



Services to Scholars

CARL M. WHITE

"SCHOLARSHIP MAY be defined as high competence in a delimited field of conscious and sustained inquiry for related facts, valid generalizations, and workable truths."¹ This is a good definition from the standpoint of the profession of scholarship but not from the standpoint of the library profession; it implies a remoteness, a separability of scholarly materials from the needs of "non-scholars" that is unrealistic and impractical. Intelligent laymen can, do, and should use many of these materials productively. They can do so because the greatest mass education program on record gives so many men and women the necessary basis of comprehension for use and also because so many of these people continue to grow in wisdom and stature long after they leave the classroom. William L. Clements illustrates how thin the line is which distinguishes professional and lay scholarship—although he is hardly typical. With limited schooling he made himself an authority on the literature dealing with the early history of our country. William Warner Bishop says of the collection he assembled and gave to the University of Michigan that its greatness lay less in the rarity, price, and reputation of its items than in the extraordinary scholarship and critical judgment shown in the selection of materials.²

Other examples are contributed by librarians themselves: "Time and again I have seen reference workers made wise by long years of training handle with consummate ease and success an inquiry which had baffled inexperienced folk of excellent, even superior, training."³

We need more precise knowledge of differences, real and fancied, between professional and lay scholarship. Meanwhile library experience shows that when in 1939-40 debate teams in Michigan "Resolved that the United States should follow a policy of strict isolation towards all nations outside of the Western Hemisphere engaged in armed international conflict," these young thinkers used materials similar to those being used in the same great debate by their parents who were

Mr. White is Dean of the Faculty of Library Service at Columbia University.

Services to Scholars

editing newspapers, teaching, preaching, farming, and making automobiles—and that the best informed of these adults were in turn using materials similar to those being used by professional scholars at the University of Michigan. Library experience also shows growing public interest in having access to existing scholarly materials, shows it both in requests for access to institutional collections as well as in the multiplication of scholarly collections outside recognized centers of scholarship. The U.S. Weather Bureau has probably the largest library in the world devoted to the meteorological sciences. Certain specialized collections used by the automotive industry in Detroit are probably unsurpassed. While the Library of Congress “is primarily a scholarly library, . . . it is a ‘people’s library of reference’ also.”⁴

This paper assumes that the differences, while real, between scholarly libraries and certain other libraries are at times exaggerated by thinking of the scholar as a more distinct species than the facts of library experience show him to be. The differences seem to be a matter more of degree than kind. Accordingly, the meaning given “scholar” here will differ from the definition above. Ralph Waldo Emerson defined the scholar as “Man Thinking.”⁵ Born in the climate of reason provided by the eighteenth century, our nation stands in a peculiar way for the application of intelligence to the problems of life. It will accordingly be convenient to let the term “scholar” include any person who regularly uses the library—any type of library—for this purpose.

A word about “services.” If we were to analyze the meaning of libraries in the life of a free society, such services could be enumerated as the role of libraries in giving man power over what Emerson calls the mind of the past, their role in putting this accumulated knowledge to work, in advancing the boundaries of accumulated knowledge, in formal as well as informal education, and in maintaining access to the record free of partisan or sectarian influence. Our job here has as its focus, not society, but individual readers. We are to take stock of what the individual scholar can and does receive from libraries. Such an inventory is too big a job to be done all at once, but here are seven services, or classes of service, which if quickly reviewed will tell us a lot about the shape our business is in.

1. *Free lending.* Sixteen years ago a study of the recorded use as shown by the circulation figures of university libraries over a period of years showed a long curve sloping sharply upward.⁶ The summary in Table 1 brings the record down to date for twenty of the libraries which participated in the original study.

TABLE 1

*Summaries of Recorded Use in Twenty University Libraries**

	Total Recorded Circulation	Per Cent Based on 1927-28	Total Persons Regularly Using These Libraries†	Per Cent Based on 1927-28	Per Capita Use	Per Cent Based on 1927-28
1927-28	6,618,257	100.0	170,291	100.0	38.86	100.0
1936-37	9,042,708	135.1	191,825	112.6	47.14	121.3
1947-48	13,205,862	199.6	346,164	203.2	38.15	98.1
1952-53	11,051,630	168.5	250,409	170.4	44.13	113.5

* Brown, Chicago, Cincinnati, Columbia (Teachers College included in accordance with earlier practice), Cornell, Illinois, Iowa State, Iowa University, Louisiana, McGill, Michigan, North Carolina, Northwestern, Ohio State, Oregon, Princeton, Stanford, Temple, Tennessee, and Toronto.

