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Introduction

HOWARD W. WINGER

This collection of papers on American library history was planned to help commemorate the one hundred years of development that has occurred since the founding of the American Library Association, the publication of the report on libraries by the U.S. Bureau of Education, the origin of the Library Journal, the publication of Dewey's decimal classification, the publication of Cutter's rules for a dictionary catalog, and the signal acceleration of American scholarship marked by the founding of Johns Hopkins University—all events of 1876.

The organization of this collection has aimed at a comprehensive view of what American librarians and libraries were thinking and doing. The problem of such an organization is the problem of any attempt at historical summary: among events that are complex and have different degrees of acceleration, what do you choose? Furthermore, since summary accounts depend on previous work, the bibliography of American library history becomes a part of the problem. A very large number of original histories about American libraries have been written, some for the period under review, but no general history has been written which an editor can consult for an outline. American library histories in large part are a collection of special studies carried out by too few students in pursuit of an academic goal, and left to hang on the vine. They include histories of particular libraries, of a kind of library in a particular time and place, of particular aspects of service and of the profession, of biographies of outstanding librarians, etc. John Colson has enumerated twenty-six such categories, to which he adds "and other."

One cannot say, of course, that the specialized studies that have been completed failed to affect the organization of this volume. For one thing, many of the historians responsible for the production of previous histories were enlisted to contribute papers. However, since
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their earlier research was appropriately concentrated on narrower questions, they had to recast their thoughts on a broader scale, because the plan of organization adopted for this volume aims at a straightforward account of events without a rigorous development of hypotheses.

The first section deals with the setting, including a paper on the writing of library history, in order to acknowledge historiographical trends which the editor tried to ignore in his major outline. The spread of libraries, the growth of collections, the system of statistical reporting, and the development of library buildings follow as integral aspects of the setting.

The second section deals with the library profession, including education, associations, the library press, the generalized characteristics of the librarians, and some points of contact between librarians in the new world and the old.

The third section includes four papers on the development of various aspects of bibliographic organization. The comparatively heavy emphasis given in this section reflects the editor's view that bibliographic organization is the quintessential task of the librarian and that the revolutionary changes now underway have a basis in the developments of the past century.

The final section attempts to recount developments in aspects of library service for different kinds of users—children and young people, the college and university users, the general adult public, and the specialized users in nonacademic settings. These are large topics to handle, and some readers may regret the lack of planning for special papers on reference, extension, service to the handicapped, incorporation of media, types of institutions and other aspects that have a long history of development. These are important, even massive topics, but they did not fit into the organization adopted.

The reader will notice the lack of paper on the development of financial support for libraries, a crucial aspect of the physical setting. This is a complex question, involving legislation, appropriations, expenditures of a wide range of public and private bodies, and large and small philanthropy. One can reasonably hypothesize that support has increased both absolutely and relatively during the past one hundred years. For this, the support of public libraries from 1960 to 1975 is instructive. Per capita support for public library systems serving populations of 100,000 to 150,000 (1960) and populations of 100,000 to 199,000 (1975) multiplied 4.3 times for an annual compounded rate of 9.5 percent, higher than the annual rate of inflation.
Introduction

Yet these larger funds were adequate to support neither the task appointed nor the task envisioned. Herman Fussler has painted a graphic picture of increasing support and simultaneously increasing needs in research libraries of the present day: "Despite rapid increases in expenditures, the typical research library is visibly hard pressed, and is not presently in a strong position to respond, either qualitatively or quantitatively, to additional burdens or new demands."

Part of this feeling of inadequacy comes from the pressures of a society that is increasingly dependent on information and on librarians' efforts to respond to new needs. One may beat the inflation of the dollar, but to this must be added the cost of greatly accelerated production of records and society's increased dependence on greater access to them. Not only do materials increase in price, but more and wider varieties of materials are demanded. Not only have the salaries of librarians increased, but more librarians are needed. Librarianship, to the delight of most who labor at it with love, remains a labor-intensive enterprise, and it is difficult, considering expanding needs, to foresee a time when libraries, like automobile companies, can meet production requirements with reduced numbers of workers. It is a glory as well as a frustration of librarianship that vision exceeds reality. This characteristic epitomizes the last century and, it is hoped, will direct the next.

Before concluding, one more comment must be made about the irregular progress of developments. Although the subject of this volume is one hundred years of library history, events did not occur and ideas did not surface at regular intervals on a yearly basis. Some authors found it desirable to begin earlier than 1876; others began their serious accounts at a later date. All, of course, devote more attention to some years than others. Sometimes these emphases are contingent on the availability of records. Such is the nature of history.

Finally, a personal word from the editor seems appropriate. My thanks go to all the contributors who labored with such diligence and such skill to deliver their papers at the appointed time, and my admiration goes to Arlynn Robertson and the Library Trends staff for their skill and care in preparing the manuscripts for the press and seeing them through it.
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The Writing of American Library History, 1876-1976

JOHN CALVIN COLSON

The other articles in this issue of Library Trends are concerned with substantive elements of American librarianship, 1876 to 1976; this article examines the ways in which some American librarians and others have viewed the progress of American librarianship during the same century. Inevitably, it is also about the ways in which that development has not been viewed, if only by implication, for, as a study of the literature will indicate, much of American librarianship during the past century has been left unexamined by the historians of American libraries. A general view of the course of development may be gained from these eighteen papers, but many of the details will not be clear. There are simply too many gaps in the study of the record of American librarianship. Causes for this state of affairs may be, but the purpose behind these remarks is not to fix blame for them. Rather, it is to examine some of the assumptions about, and to assess some of the results of, the historical study of American librarianship.

Thirty years ago, the Library Quarterly published Jesse Shera's milestone paper, "The Literature of American Library History." The present paper is a study of the history of American libraries and librarianship since then, with some consideration of the period 1930-45.

Approximately two-thirds of Shera's paper was a rather bleak review of what passed for the history of American librarianship in the years 1850-1930. Indeed, Shera was not given to praise of most works from 1930 to 1945, but he was hopeful for the future, in light of the works of Carleton Joeckel, Gwladys Spencer, and Sidney Ditzion. In these and one or two other works, Shera saw the arrival of the "new
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library history," and he issued a modestly phrased prophecy that it
would lead "toward a better understanding of the library in its true
relation to the entirety of human life." This was modestly phrased
because he did not mention the most influential history of American
librarianship yet produced in this century, his own Foundations of the
Public Library?

However modest his prophecy, Shera placed a large burden on
subsequent historians of American librarianship. To challenge his
colleagues to set forth a "better understanding of the library in its true
relation to the entirety of human life" was to ask mortals to take on
the powers of divinity or, at the very least, to steal fire from the gods.
How have we who work at library history met that challenge?

In one aspect we may be said to be making an earnest, if not valiant,
effort. Jesse Shera reviewed a century of work and dealt with not
much more than a baker's dozen of European and American histo-
ries. In the thirty years since Shera's paper was published, there have
been approximately 140 book-length works on the development of
U.S. librarianship alone. In addition, the Journal of Library History has
been established, a number of anthologies and festchriften published,
and the Seminar in Library History developed. There is ground on
which to take a prideful stand in respect to the development of
American library history; it flourishes as never before.

The flowering has been marked by a considerable diversity. The
writing of American library history has been transformed into the
study of American libraries and librarianship, with major works in the
following categories: education for librarianship (8), the development
of professional associations (13), colonial libraries (6), college and
university libraries (21), nationwide studies of public library develop-
ment (5), regional studies of public library development (2), public
library development in particular states (8), state library development
(4), state library legislation (1), Congressional legislation for libraries
(1), library architecture (3), archival and manuscript libraries (2),
children's libraries and librarianship (2), school library development
(4), Andrew Carnegie's philanthropy and influence (3), the develop-
ment of cataloging and classification (3), the role of women in librar-
ianship (3), historical society development (2), adult education and
libraries (2), special library development (1), studies of individual
public libraries (10), biographies (14), studies of endowed libraries (3),
fiction in public libraries (1), the development of reference services
(2), printed book catalogs in libraries (1), and others. The categoriza-
tion is incomplete; some histories cannot easily be classified. Also, it is
clear that in some of the categories of study there is developing a respectable concentration. If the trends of concentration and diversification continue, librarianship will be much enriched.

The enrichment is more easily prophesied than achieved. The historical study of American libraries and librarianship has been encumbered by a number of problems which at the least make that study dysfunctional: problems of the definition of history, of its relationship to the social sciences, of its place in education for librarianship, of its values and uses, and of the way in which history is done. Their effects are apparent in the literature, and are sources of doubt about how well we are responding to Shera's prophecy.

Definition is the principal problem; it is central to the others. The uses of history, its ascribed values, the way in which it is done, all derive from definitions of history, and such definitions are numerous in this diverse discipline. There appear to be only two fundamental definitions of history, however: one is of history as a past which is known, and needs only to be explained; the other is of history as a method of study. In the former definition it is assumed that history is a finite entity presented by the past. For example such an assumption is implicit in Felix Reichmann's remark, "But the historian does not make history." The second definition is exactly opposed to that view, in the assumption that only the historian makes history, by writing it. This viewpoint entails a characterization of history as a "way of learning," as William Williams stated it, or as the creation of a "usable past," according to Herbert Muller.

Among the historians of libraries and librarianship there has been a tendency to work from the first definition of history, to view events of library development as closed and finite phenomena which may accumulate in the passage of time, but which will not change. Jesse Shera himself has been most explicit in the statement of the idea: "The basic pattern was all there in New England from the Colonial Period down to the Civil War; the rest was only variations on a theme." The prevalence of the idea is demonstrated in works written since the publication of Foundations of the Public Library. For example, in Mary Anders's doctoral dissertation there is the statement: "Public library service in the Southeast has been studied as a social development with emphasis on the factors contributing to the movement for library services rather than on the order in which events occurred or the specific advances were made." The order of events and advances does much to define the nature of a movement, but it can be ignored in a study in which it is assumed order is known. Similarly, the search
The most striking characteristic of nineteenth century literature on library architecture is its bewildering variety of suggestions... no definite central thought, no central guiding line apart from the universal desire for safety... The lack of an orderly, chronological development of ideas is a second characteristic... Frequently, the literature implied rather than expressed new concepts and it was often vague.

In a similar manner a large number of histories of libraries and librarianship may be judged as having failed to meet their authors' purposes. Nevertheless, they have value to other historians as sources of information which may stimulate and aid research on more precisely formulated problems in the study of the development of libraries and librarianship.

The concept of history as the reduction of what is known leads to a more serious result—what Shera called the interminable sequence of summaries of the record of particular institutions. Such histories really result from a process of condensation, of boiling down a record in search of what may be called the essence of history. In his 1945 paper Shera called such studies factual histories, but it appears to be more appropriate to describe them as results of searches for the essential qualities of the institutions. The logic of the idea leads ultimately to works such as Cecil Roseberry's For the Government and People of This State: A History of the New York State Library, a series of chronological anecdotes about the most dramatic events in the record of the New York State Library.
The other definition of history is liberating. The concept of history as a way of learning opens opportunities for expanding one's knowledge of any subject. Rather than a search for a pattern, the historical study of a subject may be a demonstration of variations from patterns. For example, in the transfer of the New England social library from its native region to Wisconsin in the nineteenth century, a familiar model was used by those who took it there, but the varying circumstances of their lives broke the pattern, and the public library in Wisconsin became something different from what its founders and promoters intended. Meanwhile, back in nineteenth century New England, a different set of circumstances was developing into a pattern of public library development different from that described in *The Foundations of the Public Library*. The industrialization of the textile industry resulted in the establishment of several factory villages which were characterized by "boarding house mills and large communities of female operatives." Elfrieda McCauley's study illuminates another characteristic of history as a way of learning; it is one which "springs from a live concern, deals with life, serves life," for there is apparent in it her interest in the feminist movement, and her concern to demonstrate its relationship to the public library movement, and the function of the mill girls' library movement as a training ground for feminist leaders.

History as a way of learning also can expand the student's knowledge beyond the confines of a discipline, a profession, or an institution, an achievement exemplified by Frank Woodford's *Parnassus on Main Street*, a centennial history of the Detroit Public Library, and by his conclusion that "a history of a library reflects clearly the history of the community it serves." Similarly, Joe Kraus's study of the book collections in five colonial American college libraries led him to the conclusion that the development of those collections occurred in response to changes in the colleges themselves.

It is unfortunate for students of librarianship that there are no more than a few such studies of this development. The lack may be attributed in part to the supposed relationship between history and the social sciences. An extended discussion of that topic is not appropriate here; inquirers are directed to the incisive, humane, literate and humorous work by one of our most distinguished historians, Jacques Barzun. Here it is sufficient to argue that history is neither a social science nor a humanity, but the study of a subject by analysis of its record. History, i.e., a written report on the record, may borrow from the ethos and methods of both, but history transcends them, as...
evidenced by McCauley's observation, mentioned earlier. Nonetheless, within librarianship there is extensive belief that history is a social science. The belief may have many sources, for historians have for the past seventy-five years or longer engaged in a running debate on the matter. A succession of influential scholars in librarianship, from Carleton Joeckel to Jesse Shera and Leon Carnovsky, have effectively promoted the gospel of history as a social science. Be that as it may, social science concepts have pervaded the history of American libraries and librarianship. Sometimes the use of social science concepts has been severely methodological, as in Guy Garrison's *Seattle Voters and Their Public Library*, a study of voting behavior in Seattle in three public library bond referenda, 1950-56. The methodology overpowered the study, even to the selection of sources, and led Garrison to the conclusion that although voting behavior could be predicted, it would not suffice to predict the outcome of an election. Somehow, both social science and history were losers.

In a number of other studies, the reliance on method has not been as clear, although it is apparent that the authors were attempting to apply social science methods. For example, in Laurel Grotzinger's biography of Katharine Sharp, there is a four-page discussion of "Resources and Methods," but no discussion of a particular method; nor is the use of a method apparent in the work itself. Conversely, a method is apparent in Ernest Erickson's *College and University Library Surveys, 1938-1952*; this was a study based on the hypothesis that the academic library survey performed by outside experts "is an effective instrument in bringing about results conducive to the growth and development" of the libraries surveyed. An elaborate quantitative evaluation of the surveyors' recommendations and the uses to which they were put was asserted to have confirmed the hypothesis. Unfortunately for his hypothesis, however, Erickson disregarded a significant historical fact: given the social circumstances in which American higher education existed in the period 1938-52, it is likely that the libraries surveyed would have undergone substantial growth and development regardless of the surveys. The validity of the history was thus imperiled by an inappropriate application of a social science method. Moreover, what might have been a useful study was weakened seriously by a social scientist's failure to ask what E.J. Hobsbawm has called "properly historical questions," e.g., What happened in the academic libraries which were not surveyed? As Barzun and Hobsbawm both have taken care to point out, the findings of social scientists can be used with profit by historians, but "the prospect of
turning social history into a backward projection of sociology" does not seem to be a useful attempt at hybridization. It may be argued that the social sciences have greatly influenced the history of libraries and librarianship as a result of the functions assigned to history in programs of education for librarianship. As most library school catalogs indicate, history has a distinctly secondary place in the various curricula; it appears to be used to indoctrinate students in professionalism, to convince them that they have made worthy career selections, and to assert the "success" of libraries and librarianship. There is also a tendency among library educators to argue the function of history as a device for instilling administrative skill in librarians, namely, Peter Conmy's remark about history as "an invaluable aid in the solution of problems," or Jesse Shera's comment: "Finally, the administrative knowledge of the librarian must reflect an historical awareness." Such propositions are plausible, but it may also be said that they reduce history to what might be called a Sittenpredigtgeschichte. The didacticism of such beliefs has created an intellectual attitude about the values of history which makes it easy for the certitudes of social science to prevail. Both concepts of history presuppose a definition of history as a reduction of what is known. The very idea promotes the use of history as a vehicle for the proof of doubtful hypotheses; for example, Herbert Searcy states in his "Parochial Libraries in the American Colonies": "The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that Dr. Thomas Bray's . . . libraries . . . were a successful educational venture of the Church." In his major conclusion Searcy asserted the success of Bray's work, but nowhere in the work did he define success in any meaningful terms. Moreover, as Searcy and other historians of Bray's work have made clear, the church was not much involved in the effort to establish parish libraries in the colonies, because most of the support for doing so came from the Bishop of London and Bray's friends. Furthermore, the effort never was more than haphazardly organized. The hypothesis is historicist rather than historical, i.e., it is based in an excessive respect for the goals and achievements of our predecessors.

A similar criticism could be made about a number of other works, such as Kenneth Peterson's The University of California Library at Berkeley, 1900-1945 which is a summary of development, to the conclusion that strong and determined leaders produce a distinguished institution; or John Abbott's "Raymond Cazallas Davis and the University of Michigan General Library, 1877-1905," a chronicle of a university librarian running to stay in place during a period of
tremendous change in American academic life—always short of funds, space and time—but about whom Abbott concluded, "The library profession would enjoy more prestige today if more librarians . . . had followed his lead."35 The literature would have agreeably less material of this sort if library school faculties were less inclined to tolerate history as a celebration of the past, and more inclined to see it as the study of librarianship based on the record of its development.

The fault is not solely with faculties; to all but casual observers it should be apparent that the history of libraries and librarianship is lightly regarded within the profession. One indication is that it seems that histories of libraries are usually written to celebrate significant anniversaries of the institution or the virtues of the founders; such is the case with Josiah Quincy's The History of the Boston Athenaeum, with Biographical Notices of Its Deceased Founders, Walter Whitehill's The Boston Public Library, A Centennial History, and C.H. Cramer's Open Shelves and Open Minds, a centennial history of the Cleveland Public Library. These volumes are the fruits of a literary tradition which is ancient in historiography—deservedly so, as works of literature—but one which has not contributed much to the use of history as a serious intellectual endeavor in the study of librarianship. If institutions and the people closely associated with them are to be seen principally as objects of veneration, there is no reason for any serious inquiry into the development of the institutions.

That such an attitude has been prevalent in library schools has been noted frequently, by Peter Conmy, Felix Reichmann, and Jesse Shera, to demonstrate the continuity of the belief.36 There is also abundant, albeit indirect, evidence about the defensiveness in the statements about history to be found in the prefaces to many doctoral dissertations on the history of libraries and librarianship. For instance, in Frank McGowan's The Association of Research Libraries, 1932-1962, there is the statement: "This study is essentially a history, with side trips to examine a few interesting questions."37 Those few interesting questions have to do with the nature of one of the most powerful associations in American librarianship, and this significant work needs no such defense.

Lucy Maddox's dissertation, "Trends and Issues in American Librarianship as Reflected in the Papers and Proceedings of the American Library Association, 1876-1885,"38 offers yet another kind of evidence for the casual attitude in the profession toward history. The trends and issues with which Maddox concerned herself virtually cover the scope of librarianship. Although her observations are
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stimulative to thought about the early development of organized American librarianship, the work is based on the assumption that one scholar can know enough about all aspects of that decade.

Despite such reservations, there is a positive point to be made about doctoral study in the history of libraries and librarianship in the United States. It has resulted in the production of sixty-six works—almost one-half of the approximately 140 works consulted in research for this paper. In comparison, regular departments of history have been the source of only a handful of studies, most notably at the University of Pennsylvania during the 1950s, where two dissertations were written. Nearly all the sixty-six works have merit, and in spite of the deficiencies noted earlier, it may be said that those doctoral studies have accounted for nearly all the significant histories of American libraries and librarianship.

It is necessary to enter a caveat here against any ideas about a "new history" of libraries and librarianship, if the phrase is taken to mean approximately what was meant by "the new history" of the 1930s, or the "new urban history" which has received so much attention from academic historians. In the doctoral histories, and others, there is too great a range of style, content, point of view, and substance to support any notions about "a new library history." Given the diversity in American librarianship and its historians, the result could not be otherwise. For that matter, if the histories of libraries are to be considered as a group, Warner's remark about the "new urban history" could be applied to library history: "The usual shelf of urban history books looks like a line of disconnected local histories." Whether the histories are of academic or public libraries, there are not enough of them to permit the development of a coherent synthesis.

A limited synthesis may have begun to develop from the histories of public libraries. It is not generally accepted, and indeed is the source of rising controversy among historians of public libraries, which might be called the "Harris-Dain debate," which also includes Elaine Fain and Dee Garrison. The "debate" is about the purpose of the public library; to be more precise, it is about the purposes of nineteenth-century promoters of the public library, with special reference to those who played leading roles in the establishment and early development of the Boston Public Library. Harris has argued that its founders' purposes were conservative if not reactionary, in that their principal concern was maintenance of their control over society, and that the library was established as an instrument to that end. Phyllis
Dain's wide-ranging response is not precisely a rebuttal but rather a set of questions about the admittedly speculative nature of Harris' work; she charges Harris more with sins of omission than those of commission. Garrison was brought into the controversy by Harris and Fain, through Harris's contention that Garrison's dissertation, "Cultural Missionaries: A Study of American Public Library Leaders, 1876-1910," although not a study of institutional development, tends to support his thesis. Elaine Fain's criticism of Harris/Garrison is more difficult to summarize, but it seems fair to say that she dislikes the self-conscious revisionism of Harris and Garrison's scorn for the passivity of American librarians.

In some important respects, the "debate" may have come to appear to revolve around semantical shadows—the arrogant elitism of George Ticknor and the male chauvinism of Justin Winsor. It can be argued that the personality traits of individuals contribute importantly to the development of institutions in which they play leading roles. In this case, however, it does not seem relevant to worry about Ticknor's arrogance or Winsor's chauvinism. Both terms have come to be used as slogans or labels which serve to mask deeper issues, and there does not appear to be evidence which directly relates those matters to the purposes for which the two men advocated the establishment of public libraries.

As for the conservative purpose behind the promotion of public libraries, the weight of evidence seems to be amassing on the side of Harris and Garrison. This author's study indicates clearly enough that in Wisconsin the promoters of the public library strived to maintain their control over society or, at the very least, to use the public library as an instrument for indoctrinating immigrants to Wisconsin into the culture and customs of the Yankees who controlled the movement; they said so. There is also some evidence for such a conclusion regarding the promoters of library associations in Baltimore, 1840-60, although the study of library associations in that city remains incomplete. Finally, Ray Held's The Rise of the Public Library in California allows one to infer that if he had sought evidence on that point he would have found it.

Until more evidence is available, it would be better to suspend the debate, especially as the principal contestants have digressed from their concern over the purposes of public library promoters into sterile arguments about the purposes of the debaters themselves. Nevertheless, the controversy does lead to some considerations about the relationship between "library history" and other history. Harris's
statement of his revisionism is self-consciously deliberate, and derived from his study of other historians' works (especially those of the younger "revisionist" historians, whose numbers are substantial). Also, Dee Garrison is a "regular" historian, one of the few such in the United States who is concerned with libraries and librarians. Harris desires to have his work considered part of the mainstream of the new "new history." Garrison, on the other hand, is a historian of women in the United States; their roles and functions in American librarianship offer her a convenient and intriguing focus for a study of women in the society at large. Their purposes in history are divergent, and this accounts in part for their divergent contributions to the debate. It is this condition which offers entry into the larger question about the history of librarianship vis-a-vis "history."

Among historians there is a great deal of ferment about their discipline, and some portion of it concerns the integration of history. Historians, whatever differences they exhibit, are enormously attracted by the ideal of the unity of knowledge. The attraction stems in part from a related concept of the cumulative nature of knowledge, although that idea is under challenge. It is also likely that ideas about the unity of knowledge are derived in some degree from an ancient idea about the unitary nature of society. The unitary society has been overwhelmed by industrialization and urbanization, as has the unity of knowledge, for knowledge is a function of society. Nevertheless, the power of the idea is demonstrated in the debates among "hyphenate-historians" about the relationship between history and other branches of knowledge. One very interesting quality of the papers cited (and many others as well) is the undercurrent of concern about the relationships between the hyphenate-historians and the disciplines or professions to which they are attached. In all cases, apparently, there are tensions between historians of an activity and those directly involved in its practice. Librarianship is not exempt from this condition.

There appears to prevail a notion that the historian of librarianship is involved in librarianship as an outsider, even as a voyeur looking in on something which is not quite his business. Perhaps this interpretation should not be stated so boldly, but librarians' attitudes about the history of their profession do appear to spring from some such idea of history. If the historian writes to celebrate the victories and virtues of librarianship, his work is accepted as providing a useful background for neophytes in the profession, but if he writes in a desire to apply scholarly inquiry to the ideas, events, institutions and
people of librarianship, then the work is too often dismissed as "mere history," remote from the real problems of librarianship. Such an attitude reflects a severe misunderstanding of history. The subject of historical inquiry into a profession is the profession itself, but the work which results may not integrate the subject. Barzun has pointed out that the integrity of any subject comes not from its forms and ideas, but from the problems to which the forms and ideas are offered as answers. The function of the historical study of a subject is to analyze the workings of those forms and ideas.

The historian analyzes some part of the subject, by studying its record, and adds to our store of knowledge about it. To that analysis the historian brings a set of knowledge and speculations, partly derived from the subject itself, partly from other subjects. Such knowledge is applied not to the record, but to the historian's ideas about the record. Other knowledge may inform the historian's thought about the record, but it may not be used to transform the record. It is this prohibition which prevents the metamorphosis of history into a science, for in the sciences the subject of study is not the record of an event, but the event itself. An example from the Harris/Dain debate may clarify the point. In her "Rejoinder," Garrison observed, with reference to nineteenth-century librarians, that: "The knotty problem of Democracy vs. Culture was never clearly resolved." The statement is true enough, but unhistorical. The record of nineteenth-century librarianship does not disclose that librarians perceived such a problem; rather, it indicates that they thought of their culture as democratic. It is our knowledge of a conflict between the claims of a culture and the principles of democracy which may enable us also to see that our predecessors' forms and ideas may not be appropriate to the problems we perceive.

It is necessary to discount the idea of history as a science. For nearly one-half century, librarians have been admonished to use history as an instrument to gain an understanding of the sociological beginnings of the library movement, to develop wisdom, to prevent mistakes, to solve practical problems, and to find new purposes for the library. All of these are worthy objectives, and it is perhaps our misfortune that history cannot bear the burden placed upon it by such earnest testimonies of faith. Librarians who understand their profession and its functions may be able to achieve those goals; history, as the study of the profession's record, may assist in the development of the necessary understanding, but only in the minds of librarians who are free from the past.
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We will be free from the past when we understand that in history—the study of the record from the past—we serve our purposes, not the past. The writing of American library history, 1876-1976, is evidence of how far we have come, and of how far we must go in the service of those purposes.
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The Distribution of Libraries Throughout the United States

HAYNES McMULLEN

This article is a survey of the distribution of various kinds of libraries in the United States at different times during the last one hundred years. It is a count of libraries, not a study of the distribution of library resources or of use. Counting libraries and giving each of them the same value raises two very serious questions: (1) Why count libraries in the first place? Why not use some other measure of library service? (2) How does one decide when a particular service agency—a branch library, for example—is a library and when it is not?

Ideally, in order to understand how library service has been distributed in the United States at various times during the past one hundred years, several measures should be used; the choice of measures would depend on one's philosophy of librarianship. Practically, however, the only figures available for any large number of libraries are the simple count of libraries and the number of volumes they contain. Some surveys have made good use of volume counts, but the present study is limited to a simple count of libraries for these reasons: (1) it seemed desirable to deal with a large number of libraries and to classify each library fairly carefully (to have considered the number of volumes would have doubled or tripled the amount of work); and (2) during much of the past century, the concept of a library as a single unit has been quite meaningful. A simple count can answer several questions: How rapidly did public libraries spread across the United States? Did they first appear in areas where the old social libraries were already popular? How quickly did the social libraries disappear in various regions? Have college libraries been distributed throughout the country in proportion to the population?

Haynes McMullen is Professor of Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Decisions about when to consider a library as a separate entity and when to consider it as a part of a larger unit have been necessary mainly in the case of public library systems and university libraries. Actually, the decision depends on a person's viewpoint: a user of a branch library might consider it separate, while a library administrator would view it as part of a larger unit. In this study, a third viewpoint, that of the compiler of a list or directory, is used: if the unit has a separate line or entry in the list, it is considered to be a library. The effect of this decision has been that large public library branches on distinctive subjects and medical or law school libraries are usually included, whereas ordinary public library branches and departmental libraries in universities are not.

To obtain the clearest understanding of how the distribution of libraries has changed in the United States during the last one hundred years, it would be best to know how many libraries of each kind were present during each year. This cannot be ascertained because lists have been issued only at intervals of several years. For the purposes of this paper, rough indications of changes have been obtained by examining lists and directories of national scope issued at approximately twenty-five year intervals, that is, as close as possible to the years 1876, 1900, 1925, 1950, and 1975.

No national list of libraries issued in the United States in the last century has pretended to include all libraries; all lists or directories omit small libraries, or libraries of certain types, or ones whose librarians have failed to answer a questionnaire. For the purposes of this study, five national lists have been chosen. The first three were issued by the U.S. Bureau of Education:

1. *Public Libraries in the United States of America* . . . , published in 1876. The bureau's 1876 report uses data gathered in 1875 and 1876 from about 3,600 libraries of all kinds except those in common schools (academies, or secondary schools, were included). Only data from libraries with three hundred volumes or more are presented.

2. *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900*, published in 1901. The tables in this volume are based on reports from about 5,400 libraries of all kinds which had collections of 1,000 volumes or more in 1900.

3. *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries, 1923*. The bureau's 1923 volume covers all kinds of libraries; it is not as limited as its
title implies. It contains data on about 5,100 libraries with holdings of 3,000 volumes or more.

The most satisfactory list of libraries published near the year 1950 is the nineteenth edition of the *American Library Directory*, published by the R.R. Bowker Company in 1951.\(^5\) It contains about 11,000 libraries in its section for the United States, but omits all school libraries, some special libraries which failed to answer a questionnaire, and the smallest public libraries. To be included, a public library had to have: (1) an annual income of $500 or more, (2) an annual expenditure of $100 or more for books, or (3) service that was countywide. For school libraries, it has been necessary to use one of the tables in *Statistics of Public-School Libraries, 1953-54*, chapter 6 in the Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1952-54.\(^6\)

In order to obtain a list as current as possible, the twenty-ninth edition of the *American Library Directory, 1974-1975* was used; it contains information about 26,000 libraries in the United States other than those in schools.\(^7\) The compilers of this directory apparently have not excluded any public libraries but they have, for some reason, excluded law libraries of fewer than 10,000 volumes unless they are devoted to special kinds of law. The presence of small libraries has had little effect on the totals in the 1951 and 1974 lists; they include few libraries with collections under 3,000 volumes and almost none with collections under 300.

The 1974 *Directory* contained so many libraries that a sample was taken by selecting ten states from various parts of the country which might be fairly representative of the presence of libraries. Those states selected were: Maine, New Jersey, Alabama, Kentucky, Virginia, Indiana, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Arizona and California. The *Directory* lists 4,201 libraries from these states. A general indication of the ability of these states to represent the entire United States is that in 1951, in these ten states taken together, the relationships among the numbers of various kinds of libraries are about the same as the relationships in the entire country. For example, in these ten states in 1951, public libraries constituted 56 percent of the libraries other than those in schools; in the United States as a whole, public libraries constituted 58 percent. However, in this study, the 1974 figures for these ten states are presented as very rough indicators of changes since 1951. No satisfactory list of school libraries compiled within the last few years has been found, so no recent figures for this type of library are included in the study.

---


In using each of the lists, the compiler's decisions about inclusion have been accepted. For example, libraries with fewer than 3,000 volumes in the lists for 1876, 1900, 1951 and 1974 have been included, even though they are omitted from the 1923 list. Because each compiler had different criteria for inclusion, no list is completely comparable with another. Each compilation has been accepted as containing several thousand of the most important libraries in the United States at the time, according to the compiler. On balance, it has seemed better to sacrifice comparability of lists in order to learn as much as possible about the distribution of libraries at any one time.

These lists have been used to investigate three aspects of library development in the United States during the last one hundred years: (1) changes in the number of well-recognized "kinds" of libraries (public, college, etc.), (2) changes in what might be considered the "proprietorship" or control of libraries, i.e., changes in the roles of local governments, state governments, voluntary associations, etc., and (3) changes in the subject matter of those libraries on special subjects such as law and medicine: Are some subjects more frequently found in recent years? Have some subjects disappeared?

In order to learn about changes in the kinds of libraries and in the kinds of agencies controlling libraries, every library in every list was classified according to kind (public, etc.) and according to controlling agency if that was not determined by its kind. If the library was concerned with a distinct subject, that subject was also identified. For example, a medical library in a hospital operated by the U.S. government went into a category for federal hospital libraries on medical subjects. This category was later combined with categories for other kinds of hospital libraries in order to determine trends for all hospital libraries, with categories for other federal libraries in order to understand the role of the U.S. government, and with categories for other medical libraries to learn about the prevalence of libraries on this subject.

One kind of library must be mentioned at the outset because it constitutes such a large group and because its examples are so difficult to count: the school library. Only rarely during the last one hundred years has anyone expressed much confidence in statistics about the number of libraries in elementary or secondary schools, yet estimates indicate that, at least during part of the century, they have far outnumbered the total of all other kinds of libraries. For these reasons, school libraries have been ignored in this study in considering a total with which various types are compared. All percentages will
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refer to the total of the nonschool libraries in any list or directory as 100 percent. School libraries will be discussed but statistics for them, also, will be compared with the total for other libraries. The term all libraries used in this study signifies all libraries other than those in schools.

In comparing the prevalence of libraries in the various regions on any one list, either of two methods can be used: (1) to think of all the libraries in the country as 100 percent and to state the percentage found in each region, then to compare each region's percentage of libraries with its percentage of the population, or (2) to calculate, for each region, the ratio of libraries to population, (e.g., the number of libraries per 10,000 persons). The two methods give similar results; if a region's percentage of libraries is higher than its percentage of the population, its ratio of libraries to population will be higher than the ratio for the entire United States. In this study, the first method was used because its terms, percentages of national totals, seemed more meaningful; for example, to know that in 1900, the South had .22 libraries per 10,000 population has almost no meaning unless one is already quite familiar with the use of this measure.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF LIBRARIES OTHER THAN THOSE IN SCHOOLS

To consider the distribution of libraries in the United States, it is necessary to think in terms of regions. There is, however, no completely satisfactory way of dividing the country for library purposes. Therefore, mainly as a matter of convenience, the census groupings of four major regions have been used in this study: (1) the Northeast, including New England and the Middle Atlantic states, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; (2) the North Central states, to include the two census subregions, "East North Central" and "West North Central" — that is, a region embracing the states north of the Ohio River and including at its southwestern and western edges Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas; (3) the South, a region made up of all states south of the two regions just described, and the District of Columbia, and extending far enough west to include Texas and Oklahoma (this region is made up of the census groups "Southeast," "East South Central" and "West South Central"); and (4) the West, a region which includes every state or territory west of the three major regions just described.

Before considering individual kinds of libraries, something must be said about the regional distribution of all libraries at various times. As
Table 1 shows, in the Northeast the percentage of nonschool libraries has been considerably higher than the percentage of U.S. population at the time of the issuance of every list from 1876 through 1951. Actually, the concentration of libraries has been only in New England; at all times, the states of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have had about the same proportion of libraries and of population. The disproportion between the percentage of libraries and of population in New England was greatest one hundred years ago: in 1876, New England had about 9 percent of the population and 26 percent of the nonschool libraries. By 1951, the difference was somewhat less: about 6 percent of the population and 13 percent of the libraries.

**TABLE 1**

**Distribution of Nonschool Libraries and Population by Regions, 1870s to 1950s; Number and Percentage in Each Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>All U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, 1876</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1870</td>
<td>12,299</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12,982</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1880</td>
<td>14,508</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17,363</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, 1900</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1900</td>
<td>21,047</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26,333</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, 1923</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1920</td>
<td>29,661</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34,018</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1930</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38,594</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, 1951</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,479</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the North Central states, libraries lagged somewhat behind population but later moved ahead. The states in this region had 28 percent of the libraries in 1876 and about 34 percent of the population; by 1951 they had 31 percent of the libraries and 29 percent of the population. Here again the subregions exhibit a different pattern.
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In the states east of the Mississippi (that is, in the East North Central census region) population declined slowly from about 23 percent to about 20 percent between 1876 and 1951, while the percentage of libraries declined from 21 percent to 18 percent. For the states west of the Mississippi (the West North Central census region) the percentage of population increased from about 11 percent in 1876 to about 14 percent in 1900, while the percentage of libraries increased from 7 percent to 11 percent. Libraries subsequently became more prevalent, however: in 1923 this subregion had 13 percent of the libraries and 11-12 percent of the population; in 1951, it had 14 percent of the libraries and 9 percent of the population. The reasons for such changes cannot be determined from a broad-scale study such as this; they may be quite complex. A study of the founding of libraries in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois before 1850 showed that the prevalence of libraries seemed to be closely related to the sources of immigration into the various parts of that section of the East North Central states.

The West (that is, the census regions of Mountain and Pacific states) was, of course, very thinly populated in 1876; by 1950, its population was still small in relation to its area: 11.5 inhabitants per square mile as compared with the national average of 42.6. However, its percentage of the national population had risen from 4 percent in 1880 to 13 percent in 1950. The pattern of its library development has been generally similar to that of its population growth: in 1876 it had 4 percent of all the libraries in the country, and in 1951, 13 percent.

Among the western states, the most noteworthy distinction in terms of libraries and population is not in difference between the census subregions of Mountain and Pacific states, but rather between the state of California and the rest of the West. In the years between 1876 and 1951, California had a much greater population and many more libraries than any other western state. In 1876, California had about one-half of all the population in the West and 63 percent of the libraries; in 1900, it had 34 percent of the population and 49 percent of the libraries. After that its library/population ratio goes down: in 1923 it had about the same percentage of libraries and population; in 1950, it had 52 percent of the population in the West and, in 1951, 39 percent of the libraries.

In the South, the percentage of population of the entire United States remained remarkably stable between 1876 and 1951; it remained at 31 or 32 percent in all census years close to the years when the four lists of libraries were issued. The South, however, had a noticeably lower percentage of libraries and this percentage fluc-
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uated somewhat: in 1876 it was 17 percent; in 1900, 15 percent; in 1923, again 15 percent; and in 1951, it had risen to 23 percent.

In the South, there have always been more people in the South Atlantic census region (states on the Atlantic seaboard plus West Virginia) than in either the East South Central region (between the Appalachians and the Mississippi) or the West South Central region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and Oklahoma). Considering the population of the entire South as 100 percent, the South Atlantic states had a population of about 47 percent in 1876 and about 45 percent in 1951. In the states west of the Alleghenies, there was a definite shift in population from east to west: the percentage in the East South Central region dropped from 35 percent to 24 percent between 1876 and 1951, and the percentage in the West South Central states rose from about 18 percent to 31 percent.

The pattern for libraries in the South between the 1870s and 1950s differed from the population pattern in that the number of libraries along the Atlantic seaboard has always exceeded that of all other regions combined. Considering all southern libraries as 100 percent, 56 percent of libraries in 1876 were in the South Atlantic region, 57 percent in 1900, 53 percent in 1923, and 53 percent in 1951. Twenty-nine percent of Southern libraries were in the East South Central states in 1876; this had dropped to 20 percent by 1951. In the West South Central region, it rose from 15 to 27 percent in the same period.

VARIOUS KINDS OF LIBRARIES

This section first traces the rise of the public library, the decline of the social library, and changes in the number and distribution of libraries supporting educational activities. The changing roles of local, state, and federal governments and voluntary associations will then be examined. Finally, brief consideration is given to several kinds of libraries of more or less charitable intent—those in hospitals, prisons, and asylums—and to a kind that has no charitable purpose whatsoever—libraries in business establishments.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Without a doubt the rise of the free, government-supported public library has been the single most significant phenomenon of the last one hundred years in the library history of the United States. Such libraries were virtually nonexistent before the Boston Public Library
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was established in the 1850s; they had begun to grow in number by 1876, but fewer than 300 appear in the U.S. Bureau of Education's report for that year—11 percent of all nonschool libraries in the country. By 1900, the number had tripled; the 963 public libraries represent 26 percent of the nonschool libraries. In the 1923 list, almost 2,200 public libraries constituted 53 percent of libraries and in 1951, 6,400 libraries represented 58 percent.

By 1974, consolidations, regional systems, and other kinds of networks made it more difficult to decide whether a particular building and collection should be considered as a separate library. However, if we accept the definitions used by the compilers of the 1951 and 1974 library directories, we find an increase in the number of public libraries during the twenty-three-year period in the ten states constituting the 1974 sample. Those states had just fewer than 1,300 public libraries in 1951, 56 percent of the libraries in the ten states (close to the national average of 58 percent), and in 1974, they had more than 1,600, 39 percent of the ten-state totals for all kinds of libraries.

Public libraries have been unevenly distributed in the United States during at least part of the last century. The Northeast has always had a higher percentage of these libraries than its percentage of the country's population. In 1876, when it had about 30 percent of the population, it had almost exactly two-thirds of the public libraries. The proportion of the population in the Northeast has gone down somewhat; by 1950 it was 26 percent, but in the Directory issued a year later it had one-third of the public libraries.

In all the lists from 1876 through 1951, the South has had fewer public libraries in proportion to its population than did other regions. In 1876 and 1900, the number of public libraries in the South was negligible (less than 5 percent of the U.S. total; in the 1923 list the figure was 10 percent and, in the 1951 list, 19 percent.

The North Central region in 1876 had slightly fewer public libraries in proportion to population: 30 percent of the public libraries and 34 percent of the population. In both 1923 and 1951, its percentage of libraries was 7 to 8 points higher than its percentage of the U.S. population.

The prevalence of public libraries in the West shows a pattern which is difficult to interpret. In 1876, when it had about 3 percent of the population, it had only 1 percent of the libraries. However, in 1900 the West had 6 percent of the population and 7 percent of the libraries. Its percentage of public libraries continued to increase faster
than its percentage of population; in 1923 it had 15 percent of the libraries and 9 percent of the population. The statistics for 1951, however, are surprising: in that year it had only 12 percent of the libraries whereas in the preceding year it had 13 percent of the population; its ratio of libraries to population was about the same as in the rest of the country.

SOCIAL LIBRARIES

The century since 1876 may have belonged to the public library; the century before that date certainly belonged to the social library. Social libraries were outnumbered, in those days, by only two other kinds, school and Sunday school libraries, which were often very small and short-lived. Almost one-half of all the nonschool and non-Sunday school libraries which existed before 1876 were social libraries in the broad sense of the term; that is, they were libraries formed by societies which were organized to acquire either specialized or general collections, for the use of their own members, or for the use of persons of a particular age, gender, interest, or vocation. Even if a strict definition of the term "social library" is used—that is, limiting it to a general collection formed by a nonspecialized group for its own use—one-third of the nonschool and non-Sunday school libraries were of this kind.

In the first few decades after Franklin founded the Library Company of Philadelphia in 1731, when social libraries were first established in the colonies, almost all of them were social libraries in the strict sense. Throughout the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, these "pure" social libraries were joined by a variety of libraries which had some of the characteristics of the early social libraries, but were specialized in some way. However, the central core of pure social libraries continued to be more numerous than all other kinds combined. Changes in the distribution of the various kinds of social libraries will be considered here after the pattern for the entire group is described.

Although the last one hundred years constituted the century of the public library, social libraries did not begin to diminish in number when public libraries first became plentiful. The 1876 report contained 738 social libraries, using the broadest definition, and the 1900 Report included 867, some of them established after 1876. After that the decline was undeniable: the 1923 list contained 643 social libraries, and the 1951 directory, 41; the ten states included in the 1974 tabulation had only three. These social libraries constituted 28 per-
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cent of all nonschool libraries in the 1876 Report, 24 percent in the 1900 Report, 15 percent in 1923, and less than one percent thereafter.

Part of the apparent decline in the number of social libraries may be attributed to methods of counting. In the lists from 1876 through 1923, libraries have been considered in this study as social libraries if they were controlled by library societies, even though local governmental units may have contributed to their support through the purchase of stock or by annual payments, and even though some or all of the citizens may have been allowed to use them without cost. In recent years, this semipublic, semisocial kind of library has come to be considered, by most students of the public library movement, as a special kind of public library. Neither the 1951 nor 1974 directories gives enough information to separate these quasi-public (or quasi-social) libraries from true public libraries, so it is likely that some libraries classified as public in these directories would have been considered as social libraries on the basis of information available in the earlier lists. These hybrid forms still exist; in the Southeastern States Cooperative Library Survey—conducted from 1972 through 1974, and just recently published—thirty two “private” libraries have been identified in nine southern states, 5 percent of all “public” libraries for which data are presented: these “private” libraries are controlled by societies. It may be that the percentage of libraries legally under the control of societies is as high or higher in other regions.

The number of social libraries in the different regions did not decline evenly; in fact, in one or two regions, they increased from one list to the next. A few generalizations can be made. The majority of social libraries were always in the Northeast, about six of every ten in 1876, and seven of every ten in 1900 and 1923. The North Central region lost its social libraries faster than did other regions: it had about 28 percent of them in 1876, and by 1923 had only 14 percent. The West never had many, but the South presents a puzzling pattern: a drop from 10 percent in 1876 to 4 percent in 1900, then a rise to 12 percent in 1923. Since the number of social libraries was negligible by 1951, no regional pattern is discernible after 1923.

The “Pure” Social Libraries—The social library which had a general collection and which was not restricted to use by persons of a particular age or gender, was the most common form of social library both before and after 1876. The pattern of founding of these “pure” social libraries before 1876 is distinctly different from that of any
other kind of library. After a great surge, mainly in New England and mainly in the 1790s, the number founded in each decade varies but does not rise above the 1790 rate until the years immediately following the Civil War; quite inexplicably, another surge takes place between 1865 and 1875.

More than 2,000 of these "pure" social libraries were in existence in the American colonies or the United States at one time or another before 1876; however, the 1876 report lists only 434 such libraries, 16 percent of all nonschool libraries. A total of 601 is to be found in the 1900 list, but its percentage of all libraries in the list increases by only one. In 1923, the number decreased to 544, or 13 percent. Because the 1951 and 1974 directories do not permit easy identification of social libraries, it is impossible to tell how many were present; the number would have been small.

Social Libraries Established by One Group for the Benefit of Another—Beginning at least as early as the second quarter of the nineteenth century, Americans began to organize themselves into groups for a great variety of charitable purposes. It should not be surprising, then, that libraries planned by groups for the benefit of other, less fortunate groups should be second in number only to the "pure" social libraries in 1876. The list issued in that year contained about 150 of these, more than one-half of them formed by the Young Men's Christian Association since its establishment in this country in the early 1850s. The only other group of any size was made up of about thirty-five libraries originally established for young mechanics but, by this date, often permitting use by others. In the years following 1876, the number of libraries established for the benefit of special groups becomes smaller; in 1900, two-thirds of them were YMCA libraries. Even these were seldom found on the 1923 list; almost none of the charitable libraries were present in the 1951 directory or in any of the ten states in the sample for 1974.

Social Libraries for a Single Gender—Social libraries established primarily for use by members of the one gender were fairly common in the mid-nineteenth century; at least 700 had existed by 1876, although the U.S. Bureau of Education's list for that year contained fewer than one hundred, that number being equally divided between use for women and use for young men. More than one-half of the "ladies' libraries" were in Michigan, where women had, for some reason, become intensely interested in establishing libraries, some-
times admittedly to compete with existing social libraries which were dominated by males. 12 In 1900, the libraries for women outnumbered libraries for young men by five to one, and Michigan was still the center for women's libraries. By 1923, very few of either kind were left.

Lyceums, Athenaeums, and Social Libraries on Particular Subjects—Before 1876, a few other kinds of libraries existed which were sometimes almost indistinguishable from "pure" social libraries. The lyceum movement, started by Josiah Holbrook in the 1820s, had caused the formation of associations which established libraries and sponsored lectures and debates. In many of these local lyceums, only the library aspect remained after the first few years. However, even the libraries had become rare by 1876; only eighteen lyceums are to be found in the list for that year and even fewer are found in later years.

A similar kind of association, the athenaeums, flourished for a while during the mid-nineteenth century. If the athenaeums differed from typical social libraries, it was in their emphasis on the provision of current periodicals and newspapers. Only twenty-two were included in the 1876 list; later lists have fewer.

Another type of library, unlike the lyceum and the athenaeum, was being founded with increasing frequency during the decades just prior to 1876: the social library with a collection on a special subject. In their operation, societies formed for the purpose of establishing special libraries may sometimes have been indistinguishable from societies which had other purposes but also maintained libraries. However, in name at least, a "law library association" is different from a "bar association which owns a library." Only about forty subject-related social libraries of any kind appeared in the 1876 report, about one-half of them legal collections and the rest on religion, agriculture, or medicine. In the 1900, 1923, and 1951 lists, all but the law collections disappear; even the legal collections seem to have disappeared in the ten-state sample by 1974.

**COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**

Despite the fact that the college library is one of the oldest kinds of American libraries, dating from the 1630s when a library was started at Harvard, there were few academic libraries before the 1820s, when the number founded in each decade began to increase rapidly. By 1876, more than 750 had been established; the Bureau of Education's
During the century since 1876, the increase in the number of libraries in institutions of higher education has kept pace with the increase in the number of libraries of all kinds; in no list from 1876 to 1951 have college and university libraries constituted less than 18 or more than 21 percent. The college and university libraries in the ten-state sample for 1974 had, in 1951, been 21 percent of all of the libraries in those states; in 1974 they were 18 percent of the total.

When the various kinds of college and university libraries are considered, several changes over the last one hundred years can be noted; of course, these changes reflect the changes in the types of institutions of higher education. The liberal arts college had dominated in the years before 1876; in the century since then, the liberal arts section of undergraduate and graduate work has continued to be considered central. Several types of professional schools, however, had developed before 1876: the best established were the law schools, medical schools, and theological schools, although engineering schools and agricultural colleges did exist in small numbers. Training for most other occupations took place either at the secondary level or through apprenticeship.

Before 1876, professional schools as well as liberal arts colleges characteristically had libraries. Approximately two-thirds of all academic libraries established before 1876 were in liberal arts colleges; about one-sixth were in theological seminaries, and most of the rest were in medical schools, law schools or technical schools. The distribution in the U.S. Bureau of Education’s report for 1876 is almost the same.

In 1900 and again in 1923, seven of every ten college or university libraries had only general liberal arts collections, and there continued to be more collections to support theological training than law, medicine or engineering. However, a new type of institution was rising: the teachers’ college. By 1923 there were more collections serving teachers’ colleges than there were for medicine or law; the number of teachers’ college collections had almost equaled that of the theological seminary libraries.

By 1951, general collections for four-year colleges and for universities made up only one-half of the total of academic libraries; a new kind, the junior or community college library, had risen to a total of 23 percent and the seminaries and teachers’ colleges were far below with 7 percent each. Collections serving medical, law, engineering and agricultural schools were even less numerous. The figures for the
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ten states chosen from the 1974 directory may not be representative
because they include California, the home of a very large number of
community colleges. At any rate, the pattern for 1974 is not much
different from that of the same states in 1951, except that community
colleges are slightly more prominent and four-year or graduate
liberal arts collections are slightly less noticeable. In 1951, in these
states, community college libraries were 4 percent above the national
average and liberal arts collections were two percent below; in 1974,
in these states, community colleges represented 4 percent more of the
total than they had in 1951, and liberal arts collections represented 3
percent less than before.

The distribution of academic libraries throughout the four major
regions of the United States has been similar to the distribution of the
population at the time of every survey from 1876 through 1951. At
no time has a region's percentage of academic libraries varied by
more than five points from its percentage of the population. In 1951
the balance was particularly striking: in no region did the percentage
of population vary by more than two points from its percentage of
academic libraries.

Libraries in College Literary Societies

The libraries owned by college literary societies have not been
included in the figures for college and university libraries, but they
deserve some attention because they had not yet disappeared one
hundred years ago. The 1876 report does not always indicate the
exact number of society libraries which existed at a particular college,
but it includes references to at least 327 such libraries—almost exactly
two-thirds of the number of college libraries. The society libraries
disappeared quickly from the lists; only sixty-one appear in the 1900
Bureau of Education report and they are rarely mentioned after that.

School Libraries

Of all the kinds of libraries in this study, those in schools are the
most difficult to describe. The lists for 1876, 1900, and 1923 include
them on the same basis as other libraries; the 1876 report omits those
in elementary schools. The two later lists have few, if any, elementary
school libraries, possibly because they set their lowest volume limit for
inclusion above that which elementary schools were likely to have had.

The 1876 report includes 1097 school libraries—42 percent of all
other kinds combined; school libraries were more numerous than
were any other kind of library. Public high schools were almost nonexistent in 1876 but had begun to appear by 1900, when high school libraries were again the most numerous; the 1,762 high school libraries were 49 percent of all other kinds combined. In 1923, perhaps because the lower limit for inclusion was 3,000 volumes, the group of 853 school libraries was equal to only 20 percent of the total for all other libraries combined. In that year, one other group was larger; 2,175 public libraries comprised 53 percent of the total of nonschool libraries.

The regional distribution of the school libraries in the first three lists is quite different from the distribution of other major kinds of libraries. In 1876, 66 percent of all public libraries were in the Northeast, and 55 percent of all school libraries. The North Central region had 30 percent of the public libraries, but only 22 percent of the school libraries; in the West, there were few of either kind. In that year, the South had only 3 percent of the public libraries, but had 20 percent of the school libraries.

By 1923, the distribution of school libraries and public libraries had become about the same in the major regions. The Northeast had 34 percent of the school libraries and 37 percent of the public libraries; the North Central region had 40 percent of the school libraries and the same percentage of the public libraries; the West had 13 percent of the school libraries and 15 percent of the public libraries. In the South, the school libraries were still ahead; that region had 13 percent of them and only 9 percent of the public libraries.

It is very likely that great numbers of school libraries were omitted from these three early lists. One indication is that the number of nonschool libraries in the American Library Directory for 1951, which is more inclusive than any of these early lists, is about one-twentieth as great as the number of schools with library service to be found in the U.S. Office of Education's Statistics of Public-School Libraries, 1953-54. The 1953-54 volume counts schools, not libraries; if a school had several classroom libraries, it was counted only once. It shows that the Northeast had 15 percent of the schools with library service, the North Central region had 41 percent, the West had 11 percent, and the South had 33 percent. For some regions, these percentages are similar to the percentages of the population at about that time: the Northeast had 26 percent of the population in that year (25 percent in 1960); the North Central region had 29 percent in both 1950 and 1960; the West, 13 percent in 1950 and 16 percent in 1960; and the South, 31 percent in both years. Of all the schools in the 1953-54
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survey, 80 percent were elementary schools, 14 percent were high schools, and 6 percent were schools in which a single library served both elementary and secondary grades.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

During a century when many services performed by voluntary organizations have been taken over by governments, it is to be expected that federal, state and local governments would control an increasing percentage of all libraries. This has been the case: of all the nonschool libraries which could be identified as existing before 1876, 11 percent were government libraries (including public libraries but not including publicly controlled college or university libraries). Of the nonschool libraries in the 1876 report, 24 percent were operated by a government; in 1900, 35 percent; in 1923, 61 percent; and in 1951, 66 percent. For the ten states in the 1974 sample, the percentage in 1951 had been 66 percent, but in 1974 was only 52 percent, mainly because the number of public libraries had not increased as rapidly as had the number of libraries operated by business and industrial establishments, private hospitals, and various kinds of associations. Indeed, the rise of the public library has been the main cause of all changes in the statistics of government-controlled libraries since 1876; the other kinds of government libraries have increased in number but not in the percentage which they represent of all libraries in the country. Excluding public libraries, the percentage for 1876 was 13 percent; for 1900, 8 percent; for 1923, again 8 percent; and for 1951, 9 percent. For the ten-state sample, the percentage in 1951 was 11 percent and, in 1974, 13 percent.

Libraries Operated by Local Governments—During the past century, even though free public libraries (discussed earlier in this article) have been the most numerous of the libraries established by local governments, they have never been the only ones. In 1876, about one-fourth of all libraries controlled by counties or cities were special collections for particular groups of people; but after that, nine out of ten were general public libraries. In 1876 there were an appreciable number of county law collections; in 1900, a few of these and a few “teachers’ libraries” in cities; in 1923, a small number of law libraries; and in 1951 and in 1974, some law libraries and hospital libraries.

Libraries Operated by State Governments—Few libraries had been
established by state governments before the 1820s, but from that decade forward, more and more were founded. At least 200 had existed by 1876; about one-fourth were state libraries containing varying mixes of general and legal books, about one-fourth were in state prisons, one-fourth in various eleemosynary institutions of some kind, and a final quarter were mainly for the use of state courts.

The 1876 report included about 150 libraries provided by state or territorial governments; this represented 6 percent of all nonschool libraries. The number of state-owned libraries fluctuates from list to list, but the percentage which these represent of the nonschool libraries drops steadily until it reaches 1.5 in 1951. It is possible that this ratio was higher by 1974; for the ten-state sample, it was slightly below 2 percent in 1951 and was between 3 and 4 percent in 1974.

The kinds of state-owned libraries have not changed very much over the last one hundred years. The “state libraries,” i.e., collections of general or legal material at the seats of government, have, of course, increased only slightly; the number of prison libraries in the lists has fluctuated without any definite trend indicated. Asylum libraries, however, have disappeared, and the number of law libraries has increased. In 1974, each of several states in the sample owned a few scientific or technical collections.

Libraries of the Federal Government—In no list before that for 1951 did the federal government have more libraries than did the states, considered together. Fewer than one hundred federal libraries appear in each of the lists for 1876, 1900 and 1923. In 1951, the number jumps to almost 800, 7 percent of all of the nonschool libraries. For the ten-state sample, the federal libraries constituted 8 percent in 1951 and, although the number was greater in 1974, it represented only 7 percent of all libraries.

The concentration of federal libraries in Washington, D.C., was far greater in 1900 and 1923 than in 1876 or 1951; the District of Columbia was not included in the 1974 sample. In 1876, almost the only libraries outside of the District of Columbia were those in army posts; few of these appear in the 1900 or 1923 lists but they are back in great numbers in 1951 and by that time, many federal libraries on technical subjects had been established in various parts of the country. This situation accounts for the percentages of federal libraries in the District of Columbia in the different lists: 39 percent in 1876, 71 percent in 1900, 71 percent in 1923, and 14 percent in 1951.
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SOCIETIES USING LIBRARIES TO ACHIEVE THEIR PURPOSES

Americans are known for their propensity for forming associations. It requires almost no excuse at all for a group of people to organize a society, and the lists of libraries published during the last century make it clear that many societies have formed libraries as they pursue their various aims. In this study, society libraries on particular subjects are considered along with other libraries on those subjects, but by considering all of the association libraries together, the tendency of voluntary organizations to establish libraries can be evaluated.

In 1876, these libraries made up 10 percent of all nonschool libraries in the country; by 1951, the number of such libraries had increased, but its incidence among all libraries had gone down to 5 percent. In the ten states used for the 1974 sample, the percentage had been 5 percent in 1951, but had risen to 7 percent by 1974.

No one kind of society has ever had noticeably more libraries than others. In 1876, an approximately equal number of libraries were held by historical societies, religious societies (excluding churches), and fraternal organizations; societies with German interests (the Sängerbunds and Turnvereins) were not far behind. In later years, libraries continued to be held by a variety of societies, but some kinds of societies disappeared and others began to establish libraries. By 1900, a considerable number of what were designated as “general” societies were appearing in the lists; the purposes of these organizations were not always clear, but some were simply clubs to provide opportunities for a pleasant social life.

The century since 1876 has been the century of the museum in America; few of these existed one hundred years ago. In this study, the gradually increasing number of museum libraries has been grouped with societies of similar purpose, e.g., scientific museums with scientific societies, etc.

Kinds of societies whose libraries have virtually disappeared from lists and directories during the last one hundred years have been the fraternal organizations and the German-language societies. Both in 1951 and in the sample from the 1974 directory, libraries of scientific societies and museums have been more numerous than any other kind; there has been a small but increasing group of libraries held by art museums and art associations.

The geographical distribution of societies holding libraries reflects the general tendency of such societies to cluster around population centers; the proportion in the North remained remarkably stable.
from 1876 through 1951; in the four surveys the northern societies held between 86 and 88 percent of the society libraries in the United States. The Northeast has had a far greater percentage of these libraries than it has of the population in the country. In 1876, when it had 61 percent of society libraries, it had about 30 percent of the population; in 1951, it had 46 percent of the libraries and 26 percent of the population. In three of the four lists issued from 1876 through 1951, the West has had more than its share of society libraries, always because of the dominance of California.

INSTITUTIONS WITH LIBRARIES OF A CHARITABLE PURPOSE

During the past century, governments have to some extent taken over the work formerly done by charitable organizations. Even in penal institutions before 1876, the establishment of a prison library was often a charitable enterprise undertaken by some church or religious society. Nevertheless, in the present study it has seemed desirable to group “institutional” libraries together—whether operated by voluntary associations or by governmental units.

Hospital Libraries—A few American hospitals had libraries by 1876; approximately fifty such collections have been identified as existing before that date, but none of the three lists issued before 1951 included more than thirty-five. In 1876 most of them were in the Northeast, but by 1923 they were scattered throughout the country. In 1951, the number of hospital libraries was much greater, both in number and in the percentage they represented of all non-school libraries in the country. In this study, if a hospital was known to have a separate medical collection and patients’ collection, each of the two collections was counted as a library in order to make some estimate of the percentage which were medical; apparently, about six of every ten collections were on the subject of medicine.

Even if a hospital’s medical and patients’ collections had not been counted separately, the number and percentage of hospital libraries was far greater in 1951 than in earlier lists. A large part of the increase was in federally operated hospitals; about two-thirds of all listed collections were in these (almost all were veterans’ hospitals). In the ten states in the 1974 sample, hospital libraries tripled in number, compared with 1951, and almost doubled in their percentage of all libraries in the sample. This increase was greater among collections in nongovernmental hospitals.
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Prison Libraries—The provision of wholesome reading matter had been a part of the movement to transform prisons into "reformatories" for several decades before 1876. The U.S. Bureau of Education's list for that year included sixty libraries in penal institutions, mostly in state prisons or reformatories. Despite the continuing interest in prison reform since 1876, the number decreased to fifty-one in the list for 1900 and to thirty-one in the 1923 list. In the 1951 directory, thirty-eight prison libraries could be identified, a very small percentage of all libraries. In the sample of ten states, the number increased appreciably between 1951 and 1974, but the percentage represented by these libraries again decreased.

Libraries in Protective Homes—The charitable efforts of Americans in the nineteenth century were partly expended in the establishment of protective homes or asylums for orphans, for the aged, and for the mentally ill. The survey for 1876 lists libraries in 122 of these institutions, approximately one-half of them operated by governmental units and one-half by charitable organizations; the sponsorship of some is not clear. In the past century these homes have become less necessary for various reasons, including the tendency to care for the mentally ill in hospitals and the growth of pension plans. For whatever reasons, libraries in asylums or homes for the unfortunate are rarely found in the list for 1900 or in any later lists.

BUSINESS LIBRARIES

The lists used for this study indicated that libraries owned by business firms have been rare until recent decades. In 1876 and again in 1900, the operators of commercial rental libraries were virtually the only entrepreneurs who owned libraries as parts of their businesses. By 1923, a few firms had technical libraries, law collections, or libraries about some aspect of business. However, in no list before the 1951 directory did libraries held by businesses comprise more than 5 percent of all of the nonschool libraries in the country. In that year, about 800 such libraries appeared, approximately one-half of them on science or technology and the rest in advertising firms, publishing houses, banks, and law and other firms. In the sample of ten states for 1974, four out of every five collections were scientific or technical libraries; however, in these ten states in 1951, two-thirds of the business-owned libraries had been on scientific or technical subjects, a proportion well above the national average. The figures from these
five lists are not directly comparable with statistics gathered by Anthony Kruzas in 1961-63, but they are generally compatible with his; for example, he found that 57 percent of the company libraries were on science/technology.\textsuperscript{13}

**LIBRARIES ON SPECIAL SUBJECTS**

In a century which has seen the rise of the special library, one might expect that the proportion of libraries on particular subjects would increase. However, the number of libraries on special subjects has not increased with noticeably greater speed than has the total number of libraries, each of which covered a variety of subjects, unless the acceleration in the growth of the special libraries has been quite recent. In 1876, 23 percent of all nonschool libraries were subject-specialized; in 1900, 20 percent; in 1923, 14 percent; and in 1951, 24 percent. By 1974, the subject-specialized libraries may have increased considerably in comparison with libraries on general subjects: in the ten states in the 1951 sample, the percentage of specialized collections was the same as that for the entire country: 24 percent. By 1974, it had risen sharply to 43 percent.

In comparing the distribution of subject-specialized libraries in the various regions, one surprising phenomenon appears: the South had a higher percentage of the specialized libraries than it did of all libraries in every list from 1876 through 1923. In the 1876 list it had 17 percent of all libraries and 19 percent of the libraries on special subjects; in 1900, 15 percent of all libraries and 19 percent of the subject libraries; and in 1923, 15 percent of all libraries and 22 percent of the subject libraries. In 1951, subject libraries and all libraries in the South each comprised 23 percent. As might be expected, the District of Columbia contributed to the South's good showing for subject-related libraries. In 1876 and again in 1900, 29 percent of all southern libraries on special subjects were in Washington, D.C.; in 1923, 28 percent, and in 1951, 24 percent.

In the North, the Northeast understandably had a large share of all the subject-related libraries in the country—56 percent in 1876. This ratio dropped to 36 percent by 1951, but in that year the percentage of all libraries in the Northeast was 32 percent. The North Central states always had considerably fewer libraries on particular subjects than they did of all kinds. In different lists the percentages varied somewhat; in 1951 that region had 24 percent of the subject-related libraries and 32 percent of all libraries. In the West, the proportion of all libraries and of libraries on special subjects remained about the
same until 1951, when that region had 13 percent of all libraries and 17 percent of the subject-related collections. Of course, California was the home of a large proportion of the subject-related libraries in all the lists.

When examining the libraries on special subjects formed during the last one hundred years, the order of consideration probably does not matter. In the following sections, the kinds which are first described are those which are well established before 1876: libraries on religion, law, medicine, history, agriculture, and military science. Some subjects are then considered which have become numerous only during the last one hundred years: science and technology, education, and business and economics. Finally, a few subjects are briefly mentioned which have been represented only occasionally by special libraries.

RELIGION

In the years before 1876, Americans gave expression to their interests in religion by establishing more libraries on this subject than on any other; there were about 40 percent more special libraries in the field of religion than on the next most popular subject (agriculture). The number founded each decade had been increasing fairly steadily since the 1790s; in the 1876 report, 150 religious libraries were included, 6 percent of all the nonschool libraries in the list.

The dominance of collections on the subject of religion continued until the beginning of the twentieth century; in 1900, they made up 5 percent of all libraries, still leading all other special-subject libraries in number. However, in 1923 and again in 1951, they comprised only 2 percent of the total; special libraries on several other subjects were more numerous. In the ten-state sample for 1974, religious libraries have risen again: they have quadrupled in number and have risen from 2 to 5 percent since 1951; scientific and medical libraries are the only subject-specialized libraries which are more numerous in the 1974 directory.

The proportion of religious libraries in the four major regions changed somewhat between 1876 and 1951. In 1876, the Northeast had about 60 percent of these libraries and only about 30 percent of the population. The tendency of the Northeast to have more than its share of the libraries on religion persisted, but its dominance was not as great in later years. By 1951, its proportion of libraries was one-and-one-half times greater than its proportion of the population rather than twice as great. In the North Central states, libraries on
religion were relatively scarce in lists prior to 1923. When that list was issued and when the 1951 directory was issued, both the proportion of libraries and that of the population were approximately 30 percent. For the West, three of the four lists show almost the same proportion for libraries as for population. Religious libraries have been found less frequently in the South; its proportion of such libraries has been approximately one-half that of its proportion of the population in all lists from 1876 through 1951.

LAW

Collections of law books were very rare in the American colonies and in the new nation until about 1800, when a few began to appear; during the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, the number of law libraries founded each decade increased at a fairly steady pace. The U.S. Bureau of Education list for 1876 includes 139 law libraries; local governments owned more of these (sixty-one) than did any other kind of agency. Twenty-two of them were in law schools, twenty-one were owned by associations formed for the purpose of establishing libraries, that is, by "law library associations"; seventeen were owned by states, mainly for the use of courts and not including "state libraries" (some of which might properly have been included because of the large numbers of law books which they contained); a very few were held by bar associations and by the federal government.

