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Introduction

Joanne E. Passet

As chair of the Library History Round Table in 1992-93, I had the distinct pleasure of planning two programs for the 1993 annual American Library Association (ALA) meeting, held in New Orleans. One of my first thoughts, in this era of library school closings and mergers, was that we should celebrate the centennial of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science. As a historian of women, I also recognized that we could not honor the spirit of the University of Illinois Library School without recognizing the contributions of the first generation of library women. Although Melvil Dewey initiated professional education for librarians in 1887, a multifaceted circle of his female students and colleagues enabled it to spread throughout the nation. From 1887, these women dominated library education and the placement of both female and male librarians. This circle included such exemplars as Katharine L. Sharp, Margaret Mann, and Harriet Howe. As they shared their vision of the library's role in society with countless students, these women formed an indestructible network that in turn enabled hundreds of library women to achieve success—in terms of their careers and in the system of libraries and services they established.

In 1893, Reverend Frank W. Gunsaulus, president of Chicago's Armour Institute, asked Melvil Dewey to recommend a man to start a library and library school at his institution. Dewey's oft-quoted response—"The best man in America is a woman, and she is in the next room"—referred to none other than Katharine L. Sharp. One of Dewey's disciples, Sharp was dedicated to the profession, her colleagues, and her students. She left an indelible impression on librarianship that exists to this day. Indeed, many shared her vision, but Sharp exemplifies the library spirit inculcated in hundreds of women and men who attended the nation's library schools during this formative era. Their collective influence on the nation's library development stands as her legacy today.

When Sharp opened a library school at Chicago's Armour Institute in 1893, she established the fourth such school in the nation, the first
in the Midwest. She quickly extended the course of study and in 1897 moved it to the University of Illinois. Sharp, who considered the library as second only to the church in its ability to do good, worked to instill high ideals in her students and to develop standards for an emerging profession. Recruiting a staff who shared her vision, Sharp led her colleagues as they nurtured generations of students and socialized them into the profession. Subsequently, these graduates became part of an impenetrable professional and social web that spread throughout the nation.

Several themes recur in the three essays included here. First and foremost, these essays challenge the image of women librarians as passive and subservient. The leaders described here transcended feminine stereotypes as they took books to the people in the North, South, East, and West. Although some historians have depicted early librarians as women who focused on trivial technical details, it is clear that they tolerated the mechanical routine because they regarded it as the means to a more significant end. Second, these authors reexamine the feminine ethic of caring. As exemplified in the lives of these women, readers will find a basis for revaluing and reclaiming their past in this female-intensive profession. Finally, these essays document the power of a pervasive women's network that was generational as well as hierarchical and social. It filled several functions, among them mentoring. As the pioneering female library educators extended their own spheres of influence, they allowed students to glimpse the possibilities beyond their own horizons. Nonetheless, they operated within the limitations of time, place, and gender.

It is useful to approach these essays in a chronological fashion. The phrase "invisible, indestructible network" in Laurel A. Grotzinger's paper, "Invisible, Indestructible Network: Women and the Diffusion of Librarianship at the Turn of the Century," came from a talk given by the late Alice Bryan at the 1992 ALA meeting in San Francisco. Grotzinger provides insight into the contributions of such pioneering librarians and library educators as Katharine L. Sharp, Salome Cutler Fairchild, Margaret Mann, Cornelia Marvin Pierce, Alice Tyler, and Harriet Howe. She rightly acknowledges that these and other early women librarians have remained "faceless and exploited nonentities" in our profession's history, even though it is female-intensive. Using Sharp as an example, Grotzinger describes the informal network that developed among Sharp, her students, colleagues, and employers, concluding that it empowered women both personally and professionally.
In "Southerners in the North and Northerners in the South: The Impact of the Library School of the University of Illinois on Southern Librarianship," James V. Carmichael, Jr., assesses the collective impact of the University of Illinois Library School graduates on one region, the South. Documenting the experience of southern students (often considered "exotic") in a northern school, Carmichael also addresses such themes as the work of northern-born librarians in the South, racial relations, southern economic conditions, deficiencies of library education in the South prior to 1930, and the question of regional professional loyalties versus a national professional standard. Understandably, graduates of northern schools faced significant competition for positions from local women educated at the Carnegie Library School in Atlanta. The Illinois school's network extended into the South and enhanced the credibility of librarianship as a profession as the graduates working there demonstrated their solid academic credentials.

Finally, Mary Niles Maack addresses the continuity of this network in "Women as Visionaries, Mentors, and Agents of Change." After identifying and briefly discussing three main periods in the history of library education (1887-1923, 1924-50, and 1951 to the present), Maack focuses on the role of mentoring in the lives of library school educators, women working in the context of traditionally male universities. She considers the extent to which women have begun to change academia, focusing on librarianship as well as on other traditionally male fields. Recognizing that librarianship is a profession that has developed out of the cooperative efforts of men and women united for a common cause, Maack reminds us that early librarians did not jealously guard their expertise but instead used it to empower the people they served. Although the history of this profession is characterized by cooperation, Maack concludes by reminding us that it is time to reconsider the values inherent in the female model of professionalism.

As all three papers illustrate, Katharine L. Sharp and her heirs successfully blended feminist ideals, rational values, and an ethic of caring. These authors, by exploring the lives of women who crossed regional and gender barriers in their quest for a profession, enable us to reexamine, revalue, and reclaim our profession's past.
Invisible, Indestructible Network
Women and the Diffusion of Librarianship
at the Turn of the Century
Laurel A. Grotzinger

ABSTRACT

The early history of women in libraries ignores their accomplishments and significant impact on the profession despite their numerical dominance of positions in public libraries and the smaller colleges and universities. In actuality, after the initial establishment of the first formal library training class by Melvil Dewey at Columbia College in 1887, women dominated and directed both library education programs and the placement of other women in positions across the country. As they carried the principles of and established the standards for library service, they were served primarily by an indestructible and not-so-invisible national interpersonal and professional network. The network involved a series of hierarchical and social interactions that had their pivotal focus in key women directors of the library schools established from 1890 through 1920. Using the primary example of Katharine Lucinda Sharp, who directed the first midwestern school originally at the Armour Institute in Chicago and then at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the paper illustrates hierarchical, horizontal, social, and communication networks that permeated the turn-of-the-century library world. The strong generational mentoring that produced a significant number of publications as well as practitioners and library instructors is illustrated through brief highlights from the exemplary lives of Mary Salome Cutler Fairchild and Katharine Sharp as well as Margaret Mann, Cornelia Marvin Pierce, Alice Tyler, and Harriet Howe, among others. The paper concludes by emphasizing the strength of the early network and its ability to produce a personal and collective power that enabled these pioneer women librarians to establish a system of libraries and services unique to this century.
A QUESTION OF ACHIEVEMENT

You have brains in your head.
You have feet in your shoes.
You can steer yourself
any direction you choose.
(Seuss, 1990, p. [2])

[An] advantage of the concept of networks lies in emphasizing the content of the links between individuals within the association. In a hierarchical organization the relations between individuals are assumed to be at least partially relations of authority; in social networks they are not. Instead, the number of contacts drawn through any single individual suggests spheres of influence, or pivotal locations in the communication process, without explicitly attributing power or authority. (March & Taquy, 1986, p. 7)

The quotations that head this discussion represent, in a simple way, two perceptions of how to achieve success or what might be considered to be causal factors in accomplishing a professional mission. The intent of the following commentary is to examine, in a necessarily limited fashion, the role of women in librarianship at the turn of the century and, more specifically, to describe the types of informal networks, both hierarchical and social, that were influential in promoting women and assisting them in their contribution to the development—or diffusion—of libraries in the United States.

As much of our literature attests, regardless of Dr. Seuss's compelling argument that intelligence and physical stamina will invariably produce a high standard of achievement, the women of early librarianship have seldom been characterized as "women of accomplishment." This disconcerting failure to perceive women as more than faceless and exploited nonentities in the library community has been attributed to the lack of quality research about women. For example, and echoing earlier studies, Denise Sallee (1992) in her article "Reconceptualizing Women's History: Anne Hadden and the California County Library System" concluded that existing research does not address "the necessity of exploring women's history within the context of their political and social reality and recognizing that these women are agents of their own history" (p. 372). While intelligence and stamina were undoubtedly requisite to women's work, even when they existed, they, in and of themselves, did not provide the mechanism by which women could immediately function as professional librarians. Thus, Dr. Seuss's neat prescription must be laid aside, and the reason for the second introductory quotation becomes more obvious.
When rethinking one's own past research, one particular factor intrudes as a causal mechanism in bringing about effects or results that are far-reaching. Moreover, although not widely described or emphasized in the literature, this occurrence is certainly not unique in history: it is the factor of informal associations (albeit a number of the informal associations evolved into formal ones) and their influence on future actions of the participants. Or, to state it more precisely, there existed numerous implicit and explicit interactions between female—as well as male—librarians that were uniquely instrumental in assuring that the libraries of the country as well as the principles and especially the standards of the profession of librarianship were solidly established. From this perception came the title and theme of this paper, the "invisible, indestructible network." Although this paper will tend to use the extraordinary involvement of Katharine Lucinda Sharp in both libraries and library education and the Illinois State Library School as an exemplary focal point, similar patterns and effects were occurring across the country as the practices of and preparations for librarians gained increasing direction and strength.

**A NETWORK CLASSIFICATION**

A melange of networks existed among these early women, and the next few pages contain selected examples of the differing types. The most obvious and often noted is the typical hierarchical network; this undoubtedly existed from the point that the "profession" first emerged, but it is particularly obvious in the strong and predominant role of the early women library school directors who, almost singlehandedly, obtained employment for the students admitted into the programs and/or the graduates. Second, and sometimes equally important, an ongoing horizontal network crisscrossed the library systems and also the teaching rosters of the schools, summer programs, and Chautauqua sessions. If a graphic representation were made that indicated the movement back and forth from the major program centers established prior to 1920, the lines would ultimately create close to a visually impenetrable web across the continental United States.

Third, there existed a concomitant social interlinking that was impossible to extricate from the professional network. These women were in constant written and verbal communication that sometimes separated but occasionally mixed personal and professional concerns and efforts. They used the telephone and telegraph readily, and if they
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were alive today, the electronic network would be their constant companion. As a result, they carried professional relationships inside the four walls of their homes, often sharing houses, as did, for example, Katharine Sharp and Margaret Mann at Illinois and Minnie Sears and Isadore Mudge in New York. Since they regularly traveled back and forth from their workplace—whether institute, university, or library—to give lectures and advice, they were also frequent visitors in each others' homes. As in the case of the politicians' smoke-filled rooms that often determined the outcomes of elections before the vote was taken, these social interactions invariably produced professional results.

Still another aspect of the network, but one that is not explored in this paper, was the role of the numerous types of associations, clubs, and organizations to which the women belonged. It is not by chance that early records document so thoroughly the number of attendees at the American Library Association conferences or state association functions—these were essential communication hubs, and few skipped by them lightly. In addition, there were literary clubs of all types or professional associations, notably the Chicago Library Club, the Bibliographical Society of America, the American Library Institute, the Association of Collegiate Alumni, the alumni associations of the library schools, and assorted honorary fraternities and societies from Phi Beta Kappa to Kappa Kappa Gamma. Still another aspect of the early networks is manifest in the generational mentoring that is evident in both the publications of the period—publications that established the basis for a considerable portion of today's professional literature—and in the strong influence that these women library leaders brought to bear on their students, friends, and professional colleagues.

**THE EMERGENCE OF WOMEN**

**Dewey and the New York State Library School (NYSLS) Women**

Katharine Sharp was one of the first who realized that networks were essential. As anyone who has read much about Sharp recalls, Sharp was part of the vast Dewey network. Who can forget the story of Sharp’s selection as head of the first midwestern school? It was Dewey's old pastor, Frank Gunsaulus, who asked for Dewey's recommendation for a male director at the Armour Institute library and training class—the first such training class to be opened in the Midwest. That question, in turn, elicited the famous response: “The best man in America is a woman, and she is in the next room” (Dewey, 1922). Perhaps even
Invisible, Indestructible Network

more crucial was his recommendation, four years later, to President Andrew Draper at the University of Illinois, another "old friend" of Dewey's, that led to the offer to transfer the Armour program to the University at Urbana-Champaign—thus firmly placing the school in a formal academic tradition and enhancing the credibility of the educational experience that was offered to the Illinois students—along with a credentialed degree. Earlier, Dewey's carefully designed first program of library economy, the 1887 Columbia College library training class (from 1889 to 1926, the NYLS), was purposely directed to women participants/students. By that action and the subsequent years that found programs dominated by female instructors and students, the foundations were laid for all of the women's networks that formed across the country.

In reviewing that early historical period, no one would deny that Dewey was the "man" behind the early educational movement. At the same time, many have forgotten or never knew that Dewey did far more to initiate than to deliver. Behind—and before long in front of—Dewey, there was a phalanx of women who, in actuality, outlined, expanded, and eventually characterized the nature and components of early library education. It is also important to note that many of the criticisms of these women that suggested they were tied to trivial enterprises and routine mechanisms are unjustified in the larger framework of the development of library education and the profession as a whole. It was "splendid women"—not men—who were responsible for the institutionalization of public libraries and library education; these so-called protégées of Dewey were also the major actors in the play in which he is usually billed as the only significant protagonist. As Miksa (1986) correctly asserted, "It seems obvious that Dewey's most immediate heirs—including especially those most responsible for his school after 1889 when he himself began to lessen his own direct involvement in it and those students who took the example of his school into other library education programs—continued to refine and develop what he had begun" (p. 377). Miksa does not specifically say, as Vann (1961) had said earlier, "that women [emphasis added], in their ready acceptance of formal training, were largely responsible for the continuation of the first formal training program and others which were to be developed afterward" (p. 39). In fact, Miksa suggests that Dewey's presumed influence on the contributions of the "heirs" is really a moot point because both librarianship and libraries were to undergo major changes in the next few decades. However, as he also attests, change, struggle,
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and evolution are essential to professional maturation, and in so saying, he implicitly recognizes the unique expansion and development that did occur during the prototype decades—initiated and directed by those female heirs.

The names of the early women educators (and librarians), those "heirs," may be somewhat familiar to many, but their integral, interactive, personal network is often not recognized for the strength that it brought to their efforts—especially as their own modest writings and unfortunately limited presentations, actions, and activities within major formal organizations give the impression that they had no power or strength as change agents. That, in fact, they made major presentations, were instrumental in policy development, and were effective implementors of numerous memorable actions that defined the profession during this period is also moot—women, as commented earlier, have seldom been so recognized.

**Founding Mothers: Women in Early Library Schools**

Let me return, however, to the specifics of the early library education network—the women's network. The "invisible, indestructible network" that was centered in the early training programs began with the first women in the first class. One of those women was Mary Salome Cutler Fairchild, the power behind the Dewey throne. Holley (1978) states unequivocally that Fairchild was an especially strong influence for "she was the actual Administrator of the Albany school" (p. 89). He cites E. H. Anderson, of New York Public Library (NYPL) fame, as stating that he "was indebted more professionally and personally to Salome Cutler Fairchild than any other librarian or teacher" (p. 90). Further, he argues that her role as an "American library leader" was due to "the influence she [Fairchild] exerted through the students at Albany" (p. 90). As Ruldolf Engelbarts (1981) asserted in *Librarian Authors*, "by 1905 she had trained 346 women and 100 men" (p. 42), and she "did much to set the standards for the emerging profession" (p. 41). This early manifestation of the existence of a hierarchical network dominated by women is equally evident as additional training programs were established. In fact, the early network, whether focused on Dewey as catalyst or Fairchild and her cohorts, Florence Woodworth, Ada Alice Jones, May Seymour, and Edna Sanderson, as the "professors" and processors, *did* produce the second- and even third-generation level of networks.
After the success of the New York State Library School, over a dozen additional schools were established from 1890 through 1919. The results of the early network are outlined in an article by Maack (1986) that discusses the three periods of feminine involvement in library education. The section, “Missionaries and Mentors 1887-1923,” points out that the next three training programs and their leaders were products of the Columbia/Albany experience. Mary Wright Plummer at the Pratt Institute (New York, 1890), Alice Bertha Kroeger at the Drexel Institute (Philadelphia, 1891), and, then, Katharine Lucinda Sharp at the Armour Institute (Chicago, 1893) were key protagonists in the second cycle that encompassed “pivotal locations in the communication process” (March & Taqqu, 1986, p. 7). Records indicate that each of them was selected as a director of a “spin-off” form of library education because of her preparation and experiences in the first formal library training program—and that their programs emulated, to the degree possible given the less-rigorous entrance requirements and the one-year completion period, the Albany model to which they had been exposed.

Maack (1986, p. 407) also illustrates that of the 15 schools established between 1887 and 1919 only two might be solely attributed to male leadership—one at the University of Washington, where, it should be noted, a summer school program had previously been directed by Harriet Howe, and a second at the University of California at Berkeley. Not only, as was noted earlier, did Dewey not actively administer the program with which he was associated, but William Brett’s leadership at Western Reserve was shared with and, to a degree, matched by the contributions of Electra Doren and, earlier, Esther Crawford, who had taught the summer school and who also was associated with the New York experience. In addition, although Everett E. Perry greatly influenced the library school at the Los Angeles Public Library and transferred any surviving elements to the University of Southern California, he did not arrive on the scene until 1911. As early as 1889, Tessa Kelso, city librarian, actually initiated the program with the help of Adelaide Hasse.

The other programs established during this time frame were directly associated with women from their inception: Frances Jenkins Olcott at Pittsburgh (1901), Mary E. Robbins at Simmons (1902), Anne Wallace Howland at the Carnegie Library of Atlanta (1905), Mary E. Hazeltine at the University of Wisconsin (1906), Mary J. Sibley at Syracuse (1906), and Harriet P. Sawyer at the St. Louis Public Library (1914). During these formative years, the last program to be opened was the University...
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of California at Berkeley, which began classes in 1919 with a faculty composed of Sydney Mitchell, Edith Coulter, and Della Sisler. Although Mitchell was “in charge,” the two women were referred to as the “mainstays of his faculty” (Swank, 1970, p. 653).

Berkeley’s strong women faculty completed the multifaceted circle of feminine leaders in library education who formed a second linking tier that placed hundreds of women in libraries. By sheer number alone, these women brought about the diffusion of library services across the United States. Furthermore, these facts about feminine leadership of the early educational programs do not begin to address the contributions of the women instructors who were integral parts of the network as well. From the first year of classes at Columbia, the graduates of the New York school, as well as other well-known librarians from around the country, returned to Albany to lecture and teach—another aspect of the indestructible network since their influence and their recommendations for positions were powerful incentives to acceptance. Among them were such notable women educators as Ethel Bond (Illinois), Anna M. Boyd (Illinois), Estelle Brodman (Columbia), Edith Coulter (NYSLS), Essae Culver (NYSLS), Lucile Fargo (NYSLS), Lucy Fay (NYSLS), Helen Haines, Josie Houchens (Illinois), Margaret Hutchins (Illinois, Columbia), Harriet MacPherson (NYPL), Julia Merrill (Illinois), Isadore Mudge (NYSLS), Effie Power (Pittsburgh), Ernestine Rose (NYSLS), Minnie Sears (Illinois), Della Sisler (Illinois), and Constance Winchell (NYPL)—women from the Midwest, South, and Far West (Trautman, 1954, pp. 69-76). Other graduates of the Albany program involved in the emerging schools included Bessie Macky at Drexel; Mary Letitia Jones at the University of Illinois; Josephine A. Rathbone, who followed Plummer at Pratt; June Donnelley at Simmons, where she served first as instructor and then as the director; Margaret Emerson at Syracuse; and Theresa Hitchler at Simmons, Riverside (California), and the New York Public Library.

COLLEAGUES AND PROTÉGÉES: SHARP'S AMAZING INFLUENCE

A Personal Gatekeeper

Turning more specifically to the interpersonal network that occurred in a second-tier school, the experiences of Katharine Sharp and her students and faculty at Illinois demonstrate a variety of linking roles of the women who were dominating the library training/education
programs and, ipso facto, the libraries themselves. As in all the early
schools, the first classes were small, and the faculty, other than the
director, did not automatically hold a degree from the prototype school
at Albany. At Illinois, as was invariably seen in the schools associated
with some form of “educational institution,” selected courses were given
by subject experts. At Chicago, President Gunsaulus, who taught the
history of books and printing and comparative literature, and Thomas
C. Roney, an English instructor, with Sharp and May Bennett as the
primary library economy instructors, constituted the first year’s staff.
Of course, there were qualified guest lecturers from nearby libraries
as well as specialists from around the country. These individuals often
emerged as other cogs in the placement network that quickly developed
and became, as did the one centered at Albany, a powerful force in
disseminating library principles and practices through the activities of
the graduates of the programs as well as the continuing interaction
between the principals themselves. Two examples are Edith E. Clarke,
also one of the first Columbia students, who, by 1893, was head cataloging
librarian at the Newberry Library, Chicago, and Zella Dixson, assistant
librarian at the University of Chicago. Not only did the Armour students
use the library as a source of information and observation, but as
graduates, they were sought out for employment by John Vance Cheney,
the librarian at Newberry, as well as Clarke herself. Similarly, Zella
Dixson, assistant librarian at the University of Chicago, both lectured
to and then employed the Armour-trained young women.

The student files and the Sharp letterbooks as well as the files of letters
received provide ample evidence of the intense efforts made by (1) Sharp
and Bennett at Armour; (2) Sharp, Mann, and Simpson, especially in
the years at Illinois when Sharp was still director; and (3) Simpson
and Krieg at Illinois as the century progressed. The amount of
documentation is daunting since positions seemed to be abundant, but
matching the right woman to the right combination of library and
position was often not a simple matter—especially given both implicit
and explicit male discrimination for certain positions and libraries. Roy’s
(1985) detailed statistical and descriptive analysis of “the first generation
of graduates from the Illinois Library school” covers the years from
1898-1908. Her paper provides additional supportive information about
the interrelationships. Roy identifies 210 individuals and tracks them
through the manuscript records located in the University of Illinois
archives. In one section, she describes what she calls the “placement”
activities of Sharp—the hierarchical network that often became a social
network as well:
It is not surprising that the 512 letters Sharp wrote to the students under consideration in this study were written in a most terse style. While no correspondence could be found between Sharp and 67 students, on the average each student received two letters from her. Nine students (9%) received 10 or more letters. Sharp received twice as many (1063) letters from these students than she wrote, with an average of five letters per student; 38 (18%) wrote ten or more letters to her. (p. 32)

Roy's figures are not imaginary. Partially reconstructing her analysis, I examined the student files for students whose surnames began with letters A, B, or C who attended the program from 1894 through 1903—some 37 files ranging from a sheet or two of very basic record through the thick compilations that are found in certain files; for example, Mary Eileen Ahern and Mary Josephine Booth. Found in the files are not only the letters from the students and prospective employers to their mentors and/or colleagues, but copies of the responses as well. For example, a young woman by the name of Adaline Maitland Baker received a B.L.S. in 1902. Her professional career lasted until 1944 with experiences at Northwestern, Kansas State, Newberry, the University of Nebraska, the Evanston Public Library, and the University of Missouri at Columbia. She was supported for positions by Sharp, Simpson, and Krieg; both letters and a spate of 3 X 5 cards document that recommendations had been sent to prospective employers during her entire, lengthy career.

Booth, Mann, and Warren

Another alumni file that is even thicker reflects a different type of network involvement. Mary Josephine Booth, who earned the B.L.S. in 1905, became librarian at Eastern Illinois University, then Eastern Illinois Normal, and remained for 41 years. She had little interest in changing her position, but during her four decades of library direction became a major influence in the library service of that institution and had the satisfaction of having a fine new building named after her. Her letters to Sharp, Simpson, and others at Illinois were discipline oriented and focused on library issues; she requested special materials, advice, information, and recommendations for staff. She, in turn, was obviously influential in assisting others in the library network.

Sharp's personal involvement with the library community—one that can also be traced in her protégées and colleagues—is illustrated through a sample of her official letters during a given period. Although the material in the letterbooks from this period is fading due to the inadequacy of the turn-of-the-century duplication process, the indexes
are still clear because they were handwritten on a better base. In the 1884 yearbook, a volume also threatened by paper disintegration, the index includes letters to a large percentage of the well-known librarians of the period. A selected sample of those who were part of the network included names readily acknowledged as contemporary leaders in the profession. Among the men were Clement Andrews, William Warner Bishop, F. M. Crunden, Charles Ammi Cutter, John Cotton Dana, Melvil Dewey, H. L. Elmendorf, Anderson Hopkins, Josephus N. Larned, Herbert Putnam, Ainsworth Rand Spofford, Reuben Gold Thwaites, George Burwell Utley, and George Edwin Wire. The women reflect many then active in the Midwest, e.g., Mary Eileen Ahern, Zella Dixson, and Lodilla Ambrose in Chicago as well as Lutie Stearns in Wisconsin, but also Linda Eastman, Mary Salome Cutler Fairchild, Tessa Kelso, Mary Wright Plummer, and Florence Woodworth from the East and West. A larger portion of the correspondence is directed to the employing agents for libraries across the Midwest—most in the primitive stages of organization, usually public, but also including normal schools, colleges, and special collections. The progress of several of the early students is well documented, especially when those students became instructors in the Illinois school and in the growing number of summer school training programs as well as state library commissions. Within a few years of the Armour Institute's opening 1893 class, the names of Mary Eileen Ahern, Margaret Mann, Alice Tyler, Irene Warren, Cornelia Marvin Pierce, Eleanor Roper, Maude Straight, Minnie Sears, Frances Simpson, Harriet Howe, and Julia Wright Merrill were becoming well known for library activities that ranged from New York to Oregon. The net was not instantaneously scattered nationwide, but had a powerful impact in the immediate area. Margaret Mann, who was hired as a cataloging instructor and cataloger, upon completion of her 1893-94 year of Armour training, wrote in 1902, "I think if you visit libraries in Chicago, you will find in most all of them some student from the Illinois State Library School who will be glad to show you around." Another accomplished, early graduate, Irene Warren, who earned the two-year diploma in 1896, wrote Phineas Windsor many years later and made a number of observations about the Paris Library School but also described Mann's impact:

I cannot speak too highly of the results she is gaining... She has devoted her undivided attention to this [cataloging's] special field. She has accumulated a tremendous fund of information and a technique that should be so recorded that others may benefit by it and she should be so located in the future that she can continue this fine work that has won the recognition of these foreigners. (Warren, 1926)
Laurel A. Grotzinger

Warren was not uniquely perspicacious in her observations, for as history tells us, William Warner Bishop was actively first among many to recognize Mann's leadership in the field and met her at the boat when she returned from Paris in order to assure her appointment at the University of Michigan library school. During the intervening years before her exceptional Paris experience, Mann's contacts with Sharp and others in the network had taken her, after five years of development as a cataloger and instructor under Sharp, to the Carnegie Library and the training program at Pittsburgh as well as the Engineering Societies Library in New York. In some respects, Mann's career is characteristic of the mentoring network that existed among the early librarians. When one researches Mann's career, the dedication to her famous text, *Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books* (Mann, 1930), cannot help but catch one's attention; it reads, "To Catalogers in Memory of K.L.S." A cursory exploration of the early days of the Illinois State Library School reveals that "K.L.S." was Katharine Lucinda Sharp, who was both mentor and beloved friend. That Mann used this dedication over 14 years after Sharp's death indicates the remarkable influence of Sharp on Mann as well as their collegial relationship. Mann's influence on her students was equally strong; a number of future cataloging instructors studied under her at the University of Michigan during the 1930s including Thelma Eaton who taught for several years at the University of Illinois. Although Dr. Eaton had a reputation as a difficult and trying instructor, she, in turn, influenced a number of other students who became involved in history, library education, and bibliographic organization.