† Figures include faculty and students during the regular academic year. To the total were added summer session figures, reduced in weight to allow for the fact that a student is in residence only a fraction of the time of a student who is in residence during the regular year.

Total use recorded in these libraries rose over 68 per cent in twenty-five years, the gain being around 100 per cent at the peak of postwar registration. Per capita use went down then, climbed back in 1952-53 to a point 13 per cent above the figures for 1927-28, but there has been a leveling off, and since 1936-37 a drop.

This drop is a reversal of a long trend in recorded per capita use which held steady till around the outbreak of World War II. Comments made by librarians in transmitting the information needed to bring the original study up to date enumerate various factors which have a bearing on this leveling off—in some libraries a falling off: the effects of the war and the unsettled times in which we now live (“The students now are less well prepared [due to the war-originated crisis in secondary schools] and reflect the fact that they are children of an uncertain age.”); progress away from the use of reserved-book collections as textbooks in different form; lending regulations which reduce circulation statistics but provide better service—and better public relations; spread of measures designed to supervise institutional property without interposing physical barriers between readers and books. These measures include organization of materials by division, spread of the undergraduate library idea, opening stacks to more readers, placing room control at the exit instead of at the desk, and new buildings which emphasize free access. Princeton’s faculty and students have worked in the midst of their books since 1948. The entire collection at Iowa has been on open shelves since 1952. Chicago,

Services to Scholars

Columbia, Illinois, Oregon, and Stanford, among others, have taken steps of various kinds in recent years all aimed at bettering opportunities for free access.

All this adds up to saying that postwar developments are accelerating a change in *manner of use* which in its way is as much of a departure from nineteenth-century lending practices as free lending itself is from the chained book. We do not have adequate measures to tell us how much, if any, the *volume* of use has gained while the manner of use has been changing the looks of our statistics. There are indications that the gain may be considerable—the count of students in the stacks at Stanford, circulation combined with door count at Princeton, etc. Be this as it may, the pattern of service is being recut around the idea of *quality* of service, and if lending services, old style, are losing ground in the process, it is to be expected. Meanwhile, statistics for books borrowed from the library—what is ordinarily meant by “recorded use”—are being kept, but kept perhaps in better perspective. Librarians have long pointed out that these statistics do not measure total use, and even the use thus measured is sometimes productive, sometimes not.

Nevertheless, free lending as one means of access remains a key service of the institutional library. The interlibrary loan is a reminder of this fact, if one is needed. The twenty libraries mentioned above made 59 per cent more loans to scholars through other libraries in 1952-53 than in 1947-48, and borrowed 22 per cent more during the same period. Table 2 shows the same upward trend over a longer period for a somewhat smaller group of libraries.

TABLE 2
*Interlibrary Loans Handled by Eleven Universities**

	1927-28	%	1936-37	%	1947-48	%	1952-53	%
Items loaned	7,214	100	15,560	215.6	27,345	379.0	41,749	592.5
Items borrowed	4,014	100	6,745	168.0	13,245	329.7	16,935	421.8

* Chicago, Cincinnati, Columbia, Cornell, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio State, Princeton, and Stanford.

We do not know all the factors back of this upsweep. We do know the curve would climb even faster if photocopying had not developed into such a valuable means of facilitating access. Though our information is scrappy in places, we know some of the factors on the other

side too: enriched collections which invite borrowers, wartime gaps which necessitate borrowing, pressures due to graduate study and postdoctoral research, new programs, costliness of inclusive coverage, and an expanding clientele.

This last phrase refers to a trend all by itself: to groups which are taking up residence as neighbors to scholarly libraries; to business and industrial organizations, which Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, Princeton, and others report as borrowers; and to government agencies. Government installations in or near Knoxville have received loans from the University of Tennessee in increasing volume ever since 1933. The same thing is happening to scholarly collections elsewhere.