By 1951, no kind of law library had disappeared; there were still a few law library associations and bar associations with libraries, but other types had increased greatly in number: the list includes approximately one hundred libraries in law schools, more than sixty controlled by local governments, and about the same number controlled by the federal government. A type which apparently had not come to the attention of compilers of lists of libraries in 1876 was the library owned by a law firm or other business; more than forty of these appear in the 1951 list. In the years between 1876 and 1951, law libraries were distributed geographically in about the same way as the population. In the ten-state sample, law libraries tripled in number between 1951 and 1974; their percentage of all the libraries in those states almost doubled despite the omission in the 1974 list of nonspecialized collections with fewer than 10,000 volumes.

MEDICINE

Medical libraries were not common in the United States before the
second quarter of the nineteenth century, but beginning in the 1820s, the number founded in each decade increased steadily; the Bureau of Education's 1876 list includes sixty-four medical libraries, more than one-half of them in medical colleges. No other type of institution controlled very many such libraries; a few were held by hospitals and medical societies.

About 500 medical libraries were included in the Bowker directory for 1951. By this time, hospitals had slightly more than one-half of these libraries, and at least one-half of all of the hospital libraries were in veterans' hospitals. Somewhat less than one-fourth of all medical libraries were in medical schools; a few were held by medical societies and other organizations. These libraries were fairly well distributed throughout the United States, but with a slight tendency to favor the North; in 1950, 69 percent of the population lived in the North and, in the 1951 directory, 73 percent of the medical libraries were there. If the ten states used in the 1974 sample are representative of the whole country, the number and percentage of medical libraries had increased greatly between 1951 and 1974. In 1951, medical libraries in those states made up a little more than 4 percent of all libraries, whereas for the entire United States, medical libraries made up just under 5 percent. In 1974, medical libraries made up 10 percent of all libraries in the ten states; they had quadrupled in number. The greatest growth had been in hospital libraries; they now made up about three-fourths of the total.

HISTORY

Libraries on the subject of history may have contained the first American collections deliberately gathered to support scholarly investigation. The historical societies established in various parts of the country beginning in the 1790s were acquiring manuscript letters and other source materials as well as books at a time when most academic libraries acquired only books or periodicals for general reading.

The Bureau of Education's report for 1876 lists fifty historical libraries, all held by societies. Approximately one-third of them were in New England and one-third in the Mid-Atlantic states; the remainder were widely scattered. Between 1876 and 1951, the number of historical libraries did not increase in the Northeast, and increased in the rest of the country more slowly than have most other kinds of special libraries. During the early part of this century, the proportion of historical libraries outside the Northeast began to approach 50
percent; by 1951, two-thirds of the libraries were outside that region. During these same years, historical libraries moved down from fifth to eighth place among all libraries on particular subjects. In 1974, historical collections in the ten-state sample had grown in number and in the percentage which they represented of all libraries; the numbers are so small, however, that an increase for all states should not be assumed.

Unlike most kinds of special libraries, those on the topic of history have continued to be possessed by the same kind of organization from the earliest days to the present; in 1974, almost all were still owned by societies. Of course, the lists do not consider as separate libraries the parts of university libraries which were on the subject of history.

**AGRICULTURE**

The history of agricultural libraries in nineteenth-century America is very unclear. Almost 300 small libraries were established by agricultural societies in the 1830s and 1860s, but it is difficult to determine whether books on agriculture actually predominated in any of them. The 1876 report lists only twenty-three on the subject, and some of these were in land-grant institutions whose collections often held engineering books as well. Agricultural colleges continued to have most of the collections on this subject—more than one-half in 1900, 1923 and 1951. However, one other type of agricultural library had increased in number by 1951; in that year, there were about one-half as many agricultural libraries owned by the U.S. government as there were in colleges of agriculture. In each of the four lists, libraries on this subject were quite evenly distributed throughout the various parts of the country, except that they had virtually disappeared in New England by 1951. In the 1974 sample, the number of such libraries was negligible, as it had been in 1951.

**MILITARY SCIENCE**

Libraries connected with military establishments present the most unusual pattern of any of the subject-related libraries. By the time that they begin to appear in numbers, almost all of them clearly belong in one of three groups: (1) garrison or camp libraries, primarily intended for the recreational reading of military personnel, (2) libraries at specialized military establishments, for those engaged in the advanced study of the technique of waging war, and (3) libraries at veteran's hospitals and elsewhere. Libraries about war in general have been very rare.
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During the last one hundred years, the garrison or camp libraries have waxed and waned several times. Very little has been written about these libraries in the years before World War I, but it is clear that they were fairly common in the 1850s, during the Civil War, and in the 1870s. The 1876 report lists forty such libraries, scattered across the country fairly evenly, except that the South had more than its share (fifteen). Very few (only thirteen) of them were present in the 1900 list, and fewer still (only five) in the 1923 list. Many were established with the help of the American Library Association during World War I, but very few camp libraries could still be identified in the 1923 list.

In 1951, these general or recreational libraries were more numerous than ever before; the Directory for that year noted approximately 200 of them. As in 1876, the South had more than its share: 45 percent of them. The West had 30 percent, one-half of these in California. The remainder, only about one-fourth, were scattered fairly evenly throughout the rest of the North. The ten states in the 1974 sample had the same number of general camp libraries that they had had in 1951; in both years, California had almost the same number as were to be found in all of the other nine states combined.

Libraries on advanced aspects of military science were not common in any of the lists before 1951; most of them have been classified, in this study, with other libraries on scientific or technical subjects. The medical libraries connected with military establishments have mainly been located in veterans' hospitals; they too were found mainly in the 1951 Directory, and are considered with other hospital libraries.

Science and Technology

Libraries on science and technology were not rare before 1876. However, they had gotten a late start; few were established before the second quarter of the century. By 1876, more than one hundred had been founded, mostly in the North and principally to serve the needs of scientific societies. In the 1876 list and again in the 1900 list, only religious and legal libraries were more numerous. In 1923, when law was ahead, medicine and science/technology were tied for second place. By 1951, when there were 680 science/technology libraries, that subject led all others by a good margin (second place was held by medicine with 506 libraries).

By 1951 about 60 percent of all scientific and technical libraries were owned by business or industrial firms; in the 1876 list, apparently no library on these subjects had been owned by a commercial
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firm. In 1951, societies operated about one-sixth of the total of libraries of this kind and the federal government controlled about the same number; only about 8 percent were the libraries of technical colleges or were separate libraries in multipurpose universities. No other type existed in appreciable numbers.

As might be expected in regard to libraries which were frequently associated with business and industry, the science/technology libraries were, by 1951, concentrated in the East. About one out of every five was in New York state; that state combined with New Jersey and Pennsylvania had about one-third of them. California, Illinois, the District of Columbia, and Ohio each had a respectable number; few were to be found in New England, the South, or the West (outside California). By 1974 the ten states sampled had almost five times as many science/technology libraries as they had in 1951. In those states, science/technology libraries had made up 7 percent of all libraries (1 percent above the national figure) in 1951; by 1974 they comprised 17 percent. The greatest increase had taken place in the number of libraries in business and industrial firms; such commercial operations owned two-thirds of all libraries in this field. About four out of every ten science/technology libraries in the states of the 1974 sample were in California; this proportion is not surprising because California had close to 40 percent of the population in the sample.

EDUCATION

It is difficult to determine the content of libraries related to the subject of education. Educational libraries of any kind were almost nonexistent in 1876; later, collections in teachers' colleges were at least partly about education, although they contained many books of a general nature. After the teachers' college libraries appear in the lists, they were always the most numerous libraries with educational emphasis; they made up two-thirds to nine-tenths of such libraries in lists from 1900 through 1951. The 1951 Directory includes seventeen libraries in state departments of education, ten controlled by local governments, and eleven by educational associations. By that year, libraries related to education were distributed in the various regions of the United States in approximately the same way that population was distributed; however, the Northeast had somewhat more of these libraries than it did of the population: 37 percent of the libraries and 26 percent of the population. In 1974, the number of libraries related to education was considerably smaller in the ten-state sample than it had been in 1951; this decrease may have resulted from the continu-
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ing tendency for teachers' colleges to become multipurpose colleges or universities.

BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Special libraries on the subject of business or economics have been rare in this country until quite recently. Before 1876 a very small number were owned by boards of trade and federal offices. The "mercantile libraries," which were more common, contained very few books about business; they were general libraries for the use of young men who were clerks in business establishments. Libraries on the subject of business or economics numbered only thirty-one in the U.S. Bureau of Education's 1923 list of libraries, but the number had taken a great jump by 1951; at that time there were more than 300 libraries on these subjects. It is difficult to ascertain their number because some collections were strong in both law and economics or finance; libraries in advertising firms have been placed here rather arbitrarily. In the 1951 Directory, approximately two-thirds of the libraries on the topic of business were held by business firms; approximately one-fifth were owned by associations in the field and most of the rest were in federal bureaus or departments. They have been concentrated around cities; about one-half of those in the 1951 Directory were in the state of New York; appreciable numbers also were to be found in California, the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. For the ten states in the 1974 sample, the number of libraries on these subjects had increased, but the percentage of all libraries had hardly changed; as in 1951, it was close to 1 percent.

SUBJECTS LESS FREQUENTLY FOUND

A few libraries on each of three other subjects have appeared in the various lists: art, music, and government or political science. Art libraries existed in 1876 but there were never more than a dozen in any list before the 1951 Directory, when there were from forty to fifty; it is difficult to be sure about the subject matter of a few collections held by businesses and museums in which art books may have predominated. In the 1974 Directory, the art collections for the ten-state sample made up about the same percentage of the non-school libraries that they had in the same states in 1951: slightly less than 1 percent.

A very few libraries on the subject of music have been listed in each directory, mainly those in independent schools of music; clearly, the many music collections in universities have not been considered as
separate libraries. Virtually the only libraries on the subject of government were in the 1951 Directory, when fewer than forty appeared, almost all of them held by associations with interests in the field.

Because of differences in the five lists which have formed the basis of this study, and the lack of precise information about school libraries, no exact figures can be given about the increase in the number of libraries in the United States between 1876 and 1975. However, for nonschool libraries of 300 volumes or more, the 1876 report of the Bureau of Education indicates a total of 2,637. The 1974 American Library Directory includes a very small number of libraries with fewer than 300 volumes; its total of libraries with 300 volumes or more is approximately 26,000, an increase of about 985 percent during a period when the country's population increased by approximately 460 percent. Clearly, the number of libraries has been increasing much more rapidly than the number of people.

While the concentration of libraries has been increasing, their distribution within the country has been shifting. The Northeast has always had a high proportion of libraries in comparison with its proportion of the population, but its lead over the rest of the country has not been as great in recent years. The South, on the other hand, has always had a higher proportion of population than of libraries but, again, the trend over the years has been to equalize its proportion of the nation's libraries with that of its population. The Midwest and the Far West have not had a perfect balance between libraries and population, but have usually shown less extreme positions than either the Northeast or the South. When various kinds of libraries are considered, a variety of patterns—chronological and geographic—can be seen. This paper has been concerned with tracing some of the major variations in a very rough way.
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The Growth of Research Collections

ROBERT B. DOWNS

REFERENCE TO that invaluable mine of information, *Public Libraries in the United States of America*. . . (1876) reveals how far American libraries have come during the past one hundred years. In that pioneer compendium, all libraries possessing more than 300 volumes each—a total of 3,647 libraries—were recorded. Their combined holdings totaled 12,276,964 volumes, to which were being added less than one-half million volumes annually. Yearly expenditures for books, periodicals and binding were at the rate of $562,000.¹

Viewed in the light of the gigantic 1976 collections, individual library holdings in 1876 were picayune. The Library of Congress reported 300,000 volumes. The Boston Public Library was the same size. The largest university libraries in the nation were Harvard (227,000) and Yale (114,000) which, incidentally, have maintained their leads to the present day. The New York Public Library had not yet come into existence, but its predecessor, the Astor Library, held 152,446 volumes. State university libraries were in their infancy. Among the largest today, Michigan held 27,500 volumes in 1876. California (Berkeley) held 12,000, Illinois 10,600, Minnesota 10,000, Wisconsin 6,370, and Indiana 6,000. The universities of Texas, Stanford, UCLA, Duke, and Chicago were still to be born.

Twenty-five years later, the U.S. Office of Education reported a spectacular growth in American library resources—relatively speaking. There had been nearly a fourfold increase, bringing the national total to 45 million volumes. At the turn of the century, the Library of Congress contained one million volumes, plus substantial numbers of manuscripts, maps, prints, and pieces of music. Harvard's collections had grown to 600,000 volumes, and the recently consolidated (1895) New York Public Library held 538,000 volumes.

¹ Robert B. Downs is Dean Emeritus, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
In 1908, M.B. Iwinski, a European, calculated that there were 10,378,000 different books in existence, based upon a careful examination of bibliographical and publication records. In about 1940, LeRoy Merritt projected the Iwinski study through 1940, starting from the beginning of printing. The conclusion was reached that the total book production for those countries and those periods for which data were available was 15,377,000 titles, representing an average world book production of 156,000 titles during each of the thirty-two years from 1908 to 1940. By sampling the National Union Catalog, various regional union catalogs, and the catalogs of large individual libraries, Merritt estimated that there were 10 million separate titles in American libraries, as of 1940, or about two-thirds of all books then in existence. The rates of publication and of library acquisition vastly expanded in the succeeding thirty-five years.

Writing in 1938, William Warner Bishop pointed out that “rare books in the collector’s sense are . . . likewise concentrated in very large measure on the Atlantic seaboard.” To support this conclusion it was noted, for example, that great collections of early Americana were to be found in Boston and Cambridge, the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Yale University, the New York Public Library, the New York Historical Society, and the Library of Congress. Collections of comparable importance could be found in only three locations west of the Allegheny Mountains: the Clements Library at Michigan, the Newberry Library in Chicago, and the Huntington Library in California.

A second example cited by Bishop was English literature, in which not more than seven American collections ranked with those of the British Museum, the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Cambridge University, and the John Rylands Library at Manchester. These were Harvard, Yale, New York Public, Pierpont Morgan, Folger, University of Texas, and Huntington—only two of these away from the Atlantic coast area. A similar situation was discovered to exist in early printing. All major collections were in the Northeast, except for those at Newberry and Huntington.

During the period of nearly forty years since Bishop’s investigation, an avid interest in rare-book collecting has developed among a number of other American libraries. In particular, various great state university libraries have come to the forefront, possessing financial
Growth of Research Collections

resources beyond those of all but a limited number of privately supported institutions.\(^6\) Statistical evidence of the growth of the public institutions shows that of seventy-five university libraries in the United States holding more than one million volumes each in 1974, fifty were in state universities.\(^7\)

At approximately the same date as the Bishop study, Louis Round Wilson was exploring the geographic distribution of American library resources in general, especially on the quantitative side. As reported in his *Geography of Reading* (1938), based on sources published in 1935, it was found that there were seventy-seven centers in the United States each holding 500,000 volumes or more. The specifications stated by Wilson for computing his data were as follows:

In general, the area included does not cover more than 50 miles (airline) from center. When a city could be attached to more than one center, the total number of volumes in the area and transportation facilities were considered in allocating it. Public or college libraries of less than 20,000 volumes and special libraries of less than 5,000 volumes were not included. State lines were not crossed except in special cases. No city was chosen as a center unless it contained one library having at least 75,000 volumes. Preference was given to state capitals, or cities in which state universities are located. Metropolitan areas were selected unless the library center would fall elsewhere.\(^8\)

Wilson compared the number of centers and volumes in the four quarters of the nation formed by the thirty-eighth parallel and the ninety-seventh meridian. An overwhelming lead was held by the northeast quarter—further confirmation of Bishop’s findings on the locations of rare-book collections. In terms of volume holdings, only four of the first twenty-five centers were outside the Northeast; these were all in California.

Utilizing the same or similar sources of information, the Wilson study was updated about twenty years later.\(^9\) Thirty-two new centers had developed, fifteen of them in the Southeast. Eight states still lacked a center: Mississippi and seven western states—Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. The total book resources of the country had more than doubled, from 138,867,606 to 289,355,391 volumes.

A third investigation of the distribution of the nation’s library resources was reported in 1974.\(^10\) The results were little short of startling. The number of centers in the United States holding in
excess of 500,000 volumes had jumped from 109 in 1955 to 265 in 1973. Even more striking, the total number of volumes in such centers had gone from 138,867,606 in 1935 to 289,355,391 in 1955, to 724,045,043 volumes in 1973—more than a fivefold increase in less than forty years. The growth rate during the last eighteen years was especially phenomenal. Including collections outside the centers, the country's libraries held approximately 800 million volumes. In percentage of increase, the southern, southwestern, and northwestern states were the leaders. None of the states except Alaska held fewer than one million volumes.

The reasons for the explosion of library collections in all the American states are complex. Among the factors were: (1) the establishment of hundreds of new institutions of higher education, (2) millions of additional students in colleges and universities across the land, (3) increased book budgets in all types of libraries, (4) extensive new foreign acquisition programs, and (5) a steadily growing rate of publication of books and journals, to which libraries responded by stepped-up acquisition programs.

**TYPES OF LIBRARIES**

Another aspect of the distribution of library resources is the types of libraries and their varying facilities to be found in the United States. Standing at the top, from the point of view of advanced study and research, are the university libraries. On the basis of quantitative standards alone, there are perhaps as many as one hundred American universities which hold collections of considerable importance to the scholar and research worker. A recent listing of one hundred notable American libraries included seventy-three university libraries.

Closely related to the university library, but of relatively slight significance from the point of view of advanced study and investigation, is the college library, few of which have the funds, incentive, or need for developing research materials. Occasional exceptions may be noted in special collections developed in such New England colleges as Amherst, Bowdoin, Colby, Dartmouth, Mount Holyoke, Trinity, Wellesley, and Wesleyan, and a limited number of libraries elsewhere, e.g., at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Oberlin, and Claremont.

A third group—public libraries—while large numerically (approximately thirty hold collections of one million volumes or more), are
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generally not noted for their research holdings. They must serve the needs of many general readers, who require less specialized materials than the university professor and graduate student, and they must do an excessive amount of duplicating to meet the demands of the large clienteles served. Exceptions are the New York and Boston public libraries, which rank among the great research libraries of the world. Other public libraries have developed outstanding special collections, such as the White folklore collection in the Cleveland Public Library and the automotive history collection in the Detroit Public Library.

Comprising another considerable group are the state libraries, the first of which were established in the United States in the 1790s. All states presently have state libraries, extension agencies, state archives, and state law libraries. The chief categories and research materials held by state libraries are newspapers, state and local history, archives and manuscripts, and government publications.

A fifth type of library which has grown rapidly over the past several decades, and has assumed first importance in many fields, is that of libraries belonging to the federal government. At the top of the system is the Library of Congress, probably the world's largest library, holding notable collections in many fields, but especially outstanding in the social sciences, law, history, fine arts, and music. Also among the world's leading libraries in their fields are the National Agricultural Library, National Library of Medicine, U.S. Geological Survey Library, U.S. Labor Department Library, the Health, Education and Welfare Library (for education), and the Pentagon Library for military science.

A small but important group of institutions is referred to as reference libraries. Examples include the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, rich in literature, history, and early printing; the Newberry Library in Chicago, dealing with literature, history and the arts; the John Crerar Library in Chicago and the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, both for science and technology; the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, famous for rare books and manuscripts; the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington; and the John Carter Brown Library in Providence and the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, both celebrated for early Americana.

Finally, a seventh class—special libraries—has significant resources for research. These are of two principal types: those formed in connection with business or industry, emphasizing current material and up-to-date information, and concentrated in the heavily industrialized areas of the country; and those libraries owned by societies,
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associations, and similar organizations, such as bar associations and medical societies. An example is the Engineering Societies Library in New York, maintained by several national engineering societies, which holds one-quarter million volumes.

COOPERATIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

The first major program on a national level to build research library collections jointly was the Cooperative Acquisitions Project for Wartime Publications, growing out of World War II. This successful enterprise extended over a period of approximately three years and involved the principal university and general research libraries of the United States.

It is recognized that reference and research libraries are among the institutions hardest hit by modern war. Even those not located in combat zones are seriously hampered by conditions created in time of war. During the two world wars, the European book market was almost completely cut off from American libraries. Normal channels of communication, transportation, and trade were largely closed, materials were destroyed or confiscated in transit, and little information was available on the nature and extent of publishing in the countries at war. In each period the curtain descended further for American libraries when the United States became an active belligerent. Such volunteer and unofficial groups of librarians as the ALA Committee on Importations (in World War I) and the Joint Committee on Importations (in World War II) labored diligently, and not without a certain measure of success, to alleviate the situation, but the problem was too large and complex to be coped with by any except governmental and military agencies.

As early as April 1943, with State and War Department support, the Library of Congress sent a staff member on a procurement mission to Portugal and Spain, and before the end of the war representatives were working also in Algeria, Italy, and France. The Library of Congress was obviously in a distinctive position among the nation's research libraries. As an integral part of the federal government, its agents were permitted to follow the American army into liberated and occupied areas, while these regions were closed to representatives of nongovernmental libraries.

Fully aware of this situation, the Association of Research Libraries requested in 1944 that the Library of Congress make available to other institutions its unique facilities for the acquisition of foreign
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materials. No action was taken on the proposal until the end of the war, when the Librarian of Congress transmitted a formal request to the Secretary of State indicating that the national interest would be served by having the federal government assist American research libraries in maintaining their collections. The State Department agreed to the recommendation with the stipulation that participating libraries "had agreed upon and carefully planned a program of cooperative buying and that they would continue to support such a plan as long as federal assistance was granted them."

With the way thus cleared, the Library of Congress proceeded to increase the size of its European mission. Between August 1945 and October 1947, twenty-six American librarians and subject specialists were employed abroad to purchase materials issued during the war years, to screen and ship materials obtained from German army and Nazi Party sources, and to locate and evacuate stocks of books held by German dealers for American libraries. Members of the mission were directed to procure up to fifty copies of books of general reference value and at least three copies of all other publications. In addition to these materials, the Library of Congress made available for distribution large quantities of duplicate foreign publications received from the Office of Censorship, Army Military Intelligence, the Historical Records Branch of the Army, and other sources—Italian, French, Swiss, Dutch, Belgian, German, Austrian, etc.

After the acquisition procedures began to function, a committee was appointed to advise on the distribution of materials received. Based on a list of 254 categories which generally followed the Library of Congress classification, priorities were assigned to 113 libraries. In its decisions on priorities, the advisory committee became acutely aware of the dearth of information on the strength of library resources in different institutions and in various fields. Its experience emphasized the need for published guides to library resources in all areas of research.

In its three-year career, the Cooperative Acquisitions Project distributed a total of 819,022 books and periodical volumes, representing approximately 2 million pieces. In number of volumes obtained, the leading institutions, after the Library of Congress, were (in order) the New York Public Library, Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Illinois, California, Chicago, Iowa State, National Library of Medicine, Minnesota, Duke, Princeton, Wisconsin, and Northwestern.

Chiefly through the efforts of the Library of Congress, supported by the nation's major research institutions, the Cooperative Acquisi-
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tions Project brought to the United States an unsurpassed collection of European wartime publications, far richer than would have been possible if dependence had been placed on individual institutions. The undertaking demonstrated several important facts: (1) American libraries could look to their national library for leadership in large cooperative activities; (2) research libraries were able and willing to support a broad program for the improvement of library resources; (3) the idea of libraries combining for the acquisition of research materials is feasible and desirable; and (4) the research resources of American libraries, as represented by their holdings, are a matter of concern to the federal government.

The wartime project was also a step toward correcting a serious imbalance in American library resources. At the beginning of World War II, it was discovered that U.S. library collections were deplorably weak for vast areas of the world. Even in the Library of Congress, which had long been the most internationally oriented of U.S. research libraries, it was found, for example, that the Oriental Division had concentrated on collecting Chinese publications, to the virtual exclusion of Japanese, and the Slavic Division had emphasized pre-1918 publications instead of Soviet materials. Scholarly libraries were mostly concerned with publications in western European languages, with a mere smattering of materials in other languages. There were a few notable exceptions, such as the Harvard-Yenching Chinese-Japanese Library, the Japanese collections at Columbia and the University of Michigan, the Hoover Library at Stanford, the Library of Congress, and the New York Public Library.

As a result of the deficiencies revealed by World War II, radical changes occurred in the procurement policies of U.S. libraries. The wartime and postwar project paved the way for the Association of Research Libraries' Farmington Plan, which profited from the experience gained in the earlier venture. The stated objectives of the Farmington Plan were to ensure that at least one copy of every new foreign book of possible research interest was acquired by an American library, promptly listed in the National Union Catalog, and made available by interlibrary loan or photographic reproduction.\textsuperscript{15}

The inception of the Farmington Plan dates from a meeting of the Library of Congress's Librarian's Council in Farmington, Connecticut, in 1942. Out of this conference developed a Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials. The plan was adopted in 1947 by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Subject allocations were agreed
upon and preparations were completed for putting the program into operation for publications issued in three Western European nations: France, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Changes in the Farmington Plan were almost continuous from the outset. Within five years its scope was worldwide. The original scheme of assigning subject responsibilities was modified to provide also for area assignments covering publications of less developed countries, especially where the book trade was not well organized and where there were language difficulties. Numerous changes in subject allocations were also made. In addition, the Farmington Plan was decentralized and its effectiveness increased by the establishment of a number of regional subcommittees for the Far Eastern, Middle Eastern, Slavic, African, Latin American, South Asian, and Western European areas.

Like every large and ambitious undertaking, the Farmington Plan had critics. Some believed it was too inclusive, bringing into libraries quantities of material of little or no value. Spokesmen for an opposite point of view held that practically everything published abroad should be available somewhere in the United States. The plan attempted to steer a middle course between all-inclusiveness and extreme selectivity.

In one respect the Farmington Plan had a major hiatus from the outset. For simplicity of operation it was agreed that only monographic works should be included, omitting the important areas of serial publications, newspapers, and government documents. The deficiency was partially corrected by various supplementary and complementary programs.

In 1972 the ARL merged the Farmington Plan Committee with its Foreign Acquisition Committee, and the Farmington Plan ceased to exist as a separate entity. Three reasons were cited by the ARL for discontinuance of the plan: (1) the increasing use of blanket-order programs by member libraries (which presumably duplicated the Farmington program), (2) the Library of Congress's national program of acquisitions and cataloging, and (3) the reduction in many library acquisition budgets in recent years. Nevertheless, during its twenty-four years of existence the Farmington Plan was responsible for adding hundreds of thousands of volumes to participating libraries.

A more geographically limited undertaking began in 1959: the Latin American Cooperative Acquisition Program, familiarly known by its acronym LACAP. This enterprise grew out of the annual
Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials, which held its first meeting in 1956. The project, in which forty-three libraries participated, was designed to cover a large area where library acquisition activities were notoriously difficult because of the book trade’s poor organization. In essence, the plan was to have libraries place blanket orders with the firm of Stechert-Hafner for current Latin American materials. The orders were expected to provide a sufficient volume of business to enable Stechert-Hafner to maintain a traveling representative in Latin America and local agents in the principal publishing centers.

Despite its quite considerable success, LACAP ceased operations early in 1973. The decision to abandon the program was reportedly based on a decreasing volume of business at Stechert-Hafner, the plan’s official agents. The economic situation in individual libraries was an important factor.

A natural outgrowth of the Farmington Plan was the Public Law 480 Program administered by the Library of Congress. In 1961 Congress authorized the expenditure of counterpart funds or blocked currencies for the acquisition of multiple copies of publications in certain countries where surplus funds had accumulated. Previously, an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, approved September 6, 1958, had authorized the Librarian of Congress “in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies” to direct a program using United States-owned currencies in foreign countries to procure in those countries books and other library materials, to distribute such informational matter to libraries and other research centers in this country specializing in the areas, and to carry on, in the foreign countries where such currencies were available, such related activities as cataloging, photocopying, and binding. The program became operational in 1961.

The first undertaking under Public Law 480 was a pilot project limited to three countries: India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic. Invitations to participate in the program were sent to a small list of university libraries selected by an advisory committee. At the end of the first six months of operation, nearly 400,000 publications had been acquired and shipped directly to American research libraries. By July 1, 1962, publications were being received at the rate of one million per year. The distribution of accessions lists publicized the availability of materials received.

For fiscal year 1964, Congress authorized a substantial increase in
appropriations to allow for the continuation of the original projects and for extension of the program to Burma, Indonesia, and Israel. Ceylon, Nepal, and Yugoslavia were subsequently added. In 1971, the Librarian of Congress reported that more than 14 million items had been acquired from eight countries since the program's inception. Comprehensive sets of publications in English and in the vernacular languages were being shipped to forty-one major research libraries and sets of English-language publications were being distributed to approximately 300 college, university and public libraries in all fifty states.

Certain regional plans served a similar purpose. For example, book and travel funds were made available by the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities to the libraries of the four cooperating universities—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan State, and Wisconsin—to send representatives to various areas of the world for the cooperative acquisition of library materials. Members of the library staffs spent extended periods in Latin America, Africa, East Asia, South Asia and Southeast Asia on buying trips, procuring important material that could not have been acquired through regular trade channels. Individuals sent on these missions benefited by an increased knowledge of the areas in which they specialized.

Foreign procurement through cooperative undertakings provided an excellent background of experience for the most ambitious plan of all, the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC), centering in the Library of Congress.\(^{18}\) The enabling legislation for this program was contained in an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965, entitled "Strengthening College and Research Library Resources." The provisions charged the Library of Congress with the responsibility of:

(1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and (2) providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means, and enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections.\(^{19}\)

It was soon recognized that cooperative efforts would be needed to accomplish the library's goal of acquiring on a worldwide basis all currently published library materials which are of value to scholarship, and of supplying cataloging information for these materials...
promptly after receipt. All types of published material except periodicals were to be included in the plan. Acquisition centers were established in foreign areas where the book trade was not well organized or where there was no national bibliography. The cooperation of a number of national libraries was enlisted to assist in cataloging the imprints of their countries. At the end of the first three years of operation, it was reported that the Library of Congress had established ten shared cataloging centers overseas and had worked out cooperative arrangements with national libraries and national bibliographies in twenty-two countries for the use of catalog entries prepared by these institutions.

At the end of its first decade the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging was providing substantial benefits to the Library of Congress, to the research libraries of the United States, and to libraries, publishers, and book distributors in other countries. When the program is fully established and funded, it may be anticipated that the world's publishing output will reach the United States soon after coming off the printing presses, will be cataloged at home or abroad, and will be ready for use.

It should be emphasized, however, that NPAC will not completely replace or supersede other cooperative acquisition efforts. To ensure wide availability of important foreign publications, it is generally agreed that it is desirable to acquire more than one copy of every worthwhile book issued abroad and to decentralize locations. For these and other reasons, individual libraries are continuing their acquisition activities in the foreign field to provide support for the area studies that have proliferated in the larger universities of the United States, as well as for the traditional curricula in languages, literature, history, the social and natural sciences, and other disciplines.

Another approach to cooperative acquisition was taken by the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) in Chicago (originally established in 1949 as the Midwest Inter-Library Center). At the outset, the organization's primary purposes were to serve as a storage library for little-used books and to purchase selected materials for cooperative use; subsequently, however, an independent acquisition program became of primary importance. Starting in 1956 and supported by grants from the National Science Foundation, the center entered subscriptions for several thousand rarely held serials covered in Chemical Abstracts and Biological Abstracts. Also cooperative in nature is the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, sponsored by the Asso-
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The Center for Research Libraries and housed in the center; approximately 150 of the leading newspapers of the world are currently received by subscription, microfilmed and filed for the use of cooperating libraries. More recently, beginning in January 1973, the CRL announced an expanded program of journal acquisitions to add 6,000 new subscriptions over a five-year period, unlimited as to subject with the exception of medicine and agriculture.

In response to its defined mission, the Center for Research Libraries concentrates its collecting activities on highly specialized, infrequently used materials. In addition to collecting foreign journals and newspapers, the center has assembled the most complete collection of foreign dissertations in the United States. It also possesses extensive holdings of foreign government publications, the publications of U.S. state governments, college and university publications, textbooks, and various other categories.

The CRL has an international membership of about 200 American and Canadian libraries. From the point of view of acquisition policies and programs, the principal value of the center to individual member libraries is to relieve them of responsibility for collecting a variety of fringe materials, expensive to acquire, seldom needed, and filling valuable space, but perhaps important when wanted.

A similar program on a smaller scale is conducted by the Hampshire Inter-Library Center in Amherst, Massachusetts, established in 1951. Four libraries, those at Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, and Smith colleges and at the University of Massachusetts, pooled their research collections. Duplicates were sold and the proceeds used to acquire works of research importance not held by any of the libraries. The institutions have comparable interests and are near each other geographically—facts that have contributed to the success of the plan.

The most recent large-scale plan projected for interlibrary cooperation in resource building and sharing involves four major libraries in the Northeast. The New York Public Library is joining with the libraries of Columbia, Harvard and Yale, according to a 1974 announcement, in what the New York Times described as "a sweeping and controversial program of combining operations that will entail cutting back purchases of many publications and systematically exchanging photocopies of previously published writings." The four libraries, which together possess more than 25 million volumes, aim to make materials from their collections quickly available to one another's readers through the use of everything from Greyhound buses to the latest electronic equipment, relaying printed
material and facsimiles back and forth. Among the devices to be used are teletype machines, open telephone lines, centralized catalogs compiled by computers and, as it becomes cheaper and more efficient, telefacsimile equipment. The chief economy is expected to be realized by acquiring single copies (instead of four) of expensive sets and little-used journals. Another possibility is an agreement to allocate responsibilities for in-depth collecting, based on subject and language specialization and on forms of material.

The four institutions—known as the Research Libraries Group—hard pressed by inflationary labor costs and rising expenditures for publications, particularly those from abroad, regard the plan as "one of the most important cooperative undertakings in the research library field in decades." An information center to be established at Yale will contain information not only about the libraries' millions of volumes, but also about millions of maps, manuscripts, microfilmed documents, and other nonbook materials. The response of the book world outside libraries, however, is highly critical of the scheme. The Authors League and the Association of American Publishers, for example, maintain that the consortium will violate authors' and publishers' copyrights, take away their rightful earnings, and make difficult, if not impossible, unsubsidized publication of serious books and periodicals. The rare-book trade also expects to be drastically affected.

MICROFORMS

One of the most useful devices that modern technology has given libraries is microform reproduction. The use of microfilm in roll form came into general use in libraries in the 1930s. A variety of other forms were subsequently developed: microcards, microprint, and microfiche. Since the late 1930s, microreproduction projects have proliferated, miniaturizing large bodies of newspapers, manuscripts, archives, journals, early books, government publications, bibliographies, and other types of specialized research materials. A recent development is the use of ultramicrofiche techniques for the reproduction of complete "libraries" of books and periodicals; this method manages to place a large number of pages on a very small surface.

The reasons for the microform revolution are diverse. On the part of some persons there is a belief that the traditional book is obsolete and all literary materials should be reduced to a microcosm. A better-balanced view is that the new media have both potential and
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limitations. The value of microreproductions is recognized in preserving fragile records, in saving war-endangered materials from possible destruction, in increasing the availability of unique and rare items, in saving storage space, and, in the case of highly specialized works, for original publication. At the same time, it is obvious that library materials are frequently less useful in microform than in their original formats.

Examples of major projects of microreproduction are Pollard and Redgrave's *Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland* for the period 1475-1640; Wing's *Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*; Charles Evans' *American Bibliography, 1639-1800*; and all United Nations publications.

Reproduction of material in full size using photo-offset and other processes is also having a dramatic effect on library acquisition activities. It has been correctly stated that no book need henceforth be considered out of print if somewhere a copy is available for reproduction. The importance of this fact is accentuated by the requirements of many new university and college libraries, which in the past would have found it virtually impossible to acquire the basic periodical files, collections of historical sources, and reference works needed for a research library. Such materials were out of print and simply unprocurable. The annual *Guide to Reprints* for 1975 lists some 350 firms engaged in reprint publishing in the United States and abroad. Their productions include complete runs of general and special journals; society publications; bibliographical and other reference works; series dealing with special subjects, such as the Negro, law, theater, criminology, and the history of science; and innumerable individual book titles.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

Interest in problems of bibliographic control in the United States began at least a century ago. The first meeting of the American Library Association in 1876 was instrumental in securing the revival and continuation of *Poole's Index to Periodical Literature*; the *American Catalogue of Books* was published the same year.

The master key to bibliographic control in the United States, it is generally conceded, is the National Union Catalog in the Library of Congress. Efforts to compile a union catalog may be traced to the
beginning of the present century, but the National Union Catalog in its present form was organized in 1927. More than 3 million cards are added annually, with locations in about 2,500 libraries in the United States and Canada. In addition to the huge alphabetical author catalog for books in western languages, the Library of Congress also maintains a number of specialized union catalogs for Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Hebraic, Near Eastern, Slavic, South Asian, and Southeast Asian languages. In the early 1940s the Library of Congress published its card catalog in book form, and about a decade later began adding locations in other American libraries to the published catalog. Under the title The National Union Catalog: An Author List Representing Library of Congress Printed Cards and Titles Reported by Other American Libraries, the work has since been issued periodically. Now in progress is a complementary work, National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints, to contain some 13 million titles in 610 volumes when completed.

Supplementing and complementing the National Union Catalog are various regional, state, and local union catalogs scattered throughout the country. Three outstanding examples are known as bibliographic centers: the Union Library Catalogue of the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area, the Bibliographical Center for Research for the Rocky Mountain Region, and the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center and Union Catalog. The great impetus for the development of regional union catalogs in the United States came during the period 1930-41. The growth was stimulated and made possible by the availability of free labor from government relief agencies during the depression.

Two major types of nonbook material are presently being covered by supplementary volumes to the National Union Catalog: music and phonorecords, and motion pictures and filmstrips. In 1962 the Library of Congress began publishing an annual volume of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, containing reproductions of cards describing manuscript collections in libraries, archival agencies, and other U.S. repositories; more than 40,000 collections have been described thus far. Another annual publication, beginning in 1965, is the Library of Congress's National Register of Microform Masters.

One of the largest and most difficult aspects of bibliographic control is that of serial publications. For more than a century, serial literature has been assuming an increasingly important place in libraries. The learned and technical journals, transactions of academies, museums,
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observatories, universities and institutions of all sorts, and the serial publications of governments make heavy demands on library funds, space and staff. The third edition of the *Union List of Serials in the United States and Canada*, published in 1965, records more than 156,000 titles, with holdings in 956 cooperating libraries. Currently, the chief source of information in the field is the Library of Congress’s *New Serial Titles*, which lists periodicals issued after 1950, and reports holdings in more than 700 U.S. and Canadian libraries. A special branch of the serial field is newspapers. The seventh edition of the Library of Congress’s *Newspapers on Microfilm* (1973) lists 34,000 domestic and 9,000 foreign newspaper titles, with locations in hundreds of libraries and commercial firms.

Another complex area from the point of view of bibliographic control is that of government publications at all levels. The U.S. Government Printing Office is by far the most prolific of American publishers. Much of the huge mass of government publishing is ephemeral and fugitive, most of it never appears in the book trade, and its acquisition offers many practical difficulties to libraries. Federal documents have been comprehensively recorded in various bibliographies since 1774, state publications since 1910, and municipal and other local documents very sketchily or not at all.

The distribution of U.S. government publications to libraries, through some form of depository system, dates back more than a century. The Printing Act of 1895 brought together into one law all the previous acts and resolutions which concerned the printing and distribution of public documents. A substantial number of federal, state, university, and public libraries hold extensive collections of depository publications for the present century, and in some instances earlier. Establishment of a regional system of depository libraries (now numbering approximately forty) by the Depository Library Act of 1962 assures strong collections of current publications in strategic locations around the country.

The interest in and extent of efforts to make the nation’s library resources known and used is demonstrated by the numerous printed library catalogs, union list of books and periodicals, descriptions of special collections, surveys of library holdings, calendars of manuscripts and archives, and exhibition catalogs. Downs’s *American Library Resources; A Bibliographical Guide* records over 11,800 such titles through 1970.
A promising and occasionally successful device for library cooperation is subject specialization. The idea of library specialization or division of fields is not a new concept. Charles Henry Gould, then president of the American Library Association, proposed a scheme for regional specialization in 1909, and Ernest Richardson, librarian of Princeton University (1890-1923), developed a detailed plan for specialization on the research level. Practical applications of the theory appeared even earlier. In New York City, an agreement between Columbia University and the New York Public Library dates back to 1896; certain fields were allocated to each library. In Chicago, according to a plan adopted in 1895, the Newberry Library assumed responsibility for collecting in literature, history and the arts, and the John Crerar Library agreed to cover the natural, physical, and social sciences. Similar plans were made effective later in Minneapolis, Providence, Cleveland, Nashville, Chapel Hill-Durham, Oregon, and elsewhere. In Washington, the Library of Congress leaves the field of medicine largely to the National Library of Medicine and that of agriculture to the National Agricultural Library.

Despite such instance showing the feasibility of divisions of fields among libraries, especially research institutions, the idea has not gained general or ready acceptance. A prime reason is competitive institutional ambitions and rivalries. University administrators and governing boards have expanded curricula to include graduate study, research, and teaching in every field offered by any other university. Not free agents, librarians are expected to support these programs by providing materials and services. Limitations of fields is a direction in which universities have been reluctant to move. The trend is generally toward expansion rather than retraction, except in periods of financial depression. Unless there is a change among educational leaders in this attitude, the outlook for comprehensive programs of library specialization is not encouraging.

SURVEYS OF LIBRARY HOLDINGS

Surveys are a typical American institution. In the library field, surveys have dealt chiefly with technical processes, administrative procedures, and social aspects. The primary reason for the existence of libraries—their actual contents or holdings—has become more recently recognized and is receiving increasing attention. Resources surveys serve a variety of purposes: they reveal a library's strengths
Growth of Research Collections

and weaknesses, show how well it is adapted to its clientele, provide a basis for planning and interlibrary cooperation, and locate materials which might otherwise be overlooked.


The techniques for describing and evaluating library collections on the research level are still experimental. No generally accepted standards have been established, chiefly because of the difficulty in defining research materials. Anything in printed or manuscript form is of conceivable research value.

NATURE OF RESEARCH COLLECTIONS

Individual library development is a many-sided undertaking, involving the building of collections in special subject fields; of collections of general classes of material, such as public documents, periodicals, newspapers and manuscripts; and perhaps of distinctive special collections. The development of a great research library has a certain mirage quality; the goal of completeness may be approached but can never be attained. Four stages can be recognized in rating a library’s resources in special subject fields: a general information collection, a well-rounded reference collection, a comprehensive research collection, and an exhaustive research collection, the last comprising everything in any form which can be assembled on a subject.

Library materials break down into several major categories. Sepa-
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rately printed books, serials, government publications, and manuscripts are the leading types for research purposes, but a variety of other records are being assembled. In the Library of Congress's annual report on acquisitions, for example, separate figures are included for volumes and pamphlets, technical reports, bound newspaper volumes, newspapers on microfilm, manuscripts, maps, micro- opaques, microfiche, microfilm reels and strips, motion-picture reels, sound recordings, books for the blind and physically handicapped, prints and drawings, photographic negatives, prints, slides, posters, and a miscellany of broadsides, photocopies, nonpictorial material, photostats, etc.—a total of more than 75 million items.

In most of the sciences, the literature of mathematics is fundamental. For the biological, chemical, and physical sciences, the important materials are: (1) complete files of specialized journals, (2) the transactions of societies and institutions devoted to specific sciences, (3) the transactions of pertinent academies and general societies, and (4) monographic publications, handbooks, and encyclopedias. The same is true of the applied sciences of medicine and surgery, chemical technology, and engineering and industry in general. For the earth sciences—geology, paleontology, mineralogy, geography and geophysics—scientific journals also hold high rank, but of equal concern are publications such as the geological surveys issued by governmental agencies around the world.

Research materials for the social sciences are far more diverse than for the sciences. History, sociology, economics, political science, law and government are served by journals, society transactions, government publications, sets of collected sources, published archives and manuscripts, laws and treaties, court reports, statistical series, census reports, administrative documents, atlases and maps.

The great field of literature and language presents still another picture. Monographic material predominates. Journals, although comparatively few, are important. The amount of literary material in any major language is immense, and only the largest libraries attempt to maintain comprehensive collections.

Another leading field—philosophy and religion—produces books, journals, and society transactions in great numbers, along with a large body of collected sources, scriptural commentaries, council decisions, etc. The source materials for early, medieval, and modern theological studies are numerous and sometimes rare. Much advanced study and research in philosophy and in ancient and medieval history are dependent upon works generally classified in theology.

[74]
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In addition to the foregoing disciplines, other fields have developed in recent years, such as education, psychology, and business administration, which produce journals in large numbers, quantities of pamphlets, extensive series of reports (mainly statistical), some society publications, and dissertations.

A highly specialized area, the fine arts and music, requires monumental collections of sources, journals, sheet music, sound recordings, prints and slides, and printed books.

STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Interest in and the need for standards for university and other research libraries have long been evident. In measuring a university library's resources, at least ten criteria may be used: (1) total library holdings, (2) total volume holdings in relation to student enrollment, (3) volume holdings in relation to graduate student enrollment, (4) volume holdings in relation to number of faculty members, (5) volume holdings in relation to major subject fields for undergraduates, (6) volume holdings in relation to fields of concentration at the master's level, (7) volume holdings in relation to fields of graduate concentration at the doctoral level, (8) number of volumes added annually, (9) number of current periodical subscriptions, and (10) number of current serial subscriptions.29

A majority of these criteria was adopted by Clapp and Jordan in their study entitled "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections,"30 and in somewhat modified form by Washington state college and university libraries in A Model Budget Analysis System for . . . Libraries.31 The general formula developed by Clapp and Jordan has been widely applied during the past decade, and for the most part has demonstrated its validity as a practical device for testing the strength of a library's collections. The primary criteria are as follows, in terms of volumes:

- Basic undergraduate collection .................. 50,750
- Each FTE faculty member ......................... 100
- Each FTE student (all levels) .................... 12
- Each undergraduate in honors programs ............ 12
- Each field of undergraduate concentration ........ 335
- Each field of graduate concentration—master's .... 3,050
- Each field of graduate concentration—doctoral .... 24,50032
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The Washington state formula increased these totals for most categories:

- Basic collection: 85,000
- Each FTE faculty member: 100
- Each FTE student: 15
- Each undergraduate major: 335
- Each master’s field, when no higher degree offered: 6,100
- Each master’s field, when higher degree offered: 3,050
- Allowance per doctoral field: 24,500

The Washington state formula recognizes that constant growth is essential to keep a library alive: “A minimum number of acquisitions per year shall be established equal to five per cent of the estimated number of units of library resources held at the start of each fiscal year.”

Clapp and Jordan also proposed a formula for current periodicals:

- Undergraduate collection: 250
- Per FTE faculty member: 1
- Per field of undergraduate concentration: 3
- Per field of graduate concentration—master’s: 20
- Per field of graduate concentration—doctoral: 200

Another set of standards was adopted in 1972 by the Association of Research Libraries as minimum criteria for membership in the association, a select organization of about ninety major libraries of the United States and Canada. The criteria are based on ten of the statistical categories used by the association in its annual compilation of Academic Library Statistics. The categories are: volumes in library, volumes added (gross), number of FTE professional staff, number of FTE total staff, expenditures for library materials and binding, expenditures for salaries and wages, total library operating expenditures, number of current periodicals, number of Ph.D.s awarded, and number of fields in which Ph.D.s are awarded. To qualify for automatic invitation to membership, a university library must have maintained for a three-year period an average of more than 50 percent of the current median levels of the first eight categories, and an average of more than 40 percent of the medians of the last two categories. As examples of the application of the formula, an institution applying for membership in 1972 would have been required to hold a minimum of 743,206 volumes, to have added 43,237 volumes, and to be receiving 8,580 current periodicals.
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METHODS IN COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

There has been increasing emphasis in recent years on the library staff's responsibility for collection development. Book selection in college and university libraries was formerly regarded as a faculty prerogative on the assumption that, as experts in their fields, faculty members were best qualified to determine what publications were important and desirable. As attitudes and practices have changed, especially in university libraries, collections are being built in large part by subject specialists on library staffs. The entire professional staff may be involved to some extent in book selection. At the same time, it is agreed that where faculty members are willing to participate in building library resources, and have the necessary expertise, their advice and guidance are invaluable.

An increasingly popular device—blanket or standing orders, sometimes referred to as approval plans—gives a new dimension to the problems of book selection. Several factors appear to have influenced librarians in their acceptance of such arrangements. The rate of publication has made new selection mechanisms imperative. The volume of printed materials and staff costs have forced libraries to seek methods of selecting the greatest number of books in the most expeditious fashion. To have books ordered with minimum clerical and routine labor, frequently with catalog cards provided, saves time for other, perhaps more important, activities. A further advantage may be a savings in time for users; an efficient standing-order plan should ensure prompt receipt of most current materials. As foreign acquisition programs have expanded, there is a need to acquire materials from areas for which no adequate bibliographic tools exist. The national bibliographies and reviews on which standard selection systems depend are simply lacking in many countries.

Despite the obvious advantages of standing-order and approval plans, there are problems and dangers associated with their extensive use. Serial publications is a complex category. Too much ephemeral and marginal material may be received, while important single titles may be overlooked. Also, dealers and jobbers often fail to cover certain types of publications central to a research library, such as those issued by universities, art museums, learned societies, and private membership organizations. These items may not get into the regular book trade, and there is little or no profit in them for dealers. A further objection is that major research libraries, by utilizing the services of a small number of dealers, are building book collections
that are too similar in both strengths and weaknesses. Investigations have revealed a significant fact: the most-used books are those selected by librarians, second in demand are books selected by college and university faculty members, and least used are titles chosen by book jobbers.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the larger a research library becomes, the less selection is involved in its growth. Not all areas are developed comprehensively, but in fields of primary concern to the institution, the library is likely to be engaged in collecting rather than selecting. Completeness becomes the main goal.

THE FUTURE OF THE BOOK

Prophets of doom maintain that books are an obsolete, vanishing artifact, replaced by such mass media as large-circulation magazines and newspapers, telephone, telegraph, film, radio and television. The validity of this belief is questionable. In 1973, Americans spent about $3 billion for 1.4 billion books, an average of nearly seven books per capita, more than three times as many per person as were sold in 1929, when 122 million people bought 214 million books, before the advent of radio, television and talking motion pictures.

Book production is another statistical measure. According to the Publishers' Weekly, 13,142 new books or new editions of books were published in the United States in 1957. In 1973, the total had more than tripled, to 40,000 titles. World book production, based on UNESCO statistics, has followed a similar trend. One reason for this rise is the popularity of paperback books; the number of paperbacks in print grew from 4,500 titles in 1955 to 123,000 titles in 1975.

Numerous university and research libraries are attempting to provide more efficient service by the use of data processing equipment to perform operating routines. Less progress has been made in the application of computer technology to the field of information storage and retrieval, where the aim is to extract the intellectual content of texts. If the purpose is to correlate facts and relationships from the complete contents of books, the problem becomes exceedingly complex and costly. It is indeed highly doubtful whether it will ever be economical and desirable to store vast quantities of information for infrequent use. The flexibility, economy, ease of use, and information storage capacity of the book in its historic form remain unmatched. A statement issued by the Association of Research Libraries points out that the intellectual content of large encyclopedic
research libraries is not likely to be reducible to a small black box or a desk drawer for many years, if ever; therefore, the traditional book will continue to be a reality with which we must deal.
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Statistical Reporting of American Library Developments by the Federal Government

Frank L. Schick

Nearly one century elapsed between the establishment of the first college library at Harvard in 1639 and the inauguration in 1731 of the first subscription library in Philadelphia by Benjamin Franklin. A period about one and one-half times as long passed until the beginning of the official collection of library statistics in 1870. Nongovernmental compilations of library data appear in publications, of which Trübner's Bibliographical Guide to American Literature may be among the earliest. However, the precise date of the first presentation of such data has not been ascertained.

The Office of Education: 1867-1965

The official collection of educational statistics started in the United States on March 2, 1867, when President Andrew Johnson signed the Organic Act which established the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). This basic law states in Section 1 that:

There shall be established, at the city of Washington, a department of education, for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several states and territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

The role of the newly created agency—to collect statistics and other educational information—was complicated by the fact that the U.S.
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Constitution gives authority for education to the states; consequently, each state had developed its own system of education and its own methods to deal with its educational problems and to collect whatever data seemed necessary. This condition of state education responsibilities, however, did not prevent the Organic Act from defining the duties of the agency's chief administrative officer, the Commissioner of Education:

Section 3. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to present annually to the Congress a report embodying the results of his investigations and labors, together with a statement of such facts and recommendations as will, in his judgment, subserve the purpose for which this department is established.5

After less than two years of its existence, the agency's name was changed by Congressional appropriation to the Bureau of Education. Sixty years later, in 1930, the original name Office of Education was reinstituted. In 1939 the office was transferred to the Federal Security Agency; in 1953 this agency was reorganized as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with the Office of Education as one of its agencies.6

Henry Barnard, the first Commissioner of Education, started immediately on his assigned tasks with a staff of three clerks to collect statistical information on various aspects of education: (1) the number and condition of all types of schools (elementary, secondary, public and private, higher and professional as well as those for Negroes, the handicapped, orphans, prisoners and sunday schools); (2) teachers, teacher training, teaching conditions and teaching requirements; and (3) status and functions of school libraries. As a result, the reports of the Commissioners of Education contained from the outset some statistical data about school libraries and later other types of libraries.7

The collection and dissemination of educational statistics initiated by Henry Barnard was continued after his resignation in 1870 by John Eaton, an appointee of President Grant and former State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Tennessee. Eaton was as dedicated to education and statistics as Barnard, stressing throughout his career the words of the enabling act: "to promote the cause of education."

In order to standardize the collection and reporting of statistics, a standard form for public school financial statistics was developed in 1910. In 1912 the office published the Report of the Committee on Uniform Records and Reports.8 Similar reports were published in 1928,
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1940, 1953, 1957, and 1959. The statistical functions of the office were reviewed over the years, with the three most recent reports published in 1946, 1957, and 1960. These reports included two basic and recurring problems: (1) the need for expansion of the office and its impact on statistical operations, and (2) the development of equipment and techniques which will affect future data collections and their dissemination.

EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS: 1965-1975

In 1965 the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) was created by administrative action of the Office of Education to serve as its statistical arm. Its function was to gather and disseminate information on the condition and progress of education in the United States; this mission included a library statistics program which was taken over from USOE's Library Services Division and organized into the Library Surveys Branch.

The Educational Amendments Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-380, enacted August 21, 1974) redefined the mission of NCES and required several mandated reports. In addition to data collection and dissemination, requirements were established regarding the analysis of the meaning of educational data, international statistics, and the assistance to state and local agencies for improving and automating statistical data collection activities. NCES is currently one of the six major national statistics centers in the federal government.

Organizationally, the center was placed in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education. Also created was an Advisory Council on Education Statistics, to be composed of seven members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and four ex officio members consisting of the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Education, the Director of the Census Bureau, and the Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

Recent NCES programs to improve data accessibility include the early release procedures of important national data prior to the final publication. The first example of this for library statistics was the release of the 1975 College and University Library Survey on December 24, 1975. The NCES Reference Services, which answers over 10,000 inquiries each year, also prepares an annual Digest of Educational Statistics, covering American education from the kindergarten level through graduate school. The branch also provides ten-year
projections of the most important national educational statistics in the annual *Projections of Educational Statistics*. Both of these publications contain some statistical tabulations and projections of library data.

*The Condition of Education*, a new annual publication of the center, presents statistics about education in an output-oriented framework. Its intent is to link educational outcomes to more general societal characteristics and trends, and to show the links among levels of the educational process and types of educational experiences available to the youth and adult populations.

*The Remote-Access Educational Data Base (EDSTAT)* system was established in fiscal year 1974. It is a major means of increasing the timeliness and accessibility of data using a time-sharing computer system which permits users of standard keyboard terminals in the continental United States to interrogate, on-line, a large data bank of educational statistics. This development may be of particular interest to the newly developing library cooperatives, consortia, networks and state libraries in the larger states. Some library data are now available on EDSTAT.

**THE LIBRARY STATISTICS PROGRAM: 1867-1976**

The first official library statistics publication appeared in 1870 in *The Report of the Commissioner of Education made to the Secretary of Interior for the Year 1870.* This document contains a table entitled "Principal Libraries of the United States, Exclusive of Those Connected with Colleges, etc." This listing of 161 libraries supplies the library's name, location, date of founding, number of volumes and annual acquisitions increases. Commissioner John Eaton, in his report of October 27, 1870, indicates that "less than eight months have elapsed since I entered upon the duties of this office." Apparently his is the second report, because he states that the "small edition of the only report which had been published by the Department was soon exhausted." Commissioner Eaton recommended in his report "that increased means be furnished for the publication of facts, statistics, and discussions, to meet the constantly increasing demand."

Eventually funds were made available; by 1876, the first official report on libraries was issued. Government statistics on libraries, now published for more than a century, afford the opportunity for retrospective. The library statistics century can be divided into four periods.
EXPLORATORY PHASE: 1870-1937

During this period surveys were conducted intermittently. There was no organizational unit within the USOE specifically responsible for library data. In 1880, Melvil Dewey discussed with Eaton the appointment of a library officer who would devote his attention to general library interests, but no specific action was taken for the next thirty-nine years. Statistics on public, school and society libraries were published with some regularity. In 1919, legislation was introduced in Congress to create a separate library unit, but not until 1937 did Congress actually appropriate funds for the Library Services Division in the Office of Education.

DEVELOPMENTAL PHASE: 1938-1956

During the next eighteen years, Ralph Dunbar (who directed the Library Services Branch until 1957) established a pattern of library statistics which resulted in separate nationwide surveys on public, college and university, and school libraries. Twelve nationwide studies were conducted (four in each of the three fields) at intervals of five, six, or seven years; the six-year cycle was most common. In addition, shorter annual surveys were developed which dealt with a very limited number of data items or covered a segment of the respective survey universe. For example, surveys were occasionally conducted of not all public libraries, but only of those serving communities of 100,000 population and more.

BROADENED RESPONSIBILITIES: 1956-1965

In 1956, when the Library Services Act was passed by Congress and the responsibilities of the Library Services Branch under the direction of John G. Lorenz were substantially expanded, its staff increased correspondingly. In 1958, the staff was divided into the legislative and basic research programs. By 1965, twenty-seven staff members were assigned to the basic research program, dividing their time fairly evenly between statistical surveys and consultant and advisory work for all segments of librarianship and information activities.

Academic library surveys became annual studies, and analytic reports of these surveys were published every two years. Public library surveys approached a four-year cycle. Studies regarding library education programs and surveys of special libraries serving state governments and the federal government were initiated. During this period
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expanded coverage and increased data elements provided more meaningful information for congressional and executive action, budget considerations and related purposes. The American Library Association and the Special Library Association expanded existing statistics committees and created additional ones which have given valuable advice on plans and programs. They were also responsible for initiating new surveys and survey components. In cooperation with these groups, the *Library Statistics Handbook* was developed and published by the American Library Association in 1966.\(^{16}\) During these years the responsibility of all statistical surveys about libraries was located in the Library Services Branch. Since the early 1960s, assistance regarding the development of survey instruments and data tabulation presentation was provided by the staff members of the Division of Educational Statistics of the USOE.

**DIVERSIFIED RESPONSIBILITIES: 1965-1975**

In 1965 the U.S. Office of Education was reorganized. All statistical operations were combined in the newly formed National Center for Educational Statistics and separated from various Office of Education grant and research programs. The staff responsible for library statistics was reduced from a full-time equivalent of about 13.5 positions to three positions. Between the end of 1965 and the end of 1967, most survey activities were slowed down or changed into new formats. In June 1966, a National Conference on Library Statistics was cosponsored by the American Library Association and NCES. Between 1967 and 1970 the Library Surveys Branch was organized with the staff of four professionals and two support staff members. During this period, the first extramural contracts were developed. Previously, work consisted of conducting surveys as in-house efforts. During the last five years, contracting for statistical projects has become standard operational procedure. For this purpose NCES staff prepares requests for proposals which are announced in the publication "Commerce Business Daily."

During 1973-74 two new projects were developed in close cooperation with the Federal Library Committee of the Library of Congress and the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. These projects resulted in a complete survey of federal libraries\(^{17}\) and an extensive study of library manpower.\(^{18}\)

As of December 1975, a national public library survey and a national school library/media center survey, both for 1974, were completed in eighteen months. The 1975 academic library survey
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with institutional data was completed in three months; the analytic report is to follow about six months later. During 1976, surveys are to be started for special libraries in commerce and industry, in state libraries and state library agencies. In addition, a new survey of library cooperatives, consortia and networks will be initiated as the first multi-type library survey, including academic, public, state and special libraries. The following year will probably witness a return to surveys of the basic type libraries (academic, public and school).

A glance at the recent past, present, and near future of library surveys indicates an alternate pattern between basic type surveys (academic, public and school), and special and experimental surveys. The three surveys for 1974-75 yielded data more quickly than any previously conducted library survey. Among the reasons for this increased efficiency are the following factors:

1. Substantial pretesting of data items and extensive planning is done before surveys are actually started.

2. The development of the LIBGIS (Library General Information Survey) data system has been essential. LIBGIS is based on close cooperation with relevant state education and state library agencies in the data collection and pre-editing cycles.

3. The use of a standardized library statistics terminology and "core" items (which are identical for all library surveys and are to remain unchanged for the foreseeable future) has been accepted by the respondents. It should be noted, however, that a limited number of new data items, unique for each type of survey, will be part of every survey.

4. Experience over the last few years has produced a methodology which combines work done by in-house staff and contractors who use computerized equipment and engage in hand- and machine-editing to produce machine tabulations.

This program and its new technological aspects and speedier data delivery indicate that in spite of the current economic uncertainties, recent library statistics have placed library planning on bases that are firmer and more expanded than were available in the preceding century. This information will allow the nation's libraries and information and resource centers a more adequate balancing of their financial resources with staff, information materials, and data bases. This in turn will enable them to provide adequate service for its expanding groups of users.
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Library Buildings

WALTER C. ALLEN

Among the more visible changes in the library field during the past one hundred years is the development of the library building—its appearance, arrangement, structure, equipment, and atmosphere. Not only are there many more buildings, they are immensely more complex, varied, and sophisticated. Just as all library materials and services have evolved into new forms and techniques, so have buildings changed to reflect and encourage these new responses to the needs of the various communities and subcommunities which make up our nation. It is the purpose of this paper to examine a century of library architecture in relation to the changing perceptions of library functions, the development of building techniques and materials, fluctuating aesthetic fashions and sometimes wildly erratic economic climates.

In an arbitrary fashion which may annoy some, I have divided the century into several periods of unequal length. Naturally, there were exceptions to patterns, and I shall attempt to note the most important (or egregious) of these. First, there will be a description of the scene in 1876, followed by a summary of the developments until 1892, a period which can only be called “floundering.” Next will be a larger section on the “monumental,” from 1893 to 1950, with a subsection on 1939-50, which might be called the “dawn.” The period 1950-76 has already been called a “golden age,” certainly in terms of quantity if not always of quality. I prefer to think of it as simply “the modern,” for while we have made many advances during the past twenty-five years, we may not have yet reached full maturity. Given the present state of the economy we may never attain that stage; one can only hope. A final brief section will offer a few thoughts on this notion.

It must be noted that, even though there is a huge body of material

Walter C. Allen is Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

JULY, 1976
on library planning and building dating back to the 1870s and even earlier, there is relatively little on the history of library buildings. To date, there have been just two comprehensive bibliographical essays which might lead a researcher to useful material. The first, by Donald Thompson, deals chiefly with secondary sources. The second, by Donald Oehlerts, emphasizes primary sources and research studies. 

There is no single article or book which pulls everything together. Neither is this article such an attempt, but perhaps it may serve as a first step. A general survey of the whole picture can hit only a few high spots; a comprehensive study would involve far more than the secondary sources consulted for this article. It would be necessary to search many records of libraries and librarians, of architects and their firms, of universities and municipalities, and of foundations and government agencies. In short, even a modest attempt would involve much time, labor, expense, and courage. But it is to be hoped that it will be done.

1876-1892

From our hillside vantage point of 1976, looking backward and downward, we are inclined to be very superior about our professional ancestors' primitive notions of what librarianship was all about. Particularly offensive to our critical eyes are those occasionally monumental—more often merely dull—horrors that were called libraries. In what ways was 1876 significantly different from 1976, in terms of library building planning?

College curricula were still based largely on rote learning. The ideas of the seminar and elective systems were only just beginning to take hold in America. Library planning lagged behind these concepts for several decades, not really catching up until well into the twentieth century.

Institutions were small, and their libraries were especially so. Harvard had some 200,000 volumes in 1876; the Library of Congress had 250,000. Collections were scattered; 19,000 of Columbia University's 32,000 volumes were in departmental libraries, and all of the University of Michigan's were. There were no library schools to provide guidance or training or leadership. There were no professional librarians, as we define the term today. Public librarians were for the most part well-educated gentlemen of letters assisted by volunteers. With few exceptions, academic libraries were administered, in the most primitive fashion, by faculty members who devoted a few hours a
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week to the additional and often unwanted burden of guarding a collection. The librarian was sometimes personally responsible for the safety of each volume. Hours were brief; in 1876, for example, while the library at Harvard was open forty-eight hours per week, that at Columbia was open only twelve, and at Williams, four. The emphasis was on retention and safety, not on circulation or other use. The notable exception to the common practice was the enlightened administration of Justin Winsor at Harvard.

Planning was generally haphazard, to put it mildly. Academic libraries were commonly designed by institution presidents, sometimes with the assistance of trustees, and usually without reference to faculty, including the librarians. Typical is Union College's Nott Library (1858), a handsome but dysfunctional octagon. Harvard's Gore Hall (1841) was originally planned largely by President Quincy, but considerably altered by a committee of trustees and faculty. It was a Gothic church, lancet windows and all, with alcoves and a great central nave. Both were built before 1876, of course, but illustrate the prevailing patterns. Public libraries were even more casually planned, and often consisted of a suite of rooms in a town hall or other public building.

Yet, even in this period of floundering, there were gleams of better things to come. In 1853, Charles Norton was the first to make theoretical suggestions about the planning of library buildings. In the 1870s, with the approval of the new librarian, Justin Winsor, Harvard added a functional cast iron stack wing to Gore Hall, the first such in America. By 1876, Winsor had a scheme for a seven-tier, million-volume library. In 1870, William Poole helped with the planning of a public library in Cincinnati, and by 1881 was beginning to plan the Newberry Library in Chicago, using a controlled departmentalization scheme. The exterior was planned last, in 1890. Half-built in the early 1890s, it was never finished, but serves today, after a fashion, with only minor alterations. Poole started writing about library building needs, outlining sound and lasting fundamentals in 1876. Finally, C.C. Soule published his ten points in 1891.

Important architects were involved in library planning during this period, but most simply did not know much about libraries, nor did their employers. Perhaps the most notable of these architects of historical importance was Henry Hobson Richardson, whose structures and influence on subsequent projects have appalled many librarians of later times. Richardson designed five public libraries, four of them in Massachusetts, and one academic library at the
University of Vermont. Joseph Wheeler and Alfred Githens wrote: "It was a period of retrogression in functional planning; nothing constructive was developed." They were especially critical of the oppressively heavy, poorly lit, fortress-like quality of Richardson's adaptations of the Romanesque architectural style. Yet two of his public libraries, with highly successful additions and some alterations, appear to be functional today. Modern lighting and heating techniques have made these buildings more habitable, if not ideal, and have preserved what some architectural historians and librarians regard as originality. Unfortunately, what Richardson handled well (stone detailing, arches, remarkable brass and bronze fixtures), his imitators botched, usually missing the point altogether. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, however, regards Richardson as overly criticized and undervalued. Certainly no other architect of the nineteenth century has received so much attention as Richardson; his work was bold and innovative, even if he did lead others astray.

Although most of Andrew Carnegie's benefactions were built after 1893, his first donation was constructed in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, in 1890. It was less than completely successful, in large part because it was a combination of public library, auditorium, swimming pool, and other community services. All of these unrelated functions interfered with the functions of the library. This error in judgment and subsequent attempts at combined-services libraries have led most library planners to the belief that libraries generally should be libraries. As early as 1876, Poole had made this point.

Nevertheless, there was enough new thinking, aided considerably by the founding of the American Library Association and Library Journal and the consequent availability of forums for discussion and exchange of ideas, that by 1887 Josephus Larned could write: "we need not hesitate to say that American library architecture has distinctly taken a new departure."

1893-1950

By 1893, a number of things had happened in the world of libraries which had major influence on library building planning. Academic institutions had almost completely changed their curricula. The new approach meant larger collections and greater usage both in and out of the building. Larger collections meant a new problem of housing, and the rapid development of the cast-iron (and steel, after 1897) bookstack. An increase in the number of users meant more and
bigger reading rooms. The rapid growth of the concept of the card catalog, accelerated acquisition of materials and increased service to users all made more staff and more workspace necessary. New building materials and techniques gave new solutions to problems of construction, lighting, ventilation, heating, cooling, and fireproofing.