Kroeger, Mudge, and Winchell

Such hierarchical interactions were far more common than apparently is known or, at least, acknowledged. The close-knit social as well as professional relationships and ongoing interchanges between the faculty and directors of the early schools brought a number of collaborations that radically affected the diffusion of early library principles. The network that developed in the writing of several key publications became obvious while I was researching another paper about the "first" contributions of women librarians. Early women librarians were instrumental in authoring the works that served as a basis for numerous library school textbooks as well as key practitioner aids. Several of these aids "changed our world"—to paraphrase Robert B. Downs (Downs, 1977).

One of the most valuable resources, both as a guide to the librarian and as a tool within library schools, is a bibliography of reference books.
No matter what method one uses in developing a solid working foundation of resources, the experience usually begins with a bibliography of reference sources. It was Alice Bertha Kroeger, graduate of the Albany school and first director of the Drexel Institute training program, who produced a relatively small publication called *Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books* (Kroeger, 1902). That basic text, which she carried through three editions, began a tradition continued by Isadore Gilbert Mudge, who also graduated from Albany, worked with Katharine Sharp for three years at Illinois, and later became an esteemed instructor at Columbia. The *Guide to Reference Books* became as significant to the profession as Shepard’s *Citations* or Gray’s *Anatomy* are to law and medicine. First Kroeger, then Mudge, and, of course, Constance Winchell, Mudge’s colleague and heir at Columbia, formed a female triad that dominated the reference world. Generations of today’s librarians still refer to the Mudge (who produced the third through the sixth editions—1917, 1923, 1929, 1936) or Winchell (who produced the seventh and eighth—1951, 1967) of *their* education—although men picked up the baton to produce the ninth and tenth editions (Sheehy, 1976, 1986) and the supplement to the tenth edition (Balay, 1992). However, as Sheehy (1986) states in the “Preface” to the tenth edition, the work builds firmly on the preceding editions and aims to continue the traditions thereof. Indeed, many of the introductory notes, as well as annotations for certain older materials, are little changed from Constance M. Winchell’s last edition, while some of the annotations still bear the stamp of Isadore Mudge. Although there has been less and less emphasis in recent years on the *Guide’s* early function as a study aid for library school students and greater stress on its use by the practicing librarian and research worker, the criterion of usefulness that governed Miss Kroeger’s first edition remains salient. (p. ix)

**Fairchild, Akers, and MacPherson**

This example of generational mentoring and/or networking is not unique among the uncommon women librarians of the early 20th century. Although there were earlier authors who began the difficult task of describing and codifying rules relating to cataloging and classification, Mary Salome Cutler Fairchild authored a bibliography of cataloging rules (1905) and produced the first “outline” of the modern library movement (1901), which was expanded by Elizabeth Stone in 1977. From Fairchild’s hand came Katharine Sharp who taught cataloging to Margaret Mann. Mann’s classic text, noted earlier, remained a key source for dozens of years after the last, 1943, edition was published. As shown in the study by Donald Lehnus (1974), *Milestones in Cataloging: Famous Catalogers and Their Writings, 1835-1969*, Mann’s work was the most
cited cataloging text of a dozen or more contemporary authors including another 20th-century librarian, Susan Grey Akers, whose text, *Simple Library Cataloging* (Akers, 1927), also stands as a milestone in the library literature. Of equal importance among the third-generation women of this period was Harriet Dorothea MacPherson who is known for her leadership of the library schools at Drexel and Denver and for her texts, including *Some Practical Problems in Cataloging* (MacPherson, 1936). These women demonstrated another aspect of the linkage and interactions that permeated the female world during the early years and extended well into the second half of this century.

**Ahern and Pierce**

As noted earlier, the Illinois State Library School graduated a number of individuals who, in turn, added to the expansion of the invincible network. Although “militant” Mary Eileen Ahern never was employed in a library after her year's preparation at the Armour Institute in 1895-96, she commanded a far more impressive network through the almost single-handed editing of the primary networking journal of the early 20th century, *Public Libraries*. From 1896-1931, she was the force behind the journal, and when she was retired because of eye problems, the journal ceased publication. Her file at Illinois reveals only the tip of her nationwide involvement in library matters, but as Amelia Krieg, assistant director of the school, wrote on occasion of Ahern’s retirement in 1931:

> Ahern has been its [the Illinois State Library School’s] loyal supporter, ever concerned for its welfare and progress, and ever willing and eager to extend a helping hand to its graduates. In the pages of 'Public Libraries' and 'Libraries,' she has provided for faculty and students the needed materials for the teaching and study of library science. . . . [She will be remembered for the] wise counsel she has given to beginners . . . and splendid assistance to faculty in their teaching. (Krieg, 1931)

Ahern’s influence was tremendous. Not only did she publish details about the schools and their training, but she identified positions and people in a variety of settings—and brought the two together. As she wrote in 1901 to Sharp, “I have been trying to find, what seemed to me, the right people to fit the right place where my assistance has been asked” (Ahern, 1901).

Another individual who had access to numerous resources and positions was Cornelia Marvin Pierce who was in the second class in Chicago, obtaining a certificate in 1895. Sharp recognized her potential and immediately recruited her as a reference librarian and instructor. From
that position, she moved to the Scoville Institute in Oak Park but, in a short time, accepted a pivotal position as secretary of an active library network, the Wisconsin Library Commission. In addition, she assumed major responsibility for the state's summer school training program that Sharp had first directed in 1895; Marvin then directed it from 1897 to 1905. Her interactions with Sharp were numerous and disparate. As she wrote in 1902:

I am rather unsettled about an assistant for the summer school—some one who can teach classification, shelf, &c. . . . I want a woman of dignity and cultivation—one who will impress the girls with a feeling of respect for herself—I can't explain—but you know what we need—do you think of anyone? (Marvin, 1902; quoted in Fenster, 1977, pp. 123, 133)

Marvin's key involvement in public library development in Wisconsin was built on the work of Lutie Stearns (who was also a member of the Sharp midwestern network), Frank Hutchins, and Senator James Stout. Her commitment to library expansion was eventually carried to the West Coast. In Oregon, during the first decade of the new century, a young Pratt library school graduate was hard at work in an attempt to develop a public library system similar to that found in Wisconsin and New York. Mary F. Isom was able to entice Cornelia Marvin away from her Wisconsin home to help in her efforts. During this period, Marvin continued her communication with Sharp—often asking for advice and recommendations. As she wrote in December 1905:

Thank you for your very good criticism which came today. I agree on nearly all—how I would like to talk it over. . . . I am very busy and enjoying all the new problems, and though there are some trials and troubles, they are new and are more easily borne than the same old ones. . . . As soon as I get Oregon firmly fixed in library ways, I shall try my hand. . . . at something else. (Marvin, 1905)

Of course, Cornelia Marvin was able to do more than "get Oregon firmly fixed" since the fledgling efforts on behalf of the Oregon commission evolved into a state library by 1913—and Marvin was named as the librarian. Her social and paper network was immense. She worked with the legislature at regional and national levels, with national and state library associations, as well as with a variety of community organizations. In her summary article on Pierce published in the Dictionary of Library Biography, Melissa Brisley Mickey (1978) notes:

The files of the Oregon State Library and the Cornelia Marvin Pierce Papers contain countless copies of her letters to librarians, public officials, and persons in various positions of authority all over the nation encouraging, exhorting, or informing them of situations that demanded their attention. (p. 397)
Sears, Tyler, and Howe

The linking of women to the positions that permitted them to advocate, build, and disseminate information is, indeed, an endless story—even using the Illinois situation as a single model. Among the names mentioned earlier are additional examples of strong library women who began their library careers among the cornfields of central Illinois and fell under the commanding influence of the likes of Margaret Mann, Isadore Mudge, Frances Simpson, and, invariably, for the first few years, Katharine Sharp. Minnie Earl Sears earned her B.L.S. in 1900 and became an assistant cataloger at the University of Illinois Library in 1901. Her file reflects the numerous references that helped to establish her career options at Bryn Mawr, the University of Minnesota, the New York Public Library, and, finally, at the H.W. Wilson Company. As one biographer commented, "Sears was able to influence a large number of younger librarians, and the evidence is that she was an exemplary teacher in every sense of the word" (Whitmore, 1978, p. 468).

Other key graduates were also essential parts of the network, and a recounting of their personal contributions as well as their support of others would take a substantial amount of commentary. Two who need at least more than a single reference were Alice Sarah Tyler, a member of the first class, and Harriet Howe, who earned the B.L.S. in 1902. Tyler's career was quick to catch fire—first through her work with Brett in Cleveland—another strong way station in the network since Sharp had offered extension classes there as early as 1896. But she, too, was attracted by the challenges of a state library commission and took strong charge of statewide library development in Iowa where she remained for 13 years. Her file at Illinois also reflects the continuing contacts that she had with the personnel at the Illinois State Library School and her own strength as a librarian.

Tyler "soon became a leader in library extension work of all sorts. She was an adviser of trustees, a prodder of holders of local and state purse-strings, and a publicizer of libraries and good library service to the citizens of Iowa" (Focke, 1978, p. 522). In 1913, she responded to an even larger challenge and returned to Cleveland as director of the library school at Western Reserve University. Her work there was, once again, a masterpiece of industry and professional perception. Her "spheres of influence" were nationally founded, and when she retired in 1929, she "knew all of the important people in the library world" (Cramer, 1979, p. 50)—a fact reflected in her several association presidencies
Invisible, Indestructible Network

including the Ohio Library Association, the Association of American Library Schools, and the American Library Association.

Finally, a brief mention of one last individual who was enmeshed in the invisible, indestructible network of those early decades. Harriet Emma Howe followed a career path that began with work at the school from which she first received library training. Emulating other graduates, she then became seriously immersed in summer school training classes—in this case on the West Coast at the University of Washington during 1905 and 1906. Additional teaching experience was obtained in Iowa, Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Illinois, but her career reached a unique height between 1931 and 1950 when she directed the new school established at the University of Denver. She was described as a woman especially remembered for her compassion and support of colleagues and students: “She worked closely with them and helped to identify their special aptitudes and to counsel them in appropriate career paths” (Boaz, Eastlick, & Grotzinger, 1978, p. 254). Her lifetime circle of involvement is reflected in an early letter, written from Seattle, to Katharine Sharp:

When I want to ask you anything I can’t go down to the office and find you, but must write to a place about as far as possible from here. . . . I must ask you about the appointments for next year. Have you decided on some one for the loan desk work? If not will you consider my recommendation for Miss McDonnell, the assistant here in the university library? . . . Our school starts out with seventeen students, and one private pupil for me. The librarians from the East will arrive tomorrow afternoon, and we hope to have Mr. Dewey speak in assembly Monday. . . . We seem to be attracting quite a little attention. (Howe, 1905)

THE NETWORK TRIUMPHANT

And so the network continued. In today’s world of instantaneous electronic interactions, the communications of that period may seem ponderous, but they were not ineffective, as is evidenced by the placement success and the elaborate infrastructure that existed in and around the librarians of those times and places. Success did not come as easily as did numerical distribution, and if the Williamson criticism has any validity, then the “success” only added bricks to the barrier called “feminization of the profession” in years to come (Williamson, 1923, passim).

There is little doubt that women dominated the educational environment. There is even less doubt that the not-so-invisible, after all, network existed, that the teaching staff was purposefully inbred, and that
placement was extraordinarily controlled through the women leaders. Williamson (1923) states that "90 to 95 per cent of the graduates are placed initially by school officers" (p. 103); the "officers" were composed of, as just illustrated, an equally high percentage of women. Without belaboring this issue, it must still be emphasized that library development in this nation would simply not have occurred without the saturation by professional women who were there, were trained to do the necessary work, and who, along with other women of this century, fought against a predominately male-structured society in which they were deemed separate and not equal.

Rosalind Rosenberg (1992), in Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century, concluded that the history of women is not "a tidy story of steadily increasing freedom for all, but rather a complex tale in which the very concepts of freedom and progress, commonality and difference, have been the subject of continuing debate" (p. xii). And so it can be said of the early "invisible, indestructible network" of women librarians. That they had freedom is debatable. That they made progress is not. That they shared a common commitment is open to question. That there were differences is not. However, whatever the complexity, the network of library women and their informal alliances became "bridges of power"—the power to instruct, to acquire, to organize, to disseminate, to provide books and information to a democratic society. A 1990 volume entitled Bridges of Power: Women's Multicultural Alliances (Albrecht & Brewer, 1990) defines power as

the process in which people transform themselves personally and collectively (Hartsock 1981). Power, derived from energy and strength in people, requires an openness and vulnerability. It involves linking the personal domain with the public domain to redefine the self as a whole and as vitally connected to others. (pp. 4-5)

This was the power behind the diffusion of librarianship at the turn of the century. These women, through their networks, had the power to and did establish a system of libraries and services as yet unequalled in the 20th-century world.

NOTES

1 The name of the school was listed as the Illinois State Library School on the Illinois State Library School Circular of Information from 1897 until 1909. Beginning with the Circular for 1910-11, it was called the University of Illinois Library School. In 1981, the name was changed to the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science.
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Southerners in the North
and Northerners in the South
The Impact of the Library School of the
University of Illinois on Southern Librarianship

James V. Carmichael, Jr.

ABSTRACT

The Library School of the University of Illinois attracted many native-born southerners during the administration of the school’s longtime dean, Phineas Windsor (1909-40). The influence of these graduates on the southern region was profound, matched only perhaps by that of the South’s only accredited library school at the Carnegie Library of Atlanta and by the New York State Library School at Albany. However, the Atlanta school was exclusively female until after 1930, and at Albany, for many years, southern students were more rare than foreign-born students. This study compares prosopographical graduate data for the three schools based upon published directory information, student files, and/or historical narratives, and describes the spheres of influence of the three schools. At Illinois, southerners gained a broadening experience through racially integrated coeducation. Educational standards at Illinois were quite high, so that graduates of the program, both male and female, gained entrée to more prestigious southern academic posts than their Atlanta counterparts. Through the New York State and the Illinois faculty/alumni networks, they also penetrated areas of the South where Atlanta graduates were rarely employed. Examination of attitudes towards regional conditions between northern and southern graduates of Illinois working in the South indicates that the school exerted some influence in combatting provincialism, and in matters of gender parity in employment, attitudes at Illinois were more frankly slanted towards open discussion of inequalities than at the Atlanta school. The files of some African-American graduates at Illinois indicate that the attitudes of northern faculty were sometimes construed as racist, although the
Illinois program throughout the Windsor years graduated many black students who became leaders in their field.

INTRODUCTION

Graduates of the University of Illinois Library School\(^1\) (ILS) contributed to the development of southern librarianship to a degree that has never been formally recognized. The achievements of individual librarians like Edward G. Holley, an Illinois graduate from Tennessee honored at the 1993 American Library Association (ALA) convention, have been noted in passing, but the collective impact of ILS graduates on the region has never been assessed. Moreover, modern measures of library school prominence, such as the controversial White rating of library education programs, while they assume the efficacy of the triune research-publication-teaching formula in evaluating faculty, fail to account for qualitative factors that shape student experience (H. S. White, 1993). Long before Chicago's Ph.D. program became the benchmark by which other leading schools took their measure, ILS had developed a reputation for quality education among some southern library leaders exceeded perhaps only by the New York State Library School at Albany (NYSLS, 1889-1926, formerly the Columbia College program, 1887-88).

In the South, where after about 1920 there was a decided dissonance between the educational and economic development of the region on one hand and the demand for professional qualifications for librarians on the other, the ILS program supplied individuals equally well versed in the practical and intellectual aspects of library work. ILS conformed to the high educational standards originally conceived by Melvil Dewey in his ambitious curricular plan at Columbia in 1887 (Miksa, 1988). No doubt, a great deal of the credit for the remarkable balance achieved at ILS between rigorous studies and mundane applications of library practice owed a great deal to the shrewdness and vision of Katherine Sharp, founder and director of ILS (1893-1907). After all, it was she who moved the Library Science Department at Armour Institute (1893-97) to the University of Illinois (Carroll, 1970). As Laurel Grotzinger (1992, p. 15) points out, Sharp deserves credit for putting the program on a graduate basis, although it was not until her successor Phineas L. Windsor (1909-40) had assumed leadership that entering students
were required to possess the bachelor’s degree. To be sure, “special” students were sometimes admitted with formal educational credentials that were less than complete—courses assembled from a variety of institutions of higher education in a haphazard fashion, sometimes without the closure provided by a degree—but these cases were relatively rare. It was not unusual, however, for students to have a subject master’s degree by the time they entered ILS.

In the early days of ILS, southern students were exotic creatures, just as they were at NYSLS. ILS did not admit its first southern student until the school had been in operation for five years, and by 1902, only two southerners had entered the program. During the same time period, two Canadians, one Swede, one Norwegian, and one Japanese had already matriculated at ILS. At NYSLS, the poor showing of southerners was even more pronounced—the first southern student, May Payne of Nashville, did not receive her certificate until 1893, and not until 1907 would the second southern student graduate. Students from the South were indeed more scarce than “foreign” students at ILS and NYSLS. At the South’s only library school for whites, the Library School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta (CLA), only 9 students from outside the region matriculated between 1905 and 1930—less than 3% of all enrolled students. Naturally, early library schools catered to a local market: of the 428 professional library positions filled by ILS from 1893 until 1903, for example, 172 (over 40%) represented Illinois positions. Still, the degree of regional diversity at ILS was apparently as great if not greater than that of other programs. Among the 210 graduates of the ILS classes of 1898 to 1908, 27 (13%) came from the Northeast, 5 (2%) were from the South, 4 (1%) were foreign, and 2 (1%) came from the West. Placement of graduates in the underdeveloped southern states also presented a problem: for example, by 1921, Wisconsin had placed only 13 of its 285 graduates in the region (4%), while ILS by 1924 reported only 27 graduates working in the South, and 15 of these positions were in the states of Texas and Tennessee, while Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina were not represented at all (University of Illinois State Library School, 1903, pp. 38, 40; Roy, 1985; Fenster, 1977, p. 388; University of Illinois Library School, 1924).

Part of the reason there were so few southern students abroad in the North—meaning outside the former 11 Confederate states, plus the two states of divided regional loyalties (West Virginia and Kentucky)—lay in the abysmal general economic conditions that prevailed in the South, the apparent lag in the development of all public services, including
libraries, and the impoverished condition of universities and colleges, all of which had been enumerated periodically by Washington since the 1876 Bureau of Education report (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1876, pp. 882-883, 890-892). In 1921, C. C. Williamson echoed the disparagement of the early government report in his recommendation to close CLA, since according to him, public libraries in the region were not sufficiently developed to warrant a library education program comparable to those of the Northeast and Midwest (cited in Vann, 1971, pp. 120-121). The career of Laura Gibbs of Kentucky ('02; matriculated 1898), first southern graduate of ILS, certainly bore out this observation; she employed her newly acquired skills in the prestigious northern academic institutions of Radcliffe, Brown, and Columbia before she settled into public library work in Boston; she apparently stayed in the North for want of equally challenging work in the South (Gibbs file, ILS).

Many, but not all, of the problems associated with the lag in southern library development could be attributed to racial segregation, which, in theory at least, doubled the expenses of all public services and contradicted the philosophy of "missionary" library service; yet in practice, the more general problem of racism was ignored even by northern liberals following the failure of Reconstruction, and de facto segregation shaped urban politics just as it informed the rhetoric of national political platforms of the day. Clearly, the solution to southern library problems could not be devised without reference to the whole social structure of the region, and it could not be contained in any single-factored formulation of cause and effect (J. Williamson, 1984, pp. 70, 71-73, 85-108, 482-493).

The South was for over a century the central paradigm of "other"—the Cain of national conscience. Southern racial policies demonstrated only the most tangible aspects of this "otherness," around which sprang a self-defensive posture of the uniqueness of the South's class, gender, and folkways. The southern mythological identity encompassed not only the ideals of agrarian life given literary form by a group of Nashville writers in 1930, but it also embraced the sectional thinking that expressed the victimization of the reconstructed South in everything from differential freight rates, to disproportionate shares of foundation and federal funds, to exploitation at the hands of crass Yankee merchants. Some of these complaints were legitimate, and some expressed an acquired taste for rhetorical martyrdom; whatever their basis, they formed the core of an ongoing national dialogue that informed a great
deal of debate in the press, in Congress, and in the professions—including librarianship (Twelve Southerners, 1930; Vance, 1935).

While the pitch and intensity of discussion surrounding southern librarianship rarely achieved the notoriety as that received by, say, the Scopes Trial, the lynching debates of the turn of the century, or the shameless antics of southern politicians “Ma” and “Pa” Ferguson of Texas, Cole Blease of South Carolina, Huey Long of Louisiana, or Gene Talmadge of Georgia, they did occasionally erupt—as in the short-lived Work with Negroes Round Table of ALA in 1922 (during which southerners and northerners apparently huffed off in different directions), and the embarrassing Richmond ALA conference of 1936 during which African-American librarians were painfully absent from key social events because of strict segregation laws. For the most part, however, discussion of the southern problem was sublimated in regional attitudes—openly hostile, like that of Herbert Putnam, who found Atlanta “barbaric” in 1899; or paternalistic, like that of Phineas Windsor, who at ILS was willing to give his southern charges a chance, even if they rarely possessed the tokens of Ivy League membership that would entitle them to “plum” positions in the Northeast (Du Mont, 1986; Work with Negroes, 1922).

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purposes of the present study are heuristic: first, to identify ILS graduates, both southern and nonsouthern, who worked in the South, and to assess the contributions of ILS students to the region; second, to describe individual and collective motivations for choosing work in the South, taking into account working, social, and political conditions prevailing in the region; and, finally, to note differences between the reactions of northern and southern students to these conditions, especially in the years preceding the end of the Second World War. What patterns of employment characterized these individuals, and how did they differ from their contemporaries at the Atlanta school? What was the strength of ILS in the South as compared to the seeming hegemony of CLA? How did the activities and attitudes of ILS graduates differ from the prevailing CLA tradition of professional accommodation to local conditions? Did the policies of the ALA, which were presumably more cordially received in the midwestern states than in the southern states, influence the success of graduates in terms of achieving professional prominence in the South? Did ALA intervention better their
working situation? Most importantly, what weight did regional factors assume in professional deliberations—were they mythical, actual, or a combination of both? The answers to these questions might illumine some aspects of current-day debates surrounding issues of "diversity" and the propriety of social agendas in professional life. The South provides a rich example of "minority" ideology, for its writers, politicians, and people expostulated its "difference" in literary works, political platforms, and conventional southern folkways. Southerners bore the pariah's mantle of dissent in every forum of national life, not least of which was librarianship (Wiegand, 1986; Hobson, 1983). How was the gap bridged between regional professional loyalties and a national professional standard?

SOUTHERN LIBRARY BACKGROUND

The characteristics of "southern" librarianship, particularly as exemplified in the lives and careers of graduates of CLA, have been identified and described, but the events surrounding the reconciliation of southern librarians to a national library agenda bear reiteration. Particularly in the years immediately preceding the Great Depression, the attention of national library leadership had been drawn to the southern states, first by the formation in 1920 of the Southeastern Library Association (SELA); the passage in 1927 of high school library standards by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (hereinafter "Southern Association" and "Southern Association Standards"); the funding of county library demonstration work, first by the Carnegie Corporation in Louisiana in 1925, then by the Julius Rosenwald Fund throughout the South in 1929; and, most significantly, one week before the stock market crash of October 29, 1929, the adoption of a program for southern library development by SELA (Anders, 1958; Holley, 1983b; Certain, 1917; Stone, 1928; Carmichael, 1988, pp. 160-192). The latter program called for a survey of library education in the southern states, since the demand for trained librarians mandated by the new Southern Association Standards had led to a proliferation of hastily assembled and often ill-advised library science programs. SELA's southern agenda also called for supervision of library development through state agencies, all directed to some degree by an ALA Regional Field Agent for the South. The person chosen to fill this appointment, Miss Tommie Dora Barker (1889-1978), was a fitting spokesperson for the southern library establishment, for she had headed CLA since 1915 and was arguably...
the most knowledgeable person in the region about southern library personnel and conditions. During her six-year appointment as Regional Field Agent (1930-36), Barker failed to accomplish the goals for which the position had been created, largely because financial conditions during the Depression prevented the completion of foundation demonstration projects.

Barker's greatest achievement was diplomatic. Since she had a more tolerant attitude than most southern library leaders towards the involvement of the ALA in southern library affairs, she effectively promoted national library initiatives in the region. At the same time, she also served a reciprocal function in championing the southern point of view to ALA officials. She screened unworthy southern proposals before they reached formal consideration by ALA and foundation officials and fostered library development in the region through the help she gave local librarians in myriad informal recommendations, scores of site visits, hundreds of days "in the field," and thousands of letters of advice. (Carmichael [1988] plots Barker's calendar for 1930-36.) These were the escalating dynamics of the southern library situation into which many ILS graduates were drawn just as the Great Depression deepened. These years were hopeful, heartbreaking, ripe for conflict, and full of change.

At least part of this study concerns the reactions of the southern library establishment to outsiders and the reaction of ILS graduates to southern library conditions. A small but influential group of native southerners exerted a very profound effect on southern library politics. Barker naturally exerted her greatest influence through CLA graduates, and, of course, Louis Round Wilson of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, who had been in the thick of ALA politics since at least 1925, had by now become a national figure. Next to these, the most powerful group was led by Mary Utopia Rothrock (NYSLS '14), founder of SELA and librarian of the Lawson McGhee Library in Knoxville. Rothrock was at times unabashed in her open contempt for CLA because of its lax entrance requirements and its influence in southern library affairs. Rothrock and other NYSLS graduates sought professional librarians of "Albany quality" (Rothrock, 1917; quoted in Carmichael, 1992, p. 204). Whether or not there was also a touch of jealousy in Rothrock's occasionally intemperate outbursts, her sentiments were only confirmed by the severe criticisms of CLA in Williamson's famous 1923 critique of library education (C. C. Williamson, 1923).
Barker's efforts to gain credibility for CLA were unstinting. By 1928, she had effected an affiliation with Emory University, had instituted the formal admissions requirement of the bachelor's degree, and had obtained Type II accreditation for the school from the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) of the ALA. CLA was physically removed to the Emory campus in 1930, and when Barker left CLA to assume her field agent duties, ILS graduate Clara Howard replaced her as dean. In 1930, the first male students were also admitted to the Atlanta school through a special scholarship program funded by the Rosenwald Fund. Whether or not these changes represented a fundamental shift in philosophy for CLA, they at least conferred on the Atlanta school a cosmetic similarity to other accredited library education programs in the country.

