

tion Science. It is hoped that the others will be equally as impressive. The general objectives are excellent.—Donald E. Thompson, *Wabash College*.

**The Maturity of Librarianship as a Profession.** By Dale Eugene Shaffer. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1968. 166p. \$5. (68-2631).

Although he contends that "the future appears very bright for librarianship," Shaffer paints a dark picture of its status as a profession in this compact almanac of professionalism. "Librarians like to think of their occupation as a profession and do not want it thought of as a job or trade. However, it is still considerably below the requirements set up by the recognized professions of law and medicine." (pp. 131-132)

This dismal conclusion is based on an extended summary and analysis of what many authors have said over many years about the true professional and his role in society. Shaffer measures librarianship against his restatement of the criteria for professional status and finds it wanting. He then offers a sort of catalog of recommended means of salvation from this wretched state. If long, numbered lists of verbal propositions supplemented by even longer lists of professional and educational institutions, associations, and accrediting bodies can win an argument, Shaffer is a winner. He even lists the thirty-nine accredited librarianship schools (as of 1967) and the eighty-three national, state, and local library associations.

However, there is a certain verbal scholasticism to the whole procedure. This is not Shaffer's fault. It is inherent in the question, "Is librarianship a profession?" Reduced to absurdity, the syllogism goes this way:

The only ancient and true professions are law, theology and medicine; librarianship is not law, theology or medicine; therefore, librarianship is not a profession.

Although Shaffer's argument is some 166 pages more complicated than this, it is still circular.

Librarianship should not strive to emulate other occupations, just because they

are called "professions," at the expense of "doing its own thing" (as the current jargon has it). This is not to say that there is no value in Shaffer's carefully worded indictments and his corresponding catalog of remedies. However, their value should be judged according to their potential for making the occupation a better servant of society rather than in meeting the terms of some arbitrary definition derived from the Oath of Hippocrates.

Just as the study of Saint Thomas is excellent discipline for the seminarian; so is the reading of Shaffer an excellent way to introduce the neophyte into the prof . . . er . . . occupation of librarianship. All the materials for his hair shirt are here. Should such standard lamentations as "full membership in the American Library Association is open to anyone having an interest in librarianship" or "no specialized body of theory presently exists which requires communication" (p. 132) fail to evoke appropriate feelings of inferiority, then try the Curse of Eve:

Eighty-five per cent of those in librarianship are females. Consequently, the public views librarianship as a woman's work, in contrast to the recognized professions, which are predominantly male. (p. 133)

(At this point your reviewer prefers to join the ladies in opting out of Shaffer's Company of the Elect.)

Shaffer does not burden his arguments with a plethora of footnotes. Sources of major points and direct quotations only are given. So thoroughly has he reworked and synthesized a very large body of literature that a footnote for every sentence or so would be required to document it completely. Detailed bibliographic access to the literature is readily available elsewhere, notably in Gilda Nimer's recent "Professions and Professionalism: A Bibliographic Overview" in the University of Maryland School of Library and Information Service's *Manpower Research Project Newsletter*, no. 2, July 1966.

Speaking of the Maryland and Manpower Project, Shaffer's work seems to have been completed before the advent of that massive assault on the problems of librarianship as a profession. At any rate, he

makes no reference to such major documents as Mary Lou Bundy's "Professionalism Reconsidered" (*CRL* 29: January 1968, 5-26). Less understandable is his failure to cite sociologist William J. Goode's oft-reprinted deflation of the claims of librarianship to professional status, "The Li-

brarian from Occupation to Profession," *Library Quarterly*, 31: October 1961, 306-318. On the other hand, let's face it, sociology isn't law, medicine, or theology either.—*Perry D. Morrison, University of Oregon.*

■ ■