Unfortunately, an outside factor, which had been present in earlier years but had been seemingly under control, burst forth in all its mistaken glory: monumentalism. This disease manifested many symptoms through the next five decades, but at least in the earlier years it tended to take the form of eclecticism. Reynolds notes that the beaux-arts influence on the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 ended the passion for Romanesque which Richardson had touched off in the 1870s and 1880s. The new eclecticism was probably worse in the long run, since so many more buildings were affected. By the 1920s, according to Burchard and Bush-Brown, the beaux-arts disciples "became increasingly sterile." Standard styles, such as Gothic, Tuscan, Georgian (or "Colonial"), Classic, etc., were bastardized in the attempt to contain the vast study rooms, work areas, and bookstacks within suitably impressive facades. The idea of the master plan for campuses developed rapidly, with all of the resultant headaches for library planners. Thomas Jefferson had used the concept in an earlier era with exquisite taste and grace at Virginia, but in less sensitive hands in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we have been offered the tastelessness and awkwardness of Miami (Ohio), Duke, Temple, Texas, and many other universities. Even the more stylistically successful campuses, such as Chicago, presented planning and functional difficulties for their librarians. Insistence on uniform cornice and window levels, for example, has frequently made rational planning impossible. Worse, in many cases, were the individual buildings which suffered under the hands of the monumentalists in their insistence on making the library the "center of it all." A perfect example is Columbia's Low Library (1900), a "gem" set in the matrix of the master plan of the rest of the campus. Another is Philadelphia's Free Public Library (1927), an outsized and forbidding palazzo in an impressive but inappropriate location.

This was also the period of generous, well meant, but sometimes misguided gifts, the terms of which often left many of the decisions concerning appearance (and worse, planning) in the hands of the donors of their representatives, even unto posterity. Harvard's Widener Library is just one of many examples of this situation.

While there were not many professional librarians in the 1890s,
there were a few, plus a solid cadre of self-trained and thoroughly professional practitioners. These pioneers laid the foundations over the next few decades for a system of professional education for librarians. Many of the leaders of the period were influential in the development of what might be called rational planning. Soule, writing in 1891, had already accused the architect of being “the librarian’s natural enemy.” It was not many years before public librarians were joining their academic colleagues in searching for solutions to their growing problems.

Yet, for all the excesses of decoration and lack of attention to function, many striking gains were made in all aspects of library planning. If the path was not a straight one, and if there were many unfortunate lapses which frequently maddened the librarians, it was nonetheless a lively and interesting period in library architectural history, offering many lessons for contemporaries and successors. Increased interest in buildings meant more seminars, conferences, journal articles, visits, and other ways to profit from the triumphs and failures of others.

The first grand building of this new era was the Boston Public Library, designed by Charles F. McKim, of McKim, Mead and White. Situated in Copley Square, it had considerable competition for the eyes of its beholders, for it was across from Richardson’s famous Trinity Church (1877). Whatever one may think of the romanesque style, or of Richardson’s and his followers’ renditions of it, Trinity Church is a remarkably strong building. “Viewed only as an architectural composition,” wrote Burchard and Bush-Brown, “McKim’s design was masterful. It picked up the theme of the arches of Richardson’s church, but made it no other stylistic concession.” Complete with grand staircase and murals, great hall, arcaded interior court, elegant materials and dignified facade, it remains one of the landmarks of American architectural history. A 1974 wing, really an additional building, by Philip Johnson has become the newest wonder of Boston. Again, Johnson has picked up only the cornice line hints of continuity of arches and windows; otherwise the building is completely contemporary in mood.

If McKim created an architectural monument which is admired to this day for its externals and decor, he also gave the nation’s librarians a problem. Poole condemned the library in 1890, before it was built: “In libraries abundant light is more essential than facilities for fortification.” William Warner Bishop called it “a building which had an enormous influence—chiefly a bad influence.” After paying tribute to
the beauty of the building and the richness of its contents, he continues:

But its following of palatial architecture results in a very small main door, narrow windows on the ground level (precautions most welcome against a mob), a great amount of space devoted to the magnificently conceived and decorated staircase well, a fine reading room across the front, separated from the stacks by a considerable distance, and a courtyard which forces books to travel around three sides of a square to be delivered at one side.

At the same time that Boston’s public library was setting a trend, the new Library of Congress (1897) was reinforcing it. Admired by Bishop, and by many others, it was about as monumental as a library can be, perhaps appropriately so, clad in “full classic panoply with strong touches of the Grand Opera House of Paris.” Successive additions have followed a later, more stereotyped and generally dreadful style that can only be described as “bureaucratic”—massive, awkward, depressing to look at, if largely functional in layout. The stacks of the original 1897 building were the first to be made solely of steel (as opposed to cast iron).

The New York Public Library’s variously named lions repose benignly before one of the worst monsters of the nation. Finished in 1911, it is grand beyond all reason, with a railroad station-sized main reading room on the third floor; a huge double staircase; seemingly miles of overly wide and overly high corridors; and woefully inadequate staff workspace. It was Carrère and Hastings’s chief contribution to library monumentalism.

The beat was set, and city after city joined the parade, putting up libraries that have drawn critical reactions ranging from mildly favorable to violently hostile in terms of both architectural style and planning. One, the Indianapolis Public Library (1917), has been called “the best classic building in America”; staff members frequently use other descriptions.

Whatever the details, the large buildings of the period had a few things in common, among them enormous operating expenses, varying degrees of dysfunction, and a depressing tendency to scare away the very people they were designed to serve.

One of the major events of this period was the infusion of millions of dollars into libraries and collections by Andrew Carnegie and his foundation. More than $40 million went into 1,679 library buildings in 1,412 communities in the United States alone. While reaction to
Carnegie buildings has been varied, they called the nation's attention to the public library in a most dramatic way. However, it is doubtful indeed that they added much to the development of library architecture. What seems remarkable is that they did no more damage than they did. Bobinski devotes considerable space to the architectural problems which plagued many of the Carnegie projects and to Carnegie's increased concern over the tendency of architects and local boards to throw common sense to the winds. So concerned did he become about the typical "imposing exterior . . . and poorly organized, space-wasteful interior" that Carnegie's private secretary, James Bertram, composed a memorandum reporting a policy of close architectural control. Conferences with leading librarians and architects led to Bertram's development of standards, first published in 1911 as "Notes on Library Buildings" [sic]. While more than one-half of the American buildings had already been built or approved, the remainder benefited from this and five later editions. There were a number of prohibitions, among them fireplaces, smoking rooms, Greek temples. Bertram waged war with a number of architects, and almost always won.

Actually, many talented architects were involved in Carnegie projects, among them McKim, Julia Morgan, and J.L. Mauan. Some of the buildings were, and remain, quite attractive, but all too many were dull, with awkward entrances (split-level), and very poorly lit and ventilated.

While most of the Carnegie money went into small towns and branches for larger cities, a number of central library buildings were erected, a fact which is often overlooked. Here the suggested patterns in the "Notes" were less applicable, and the results seem less stereotyped. The big difficulty in subsequent years, especially in smaller communities, has been to educate trustees and other community leaders to envision library buildings of a less imposing and more flexible nature.

New York's Carnegie branches—sixty-six in all—were all designed by three firms: McKim, Mead and White; Carrere and Hastings; and Babb, Cook and Willard. They are highly individual, at least on the outside, but share heavily monumental exteriors and stark interiors, the latter sometimes softened by later remodeling or redecorating. The description of the design process by Walter Cook in Koch's A Book of Carnegie Libraries is typical of the time. As might be expected, niceties of function were generally overlooked.

There were exceptional buildings. Wheeler and Githens refer to a
number of buildings which they believed showed evidence of definite progress. Admirers of the "rational planning of the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts and the classical forms of the Italian Renaissance," they cite Providence, St. Louis, Newark, and a little later, Cleveland and Los Angeles, the latter being influenced by southwestern rather than Italian styles. Most of these have at least overtones of the monumental.

Nearly all public libraries build after 1900, and a few before, separated adult and children's activities. The idea of having meeting rooms predates Carnegie's involvement, by which time they were almost universal. Separation of adult services into delivery, or circulation, and reading and reference areas is found in some of the earliest libraries, but the idea of having separate departments for different branches of knowledge is a more recent development. While by no means the first library to have such units, the Cleveland Public Library (1925) was the first major library to be planned almost entirely on the basis of a series of reading rooms arranged around a central stack, with mostly open shelving, separate card catalogs, specialist staffs, etc. The great difficulty with the multidepartment plan within fixed walls is the inordinately large number of staff members needed for service and control. The older behemoths have only rarely been capable of some modification; the rest defy alteration and seem likely to survive as they are.

The so-called "open plan" introduced by Edward Tilton in the 1930s in Springfield, Massachusetts, with open shelf collections above and stacks below, was a breakthrough. This design heavily influenced Baltimore's Enoch Pratt (1933), Rochester (1936), and Toledo (1940). More open in their planning and at sidewalk level, these libraries were much more approachable, relaxing, and functional. Bishop noted their similarity to department stores. Furthermore, some have been capable of at least some remodeling, increasing functional efficiency and saving greatly in personnel costs.

Turning to the academic library scene, we find somewhat more innovation in design and development of functional planning, although there were again perhaps more exercises in creating grandeur than in achieving comfortable and workable libraries. Helen Reynolds's 1946 master's thesis, "University Library Buildings in the United States 1890-1939," is the most comprehensive study of the larger buildings. She cited many factors on campuses which in turn created previously unheard-of service needs, at the same time that the craze for impressive buildings was at its height. The increasing
importance of the seminar meant small teaching rooms near books; at the same time, the large survey course was developing. The library had become the laboratory of the social sciences. The question of centralization versus decentralization, not yet really solved on many campuses, came to the fore. While some schools with no adequate central facility were forced into decentralization, others were taking that path deliberately, permitting and even encouraging the development of smaller, scattered collections. The sheer size and disjointed state of some campuses made this virtually inevitable. Other institutions preferred and maintained a greater degree of centralization, and went through series of buildings as holdings and other pressing needs increased at an unforeseen rate.

Reynolds notes that the period she covers divides naturally into two groups: 1890-1910, a transitional period; and 1911-39, modern buildings. Her first example, the University of Pennsylvania’s French Gothic library (1890) was indeed transitional in plan and eclectic in style. It was unusual for its time in that it could be added to without great difficulty. Additions were in fact made three times, before the building was abandoned in 1962 in favor of a new building. It serves today as the library of the University’s School of Fine Arts.

A few basic forms emerged which, with variations, served for the next two decades. Pennsylvania was linear in construction, that is, with major rooms generally in one line; Cornell (1891), Minnesota (1895) and Columbia’s Low (1897) are examples of the “cruciform”; and the University of Illinois Library (1897) is an early “T”, with a reading room on either side of the entry and with the stack behind. Reynolds writes that most of these “transitional” libraries had the main reading room, stack and loan desk on the main entrance floor, which was usually the first floor. As multi-tier stacks developed, sloping sites became popular, so that the middle tier could be at main floor level, others above and below, with the latter taking advantage of the slope for natural light. Cornell’s building, now used as an undergraduate library, is an example of this structure.

The monumental library par excellence was Low Library at Columbia. It was designed by Charles McKim, with a great inner octagonal reading room three stories high, stacks underneath, and classic dome above. Other library and unrelated services were housed in four stubby wings off the central octagon, the whole forming a very neat Greek cross. One of the building’s more notable inefficiencies was that the circulation desk was located in such a way that there was
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no direct contact with the stacks. Furthermore, the building was located at the center of a sort of "court of honor" in the middle of the campus. Such was the location, plan, and architectural treatment that enlargement in any direction was impossible. It has been admired as a latter-day Greek temple, but soundly damned as a library. Wilhelm Munthe called it an "historical monument to the triumph of architect over librarian."40

Texas retained a "T" plan in 1911, but added a new feature which rapidly became almost universal in large academic buildings: The main reading room was on the second floor, with lesser functions on the ground floor.41 California (1912) and Widener (1915) followed closely: both were large and complex buildings; both were variations of the Texas "T" approach. The Widener Library was, of course, a memorial gift, with many peculiarities and restrictions, ranging from the grand staircase and memorial room, reminiscent of a religious shrine, to bans on alterations and additions. Widener did include stack tables and chairs (not quite carrels yet), one of the first major libraries to have them. Johns Hopkins's Gilman Library (1914) was another to take advantage of natural light from a large light court for stack study space.

William Warner Bishop, an early advocate of efficiency and sensible planning, wrote with particular pride of his (and Albert Kahn's) University of Michigan library of 1920, brought in for $635,000—much less than the going rate for buildings of its size. Kahn's application of factory-building reinforced-concrete techniques to a library was not only economical but functional.42

Many observers have been favorably impressed by Illinois's ability to extend its bookstack almost indefinitely. By situating the building (opened in 1926) at one side of the principal mall of the campus with the stacks to the rear, five stages of stacks have been added, with a sixth in the planning stage in 1976. As early as 1932, Munthe felt that the limit of lateral expansion had been reached, and that there should be a stack tower.43 The master plan of the time, however, decreed uniform cornice lines. While there is room for more stack additions, unfortunately the rest of the building is frozen. One of the technical services departments now occupies one end of the great reading room, screened off only by high shelving, and the card catalog has not only filled the beautifully panelled delivery room to capacity, but has overflowed into the reading room lobby and spilled down a long lateral corridor. Stack seating can be added, but any real remodeling to provide more reader or staff space is impossible because of load-
bearing walls. This is a sample of the kinds of problems which nearly all libraries built before 1950, and some built thereafter, must cope with.

Yale's Sterling Library (1931) and Northwestern's Deering Library (1932), both designed by James Gamble Rogers, reflect their architect's and owners' predilection for Gothic style. While Northwestern displays the conventional second-floor public service center with an uncommonly well-related technical services area, Yale was given a largely one-level layout, with a stack tower. The Gothic sheaths of both seem somewhat halfhearted, pointing up Burchard's and Bush-Brown's observation about the gradual dilution of the eclectic.

Columbia's South Hall (1934), now Butler Library, is another unexpandable building, the lesson of Low apparently having been disregarded. Essentially a huge, rectangular doughnut around a central stack, it has many excellent features, but is as inflexible as most of the great libraries of the period.

Somehow, some of the buildings which were forced into conventional styles came off well. Many contain beautiful stonework and woodwork, even handsome stained glass. Perhaps it is the smaller and usually simpler college libraries which come off best. One is Dartmouth's Baker Library (1928), clad in traditional Georgian garb, but beautifully proportioned and somehow right in its setting. But there were not very many of these; even on smaller campuses, there was an unfortunate tendency to make a great impression on the outside, and ignore considerations of planning. Williams College's Stetson Library (1922) was a pleasant building, but less than ideal in arrangement.

Especially during the 1920s and 1930s, technology was making many new things possible in building. Steel replaced cast iron in stacks; supports became smaller, shelving lighter. Standardization of shelf length at three feet was established around 1931, although many libraries had been using that size for decades.4 Ventilation and lighting had improved enormously; air conditioning became available, albeit at enormous cost. Reinforced concrete meant large savings in money and gains in strength. Conveyors helped with the movement of materials, as did elevators and booklifts for people and materials. The rapid development of automotive technology brought the bookmobile into existence, making it possible to move small libraries from place to place rapidly.

Besides bookmobile service, many other new services appeared during these decades which had implications for library planning. A few other such services in public libraries include: separate magazine
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and newspaper collections, archives, local history and genealogy collections, and more elaborate services for elementary and high school students, the latter sometimes a separate area. A daring few were even beginning to experiment with audiovisual services. Academic libraries experienced the rise of reserve reading rooms, rare book and other special collections, and separate reading rooms and collections for undergraduates.

However, the Great Depression of the 1930s had a blighting effect on library building of all types. World War II followed so closely that the reviving industrial potential was shunted into the manufacture of war materiel. Library building was not to become a major factor again until the late 1940s.

In the meantime, a few leaders of both the architectural and library professions had become increasingly dissatisfied with the awkwardness and expense of the library buildings of the previous several decades. Their complaints increasingly filled the literature of the 1930s, and there were some positive, if halting, steps in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Librarians and architects alike were determined that the future should offer better buildings. Depression and war did not stop them.

One of the most vivid and forceful of these leaders was Angus Snead Macdonald. Trained as an architect at Columbia just after the turn of the century, he never practiced his profession except as a consultant. Instead, for many years he managed a family business, Snead and Company, which for several decades was one of the principal American manufacturers of cast-iron and, later, steel bookstacks. Charles Baumann’s book is an excellent study of the man, his work, and his long-lasting influence on the library profession.

In a sense, Macdonald was working against himself and his company, for he advocated a freer, more open approach to planning, with less dependence on fixed, load-bearing stacks and walls, so that alterations could be carried out easily as changing needs indicated. His 1933 paper in Library Journal was a visionary’s dream of the public library of the future. While many of his ideas were (and are) impractical and have been passed by, others have been adopted. For example, the idea of informal reading areas surrounded by books of particular subject categories, shelved in movable, freestanding stacks, has become a major feature of most modern libraries. Conveyors, lower ceiling heights, lounge areas, and carpets have all become virtually standard. In 1934, Macdonald wrote:
No library has yet been built wherein full advantage has been taken of the logical scientific and engineering facilities that are known to be available. For this we have principally to blame the forces of tradition and habit which can be conquered or diverted but slowly. . . . While we are actually living in an electrical era our library architecture has as yet been only partly accommodated to electrical operation. Fundamental designs and story heights in particular still follow the precedents of the Classical, Gothic, and Renaissance periods.

He continued to lecture and write in this vein and, in 1939, introduced a semi-freestanding ("convertible") stack at Colorado State College of Education, in which only one-third of the columns were load-bearing. In the 1934 article cited above, Macdonald outlined a scheme in which evenly spaced hollow columns would serve to bear the load and also to carry heating, ventilating and electrical systems. While only three libraries using this concept were built, it marked the beginning of a new era in library building.

The period 1939-50, one-half of which was given over largely to a huge war effort, represents another short, but vitally important, transition. During this period, Macdonald attracted the attention of a young library administrator named Ralph Ellsworth, then of the University of Colorado, whose leadership in the movement toward rational, sensible, flexible libraries spanned several decades. During the war years, Ellsworth planned a new building for the State University of Iowa. The project began in 1943, was built in 1945-47, and has been added to and rearranged since. Ellsworth, already influenced by Macdonald, wanted and got a plan totally different from anything previously built. He wanted flexibility to meet the changing and unpredictable needs in higher education. This first truly "modular" building had a stunning impact on the library community.

In the meantime, Macdonald and an architect named J. Russell Bailey were constructing a full-scale model (1945) of a "modular" layout. The Cooperative Committee on Library Building Plans, a committee of college and university presidents concerned with planning principles, held one of its meetings in Orange, Virginia, to study the model. The model impressed many of these presidents, their library directors, and others who saw it. A report of the committee's views on the nature of good planning appeared as a book, Planning the University Library Building, in 1949. This publication, along with many journal articles, had a considerable impact in the period im-
mediated after the war. Baumann's "Library Building Survey, 1930-1960" clearly shows a dramatic shift from the older approach to the modular.\textsuperscript{56}

No comment on this decade would be adequate without mention of Princeton's Firestone Library (1948), outwardly a fairly conventional neo-Gothic (but not overwhelmingly so) structure, a facade which conceals a completely functional layout, using a pattern of fairly small reading areas scattered, in part, among stacks. The building, many years in the planning, was immediately hailed as a step in the right direction.

With these few early examples, and with the continuing writings of the Cooperative Committee on Library Building Plans and its successors, the stage was set for the explosion of new buildings of the past twenty-five years.

\textbf{SINCE 1950}

Late in 1945, Macdonald published a paper which he ended with this prophecy: "I think we are entering into the greatest architectural era the world has ever known, and I believe that it will be known to history as the American Era. I also believe that libraries, instead of trailing the procession of progress, will take the lead, consistent with their position as sources of the knowledge whereby culture and civilization advance."\textsuperscript{57} It is abundantly clear that libraries have indeed been leaders in the new American architecture which emerged about 1950. Nearly all of the major architectural journals began to feature new libraries, large and small. Countless architects who had scarcely been in a library suddenly found themselves caught up in a new specialty. Nearly all of the nation's greatest architectural leaders became interested, and their projects grace communities throughout the nation. Scores of manufacturers began to supply furniture and equipment designed specifically for libraries.

Why did this sudden burst of activity occur? A new prosperity certainly helped. As the nation's economy improved, tax bases at all levels produced huge new sums for public works. Similarly, citizens felt able to afford to tax themselves additionally to replace ancient Carnegie libraries or other outdated facilities, a project impossible to accomplish during the depression and war. Entire new communities had sprung up, and small suburbs began to grow, requiring wholly new facilities. In academe, Fremont Rider's startling forecasts concerning collection growth proved to be, if anything, conservative.\textsuperscript{58}
Returning GIs and other young people had the money and will to go to college, creating a demand for seats as well as stack space. On many campuses, satisfactory additions were impossible because of site restrictions; new buildings were the only answer.

More than enough has been written about the burst of interest in higher education and its methods in the 1950s. Let it be said simply that the resulting boom in students, both from the GI Bill of Rights, Sputnik, and the maturing of the postwar babies, combined to cause a constantly rising curve of demand. Larger faculties, more graduate programs, and the need for more materials added to the problem. In the early 1960s a generous federal government, led by a new administration dedicated to more education in all its forms, poured millions into the library hopper. From 1967 to 1971, almost one billion dollars went into academic libraries alone. Even when this all-too-brief period came to an abrupt halt with the election of an administration with other priorities, there was so much momentum that slowdown in construction did not occur for some time. It took the recession of 1973 to make the federal government eliminate construction funds altogether. At the same time, citizens looked hard at their taxes, and began to balk at maintaining them, much less adding special levies. The number of new academic buildings fell from 48 in 1970 to 18 in 1975, and of new public libraries from 191 to 125.

Public libraries felt the same increase in interest, especially in demand for nonfiction materials of all kinds, audiovisual and children's programs and materials, branch and bookmobile service, and public meeting facilities. Circulation climbed steadily for a few years, then began to decline in the 1960s, particularly of books, presumably in response to the availability of television. The recession of the mid-1970s, however, seems to have reversed that trend, at least temporarily.

The increased needs of the various communities meant more librarians and more and better workspace from which to serve users. As circulation and serial records proliferated, automated techniques of control were introduced. These have specific implications for library planning. Many administrators are wondering how to get thick computer cable through too-thin reinforced concrete floors; one can go only so far with dropped ceilings or raised floors. Wise planners have built in duct space and even rooms for as yet unordered hardware. The audiovisual production areas of learning resource centers in community colleges have an even greater impact on space and costs.
Tremendous increases in numbers of serials have made necessary enormous amounts of open and closed shelving. Greater use is being made of various forms of compact storage, warehousing, or cooperative deposit centers. These range from simple open space to sophisticated mechanical stacks, such as the Randtriever.

Microforms, few in 1950, are now almost universal. Space for microform readers is usually short, and they often wind up in awkward corners of basements. The most advanced new buildings offer comfortable reader areas in at least near-prime space, with controlled environment storage for the materials. Similarly, "special collections" (rare books, manuscripts, archives, maps, etc.) have grown vastly, so that even smaller public or college libraries are likely to include some rooms or areas dedicated to these uses, all of them with special needs for mechanical and other equipment.

Library buildings, then, have grown from simple affairs of a reading room or two, workroom, and bookstack, to facilities requiring many special rooms or areas, all of which need to be in some sort of sensible relation to each other, for the convenience of users and for efficient service to them. Sophisticated new systems of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (also, occasionally, stronger and thinner reinforced concrete, etc.), new lighting techniques, improved floor coverings, including carpeting no more expensive to install and maintain than tile, lighter-weight and more graceful furniture, better acoustical materials—all of these need to be analyzed and the best available and cost-feasible systems selected.

As the planning process has become more complex, two significant developments have taken place; both have helped to keep the situation under control. First, the role of consultants has become prominent. From the earliest years of the century under discussion there have been a few; William F. Poole, Josephus Larned, Justin Winsor, Arthur Bostwick, and Joseph Wheeler all helped to build better libraries. However, the practice did not become commonplace until after World War II, and is now required in many situations where state or federal funds are involved. The successful efforts of Wheeler, Ralph Ellsworth, Keyes Metcalf, Ralph Ulveling, Charles Mohrhardt, Ellsworth Mason, Donald Bean and his associates, and scores of others have made it clear that the practice is generally desirable.

The other practice is again not a new one, but now generally employed: the written statement of program. While some librarians and architects still maintain that they prefer to develop a program as they go along and wave it triumphantly to the assembled throng at the
dedication, most begin with a statement of what the library is and does, what it hopes to be and do, what rooms and areas it will need to do its work, and how those spaces should be related. Some are so simple they are superfluous; others are unbelievably detailed, even including the placement of wastebaskets and ashtrays. Many librarians who lack building experience find this an impossible task to accomplish; a competent consultant, working with the librarian, can manage it fairly easily.

A number of books and a huge mass of journal articles on all aspects of library building processes began to appear in the library press. Some of these, such as Keyes Metcalf's *Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings*, and the proceedings of the Library Building Institutes which have been features of many ALA annual conferences, are landmarks in themselves. Critiques of plans and finished buildings were included in most of the ALA publications. A number of individuals (Ellsworth Mason, for example) published perceptive and sometimes barbed comments on buildings which attracted their attention.

Using new concepts, materials, technology, and expertise, librarians and architects together can point with pride to literally hundreds of eminently successful new buildings. Behind many of these successes lie tales of hours spent in bitter disagreement and tension between client and architect—a stormy process which, somehow, has come out right. But there have also been failures, condemned by librarians and users alike. While blame for some of these disasters can be laid at the feet of overly zealous or recklessly experimental architects, as much or more blame can be assigned to librarians, trustees or academic administrators who let these architects get away with it, or who heeded parties representing special interests or misplaced pride, or otherwise failed to use common sense and wisdom. There are few human relationships more complex than that of client and architect, and like all human relationships, they are subject to varied and often unique pressures.

Outside pressures have caused much mischief. What sort of judgment permits a state university to use, virtually unchanged, a set of plans in 1959 which were developed in 1933 and had been lying in a drawer because of a lack of funds? How can a major university plan a library building, using a faculty committee with virtually no librarian participation? How can a first-rate small college build a library with a grand staircase leading to an outsized temple to the world's great writers (upon the insistence of a donor), thereby effectively freezing
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two floors? How can public library boards and academic administrators permit buildings with no opening windows in erratic climates (which would appear to be most of the nation)? How can cheap carpeting be bought for a stairway leading to the stack levels of a major university library? How can a public library be built in split-level fashion, a la Carnegie, with no elevator? How can a small university permit the erection of an architecturally beautiful small temple which can never be enlarged without the utter destruction of the building's acknowledged architectural integrity? And what about the assumption that a county in the San Francisco Bay area never has hot weather, and therefore its public libraries don't need air conditioning? Human frailty plays a larger role than almost any other factor in achieving success or failure.

At this point, mention of specific landmark buildings becomes difficult, for there are so many imaginative, attractive, functional libraries. Others are merely adequate; still others are variously flawed. The laws of libel, professional discretion, and, most of all, a recognition of differences in taste and interpretation of what is functional dictate caution. On the other hand, some of those that are really controversial, some of which have drawn considerable published comment, should be mentioned.

Space prevents mention of more than a handful of generally acclaimed libraries. Among academic libraries, some of the pacesetters are: Lamont Undergraduate Library, Harvard (1949); McKeldrin Library, University of Maryland, unhappily clad in neo-Georgian (1957); University of Michigan Undergraduate Library (1958); Olin Library, Washington University (1962); Earlham College Library (1963); Wessell Library, Tufts University (1956); Harvard's Countway Library of Medicine (1965); University of California at Santa Cruz library (1966); Arizona State University library (1966); Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College (1967); Hofstra University library (1967); University of Illinois undergraduate library, built underground to avoid shading an historic cornfield (1969); Indiana University's huge complex (1970), combining yet separating graduate and undergraduate libraries and a sizable cafeteria; University of Washington undergraduate libraries (1972); Oberlin College library (1974); and Sawyer Library, Williams College (1975).

There are hundreds of public libraries, large and small, but a few generally admired (with a couple of personal favorites thrown in) are: Cincinnati (1954), with enlargement planned for 1976; Dallas (1955), also hoping for enlargement or replacement; Denver (1956); Char-
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lotte (1957); Seattle (1960); Jacksonville (1965); Tulsa (1965); Wichita (1967); and substantial additions and remodeling in Detroit (1963), Memphis (new in 1966, enlarged in 1972) and Houston (1975). Many smaller communities boast unusually attractive and workable libraries, among them: Skokie, Illinois (1958, tripled in 1972); Shawano, Wisconsin (about 1962); Pomona, California (1966); Elgin, Illinois (1968); Columbus, Indiana (1969); Northbrook, Illinois (1970, enlarged in 1975); and Edina, Minnesota (1974).

If some buildings were largely approved, others generated mixed reactions, even hostility. In recent years, probably the most controversial building was Skidmore Owings and Merrill's (SOM) Northwestern University library (1970), built on reclaimed land behind (and ingeniously attached to) Deering Library. Above one vast principal floor, three large round-appearing towers rise. These contain stacks radiating from central lounge areas, with seminar/office/carrel space arranged around the periphery; a special core collection; and various other functions. It is a striking building in terms of architecture; a first viewing of it in dense fog is an interesting experience. However, opinions differ about its functional aspects in particular.

Less controversial, but much discussed, is Chicago's Regenstein Library. Another SOM building, also from 1970, it has a totally different design pattern. The multileveled but not multitiered stacks are a separate entity, physically and mechanically apart from the reading and study areas. That is, there are no carrels (only a few chairs and tables) in the stacks. Instead, the stack ranges are unusually long, and the various levels are kept at controlled humidity levels and at lower temperatures than are the reading areas. The comfortable, carpeted study areas are amply furnished, and great banks of book lockers are provided. While the amount of staffing desirable for such an arrangement has had to be deferred because of funding difficulties, the plan seems to be working reasonably well, if not at optimum level. The concept appears to be something of a throwback, but the improvement in stack climate augurs well for the continued health of a major research collection.

The University of California's San Diego library (1970), by William Pereira, is an architectural tour de force which has attracted much attention. Again, a huge main floor supports a single tower which rises upward and outward and then tapers back in again, much like a stepped pyramid set squarely upon an inverted stepped pyramid. It is an engineering and visual triumph, and appears to be more functional than might be imagined from a description or casual glance.
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Architects greatly enjoy experimenting with odd shapes. We have seen circular libraries, such as the Inkster (Michigan) Public Library (1960) and the Chabot College library (1966); triangles such as the Wright State University library (1974); elongated ovals, such as the Niagara Falls (New York) Public Library (1975); and many others, some of them virtually indescribable. In recent years, many of the awards for library architecture by the American Institute of Architects have gone to libraries of odd, if often intriguing, shapes. The functional results of many of these are questionable, some of them winding up just plain "gimmicky." Some even seem to suffer from another strain of the old malady of function following form—in these cases, forms are chosen for the sake of being different and spectacular.

Unquestionably, this has been an exciting quarter-century of library architecture. Can anything better follow? It is unlikely, at least for some time.

With the ubiquitous problem of differences of opinion regarding space utilization and architectural styles, and the enormous costs of this economic era with a concomitant lowering of the quality of much labor performed and many materials produced, it has become increasingly difficult to build long-lasting buildings for anything approaching a reasonable amount of money. Inflation has wrecked many programs, resulting in scaled-down and inadequate buildings erected for more money than much larger buildings cost only a decade ago. We have an enormous technological capability; we have dedicated and imaginative librarians and architects; and we have an accumulation of more than one hundred years of knowledge of how to plan and build (and how not to plan and build) libraries. However, we are caught in a period of unsettled economy, with the future looking murky, at best, at least for the short term. Building has already been sharply limited, and it will continue at a reduced pace for some time.

We are also living in an era in which many workers, for a variety of reasons, do not take the kind of pride in their work that their fathers and grandfathers did. The result may be that the ancient horrors will stand, while the newer, better-planned, better-looking, but shabbily built buildings will deteriorate more rapidly. Only the most careful planning and thorough followup can prevent what is already visible in many situations from becoming as much of an epidemic as the monumentalism of the early 1900s.

JULY, 1976
In those buildings which are built, certainly more attention will be paid to energy considerations. Solar energy will probably be a practical solution to heating needs within ten to fifteen years. One library under construction in early 1976—Troy (Ohio) Public Library—includes a provision for the addition of the necessary equipment when funds can be obtained.

Much more attention will be paid to the needs of automation. The proliferation of consortia, networks and other cooperative arrangements may well have an impact on growth considerations. In the light of the economy, soaring building costs, and a rising tide of public demand for accountability for public money, flexibility in plan has become more important than ever. Perhaps there will be another and better “golden age” in the twenty-first century.
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Additional References
A survey of American education for librarianship in the past century requires that one begin more than a decade before a formal instructional program in the profession came into being, and bring that story to the present. Fortunately, library educators have exhibited interest in the history of their movement from its early years, and capable scholars have presented both histories of individual schools and periodic summary interpretations, as well as detailed studies of specific chronological periods. The following essay attempts to draw this body of literature together and to put it into a general framework. The century of development divides into seven periods of varying length, each comprising a separate unit, but each building on the continuing issues or problem solutions of the previous period. A brief view of the state of librarianship since the mid-nineteenth century will help to establish a setting for discussion of the half-century following 1876.

THE PRELUDE: BEFORE 1876

In the second half of the nineteenth century librarians, not unlike practitioners of other professions, assumed their positions with a great variety of background preparation. The custodians of collections prepared themselves for their responsibilities according to their abilities and opportunities. Although biographical sketches and reminiscences provide a complete spectrum of variation, several methods of preparation proved helpful. Experience gained from exposure to current library operations and from attention to the existing professional literature was the most common avenue of training. The ways in which this experience took place varied. Mary Wright Plummer outlined three common methods in 1901: learning...
through personal confrontation of library problems in one's own institution; learning by observing in another library for two or three weeks and gradually modifying its system to fit one's own; and learning by a kind of apprentice instruction, most often in college libraries, whereby one gained basic principles and practices of library practice.¹

These approaches frequently were combined in a kind of informal apprenticeship in the larger libraries under the general supervision of leading librarians such as Justin Winsor and William Frederick Poole. The former suggested the following steps for organizers of libraries in 1876:

1. Procure what is in print.
2. Send to any library which is a fit exemplar, and ask for its rules and reports.
3. Take time to study all these documents and when you have got a clear idea of what a library is, and how it should be maintained, consider closely the fitness of this or that library to this or that community, or to those conditions under which you are to work.
4. If you have no time, resign your trust to some one who has, and who has a correct appreciation of the old adage that those who help themselves are soonest helped by others.
5. After studying and problems are still unsolved, write to an old librarian but do not be surprised at the diversity of opinion among experts.
6. Choose that which you naturally take to; run to it, and do not decide that the other is not perfectly satisfactory to him who chose that.
7. Whichever you have chosen, study to improve it.⁴

Among the few works devoted to librarianship from which the librarian could draw were the national surveys of Jewett (1851)⁵ and Rhees (1859)⁶ and several journals such as Norton's Literary Gazette, American Journal of Education, and Publishers' Weekly, established in 1851, 1855 and 1872, respectively. The latter included a regular section of particular interest to librarians. In the Publishers' Weekly column "The Library Corner," for February 7, 1874, appeared a letter from George Washington Fentress of the San Jose (California) Library Association—probably the first public reference in America to the need for special training in librarianship. He wrote about the need for "men educated for library work" and added "I think it is a
distinct profession and should have special training." However, the subject was not pursued in print until 1876.

1876 to 1919: PIONEER EFFORTS

The prospectus for the new American Library Journal excerpted a segment from Winsor's 1869 report of the Boston Public Library which indicated in part the purpose for the new journal:

"We have no schools of bibliographical and bibliothecal training whose graduates can guide the formation of and assume management within the fast increasing libraries of our country, and the demand may, perhaps, never warrant their establishment; but every library with a fair experience can afford inestimable instruction to another in its movitiate; and there have been no duties of my office to which I have given more hearty attention than those that have led to the granting of what we could from our experience to the representatives of other libraries, whether coming with inquiries fitting a collection as large as Cincinnati is to establish, or merely seeking such matters as concern the establishment of a village library."

To further these and like purposes it is proposed to publish an American Library Journal. The rapid growth of libraries in this country makes such a medium of exchanging experience vitally necessary, and it will be a means of economizing both time and money. The Journal is meant to be eminently practical, not antiquarian.

Not only did the journal attempt to fulfill the need for library education in the autumn of 1876, but the compendium Public Libraries in the United States also did its share to spread information and stimulate ideas and the fledgling American Library Association (ALA) held promise of facilitating discussion among professional peers.

While formal education for librarianship was not a subject for discussion in these efforts, each in its way contributed to the generation of interest on the part of librarians, and others, in the need for avenues to facilitate the spread of beneficial professional information and the possibility for joint professional action. These needs, implicit in the formative months of a century ago, expressed themselves explicitly within the next decade.

That Melvil Dewey represented the prime moving force for formal education for librarianship has not been questioned from his time to
the present, although his ideas and methods have led to lively debate. Building on the consensus of his peers, Dewey sought in 1879 to promote an organized apprenticeship program under the auspices of the libraries and librarians which represented the best current practice. He further suggested that "perhaps by and by we may have one central library school where all will want to finish off." However, the librarians involved did not demonstrate interest and the notion languished. The movement of Dewey to Columbia College in 1883 as librarian brought with it the possibility of a library school being established. Hoping to enlist the support of the American Library Association in his proposed school, Dewey presented his tentative plans for consideration at the 1883 conference in Buffalo, initiating the liveliest discussion in the organization’s short history. Expressing guarded approval, the body voted "to express its gratification that the trustees of Columbia College are considering the propriety of giving instruction in library work, and hopes that the experiment may be tried." The debate symbolized the diversity of opinion on professional training that has persisted to the present.

The launching of the School of Library Economy’s first class of twenty students on January 5, 1887, was the beginning of an experiment to see whether and how librarians could be taught within a formal framework. (For two years Dewey had conducted small training classes for his Columbia library staff members, several of which soon took other positions because of their training experience.) As he attempted to incorporate lectures, readings, seminars, library visits, problems, and work experiences into the curriculum, Dewey enlisted the aid of many of the eminent librarians of his day as visiting lecturers and sought to wed theoretical presentation and acquaintance with practical library operations. While the first four-month course was later expanded, the comment of a student in that first class strikes a chord familiar to later students: "The time was all too short, however, to thoroughly conquer the vast amount of detail, and the apprenticeship term was of great value in confirming our uncertain impression of what we had been taught."

The future of the experiment was secured by the transfer of the school to the New York State Library in Albany in 1889 when Dewey accepted a position there following differences with the Columbia College trustees. With more freedom to develop his ideas, a pattern of library education emerged that would serve as a norm for several decades: a two-year program developing from an emphasis on practice (apprentice) work to more systematic classroom instruction.
the end of the century, at least six programs of various types had come into existence and the organized profession began to monitor the preparation of its practitioners more closely.\textsuperscript{15}

The ALA committee established in 1883 to watch the progress of Dewey's school made periodic reports beginning in 1885. Expanded to become a liaison body between the profession and all library schools, the committee was relatively inactive until 1900 when, under the chairmanship of John Cotton Dana, it made an analytical report on the four existing schools—Albany, Pratt, Drexel, and Illinois. This highly critical report called upon the ALA to assume a stronger role in library education and suggested the establishment of some form of endorsement to be given or withheld.\textsuperscript{16} The result was the establishment of the Committee on Library Training, which in 1903 presented a survey of the whole array of training programs and recommended the establishment of a standing committee of eight persons representing a cross section of the profession, a public listing of training agencies, development of training standards, and evaluation of schools by those standards. Although in 1906 the committee's standards and school evaluation were accepted by ALA, the information was not publicized as the committee had hoped. Lists of some schools appeared, however, in the ALA Handbook from 1907 until 1909.

Although the ALA seemed reluctant to take leadership in education for librarianship, specialized segments of the profession did seem prepared to do so. The short-lived Round Table on Professional Instruction in Bibliography voiced concern in 1901 regarding the overemphasis on technical training in library schools rather than on the scholarly aspects of librarianship.\textsuperscript{17} Faculties of library schools met for the first recorded time at the 1907 ALA Conference in Asheville. Although it was an inauspicious meeting, the group also met the following year with the Committee on Library Training. By 1909 the ALA established the school faculties as the Section on Professional Training for Librarianship in order to provide a forum for the discussion of all forms of library training. When the interests of the majority of section members appeared to be training classes and summer schools, the library school faculties formed their own Round Table of Library School Instructors and met for the first time on January 5, 1911, with sixteen persons from nine schools. In 1915 this body voted to become the Association of American Library Schools (AALS).\textsuperscript{18} The formation of this body outside the ALA was greeted with mixed reaction by library practitioners.

The decade following the establishment of the AALS witnessed a
great deal of activity in the organization, critical examination, and
orientation of education for librarianship. Soon after the faculties of
library schools began meeting separately in 1911, they needed to
ascertain which institutional representatives to welcome. Not only was
variation in standards great among the higher-level schools, but there
were also special-purpose courses and schools at academic and tech-
nical institutions, training classes at larger libraries (primarily for
their employees), and institutes and summer schools. The Committee
on Library Training examined the schools in 1914-15 based on its
low 1906 standards, and presumably all schools with at least a one-
year program received visits. In 1915, chairman Azariah S. Root
admitted that he was looking to the new AALS to act positively on
standards. This hope was not realized, since the AALS did little more
to establish its standards than to formulate common denominators of
conditions prevailing in its ten charter schools. The indecision and
confusion of these years seemed resolved by ALA action in 1923.

In 1915, the Carnegie Corporation turned its attention to library
education. After denying a request for funds from Melvil Dewey in
1890, Andrew Carnegie had agreed in 1903 to provide endowment
funds for a library school at Western Reserve University. Having
funded local libraries, the need for capably trained staff was urgent.
Additional funds went to the training programs at the Carnegie
Library of Pittsburgh, Atlanta, and the New York Public Library.
Alvin S. Johnson surveyed the provision of free library buildings and
the state of library schools and their products, publishing his report to
the Carnegie Corporation in 1916. According to Vann, "a dismal
picture emerged" with regard to personnel; library schools did not
fare much better. In 1918 the Carnegie Corporation authorized
Charles Williamson to investigate library training. He conferred with
sixteen librarians during the 1918 ALA conference and published his
findings in Library Journal. The paper criticized library schools,
suggested several avenues of improvement, but most significantly
challenged and warned the profession of its failure to bring forth a
plan to assure that educational needs might be met. His suggestion of
a general agency to coordinate the various training programs did not
seem to evoke much discussion at the AALS meeting in March 1919,
even though it had caused a stir in the profession.

1919 TO 1924: PROFESSIONAL DEBATE

Both to contemporaries and in retrospect, the annual ALA meeting
in June 1919 was noteworthy. World War I, in which the profession
had honored itself through the Library War Service Program, was over. Attention turned to library service at home—the diffusion of books and libraries to inadequately served segments of the nation and the training of personnel to carry out these programs. What American organization could accomplish for efforts overseas, it could also do for itself.24 Although several speakers dealt with various aspects of training for librarians of special groups, Charles Williamson, a member of the ALA committee to survey library service in the postwar environment, presented his personal reflections in "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training" to a general session. He proposed "the organization of all training activities and facilities into one system under the general direction of an A.L.A. Training Board, with a permanent staff and a competent expert as its executive, and empowered to work out and adopt a scheme of standards of fitness for all grades of library service and to grant appropriate certificates to properly qualified persons."25 Functions of that agency would be: (1) to formulate a grading scheme for library positions, (2) to determine minimal standards of training and experience for each level and issue certificates, and (3) to examine and accredit schools meeting appropriate standards.

Focusing primarily on the certification provisions, the designated ALA committees continued to struggle with the minimum requirements for certification as a professional librarian; these inevitably contained provisions for graduation from an approved library school. When it finally appeared that neither the ALA Council nor the AALS would respond actively to attempts by the Committee on Library Training to secure standardized and modified criteria for summer school and training class programs, the committee, acknowledging its own weakness, stated that the time was at hand for ALA to "exercise a more positive influence over the various library training agencies of the country."26 After more debate, the ALA Council finally voted on April 24, 1923, "that a temporary Library Training Board be appointed by the Executive Board to investigate the field of library training, to formulate tentative standards for all forms of library training agencies, to devise a plan for accrediting such agencies and to report to the Council."27

Williamson's report, *Training for Library Service,* on which he had been working since 1920, appeared some four months later and helped to provide direction to the new agency, which in 1924 became the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL). The study had included fourteen "approved" schools (Albany, Atlanta, Berkeley,
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Boston, Brooklyn, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Madison, Columbia, Pittsburgh, Seattle, St. Louis, Syracuse, and Urbana) as well as the school in Riverside, California. A landmark survey, similar in significance to Carnegie studies of the period in other professions, the Williamson report had a far-reaching effect on librarianship and its educational institutions. Its recommendations in summary form were:

1. There is a difference between professional and clerical work in libraries and education, and library schools should train only professionals.
2. There was little agreement among the schools as to the relative importance of subjects, and courses should be standardized.
3. A standardized entrance examination was needed.
4. Many instructors were not qualified to teach graduate students, and quality could be raised by better salaries. More full time instructors (at least 4 for each school) and more textbooks were needed. Field work is important.
5. Financial support for schools was inadequate, and each school needed an independent budget.
6. Recruitment of students was hindered by the low salaries and poor working conditions. There was no need for new schools, and the existing ones should offer scholarships to attract good students.
7. Library schools should be organized as a department of a university to maintain prestige, proper standards, and good people.
8. Library service is growing highly specialized. Schools should offer 2-year courses: the first year for general principles and the second for specialization.
9. Library workers should seek continued professional growth and improvement. Correspondence studies should be developed.
10. There were no standards for fitness for library work. A system for certification for librarians should be developed, and library schools should be standardized through accreditation.
11. Special courses should be developed to train librarians for small libraries with limited budgets.

The establishment of the BEL signaled a new direction in education for librarianship. Although Dewey organized the first library school, Williamson nearly forty years later pressed the idea that the ALA had
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a responsibility to create an agency to accredit the profession's schools. "Upon the implementation of that concept by the establishment of the Temporary Library Training Board, the pioneer period in the history of training for librarianship had come to an end."160

1924 TO 1936: FIRM FOUNDATIONS

Following a year of fact-gathering through surveys, conferences, and open meetings, the Temporary Library Training Board recommended the creation of a permanent Board of Education for Librarianship to exercise general supervision over library education by fulfilling about a dozen specific functions, including determining appropriate standards, applying them to schools, and publishing a list of the accredited agencies.

The establishment of the BEL in June 1924 marked a turning point in the consolidation of American library education. Supported by the widely discussed and debated findings of the Williamson report, the board began its work almost immediately and by the end of the decade a number of positive contributions were evident. Minimum standards appeared in 1925 and 1926 for library schools, summer courses, training and apprenticeship classes, and school library curricula. BEL further sponsored two summer institutes for library science teachers, conducted a curriculum study to gain information for use in designing instructional materials, and commissioned seven textbooks on aspects of librarianship.31

The BEL was aided in its work by the initiation of the Carnegie Corporation's Ten Year Program in Library Service which began in 1926 in order to implement some of Williamson's recommendations. Although the corporation had been supporting four library schools since the early 1900s and had generously underwritten the BEL and its predecessor, it now provided substantial endowments to the ALA ($2 million) and the new Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago ($1 million), with additional funds for support. Within the next fifteen years, the corporation distributed nearly $1.9 million to seventeen new and existing library schools, and more than $100,000 for study fellowships.32 In many of these ventures the BEL cooperated and served in an advisory capacity to the corporation. Support of this level, particularly during the depression, sustained a period of orderly development in education for librarianship.

The Minimum Standards for Library Schools, adopted in 1925, included categories for junior undergraduate library schools, senior
undergraduate library schools, graduate library schools, and advanced graduate library schools.\(^3\) The first two groups did not require a college degree for admission; the last category required both a college degree as well as completion of a one-year professional program. Although no advanced program existed at that time, during the following year the establishment of the Graduate Library School at Chicago was announced. Its purpose was to do “for the librarian’s profession what the Johns Hopkins Medical School and the Harvard Law School have accomplished in their respective fields.”\(^4\) Thus an idea that had been generating for several years became a reality. The contributions of this school—diversely qualified faculty, research-oriented curricula, publications and conferences—have been well recognized. Graduates of the doctoral program, established in 1928, provided new leadership in library education. The founding of the Chicago school was perhaps of greater significance to education for librarianship than was the founding forty years earlier of the Columbia school.

The establishment of the BEL in 1924 and the expansion of its influence in the following decade nearly rendered the AALS defunct. After an inactive period, it came back to life in the late 1920s. While it continued to provide a forum for library school faculties to present and discuss problems in their teaching, it did not function as a \textit{de facto} accrediting agency as it had before the 1925 standards. After 1927, its membership was determined by the schools approved by the BEL. In time, the strained relations between the AALS and the BEL mitigated. One event contributing to this was cooperation of both bodies on the revision of standards, adopted in 1933,\(^5\) which reduced much of the quantitative, specific provisions of 1926 to a broadened, qualitative statement with three types of schools, one of which did not require completion of college for admission. The other event was the appearance in 1930 of the report of the ALA activities committee which suggested closer cooperation between the two bodies. By the late 1930s educators and practitioners seemed to be working together. Former board members were directing library schools, and school administrators and deans were serving on the board.\(^6\)

Two practitioner groups—school and special librarians—sought aid in securing appropriate training for their new members. Both groups wanted library schools to modify the traditional curriculum emphasis, aimed at producing generalists, to accommodate their peculiar demands. Neither group made much headway with either the BEL or the schools in the AALS, although the special librarians finally helped
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to spur interest in curriculum revision within the schools after 1938. The school librarians turned to undergraduate programs, which burgeoned during this period but enjoyed little support beyond the agreement on standards from the BEL.

The Great Depression caught the library schools in an expansion phase fostered by the BEL. Not until 1932 did the board reverse itself. By 1936 there were twice as many accredited schools as there had been AALS member schools twelve years earlier. Among the newly established schools was McGill University, which in 1929 became the first accredited Canadian library school. In retrospect, the argument that librarians were in oversupply is less convincing than the fact that the depression had temporarily forced the reduction in the employment of librarians. As the need for librarians became apparent again, the schools were ill prepared to meet the challenge.

1936 TO 1951: CREATIVE RETHINKING

The late 1930s witnessed the wane of Carnegie funding, the BEL losing its early momentum, and library schools readjusting to the economic and educational pressures of the decade. The implementation of the 1933 standards and the maturation of the Graduate Library School at Chicago seemed to foster a period of reexamination, critical assessment, new proposals, and educational experimentation. A consensus seemed to develop after World War II that achieved partial consolidation in the 1951 standards.

During these years and particularly in the 1940s, at least seven major studies appeared on the subject of education for librarianship. Consisting of surveys, observations, and proposals, these reports stimulated interest in change and seemed to suggest another level of development in library education beyond that undertaken in the formal reorganization of 1924-36. Among the more significant of these studies were Munn's *Condition and Trends in Education for Librarianship* (1936), Reece's *The Curriculum in Library Schools* (1936), Wilson's "The American Library School Today" (1937), Munthe's *American Librarianship from a European Angle* (1939), Metcalf, Russell, and Osborn's *Program of Instruction in Library Schools* (1943), Wheeler's *Progress & Problems in Education for Librarianship* (1946), Danton's *Education for Librarianship: Criticisms, Dilemmas and Proposals* (1946), and Leigh's "The Education of Librarians" (1952). These works tended to touch on common themes, such as the unfortunate dwelling on routines and "technique" in the curricula, the lack of
application of theory to real problems, the need for flexibility in curricula and emphasis on administration as a subject, the need to differentiate the levels of instruction required for various library personnel, and the great variation among types of accredited schools in quality of education.

Along with the written documents, the profession participated in some ten special conferences on library education from 1940 through 1948: Chicago, 1940; Urbana, 1943; Buffalo and Chicago, 1946; Urbana, Berkeley, and New York, 1947; Atlanta, Chicago, and Princeton, 1948. Of these, the 1948 Chicago and Princeton conferences seemed to recapitulate much of the ferment of the preceding dozen years. The University of Chicago conference featured outstanding educators and practitioners addressing themselves to general problem areas. While no consensus resulted—by design of the planners—the proceedings have become a classic. In his introduction to them, Berelson wrote: "Historians of American librarianship will undoubtedly note the years 1946 to 1950 as a period of major revision in the system of library education in this country, perhaps of equal importance to the period of the 1920s which was characterized by the Williamson Report and by the establishment of the Board of Education for Librarianship and the Graduate Library School." 59

The conference at Princeton University, sponsored by the Council of National Library Associations, sought to reach a consensus, and presented nine recommendations to the profession, even though it had no official power. It recommended a joint committee on education for librarianship for communication between library schools and professional groups, an expanded AALS Newsletter, a determined recruitment effort, accreditation by BEL of library education of all types and at all levels, leadership of the BEL in guiding new programs, a survey of the needs for special library training, an investigation of the place of undergraduate programs, expanded financial support for the BEL, and an ALA placement agency. 40

The problems of education for librarianship had come to a head in the environment of post-World War II academic growth and library expansion. By 1950, nine reasonably distinct types of library education programs could be identified. The chairman of the BEL announced that the 1933 Minimum Requirements for Library Schools would undergo revision as a joint effort of the BEL, AALS, and the ALA Library Education Division (an outgrowth in 1946 of the Professional Training Section and Round Table). The Standards for Accreditation received ALA approval on July 15, 1951, and the State-
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ment of Interpretation appeared the following year. The new document, (and thus the BEL) concerned itself only with the “basic program of education for librarianship covering a minimum of five academic years of study beyond the secondary school.” While this general provision made for flexibility in various programs, the awarding of the master's degree effectively prevented undergraduate programs from achieving reaccreditation. The Standards represented a new plateau in professional education.

1951 TO 1960: CAUTIOUS READJUSTMENT

The basic decisions of the postwar years ending with the new 1951 standards were worked out in the decade following their approval. Although a national moratorium on accrediting delayed examination of new and established schools until 1953, by 1957 the work was completed. The new standards provided for certain variation in interpretation, but they also required a minimum of graduate-level work which forced several former undergraduate schools to upgrade their programs and others to forego accreditation by ALA.

Before the new standards had been fully implemented in the schools, an ALA reorganization divided the functions served by the BEL between two other agencies, and after thirty-two years the board went out of existence in 1956. The Library Education Division (LED) assumed responsibility for the survey and promotion of education for librarianship on all levels, and the new Committee on Accreditation (COA) continued responsibility for first professional degree programs, including standards maintenance and accreditation.42

Both the BEL and the AALS had expressed concern about the expanding number of undergraduate programs. If the profession exerted no control over these, the argument ran, it could hardly complain about the results. Although library educators differed as to what stance should be taken, standards for undergraduate training received ALA council approval in 1959 and served to “guide” teacher education programs, most of which were seeking accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.43

In addition to undergraduate programs, library educators began to think more seriously about those at the doctoral level. During the late 1940s, Illinois and Michigan had joined Chicago in offering the Ph.D. In the next decade, Columbia, Berkeley, Western Reserve, and Rutgers joined them. The graduates of these schools formed the base from which came the expansion of the 1960s. Prior to 1951, the three
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Schools with doctoral programs had awarded twenty-seven degrees; in the next decade eighty-three students earned doctorates.44

During this decade of readjustment, library schools seemed to get a new burst of enthusiasm. Their association became somewhat more active and visible. During 1955-56 Harold Lancour served concurrent terms as chairman of the BEL and as president of the AALS. Although his far-reaching proposals to the school association did not gain immediate acceptance, they pointed the way to a more productive organization.45 (A decade later eight Canadian schools formed the Canadian Association of Library Schools.46) Enrollment expanded also, growing from a school average of 79 students in 1950 to 138 in 1960.47

1960 TO 1970: DYNAMIC EXPANSION

There is no doubt that the decade of the 1960s witnessed the most dramatic growth that the profession has yet seen. The restructuring of, and the increase in demands upon, education for librarianship which took place in the previous decade set the stage for what was to come. Throughout the twenty-five years following the close of World War II, the expansion of library services grew steadily. As the standards of the profession rose, more trained librarians were needed to fill vacated or new positions in all types of libraries. In the mid-1950s a trickle of federal legislation, beginning with the Library Services Act of 1956, initiated financial support to libraries which had grown to a steady stream a decade later. These funds caused an increased need for more personnel in first public, and then school, academic, and special libraries. The programs undertaken by these appropriations encouraged outreach into neglected segments of society: the rural and urban poor, the racial and ethnic minorities, and people deprived of cultural and educational opportunities.

Having put their own houses in order, library educators acted in concert to meet these challenges. The Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education became increasingly aware of its responsibilities, and following several years of agitation by library educators, appointed in 1963 Sarah R. Reed as Library Education Specialist; she acted as liaison between the federal government and the various library education agencies. About one year earlier, nearly ninety participants had attended a four-day institute on the future of library education at the library school of Western Reserve University. Co-sponsored by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of
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Education, the institute proposed that ALA seek funding for "the study and development of a national plan to develop library schools." The resulting Commission on a National Plan for Library Education took shape early in 1963. Eventually composed of some fifty members, it sought to assess the professional personnel needs of the library profession and to recommend appropriate actions to meet those needs in the years immediately ahead.

One of the concrete achievements of the commission's recommendations was the establishment within the ALA of the Office for Library Education in 1966, with the five-year matching support of the H.W. Wilson Foundation. Responsible for promoting coordination of library education activities (including accreditation) of the ALA, the office, under the direction of Lester Asheim, represented a new level of concern for education for librarianship and the utilization of library manpower. Some of the functions of general coordination delegated to the former BEL reappeared. The office's carefully prepared statement on "Library Education and Manpower," which has been widely discussed, seemed to fulfill in part the original mandate of the commission when it became official ALA policy in 1970.

The alleged shortage of trained library personnel had been the subject of active concern to the profession since the early 1960s, and among the suggested measures for meeting the "crisis" were an active recruitment program and the training of library technicians who could perform essential services that would free the limited number of professionally qualified people for other work. The net result of these forces was the expansion of library education programs, accredited and otherwise, from community college through doctoral level studies. In 1962 the first new library school program since 1953 was accredited, but by the end of the decade there were more.

One innovation, which paralleled the former sixth-year master's programs offered before the establishment of the 1951 standards, was the sixth-year certificate program designed to enable librarians to receive specialized and continuing education. Providing an alternative between the master's and doctoral degree programs, these options seemed to be meeting a need in the profession. The oldest of the programs was that of Columbia, initiated in 1961; by 1969 twenty had been established.

Recognizing the need for additional faculty to educate librarians to serve the nation's expanding library systems, the federal government provided funding for assistance in professional study, aimed pri-
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arily at prospective library school faculty members, and for the support of short institutes, aimed primarily at practitioners. The Higher Education Act of 1965 supported 6,532 librarians in institutes through fiscal 1970. Federal encouragement through financial support coincided with the establishment of new doctoral programs at eleven new schools between 1961 and 1971. ①

The "need for change," a slogan of the decade, reflected itself in the focus of the profession's concerns, and consequently in the curriculum of library schools. ② "Innovation" and "relevance" were sought through new courses dealing with information science and behavioral sciences, more emphasis on user and potential user needs in general programs, and implementation of developing teaching strategies and educational technology. In order to provide library educators with an organ for communication and dissemination of useful information, the AALS launched its Journal of Education for Librarianship in 1960 with the help of Beta Phi Mu, the library science honor society, founded eleven years earlier. ③

New subject specializations arrived during this decade and found a permanent place in the curricula of library schools. While special librarians—especially those in the fields of medicine, law, theology and music—most often turned to their respective associations to provide additional special training and continuing education, the new field of documentation or (later) information science took root in many schools. Beginning with scattered courses in the 1950s at Western Reserve and Columbia Universities, conferences, surveys, and symposia sponsored by schools, government agencies, and the American Society for Information Science had fostered by the 1960s curricular sequences and concentrations in most accredited programs. ④

Even while library education was enjoying unprecedented support, growth, and apparent success in the mid- and late 1960s, signs were beginning to appear which indicated that another period of reexamination was on the way.

1970 TO 1976: CHANGING EMPHASES

As the new decade began, library educators became increasingly aware of the implications of adverse economic and political shifts in the nation. The change in U.S. presidential administrations and philosophy brought redirection of the funds enjoyed in the 1960s. The withering of federal support quickly turned the "spring of hope"
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into the “winter of despair.” The slackening pace of vigorous expansion and upgrading of educational institutions, as well as less certain support for state and public libraries, seemed to make the personnel shortage vanish just as the alleged requirements appeared to be within reach. While the apparent demand for library school graduates lessened and employment became somewhat more restricted, a shift in governmental priorities from doctoral fellowships to master’s level support for minority students limited the anticipated growth of the advanced programs. Nevertheless, the numbers of both schools and graduates continued to increase.

One indication of the changing emphasis within the profession was the demise of the heralded ALA Office for Library Education in 1971; its functions in greatly modified form were assumed by the new Office of Library Personnel Resources, which had much broader and diffused interests. Meanwhile the Committee on Accreditation (COA) revised the Standards for Accreditation and upon their approval in 1972 launched a four-year period of examination and reexamination of applicant schools. Although the ALA would no longer support its coordinating agency for library education, the COA was busily accrediting programs in an increasing number of schools which had been established in the 1960s to help alleviate the personnel shortage.

The variety in the accredited programs of the various schools seemed greater than ever before as the new decade began. Not only did the curricula show individual emphasis, the teaching methodologies did so as well. No longer were teaching materials in short supply. Several newer publishers joined the traditional firms to produce an abundance of textbooks. The publication of Jesse Shera’s long-awaited The Foundations of Education for Librarianship in 1972 is an event worthy of special mention. Another important work which appeared to suggest future possibilities in professional education was the survey Targets for Research in Library Education which dealt with ten fields needing research. A third example of a fresh attempt to relate library education to a current need was Elizabeth Stone’s Continuing Library and Information Science Education, a survey report to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science which recommended establishment of a Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE).

Two studies were underway in the mid-1970s which sought to untangle some of the chaotic descriptions of the state of manpower and education needs within the profession, as well as to suggest possible courses of action. The first, undertaken by the U.S. Bureau
of Labor Statistics, attempted to analyze the current manpower situation and to project the requirements and supply through 1985. The second, undertaken by Ralph Conant through a grant from the H.W. Wilson Foundation, sought to examine the needs for education for librarianship in the years ahead.

Despite the disparagements of its more impatient critics, education for librarianship has progressed a considerable distance in the past century. Undoubtedly some of the changes made appear superficial, but the upholding and transmission of traditional practices seems to be fading quickly. The current retrenchment phase in the midst of progress gives time for reflection. The words of Lester Asheim form a fitting conclusion:

The next few years may be the period of synthesis following the antithesis of the past decade—not a complete return to an earlier and more leisurely past, but not so violent a wrench as was feared by some, and sought by others. The clues to what will happen lie, of course, in the society itself, not just in library schools, or even in the broader field of librarianship. Libraries can help shape society, but they are also shaped by it. . . . Library education, a small corner of the total society, is nevertheless a sensitive barometer of the larger whole.
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APPENDIX

AALS MEMBER SCHOOLS:
GRADUATES OF BASIC AND DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
FOR SELECTED YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Basic Programs</th>
<th>Doctoral Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>188&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>391&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,025&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,793&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,710&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>52&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (48 reporting)</td>
<td>5,569&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>62&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (61 reporting)</td>
<td>7,404&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional membership criteria in AALS consisted of ALA accreditation after 1927.

Sources of statistics:
- ALA, Temporary Library Training Board. *Report* (1924), adjusted to AALS members.
- ALA, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Annual Reports*.
Library Associations

PEGGY SULLIVAN

The affinity of librarians to organize has been much discussed, and de Tocqueville and other general commentators on American society have been cited to explain the great interest that librarians have shown in coming together in diverse organizations. Vance Packard, writing about American professional and trade organizations in general, has speculated that the high rate of mobility of contemporary America has led individuals with interesting and demanding jobs to develop friendships with others in their area of interest. Although they might see each other infrequently, common concerns and an ability to communicate quickly by letter or telephone have enabled them to construct a kind of neighborhood within their profession, as if to compensate for the lack of community they might feel because of frequent moves, unrelated interests with those living nearby, or lack of time to be active in a community. It is an intriguing idea when applied to librarians, and it ties in with one suggested by Ralph Ellsworth fifteen years ago, when he reviewed library associations in the United States. “In our time,” he wrote, “participation in a national association provides for many a substitute for the kind of participation previous generations were willing to give to the church.”

Whatever the reason, the facts are clear: librarians and libraries form readily, usually enthusiastically, often uncritically, and almost always enduringly into organizations. Seventy-five associations of libraries and librarians were included in a recent Encyclopedia of Associations. While some, such as the Center for Research Libraries, the National Registry of Librarians, the School Library Manpower Project, or the Melvil Dui Chowder and Marching Association, scarcely fall within the scope of this review, the others illustrate the tensions which produce and vivify associations. State and regional
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associations are not included in the group of seventy-five, nor are local groups. The range of age of the associations is considerable, and the size range even greater (from fourteen members in the Independent Research Library Association to some 30,000 in the American Library Association). Indeed, one phenomenon affecting studies of library associations in the United States is the overwhelming size and history of the American Library Association, celebrating its centennial in 1976. Of the associations giving membership figures in the previously mentioned encyclopedic listing, only three have more than 10,000 members, and these are the ALA itself and two of its divisions, the American Association of School Librarians and the Association of College and Research Libraries. The Special Libraries Association, generally considered a major competitor of ALA in terms of program and member loyalty, reported only 8,500 members in the survey.

A kind of tension drives individuals or institutions to form cooperative groups, and aspects of that tension can cause fragmentation, change of course or identity, and progress. Observers from outside the U.S. library community have commented on this tension, and librarians and others have demonstrated it by their love/hate relationships with associations to which they feel some loyalty and by their willingness to form new associations or to reform old ones. In both of these latter activities, Melvil Dewey played a major role. He was the instigator of the 1876 conference at which the American Library Association was founded, and, while remaining active in it, he also helped to found the National Association of State Libraries and the American Library Institute (ALI). He further believed, as evidenced in his writing and in his action to establish the New York Library Association, that there should be state associations working actively in library development. The ALI is an interesting example of an association which failed to survive. It came into being at a time when ALA was seen as “a small compact body concerned almost entirely with details of work, organization, and related subjects.” However, perhaps because Dewey envisioned the ALI as “a sort of honorary society open to the senior members who had achieved worthily,” it failed to develop a significant program of its own, and its life spanned only the first four decades of the twentieth century. Its short but placid history suggests that tension is an important component for survival.

The American Library Association has had its share of tension and has responded to it in varying ways. A review of statements about its history leaves the impression that it is always reorganizing and/or on
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the threshold of promise or disaster, depending on the writer’s viewpoint. In fact, many of the library associations which have formed and survived have been established during ALA conferences. The National Association of State Libraries functioned as an ALA section from 1889 to 1898, when it became independent; however, its current counterpart, the Association of State Library Agencies, is now an ALA division, recently designated as a “threatened” one because its small membership probably cannot justify its continued existence. The American Association of Law Libraries began at the ALA conference at Narragansett Pier in 1906, the Special Libraries Association at the Bretton Woods conference in 1909, and the Music Library Association at the New Haven conference in 1931. Leaders and founders of these groups also came from the ranks of ALA leadership, some of them maintaining close ties with more than one group. While relations were often cordial between ALA and such offshoots, the desire for independence of the smaller associations was very strong. Thus, John A. Lapp, an early editor of Special Libraries, reminisced in 1932: “Our chief battle in the early days was to keep our association from being absorbed in the American Library Association.” The Association of Medical Librarians (now the Medical Library Association) considered ALA affiliation in 1898, when it also considered affiliation with the American Medical Association, but decided against either course.

For the individual member, the tensions of being affiliated with an association may be seen in a somewhat different way. In general terms, he seeks association membership in order to establish his own identity as a member of the library profession or, given the wide latitude most library associations offer, to indicate his interest in librarianship and its improvement. His choices of membership and of activity are obviously tied to what he has to offer of his own time and competence and also to what membership advantages he seeks. A local group, such as a library staff organization or the Chicago Library Club—founded in 1891 and the longest-lived group of its kind—may offer the individual social contact with others who share his general interests but who work in different kinds of libraries or in different departments or specialties. The individual seeks, perhaps unconsciously, this mix of diversity and similarity. The same search may lead him to be active in a state library association, where his special competence or leadership may be readily utilized, and/or in a national association, where he may benefit not by active participation but by
more passive acceptance of benefits such as identification with the
association’s goals, receipt of membership publications, or occasional
attendance at national conferences.

