C. M. Hanson. Truly a modest libation for one whose career was so distinguished.

As one might expect, the implications of the new A.L.A. catalog code loom large in the several papers, for it was during the period covered by these essays that the A.L.A. Catalog Code Revision Committee brought to completion its preliminary work. But if one were to point out a common denominator for all the papers which comprise this collection, it would be a recognition of the growing awareness among catalogers that they are on the defensive against charges of steeply mounting cataloging costs. That these accusations are not without foundation is evident from the seriousness with which all the writers regard them and the impressive array of statistical evidence that is beginning to accumulate from cost analysis investigations in various types of institutions. It is too easy to dismiss the seriousness of the growing financial burden involved in the maintenance and expansion of our swelling card catalogs as being merely an inevitable by-product of the increasing size and complexity of libraries themselves. The problem is much more than a mere exercise in the projection of a parabolic curve; it strikes at the very raison d’etre of the dictionary catalog and asks frankly and bluntly whether the instrument really justifies the tremendous expense involved.

Julia Pettee, in the opening paper of the collection, hastens to defend the “authorship principle” elaborately set forth in the new code as being in reality a long-term economy and denies that the code should be made a “scapegoat” for “all the costs that new modern demands make upon our catalogs” (p. 19). Grace P. Fuller is equally staunch in her support of economies made possible by the present methods of establishing corporate entry; and a similar point of view is maintained by Clara Beetle when she writes of personal authors and anonymous classics in the Library of Congress catalog.

That the card catalog is a focal point in library operation is implicit in the trilogy on
cataloging for the college library. Frances L. Yocum, after examining her survey of ten college libraries, urges greater care in developing and expanding the resources of the catalog and more attention to its interpretation on the part of both library staff and faculty. She would be among the first to argue for the values inherent in this increasingly expensive index of the library's resources. In an effort to determine how far simplified cataloging practices could contribute to the current demand for decreasing the cost of cataloging, Evelyn Hensel surveyed twenty college libraries. She concludes, however, that there has been "too much attention to the problem of simplification of the details on catalog cards without having determined what simplification is desirable" (p. 50). Finally Winifred A. Johnson reverts to the age-old cry of the cataloger that "economies" in cataloging do not always result in economies elsewhere in the library system.

The papers contributed to the Yearbook terminate with Robert B. Downs's cursory examination of the perplexing problems of library statistics, duplicate copies, pamphlets, and rare books, and Herman H. Henkle's report on the Library of Congress conference on cataloging held in Washington from Oct. 18 to Nov. 19, 1943. At these meetings there apparently was much agitation for a simplification of cataloging processes that would result in a material reduction of costs, but little seems to have been accomplished except a general expression of faith in pooling resources and intensifying cooperation.

One perhaps can best summarize the cumulative impression of the symposium under review by saying that it is professionally wholesome to see catalogers and library administrators alike alarmed by the increasing costs of the catalog, which are certain to increase if present-day procedure and methods are maintained in the face of the growth and increasing complexity of book stocks. It is heartening to see this new awareness because the recognition of any problem is an essential preliminary step to its solution. But these essays also testify to the degree to which the thinking of catalogers is still too strongly molded by tradition to admit of effective action in dealing with rising catalog costs. The real problem of the catalog is not one of costs but of values, and until we can view the catalog, especially the subject catalog, objectively and in its proper relation to the other bibliographical resources of the library and can say with certainty that it can accomplish with greater efficiency than any other bibliographical instrument the task which it purports to perform, then and then only can its mounting costs be justified. This is a problem which is certainly not impossible of solution, but it cannot be solved by conferences and armchair speculation. It is one that can be met adequately only through the united effort of practicing catalogers and the library schools; for only by research and experimentation, based on a sincere attempt to examine all the factors involved, can the true answer be found. One scarcely needs labor the point that if libraries continue to grow as they have in the past the dictionary catalog in its present form cannot long survive; and if a more effective substitute is not developed catalogers will soon discover that the house of cards which they have so pains-takingly built will come fluttering down about their ears.—Jesse Hauk Shera, chief, Preparations Department, University of Chicago Library.