2. *Direct personal assistance given to readers in the use of resources of the library.* This phrasing follows closely the definition of reference work given by Alice B. Kroeger⁷ in 1902. Margaret Hutchins⁸ had to expand this earlier definition in 1944 to encompass newer services treated in later sections. In this section we are sticking to a function of the library, not of one of its departments—the clear and present task of helping the reader get what he wants when he wants it. This is an elemental service of the present-day library, performed by persons styled as differently as “circulation librarian” and “documentalist.” Differing amounts and kinds of assistance are given readers, but the following description of the reference librarian as of 1915 gives a rough indication of what tradition has made the norm in the American library:

. . . the “reference librarian,” [is] the man who is compelled to be all things to all men, who, counting nothing and no one trivial, spends his days opening up to the miscellaneous public the stores of the library’s books. . . . He sends the interesting inquiry on to the specialist; . . . he greets generations of students . . . ; here he averts a difficulty, there he smooths down an irate reader with too often a just grievance; he is an interpreter, revealing to inquirers what the library has; he is a lubricant, making the wheels run noiselessly and well. . . . At his best scholars use him, like him, thank him. At his lowest ebb no one considers him save as a useful part of the machinery. This is the theory of his work—service, quiet, self-effacing, but not passive or unheeding. To make books useful, and more used,—this is his aim.³

Today those who give personal assistance are perhaps more likely to recognize the trivial for what it is and to concern themselves with the “interesting inquiry” as well as the “machinery” of library technique. Certainly they turn the wheels as well as lubricate them, and self-effacement is distinguished from courtesy and tact. On the other

Services to Scholars

side, some observers believe that the spirit in which personal assistance is given has deteriorated somewhat. Any such tendency must of course be resisted as the plague. Meanwhile, the total score is favorable. Direct personal assistance is the best known of our services and, if we may judge from the prefaces of books, the one *consciously* most appreciated by scholars.

3. *Teaching and counseling services.* By tradition the reference librarian, a teacher at heart, has used every reasonable opportunity to help the inquirer learn to proceed better the next time on his own. This is still the basic line of attack in teaching the use of the library.

The second form of instruction is the use of handbooks, leaflets, and other aids aimed at reaching one individual at a time. The quality of these aids is steadily improving.

The third method is formal instruction. To teach throngs of students one at a time is costly, and so far instruction through printed and visual materials, while good as first aids and even better for describing special materials or services, has not proved to be the answer. Organized class instruction is the normal device used by modern man in passing on a body of basic know-how. In high schools the trend is to offer such instruction through English courses, the librarian and the teacher closely cooperating. Colleges and universities are not so far along, and their librarians, while experimenting, are not very happy with the results. One thoughtful librarian puts it this way: "Despite many gestures made in the general direction of teaching the use of the library, it must be admitted that the library profession has failed to make its essentially esoteric tools seem easy to understand and use. Failed, not because of the difficulty of such teaching, but because of unwillingness to insist on the kind and amount of instruction necessary." ⁹

The minimum essentials in effective library instruction include students with homogeneous interests, subject matter selected and arranged to further these interests, and a stimulating teacher. All these points present difficulties. Some of the best work is being done in colleges and universities, as in high schools, by cooperating with other departments. Teachers College at Columbia University has had considerable experience with library instruction. A quick review of practice there may point up a tendency to use more than a single-shot approach. Alongside a reference department is a consultant service. It is directed by the Library Consultant, Associate Professor Ethel M. Feagley, also Associate Librarian, aided by an Assistant Library Consultant. The work of the consultant service includes:

a) Informal work with individual students.—Includes location of materials, the card catalog, indexes, bibliographical form to be used in dissertations, advice on books. Conferences, often initiated by the consultants, on these or other matters connected with the student's work, as required.

b) Preparation of materials of instruction.—Includes tests on the library and leaflets for use in connection with the course work of the college. Leaflets deal with practical problems, contain equally practical suggestions. Some are prepared for sale and circulate widely.

c) General library lectures each semester.—These cover the use of the library, term papers, children's books.

d) Special library lectures on invitation of professors.—During 1953-54 lectures were given to classes in childhood education, nursing education, supervision of teaching, home economics, physical education, rural education, and to groups of foreign students. Sometimes lectures are requested by the professor, sometimes suggested in conference by the Library Consultant.

e) Special courses conducted entirely or in part by the Library Consultant staff.—Education sa221 LS. Locating educational information, 1-3 points. Education 321 ER. Orientation in educational research and planning, 3 points. Education 261 LU. The English teacher and the library, 1 point.

f) Participation in doctoral examinations, in project committee work, and other academic activities having a special library angle.