When John Cory was executive secretary of the American Library
Association, he spoke to the Catholic Library Association conference,
and cheerfully admitted to belonging to fifteen different library
associations and to believing “that a reasonable diversity and multi-
plicity of library associations is logical, healthy, and inevitable.” He
believed that, since only about 3 percent of ALA members could
participate in membership activities at any one time, it was good that
there were other associations in which they could be active. Within
the large national associations, most notably in ALA, members have
sought to satisfy their interests in broad topics by being affiliated with
the national group, while giving major loyalty to one or two of the
association’s special-interest divisions. ALA and the Special Libraries
Association are best able to offer this solution, probably because of
their size.

In terms of organization, SLA has a major advantage over ALA in
its well-organized local chapters. Partly because the development of
special libraries tends to occur in metropolitan centers, chapter orga-
nization is very effective. The first such group was formed in Boston,
one year after SLA was founded, in 1910. These groups have served
to develop leaders for the association, and for the many years when
SLA’s national staff was quite limited, the local chapters were of great
importance in organizing conference arrangements and much of the
association’s work. The Catholic Library Association has had a similar,
consistently strong relationship with its local units, although both
associations have also allowed for specialization of interests with
subgroups at the national level.

ALA’s stance in relation to state chapters has been more ambiva-
lent. Grace Stevenson, formerly deputy executive director of ALA,
conducted a study of relations with ALA chapters in 1971, and
reported that members who were asked whether regional offices of
the association might be helpful to them knew so little about ALA that
they could not envision what such offices might accomplish; they did
think, however, that a chapter relations office at ALA headquarters in
Chicago could be helpful.

In broad terms, the concerns of state or regional library groups
may seem to duplicate those of national ones. Stevenson found, for
example, that legislation, standards, education, and publications were
cited most frequently as concerns for the national association. Yet
these same topics occupy significant places on the agendas of state and regional associations. It is only the area of their implementation which is different. For example, a state chapter’s legislation committee may work most effectively with its own state legislators on issues currently being considered for that state, and may rely on the ALA’s Washington Office to represent libraries in federal legislative activity, for which the state association may pledge some financial support. Present efforts to establish legislative networks, already fairly successfully achieved by school librarians, are causing ALA to consider more thoughtfully closer liaison with state groups.

Another kind of association which has developed in the past seventy years is the regional library association. John Richards, reviewing their history in 1955, observed that there were five of them, covering thirty-two states and British Columbia, and that they had developed on the periphery of the U.S. and/or in sparsely settled areas with comparatively small ALA membership. These associations were the Pacific Northwest, Southeastern, Southwestern, New England, and Mountain-Plains Library Associations. More recent efforts to form a viable organization in the Midwest suggest that his implied assumption was correct: a sense of geographic isolation may encourage such development, and lack of that feeling may deter it.

It is difficult to assess the value or costs of activities carried out by state or regional chapters. Stevenson considered the major activities of the five regional associations in the 1960s as “a thin work record indeed,” and suggested that all six of the journals published by states in the Southwestern Library Association should be critically evaluated in the light of an observation by Eric Moon that one out of three of all library journals should cease publication. The journals are an interesting case of controversy. Often initiated as a means of communication, they frequently come to symbolize the association’s prestige, and articles and other features may be added to news topics. When this delays publication or necessitates fewer issues per year, the original purpose of communication may be lost. In library publications as in various other kinds, however, there is a great deal of inertia, and it is probably almost as difficult to stop one as it is to start one. In spite of that, in recent years, several state associations have responded to membership need for faster communications by eliminating more costly journals in favor of newsletter-format publications.

One observer outside the library field was Oliver Garceau who, as part of his work on the Public Library Inquiry in 1949, reviewed the roles and purposes of state associations, concluding that “they, more
than the ALA in many sections of the country, had what political
strength the American library movement could muster; they were the
organizations to which the librarians of small towns gave their loyalty
and from which they gained most of their professional attitudes.”
Wilhelm Munthe, the noted European who commented on American
librarianship before World War II, felt that all state and regional
associations should be organized as chapters of ALA. In his view,
ALA itself was “the picture of an army with excellent headquarters,
under the direction of a chief of general staff in direct contact with the
supreme council of war, in which the officers are in due course and
order appointed to the position of commanding general—but only
for a year.” In that figurative statement, he touched upon several
problems which have affected not only the ALA but smaller library
associations as well. The rapid turnover of leadership, at least since
Justin Winsor’s lengthy tenure as ALA’s first president, seems to be
necessitated in order to provide for democratic variety, and also to
permit busy leaders to carry on in their often demanding jobs with
interludes devoted to association work. Yet more than one president,
who might have been overwhelmed at the thought of making a
commitment for a period longer than the one-year term, customarily
preceded and followed the presidency with a year on the association’s
governing board, and felt reluctant to leave his post when the presi-
dential year was over because, as a retiring president of the associa-
tion of American Library Schools expressed it in a recent conversa-
tion: “Here I am, quitting, just when I have learned what has to be
done and how to get it done!”

Munthe also hinted at a problem which has already affected some
associations and will certainly affect others as they become able to
employ staff members of some competence. In ALA, Carl Milam, the
executive of the association from 1920 to 1948, epitomized this
problem. His earned nickname, “Mr. ALA,” suggested the fact that
he symbolized the association for many. He was articulate, political,
and ambitious or, as his detractors might phrase it, he was outspoken,
crafty, and grasping. It was to the benefit of the association that he
centered his ambition on the welfare of ALA and of librarianship in
general, but his strong direction, observed by Munthe, earned him
enemies as well as friends.

A growing number of state library associations have staff members
at both professional and clerical levels, and only the smallest or most
specialized of national associations are now without some kind of
staff. As the role of the association executive becomes recognized as
Library Associations

that of a special kind of manager (as evidenced by their formation of a national association of their own), it is probable that more than the one or two who have come from such a background to service in a library association will be attracted to this area. As Stevenson has noted, most library associations have chosen librarians as their first staff members. There are probably a number of reasons for this: (1) knowledge of the individual as a professional colleague, (2) the fact that librarianship is still a profession of generalists who may have the entrepreneurial qualities required in such posts, and (3) the prospect of hiring someone who can be an administrator as well as a credible spokesman for professional concerns. Stevenson has deftly outlined the reasons for having staff and the hazards and benefits of having staff in membership organizations. According to her, the time to hire is when membership and paperwork increase or when a program of library development requires consistent intelligent support. Reasons why staff sometimes become too powerful are: “the lack of a clearly stated policy; the presence of an executive officer who is less than scrupulous about assuming, or allowing his staff to assume, unwarranted positions of power; apathy on the part of the membership; or weakness, incompetence, or sheer laziness on the part of elected and appointed officers.” She follows with good rationale for staff: “The staff provides the continuity, the corporate memory. . . . Imperative to a sound, workable membership-staff relationship is the clearly understood and scrupulously observed tenet that the membership establishes policy and the staff works within that policy.”

Other reasons for the emerging importance of staff appointments were outlined by David Brunton, the former executive secretary of the California Library Association, after he had surveyed state library associations almost ten years ago. He noted that typical associations were more than forty years old, unincorporated, and that their budgets, which had initially been less than $1,000 per year, had grown to the $10,000-$20,000 per year category—although the associations had never dealt with either the U.S. Internal Revenue Service or departments of revenue within their own states! Furthermore, their budgets were no longer the simple ones of the past, as evidenced by the fact that typically less than one-half of their income came from dues. Situations like this practically cry for effective staff leadership, and that cry is being answered with more and more individuals employed in this work, thus creating a growing kind of specialization within librarianship.

As suggested by this brief survey, most library associations are
open-entry ones which make no initial demand on members in terms of academic background, experience, or type of work. Trustees of public libraries, representatives of commercial enterprises serving libraries, well-wishers in general, school and university administrators, and an amorphous "other" group are to be found on the membership rosters. And in national associations especially, institutional memberships are also encouraged. Perquisites of institutional memberships are most often related to an association's publishing program in terms of institutional subscriptions or discounts on other purchases, but two national organizations are primarily for institutional members, and they deserve special mention.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) was founded in 1932 with forty-three members. Included were libraries of universities which were members of the Association of American Universities, as well as the Library of Congress, New York Public Library, the Boston Public Library, and several specialized research libraries. As Stephen McCarthy, the ARL's executive director in 1972, observed, the association remained at about the same size for some years, with an elected, volunteer secretary and an advisory committee of five managing its work. In 1962, however, it became a corporation, appointed its first full-time paid executive secretary, and established a permanent office in Washington, D.C. Its membership has since expanded rapidly, although it is still limited to institutions. Those seeking membership are evaluated in ten categories, including number of full-time-equivalent professional staff, expenditure for library materials and binding, and number of Ph.D.'s awarded, in order to ensure that members will be from fairly large university libraries. Nonuniversity libraries, which cannot be judged on the same criteria, are elected to membership. The success the association has had in numerous cooperative programs and the prestige associated with membership have greatly increased potential members' interest in being included.

Perhaps unique in its selection of institutional members according to the standards of another association is the Association of American Library Schools. Although it, too, has recently relaxed requirements for membership—allowing individuals to join and granting associate membership to institutions which do not have ALA-accredited programs of library education—the AALS continues to grant full membership only to library education programs which have been accredited by ALA. In addition, two other distinctions are of interest. Donald Davis's history of its first fifty years is probably the most
thoughtful and objective history of a library association now available in published form, although, as Davis himself has stated, it is to be hoped that more such studies will come. It is also an association peculiarly free of the self-congratulatory feelings and statements which characterize others. It may be that this is deservedly so, for Davis has criticized it for lack of identity and lack of leadership, noting that capable members who might have been major leaders were often too actively engaged in other associations (usually ALA) or in their own work of teaching, administration, and research to provide the dynamism needed to make the association strong.

All of the associations mentioned to date are predominantly American in their membership, but not exclusively so. Almost all of the national associations include Canadian members, as does the Pacific Northwest Library Association. In fact, because of the close rapport with ALA, there was no independent Canadian Library Association until after World War II. The Medical Library Association has repeatedly chosen to keep “American” out of its title in order to underscore its international scope, and other associations typically offer special inducements in terms of lower dues or other advantages to international members.

These library associations are a varied group. They differ in size, composition of membership, staffing patterns, geographic locations, and a dozen other features. This brief survey should have suggested their diversity, while the following section should highlight their many common concerns and activities. Six topics, occasionally overlapping or interrelated, recur with reference to library associations. They are: publishing, personnel, standards, legislation, international relations, and intellectual freedom.

**PUBLISHING**

Typically, a library association’s publishing program starts in a small way, with a newsletter or some modest means of communication to its members. This may grow to a journal of some significance or, as suggested by Stevenson, the continued existence of an ineffective device for communication may be questioned. Besides doing its own publishing, an association may see itself as the instigator, acting as a kind of gauge for the potential market and alerting a commercial publisher to a need. Thus, the Special Libraries Association was the genesis for *Public Affairs Information Service* and for the H.W. Wilson Company’s *Industrial Arts Index*. The Pacific Northwest Library Asso...
ciation, which had started the service that became ALA's *Subscription Books Bulletin*, turned that endeavor over to the national association when its continuation became onerous for the regional group. The volunteer efforts of members of ALA's Junior Members Round Table resulted in the compilation that became Wilson's standard index, *Library Literature*, thus illustrating another feature of many library publications. Like this one, they have usually grown from a definite need in the field, and have come to fruition when some generous individual or group makes the effort to get them started.

Flora Ludington, reviewing association responsibilities in publishing almost a quarter-century ago, cited the kinds of publications which are customarily provided by associations: selection aids; cataloging tools, including filing aids; reference tools; manuals and texts on library methods and materials; library directories and surveys of resources; information about materials requiring special handling; and bibliographic control. This listing is also a generally accurate chronology of the kinds of publications offered by associations. There are, of course, some individual differences. For example, the Catholic Library Association, especially in its early history, published Catholic supplements or adaptations of other works. Various local groups of SLA produce union lists, directories of special libraries, and other items of immediate local interest.

**PERSONNEL**

Perhaps the concern about personnel expressed by associations varies more in emphasis than any other of these major aspects. Included here would be placement services, education, recruitment, scholarships, and awards for service. It is hard to imagine a library association which has not at some time laid heavy emphasis on one or more of these. This concern is directly related to the societal changes which affect libraries. In times of emergency such as war or great expansion of services by libraries, such as occurred in the 1960s, the emphasis tends to be on recruitment, and when needs are filled or figurative belts are tightened, there may be a rapid change to emphasis on placement activities combined with stress on higher educational standards for admission to the profession. Of the major national library associations in recent years, SLA has probably been most active in its concern about placement, but there is no denying that other associations deal in it at least indirectly. Activity and accomplishments in an association, for example, have led many librarians to
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positions to which they might never have aspired or even been aware of except for their affiliation with the association. At the present time, however, as institutional members seek assistance in developing plans for affirmative action in employment, or as staff associations develop stances more like those of unions, they turn to the programs of library associations for assistance.

Although we may think of library associations vis-à-vis education most readily in terms of formal programs, accreditation or certification plans, or in terms of programs of educating the public about libraries, one major aspect often overlooked is the education which associations themselves provide through conferences, publications, or the opportunity for personal development through committee or other organizational work. It is difficult to assess the impact of such education even for one person, much less for a mass of members, but this contribution of associations should be recognized. David Clift, the late executive director of ALA, commented once on two major reasons why members participate so generously in that association: "to help move along a program or a project for which they have accepted responsibility . . . [and] to find some practical help or some inspiration in solving some individual library problems at home." The broadened perspective which can come from participation in an association is surely a part of professional education.

It may be that with the current emphasis on continuing education in librarianship, establishment of a program for providing continuing education units for participation in workshops or similar programs, and a generally broader definition of education, there will be better recognition of the educational contributions of library associations to their own members. Their concern with formal education usually relates to pre-service education of library personnel, ranging from the ALA's strong program of accreditation to the modest investments made in scholarships by the smallest state or local associations.

Within the past decade, the ALA's Awards Committee made a generally unsuccessful attempt to reduce drastically the number of awards to be given by that association. Reaction from most groups within the membership was strongly negative. It is facile to dismiss awards as being undignified, unprofessional, and/or unnecessary. However, their hearty survival suggests that they are significant in the program of an association. They may serve different purposes; for example, ALA's awards for trustees recognize individuals who have provided unusually effective service and often highlight a library's accomplishment in terms of planning, financial support, or public
relations at the same time. The Catholic Library Association's Regina Medal has, within its comparatively short lifespan, achieved considerable prestige because it has been presented to individuals in recognition of their lifelong contribution to literature for children. SLA's awards of merit—and many others in other associations—recognize a librarian's professional contribution. One thing which these awards consistently provide is "good copy," a positive reason for good public relations emanating from the association.

STANDARDS

Almost every major decision of an association is in some respect evaluative. Publications of reviews of various library materials or of equipment are evaluations. But the term standard has a special meaning, suggesting a norm recommended for all. With some exceptions, standards for performance set by library associations are not enforceable as such, but considerable moral pressure may be exerted once an association has made recommendations and adopted them as standards. Among the most cited standards are those emanating from the ALA’s American Association of School Librarians since World War II. The 1960 publication, Standards for School Library Programs, came at the ideal time for implementation when significant federal funds were first given to school library programs with the passage of the 1963 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Standards relating to formal education and to equipment appear to be the easiest to draft and to implement. Much more difficult are standards for service, but associations have attempted to state these also, often settling for guidelines or recommendations. These have force to the extent that the association itself implements and publicizes them.

LEGISLATION

As noted earlier, library associations work to support favorable legislation on several fronts and several levels. The technique of lobbying is one practiced and, indeed, perfected by many librarians within their own states; however, this is a relatively recent development. Early library leaders often felt that such activity was undignified and inappropriate, or they ignored the possibility of such action altogether. Within ALA itself, there were wrenching internal tensions before wholehearted support was given to a program of federal library development in the late 1930s, and little was achieved
Library Associations

by its early efforts until the breakthrough of the Library Services Act of 1956.

It would be misleading to suggest, however, that only legislation which bears the word library somewhere in its designation is of concern to libraries, librarians, and library associations. For example, revenue sharing, a fairly new concept in federal legislation, has proven beneficial for libraries which succeeded in getting funds through the program; there was also scattered assistance for school libraries under the National Defense Education Act when individual leaders were informed enough and successful in obtaining allocations for their district or school programs. Even beyond those programs, legislation at the national level affecting postage, employment practices, educational requirements, community centers, day-care services, and a myriad other topics demand the attention of librarians. In some states, the legislative agendas are scarcely less complicated, and may be more difficult to follow because of the means of disseminating information about pending legislation. These circumstances have caused some library associations to hire lawyers or others as their lobbyists, and have led to the presently well-staffed ALA Washington Office. In the arena of national legislation, ALA had an early lead over other national library associations, and is still the leader in working effectively with them.

While the dramatic breakthroughs in library legislation are long remembered, constant vigilance is required for a strong legislative program. Political savvy is necessary, including the ability to compromise when appropriate or to come out strongly regardless of the consequences when that is the best course. Library leaders may be skillful in many ways without being able to exercise these abilities, but there appears to be a growing willingness to learn the desirable techniques. Relations with government in general may also be a part of a legislative program, or at least closely related to it. The library associations’ reactions to nominated Librarians of Congress, for example, are not really legislative efforts, but are so much a part of the associations’ relations with the federal government in the executive and legislative branches that they must be included here.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Although local, state or regional library associations may have members from other countries or some interest in international exchange of personnel, international activities are almost exclusively
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the responsibility of the major national associations. The Association of Research Libraries, primarily responsible for the development of the Farmington Plan to provide international resources, has remained strong in this area as co-initiator with the American Council of Learned Societies and the Library of Congress of the P.L. 480 program for the purchase of multiple copies of current publications from developing countries, which are deposited in sets in selected research libraries. The ARL has special projects for bibliography and documentation in Slavic and Chinese research materials, and has participated in the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) and other international efforts.

Typical commitments for the national library associations include membership in IFLA, interest in international exchange of personnel (usually more popular in times of affluence and/or personnel shortages), concern for the development of international standards where appropriate, and communication on a fairly consistent basis with similar associations in other countries.

The ALA has had an interest in international relations from its earliest days, when several of its leaders attended the founding meeting of the Library Association of the United Kingdom the year after ALA's own founding. Assistance to the American Library in Paris and responsibility for the administration of the Paris Library School in the period after World War I are perhaps its two most notable commitments until World War II, which precipitated extensive international concern, especially for developing countries. Foundation support made an International Relations Office possible, but it has not been maintained at the level it was originally funded, and it was dropped entirely in the early 1970s.

The ALA experience illustrates one of the problems with international relations programs of library associations. It is exceedingly difficult for members at the proverbial grassroots levels to recognize the values of international involvements, and they are often suspicious of the world-traveling leaders who encourage them to see this as a responsibility. An association like ARL, many of whose leaders have had international experience or who work closely with collections that require materials from all over the world, does not have this same problem—or at least, it does not have it on the same scale.

**INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM**

Although ALA, with its Intellectual Freedom Committee, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and the Freedom to Read Foundation (inde-
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ependent but housed in ALA headquarters), has probably stressed intellectual freedom concerns more than any other library association, there has been consistent support for this concept from all kinds of library associations over the years. In a generally negative review in 1961 of ALA activities, Ralph Ellsworth had to admit that on the issue of intellectual freedom, ALA's record was "clear, brilliant, and important."29

Intellectual freedom, however, is a concept which has changed as it has been handled by library associations. Strong proponents of true freedom in one area may be ready to compromise in another. Time also changes views on what aspects must be defended. It would be interesting to see what the response of members of a 1976 Intellectual Freedom Committee might be if some statements from early ALA conferences were presented to them. Early emphasis on the need to provide "the good, the true, and the beautiful" in books suggested that librarians should not only be arbiters of taste but selectors of what they judged, in their special wisdom, to be for the good of the public. While many might smile today at the somewhat naive statements made in those early days, it should be noted that some signs of conflict are developing between proponents of intellectual freedom and proponents of social responsibility for libraries. An example is the concern about presentation of racial, ethnic, or sexual stereotypes, usually protested by librarians as socially evil presentations. Literal defenders of intellectual freedom, however, have reacted quite negatively to such protest, and the end of the debate is not in sight. One point, however, is clear: intellectual freedom as a general concept has probably been defended most ably by representatives of library associations in times of stress. With the development of the Freedom to Read Foundation, the library community is better able to provide support to individual librarians under attack for their beliefs than it ever has been in the past. This must be recognized as progress.

Treatment of major concepts in a cursory manner is never satisfactory. It might be preferable simply to list the areas of activity in which library associations have customarily engaged and to allow the reader to provide his own examples or interpretations. That, after all, is an individual matter, and surely readers may disagree with some points made here. Major disagreements with what those major concepts are seem less likely, although expression of them may vary. Any attempt to predict the future will certainly provoke disagreement, however, but the future must be considered when discussing library associa-
tions because they deal with it all the time—not always well, but usually thoughtfully.

Past experience suggests that concerns expressed about the proliferation of library associations amount to little when times are favorable for expansion of programs. Fiscal problems are probably the major cause of mergers or retrenchments in these associations, as in other parts of society. If this is true, the future may hold some mergers or at least a reduction in the number of associations. Edward Holley, writing shortly before assuming the ALA presidency in 1974, believed that federation of associations was more likely to occur than at any time in the past, but he observed: "the price for federation would be a large degree of independence for ALA divisions and a recognition of the continued autonomy of other associations." He was viewing federation as a prospect under the umbrella of ALA. Since then, ALA's change in dues structure has led to more divisional autonomy than has been possible for some years, but it also seems to lead inevitably to the demise of smaller divisions. This may not offer much promise to the small national associations which might otherwise be those most likely to consider uniting in an ALA-headed federation.

The idea of federation was behind the organization of the Council of National Library Associations in the 1940s, but that organization has never fulfilled its promise. Governed by representatives from the major national library associations, it has probably suffered from the same problems that have prevented the full development of the Association of American Library Schools: its members' chief loyalties have been firmly rooted elsewhere. Its failure is tacitly acknowledged in the fact that current discussions about possible federation rarely contain a reference to it.

Another prospect for library associations is this: as members become more insistent on support for placement activities and defense of individuals in matters of intellectual freedom or job security, the associations may become the quasi-unions which Gail Schlachter has described. According to her, "as collective organization and militant behavior become more of a norm in American society, collective organization and militancy will likely become more acceptable and common among professional workers, including librarians." These quasi-unions might not change their names, but simply become more oriented to providing for the economic or security needs of members, rather than responding only to such professional needs as publications, research, or the influence of legislation.
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Perhaps because several of the national associations were offspring of ALA, it may seem historically sound to picture them returning to that "parent", but it does not seem likely. It seems certain that programs of common concern and cooperation will increase, and concerted effort may have more effect, in some instances, when it comes from several points. This is a strong argument for the continued independence of national associations, and the unfavorable economic climate for growth suggests that the era is over in which new organizations develop or segments within larger associations splinter off.

State and regional associations appear to be in a different situation. Tersely stated, the strong ones will probably grow stronger, and the weak ones weaker. Some may not survive, but one good outcome could be the unification of groups such as school librarians into the more generally oriented state library associations. As the National Education Association and its closely affiliated state organizations become more militant, that prospect may be more appealing to school librarians, who are, in some instances, beginning to feel ill at ease as units of state education associations. Attempts at total independence may be followed by more ready interest in becoming part of a library association as a less threatening prospect.

For many reasons, library associations will continue. It is also likely that, as in the past, they will appear to those most knowledgeable about them to change dramatically, and will appear to those on the outside to have altered not at all. With the inclusion of more emphasis on members' individual concerns, their major areas of interest will probably be much the same.
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THE PERIODICAL LITERATURE

In view of the importance of its journal literature to every discipline, and especially in view of the large amount of writing on the bibliographical control, selection, acquisition, organization and technical handling, and general use of periodical literature, it seems astonishing that the library profession has devoted so little attention to library periodicals per se. To be sure, during the past quarter-century several hundred editorials, news notes, and queries about the present and future of particular periodicals have appeared. In the same period, however, fewer than a score of papers have dealt in any depth with their history, status or evaluation. No dissertation has done so, nor has any other book-length publication, although there are several relevant master's theses.

Harvey has pointed out that the literature about library periodicals is “almost nonexistent,” and has suggested some aspects of the topic that need investigation.1 In the twenty years since he wrote, several articles and a few studies have appeared, but the number is still very small, the coverage exceedingly spotty, and very little writing treats thoroughly any aspect of the library press; the few notable exceptions are considered hereafter. What is especially lacking is solid historical and evaluative accounts of our principal journals. If only because of a rigid space limitation, the present article by no means fills this important lacuna; it does attempt, however, to provide a serious, objective overview of the most important groups of our journals.

Such an effort is particularly appropriate since this volume celebrates, among other important events in American library history, the centennial of our first professional periodical, the Library Journal (LJ). (Unlike numerous other American library “firsts,” LJ was not a
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"world first"; Germany produced Serapeum from 1840 to 1870, and Anzeiger fuer Literatur der Bibliothekswissenschaft, with varying titles, from 1840 to 1886.

It would require a substantial volume, or more likely two or three volumes, to treat fully the history and evaluation of even one-fourth of our journals. The first part of this paper is limited to a discussion of some major types and titles and is divided as follows: (1) the status and scope of the field, (2) literature survey and general evaluation, (3) principal national general-interest journals, (4) state publications, (5) national special-interest journals, and (6) journals of individual libraries other than those of states.

STATUS AND SCOPE OF THE FIELD

During the past one hundred years, periodical publications in librarianship have proliferated enormously. One-quarter century after LJ's first appearance, the United States had six additional periodicals. Cannons's Bibliography of Library Economy, published in 1927, covered forty-two. The first volume of Library Literature covered the period from 1921 to 1932 and indexed sixty-five American journals. LL's figure today is over 125—and it is certain that a much larger proportion of publications is not indexed now than was the case in the first volume of LL or Canons's bibliography. Since up-to-date and inclusive lists of the literature are not published, it is safe to say that no one knows exactly how many periodical publications in librarianship there are today. Based upon the listing in Springman and Brown, the number must be at least 800 and may well approach 1,000, although a majority of these are not journals in any narrow sense. New titles appear, if not daily or weekly, at least every few weeks. As these lines are written the first issue of the Journal of Academic Librarianship (JAL) has come to the writer's desk. We have journals covering almost every conceivable aspect, interest, and concern of our field, and every kind of library. Examples of these include: Journal of Education for Librarianship (JEL); Journal of Library History, Philosophy and Comparative Librarianship (JLH); Music Library Association Notes (MLAN); Law Library Journal (LLJ); Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries Quarterly; American Theological Library Association Newsletter; Microform Review; the Bulletin of the Medical Library Association (BMLA); the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom; and the Public Library Trustee. Most state's libraries have at least one publication, some have two or more. There are publications ad-
addressed to regional interests, for example, the Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly and the Southeastern Librarian. Many academic libraries publish journals: The Harvard Library Bulletin, Columbia (University's) Library Columns, and Huntington Library Quarterly. The Library of Congress Information Bulletin, although primarily a house organ, regularly contains much of interest to the profession at large. There are even journals based upon religious orientation, such as Catholic Library World.

A considerable number of writers have deplored the great and uncontrolled growth of our periodical literature. "The deadliest disease afflicting the library press," wrote Moon in 1969, "is proliferation." Moon, editor of LJ for nine years, cannot be accused of trying to preserve his territory from competition, for he was no longer editor when he wrote. In any case, the solid, national position of LJ is not likely to be much affected by the flood of new journals that has continued unabated. Moon also pointed out the resulting injury to the profession: the great plethora of journals "spreads too thinly the limited amount of good material" and "makes it possible for almost anything on the topic of librarianship, no matter how appalling, to find its way into print somewhere."

Shores has voiced the opposite view of the number and proliferation of library publications. He feels that proliferation provides outlets for both the status quo and the activist protest positions, as well as for a range of views in between. He also believes that the more outlets there are for would-be librarian writers, the better; and he seems to fear the exercise of a potential censorship if the number of our journals were reduced. Shores's position, however, seems not to be shared elsewhere. Whatever one's view of the matter, it is certain that the remarkably large number of our periodical publications has been an indirect cause of some of the attacks upon them.

LITERATURE SURVEY AND GENERAL EVALUATION

Almost from its beginnings and to the present, the library press as a genre, has been subject to severe criticism on the grounds that, in Carnovsky's words, "much of it [is] dull, repetitious, and worthless." Carnovsky goes on to underscore the indisputable fact that it is not the journal editors who are solely at fault: "as long as each round table, division, state association, regional group, and special library unit demands its own publication, the proliferation of library periodicals is likely to continue." Many people would call the Library
Quarterly (LQ) our most prestigious and scholarly journal. Carnovsky, a long-time editor of LQ (1943-61), confessed to having "been guilty of accepting too many second-rate manuscripts." Carnovsky reports the editor "of an excellent and highly respected library periodical" asking him if he had a manuscript available or if he could refer manuscripts to him, saying frankly that he needed more material if he were to meet his publishing schedule.

Speaking from the vantage point of an editor of a state journal, Berry writes: "To say that library periodicals lack originality, that there are too many of them, that the material they contain is repetitious, dull and badly written, and that at some levels their contents are not even worthy of the poor paper and bad printing they receive, is only to echo the complaints so often in the professional literature of the past decade that the criticism itself is guilty of the faults it condemns."[10]

"The dearth, the paucity of quality is most noticeable if you examine... the articles," writes Moon in criticizing virtually every aspect of the journal literature.[11] Becker in 1957, Blake in 1961, Katz in 1966, and Thompson in 1961 are among others who have written harsh and unqualified attacks.[12]

Oboler, prefacing "a severely selective choice of... library periodicals," strongly suggests the contrary, in claiming their "vigor, variety, and freedom of expression," and in advancing the belief that "these periodicals and most of the rest are neither duplicatory nor dull."[13] Oboler's view was distinctly in the minority, however, and almost unique in its defense of our journal literature. The profession simply has not produced, and is not likely in the future to produce, a volume of significant, original material to fill even half of our existing journals.

We are not alone here; exactly the same kinds of criticism have been leveled at the journal literature of other disciplines:

There is too much publishing and too little perishing. Most of what is printed in the more than 500 journals related to our field [language and literature] would be better left unpublished. I place the onus primarily on those editors who accept work that is clearly inferior in style and substance. As long as there is an editor who will print mediocre stuff, there will be more than enough contributors to supply the stuff... The typical ms. is on the one hand pretentious and foot-heavy, on the other... superficial and banal."[14]
Although this unnamed writer lays the principal blame on the editor's doorstep, it is arguable that every editor has or feels a compelling duty to keep alive a journal for which he has been given responsibility. If he does, indeed, have this responsibility, and if sufficient first-class material to fill his issues is not submitted, he is bound to publish second- and third-class material—or let the journal collapse. Perhaps this is the key; perhaps more editors—and especially editorial boards—should be willing to face the demise of their journals, or reduced frequency.

Nonetheless, a corrective word is in order. Most of the attacks cited date from a decade or more ago. It is still all too true that there is an enormous amount of duplication and repetition, especially in news notes of all kinds, including personnel, book reviews, and notices and reports of meetings and events. This seems wickedly wasteful. However, the accusations of dullness and unoriginality no longer quite hold water. Much of American Libraries (AL), LJ, Wilson Library Bulletin (WLB), and a small handful of the state journals is not dull and does contain new approaches and ideas. Much of the material in College & Research Libraries (CRL) and LQ is not dull except to those to whom all scholarship is dull; a large proportion of the contents today is highly original and very little (except the book reviews) is duplicatory.

A more recent, excoriating attack on our periodicals has been offered by Wasserman. Wasserman is looking for intellectual and ideological leadership and he does not find it in our journals. The discussion is limited to LJ, WLB, AL, LQ, Library Trends (LT), JEL and Journal of the American Society for Information Science (formerly American Documentation). Speaking of the first three, he writes: "If one seeks to identify a role of intellectual leadership in the general media, he is inevitably disappointed." He further suggests that "their very frequency of issue, their space limits for substantive contribution, their inappropriateness as vehicles for research reporting, and the varied expectations of their large and diversified readership strongly militate against the assumption of such a role."

Later he suggests:

Perhaps the limited standard of the intellectual discourse of the field is most dramatically reflected in the level of its book reviews. . . . For with only rare exception, there is virtually no serious review of the literature of librarianship. Reviews, like librarianship itself, tend to the descriptive and normative account
of contents. The rigorous, analytic, scholarly assessment of ideas is most uncommon. . . . In all American library media . . . the most pervasive feature is the lack of scholarly sensitivity, a glossing over of substance, a type of superficial treatment which conveys a sense that rigorous and critical reviewing is not the business of librarianship. . . . The effect is a periodical literature bereft of the serious analytic assessment of new contributions to the idea flow of the discipline.\textsuperscript{16}

However one defines \textit{leadership}, Wasserman's indictment is a severe one. He may be open to rebuttal here and there, for example in his judgment of LQ, but overall it is hard to disagree.

Carnovsky attempted to lay down standards for library periodicals, but beyond the criteria of accuracy, adherence to the dictates of good English, and the rejection of second-rate manuscripts, he was unable to go very far.\textsuperscript{17} The reason, of course, lies in the widely varying purposes and audiences of the journals. The same standards—other than those just mentioned—cannot validly be applied to the publication of a state library association and to \textit{Special Libraries} (SL), or to LT and WLB. These journals have substantially differing objectives and readerships which go far to determine contents, approach and, indeed, the whole "atmosphere" of the journals.

In 1955, Blough wrote brief histories of sixteen library periodicals.\textsuperscript{18} No criteria for the selection of the group are stated, nor is any evaluation attempted. As the sixteen are covered in only about fifty-three full pages of text, the average history is very short, and many of Blough's data are now, of course, out of date. Carlson also surveyed a group of publications about twenty years ago, this time those of four regional and thirty-two state association journals.\textsuperscript{19} The study is solely an enumerative and descriptive one.

Since its first issue of January-February 1972, \textit{CALL (Current Awareness—Library Literature)} has paid conscientious and comprehensive attention to the journal literature of librarianship. The bulk of each issue consists of a listing of the tables of contents of current issues of journals—usually approximately 300 issues of more than 200 titles. There are also in-depth reviews of new titles and, of special interest here, "Abstracts of the Current Literature on Library Literature." A series of articles in several issues is entitled "Statistical Bibliography and Library Periodical Literature." Several of these report on studies of the "most used," "most cited," "most liked," or "most read" journals.
No comprehensive study of library literature has precisely emulated the pioneering methodology developed for journal articles in chemistry by P.L.K. and E.M. Gross in 1927. Penner employed the consensus technique for library journals, and reports the "votes" of the heads of six Canadian library schools. For several reasons—some of which the author himself refers to, notably the variation in "expert" opinion—this is not a very reliable method of determining "most important" titles. What titles are most important for whom or for what? A group of American deans, similarly addressed, would certainly not have listed Canadian Library in sixth place. Bearing this in mind, however, it is of interest to note that CRL, LJ, LT, SL, and AL received the largest number of votes.

Citation studies by Hart (1950, 2,203 articles), Barnard (1957, 863 articles), Lamers (1965, 4,455 articles), and Little (1968, 5,451 citations) are much more ambitious and more significant. (The inherent weaknesses of citation analysis methodology have been frequently pointed out and discussed, and need not be considered here.) The studies are in agreement in at least three respects: (1) LJ, CRL, AL/ALAB, LQ and SL are in the top ten of all four lists, and American Documentation, (now Journal of the American Society for Information Science), LT—just begun at the time of Hart's study—and WLB are in the top ten of three of the four studies; (2) no foreign title is listed in the top ten of any of the studies (Lamers is concerned with American journals only); (3) the top ten journals account for a very high proportion of all citations—between 58 percent and 85 percent. In the three studies including twenty or more titles (Hart, Lamers, and Little), between 70 percent and 91 percent of all citations come from just twenty titles. These figures conform to Bradford's "law of scattering." Hart's study also included a journal citation from ten "representative" books; the results were substantially the same. By a wide margin, LJ (248 citations), CRL (205), LQ (176), AL/ALAB (173), SL (95), and WLB (74) head the list. No other journal was cited more than twenty-two times.

It is especially interesting to note that the ten journals found by Sumner to be most cited by authors of articles in the international journal Libri also include LJ, LQ, CRL, and LT, with the first three of these ranking behind only Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen and Libri itself.

LJ, LQ, CRL, AL/ALAB, and LT were found to be the top five, with SL and WLB in the next five in a study by Lehnus of journals most frequently cited by authors of articles published in JEL between July, 1976
The top five journals provided 65 percent of all the citations. It is clear that those who write about librarianship refer, in general, to a very small, concentrated group of journals. If referral can in some degree be related to use (and to importance?), there is then fairly hard evidence of which periodicals are the most used and considered most important (or at least most relevant) by our writers.

Herbert Buntrock, interested in the documentation of documentation rather than of traditional librarianship, examined nine abstracting and citing media, not including LL, chiefly for the years 1961 and 1962. Among his briefly reported findings is the interesting fact that even from this limited approach, LJ ranked in a tie for second place and AL in fifth place for number of times cited by the different media. The other American journals in the top ten were *American Documentation Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, SL and *Library Resources & Technical Services* (LRTS).

Somewhat comparable results were obtained by Bundy from a questionnaire returned by 129 public and state library administrators. Among other data, Bundy's findings showed fifty citations to "particularly good" LJ articles, fourteen citations for WLB, and five for AL/ALAB. All other periodicals were cited fewer than five times. Columns and features cited as "most liked" were named 115 times for LJ, 101 times for WLB, and 39 times for AL. It is an interesting commentary that no other journal was cited more than eleven times and only three state journals were cited at all, each three times or fewer. In view of the fact that these data are now fifteen years old, that they represent the view of a very limited group, and that "liking" is not the same as "citing," they must be viewed with extreme caution. In particular, AL has improved and changed more dramatically than the other two and, in fact, today covers certain kinds of material—personnel news, for example—that formerly appeared in the other two only. Journals that do not appear, such as CRL, LQ and SL, contain very little of interest to the public library practitioner.

On the other hand, the findings of Bryan's even older but much more comprehensive survey of the professional reading of 1,837 public librarians did include these three journals among the "very helpful professionally," but in small percentages. Forty-one percent of the respondents viewed WLB as "very helpful professionally"; the figures for the other library journals were: LJ—38 percent, ALAB—21 percent, LQ—8 percent, SL—5 percent, and CRL—4 percent.

Certain journals, such as the respectably solid *Drexel Library Quarterly* (DLQ) founded in 1965, and the *Journal of Library History*,
Philosophy, and Comparative Librarianship (JLH) founded 1966, were begun after or had only just been founded at the time of the studies.

From all of the foregoing, one may say that a list of the journals most cited by the generality of American library authors—the journals probably most generally used—has to include AL, CRL, LJ, LQ, LT, SL, and WLB (which this author has carefully put in alphabetical order). If information science is to be covered, the Journal of the American Society for Information Science must be added. The reader intimately acquainted with the literature may find no surprises here. If he does find any, it may be the inclusion of three popular or mass-appeal titles in a list of those most cited by our writers.

Mention may be made here of the section on librarianship in the compilation Magazines for Libraries by Katz and Gargal.29 The twenty-two pages devoted to professional serials include virtually all of the best and most useful journals, each of which is provided with a perceptive and trenchant annotation.

The most detailed recent description and evaluation of most of our leading journals is that by Westerling. This 130-page study, fortunately available in reproduced form, carefully analyzes all issues of fifteen major journals for the years 1960 and 1969 according to a well developed list of objective criteria. These include aspects of format, editing, contents, authority, scope and treatment. The attention Westerling devotes to the several components of format is somewhat disproportionate, but there is careful and close examination of the other criteria, and the study is the best general evaluation we have. Westerling's basic conclusions, that the periodicals she examined "are less than completely satisfactory," and that overall quality increased markedly between 1960 and 1969, are ones with which this writer agrees.30

NATIONAL GENERAL-INTEREST JOURNALS

There are three national general-interest journals, the first, as already noted, being LJ. It was begun as a result of the interest of and discussions between Frederick Leypoldt and Melvil Dewey, both of whom felt that it was time for the budding profession to have a journal of its own. Before 1876, Publishers' Weekly had published a substantial amount of material on libraries and librarianship, including an occasional "Library Corner" section and, in October 1872 and January 1875, had devoted entire issues to libraries.

The first issue of LJ, dated September 30, 1876, listed Dewey as
managing editor and R.R. Bowker as general editor, and was distributed at the conference that founded the ALA in Philadelphia in October. This first issue and the others in volume one bore the title *American Library Journal*, but the first word was dropped before the title page and index to the volume were issued. More important, the subtitle read "Journal of the American Library Association." Up until the founding of *Bulletin of the American Library Association* in 1907, *LJ* was the official organ of the ALA and published not only its conference proceedings but also the *ALA Handbook*, now called the *Membership Directory* and separately published.

*LJ* is the only one of the three major library periodicals to begin as and to remain a truly general-interest as well as national journal. Included in the first issue were articles on public documents, the profession, international library concerns, and on the establishing of libraries, as well as three departments. News of some libraries in England, France, Germany, Italy and Sweden appeared in a section called "General Notes." Interest in affairs abroad has been a continuous one and was not matched until after World War II in either ALAB, AB or WLB.

Furthermore, the proceedings of the conference in London in 1877 that saw the founding of the (British) Library Association were also published in *LJ*, which remained the official organ of the Library Association until 1882 when the association began publication of *Monthly Notes*.

Although *LJ* began under excellent auspices and carried a subscription price of five dollars, it had serious financial problems in its early years, resulting from the paucity of advertising revenues. Discontinuation was announced in June 1880, but the announcement immediately produced promises of support, and a year later Leypoldt announced that the journal had become self-supporting.

No attempt can be made here to evaluate or detail the history of *LJ* up to World War II. It expanded and improved somewhat, but not steadily or dramatically. It is today a multipurpose, independent, inclusive, broadly directed, usually lively, attractively packaged periodical; there is strong evidence to suggest that it is also the most widely read. It has what is probably the most controversial and spirited editorial section of any major journal. There is a large section of book and media reviews. *LJ* further includes *School Library Journal* (also published separately). Its biweekly (except in July and August) appearance enables it to remain more up to date for its readers than any other journal in the field.
The second of the three major journals is *American Libraries*, formerly the *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, which was founded in 1907. For about four decades, its pages were devoted almost exclusively to news and reports concerning the work of the association, and for most of this period it was a rather stodgy and uninspired journal. It was clearly hoped that publication of this material would increase membership in the association, since the proceedings and papers of the annual conferences, the reports of committees, and the *Handbook* would not be available elsewhere. This hope was not realized in great degree: membership in 1906 was 1,844 and by 1911 was only 2,046.

Since World War II, AL has become an increasingly general-interest periodical, publishing news and articles quite indistinguishable from those that appear in WLB and LJ in addition to material relating to the organization, conferences and work of the association. It has also become, as have the other two journals, a much more lively, readable, socially conscious, and interesting publication, with a vastly improved and more attractive format.

The third national journal of general interest is the *Wilson Library Bulletin*. It was begun as the *Wilson Bulletin* in 1914, an irregularly issued house organ and promotional medium of the H.W. Wilson Company, and for years was sent gratis to anyone who requested it. In 1930 a subscription price of one dollar was instituted; as late as 1955 the subscription price was only two dollars. It not merely announced, described and advertised the company's indexes and other publications of interest to libraries, but frequently cited particular libraries or library uses.

Although this content is not entirely lacking today, it is greatly subordinated to general articles, news notes of all kinds, conference and other meeting reports, and notes concerning exhibits and other practical matters. It is similar in content to LJ, but addresses itself somewhat more exclusively to the practical side of library work.

Undoubtedly the most striking and significant change in these three journals during the past decade has been the abandonment of the position of neutral, professional reporting and the acceptance of social responsibility, relevancy and, most recently, advocacy journalism. This closely related group of changes reflects, or at least parallels, developments and viewpoints which began to be apparent in virtually every aspect of American society in the 1960s. It was abundantly evident in the profession outside the journals, came to a focus in the establishment at the ALA conference in 1968 in Kansas City of the...
Social Responsibilities of Libraries Round Table, and caused the volcanic explosion at the Atlantic City conference the following year when, among other things, the Vietnam war was opposed and the recruitment of librarians from minority groups was advocated.

A few years earlier, in its October 15, 1964, issue, LJ editorially endorsed Lyndon Johnson's candidacy for the presidency, based upon his and Barry Goldwater's voting record on library legislation. (The gold-framed portrait of Senator Goldwater that appeared on the cover of that issue apparently led some readers to think that LJ was supporting him, rather than his opponent.) Many readers believed then that it was quite unjustified for LJ to endorse a candidate for the presidency even when the probable impact upon library service was so clear. It is not likely that many would take this position today.

In writing of advocacy journalism and social responsibility, one cannot fail to note a significant and much earlier example. Just before the ALA conference in Richmond in 1936, Stanley Kunitz, then editor of WLB, wrote an excoriating editorial on the segregated provisions of the conference and the outrageous letter regarding them that ALA had sent to black librarians. This was quite an isolated incident, however, and it had little if any immediate impact. It was not until 1954 that protests from the profession caused the ALA to move the annual conference from Miami Beach to Minneapolis. Subsequently, the winds of change began to blow stronger and more steadily. Articles and editorials in WLB in September and LJ in December 1960 addressed the question of segregated libraries in the South, and in the following year WLB published a symposium on the general topic of segregation. It is not a matter of pride to note that the ALA and its Bulletin were still dragging their feet; an editorial in the latter, in effect, evaded the issue and pointed out simply why the association "is not doing and cannot now do some of the things demanded of it." As late as the early 1960s, too, black librarians could not be members of some of the southern state library associations.

Additional improvement and change in the top three journals (and in a number of state journals as well) have been very great indeed during the past decade, as anyone who picks up a journal of 1966 and one of 1976 can immediately recognize. The improvements are in liveliness, coverage, "relevance," format, and the appearance of non-librarian writers from the fields of literature and the social sciences. Despite these changes, sizable minorities among the most activist
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members of the profession have been far from satisfied. This led to a small rash of generally radical, nonconformist publications of which Synergy (1967-73), its successor, Booklegger Magazine (November-December 1973+), Sipapu (January 1970+, not indexed in LL), U*N*A*B*A*S*H*E*D Librarian (November 1971+), and the Liberated Librarian's Newsletter (1969+, not indexed in LL) are among the best known. Synergy (produced by the Bay Area Reference Center, San Francisco Public Library) was and Sipapu is among the best examples of the alternative, anti-establishment or counterculture, semirevolutionary library press. They have been greeted with something less than wide acclaim by the establishment, and Synergy was killed by the new librarian of the California State Library—which gave support through LSCA funds—on the grounds of “lack of relevance and the brutal competition for available funds.” The first reason seems open to some question in view of the fact that Synergy won the H.W. Wilson Company Library Periodical Award in 1970 and 1972, and the journal received an astonishingly large number of favorable press notices and reviews.

STATE PUBLICATIONS

Before the end of the nineteenth century a number of state library associations had been formed, but none immediately began publishing a journal. By the early twentieth century, however, several associations had begun journals, some of which became and remain significant publications, for example, Bay State Librarian, founded in 1911. The earliest and most numerous of the publications coming from states were those of the agencies: Bulletin of the Board of Library Commissioners of New Hampshire (1895), Indiana’s Library Occurrent (1906), Iowa Library Quarterly (1901), Minnesota Libraries (1904), News Notes of California Libraries (1906), Pennsylvania Library Notes (1908, no longer published), Texas Libraries (1909), Vermont Library Commission Bulletin (1905), and Wisconsin Library Bulletin (1905).

Carnovsky has suggested that the primary obligation of the state journals is to publish (1) the proceedings of the state library association conferences and reports of the state committees, (2) annual statistics of libraries in the state, (3) personnel news, (4) innovations in service and practice, and (5) information on state library planning and on state and local legislative developments.34

Whether through a publication of the library association, the state library, or a state library agency (such as a commission), most states do in fact publish news of libraries, library legislation, and individuals;
proceedings of the state library association conferences; reports of state committees and library planning; and annual statistics of libraries in the state. Beyond this, it is impossible to generalize. The publications vary from newsletters to substantial journals, from sheets of small scope and mediocre format that contain little but local news, to attractive, well-produced magazines with editorials, serious articles of general interest, notes and information on the national scene, and general book reviews. As to "serious articles of general interest," it seems certain that the periodical literature overall would be strengthened if articles like "American Fiction Today" or "The Alexandrian Library" were not published in state journals, but were referred elsewhere by their editors. Similarly, we do not need twenty or thirty reviews of a new novel or even of a new reference work. Reviews of both kinds of publications appear in a number of national periodicals, and it is unnecessary duplication for the state journals to publish them. A majority of these publications probably have limited out-of-state distribution, but a few have national coverage, at least to the extent that they are subscribed to by numerous libraries in other states. In some cases—for example, Kansas Library Association Quarterly Newsletter—subscribers are limited to the membership of the state association.

For financial and other reasons, the state publications generally appear to be in a period of decline. A number have ceased publication entirely, e.g., Arizona Librarian and D.C. Libraries. Others, formerly journals, are now only newsletters, such as Missouri Library Association Quarterly, Florida Libraries, New Mexico Library Bulletin, Bulletin of the Maine Library Association, Montana Library Quarterly, and New Jersey Libraries.

Regardless of this, there is serious question as to the out-of-state impact or use of state publications, although some libraries undoubtedly review reported library statistics for comparative purposes, and may benefit from reports on library planning and legislation elsewhere, but it seems significant that only one state publication appears in the first ten most-cited titles in the studies already noted by Hart, Barnard, Lamers, Little, Sumner, Thompson, and Lehnus. Illinois Libraries is number two in Lamers's study, number eleven in Lehnus's, and number sixteen in Little's. This does not mean, of course, that none of the material appearing in the state publications is valuable; some surely is. The data certainly strongly suggest, however, that librarian writers do not often consult such publications or, if they do, do not find material in them relevant to their needs.
The indexing or nonindexing of state as well as of other journals may tell us little or nothing about the intrinsic value and quality of a publication, but it does indicate something about the general accessibility of its contents. From this point of view, it is interesting to note that the most recent issue of LL available at this writing (October 1975) indexes publications from only thirty-four states.

To single out individual publications from among the nearly one hundred state journals is probably an act of temerity. Nonetheless, a subjective impression gained from extensive sampling suggests that *Bay State Librarian, California Librarian, California School Libraries* (the publication of the California Association of School Librarians), *Illinois Libraries, Michigan Librarian, Minnesota Libraries, Ohio Library Association Bulletin, Oklahoma Librarian, Texas Library Journal* and *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* are today among those that consistently maintain relatively high standards. Since its establishment in 1960, the H.W. Wilson Company Library Periodical Award has been given three times to *California Librarian*, twice to *Ohio Library Association Bulletin*, and once each to *Illinois Libraries, Bay State Librarian, and Texas Library Journal*.

**NATIONAL SPECIAL-INTEREST JOURNALS**

A third, very large group is a category that might be called national special-interest journals—that is, publications of potential interest to any librarian in the country concerned with the particular subject matter. Here we have an *embarras de richesses*. In fact, the bounds of the group are difficult to define; the category, if carried to the ultimate limit of the definition, could logically include almost everything that is not a journal of national general interest or a state publication. Consequently, only a few of the most prominent and best known can be considered here.

These journals may be divided into several subgroups: (1) types of libraries, (2) types of library activity, service or function, and (3) journals of particular subject matter of limited interest. In the first subgroup fall the oldest of all these journals, *Law Library Journal* (LLJ, 1908), *Special Libraries* (SL, 1910), and *Medical Library Association Bulletin* (MLAB, 1911). Also belonging here are *School Libraries* (Sc L, 1952), now *School Media Quarterly*, the publication of the American Association of School Librarians, an ALA division; *College & Research Libraries* (CRL, 1939), of ALA’s division, the Association of College and Research Libraries; *Journal of Academic Librarianship* (JAL, 1975); *Journal of Library Automation*, the official publication of ALA’s Infor-
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formation Science and Automation Division; and School Library Journal (SLJ, 1954), formerly Junior Libraries, published both separately and as a part of LJ. To the second group belong such publications as RQ, (1960), the publication of ALA's Reference and Adult Services Division; Library Technology Reports (LTR, 1965); Library Resources & Technical Services (LRTS, 1957), successor to Journal of Cataloging and Classification and Serial Slants, the publication of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division; and Top of the News, from ALA's Children and Adult Services divisions. The third subgroup includes, among others, the Journal of Library History, Philosophy, and Comparative Librarianship (JLH, 1966); and the Journal of Education for Librarianship (JEL, 1960), the official publication of the Association of American Library Schools. These listings are a bare minimum and could readily be doubled or even tripled.

For want of a better place, three important journals, Drexel Library Quarterly (DLQ, 1965), Library Trends (LT, 1952), and Library Quarterly (LQ, 1931) may also be included here.

All of these journals would rate at least a "B" on the academic grading scale and several of them merit "A." All more or less regularly publish first-rate articles, and all, more or less regularly, publish distinctly second-rate material. (JAL, only two issues old at this writing, is omitted from this evaluation.) Most are today attractive in appearance and "unstodgy," JEL, LQ, LT, and JLH less so than the others. Most seem to be better edited now than they were ten years ago.

LT and DLQ are distinctive among our journals in that each issue of both, under a guest editor, is entirely devoted to a single, rather narrow topic such as "Education for Librarianship Abroad in Selected Countries," "Problems of Acquisition for Research Libraries," "Library Services to the Aging," or maps. There are no news items, no book reviews, no editorials, no reports. Each issue, with a dozen or more contributors writing articles on various aspects of the topic, is comparable to a book, and some issues have become documents of considerable resource importance.

If any of our journals deserves the adjective "scholarly," it is probably LQ. It was established as "a journal of investigation and discussion in the field of library science" by the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in 1931 with an international list of distinguished advisory editors. Certainly no American library journal before it had the avowed aim of publishing the results of research and investigation, and none to this day adheres so closely
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and single-mindedly to this purpose. After the advance publicity, which promised articles of a kind in which other periodicals were not interested or for which they lacked space, the first issue brought a good deal of disappointment. The specifics were pointed out in an editorial in LJ in which it is suggested that, with two exceptions, the articles were ones that would have been welcomed in existing periodicals. Objection was also made to the publication of an important report in condensed form rather than in its entirety. The first of these criticisms was certainly valid, and is worth mentioning because it could be leveled at many subsequent issues of LQ—and at issues of most other journals. But this is not really the important point. The important points are that LQ provided for the first time a medium devoted exclusively to scholarly publication, it did and does provide an avenue for the publication of some writing either of a kind or of a length to which almost all other journals are not hospitable, and through the years it has maintained a high scholarly standard. Except in format, which for financial reasons was considerably altered for the worse after 1970, LQ today is virtually unchanged from its beginnings four and one-half decades ago.

Most of the other major representatives of this large group—JAL, LTR, and JLH being among the notable exceptions—are publications of library associations or ALA divisions which, from most practical points of view, amounts to about the same thing. They therefore necessarily have several basic purposes in common: (1) to provide news and reports on the association's/division's meetings, committee activities, plans, proposals, projects, and the like; (2) to publish reviews of new titles of interest to the membership; and (3) to publish substantive materials in the form of articles, on topics of concern to the membership. With respect to the first two of these purposes, the journals perform comprehensively and in detail. With respect to the third, every critic is a layman in all but a very few of the fields involved, and in no position to make qualitative judgments.

As the oldest and probably the best of the ALA divisional publications, CRL has achieved a solid position, not only nationally but also internationally, as the previously noted citation studies tend to demonstrate. From its first issue in December 1939, it did not limit itself to news and reports of divisional work and meetings, or to "how-to-do-it" articles, although all of these have been and still are present. Even the earliest issues contain scholarly writings and, increasingly, the results of real inquiry and research. An interesting and worthwhile innovation begun in 1966 has been the publication, as a supplement
to CRL, of *College and Research Libraries News*. As its name suggests, the publication includes all of the more ephemeral, less important matters, so that CRL itself contains only articles and other substantive material, as well as book reviews, abstracts and notices.

In contrast, RQ, the newest of the divisional publications, began in 1960 as an exceedingly modest, seven-page mimeographed newsletter that contained neither articles nor book reviews; today it has both. Much of the content, both in subject matter and treatment, is fresh, lively, and of potential interest to librarians outside the division.

*Top of the News*, Sc L, and LRTS are much more strictly limited to the interests of their primary audiences—a statement that is in no sense intended as criticism.

Although there obviously are differences in the kinds of articles published (not only from one journal to another, but also from changes in the editorships of the same journal), another of Westerling's general findings, is worth noting here. In all 1969 issues of the fifteen journals she studied, she counted 61 "philosophically oriented articles" and 398 articles with a "practical or situational orientation." No one will argue that the profession does not need information and guidance of a practical or procedural nature, but the proportion here seems excessive. The frontiers of the profession will not be advanced, its fundamental problems will not be solved, and the many "whys" which it faces will not be answered by "how-we-do-it-good-in-our-library" articles, no matter how numerous, useful, informative and well done.

**JOURNALS OF OTHER THAN STATE LIBRARIES**

The last group to be considered, a small but selective one, consists of approximately fifty journals published by individual libraries other than those of states. A number of commendable former members of the group are no longer published, e.g., the *Boston Public Library Quarterly* and the *Grosvenor* (Buffalo) *Library Bulletin*. The group includes publications from smaller institutions, such as the *Colby Library Quarterly* and *Dartmouth College Library Bulletin*, as well as journals of large universities like the *Cornell University Libraries Bulletin*, Princeton University's *Library Chronicle*, and the Yale University *Library Gazette*. Also included are the *New York Public Library Bulletin* and the *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress*. According to LL and LISA, this group has never been seriously studied. Further, and regrettably, none of these journals is covered by *Library and Information Science Abstracts* (LISA) and fewer than a dozen by LL.
A number of generalizations may safely be made about the journals comprising this group: (1) with few exceptions, they are produced by privately supported institutions; (2) their contents are primarily bibliographic, bibliophilic, and in the areas of literary criticism and literary history, rather than of librarianship; (3) format and editing are substantially better than the average of other library periodicals—all are good in these respects, some are excellent, and a few, such as Columbia University's *Columbia Library Columns*, the University of Pennsylvania's *Library Chronicle*, the University of Southern California's *Coranto*, and the University of Texas's *Library Chronicle*, are distinguished; (4) articles are generally scholarly in nature, often the result of intensive research, and frequently written by national or international authorities; and (5) many of these articles are based upon important additions to or holdings of the libraries.

A final comment seems appropriate. Considering the fact that almost all librarians are constant users of indexes, and are generally critical of documents that do not contain them, it is noteworthy that a number of our important journals do not provide annual indexes. To be sure, authors and subject matter of articles are generally revealed in LL and/or LISA, but this is no substitute for a detailed index. Among the journals that do not have full indexes are JEL, LJ, SLJ, RQ, and WLB.

**BOOK PUBLISHING**

Until well after the end of World War II, the overwhelming majority of publishing in the library field was carried on by the American Library Association (beginning in 1886), the R.R. Bowker Company (1872), and the H.W. Wilson Company (1898), with the Special Libraries Association (1909)—quantitatively speaking—a poor fourth. Up until this time the output of all four publishers consisted almost exclusively of bibliographies, guides, indexes, manuals, texts, and other “tool” publications. Such publications still predominate. The appearance of a scholarly work, such as Louis Shores's *Origins of the American College Library, 1638-1800* (New York, Barnes and Noble, 1935) or William M. Randall's *The College Library* (Chicago, ALA and University of Chicago Press, 1932), was an exceptional event.

Lest the intent of these comments be misinterpreted, it should be said that librarians everywhere could not operate—or could do so only with greatly decreased efficiency—without publications of these
three publishers such as Library Literature and the numerous other Wilson periodical indexes; ALA’s Guide to Reference Books, American Library Laws and the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules; and Bowker’s Publishers’ Trade List Annual and Books in Print.

The situation has changed markedly during the past twenty to thirty years. In the first place, the number of publishers, like the number of journals, has greatly increased. In the second place, scholarly works appear regularly and with increasing frequency.

Although ALA, Bowker, and Wilson still account for the great bulk of library book publication, some newer entrants have substantial publication lists. For example, Scarecrow Press (1950) and Shoe String Press (1952) each have approximately 250 titles in librarianship and bibliography/reference. Both presses were begun by librarians, and were created to provide inexpensively produced, low-cost library publications of a kind or for a clientele somewhat neglected by the existing publishers. Presumably as a result of production economies, the publications of Scarecrow Press, and to a somewhat lesser extent of Shoe String Press, have been characterized by poor format and, what is much worse, by excessive and often inexcusable errors of all kinds. In this latter respect, there has recently been some improvement.

More surprising than the appearance of these two publishers is the activity of a few big-name publishers such as Pergamon Press, Gale Research Company, McGraw-Hill (with its “Series in Library Education”), and Wiley (with its “Wiley Information Science Series”). Furthermore, the original publishing of the reprint firm, Greenwood Press, the output of Libraries Unlimited, and the publications of Linnett Books are all largely if not exclusively devoted to library publications. Microcard Editions, founded in 1961, publishes a useful “Reader Series in Library and Information Science.” All of these have begun during the past two decades. To these names must be added those of a number of university presses, chiefly in institutions with library schools offering doctoral programs: California, Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, and Rutgers, among others, all of which publish scholarly works with some frequency, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—a university without a library school. Before World War II, the University of Chicago was the only one that had any library publishing program at all.

With the exception of those of the University of California and M.I.T., the university presses have yielded, at least to some degree, to the financial expediency of publishing textbooks and other “tool”
works. The usefulness and practical value of such publications is not questioned here. However, almost all university presses are subsidized to some extent, and it would be of greater long-range benefit to the profession if the presses would concentrate their energies in areas for which universities and their presses are uniquely and most fundamentally established: inquiry and research.

Whereas the great majority of the nontool publications of the other university presses are historical, bibliographical, or administrative, those of M.I.T. have consisted of studies that attack the intellectual bases of library and library-related problems. It is no favorable reflection upon the doctoral programs in librarianship that this statement applies to the publications of a university that does not have such a program.

While both Bowker and Wilson have broadened their lists to include publications of a more or less scholarly, nontool nature, in recent years the ALA has changed most in this regard. Sometime during the 1960s the publications list was broadened to include an occasional scholarly study, not necessarily on matters related to librarianship. This development, at least insofar as library material is concerned, has been slowed by ALA's financial difficulties in the past few years. It may be noted, too, that some friends and critics of the ALA find it astonishing and unfortunate that the association will publish books of a general nature, such as those about William Carlos Williams, Robert Frost, and Henry James, when it will not devote funds to the publication of a badly needed professional title, a new edition of its 1943 *ALA Glossary of Library Terms*.

The Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of ALA, will shortly celebrate the silver jubilee of its "Publications in Librarianship" series, formerly "ACRL Monographs." Nearly forty titles have been published, varying in quality from the indifferent to the excellent, but even the least good have brought to the attention of the profession useful information that otherwise would probably not have been made generally available.

The overall intellectual quality of the publications of the American Society for Information Science seems better than that of the other associations, and its *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, in particular, is a work that in all respects compares favorably with similar publications in other fields. As Wasserman notes, however: "Its intellectual forum centers on means, not ends. Its keenest contributors and the lines of their analysis are sharply focused upon the technical issues as if the more fundamental ethical concerns had
been consensually derived, when they have not been."^7

We do not usually think of the Library of Congress (LC) as a publisher in the sense of being a library press, because most of its nearly 400 in-print titles are bibliographies, catalogs and checklists, and perhaps because LC does not always publish what it produces. Nonetheless LC has been producing/publishing for 150 years, and some of its titles are just as much library tools as are similar publications of ALA, Bowker and Wilson. LC's author and subject catalogs in book form must be counted among the most important bibliographical undertakings and contributions.

Some conclusions and evaluations have been offered in this paper, chiefly on the present status of the library press and its development during the past thirty years. A longer perspective also seems worthwhile. Few are alive today who were knowledgeable professionals in 1923, a date about halfway between the founding of LJ and the present. Writing of our professional literature in that year, Wilson had this to say:


Whether there may have been a few additional titles properly belonging to "the core of professional literature" in 1923 is not important. Even if there were, our situation today is almost incredibly better and the difference in only a little more than one-half century is not only of amount, variety, and scope, but also of quality. There is, it is true, still far too much duplication in our periodical literature, and the number of titles is probably greater than we need. Granting further that a good deal of trivia is still being published, and that in neither the journals nor the monographs is enough attention paid to the philosophical and intellectual bases of the profession or the research necessary to solve our fundamental problems, it may still categorically be said that the library press has made a great deal of progress.
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Librarians, 1876-1976

EDWARD G. HOLLEY

When the U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration conducted hearings on the nomination of Daniel J. Boorstin to be Librarian of Congress in July and September 1975, one had a sensation of *déjà vu* about the arguments on "Who is a librarian?" and "What does a library administrator do?" The organized library profession has, in fact, spent much of its first century discussing the qualifications of the librarian, how he or she will be trained, what salaries and other perquisites should be available, whether or not civil service and/or unions would help or hinder the development of qualified staff, the roles of women and minorities, and whether there is a shortage or surplus among the graduates of library schools.

Early contrasting points of view on the qualifications of the librarian may be found in the paper of Lloyd Smith at the 1876 ALA conference, the discussion of the librarian as scientist in the opening remarks of John William Wallace, and a section of William Frederick Poole's article in the 1876 report on public libraries. Smith saw the librarian as the traditional gentleman scholar, a lover of books, aristocratic, steeped in classical and foreign languages and sensitive to the problems of scholarship. Wallace saw the librarian as not only a "valuable minister to letters" who stood between the world of authors and readers, but also as a professional who could bring to bear the chief qualities of science in solving the bibliographical problems then so clearly emerging. Thus, Wallace thought the time had arrived for a new science, "bibliothecal science," and that the promotion of this science through various bibliothecal conferences and congresses organized by a united profession would be of immeasurable benefit to the human race. As a distinguished practitioner of both the scholarly and practical side of librarianship, Poole felt strongly about experi-
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ence in a good library as the fundamental qualification of a new appointee, and he deplored the tendency of boards to employ only local candidates or those who had failed in other occupations:

The directors, if they use the same good judgment which they apply to their own private business, will appoint a person who has had experience; and such a person can be obtained at a moderate salary if inquiries be made at some of the large libraries where young persons of both sexes have been regularly trained. The local prejudice that the librarian must be a resident is absurd, and one which the individual members of the board do not observe in conducting their own affairs. The business of a librarian is a profession, and practical knowledge of the subject is never so much needed as in starting a new enterprise. If a person of experience cannot be found, the best material that offers, resident or otherwise, must be taken. Persons who have failed in everything else are usually the local applicants for the position. Broken down ministers, briefless lawyers, unsuccessful school teachers, and physicians without patients, especially, are desirous to distinguish themselves as librarians. The same energy, industry, and tact, to say nothing of experience, which insure success in other avocations are quite as requisite in a librarian as book knowledge. A mere bookworm in charge of a public library, who has not the qualities just named, is an incubus and a nuisance.

Arguments on such qualifications have raged vigorously over the past century as education for librarianship has moved from apprentice training in libraries, through library training schools in public libraries, and finally to professional graduate schools connected with universities, culminating in doctoral programs to educate librarians at the highest level of research. The library profession in the United States, which followed the pragmatic strain of Poole and the scientific strain urged by Wallace, has often been contrasted to the more traditional and scholarly approach characteristic of their Western European colleagues. Whatever the successes and/or failures along the way, at the close of its first century most major administrative positions in American libraries reflect the increasing professionalization and standardization of librarianship. As John Darling noted in a recent master's paper comparing the changes in directorships of large academic libraries in the late 1960s and early 1970s with similar changes which took place in the late 1940s: “If one wants to be a director of a large university library, he should start early, earn a
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professional library science degree, spend his career in academic librarianship at increasing levels of administrative responsibilities, and worry about it if he hasn’t reached the top by the age of 46.”

When the 1876 conference was held, the number of librarians, however defined, was small. In a table compiled from the 1870 U.S. census, the Commissioner of Education reported that there were 209 librarians in the thirty-seven states and four more in the various territories. Not surprisingly, the largest number (sixty-three) was found in Massachusetts, and the second largest number (thirty-six) in New York. Other states with ten or more included California (ten), Connecticut (sixteen), Pennsylvania (nineteen), and Rhode Island (eleven). Under the circumstances, the fact that 103 persons interested in libraries assembled at Philadelphia to found the American Library Association can be regarded as significant.