Liberal Education in America


College librarians looking for a simple answer to all problems confronting teachers will not find it in any of these studies. There is no blueprint for the good life. Each of the books is pregnant with the complexities of our present-day culture. Recognition of these complexities should stimulate rather than frighten, should encourage rather than depress. The greatest ultimate strength of
a democracy might be that none of its members fits perfectly into a single rigid system, yet each man has the potentiality, latent at times, to make his own contribution.

Mr. Barzun's book is many things: thoughtful, articulate, witty, and extraordinarily readable. He turns from the "phantasmagoria of education" to concentrate upon teaching and particularly upon teaching as it is now practiced in American colleges. It is not a lost art, he says, but the regard for it is a lost tradition.

You can teach subject matter. You cannot teach democracy or citizenship. This does not mean that these virtues and benefits are not connected with good teaching. "They come, not from a course, but from a teacher; not from a curriculum, but from a human soul."

After discussing the benefits and faults apparent in various current teaching practices—the classroom lecture, the discussion group, and the tutorial session—Mr. Barzun examines each major subject as it is now generally offered on American campuses. The book makes no claim to surveying American education as a whole. It is concerned primarily with the author's personal experience. But Mr. Barzun's experience is extensive, his awareness impressive. He asks that science leave its ivory lab and states that the sciences are humanities and should be introduced into the curriculum as such. The classics, philosophy, and science are not only overlapping but complementary disciplines.

There are two excellent chapters on writing and reading. He is continuously critical of jargon and suggests that the writer should know his own meaning and then present it as forcibly as possible. As for the classics, he suggests that they be read before they are talked about and finds that "they are worth studying as examples of how to think, not of what to think."

Other chapters discuss certain failings of college administrators, the dehumanizing effects of the Ph.D. requirements, the education of women, adult education, Columbia College, grading systems, and "the human boy."

Mr. Barzun modestly offers this book as a discussion of teaching, but his conception of teaching covers a wide range of responsibilities. The book gives us an insight into twentieth-century American culture. According to it, an overemphasis on fact stands out as one of our difficulties. This characteristic comes close to the root of the cultural problem. The inherent weakness of all modern literacy is that it is half-baked and arrogant. "It trifles solemnly with the externals of things, neglecting even the surfaces or the handles by which a truth may be seized: it goes like a child for the false glint or striking triviality of detail."

In a chapter titled "Too Little Money," Mr. Barzun examines the nature of bequests and the strings so frequently attached to them. Bequests should be invested in men, not in things or projects. It is this concentration on man, the individual, that runs through the entire volume like a leitmotiv. It offers the testament of a teacher truly conscious of his responsibility, of intelligent democratic man's awareness of the potential value of the young. There are latent potentialities for good in men, and the teacher worthy of his trust helps the student to recognize these potentialities and encourages him to continue making use of them in all his later life.

After reading this book it is difficult not to agree with Mr. Barzun when he states that teaching in America is a twenty-four hour job, twelve months in the year, sabbatical leaves being provided so the teacher can have his coronary thrombosis off the campus.

Cooper's Report

Better Colleges—Better Teachers is a study made by the Committee on Preparation of High School Teachers in Liberal Arts Colleges of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools under the direction of Russell M. Cooper. The purpose of the study was to examine the curricula, instructional methods, and personnel programs of the colleges in this group and then to recommend improvements. The committee studied the types of preparation afforded prospective teachers in twenty-eight representative member colleges. The report summarizes its findings. It sets forth "what individual colleges have done, how results have been achieved and especially the direction in which they are moving." As the chairman, H. M. Gage, states, there is no
finality about the report. It is a description of an on-going movement. The report is more than an analysis of teacher preparation. In a broader sense it is a study of general college educational practices. It concerns itself with all aspects of the student's college life: the subject matter of his courses, student-teacher experiences, extracurricular opportunities, and the nature of the guidance available to the student.