Barker had obtained accreditation in part by increasing the number of qualified CLA instructors, many of whom she imported from more established northern schools. While these appointments were of sufficient magnitude to convince BEL that the program was sound, few northern appointments lasted longer than a year or two. With one exception, CLA by 1936 had replaced all full-time northern instructors with southern instructors educated in the North or with CLA graduates who possessed the “accredited” CLA degree (Carmichael, 1992, pp. 176-177). However willingly CLA ceded to the need for interregional cooperation, some form of accommodation had to occur between the closely knit Atlanta “old girl” network and the employment networks of other library schools in the North. By the same token, southern students who ventured North for their library education must have accepted broader perimeters for the purposes of professional education and surrendered a degree of insularity in exchange for a less parochial interpretation of librarianship.

The generation of southern librarians who came to professional maturity during the Great Depression were beneficiaries of an emerging regional—as opposed to sectional—consciousness, manifested in the writings of sociologists Howard Odum (1936) and Rupert Vance (1935) of Chapel Hill. While the tenets of regionalism were debated largely in academic circles, they informed government planning and (by default) statewide and national library planning in the Roosevelt years. For these reasons, the decades of the 1920s and 1930s provide very fertile grounds for investigation, not only for the history of southern librarianship, but for the study of “national” character—which only now scholars seem to be rediscovering as “regional,” after all (Lich, 1992).
The identification of Illinois graduates who worked in the South is problematic. Early alumni bulletins were irregular in their placement reports, and ILS surveys are scattered. A 1926 alumni list includes 37 graduates in 10 southern states—with none in Alabama or South Carolina—but does not include longitudinal data (University of Illinois Library School Alumni, 1925-1926). Amelia Krieg apparently surveyed Illinois graduates working in each of the states in 1933 through state alumni leaders, but to date only one of these surveys has surfaced for the southern states (see Davis, 1933). None of these reports cumulates geographic placement data. Short of examining every file for every ILS student, probably the most representative and certainly the most practical list of “first-generation” ILS workers in the South is the first edition of *Who's Who in Library Service* (Williamson & Jewett, 1933, pp. 2-5). Although the editors of this compilation asserted that their work “could not claim to be” comprehensive, and nearly a fifth of the entries for the southern states represented individuals who did not possess at least one full year of library training, it does identify “those library workers who through other types of training or by means of experience alone had reached positions of professional importance” (p. 4). Even so, criteria for inclusion of graduates of library education programs left much to the discretion of program directors who, as in the case of CLA, forwarded the forms to students deemed worthy of inclusion by the directors. Additional problems, such as the cost of the publication and the reluctance and/or failure of some individuals to return their questionnaire forms, effectively eliminated some influential librarians. Among southern entries, the names of Lila Mae Chapman of the Birmingham Public Library and Duncan Burnet of the University of Georgia Library are notably absent; the end result is therefore somewhat impressionistic.

*Who's Who in Library Service* entries for the southern states number 551 or roughly 20% of the 2,876 professional library workers listed in the 1930 U.S. Census (Carmichael, 1988, pp. 132-143). From the directory and the 1930 U.S. Census, a useful sketch of southern librarianship can be drawn: 93.1% of all southern librarians were female, as compared to 91.4% nationally; over 50% of male librarians working in the South had accepted their first southern position in the 1920s; and over half of these men had moved to the South for their first library job. Seventeen percent of all southern head-of-library positions represented by *Who's Who in Library Service* entries were held by males, about twice the number they should have held based on male/female librarian ratios.
in the South. Roughly a quarter of all southern librarians listed in *Who's Who in Library Service* were regional outsiders by birth; and 59% of all southern *Who's Who in Library Service* entrants received their library degree outside the South. Finally, the southern entries are ethnically and religiously homogeneous, with only 6% African-American, 2% foreign, 2% Catholic, and less than 1% Jewish.

Southern entries include 73 individuals who received their last library degree (or courses) at ILS. In two other cases, Illinois graduates had gone on to receive master's degrees from other institutions (Michigan and Columbia, respectively). Two other individuals had taken courses at Columbia after their ILS courses. These individuals were included in the ILS sample to broaden the statistical profile and available documentation on Illinois graduates working in the South. Eleven of the 77 subjects attended ILS irregularly, were admitted as special students because they did not possess an undergraduate degree from an accredited school, had taken only summer school courses, or had been otherwise unable to fulfill the necessary requirements for the completion of their degrees. However, 9 were honor graduates, 28 graduates either had already earned or would eventually earn a master's degree, and 1 eventually received a doctorate in sociology. By CLA standards, ILS students were an educated elite.

One could argue that other individuals should be included in the present discussion of ILS graduates even though they were not working in the South at the time. Jackson Towne, for example, had only just left the South after heading up the library education program and the library of the George Peabody College for Teachers from 1928 to 1932. Still others had been closely associated with ILS even though their library degree came from another school; for example, NYSLS graduate Florence Rising Curtis, director of the Hampton University Library School, 1927-39, received her undergraduate degree from Illinois and had served on the ILS faculty from 1908 to 1920. Where appropriate, mention will be made of individuals such as these from outside the sample, although they are not included in statistical computations (see Appendix A).

For comparative purposes, some reference is also made to the more complete data available for southern library workers of NYSLS and CLA. The NYSLS statistics are based on the *Library School Register, 1887-1926*, which includes the names and employment histories of 1,093 graduates, while the Atlanta statistics are based on class lists, employment records, and student files of the first 322 CLA graduates.
(1906-30) (New York State Library School Register, 1959; Celebration of Education, 1988; Graduate Files, CLA). As the NYSLS and CLA lists are complete for the period covered, strictly speaking, the statistics derived from them are not comparable to the Who’s Who in Library Service ILS sample. Of course, one could limit the study to only CLA and NYSLS graduates included in Who’s Who in Library Service, but what would be gained in statistical elegance would be lost in lack of detail.

There are additional reasons why NYSLS and CLA provide intriguing comparisons. Phineas Windsor, longtime ILS director, was a NYSLS alumnus from the Class of 1899, and the employment network he organized included many influential NYSLS connections. CLA, on the other hand, was the first and for many years the only southern library school for whites, and was until 1930 exclusively female and distinctly southern, both in the composition of faculty and students as well as in its orientation to “southern conditions.” CLA represented a practical model of library education adapted to the economic rigors, the political and ideological strictures, and the social predispositions of the South. More importantly, according to the rank order of schools by number of graduates working in the South and included in the first Who’s Who in Library Service, CLA, ILS, and NYSLS were among the top four schools (see Table 1). The fact that Columbia University ranked second among library schools represented in southern entries of Who’s Who in Library Service after only six years of incorporation no doubt reflects the inclination of coeditor C. C. Williamson, who was also dean of the Columbia Library School, to include students with whom he was familiar, but it also reflects the large size of Columbia classes, the great demand for librarians at the time, and the fact that “Columbia graduates seem to be well received in this part of the country [i.e., the South]” (Ebeling, 1939; see Appendices B and C).

Graduates of northern schools like ILS and NYSLS faced a solid wall of competition from CLA, although library leaders like Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam (1899-1939) and NYSLS graduates Rothrock and Burnet earnestly derided the quality of CLA’s program. After CLA received official ALA endorsement as a Graduate Library School in 1928, with financial security in the form of grants from the Julius Rosenwald Fund and the Carnegie Corporation and the blessing of the Emory University administration, it achieved a measure of academic respectability. There was therefore little that any rival could do to impede the progress of an already impressive showing of Atlanta graduates in
public library positions and private academic positions, particularly in the states of Georgia, North Carolina, Alabama, and South Carolina (see Table 2).

Table 1
Analysis of Entries for Southern States in Who's Who in Library Service (1933): Library Education Program Attended 
(n = 551)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AL</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA, KY</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emory (CLA)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Reserve</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Institution where highest library degree attained or institution last attended. These figures represent a correction of those given in Tommie Dora Barker and Southern Librarianship (Carmichael, 1988, p. 136).

* Represented are programs and training classes at the University of Texas (8), George Washington University (4), George Peabody College for Teachers (3), Amherst College (2), Our Lady of the Lake College (2), University of North Carolina (1), North Carolina College for Women (1), and College of William and Mary (1).

CLA, under the early leadership of Anne Wallace (1905-08) and Delia Foreacre Sneed (principal, 1908-14; principal and director, 1914-15) had made inroads into the primitive library landscape of the benighted but bustling "new" New South. Atlanta graduates were assumed to understand the peculiar southern mores of their native land as no outsider ever could. Also, it would appear that their commitment to their profession was evidently more equivocal than that of students at NYSLS and ILS. The marriage rate of 55% among CLA graduates of 1905 to 1980 (see Table 3) was more than twice as great as NYSLS and was
## Table 2
**Type Library and Level of Position: An Analysis of Entries for the Southern States in Who's Who in Library Service (1933) for Graduates of ILS, NYSLS, and CLA**

* (n = 261)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Library and Level</th>
<th>ILS (n = 73)</th>
<th>NYSLS (n = 29)</th>
<th>CLA (n = 159)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic, all</td>
<td>39 (53.42)</td>
<td>12 (41.37)</td>
<td>65 (40.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>23 (31.51)</td>
<td>5 (17.24)</td>
<td>24 (15.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 (23.38)</td>
<td>7 (24.14)</td>
<td>41 (25.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public, all</td>
<td>14 (18.18)</td>
<td>12 (41.37)</td>
<td>64 (40.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>10 (12.99)</td>
<td>5 (17.24)</td>
<td>14 (8.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (5.19)</td>
<td>7 (24.14)</td>
<td>50 (31.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, all</td>
<td>5 (6.49)</td>
<td>1 (3.45)</td>
<td>11 (6.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Librarian</td>
<td>1 (1.29)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chief</td>
<td>4 (5.19)</td>
<td>1 (3.45)</td>
<td>3 (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7 (4.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital (V.A.)</td>
<td>3 (3.90)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3 (3.90)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13 (8.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Education, all</td>
<td>9 (12.33)</td>
<td>4 (13.79)</td>
<td>2 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Program</td>
<td>2 (2.74)a</td>
<td>2 (6.90)b</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7 (9.09)</td>
<td>2 (6.90)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special positions</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Includes two individuals educated at ILS who headed academic libraries and directed library education programs: Charles Stone (North Carolina College for Women) and Mary Buffum (Texas State College for Women). They are counted here, although their responsibilities were clearly divided. Irene Doyle (Peabody) also served a dual appointment as head of cataloging and as instructor in the Library School at George Peabody College for Teachers; she is counted with faculty.

*b* James McMillen listed himself as head of the Louisiana State University library education program and director of the library, although it is clear from correspondence that Margaret Herdman (ILS '14) actually ran the library education program from 1931-40.

*c* Martha Shover headed the Library Science Department at Montevallo College in Alabama (1931-33).

*d* Tommie Dora Barker served as American Library Association Regional Field Agent for the South (1930-36).

nearly double that of ILS. CLA graduates who married eventually constituted a fluid working force that could be mustered back into service when the demands of childbearing, child rearing, and housekeeping palled. Nearly half of CLA graduates who married returned to work at some later point in their lives. Long-term attrition of the female labor force due to marriage shows some variation among the three
### Table 3

**Comparative Demographic Profile of Sample Workers in the Southern States Who Attended Three Library Schools: ILS, NYSLS, and CLA**

\( (n = 535) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>ILS  ((n = 77^a))</th>
<th>NYSLS  ((n = 136))</th>
<th>CLA  ((n = 322))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9 (11.69)</td>
<td>24 (17.65)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68 (88.31)</td>
<td>112 (82.35)</td>
<td>322 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>8 (10.39)</td>
<td>57 (41.31)</td>
<td>6 (1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>29 (37.66)</td>
<td>46 (33.82)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1 (1.30)</td>
<td>6 (4.41)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>37 (48.05)</td>
<td>27 (19.85)</td>
<td>314 (97.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 (2.60)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No L.S. degree</td>
<td>12 (15.58)</td>
<td>16 (11.76)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>28 (36.36)</td>
<td>24 (17.65)</td>
<td>16 (4.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 (1.30)</td>
<td>10 (7.35)</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage (Female)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married after school</td>
<td>20 (29.41)</td>
<td>31 (27.68)</td>
<td>176 (55.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to work</td>
<td>6 (8.82)</td>
<td>6 (7.40)</td>
<td>83 (25.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave Up Work</td>
<td>14 (20.59)</td>
<td>25 (22.32)</td>
<td>93 (29.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>47 (69.12)</td>
<td>81 (72.32)</td>
<td>144 (45.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, Left Library</td>
<td>1 (1.50)^c</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21 (6.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>1 (1.50)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Graduate Placement Files, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University; *Who's Who in Library Service* (Williamson & Jewett, 1983); Graduate Library School Files, University of Illinois Archives; *New York State Library School Register 1887-1926* (1959).

*Note:* The sample consists of all graduates of ILS working in the South as listed in the sources (above). For NYSLS, the classes of 1888-1927 are represented; for CLA, the sample is inclusive of the classes of 1906-50.

*Includes four individuals who did work at other institutions after their ILS education; Marian Leatherman (A.M. in L.S., Michigan); Clara Howard (M.S., Columbia); Lenoir Dimmitt (Columbia, '28-29); and Lorena Baker (summer school, Columbia).*

*Regional definition of South adapted from *Southern Regions of the United States* (Odum, 1936, p. 286). Other regions conform to current Bureau of the Census definitions, except that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Delaware are included in the Northeast. The Midwest here corresponds to the North Central States on the Census map. F = Foreign.*

*Lois Shortess (1895-1977), state school library supervisor of Louisiana (1929-40), was dismissed due to a shift in the state political power structure. She ran a bookshop from 1940 to 1951 and returned to the Louisiana State Library as head of the Library Extension Department, where she remained until 1968.*
schools, ranging from 20% of ILS graduates to nearly 30% of CLA graduates. The high rate of marriage among CLA graduates signifies the primacy of wedlock in the ethos of the southern lady, prevailing social conventions, and labor policy in most southern municipalities. At any rate, leaving librarianship for marriage rarely precipitated a crisis of professional conscience among CLA graduates (Goldin, 1988; Garrison, 1979, p. 176; Carmichael, 1988, 128n).

DEFICIENCIES OF LIBRARY EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH PRIOR TO 1930

While “southern” library education was admirably suited to the social and political subtleties of the South—among which one would be hard-pressed not to notice the onus of legalized racial segregation—its deficits limited the impact of the school on the region. First, it failed to create a fully mobile and heterogeneous cadre of professionals. The students recruited into the school were a largely homogeneous group of middle-class young ladies of Protestant descent: as mentioned before, in the first quarter century of the school, no men were admitted, and the student body included only eight “northerners” (meaning those born outside the southern region—but even two of these had southern family connections)—six Catholics, one foreigner, and one Jew. On the other hand, southern students of high calibre were recruited in relatively high numbers to NYSLS (almost 20%) and ILS (48%).

More serious was the paucity of academic credentials among CLA graduates as compared to those of other schools, even measured against the somewhat amorphous educational standards of the early part of the century. Lack of coeducation, of course, meant that a finishing school atmosphere prevailed at CLA decades after the “genteel” model of library work had given way to more businesslike paradigms of professionalism elsewhere. ILS, on the other hand, was a more practical version of the NYSLS, established early in its history as a two-year “graduate” program but firmly committed to the ideal of service to the field. ILS was the first library school to award a baccalaureate degree and the second to give the master’s. There were relatively few graduates of CLA who later completed master’s degrees, but ILS included some notable southern students on the honor roll, as well as a fair representation of southerners who completed master’s work. Only one CLA graduate completed a master’s degree at Columbia between 1927 and 1932, as compared to 23 ILS graduates and 33 NYSLS graduates (see Appendix D).14

Third, it is obvious that while CLA had at least some representation in all southern states, there were several areas (Arkansas, Kentucky,
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Louisiana, Texas, and West Virginia) where its influence was minimal (see Table 4). In touting CLA as "southern," Wallace clearly meant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Illinois (n = 128)</th>
<th>NYLS (n = 176)</th>
<th>CLA (n = 792)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3 (2.34)</td>
<td>4 (2.27)</td>
<td>90 (11.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>9 (7.03)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5 (3.91)</td>
<td>12 (6.82)</td>
<td>35 (4.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>18 (14.06)</td>
<td>7 (3.98)</td>
<td>319 (40.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>13 (10.16)</td>
<td>23 (13.07)</td>
<td>19 (2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>14 (10.94)</td>
<td>6 (3.41)</td>
<td>12 (1.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4 (3.12)</td>
<td>2 (1.14)</td>
<td>25 (3.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5 (3.91)</td>
<td>22 (12.50)</td>
<td>109 (13.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2 (1.14)</td>
<td>6 (3.41)</td>
<td>76 (9.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>9 (7.03)</td>
<td>27 (15.34)</td>
<td>37 (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>36 (28.12)</td>
<td>34 (19.32)</td>
<td>17 (2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5 (3.91)</td>
<td>22 (12.50)</td>
<td>49 (6.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>7 (5.47)</td>
<td>14 (7.95)</td>
<td>5 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Graduate Placement Files, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University; Who’s Who in Library Service (Williamson & Jewett, 1933); Graduate Library School Files, University of Illinois Archives; New York State Library School Register 1887-1926 (1959).

Note: Numbers represent all southern positions held by sample graduates throughout their careers (for NYLS, classes of 1888-1927; for CLA, classes of 1906-30). Separate consecutive appointments in the same institution are cumulated and counted as one position. Includes substitute work, part-time work, and work as library “organizers.”

* Whitman Davis, longtime librarian of Mississippi A & M College (1905-18; 1921-28), interrupted his career to organize and administer Camp Shelby library in 1917 as part of the war effort. He then worked as a merchant and insurance agent before returning to Mississippi A & M; his appointment there is considered as a single long-term position. to limit that definition to the states of the “deep” South. As mentioned before, while the number of CLA graduates working in Georgia itself may seem abnormally high (40%), all library schools served their home region first (University of Illinois State Library School, 1903, p. 40). One ILS graduate from Georgia attributed her inability to get a job in her home state to “the strength of the Emory Library School in this section. Practically every prominent librarian is an alumnus of that school and naturally pulls for its graduates” (Spence, 1935). ILS Assistant Director Amelia Krieg admitted that there was “very little
that I can do for southern people, especially in those states where there are library schools” (Krieg, 1935b). Other students were not so charitable to CLA graduates, and one young woman complained of having to turn her library over to an “inexperienced Emory graduate” whose main qualification seemed to be that she was “tall—she can reach the new high shelves that made me resolve to leave Douglas [Georgia] whether I got the job here or not” (Fant, 1935c).

Finally, the limited mobility of Atlanta graduates outside the region meant that they had more limited exposure to alternate professional models of service in other parts of the country. Although nearly 30% of graduates left the South for work in other parts of the country, nearly 60% of these individuals stayed away less than three years, and only 10% lasted 20 years or more (see Table 5). Even after an informal agreement was reached with the New York Public Library (NYPL) in 1909, whereby superior CLA students could gain more extensive experience in NYPL branches among extremely diverse populations, only 3 of the 26 CLA students who worked at NYPL before 1916, or who later took the Senior course of NYPL's library school, made permanent professional attachments in New York. “Northern” NYSLS graduates likewise made the South their professional base for 20 years or more in only about 10% of cases, although an additional 8% stayed in the South for over 10 years. On the other hand, at ILS, nearly 25% of those “northerners” listed as working in the South in Who's Who in Library Service held their southern positions for over 20 years.

**THE ILLINOIS “SOUTHERN” NETWORK**

No doubt the longevity of ILS positions in the South owed something to the fact that the Midwest was not as distinctly “northern” as the Northeast. Of course, in parts of the Midwest and in certain areas of the South, regional identity was somewhat amorphous: parts of Indiana, Ohio, and Oklahoma still claimed southern roots, while southern communities like Fitzgerald, Georgia, were settled entirely by enterprising Yankees in the flush years of the 1890s, driven by dreams of a “new” South (Coulter, 1947, p. 433). Similarly, the southern educational movement at the turn of the century owed its existence to the conscious cooperation of northerners and southerners determined to heal the wounds of war with philanthropy (Tindall, 1967, p. 258; Dabney, 1936, esp. pp. 54-73).
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### Table 5

**Graduate Mobility and Durability: Positions Away from Home Regions for Sample ILS, NYSLS, and CLA Students**

(n = 535)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>ILS</th>
<th>NYSLS</th>
<th>CLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility of Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southerners</td>
<td>(n1 = 77)</td>
<td>(n2 = 136)</td>
<td>(n3 = 322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left South</td>
<td>37 (48.05)</td>
<td>27 (19.85)</td>
<td>314 (97.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>1 (2.70)</td>
<td>7 (25.93)</td>
<td>42 (13.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed Outside</td>
<td>3 (8.11)</td>
<td>5 (18.52)</td>
<td>51 (16.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in South</td>
<td>34 (91.89)</td>
<td>15 (55.55)</td>
<td>221 (70.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsoutherners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left South</td>
<td>40 (53.33)</td>
<td>109 (80.15)</td>
<td>8 (2.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>1 (2.70)</td>
<td>7 (25.93)</td>
<td>42 (13.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in South</td>
<td>20 (50.00)</td>
<td>94 (76.24)</td>
<td>42 (13.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by Outsiders</td>
<td>(n4 = 56)</td>
<td>(n5 = 126)</td>
<td>(n6 = 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 Years</td>
<td>14 (25.00)</td>
<td>63 (50.00)</td>
<td>2 (22.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 Years</td>
<td>20 (35.71)</td>
<td>41 (32.54)</td>
<td>6 (66.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>8 (14.29)</td>
<td>10 (7.94)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Years</td>
<td>14 (25.00)</td>
<td>12 (9.52)</td>
<td>1 (11.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by Southerners</td>
<td>(n7 = 7)</td>
<td>(n8 = 40)</td>
<td>(n9 = 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 Years</td>
<td>3 (42.85)</td>
<td>23 (57.50)</td>
<td>58 (55.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 Years</td>
<td>1 (14.29)</td>
<td>12 (30.00)</td>
<td>19 (18.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>1 (14.29)</td>
<td>2 (5.00)</td>
<td>16 (15.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Years</td>
<td>2 (28.57)</td>
<td>3 (7.50)</td>
<td>11 (10.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Graduate Placement Files, Carnegie Library of Atlanta, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University; *Who's Who in Library Service* (Williamson & Jewett, 1953); Graduate Library School Files, University of Illinois Archives; *New York State Library School Register 1887-1926* (1959).

**Note:** "Duration" here represents the length of single positions. The position tracking takes into account the whole career of the librarian from the time of graduation (or after attendance at library school) until retirement or death.

The longevity of ILS graduates in southern jobs also owed much to the paternal interest of Director Windsor in the southern states, and particularly in Texas. Like Katherine Sharp, he had received his library degree at Dewey's school. Windsor's years as director of the University of Texas Library (1903-09), where he ran a library training class begun by Benjamin Wyche in 1901, later brought rich rewards in terms of a southern network. The network funneled graduates to ILS through referral and word of mouth among the "old boy network" of fellow NYSLS graduates, ILS graduates, and members of the Texas training
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class. Windsor promoted Texan bonhomie with particular relish. When LeNoir Dimmitt wrote Windsor in 1914 to enquire about the ILS program, she remarked, "I have heard much of you from both [of] the girls who used to work under you," and Windsor assured her in turn that she would not be the only Texan in the school. "It goes without saying," he wrote, "that I am particularly glad to have someone from the University of Texas again" (Windsor, 1914a). By 1927, he could assure a Texan student that "I am always especially interested in any of our students who come from Texas, and we generally have a few each year" (Windsor, 1928a). ILS graduates in the South duly recorded for Windsor the number of professors at southern academic institutions who had doctorates from Illinois (Coffin, 1928) or relayed messages of greeting from his friends among the professoriate in Texas and in the nearby southern border states of West Virginia and Arkansas (e.g., Millar, 1927). A Windsor appearance at a Texas Library Association meeting was usually a cause for celebration, and in 1935, Illinois alumni made a magnificent showing when Windsor spoke there. A total of 24 alumni were on hand to greet him, so that one alumna complained, "There were so many to talk to him that a small fry like myself just got left out" (L. Baker, 1935).

Windsor had entrée into parts of the South closed to CLA, because either family demands or uncertainty about living conditions in border states kept CLA graduates firmly entrenched in the Southeast. The particular state strengths of the ILS "southern" field included Texas, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Kentucky—states where NYSLS had already established some representation—but also Mississippi and Florida where CLA influence was minimal. Moreover, since Burnet had a decided dislike for CLA Director Barker, ILS penetrated Georgia, particularly at the university and in the Athens area. From Arkansas, a state in which library services were still primitive in 1935, even by the relatively lax southern standards of the day, ILS attracted the daughter of Helena's (Arkansas) celebrated Sarah Alexander Sanders, founder of the first woman's club library in the state (Wilson, 1938, p. 410; D. Taylor, 1985, p. 325).15

Through early southern graduates and the collective efforts of Windsor and Assistant Directors Frances Simpson (1912-31) and Amelia Krieg (1931-41), ILS created a network that referred still other southerners to the school—if not sooner, then later. Arthur Curry ('21) convinced
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Errett Weir McDiarmid to enter librarianship, but McDiarmid was
drawn to CLA by one of the five Rosenwald Scholarships created to
attract male students to the reincarnated Emory program in 1930. However, he later served for five years (1937-43) as assistant director
of ILS. Curry, a Texan, had been convinced by Adelaide Royall to go
to ILS rather than NYLS because he would have Texan classmates,
people who would, like him, go to work in the libraries of the state—
his future colleagues (Winship, 1966, pp. 16, 29). Similarly, Charles
Stone ('14), in his years at George Peabody College for Teachers (1919-
27), referred several Tennesseans to ILS—among them, Anna Roberts,
who later directed the library of Mississippi State Teachers College
(1926-62). Whitman Davis ('34) convinced Josephine Inge to attend ILS
instead of CLA in 1930 after she had already been accepted by Atlanta
(Davis, 1930a). In fact, Stone derived the rationale for establishment
of the Peabody library science program in the complaints received by
NYLS graduate Mary Utopia Rothrock about the lack of suitably
trained southern talent: “One of our leading librarians told me recently
that Atlanta never supplied them with trained workers and that she
felt sorely the need for a school here for one year training and with
some college education requirements” (Stone, 1921; see also,
Carmichael, 1992, p. 204; Windsor, 1924a). However, no particular
enmity existed between CLA and ILS. Barker wrote a particularly warm
letter of recommendation for Whitman Davis to enter ILS, and
Charlotte Newton enlisted the cooperation of Barker to permit her to
do her summer field work in Atlanta (Barker, 1925, 1927). (Only the
objections of her father, who apparently found the big-city temptations
of Atlanta more threatening than the vicissitudes of the rural Midwest,
prevented her from doing so.) Of course, the ILS network extended
to other faculty and was social as well as professional: Simpson, for
example, told Dorothy Fogarty ('28), who had just accepted a cataloging
job at Hampton Institute, to “Be sure and get in touch with [Florence
Rising Curtis, former ILS faculty member] as soon as you can after
you reach Hampton, and tell her you are from Illinois” (Simpson, 1920).