Despite the growth of libraries in the late nineteenth century, the number of librarians increased slowly. However, by the turn of the century, when the decennial census first began to provide more consistent data on librarians, the number of librarians was cited as 4,184, and in the intervening seventy-five years the number has increased rapidly (see Table 1). During the same period the number of librarians who were members of the American Library Association also increased dramatically (see Table 2). In 1902 ALA reached a membership of 1,152, its first time to surpass one thousand. That same year, attendance at the annual conference was more than 500 for the first time: 1,018 registered for the Boston and Magnolia (Massachusetts) conference. The largest attendance ever at an annual conference occurred in New York in 1974, when 14,382 persons were present. The membership that year was 34,010.

While census figures are not wholly accurate, they do reveal that approximately one-quarter of million persons are currently working in American libraries. Despite this large number, a recent article by Michael Cooper indicates that professional librarians represent only about 0.16 percent of all workers in all industries in the United States, and only 1.13 percent of the occupational group labeled professional, technical, and kindred workers.

Another article recently analyzed the highlights of a Bureau of Labor Statistics bulletin, Library Manpower—A Study of Demand and Supply, and noted that of an estimated 115,000 librarians in 1970, about 45 percent were school librarians, 23 percent public librarians, 17 percent academic librarians, and 15 percent special librarians. Library attendants and assistants, who constitute about one-half the
### TABLE 1
**NUMBERS OF LIBRARIANS AS DERIVED FROM U.S. DECENNIAL CENSUS INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black Male</th>
<th>Black Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>Total Blacks: 99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>5,829</td>
<td>Information not given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 (assistants)</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1910)</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>8,621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>15,297</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 (assistants)</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1920)</td>
<td>17,576</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>14,714</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>29,613</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>27,056</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>36,347</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>32,546</td>
<td>Information not found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>57,060</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>50,670</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>85,392</td>
<td>12,357</td>
<td>73,035</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>123,549</td>
<td>22,286</td>
<td>101,263</td>
<td>Only figure given: 92% white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (assistants)</td>
<td>126,207</td>
<td>26,207</td>
<td>99,337</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>6,735</td>
<td>2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1970)</td>
<td>249,756</td>
<td>48,493</td>
<td>200,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** In the 1910 census catalogers were included as assistants. In 1920, catalogers were classified as librarians. It is not precisely clear what the term “assistant” meant, but it is perhaps helpful to note that in 1920, some 25 percent of them were under the age of 18. In 1970, the term “assistants” is taken to mean nonlibrarians (supportive staff).

The total number of persons working in libraries, are employed chiefly in public and academic libraries. Projections for 1970-85 indicate that there will be an increase of about 139,000 persons working in libraries during the fifteen-year period, but the largest increase will be among attendants and assistants and not among librarians (see Table 3).

Throughout the century that librarians have discussed their role in society and have attempted to come to grips with problems such as the definition of various tasks to be performed in libraries, there have been cycles of growth and stability. The census data, however, clearly indicate a long-term increase in the number of persons employed. At various times librarians have stressed different facets of problems...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Conference Attendance</th>
<th>Conference Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Waukesha, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>8,848</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>19,701</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33,516*</td>
<td>11,662</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of August 31, 1975.


NOTE: The 1976 Conference will be located in Chicago. The ALA Membership Committee has set a goal of 50,000 members for the Centennial Conference and the conference attendance may set a record for the century.

associated with library development. In the early period there was concern chiefly for the organization of book collections and buildings. Then personnel became a concern as the Carnegie Corporation shifted its attention to the staffing of the buildings it had funded. Finally, the profession began to look seriously at the role of the individual librarian within the environment in which he or she worked. This paper will attempt to highlight in twenty-five-year periods events which reflected concern for the librarian, and will conclude by calling attention to the in-depth studies of individual librarians. Some oversimplification is inevitable in such a process; the picture must be painted here with a broad brush.

1876-1900

Although it is not easy to generalize about the first twenty-five years of library history, perhaps it is safe to say that it was a period of a few giants in the profession. Among the founders, Justin Winsor, librarian of the Boston Public Library and subsequently Harvard, was ALA president for ten years, and was succeeded by William Frederick Poole and Charles Cutter, each of whom served for two years. All three librarians have been the subject of extensive studies in dissertation form, but so far only one has been published. The other dominant figure of the period, except for nonlibrarian Richard
### TABLE 3

**Projected Employment Requirements for Librarians and Library Attendants and Assistants, by Type of Library, 1970-85**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Library Attendants and Assistants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All libraries</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Rogers Bowker, 19 was Melvil Dewey. Unfortunately, Dewey has not yet been the subject of a standard, substantial biography. To be sure, there were other librarians whose names deserve mention, but these figures dominate. William Foster’s descriptions of the five are still apt enough to bear quotation: “They were all needed; the well-balanced wisdom of Justin Winsor, the mellow view of life of William Frederick Poole, the delicate and accurate scholarship of Charles Ammi Cutter, the unconquerable tenacity of purpose of Melvil Dewey, and the clear-headed perception and patient cooperation of Richard Rogers Bowker.” 19 They and their protégés made the major decisions for the emerging profession; it was not until the end of the century that they were succeeded by the newer leaders like Herbert Putnam.

What were the library staffs like during this period? They were often presided over by a chief librarian who had been trained in one of the major libraries of the period, such as the Boston Athenaeum, the Boston Public Library, or the Chicago Public Library. By the end of the period, they were emerging from Melvil Dewey’s New York State Library School at Albany, which had first been started at Columbia and then transferred when Dewey and the trustees couldn’t agree on the matter of the admission of women. To meet the growing demand for public librarians, training schools had been established at Drexel, Pratt, and Armour Institute, as well as at the public libraries of Denver and Los Angeles. 12 Since these training schools could
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supply only part of the demand, the rest of the staff tended to be recruited from the local area, and on-the-job training was a major fact of life for most libraries.

Although the 1876 conference was dominated by men, women became prominent in the library profession quite early in ALA's history. The 1876 conference was reportedly attended by ninety men and thirteen women, but by the turn of the century, the sexual ratio of the profession had almost reversed itself. At the Boston-Magnolia Conference in 1902, women accounted for 736 of the total 1,018 present. Women had been employed in academic libraries as early as 1858 at Harvard, and 1852 at the Boston Public Library. Despite stories of their having asked "Papa" Poole, Lloyd Smith or some other male librarian to speak for them in the deliberations at early conferences, they quickly learned to speak for themselves. As early as 1879, Caroline Hewins, Librarian of the Hartford Public Library, and Lucy Stevens, Librarian of the Toledo Public Library, were ALA councilors.

At the 1877 International Conference of Librarians, the conservative Lloyd Smith had noted that a lady librarian was almost never encountered in England while the majority of librarians in America were women. Both Winsor and Poole strongly supported the employment of capable women in libraries, and Winsor said it was the college-educated woman whom libraries ought to seek for employment in the future.

Some years later, William I. Fletcher noted in his book, Public Libraries in America (1894), that "librarianship affords a fine field for woman's work, and a decided majority of all American librarians are women." He added that precisely one-half of the 100 largest libraries listed in the appendix to his book were headed by women. What Fletcher did not note was that women did not head the largest and most significant libraries. Of the five public libraries listed as having over 100,000 volumes, none was headed by a woman. Among the prominent women librarians in charge of sizable public libraries one must include Caroline Hewins, one of Poole's protégés at the Hartford (Connecticut) Public Library, which had 40,000 volumes; Theresa West, an ALA councilor and vice president the following year, at Milwaukee with 70,027 volumes; and Tessa Kelso at Los Angeles with 29,389 volumes. Incidentally, West was later elected the first woman president of ALA for 1911-12. The American Library Association was considerably ahead of other educational and professional associations in electing women to leadership posts.

JULY, 1976
At the request of the ALA president, Salome Cutler Fairchild prepared a paper on "Women in American Libraries" for the 1904 conference at the St. Louis Exposition. Although she did not read the paper, it was subsequently published in Library Journal. Fairchild had made a thorough analysis of the place women had occupied in librarianship and noted that although they had been quite active in ALA, with a "pleasing lack of self-consciousness," she found their position in the field to be quite another matter. In her survey of one hundred representative libraries of all types, she had asked for data on total staff, total number of women, and relative salaries. Among the twenty-one largest public libraries, nineteen were headed by men, with only Indianapolis and Minneapolis being exceptions. In contrast, out of the thirty-three smaller public libraries, twenty-one were headed by women. None of the free reference libraries, governmental libraries, proprietary or subscription libraries were headed by women, and only four of the twenty-four academic libraries had women as chief librarians. There was considerable discrepancy in the salaries paid to women and men, although the women greatly outnumbered the men on the staffs of these one hundred libraries. Fairchild concluded that "they do not hold the positions offering the highest salaries, and broadly speaking, apparently they do not receive equal remuneration for the same grade of work."

In a paper on the feminization of libraries, Dee Garrison has hypothesized that low salaries of librarians and their poor recognition by society have resulted from the fact that librarianship by the turn of the century had become largely a feminine profession. Cheap female labor and low professional status reportedly go together, and statistical data in the intervening years have not much altered Fairchild's basic conclusions. In his foreword to Alice Bryan's study, The Public Librarian, published in 1952, Robert Leigh noted that: "like teaching and nursing, librarianship has been and still is carried on largely by women. The dearth of job opportunities of equal dignity and opportunity for able women in other occupations in the past undoubtedly accounted in part for the maintenance of relatively low library salary levels, which nevertheless retained good quality of personnel."

For an up-to-date review, Anita Schiller's "Women in Librarianship," published in the fourth volume of Advances in Librarianship, provides a thorough analysis.

As the Michael Cooper study shows, librarianship enters its second century still predominantly female and still predominantly underpaid. Affirmative action may eventually reduce the discrepancies and
make a reality of the ideal expressed by R.A. Peddie at the second London conference in 1897: "I believe that in America women often do the same work as men and I consider that if the work is equal the pay should also be equal."**

1901-1925

If the first twenty-five years of the American Library Association was a period of pioneers and giants, the second began at the Waukesha (Wisconsin) conference in 1901 with almost no attention that this was a significant celebration. That an association about which many had doubts could have survived for a quarter-century and have a membership which reached almost a thousand should certainly have been some cause for rejoicing. Strangely enough, though, the only mention of the twenty-fifth anniversary came in a few introductory remarks in Henry James Carr's presidential address, "Being a Librarian."** Carr, librarian of the Scranton (Pennsylvania) Public Library, took some pride in the association's success in attracting and holding its membership, but he spent most of his address on the fundamental question of whether librarianship was a profession. That was a question which would be raised often in the future and to which Abraham Flexner, who told the social workers in 1915 that they were no profession,** would give a frank "no" in his provocative book, *Universities: American, English, German* (1930).** The tenor of Carr's address was that librarianship has many of the characteristics of a profession and that it really was a profession on which other professions depended for the service of their literature. Carr, however, was fully aware of some of the unresolved problems of librarianship. He noted the necessity for delineating the functions of the librarian as generalist from those of the librarian as specialist. Moreover, he called attention to the fact that librarianship had not yet clearly defined the tasks of the chief executive and implied that many chiefs were still too concerned with details. Finally, Carr said that librarianship needed to formulate some ethical principles like other professions if it was to be regarded in the same light.** This last point was to be considered by numerous individuals and groups in the next three decades, but not until 1938 did ALA adopt its first code of ethics.** Moreover, the difficulty of changing such statements became clear as the century advanced and the 1938 code, long out of date, was superseded by a new Statement of Professional Ethics adopted at the ALA Midwinter Conference, 1975.** The Ethics Committee had been working on the revised statement for more than a decade.
Training emerged as a major concern during the second twenty-five years, culminating in the famous Williamson Report in 1923 and the establishment of ALA’s Board of Education for Librarianship the following year. Indicative of the concern about personnel was an article, “Training for Librarianship,” by Mary Wright Plummer, director of Pratt Institute, which appeared in *Library Journal* one month before the 1901 conference convened. Plummer discussed the instruction being given by training schools and the reasons for it, but her chief concern was the attitude of the profession toward training-school graduates. She took strong exception to those who counterpoised library training and personality as qualifications for library positions for she believed a librarian could have “common sense and sympathy” as well as solid school training. There was considerable indication of prejudice in some libraries against employing library school graduates, and Plummer was also sensitive to the fact that many libraries discriminated against them in promotion. Unless such libraries developed a rigorous examination for entrance and promotion, she did not see how the librarian would know who was competent to fill the professional positions. Plummer’s article was followed by a series of library examination papers from various libraries, and the editor of *Library Journal* noted that “libraries have endeavored to apply the best civil service principles in selecting assistants, and in no profession has there been more marked growth in the standard set for entrance into practical work.” The argument over professional credentials would also be one which still haunted librarians as they began their second century. Could a librarian learn enough on the job to take examinations and demonstrate the same competence as a library school graduate for promotion purposes? The debate continues.

Plummer was defensive about the training-school products and attempted to answer those who said common sense was more important than training. She thought rather that the profession should have both, and would be the better for it; nor was she happy that some administrators offered small or no salaries to the school-trained assistants and cited their lack of experience as sufficient reason. She claimed: “Nor can we have much sympathy with the board of the large library whose recognition of service ranges from the wages paid to cash-girls in stores, through a gradual advance of $25 per year, up to the salary of the primary or intermediate grade teacher, when it expects to secure for this the selected student of the schools.” If there was some maternalism in Plummer’s defense of her students, it
was also a case of recognition that library salaries and benefits were disgracefully low in any case and that excuses for keeping them that way should not be accepted without something said on the other side.

Salaries and benefits, of course, were an early and continuing topic of concern to librarians. At the 1877 conference in London, E.B. Nicholson deplored the low salaries which some British librarians in the provinces were receiving. In line with the perceived gentility of the profession, J.D. Mullins thought there was a reluctance to discuss such matters, but he also thought that the conference could make a major contribution by gathering a list of requirements for library positions and statistics concerning salaries paid in England and America.

Both at the 1877 conference and at the second international library conference in 1897, regret was expressed over the inadequate salaries, especially since they discouraged bright young men from entering the profession. Melvil Dewey, the inveterate optimist, thought that the law of supply and demand would take care of the situation since there was a scarcity of good librarians in 1877; twenty years later Dewey thought librarians would be better rewarded if they performed better. On both counts he had disagreement. Some librarians were not reluctant to add that the prevalence of women in librarianship demonstrated that librarianship was an underpaid profession as much as it demonstrated the field's openness to capable women. The second twenty-five years would see increasing concern with such matters as salaries, working conditions, vacations, and other benefits. In one of the series, "Classics of American Librarianship," Jessie Sargent McNiece collected reprints of articles and addresses on The Library and Its Workers (1929). Most of the articles on salaries, hours of work, vacations, standards, civil service, pensions, etc., appeared in library literature between 1901 and 1926.

One of the pioneers in the efforts for better salaries was William E. Henry, librarian of the University of Washington (Seattle), whose "Living Salaries for Good Service," published in 1919, compared the salaries of teachers and librarians to the disadvantage of the latter. Henry encouraged grading of positions, paying decent salaries, and attracting good people. He was one of the early academic librarians to work out a formula for library staffing, which achieved national recognition by being published in the ALA survey in 1926. More importantly, as an indication of the lag in academic libraries, the University of Washington was the only academic library which reported a scheme of service similar to that reported for public libraries,
with a grade for clerical employees and three grades for professionals, including salary steps and descriptions of duties. With the passage of the Classification Act of 1923, federal employees became even more concerned with their relative ranking in the new scheme. The ALA council therefore created a new Committee on Classification of Library Personnel under the chairmanship of Arthur Bostwick. Working with Fred Telford, director of the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration, the committee was influential in the development of the Proposed Classification and Compensation Plans for Library Positions, an analysis of 170 library positions published in 1927 and subsequently known as the Telford Report. This was a forerunner of numerous classification and pay plans for library personnel developed during the 1930s and 1940s.

At about the same time that these developments were occurring, the concern for training and adequate salaries led to the appointment in January 1922 of the ALA Salaries Committee. This committee was specifically charged with collecting statistics and making comparisons with other professional groups. The first report of the committee, which was chaired by Charles Compton, indicated the nature of the task: "The Salaries Committee's primary object should be to supply ammunition to the librarian in his fight for the development of a favorable community attitude toward better library salaries. The Committee, it would seem, can best do this by making available such facts bearing on salaries as have been indicated in this report." The committee later expanded its efforts to include such personnel matters as pensions and tenure. It began the publication of statistics on salaries which lasted from 1922 to 1943, and was continued after that for academic libraries by the Association of College and Research Libraries. The committee's work included comparisons of librarians with social workers, as well as attention to the needs of library assistants. Its work later embraced the development of classification and pay plans during the 1930s, 1940s, and early 1950s, and has been summarized in several articles, including an excellent one by Hazel Timmerman.

Immediately after World War I, ALA made plans to conduct a massive national survey of libraries. The problem of funding delayed the study, but it was finally begun in 1924 under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The director of the survey was C. Seymour
Thompson, who was assisted by a committee chaired by Arthur Bostwick. Publication of the survey was to be timed to coincide with the ALA fiftieth anniversary celebration. The survey staff distributed to all libraries holding more than 5,000 volumes a detailed questionnaire on the total range of library problems, from administrative through staff to services, both public and technical. Replies were received from about one-half of the entire number and included 1,243 public or semipublic libraries and 261 college and university libraries. Although Thompson regretted the omission of a few major public and university libraries, the data seemed adequate for analysis. Volume one, *Administrative Work of Public Libraries and of College and University Libraries*, appeared in 1926. It contained extensive information on organization, administration, and staffs both of public and academic libraries.

What specifically did the ALA survey discover? Among public librarians the arguments for and against civil service as a basis for employee selection were continuing. Nonetheless, by this time many of the large libraries were wrestling with questions on the criteria for appointment and promotion. A number developed personnel schemes for grading staff, while seven states had adopted some form of certification. There were numerous examples of examinations from various libraries, efficiency or service records had become a part of personnel procedures, and the libraries of New York and Chicago were cited as examples of public libraries with specific analysis of duties, qualifications, and salaries for various grades. According to the statistics of full-time employees in public libraries, less than one-half had enjoyed as much as six months training of any kind. The range was from 55.38 percent in libraries of more than 100,000 volumes to 77.05 percent for those of less than 20,000 volumes. Fewer than one-fourth of the full-time employees in all public libraries were college graduates and only about one-fourth were graduates of either one- or two-year library schools (see Table 4).

Not surprisingly, the academic libraries made a better showing on collegiate education, but those with less than six months training ranged from 31.5 percent to 58 percent (see Table 5). The statistics are based on only 144 replies, and the percentages represent only the full-time staff as was true of the public libraries. Unfortunately, most academic libraries did not define their educational and technical qualifications for various positions, except for the single instance of the University of Washington, as previously cited. Librarian W.E. Henry had worked out his scheme very carefully and had also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Represented</th>
<th>Full-time Employees</th>
<th>Part-time Employees</th>
<th>College Graduates</th>
<th>Two-year Library School Graduates</th>
<th>One-year Library School Graduates</th>
<th>Training Class (at least 6 months)</th>
<th>Less than 6 Months Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries of more than 100,000 volumes</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>2,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries of 50,000-100,000 volumes</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries of 20,000-50,000 volumes</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries of less than 20,000 volumes</strong></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages computed on the number of full-time employees alone
### TABLE 5
**College and University Libraries**

#### Libraries of More Than 100,000 Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries represented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries represented</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employes</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employes</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduates</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year library school graduates</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year library school graduates</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training class (at least 6 months)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months training</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Libraries of 50,000-100,000 Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries represented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries represented</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employes</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employes</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduates</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year library school graduates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year library school graduates</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training class (at least 6 months)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months training</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Libraries of 20,000-50,000 Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries represented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries represented</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employes</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employes</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year library school graduates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year library school graduates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training class (at least 6 months)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months training</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Libraries of Less Than 20,000 Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries represented</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries represented</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduates</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year library school graduates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year library school graduates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training class (at least 6 months)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months training</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *ALA Survey, I*, 1926, pp. 263-64.
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established a tentative basis for determining how many staff members an academic library needed. This formula for the adequacy of the number of staff was based on the number of volumes added and the number of patrons served. Henry's attempts did not gain a wide following, but by the 1950s a number of states attempted to develop such formulas for academic libraries.\(^6^0\)

1926-1950

Although library education is treated in another article in this issue,\(^6^1\) one should note that the third quarter-century of ALA's existence saw extensive Carnegie Corporation grants for improvement of library schools, the affiliation with universities of those schools associated with public libraries (as recommended by the Williamson report), and the founding of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago. The last named event may have been the most significant of all for the long-range upgrading of library personnel. Under the leadership of Louis Round Wilson from 1932 to 1942, the GLS not only pioneered in a new research-oriented approach to library education but also produced studies of fundamental importance to the library profession. Whatever the critics might say (and they were numerous), and despite the extent to which some librarians might talk about "common sense" and "experience" as opposed to education, the Graduate Library School would educate library leaders whose influence on the profession during the post-World War II period would be profound.\(^6^2\)

Also emerging during the 1930s was a concern for work with Negroes and attention to the need for training Black librarians. The history of this development has yet to be written, but a significant event happened at the 1936 Richmond, Virginia, ALA conference as a result of discrimination against Black librarians.\(^6^3\) The association adopted a policy that it would not again meet in cities which could not guarantee equal accommodations for all ALA conference attendees; twenty years would pass before ALA met in the South again. Some of the perceptions of Black librarians concerning discrimination in the profession can be found in essays in two books edited by E.J. Josey, *The Black Librarian in America* and *What Black Librarians are Saying*.\(^6^4\) Table 1 in this article indicates that the number of professional librarians from minority groups is extremely small. Although fellowships under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 have somewhat ameliorated the situation, much remains to be done to recruit Black librarians to the profession.\(^6^5\)
In a forthcoming article on "Library Services to Afro-Americans, 1876-1976," A.P. Marshall has termed the period from 1925 to 1950 "The Sleeping Giant Awakens," and notes that there was a consciousness among Blacks during this period that they must demand the rights of citizenship. Black literacy had increased to 83.7 percent by 1930 with the concomitant necessity to improve library services and extend them to all citizens. There had been some earlier efforts, including the establishment of a Roundtable on Work with Negroes in 1922 and a training program at the Louisville Public Library's Colored Department, which had trained assistants to work in libraries.

Two major figures among Black librarians during the early period were Edward Christopher Williams, librarian at Western Reserve University (1894-1909), and subsequently at Howard University (1916-29), and Thomas Fountain Blue at the Louisville Public Library. Williams has been the subject of a lengthy and impressive essay by E.J. Josey, but Blue's life has not yet been treated in similar fashion. Marshall has noted, however, that Blue's impact upon Negro librarianship was significant. In Blue's thirty years with the Louisville Public Library:

He made his department such a model of service that his contributions there brought him wide recognition. He established training workshops for the library employees, welcoming interested persons from other cities which were interested in the establishment of branch libraries to serve the black population. Such cities as Houston, Birmingham, Atlanta, Evansville, Memphis, Knoxville, Nashville and Chattanooga sent workers to Louisville to receive basic training in library techniques.

Also important in the training of Black librarians was the library school at Hampton Institute, which flourished from 1925 to 1939 and was succeeded by the school at Atlanta University in 1941. Under the deanship of Virginia Lacy Jones, Atlanta University has produced more Black librarians than any other library school. Many of the current Black library leaders are graduates of Atlanta's program.

Significant also in this third period of American librarianship was the awarding of the first doctoral degree in library science to a Black person, Eliza Atkins Gleason, whose dissertation was published in 1941 under the title The Southern Negro and the Public Library. Gleason's study documented the extent of poor or nonexistent library service for four-fifths of the Negro population in the Southern states. Despite some good work in North Carolina, where Mollie
Houston Lee was a leader,71 progress was slow, but the foundation was laid for further progress during the fourth quarter of ALA's first century.

1951-1976

Marshall calls the 1951-76 era "The Responsive Period,"72 but it is apparent that much remains to be done. There did emerge in the 1960s a strong professional stand on free access to all public libraries for all citizens. However, Robert Wedgeworth has indicated that few Black librarians had been appointed to ALA committees in the 1960s and few had been elected to the council.73 His own subsequent appointment as the first Black executive director of the ALA in 1972, and the election of Clara Jones to the post of vice-president and president-elect in 1975 indicate that the struggles of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1960s were not without positive results. If, as A.P. Marshall has suggested, it has taken one hundred years for the Afro-American to become visible in librarianship, perhaps he is also right in asserting that "the second century should make his color invisible by absorbing him into the mainstream of American life, and allowing release of his pentup abilities and emotions, exploding 'the dream, no longer deferred.' "74

The 1930s saw the continued work of various ALA committees concerned with the welfare of librarians, but the depression also gave rise to criticism that library schools were producing too many graduates who could not subsequently find employment. In response to the critics, the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) in 1932 adopted a policy of discouraging new library schools and also encouraged the accredited library schools to reduce their enrollments.75 This ultimately was to have unfortunate consequences. As Charles Churchwell has noted, the primary cause of unemployment among librarians was not an oversupply, but rather the economic crisis caused by the Great Depression.76 While the BEL's action led to a reduction in librarians trained by the accredited schools, there was no comparable action to reduce the number of teacher-librarians from unaccredited programs. With economic recovery and World War II, which saw many librarians leave the profession for either military service or better-paying jobs, a shortage of trained librarians developed.77 Much of the post-World War II period was to be concerned with the recruitment and training of librarians. The expansion of libraries in the 1950s and 1960s would cause severe personnel shortages before leveling off in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

[194]
One of the major problems along the way was that of the school-librarian. Although everyone recognized the need for libraries in elementary and secondary schools, and although they were included in state and regional accreditation standards as early as the 1920s and 1930s, their relationship to the main body of librarians remained nebulous at the end of the century. From the beginning, many of the school library leaders have proclaimed that school librarians should be trained as rigorously as other kinds of librarians, since they needed to know far more than just the principles and practices of librarianship. The problem is how this can be achieved.

At first the school-librarian was the solution, a sort of intermediary point between teaching and librarianship. An individual could obtain a teaching certificate with an option in librarianship by taking some minimum number of courses at the undergraduate level. Many school librarians were trained in teachers' colleges and their relationship to the main body of the profession was minimal at best. Although the profession has grappled with the problem over the years, it has not been solved. In late 1967, the ALA received a grant of more than $1 million from the Knapp Foundation for a study of the varied tasks performed in school libraries and the appropriate training and education to prepare for their performance. The first report of this five-year project, *Curriculum Alternatives: Experiments in School Library Media Education*, appeared in 1974. As a recent reviewer has noted:

> While this project represents another major step in school library development, it suggests many significant questions yet to be addressed seriously by the library profession. “Should library education at the undergraduate level be eliminated or continued and improved? Should it be designed chiefly for school media specialists or should it prepare personnel for positions as library associates in all types of libraries?”

The final assessment of the Knapp School Library Manpower Project, which appeared in 1975, listed many unresolved issues, but ended on a hopeful note: “the School Library Manpower Project set out to produce changes in the profession. It has done that, but at a considerable cost in time and effort. The development of new educational programs is a slow, time-consuming, and often painful process. But it can be done and it is worth doing.”

The post-World War II period was a time of rapid growth for libraries. With the encouragement of the federal government through the GI bill, thousands of veterans returned to campuses and
swelled college enrollments. The expansion of higher education, stemming in part from the research efforts conducted by universities during the war, would continue for three decades. Among the concerns of academic librarians was their place under the higher education sun. Arguments on the virtues and drawbacks of faculty status had risen to a crescendo by the end of the fourth period. ACRL published two monographs on the subject, numerous articles, and in 1975, a collection of policy statements. Included in the last-mentioned document was a Joint ACRL-AAUP “Statement on Faculty Status” which was adopted in 1973.

Collective bargaining was also emerging as a factor in the academic librarian's struggle for status and salaries comparable to the perquisites of his teaching colleagues. Much of the union activity to date has occurred in public libraries. Theodore Guyton, in his recent book, Unionization: The Viewpoint of Librarians, notes that library union activity has gone through three stages in this country: 1917-20, 1934-49, and 1960 to date. By far the most significant of these periods in terms of membership, agreements negotiated, and impact upon the profession, has occurred since the mid-1960s. Although union membership is still relatively low among librarians, the degree of unionization is increasing and the decision of AAUP to enter the collective bargaining arena will undoubtedly have a major impact on academic librarians.

In 1951 the American Library Association celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary just after the publication of several volumes of a survey called the Public Library Inquiry. Directed by social scientist Robert Leigh under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the Public Library Inquiry was intended to provide a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the American public library. It reportedly was to provide more data than any yet collected on major topics of interest to public librarians. Because of widespread interest in the results, the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago devoted its 1949 conference to a forum on the inquiry. Among the reports discussed at that conference was Alice I. Bryan's The Public Librarian, although the book itself did not appear for another three years. As Amy Winslow noted in her comments on the study, “Most of us will find the results depressing.” Although there had been progress in the education of staffs since the 1926 survey, many of the same problems remained. The library profession was still 92 percent female, the shortage of librarians was compounded by the inadequate salary levels, clerical duties continued to predominate,
and public librarians were rarely community leaders. Moreover, only 58 percent of the professional librarians held college degrees and, in spite of pressures, only 40 percent held a fifth-year degree in library science. Not surprisingly, administrators responding to the survey admitted that their major personnel problems were securing qualified persons, and low and inadequate salaries. Foreshadowing the debates that would accompany subsequent discussion of the ALA Manpower Statement, Bryan noted a lack of definition of the middle-level position (between the professional librarian and the clerical workers) which had been designated “subprofessional librarian” and recommended that it be eliminated. She also suggested a new non-professional category called the “library technician,” who would hold a four-year degree and have some courses in library science. Thus did Bryan deal with the perennial problem of how to define supportive staff and create levels of responsibility in which they could work creatively.

During the 1950s and 1960s librarians continued to be concerned about the problem of attracting the “best and the brightest” to the library profession. Library schools expanded, salaries improved, but the perennial problems of adequate definition of the various tasks performed by librarians remained. At the 1961 Chicago GLS conference on “Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship,” Ralph Parker read a paper on “Ports of Entry to Librarianship.” Parker noted that there was only one recognized entry: the graduate library school. However, people became librarians through many other avenues, e.g., the undergraduate library science programs, from faculty positions either in colleges or schools, and from non-professional library positions into which some capable people had often drifted. He accused professional training of being educationally unsound without an undergraduate program; perhaps more important, however, was his concern that delayed entry to graduate work often meant that the best students were lost to librarianship.

Agnes Reagan, who was to review the following year the reasons people became librarians, was the discussion leader for Parker’s presentation. She did not agree with his emphasis on undergraduate study in librarianship, and noted that there was demonstrated value in recruiting older individuals as well as the bright youngsters to the profession. The difference between the performance of the library school graduate and the non-library school graduate had not been determined objectively, but she did note that the former group seemed to be more mobile and more active professionally.
In her own research Reagan cited the earlier data of Alice Bryan, as well as numerous other studies. Librarians chose their profession for a variety of reasons: love of books and people have been traditional reasons and still predominate on most library school applications. However, Reagan noted that a number of studies indicate that some persons enter librarianship because it will supplement or satisfy a major interest they could not pursue otherwise, and the field itself offers a reasonable possibilities for good positions and advancement. Those reasons which emerged in the 1950s have particularly appealed to some recent Ph.D. holders who cannot find jobs teaching English or history. One should note that such reasons did not first appear in the early 1970s. Intellectual stimulation for such individuals also ranks high, and this is often allied to the desire to use previous academic training.

One new category of personnel which emerged in large academic libraries in the 1960s was the subject area specialist, an individual with training in a subject discipline as well as in librarianship, who could provide bibliographic or reference service in greater depth than the traditional librarian. Whether or not steady-state financing will affect the continuation of such expertise in libraries is a question, but a number of those now switching to librarianship from other disciplines hope to use their previous training in their second professional choice.

Throughout its history the library profession has been plagued with an inability to define precisely what differences exist between the responsibilities of the professional staff and those of other persons who work in libraries. In 1965, through a grant from the H.W. Wilson Foundation, the ALA established an Office for Library Education, one of whose objectives was to try to determine these differences and to develop guidelines for the training and education of library personnel at all levels. The eventual result was a policy statement, Library Education and Manpower, approved on June 30, 1970. For many librarians who had long struggled with this problem, this seemed to be the answer. Categories of personnel, both professional and supportive, were delineated in considerable detail (see Table 6). The statement defined the first professional degree for all librarians as being the master's and indicated that henceforth the title "librarian" should no longer be used indiscriminately to designate all who work in libraries. Despite the fact that regional hearings were held and voluminous correspondence took place before its issuance, the policy statement continues to evoke controversy and its proposals
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have by no means been accepted by all librarians. In view of the years of struggle involved in the writing of such a document, such disagreement appears unfortunate as librarianship enters its second century.

Much of the foregoing discussion has dealt with how librarians have looked at themselves, their roles, and their perquisites in society. Yet that kind of approach must be supplemented by a humanistic look at the individuals themselves, who provide fascinating glimpses of our professional history. Unfortunately, there have been few biographical studies which really interpret the lives of library pioneers; even the long biographical essays often leave much to be desired. As Michael Harris has noted in his book, *A Guide to Research in American Library History*, most of the substantial work along this line has been accomplished in pursuit of the doctoral degree. He lists some thirteen librarians or library benefactors who have been the objects of such doctoral research. Of those thirteen, only four have yet been published: Holley's *Charles Evans*, William L. Williamson's *William Frederick Poole*, Laurel Grotzinger's *Katharine Lucinda Sharp*, and Charles H. Baumann's *Angus Snead MacDonald*. John Cole's work on Ainsworth Rand Spofford has been published in several articles, and Peggy Sullivan's biography of Carl Milam is scheduled to be published in 1976.

Not to be overlooked in any discussion of major library figures is the earlier biography of Richard R. Bowker by E. McClung Fleming and Maurice Tauber's work on Louis Round Wilson. Because of their impact on American librarianship, the biographies of two English librarians, *Edward Edwards* by W.A. Munford, and *Antonio Panizzi* by Edward Miller should also be mentioned.

In deploiring the absence of monographic treatment one can only note that the situation has improved during the past decade. The library historian welcomed the perceptive sketches of William Brett and Linda Eastman in C.H. Cramer's history of the Cleveland Public Library, as well as the important study of William Fletcher by George Bobinski. Moreover, 1976 promises the publication of the *Dictionary of American Library Biography*, which will include some 300 biographical sketches written by experts in the field.

It is regrettable that the profession enters the second century without a definitive biography of Melvil Dewey, and that major work on Justin Winsor and Charles Ammi Cutter remains embalmed in dissertations. Library biography has gone through the stage of sketches by friends and colleagues, memoirs and collected letters, and
TABLE 6
CATEGORIES OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL—PROFESSIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>For positions requiring:</th>
<th>Basic Requirements</th>
<th>Nature of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library-related qualifications</td>
<td>Nonlibrary-related qualifications</td>
<td>In addition to relevant experience, education beyond the M.A. [i.e., a master's degree in any of its variant designations: M.A., M.L.S., M.S.L.S., M.Ed., etc.] as: post-master's degree; Ph.D.; relevant continuing education in many forms</td>
<td>Top-level responsibilities, including but not limited to administration; superior knowledge of some aspect of librarianship, or of other subject fields of value to the library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Librarian  Specialist  Master's degree  Professional responsibilities including those of management, which require independent judgment, interpretation of rules and procedures, analysis of library problems, and formulation of original and creative solutions for them (normally utilizing knowledge of the subject field represented by the academic degree)

---

a few short works to celebrate either the fiftieth or seventy-fifth anniversary of ALA, but we shall continue to have only the skeleton of our professional history, and not the personality, until we have more good interpretive studies. In view of the contributions of some of these men and women, our lack can only be a matter of profound regret. Perhaps aspiring library historians in our second century will do better.
## Categories of Library Personnel—Supportive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Basic Requirements</th>
<th>Nature of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Associate</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree (with or without course work in library science); OR bachelor's degree, plus additional academic work short of the master's degree (in librarianship for the Library Associate; in other relevant subject fields for the Associate Specialist)</td>
<td>Supportive responsibilities at a high level, normally working within the established procedures and techniques, and with some supervision by a professional, but requiring judgment, and subject knowledge such as is represented by a full, four-year college education culminating in the bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td>At least two years of college-level study; OR A.A. degree, with or without Library Technical Assistant training; OR post-secondary school training in relevant skills</td>
<td>Tasks performed as supportive staff to Associates and higher ranks, following established rules and procedures, and including, at the top level, supervision of such tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Business school or commercial courses, supplemented by in-service training or on-the-job experience</td>
<td>Clerical assignments as required by the individual library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Librarianship in the New World and the Old: Some Points of Contact

W. BOYD RAYWARD

The aim of this paper is not to examine foreign influences on American librarianship, for although these influences did exist, despite isolation, they were thoroughly absorbed and transformed. Nor is the nature and extent of the influence abroad of mature American librarianship at issue, although in some regions of the world this has been profound. The purpose of the paper is less formal: it is to touch selectively upon points of contact between the librarianship of the old world and of the new in order to indicate modes of interrelation and channels of influence through which different kinds of effect have been produced. The presence of significant individuals, the cooperative development of tools, techniques and organizations, and threads of ideas and influences that have contributed to the creation of the complex phenomenon of American librarianship are the subjects of this discussion.

BEFORE 1876

Both during the later part of the colonial period and afterward in the United States, whenever there was an acknowledged need for libraries, they were established in form little different from those in England. They were, although small, a necessary part of the colleges gradually erected in each of the colonies and states. As local and state scientific societies and institutes were created and began to sustain some healthy signs of life, they collected books and specimens which led to the formation of libraries and museums. Occasionally public libraries attached to village and town governments were created as a result of gifts and bequests, but they were, in general, little used before mid-century and continuous support was not provided for
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them. Above all, subscription and circulating libraries appeared in the eighteenth century and persisted well into the nineteenth as they did in England. Benjamin Franklin's Library Company of Philadelphia grew out of his attempt to provide a library for the scientific discussion and debating society, the Junto; later there were commercial rental libraries in bookshops and subscription libraries or social libraries of various kinds, some for the use of scholarly and wealthy men, many for the use of working-class youths and clerks, shopkeepers and mechanics. Shera and Joeckel have discussed them, and in organizational patterns and range of function and clientele they are little different from their counterparts in England described by Kaufman, Kelly and Altick.

It is interesting to note that the public library in its modern, freely accessible, tax-supported form emerged both in the United States and in England in the mid-nineteenth century. Underlying its foundation in both countries were a number of similar beliefs, but it is not clear there was much, if any, mutual influence. There was something local, gradual, piecemeal about the evolution of public libraries in the United States; Britain's rigidly defined social structure, central parliament, and blanket enabling legislation produced the Public Libraries Act of 1850, which was drafted to extend the provisions of the Museums Act of 1845. After the establishment of the Boston Public Library, the public library movement developed more swiftly and variously in the United States and, at least until after World War I, was more successful than in Britain, although the difficulty of making comparisons between the two nations in this matter should be recognized. In both countries, however, the public library was seen as helping to complete the educational system as it then existed. It was considered to be a source of solid and nourishing intellectual food for a class of persons only just advanced to the stage of readiness for such sustenance. It was believed that by providing a selected collection of books, public libraries were a useful, if novel, apparatus for encouraging that self-knowledge which would lead to heightened respect for the existing social order and contented acceptance of one's place within it. Moreover, the public library presented a beguiling alternative to the temptations of drunkenness, criminal folly and vice. Above all, it was widely accepted in both countries that public libraries could offer significant aid in preventing public disorder: "The principal argument in favor of rate-supported libraries was that they were the cheapest insurance against a revival of the public disorders which had lately culminated in the Chartist alarm of 1848."

[210]
Michael Harris has explored at some length the patrician attitude of the Boston Brahminate towards the common man. He has argued that the founding of the Boston Public Library by Everett, Ticknor, and others—the event from which the public library movement in the United States is generally seen as stemming—was not a philanthropic expression of a Jacksonian, democratic belief in the essential goodness and perfectibility of the working man. In his view, it partly expressed a deep-seated fear of the consequences of the immigration to Boston of a large body of Irish peasants fleeing famine. Libraries were one of the instruments of social control available to the authorities, although, of course, useful only against the literate. Harris contends that behind both the founding and subsequent development of public libraries in nineteenth-century America lay the firm belief of an authoritarian, intellectual and power elite that the common man, like his counterpart in Britain, was to be distrusted and had to be educated sternly and for his own good by his betters. It was necessary that he be able to read and have uninhibited access to improving literature to ensure his continued moral development and effective socialization. In this way he would be protected from demagoguery and the havoc that could be wrought by ignorance and disaffection in a society in the throes of accelerating change.

If the old-fashioned view of the public library smacks too much of sweetness and light, the revision proposed by Harris is salutary, although in itself not sufficient as complete explanation, nor surprising if one examines the context of the time or is aware of English parallels. What is important from the point of view of this paper, however, is that the public library movement in the United States particularly was as much a library movement as it was public, and was informed by reference abroad. In England, continental librarians testified before the select parliamentary committee that inquired into library provision in 1849 and Edward Edwards buttressed their observations by vast compilations of statistics. This was a typically British procedure, facilitated by the presence of some of the foreign experts already in England (for reasons of political expedience). Only Alexandre Vattemare had come to the United States, finding throughout the country a lack of libraries in which he could arrange to deposit foreign publications. In 1841 he suggested that a number of existing libraries combine to form the public institution he thought a city like Boston needed, which created a flurry of interest and was acknowledged to have played a considerable part in the city's eventual authorization of the formation of a public library seven years later.
If the presence of foreign library experts was minimal in the United States, knowledge of foreign libraries was not. A group of well-to-do, scholarly citizens had begun to take the American equivalent of the grand tour of Europe and were soon poignantly aware of the absence of adequate libraries at home to support the scholarly research and writing in which they wished to engage themselves. The excitement generated by their exposure to the great universities and libraries of Europe is conveyed in the letters they wrote home and in what they attempted to achieve on their return. Longfellow, for example, writing from Göttingen to his father, reviewed his experiences in Europe and was emphatic that universities on the German model, not colleges, were what the United States required, and declared: "let the Library be made public. . . . Let a librarian be appointed by the town, with a moderate salary. Let his duty be to attend the library rooms daily—morning and afternoon. Let the Library rooms be furnished with tables and chairs—and writing materials:—then throw open its doors—and let it be as public as the town pump." Fifteen years before Vattemare had suggested that Boston should have a public library, Ticknor had made a similar suggestion, but his mind had been filled with the educational potential of such an institution for all of the public. His model was Göttingen:

I have a project, which may or may not succeed; but I hope it will.

The project is, to unite into one establishment, viz. the Athenaeum, all the public libraries in town; . . . and then let the whole circulate, Athenaeum and all. . . . To this great establishment I would attach all the lectures wanted, whether fashionable, popular, scientific—for the merchants or their employees; and have the whole made a Capitol of the knowledge of the town, with its uses, which I would open to the public, according to the admirable direction in the Charter of the University of Göttingen.14

As Borome has said, "The serious student turned a longing eye toward Europe and the well-selected and invaluable" libraries in the major centers there. By 1846, he says, "the striking inadequacies of American libraries had more than once been the subject of public, not to mention private, regret, and the North American Review had called for remedial treatment."15

At this time, three notable figures helped to mediate the bibliothecal experience of Europe and the new world. Of these, Vattemare is perhaps of least interest, but he had some influence in
The New World and the Old

promoting the development of libraries (although upon no particular model) in the United States. Moreover, his scheme for implementing worldwide exchange of publications had some impact on the occasions of his two visits in the early 1840s and in 1848-49.16

The other two figures of the period who stand out as having interests spanning the two worlds and whose influence reaches beyond the period of 1876 are Henry Stevens of Vermont and Charles Coffin Jewett. As librarian at Brown University, Jewett visited Europe to purchase books and, seizing the opportunity thus presented, made it his business to study European librarianship in practice and to make the acquaintance of librarians such as Antonio Panizzi, the controversial Keeper of Printed Books and later Principal Librarian of the British Museum, with whom he formed a sturdy friendship. Jewett has a dual importance in the context of this paper. His work may represent the beginning of systematic book-collecting in Europe for American university libraries; he is therefore a forerunner of the more aggressive righting of the bibliothecal balance between Europe and the United States conducted by the recently established University of Chicago in the 1890s and by the University of Texas, among others, after World War II. Perhaps more important, however, is Jewett's work as assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. It is difficult to say how much of what he attempted to do at the Smithsonian, ultimately so unsuccessfully, was influenced by his study of the British Museum Library and his knowledge of Panizzi’s work. Certainly, Panizzi’s famous “ninety-one rules” had considerable impact in America and influenced Jewett’s preparation of his own cataloging rules, which were intended to facilitate the construction of a national union catalog by a method of stereotyping titles.17 However, Jewett’s vision of the Smithsonian as a great national library, deriving much of its collection from copyright deposit and housing a carefully constructed catalog representing the nation’s bibliographical riches, similar to Panizzi’s vision of the role of the British Museum Library, but with appropriate differences. Jewett’s desire to formulate a nationally accepted code of rules was not merely a precursor of the codes promulgated in and after 1876 by the American Library Association, the (British) Library Association, and the Library of Congress, but was one of the channels through which foreign library practice was introduced into the United States and transformed.

Even more instrumental in facilitating the flow of European books—sometimes in the form of complete libraries—to the United
States was Henry Stevens of Vermont. He had arrived in London in 1845 and his subsequent career was brilliantly successful. He became the British Museum's agent for American books, and later the London agent for the Smithsonian Institution. For the British Museum, he was responsible for seeing that it acquired a copy of every important American work. For the Smithsonian, he distributed materials from the exchange service to participating English libraries and dispatched gifts of books to Washington. He was a conduit not only of materials but of professional knowledge. He testified about the American experience before the 1849 select parliamentary committee inquiring into library provision in Britain. His emphasis on the superior literacy of the American reading public and the vigorous movement to create public libraries in the United States may have had some influence in its implications of inferiority of the English system.

Not only was he intimately acquainted with such famous British and American librarians as Panizzi and Jewett, he was sympathetic to and well informed about library problems, not least about matters of the bibliography and cataloging of rare books. He prepared a catalog himself and was involved in the preparation of a number of others. He was actively engaged in the 1877 conference of librarians in London at which the Library Association was formed. His paper "Photobibliography" was widely discussed at the conference; his biographer has suggested that it revived many of the ideas Jewett had formulated a quarter-century earlier on the subject of national bibliography. Stevens's career (he died in 1886) spanned the adolescence and young adulthood of American librarianship and he contributed to the growth of scholarly libraries both in the United States and in the United Kingdom, and to mutual bibliothecal understanding.

Curiously, there are few careers similar to Stevens's in their wide experience of and personal contacts in book and library circles both in Europe and the United States. One which deserves mention, however—because it provides a complement to Stevens's Americanness and antiquarianism—was that of Cedric Chivers in the next generation. Chivers was not so much a rare book dealer as he was a bookseller and library jobber. He acted for a time as the London representative of the Boston-based Library Bureau, and in this capacity supplied Paul Otlet and Henri La Fontaine with their first copies of Dewey's Decimal Classification, from which they developed the Universal Decimal Classification. His principal achievement, however, was the invention of a swift, relatively inexpensive mechanized method of binding. In pursuit of his various professional and
commercial interests he allegedly crossed the Atlantic 120 times in the course of his life (1856-1924), and visited more public libraries in the United States than any other man. The effects of such peripateticism are imponderable but are unlikely to be negligible.19

AFTER 1876

John Metcalfe, an Australian librarian vitally aware of the influence of American librarianship on antipodean library provision, has described 1876 as an annum mirabilis. It was the year of a massive official survey and report on libraries in the United States. It saw the publication of Cutter's Rules for a Dictionary Catalog, an edition of Melvil Dewey's Decimal Classification, the founding of the American Library Association and the creation of a professional voice, the Library Journal. In a sense, 1876 is the year of the majority of librarianship in the United States. Henceforth the dictionary card catalog, which contained subject entries formulated according to Cutter's rules for specific entry, would become standard throughout the country. The Decimal Classification continued to be widely adopted for the arrangement of books on shelves, and only the development at the turn of the century by the Library of Congress of a program of national bibliographic activity as an extension of its own much expanded work was lacking to complete a picture whose outlines have remained largely the same to the present.

Henceforth, too, there was less looking abroad for example. The pattern of foreign relations gradually modified to the present formalization of international cooperation in terms of nongovernmental activities mediated by the American Library Association and governmental activities mediated by the Library of Congress or other U.S. government agencies. At first, there was little formality. The trip of a group of distinguished librarians to the international library conference in London in 1877 has been described as a "great junket."20 Individually and collectively, this group had some influence on their English colleagues who had mixed opinions about their generally more liberal attitudes toward professional matters; nor was it by chance that the Library Association was formed on this occasion.

The importance of the 1877 conference lies in the fact that it was the first in a series that became one of the most important points of contact between the librarianship of the new world and the old. The annual conferences of the two associations became forums for exchange of information and for the extension of personal acquaint-
ance, and the relationship between the two was further intensified, at least in the early years, by the *Library Journal*'s role as the professional organ for both associations. Later, American representatives attended other kinds of professional conferences—most notably those of the International Institute of Bibliography, which became the International Federation for Documentation, and the meetings of the International Library and Bibliographical Committee, which became the International Federation of Library Associations. After World War I, an international forum both for discussion and work in librarianship and bibliography was created through these organizations and the League of Nations Committee and Institute for International Intellectual Cooperation. Although the United States did not join the league, Americans took an active part in the international institute's work. From this emerged a pattern of international meetings and activity that continues today in UNESCO and allied international organizations.

It is interesting that in the early years, when attending conferences was largely a matter of exchanging official and unofficial delegates at English and American annual meetings, not only positive understanding was achieved; the existence of significant differences between the librarianship of the two countries also became evident. Tedder described them in 1882 in this way:

> Whereas the A.L.A. is exclusively practical and technical, the L.A.U.K. has devoted considerable attention to the history of libraries, and some regard to bibliography has justified the retention of that subject as one of our main objects. . . . The American conferences . . . are more interested in methods of actual library management than in bibliographical museums or other curiosities of librarianship. The L.A.U.K. is constituted upon the lines of the antiquarian and scientific societies familiar to the Englishman, with frequent meetings in London . . . and yearly gatherings in different parts of the country . . . One of the best features of the L.A.U.K. is that, while it has always maintained its distinct professional character, it has the advantage of being able to attract a very large number of persons not connected with library management but deeply interested in library work, and who have given to our discussions a certain breadth of tone that might have been wanting had librarians alone taken part in them.21

One major influence in American librarianship mentioned earlier grew stronger as the nineteenth century progressed. Germany was
recognized as preeminent throughout the world in tertiary education; American and English youths (like Ticknor and Longfellow among hosts of others) flocked there for what Predeek has called "the honor" of a German academic degree. In Germany they were able to study subjects of scholarly investigation long neglected at home, and enthusiastically to obtain experience of new methods of research and criticism. Particularly important was the enormous impetus given to the development of the sciences and social sciences. Although the American colonies and states had built colleges often quite early in their development, these colleges had limited curricula. Their libraries were small and would have inhibited research had there been any urgent desire to conduct it. Instruction tended to be by means of textbooks to a student body which was almost entirely undergraduate. The effects of German academic preparation of many Americans gradually became apparent in the 1870s in the United States. One major effect of changes then stimulated in university curricula was the demand that German books and other scholarly materials be made available. Predeek lists the various collections, usually of private scholarly libraries, that were acquired by American universities with increasing frequency after 1850. Moreover, as German or German-American scholars achieved academic eminence in the United States, they frequently built up personal libraries which, by gift or bequest, eventually enriched a number of American institutions.

Two other major effects of the German influence were: (1) the institution of graduate schools in which the Ph.D. could be earned, an event representing the beginning of the professionalization of research in American universities; and (2) the creation of new universities strongly adapted to the German model as it was then perceived. Given the strength of the German influence in the development of American scholarship toward the end of the century, one would expect university libraries to have followed the pattern of library organization and provision of the German university, especially in the newer universities. There was, indeed, some influence, especially through the demands of scientists, the most eminent of whom had typically been trained in Germany. Departmental libraries were an important expression of this influence and corresponded to the German seminar and institute libraries. At Johns Hopkins University, "dispersal of library resources to seminar rooms within the main library and to department buildings was an early phenomenon." Gilman, then president of Johns Hopkins, "embraced the idea that
books should be as close to professors and students as possible." The University of Chicago had no central collection for several decades after its founding: "In Chicago, according to the plan of President Harper, the research institutes and laboratories were to be operated in conjunction with libraries; and there was actually no university library until 1912, for it existed only as the sum total of books in departmental libraries." Nevertheless the pattern of German library organization was much modified by local necessity. One reason for this was financial: for reasons of economy, Gilman wished the university to rely heavily on the extensive library holdings generally available in Baltimore; Harper could not secure the university librarian he wanted, and there was the no less pressing problem of finding funds for a central library building. Another reason lay in the fact that American universities, however much influenced from abroad, had strong local traditions that persisted. In Germany, preparation was for a single degree, the Ph.D.; in the United States, the necessity of providing for an undergraduate degree in colleges led to a continuing "peculiar, quite fundamental difference between American academic libraries and related European institutions." Ben-David has analyzed the misconceptions American students formed of the German system of institutes in the university, and has suggested that the American notions of academic departments, graduate schools, professional schools and undergraduate colleges as active and essential parts of the university eventually led to a typically American institution which was considerably different from the German university. The differences inevitably led to differences in library provision. Moreover, although there was a trend toward departmental libraries and the general dispersion of collections in American universities in the latter part of the nineteenth century, it was followed in the first decades of the twentieth century by a countervailing trend toward centralization. Danton has graphically described the problems that the institute system caused in Germany. He contrasts the dispersion and fragmentation of collections which had a wide range of consequent inefficiencies and inequities with the trend in America toward a centrally owned and controlled library "system."

Among the tools widely adopted in United States library practice in the last quarter of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth centuries were the Decimal Classification and cataloging rules. Moreover, after 1901 libraries were able to rely on the availability of Library of Congress cataloging in the form of purchased cards. Classification, rules and cataloging have each provided an important
point of contact between librarianship in the United States and that practiced abroad, and have been modified in some ways as a result of foreign input.

It is possible to construct a genealogy of cataloging rules showing the reciprocal influences that led to the 1908 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. These rules represented direct experience of collaboration and mutual compromise by the two library associations preparing them. Moreover, the venture which led to them was not entirely or merely Anglo-American. Cutter's Rules, upon whose notes and examples they drew displays his familiarity with European catalogs and cataloging practice. Moreover, in a paper to the 1908 International Conference on Bibliography and Documentation in Brussels, J.C.M. Hanson of the Library of Congress and chairman of the ALA Catalog Rules Committee remarked that as the committee producing the Rules had proceeded with its work, the Prussian Instruktionen had been constantly consulted "with a view to a possible future agreement between the new Anglo-American code and the rules which govern in the compilation of the great Gesamtkatalog."

The committee had also examined the Italian and Spanish codes closely. The aim of all of this international activity was, he explained, an attempt to see generalized the provision of cataloging of the kind provided by the Library of Congress:

"We American librarians, who are more and more coming to look to a central agency for at least a part of our cataloging, are prone to look forward to the time when England, Germany, France and other countries may be in a position to supply printed cards or slips for the great sets of monographs issuing from their publishing centers and of which many copies are imported by American libraries."

This is an early statement of what has become a crucial goal of recent work toward the international standardization of bibliographical description, work in which the American Library Association and the Library of Congress have continued to play an important role. A joint committee of the Library Association and the ALA is now revising the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR 1967). The advent of the computer, and the existence of wide international bibliographical effort represented by the work of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), which has culminated in the promulgation of the International Standard Bibliographical Description (ISBD), has lent some urgency to the process of revision and
has introduced new elements which must be reflected in the rules. No less important has been the creation by the Library of Congress of machine-readable cataloging (MARC). Although numerous and variously modified MARC formats have appeared internationally, the possibility of recording and communicating bibliographical data in machine-readable form from country to country is now feasible because of them. These developments, mentioned so fleetingly here, suggest that the period which Hanson had believed American libraries were anticipating has now actually arrived and has received expression, for example, in the shared cataloging program of the Library of Congress.

The kinds of cooperation, standardization and national organizational requirements needed for the development of a successful international system have been expressed in IFLA's program for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC) and UNESCO's National Information System (NATIS) concept. The UBC program represents a distillation of aspirations, ideas and techniques exchanged during the last fifteen years between the United States and other countries. One may venture to suggest, however, that this essentially grew from the card distribution program of the Library of Congress and the cooperative work on the rules for bibliographic description recognized in the first decade of the century as crucial to a viable program. Nevertheless, the international movement in cataloging has involved much reciprocity among the United States, other countries, and international organizations such as IFLA, UNESCO, and the International Standards Organization.

In this movement, the work of the Council on Library Resources (CLR) is of some significance. Many of the international developments in cataloging which have had subsequent effect in America have been an outgrowth of American initiatives. Intellectually, there was the work of Lubetsky in the United States, but the CLR helped to fund the International Conference on Cataloging Principles held in 1961, and now provides the major part of the support for the IFLA office for UBC. Perhaps the CLR may be viewed as a latter-day Carnegie for the influence that its generous but carefully selected philanthropy has had on the development of aspects of librarianship both locally and internationally.

The Dewey Decimal Classification has also been the focus of continued international interest. One of the earliest expressions of this was the classification's adoption as the major tool for the work of the International Institute of Bibliography set up in Brussels by Paul
Otlet and Henri La Fontaine in 1895. For these men, the classification made possible the creation of a centralized universal author and subject bibliography which they called the Universal Bibliographic Repertory. They developed the Universal Decimal Classification (sometimes called the Brussels expansion of Dewey) to serve their essentially bibliographical (as opposed to the original classification's library) purposes. A type of cooperation between the Decimal Classification's editorial office in Albany, and later in Lake Placid, and Otlet and LaFontaine and their collaborators resulted. Dewey resisted any attempt to translate the first edition of the Belgian version of the classification into English, but many of the Belgian expansions were incorporated into or influenced successive American editions. The Belgian scheme for obtaining greater flexibility using various combinatorial procedures and auxiliary tables was explained by Dewey in the preface to the seventh edition of the Decimal Classification in 1911. Little real collaboration between the compilers of the Universal Decimal Classification and the Dewey Decimal Classification occurred after World War I, however, although attempts were made to maintain a certain degree of concordance between the two versions.\(^\text{52}\)

In more recent times, the Decimal Classification has been widely used in English-speaking countries such as Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. There has been some competition from the Library of Congress Classification in these countries, but the use of Dewey's system is probably more widespread than the use of any other single system. The British National Bibliography, Canadiana, and the Australian National Bibliography all provide Decimal Classification numbers for the materials they list. The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee in the United States recognizes the importance of the contributions that can be made from these national bibliographies, and collaboration with them has taken various forms. The development of national geographic tables has been entrusted to them and they submit revisions of sections of the classification and comment on other revision proposals as well. The need for mutual, intimate knowledge of editorial practices concerning the development and use of the classification recently led to an exchange of personnel between the offices responsible for it in the Library of Congress and the Bibliographical Services Division of the British Library.\(^\text{35}\)

International developments similar to those in cataloging have occurred in the area of subject bibliography, although these have not involved the general American library community to any great extent.
Again, there has been a historical evolution toward certain forms of internationalism in which Americans have participated, the requirements of which have led to modifications in American practice. Two early schemes were unsuccessful. While in London for the conference of 1877, William Frederick Poole called for cooperation from English librarians in extending and completing the coverage for English periodicals in a new edition of his famous index, then in preparation. The English set up a committee but it did so little that Poole was scathing in describing the English librarians' lack of confidence both in the "cooperation principle" and in each other. The other scheme which failed in terms of international cooperation was the Royal Society's Catalogue of Scientific Papers. The suggestion that a catalog of scientific memoirs should be cooperatively undertaken was made in the mid-nineteenth century by Joseph Henry, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. However, the actual responsibility for the work, which was carried on from 1858 to 1925, was entirely assumed by the Royal Society. It is not clear why Henry apparently sought no active role in the venture he had suggested, nor why his aid was not solicited by the Royal Society. When the Royal Society could no longer support the development of a catalog covering a period beyond 1899, it decided to continue the work by international cooperation. American advice was sought, and the participation of John Shaw Billings in the first planning conference was of considerable importance, partially because he was strongly opposed to the use of any form of the Decimal Classification as the basis for a classification system for the new catalog. The American Regional Bureau of the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature was set up in the Smithsonian Institution where it had the support of the librarian and assistant secretary, Cyrus Adler. The bureau was directed by Leonard Gunnell, under whom it became one of the most active and successful of the regional bureaus established in various countries throughout the world.

World War I marked the end of this venture. Nothing similar was undertaken until recent years, when the advent of the computer permitted the transmission and manipulation of machine-readable indexing data. The two most highly developed, internationally organized and controlled systems in which the United States participates are the International Nuclear Information System (INIS) in Vienna and the Agricultural Information System (AGRIS) in Rome. Each has an organization similar to that developed for the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature: decentralized input from national centers of standardized bibliographic data to a central agency,
which produces copies of the merged files on magnetic tape and, as in the case of INIS's Atomindex and the trial Agrindex, in hard copy. These systems are intergovernmental. The private sector has also displayed considerable interest in the potential of internationally exploited indexing data in machine-held form. The great American indexing and abstracting services, such as Chemical Abstracts, Biological Abstracts, and Engineering Index, as well as agencies such as the National Library of Medicine, are members of the International Council of Scientific Unions Abstracting Board (ICSU-AB), which has attempted to facilitate cooperation, standardization and data exchange. The entire information community has begun to explore the possibilities of a worldwide scientific and technical information system under the aegis of UNISIST, which is jointly sponsored by UNESCO and the International Council of Scientific Unions.

As always, contact between librarianship in the United States and abroad has continued to be mediated by individuals. In the last one hundred years, their number has been legion, but certain figures such as Andrew Carnegie, Ernest Cushing Richardson, William Warner Bishop and Wilhelm Munthe stand out. After World War II the picture is confused by propinquity; thus, I do not propose to discuss on the one hand the influential work of distinguished Europeans, Indians and other foreigners, nor on the other that of the postwar directors of ALA's International Relations Office, Luther Evans (the ex-librarian of Congress and Director General of UNESCO), nor Robert Vosper in IFLA. After the war, much of American activity has been in the third world, commissioned by UNESCO or various American philanthropic foundations, or it has been concerned with establishing mechanisms for the acquisitions of foreign materials—the Farmington Plan, the Latin American Acquisition Plan, and those administered by the Library of Congress, for example.

Andrew Carnegie, of Scottish origins, was in a curious sense the Thomas Bray of the nineteenth century, and the differing philosophies of the devout Anglican clergymen who promoted libraries in the American colonies and the ruthless industrialist and financier of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries may well epitomize differences in their eras. The impetus given by Carnegie to the development of public libraries in the United States, Great Britain and many British colonies was extraordinary. That the motivation for much of his philanthropy may have been mixed is very likely, and that in the final analysis some of its outcomes were regrettable is undeniably true. Nevertheless the very presence of a Carnegie library in a
town brought it into a mainstream of national and international library development, helped to give people an image of libraries as open public places for study and self-advancement, and set public libraries up in a common pattern.

The work of Ernest Cushing Richardson was important in the context of this paper because of his attempts to secure American involvement in the work of the International Institute of Bibliography, both directly and through the League of Nations Sub-committee on Bibliography and the Institute for International Intellectual Co-operation. His efforts were not successful, but he kept alive some interest in the failing fortunes of the institute in the United States from 1921 until 1932. He was supported in this by Melvil Dewey's son Godfrey, who maintained a fairly close association with Otlet in the 1920s and 1930s and attempted to collaborate in securing a measure of concordance between the tables of the Universal Decimal Classification and those of Dewey's Decimal Classification, despite active opposition from some of his colleagues. It is curious how long it took for any active formal American participation in the International Federation for Documentation to occur, or for there to be any appreciation of the philosophy and technique of documentation developed by Otlet and others in connection with it. It was not until after World War II that American membership was secured; and only after Shera and Egan's scholarly, perceptive introduction to the second edition of Samuel Bradford's *Documentation* appeared was a clear account of the European documentary movement made available in America.35

William Warner Bishop may well have been the international librarian of his generation. His work as chief American advisor in the reorganization of the Vatican library, his long association with IFLA, his work in the League of Nations, his guidance of foreign library dignitaries such as the visiting commission from Oxford in 1930, his sponsorship of the international exchange of librarians, together with many other efforts involving international relations in association with the Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corporation, were only one aspect of a lifetime of extraordinary achievement. His reports and writings brought some awareness in the United States of various national and international developments of the period. One interesting association was his friendship with Wilhelm Munthe, who was invited to study American libraries by the Carnegie Corporation and to report critically from his European viewpoint on what he found. The result was the interesting (if rather quirky) *American Librarian-
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ship from a European Angle,\textsuperscript{6} which is a fascinating and still useful example of the value of an outsider's analysis. His observations on public libraries, the American college library (the value of which he finds difficult to determine), library associations, and many other topics are fresh and stimulating. The work represents an experiment that might usefully be tried again.
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"Treated With A Degree Of Uniformity and Common Sense": Descriptive Cataloging In The United States, 1876-1975

KATHRYN LUTHER HENDERSON

Descriptive cataloging can be defined as "that phase of the process of cataloging which concerns itself with the indentification and description of books." It involves several levels of work. The first level is concerned with the choice of a main entry and of added entries and references by which to provide points of access for the library user. The second involves the construction of headings—fixing the place of the names or titles in the catalog. The third step involves the identification and description of the physical item—often by transcribing specified elements from the item itself—to aid the user in selecting or rejecting one item from the others in the file.

While it is important for a cataloger always to keep in mind the users of a particular catalog and the functions of that catalog in providing the descriptive cataloging data, the cataloger has found it increasingly necessary to do this within the larger context of being able to cooperate with other libraries—either to use all or some of the data from those libraries, or to contribute data for the use of other libraries. In order to cooperate most effectively, codes have become important tools for the descriptive cataloger. This paper will deal mainly with the development of general codes that have been available for catalogers in the United States. It will also discuss the generation of bibliographical data within local libraries.

THE TIME OF PIONEERING

In 1852, Charles C. Jewett recognized the need for standardization in his On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries. Proposing a national cooperative catalog using stereotype plates, he wrote: "Min-
ute and stringent rules become absolutely indispensable, when the
catalogue of each library is, as upon the proposed plan, to form part
of a general catalogue. Uniformity is, then, imperative; but, among
many laborers, can only be secured by the adherence of all to rules
embracing, as far as possible, the minutest details of the work."Although his code would be used, Jewett was unable to bring his
proposed catalog to fruition, nor did his attempts succeed in forming
a national association of librarians to provide a forum for the discus-
sion of cooperation and of codes for cataloging. However, in the
American centennial year of 1876, 103 librarians visited Philadelphia
to observe this historic occasion and to organize the American Library
Association. As one of its early acts, the association established the
Cooperative Committee and discussed the need for cooperative cata-
loging efforts, ranking the subject as third in importance of the
permanent results of the conference.1

While the librarians were meeting, they received copies of the
special report on Public Libraries in the United States of America4
on the second day of the three-day conference. Part II of the report was
Charles A. Cutter's Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue, the first
code for the dictionary catalog as a whole.

Cutter's code included "Objects" and "Means" for the catalog,
definitions, and rules for entry. "Where to enter" included rules for the
author, title, subject, and form aspects of cataloging as well as for
analytics. The second section of the code was concerned with style ("how
to enter"), Cutter advising: "Uniformity for its own sake is of very little
account; for the sake of intelligibility, to prevent perplexity and
misunderstanding, it is worth something."5 This section included rules
for style of headings for the catalog and bibliographical description,
concluding with rules for arrangement of entries. Appendices in-
cluded a brief discussion of other types of catalogs and some refer-
ence works for the cataloger. Except for the three subsequent editions
of Cutter, no other American code has been so inclusive.

Cutter's five-volume Boston Athenaeum Catalogue6 issued from
1874 to 1882 was well received by the profession, so his code of rules
was also well received. A second edition appeared in 1889. Klas A.
Linderfelt asserted that it was impossible to add to this edition in any
helpful way.7 However, Cutter published a third edition in 1891, and
a fourth edition was published in 1904, the year following his death.
Each succeeding edition added rules and examples. The 205 rules on
80 pages for the first edition had grown to 369 rules on 146 pages in
the fourth edition.
For the Columbian Exposition of 1893, Melvil Dewey proposed a set of papers to form a handbook of library economy to show points of general agreement reached since 1876. William C. Lane, writing on cataloging, discussed some areas in which opinion was still divided. He noted that although several catalog codes were available, Cutter’s rules were “most generally followed.” Among fifty-eight libraries surveyed, Lane found that few libraries followed any one code absolutely, but most followed one or two as a general guide, changing details that seemed advisable for local needs. Cutter’s rules were the most frequently used general guide. Also widely used was “Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog,” issued in 1883 by the ALA Cooperative Committee. Intended only as an outline of cataloging, the condensed rules referred to Cutter’s Rules for definitions, discussion of particular cases, and illustrative examples. In the second edition of his Rules, Cutter (as a member of the committee) included this skeletal outline of a code.