Methods of attacking these important problems are as numerous as the twenty-eight colleges involved. The committee made no effort to impose regulations from above. It served more as a clearinghouse for ideas, and stood ready with suggestions and help when needed. It confined its main efforts to encouraging an interested examination of present practices and in stimulating a desire for improvement in the minds of students, faculty, and administrators. Its greatest contribution may be that it drew so many different colleges together for a free discussion of educational mores.

It is impossible, in a review, to describe the various activities of twenty-eight colleges in their attempts to bring added life and meaning to the student's college experience. Certain general statements are possible. The investigation shows clearly that most teachers and administrators attending the intercollegiate conferences felt that personality and general educational deficiencies are responsible for more teaching failures than are scholarship deficiencies. It shows, too, a trend toward divisional groupings of the curriculum and a general movement away from strict departmental lines.

This voluntary examination of their educational procedures by the cooperating colleges stimulated investigations along many lines. Grading systems were analyzed, college personnel programs reorganized, professional work in teacher education reviewed, and extracurricular activities discussed and revalued. Instructional problems, frequently attacked with less zeal than that granted the curriculum, were re-examined. Students, faculty, and graduates were given the opportunity to offer criticisms and suggestions. The methods adopted to investigate these problems varied, but the majority of the colleges were pleased with the results. The information gathered by these colleges is now analyzed and available to any interested group.

The philosophy behind the committee's work makes it clear that the new procedures in prospect are not to be allowed to fall into a rigid pattern resisting change. The investigation is intended to be a continuing effort. The following statement suggests that changes will be made as they are needed:

It is not enough to say that "education" is the hope of civilization. The problem is: what kind of education? Surely it must be an experience specifically dedicated to the values of an emerging democratic society with a program clearly and effectively contributing to those ends.

Millett's Study

Mr. Millett's study is based upon the assumption "that liberal education is being or may be reborn wherever the humanities . . . are restored to the primary position in the college curriculum." The book resulted from an investigation suggested by David H. Stevens, director of the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation. It was Mr. Millett's purpose to examine a number of colleges and universities where experimentation in the humanities was in process. The author visited six colleges and ten universities throughout the country and talked with administrators and faculty members at all of these institutions. The book is divided into five chapters. The first traces the decline of the humanities in the American college curriculum. Chapters two through four are concerned with experimental programs and courses now in operation, new instructional techniques, and the personnel presently responsible for teaching the humanities. The final chapter discusses the future of the humanities and offers recommendations looking toward their vigorous rebirth.

Professor Millett expresses the belief that the humanities must regain a primary place in the curriculum. Before this is possible those responsible for teaching them must clarify objectives. He realizes the complexity and the obscurity of the problem but insists that there is one element common to the humanities—their concern with human values. There are values peculiar to the sciences and values common to the sciences and the humanities, but he states that "it is possible
and necessary to contend that the disciplines represent a scale of values, and that the humanities are unequivocally at the top of that scale." The humanities rank as the highest discipline because they are concerned not alone with physical or social values but with individual and humane ones. The contemporary loss by the humanities of their primary position in higher education is explained by the dominant scientific and materialistic climate of the modern world, by the competition the humanities face in the multiplication of subject matters and departments, with the resulting obscuration of the objectives of liberal education and the application of inappropriate scientific methods to humanistic material as a defense against scientific competitors.

Professor Millett has harsh words for the present Ph.D. regimen, with its narrow specialization and its unhealthy ability to drain the vitality from prospective teachers. College administrators are criticized for their failure to furnish a far-sighted, vigorous leadership conscious of the functions and purposes of the institutions over which they preside. Liberal arts education should "teach men and women how to make, not better livings, but better lives. It achieves, or attempts to achieve, this objective by developing, not the student's mechanical or technical or even organizational and managerial capacities, but his intellectual, esthetic, and spiritual powers."