Naturally, the network was not infallible in its operations, and
mitigating circumstances could sabotage the most promising auspices,
as when four University of Georgia librarians decided to apply to the
master’s program at Michigan instead of ILS because the order
librarian, a Michigan alumnus, was a brother of the well-known
librarian of Duke University, Harvie Branscomb. On the other hand,
even as Georgia lost four librarians to Michigan in 1941, it regained
for a short time at least some of its ILS representation in the person
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of Wayne Yenawine ('34), who was associate director (1941-42) and acting director (1942-46) of the University of Georgia libraries (Fant, 1941b). At the other end of the southern network, both ILS and NYSLS had a southerner on their staff—Texan Lucy Ella Fay at Albany (NYSLS '08), who had vied against CLA's Tommie Dora Barker for a professional position in Alabama in 1910, and Louisianan Josie B. Houchens at ILS (1882-1974) who served the University of Illinois Library bindery and the school for more than 40 years (1907-51), eventually attaining the rank of associate professor and personnel director of the library. After NYSLS was consolidated with the Library School of New York Public Library at Columbia University, Houchens taught summer school there for 13 years. It was not unusual for ILS to assign southern students to work with Houchens in the bindery, where presumably their southern temperaments would blend harmoniously. Both Fay and Houchens could serve as examples of successful adaptation for southern students who felt incapacitated by estrangement (Houchens file, ILS; Rites, 1974; Reagan, 1969, p. 82).

The ILS program gained credibility for librarianship as a profession in the South through the superior academic credentials of its graduates who filled many top southern academic library posts beyond the reach of the more haphazardly educated CLA graduates. While CLA could point to several stars in the academic library field in its first quarter century—the long careers of Emory librarian Margaret Jemison and Auburn librarian Mary E. Martin being among the most exemplary—a quarter of all positions (215 out of 792 positions) were in the immediate Atlanta area, with the balance going to the struggling public libraries of towns like Greensboro (9), Charlotte (15), Durham, North Carolina, and Greenville, South Carolina (13); and smaller colleges like Goodwyn Institute in Memphis, Sweet Briar College, Winthrop College, Limestone College or St. Mary's College in Raleigh; and occasionally in even more challenging positions such as the librarianship of Furman University, which employed four head librarians from CLA in a continuous line of succession from 1907 to 1945. There were some notable records of extension work, as well. The North Carolina Library Commission was organized by Susan Flournoy (CLA, '11), and the commission employed eight CLA graduates between 1923 and 1937. There were other attractive venues available to the CLA graduate, of course: Chapel Hill employed 10 Atlanta graduates before 1940, including Mary Lindsay Thornton (CLA '13), who founded the North Carolina Collection. The Women's College Library at Duke University was headed
by Lillian Baker Griggs (CLA ’15) for nearly 25 years. It was rare, however, for a CLA graduate to be appointed head of a major academic library, even if by northern standards, southern university libraries merited serious consideration only from those with a pioneering spirit (Tucker, 1983, p. 193).

ILS graduates, on the other hand, headed state academic libraries and larger private academic libraries, positions which demanded more rigorous academic credentials. They assumed other library posts in parts of the South where CLA graduates were generally loath to go. The directorship of the University of Texas, of course, went to two other male NYLS graduates after Windsor left, but at other sites, women as well as men graduated from ILS were appointed to head librarian positions at institutions representing a great variety of resources, personnel, and philosophies: Agnes Scott College,18 Arkansas State Teachers College, East Carolina Teachers College (later East Carolina University), George Peabody College for Teachers, Hampton Institute, Hendrix College (Arkansas), Marshall College (West Virginia), University of Mississippi, Mississippi State College, Mississippi State Teachers College, Southwestern University, Tulane University, Tuskegee Institute, and West Virginia State College (see Table 6). Over half the southern positions filled by the ILS sample were academic, and during their careers, subjects in the ILS sample headed up a total of 26 southern academic libraries. In addition, they also headed 9 large public libraries at cities virtually inaccessible to Atlanta graduates, not only in Texas (San Antonio, Houston, La Retama, and Lubbock), but also in West Virginia (Wheeling), Arkansas (Helena and Little Rock), Tennessee (Nashville), Virginia (Richmond), and even Georgia (Savannah). ILS graduates headed the public library commission in Kentucky, directed the only southern statewide WPA library project (Texas), and organized and managed the short-lived Arkansas Free Library Bureau. Fannie Wilcox, who attended ILS briefly in the summer of 1915, served as Texas state librarian for nearly 20 years (1927-46). Three ILS librarians pioneered hospital librarianship in the South; Bertha Wilson, who spent eight years (1931-39) at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Little Rock, received an ALA Exceptional Service Citation of the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries in 1968 (ALA Citation, 1968).

Most significant of all, however, was the service that ILS graduates rendered to library education in the South. ILS graduates founded or strengthened library programs at George Peabody College for Teachers, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the College of William...
TABLE 6
ILS GRADUATES: SELECTED EXAMPLES OF DISTINGUISHED SOUTHERN SERVICE AS IDENTIFIED THROUGH ANALYSIS OF WHO'S WHO IN LIBRARY SERVICE (1933)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Library</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position, Institution (and Place)</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>May Fidelia Boudinot</td>
<td>L.n., John Brown Univ. (AR)</td>
<td>1934-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Ruth B. Campbell</td>
<td>Head, Louisiana Room, LSU</td>
<td>1934-52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Curry</td>
<td>L.n., Sam Houston STC (TX)</td>
<td>1947-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitman Davis</td>
<td>L.n. Univ. of Mississippi</td>
<td>1928-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lenoir Dimmit</td>
<td>Chief, Loan Bureau, U. Texas</td>
<td>1917-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy B. Foote</td>
<td>Head of Cataloging, LSU</td>
<td>1927-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florence B. McGlachlin</td>
<td>L.n., STC Conway, AR</td>
<td>1929-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethel K. Millar</td>
<td>L.n., Hendrix College (AR)</td>
<td>1919-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Glyde Peavy</td>
<td>L.n., Texarkana Jr. College</td>
<td>1931-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nannie H. Rice</td>
<td>L.n., Mississippi State College</td>
<td>1934-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Roberts</td>
<td>L.n., Mississippi STC</td>
<td>1926-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Opal Williams</td>
<td>L.n., East Texas STC</td>
<td>1933-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Thomas P. Ayer</td>
<td>L.n., Richmond, VA, PL</td>
<td>1924-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Harriet Dickson</td>
<td>L.n., Houston, TX, PL</td>
<td>1950-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis K. W. Drury</td>
<td>L.n., Nashville, TN, PL</td>
<td>1931-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Virginia Ebeling</td>
<td>L.n., Wheeling, WV, PL</td>
<td>1951-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Grothaus</td>
<td>L.n., San Antonio, TX, PL</td>
<td>1932-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vera Snook</td>
<td>L.n., Little Rock, AR, PL</td>
<td>1926-48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ola Wyeth</td>
<td>L.n., Savannah, GA, PL</td>
<td>1924-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Edna Bothe</td>
<td>Dir. Field Svc., KY Lib. Comm.</td>
<td>1951-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lena Nocifer</td>
<td>Sec., KY Library Commission</td>
<td>1930-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Sanders</td>
<td>L.n., AR Free Library Bureau</td>
<td>1928-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lois Shortess</td>
<td>L.A State School Library Supvr.</td>
<td>1929-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head, Extension Dept., State L.</td>
<td>1954-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fannie Wilcox</td>
<td>State Librarian, TX</td>
<td>1915-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Mary S. Buffum</td>
<td>Org. &amp; Dir., Texas State WC</td>
<td>1928-46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Margaret E. Herdman</td>
<td>Assoc. Dir. &amp; Prof., LSU</td>
<td>1931-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof., LSU</td>
<td>1941-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clara E. Howard</td>
<td>Dir., Emory Univ.</td>
<td>1930-55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Stone</td>
<td>Org. &amp; Dir., Peabody</td>
<td>1919-27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dir., North Car. W. C.</td>
<td>1927-33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dir., William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>1935-43b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary D. Taylor</td>
<td>Prof., Texas State WC</td>
<td>1929-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dir. &amp; Prof.</td>
<td>1946-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Matella Williams</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof., LSU</td>
<td>1932-61*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Died in service.
a Librarian and Director of Library School.
b Assistant Librarian and Director of Department of Library Science.
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and Mary, Texas State Women's College, Louisiana State University, Emory University, and Atlanta University, and served as instructors at Emory University, the University of Georgia, and the University of Tennessee. At other sites, such as the Western Kentucky State Teachers College and the University of Mississippi, their efforts were unrewarded, although the impulse to improve library service through library education was clearly motivated by the superior instruction they had received at ILS.\(^{19}\) They otherwise unwittingly challenged the assumptions of prevailing practice that had predicated the die and cast of southern library education and southern librarianship. In providing a competing norm of professionalism, they raised the standards by which service to the region was systematized, evaluated, and funded. They left the imprint of the Windsor years at ILS on the South, and through Windsor, connected southern library service with the dual traditions of theory and practice that Katherine Sharp had established.

REGIONAL FACTORS

The files of the graduates of the Library School of the University of Illinois are a rich source of information about the conditions under which many of the graduates worked. Although files for the summer school students and irregular students who did not finish are in some cases nonexistent—files of seven of the Who's Who in Library Service sample are missing—generalizations about the regional sentiments of ILS graduates can be sketched.

Recommendations

Recommendations received by the school reveal qualities that both employers and professors deemed desirable for those who assumed the rigors of library education at ILS. The nature and tone of recommendations varied by whether the candidate was male or female, southern or northern, black or white, and were dispatched with a now almost unthinkable degree of frankness. Summaries of these evaluations were sometimes, although not always, toned down for formal letters of recommendations that were sent from the school under Windsor's signature. Windsor himself tended to equivocate in recommendations, enough so that Mary Eileen Ahern exhorted him to be more frank: "When I am asking for meat, I want definitively fish, fowl or a good red herring. So there!" (Ahern, 1912).\(^{20}\) He left a great deal of the substance of evaluations to the faculty and the final product to the personal flair and editorial skills of Assistant Directors Simpson and Krieg (Grotzinger, 1992, pp. 18-19).
Unlike CLA, where recommendations from references, faculty, and employers alike stressed the importance of breeding, refinement, family, and local connections throughout the mid-1920s, at ILS, personal appearance, intelligence, and leadership were the qualities that raised the most comment. Thus, one young Arkansas woman, who had won the scholarship medal two years in succession at Central College in Conway, was recommended to Windsor in 1928 as a “wonderfully fine cultured, Christian young woman. She is not the giddy, flapper type, but . . . is very quiet, and studious” (S. R. Doyle, 1928). Another Indiana native was routed to ILS for her industriousness, “not [as] a leader but [as] a ‘wheel horse’ so to speak” (E. Allen, 1916). Even students from the deep South were referred to ILS for their intellectual qualities, and references to family usually called upon the scholarly attainments of their relatives. Lucy Foote, for example, who was the first recipient of the Katherine Sharp Fellowship Award, came “from a family that is unusually able,” since she had a brother in the [Louisiana] State Department of Education and another brother was a professor at Louisiana State (Frost, 1932); another recommendation described her as coming “from a family of educators, and she is no exception to the rule” (Stone, 1925). The registrar at Illinois was not as generous in his evaluation of Foote, however, noting that her case was not a strong one since her undergraduate credits had been earned at six different institutions (Tuttle, 1930). Louisiana State University (LSU) librarian James A. McMillen, a graduate of NYSLS and therefore a trusted source of information, praised Foote for being able to handle problems in her daily library work at LSU “with a minimum of direction from me—which to my mind, is one of the greatest abilities to be expected from a departmental chief” (McMillen, 1935). Near the completion of her master’s thesis, a bibliography of Louisiana state documents, Foote confirmed Windsor’s faith in her to such an extent that in a burst of enthusiasm, he scribbled a draft of a letter to her which read, “You deserve a Ph.D., not merely a Master’s” (Windsor, 1935b). (In a final draft, he prudently changed the wording to read, “the work you did on your thesis was easily enough for two theses” [Windsor, 1935c].)

Lack of initiative was quick to be condemned as much as abundance of it was applauded, and in some cases, a lackadaisical attitude was chalked up to either the risky southern temperament or the supposedly abysmal examples that had been set for these students in their home states. ILS Professor Rose Phelps (1928-58) commented on the “delightful personality” of one young woman from Georgia, but attributed her slowness to the fact that she was partially deaf “and somewhat limited
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and provincial in her outlook, but the situation in that library [the University of Georgia] is very bad and no wonder she is uninspired" (Phelps, 1938). She also noted that ILS's resident southern instructor, Josie Houchens, was "an old friend of hers," as if that fact would explain her presence among the ambitious class in which she had been placed. Associate Professor Marie Hostetter (1926-60), simply stated that the young woman was "somewhat lacking in physical vitality... a likeable and pleasant southern girl" (Hostetter, 1932).

It is interesting to note that the adjective "southern" nearly always figured its way into evaluations of southerners, whether the recommendations were favorable or not. The word "southern" carried multiple connotations but served to flag students who might find life unpleasant under an administration with a positive aversion to slow accents, loquaciousness, or the southern lady's profound attention to dress and appearance. Thus, ILS instructor Anne Durand's (1929-31) appraisal of Tennessean Anna Roberts both flattered and damned the young woman: "Very Southern in accent and manner, dresses beautifully and has a most pleasing personality. She is an outstanding student and has excellent judgement. Her greatest drawback is that she is an inveterate talker" (Durand, 1931a).

More often, comments critical of southern female students implied deviance either from the southern female ideal of beauty, social graces, wit, and vivacity or a shortfall in professional commitment, as if beauty and professionalism were incompatible. One young southern woman in the class of 1931 was described by Associate Professor Ethel Bond (1912-49) as a "Nice looking southern girl... She is still active in sorority and other undergraduate activities. Attitude very good, but does not seem to know what library work is!" (Bond, 1931b). If a southern female student possessed neither outstanding intellectual qualities or a surfeit of beauty, she could usually pass muster on durability, for as Burnet said of one Georgia prospect, "She is not pretty but pleasant looking... Not a dashing southern beauty but will wear 1000% better in the end" (Burnet, 1924). Rose Phelps, who had worked in Texas in 1923-24, found one young "attractive" Texan "hard working and ambitious, and I know she is quite able as an administrator. I do not think, however, she is a girl who is entirely devoted to her profession and I should not be at all surprised to hear that she had made a good marriage and retired to private life" (Quotations, 1935). (In this case, the student did not marry and was honored in 1961 as the University of Texas employee with the longest record of service [Senior employe,
n.d.].) One Knoxville native, who in the opinion of one instructor "would no doubt enjoy work in the South much more than in the North," was labeled by Professor Anne Boyd (1918-52) as a "red-haired southern girl" (Boyd & Hill, 1931), even after University of Tennessee librarian Mary E. Baker—an NYSLS graduate who was well acquainted with red-headed Knoxville NYSLS graduates Mary Utopia Rothrock and Helen E. Harris—assured Simpson that she had "a very even disposition notwithstanding her red hair" (M. E. Baker, 1930). On the other hand, standards of beauty sometimes clouded the issue of regional identity. Madeleine Canova, a Texas native whose parents had been born in Lombardy, Italy, had a "strong southern accent" according to Windsor, plus the southern prerequisites of "personality and charm," and the added attraction of executive ability (Windsor, 1931a). As one faculty member described her, she was "a splendid girl—will be successful almost anywhere." Another report, however, depicted her as a "breezy Western type," and in recommending her to prospective employers, the school was more guarded in its comments. Krieg wrote Sydney Mitchell, for example, that "Miss Canova, although born here in the United States, looks very much like a foreigner and is typically vivacious and spontaneous after the manner of the race of her parents (Italian). In my talks with her instructors . . . this matter of appearance and personality have been considered possible difficulties, but since you have seen her and liked her, this would certainly not be a question on your mind" (Krieg, 1932).

To be sure, faculty were sometimes hasty in their appraisals of students, but fortunately, the instructional staff was large enough so that errors in judgment tended to be self-correcting. Thus, Dorothy Spence met instructor Margaret Gramesley's (1923-24) definition of "decidedly Southern. Rather good looking" (Gramesley, 1931). While Spence had struck Hostetter as "one of the least interesting and likeable students," being "selfish, and cold in personality, and . . . determined to reach her objectives at all odds" (Hostetter, 1931), and Bond criticized her mental laziness for asking questions "continually" (Bond, 1931c), Durand generously conceded that her tendency to brusqueness "to the point of seeming rude" was "unintentional" (Durand, 1931b), and Gramesley made an effort to understand the young woman both psychologically and professionally: "[Spence is] abrupt in manner, and often antagonizes people without meaning to do so. She seems to have had to fight for her rights, and in doing so has developed an abrupt manner of speaking. She is honest, square, wants to know the right way to do things. She is the stuff of which pioneers are made, and
might be just the person for a position requiring those characteristics” (Gramesley, 1931). Gramesley’s statement was prophetic: Spence became Georgia WPA field library supervisor (1937-39), and later state library supervisor (1939-42)—positions in which her flintiness and attention to administrative detail were well placed. She apparently obtained these positions without recommendations from the school.

For northeastern and midwestern women, the standard of attractiveness was almost moot, except in the matters of grooming and carriage. Thus, Mary Taylor of Iowa was described by one employer as having an appearance that worked “a little against her—or would be in some positions,” not least of all because she was 43 years old (Brace, 1927a). Pressed by Simpson to explain Taylor’s defects (“just what do you mean by that? Is it physical or lack of taste or neatness, poor carriage or what? . . . A change at her time of life is too serious a matter” [Simpson, 1927]), an employer explained that while Taylor was “neat—or perhaps I should say clean . . . she does not know how to wear clothes:—particularly does not know how to dress her hair and she is plain. In view of her appearance . . . I would not recommend her for work in the circulation dept. of a public library . . . Her carriage is not graceful & adds to a sense of hesitancy on her part” (Brace, 1927b).

Men were not exempt from such close scrutiny, although in the case of men the issues involved were more often moral and behavioral than physical. Thus, while young New Englander Thomas Ayer had behind him a degree from Brown University—a degree that he himself dismissed as a “Master of Profane Literature”—and came to the school with the reputation of possessing “something in him which drew people to him” (Harrison, 1913), Windsor noted that his grades were below average, a failing that he attributed to the lack of an assistantship in the Illinois library and the necessity of doing shelving work, which in Windsor’s estimation was “a lower grade of work than his experience made him capable of” (Windsor, 1914b). While Windsor professed no knowledge of Ayer’s morals, he noted that the young man was “not interested in any form of religious activity” and, further, that Ayer had been “indiscreet at times in expressing too openly his criticisms of persons, places, and conditions” (Windsor, 1915). Southern men were commended for their gentlemanly manners, their sensitive natures, and their seemingly inescapable devotion to their native region. Thus, to Simpson, Arthur Curry was a “Texan, and I may add, a very enthusiastic Texan . . . a young man of a good many talents, writes extremely creditable verse, is interested in social movements and politics to some extent. . . . He
is rather inclined to be dreamy and poetic in his outlook upon life, but he will probably outgrow that" (Simpson, 1922). Whitman Davis of Mississippi came to the school with a recommendation from a professor of bacteriology that praised him for being "an excellent church worker, holding the superintendence of the Methodist Sunday School here at Starkville for a number of years. He is a [C]hristian gentleman. He puts his whole soul into the library work" (Briscoe, 1927). Windsor was indeed impressed with Davis, who came to ILS with over 20 years of service as librarian of Mississippi State College behind him, and who explained his desire to earn a degree as a means of gaining credibility for professional librarianship in his home state. It was Windsor who convinced Davis to stay in Mississippi in the lean days of the Great Depression, and he qualified his general approval somewhat when Davis pressed him for a recommendation for a job outside the South. Windsor noted Davis's "ability, his thoroughness, his gentlemanliness, and his undoubted fitness for taking charge of any educational institution in the South. I said in the South because all of his life and experience have been in the South, and he naturally prefers to stay there" [emphasis added] (Windsor, 1934). Actually, Windsor misunderstood his motives. At the time, Davis was considering an academic library position in Oklahoma only because he needed more money. He stayed in the South, not only because the salary in Oklahoma was insufficient for him to afford out-of-state college tuition for his daughter, but also because the "political situation [in Oklahoma is] even worse than that in Mississippi" (Davis, 1934).

Walter B. Williams, on the other hand, a black New Yorker with an undergraduate degree from an Ivy League school, entered ILS under a shield of paternalistic opprobrium that owed no small amount to stereotypical views of African-Americans. The dean of Tuskegee Institute, where Williams had taught foreign languages, assured ILS that "His whole career here has been entirely that of a gentleman . . . free from the frivolity and the common vices of youth" (W. T. B. Williams, 1930). Faculty at Illinois were similarly impressed, noting that he was "a perfect gentleman in every respect . . . more extensive knowledge of books than the average student" (Boyd, 1931). Instructor Esther Hill noted in her summary comments: "Colored. Neat and gentlemanly. A 'real man' . . . should be doing executive work" (Hill, 1931). Intelligence, manners, and appearance were prized even more highly for African-American students than for whites. Indeed, former faculty member Curtis, then director of the Hampton Institute and arguably the most knowledgeable person about African-American library talent at the time, channeled many black students to ILS. She recommended Eliza Atkins
on her educational credentials alone: she came "of a family of well-known teachers, her father is the President of the Winston-Salem Teachers College, her sister is a member of our class of 1927" (Curtis, 1930). In spite of the fact that Gleason was evaluated by some faculty as "the best in the class," and an "excellent student with executive ability," summary statements pointed out that she was "a little sensitive concerning her race" and was recommended for administrative work in a college or public library "where problem [sic] is not a social welfare one." Atkins, a strikingly beautiful woman in her photographs, was described as a "negress of decidedly Spanish features. Has few of the typical negroid features" with "unusual poise" [emphasis added] (Faculty recommendations, 1935, 1938). Small wonder, then, that she wrote to Krieg a decade after graduation (and seven years after she had been refused a scholarship for master's work because her application was too late) that

It has been called to my attention during the past five years that the School has not always accorded fair treatment to its Negro students. These reports would be discounted by me except that I received similar treatment during my work there. Is this the recognized policy of the School? I feel that I have the right to know this so that I may be aware of the facts in the case when asked by Negro students to recommend to them a library school. (Gleason, 1940)

Krieg was unequivocal in her response:

We were unaware that our Negro students have called their treatment here "unfair." We make an honest attempt to treat all students alike. Possibly there has been some misunderstanding on the part of a past student. If that was so, it certainly was too bad that the student did not discuss the matter with me. If you will explain the cases which have come to your attention, I shall be very glad to look into the matter. (Krieg, 1940c)

Whether or not ILS policy was intentionally discriminatory, statistics for African-American students during the period indicate disturbing trends that may explain to some extent ILS Director Carl White's comment that he was "leary [sic]" about sharing them with Gleason (then head of the Atlanta University Library School) (Gleason, 1942). Of 47 African-American students matriculated or graduated at ILS between 1929 and 1942, 26 were southern, and 28 had graduated; 6 were taking summer school courses, 3 were enrolled in the regular course, and 1 was on probation; 5 more had withdrawn, and 4 had been dropped because of poor grades (Negro Students, n.d.). While ILS was unusual in promoting the education of African-American students to such a large degree, there can be little doubt that instructors and the faculty were not equipped to deal with special academic difficulties and social barriers faced by black students. Moreover, several faculty members were not sensitive to racial slurs, however unintentional. Virginia Lacy Jones, for
example, an ILS graduate of a slightly later period, gave lie to the fact that black students at the University of Illinois were treated with an equal degree of respect as whites, and her famous description of her year at ILS adds poignancy to the comments that she received on her faculty evaluation forms: "Short and round. Quite attractive for a Negro. Neat and conservative in dress. Always immaculate. Cheerful in disposition though serious in demeanor. . . . Has good self-respect; inter-racial relations, very good. . . . Unusually fine for a Negro. . . . We have only had three superior Negro students, in this Library School. Miss Lacy is one of them" (Krieg, 1941a; Jones, 1970).

Yet even white males of impeccable credentials might require explanation if their mannerisms gave rise to speculation; thus, Charles Stone, one of the leading figures of southern library education, carried in his file until 1940 a qualified recommendation that, while it supplied evidence of his superior teaching record at Columbia and Illinois in summer sessions and praised his "easy address, excellent good humor, fund of good stories and general alertness," also mentioned that he had "unfortunately a somewhat effeminate manner. His voice, too is rather high pitched and soft for a man. These facts, however are soon forgotten because his knowledge and real ability secure respect and lend dignity . . . he is loyal and the very soul of honor" (Summary evaluations, n.d.). Thus, standards of behavior, deportment, and appearance were severe, whatever one's racial, ethnic, regional, or sexual identity, even if such judgments did not bear the weight at ILS that they did in the internecine employment network of Atlanta. (For typical Atlanta evaluations, see Carmichael, 1986, p. 390; Carmichael, 1988, pp. 101, 104.)

Southern Conditions

In their letters to ILS faculty, graduates of Illinois left a record of their impressions of some of the southern locales in which they worked. Whereas letters from CLA graduates abroad in the North—particularly those who studied or accepted short-term positions in New York—depict a cohort of southern young ladies at their ease for short periods of time with the advantages of cosmopolitan living at their disposal, those from ILS graduates in the South for the most part detail progress and setbacks in their work and the hardships of their particular situations. CLA students entertained the notion of northern employment as a short-term, "enriching" interlude in their professional progress and
soon grew homesick for the familiar pace and flavor of southern life. Some could not even bear to go away for a short while; Louise McMaster (CLA '06) apologized to CLA Director Julia Rankin (1908-11) for her failure to brave work in the New York Public Library as one of her classmates had: "I wish I had her courage to go so far away from home" (McMaster, 1911). On the other hand, the adventuresome Atlanta girl could find pleasure even in the role of a rancher's wife on the ranges of Montana, where in addition to employing her talents as a volunteer in the library, there were familiar social benefits: "We play Bridge, Five Hundred and entertain just the same as Georgia people!" (McCulloch, 1911). CLA graduates seemed genuinely pleased to respond to the challenges presented by metropolitan librarianship, and especially the influx of foreign populations and the interracial mix of their clientele, even if their sheltered backgrounds sometimes led to feelings of being "a round peg in a square hole" (Sneed, 1915). It is difficult to determine exactly why so many of them returned or remained in the South, whether it was simply because of convenience and family ties, or whether permanent employment outside the region would have constituted for them endorsement of living conditions, political views, and social mores incompatible with their native propensities. CLA's New York program, plus occasional postings in the Cleveland Public Library, provided at least some of these southerners with the opportunity to explore librarianship from a different point of view and exposed them to living conditions distinctly different from that of their racially segregated and largely conservative communities. The fact that one had worked in a big-city system like that in New York or Cleveland enhanced the Atlanta graduate's marketability—at least in her native region (Carmichael, 1986, pp. 391-392).