The ALA rules as applied and enlarged by Dewey’s Library School were first printed in Library Notes in October 1886. Published separately in 1888 as Rules for Author and Classed Catalogs as used in Columbia College Library, later editions carried the title Library School Card Catalog Rules.

Klas Linderfelt, Librarian of the Milwaukee Public Library, adapted Karl Dziatzko’s Instruction fur die Ordnung der Titel im alphabetischen Zettelkatalog der Königlichen und Universitäts-bibliothek zu Breslau (Berlin, 1886). Linderfelt’s Eclectic Card Catalog Rules, published by Cutter in 1890, covered author and title entries and references in the first part, while the second part contained information related to accents, transliteration, form and spelling of foreign names, and an exhaustive discussion of alphabetical arrangement.

In 1884, Fred B. Perkins issued San Francisco Cataloguing for Public Libraries. He tried to construct a manual which would enable anyone with a fair education and intelligence, who had never done any cataloging, to catalog an ordinary town library well enough for practical purposes. He believed that Cutter’s Rules were remarkable but deficient in “rudimentary detail.” To him, the ALA “Condensed Rules” were “too condensed to be of much service except to experienced cataloguers who will not need them.”

Although the three leading codes in use—Cutter, Dewey and Linderfelt—did not differ substantially, in December 1900 the ALA Publishing Board appointed an Advisory Committee on Cataloging Rules, composed of J.C.M. Hanson, Salome Cutler Fairchild, Nina E.
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Browne, Charles A. Cutter, T. Franklin Currier, Anderson H. Hopkins, and Alice B. Kroeger to reconcile their differences. The plan called for the committee to make its recommendations to the Publishing Board for submission to the ALA Council for approval. Catalogers would use meetings of their group, organized as a roundtable in 1900 and as a section in 1901, for discussion of difficult problems. This separate section provided a good forum for those most consistently interested in cataloging, but also led to the separation and isolation of catalogers from administrators. Before 1900, cataloging was a concern of all of ALA's members, since the issues were discussed in general meetings.

The Advisory Committee met in March 1901 in anticipation of the distribution of printed catalog cards by the Library of Congress. They made recommendations for typography and form of the cards, decided on the placement of collation (a disputed point for some time) and the placement of the series note. The ALA "Condensed Rules" as printed in Cutter were to be the point of orientation for discussion of fullness of name, pseudonyms, and corporate entries. The Advisory Committee could not, however, reach an agreement on designation for size, a problem which had plagued the association since its first meeting. Three alternatives were considered: (1) the bibliographical format to indicate approximate size (a holdover from earlier times when it had greater meaning), (2) letter symbols adopted by ALA in its early sessions; and (3) the exact size in centimeters.

The committee set the pattern for all future ALA codes by deciding that the plan for the code should be "carried out for the large library of scholarly character, since the small libraries would only gain by full entries, while the large libraries must lose if bibliographical fulness is not given." For this code, as well as the others which were to follow, the question would arise of whether an abridged edition should be issued. As it has turned out no abridged code for small libraries has ever been developed.

The Library of Congress began distributing cards in November 1901. To help librarians understand the practice on LC cards, the library issued an advance edition of the code in August 1902. An editorial in the Library Journal, as well as a review by Gardner M. Jones, hailed the rules as "progressive," and a "reaction against some of the minutiae of sign and symbol." The code was seen as an accepted standard for American libraries "if not for all time at least for the lifetime of most of those now engaged in library work." Alice
Kroeger, a member of the committee, assured librarians that there would not be "many decided changes in the future."22

Change, however, was inescapable. Although Hanson found the rules in the advance edition in "accord almost point for point with those of the Library of Congress,"23 the library issued additions to them. The first set of additional rules (for collation and series notes) was dated April 20, 1903.24 The printed rules were issued on cards and in pamphlet form with a copy of each card sent free of charge to subscribers to LC cards. Nonsubscriber libraries could order them in the same manner and for the same price as LC cards. The rules in pamphlet form were free to all.

In 1904, a request came from the Catalogue Rules Committee of the (British) Library Association to join with the ALA committee to consider the adoption of a joint code of rules for American and British libraries. The draft code submitted by the British was based, in part, on the ALA advance edition of 1902 and the points of differences were found to be fewer than had been anticipated. Various exchanges by correspondence took place from 1905 to 1907, delaying the publication of the American edition several years. In September 1907, Hanson traveled to Glasgow to meet with the British and the two committees came to full agreement on all but 8 of 174 rules.25 The American rules, printed in 1908, included some LC supplementary rules and also identified the areas of difference between the British and American codes.26

The publication of this 1908 code set several trends. Important was the trend toward cooperation, not only among librarians in this country, but also with librarians abroad. Hanson's trip across the Atlantic would be repeated many times by catalogers from both sides of the ocean. Second, the role of leadership assumed by the Library of Congress in code revision continued. The Library of Congress provided Hanson to edit the 1908 code. In subsequent years, Charles Martel, Nella Martin, Clara Beetle, Lucile Morsch, Seymour Lubetzky, C. Sumner Spalding and Paul Winkler would also come from the Library of Congress. Third, the code confirmed the emphasis on author and title entries, leaving subject entry "theory" to Cutter's rules.

The pioneering years were also times of "settling in," but some unsettling affairs in the offing would once again affect codes. Charles Hastings once hinted that American libraries had become quite spoiled by LC's printed cards. Once LC had begun to issue some cards,
the libraries expected it to fill all their cataloging needs. With the availability of printed cards for ever-increasing amounts of materials and with more places to locate LC card order numbers, more and more libraries of all types took advantage of the service. The growth in the files of cards at LC resulted in space problems as well as in printing delays. World War I brought added problems: new books were not received on time and assistants went to war or to the ALA War Service. Changes in personnel were frequent after the war when low salaries at LC made it difficult to keep efficient workers. Then, during the depression, large libraries found it difficult to get funds to buy cards. In 1931/32, for the first time since card distribution had begun, the sale of cards decreased from the previous year.

On the whole, the attitude of many administrators and librarians toward cataloging left much to be desired. With the printing of LC cards, too many librarians had taken seriously Cutter’s statement about “the golden age of cataloging” being over, even though for some libraries only a small percentage of cataloging was provided by LC. As the profession concerned itself with principles of “efficiency management,” it looked critically at cataloging production. In a paper read at the New York Regional Catalog Group, T. Franklin Currier, Assistant Librarian at Harvard, noted that in the year ending June 30, 1928, Harvard was able to procure LC cards for only 15 percent of the titles cataloged. With a grant from the General Education Board, the ALA Committee on Cooperative Cataloging began a study in 1931 that eventually resulted in more detailed plans for providing copy. In 1940, LC agreed to take this entire operation under its sole auspices; nevertheless, the efforts failed to increase the flow of cooperative copy to the degree hoped.

The Library of Congress continued to issue supplementary cataloging rules which were sent to other libraries. In addition, a new series of rules relating to points peculiar to cataloging in the Library of Congress, or points in which that library’s practice was still in the experimental state, were distributed only to catalogers at LC or to those libraries supplying copy to be printed at LC. To illustrate some of its cataloging practice, LC issued guides for the cataloging of periodicals, serial publications of societies and institutions, and government publications.

The emphasis on cooperative cataloging in the 1930s promoted the idea of a new code. Rudolph H. Gjelsness, writing to Carl H. Milam on projects that might have a bearing on the scholarly and bibliographical work of ALA, recommended: “revision of the A.L.A. Cata-
log Rules. . . . This is now out of date and in many respects inadequate for present needs. New rulings should be made, and the old ones scrutinized with particular attention to further extension of cooperative cataloging." Meanwhile, Hastings, chief of LC's Card Division, wrote about the first year of the Cooperative Cataloging Committee's work, and noted the difficulty resulting from the fact that both the ALA catalog rules and LC's supplementary rules were general codes that failed to cover a multitude of small points except by interpretation. The widespread concern of librarians generally was reflected by New York catalogers in 1932 in the "Summary of Discussion of need for Revision of Catalog Code."

Later in 1932, the ALA Executive Board created a Committee on Revision of the ALA Catalog Code, defining the duties of the committee to make necessary revision in the ALA catalog rules while cooperating with the Library Association and other national library associations if this seemed advisable. Charles Martel from the Library of Congress was named to head the committee, working with an executive committee composed of William W. Bishop, J.C.M. Hanson, Margaret Mann, Harriet D. MacPherson and R.H. Gjelsness.

In a November 11, 1932, memorandum to the committee, Martel called for their suggestions and for a thorough study of inquiries from catalogers and the public and for a comparison with foreign codes. "The conclusion seems justified," he wrote, "that but few of the important rules—the rules that govern the principal main entry headings—call for serious changes." He saw an exception to this in the "now more and more prevalent publications of mixed authorship—personal, corporate and official—in various degrees of complexity." As suggestions came to Martel from individuals and groups, he reflected that catalogers seemed to want a handbook more than a "mere skeleton of rules with a few examples illustrating." He changed his mind about the amount of revision necessary, estimating that nearly all the rules required extensive addition. The next year's conference found Martel reporting that "the rules are being made as explicit a guide to cataloging as minute specifications fully illustrated by examples can make."

While acknowledging Martel's contributions, many librarians objected to delays in revision. They called for someone of more administrative or executive ability to push the code toward completion, citing the Committee on Cooperative Cataloging in particular as requiring the code in their work. The two years which were earlier projected for code revision doubled, and the Carnegie Corporation...
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granted ALA $15,000 payable over two years to expedite the work. Various advisory subcommittees were appointed, and on September 15, 1936, Nella Martin began her work as executive assistant to the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee with Martel continuing as a consultant.43

Up to this time, the British had not participated in this revision. In August 1936, however, an inquiry came from them about code revision progress.44 In October of the same year, James D. Stewart, chairperson of the British code revision committee, met with Gjelsness, chairperson of the American committee. Assured of a desire to cooperate, the American committee agreed to assemble the materials and reach tentative conclusions before submitting anything to the British.45 By June 1938, the American committee questioned whether the preliminary edition could be a joint one. Preoccupied with rushing things to completion, the committee became concerned over the length of time the British were taking to deliberate, remaining convinced, however, that the two groups should work together toward a final joint edition.46 The outbreak of World War II in 1939 delayed action further, and a joint code did not materialize.

In 1939, Gjelsness announced that working drafts of the code had been issued in a small edition and distributed primarily to committee members.47 It was September 1941 before 300 copies of the preliminary edition were distributed for study and criticism to a larger group, and 700 copies were made available for purchase.48 Even before it was available for sale, however, some librarians objected that certain aspects of the new code were too elaborate and would never be used by the public.

"AN ERA OF CRITICISM OF CATALOGING": THE GREEN AND THE RED BOOKS

In June 1941, Andrew Osborn read The Crisis in Cataloging to the American Library Institute.49 This, according to Paul Dunkin, opened up an era of criticism of cataloging. "The paper's title was dramatic, the style was popular, and in its sweeping generalizations the simmering frustrations of a generation of librarians came to boil. . . . Everybody read it, every cataloger talked or wrote about it and it gave a name and an atmosphere to a whole era of thinking about cataloging."50

Although he did not discuss the 1941 preliminary code, Osborn wrote about the philosophy of codes and the relationship of this
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philosophy to the cataloging situation, and he called for more cooperation between administrators and catalogers. Osborn perceived four theories of cataloging in vogue. The most dominant was the legalistic theory, calling for rules and definitions to cover every point that arises and to provide an authority to settle questions at issue. The second was the theory of perfectionism, which called for the cataloger to catalog a book so well, in all respects, that the job would be done once and for all (an impossibility, of course). Third was the theory of bibliographic cataloging, attempting to make cataloging into a branch of descriptive bibliography. Finally, the pragmatic theory asserted that rules hold and decisions are made only to the extent that they seem practical. Since needs are so different, standardized cataloging for all types of libraries was pragmatically impossible. Therefore, a few simple rules for catalogers trained to use judgment would suffice. This was in sharp contrast to Martel's position.

The ALA code which appeared a short while later most nearly represented Osborn's legalistic theory. Its 408 pages of rules lacked guiding principles or theory. Part I pertained to "Entry and Heading," while Part II dealt with "Description of the Book." The appendices covered: abbreviations; punctuation, modified vowels, accents and figures; capitalization; transliteration; authority card; incunabula; maps and atlases; and music.

The code met with a divergent reception. On December 31, 1941, the ALA Council approved the establishment of the Committee on the Use of the ALA Catalog Code "to consider the revised A.L.A. Catalog Rules from the standpoint of the library administrator as well as the cataloger, particularly with regard to the question of elaboration and of expense." After two years of careful study, this committee recommended that a Committee on Catalog Code Revision be authorized to proceed with the editorial revision of Part I in light of all criticism then before it, and to reconsider the question of rules for descriptive cataloging considering whatever decisions have been reached by LC and ALA.

By the ALA annual meeting in 1946, Amelia Krieg, president of the Division of Cataloging and Classification (DCC) reported that an editor would be appointed for Part I to work with an advisory board. Clara Beetle was granted a leave of absence from her position in LC's Descriptive Cataloging Division to serve as the editor and began preparation of the revised edition in September 1946. By the annual meeting of DCC in July 1947, she reported that the text of
Part I had been edited. Because of publishing problems, the code did not appear until 1949. This was the Red Book.

Meanwhile, criticisms of Part II of the 1941 code abounded. The work was filled with detail that few libraries would need. Even prior to its publication, there had been signs that some of the major libraries in the country had abandoned LC's elaborate description and "developed more effective rules for their own purposes." Those who participated in cooperative cataloging found themselves working with two different codes and there were even signs that perhaps LC would soon adopt a briefer form of descriptive cataloging.

Even before Archibald MacLeish, the newly appointed Librarian of Congress, took office in October 1939, he was urged by librarians to do something about the delay of LC cards to subscribers. In response, he set up various committees of experts inside and outside of LC to make studies and reports, and did some study of his own. As part of the study on LC card delays, he wrote to Arnold H. Trotier, on November 15, 1939, suggesting that the committee investigating this problem "ascertain what, if any, bibliographical data (possibly added by changes of procedure over a period of years), may now be omitted from our printed catalog cards without affecting the integrity of the system of printed catalogue cards serving not only ourselves but also upwards of 7,000 libraries." Trotier, Margaret Mann, Harriet MacPherson, Keyes Metcalf, Rudolph Gjelsness and Wyllis Wright were called to Washington to study LC's problems. One of their discoveries was an arrearage of 1,670,161 unprocessed volumes, with 30,000 books being added to that number annually.

Carleton B. Joeckel, Paul N. Rice and Andrew Osborn made up yet another LC advisory committee, the Librarian's Committee. Although the report of this committee remained confidential, Joeckel requested Andrew Osborn to write the Crisis in Cataloging "to present some of the evidence uncovered." As a result of the Librarian's Committee report, LC's subject cataloging was separated from the other cataloging operations and the phrase "descriptive cataloging" was coined "to cover the choice and form of main and added entries, transcription of title-page details, collation, etc. The Committee wanted to get away from the prevalent term 'bibliographical cataloging' which had overtones it wanted to avoid both for the Library of Congress and for libraries in general." Not least important for future events was the committee's conclusion that "there must be recognition of the need for modifications in the form and fulness of cataloging." Meanwhile, the Librarian of Congress acknowledged that "one of the present necessities in
the cataloging operations of the Library is the progressive development of rules of practice for cataloging."

Discussion and studies of rules for descriptive cataloging began early in 1942 at LC. Seymour Lubetzky—technical assistant to the Director of the Processing Department—prepared in 1943 an "Analysis of Current Descriptive Cataloging Practice." In previous rules for descriptive cataloging, Lubetzky found a lack of a statement of function, resulting in cataloging entries repetitious in some aspects but inadequate in others. There was no underlying interrelationship in the organization of the elements, although there was an effort to preserve the integrity of the title page. Lubetzky saw the latter as no longer justified in modern books.

During the later years of World War II, ALA annual meetings were canceled, so from October 18 to November 19, 1943, Herman Henkle (director of LC's Processing Department) and Lucile Morsch (chief of LC's Descriptive Cataloging Section) conducted a series of conferences in fifteen cities to ascertain from catalogers and administrators whether there was a basic difference between LC's needs in descriptive cataloging and those of other libraries. It became more and more apparent that a statement of function of the catalog, and guiding principles upon which to base the rules, both lacking in previous codes, were necessary. A set of principles was presented to librarians at two meetings in November and December 1945. Questionnaires regarding the proposals were distributed to twenty-eight additional catalogers and administrators, evoking "expressions of feeling ranging from apprehension to enthusiasm and relief." On the whole, the returns seemed to indicate that the proposed principles and changes were adequate for the majority of users of catalogs.

The Librarian of Congress appointed an Advisory Committee on Descriptive Cataloging, which agreed in general with the proposals but made further suggestions and modifications. Lucile Morsch then drafted Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress (RDC), which appeared in June 1947. Reports of ALA subcommittees led to some revisions, and in January 1949 ALA accepted the revised draft to supersede Part II of the 1941 ALA Catalog Rules. Publication of this draft of RDC appeared in September 1949 after the addition of chapters on maps, music and incunabula. This was the Green Book.

After RDC was published, work began on rules for other nonbook materials based upon the objectives of descriptive cataloging. These objectives had evolved to be: "(1) to state the significant features of an
item with the purpose of distinguishing it from other items and describing its scope, contents and bibliographic relation to other items; (2) to present these data in an entry which can be integrated with the entries for other items in the catalog and which will respond best to the interests of most users of the catalog. In following these, RDC intended to describe each item as fully as necessary but with an economy of data and expression. The terms used by the author, publisher, or other authority in issuing the item were the usual basis of the description. The basic part of the description was set forth in the body of the entry (i.e., the first paragraph after the heading) in a prescribed order: title, subtitle, author statement, edition statement (including statement of translator, illustrator or illustrations), and imprint. The second paragraph included the collation and series note, and supplementary notes were included in as many succeeding paragraphs as required. The data came mostly from the title page but would no longer require transcription of the elements in title page order. Omissions from the title page would require ellipses only if they came from the title, the alternative title or subtitle. Rules for capitalization, abbreviations and recording numerals were included in the appendices. In addition to rules for separately published monographs, there were to be found those for issues, offprints, supplements, indexes, analytical entries, serials, maps, relief models, globes and atlases, music, facsimiles, photocopies, microfilms, and incunabula. From 1952 to 1959, separate publications were issued covering the rules for descriptive cataloging of phonorecords; motion pictures and filmstrips; books in raised characters; manuscripts; and pictures, designs and other two-dimensional representations.

In the Red Book the rules for entry and headings, as they were published in 1949, were developed for the dictionary catalog's author and title entries. The main entry was based upon authorship (i.e., the person or corporate body "considered to be chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual content of the work"). This was to extend the finding list function of the catalog "beyond what is required for location of a single book to the location of literary units about which the seeker has less precise information." Added entries were to help achieve this kind of location for users who lacked complete knowledge about a work to complete the assembling of related materials as part of a literary unit. The added entry would, of course, often fail to accomplish this since added entries relate to a representation of a work (i.e., a book) rather than to the work itself. The lack of provision for naming a uniform title made it impossible in many instances for this
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code to achieve what it had intended; however, uniform entries were established for names based upon the full and real names of persons, and the full name of corporate bodies; for both, the use of the vernacular was the first choice.

Structurally, this edition attempted to arrange the material so as to emphasize the basic rules and subordinate their amplifications. Purporting to make a more logical sequence and to reduce the number of alternative rules, the editor still did not achieve a logically structured code that flowed evenly from one point to another. Rules for choice of entry and construction of heading, particularly in regard to pseudonyms and corporate headings, were confusingly intermixed. Exceptions followed exceptions. With no clear underlying principles, the case-by-case method was all that could be effected. Lacking a definite rule for a given situation, the cataloger could only resort to cataloging by analogy.

Many criticized the code. Osborn claimed that while great publicity was being afforded the new LC rules, the ALA code was pushed through on a "hush-hush" basis. Haste had killed the ALA code, and after a close study of it, he believed many librarians would feel that the third edition could not come too soon. He indicated that the code was already outmoded since it did not follow changes which LC was already using, such as "no conflict" cataloging.78

A Library of Congress Processing Department Memorandum (No. 60, April 20, 1949) announced the library’s plan to speed up the work of cataloging by establishing personal names in the form given in the book being cataloged without further search, provided that the name in the work conformed to the ALA Cataloging Rules for entry and was not so similar to another name already established as to give basis for the suspicion that both names refer to the same person.79 Some attempt would be made to supply the first given name if it was represented on the book being cataloged by only an initial or an abbreviation. This practice was based on an LC study made in February 1948. In approximately 90 percent of the cases, LC found that the form of name on the book could be used without conflict with previously established names.80

In its 1948/49 report, DCC recommended that a serious study be made of LC’s “no conflict” cataloging in an attempt to gain simplification in the form of the heading.81 Pressure to change the ALA Cataloging Rules began even before they were off the press!

This era is a confusing one. Even as rules were being developed, practice was being implemented that would, in some cases at least, be
contrary to them. There was a failure to define what the catalog should do before rules were constructed to make the catalog. During this decade, the Library of Congress increased its role in the study of cataloging, in code revision, and in determination of practice. LC became so active that ALA members began to wonder about their own role in the determination of cataloging rules. It was agreed that the Library of Congress would make no major change in its rules for descriptive cataloging without consulting ALA’s DCC. Such joint approval regarding cataloging codes has continued to the present.

"A COMPLETE RECONSTRUCTION OF OUR CODE IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELIBERATELY ADOPTED OBJECTIVES"

In May 1951, DCC’s newly established Board on Cataloging Policy and Research decided that the most important problem to study was that of corporate entry. LC and Seymour Lubetzky were again called upon to explore a cataloging problem. Lubetzky studied the background and philosophy of the rules and practice of cataloging materials of corporate bodies. Before the 1953 ALA Conference, every member in good standing of DCC was sent a copy of Lubetzky’s *Cataloging Rules and Principles*, subtitled “A Critique of the A.L.A. Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for Their Revision." He found many of the ALA rules to be either unnecessary or not properly related to the code. Some rules were inconsistent with others or different from others for reasons irrelevant to the purposes of cataloging. The multiplicity of rules was designed to fit particular cases which occasioned them, rather than to meet certain bibliographical conditions. Particularly confusing were rules for societies and institutions. He concluded that “a rationalization of our cataloging will require not a revision of any particular rules, but a complete reconstruction of our code in accordance with deliberately adopted objectives which should define the aim of our rules, and well considered principles which would outline the pattern and character of the code."

Lubetzky saw the objectives of such a code as enabling the catalog user to determine whether the library has the book as well as revealing the works that the library has by a given author and what editions or translations of a given work are in the library. Since author and title entries are the most common elements used in citing and searching for publications, the principles and rules for entries should
be based on these elements. To Lubetzky, these principles concerned themselves "with the elemental bibliographic conditions of a book and thus provide the core around which a logical and practical pattern for a cataloging code could be evolved."\textsuperscript{xii}

The theme of DCC's 1953 conference sessions was "ALA Rules of Entry: The Proposed Revolution"; papers relating to Lubetzky's report were presented.\textsuperscript{xvi} Later Lubetzky's report was discussed at meetings of the division's regional groups and by representative bodies in England, France, Switzerland, Cuba, and Japan. (Throughout the preparation of the study, Lubetzky had kept in correspondence with Henry Sharp of the Library Association.)\textsuperscript{xvii}

In view of the recommendations of the Lubetzky report and the interest expressed in it, the DCC Executive Board appointed a committee to investigate the desirability of a revision of the code.\textsuperscript{xx} In 1954, a Catalog Code Revision Committee Steering Committee composed of Wyllis Wright, Laura Colvin, Pauline Seely, Evelyn Hensel, and Richard Angell was appointed. Later, other members would be added to the committee or to subcommittees.\textsuperscript{xxi}

Code revision was to be planned around four propositions advanced by the steering committee: (1) the library catalog is primarily a finding list of items in the library's collection, and only secondarily a reference tool; (2) economy in the construction of a catalog should be emphasized up to the point where loss in economy in meeting a valid reference need resulted; (3) code revision should proceed without regard to consideration of recataloging of materials in existing catalogs; and (4) the proposed code was to be for author and title entries to serve in constructing a catalog of all types of library materials.\textsuperscript{xxii}

By 1956, the framework of revision began to take shape and an agreement between ALA and LC was made in regard to preparation of the new code. RDC was to be incorporated into the new edition, and at ALA's request, LC made available the services of Seymour Lubetzky to work with the Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) and to prepare a draft code.

As Lubetzky prepared several draft codes\textsuperscript{xxiv} and as important working papers\textsuperscript{xxv} were prepared for two conferences relating to the code, one would have to look hard to find another time in American cataloging history when so much thorough investigation was being carried out in regard to code revision. At the 1960 conference in Montreal, the attendance of a number of international representatives heralded the dawn of more intensive international cooperation, the implications of which are yet to be determined fully.
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"A LANDMARK, A WATERSHED IN THE HISTORY OF CATALOGING"—THE MOVE TOWARD INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Nine American librarians in London during the summer of 1952 were invited by the Library Association to discuss code revision with the British Cataloguing Rules Sub-Committee. The British, not having recognized the 1949 code, were working on a revision of the 1908 code and were considering the possibility of a code with from twelve to twenty basic rules, each of which would be followed by specialized applications. Having already established contact with Lubetzky, the subcommittee urged that consideration be given once again to an Anglo-American code. Even wider cooperative efforts were soon to occur in catalog reform. Until this time "the leaders of this movement were primarily American and were working essentially within the American tradition" and "the slow and painful efforts to incorporate the new insights into a working code have also been overwhelmingly American"; now, however, the trend would be toward international considerations through the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA).

In 1954, the Working Group on the Co-ordination of Cataloging Principles was appointed by IFLA's General Council. By 1957, the General Council proposed a worldwide conference to seek agreement on basic cataloging principles. With a grant from the Council on Library Resources (CLR), a preliminary meeting was held in London from July 19-25, 1959. Among the fifteen working papers prepared was one on the "Principles for the Construction of a Cataloging Code" by Wyllis Wright and Seymour Lubetzky. As a result of the discussions at this conference, there was unanimous agreement that "a basis exists for a broad agreement on important cataloging principles." Confidence was expressed that an international conference "could achieve practical results which would facilitate access to an international exchange of bibliographical information."5

The Institute on Catalog Code Revision held at McGill University, Montreal, June 13-17, 1960 (sponsored by the ALA Cataloging and Classification Section, the Canadian Library Association's Cataloging Section, and McGill University), included among its 255 registrants persons from England, France, Germany, India, Mexico, Russia, and the Philippines, as well as from Canada and the United States. Among this group were the members of the organizing committee for the proposed IFLA Conference, so a further chance was given for an
understanding of the work of the Americans.45 Serving as resources for the institute were Lubetzky's working drafts and papers alluded to above.

The CLR provided the funds for the International Conference on Cataloging Principles (ICCP) held in Paris, October 9-18, 1961, which attracted representatives from fifty-three countries and twelve international organizations. While the principles and decisions of this conference were not vastly different from those generally accepted, the international acceptance of them was "a landmark, a watershed in the history of cataloging." Chief among the achievements was the acceptance of corporate authorship—a long-disputed point among the German and Scandinavian traditions.

The conference dealt only with the choice and form of headings and entry words in catalogs of printed books (defined to include other materials having similar characteristics) in author/title catalogs. The "Statement of Principles" was framed for catalogs of large general libraries, but with modifications could be recommended for other libraries and to other alphabetical lists of books. The function of the catalog was stated; its structure was defined; the kinds of entries, and the functions, choice and form of different kinds of entries were noted.

It is appropriate to recount here some developments that belong chronologically in the next section, but which illuminate the nature of the Paris agreements and their implications for cataloging in the United States. With international agreement on the basic general principles, related to the first aspects of descriptive cataloging, the next consideration would be to set some international standards for description of the physical item. In 1963, Mary Piggott, a member of the Library Association's Cataloguing Rules Committee and a participant in the 1961 IFLA Conference, suggested that it was reasonable to hope that agreement could follow on the choice, form and sequence of the items of description necessary to complete the author/title entries. To this end, she identified the essential areas of description of the physical item.

In 1969, IFLA sponsored the International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts held in Copenhagen to consider the effect of the "Statement of Principles" as well as other possible areas of international cooperation. By that time, U.S. librarians, through the Shared Cataloging program in effect since early 1966, had discovered that they could accept the descriptive cataloging for physical items supplied by the national bibliographies of a number of countries throughout the
world. In addition, the growing use of electronic data processing in bibliographical systems made desirable the establishment of an international standard for the descriptive content of cataloging entries. MARC had been designed as a standard format for the interchange of bibliographic records on magnetic tape, but it did not define the content of individual records.102

By October 1971, the Working Group on the International Standard Bibliographic Description, again founded by CLR, had prepared the preliminary edition of the *International Standard Bibliographic Description (for single volume and multi-volume monographic publications).* ISBD(M), as it came to be known, was designed “as an instrument for the international communication of bibliographical information.”104 The elements of bibliographical description to be used in all bibliographical activities to identify a record were specified, as well as the order in which they were to be presented and the punctuation to be used. The objectives were “to make records from different sources interchangeable; to facilitate their interpretation across language barriers; and to facilitate the conversion of such records to machine-readable form.”105 The first standard edition was published in 1974; in July of that year, the North American text of Chapter 6 of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* was revised in accord with ISBD(M).106 Since the international standard had essentially accepted the order of the elements as included in American descriptive cataloging codes since 1947, the changes in the new Chapter 6 came in the new punctuation, in the imprint area, and in the use of data not on the title page without the use of brackets if the data were obtained from certain specified sources.

According to John D. Byrum, Jr., a meeting was held in October 1975 “between representatives of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR and the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing which had the result of producing an agreement specifying a framework to govern the contents and future developments of specific ISBDs.”107 Catalogers who once had given up the niceties of spacing, punctuation, etc., as rather unimportant descriptive cataloging elements must bring them back again as absolute essentials.

**BACK FROM PARIS—COMPROMISE AND THE PARIS PRINCIPLES**

Much credit for the success at Paris in 1961 belongs to U.S. librarians, but their brilliant efforts were soon to be curtailed at home.
In fact, some erosion had already begun before the conference. On August 9, 1960, Lubetzky resigned from the staff of LC. For almost twenty years, his voice had urged Americans to concentrate on principles and "the fundamentals of cataloging." When Lubetzky resigned from LC, the library canceled the ALA-LC contract supporting editorial work of the committee. No rules for special materials had yet been drafted—there was important work yet to be done. Cooperation, economy and compromise, which seem to go hand in hand with American code revision, came back together. The production of a code that would not consider costs could not come to pass. Throughout code revision discussions in 1961 were "considerations of methods by which proposed new rules might be implemented and whether it would be necessary to change headings already established or whether the new rules might be applied to newly established headings only. Mr. Spalding suggested the term 'superimposition' for the latter method."

In December 1961, Johannes L. Dewton, then assistant chief of LC's Union Catalog Division, suggested that CCRC suspend its work and instead revise the 1949 rules in light of the Paris Principles. In response, CCRC affirmed "its intention to carry the draft code to completion on the Paris Principles as modified by committee action." There were tough decisions ahead for the committee, who wanted to follow the urging of ICCP to implement the principles in their own codes, even while there was pressure from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and from LC to compromise on certain principles. Particularly difficult was the principle for entering the institutions under their own names—the basis on which some countries had agreed to accept the Paris Principles.

While the British (who were working closely with CCRC) saw the difficulties for existing catalogs, they also realized the importance to libraries of other countries for the United States to accept the principle, if not the practice. Because LC adopted superimposition, the need to write the rules in a manner contradictory to the Paris Principles was gone. At the meeting where entering institutions under their own name or under place was being discussed, Lucile Morsch, representing the Library of Congress, announced that LC had already decided to introduce the superimposing of one pattern of cataloging upon another pattern that had previously been followed.

In June 1962, the Library of Congress agreed to give C. Sumner Spalding a leave of absence as chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division to be the editor of the new code, while Morsch would edit
the chapters on description of the physical items. The code would be entitled the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR) but would be published in two editions, American and British, with the ALA and LA reserving the right to publish any variants considered necessary. Quite obviously, the British would not adopt the "institutions" compromise forced by LC and ARL. Financial support to complete the code came from CLR (which contributed a total of $82,399 for the code), LC and ALA. In the spring of 1967, the long-awaited code appeared.

**THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES**

Because reviews, criticisms and summaries of AACR appeared in many sources, coverage here will be brief.

First, this code is based on principles which in turn are based on a statement about the function of the catalog. The function of the catalog has not been the most popular subject in cataloging literature or in code revision sessions, yet Ruth Strout Carnovsky tells us that we could help solve code problems if "we could reach some decisions about the purposes of catalogs."\(^{114}\)

Cutter identified inquiries with which the user is likely to approach the catalog.\(^{115}\) These could be regarded as statements of functions of the catalog. Cutter's codes identified what he called "Objects and Means of a Catalog."\(^{116}\) In the second edition of his rules Cutter noted that "this statement of Objects and Means has been criticized; but as it has also been frequently quoted, usually without change or credit, in the prefaces of catalogues and elsewhere, I suppose it has on the whole been approved."\(^{117}\) One must agree. His code was, after all, an attempt "to investigate what might be called the first principles of cataloging,"\(^{118}\) but Lubetzky observed that Cutter never formulated "general governing principles to be detailed in the rules."\(^{119}\) Cutter's explanations under specific rules seem to come about as close as anything to the governing principles. No American code openly stated objectives or functions again until the *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging* in 1947.

For Lubetzky it was natural to turn to objectives when he was writing the draft codes that preceded AACR. To develop a "rational and functional system of cataloging"\(^{120}\) rather than a maze of rules, Lubetzky set about to identify the material cataloged as a medium through which the work (i.e., the intellectual content) is presented. The work might be presented through different media and many...
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editions. He saw the material (the book) and the work, which are not the same things, as being blurred in previous codes. In his study of the fundamentals of cataloging, Lubetzky identified these objectives
of cataloging in his Code of Cataloging Rules:

First, to facilitate the location of a particular publication, i.e. of a particular edition of a work, which is in the library.

Second, to relate and display together the editions which a library has of a given work and the works which it has of a given author.121

These statements were influential in forming the “Functions of the Catalogue” statement in the Paris Principles:

The catalogue should be an efficient instrument for ascertaining
2.1 whether the library contains a particular book specified by
(a) its author and title, or
(b) if the author is not named in the book, its title alone, or
(c) if the author and title are inappropriate or insufficient for identification, a suitable substitute for the title; and
2.2 (a) which works by a particular author and
(b) which editions of a particular work are in the library.122

While AACR does not completely fulfill these functions (which, incidentally, are not included in the AACR text), it does so better than other codes have done.

To discharge the functions, a certain structure is assumed for the catalog. In the IFLA statement it is assumed that the catalog will contain at least one entry for each book cataloged and more when this is necessary in the interest of the user or because of the characteristics of the book. The Paris Principles assume the use of main and added entries and references, the traditional structures upon which the author/title catalog has been built. To Cutter, who was first thinking of a book catalog, and to others even today, the idea of a main entry meant a full entry; or, as Lubetzky stated, the “most important entry for a given work.”123 The other entries were considered auxiliary entries. Cutter did not include a definition of main entry until his fourth edition. By then, printed cards were available and, if unit cards were used, the entries were all the same except that the main entry served as a record of the other entries, including references made for the catalog. From the time of Cutter, the main entry was usually first thought of as an author entry. In applying AACR, many more entries become title entries than under previous codes.
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A main entry is assumed to be necessary in AACR to serve as a collocating device—"the necessity persists because, for one thing, even in multiple-entry catalogs it sometimes happens that a work, other than the work being cataloged, must be identified by a single entry—e.g. a work about which the work in hand has been written or a work on which the work in hand has been based." While an added entry can locate a book, only the main entry can with certainty bring together the representations of the work, the works related to the work, and the criticisms of it. Those who equate the unit card practice with the main entry concept fail to take this into account.

In AACR, the choice of main entry is approached as a problem of analyzing authorship responsibility. If no principal author can be identified (except for works of two or three), entry goes to title by default. The code is not always clear-cut or logical in this analysis, but it does call for an identification of the bibliographical conditions in the book itself.

The construction of heading depends on the analysis of problems and subproblems related to names. The first problem to be solved is the choice of a name and a particular form of that name. The second problem involves the conformation in which the name should appear in the catalog. In keeping with the Paris Principles, the code attempts to allow the name to be that which was used by the author in his or her works; when a choice is necessary, however, AACR prefers reference sources to the way the author is most frequently identified in his or her works, as IFLA suggests.

One of the departures of AACR from the Paris Principles concerned the entry of collections. The Paris Principles prefer entry of a collection consisting of independent works (or parts of works of different authors) under the title of the collection if a collective title is present, unless the name of the compiler appears prominently on the title page; this was largely a concession to the Anglo-American point of view. At ICCP, a proposal to permit entry under compiler if named on the title page lost; the proposal to permit entry under compiler if prominently named won. The rules in AACR as published made a distinction between editors of works of shared authorship (i.e., written for the same occasion and publication) and compilers of collections (defined as previously published individual works). The rules for compilers allowed entry under compiler if the compiler was named on the title page (rule 5). The rules for editors took into consideration the different types of editorial activity allowing entry under an editor if all three of the following conditions were met:
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editor named on the title page; if the publisher's name was not part of the title; and if the editor was primarily responsible for the existence of the work (rule 4). The first two conditions were easily determined. The third one was difficult to determine if the work itself gave no positive clues. A modest editor could become merely an added entry rather than a main entry simply because he or she did not openly indicate the degree of responsibility assumed. Despite a note in Cataloging Service to help the cataloger in this decision-making process, the decisions were difficult and arbitrary. One especially difficult aspect of this rule concerned works of a continuing nature where changes in editors or compilers often occur. These works could become widely separated in the catalog if entry were under editor or compiler.

Codes before AACR tended to follow the Anglo-American tradition with entry under the editor or compiler as the first choice. Several previous codes were better than AACR, allowing for entry under editor or compiler as the first choice but giving options for title or other entry under certain conditions. For example, Cutter (1904, rules 100-104) cited cases in which "for convenience of the public it is better that the catalog’s recognition of the collector should in certain cases take the form of reference or added entry rather than of main entry." Such cases included anonymous collections, periodicals, "collections intended to be indefinitely continued," and "collections known chiefly by their titles." Festschriften "may be entered" under the name of the person being honored. ALA 1904, 1908, 1941 and 1949 allowed for entry under title for conditions indicating that the editor's contributions were slight or where there were frequent changes of editors.

In keeping with the current policy of revision between editions, Cataloging Service records an official change that calls for entry of such works with a collective title under the title. A long-standing American tradition has come to an end. Little attention seems to have been paid to two user studies which indicate that an "author" (and AACR did consider editors and compilers as authors) approach is the preferred choice of users when both author and title are known, even when information about a title is better known than that about the author. Significantly, fewer than one-half of the users who fail in a first attempt to locate a known item continue their search.

Since it is based upon identification of bibliographical conditions, AACR attempts to do away with special rules for special types of materials rather than using the case-method approach of the earlier
rules. Each rule dealing with a special problem is to be understood in the context of the more general rules. Rules for entry, heading and description in the general section for monographs apply to the cataloging of nonbook materials as well. For such instances where the general rules are inappropriate or insufficient, special rules are provided.

Serials received a special rule for entry in AACR. While AACR makes provisions for entry of serials under personal or corporate author or under title, some librarians, taking account of the computer age and the desirability of international standardization, are calling for entry of all serials under title. The advantages and disadvantages of title entry have recently been discussed by several persons. While arbitrary title main entry for serials is not a new idea (it having at one time been the choice of the CCRC for AACR), the consequences of such a decision may cause problems for users because in the past, not even title added entries were provided for serials with "nondistinctive" titles.

Several changes relating to headings for corporate bodies appear in AACR. Those bodies treated subordinately can be entered as a subheading of the lowest element in the hierarchy that can be independently entered. Intervening elements can be omitted if they are not necessary to clarify the function of the smaller body as an element of the larger one. It now appears that this rule may not survive current code revision.

Included in the North American text of AACR as published were rules 98 and 99, providing for entry of institutions under place. By May 1972, these rules were deleted from AACR, allowing institutions to be entered as other corporate bodies and bringing AACR a little closer to the Paris Principles.

"IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT THE AACR IS THE LAST CODE WE SHALL SEE"

On March 24, 1974, the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) was formed. This international committee is made up of one representative each from the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, Catalog Code Revision Committee; the British Library; the National Library of Canada; the Library of Congress; and the Library Association. In addition to the JSC, code revision committees are at work in each of the countries, with the British con-
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Why, less than a decade after fifteen years of the most expensive code revision ever experienced, are persons again engaged in this activity? There are several reasons. C. Donald Cook indicated soon after AACR was published that general consensus on a code had not been reached, citing particularly the Standard for Descriptive Cataloging of Government Scientific and Technical Reports as one instance of variance from AACR. This work, first issued in 1963 by the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information of the Federal Council for Sciences and Technology, aimed at achieving uniform cataloging of technical reports by government agencies. Designed particularly for relatively untrained catalogers, the work preferred main entry primarily under corporate author at a time when AACR was providing for more entries under persons. A second problem indicated by Cook was the concern on the part of those working in computer applications about the suitability of the new code for computer-based cataloging purposes. "It is doubtful," predicted Cook, "that the AACR is the last code we shall see."

On March 20, 1967, LC began to apply AACR to publications within the limits of superimposition. By September 1967, there were already additions and changes to AACR which had been approved by DCC and by LC. Near the end of 1968, William J. Welsh, director of LC's Processing Department, indicated that LC had readied more than a dozen proposals for additions and changes for DCC's consideration at the 1969 ALA Midwinter Meeting. At the same time, the library was also working on a revision of Chapter 12 of AACR, relating to motion pictures, and on a number of transliteration tables. As LC continued to take an increasing role in initiating code revision, one is reminded of Lucile Morsch's indication that programs such as Shared Cataloging "cannot be delayed for decisions on new rules; the Library must have the authority and must take the responsibility to develop them as required to provide catalog entries promptly."

As the additions and changes continued, the British concern over them was shown in the lead article of Catalogue & Index in April 1969, which claimed that some of the "amendments appeared to have the effect of undermining the principles of the original text." It was suggested that the case for introducing substantial modifications to the principles "needed more evidence than any that had so far been presented."
While emphasis originally had been on clarification of existing rules by including examples, adding explanatory footnotes, or rewording the rules, the emphasis in the 1970s changed to filling the lacunae as LC and DCC, with revision committees of Canada and Britain, devoted their attention primarily to the development of rules for nonbook materials. A Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files was investigating the formulation of rules for cataloging computer records. All of this only brought to light the need for more additions and revisions in the near future, and the need for a second edition of AACR became more evident. A subcommittee was proposed to consider this problem. By the July 1973 ALA meeting, DCC's proposal for code revision was accepted and the organization and objectives of this proposal were tentatively accepted by CCS, LC, the Canadian Library Association and the Library Association.

At the 1974 ALA Midwinter Meeting, the newly appointed ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee was shifted from the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) to division (Resources and Technical Service Division (RTSD)) committee status and given the authority for code revision until the publication of the second edition.

A short while later JSC was formed to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) to reconcile in a single text the present North American Text and the British Text of the AACR; (2) to incorporate in the single text all amendments and changes since 1967 that have already been agreed upon and implemented by the authors under procedures following from the 1966 "Memorandum of Agreement on Catalog Code Revision between the American Library Association and the Library Association"; (3) to consider for inclusion in the revision all work currently in process and all proposals for amendments by the authors of the revised text and national committees of other countries that use English versions of the AACR texts, that have been put forward by a date not later than seven months after the commencement of editorial work on the revision, and (4) to provide for international interests in AACR as made known to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR by the date mentioned in 3 above.

In July 1974, at its first meeting, JSC appointed Paul Winkler, Principal Descriptive Cataloger, Library of Congress, as the editor and Michael Gorman of the British Library as associate editor.
Four policy statements were adopted by JSC in January 1975. First, the second edition should maintain general conformity with the Paris Principles. Second, it should conform with ISBD(M) as the basic bibliographic description of monographs and to the ISBD principle of bibliographic description for all categories of materials. Third, it was resolved that the second edition should take particular account of developments in the machine processing of bibliographic records, neglected in the first edition. Fourth, JSC accepted the commitment entered into by the predecessors to base the revision of relevant chapters of Part III of AACR primarily on the following four sources: Draft Revisions of Chapters 12 and 14 of the AACR (U.S.); Non-Book Materials Cataloging Rules (U.K.); Nonbook Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collection (Canada); and Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials (U.S.).

The same article that reported the Council on Library Resources grant of $111,431 to ALA on behalf of JSC to complete the second edition of AACR also announced the CLR grant of $350,000 to the University of Chicago to achieve full operational status for its comprehensive data management system and to make it available for sharing with other libraries. An almost equal amount, $348,800, was granted to Stanford University to enable its BALLOTS system to be expanded into a California library automation network.

As yet, there is no truly electronic catalog, although some librarians are working toward making catalog holdings available in machine-readable form. Some librarians believe that rules such as we now have may no longer be required for the establishing of personal entries in such catalogs because truncated searches can accomplish retrieval regardless of the degree of fullness of an author's name. They see no need for adhering to principles of "book" and "work" or for the concept of authorship—indeed, the movement toward title entry, especially in regard to proposed rules for serials, is an open admission of computer accommodation (although the user's convenience is thrown in for good measure).

On the other hand, some catalogers are moving in the direction of authority files and book/work identification in automated catalogs based on principles. At a conference in October 1975, Michael Malinconico of the New York Public Library described an on-line catalog with collocation capabilities in regard to representations of the work. He recognized the intervention of the human cataloger to achieve the collocation, while Frederick Kilgour saw the on-line catalog as having much more power than the Paris Principles for
helping the user and therefore foresaw the end of the classical catalog in the immediate future. Just as in the past, there are differences of opinion today in the making of the catalog. The machine is and will be influential—but it cannot be the only consideration.

Concerning nonbook materials, the rules covered by AACR, Part III, were essentially those covered in the previous code.\textsuperscript{155} The intent was that the general principles and rules of the code could cover all materials with special rules necessary only when a medium required them. Lois Mai Chan says that Part III, "especially chapters 12, 14 and 15, has proved to be inadequate in coping with the proliferation, particularly in the range, of nonbook materials in recent years."\textsuperscript{156} In an attempt to fill the gap, Jean Riddle Weihs, Shirley Lewis and Janet Macdonald, in consultation with a number of organizations interested in rules for nonbook materials, prepared \textit{Nonbook Materials; The Organization of Integrated Collections},\textsuperscript{157} based on AACR principles. This publication, as well as the revised Chapter 12 ("Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials") published in late 1975, have been received as basic documents for the revision of AACR.

The new code is projected for 1977. That date leaves little time for its discussion by a profession which has been, in the past, much engaged in code revision.

Even as work on AACR2 continues, the CCS Policy and Research Committee contemplates AACR3. Fearing that present revision efforts are being conducted in a fragmentary manner, the committee has called for basic research "to insure that future code revisions can be based upon and reflect the results of objective research."\textsuperscript{158} Named as topics for research were "catalog use and user preferences; the form of catalog entries including headings and tracings; the structure and style of catalog records including card catalogs, book catalogs, and computer catalogs; the relationship between manual and machine bibliographic records; and the relationship between form and/or type of material, cataloging treatment, and patterns of use."\textsuperscript{159} Now would be the time to begin such studies.

\section*{THE LOCAL LIBRARY}

Although \textit{Network} can report that "the 1967 AACR has played a significant role in English-speaking countries in standardizing the choice of entry, form of heading, and physical description of library materials,"\textsuperscript{160} how much effect do codes have upon local libraries which also have obligations and responsibilities to their users?
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Apparently, in some libraries, codes have little or no effect. For example, Virginia Woll Atwood found in a study of university and college libraries in regard to adoption of AACR that, while no large university library had disregarded the code, "of the small college librarians . . . almost a third have totally disregarded the code and continue to operate under earlier rules." Neal Edgar reported after a November 1, 1974, meeting of the Akron Area Librarians Association and the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians to discuss changes in catalog rules that of approximately 120 persons showing interest in code revision, only three in the audience indicated current use of AACR.

Codes exist to give general guidelines for recurring situations found in library materials. They are helpful in achieving a degree of standardization within an individual catalog or whenever it is desirable to achieve cooperation between libraries. Codes are not laws however; even if they were, as they have been written, they would not prove to be so inflexible as to result in completely uniform application. Catalogers bring individual interpretations to both the materials and the rules. "Catalogs are complex because people and books are complex," William W. Bishop advised students at the New York State Library School in 1915. He went on to identify the problems of descriptive cataloging and concluded that "somehow these must be treated with a degree of uniformity and common sense."

While codes may attempt to provide uniformity, only the cataloger with a concern for local users can apply the common sense required. How both the uniformity and the common sense should be applied will vary with the form and function of the catalog, the other bibliographical tools and materials available, the size of the collection and the catalog, the filing arrangement (in a manual catalog at least) and, of course, the users.

Among the total topics covered in one hundred years of cataloging literature, treatment of the making of a catalog of integrity for users seems sparse. Much more than the acceptance of bibliographical data from another source is implied in the act of compiling such a catalog. Herbert Putnam had hinted of this in his speech before ALA just prior to the issuance of LC cards to other libraries. Referring to the cards, he stated that: "The usefulness of copies of them to any other library for incorporation in its catalogs must depend upon local conditions; the style, form, and size of its own cards, the number of books which it adds yearly, the proportion of these which are current and other related matters."
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Despite the great response to the sale of LC printed cards, not all libraries availed themselves of this service for a variety of reasons, and for many materials LC cataloging was not available. For many years the percentage of foreign books covered by LC cataloging was small and coverage still is not available for many kinds of media. Many of the libraries preparing their own catalog entries were school and small public libraries for whom an abridged code was often requested but never issued. In his work, *Milestones in Cataloging*, Donald Lehnus cites the popularity of five American cataloging manuals which were among the fourteen most frequently cited works in his citation study of cataloging literature. Because of their frequent citation and because the same authors also wrote in the literature and were active in the profession, their suggestions undoubtedly influenced many librarians. For these reasons, the works of Theresa Hitchler, Jennie Dorcas Fellows, William W. Bishop, Susan Gray Akers, and Margaret Mann were studied here, as well as the more recent manual of Esther J. Piercy, revised by Marion Sanner.

Although these manuals were often written for beginners or “untrained” persons, they usually carried a philosophy about making a catalog to serve the user. Even though the form of name might be taken from the title page, the cataloger was encouraged to use a uniform form of the name that was full enough to be clear and to distinguish one person from another. In the manuals of Fellows, Akers and Piercy, which attempted to follow contemporary catalog codes, rules for choice of entry and form of name were usually simplified and abbreviated from the codes themselves. In a sense, they served as surrogate codes.

For descriptive cataloging, the manuals often suggested an abbreviated form for transcription of the title and other title-related information. The place of publication was usually not considered important and the publisher was abbreviated. The copyright date however, was considered essential. Collation was usually restricted to the last numbered arabic page, the term “illus.” usually sufficed except for certain kinds of publications, for which the use of “map” and “ports.” was suggested. Size, which had caused early librarians so much concern, was usually omitted. A series statement and notes were used if important; contents notes were among the most frequently mentioned notes, especially for literary works.

When printed cards were not used, different kinds of entries often were of different fullness. The main entry was the full entry. Subject entries were often full so that the user interested in many books all on
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the same subject was not required to refer to many main entry cards for full information. Harriet D. MacPherson made the following synthesis about other secondary entries:

All other secondary types, such as those for editor, joint author, title, etc., were given only in skeleton form, with the understanding that the reader would use the added entry card for ready reference only, and refer back to the main entry for all detailed information. . . . The shortening of the secondary entry card generally involved merely placing the author's initials in the heading and omitting notes, either entirely or in part; sometimes other items, such as a portion of the title, the edition, the imprint (except the date), and the entire collation, were omitted as well. If many notes or other items were omitted a blanket stamp referring the reader to the main entry card for further information was often used.168

Fiction cards in the smaller libraries were frequently very brief; often only author and title were recorded. Added entry points of access were to be made if “useful.” They seldom were to be made for editors, compilers or translators.

In the days of manuscript cards, a ruled card was often used. Bishop, who saw his manual as being written from the administrative viewpoint, encouraged the use of cards “ruled with the top and two sides in red”169 for all manuscript cards. The computer brought back an old practice from the days of manuscript or typed cards—that is, using a different form for each type of entry.

Shortened forms used abbreviations and punctuation known only to catalogers. Fellows recognized them as time-saving for the cataloger who knew their meanings, but not helpful to the user.170 (In the 1970s the same difficulty was recognized in regard to ISBD punctuation.)

Another source of descriptive cataloging data also came from centralized or commercial cataloging and/or processing centers. For thirty-five years, the H.W. Wilson Company issued catalog cards and included the cataloging data in their Standard Catalog series. Although the cards are no longer available, the cataloging data is still included in other of Wilson's services.171 In recent years, the entries reflected the form of name on the title page; the descriptive cataloging was brief; imprint consisted of a brief form of the publisher's name and the date; and collation included arabic paging and a brief statement of illustrations. No doubt this pattern influenced many
libraries using Wilson cards when it was necessary to make their cards locally.

In a study of commercial processing firms, Barbara Westby reported that the title-page form of name was used almost exclusively: "This results in variations in the entry for a single author if his name is printed differently in his books, e.g., Smith, J.J.; Smith, James J.; and Smith, James John. Only a few firms maintain name authority files; and cross-references for names and subjects are seldom furnished." She reminded the local cataloger that there was work to be done in making the catalog even if cards were purchased. From examples in her study and from those obtained elsewhere, one notes the same lack of publisher and size and the use of a brief title as called for by the manuals cited above. Brief annotations are often used.

A study of cataloging in the National Union Catalog series also shows variation in descriptive cataloging data used. Indeed, both Hastings in the 1930s and Dewton some thirty years later raised complaints about the entries supplied by different libraries to cooperative ventures. Dewton went so far as to say that a large part of the cataloging done by American libraries did not live up to expected standards. With the computer came the possibility of suppressing information on certain records and of formatting different records in different ways. This proved to be particularly useful in book catalog production. A great variety can be found in recent book catalogs because they have been made for many different types of libraries. In their study, Tauber and Feinberg found that:

The amount of information included in the entries varies in different book catalogs. Some include all the information appearing on the catalog card, others limit the entries to what may be considered as the minimum elements. . . . Entries may be shortened by such practices as the use of abbreviations for name of publishers and other elements, by use of initials for authors instead of the full form of name, by limiting the title to a specified number of characters and by limiting descriptive cataloging." Not all libraries follow rules exactly as written. One large university library entered corporate names under the form used at time of publication long before AACR sanctioned this practice. Even after AACR's appearance, some libraries continued to catalog serials under latest title, while others used successive titles long before AACR. A smaller university library finds LC summaries for audiovisual materials inappropriate for its use and therefore writes its own. A univer-
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sity library with a computer-produced book catalog, where all information is keyed into the computer, alters descriptive cataloging to conform to the latest practice as well as providing main entries to agree with the revision of AACR rules 3-5. A cataloger for a school processing center finds the need to add additional subject headings for her system. An art library/museum cataloger makes many more added entries than AACR calls for.

While not much may be written about the adaptations of local libraries to meet the needs of their users—perhaps because standardization is so much the watchword these days—the making of a catalog of integrity for the local user does continue. Centralized and commercialized services and systems like OCLC do not currently generate cross references, do not match the entries to forms existing in local catalogs, nor do they perform any of the myriad of details that make the difference between a catalog and a mere listing of individual authors and titles. There is little need to modify perfectly good bibliographical data used in description of the physical item simply because it goes beyond that ordinarily provided locally or because it differs in form. There may be local needs, however, which call for going beyond that provided on standardized cataloging data. Here could be mentioned the need for contents (sparsely presented on LC cards); the need for added entries that exceed the "rule of three" in cataloging codes and in LC practice; and the need for analytics brought about by changes in publishing, the lack of prompt indexing in other tools, and the needs of specialized users.

In the future, local libraries will still need to supply cataloging for items for which the need is uniquely local. Even the Library of Congress realizes that "it can supply no more than 75-80 percent of the cataloging information that is required nationally" and that "it will never acquire some bibliographic items; for example, many state and local documents, the output of minor publishers, and various publications in specialized fields."

An encouraging development is the LC publication of *Names with References* and the prospect of LC authority information being distributed in machine-readable form. The research done by the national library can become a powerful tool in many local libraries either using or adapting the information. The use of the computer should enable local libraries also to provide information for their users in a way never before possible, and to update or change some kinds of entries rapidly. But the local library must set the priorities for itself.

Until recently, relatively few changes occurred in the form of the
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catalog in the century under review. It was the time of the dictionary card catalog; in the future, however, we shall certainly see all types of catalogs—book, microform, card, on-line—or a mix of several types. Regardless of form, what we must learn from history is to consider the user and the bibliographical data for the one tool that has been made specifically for the local user.

A SHORT LOOK AT A LONG TIME: SYNTHESIS

Descriptive cataloging is concerned to a large extent with the choice and form of bibliographical data elements necessary to provide access to the items in the collection, and to describe and identify the items for purposes of selection or rejection by the user.

Alternative methods exist by which to provide access, determine the forms of names, and describe and identify the items. Because of this fact, some persistent problems have recurred throughout the century: real name vs. pseudonym; editor vs. titles; entry under place vs. entry under the name of an institution; transcription in title-page order vs. transcription in a prescribed order. Each has its advantages and disadvantages.

The card form of the catalog has prevailed in this period of history. It did not appear overnight, nor will it disappear overnight. Much has happened, however, in the last fifteen years to lead to the conclusion that the catalog may appear in many forms in the future—even within the same library. Since form of the catalog can affect descriptive cataloging, this point cannot be overlooked.

To determine which of the alternative methods of access, forms of name, etc. to choose or which forms of the catalog to use, the function of the catalog must be predetermined. Even after one hundred years function is not well defined. There may be different functions for different libraries, although there is likely to be some commonality of function for many libraries of the same nature, size, or user population. Any one library must remain flexible enough to respond to the needs of its users and define its own functions if necessary. The computer should be helpful in providing flexibility, but human intervention is necessary to recognize the need.

User studies have usually been related to a particular library. However, any one user may have different needs at different times. What little is known about users seems sometimes to have been ignored in cataloging codes.

Codes are not laws, although some librarians have interpreted them
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as such. They seem to move more in the machine age toward achievement of some degree of more rigid standardization on national and international levels. Modern technology should free the local library to alter standardized services more easily, should the functions of the library and the needs of users require this. Standardization to communicate on one level need not mean uniformity in all libraries.

Politics and rhetoric have been a part of descriptive cataloging practices as they have been a part of all of life. Often the literature, especially during times of code revision, has been filled with attempts "to sell the product." We have not escaped what Robert A. Fairthorne calls "salesmanship without responsibility" any better than have others in the information revolution. On the other hand, those who have had ideas and have not made them evident may have, in their lethargy, robbed the profession of solutions we could have used.

William Dix, librarian emeritus of Princeton University, recently wrote a short paragraph on the presentation of the 1975 Esther J. Piercy award to John D. Byrum, current chairperson of CCRC. Dix noted that this "may be the age of the cataloger." He sees the cataloger as a "library professional with a firm intellectual grasp of theory and insistence upon high standards, and a recognition of the opportunities offered by new attitudes and new technology." As other bibliographical tools move toward acceptance of the same standards and principles as those used in making the catalog, Cutter's golden age of cataloging may be not over, but just arriving.
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Subject Analysis: An Interpretive Survey

DORALYN J. HICKEY

CHANGING PATTERNS OF SUBJECT ANALYSIS

The year 1876 marked the publication in the United States of Charles Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue* and, to some minds, the beginning of an inevitable dichotomy between the development of rules and procedures for the descriptive identification of library materials and the evolution of principles and practices of subject analysis. For the better part of the ensuing century, even the field of subject analysis divided itself into two essentially separate disciplines: subject cataloging and classification. Because subject cataloging involved the selection of terminology to describe the content of the material, it was regularly and quite logically associated with the descriptive cataloging effort; the process of classification however, was seen basically as an attempt to group materials in meaningful ways and thus formed a separate operation.

As library collections grew and efforts to centralize the cataloging operation intensified, selection of subject terms became a larger problem than Cutter had perhaps anticipated. Whereas this pressure resulted in the elaboration of rules and examples in the area of descriptive cataloging, it eventuated merely in the development of lists of subject headings. Meanwhile, classification established itself as primarily hierarchical and enumerative, also taking on—especially with the appearance of the Library of Congress Classification—the characteristics of a list rather than a code. Indeed, it is somewhat astonishing that there is still no comprehensive set of rules for the application of the Library of Congress Classification.

After World War II, the inadequacies of lists without codes in the area of subject control of library materials began to be felt in significant ways. Prosperity, accompanied by a startling increase in the number of materials being published and the size of library acquisi-
tion budgets, introduced two strong trends: (1) to reduce the amount of time devoted to the selection of subject headings and classification symbols, and (2) to increase the precision of subject analysis while maintaining a greater consistency among materials. Unfortunately, these trends frequently contradicted each other. Some librarians, particularly administrators of large library systems, argued that precision was a chimera and consistency an unreasonable dream; they contended that only a reliable bibliographic identification was really important, and that subject analysis of any value should be left to the subject bibliographers and information specialists. In contrast, many catalogers and reference librarians argued that general bibliographic control in the subject areas was a shambles, requiring that the libraries take the initiative in producing the depth and consistency of analysis desired. The growing number of information scientists, meanwhile, looked to the computer for the needed speed and accuracy to provide an acceptable level of subject control, and rejected the library efforts as misguided.

Because of these often conflicting trends, the once-honored effort to provide subject control through traditional library cataloging and classification procedures has fallen into disrepute as shallow, imprecise, and time-consuming beyond its worth. Specialized, computer-based bibliographic data banks offer better subject access, but their growing size often precludes comprehensive search except at great expense.

GENERAL PROBLEMS IN SUBJECT ANALYSIS

Part of the dilemma of modern subject control of library materials stems from certain basic problems which were present when Cutter formulated his rules. There are fundamentally divergent purposes in performing a subject analysis of any material: (1) to identify its content so that it can be retrieved uniquely according to its particular aspects, and (2) to identify its content so that it can be related to other materials and retrieved in conjunction with them. It might be argued, simplistically, that subject heading work serves the first purpose of providing unique identification, while classification work serves the second. An examination of the subject cataloging effort as it has evolved in libraries reveals, however, the fallacies in this oversimplification. Subject heading lists include both “separating” and “grouping” devices, that is, specific headings which may apply to very few materials, and general headings designed to create large groups of
related materials. Similarly, classification can be used to delineate unique characteristics of materials, or to bring quantities of materials together in an undifferentiated array.

A second type of dilemma has been occasioned by the rather loose use of the term subject. Traditional library practice in the United States has glossed over the distinction among various aspects of materials. Such characteristics as authorship, title and series statements, publication data, and format have been assigned to descriptive cataloging.

Most of the other characteristics have been assigned to subject analysis: topic, form, level, geographical coverage, and time factors. Falling between the cracks are such characteristics as association (e.g., the identification of the person honored by a festschrift), which are neither subject nor descriptive in nature. Again, both the subject heading lists and the classification schemes include these types of analysis which are not, strictly speaking, subject in nature.

The lack of a clear set of principles governing the subject analysis of library materials has produced a third problem; namely, the reliance upon lists of headings and classificatory divisions, centrally issued and updated. Although there have been a number of attempts, usually originating outside the United States, to establish a set of principles or at least a code for subject analysis, the American librarian has delegated responsibility for the construction of lists and classification schemes largely to the Library of Congress, partly monitored by such library organizations as the American Library Association. Since the Library of Congress has only infrequently published any official explanation of the principles underlying the maintenance of its list and schemes, it is not surprising that most librarians are unable to state with any assurance the basis for selection of subject terms and classification symbols beyond the general rule of "specificity."

An additional problem is the paucity of information concerning the effectiveness of the subject analysis systems which have developed over the past one hundred years. Catalog use studies seem to indicate a better-than-haphazard level of user satisfaction with subject retrieval devices in libraries. The uneasiness of many reference librarians persists, however, as they observe the relatively unsophisticated demands which catalog users place upon the subject control mechanisms available to them in the majority of libraries. They reason, along with many catalogers, that an unknown number of library users is satisfied too quickly and too superficially by a likely looking book title or a common classification number which seems to appear in
frequent association with likely looking titles. The construction of a reliable instrument to measure and separate all of the variables involved in a library user’s subject approach to the catalog is, however, extremely difficult; securing a set of reliable conditions under which to administer such an instrument is even harder. Thus, it is not surprising that most of these studies are either shallow or highly specialized.

It may be helpful to consider these four major problems against the general trends in the development of the two devices most familiar to library users who seek to use the subject approach to materials: classification systems and subject headings. The following sections will attempt to provide an interpretive review of the history of these two devices in the United States from 1876 to 1976.

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

The year 1876 marked not only the publication of Cutter's *Rules* but also the appearance of the first edition of Melvil Dewey’s *Decimal Classification.* Destined to achieve a popularity among libraries which was not seriously challenged until the 1950s, the Decimal Classification (DDC) began its history modestly enough as a system for solving the problems of a college library. Dewey attempted to make utilization of materials simple even for the relatively untutored library clientele, although it assumed a level of literacy and general familiarity with the structure of knowledge not uniformly shared by library users.

Dewey’s various library activities often pushed the classification system aside, but he continued to revise it and supervise its development for the next fifty years. His unwillingness to make the radical adjustment required for the handling of the Library of Congress collection resulted in the inception of a new scheme based to some degree upon Cutter’s *Expansive Classification.* The Library of Congress Classification (LC) evolved more slowly, with editions of various sections appearing at irregular intervals. It began with the Z schedule at the turn of the twentieth century, and is still being completed with the issuance of the K schedule, along with the numerous revised editions and reprints of other sections.

Meanwhile, some of the larger research libraries, having had no opportunity to wait for the development of DDC and LC, continued to utilize various forms of arrangement of materials: fixed location, broad subject groupings, and local classification schemes. Early suggestions for the standardization of the development and application
of classification schemes eventually bore fruit as libraries gradually phased out the localized systems and adopted DDC. Not until the post-World War II period did any system offer a significant challenge to DDC; that which did was the centrally maintained and applied Library of Congress scheme.

The pressures of handling large quantities of materials in the 1950s, accompanied by a shortage of qualified personnel in libraries, occasioned a crisis resulting in a flight from DDC to LC. Critically read, the literature shows all too clearly the economics of the library classification policies. Much space was devoted to often incomplete and inaccurate summaries of the advantages and disadvantages of the two major systems; at the heart of the movement away from DDC, however, was the simple fact that LC symbols appeared more consistently and completely on Library of Congress printed cards. The centrally applied scheme of a nationally recognized library was obviously more economical to use than one which existed essentially as a private enterprise; the fact that LC also enjoyed the somewhat ill-deserved reputation of a "scholarly" system provided a respectable justification of a cost-based decision.

The process of reclassification from DDC to LC deserves considerable attention, for it tended to overshadow another trend which had more impact in Great Britain and the Commonwealth nations than it did in the United States. This latter trend, had it really affected American libraries, might have obviated the need for switching to LC and propelled the United States into faceted and synthetic classification. This did not happen, however; indeed, the major discernible effect of faceting upon the American scene is its influence upon the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress under the administration of the DDC editor Benjamin Custer.

Several historical factors combined to propel libraries to reject further use of DDC and accept LC. The first factor was the methodology used for revising DDC. The editions which appeared while Dewey was still alive reflected a reasonably consistent editorial policy and a relatively conservative approach to drastic change. The appearance of the unabridged DDC 15 (which looked more like an abridged edition in size), severely shocked the library world. Classes were moved and rearranged, seemingly without regard to the effect upon existing collections. Since DDC was basically a shelf classification, it was incredible that the editor and the publisher of the system could expect librarians to react favorably to so drastic a revision, however intellectually defensible it might be. Interestingly, DDC 15
was not a particularly bad effort; it was simply radically changed and created chaos.