All three of these books are well worth reading. Those by Professors Barzun and Millett especially contain pertinent material of interest to librarians. They both discuss administrative problems, the weaknesses and dangers of the present Ph.D. program, the menace of overspecialization, overemphasis on the materialistic element, and the interest in facts, with the consequent loss of interest in human values. These problems, related as they are to both instruction and research, are of direct interest to librarians in all areas of service. Professor Barzun offers a personal reaction to certain library practices, and the North Central Association study discloses an apparent trend toward broad divisional groupings in the curriculum as contrasted to arrangement along strict departmental lines. This movement might very easily bring with it a greater centralization of readers' services.

There is one thing that all of these studies suggest: closer understanding and cooperation among faculty, students, and librarians will become more, rather than less, necessary, if the job to be done is to be done adequately. Certainly the college librarian will need to keep abreast of new developments in educational thought.—John H. Berthel, acting librarian, Columbia College Library, New York City.

Sources on Industrial Hygiene


This is a small but welcome addition to the literature of public health in general and industrial hygiene in particular. Its limitations as to scope and form of entry are freely admitted by the compilers, but the compactness and the general organization of the bibliography make it valuable, both as a handy reference tool and as an introduction to the entire field of industrial hygiene.

The years covered, 1900-43, with a few citations of the more important contributions appearing in the early part of 1944, seem adequate to present a picture of the field of industrial hygiene as we understand the term today. Although the antecedents of this branch of public health go back much farther, the development has been most rapid since the turn of the century and the significance of the modern conception of the term lies almost entirely within the period covered by this volume.

The general utility of the bibliography, from the librarian's standpoint, is enhanced by a fairly complete table of contents and a generous sprinkling of See and See Also references.—Seymour Robb, librarian, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City.
Surplus Books Available from Army and Navy Instructional Programs


Of the 115 questionnaires sent out from A.L.A. Headquarters, returns were received from 75 libraries. Of the number which answered, 31, or almost one-third, replied "no" to the first question asking whether they had or would have books or periodicals to be offered for sale.

Of the remainder, 16 replied to the second question that they had no knowledge of any plans to dispose of surplus library materials when the training courses sponsored by the armed services were liquidated and 10 others said that their stocks had reverted or would revert to the military or naval authorities establishing the projects. Of this last group, two libraries indicated that the books had first been offered to them for their collections but in neither case were they interested. In 15 institutions all or a portion of the books were acquired by the university, and of these, 7 returned surpluses to the armed services, a similar number sold at least a part of theirs through the college bookstore, and in 9 instances the library purchased all or a part of the books.

In answer to question three, concerning the character of the volumes, there was universal agreement that they were almost entirely texts; 22 libraries stated that they were largely in engineering, 11 showed a great proportion of titles used in the study of foreign languages, and the remainder indicated that the books represented a wide variety of texts in history, government, science, geography, and "Western civilization." As one might expect, most of the collections were composed of relatively few titles duplicated in large quantities.

There was general agreement, too, in the belief that by and large these books were unsuitable for libraries, and 13 said so in so many words. However, 16 expressed the opinion that they might contain some titles useful to the small college, 12 thought that possibly the larger universities might find a few of the books serviceable for reserve purposes, 7 believed that public libraries might find them useful, but only 4 considered any of the materials appropriate to the needs of libraries in rural communities. Two librarians suggested selling the books to dealers.

By way of summary it may be concluded that the surplus books remaining after the discontinuance of the army and navy programs have little value for any library and that the disposal of these residual titles offers no opportunity for a coordinated interlibrary program. The relatively low importance of the books, taken in conjunction with the governmental requirement of lot bidding, which compels the purchaser to take all or none, suggests that the best method of handling this problem is for each institution to work it out as best it can with reference to its own particular situation.
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