For "northern" library school students, however—including those from the Midwest—southern work engaged entirely different sensibilities. The relatively primitive conditions in many southern libraries during the first five or six decades of the century would have tested the tolerance and endurance of the most promising graduates, who were presumably apprised of the latest methods of library practices at ILS. Racially segregated library conditions would have presented an affront to others. Moreover, the peculiar irritants of southern work, including nepotism, political chicanery, and the discounted position of public education in many state budgets (not to mention territorial battles between state departments of education and emerging public library commissions),
were thrown into sharp relief by the sweeping federal initiatives of the New Deal. Federal intervention evinced an intense reaction in conservative sectors of the South, where, even in libraries, outside interference was viewed with suspicion (Willingham, 1982).

**Heat as Metaphor**

Primary among the complaints received from northern ILS graduates working in the South concerned the natural climate; but "heat" signified a host of other ills. The frequently expressed desire for a change of employment in a more promising professional environment reflected emotional as well as physical discomfort. For graduates like Mary Osgood ('04) who had been raised in Maine, the "unprogressive element in Tyler [Texas] as in many southern towns, which opposes free schools and all public enterprises" (Osgood, 1906a) was almost as galling as the "summers which last two thirds of the year" (Osgood, 1907), and the overwhelming sense of isolation (Osgood, 1908b); indeed, "it ought to be some recommendation for a northern woman to succeed in a town of such extreme southern sentiment as this" (Osgood, 1908a). As for the missionary aspects of the work, they were "ideal . . . if one is willing to work very hard in a very trying climate" (Osgood, 1906b). Helmer Webb ('27), who accepted the librarianship at Tulane University with the promise of a new building only to discover upon his arrival that it had yet to be constructed, was amused at the false pretenses with which he had been lured to the South (Webb, 1929). Nevertheless, he scoffed at the political situation in the university, which he had been led to believe by a staff member was much worse than in fact it was. Even though the librarian of Princeton, after visiting Tulane's library, advised Windsor that "the prospects there do not seem to me to be very good" (Gerrould, 1931) for a dynamic individual like Webb, he stayed on for five more years, and only "the prospect of another summer here" was enough to make him "at least open minded on the subject" of a new position in the North (Webb, 1932).

There was superb irony in the fact that a northern graduate could complain of the "terrific heat into which I tumbled" (W. B. Williams, 1931), when the summers of Illinois were so infamously hot. As Windsor wrote to Ola Wyeth ('06), librarian of Savannah one July, "We have been having from 90° to 100° of heat here and I suppose we have been suffering from it about as much as you have" (Windsor, 1925a). Louise Fant ('28, '39), a native South Carolinian, jested only in part when she wrote from Athens, Georgia, that "the sun beams down and the
thermometer goes up, but in the house and in the shade my clothes
do not stay wet like they did in Urbana last summer, and we sleep
under cover" (Fant, 1937). Even southerners could be picky, though:
Charlotte Newton ('29) preferred work in the "Southeast," as the
"climate of Florida and Louisiana is enervating, and I would rather
live at a higher altitude" since "most people do their best work in
an environment which is native to them" (Newton, 1934).

Some northern graduates were sick of the harsh winters at home,
however, and the heat of southern summers was an antidote to snow,
slush, and rain. "It is indeed a pleasant thought to be going to a warmer
climate," wrote one graduate, ready to embark on a new job, "for these
last two days [in South Dakota] have been very cold and stormy"
(Donahey, 1930). Canadian Charles Flack ('26) still expressed the desire
to return to the South after only six years as head of the Library Science
Department in Clarion, Pennsylvania (Flack, 1948). Still, even the most
contented northern graduate working in the South was unprepared
for the ferocity of southern heat coupled with humidity, which to one
graduate in Nashville was "bad enough to make one postpone letter
writing until cooler weather" (I. Doyle, 1930b). For those like Irene
Doyle ('30) working in academic institutions, the situation was made
even worse when the normal ceremonial functions like graduation were
conducted out-of-doors in full academic regalia under the blistering
sun, during "one of the hardest and hottest summer sessions we have
ever had": "Our academic gowns were so hot this afternoon at
Commencement" (I. Doyle, 1934). Regardless of the heat, northerners
were sometimes deceived by meteorological myths and were un-
pleasantly surprised by the amount of cold and rain they experienced
in winter. One southerner who spent part of the Depression doing field
work for the WPA warned that "Winter travel down here in Georgia
is cold and disagreeable. Unpaved roads are of that famous, slick, sticky
red Georgia clay!" (Fant, 1934b).

For other northerners, the romantic ideal of the South precluded even
the summer heat. Matella Williams of North Dakota spent most of her
career in Louisiana, where people were "friendly and pleasant," and
where she could finally enjoy "real magnolias . . . they are really
beautiful, but the odor is almost too strong to be shut up with" (M.
Williams, 1930). Lois Shortess of Illinois found she was "enjoying the
South in spite of the warning of all of my friends to the contrary.
The weather was almost unbearably hot the first month I was down
here, but I didn't mind" (Shortess, 1923). A more seasoned Illinois native
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like Ola Wyeth was willing to entertain the doubtful aspect of Windsor's notion that Savannah was probably "not quite so progressive as some northern towns, but I'm not even sure of that" (Windsor, 1924b). Her immediate reaction was negative, and she requested a change of position to anywhere but Tulsa, where the "only" attraction was family. "After all, Savannah is a 'backwater' and not stimulating... somewhat like living abroad—very interesting, but not home" (Wyeth, 1925). While she was at times disgusted at the political complexion and cultural torpor of coastal Georgia, she was held in thrall by the "special paradise" of Tybee Beach for 27 years (Miss Wyeth, 1971).

Southern ILS graduates also experienced problems of adjustment. Bond reported that a Mississippi protégé of Whitman Davis found "northern ways quite different, and has some difficulty adjusting herself" (Bond, 1931a). Most southern students, however, seemed to long for geographic change and the professional challenge it promised. Male southerners like Arthur Curry longed to test their ideas in the northeast where the prospects of larger salaries and more challenging responsibilities were rumored to reside (Curry, 1923). Other Texans like Martha Dickson took rest cures in Michigan to recover from the physical strain of seemingly endless Texas summers and the psychological strain of inactivity in sleepy southern towns: "I do not care into what part of the country I go, so [long] as it is east of the Rockies and not South" (Dickson, 1931). Northerners seemed mesmerized during the 1920s by the tests that southern conditions placed on their powers of tolerance, but many felt frustrated when they found themselves trapped in these jobs as the employment market tightened in the early 1930s. Southerners like Helen Coffin ('28), who ran the La Retama (pop. 50,000) Public Library in 1936 on a $5,000 budget, were inured to difficulties even before the Depression began and were circumspect in their speculations about better times: "If one can last another eight years as hard as the last ones, there may be some sort of satisfactory life for the librarian. The prospect looks interesting but tough" (Coffin, 1944). Yet southerners as well as northerners could well be dissatisfied "due to living in the South and to the severe heat" (Kinney, 1930) and distracted by the same unchanging conditions that drove Coffin to complain that "the dullness of this very isolated small town together with the paralyzing atmosphere of the Cataloging Department is more than I can take" (Coffin, 1948).

The school's office regularly polled graduates on their regional preferences for employment and their desire for a subsequent change, and many provided variations on Marian Leatherman's formula "north
of the Mason and Dixon's line and east of the Mississippi" (Leatherman, 1924). Their comments give some indication that weather was only one of the factors that determined geographic preference. As Helmer Webb commented, "It is a funny world down here. The weather must be the reason" (Webb, 1926-27). Like Atlanta graduates of the same period, home and family were the chief reasons for change of venue. While ILS southern graduates like Louise Fant, whose parents were dependent on her for a livelihood, regarded her mobility as a financial asset (Fant, 1932), for others, like Dorothy Gray ('31), a return to the South struck an emotional chord: "I have never become entirely adjusted to living here in the East—what family I have left is still in the South and I find that I would be much happier if I were a little closer to them" (Gray, 1943a). When Errett McDiarmid (1943) explained to Gray that advanced cataloging positions such as the one she had been holding in Newark, New Jersey, were almost nonexistent in the South outside of the anomalous social setting of Washington, DC, she replied: "Washington would not appeal to me . . . I do mean the deep South when I speak of going back South" (Gray, 1943b). Eleanor Heuver ('31), who spent the depths of the Great Depression as librarian of Arkansas State College, expressed the simple desire to "get back up North again . . . to get closer to my parents who are getting old and who need me," but the scarcity of comparable jobs in the North and the eventual death of her father brought forth a more direct request five years later: "I have been here . . . for eight years, and I don't want to stay in the South always" (Heuver, 1939).

Whatever the reasons ILS graduates professed for changing positions—weather, salary, cultural impoverishment, politics, or religion—their dissatisfaction was symbolic. The "southern condition" was an immutable state of mind that land booms, urban boosterism, northern migration, and southern tourism had not altered. In the correspondence of ILS library graduates, descriptions of southern library conditions cast only dim reflections of "progressive" northern practice. The Depression erased some, but not all, of these distinctions and drew attention for a while to the need for a national plan for libraries. Louise Fant flatly disabused Krieg of any lingering notions she might hold about the protocols of employment at the University of Georgia in 1935: "It isn't necessary to send a southern girl to this southern job. There are northerners in the student body" (Fant, 1935b). Hopeful schemes like the precipitous adoption of Southern Association Standards ignored the possibility that school superintendents might not "have any notion of meeting requirements, and give the jobs to
untrained people every day in place of trained ones," especially when state and local coffers had been depleted by bond sales to meet payrolls. "There has to be a beginning for everything," wrote Mary Taylor from Texas, "but southern libraries are a mess" (M. D. Taylor, 1931).

"Politics" and Support for Southern Libraries

The "climate" of the South also comprised its political character, and politics could be equally irreconcilable with professionalism, whatever the regional origins of the librarian. Native Texan Arthur Curry ('21) was caught in the worst of local retrenchment politics of the Depression at Texas Christian College when the president of that institution reduced salaries of the faculty by 35% over a period of four months. The president then terminated faculty or supplanted them with family members of several key administrators. He released Curry and replaced him with Curry's former assistant, the dean's sister. Curry and other faculty sued the college administration in the courts, only to be advised in the court's favorable finding for the institution—a specious example of southern judicial reasoning—that it would be easier for the individuals concerned to absorb any losses than the university (Curry, 1933a, 1933b; Winship, 1966, pp. 30-32).

Curry's fortunes declined even further after he accepted a supposedly prestigious position as librarian of the Rosenberg Library at Galveston, where a member of Melvil Dewey's first class, Frank Patten, had been espousing antiquated methods of library practice since 1909. Curry's second-in-command, a devotee of Patten's methods, resented Curry's efforts to modernize the library and mobilized considerable board opposition to his ideas. The self-perpetuating board of trustees, which elected lifetime members to an executive board from among the most conservative business elements in Galveston, looked with suspicion upon "the impression" of his "political views." As he explained to Windsor in 1936, the book-buying policy was shamelessly censorious: "We are not allowed to buy any books on socialism, on Russian conditions, on the Townsend plan; and, believe it or not, any books by Secretary Wallace, Ickes, and John Dewey have been canceled from the order-lists sent to the book committee for approval" (Curry, 1936). Florence Rising Curtis, in Texas for a summer training institute for African-American librarians, advised him to find another position, but Curry's growing family and his need for money forced him to stay. The board also canceled Curry's Texas history indexing project which he was conducting with National Youth Administration (NYA) aid: they...
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considered the project "trivial," especially since they objected to the general philosophy of the New Deal. When it was learned that Curry had voted for socialist Norman Thomas in the last presidential election, he was finally and flatly asked to resign. After serving as state field supervisor for the WPA until that program was phased out at the beginning of the Second World War, Curry left librarianship for almost a decade. It was hard to be progressive in the South, even for native southerners.²⁴

To be sure, city and state politics were just as bad, if not worse, in the North and the Midwest. Nepotism was rank at the public library of Muncie, Indiana, in 1919, and graduate Mary Torrance ('13) had to "kowtow" to two staff members who were daughters of a new library board member; the board member criticized Torrance to other staff members behind her back and proved himself to be a "low politician who does not stop at the truth, in fact he does not know what the article is" (Torrance, 1919). Moreover, city government in Muncie didn't inspire confidence: "With our major prosecuting attorney serving time in the federal prison in Atlanta, [and] the sheriff and four prominent lawyers under suspicion just now, we are in a rather deplorable state as to law enforcement" (Torrance, 1920). Oklahoma, a "border" midwestern state, was "thoroughly politicized" according to one ILS graduate (Webb, 1934). On the other hand, for graduates like Illinois native Vera Snook, the challenge of operating a public library in the brazenly demagogic southern political climate was delicious. She confessed to Windsor that she had gained a reputation as a "poor politician" and bragged that she had made every mayor of Little Rock angry. At the same time, she was adamantine in her determination that "an alderman who boasts that he is chairman of the library committee of the [city] council because he has never read a book will not be in a position to recommend or dictate library policies." She also took vast amusement in the foibles and financial finagling of city officials: asked on an information form to list professional activities that she had directed or in which she had participated, Snook replied, "Arkansas politics" (Snook, 1929, 1932a, 1932b, 1942). Few northern graduates expressed Snook's delight in the political chase, however, and several, such as Arthur Curry, discussed above, lost their jobs due to their naïveté.

Library politics encompassed both the flavor of life in the host community and the degree of financial support that governing bodies were willing to invest in libraries. One had to be skillful in adapting
progressive library programs to local norms and to exhibit acceptable levels of conformity. At least three ILS graduates in the South, for example, worked in strictly religious southern schools. From Kentucky's Asbury College, which was by then supposedly an interdenominational campus, although in fact it still clung to Methodist doctrine, Perma Rich finally sent a request for transfer after four years of stifling constraints. The Secretary of the Kentucky State Library Commission, Lena Nocifer, explained to Krieg that it was "rather difficult for anyone to be happy there [at Asbury] because of the religious atmosphere" (Nocifer, 1934). Louise Fant, a southerner, could not be induced to replace Rich because she already knew to what extremes southern religious fervor could be roused and was not interested "in getting mixed up with a bunch of Holiness [sic] people" (Fant, 1934a). At Sue Bennett Junior College in London, Kentucky, Ione Williams grew uneasy when "circumstances" plainly told her that "church policies will soon demand my replacement by a deaconess of the M.[ethodist] E.[piscopal] Church, South, though in all probability, said deaconess will have had no library training at all" (I. Williams, 1933).

Political conditions were hardly improved by the physical conditions of southern libraries. Disasters plagued the southern library landscape, and not only in Mississippi and Louisiana, where floods were endemic: a tornado ripped through Gainesville, Georgia, in 1936, and by 1939, WPA relief work had still not replaced the library. "Somehow," wrote Ethel Donahey, "that library has been violently attached with [sic] hard luck always" (Donahey, 1939). The library at North Carolina College for Women burned on September 15, 1932, and when Eleanor Heuver arrived at Arkansas State College, she found that "the entire library was destroyed by fire a few months before I came" (Heuver, 1933). However, the physical disasters were not always so dramatic. Fant described a high school library in Athens as uncataloged and miserably funded, "a motley collection of tables and tin folding chairs" in a former courthouse presided over by a librarian with a minimum of summer training from the University of Georgia (Fant, 1934b).

Money was always a problem and was nearly nonexistent during the Depression, when the entire annual budget of the University of Mississippi Library was under $6,000 (Pace, 1975, pp. 258-259, 271-272). The librarian and the entire reference and circulation staffs were dismissed from Mississippi State College by Governor Theodore Bilbo, and he appointed ILS graduate Nannie Herndon Rice to fill the post of acting librarian in order to save money, although by that time, her
$1,600 salary was dubious since paychecks had not been issued for 14 months. Even so, Rice claimed Mississippi was in “better condition than some of our neighboring states” (Rice, 1932a, 1932b). On the other hand, “the salary question” was also “a very unhappy one” at the Newark, New Jersey, Public Library (Gray, 1937). The leveling of expectations between northern and southern salaries during the Depression was only one indication of the gradual changes that were bringing northern and southern conditions closer together. Like many other universities across the country, Knoxville emerged from the twenties with a new library building, but it was “a problem to operate” with no increase in staff (Bergen, 1931).25 Even before the Depression, one observer had noted, “It is outrageous to think that we can get so much [personnel] for so little [money]” (Roberts, 1929), and while the South’s salaries were the lowest in the nation, they were indicative of the general estimation of library work in both the public and private sectors. Even regional natives like Helen Coffin doubted “being missionary enough to stay here at $105.00 with conditions at the State Library as they are, crowded and ill supported” (Coffin, 1935). It was a rare soul who could look at the demise of a library job at the hands of a politician and still claim “happiness and satisfaction in my work are worth more than the salary” (Shortess, 1940). Better to laugh at the absurdity of being “mixed up with politics” like one Georgia student who described the irascible Governor Gene Talmadge as “noisy as Huey Long” (Fant, 1935a), than to wail over the “mutilations of the depression” (Towne, 1932).26

Professional Politics and Southern Library Education

Closely related to public politics were university and professional politics, which took an especially heavy toll on ILS graduates. However, in only one instance did conflicts between “northern” and “southern” philosophies arise. Margaret Herdman (‘15), whose short tenure as director of the Library School at Louisiana State University (1937-41) was indicative of a progressive style of management both too abrasive and too experimental for that southern university, was forced to take a leave of absence while tempers cooled (Carmichael, 1992, pp. 181-182).

More troublesome were environmental pressures exerted by the involvement of BEL and ALA in regional library education and the inevitable toll of the Great Depression. The adoption of Southern Association Standards had spurred the creation of new programs specifically geared to high school librarians at the same time that the
Carnegie Corporation and the Rosenwald Fund had interested themselves in strengthening the region's general-purpose programs. Competition between general programs became fierce as each vied for the foundation dollar, at the same time that ALA was trying through a variety of schemes to secure an additional permanent endowment for the national association. The promise of foundation support placed ALA in the position of referee for regional library education, and any conflicts of interest inherent in such a plan were only exacerbated by the inevitable conflict between state academic institutions. The worst aspects of southern university politics were aggravated by the Great Depression and the SELA southern program of library development adopted by ALA, because in strengthening the standing of the profession in the region, a great deal of local deadwood had to be cut. Southern librarians resented ALA intrusion in local affairs because, among other reasons, they had never received a proportionate share of ALA elective offices and because ALA rarely met in the South (Carmichael, 1986, pp. 393-394).

University and professional politics plagued the career of Charles Stone (’14). Stone had founded a library science program at George Peabody College for Teachers in 1919, and by 1930 fellow ILS graduates Margaret Gramesley, Irene Doyle, and F. K. W. Drury had all taught there. Stone left Peabody in 1927 to assume the librarianship at North Carolina College for Women in Greensboro (NCCW), including the library science courses that Charles Shaw had taught there since 1921. In 1930, NCCW became the first ALA-accredited library program (Type III) in the state. When the program proved superfluous in a state university consolidation scheme (a plan that was fine-tuned by an Advisory Committee chaired by Chapel Hill's librarian, Louis Round Wilson), the state abandoned it. Henceforth, all library instruction was to be delivered in Chapel Hill. Stone was led into believing that ultimately he would become the next librarian and director of the library science program at Chapel Hill when Wilson left to become dean of the Graduate Library School at Chicago. He was positively assured by Wilson and University President Frank Porter Graham that no appointment would be made without his approval, but he learned shortly after this interview that the position had been placed under an acting librarian, and the rumor circulated that the position was being held "open" for Wilson in combination with a university vice presidency (Stone, 1933a, 1933b). For his part, Wilson had a low estimation of the NCCW library headed by Stone, although his
opinion was not shared by everyone; Tulane Librarian Helmer Webb called NCCW "the finest library in the Southeast" (Webb, 1935).

Stone's luck worsened: an electrical short in a water cooler started a fire that destroyed the NCCW library quarters. His salary was cut from $4,500 to $3,800 in the general state financial retrenchment. Having served as state library association president (1933-35) as well as the leader of the library education movement for school librarians in the state, he justifiably felt that his efforts in North Carolina had not been appreciated. The fact that the "new" Chapel Hill program would not encompass the training of school librarians struck him as a particularly treacherous turn of events, especially since Wilson had been in part instrumental in the adoption of the Southern Association Standards. Stone was convinced that "the whole story was not told and . . . the facts of the case were distorted to keep the school [in Chapel Hill]" (Stone, 1933b). He left NCCW for the College of William and Mary in 1935 and, within three years, had secured ALA accreditation for still another program geared to school librarians. He lasted only seven years at William and Mary (1935-42), however, because Earl G. Swem, librarian at the college since 1920 and now in his sixties, kept interfering in the daily affairs of the library in spite of his promise to give Stone free rein in administration. As Stone surmised, Swem was a meddlesome curmudgeon, and "the angel Gabriel himself couldn't get on with him" (Stone, 1938). Stone left William and Mary and eventually settled into full-time college library administration at Mercer College (1943-63) (Holder, 1957, p. 63).

The Texas State College for Women (TSCW) also ran afoul of state budgeting cuts in 1931, but professional politics, rather than university politics, proved the greater threat. Largely in response to the passage of Southern Association Standards, the limited library science electives that had been offered at TSCW since 1916 were expanded, and Mary E. Buffum ('27) was hired to organize and direct a new program as well as to administer affairs in the newly constructed library building (Turner, 1977). Meanwhile, the University of Texas at Austin, which had never fully recovered from the blow dealt by Governor "Ma" Ferguson when the library science program (1919-25) developed by NYSLS graduate Elva Bascom had been eliminated, nurtured ambitions to develop a revived and fully accredited program and lobbied vigorously with the BEL. Buffum had been joined meanwhile in 1929 by ILS graduate Mary Taylor ('28, '30), and both were striving to upgrade the official standing of the school. However, the report filed
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by BEL Secretary Sarah C. N. Bogle for a survey of southern training agencies after a brief site visit to TSCW in 1930 was disturbing (Bogle & Barker, 1931). Buffum took exception to Bogle's description of the "high school appearance" of her charges, especially since other visitors had noted the "maturity" of the group. Moreover, Bogle's visit had been poorly timed, argued Buffum, since she observed only one laboratory session and no classes. Bogle's published findings recommended the maintenance of one strong library education program in each southern state, preferably one affiliated with the state university, so that official BEL endorsement seemed to favor the University of Texas. The State Board of Education, on the other hand, had officially approved both TSCW and the University of Texas among all the "wildcat" programs then operating in the state.

Buffum pleaded for Windsor's intervention on TSCW's behalf, apparently with no results (Buffum, 1930). Her complaints grew more vociferous: Anita Hostetter of the BEL had declined Buffum's invitation for a second site visit, claiming that the BEL lacked travel funds; Regional Field Agent Barker had similarly excused herself from a visit to Denton while in Dallas and Fort Worth for the organizational meeting of the Southwestern Library Association, although those cities were "only forty miles" away: "in write ups of the Library work in the South, what we have been doing here has been ignored, or passed over in the most casual manner" (Buffum, 1932). Buffum felt further slighted when she heard that Barker's visit to nearby Our Lady of the Lake College ("a Catholic school in San Antonio") had resulted in a $10,000 Carnegie grant to bolster that school's library education program. Buffum was inconsolable: "I have been chagrinned at the treatment from the A.L.A. Board" (Buffum, 1932).

In 1932, when the Texas legislature cut the Denton library science program from the TSCW budget, President Louis H. Hubbard reinstated the program on his own initiative and bolstered library education at the college with the addition of another instructor. Although Hubbard was initially determined to save Buffum's program, his resolve dissipated almost as soon as he assumed Buffum's battles. Taylor outlined for Windsor the difficulties the program faced in gaining recognition: Miss Edwin Sue Goree, Texas state field supervisor, wouldn't "set foot in Denton" and never mentioned TSCW in news releases; ALA would not respond to repeated requests for site visits; and the college did not feel justified in putting up a fight for the department. Taylor, completely disheartened after only two years at
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TSCW, summed up the experience of many northern veterans in the South: "There is plenty of pioneer work to be done in Texas, and I have enjoyed doing it, but the situation is so hopeless that I prefer to get out of the depressing atmosphere as soon as possible" (M. D. Taylor, 1935).