Once “betrayed,” the American classifiers were not likely to be so naively trusting again. The groundwork was laid for considering other kinds of drastic change if DDC could be so irresponsible. With the rapid growth of library collections, it was imperative to make quick decisions about the future of DDC in large libraries. The erosion of trust in the integrity of the system thus set the stage psychologically for the later movement to LC.

The sixteenth edition was received with a collective sigh of relief, but the damage had already been done. The Dewey office established at LC was unable to secure the facilities and staff to keep up with the expanded acquisition program of what was becoming, in fact if not in name, the national library of the United States. Programs for bringing in foreign materials, such as the Farmington Plan, the P.L. 480 plan, and Title II-C of the 1965 Higher Education Act (National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging), increased the pressure on the Dewey office. DDC numbers appeared on cards for English-language materials and, where possible, on cards for items in major European languages; little else was covered. Missing numbers and the ever-present possibility of further alterations in DDC combined to convince many library administrators that the time to change classification systems had arrived. The literature of the 1960s erupted with arguments for and against DDC, descriptions of “how we switched in our library,” and bibliographies of materials dealing with reclassification.

Although the editorial work on DDC had been centralized at the Library of Congress since 1927, the percentage of materials covered by numbers on LC printed cards had steadily dropped, in terms of the total quantity of cards issued. Furthermore, because LC did not arrange its materials in DDC order, the “book numbers” (devised by Cutter to provide an alphabetical order within classes) were not included on the cards. LC classification symbols did, however, provide a complete and unique designation for each item. The final blow was perhaps cast by the elaboration of DDC numbers associated with edition 17 as reflected on the LC printed cards. Despite the introduction of segmented notation which would allow the logical truncation of a classification number to fit the needs of the local library, the strings of ten to fifteen DDC digits appearing more frequently on LC cards only hastened the switch to LC.

Looking back on the almost fifty years of the appearance of editions
of DDC under the direction of Dewey's hand-picked assistants, it is hard to comprehend the atmosphere of near-panic which surrounded the issue of each new edition after the fifteenth. The total lack of satisfaction with DDC 17's index certainly did not allay these fears, although the editor's efforts to update the scheme through phoenix schedules and additional expansions were regularly applauded. The nagging question persists, however: Would the large libraries have been so ready to abandon DDC if the economic affluence of the 1960s had been replaced by the recession of the 1970s?

While the controversy concerning the desirable classification system dominated the literature, other voices raised basic questions about the validity of any enumerative classification system. As has already been noted, the challenges presented by faceted and synthetic classifications can be discerned at least partially in the development of DDC under the editorship of Benjamin Custer. The familiar Table of Form Divisions in DDC—which some view as a basic, although perhaps accidentally introduced, synthetic device—became in DDC 16 the Table of Standard Subdivisions. In DDC 17, it was joined by a Table of Areas; the eighteenth edition carried the possibility of synthesis even further by establishing an additional five tables to permit the uniform expression of literary form, language, and racial/ethnic/national divisions within a class.

The concept of subject analysis logically implies a breakdown of a field into its component parts. The hierarchical classification systems did not, however, make explicit the fact that a number of subject fields are interrelated in ways inappropriate to such a hierarchy. Some library historians have seen in Henry Bliss's *A Bibliographic Classification* the basics of a synthetic approach, but more authorities cite S.R. Ranganathan's *Colon Classification* as the first self-consciously faceted scheme. The number of U.S. libraries using Bliss has never been large, even though periodic attempts have been made since the 1950s to issue a revised edition and cumulated additions and corrections. The *Colon Classification* attracted even fewer devotees in America, but its impact on library education, and especially on the teaching of subject analysis, is yet to be explored fully.

Another system which has been called synthetic is the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC). Under the aegis of Paul Otlet and Henri La Fontaine, UDC progressed from its DDC base to an elaborate and detailed set of multilanguage schedules, begun in the late nineteenth century and issued at irregular intervals through the sponsorship of the International Federation for Documentation.
(FID). The complete English version is still to appear, and there are frequent rumors that its continued updating is threatened by the precarious financial structure which supports it. Called by one scholar "a hybrid," UDC gained its reputation as a synthetic system under the interpretation of S.C. Bradford in England, who explained the "auxiliaries" which can be used with UDC to indicate facets.¹⁵ Most of the facets are now at least partly expressible through the DDC tables, but the direction of the expansions adopted for UDC is often quite different from that in DDC. Despite their common heritage, there appears to be little hope that the two systems will be united any time in the near future.

General American disinterest in the theory of library classification has puzzled many and elated a few. The great American library iconoclast, Ralph Shaw, expressed open disgust at the vagaries of classificatory analysis. His maxim was that "the intensity of interest in classification theory is in direct inverse ratio to the level of library service" in a given country.¹⁶ The evidence provided by American library literature tends to support the contention that Shaw's attitude was fairly typical.

There has nonetheless been a relatively small but quite influential group of American members of the British-based Classification Research Group (CRG),¹⁷ and a chapter of CRG has operated in the United States for nearly twenty years. Few effects of CRG have been discernible in the traditional American library; however, the theorists have found a more hospitable reception among the growing numbers of information scientists and "documentalists" in the United States. It would be improper to conclude a survey of classification developments within the United States without noting the attempts of information specialists outside of libraries to discover faster and more accurate means of classifying. The thrust of their efforts has been directed toward the classification of ideas or of knowledge; it is in this regard that they often differ from the librarian, who is interested almost exclusively in the arrangement of materials on the shelves. It is important to understand that the American library tradition has moved consciously away from the display of subject relationships through a card file (the classed catalog) or a printed list. More recent attempts to reintroduce the classed catalog¹⁸ seem to have had little effect on the more institutionalized library services, although the use of a classified approach to periodical indexing and information retrieval is receiving a more positive response.

Contemporary attitudes toward classification appear to be po-
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larized. Faced with reduced budgets and staff limitations, libraries support the development of simple systems which can be easily—preferably centrally—applied, and result in a notation string of reasonable length which can be used effectively to arrange materials on the shelves. Information specialists and subject bibliographers, faced with a seemingly endless publication effort, support the development of highly analytic knowledge-classification schemes which can reveal salient information on both broad and narrow topics; the arrangement of the materials on shelves or in files or on computer has, to their minds, no necessary relationship to the classification notation.

Those who reject traditional shelf location systems such as DDC and LC as inadequate for their requirements are generally faced with the challenge of developing their own systems. Specialized schemes for medical and law libraries have long been recognized, although it was only with the advent of the computerized MEDLARS (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System) of the National Library of Medicine that medical libraries were able to agree upon a single classification plan, namely that of NLM itself. The multiplicity of essentially enumerative schemes for the control of special subject fields is easily observed from the literature; however, the rise of strong, centralized libraries and the recognized cost of local maintenance and application of special systems have effectively eliminated further development of new enumerative classifications.

There persists the hope that the computer will provide the answer. Especially during the 1960s, information scientists looked to the possibility of "automatic classification" as a means of avoiding the pitfalls of both enumerative and faceted schemes. Early experiments seem to demonstrate the probability of at least limited success with the computer-grouping of documents or their abstracts on the basis of the similarity of language used in them. However, the costs of translating the small successes achieved with document collections numbering under 10,000 in highly defined technological fields into successful manipulation of a million-document collection on more diverse topics are staggering. Investigation of automatic classification on a large scale has not materialized.

Despite the seeming preoccupation of American librarians with shelf arrangement, it is clear that subject control cannot be achieved at such a superficial level. Attention is being focused increasingly on the improvement of subject bibliography, although it has not held so high a priority as the achievement of descriptive control. American preference seems to be, however, for the use of subject terms rather
than classification symbols as the primary means of achieving the desired level of subject control.

SUBJECT HEADINGS

Classification does not necessarily involve the use of numbers to express relationships; words themselves provide a form of notation which can be arranged to display the topical interconnections of library materials. The subject cataloging practice which formed Cutter's heritage as he compiled his rules of 1876 was primarily classificatory in nature. While he advocated the specific entry of materials under headings expressing the topics as directly as possible, those libraries utilizing his rules followed an older practice of entering materials specifically by working down from the general discipline to the narrow topic. Cutter's preference for direct, specific headings did not, however, override his belief that some of the library's clientele might conceptualize their needs in hierarchical fashion rather than directly. Few studies were available to indicate precisely how people think about their subject needs, and the tradition of the classed and alphabetico-classed catalogs suggested that Cutter's argument might be defensible. In any case, he contributed to the library world a "code" for selecting topic words which were sometimes direct and sometimes hierarchical. It is perhaps no wonder that successive librarians found themselves unable to maintain consistent form in the subject headings used. By the turn of the century, the need for standard lists of acceptable headings was firmly established.22

Librarians turned to the American Library Association for aid in obtaining a list of subject headings. The early ALA lists were eventually superseded by the work of the Library of Congress, although the lists were published concurrently during a short period.23 With one or two exceptions, no one seriously tried to explain the theory underlying the selection of subject headings to be included in the LC list.24 Substituted for the theory was an ever-growing, elaborate syndetic structure built into the lists to aid the subject cataloger in selecting the authorized heading. Remnants of the alphabetico-classed approach, such as inverted and subdivided headings, could remain so long as appropriate cross-references were constructed. Neither library user nor librarian thus needed to know why a particular heading was chosen for inclusion in the list, only which version of it was acceptable to the system and which was not.

The major issue dominating the 1920s and 1930s was the im-
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provement of the LC list and the publication of the syndetic structure. By the early 1950s, the strains noted earlier, occasioned by the expanded publication activities of the postwar period, also began to highlight the weakness of the LC list. When Sears’s List of Subject Headings first appeared, it was evident that a number of librarians had given up any hope of being able to understand the LC list and were doubtful that their clienteles, especially in small libraries, would do any better.

David Haykin’s attempt to explain the logic of LC headings, published in the 1950s, was reassuringly clear, but even Haykin admitted that LC often failed to follow the principles which supposedly governed the selection of new headings. His work summarized many of the challenges directed to the LC staff, and he offered cogent responses. He tried to explain why some headings were inverted, why some were provided with topical as well as general (usually “form”) subdivisions, why geographic names were sometimes the main heading and at other times used as subdivisions, and why some headings could be divided chronologically while others could not. Despite Haykin’s efforts, dissatisfaction with the inconsistencies of the LC list continued; unfortunately, few viable options to the LC system emerged.

Those who were concerned about the need for simplified headings for children and young people attempted to issue their own lists for use in elementary schools and in the children’s departments of public libraries. Essentially, these lists served the same purpose as did the Sears list, namely, to help an untutored user to find appropriate subject matter more easily by employing simpler and more familiar terminology. Common (rather than scholarly) names appeared in these lists, and fewer subdivisions were added than ordinarily would be available to users of the Sears and LC lists.

Each of the attempted substitutes for the LC list had one major deficiency: the terms which users employ to search for materials in library collections do not remain constant over more than a few years. In the 1960s, another challenge was leveled at the lists, and to some degree at the traditional classification schemes as well: bias. Outdated and inaccurate terms, occasionally with racial, ethnic, religious, or sexual slurs, were still much in evidence in many lists; they had not been purged, it was argued, because they had been correct when they were adopted and change was too costly.

Although the Processing Department of LC established a research unit to investigate, among other things, the various alternatives to the
no significant, nationally applicable program for the development of new subject headings has yet been proposed. As in the field of classification, the major viable alternatives to traditional lists of subject headings have appeared in special, nonlibrary situations.

The most popular alternative of the 1950s achieved almost the status of a fad. Promoted by Mortimer Taube, the Uniterm system was sold to special libraries and business/industrial concerns as a means of bringing file information under subject control. The work done by Taube was imitated by a number of enterprising colleagues, to the extent that uniterm became almost a generic word for an open-ended list of single-noun headings. The genius of Taube's system was its apparent simplicity; it is interesting to note, however, that uniterms were designed for machine manipulation. Taube's studies in coordinate indexing, often unread by his imitators, prescribed the ways in which simple nouns could be joined to identify documents dealing with quite specific pieces of information.

While uniterms, and later "descriptors," were being introduced into the subject processes of special libraries and information systems, others were advocating a machine-based procedure which bypassed the problem of establishing standard terminology: the keyword index. Although the keyword approach to subject indexing was certainly not new—it had been used in German catalogs for over a century—its combination with the peculiar capabilities of the electronic computer made it more attractive. By a relatively simple process of comparison, the computer could ignore common words and prepare an alphabetical listing of content words, in complete or partial context, reflecting the topical import of the material. The limitations of the method were recognized immediately: keywords taken from a title or abstract do not always reflect the true subject of the work; no procedure is available for providing links between synonymous terms and between terms with a common root but appearing in different forms; keywords in different languages are not collocated. The proponents of the system argued, often convincingly, that keyword indexes were not designed to replace more careful assignment of standard subject terms, but rather were constructed to provide what is sometimes called "quick and dirty" access. Thus the keyword approach acquired popularity as a "current awareness" process, quickly available at relatively low cost.

The currency of the keyword index and the simplicity of the Uniterm system were clearly desirable, although neither device was fully satisfactory. The predictable outcome of experiences with both
systems was the emergence of a hybrid: the thesaurus. Offering the control provided by traditional subject headings, but with the greater flexibility characteristic of the open-ended keyword system, thesauri quickly gained favor among special librarians. The thesaurus did, however, depend on a carefully stated code of rules for the addition of new headings and the establishment of relationships among headings. In new information fields, it proved difficult to establish the basic consistency of terminology which a successful thesaurus presupposes. In such cases, the keyword index was sometimes employed to establish the terminological frequencies and boundaries of the new field; then, on the basis of research into the keywords, a preliminary thesaurus could be constructed and tested.

There were, of course, questions concerning the effectiveness of these various methods of subject analysis. The American scene watched and occasionally produced critics of the Cranfield comparative evaluation of traditional and newer subject control devices in the field of aeronautics. No clear evidence has been uncovered, however, to demonstrate the superiority of one system over another. Furthermore, the use of terms such as thesaurus has been clouded by the release of subject heading lists which seem merely to have been called thesauri in order to make them sound modern.

The search for a general-purpose subject analysis pattern continues, but the impetus has shifted from the United States to England. There, particularly represented in the work of Derek Austin, an approach called PRECIS is being perfected. To some Americans it is quite disappointing that the century of experience in the United States with developing and testing subject heading lists has eventuated in so little progress toward a satisfactory resolution of the discerned problems.

FUTURE OF SUBJECT ANALYSIS

The history of subject analysis in the United States reflects an intensive initial effort by Cutter and others to establish viable principles for classification and selection of subject headings. The latter part of the nineteenth and the first one-third of the twentieth centuries witnessed the solidification of shelf classification schemes which suffered from inconsistencies and bias, and subject heading lists that tended to stifle creativity in the interest of standardization. The past twenty-five years have offered challenges to the traditional systems of subject control, but they have failed to stimulate the development of
significant alternatives. Librarians regularly bemoan the inadequacies of DDC, LC, and the LC and Sears subject lists, while continuing to defer to the Library of Congress and, more recently, to the Ohio College Library Center to provide the answers to problems which have been recognized and documented for the last forty years.

It may be that the failure of Americans to concentrate attention on the theory of subject analysis and control has produced the current dilemma. If so, it could be resolved by a concerted effort on the part of library educators and administrators to re-examine the goals of subject analysis and to encourage the invention of more effective systems operable in both a network context and as part of a national subject bibliographic control program.

The trends leading to the development of special schemes and lists for individual subject fields appear to have resulted in costly processes no more satisfactory than those carried out by the Library of Congress. Nor have the information indexing and thesaurus-based techniques practiced by special librarians and information scientists proven to be extendable to large collections of the dimensions of those housed in the modern research library. In sum, the old procedures are failing, but the new ones are not yet capable of reliable performance.

The future of subject analysis does not loom bright, especially since current library attention is focused on basic descriptive control, where the issues are more clearly defined and perhaps more crucial. Current trends indicate that the future of subject analysis will depend largely on forces either outside of libraries or outside of the United States.

In the United States, the initiative in devising subject bibliographic control seems to have passed to the information specialists. In the 1950s and 1960s, most of their efforts were directed toward the creation of separate plans for each subject area, no matter how specialized. The current spirit appears to move in the direction of amalgamation, although merging of individualized systems has undoubtedly been slowed by the economic reversals of the 1970s. In contrast, the library-based information systems have often tried to begin with a large discipline and “spin off” continuing bibliographies in the narrower areas. Markets for both the general subject bibliography and specific area bibliographies clearly can be stimulated. Because experienced librarians understand more readily the complexities of large cumulating data bases, the possible movement of qualified library personnel from traditional library classification and
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subject heading work into major continuing bibliographic programs is an attractive prospect.

Outside the United States, only the relatively new and—in America at least—largely unknown PRECIS system holds significant promise as a "universal" approach to subject analysis. It remains to be demonstrated that PRECIS can operate effectively in languages other than English and can adapt itself to emerging fields of investigation. The search continues for a universal subject-analytical process which can transcend the limitations of language and national differences to enable human beings of all backgrounds to share information effectively. Whether PRECIS is a reliable step in that direction is uncertain, but it is one of the few operational systems having such potential.

Will the enumerative classification systems and subject lists survive? Shelf classification is quite likely to persist, but the illusion that such classification work is highly professional is rapidly being dispelled. Furthermore, a growing demand for a dual structure of subject control in libraries is emerging. At the level of stack arrangement and rapid identification of broad subject areas for browsing, there is a need for a notation which many have characterized as "something between the abridged and the unabridged Dewey." If DDC's numerical notation could be kept to six or seven digits, if it were coupled with a flexible book-numbering system, and if it were centrally applied to all new materials as they are published, it would be well received by librarians. Attention could then be safely redirected to the creation of a detailed national (and international) subject bibliographic structure utilizing computer techniques and appearing regularly in a variety of formats.

Little attention has been paid in this discussion to the phenomenon of the "subject catalog," that is, the creation of a separate library card file or printed list for the subject approach. During the 1950s and 1960s, the so-called divided catalog (subject cards separated from author and title cards) became popular. While studies of catalog use have never established the superiority of either the dictionary or the divided catalog, it should be acknowledged that the modern version of the subject catalog exists primarily to benefit libraries by reducing the complexity of a large card file.

The prime benefit of the separate subject catalog may prove to be the ease with which it can be discontinued. The relationship between general subject bibliographies and the shelf arrangement of libraries needs to be established clearly. At present, it appears that the most
natural link is created by the movement of the information seeker from (1) the national or international data bank (or printed bibliography), to (2) the library's "finding list" (its holdings list, arranged by author, title, series title, etc.), to (3) the library's shelves. If the search fails at the third step—that is, if the material is not on the shelves—then the library's shelf classification system comes into play as a means of scanning other library holdings on the same general topic.

As a final note, it might be argued that the problems of attaining effective subject analysis in the United States are basically the result of too much affluence. Another of Ralph Shaw's aphorisms was that it does not matter what scheme is used to classify a collection that is small, for the entire library can be memorized if it is under 10,000 items. Whether Shaw's simplistic statement is accurate is unimportant; its value lies in the fact that it suggests a more radical solution to the problem of subject control, namely, the creation of a series of relatively small libraries for those who want general and popular information and materials. In these libraries, the subject systems would be relaxed and as nearly self-explanatory as possible, to stimulate browsing. To serve the more sophisticated, the library staff would be available to search bibliographic data bases and to refer the client to research-oriented library collections.

The anxieties and confusions associated with subject analysis in the United States stem from the fact that American librarians have developed no clear philosophy of subject control. The result, well known to the ancients as the bursting phenomenon associated with the pouring of new wine into old wineskins, is predictable: the 1876 philosophy of Charles Cutter cannot accommodate the requirements of 1976.
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The Evolution of Bibliographic Systems in the United States, 1876-1945

EDITH SCOTT

This paper is an attempt to describe the structure of the mechanisms and problems in the distribution and utilization of bibliographic data in U.S. libraries in the period from 1876 to 1945, or from the founding of the American Library Association to the close of the precomputer age. In this paper, a bibliographic system is defined as the compilation and nationwide dissemination of bibliographic information, either cooperatively or from a central source agency, to independent libraries. For the period under consideration it is appropriate to speak of the evolution rather than the development of such systems.

The purpose of a national bibliographic system is obscured by the terminology of the times. In the voluminous literature on economy in cataloging, for example, librarians did not project a national bibliographic system but wrote in terms of specific topics. They wanted better catalogs with less expenditure of time and money and tended to omit stating the obvious—namely, that the savings would result in better service to library users. The system could release staff time and energy for more direct service to users or for expanded services. It would also provide higher quality bibliographic data, expand subject access to library materials, include more efficient access to a greater number of bibliographic entities, and furnish location information for a particular item needed but not available in the user's local library.

A comprehensive universal bibliographic system remains a dream of librarians. Two aspects of the system, bibliographic data from a central source and access to the item by interlibrary lending, had been part of Jewett's dream for the Smithsonian Institution. His ill-fated
scheme for the production of library catalogs from a central stock of cooperatively prepared catalog entries was part of his plan for the accomplishment of "that cherished dream of scholars, a universal catalogue." Jewett's catalog would include location information, and he envisioned the establishment of a system of exchanges and interlibrary loans, the latter "with certain stringent conditions."

That these two aspects of a national bibliographic system were discussed at the 1876 Conference of Librarians is not surprising. James G. Barnwell, librarian of the Philadelphia Mercantile Library, argued the "necessity and practicability" of a universal catalog which would include "the literary stores of every existing or possible library" and allow "millions of readers . . . by instant reference to ascertain what books existed on certain subjects or by certain authors." Moreover, Barnwell continued, this ideal catalog, when properly marked, would "obviate the necessity of either issuing printed catalogues, or of preparing card catalogues, except for books published later than the period covered by the general catalogue."

The discussions at the conference were on a more practical level and included: "preparation of printed titles for the common use of libraries," i.e., cooperative cataloging, the continuation of Poole's Index of Periodical Literature, and a general subject index of works other than periodicals, similar in plan to Poole's Index and compiled on a cooperative basis.

Although interlibrary loan was not among the topics presented at the 1876 conference, it had been suggested for consideration by the conference. In a letter to the editor in the first issue of the American Library Journal, Samuel S. Green wrote that "much good would result" if libraries agreed to help one another by lending books to each other "for short periods of time." By referring to "books of reference," by excluding "exceptionally valuable books," and by citing the Boston Public Library's policy of allowing nonresident students to borrow books "needed in the pursuit of their special investigations," Green implicitly defined the scope of interlibrary loans as books to aid research by serious scholars. These restrictions as to kinds of materials and types of readers became the controversial points in the ALA's attempts to define acceptable interlibrary loan practices.

The interrelated themes of efficiency and economy, dominated the 1876 conference and the early period of organized librarianship. Maximum economy in cataloging could be achieved if cataloging data were available from a central source; in turn, the better catalog would provide more efficient service for the individual reader. In cataloging,
the first step was seen as standardization. Barnwell gave first importance to an expertly compiled code of rules to be adhered to with "the most slavish servility; for entire uniformity, next to accuracy of description, is the most essential element of a useful catalogue."

The new association began work almost immediately on standardization. In January 1877, Melvil Dewey published a proposed set of rules to be adopted as the standard for catalog entries, while the selection of a standard size for catalog cards was the first work of the Committee on Co-operation. It took only seven years for the ALA to agree on a set of cataloging rules—but it would be seventeen years before it attempted to supply from a central bureau printed catalog cards which, because of the lack of agreement, were furnished in a variety of sizes.

Standardization is a first requisite for a bibliographic system but for current publications, such a system also requires: (1) comprehensive, if not complete, access to current publications; (2) staff, adequate in number and competent in bibliography and subject analysis and with the requisite facility in foreign languages; (3) legitimacy of the entries as conforming to an accepted code and standards; (4) efficient means of disseminating the bibliographic data; (5) economical means for reproducing the entries; and (6) agreement on lending policies, practices and payment of costs. For retrospective coverage, the ideal system would presuppose: (1) a complete national trade bibliography; (2) published catalogs of the great national and special libraries; (3) analytical indexes to periodicals and other serials; and (4) union catalogs, union lists of serial holdings, etc., for the location of individual items.

The situation in 1876 was far from meeting the requirements of a system. A comprehensive national bibliography of U.S. publications was not available. The United States was, according to Frederick Leypoldt, "almost the only civilized country . . . not represented by a national bibliography, that is, a complete and accurate title record of all books published in the country, inclusive of the various editions of early issues and of all the changed or revised editions of more recent date."

He felt that the situation was irredeemable at such a late date and proposed instead a "Practical Finding List," an alphabetical author/title/subject record of all American books in print. The first parts of this list, The American Catalogue, listing books in print and for sale on July 1, 1876, did not appear until 1878. The first volume was completed in 1880 with the subject index volume appearing in 1881. The work was not a financial success, in part because Leypoldt had
underestimated the enormous amount of labor which would be required and in part because of the lack of support from the book trade. Leypoldt and his successor, Richard R. Bowker, did not attempt another basic list but issued supplements to update the work until 1910. Librarians, however, had turned to the H.W. Wilson Company's *Cumulative Book Index* (begun in 1898) and its *United States Catalog* (1899) for the comprehensive record of American publications. The usefulness and popularity of both publications was enhanced by the dictionary-catalog form adopted shortly after their first appearance.

A current trade bibliography did exist. Alphabetical lists of U.S. publications were appearing in the *Publishers' Weekly* with a monthly cumulation in the first issue of the succeeding month. Although the entries were "full" by the standards of the time, the information was supplied by the publishers rather than taken from the book itself. Subscription books were not included in the lists, since the latter were limited to books for sale in the trade.

United States national trade bibliography was therefore still in its infancy in 1876. On the other hand, the printing of the catalogs of the large libraries was beginning to decline. The most recent author catalog of the largest library—the Library of Congress—had been published in 1864 and thus included only 85,000 of its 300,000 volumes. Eight annual supplements could be consulted for additions up through the year 1872. The ninth supplement (which was to be the last) appeared in 1876, but covered only the most important works acquired in the period 1873-75. The subject catalog of the library, an alphabetico-classed one, was more recent, having been published in 1869, and it included some 96,000 volumes. There were no supplements to the subject catalog, although the 1876 supplement to the author catalog included a subject index for the years 1873-75.

Both the Boston Public and Harvard libraries, the second and fourth largest in the United States in 1876, had abandoned complete printed catalogs. The Boston Public Library preferred separate classed lists of its popular collection, such as its 1873 class list of history, biography and travel. The third largest collection was that of the New York Mercantile Library with 160,613 volumes. Its last catalog appeared in 1866, with supplements in 1869 and 1872.

The catalog of the Astor Library, the fifth largest library, could have been considered a substantial contribution to a national library catalog. Published between 1857 and 1861, with a supplement in 1866, it contained entries for approximately two-thirds of its 152,446
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volumes. With 105,000 volumes, the library of the Boston Athenaeum was not among the largest but its catalog (of which only the first two volumes were available in 1876) should be mentioned because it was already drawing praise for its meticulous accuracy and usefulness.¹⁴

The heart of a national bibliographic system is a central source of bibliographic data. One aspect, the subject indexing of periodical literature, was considered separately at the 1876 conference. Specifically, this was the revival or continuation of William F. Poole's *Index to Periodical Literature*, of which the last edition had appeared in 1853. A special committee was appointed to consider and report on a plan for carrying out the work cooperatively.¹⁵ Approximately fifty libraries, each indexing one or more series of periodicals, contributed the entries which were then incorporated into a single alphabetical arrangement by Poole and William Fletcher. The project inevitably required more time than originally anticipated, and the first volume was not published until 1882. This date was nevertheless more than ten years before the beginning of a central source of catalog cards for books.

As with all printed indexes, currentness remained a problem. Five quinquennial supplements were issued, the fifth and last covering the years 1902-06. Monthly updating was attempted by the cooperating libraries as the *Cooperative Index to Periodicals*, edited by Fletcher and published as a supplement to the *Library Journal* from the spring of 1883 until the end of 1884. It then became a quarterly, but in 1890 and 1891 was issued only as an annual. The solution came in 1901 when H.W. Wilson launched his *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*. Begun as an index of twenty periodicals, it expanded to the indispensable library tool known today.¹⁶

In spite of some limitations in the product, the work of the ALA committee on Poole's *Index* was significant in its reflection of librarians' will to provide wider service to readers by cooperative work when capital was lacking. Even more significant was the permanent establishment of the precedent for excluding analytics for periodical literature from the catalog.

Analysis of the publications of the principal learned societies and of certain scholarly periodicals in the catalog was not discontinued immediately. In 1898, the Publishing Section of ALA established a limited cooperative program of printed card analytics prepared by five libraries for 184 such serials specifically devoted to history, philology, economics, fine arts and literature.¹⁷ The exclusion of purely scientific publications was due to the announced plan of the
Royal Society for publishing an index to scientific literature. The number and actual titles analyzed varied from year to year as the periodicals were added to the Wilson indexes and as the analysis of monographic series was undertaken by the Library of Congress. By 1914, only lengthy papers in the transactions and memoirs of learned societies and some monographic series were being analyzed. Difficulties in receiving foreign serials during World War I further reduced the program, and it was abolished in 1918 when the H.W. Wilson Company offered to include the titles in its Readers' Guide Supplement.

An even greater cooperative project, first undertaken in the early 1920s, created the powerful tool for interlibrary loan, the Union List of Serials. In cooperation with H.W. Wilson, under an advisory committee of the ALA, 225 libraries in the United States and Canada checked their holdings of 75,000 serial titles. The first edition was published in 1927 and was followed by two supplements. A second edition, financed in part by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, was published in 1943. More than 600 cooperating libraries checked their holdings for this list, which included between 115,000 and 120,000 titles. Further progress in the development of this integral part of the national bibliographic system is outside the chronological scope of this paper.

Progress toward a central source of cataloging data was much slower and more difficult than the continuation of Poole's Index. Melvil Dewey, the leader of the discussion on the question at the conference, summarized the options in an early issue of the Library Journal: "Shall we try to establish a central cataloguing bureau supported by the Association? Can the publishers be induced to prepare suitable titles and furnish them with the books? Is it practicable for the Library of Congress to catalogue for the whole country?" The last alternative had been answered at the conference: the Library of Congress was much too crowded and its staff too small to undertake the work.

With no assistance forthcoming from the Library of Congress, the publishers' route was tried. That publishers should insert in the book a bibliographic record on uniform-sized slips of paper had been a preconference suggestion in the Publishers' Weekly, which credited Justin Winsor for the idea. The conference also approved the proposal, but with the unrealistic proviso that the publishers not prepare the entries themselves but "pay for having it done by a competent person appointed by the librarians."
It was not until the summer of 1878 that the ALA Committee on Publishers' Title-Slips, supported by and in cooperation with Richard R. Bowker and Frederick Leypoldt of the Publishers' Weekly, was prepared to initiate the project, which was implemented with modifications the following year. The Publishers' Weekly agreed to prepare the entries for its "Weekly Record of Publications" according to the proposed ALA cataloging rules and under the supervision of Justin Winsor and Charles A. Cutter. Copies of the entries, printed on thin sheets of paper suitable for pasting on cards, were to be sent each month to subscribers of the Library Journal as a supplement. Extra copies would be furnished for an annual subscription of one dollar.25

The new style entry first appeared in the September 14, 1878, issue of the Publishers' Weekly. The entries taken directly from books furnished by the publishers were printed in 8-point type; the entries prepared from publishers' descriptions, as in the former practice, were printed in 6-point type. The Title-Slip Registry was not begun until the January 1879 issue.26

Subscriptions to the separate lists were also offered to the book trade as the Book Registry but the response was negligible. Librarians, too, failed to support the project and it was discontinued early in 1880.27

The reason for the lack of support by librarians is not clear. Jim Ranz has suggested that the failure of this and other early schemes was due to the librarians' uncertainty about the permanence of the schemes, any one of which would have required "basic and far-reaching changes in their normal cataloguing practices."28 The lack of standardization was probably the major factor: the rules of the American Library Association were by no means unanimously accepted by librarians.29

In the particular case of the failure of the Title-Slip Registry, there were several other factors. First, the entries were limited to American or imported imprints, and not all publishers cooperated in furnishing copies of the books for cataloging. Second, Publishers' Weekly was a business enterprise seeking to serve the book trade. Preparation of the entries under the supervision of "the Library Association authorities"30 must have delayed the listings which the book trade needed promptly. There was also, it seems, a difference of opinion concerning the content of the annotations between what was acceptable on catalog entries and what was acceptable to the publishers and helpful to the trade.

Finally, perhaps Frederic Vinton, librarian of Princeton, was expressing a more widespread attitude than was normally acknowledg-
edged in the pages of the *Library Journal*. Vinton feared that "cooperative cataloguing (by which each librarian shall have the least possible writing to do) is unfavorable to good librarianship. For myself, I would on no account lose that familiarity with the subjects and even the places of my books which results from having catalogued and located every one.”

In 1887, the ALA publication section made another attempt to establish a central source of printed cards, this time as an experiment but again in cooperation with *Publishers' Weekly*. Cards for 100 of the best books published between September 1 and December 31 were prepared from the *Publishers' Weekly* record of new books for the *American Annual Catalogue*. One copy of each card was furnished to subscribers for $1.00, with additional cards available for one cent each, but cards for individual titles were not available. Continuation of the program on a regular basis was dependent on the success of the experiment. It was said that the experiment was "not on a sufficiently large scale and with sufficient promptness to give a fair commercial test of the support for such a scheme." Its experimental nature can scarcely have been conducive to success and a key factor may well have been the all-or-none feature; this seems also to have been a major cause of the failure of later schemes by the Library Bureau and ALA.

The seventeen-year search for a central source of printed catalog entries seemed to be at an end in December 1893, when the Library Bureau advertised "Printed Catalog Cards for Current Books/A Guaranteed Fact, Not a Mere Experiment." Libraries were required to subscribe to the entire series to be printed during the year, with the price in units of 1,000 cards based on three different weights. An average annual subscription, at $7.50 per thousand for the lightest weight, cost $37.50. There were only forty-nine subscribers for fifty-nine sets, and even this small number had to be printed on a variety of card sizes.

Delayed receipt of the cards was attributed by the Library Bureau to lack of cooperation from the publishers on whom it depended for free advance copies of the publications. This was the principal reason for the transfer of the project to the ALA Publishing Section in October 1896 since the noncommercial nature of the latter might encourage greater publisher participation. The project was thereafter housed in the Boston Athenaeum where the secretary of the publishing section, William C. Lane, was librarian. Because of the free office space and the free books, which were sold, the project made a
small profit. The number of titles varied slightly from year to year, but the number of subscribers remained at approximately sixty. The number of titles was too limited for the larger libraries, but too large for the smaller libraries unable to justify the expense for so many unwanted cards. A proposal to allow the purchase of specific titles was rejected because of the cost of "such individualistic selection." The same proposal received enthusiastic support at the Montreal meeting of the ALA in 1900. A new plan, proposed in January 1901, would have allowed libraries to select only the titles wanted but required a minimum subscription of 500 titles at 5 cents per title in order to protect the association against financial loss. This plan was not implemented because of the poor response, and the requirement of subscription to the entire series remained unchanged.

At the same time that responsibility for the printed catalog card project was being transferred to ALA in 1896, the situation was changing at the Library of Congress, which had been repeatedly named as the only logical source of centralized cataloging for the nation. In 1876 only one of the requisites for a national bibliographic system was there: comprehensive access to the current publications of the United States. In the first five years following the passage of the Copyright Act of 1870, which transferred copyright activities from the Patent Office to the Library of Congress, the library had received almost twice as many volumes as it had in the preceding seventy-five years. A slight increase in the number of volumes deposited followed the enactment of the so-called "international copyright" law in 1891, extending copyright to citizens of other nations establishing reciprocity with the United States.

The move into the new Library of Congress building in 1897 alleviated only the space problem noted at the 1876 conference in explanation of the library's inability to assist in the preparation of printed catalog entries; the staff remained inadequate. In 1896, Ainsworth Rand Spofford, LC's librarian, was asking for a catalog staff of only eight, whereas Herbert Putnam at the Boston Public Library had sixteen for cataloging and an additional eight for classification and shelflisting.

Standardization of cataloging practice had progressed considerably by the time of William C. Lane's survey in 1893, but the Library of Congress entries were modeled more on British Museum practice than ALA rules. Spofford was not in sympathy with current trends in American cataloging. He was opposed to dictionary catalogs, to card catalogs (except for staff use as supplements to printed catalogs), and...
to close classification. Furthermore, even if its catalog entries had been acceptable to other American libraries, the library had no more economical means of dissemination than any other library; the printing of its author catalog had been suspended in 1880 for lack of funds.

One of the provisions of the 1891 copyright law required the Librarian of Congress to compile a weekly list of all publications deposited for copyright. The list was published by the Treasury Department primarily for the use of customs officials. The publication was not significant bibliographically, but it did provide the means by which the Library of Congress secured its first printed catalog cards. John Russell Young, appointed Librarian of Congress in 1897, confronted the inadequate budget and staff shortage by asking the new chief of the Catalogue Department, J.C.M. Hanson, to find some way of combining the copyright listing with the cataloging in order to avoid duplication of work. Hanson, in cooperation with Thorvald Solberg, the Register of Copyrights, arranged to make the entries for the list in return for printed catalog entries. Hanson, a strong supporter of the cooperative movement in cataloging, described the new form of the entries as following insofar as possible the practice of the major American libraries. The entries, Hanson reported to Young, would then be useful to other libraries and would save them the cost of cataloging.

The new entries appeared in the April 27, 1898, issue of the Catalogue of Title Entries of Books and Other Articles Entered in the Office of the Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, in the subdivision “Books proper,” and evoked editorial praise from the Library Journal. The writer of the editorial hoped that these “authoritative” entries made in accordance with “bibliographical methods” would be made available on cards to other libraries. The Library of Congress did not itself receive printed cards until July, when the Government Printing Office agreed to print fifty copies of each of the entries on cards for the library.

The groundwork for centralized cataloging was ready when Putnam succeeded Young as Librarian in 1899. Putnam was successful in securing from Congress the necessary funds for enlarging the staff. In December 1900, the Government Printing Office established a branch in LC and the printing of all catalog entries—not just those for the copyright deposits—began.

At the ALA meeting in July 1901, Putnam announced the willing-
ness of LC to supply copies of its printed cards to other libraries. The plan being proposed at that point, however, was supply by way of the ALA Publishing Board for resale to libraries. By late September, Putnam had made the necessary legal arrangements with the Public Printer to sell the cards directly to libraries as extra copies of government publications, at cost plus 10 percent, and announced the decision to the New York Library Association at its Lake Placid meeting. The Publishing Board, which was also meeting at Lake Placid, “expressed great satisfaction in transferring this work to the Library of Congress.”

In an interview published in the Washington Evening Star, Putnam explained in detail the value of the catalog card distribution to libraries and scholars. A copy of this statement was enclosed with the circular mailed to approximately 500 libraries announcing that LC was prepared to accept orders for copies of any of its printed catalog cards. The response in inquiries and orders was not only prompt but far greater in volume than had been anticipated; the response to the quality of the cataloging was equally gratifying.

The Library of Congress had made some changes in its card style earlier in 1901 in response to recommendations of the Advisory Catalog Committee of the ALA Publishing Board, appointed in 1900 and chaired by Hanson. These changes were mainly in typography and in the spacing on the card. The library agreed to confine the printed area to 12.5 x 5 centimeters, but did not agree to “attempt, at least at present,” to clip the cards to the smaller size. This decision removed a major handicap to the economical distribution of catalog cards and assured the standardization of the size.

In considering the failure or limited success of the earlier schemes, certain factors can be identified as contributing to the immediate success of the Library of Congress’s distribution of its printed catalog cards. First, card catalogs enjoyed growing popularity during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This alone, however, would not have assured the success of the ALA project. The cost of the Library of Congress cards—two cents for the first card and either one-half or four-tenths of one cent for additional cards—was approximately the same as for the ALA cards. An average set of three Library of Congress cards cost approximately one cent per card; the cost of an ALA card, depending on the weight, was three-fourths of one cent for the lightest, nine-tenths of one cent for medium, and one and one-half cents for the heaviest. The essential difference was ap-
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parently the freedom to purchase only the cards wanted from the Library of Congress instead of having to pay for all cards issued by the ALA.

The broad bibliographical data base offered by the Library of Congress, especially when combined with the freedom to select individual titles, contributed significantly to the immediate success of the scheme. Instead of being restricted to current publications of American publishers, cards were available for all additions to the library and for all the books in its collection as they were recataloged. It is interesting to speculate on the acceptability of the Library of Congress entries if Spofford had been in a position to offer them to other libraries in 1876. As it happened, the entries were legitimatized both as emanating from the national library and as conforming to current cataloging practice. This combination was a most powerful factor in the establishment of the core of the national bibliographic system.

Another factor was suggested by J.C.M. Hanson, chief of the Catalog Division at LC until 1910. From the nature of the extensive correspondence relating to the cataloging, he was “tempted to conclude that a large proportion of the subscribers have been led to adopt the printed cards because they value the suggestions in regard to subjects.” The validity of Hanson’s assessment may be checked by the literature of the period which stressed the need for more and better subject indexing. The Library of Congress subject headings were an important contribution to the system. That the “bibliographic apparatus” offered by the library’s printed cards did not include standardized call numbers was a source of keen disappointment to Putnam.

A component of the system which evolved from the printed card service of the Library of Congress was first suggested by Putnam a year before the service began. In order to enrich the bibliographical record of local United States history at LC, he asked each state library to send a copy of its catalog entries for local material. In return, he offered a copy of each of the catalog cards to be printed by the library. The first exchange was with the New York Public Library. Putnam’s purpose had broadened and he envisioned research centers throughout the country having a card record of the resources of the Library of Congress just as the Library of Congress would have a record of every book of research value in other great collections outside Washington. The program established included exchanges of cards with the large libraries printing their own catalog cards and also a “deposit” of the LC printed cards with twenty-five geographic-
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ally dispersed centers of research and library activity in the United States and Canada. The number of depository libraries increased later.

The cards received by the Library of Congress from the "exchange" libraries were incorporated into its union catalog which included, in addition to a complete set of its own cards, the cards it printed from "cooperative" copy. The program of cooperation expanding the coverage of available catalog records began in 1902 with the current accessions of the Department of Agriculture Library. It was later extended to other government libraries and in 1910 to the depository libraries when they were asked to supply catalog copy for books not in LC's collections. Some of the depository sets were used primarily as reference tools for cataloging. The value of a depository set as an interlibrary loan tool increased as it was expanded by the interfiling of the cards of other libraries to form a "repertory" or union catalog.

The honor of having the first (and for almost one-quarter century the only) regional union catalog in this country belongs to the State Library of California at Sacramento. Established in 1909 as a union list of periodicals, it was gradually expanded to cover the nonfiction holdings of the county and municipal libraries of California. A Library of Congress depository set was added in 1914, as were cards from other major libraries either printing or otherwise reproducing their cards for distribution.

During the depression of the 1930s the union catalog idea burgeoned. By 1940, Arthur B. Berthold identified forty-nine regional union catalogs, not including twenty-five libraries having unexpanded Library of Congress depository catalogs. Reduction in library budgets during the depression forced re-evaluation of acquisition policies and increased the sense of urgency for cooperative policies in the purchase, cataloging, and lending of library materials. The immediate impetus for the establishment of union catalogs as a response to the need for greater cooperation was the availability of free labor from the Work Projects Administration and other federal government relief agencies. The successful application of microphotographic techniques was also important in facilitating the compilation of the catalogs. In fact, microfilming in libraries, introduced in the United States in the 1930s, functioned in a dual capacity. It was used for compiling the union catalog, in which the rare or needed item could be located for interlibrary borrowing, and was then used for copying the item for lending or purchase.

Photography has also played another role in transferring the em-
phasis in the national bibliographic system from cards to other
formats. The publication of *A Catalog of Books Represented by Library of
Congress Printed Cards, Issued to July 31, 1942* was made possible by the
techniques of photographic reproduction. This great enterprise, as
John Dawson has said, introduced a new era in American bibliogra-
phy; it serves, too, as the apex of the national bibliographic system in
the precomputer era.
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It is beyond my talent to compress three decades of activity—especially in a period of intense and radical change in bibliographic control—in a scholarly, definitive manner. Many of the points to be covered could well be the subject of a dissertation. Therefore, the eyewitness account technique will be relied upon whenever possible.

This paper is divided into two main parts. The second part describes the major changes made in bibliographic control systems over the past three decades, while the first discusses why these changes have occurred. The viewpoint expressed here is that, left to itself, bibliographic control would not have changed. The changes that occurred are largely attributable to causes and events outside the library field.

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

Perhaps in no other equally brief period have libraries been subject to such a diversity of outside influences, absorbed and adapted them so readily and creatively, and so altered the course of bibliographic control. Among these many influences, four broad areas are of major importance: (1) the changing philosophy of information, (2) the data processing and computer industry, (3) scientific management developments, and (4) increasing recognition of the inequities of resource distribution to disadvantaged citizens.

INFORMATION AS A NATURAL RESOURCE

The conduct of World War II demonstrated very clearly the importance of the technical superiority of the United States. Resources were marshalled as never before to provide information
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services to both private and public organizations working on military, intelligence, and defense projects. The need to provide technical information and logistic control for large-scale projects with rigid schedules was met by use of operations research techniques and the newly emerging computer technology.

Some librarians and many people who were later to be called information scientists were thus graphically exposed to the increasing value placed on information, and particularly on scientific, technical, and intelligence information. Information came to be described as a "national resource" and librarians were by implication perceived as contributing to, or detracting from, this resource. Abstracting and indexing services were viewed as playing the major role in access to this resource, whereas the library's role was often described as that of a historical repository for materials no longer of current interest. Librarians were frequently charged with having abdicated their responsibilities for bibliographic control of journal articles and technical reports. In the 1950s it was not uncommon to hear that if librarians did not adjust and do their job, others would take over their tasks.

From this milieu came mathematicians, physicists, engineers, and other specialists—a type of person whom the librarian would not normally have encountered in professional groups before World War II. The enormous influence of these people on national bibliographic programs, on special and academic libraries, on library education, and on individual librarians has yet to be documented thoroughly, but was nevertheless a crucial factor. The list of participants at the International Conference on Scientific Information held in Washington, D.C., in 1958 is perhaps typical. Attendees included Harold Borko, Lawrence F. Buckland, Cyril W. Cleverdon, Melvin S. Day, Maryann Duggan (then a petroleum engineer), R.A. Fairthorne, Eugene E. Garfield, Robert M. Hayes, Gilbert King, William T. Knox, Ben-Ami Lipetz, Hans Peter Luhn, Claire K. Schultze, Don R. Swan-son, and B.C. Vickery.

This sudden infiltration of the domain of librarianship by those outside the field created communication difficulties, misunderstanding and, in some cases, an oversimplification of the problems of bibliographic control. Nevertheless, these outsiders, who derived their concepts of information handling and control from the scientific community, military information activities, and computer developments during or immediately after World War II, forced the library
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field to re-evaluate its services, to examine its traditions, and to devise new methods of information handling and bibliographic control.

THE DATA PROCESSING AND COMPUTER INDUSTRY

The equipment available to do bibliographic tasks often has a limiting and repressive influence, largely unacknowledged or unnoticed, on our perceptions of bibliographic control. This influence subtly forces us to believe that only certain things should be done, and that they can be done only in certain ways. An instance of the former belief is that because the manual card catalog makes complex searches difficult and preparation of bibliographies for users time-consuming and expensive, these services are considered inappropriate in most libraries. An instance of the second is the difficulty of explaining why the subject-heading cards from OCLC will not be printed in red and that it makes no real difference. Attention is diverted from substance to mechanics.

The mechanics available to bibliographic control were reviewed by M.E. Scott, just prior to the time period under consideration here. In 1941 the methods included: photographic copying (resulting in cards that were like photostats), stencil and hectographic processes, offset lithography, printing (rarely used except by the Library of Congress), and the typewriter. Although the electric typewriter was proving increasingly reliable, Scott failed to discover any library using this new device.

The punched card was only beginning to be used. For example, just prior to World War II, the Montclair (New Jersey) Public Library had been selected by IBM for a test installation of a punched card circulation system. The University of Florida and the University of Texas were also early users of punched cards for circulation, and the punched card was being explored as a vehicle for bibliographic control in a few special libraries as well.

After the war, technical developments had impact on two areas of bibliographic control: (1) the production of catalog cards and other bibliographic products, and (2) the format and storage of the bibliographic record and files. In the first area, developments such as punched cards, mimeograph, multilith, photocopy machines, microfilm-based card-image systems, and tape-controlled typewriters and keyboards were relevant. In the second, the storage of the bibliographic file in machine form allowed use of photocomposition, com-
Some of the developments and experiments did not succeed. In the immediate postwar era, librarians were encouraged to store and retrieve bibliographic records from data bases in a variety of forms, including punched cards to be manipulated by card sorters, keysort cards, edge-notched cards, and microfilm retrieval devices. Although these techniques were used in some special libraries and information centers, they were largely ignored by the library field. The reasons for this are not entirely clear. One would like to think it was because librarians recognized the limits imposed, over the long run, by these techniques, but one suspects that it was due to the general apathy toward new technology; whatever the reason, the response was correct.

In general, the limitations of these technologies stemmed from the fact that they, like the card catalog, allowed no significant manipulation of bibliographic data. The computer was the first device to offer a real solution—manipulative capabilities, speed of retrieval and handling, and compactness of files. In the postwar era the infant computer industry rapidly began to make inroads in business, industry, government, and scientific fields. There was a bad period of over-sell—the computer was described as a “brain,” people would be replaced by these machines, and almost all problems would be solvable (for example, automatic translation of languages was said to be “just around the corner”). The difficulties inherent in automation of bibliographic control systems were grossly oversimplified.

Although there were a number of experiments with computers, librarians were seen as lagging behind and the dichotomy between librarians and information scientists continued. In the late 1950s and in the 1960s many universities set up different professional schools for the two disciplines. The work of individual librarians who served during this period to bridge the gap between the computer field and the library field was important in bringing to the attention of the community the problems of the automation of bibliographic control, in pointing out the benefits that could accrue from automation, and in beginning to solve the many difficulties to be faced.

A major influence during these three decades was therefore the advance of technology. Developments were so rapid that a period which began with the electric typewriter ended with on-line computer-based networks.
Although scientific management techniques had been around for some time, it was largely the trend toward automation that brought scientific management and systems analysis to the attention of library management. The attempt to automate library operations revealed our ignorance. We had little statistical data of real value to systems designers; we had ignored the interrelationships between library operations; we had an imprecise terminology with which to talk about library and bibliographic control systems; and we lacked even general cost data. For example, although the Library of Congress had been producing the printed catalog card since 1901, it was the work on the development of the MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) format which stimulated analysis of these cards, field by field and character by character.

Bibliographic control of monographs and serials over the past thirty years has been rule-centered instead of cost- and use-centered, as evidenced by citations in Library Literature. The number of articles dealing with rules and their interpretation is overwhelming in comparison to those on use, benefits, management and cost of bibliographic control. In the late 1930s, a head cataloger was one who personally sorted and distributed incoming materials and served as a referee in cataloging decisions and application of rules. Rarely were other management and analysis tasks described as part of the job. By the 1970s, while there were still many articles concerned with codes and rules, a bibliographic control literature has emerged which reflects concern for utilization of staff, unit cost of production, reorganization of work flow, and reorganization of traditional bibliographic relationships (e.g., between acquisitions and cataloging). Cataloging was seen less frequently as an arcane art, but rather as one which should be accomplished effectively using a mixture of skills and support services, including on-line networks and machine-readable data. We began this era with catalogers who were partly clerks and are ending it with clerks who are partly catalogers.

Today, public accountability for management of public institutions is of increasing concern. Although little overt attention seems to be given to this concept in the library field, it seems clear that there is a significant change taking place in our concepts of bibliographic control. In the palmier days of the past, there was great diversity in bibliographic control practices and inventing one's own system was common and acceptable. Today, the forces toward standardization
appear inexorable and as networks flourish, each local catalog is increasingly viewed as a subset of a national bibliographic control system and perhaps of a potential international system.

The systems view also attacked the notion of permanent rules for bibliographic control. The rapidity of promulgation of rules in the postwar era, and changes to the rules, give evidence of a new view that bibliographic control mechanisms must change as needs and technology change.

In contrast, the bibliographic control of journal articles and report literature, which was largely the province of professional associations prior to World War II, does not appear to have followed the same course as library bibliographic control systems. There has been no significant standardization of abstracting and indexing control systems, and they have proliferated. The analytical techniques have been applied to system design and performance within a single service, but not to the field as a whole.

Prior to the war, most of these services were meagerly funded and the major product was the published abstracting and indexing service. The need to be efficient or to standardize was of less concern when the government began putting enormous amounts of money into these bibliographic services after World War II. For example, Chemical Abstracts Service alone received more than $25 million from the National Science Foundation over a seven-year period for the automation of Chemical Abstracts. These services were increasingly subsidized but, like libraries, began to suffer as costs soared, support dwindled, and competition mounted.

RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION

As prosperity continued in the postwar era, attention was given, generally at the urging of increasingly vociferous interest groups, to the inequities in our society. Resources and benefits were not equitably distributed and certain groups began to be identified as disadvantaged.

These social issues influenced funding agencies and the types of projects mounted, causing concern as the various professions examined their policies and programs to determine the blame for these conditions. The social issues themselves are largely outside the focus of this paper, but their influence on bibliographic control was threefold: (1) increasing attention to user services, (2) increasing competition for library funding, and (3) increasing interest in resource sharing.
The dominance of the technical processing aspect of librarianship in the time period under discussion was probably due to its cohesive foundation of commonality of rules and processes, and the focus given to bibliographic control by Library of Congress activities. In contrast, aspects dealing with public service were less well organized, appear to have been less aggressive, and had a generally inferior professional literature. Libraries were accused of being more concerned with the condition of their catalogs than with service to their public. It became increasingly evident as inflation mounted in the late 1960s and early 1970s that technical processing and bibliographic control costs were spiraling and that less of the library budget would be available for materials and public services. Increasing concern for public service, even in academic library circles, caused many administrators to reexamine budgets to determine how to cut processing costs. Processes were streamlined, standardized cataloging was promoted, and tasks using professional staff skills were scrutinized. Automation was seen as a way to reverse the increasing costs of bibliographic control and to improve the public service operations.

As funding agencies were required to give attention to many neglected areas of society, libraries found increasing competition as they sought funds, not only to maintain the status quo, but to prevent the degradation of service and collections. Budget pressures increased during the 1970s as competition for funding and inflation combined, and federal and foundation support began to be cut back. This writer, for example, heard the vice-president of a major foundation, formerly known for its support of libraries, characterize libraries as a "bottomless pit." The tremendous emphasis on collection building in the immediate postwar era had changed by the 1970s to an emphasis on resource sharing and cooperative arrangements to facilitate interlibrary loan activities. Even our largest resource libraries no longer considered themselves as self-sufficient and began to implement cooperative programs. Resource sharing, in turn, placed increased requirements on bibliographic control systems, including access to holdings records and standardization of records. Resource sharing also has led to increased interaction between all types of libraries and the traditional differences in bibliographic control by type of library seem to be fading away. One now speaks of a community of libraries serving a community of users.

It is difficult to determine whether this new emphasis on user service, resource sharing and cooperation, and attention to special user needs is merely an expedient response in a period of economic
difficulty, or if it is a significant new trend in librarianship requiring a permanent change of direction in bibliographic control. If it is merely an expedient response, and if current pressures continue, it may well be that the new approaches will become too firmly embedded to allow significant retrenchment from the new position.

DEVELOPMENTS IN BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

Of the many changes in bibliographic control made in the last three decades, which are of major, lasting significance? This is, of course, difficult to determine since we cannot predict the future. It would seem, however, that history will note four major changes: (1) the concept of bibliographic control as a federal responsibility; (2) the bibliographic partnership between public and private, for-profit sector; (3) the application of computers to bibliographic control; and (4) the development of library networks.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

The provision of a printed catalog card service by the Library of Congress was not, in 1901 or for several decades to follow, viewed as stemming from a federal responsibility for bibliographic control. The rationale was rather that cards could be printed if they were a byproduct of the cataloging of materials to be added to the Library of Congress collections. Although the card service expanded both in range and volume of service, generally all federal bibliographic activities prior to World War II were directly related to the mission of the agency in question.

The importance of scientific and technical information in World War II, the challenge presented by Sputnik, the growth of higher education, the increasing attention to disadvantaged citizens, and a general expansion of federal responsibilities provided an environment suitable for federal support to libraries and information services. The lack of resources available to those living in rural areas led to the Library Services Act of 1956. This act was later to become the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) which, particularly through Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation, stimulated cooperative projects, centralized bibliographic control, and particularly the use of computer-based systems. For example, many states have used LSCA funds to support initial installations for the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) system.

These LSCA programs, although of great importance, only tan-
Bibliographic Systems, 1945-1976

gentially related to bibliographic control. A new dimension in federal support for bibliographic control grew out of the tremendous problems that the academic library community was experiencing in the acquisition and cataloging of increasing numbers of foreign-language materials.

The Association of Research Libraries took the lead in seeking a solution to this problem; after much discussion, the vehicle chosen was an extension of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include assistance for cataloging materials relevant to higher education. Title II-C of this law was enacted to provide such assistance. John Cronin, then director of the processing department of the Library of Congress, identified two major breakthroughs in this legislation. The first was the full recognition, for the first time, of the importance of federal aid and assistance toward solving this country's cataloging problems. The other breakthrough was the clear mandate given to the Library of Congress to provide new and unparalleled services for the benefit of academic and research libraries in the United States. Through this act, therefore, the Library of Congress was able to accelerate its acquisitions and cataloging and to give emphasis to materials added to libraries serving higher education.

Title II-C was made visible through the NPAC (National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging) of the Library of Congress. Through this program the library began to work more directly with other national libraries and bibliographic centers. This cooperation, in turn, had implications for cataloging standards and put the concept of international bibliographic control on a firmer foundation.

These activities and others led to increasing discussion of a "national library network." Many studies, papers, and conferences in the 1960s and 1970s discussed such a network, which was generally perceived as being a federal responsibility, and hence largely federally supported. The culmination of these efforts was the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. To date the commission's activities have only begun to influence bibliographic control. The establishment of the commission may well be only a token action. Its current budget is such that no financial support is available to underwrite a national network; its role is largely that of coordination of currently established programs in other agencies.

Although it is easily forgotten, the idea of federal responsibility for bibliographic control and of a federally supported national library network is a radical change. Within three decades, we have moved
from the use of the Library Congress card service as a supplement to local cataloging, to the idea that the Library of Congress should catalog as much as possible and to an almost complete dependence on Library of Congress cataloging either directly from LC itself or indirectly from other vendors of LC data. We have come to believe that equitable access to information is a right, that this information is a national resource, and that the federal government should help libraries by direct support.

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIPS**

A major change in thinking about libraries and information occurred principally in the 1960s and 1970s: information has become a business and some have even designated it an industry. The number of groups interested in the bibliographic control field is thus increasing.

Prior to World War II there were three principal nonlibrary components in this area: publishers and jobbers, library supply houses, and professional associations and companies (such as H.W. Wilson) that provided abstracting and indexing services. Several factors combined to change this picture: (1) the increasing need for scientific and technical information; (2) the introduction of automation; (3) federal and foundation funding for research and development; (4) the increased volume of library purchasing due to federal and other outside funding; (5) the growth of higher education; and principally (6) federal support for a wide range of information activities, including grants for many abstracting and indexing services.

One area of bibliographic partnership has been the interaction between the Library of Congress and publishers and information vendors. We have become so used to seeing the Library of Congress card number printed in U.S. books that we overlook the significance and complexity of this practice which, in the early 1950s, for the first time linked the publication in hand with its bibliographic control record. From this base, we have moved on to the International Standard Book Number, the International Standard Serial Number, and after an abortive attempt at Cataloging in Source, to Cataloging in Publication. Bibliographic control, through these partnerships, is moving from a process that begins after publication to a process integral to publication.

A second area of bibliographic partnership is the information
middleman. In this category are those companies that provide services largely based on use of data created outside the company. The bibliographic search services provided by System Development Corporation, by Information Dynamics, and by North American Aviation exemplify one type of activity; the catalog support services provided by companies such as Inforonics, Xerox, and Science Press represent another type of activity.

A third partnership is commercial assistance in developing or maintaining local bibliographic control systems. We now have companies that will convert catalogs to machine-readable form, produce book catalogs, provide packaged minicomputer systems, assist in the design and development of local automated systems, and perform other services.

In general, there is a reasonably good working relationship among the increasing number of players in the bibliographic control game. However, as this era draws to a close some of these people are becoming increasingly strident. Complex issues have surfaced, such as copyright, data base ownership and access, the roles of public versus private sectors, etc. We do not yet know the rules of the game, and can only set them as we go along. It is difficult to know whether our spectators are willing to pay the increasing cost of admission.

The interaction between so many interest groups in bibliographic control is thus forcing a re-examination of relationships, responsibilities, and traditions. At present, various interest groups—including libraries—are trying to stake out their bibliographic territories and to defend the nature, cost, and value of their services. The symbiotic relationship among all these groups and the protection of the interests of users of information need to be investigated. Perhaps we need to develop some bibliographic ecologists to ensure that we are not, through expediency and self-interest, eroding another national resource.

COMPUTERS AND AUTOMATION

It was noted earlier that, at the beginning of the period under discussion, there was use of the electric typewriter and tentatively of punched cards; at the close of this period we have many on-line bibliographic systems, including the OCLC system which links 600 libraries on-line to a data base of about 2 million records. It is impossible to evaluate this vast change in a brief review; only some of the turning points can be mentioned here.
Until the 1960s the library field was largely unaware of the ramifications of the rapidly evolving data processing field. Librarianship's initial education about the field came from the scientific and technical community, from groups such as the Special Libraries Association and the American Documentation Institute (now the American Society for Information Science) and from some lonely prophets such as Ralph Parker.6

The earliest uses of data processing for bibliographic control were by federal agencies and special libraries, and related principally to control of technical report literature. The technical report, largely a phenomenon of wartime activities, became an increasingly important mode of publication after the war. However, this was a genre falling outside normal bibliographic control channels. Perhaps this fact alone made it an early candidate for automated bibliographic control—there were no traditions to change. One result of these circumstances was the early and continued divergence in automation of bibliographic control. Bibliographic control through automated techniques rapidly took hold in organizations dealing with abstracting and indexing of technical report literature and, shortly thereafter, with journal literature. The lack of recognized and accepted standards and rules made this possible. Twenty years later, the problems created by this ad hoc, local approach are only now beginning to surface.

By contrast, the library field seemed to be moving slowly, if at all. (A notable exception was the National Library of Medicine, which had automated its indexing of medical literature through the MEDLARS project when the Library of Congress barely knew what a computer was.) Part of this lag was due to the symbiotic relationship in bibliographic control of monographs and serials, illustrated by the dependence of thousands of libraries on the Library of Congress card service. Another reason for this lag stemmed from the complexity of the relationships between bibliographic control and other library operations, such as circulation. There was considerable uncertainty as to whether a library should automate a single function, or work toward a totally integrated system encompassing all automatable functions.

Despite these problems, large amounts of library funds and manpower were allocated to automation projects in the early 1960s. Among these projects were the Inforonics study of the feasibility of producing photocomposed LC cards from machine-readable input,7 the work at the Washington University School of Medicine Library8 and the University of California at San Diego Library9 on automation.
of serial records, the catalog automation projects at the University of Toronto Library, the National Library of Medicine's MEDLARS project, the early cooperative automation efforts at the Columbia, Harvard and Yale libraries, and the automation of cataloging and circulation at Florida Atlantic University. Not all of these projects were successful, and many produced systems that have since been drastically changed. Nevertheless, these projects were of major value in demonstrating the potential of automation and in helping to educate the library field.

From 1965 to 1970, even larger projects were begun and a number of significant and far-reaching research and development efforts were undertaken. Among these were the Library of Congress MARC pilot project and the subsequent MARC distribution service, the National Library of Medicine MEDLINE project for on-line access to bibliographic records of the medical journal literature, the New York Public Library catalog automation program, projects covering a wide range of bibliographic functions at the University of Chicago and Stanford University libraries, and the formation of the Ohio College Library Center with an initial group of about fifty libraries. These major projects were dominant, but hundreds of libraries were developing local systems and using computers. There was widespread belief that most libraries of any significance would, in the future, be responsible for developing and managing their own local computer operations.

The picture changed rather suddenly. From 1972 to 1975 there was a slackening of new library computer projects and a staff cutback in many operational projects. This reversal resulted from a general reduction in research and development funding, an economic situation which reduced operational budgets and provoked a more stringent look at costs and benefits, and increasing caution about many projects which were slow in yielding benefits. Perhaps the most significant change, however, was caused by the dawning perception that individual automation projects might not be the best approach. It had become evident that automation of bibliographic control systems was complex, that the large files required were expensive to maintain, and that on-line systems would be required if immediate access to large bibliographic data files was to be provided.

In the 1970s another problem had also surfaced. Librarians frequently felt uncomfortable about placing their bibliographic control apparatus under the care of another organizational unit such as a university data processing center. Yet few libraries could afford a
large dedicated computer system—the New York Public Library, the Library of Congress, and the National Library of Medicine being notable exceptions. The rapid rise of stand-alone, packaged minicomputer systems in this period solved several problems at once: risks were lower, the need to have an in-house data processing staff was reduced or eliminated, the costs and benefits were more readily ascertainable, and libraries were able to retain a large measure of control over files, file access, and computer operations. However, these minicomputer systems were used primarily for applications which did not require large files of complete bibliographic records. The minicomputer solved some problems, but to solve the other problems, libraries turned to the library network.

One development during this period was crucial: the Library of Congress MARC format for the communication of bibliographic data in machine-readable form. MARC was well timed; it occurred after sufficient experimentation yielded agreement that a sophisticated and complete bibliographic record format would be needed, but before too much was invested in programs and files to accommodate the change to MARC. Thus, MARC was established in time to influence existing projects and, in turn, it became a potential force for new developments both in the library and in the library vendor field.

The analysis of bibliographic data in projects such as MARC gave increased emphasis to the ultimate uses of bibliographic records. For perhaps the first time in the history of bibliographic control, the input, mechanisms for manipulation and storage, communication of records, output and retrieval of data had to be considered as a unified system against which to evaluate the content of the bibliographic record. The legendary tortoise-like speed with which bibliographic rules and practices were deliberated seemed to vanish; the computer had become a unifying force. The rapidity with which catalog code revisions, the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographs, the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials, and other changes have been introduced to the field is largely due to their relationship to the machine-readable bibliographic record. Both the interaction of national libraries in projects such as NPAC and MARC, and the belief that computers might somehow assist in bringing about an international bibliographic control system were influential in increasing international cooperation in bibliographic control.

The introduction of the computer, originally regarded as a threat
to proper bibliographic control, may be considered in the future as one of the most unifying forces in the history of bibliographic control.

THE RISE OF LIBRARY NETWORKS

In a span of five years, the astounding growth of the computer-based library network changed many of our basic concepts of bibliographic control and library cooperation. The OCLC system, with its ever-increasing number of network participants, was primarily responsible for this change.

In the invention of the library network, as exemplified by OCLC, we see the culmination of the post-World War II influences on the library field. The network provides a mechanism whereby more libraries and library users can access the United States' information resources. The network provides a mechanism whereby computer services can be provided efficiently to many libraries. The network assists libraries in achieving the goals of scientific management: lower per-unit costs, increased production, and a reduction of professional time expended on clerical tasks. The network also reduces the inequities between the information rich and the information poor. Through network participation, the smallest library has access to a data base and resource-location mechanism equal to that of the largest network member.

Of central importance is the legal basis of library networks. Whereas other forms of cooperation such as interlibrary loan were generally implemented by mutual consent, networks are generally based on a legal contract. By contract, libraries agree to follow certain bibliographic protocol, to adhere to standard bibliographic practices, and to pay for centralized support systems. Many library administrators not only manage their own libraries but now have a contractual responsibility for joint administration of a library network. Within a very short period, librarians have introduced a new organizational structure to assist in bibliographic control and other library operations. Bibliographic control, perhaps for the first time, is tending toward a legal basis. It is too early to assess the impact of the library network, but it seems obvious that the library historian of the future will identify the network as one of the principal achievements of this era.

It was pointed out earlier that the computer, first seen as a threat to bibliographic control, gave new impetus to standards and provided us with a more profound understanding of our traditional bibliographic
processes and records. Library networks are moreover already focusing on problems of bibliographic control. For the first time, we have a mechanism that gets us nearer to our goal of requiring only one-time cataloging of each title. To achieve this goal, however, the single cataloging must meet extremely high criteria for thoroughness, accuracy, and adherence to rules for both cataloging and encoding in machine-readable format. Networks expose shoddy cataloging in a dramatic way, and, increasingly, there is talk of penalizing network members for inputting inferior records. The mere idea of fining libraries for poor cataloging shows what a long way we have come in the past few decades. The existence of inferior cataloging is a challenge to our profession and one that must be solved soon.