The University of Illinois is experimenting with a bolder move toward aligning the personal assistance given readers with the regular counseling and educational program of the institution. The experiment, centered in the Chicago Undergraduate Division under Associate Professor and Librarian D. K. Maxfield, has been in progress since 1948-49.¹⁰ The Reference Department was replaced in 1951-52 by a new Department of Library Instruction and Advisement. This department handles reference questions, assists the faculty in research, cooperates with the English Department in giving formal library instruction, and gives readers' advisory service. Advancing beyond this rather inclusive range of tested library techniques, the experiment introduces the technique of counseling as developed by modern students of personnel. Three specially qualified Library Advisers have been appointed to the staff of the new department. Their job is to associate the services of the library closely with instruction and counseling services heading up in other departments in producing a

Services to Scholars

healthy, enriched educational experience tailored to fit the individual student.

4. *The assistance of library tools.* The well-stocked reference room which occupies a central place in the service program of the present-day library is a phenomenon largely of the twentieth century. Not only the room itself, but the very series and sets which are the backbone of these impressive collections do not go back too far past the turn of the century, if that far. A check was made of 831 titles in Constance M. Winchell's *Guide to Reference Books* (1951), seventh edition.¹¹ For each title a single date was listed, only the earliest date being used where there were subsequent editions, volumes, or supplements. Thus 1828 was used for the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, 1768 for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1901 for *Readers' Guide*, and so on. For commentary a similar check was made of the separates (not periodical articles) listed in Kroeger (1902). A comparison of this work with Winchell (1951) is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3
*Number of Works by Date of Publication Listed
in Winchell and Kroeger*

Date of Origin of Titles	Winchell (1951)	Kroeger (1902)
Up to 1800	3	11
1801 to 1825	6	11
1826 to 1850	9	28
1851 to 1860	9	26
1861 to 1870	13	34
1871 to 1880	17	55
1881 to 1890	30	187
1891 to 1900	54	334
1901 to 1910	94	98
1911 to 1920	81	
1921 to 1930	111	
1931 to 1940	198	
1941 to 1950	206	
Total	831	784

Of the titles listed in these two sources, only four originated more than two centuries ago. Ninety per cent of the titles listed in Winchell originated in the last fifty years. Only 6 per cent originated prior to

1876. More originated in the last decade than in any other in spite of World War II, and the total for the last twenty-five years is nearly double that for all the years preceding.

The assistance provided by reference collections is uniquely the function of the institutional library. Many of the most basic tools are much too monumental to be incorporated into personal libraries. Moreover, they supplement one another and are most useful as part of a well-rounded library collection.

This dependence on institutional libraries to supply reference tools is related to other developments. The New York Public Library prepares bibliographies as part of its regular service and for years has published those of more general interest. This practice on the part of libraries is making them one of the most prolific sources of information about information. The preparation and distribution of such information about information has become one of the principal means by which the Library of Congress extends its services beyond its walls. Two days after the invasion of Korea, the Library had assembled a preliminary list of references and soon thereafter published a weighty annotated bibliography dealing with publications in Western, Far Eastern and Russian languages. "Bibliographies prepared" is a significant item in the Library's annual statistics of work done; but long before such anonymity is achieved, the actual compilations are out at work around the globe—usually in libraries.

Following World War II, certain international meetings brought home the fact that too much effort is being spent at the base of the bibliographical problem in proportion to what is being done at the top. For lack of a grand design to which separate projects can be related, there is needless waste in duplication on one hand and corresponding gaps in bibliographical coverage on the other. While much has been written on this subject, results of the kind which touch scholars at the point of library use would not justify extensive treatment here; but it is significant as part of a long tradition of improving library service through organized cooperative effort. M. E. Curti has pointed out that the advancement of American scholarship in the twentieth century owes a great deal to the talent of our people for organization, and this is so notably true of all phases of library development that 1876, the date of the founding of the American Library Association, is commonly used to mark the beginning of the modern period.