By 1935, the hostility between the University of Texas and TSCW was becoming palpable (M. D. Taylor, 1931, 1932). As Taylor explained:

Recently we took a bunch of enthusiastic students to T[exas] L[ibrary] A[ssociation] in Austin, and cold water was thrown in their faces all the time. We teachers felt there was no use fighting the few who are determined to put in a[n accredited] school at Austin, but could accomplish more by quietly winning friends. . . . We can stand the snubs ourselves, but resent the insult to the college. (M. D. Taylor, 1935)

Windsor was conciliatory and encouraging in his replies to Taylor, even if, in his rather cavalier dismissal of her troubles, he did not hesitate to betray faith in the library education programs started by Charles Stone at NCCW and Peabody:

Whenever I can, I always talk about the Texas library school situation, and put in a good world [sic] for you, stressing that the school is the state supported college for women . . . that Texas is big enough to support two library schools if any state is. My guess is that there is much more of a field for you than there is for the school in Denver. . . . Frankly, I think the profession generally will have more to gain by having eight or ten strong library schools of about 100 students, than twice that number of schools with about 50 students each. So far as I can see, there is no field for George Peabody and Louisiana State; nor for both Chapel Hill and Greensboro. (Windsor, 1932b)

TSCW President Hubbard, "empowered" by the Regents "to do what was necessary to gain A.L.A. accreditation [sic]" traveled for a personal interview with BEL officials, and "he came home from Chicago so disgusted that he will never have another thing to do with them. He says we can get along without them" (M. D. Taylor, 1935). Although Hubbard defended Buffum's program, the ALA visit confirmed his opinion that the master's degree in library science was inferior to equivalent degrees in other fields; his secretary already received a higher salary than either Taylor or Buffum, although paychecks were running five months in arrears. Taylor again appealed to Windsor for a transfer: "I have worked in accredited schools all of my life, and I should like to go now where ideals and good work count" (M. D. Taylor, 1935). Windsor, however, who counseled most students to hold on to their jobs throughout the Depression, merely acknowledged her letter, although he scribbled a private note to Krieg before passing Taylor's letter on to her: "With U[niversity] of Tex[as] progressing fast &
If, in hindsight, Windsor's judgments on library education programs seem propitious and shortsighted, it should be remembered that he was nearing retirement at a time when the whole field of library education had been thrown in a state of flux by the Ph.D. program at the University of Chicago. When Buffum retired from TSCW in 1946 and Taylor succeeded her as director of the school, the job of librarian was handed over to an English professor with no library training, and Taylor ruminated that "I fear it will be the death blow to trained librarians if this tide of putting in untrained Ph.D.s is not checked" (M. D. Taylor, 1946). Rumors had even circulated in 1930 in Nashville about the recently vacated public librarianship being assumed by a "Ph.D. with no library training" (I. Doyle, 1930a), and it was with considerable relief that ILS graduates in Nashville learned that the job had finally gone to F. K. W. Drury ('05). On the other hand, Windsor and his older staff could never accept the necessity of the doctorate in librarianship, and he equivocated about the Ph.D. throughout the 1930s, no doubt because it placed additional pressure on his older graduates. Charles Stone, for example, had difficulty finding an academic library position in 1940 comparable to the ones he had held previously. Krieg explained that "recently we have been able to do so little against the competition of the young Ph.D. from the University of Chicago that I feel utterly helpless" (Krieg, 1940d), and Stone complained to Krieg of "the evident advantage which the young Ph.D. from Chicago has thru Dr. [Louis Round] Wilson's influence and recommendations. It is indeed unfortunate that this thing has grown to the extent that it has in the past few years" (Stone, 1940).30

As America prepared for war, it was evident that women, as well as men, would have to be more highly educated than they had ever imagined. In fact, they would have to be more highly educated than the men with whom they would compete. Edna Bothe, who had struggled unsuccessfully since 1929 to establish a library training program at Western Kentucky State Teacher's College, asked Krieg in 1941 what credentials would be necessary to be able to assume a college librarianship and received the daunting reply that she would need the master's in library science "and perhaps even your Ph.D" (Krieg, 1940b). As Krieg neared retirement, she realized that the ground rules for education and employment had changed. There would be more
pronounced differences between requirements for public and academic library jobs in the future, and while it had been possible for ILS master’s graduates to secure top academic library jobs in the South, it would no longer be possible to do so on the strength of “general cultural study” (Krieg, 1939). For women, such positions would be increasingly difficult to win:

[Nevertheless] the calls come for a young man. First a man with a Ph.D. degree, then a man with a Master’s in Education. Then, possibly, a man with a Master’s in Library Science. The demand for higher degrees on the part of men is almost appalling at times. It seems to me though, that women equally well prepared will have the respect of the men who get the positions if the men really do meet the educational requirements. (Krieg, 1941b)

Gender

While CLA graduates would very occasionally make reference to the foibles and unfairness of a system that clearly favored males for top positions, it was usually with tacit acceptance of the status quo and nearly always laced liberally with indulgent humor. Katherine Carnes (CLA ’14), for example, reported to CLA that she had been offered the children’s librarian position of Savannah by C. Seymour Thompson in 1922 “in a perfectly characteristic letter—a sort of ‘assuming this is beneath your notice’ tone. His humility is so refreshing in his sex, isn’t it?” (Carnes, 1922). Likewise, Susan Lancaster (CLA ’07) was happy to accept the temporary position of acting librarian at Washington and Lee in 1937 “until a man with all the qualifications could be found” (Lancaster, 1937). There was simply no question in Atlanta that women could, or should, compete against men for administrative jobs, unless the men were old, incompetent, or political appointees, in which case women should try to work around them. There were, however, very few male contenders for southern public library positions or indeed for many academic positions until the 1920s, because southern libraries could afford professional salaries only with sacrifice, and men always cost more than women.

At ILS, the whole question of competition between women and men had always been discussed rather openly. ILS female graduates, whether native southerners or northern expatriates, seemed relatively free of the ladylike wiles that characterized the management style of female librarians educated at CLA. ILS graduates were quick to voice their ambitions as well as their frustrations with the gender inequalities in the employment market. Krieg advised one graduate to change academic jobs quickly in 1937 if she was determined to do so because she lacked
the master's degree and "the competition with men [for college library positions] will become greater as the years go on" (Krieg, 1935a). Charlotte Newton, teaching cataloging courses at the University of Florida in 1926, remarked that men were "the only ones who seem to have much trouble with it [i.e., cataloging]. They are older men who have positions as superintendents of schools next year. . . . I believe that I would rather teach high school girls than men" (Newton, 1926). Female barbs were rarely dispatched in the heat of the moment, however, and the degree of candor with which male deficiencies were discussed was tempered with shrewd assessments of individual worth. In recommending a male applicant to ILS, graduate Ione Williams ('31) remarked that he was "far more attractive than many of the men who we both know who have very quickly gone to the top of our profession" (I. Williams, 1938). Moreover, women as well as men occasionally subscribed to the view that men possessed inherent administrative capabilities: Ola Wyeth asked for the school's help in locating a male librarian for the position of ALA representative of the Gulf Division of the War Service, since "a man would do [this] sort of work . . . much better than a woman but [should] have some library training or experience" (Wyeth, 1919). When Margaret Gramesley, instructor at Peabody, died suddenly in 1934, one female graduate expressed the hope that the school could find "a bang-up man teacher for that job" (Fant, 1935b). But the gender bind worked both ways; men faced opposition in the school library field, as was the case in Leesburg, Florida, in 1935 when the school board refused to hire a male school librarian because there were already seven male teachers in the school.

It is evident that women as well as men were swayed by the prevailing belief that salaries, prestige, and leadership in the field would somehow be ameliorated by the addition of more males. Windsor was the leading proponent of this view and issued regular bulletins to selected graduates that enumerated ILS male enrollments.\textsuperscript{31} Windsor was not a chauvinist, exactly. Asked by Jackson Towne to recommend someone to take his place as librarian and director of the Library Science Department at the George Peabody School for Teachers in 1932, Windsor composed a working list of male and female candidates that included the names of ILS graduates Mary Buffum, Ola Wyeth, and Marian Leatherman; however, his formal recommendations were for males (Windsor, 1932a). Windsor's recommendations were guided by the advice of ALA Executive Secretary Carl Milam, who had originally notified Windsor when Towne was hired that Peabody President Bruce Payne "was hunting hard for a man" (Milam, 1926). Moreover, Towne realized by
1932 that NYSLIS graduate Lucile Fargo, whom he had hired at Peabody for her excellent administrative capabilities and her knowledge of school library work, would never succeed him, not even temporarily, "because of a Southern prejudice against women as department heads which is somewhat deeper here than I originally supposed" (Towne, 1931). What Towne failed to mention, but must have been obvious to all members of the Peabody staff, was that Towne was at the school only three days a month and during the summers due to an outside job as consultant for the Rosenwald Fund; Isabel Howell and Fargo actually ran the school. Sadly, accreditation visitors failed to take account of Fargo's situation and found her "uncompromising and even stubborn in her resistance to an increased teaching load" (Towne, 1929). While cataloging instructor Irene Doyle always spoke well of Towne, she was more critical of his successor Louis Shores who was away from the office for months at a time "working on writing projects which he has under way, and I have all of his work (except one class) in addition to my own" (I. Doyle, 1936; see also Tucker, 1983, pp. 201-202).

The demand for male librarians was apparently not confined to states below the Mason Dixon line, and in fact the competition was more fierce in the North because more established northern and midwestern libraries had the money with which to attract a male candidate. As Mary Osgood reported from Kansas City, "All I can tell about the place is that they are still waiting for 'the man'" (Osgood, 1916). The University of Florida at Gainesville found it expedient to employ a male replacement for librarian Henry May Eddy after she had been killed in an airplane accident in Rio, "but the actual employment of a male librarian was seemingly indefinitely postponed" because of finances (Krieg, 1938a). At any rate, the demand for male librarians was not a southern phenomenon, even if at times it was touted as a panacea for southern library ills.

It is more difficult to rationalize the "good old boy" network that worked through ILS and through male graduates by principles which, however byzantine and opaque, effectively served to limit the openings for females in certain locales. Charles Stone never fully explained why he preferred a male to a female replacement for his position at Greensboro, but he averred that "knowing the staff as I do, I think it would be unwise to make a woman permanently librarian" (Stone, 1935). Perhaps he feared a female might fare worse than a male at the hands of a female staff of long standing. Certainly Windsor was very
protective of his male charges. He introduced Jackson Towne to F. K. W. Drury at Brown University by letter and cautioned Drury that "I do not want him to settle into a position unless it is the very best position that he can get into" (Windsor, 1923), not least of all because Towne had been an undergraduate honors student and a master's graduate from Harvard and had worked at the Yale library for two years. He likewise extended the same courtesy to Drury by a letter of introduction to Memphis librarian Harold Brigham when Drury forsook the Ivy League for southern public libraries (Windsor, 1931b). Male candidates of exceptional talent—in other words, players in the national arena of librarianship outside the school or regional network—were advised by the school to inform ALA Headquarters and Chicago Dean Louis Round Wilson when they were “free” (Krieg, 1940a). It was Windsor who had counseled Stone to contact Louis Round Wilson at the University of North Carolina “and make a good impression on him” when he had first moved to Peabody in 1919 (Windsor, 1919). Yet even the most talented male librarians had difficulty in attracting fresh recruits to librarianship. Stone told Windsor in 1913, for example, that “one of the two men I had hoped to send you gave up the idea because his mother thought library work too shabby a trade. There are ten thousand lawyers to each single man in all the other professions, and my first man has increased the percentage” (Stone, 1913).

To be fair, it must be conceded that Windsor and the male graduates actively promoted the careers of many able women in the South, particularly in Texas and Mississippi where the influence of Windsor and Whitman Davis were equal to that of Wilson in the central South. Windsor championed Marian Leatherman for the librarianship of the Minnesota Historical Society even though the board obviously preferred a man, and he thought well enough of her work as seminar librarian at Illinois to raise her salary in order to retain her services. North and South, female librarians were expected to be all-purpose menial miracle workers as well as omnipotent administrative chiefs, or as Leatherman put it, “sort of a glorified housemaid and police officer,” whether material benefits accrued to the possessor of such qualities or not; conditions might be “swallowed with as sweet a smile as possible,” but they still left a “bad taste” (Leatherman, 1924).

Expectations of female students at CLA were not in fact very different from those of ILS, but there was a decided difference in the content and tone of comments received by the two schools, as well as the exceptional qualifications that some ILS female students brought with them. Irene Doyle had already earned her master's degree in
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mathematics when she came to Illinois, while Nannie H. Rice had already published articles in *Library Journal, American Mercury,* and *School Life* and could count 14 years of library experience among her assets. Like fellow southerner Lucy Foote of Louisiana, however, Rice was scrutinized and questioned especially hard before admission because of her age (45). Whitman Davis, on the other hand, who had recommended Rice to the ILS program, received no admonitions when he applied for admission, although he was a year older than Rice.

If female students at ILS accepted the differentials in treatment without protest, they at least acknowledged that such differences existed and allied themselves with organizations that would further their careers. Kentuckian Mary Torrance (ILS, '13), for example, thought it “just as necessary for the women librarians to affiliate with the women’s organizations as it is for the men,” and she regularly “boomed” librarianship as a woman’s career to high school students. While CLA graduates frequently gave recruitment talks (particularly at Agnes Scott College, Girl’s High School of Atlanta, Clemson College, and Winthrop College), joined organizations like the American Association of University Women, if they possessed the necessary academic credentials, and the Business and Professional Women’s Association, if they did not, they did so as a matter of course rather than a consciously self-defining act.

Southern female ILS graduates knew how to tow the social line in professional work as well but maintained a rather tongue-in-cheek detachment from the sometimes ridiculous protocols that required them to assume prescribed social roles. For example, Louise Fant was asked to tea at Duncan Burnet’s house when Windsor was visiting the University of Georgia campus in 1941 and had been “dying” to ask Windsor about the new prospect for University of Georgia Director of Public Services, ILS graduate Wayne Yenawine. But Burnet monopolized Windsor in conversation about other matters, so Fant “just sat and drank tea and talked flowers with Mrs. Burnet and Mrs. Windsor” (Fant, 1941a).32

Southern mores slowed the pace at which women’s role expanded in the region during the first four decades of the century. Although the University of Georgia had become coeducational in 1920, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill did not admit freshman women outside the schools of nursing and library science until 1963. There were northern enclaves where women were still not welcome in the
Southern Librarianship

1920s, to be sure; Princeton University lectures, for example, were not open to women (Carmichael, 1992, p. 184). The lack of social opportunities for women on academic campuses did in some cases make ILS female graduates reconsider employment in public libraries, not necessarily with a romantic end in view—as was often the case among CLA graduates—but for the stimulation that socialization among equals provided. Ola Wyeth, for example, considered the cloistered social life for librarians at Lehigh University too confining in 1920, a fact that was compounded by the lack of female faculty. “While the faculty wives might be cordial, their interests would be so different [from mine] that they probably would not receive me in their inner circle. . . . I know Marian Leatherman found Princeton very hard for just that reason” (Wyeth, 1920a).

When ILS graduates opted for marriage, which they did less frequently than did the graduates of CLA, they usually felt compelled to continue their career after family obstacles had been overcome. The school encouraged married women to work when they could, particularly after the Depression had altered some of the assumptions about the relationship between family, labor, and society. Krieg pressed Ethel Donahey ('30) to continue working in Florida after her marriage in 1938, even though she realized that “your husband will probably come to dislike me thoroughly, if he believes your place is strictly in the home” (Krieg, 1938b). Her advice was prescient, although it was unheeded: in 1949, the master's degree replaced the bachelor's degree as the basic professional credential, and students who returned to work after a long absence were sometimes rudely awakened to the fact that their degrees and certificates had been discounted. Theodosia Cummins ('29), an Arkansas native, had left library work in Florida in 1944 to raise a family. Her predicament as she described it to Harold Lancour in 1958 was not unlike that faced by many professional women who had chosen to abandon their careers temporarily. The lack of domestic help had prevented her leaving the home, and although she realized that a master's degree would now be a necessary credential for a better job, the pressure of educating her children, plus maintaining solvency, forced a mode of compliance with any kind of available work. Indeed, even “routine and tedium” were no “drawback” to her (Cummins, 1958).

Whatever faults can be found in the prevailing ideology of gender during the Windsor years, it operated from an entirely different baseline than in Atlanta. Acknowledgment of the differences between expectations of male and female librarians was made explicit. In spite
of obvious inequities created by the "old boy" network and the rather naive belief that male leadership would serve as a nostrum for low professional prestige and abysmal salary levels, ILS graduates did fill many key posts in the emerging educational structure of the "New Deal" South. The degree of commitment of ILS female graduates in the region was obviously motivated by factors other than remuneration; when Vera Snook, librarian of the Little Rock Public Library, died in office after 22 years of service, she was earning only $25 more per month than when she began (B. Roberts, director, Central Arkansas Library System, telephone interview, May 24, 1993). As women, ILS female graduates, like working women everywhere, experienced some degree of ambivalence about the conflicting demands of the biological imperative, social expectations, and professional ideals. In the case of ILS, however, the emphasis was clearly on the professional ideals of service, intellectual attainment, and executive maturity, even if realization of these ideals still favored the advancement of the female student who, like Ola Wyeth, had reached both the "age" and the level of maturity at which her work would "decidedly" be her "first interest" (Wyeth, 1920b).

CONCLUSIONS

On the 50th anniversary of ILS in 1943, Ola Wyeth referred to the unfounded fears of the first generation of library school students that transfer of the Armour Institute Department of Library Science to the University of Illinois would "limit" graduates to positions within the state. In fact, quite the reverse had occurred: "Wherever they go or whatever type of library they are connected with, they are found among those who raise the standards of the profession and to [i.e., who] conquer new frontiers" (Wyeth, 1943, pp. 48-49). Wyeth did not exaggerate these contributions. Although the WPA work in Georgia, which Dorothy Spence was then conducting, would soon be discontinued, the first state aid package for Georgia libraries was less than a year away, and ILS graduate Mary Torrance had been "the most active member" of the committee lobbying for state support.

Dr. Eliza Atkins Gleason ('31), the first African-American to earn a doctoral degree in library science, had left in her dissertation an indelible account of the paucity of southern library services to African-Americans (Gleason, 1941; Josey, 1986, pp. 313-314). She also founded the Atlanta University Library School and was its dean until 1945.
During that time, she also became the first African-American elected to ALA Council. She was succeeded by another ILS graduate, Dr. Virginia Lacy Jones ('38, dean, 1945-81) who would transform the face of library service to the South's largely unserved African-American population through her advocacy in professional journals and in ALA, where she helped to organize the black caucus. While one could argue that Jones built her career on Gleason's findings, the fearlessness of her dedication to racial justice, the tirelessness of her compassion for her students, and the warmth of her diplomatic skills were her own (Lundy, 1980, pp. 1-12; Jones, 1965, pp. 879-884; 1966, pp. 161-163; Caynon and Du Mont, 1990, pp. 42-46).

Through a cooperative arrangement with Barker, dean of the Library School at Emory University, Gleason secured for Atlanta University students the use of Emory's extensive collection of library science materials. The Emory University Library School did not admit its first black student until 1970, but even the limited gains for African-American librarians in the post-war period would have been unthinkable before the Great Depression. In the early 1920s, with the grip of the Ku Klux Klan on many southern municipal governments and the southern library establishment still holding fast to a segregationist line, the prospects for even gradual change seemed remote. Southern librarianship in that era was nearly exclusively defined by the Atlanta school, its composition was entirely female, white, native-born, and Protestant: the qualities deemed essential for survival in the field were not unlike those required of British colonials abroad.

As Dewey prophesied, Katherine Sharp was indeed "the best man in America" to head the Illinois school, and she and her successors achieved a felicitous blend of rationalist values and feminist ideals of service and caring. While documentary evidence from the period under review indicates that ILS female students assimilated, rather than resisted, existing societal norms of masculine privilege, they were keenly aware of the system. At CLA, masculine privilege presented a remote threat to the majority of graduates, because they rarely left the region and because male librarians were so scarce. At the same time, the southern female network in Atlanta represented a strong female institution that mimicked the corporate and municipal values of the dominant male culture: its survival was insured by outward signals of obeisance to the protocols of the establishment, while its internal operations relied on a system of referral in which breeding, family background, and being "known" in the community—values deeply
embedded in southern culture, and particularly cherished among southern middle-class females at institutions like Agnes Scott, Randolph Macon, and Sweet Briar College—were employed to express approval or disapproval when other “objective” criteria such as grades, dependability, or the quality of practice work could not supply the desired result. In the first quarter century of the school, these subjective criteria helped to identify with surprising effectiveness a core of female leaders who would lay the groundwork for more extensive development of libraries by individuals educated outside the region.

At Illinois, and no doubt at other library schools outside the South, southerners were understood in terms of regional stereotypical characteristics—beauty, vivacity, wit, and loquaciousness for females; honor, gentlemanliness, and poetic grace for males—but consideration for academic achievement was usually given equal weight with regional personality characteristics. In Atlanta, personality usually overshadowed all other considerations, no doubt because force of personality rather than power of intellect counted for more in close-knit southern communities where “family values,” including the preeminence of the church, the ideology of southern womanhood, and narrowly prescribed social and racial mores counted for a great deal indeed. Even at Illinois, racial stereotyping was inevitable, although the contribution of ILS to the education of African-American librarians during the Depression years was considerable, and perhaps unique.

As the career profiles of several of the graduates indicate, “southern conditions” were often inseparable from the conditions of the Great Depression. As one old saw had it, many southerners had no idea when the Depression had arrived, since economic and social conditions had been bad since at least 1865. Nevertheless, they took their toll on southern and northern ILS graduates alike, and the progressive stance of a southerner like Arthur Curry was just as anomalous in its way as was the dogged bid for national recognition by Mary Buffum and Mary Taylor for their struggling southern library education program. The push for high school library standards was precipitous; it is interesting to note that while Wilson, Bogle, and state and foundation leaders supported the adoption of Southern Association Standards in the flush 1920s, their enthusiasm for programs for school librarians such as that headed by Charles Stone and Buffum paled in the harsh light of economic stringency, and official support was finally thrown to general-purpose programs such as that at Chapel Hill, whether or not they educated school librarians.
The nature of "missionary" work that ILS graduates performed in the pre-Civil Rights South was twofold: first, "missionary" in the political sense, since both southern and northern ILS graduates helped to align southern expectations of professional librarianship with prevailing national norms of professional practice; and "missionary" in the sense of establishing "missions," or a network of referral through which interregional exchange of ideas and personnel could occur. Although Barker and other CLA personnel were keenly aware of the need for an end to sectional thinking in librarianship, they lacked the professional visibility and credibility to effect such changes from a national forum. The education of southern librarians in the North provided a means of increasing their academic credentials and prestige. Agnes Reagan, for example, an ILS graduate from Arkansas who spoke at the 75th anniversary of the school, had dual degrees from Emory ('39) and Illinois ('43) and was later one of Barker's most cherished colleagues (Reagan, 1969, pp. 82-85). Reagan left Emory's Division of Librarianship in 1967 to become executive director of ALA's Library Education Division.

Ironically, a northern ILS graduate also became the first male director of the old Carnegie Library of Atlanta in 1949, although his southern professional experience was considerably less sanguine than Reagan's. John Settlemaeyer, one of the most promising students of the class of 1935 (master's degree, 1937), reorganized the collection, introduced marketing concepts to promote library services, and drew reluctant users into the library with televisions. He was Atlanta's only head librarian in 49 years to be educated outside CLA, and he raised hackles on the Atlanta "old girl network." His immediate predecessor, Fannie Hinton, enlisted Barker's aid in a systematic and relentless persecution of Settlemaeyer, through letters to the mayor, the board of trustees, and the editor of the Atlanta Constitution. Although the business establishment gave Settlemaeyer the outward signals of approval and ignored Barker and Hinton's letters, they never really accepted him as an equal. When he ordered that the color line be removed at the circulation desk, however, he was fired on doubtful charges of financial improprieties. He gave some indication of the emotional cost of such courage when he refused a subsequent job in Texas. As he wrote Robert Downs, "In view of the fact that the Negro situation has definitely been one of the major reasons for my dismissal, I am sure my family and I would be happier in some other region of the United States where the Civil War does not continue to be fought constantly" (Settlemaeyer, 1960). Understandably, Settlemaeyer had been sufficiently soured by the
experience that he left the profession, but public library services in Atlanta had been irreversibly transformed.

While facile expositions of regional identity rely on stereotypical assumptions, charting modifications to that identity over time depends on accurate and candid reiteration of actions, conversations, and thoughts. Such accounts are rarely forthcoming to the historian, and the southern historian faces dual seductions from current ideological fashion, on the one hand, and a fathomless body of personal accounts, random anecdote, and narcotic reiteration on the other. Until more complete accounts of librarians' lives are drawn, and until those lives assume some importance in the professional pantheon, library historians will have to rely on such fragmentary evidence as that presented here. Even these scattered accounts would seem to indicate, however, that ILS graduates who ventured South were academically better equipped to gain entrée into an extraregional library establishment than their CLA contemporaries; that they were socially and emotionally better equipped to deal with situations that were nearly always frustrating, sometimes amusing, and often frightening; that they did indeed have a "vision" of librarianship that was considerably broader than that of CLA graduates, who were often distracted by the seeming intractability of local conditions; and that, as a group, their careers were characterized by endurance, longevity, and prominence. While it seems ungrateful to assume that the growth of libraries in the South and changes in the South's social structure were inevitable, explanation of that growth purely in terms of social factors seems gratuitous. Racial policies, gender norms, economic woes, or political styles cannot by themselves account for conditions prevalent in the region. They can describe, however, the experiences of a quasi-heroic generation of library pioneers who are now largely forgotten. The perseverance of several key ILS graduates in southern librarianship contributed significantly to the abatement of the most glaring deficiencies in the region and gradually lessened the degree of regional stereotyping at ILS.

Whether or not regional factors are irrelevant or, as sociologist John Shelton Reed (1990) claims, are now purely cultural (food, speech, leisure time activities) as opposed to political (race, gender, and social class) in substance, there is little doubt in the 1990s that seemingly insignificant ideological differences between amorphous groups of people can explode into violent clashes in which libraries and lives are lost. Social issues and library issues remain irrevocably intertwined,
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and while regional differences may now appear to be among the more frivolous of social issues to be considered by library and information professionals, they probably are no more dead in librarianship than they are in the political arena. As Reed (personal communication, November 9, 1992) remarked recently, there may be more than a little wishful thinking in Vice President Al Gore's remark that the election of southerners to the presidency and the vice presidency for the first time in the nation's history is "an expression of the reality that sectional wounds of the past are finally and irrevocably healed. We are one country now and merit, not geography, will from this time forward be the only test for the highest offices of the land" (Gore, 1992, p. 3). As the world population now seems saturated by an excess of qualifying distinctions, not only the traditional ones of nationality, race, political party, and religion, but also a host of new paradigms whose parameters are much more murky (sexual orientation, degree of disability, and placement on the age spectrum, to name only a few), librarians will do well to celebrate the careers of those librarians who crossed regional borders into lands where lines between library issues and social issues were very clouded indeed, and in which forbearance was a raiment of survival.
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APPENDIX A
Southern Entries in Who's Who in Library Service
Indicating Full or Partial Library Education at ILS
(n = 77)

Thomas Parker Ayer '14
Lorena Baker '33H (S)
Esther Lou Bergen '17
Edna Emilie Bothe '29H [M]
May Fidelia Boudinot '30H [M]
Mrs. Vivian Bougher 24-25 [M] (S)*
Mrs. Rutilla Eubank Branch '30 (S)
Mary Susie Buffum '27 [M]
Mrs. Ruth Campbell SS 15, 27 [M]*
Madeleine Canova '29 [M] (S)
Helen Thomas Coffin '28 [M] (S)
Theodosia Alice Cummins '29 (S)
Arthur Curry '21 (S)
T. Whitman Davis SS 14, 27-28
[M] (S)*
Martha Harriet Dickson '31 (S)
LeNoir Dimmitt 14-15 (S)*
Ethel Elzira Donahey '30
Irene May Doyle '30HH, '31 [M]
Francis Kees Wynkoop Drury '05 [M]
Margaret Virginia Ebeling '30 (S)
Helen Louise Edmundson '27
Louise Leslie Fant '28, '39 [M] (S)
Charles Ruthven Flack '26, '29 [M]
Dorothy Johnston Fogarty '31
Lucy Brown Foote '30, '35 [M] (S)
Dorothy Gray '31 (S)
Helen Grant Gray '35
Arthur Eric Gropp '30H, '31 [M]
Julia Grothaus 17-18 (S)*
Edith Hague '18
Mary Elizabeth Hanson '27 (S)
Harriet Rebecca Harper '31 (S)
Margaret M. Herdman '15 [Ph.D.]
Eleanor Marian Heuer '31 [M]
Mary Edith Houston '30 (S)
Clara E. Howard '01 [M]
Sibyl Gretchen Howell '31 (S)
Mrs. Josephine Hyland Inge '31 (S)
Mary H. James '31

Mary Ramon Kinney '29, 37H [M]
Ina Knerr SS 22*
Blanche Lane '28
Alene Hannah Laub '27 (S)
Marian Leatherman '16 [M]
Mrs. Florence Beck McGlachlin '00
Mrs. Margaret Moon McKennon SS 10 (S)*
Ethel Key Millar '28 (S)
Susan Elizabeth Miller '30
Myrne Moffitt '29
Charlotte Newton '29 [M] (S)
Lena Barbara Nocifer '28
Myra O'Brien '07
Sarah Elizabeth Park '31
Flora Glyde Peavy '31 (S)
Nannie Herndon Rice '32HH [M] (S)
Perma Allegra Rich '28
Anna Margaret Roberts '33HH [M] (S)
Lola Mae Rozzell '30 (S)
Christine Sanders SS 22, 24-25, 27 (S)*
Mary Jeanne Scrimger '30
Lois Fuller Shortess '23*
Vera Jessie Snook '33 (M)*
Dorothy Virginia Spence '31 (S)
Charles Holmes Stone '14 [M] (S)
Mary Delia Taylor '28, '30 [M]
Virginia Elinor Tillia '31
Mary Torrance '13 (S)
Margaret Katherine Wagner '31
Helmer Lewis Webb '27 [M]
Mae Perkinson Webb (Mrs. Helmer) '27
Frances "Fannie" Miles Wilcox SS 15 (S)*
Catherine Opal Williams '31 [M] (S)
Ione Williams '31H [M] (S)
Sara Matella Williams '30H, '31 [M]
Walter Bowie Williams '31
Bertha Katherine Williams '30
Ola M. Wyeth '06

Additional Files Consulted:
Eliza Atkins Gleason '31HH [Ph.D.]
(S)

Laura Gibbs '02 (S)
Anita Miller Hostetter '20H
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APPENDIX A (cont.)
Southern Entries in *Who's Who in Library Service*
Indicating Full or Partial Library Education at ILS

(n = 77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josie Batchellor Houchens</td>
<td>'05 (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Lacy Jones</td>
<td>'38 [M]</td>
<td>[Ph.D.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Wright Merrill</td>
<td>'03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anderson Osgood</td>
<td>'04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Clementine Pressey</td>
<td>'26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carl Settlemayer</td>
<td>'35, '37</td>
<td>[M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Edmund Towne</td>
<td>'22 [M]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: H: Graduated with Honors, HH: Graduated with Highest Honors, [M]: Master’s Degree, (S): Southern by birth, SS: Summer School, *: Had not received degree.*

a Degree received 1934.
b Died August 20, 1932.
**APPENDIX B**  
Graduates, 1927-33: Library Schools at ILS, Columbia University, CLA (after 1930, Emory University)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ILS</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th>CLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX C

**Columbia University Library Science Degrees: Home State of Recipient among Southerners, 1927-33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 48 States</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer to the Trustees with Accompanying Documents for the Years 1927-1932 (Columbia University, 1927-32).*
### APPENDIX D
Columbia University Library Science Master's Degree
Recipients: Columbia University, NYLSL, New York Public (NYP), CLA, and ILS Graduates, 1927-32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where First Certificate or Degree Earned</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYLSL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer to the Trustees with Accompanying Documents for the Years 1927-1932 (Columbia University, 1927-32).
NOTES

1 The name of the school was listed as the Illinois State Library School on the *Illinois State Library School Circular of Information* from 1897 until 1909. Beginning with the *Circular* for 1910-11, it was called the University of Illinois Library School. In 1981, the name was changed to the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

2 Only the primitive West was less well represented, but whereas the poor showing of westerners was indicative of that region's relatively unsettled state, the scarcity of southerners signaled an endemic condition (see Sallee, 1992).

3 Vance was far from a southern apologist; he was particularly critical of the southern “Chamber of Commerce mentality,” which fostered preferential tax rates and other concessions for northern businesses moving South. Some of his ideas prefigure those of southern historian C. Vann Woodward.

4 Louis Round Wilson was presiding officer at the 1936 conference; he was the first southern-born ALA president, although at that time, he was dean of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago.

5 Marion V. Higgins of Minneapolis was a member of the CLA faculty from 1937 to 1943 and for the academic year 1946-47.

6 Due to a mistake in calculations, Carmichael reported the figure for the southern states as 550 instead of 551.

7 Marian Leatherman, librarian of Agnes Scott College, 1930-32; and Clara Howard, dean of the Emory University Library School, 1930-35.

8 LeNoir Dimmitt, director of the Package Loan Library Bureau at the University of Texas, 1917-51; and Lorena Baker, head of the Loan Department at the University of Texas, 1930-67.

9 For example, LeNoir Dimmitt (mentioned above) but also Christine Sanders, librarian of the Free Library Bureau of Arkansas, 1928-34, and Fanny Wilcox, state librarian of Texas, 1915-46.

10 Notably, the network included Duncan Burnet (1876-1969), librarian of the University of Georgia (1904-46), a Cincinnati native who had graduated from NYSLS in 1900, only a year after Windsor; Essae Martha Culver (1882-1973, NYSLS '09), for many years (1925-46) secretary of the Louisiana State Library Commission and state librarian of Louisiana (1946-62); and the indomitable Mary Utopia Rothrock (1890-1976, NYSLS '14), librarian of Knoxville, Tennessee (1916-34) and later director of library services for the Tennessee Valley Library Authority (1934-48), consultant for the TVA (1948-51), and librarian of Knox County, Tennessee (1949-54). Culver, a native of Emporia, Kansas, became the first female ALA president elected from the southern states for the term 1940-41; Rothrock, a daughter of pioneering Memphis stock, served as the first native-born southern female ALA president in 1946-47.

11 Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, noted in the *Annual Report to the President and Treasurer to the Trustees with Accompanying Documents for the Year Ending June 30, 1927* that while enrollments had been stabilized at about 30 at the library schools at New York Public Library and at Albany, Columbia enrollments had been a matter of speculation before the school opened, and that during 1926 to 1927, enrollments at all schools had increased due to the shortage of librarians (Columbia University, 1927-1930).

12 The basis of Burnet's and Rothrock's complaints about the Atlanta school and its longtime director (1915-30) and dean (1936-54) Tommie Dora Barker are described in Carmichael (1992, pp. 194-195, 203-204).

13 Wallace founded CLA as well as the Carnegie Library of Atlanta and served as librarian from 1902 to 1908 and (concurrently) director of the school from 1905 to 1908. Sneed served as principal of CLA from 1908 to 1914 and filled a concurrent term as librarian and director from 1914 to 1915. The dual responsibilities of the library and the school proved quite taxing to the incumbents (see McReynolds, 1990, p. 204).
James V. Carmichael, Jr.

14 Grotzinger (1992, pp. 9-13) gives a true measure of Sharp's conception of "graduate" education against the rather nebulous definitions then prevalent; see also Carroll (1970, p. 195). For Dewey's idea of graduate education, see C. M. White (1976, p. 65). Katherine Sharp was one of the first two students to be awarded the NYLS master's degree.

15 According to Wilson (1998, p. 410), Arkansas ranked 47th among the 48 states in "Index of Economic Ability and Index of Public Library Development." Barker gives some indication of undeveloped conditions in Arkansas and the hope that was being placed in the Federal Emergency Relief Agency library projects in Barker (1984), which is summarized in Carmichael (1988, p. 303).

16 Library historian Sarah Vann, who was among those who left the library, claimed she had just "followed the herd" when she decided on Michigan. Bennett Harvie Branscomb (1940) (librarian, Duke University, 1925-45) never received a library degree, although he possessed an M.A. from Oxford and a Ph.D. from Columbia and was well known for his classic treatise on library instruction Teaching with Books: A Study of College Libraries. He gained further renown as chancellor of Vanderbilt University (1946-68). Burnet was librarian of the University of Georgia General Library until 1946.

17 Reagan (Emory '39, ILS '43) of Fayetteville, Arkansas, was alerted by an Atlanta friend and Illinois summer instructor Laura Colvin to the fact that Houchens had a room to let, and Reagan stayed there throughout most of her degree work in Urbana.

18 Agnes Scott was traditionally a CLA domain, especially since many CLA students were educated there. CLA librarians included Marian Bucher ('06, 1906-19), Alice Longshore ('16, 1919-21), Genevieve White ('18, 1922-29), and Lois Bolles (1929-30). Marian Leatherman (ILS, '16) had served as librarian only two years (1930-32) when she succumbed to an angina attack, but not before she had, in the words of ILS alumna Mary Torrance ('32), "done a big work here and had succeeded in putting the library on a more dignified basis than it had before" (Torrance, 1932).

19 Edna E. Bothe was an instructor in library science at Western Kentucky State Teachers College from 1929 to 1943. Western Kentucky failed to get ALA approval, although courses for school librarians continued to be taught. Whitman Davis, librarian of the University of Mississippi, was disappointed by the evaluation of his program and had given up the struggle to offer accredited courses by 1930 (see Bothe, 1933; Davis, 1930b).

20 Ahern's letter is in the Mary Osgood file. Osgood was not included in the southern sample for Who's Who in Library Service, as she left the South in 1916, but her file provides a particularly rich example of adverse northern reflections on the South.

21 Faculty comments are excerpted by Windsor for Gjelsness.

22 W. T. B. Williams and Walter B. Williams were apparently not related.

23 Comment in marginal note, probably by White.

24 For Curry's later reminiscences of these experiences, see Winship (1966, pp. 25-41); they vary only slightly in detail from contemporary accounts given in correspondence to the school.

25 Holley (1983a) comments on the amount of academic library building that was occurring in the late 1920s to early 1930s.

26 Governors Talmadge of Georgia and Long of Louisiana were often compared; both were notorious for their interference in university affairs.

27 Wilson thought that NCCW had a "very poor library" and that undergraduate education in Greensboro was "weak." However sound were Wilson's conclusions, they were not disinterested (see Martin, 1988, esp. pp. 636-639).

28 Compare with entries for October 28, 1930, and March 9, 1934, in Barker (1934b).

29 Barker was indeed pressed for time, and she had only been on the job for one month when she attended SWLA. She did not visit Our Lady of the Lake until 1934 (Barker, 1934a). Barker did feel that Texas was somewhat remote from the central concerns of
the RFA office, as "the library problems of states in the southwestern group cannot be considered in terms of the region as they can in the southeastern . . . each state is so individual in conditions and background that its library program . . . will have to be adapted to the local conditions in each state" (Barker, 1930).

30 The ALA had abandoned advocacy of the doctorate for librarians in 1925 (see Segal, 1991, p. iv).

31 See, for example, Windsor (1923, 1928b, 1930). As Howard was at the time heading up the Emory (i.e., CLA) program, which had just admitted five male scholarship students, the figures would have been of special interest to her.

32 Mrs. Burnet was the former Inez Daughtry, a 1908 graduate of CLA.

33 Gleason resigned in 1945, although the ending date of her tenure is given as 1946 in this source.

34 Barker was personally "devastated" when Reagan left Emory, although she admitted that Reagan could hardly have refused such a prestigious appointment (see Carmichael, 1988, p. 455).
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Women as Visionaries, Mentors, and Agents of Change

Mary Niles Maack

ABSTRACT

In the history of library education, three main periods that correspond to changes in women's status in the profession can be identified. In the first period (1887-1923), women played founding and leadership roles that diminished during the second period (1924-50) as library schools moved into universities—a trend that continued during the third period (1951-present) when women became a minority in the ranks of tenured faculty. From the earliest period, however, women in the profession have acted as mentors to students and colleagues, establishing intergenerational mentoring patterns that, as exemplified by the University of Illinois Library School and as illustrated in recent studies of mentoring in librarianship, continue to this day. In light of contemporary feminist research, the role of women in librarianship and library education can be reexamined with the hope that a truly feminist profession may be realized.

INTRODUCTION

I am very pleased to contribute to this volume celebrating the centennial anniversary of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, which was founded, moved, shaped, and nurtured by Katharine Sharp. After reflecting on the contributions of Sharp, her protégées, and those whom they in turn mentored, I decided to entitle my remarks, “Women as Visionaries, Mentors, and Agents of Change.” Since historians must always deal with continuity as well as change, let me stress that all three of the papers included here deal with ways that the new vision of the profession was passed on from the Illinois Library School (ILS) to students whose work took them
from Portland, Oregon, to Atlanta, Georgia, from New York City to Austin, Texas, or to Paris, France. Taken together, these three papers present important strands in a continuous, intergenerational network spanning the last hundred years. However, while women faculty members from Illinois and from other schools continued to show a strong commitment to library education and to their students, their role and status as educators changed markedly during this time.

In a previous article, I suggested that if one applies a feminist approach to periodization in history, three distinct periods can be identified in regard to women’s changing status in library education (Maack, 1986). The first period, which covers the years from the founding of the Columbia School in 1887 to the creation of the Paris Library School in 1923, is a time dominated by women who took an active role as “missionaries and mentors.” Not only did women assume a leadership role as founders of schools, as directors or principals, and as faculty members, they also encouraged their best students to accept challenging positions where they could become agents for change. However, during the second major period—a time of transition which lasted from 1924 to the drafting of the new standards in 1950—women began to find their opportunities for leadership more limited as library schools moved into universities. The third period, which begins with the approval of the 1951 standards, is a time marked by significant demographic shifts as women became a minority in the ranks of tenured faculty.

After briefly describing each period as it relates to the studies presented here, I will discuss contemporary mentoring patterns in library education, with special reference to the continuity of mentoring at ILS. Because the goal of these papers is to honor the spirit of ILS, I would like to especially focus on the theme of a feminist profession as I believe it was espoused by Katharine Sharp and other leading women from the school. While few of these women were suffragettes or radical feminists, most could have probably identified with Gerda Lerner’s definition of “feminism” as “a system of ideas and practices which assumes that men and women must share equally in the work, in the privileges, in the defining and the dreaming of the world” (Lerner, 1984, p. 33; quoted in Astin & Leland, 1991, p. 19). In honor of this feminist theme, the last part of my paper will be devoted to a discussion of the way that contemporary feminist research can aid scholars—both in framing new questions and in reinterpreting historical data on the role of women in librarianship and library education.
The first period of women's involvement in library education begins with their participation as students and lecturers in Dewey's 1887 library training classes at Columbia. Indeed, as Laurel Grotzinger (1994) aptly points out, "Dewey did far more to initiate than to deliver," leaving most of the work to his able female protégées (p. 11). Although this feminist period of the library education movement did not end abruptly, the year 1923, when ALA opened its library school in Paris, marks an important turning point. Set up by Sarah Bogle (a dynamic leader already well known for her ALA work with library education), the Paris Library School was staffed by a group of talented female librarians from the United States; these women, such as Margaret Mann and Mary Parsons, worked closely with their male French colleagues to open librarianship as a career for women in France. Even though the Paris Library School lasted for six years, its creation coincided with the end of a very active phase of outreach led by women who enthusiastically assumed roles as pioneers and innovators. Like Katharine Sharp, these library educators who founded schools throughout the country also mentored scores of students, thus forming a part of the "invisible, indestructible network" that Laurel Grotzinger so vividly describes in her paper.

While Katharine Sharp was an exceptional woman in many ways, her career is illustrative of the mentoring role that this remarkable generation played. Sharp was clearly an inspiration to many of her students, and she was remembered as a strong role model by several women who later became library educators. One of Sharp's most gifted protégées was Harriet Howe ('02), who served on the faculty of the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago and later became the founder of the library school in Denver. In her book entitled Pioneering Leaders of Librarianship, 1865-1914 (which was published nearly 40 years after Sharp's death), Harriet Howe remembered her teacher for "her criticalness, concentration, accuracy . . . judgment, adaptability, professional knowledge, and forcefulness" (Howe, 1953, p. 171). Even revisionist historians who prefer to categorize women librarians as passive and subservient should be struck by the fact that none of the characteristics which Howe valued in her mentor fit the typical constellation of traits considered feminine by her generation; instead Sharp is portrayed as a woman who transcended feminine stereotypes in order to play a key role in creating a new profession.
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A second library educator on whom Sharp had a profound influence was Margaret Mann. Warmly remembered as an outstanding cataloging instructor by both American and French students, Mann paid a very moving tribute to her own teacher, Katharine Sharp. She recalled that Sharp “never lost an opportunity to share with her students all the learning she had acquired; her influence was not a passing incident in their lives—it was something which went far deeper; she aroused in them a certain determination to succeed and gave them glimpses of things far beyond their own work and their own horizons” (Grotzinger, 1970, p. 313). This eloquent statement by Margaret Mann stands out in my mind as the description of an ideal mentor—someone not only capable of supporting, nurturing, and inspiring her protégées, but also able to impart a vision that empowered them to move beyond the barriers and restraints of time, place, and gender.3

Brilliant students such as Margaret Mann and Harriet Howe were not the only ones to benefit from mentoring by Katherine Sharp and her colleagues at Illinois. In a study on the placement of female library school students between 1887 and 1912, Joanne Passet has found ample evidence that women library educators (including Katharine Sharp and Frances Simpson at Illinois) also acted as mentors to many of their female students and were very influential in controlling access to the profession. These women “formed a powerful, albeit informal, placement network and functioned as gatekeepers to the profession” (Passet, 1991, p. 209). Their letters reveal that they provided support and guidance to students, attempted to influence employers, and often tried to help their protégées accommodate their families as well as advance their professional careers. While these library school directors’ efforts to help students integrate their personal and professional lives sometimes led them to suggest less-than-desirable positions for promising women, their concern in this regard is also evidence of a primary mentoring role in which the mentor’s support went beyond the narrower limits of career considerations.

TRANSITIONAL YEARS

Eight of the ten library schools set up before 1910 were founded and directed by women, but by 1921 when Charles Williamson conducted his survey of library education for the Carnegie Corporation, only seven out of fifteen schools with full-time programs were headed by women.
In his subsequent report, Williamson stated that the reasons library schools were "noticeably lacking in the prestige enjoyed by professional schools generally" was due to their small size, the "brevity of the course," "lack of . . . productive scholarship," "the preponderance of teachers having only the rank of instructor," and the "predominance of women in the faculty and student body" (Williamson, 1923, p. 142). Williamson's recommendation that all library schools be integrated into universities marked the first stage in a shift toward faculties dominated by male directors and professors.

The second major period in the history of women in library education lasted from 1924 to the drafting of the new standards in 1950; this was a transitional time when schools in libraries were closed or transferred to university campuses. During these years, female librarians and library educators actively participated in the subcommittees whose work would eventually establish the master's degree as the recognized credential for professionals. Nonetheless, women's leadership opportunities began to decline as library schools moved from the less-discriminatory environment of large libraries and four-year institutions into universities where those women who held faculty positions were often in the lowest ranks—-for many due in part to their lack of doctorates (see Graham, 1978). A few female library leaders did act as advocates for the creation of the first doctoral program in library science at the University of Chicago, but only one woman, Harriet Howe, was named to the original Chicago faculty. Although the first Ph.D. earned in this program went to a woman, a comprehensive study of library science dissertations revealed that only 41 doctorates were granted to women, whereas 97 were awarded to men between 1925 and 1955 (Schlachter & Thomison, 1974, p. 258). The smaller proportion of doctorates earned by women had a negative effect on the appointment and advancement of female faculty who gradually began to lose ground as leaders in library education (see tables and fuller discussion in Maack, 1986).

Despite their gradual loss of status in research-oriented universities, female library educators still played an important role in certain institutions. James Carmichael's (1994) study, which is largely centered on this transitional period, clearly shows that women who studied at Illinois and then returned to the South carried with them some of the missionary spirit that had characterized the early professional years of their mentors. In a sense, his paper makes a case for the idea that the
missionary period of both library development and library education occurred later and lasted longer in the South than elsewhere in the country. He notes:

The nature of the "missionary" work that ILS graduates performed in the pre-Civil Rights South was twofold: first, "missionary" in the political sense, since both southern and northern ILS graduates helped to align southern expectations of professional librarianship with prevailing norms of professional practice; and "missionary" in the sense of establishing "missions," or a network of referral through which interregional exchange of ideas and personnel could occur. (p. 81)

Carmichael also remarks that ILS graduates "founded or strengthened programs at George Peabody College for Teachers, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the College of William and Mary, Texas State Women's College, Louisiana State University, [and] Emory University. . ." (pp. 48, 50). In addition, women ILS graduates were also instrumental in the creation and expansion of library education programs for African-Americans; these leaders included Florence Rising Curtis, director of Hampton Institute, and Eliza Atkins Gleason, the first dean of the School of Library Service at Atlanta University. Gleason, who was also the first black person to get a doctorate in librarianship at the University of Chicago, was succeeded as dean by Virginia Lacy Jones, another black ILS graduate who later earned a Chicago doctorate.

MASCULINIZATION OF THE PROFESSORIATE

During the third period in the history of women in library education (which begins with the approval of the 1951 standards), ILS alumnae like Virginia Lacy Jones continued to play a leadership role at the national level. Nonetheless, these years are marked by the masculinization of the professoriate as women were progressively replaced by men—both in deanships and in the ranks of tenured faculty. Women's loss of status as leaders in library education occurred over a time period normally perceived as one of continuing professionalization and upward mobility for the field. This follows a pattern suggested by the historian Joan Kelly-Gadol (1976) who defines women's status as "the roles and positions women hold in society by comparison with those of men" (p. 810). She then goes on to observe:

Indeed, what emerges is a fairly regular pattern of relative loss of status for women precisely in those periods of so-called progressive change. . . . To pursue this problem is to become aware of the fact that there was no "renaissance" for women—at least not during the Renaissance. There was, on the contrary, a marked restriction of the scope and powers of women. (pp. 810-811)
Although there were many social, cultural, and economic factors that encouraged the recruitment of male library educators, the systematic, if unintentional, replacement of female faculty may also be linked to the leadership role played by library schools in the major universities—where biases against women have had a long, well-documented history. By 1955, women occupied only 23% of the teaching posts in higher education, but in major research universities like Chicago, Columbia, Michigan, and Berkeley, there were even fewer women faculty (Bernard, 1964, p. 40).

In a study of women's status in higher education, Patricia Graham (1978) notes that "an institution that was trying to move up the prestige ladder" began to follow the lead of prestigious universities by appointing male faculty, and by the 1950s, "several of the women's colleges [had] made a deliberate effort to increase the number of men on their faculties, presumably in the hope that this was a sign of improved quality, or at least, status" (p. 768). A similar trend was also observed in professional schools, particularly in fields where the majority of practitioners were women. In 1964, David Riesman commented: "When a field wants to raise its status, it may do so by avoiding 'guilt by association' with teaching-oriented or service-oriented women. For instance, schools of social work . . . have been gaining in prestige by securing men as their deans" (Riesman, 1964, p. xvii).

As yet, not enough historical research has been done to tell whether such policies were consciously implemented by library schools as they began to grow in size and number. However, it is possible to document the demographic shift between 1960, when women occupied a slight majority (55.4%) of the 168 faculty positions in the 30 accredited programs, and 1980 when women held 294 positions (or 41.2%) of the 714 faculty positions in 67 accredited programs (Kilpela, 1982, p. 243; Sineath, 1989, p. 5). These two crucial decades—when the number of schools more than doubled and the number of full-time faculty posts grew fourfold—coincided with the period when major universities began to make the doctorate a virtual prerequisite for faculty appointments (see Bowen & Schuster, 1986). This new emphasis on the research degree was a setback for female faculty, since women were only earning an average of 31.15% of the library and information science doctorates per year up until 1972 (Schlachter & Thomison, 1974, p. 258). Women began earning about half of the doctorates in the field in 1977, but by that point, there was little expansion in the number of new positions (Heim, 1982, p. 8).
Statistics gathered by the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) show that over the past decade (1980-90), the proportion of female faculty has risen by 5.1 percentage points, and by 1990 female faculty held 46.3% of full-time positions in ALA-accredited programs. These gains are particularly evident at the assistant professor level where women now occupy 64% of the positions. Although there has been much more active recruitment of women to faculty posts, it must be emphasized that the greatest growth of female faculty has been at the entry level where there was an increase of 11.5%. However, the proportion of women at the associate professor rank rose by just 4.6%, and the proportion of women holding full professor rank declined from 32.8% in 1980 to 26% in 1990 (Sineath, 1990).

MENTORING OF WOMEN FACULTY TODAY

Statistics such as those cited above show that women's progress in library education has been uneven at best; however, they offer us few clues as to why women have not been moving up in the academic ranks. Because Joanne Passet and I, as historians, had been impressed with the importance of mentoring in the past, we decided to conduct a study of current mentoring among women faculty to determine whether contemporary library educators were still benefiting from the kind of mentoring that Laurel Grotzinger has shown to be an important, "indestructible" characteristic of ILS. In the book and articles that have resulted from our study, we have carefully avoided the use of names in order to protect the confidentiality of our respondents; however, we did find evidence of an enduring, intergenerational network of mentoring that originated at ILS. Some of our respondents who were nearing retirement warmly recalled Thelma Eaton; others cited Kathryn Luther Henderson, who continues to maintain a very extensive network of protégées. Several women in our youngest cohort praised the support and direction they had received from Linda Smith, and others who knew her described her as an outstanding role model. However, of all the Illinois mentors named by our respondents, the most moving tribute was paid to Virginia Lacy Jones who, like Sharp, inspired her protégées to become mentors. One woman recalled:

She believed in women's rights. She was quiet but very firm. She liked clothes, enjoyed life, and worked very hard. She told me, "Never be intimidated when you deal with men. Curse, don't cry." She also told me to take time, be patient, don't try to move too fast. Move when you're ready and be confident. ... I learned to mentor because she was a mentor. (Maack & Passet, 1994, p. 67)
In order to gather information on attitudes and values, as well as personal experiences with mentoring and other support relationships, we designed our study using open-ended interview questions. During the first phase (the spring and fall of 1989), focus group interviews were conducted with women library educators at three schools in the East, three in the Midwest, and two on the West Coast. Doctoral students also participated in the discussions, and their comments added a great deal to our understanding of the mentoring process. Although some of the questions for the focus group interviews were formulated with reference to previous research that had been done on role models or on mentoring, others grew directly out of our personal experience. As facilitators in the group interview process, we found these sessions not simply a vehicle for obtaining information but an opportunity for mutual learning and sharing among colleagues. While the dynamics of each group were different, the sessions were always intense and often deeply moving as we reflected on the ways in which we had been drawn into the field and recalled the support we had received from family members, friends, colleagues, and mentors.

Although the focus group interviews provided opportunities to capture themes and issues that might not have come out in individual interviews, the dynamics of the group process do not allow for collecting data that are necessarily comparable or quantifiable. Even though the orientation of our study was qualitative rather than quantitative, we wanted to be sure that the data we collected represented a range of mentoring relationships experienced by female library educators at all ranks and from all parts of the country. Therefore, in the second phase of our research, telephone interviews were conducted with 100 female library educators whose names were drawn as a weighted sample of all 236 full-time female faculty in U.S. schools listed as accredited programs in the 1987-88 Directory of the Association for Library and Information Science Education. The weighting for this sample was by both rank and region.