Service through cooperation, well known to librarians, is not fully understood by the general public—sometimes not even by distinguished citizens who disburse library travel funds. The lawyer's

Services to Scholars

triumph is at the bar, the engineer's, in—say—the trim grace of a suspension bridge. Both points of greatest service are public, sometimes prominently public. The library profession's point of greatest service is seldom at the circulation desk and often not even in sight of its public. It is just as likely to be at the planning meeting of some committee or subcommittee of the A.L.A., A.R.L., or other professional association. No treatment of the present subject would be adequate which omitted this unsung, unphotographed procedure regularly used in achieving many of the profession's most brilliant service triumphs.

5. *Services which use librarians as the main channel between sources of information and people engaged in putting information to work.* Standard practice in circulation and reference work developed around the theory that the staff's job in the communication process is to put the reader on the way to getting information for himself. The services mentioned in the four foregoing sections are all built around this idea. In 1915 William Warner Bishop, with characteristic lucidity, formulated present-day theory of reference in a paper by that name in terms which may become classic: "Reference work, as defined in this paper, is the service rendered by a librarian *in aid* of some sort of study. It is not the study itself—that is done by the reader. . . . it is primarily help given to a reader, not performance of the reader's task."³

While the theory is still valid within limits, it has never fully jibed with actual practice. As an example, Isadore Mudge, long-time head reference librarian at Columbia University, made it the frank policy of her department to produce any information requested by the President of the University. The legend grew that the staff never failed to come through with the information and this is in fact confirmed by the unpublished papers of Miss Mudge. To keep up that record, however, it was necessary to expand "help given to a reader," into "performance of the reader's task." A dramatic example was the time when the staff narrowed—or seemed to narrow—the answer of a question to Edmund Burke. There was nothing to do at that point but to read all twelve volumes of his collected works—ordinarily "the reader's task." This the staff set out to do—until it found the answer in the eleventh volume.

This hiatus between reference theory and reference practice led J. I. Wyer to conclude that "The only tenable, impregnable theory of reference work is that which frankly recognizes the library's obligation to give . . . unlimited service, and such a theory squares with practice in commercial and other fields."¹² His example of "unlimited

service"—a damning phrase, by the way—was the librarian in Gloversville, New York, who came through when a local milkman, waiting with his horses at the curb, shouted through the door of the public library that he wanted "a book to cure my best cow." But in spite of impregnable position in which he puts this type of service where the librarian gets the reader what he wants instead of *referring* him to appropriate sources for it, and notwithstanding the growing use of this service technique in "commercial and other fields," Wyer concluded that more "moderate" standards really represent "the best current practice." The explanation of this *non sequitur* gets at the heart of confusion over differences between "regular" and "special" library work. Gloversville and other communities and educational institutions where reference practice first crystallized were compelled, for reasons of budget and staff, to hold down on the amount and quality of personal assistance given their constituencies. An added factor, of course, was the desire, particularly in educational institutions, not to "spoon-feed" readers, but to teach them to help themselves. Orthodox reference theory as formulated by Wyer in the first textbook to address itself to this subject is a rationalization of common practice in libraries of this type. "Best" as used above has no validity except in this context.

Meanwhile, librarians in business organizations and government agencies were already building important services around a different concept. In the main, these "special" librarians have been better as doers than explainers, so if others have not always understood what they were doing, the fault has perhaps not been entirely on either side. The doings and writings of special librarians give us facts which have been observable right along but which do not fit into accepted library theory used to interpret the meaning of these facts. Specifically, these facts are that society has many people and organizations typified by the Gloversville milkman. They could learn to use the library if they had to, and they could do their own study and research if the division of labor in their organizations called for it. Neither point applies. In view of the total division of labor within some organizations and agencies, it is better to let a specialist in information services go ahead and procure the information and put it in form for use than to let that person break off at a given point in the process and *refer* someone else to sources where the information can be procured. This is an oversimplification, but it is enough to stress the fact that "best" has to be defined, not as Wyer defined it in terms of practices prevailing in libraries of certain arbitrarily selected types, but rather in terms of the objectives which each organization is free to set for itself.

Services to Scholars

Granted certain objectives, the service is not "best," is not even "good," unless the librarian does more than *refer* readers to information sources. In such case, "help given a reader" takes on new meaning, while lessons about "performance of the reader's task" may have to be learned backwards.

Cornell University Library has for some years employed a member of its staff to assist scholars with the library phase of research in selected fields.¹³ The University of Florida Library is experimenting with the use of graduate students for a similar purpose. Business, industry, and government, however, are the areas where most has been done to treat the information process all the way from source to fresh application as continuous. Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Library of Congress has made good use of this principle in organizing its Legislative Reference Service—now a separate department.¹⁴ Competent specialists, with the resources of the Library back of them, seek to provide members and committees of Congress with information of a quality, and in such form, that it will further legislative action dissociated from faction, bias, suspicion—and from ignorance of past experience here and elsewhere. The new service has caught on, has repeatedly been mentioned even on the floor of Congress, while several of the compilations have been ordered published.¹⁵

6. *Building up resources to support scholarship.* The back-to-the-wall earnestness with which library development had to be pushed when the university movement in this country was getting under way can perhaps be recaptured by reading part of a statement by one president (E. J. James of Illinois) to his board, back in 1912:

Speaking from an experience of eight years as your executive officer, I think I may say that I have had more people whom I have approached to consider positions at the University of Illinois decline the proposition because of the lack of library facilities than for any other reason; even more than because of . . . inadequate salaries. . . .

One of the fundamental distinctions between our American universities as a whole and European universities, is to be found in this matter of library facilities, and I believe that one of the reasons why American scholarship has limped along at such a distance behind European scholarship is to be found in the lack of such inspiration and the lack of such assistance as are afforded by great collections of books, which contain in themselves the recorded experience of the human race.¹⁶

In general, the librarian-collector has lost standing since America began to make her big push to free her scholars from dependence on Old World libraries. We hear less today about how he serves scholarship and more about how his habits resemble the less serviceable acquisitiveness of magpies. The shift in attitude is a by-product of the rapid growth in size of twentieth-century library collections. Fourteen university libraries with a total of five million volumes in 1912-13 had fourteen million volumes twenty-five years later and have many millions more now.⁶ These libraries, we have learned, tend to double in size every sixteen years or so. The University of Illinois Library has, in fact, been doubling in size every nine years. Where, we ask, does all this lead? Where is the money coming from to go on at such a rate? Even if the money is forthcoming, will usable space hold out? (Harvard uses up two to three miles of new shelving each year.) Are libraries growing beyond human scale? If, as the social scientists tell us, man tends to be defeated by buildings and urban communities when they get past a certain size, is it time to slow down library growth to keep the human race from being "suffocated" eventually with books?

Off and on since the time of the Old Testament man has worried about the fact that of the making of books there is no end; but it has not kept him from going ahead and working out sound solutions to his book problems one generation at a time. Current discussions of library growth do not always distinguish between solutions intended for the next generation and those intended for the next millenium. Maybe we should remind ourselves that Thales fell in the well because he forgot to watch the footpath while looking at the stars. In any event collectors in and outside our libraries deserve high praise for their services to scholars. Harvard was reminded when Alfred Claghorn Potter retired in 1936 that two-thirds of the books purchased up to that point by the College library, and the majority of those for special libraries within and outside Widener, had been bought under his personal supervision. The collections were "his true monument, crowned by his term in the Librarian's office."¹⁷ It is but one such monument, though one of the most magnificent.

The builders of our vast collections would not repeat in detail what has been done in the twentieth century if they were starting from where we are now, but they did not start there. Whatever their mistakes, now beyond recall, it is to their everlasting credit that, starting with so little, they led the nation into a golden age of library development. The very success makes the library collector's task from this

Services to Scholars

point on infinitely more complex than it was earlier, and he must face up to this fact; but his remains the service to scholarship on which all other library services rest.

7. *Technical services.* Procuring and conserving library materials as well as converting them into orderly collections are also a service, and recent years have seen this fact begin to be re-emphasized. This trend is so closely associated with a second one that the distinction between the two is occasionally missed. Since the beginning of the last war one library after another has created a technical services division.¹⁸ It is a step which, each time it was taken, was believed to offer advantages in one or more of the following respects: in reducing the head librarian's span of control, simplifying flow of work, reducing processing costs, integrating related work or promoting teamwork among staff members handling closely related operations. These reasons all stress unified control. They apply to a division which centralizes in one officer responsibility for acquisitions, binding, cataloging, classification, etc., regardless of the name the division happens to bear.