In examining major influences on the career development of these academic women, we adopted a holistic approach that attempts to focus on the complex interdependencies between work and home, between the profession and library education, and between the university and its broader social context. As our mode of inquiry, we chose to use inductive analysis, which involves "exploring genuinely open questions rather than testing theoretically derived (deductive) hypotheses" (Patton, 1990, p. 40). The core of our study was therefore based on several clusters
of related questions. These questions centered on three separate but closely interwoven themes: (1) Were there significant role models whom these women identified as they entered their academic career? (2) What were their attitudes toward mentoring, and did they have access to mentors during and/or after completing their highest university degree? (3) What were the main factors that influenced their career patterns in academia?

Through personal conversations, focus group sessions, and telephone interviews, more than 150 female faculty shared with us their efforts to compose their lives within the complex environment of higher education. Many themes run through this cross-generational study, but one that recurs most often is the importance of role models and mentors acting as agents of inspiration, catalysts to move in new directions, and sources of support. Other important themes include the desire to bring about positive change through teaching and research and the challenge of attaining personal balance while being a productive faculty member and an active professional.

The lives of the women participating in our study have not been composed as a linear progression but could be better understood as compositions punctuated by postponements and transformations, shifting priorities and challenges, modifications and compromises, achievements and disruptions. However, once they attained faculty status, career interruptions were either short or nonexistent, and very few indicated that they had ever refused or postponed a promotion. On the other hand, relatively few declared that they had actively sought promotion to full professor, and a number of those who were deans recalled that they might not have pursued a deanship had they not been strongly encouraged and supported by mentors, peers, or family members.

Opportunities, attitudes, and career strategies changed markedly between the cohort of women born during the Depression years and those who came of age at the height of the new feminist movement. As the university and the broader society changed, women from the two older cohorts were able to transform their lives in ways that most of them could not have envisioned when they were undergraduates. In contrast, those from the youngest cohort moved toward an academic career much earlier and were able to benefit from affirmative action as beginning faculty members. Mentors who emphasized research were also more available to the younger women, but respondents from all three cohorts cited supportive mentors who helped them gain visibility and realize their potential.
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CAREER STRATEGIES AND ATTITUDES TOWARD MENTORING

A few women in each age cohort indicated that they did not feel a need for mentoring at any point in their career. These respondents—who often described themselves as "self-motivated and independent" or "a loner"—often felt that mentoring might be important to some individuals even if they themselves did not find it necessary. A full professor commented: "I wish I had known about mentoring and cultivated [such relationships], but I was fiercely independent." Although she recalled that early in her career she had had some faculty mentors, she noted: "They tried to do things for me but I resisted." A few other women also spoke of rejecting a potential mentor (often a very strong-minded woman) because they did not want to be pushed in a certain direction. However, our respondents rarely decided to break off a relationship because they found that it had become destructive or because the mentor was too domineering. One dean observed: "Some people may use power as a quasi-mentor: to intimidate. There is so much politics. Good mentors know how to help you and when."

Our respondents did offer a few examples of negative mentoring, but such experiences generally occurred early in their lives. Often the individual giving the negative advice was a counselor or teacher, but sometimes a friend, relative, or employer was mentioned. Often such advice was roundly rejected; for example, a woman who later became a dean responded to the suggestion that she would be a good secretary with the retort: "I don't intend to be a secretary, I will be a boss." While a number of others expressed confidence in their ability to pursue their chosen career path, several had been deflected from entering male-dominated fields like law or engineering as a result of gender-biased counseling during their college years. Almost no one described negative mentoring while working on the M.L.S., but in several instances, women had been discouraged from pursuing a doctorate due to advice from a dean or director who did not feel that the Ph.D. was necessary or that it would enhance their teaching. While a few women believed that their careers had been adversely affected by following such advice, respondents at the assistant or associate professor level often felt that they suffered much more from the general lack of mentoring than from negative mentoring.

Overall, we found that positive mentoring experiences increased with each academic level. Only 11 women described having an influential
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mentor when they were in college, but 21 enjoyed such a relationship while working on the M.L.S. Although nearly half of our respondents had had no mentoring when they were in the master's program, some of these individuals felt that they had little opportunity to be mentored because they had been part-time students or simply because the program was so short. Once they reached the doctoral level, 78 of the respondents had had at least one mentor, and 46 of these described the relationship as influential. Given the predominance of male faculty in the senior ranks at research universities, it was somewhat surprising to find that male mentors were mentioned in only five more instances than female mentors.

Evidence from our interviews and from our study of research productivity indicates that mentoring is important, although not essential, to academic achievement. Although the great majority of our respondents appreciatively recalled the guidance and support they had received from their professors, we found little indication that their mentors had actively helped them develop lifelong career strategies. Most women who were over 55 stated that they did not originally plan to become faculty members but were open to new opportunities in library education as fellowships and/or teaching positions opened up during the 1960s and 1970s. Many from this generation were also able to move up in academic rank before university promotion requirements became increasingly rigid; however, one woman in her fifties recalled that her former dissertation advisor had prodded her to consider promotion by asking why she had not yet attained a full professorship. Although the majority of the younger women in our study described definite research goals (which should ultimately lead to promotion), many still seemed inclined to wait until others nudged them to move on to the next academic rank.

More of the younger women did state that a full professorship was one of their career goals, and a few from this group also indicated that they were developing a long-term research agenda. However, only one woman, a dean in her early forties, described a carefully thought out career development plan. She described her future goals as moving up in university administration, perhaps becoming dean of the graduate division. She noted: “The kind of life I have chosen to lead is challenging. I try to participate in my kids’ lives. I am very organized. I have really planned my career, where I should be, how old I should be.” Planning of this nature appears quite exceptional; among the women in our sample, no one mentioned a clearly defined set of career strategies as she reflected on her long-term goals.
Unlike many high-achieving women in the study, the dean cited above also characterized herself as “a loner” who neither sought nor needed much mentoring. However, support from family, including her parents as well as her husband, was very important to her; in addition, she described herself as mentoring students, junior faculty, and staff. Her case illustrates the importance both of planning for career development and being able to draw on support from individuals at various positions within the relationship constellation. While the role of a mentor has been described as “crucial” or “essential” by some respondents, one person can seldom fulfill the various kinds of developmental needs one must confront as an adult. Other women in our sample who did not feel they needed mentoring often cited the importance of family, and one assistant professor stated that support from her husband and extended family was more important than that from senior colleagues or peers.

Although peer support may become more important than mentoring after one achieves tenure, the fact that women often undervalue their own accomplishments and have been generally discouraged from putting themselves forward may make it more important for them to find someone in a senior position who can act as a mentor at a later point in their career. Even when a faculty member reaches the career stage where he or she is providing mentoring to students or younger colleagues, encouragement and validation from a mentor can still provide a catalyst to accept new challenges. One very innovative dean commented: “We all have more failures than successes.” A mentor can not only offer opportunities but can help the protégée develop a willingness to try out options where success is not guaranteed.

Although many of our respondents felt that no one could replace their primary mentor, some did indicate that they had been mentored by a number of individuals at various stages in their careers. However, very few women described actively seeking new mentors as their careers developed; others, who believed that mentoring was important, warned against trying to force a mentoring relationship. While it is true that a primary mentoring relationship must be built on strong mutual rapport, secondary mentoring, which can be useful and appropriate at particular times, need not have the same degree of mutuality, emotional depth, and continuity. Although a close mentoring relationship may play an essential role at a given moment in one’s career, other support relationships should be sought and cultivated.
Despite their positive experience with early career mentoring, few of our respondents had guidance in developing lifelong career strategies. In reviewing their long-term goals, most respondents tended to enumerate specific projects or grants rather than envision a career that would pass through different stages. Although some women had had a warm, continuous relationship with their mentors, the active phase of mentoring, as they described it, generally did not go beyond assistance through the tenure process. Once they had achieved tenure, it seemed that many lacked the extra support and counseling they may have needed to pursue advancement to full professorships. Mentoring was often described as being most critical at a time of transition—such as moving to a new university. However, in the best cases, it can also empower the individual with the confidence to develop her potential while composing a life that includes both structure and improvisation.

Overall, the majority of women in our survey were very positive about mentoring relationships. When asked about their attitude toward mentoring, only six respondents indicated they did not consider it important. One retired dean who had felt no need for a mentor declared that mentoring was "over-rated," and an associate professor in her early sixties linked mentoring with power, describing it as "a kind of control over someone." However, the younger women who did not consider mentoring important indicated that "it helps in certain environments" or conceded that while mentoring is "not necessary for success . . . for certain personalities a mentor is more necessary than others." Other respondents who believed that mentoring was important in general (even if not to them personally) also indicated that the need to have a mentor varied among individuals. Altogether 46% of our respondents described mentoring as "very important," and another 48% rated it as "somewhat important."

While our findings indicate that a majority of our respondents had male mentors at the Ph.D. level, women who did their doctoral work in the 1970s and 1980s more frequently mentioned senior women who actively helped them become established as researchers. This change has come about not only because there are now somewhat more tenured women faculty in schools with doctoral programs but also because these senior women are themselves more research oriented. Women who finished college prior to 1965 often encountered women library school faculty without doctorates; these instructors either held lecturer appointments or were promoted at a time when universities imposed much less rigorous research requirements as criteria for advancement. Although one woman
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in her early fifties felt that she and her peers were the first generation of researchers, by the 1960s a few female professors had gained a reputation for their research. However, because these were "exceptional" women who achieved their tenuous foothold against considerable odds, they were recalled by some participants as "having difficult personalities" and being much less supportive of women with families than were their male colleagues.

Fortunately, both the attitudes and behavior of most senior women faculty seem to have changed dramatically. Perhaps one of our most striking findings is the enthusiasm with which the women interviewed responded to the question: "Have you been a mentor to your students?" Overwhelmingly, they indicated that they are making a conscious effort to help younger women. Furthermore, they frequently described their support of younger women as both a responsibility and a highly rewarding activity. In this respect, our field, which has a larger proportion of female faculty than most other disciplines, might be seen as pioneering in what the poet Adrienne Rich (1975) envisioned as a "women-centered university." Rich used a maternal metaphor as the key to a transformed academy: "A woman-centered university would be a place in which the much-distorted mother-daughter relationship could find a new model: where women of maturer attainments in every field would provide intellectual guidance along with concern for the wholeness of their young women students. . . . [They would also provide] an older woman's sympathy and unique knowledge of the processes younger women were going through, along with the power to give concrete assistance and support (p. 29).

While we may still be a long way from achieving Rich's ideal, women have been acting as change agents both in the work world and in the university. Furthermore, their introduction of feminist methodology is slowly transforming both research and teaching, especially in the social sciences. The implications that new feminist paradigms and research findings can have for library history will be explored in the last portion of this paper.

POWER, CHANGE, AND WOMEN'S VALUES

Our study of mentoring was greatly enriched by the work of feminist scholars in other fields, especially psychology and higher education. One of the most significant recent books in this area is Women of Influence,
Women of Vision by Helen Astin from the Graduate School of Education at the University of California in Los Angeles (UCLA) and Carole Leland from the Center for Creative Leadership in San Diego. In this cross-generational study of leaders and social change, the authors demonstrate that women faculty have exerted considerable power as scholars and teachers who are redefining the way we think about the world. Drawing on their research findings, Astin and Leland develop a new, more inclusive model of leadership that takes into account those who have reshaped our intellectual landscape and have either instigated or inspired action as "nonpositional leaders." Astin and Leland (1991) write:

While in popular usage the term leader often denotes someone who has a position, in our study the category leader included both positional leaders, such as heads of organizations or institutions, and nonpositional leaders—for instance, university professors and other researchers who create the knowledge central to social change. (pp. 8-9)

They go on to describe this proposed framework as "a model of feminist leadership in that it views leadership as nonhierarchical and represents the leader as a catalyst or facilitator who enables others to act collectively toward the accomplishment of a common goal" (p. 11).

The model of the "nonpositional leader" developed by Astin and Leland is of particular importance in female-intensive fields such as librarianship where the directorships of major institutions are still more frequently held by men than by women. By studying those women whose leadership was oriented toward service rather than administration, we can reclaim an aspect of our collective experience that has been too often ignored. By adopting this model, we can also focus on how women have used "conditioned power" which is not based on imposing one's will but on bringing out change through persuasion, education, or social commitment. This approach was advocated by Patricia Glass Schuman in a 1984 article entitled, "Women, Power, and Libraries." After noting that women are often socialized to feel that the desire to have power was somehow not "proper" (p. 42), Schuman urged that power be redefined as "the ability to get co-operation" (p. 46). She continues: "By that definition we have power when we can gain access to resources, information, and support and we mobilize these effectively to get things done" (p. 46).

Perhaps as a result of their ambivalence toward power or perhaps because of not being recruited to administrative posts (and thus to "positional leadership" status), a number of women librarians who wished to work
for change have chosen the route of library education. Many women who were interviewed in our mentoring study identified teaching with "making a difference," and one associate professor expressed her belief that being a faculty member at a top-rated university meant "being well positioned to make a long-term impact on the field." A full professor commented, "In teaching, I am molding minds, helping to develop the profession," and an assistant professor who described herself as a "change agent" noted that her goal was "to bring about change for the good of the whole."

These library educators shared values which were described by Astin and Leland (1991) as "essential" to the identity of many of the participants in their study of 77 women in higher education whose leadership has "resulted in significant societal changes on behalf of women" (p. 12). One of their interviewees stated that she believed her role as an intellectual was "to serve as a catalyst for other people's development," and another said, "I see my role with the graduate students as simply teaching them everything, both politically and academically, and empowering them" (p. 122). A third woman commented: "I'm out to have an impact on that student, to change that student's attitude . . . to inspire that student to do better and to go on and do differently" (p. 123).

The need to link research and action also characterized the scholars studied by Astin and Leland (1991), who describe these women as sharing "values that address change, the energy of personal motivation and involvement . . . and the capacity to look up from oneself and out to a society of the future" (p. 83). Similar values and goals were expressed by several of the respondents in our mentoring study. One library and information science professor commented at length on her view that interdisciplinary research could be a catalyst for innovation:

I hope the research will help to incorporate major changes in the way reference librarians carry out their work. I hope to analyze present practice and by mapping practice then change how we practice. I am out to change the field, to move it in a certain way. I may work with anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists. My research is designed to lead to positive changes.

This woman's vision also mirrors that of the women in the Astin and Leland (1991) study who "have chosen to engage in scholarly activity about women out of a desire to bring about change. . . . They are social innovators, and their research and scholarship represent their social activism" (p. 83).

Patricia Lunneborg, a psychology professor at the University of Washington, is another scholar who has presented a different view of women in the workplace by addressing the issue of how gender affects
both values and actions. Her book, *Women Changing Work*, is structured not as a traditional research study but as a "feminist discourse" that documents "the unique ways that feminists have predicted and perceived that women would perform 'men's jobs'" (Lunneborg, 1990, p. vii). Lunneborg also notes that this is a celebratory book about a becoming-perceptible transformation, the reworking of male occupations based on women's unique life experiences" (p. vii).

In discussing her unorthodox methodology, Lunneborg (1990) notes: "We had fun doing the interviews." She goes on to explain: "The environment for the interviews was informal, open, warm, and cooperative. There are no experimenters and subjects in feminist research, just participants working together" (p. xvi). The central focus of these interviews was the question: "How do you approach your job differently than do the men in it, based on your upbringing and experiences as a woman?" (p. xiii). Lunneborg's study of women in traditionally male fields included physicians, lawyers, engineers, architects, stockbrokers, state legislators, fire fighters, police officers, electricians, and carpenters. She found that across these varied occupations women had (1) a service orientation toward clients, (2) a nurturing approach toward co-workers, (3) an insistence on a balanced life-style, and (4) an attraction to managing others by using power differently than men did (p. xviii).

As was noted earlier, higher education has remained a male field where women still account for a minority of all tenured faculty. Have they truly begun to change academia? Has their style of research and their dedication to teaching had an effect that goes beyond the walls of the classroom or the pages of scholarly journals? Although Lunneborg (1990) does not include faculty members in her study, she observes that she herself was always "very different from the men" in the psychology department because she not only "offered courses no one else would dream of teaching" but also "taught in a completely different style from the men" and "did research that no one else was interested in." Although she at first considered most of her women colleagues as much "more like the men," she observed: "Still, as I think back on them, almost all of the women did their work differently. They only spoke up in faculty meeting if they had a point to make . . . [they] didn't disparage undergraduate teaching . . . [and they] treated their graduate students more humanely and sympathetically (pp. xiii-xiv).

Has such behavior on the part of a small minority of the faculty had any impact on higher education? In a 1990 report to the Carnegie Foundation,
Ernest Boyer states: "During the past several years, while visiting colleges and universities across the nation, I've been struck by the renewed attention being paid to undergraduate education" (p. xi). A central theme in the Carnegie report, which has been widely discussed on campuses throughout the country, is the need to shift from the narrow research model of faculty rewards to a broader definition of "scholarship" that would include some of the kinds of activities for which women faculty have been especially noted: teaching, service, and integration of scholarship into both the intellectual life and social fabric of the nation. The Carnegie report concludes "that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching" (Boyer, 1990, p. 16). While this new model may indeed reflect many of the ideas and values women bring to the university, looking at the kind of male-centered, market-driven decisions that university administrators make when budgets are severely reduced would suggest that a radical transformation of the university reward system may still take another generation.

Even though significant changes in the power structure of universities seem distant, the growth of feminist scholarship over the past two decades is a well-documented phenomenon in the social sciences and humanities (e.g., see DuBois et al., 1987, pp. 157-194). In addition, traditionally masculine fields like law are being influenced by feminist scholars and practitioners. UCLA law professor Carrie Menkel-Meadow (1992) writes: "Across a broad spectrum of legal doctrines, methods and practices, feminists (both male and female) have argued that the articulation of 'women's values' of care, connection, nurturance, sensitivity to others, [and] experienced-based reasoning will transform many aspects of legal doctrine, as well as practice" (p. 1516). Because the field of law has remained male dominated, feminists have faced the tension of remaining separate but vocal or trying to "mainstream" both their careers and ideas. Menkel-Meadow introduces her article on feminist legal theory by stating: "For me, the feminist project is ultimately a humanist project involving the pursuit of equality, justice, safety, respect, compassion and well being for all. Mainstreaming has its dangers, but is also essential" (p. 1497).

THE ETHIC OF CARE AND THE MATERNAL METAPHOR

While the integration of women's values into law, university teaching, and other male-dominated fields has been a slow and difficult process, because the feminization of librarianship occurred at a time when the
field was rapidly evolving, women soon entered the mainstream of the new profession and were therefore able to profoundly shape its value system. Although the most prestigious directorships were held by men, many women can be identified as opinion leaders who often functioned as change agents without holding administrative posts. However, it is only recently that historians have attempted to consider how women's unique vision and values may have influenced the transformation of librarianship from a custodial occupation or a scholar's avocation to a service profession with a strong cultural, educational, and social mission.

In a thoughtful paper published in 1983, library historian Phyllis Dain called attention to "the importance of feminist consciousness" in attempting "to understand and depict a profession in which so many women have participated" (p. 462). Since then, there has been a steady if small stream of studies that have explored the accomplishments of individual women. Among this new work is Denise Sallee's (1992) biographical study of Anne Hadden, who described her experiences in setting up 126 branch libraries and bringing books by horseback to remote regions of Monterey County, California, as a "great adventure" (p. 359). Larger studies focusing on collective achievements of women, such as Joanne Passet's article on women as itinerant catalogers (Passet, 1990a) and her work on women librarians in the American West (Passet, 1990b), have also begun to reassess the stereotype of the genteel, passive librarian. Passet (in press) writes: "Motivated by a library spirit instilled during their professional training, these women both embodied and challenged contemporary gender ideology." Like the county librarian in California who discovered that "it is easy enough to speak before an audience if you have something to say," (Sallee, 1992, p. 357), the women in Passet's study also "transcended the Victorian image of women when they moved into the public arena to deliver speeches, engage in community politics, and use their powers of persuasion to extend library service" (Passet, in press).

By examining the ways that such women, who might be described as "nonpositional leaders," shaped both the practice and philosophy of librarianship, our understanding and appreciation of our common past will be enriched. Dain (1983), who champions this approach, asks:

Must we accept society's preoccupation with leadership elites and aggregate outcomes as the measures of importance? Or should we ... start with what was actually accomplished in terms of impact on individuals. ... ? In the
end this intellectual nurturing—and I use the word without apology or embarrassment—is what the librarian aims for, either directly through interpersonal contact or indirectly through collection development and organization. (pp. 452-453)

The creation and development of many kinds of user-oriented services are a concrete expression of the "intellectual nurturing" role played by women librarians who offered books in many languages to immigrants, built county library systems to serve the rural population, extended services to the disadvantaged, and created the field of children's services.

In a paper given at the Washington Library Association Conference in April 1993, Sydney Chambers and Carolynne Myall carry the nurturing analogy further by using a "maternal metaphor of creation" to describe how librarians have shaped their profession in a way that clearly reflects "the ethic of care" as described by psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982) and other feminist scholars. They also draw on the ideas of psychologist Mary Field Belenky who advances the thesis that "women typically approach adulthood with the understanding that the care and empowerment of others is central to their life's work" (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 48). Focusing on the ethical dimensions of care and empowerment, Chambers and Myall (1993) define women's values as "a constellation of moral themes and beliefs" (pp. 5-6). Some of these values which they identify include: "responsibility to community and a sense of responsibility for community; co-operation rather than competition; concern for children and weaker members of the community;... a nonjudgemental appreciation for multiple points of view. . . ; holistic view of human beings; . . . and connectedness" (p. 5). Using numerous historical and contemporary examples, they demonstrate how these values have been expressed in client relationships which have usually been nonauthoritarian: "Since the time women entered library work in large numbers, librarianship's intended goal, both for the professional-client relationship and for libraries role in society, has moved firmly away from control of clients to provision of opportunity and enrichment for them on their own terms, to empowerment" (p. 26).

Although librarians working in the early part of this century did not use the term "empowerment," many of them defined their goals as fostering the autonomy of their clients. Among prominent female librarians who expressed this philosophy was Margaret Mann for whom the mission of the cataloger was to convey information about library materials in order to "to provide a means through which clients could choose to help themselves" (quoted in Chambers & Myall, 1993, p. 23). In a similar
fashion, Isadore Gilbert Mudge described reference service as helping the student to make “independent and intelligent use of the library resource” (quoted in Grotzinger, 1978, p. 178). These two outstanding leaders, whose contributions are honored by ALA citations, not only embraced “women’s values” but also lived lives that showed them to be active agents in the history of the profession.

**TOWARD A “NEW” FEMINISM IN LIBRARIANSHIP**

The papers presented in this volume have primarily focused on women’s vision, on their values and dreams, their supportive relationships with students, and their commitment to growth and change. Nonetheless, we must also acknowledge that librarianship as a profession has not been created by women alone but has come out of the joint efforts of women and men working together for a common cause, often with little or no consideration of gender issues. Yet despite a strong tradition of sharing in the creation of the field, the issue of a truly egalitarian distribution of power and prestige within the workplace has yet to be resolved. We have not yet embraced the kind of change that Kathleen Weibel called for in her 1976 article where she described a “feminist profession” as being “built on humanitarian values and advocacy of women’s full participation in political, social, and economic spheres” which can only occur through a major redistribution of power in the broader society. Weibel affirms that this kind of feminism “further calls for a transformation of our concepts of power: compassion and support rather than aggression and dominance. As a value system as well as a social movement, feminism demands a change in basic assumptions as well as an alteration in life style” (Weibel, 1976, p. 267).

A decade and a half later, a similar plea was also made by Roma Harris (1992) in her book, *Librarianship: The Erosion of a Woman’s Profession*. For her, the call for a “new” librarianship means reconsidering and, perhaps, reembracing the old librarianship by restoring to it a brand of female professionalism. This includes a (re)commitment to service (based on a female rather than a male model), advocacy vis-à-vis the public’s right to equitable access to information; and activism with respect to employment issues including status, salary, and equity in the workplace. It comes down, in other words, to the members of the field embracing a feminist analysis of their profession. (pp. 163-164)

Such an analysis must draw on the work of feminist scholars from other disciplines and professions, using new definitions and models to reflect the voice, perception, and experience of women in librarianship. For
example, by using Astin and Leland's (1991) definition of "power as empowerment," we can envision power as an "expandable resource... produced and shared through interaction." Astin and Leland further note that "this conception views power as energy that transforms oneself and others, and identifies the effective leader as one who empowers others to act in their own interests" (p. 1). Although often unrecognized, this kind of power has been central to the ideology of librarianship, and at its best, library practice has emphasized the sharing of knowledge rather than the jealous guarding of professional expertise. Today, the goal of shared knowledge characterizes the movement for "information literacy" which is described as "a means of personal empowerment" that enables people to not only identify information needs and locate sources but to evaluate, organize, and effectively use the available information (American Library Association, Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, 1989, p. 2).

Empowerment through extending access to the unserved has also been at the heart of previous movements to reach out to the "information poor"—whether these people lacked access due to geographic isolation, income level, low literacy skills, lack of fluency in English, or blindness or other physical handicaps. Today as the ideal of offering equal access to all has taken on new implications, librarians are actively trying to ensure that the proposed electronic information highway be accessible to the underprivileged as well as to those who can afford to pay.

Like UCLA law professor Carrie Menkel-Meadow, I believe that creating a feminist profession is ultimately "a humanist project" based on equality and mutual respect. Because women, from Katharine Sharp's generation to the present, have played an active, generative role in the field, feminist librarianship must draw on its historical roots as well as embrace the ideas of contemporary feminists—both male and female. A truly feminist librarianship then is not hesitant to validate its role in intellectual nurturing and to claim as its goal "an enlightened citizenry" assisted and empowered by librarians to use the full range of information sources for personal enjoyment and enrichment, for lifelong learning, for work and play, and, ultimately, for the public good.

NOTES

1 The name of the school was listed as the Illinois State Library School on the Illinois State Library School Circular of Information from 1897 until 1909. Beginning with the Circular for 1910-11, it was called the University of Illinois Library School. In 1981, the
Mary Niles Maack

name was changed to its present form—the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

2 A few librarians, such as Gratia Countryman (the Minneapolis public library director who served as ALA president from 1933 to 1934), have been identified as advocates of women's suffrage. Although others may have been involved in the suffrage movement, it is often difficult to find documentation on librarians' activities that were not closely related to their professional lives. More recently, a study of feminism in contemporary librarianship (Baum, 1992) found that "liberal feminism" rather than radical feminist issues dominated library science publications dealing with women's issues from 1965 to 1985.

3 In recognition of the enduring truth of Margaret Mann's words, Joanne Passet and I decided to use this quotation to introduce the first chapter of our book on contemporary mentoring (Maack & Passet, 1994).

4 All anonymous quotes are from the mentoring study by Mary Niles Maack and Joanne Passet (1994).

5 "Conditioned" is a term introduced by John Kenneth Galbraith (1983) who contrasts it with "condign power" that enforces submission through threats or punishment and "compensatory power" that gains compliance through the use of rewards, such as money.
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