The term "technical services," first used at Columbia in setting up such a division,¹⁹ was coined to help give a frame of reference within which canons for judging the purposes of the catalog, how much and what type of information should be placed on the card, etc., could be more easily formulated. Just prior to World War II librarians awoke to the fact that specialization was getting a little out of hand. For example, it was producing in acquisitions and cataloging over-departmentalization and the kind of confusion of purpose just alluded to. We spoke of a "crisis in cataloging." It centered there, but it was in reality a crisis in library administration brought on by perfecting techniques and technical processes—or allowing them to be perfected—with too little attention to what the techniques, or the processes involved in applying them, were *for*. The A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification, new courses in library schools, and various other influences have helped clarify what these processes are for. Service to readers, present and future, has proved to be the most appropriate frame of reference to use in defining these purposes. "Technical services" is one way of describing technical processes where the object is to express this orientation, and in such case the description fits the facts whether administrative control over them is centralized or not.

Seven services have been listed. The list is not complete, the treatment has been sketchy. It has seemed less important to follow lines of departmental organization than to organize the treatment along

lines which would interpret better the range of services to scholars and their interrelationship. Some trends have been disclosed. The social usefulness of scholarly materials is making it difficult to think merely of professional scholars in planning library services. Scholarly libraries are receiving much use, but the stress in current planning falls on productive use—through free access, library instruction and counseling, expansion of reference services, etc. Accepted library service theory is in process of reconstruction. It has been suggested that one or two of our best-known formulations of reference theory, while they interpret library services better than pre-Copernican theories interpreted the facts of celestial mechanics, nevertheless fit only a part of the facts in one case as in the other—and are therefore a source of confusion in professional thought. Current interest centers in services given *directly* to readers and certain activities have lost prestige as the focus of interest has shifted in this direction. Since the early 1940's, however, a more balanced view has been developing as librarians have tended to analyze, and measure the worth of, all library activities in terms of their specific service contributions to readers, present and future. This philosophy is implicit in our best library traditions; current developments are simply working it out in practice a little more consistently, maybe even a little more imaginatively.

References

1. Curti, M. E.: *American Scholarship in the Twentieth Century*. (Library of Congress Series in American Civilization) Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953, pp. 1-2.
2. Bishop, W. W.: Some Recollections of William Lawrence Clements and the Formation of His Library. *Library Quarterly*, 18:185-191, July 1948.
3. Bishop, W. W.: The Theory of Reference Work. *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 9:134-139, July 1915.
4. U.S. Library of Congress: *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress . . . 1946*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947, pp. 239-240.
5. Emerson, R. W.: *An Oration Delivered Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, August 31, 1837*. 2d ed. Boston, J. Munroe and Co., 1838, p. 5.
6. White, C. M.: Trends in the Use of University Libraries. In American Library Association: *College and University Library Service*. Chicago, The Association, 1938, pp. 15-39.
7. Kroeger, Alice B.: *Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1902.
8. Hutchins, Margaret: *Introduction to Reference Work*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1944, pp. 10-11.
9. Cooperative Committee on Library Building Plans: *The Second Princeton Conference . . . Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, June 12-14, 1946*. Philadelphia, Stephenson-Brothers, 1947, p. 26.

Services to Scholars

10. Maxfield, D. K.: *Counselor Librarianship: A New Departure*. (Occasional Papers No. 38) Urbana, University of Illinois Library School, March 1954.
11. Winchell, Constance M.: *Guide to Reference Books*. 7th ed. Chicago, American Library Association, 1951.
12. Wyer, J. I.: *Reference Work*. (Library Curriculum Studies) Chicago, American Library Association, 1930, p. 9.
13. King, H. H.: Assistance to the Faculty in Library Research; Report from Cornell University. *College and Research Libraries*, 9:227-230, July 1948.
14. U.S. Library of Congress: *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress . . . 1949*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950, pp. 24-26.
15. U.S. Library of Congress: *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress . . . 1947*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1948, p. 16.
16. James, E. J.: *Sixteen Years at the University of Illinois*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1920, pp. 103-104.
17. Harvard University. Library: *Annual Report for the Year 1935-36*. Cambridge, 1936, p. 1.
18. The Technical Services Division in Libraries; a Symposium. *College and Research Libraries*, 10:46-68, Jan. 1949.
19. Columbia University. Libraries: *Report of the Director of Libraries . . . June 30, 1944*. New York, 1944, pp. 3-5.