The success of OCLC has encouraged us to believe that a national library network, comprised of regional on-line data bases, is only a matter of time—and not a very long time at that. A national network will allow librarians to rely on centralized bibliographic control and thus to give more attention to user service. Should this occur, the dominance of technical processing may give way to user services. We need to integrate network bibliographic control systems with other mechanisms such as document delivery, reference, on-demand bibliographies and catalogs, and information retrieval. It should be possible to use telecommunication networks to access human resources as well as bibliographic resources in order to provide a total user-oriented library system in the future.

The slow acceptance of automation and the insistence on standardization of bibliographic records in the library field has been noted; this approach eventually made on-line library networks possible. Thus, by the mid-1970s the library field can move rapidly toward integration of its major bibliographic functions of acquisition, serial records, cataloging, interlibrary loan, and circulation into unified systems. The early dichotomy between the abstracting and indexing field and the library field has been noted. The early acceptance of automation by the abstracting and indexing field was felt by many to be evidence of a more appropriate and responsible stance, and many funding agencies preferred to support these efforts rather than efforts in the library field. Recently, positions seem to be reversing somewhat. In a recent discussion of the feasibility of an International Science Information Network, released by the National Science Foundation, Office of Science Information Service, the major U.S. developments cited are from the library component of the information field—OCLC, the MARC format, CONSER (the Conversion of
Serials project), and other projects and standards. Perhaps no other recent testimony so vindicates the insistence on standardization in bibliographic control systems.

This paper has concentrated on those developments that would seem most striking to a bibliographic Rip Van Winkle who settled down in 1945 for a thirty-year nap. Although the changes have occurred gradually and are thus not so apparent to us, overall it is fair to assume that to one awakening from such a slumber they would appear incredible. These changes stemmed largely from developments outside the field. The first part of this paper dealt with the pressures exerted on us by scientists, computer experts, minority groups, and funding agencies; we were told to change. These pressures were not immediately effective and even now much remains to be done, but gradually the library field is restructuring its bibliographic control systems and is absorbing new technologies.

At first one may be chagrined to be in a profession that seems to follow rather than to lead and, frequently, even to lag well behind. Upon reflection, however, this seems to be the appropriate position for a service-oriented profession. We must be certain that change is demanded by our clientele and that they will bear the cost, then we must find a way to integrate these changes appropriately so that they will complement the enormous investment society has already made in our collections, bibliographic files, and facilities. Viewed in this light, it may well be more challenging to follow than to be out in the front. The computer experts, for example, pointed out the direction, but we were left to create the route.
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Library Service to Children and Young People

SARA INNIS FENWICK

Library service to children as a public responsibility is a development of the twentieth century, but the foundations for those services were being laid throughout the 1800s. The development was not one of steady progress. The early attempts on the part of well-meaning men and women to provide children with books were often sporadic and abortive. Nevertheless, all such efforts were directed quite consistently toward a goal of providing books for youth that would foster their education as effective and useful citizens. With a variety of interpretations and in many different settings, this goal has continued throughout the past 150 years.

A survey of the development of library service to children can no more be treated neatly within the dates 1876-1976 than can any other aspect of library services; neither can children's library service be regarded as a separate and distinct phenomenon. Children were members of every community in which libraries of a variety of forms—association, subscription, circulating, and eventually free public and school—were established, and it is reasonable to assume that in many library situations there were children knocking at the doors, sitting in the reading rooms, and benefiting from books borrowed by adult relatives. The rapidity with which children made their needs known, and the characteristics of the response by the community, were largely dependent on the geographical, social and economic setting of the community. The timing of the development of children's services was influenced by the changing status of children in the family, and in community relationships.

The change in the status of children during the nineteenth century was characterized by a gradual awareness of the needs of children as individuals. Essentially, there was recognition that childhood is not merely a chrysalis period during which the child's body grows to
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adulthood, but that it is rather a part of a continuous experience of
living in which each state has its unique physical, emotional and
spiritual needs. This level of regard for childhood and its needs did
not come easily or quickly in the early years of the last century, but
gradually flowered as an aspect of the consciousness of a new nation
with egalitarian and democratic ideals.

Generally, it can be said that children were themselves the instiga-
tors of the development of library services to fit their needs. This they
achieved by continued and persistent demands to share in every
advance in the design, organization and delivery of service to the
general public. From those records that exist, we can perceive the
children's presence, but we can also recognize from these meager
references that they were always in the background when a new
building or new service was inaugurated. This spontaneous pressure
of youth on community services can be traced throughout the history
of the public library.

This paper will look at selected events that marked the develop-
ment of library services to children in the last century, marking the
time in rather large periods, not because they have unusually definite
time boundaries, but because they relate to periods of change in the
history of both public libraries and public schools. Such a discussion
must begin with a brief survey of what had been happening to
children and libraries before the year 1876.

EARLY LIBRARIES FOR CHILDREN, 1800-1876

Social historians look in a general way upon the early years of the
last century in this country as a beginning of the emancipation of
children from the world of stern Puritan spiritual values and rules of
conduct, to the more secularized atmosphere of the newly formed
nation. The recently enunciated statement concerning the rights of all
free men did not yet include children, but there was a growing
interest in the needs of children and a concern not only for the
spiritual, but for the moral, intellectual and aesthetic development of
children. This was a favorable climate for writing books appealing to
children's interests as well as providing them with knowledge and
moral guidance. Only a small fraction of the juvenile population in
these years was able to benefit from the increased number of books
available for children. These years also saw the beginning of the
industrialization of this country, and the social and economic changes
that would continue and accelerate throughout most of the century.
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Especially in the eastern cities, changes that affected many children were to be found in the growth of cities, the movement from an agricultural society to an urban one, and the beginnings of child labor in factories and mines for many children of poorer families. At a very young age, children were becoming an economic asset to the family as well as to the employer; this condition would continue to spread well into the second half of the century before there was organized concern for the social welfare of children.

At the beginning of the century, there was also a commitment to free education at least to a level of basic literacy, and it was to this end that the provision of opportunities to read assumed an importance to the social conscience of the country. A tool was at hand in the form of the Sunday school. The primary purpose of this institution was to provide educational opportunities for the children of the poor who could not benefit from the private schools attended by most of the children of wealthy families at that time. In this setting the Sunday school library evolved. Such libraries were collections of books made up chiefly of religious publications. The high regard for books and libraries as tools for educating the young and instilling correct moral values was reflected in the proliferation of these small church libraries. Because of the educational purpose of these collections, books were added in subject areas which considerably broadened the collection from the initial religious tracts and denominational publications. The operation of these libraries was similar to the pattern of the association libraries, but for children in many small towns and rural areas they were the greatest source of free books. In this role they served as forerunners of the movements for school and public libraries. Frank K. Walter noted this pattern in an article in which he quotes an 1839 report of the American Sunday School Union: "We have succeeded in circulating nearly or quite eighteen millions of publications. . . . The plan of district school libraries was suggested in our periodicals as early as 1826, and we do not think it arrogant to claim that the influence of Sunday schools and Sunday school libraries is distinctly visible in the present demand for cheap popular libraries for common schools."

Children also benefited in this early period from the activities of philanthropic citizens. In fact, most of the early records of establishment of libraries for children trace their origins to the generosity of a wealthy person. Most of these early libraries were located in New England; the small communities there, with long-established town-meeting governments and a long colonial history of concern for an
educated citizenry, made early response to the needs for libraries both more recognizable and more realizable.

The most frequently cited example of the philanthropic children's library was the juvenile library established in 1803 by Caleb Bingham of Salisbury, Connecticut. A Boston bookseller and publisher, Bingham remembered his frustrated youthful desire for the opportunity to read more books; from his successful business assets he gave a collection of 150 titles to be made freely available to the nine-to-sixteen-year-old children of the community. This collection, known as the Bingham Library for Youth, was well received and in 1810 the town meeting voted to allocate $100 for the purchase of suitable titles. This is probably the first example of an American municipal governing body contributing financial assistance to public library service.²

There were other instances of libraries for children established by men interested in the reading of youth and who had the financial means to make a contribution to their community. They existed for varying lengths of time, and some were absorbed into the general town libraries. Others simply wore out, and the lack of continuing funds or interested citizens to continue support put an end to their existence as libraries.

After the very early, sporadic juvenile libraries—like Salisbury, usually the result of one man's interest and concern—the general pattern of separate public library facilities for children did not develop. Such libraries—with separate building, staff and budget, and basically independent—were a fairly common development in some other countries until quite recent times, but in the United States this has not been a tradition. There have been, and still are, a few notable examples, but they have usually been well integrated with the adult library services to provide a total library program. The later influence of the Carnegie buildings in the many small and medium-sized municipalities, closely following the accelerated movement toward the special reading rooms for children may have influenced the development of services to fit the available facilities. In any case, the general procedure was to house all services in a single building with a greater degree of access to the total collection for all users.

Evidence that children were in fact, if not in plan, early public library users is in the records of the Peterborough, New Hampshire library. According to Shera, this library was remarkably like a modern public library in its relations with the municipal government.³ The town took advantage of a fund redistributed from an abortive special state educational fund. In 1833, Peterborough voted to bring the
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fund total to $150 to purchase books for a town library. Added to this collection was a juvenile library, an existing subscription library of 200 books. As described in the records, "Most of these Books having been in use for several years, are considerable worn, and the number is not sufficient to accommodate the young persons in Town, as is very desirabl." Records of the founder of that juvenile library indicate his desire to promote free public library service for the whole community as early as 1828.

During this same period a number of educational leaders believed that the development of an educated citizenry depended not only on literacy but also upon the opportunity to read, and they strongly urged lawmakers to translate the educational purposes of library collections for children into legislation at the state level. The result was the enactment of school district laws in a number of states from approximately 1830 to 1850. The first was a law passed by the New York legislature permitting school districts to levy a tax with matching funds to be provided. Massachusetts enacted a similar law in 1837, but few districts in either state availed themselves of the laws. By 1876 nineteen additional states had provided legislation with similar results. The school district laws of this period could not be termed successful in contributing to the development of adequate library services. Over a period of time the failure to provide for annual appropriations, or for any caretaker function, resulted in worn and dwindling collections, many of which disappeared or were absorbed by other libraries. These libraries were in no sense a foundation for the school library to come; they were actually public libraries for adults. School district libraries, operating under school district legislation, were to make a new appearance in a number of states some decades later.

It might have been expected that the school library would appear very much earlier on the library scene than it did, given the emphasis on education in the library movement as a whole. Furthermore, the examples of children's libraries that erupted in the early decades of the nineteenth century, isolated as they were, cannot be considered as laying any recognizable foundations for the eventual development of the public and school libraries that were to come in the twentieth century. The source of our interest, beyond the "first instance" of a collector's fascination, is in the visible signs of the new interest in children's welfare and in the growing concern to make reading experiences available to them.

JULY, 1976
The centennial year of our nation's founding has become the birthday of the library profession to such an extent that we lean heavily upon that date as the beginning of all worthwhile activity. Certainly, the events of that year marked the beginning of a professionalization and a national visibility for librarians, with the organization of the American Library Association, the beginning of a publication to discuss the issues before the profession and to report opinion, and a national report, *Public Libraries in the United States of America*, from the U.S. Bureau of Education. There was, of course, no work with children to report; in fact, there was no mention of children's service in the report itself, since restrictions on use of libraries by children were the general rule. There was, however, a special section of the publication titled “Public Libraries and the Young.” In this section, William I. Fletcher raised questions about the public library's responsibility to the young. He was particularly critical of the usual age limitations on children's use of library collections:

The lack of appreciation of youthful demands for culture is one of the saddest chapters in the history of the world's comprehending not the light which comes into it. Our public libraries will fail in an important part of their mission if they shut out from their treasures minds craving the best, and for the best purposes, because, forsooth, the child is too young to read good books.6

This report was an important statement, and provoked discussions about the age limitations on library use, as well as on the quality of the books being written for children for many years to come. As any children's librarian recognizes, these are questions that have continued to be asked up to the present.

To concentrate on the specific events of 1876, however, would be to ignore the changes in the political and social life in this country that had nourished some steady progress during the two decades preceding the centennial year. This growth took place in the setting of the expansion of the frontier, and a divisive and debilitating civil war. Sociologists point out that the increase of wealth after the Civil War brought increased industrialization, and with it an increased dependence on child labor. To counteract this, there was an organized effort to improve child welfare, as evidenced in the founding of the first settlement houses in New York City and Chicago; the first
Service to Children and Young People

directed playground was established, and juvenile courts were established in four of the largest cities.

Concerning children's experience with books and reading, there was a growth of available free education, increased access to public library reading rooms and Sunday school libraries, and an expanding publication of juvenile books. That these publications were not all of the best quality was evident from contemporary critics of the 1860s and the 1870s. Richard L. Darling, in studying the reviewing of children's books for that period, states: "In the new rush of freedom in children's books many authors, at least in the eyes of their contemporaries, went much too far, so that one of the great outrages of the time was against 'sensationalism' in children's books." Darling goes on to point out that much of this particular criticism was leveled at one of the most prolific and popular authors of the time, William T. Adams, who wrote adventure stories under the pseudonym Oliver Optic. In this dubious reputation he was joined by Horatio Alger, Jr. Darling notes that the publication Old and New reported that in three months of 1870 the most popular boy's books at the Boston Public Library were those written by Oliver Optic and Horatio Alger, Jr.

Fortunately, this new freedom in children's books had by this time produced Louisa May Alcott's first books, Mary Mapes Dodge's Hans Brinker, and, from England, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, among a host of others. There was still a multitude of publications in the Sunday school literature genre, but there were also periodicals, notably The Youth's Companion, founded in 1827, which continued to be a favorite family magazine; Our Young Folks, which made a considerable contribution in its short life from 1865 to 1873, and the appearance of St. Nicholas in 1873.

Increased publishing and the rise of serious literary criticism brought questions concerning what children were reading to the attention of librarians, who saw increasing numbers of children using libraries through the help of parents' memberships and school loans. The need for some professional guidance in the selection of juvenile books was beginning to be recognized, and librarians welcomed a list developed by Caroline Hewins in 1882, which became a widely used selection aid. It was a pamphlet of fewer than one hundred pages, classified and annotated; most importantly, the selection represented the best children's books available at that time. This list was revised a number of times; the last edition appeared in 1915.

In the period 1876-1900, other questions relating to children's
services were addressed by the national forum of the American Library Association and the *Library Journal*, questions that were plaguing libraries in all parts of the country by the end of the century. Among them were the question of age restrictions raised by William Fletcher in 1876 as part of the question of an open-shelf reading room, and the question of special facilities for children. Individual library reports and papers and discussions reported from national conferences give continuing evidence of the number of juvenile patrons who were making their presence felt, and who were literally pushing open the doors still closed to them by the majority of librarians, who believed children were best served through book loans to schools.

In 1890, a New York City school principal set up a library for children using an old school collection. Its members paid a dollar and there was often a line of children waiting to get in. Melvil Dewey became interested in the project and urged that this undertaking be given space in the new George Bruce Branch of the New York Circulating Library. This was done, but the move was not a welcome one to the branch library patrons. It was noted that: "A problem was created, as soon as the age limit was abolished and the doors of public libraries were open to the young. They did not come in one by one in a decorous manner; they poured in. Their very numbers forced the doors to open wider and wider, and demanded separate provision for service." Elizabeth Nesbitt noted another example in the case of the Boston Public Library:

An instance of the problem libraries were meeting is provided by the Boston Public Library which, in 1895, opened a new building to the public. That public included the inevitable large number of children, with the equally inevitable results that the staff had a situation on their hands, since no provision had been made for children. In less than two months, two thousand books for children were placed on open shelves in a room on the second floor.

There is ample evidence that these experiences were common as library administrators tried to deal with the lengthening lines of children, and at the same time not to antagonize their adult users. It was with the leadership of farsighted men like John Cotton Dana and William Brett that the doors began to open to children. Once they were inside the doors, the quality of service to children was not overlooked, as suggested by a report of the Examining Committee of the Boston Public Library in 1895:
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The children's room should be the most important place in the city for the training of those readers without whom the Library is a mere ornament, or at best a convenience for scholars, instead of the nursery of good citizenship which it was meant to be. In the opinion of your committee, no time should be lost in filling the shelves of this room with books, and in providing the most adequate guidance for their use. Advantage should be taken of the newly awakened interest in the Library building which is now bringing many children to it from curiosity, and they should be lured by every legitimate device to stay there for reading.\footnote{10}

It was even recommended in the same report that the most helpful and inspiring attendant should be on duty here, and that the room be made attractive with globes, maps, magazines, and pictures of great Americans.

The decade 1890-1900 not only marked the advance in opening general reading rooms and circulation desks to children, but was also a time of general progress toward accommodating the unique needs of children, needs that called for special facilities, collections, staff and guidance. A survey of the reports from libraries and conferences brings to the fore the activities of pioneers in the field who are repeatedly cited for leadership, both in the public forum and in practice. Notable leaders include: Minerva Saunders who set aside a room for children in the Pawtucket, Rhode Island, Public Library in 1877, provided small chairs for their comfort, and even issued some books to them; and Caroline Hewins, librarian at the Hartford, Connecticut, Public Library, whose annual reports to the American Library Association beginning in 1882 kept the matter of children's reading before that body. (A most interesting and informative book dealing in a personal way with the reading matter of nineteenth-century children is Hewins's volume \textit{A Mid-Century Child and Her Books}). A third name on the roster of influential leaders is Lutie Stearns of the Milwaukee (Wisconsin) Public Library, who delivered a paper entitled "Report on Reading for the Young" to the 1894 conference of the ALA. She spoke of the need to abolish age limitations and to provide special rooms for children, with designated attendants to provide service. The first general meeting devoted to a discussion of these issues related to children took place at this conference, marking a general acceptance by the profession of children's service in libraries.
While librarians in the last quarter of the nineteenth century were involved in solving the problems of the role of children’s services in the public library, they were also devoting attention at the local and national levels to the definition of their responsibility to public school children. Methods and resources used for teaching were gradually changing, affecting the needs of teachers and pupils for library materials. The early textbook-centered education, developed to provide the basic elements of literacy in a mass-education situation, was being gradually modified by progressive teachers to embrace a broader range of learning activities including the use of books appropriate to children’s ability and interests. The changes came gradually—in fact, the accumulation was barely perceptible until the first decade of the next century—but educators and librarians were already asking questions about the effectiveness of the teaching of reading in the schools in light of the limited opportunities to use reading skills once acquired.

An editorial in the April, 1898, issue of Library Journal described the philosophic change that had been taking place in the public schools: “Within the past year or two the phrase ‘the library and the child’—which was itself new not so long ago—has been changed about. It is now ‘the child and the library,’ and the transposition is suggestive of the increasing emphasis given to that phase of library work that deals with children, either by themselves or in connection with their schools.” The latter sentence suggests the issue that was at the center of an increasing volume of professional discussion. The attitude that had characterized the relationships of schools and public libraries, for the past fifty years was that children were best served by making books available in special loans to teachers who could guide the children’s use of them. This attitude justified age limitations on children’s individual use of public libraries. However, the gradual changes in teaching and subject matter (calling for additional study resources to supplement the textbook) and the emphasis on fostering a love of reading and literature called for more and more books for both teachers and children. Loan privileges became greater, and children were admitted to special reading rooms and eventually given borrowing privileges. The major question, however, was not solved. What should be the relationship of the public school and the public library?

Reports of individual libraries around the turn of the century
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indicate that the public libraries were developing strategies for meeting the demands for books in the schools. Most librarians saw this extension of their resources as legitimate responsibility, and one aspect of their response to an increasing variety of community needs.

Community public libraries met the school demands in a variety of ways. Library collections were increased to provide classroom loans in bulk deliveries. Some of the larger libraries eventually established special departments for service to schools. Cities that at an early date generously placed classroom collections in schools include: Cleveland, Worcester, Providence, Buffalo, Detroit, Milwaukee, and New York. In New York, a special department of the New York Free Circulating Library was opened in 1897; in Buffalo, the public library and the schools worked out a cooperative plan for service in 1898. These were indications of the steps public libraries and schools would be taking in the next decades to implement their interpretations of their respective roles in providing libraries.

At the national level, the desire to involve more teachers and school personnel in the problems associated with school-related library needs induced John Cotton Dana to petition the National Education Association in 1898 with a request for the creation of a library department within the association's structure. The petition was approved and a committee appointed to study the issues involved and make recommendations for future relationships. The report of this committee, entitled Report of the Committee on the Relations of Public Libraries to Public Schools was presented in 1899. Among other suggestions, it recognized the need for a small, carefully selected library in every grammar school, and it gave some guidelines for forms of cooperation that would make teachers better able to use libraries, and librarians better able to serve the schools. A variety of administrative patterns was already beginning to emerge; concern for the provision of library materials in the schools would continue to be a matter of controversy for years to come.

ORGANIZING THE NEW SERVICES FOR CHILDREN, 1900-1920

The first twenty years of this century must certainly been the most challenging and exciting years in library history for children's librarians. It was a period of experimentation, of developing and organizing new methods of working with both individual children and groups of children. It was the beginning of children's librarians'
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influence on bookmaking and publishing, and it brought into the profession a group of professionally trained children's librarians. In 1954, Elizabeth Nesbitt summarized the developments in the profession:

Public library work with children, as an organized specialization, is little more than half a century old. This length of time is not far in excess of the possible professional lifetime of a single librarian. The significance of this point lies in the fact that children's library work, in the last two decades, has been emerging from the impetus and vigor of the pioneer period. Until the thirties this phase of library work had been under the control of the group of children's librarians who, building on the ideas and inspiration of the real pioneers, established children's work on a departmental basis, developed methods, and formulated objectives. Historical perspective, always important, is essential in this postpioneer era if the present is to be truly evaluated and the future predicted with any validity.¹³

Nesbitt gave recognition to the seeds sown by early pioneers in the children's work, and attributed the developments of the following years to their persistence. Among these developments Nesbitt included: (1) establishing children's work on a departmental basis, (2) extending it into the branches, (3) determining criteria for the evaluation of children's literature, (4) developing relationships with community agencies for youth, (5) identifying and producing bibliographical aids, and (6) developing group and individual methods of reading guidance.

Professional education for children's librarians—a new breed in the 1890s—was to provide stimulus for the remarkable vitality of the early twentieth century. As has been the case with most professions, the establishment of recognized training programs not only gave dignity and respect to a segment of the profession but, by achieving some uniformity of philosophy and methods among the practitioners, created a body of knowledge and skills unique to that professional group.

Pratt Institute, with Anne Carroll Moore as instructor, began offering lectures on children's library work in 1896, and in 1900 Frances Jenkins Olcott started the training class for children's librarians at Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh. The following year this class became the training school for children's librarians in response to the
need for them throughout the country. Until 1917 this school trained children's librarians exclusively, and its graduates filled positions and provided leadership in all parts of the country for the next several decades.

During this time, establishment of administrative patterns in libraries caused problems for library administrators. New York Public Library set the pattern for departmental organization of children’s work in 1906 with the appointment of Anne Carroll Moore as children’s librarian. For many years she provided leadership in the development of staff and services and was an outstanding influence on the quality of children’s literature through her guidance in developing criteria for selection, her work with authors and publishers, and her critical writings in national publications.

The administrative patterns being developed for school library services were beginning to receive attention from administrators and educators. There was a growing concern with the volume of reference work that pupils at both secondary and elementary levels were expected to do. The main criticism was that teachers were not trained in the use of libraries, and thus were unable to teach their pupils how to use books and bibliographical aids. Dorothy Broderick cited five articles bearing directly on the problems of reference work with children, all of them published between 1895 and 1901, and all of them in some way critical of teachers’ assignments.14

There was a rapidly increasing use of books, pamphlets, magazines, maps, photographs—any materials which the librarian could produce—by more students in more schools; this was particularly evident in the schools in larger cities that were gradually being affected by a growing emphasis on the subject-centered curriculum. The leading colleges of teacher education conducted research on the basic content of the elementary school curriculum, and individual leaders such as Edward Thorndike, Guy Buswell, Carleton Washburne, William Gray and Charles Judd were working to raise education to the level of a respected science. The schools themselves were changing their organization of the child’s learning experiences, influenced by the examples of the Dewey school and its successor, the University of Chicago Laboratory School, the Francis Parker School, the Dalton School and others, all pioneers in the progressive movement away from the textbook study to activity-centered learning. These developments put pressure on schools to provide more and varied learning resources; this need was passed on to the public libraries, which for
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some years had been accepting the responsibility and developing the experience and expertise to provide service and books for all the children in the community.

Several forms of administration of services to schools were developing through these years. They generally fell into one of the following patterns: (1) responsibility for all library services in schools and in the public library assumed by the library; (2) responsibility for school service shared by the school administration and the public library administration; and (3) responsibility for the school library service assumed by the school administration, and that for the public library service assumed by the public library administration. In view of the origins of public library service to schools, one might expect that these patterns followed in this order, moving toward the assumption of all services by the school itself; however, this was not always true.

Shared responsibility for services probably did develop more frequently as an outgrowth of the first pattern when the increasing volume of needs for more books and more staff began to overtax the resources of the public library. Forms of cooperation with the administration of services to schools took a variety of dimensions. The most common ones were probably the bulk loans to classroom libraries, which began very early in the relationship of schools and public libraries and continued well into the second half of the twentieth century. A more complex pattern of shared services, usually of shorter duration yet fairly common, was the schools provision of space and funds for books, and aid in book purchasing, preparation and cataloging, and special reference and guidance. The characteristics of the guidance services were dependent, of course, on the staff in the children's department at the public library; these might range from periodic visits to the school to examine the books and talk with the teachers, to a regular schedule of the children's librarian at the school, during which time the library collection was made available and the librarian issued books to the children and the teachers, essentially conducting a public library extension center. Not infrequently the result of this pattern of service was that the school library became a branch of the public library, providing service to the adult community as well as to the children.

The shared library service pattern developed to its most formal, governmental form under school district laws enacted in a number of states, especially in the Midwest. Under this legislation public libraries and public schools were under the same governing board, sometimes
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a board of education, sometimes a library board appointed by the board of education. Whatever the allocation of responsibility, all general policies, budgets and appropriations, and major capital outlay plans were channeled through the board of education. In states where these school district laws continued in force for many years, the assumption of all responsibility for school library services by the board of education was likely to be delayed.

The article by Dorothy Broderick referred to earlier points out problems of school/library relationships at this early stage in library history (problems which continued into the new century) to underscore the article's title, "PLUS ÇA CHANGE: Classic Patterns in Public /School Library Relations":

Clearly, many roadblocks still found in the library and education worlds which preclude genuine cooperation between the two have roots going back almost 100 years. Public librarians wanted teachers and pupils to know how to use books and libraries—but it was the public library they were to use. Educators were quite willing to expand the curriculum and broaden the approach to learning, but without assuming responsibility for providing the materials needed for changes.\(^{15}\)

The high school library had a different history, and had just begun to demonstrate its strength in the educational scene in the 1890s. In those years the libraries in most secondary schools were likely to be miscellaneous collections of reference and textbooks, in addition to the literary classics read in English classes. In the following twenty years the secondary school libraries were less frequently under the direct administration of the public library, but they were selected as the site for many public library branches, particularly where there was a school district public library. In this arrangement they served the school as a school library, and at the same time were operated as a public library with continuous access for both student and adult users. Furthermore, such libraries were staffed with employees of the public library. One of the frequent criticisms of the library services in this setting was the fact that librarians were trained as public librarians and employed by the public library. For the majority of secondary schools, however, even in these early years, there was a library, if not always a librarian, and there was a minimum of reference books available to students.

The problems and opportunities of new administrative patterns were challenging, but the great contributions of this period were in
the methods for promoting reading and in the reading guidance programs. The decades of the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth have been called by many literary historians "the golden age of children's literature in the English language." Such a statement is acceptable when one examines the number of long-lived titles written during those years. By the turn of the century, however the potential market in inexpensive series books had also been recognized, and the growing flood of these formula-written books was evident. It was not accidental, then, that the children's librarians of this period were concerned with the quality of the books children were reading. They responded to this concern by setting high standards of literary quality for their book selection, and by producing lists of worthwhile and appealing books to attract young readers. The motivation for many of the reading guidance techniques was the desire to bring the best books to the attention of children. Long before there were actually children's librarians, those interested in the quality of young people's books had allies in the reviewers of many of the serious literary magazines of the period; reviews of books that crowned the "golden age" were usually to be found in Atlantic Monthly, Harpers New Monthly Magazine, The Nation, and others of that era. Beginning in 1918, Anne Carroll Moore contributed reviews and articles on children's books to The Bookman, and she set a high standard of comparative reviewing and criticism. Publishers developed a respect for the library market for juveniles, and sought editors of children's books.

The librarians working with children were accorded full professional standing in the American Library Association in 1900 with the organization of a Section for Children's Librarians, which provided a regular channel for exchange of ideas, goals and practices, as well as an official voice at the national level. Articles in the Library Journal and Alice Hazeltine's volume in the series of Classics of American Librarianship, Library Work with Children,\textsuperscript{16} are good sources of accounts of the activities and programs initiated by children's librarians. These essays and papers record the names of librarians who exerted leadership at this time to gain recognition for children's library service and the contribution they believed good literature could make to the lives of children. People to whom tribute is due for achievements during this period and years following include: Anne Carroll Moore, whose contributions have been noted; Louise Seaman Bechtel, appointed by Macmillan to head the first juvenile department in a major publishing house; Frances Jenkins Olcott at Carnegie Library in
Service to Children and Young People

Pittsburgh; Caroline Burnite Walker and Effie L. Power in the Cleveland Public Library; Alice Jordan at the Boston Public Library; Mary Dousman at the Milwaukee Public Library; and Clara Whitehill Hunt of the Brooklyn Public Library. This list is by no means complete.

It is appropriate to note an event resulting from the emphasis on literature of high quality. Franklyn Mathiews, who had been campaigning for better reading for boys as Chief Scout Librarian for the Boy Scouts of America, and Frederic Melcher, chairman of the American Booksellers Association, organized a committee to promote a Children's Book Week in 1919. Encouraged by the interest evident in the cooperative endeavors of publishers, booksellers, and librarians, Melcher proposed that a medal be awarded each year for the most distinguished children's book, the award to be made by the children's librarians section of the ALA. The first John Newbery medal was given in 1922 and has been awarded annually since. In 1938 the Caldecott medal was initiated by Melcher and awarded each year for the best illustrations in a picture book for children.

DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICE TO CHILDREN,
1920-1950

If the first two decades of this century could be described as those of pioneering, innovation and enthusiasm, the following decades might properly be termed years of consolidation, standardization and broadening horizons. Again, it is not at all precise to use years, or even decades, for the beginnings and endings of periods marking the development of movements that were already national in scope, but at the same time peculiar to each individual community. The period covered in this section is an unrealistic one in many ways. It spans the two decades following World War I, years of efforts to identify an international role, and more actively to form one nation from the increased flow of immigrants to this country, a nationwide Great Depression, World War II and the first years of recovery from a multitude of wartime dislocations. More importantly for children, this time span represents a complete generation in general terms, or the period when two generations of children born within its limits are using—or not using—children's library services. These years also saw the entry of a new generation of professional leadership. Some consolidation and a measure of standardization during these were made possible by the vision and sound judgment on which the
foundations of children’s library service were built in the pioneer period.

This is not to say that great gains were not made during the years 1920-50; they will be reviewed briefly. However, in the areas of library-related reading guidance, individual and group activities, library instruction, cooperation between schools and public and community-related library services, most of the techniques used by the children’s librarians had been developed in the preceding twenty years; the next thirty years and more were spent in trying to maintain, extend and modify them.

During this period, library reports testify to the continued level of good service in the face of greater numbers of children (particularly in the city branch libraries), greater demands for school assignments, and greatly reduced budgets of the 1930s. Across the country, the circulation of public library books to children averaged 40-45 percent of the total circulation, and this was a fairly constant figure over many years. While figures for circulation are poor measures of service at best, and these figures are particularly suspect (for early years of the period there was very little uniformity in the recording of school classroom loans), nevertheless, long lines of children in busy city branches and at bookmobile stops showed evidence of use by children.

An often quoted and well-deserved tribute to the children’s rooms in the public libraries in the United States was written by the French scholar and critic, Paul Hazard:

Here is an innovation that does honor to the sensibility of a people, and it is an American innovation: the libraries reserved for children. Those light and gay rooms, decorated with flowers and suitable furniture; those rooms where children feel perfectly at ease, free to come and go; to hunt for a book in the catalogue, to find it on the shelves, to carry it to their armchair, and to plunge into the reading of it. They are better than a drawing room or a club. They are a home. . . . All respect is shown to the child. He is not asked if he is rich or poor, Catholic, Presbyterian or Quaker. He has complete freedom. From the hundreds of thousands of books within reach of his hand, he takes the one that pleases him. He may remain ten minutes or several hours.¹⁷

Guidance techniques considered important by all professionally trained public librarians working with children were: (1) the individual contacts with children on the floor of the children’s room, book-
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mobile, school or hospital; (2) the selection of the best books to maintain a collection of good quality and suited to the interests of the children in the community; and (3) the provision of booklists, displays, book-talks and story hours to introduce books to children. Subject headings in the library catalogs were frequently of concern to the children's librarians, as well as a need to provide more instruction in the use of the several catalogs, bibliographies and indexes. The need for this aspect of guidance had been recognized for many years, yet with only a moderate achievement; a variety of printed aids continued to appear, but most failed to establish the motivational factor that would make them meaningful to children. Progress in this area was not significant until the curriculum reforms of the 1950s and 1960s, which helped to relate the inquiry activities of the curricular learning experiences to the library's system of organizing its materials.

Storytelling to children above the nursery-school and kindergarten levels—storytelling that was a sharing of a literary experience by an adult who gave life to the language of a selection of literature—was kept alive by children's librarians in public libraries during the early decades of this century. Outside libraries, the art of storytelling had almost disappeared during this period except for the very young child. While no longer a part of the life at the modern fireside, or in the classrooms where the emphasis on silent reading was paramount, children were lining up at the doors of public libraries one day each week to hear stories. Older children brought younger brothers and sisters to listen, and these were occasions when the storyteller had a wide-ranging repertoire of stories prepared to hold the attention of the youngest and the oldest. Children's librarians believed so strongly in the value of recreating literature for their audiences that they were willing to commit a large part of their personal as well as professional time to the preparation of such programs.

One must acknowledge some obstacles that in the later years of this period—and more obviously in the next decade with the advent of television in the home—worked to eclipse temporarily and to change permanently the storytelling programs in public libraries. When the audiences of older children began to decrease with changing school, neighborhood, and family lives and the inroads of television viewing in after-school hours, not all children's librarians took the opportunity to take storytelling out of the library to the schools and other centers where children were. There was also a reluctance to accept and to train volunteers and community aides who were able to contact
more audiences in new settings. All of these directions were adopted by some librarians to give vitality to the programs. These efforts also served to justify to administrators the time put into storytelling programs; administrators saw only that this program demanded a large part of the staff attention for proper support. (One state, in a tentative formulation of quantitative standards, proposed the figure of one full day’s staff time to support a regular weekly storytelling program if the preparation were to be largely done on the job.) Most public library administrators had not been educated to the values of the story hour beyond its usefulness for publicity pictures in the press or annual reports.

The storytelling program that became very successful in the third decade of this period was the picture-book hour or preschool story hour. While this program became a popular event in the later years of this period, it reached its peak in the 1950s and 1960s and demonstrates the resurgence of interest in storytelling when the lack of experience in hearing oral literature and literary language as living communication awakened the interest of educators, and a reevaluation of the contribution of storytelling was begun.

One major development in service for youth in the public library which originated in the first decade of this thirty-year period was the establishment of special rooms and book collections for teen-age patrons. It is interesting to reflect that the first children’s libraries, and the first special reading room privileges in the libraries of the early 1800s, were actually serving primarily youths from twelve to sixteen years old, and what they most often were allowed to read were the adult classics and family magazines such as Youth’s Companion. As service for children developed and the needs of secondary school pupils for materials beyond their textbooks increased, however, there was a professional concern that the period between the reading guidance of childhood and that of adulthood very often left the adolescent youth without such help. The continuing concept of the public library as the pinnacle of the educational pyramid of ongoing education was breaking down because of the failure of the library to provide the bridge between the children’s room and the wide and open ranges of the adult department.

The first special rooms for the teen-age readers were established in the 1920s. In 1925 the Cleveland Public Library opened the Stevenson Room in its new building, under the guidance and supervision of Jean Roos. The New York Public Library formed the Young Peoples’ Book Committee to read, discuss and evaluate books for teen-ageers.
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Under the leadership of Margaret Scoggin, the Nathan Strauss Room became a center for young people in the New York area. In 1930 the Young People's Reading Round Table was formed as an organized group in the American Library Association.

A somewhat different pattern of collection organization was adopted by the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore. In the Popular Library, a section of shelves was set aside for an introductory collection of books of interest to teen-age readers, and a reader's advisor for young people had a desk there. Margaret Alexander served in this role for many years and developed a program of service to young adults that had special strengths in work with schools, book-talks to groups throughout the city, and booklists developed by committees of young adult librarians, school librarians and teachers. Medium-sized libraries found that the pattern of an alcove or a few introductory shelves with a reader's advisor desk nearby was a feasible response to the needs of the audience, and the Enoch Pratt Free Library's pattern of organization seemed to transfer most successfully to libraries where the population served was under 500,000.

The interest in the physical location and the characteristics of the facilities for young people's services often took precedence over the concern for adequately trained personnel in the planning of library buildings. As a result, buildings were equipped with special rooms and attractive furnishings but lacked staff and a range of books—not only adult literature, but also reference and nonfiction titles related to schools assignments. Inevitably, many rooms were given up as failures, while the need for an informed, sympathetic librarian who was trained to recognize and respond to the needs of adolescents persisted in every department of the library.

It was some years before the majority of the profession saw the specialization in work with youth in the adolescent years as a facet of the work with adults rather than the responsibility of the children's department. The young people's librarians, however, continued to: (1) develop their expertise in the identification of books at all levels, and later, films, recordings and other media that were of interest and importance to their users; and (2) to develop techniques that were particularly successful in capturing the interest of the teen-age patron—e.g., booktalks, film discussions, record programs, forums on contemporary problems, and other group activities both in and out of the library. Over the years opinion vacillated as to which age group should receive the attention of the young people's librarian. The needs of communities varied, however, and services were planned in
accordance with those needs. It should be noted that this specialization has attracted and continues to attract some of the most idealistic (while also realistic) members of the profession, who have produced some of the most imaginative and responsive programs in the modern public library.

The area of children's and youth library services that underwent the most visible change and influential growth during these years was that of the school library. The period began with the first national statement of quantitative standards for high school libraries adopted by the professional and educational associations in 1918. This report was begun with the work of a Library Committee of the North Central Association and the Secondary Schools Department of the National Education Association, and was based upon a status survey of high school libraries. To respond to the shortcomings in book collections, facilities for study, and minimum staff, this report, “Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes,” was designed as a quantitative statement and served for the next fifteen years as the standard of a secondary school library's adequacy.

These standards were supplemented by the Evaluated Criteria, first published in 1939 by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards and revised in 1950, 1960 and 1969. These standards for evaluating the quality of educational services of the school library were incorporated in criteria for the entire school, and proved to be a useful vehicle for planning improvements in all dimensions of library organization and service related to the instructional program. In the mid 1940s the American Library Association recognized the importance of planning for library services of all types in the post-war period; included in the series of reports issued was one for school libraries, School Libraries For Today and Tomorrow. These standards were a combination of the quantitative and qualitative measures, stressing services to pupils and teachers as well as facilities, resources, budgets and staff. Although the standards adopted by the professional association of librarians did not have the power of enforcement of examiners of the state and regional accrediting associations, these standards nevertheless had considerable influence on the continued upgrading of the official evaluation tools.

The above steps in development of secondary school libraries were not matched by similar steps for the elementary schools, largely because the state authority (while it could withhold some funds from schools that did not meet a minimum degree of quality) did not have
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the enforcement strength of the secondary school accrediting associations. However, a report was presented to the National Education Association in 1925 making recommendations for elementary school libraries; it emphasized responsibilities to provide books and to provide instruction in using libraries. In the following decades most of the state departments of education adopted some recommendations in the form of minimum standards for elementary school libraries. The number of centralized libraries in schools at this level continued to be small—barely over 25 percent in the country.

A variety of influences operated to slow the development of centralized libraries. These included the commitment of a majority of elementary-level educators to the concept of the self-contained classroom which, it was felt, could be best supported by a classroom library; not to be overlooked, however, was the influence of the long-established public library service to the schools. To discontinue this service in favor of a school-provided library would be a much more costly investment. Nevertheless, the movement had begun, and would gather momentum in the following decades.

An institute on “Youth, Communication and Libraries” was held in 1947 at the University of Chicago; the proceedings were published two years later. A number of these papers have become classics in the bibliography of children’s library services, some of them because of new material presented, and others for issues they raised and the prophetic challenges they presented. In the final paper, Frances Henne identified the period as one of unrest for librarians working with children and young people, and she called for critical evaluation and rigorous planning:

We must in our thinking and planning break away from the barriers of administrative organization, we must recognize the basic reality that we are all concerned with youth and communication, and we must formulate our plans in accordance with that principle. The frontiers thus represent what is best for youth in library service; and immediate planning considers only how it can be effected, regardless of traditional patterns of thought or action to which we have been accustomed.20

In examining the potential resources for library services in a community, Henne referred specifically to the possibility of locating all library services to children in the elementary school, and recommended objective study and evaluation by all librarians and other groups concerned in working with children in order to determine the
situation most beneficial to children. The question that had been discussed in a variety of contexts since the 1890s was thus raised again: What should be the relationship of the public library to the public schools?

In the thirty years from 1920 to 1950, the professional association of children's librarians became a strong force for leadership and development of service to youth, both in the library world and for representing libraries to other professional organizations working with youth in the United States and abroad. In 1941, the organizations of children's librarians, young people's librarians, and school librarians within the ALA joined to form the Division of Libraries for Children and Young People. Mildred Batchelder, who had joined the staff of ALA Headquarters in 1936, and had been School and Children's Library Specialist, became executive secretary of the new division. When the American Association of School Librarians was formed as a separate division in 1951, Batchelder continued as executive secretary of the Children's Service Division and the Young Adult Services Division. Her long period of distinguished and stimulating service gave recognition to the role of the library services to children among the national organizations concerned with children's welfare.

During these years, the division periodical, *Top of the News*, first appeared in October 1942 and became a useful publication, carrying not only news of activities of children's services and activities with young people in all library settings, but also of developments in the field of children's literature and other materials.

**YEARS OF CHANGE IN LIBRARY SERVICE FOR CHILDREN: 1950-1975**

All library services to children were affected by the impact of major changes in the schools over the next twenty-five years. The school library at both elementary and secondary levels underwent an evolutionary development that greatly changed its aspect. A reevaluation of the curricula that changed subject matter and shifted grade placement followed a critical examination of the educational enterprise. At the same time, the school building and the school calendar were altered to provide for more flexibility in the effective use of teaching staff. New technological developments had made available an array of new teaching resources and equipment; team teaching, independent study, and ungraded grouping became familiar descriptors of school programming. School libraries were called upon to provide services...
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and resources to support the changing instructional programs and, in many cases, to assume new roles within the school staff.

The initial impact of these changes was felt as might have been anticipated, in the area of teaching and learning resources. The majority of schools were unable to meet the first waves of requests for materials to support new study topics, reference materials for individual research projects, rare and expensive source materials and, above all, a variety of audiovisual media. It was this new pressure for a variety of learning resources and facilities that prompted the school library to become a media center—not only in resources and services, but in name as well. This change was not immediate, but was a gradual evolution from a book-centered library to a media center with trained staff. Staff responsibilities were differentiated to accommodate skills and modes of learning with the whole range of communication media, which by this date included television, programmed and computerized learning, videotaping, design and production of learning materials, as well as the familiar film, filmstrip, recordings, books, maps, and so on.

The impact of new educational trends was reflected in reformulation of standards, and the greater frequency of publication of school library standards is an indication of the rate of accommodation to change. The 1945 standards, published in School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, provided a planning and evaluation tool until 1960, when the American Association of School Librarians published Standards for School Library Programs. This proved to be a distinct departure from earlier formulations. It was designed to provide for the development of a program encompassing all the factors in the environment that make the resources of the library accessible to students and teachers. This statement of standards was directed toward a program of good, not minimum, quality, and was developed to be applicable to both elementary and secondary schools.

By 1969 a new statement of standards was needed to recognize the metamorphosis of the school library to media center, and to deal with the new responsibilities implied in that designation. The publication Standards for School Media Programs was issued jointly by the American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association (NEA), and demonstrated the concern of both organizations to develop standards of excellence of media programs in schools. Almost immediately after the publication of this document, a committee of the two organizations began work on a replacement which was published in 1975.
For more than a decade following the publication of the 1960 standards, the improvement of school library programs was facilitated by three foundation grants: $100,000 from the Council on Library Resources for an eighteen-month School Library Development Project to implement the new standards, and two five-year grants, each of more than one million dollars, from the Knapp Foundation. The first of the Knapp Foundation grants was for the Knapp School Library Project, designed by the American Association of School Librarians to demonstrate good library services supported by adequate resources and staff; the second was for the School Library Manpower Project for training school library media personnel. Directors for these programs were Mary Frances Kennon for the School Library Development Project, Peggy Sullivan for the Knapp School Library Project, and Robert Case with Anna Mary Lowery for the School Library Manpower Project. The reports of the two Knapp projects are useful additions to the professional literature.

Services for children have been most directly affected in this period by the infusion of federal funds, but that effect was most pronounced on the school libraries. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided for the purchase of a few selected areas of materials, and school libraries began building up neglected areas of their collections. With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, school libraries were able to build collections and provide for their cataloging under Title II; Title I provided for materials for the special needs of disadvantaged students. The addition of school library specialists at the state department of education in a number of states was made possible under this same act. Almost every school in the nation has benefited in one way or another from these funds.

The periodic uncertainty about their renewal, and the shifts in priority and location of authority for administration and evaluation in the U.S. Office of Education have been a continuing concern, and hours of time have been spent by school librarians and association officers testifying to Congressional committees. On the local level the problems have been in use of restricted funds and in deadlines for expenditure that have been consistently inadequate. A strengthening of consultant staff at state and district levels has been one method of dealing with these problems. Adoption by more school systems of central purchasing and preparation and commercially prepared cataloging data has been one result of increased funding, and the larger systems have developed computerized handling of acquisition records and bookkeeping. This advance has paved the way for computer
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processing of circulation records in the larger libraries, and the experimentation with bibliography generation.

Because of the many organizational changes that have brought more funds (and therefore, more materials, more trained and auxiliary staff, more consultant help, more facilities and equipment), the services for students in all schools have been extended and enriched. In many schools the library has become a media center in every dimension of the term—a learning center for students, a resources center for teachers, a study center, a viewing and listening center, a communications center, and a variety of other designations that attempt to interpret to the school population what a library means to teaching and learning in today's schools.

Service at the elementary level has become more highly individualized as students study and become active in and out of the media center, involving the media specialist in their planning. Book-talks and discussions, reading, listening and viewing guidance, help in satisfying personal quests as well as classroom projects through a variety of media are not new techniques, but they are much more the usual program in the elementary school than they were ten or twenty years ago.

Whereas the twenty-five year period previous to 1950 in the public library was one of following, adapting and improving rather than innovating services, the immediate past twenty-five years have seen some new techniques and priorities developed. This has happened largely in response to population shifts, with economic and social dislocations that brought a mounting percentage of the population into standard metropolitan statistical areas—70 percent according to the 1970 census—with a distribution that showed central cities largely occupied by the poor and educationally disadvantaged, while the suburbs became the living area for the more economically advantaged families who can support schools and libraries. It became evident that public library services designed over the years to serve children motivated to read by home experience and encouragement to learn—the children who would use libraries and would read books despite obstacles—were neither likely to attract nor satisfy children living in the overcrowded inner-city slums, where poverty, language problems and racial tensions were barriers to communication.

The lack of reading skills was tackled by many volunteer groups, working with the advice of the schools which usually lacked the teaching time to give adequate help to the many individual problems. The libraries came rather late into active participation in most cities,
but there was an effort by every library to supply materials, to make them available to tutorial teachers and aids, often to provide a space for after-school tutoring sessions, and to give in-service training in the use of available resources. Children’s librarians did not usually feel prepared to do the actual teaching and, probably because of the pattern of library education for children’s librarians, the majority of them knew very little about how children learned to read—unless they happened to have prepared for teaching before entering the library profession.

The formal reading improvement programs, however, were only one frontier of service to children who had been for many years the “unserved.” Library sub-branches, circulation and study centers were set up in storefront buildings where the environment was less forbidding to people who had never entered libraries, and the children responded to these moves in many cities. Book collections were selected to appeal to ethnic and racial minority groups; art objects and exhibits were chosen to help the children to feel pride in their culture. Special-interest clubs, photography and writing groups, film programs and drama clubs were organized. In very recent years the emphasis has been on the community information center and the crisis center.

As stated earlier, these have been years of innovation and experimentation, and a variety of techniques have been tried; some have succeeded, while some failed. Some programs have not succeeded because they were brought into a community by outsiders rather than evolving with the active participation of the community. “Identifying the needs of the community” has been a goal on the lips of librarians, but it has been difficult to achieve from outside the community. Children have always been the first to respond because their needs are more obvious and they are more curious and open to suggestion. Librarians who have been working with youth in the cities in recent years have been vocal about the failure of their library school preparation for understanding not only child growth and development and adolescent psychology, but the value systems, cultural conflicts, and family and neighborhood structures that prevail in minority communities. Both library school and on-the-job training programs have planned work experiences to prepare future librarians better.

The sharing of literature through storytelling as a part of the library’s program has experienced something of a revival in this period. More library schools are teaching courses in storytelling, or oral interpretation of literature. More libraries are maintaining
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storytelling programs but most public libraries have discontinued the story hour for all but young children. It is the preschool story hour that has flourished, and is a strong family contact. A popular version in the neighborhood libraries is the early evening pajama story hour. Moreover, librarians are using storytelling techniques to give book-talks more frequently; they are taking stories out of the library into classrooms, school auditoriums, club rooms, camps, playgrounds, and gatherings of all ages. They are training neighborhood aides and volunteers to tell stories. In areas of minority population concentration they are using storytellers who can speak the native language of the people. In every case, they are finding that the live storyteller offers a dramatic personal experience different in quality and appeal from the mass-media viewing and listening that occupies so much of every child's life.

Relations between schools and public libraries reached a critical point in the late 1950s and early 1960s. New curricular programs presupposed student access to a wide range of material and subjects before federal funds were made available to improve school library collections. The influx of secondary students into the public library for after-school hours of reference work, study and use of materials unavailable in the school libraries became known as “the student explosion.” Surveys of public library users in these years showed that often more than one-half of the users in the majority of libraries were high school students. Useful lessons were learned at this period: (1) the realization that librarians need to anticipate demographic, economic and social changes in communities; (2) the recognition that children and youth are not sensitive to jurisdictional boundaries between institutions if they can locate the materials they need and that they will use every library in a community indiscriminately in their search for information; and (3) that librarians do not know enough about the school-related or the personal information needs of youth.

A study in progress is “The Philadelphia Project” by John Benford. This study began with a survey of school-related needs for materials and an analysis of students' patterns of library use. An “action library” was established following the analysis of the data collected from teachers and students to demonstrate a library situation that would put into practice some of the recommendations based upon joint planning of public and school librarians. The action library is a learning resource center planned to be free of the usual administrative structure and operation of both school and public libraries in order to explore new relationships with the community.
Full reporting on the success of this undertaking has not yet been available.

The need for research, pilot projects and experimentation with new patterns of organization and administration was recognized by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. In their response to the report of the Commissioner of Education's Committee on Library Development in 1970, they recommended appropriation of state funds to make such exploration possible since school libraries in the state had been urged to assume major responsibility for all library services to children. The demonstration projects and subsequent evaluation have not been made possible yet, and there are few instances in the country where some data might be gathered to test the feasibility of the recommendation; the idea, although not new to the professional discussion arena, carries new appeal to administrators presently concerned with trimming the budget.

An important achievement for children's library service in 1963 was the appointment at the Library of Congress of a specialist in children's literature; this office has been occupied by Virginia Haviland. The presence of a specialist in this field at the national library has provided for greatly improved communications and a stimulus for both bibliographical and international activities of importance.

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

If there is to be a dominant theme of library service for children during the next few years, it will be one of breaking barriers: between library personnel and children and the adults who work with them, between libraries of all types, between media in its many forms, and between media and the nonlibrary user—especially the nonuser who needs information to sustain life and spirit. There is evidence of these and many other barriers disappearing with the energy, enthusiasm and dedication of able, imaginative librarians and media specialists today.

There is currently discussion on the topic of total community service, the term that has characterized the task forces working on new standards for public library service. For children, such service might ensure joint planning of the agencies providing library services—primarily school and public libraries—at a level beyond the superficial and temporary cooperation of the past.

Barriers are falling within libraries, particularly in public libraries
where age limitations have been dropped with the recognition of the child's right of access to materials.

As obstacles are removed, children attain a degree of intellectual freedom which librarians hope to continue to enhance. Limitations on information, ideas, and imaginative and aesthetic experiences can be threatened consciously or unconsciously by the librarian's selection and guidance. The same threat can come from well-meaning individuals who would ask the librarian to apply special criteria directed toward the concerns of a particular group—religious, racial or otherwise identified. The future will necessitate a keen awareness of threats to intellectual freedom and a commitment to honesty of expression.
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Library Service To College Students

FRITZ VEIT

Within the span of approximately one hundred years, library service to college students has undergone marked changes. These changes will become apparent when some of the major elements affecting library service are individually examined. Major factors which have had an impact, and which we will analyze briefly, are: composition of student body, character of the collection, teaching methods and educational philosophies, cooperative efforts to extend local resources, hours of service, aid to users, instruction in the use of the library, and establishment of certain library units such as reserve rooms, browsing rooms and undergraduate libraries.

This study emphasizes service to the college-level (undergraduate) student; other contributors to this issue deal with various aspects of service to the graduate student.

Students and Teaching Methods

Around the turn of the century, college students formed quite a homogeneous group. Even as college enrollments grew spectacularly during the first decade of the twentieth century, the student bodies themselves remained rather homogeneous.1

Teaching methods were homogeneous, too. Textbook learning with recitation sessions as its corollary was the rule. However, under the influence of German university teaching methods, use of the lecture was introduced by many American colleges and universities. Also following German practices, the rigid curriculum which had characterized American higher education was abandoned in favor of the elective system. In Germany the freedom granted to students to select their courses and to pursue their studies nearly without supervision generally showed good results. However, this method was less successful when transplanted to the American scene, since many American students restricted their choices to the less difficult and...
often unrelated courses. Methods were consequently advocated which would assure strong curricula whose components were interdependent. Within this framework, independent study was furthered by various devices such as tutorials and honors courses. These, however, were designed principally for superior students.

The increase in the number of college students during the past one hundred years has been almost continuous, except for times of crisis and war. The end of World War II brought a particularly large influx of students, many being aided by the GI Bill. To absorb this increase many higher education institutions were enlarged in size and scope, new institutions were established, and teachers’ colleges were transformed into general colleges or universities. In some universities the growth was extensive on both the graduate and undergraduate levels. As curricula and student bodies increased, libraries of many universities grew correspondingly. To give the undergraduates easier access to materials of particular interest to them, separate undergraduate libraries were created in a number of universities.

Junior colleges, which for many years had to fight for their existence, became the fastest growing segment of higher education. A Carnegie Commission report predicts that by 1980 between 35 percent and 40 percent of all undergraduates can be accommodated by the community colleges. Unhampered by tradition, many community colleges have experimented with newer theories of education and librarianship. The publicly supported, two-year post-secondary institutions have adopted a broad perspective by including in their curricula not only college-parallel education but also vocational/technical education, career education, general education, guidance, and community services. Such diversified offerings have brought to the community college conventional college students as well as many other learners who feel they can profit from study beyond the high school level. To accommodate such diverse student groups, community colleges generally offer individualized instruction which requires a wide range of materials—by type (book and nonbook), by subject, and by level of difficulty.

Similar flexible arrangements have also become necessary for students who enter college via "open-education" channels. Many of the open-education programs permit the student to acquire knowledge in an informal fashion at a location he chooses and at a pace which suits his ability and temperament. Only a large variety of freely accessible learning materials can satisfy the diverse requirements of these students.
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Practices and procedures which have proven effective in the community college have been incorporated at the senior college and even at university levels. The result has been that in an increasing number of senior institutions, admission policies have become less restrictive, and their libraries have accepted responsibility for many types of media.

COLLECTION

In 1876 the editors of the chapter concerning college libraries in the landmark library report issued by the Bureau of Education commented on the typical book collection:

Few colleges have possessed funds to build up libraries on a scientific plan. Their collections consist largely of the voluntary gifts of many individuals, and hence are usually of a miscellaneous character. Comparatively few of the patrons of our colleges in the past have appreciated the essential importance of ample and well selected libraries. Recently, however, more liberal views have prevailed in this respect. This, with fewer restrictions as to expenditure, will enable college officers to select with greater discrimination and more definite purpose.\(^5\)

In a study published about fifteen years later, Lodilla Ambrose describes the small college library:

It consists of from six to twenty thousand volumes. It is composed in part of the libraries of deceased clergymen which have been contributed to the institution in bulk. To these are added the encyclopaedias and books of reference of the edition before the last and a miscellaneous assortment of all the most obvious books in the ordinary branches of science, literature, and art. . . . The ideas of those who use it are generally bounded, not by the horizon of the subject which they are considering but by the literature which is accessible.\(^6\)

Drawing on the 1888-89 report of the Commissioner of Education, Ambrose found the following situation regarding the size of the collections: of 456 colleges and college-type institutions which submitted data, 44 had fewer than 1,000 volumes, 57 had at least 1,000 but fewer than 2,000; in all, 253 (or 55 percent of the total group) had fewer than 5,000 volumes. Only four had more than 100,000 volumes.\(^7\)
A significant, if small, group of librarians felt that students should have at their disposal the kind of books which would support their studies or which could contribute to their general cultural improvement. Since books had become more plentiful and less expensive, most libraries could enlarge their collections considerably; many doubled or even tripled their holdings between 1876 and 1900. The trend toward increasing the holdings has continued. George Works observed that between 1900 and 1925, there was a marked expansion of the resources of the college and university libraries, a rate of increase that was more rapid than that of the student body. In other words, libraries had more books per student in 1925 than in 1900.

To assist college libraries in their task of selecting suitable books, booklists were compiled both for four-year and two-year colleges. Louis R. Wilson believed that these tools would materially improve the quality of the collections. He felt that henceforth the book shower, which yielded indiscriminate accessions, could no longer be used as an appropriate means of acquiring books to meet the quantitative holdings requirements. A List of Books for College Libraries, by Charles Shaw, and A List of Books for Junior College Libraries, by Foster Mohrhardt, are the best known early efforts, although they were preceded by others such as Eugene Hilton’s and Edna Hester’s lists. The Shaw and Mohrhardt lists are especially important because they were not only tools designed to help the librarian select proper materials, but were also the yardsticks applied by the Carnegie Corporation in evaluating the libraries considered for grants designed to upgrade their collections and make them more vital to the undergraduates’ interests. Librarians welcomed these book selection aids. Responding to the favorable reception by practicing librarians, lists are still being published. Since modern teaching methods, as well as the more recent standards, require extensive holdings, the lists have grown larger and librarians have a wider field to choose from for their growing collections. In addition to booklists covering the traditional college subjects, there are now also lists for the technical/vocational fields. Some of the recent lists include both book and nonbook media.

It has been the prevailing view for many decades that the library should be more than a collection of curriculum-related materials: “it should provide, and make easily accessible for both students and faculty, standard cultural and recreational reading wholly apart from the fixed curriculum.” College library authorities, expressing their views in articles, textbooks, standards and guidelines, stress that the
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college library should be the place where a student can satisfy both his curricular and his extra-curricular reading requirements. Authorities have also continuously stressed that the college library should not be concerned with size per se, but should contain only material which the student is likely to find helpful. Librarians are advised to keep their collections alive and give as much attention to the matter of discarding materials no longer useful as they give to the acquisition of new materials. This view is clearly stated in the 1972 guidelines and the 1975 college library standards.20

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

As the library was increasingly used for collateral reading and independent study, it became evident that no one library, even a large one, could acquire all titles a student or researcher might wish to consult. To enlarge the pool of available materials, interlibrary lending was suggested. Samuel S. Green, the librarian of the Worcester Public Library, advocated such a course as early as 1876 in a letter to the editor of the Library Journal.21 Green was certain that such a service would be helpful to many types of readers—i.e., to the researcher as well as to the student and to the general reader. This idea gained proponents among college and university librarians. For instance, the University of California, under the leadership of Joseph Rowell, adopted a plan for interlibrary loans and invited other libraries to participate.22

Interlibrary loan increasingly interested the profession and became a much-discussed issue. The culmination of these early efforts was the Interlibrary Loan Code of 1919.23 This code allowed the borrowing of books for both the scholar and the general user. Usually the condition was stipulated that the books were to be used on the borrowing library's premises. The 1919 code had a restrictive influence even though its framers had hoped that the code would extend the scope of former practices. As a result of dissatisfaction with the 1919 code, work was undertaken on a new code, and a new document was adopted in 1940. However, this code, which was meant to eliminate obstacles to interlibrary lending, proved even more limiting. The 1940 code provided interlibrary loans only to researchers whose objective was to advance the frontiers of knowledge. Since this code, too, failed to accomplish the desired objectives, it underwent a revision which resulted in the General Interlibrary Loan Code of 1952. This code no longer excluded any specific group of readers. In practice, however, libraries restricted borrowing and lending for
undergraduates much more than for graduate students. In a 1963-64 study it was found that of eight libraries included in a sample, only three routinely lent to undergraduates. Many libraries did not strictly observe the provisions of the 1952 code, just as some libraries had in the past disregarded the restrictive provisions of the 1919 and 1940 codes.

Since the 1952 code was not fully in harmony with the increasing emphasis on interdependence and mutual help, a new code was prepared—the 1968 National Interlibrary Loan Code. This code introduced a distinction between lending on the national level and lending on the local level. The 1968 code provides for nationwide lending to faculty and staff engaged in research, and to graduate students working on the theses and dissertations. The interests of undergraduates are recognized in the Model Interlibrary Loan Code for Regional, State, Local, or other Special Groups of Libraries. The provisions of the Model Code are intended at one and the same time to lighten the burden of the large academic and research libraries and to increase the accessibility of materials to the nonresearcher from local and regional resources. The local code views all kinds of library materials—book and nonbook—as suitable items for interlibrary loan transactions. Items may be requested for purposes of study, instruction, information or research.

The creation of networks and consortia has further augmented the opportunities of students—graduate and undergraduate—to obtain library materials their own institutions do not possess. In fact, the principal objective of some consortia is to give access to materials which libraries would not make available to outsiders under the Interlibrary Loan Code. While interlibrary loan presupposes a library as an intermediary, local or regional agreements now often provide that a user who is attached to a participating institution may borrow directly from any other member institution.

HOURS OF SERVICE

Most libraries were open only a few hours a day well into the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century. However, longer hours of service were gradually instituted. For instance, the Columbia College Library, which had been open only ten hours per week until 1878, increased its hours to 8:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m. after a main library was built and after Dewey had made changes designed to bring about more intensive use of the library.
Apprehension that artificial lighting would cause fires prevented many libraries from being open during evenings and during other periods when there was not sufficient natural light for reading. In spite of occasional setbacks, however, the general tendency was to extend the hours during which the library was accessible. George Works, who analyzed the fifty-year span from 1875 to 1925, found that all libraries (except one) included in his sample showed a continuing extension of the hours during which the library was open. The library at Oberlin College, which had the largest percentage increase, was open twenty-four hours per week in 1875 and eighty-seven hours in 1925. The trend to keep the library open as many hours as the budget permits has continued to the present. Restrictions imposed by war and other periods of emergency have been viewed as temporary expediency. It is the prevailing opinion today that the college student should have access to the library whenever he needs to consult its resources. The 1975 college library standards clearly reflects this sentiment by stating that even "around-the-clock access to the library's collections and/or facilities may in some cases be warranted."

RESERVES

The provision of reserve books started at Harvard, when graduate students enrolled in seminars and undergraduates enrolled in pro-seminars were assigned collateral readings. To make books equitably available, Henry Adams introduced a method that came to be known as The Harvard Reserved Book Program. By 1878-79, thirty-four instructors had books placed on reserve, and by 1887 there were sixty who availed themselves of this service. Dewey introduced the reserve system at Columbia, calling the books selected for this purpose "restricted reference books." He explained that this measure became necessary because immediately after assignments were made, a number of the students went to the shelves and checked out the items to which the class had been referred, and in this way many students were left without any collateral reading materials. Dewey decided to put these books behind the loan desk from which they were issued on call.

The practices at Harvard and Columbia remained exceptional for a considerable time, since at most other institutions the textbook method was still in vogue. The custom of supplementing the textbook and the lecture by assigned readings became more common in the twentieth century. A separate reading room, the reserve reading
room, was often created. If the institution was small, a section behind or near the circulation desk was given over to reserve readings.

By the 1930s, placing material on reserve had become an almost universal procedure. There were great variations among the institutions in length of loan periods, justification for placing material on reserve, and amount of duplication of reserved items. Policies also differed as to whether reserves should be open (accessible to the student without any barriers) or closed (held behind a desk or an enclosure and available only by request).

While there has been practically universal agreement that it would be most desirable not to have any materials on reserve and to permit all books to be freely withdrawn, it has also been generally recognized that reserves are indispensable to ensure equitable availability of curriculum-related items. If an institution of higher learning has both a main library and an undergraduate library, reserve materials for undergraduate courses are usually administered by the undergraduate library.

REFERENCE

Collection building was the principal concern of librarians, faculty members and administrators during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and well into the third decade of this century. There was not enough interest in, nor enough staff for, service activities. While it is true that throughout the history of libraries, there have been librarians who have been known for their general helpfulness to the user, by the beginning of the twentieth century, organized assistance to the college library user had not been extensively developed, nor was it generally considered necessary to make any staff time specifically available for aid to the reader. Several outstanding exceptions to this prevailing attitude can, however, be noted.

Aid to the reader was strongly advocated by a number of leading public librarians such as Samuel S. Green, who urged personal contact between reader and librarian as early as 1876. It was Green's conviction that the librarian must make himself accessible. While he spoke from the vantage point of a public librarian, his views were deemed applicable to the college scene by such outstanding college librarians and educational leaders as Otis Robinson of the University of Rochester, Reuben Guild of Brown University, and particularly Justin Winsor of Harvard. Most of the early college librarians did not have comprehensive assistance in mind. Their goals were to provide...
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help in the use of the catalog, to further the students' comprehension of reading materials, and to give them general familiarity with the collection. Justin Winsor, however, offered services which are aspects of reference work; for example, he prepared a system of "notes and queries" and lists of references in anticipation of users' requests. Winsor also advocated instruction in the use of books. Many of these measures were primarily designed to help library users in groups rather than to provide help in individualized form, although such help could also be obtained. Melvil Dewey, who was thoroughly familiar with public library work, applied to the college situation the forms of individualized assistance so well received by users of the public library. In an address delivered in 1885, he said, "We are trying to work out the modern library idea in a university library." As Rothstein emphasized, Dewey made reference service central rather than peripheral. Dewey gave "aid to readers" the same status as was generally accorded to acquisition and cataloging. He assigned two full-time staff members to assist library users. Originally, the kind of assistance provided by Dewey was simply called "aid to readers," but from the 1890s on the term "reference" became the more common designation.

Dewey's example was followed by some other institutions, but the majority of college and university libraries were slow to accord reference the same standing as technical service functions. Even large universities were hesitant about assigning staff specifically to reference functions. On the college level where collections were generally small and staffs limited, full-time employees could seldom be spared, even if their libraries accepted the proposition that providing assistance to the individual user is a legitimate library function. One factor which militated against the appointment of full-time reference librarians was the conviction held by many that a well-developed, carefully planned analytical catalog would provide the answer to practically any question an individual might have.

A survey undertaken by Dorothy Fenton showed that by 1938, only 38 of 380 libraries in colleges of liberal arts had full-time reference librarians. In assessing this situation, it should be kept in mind that many of these libraries were very small and that some had only one full-time professional staff member to handle the total library operation.

As teaching approaches changed from exclusive use of textbooks to the utilization of collateral materials, and as wide reading in general was stressed, students needed more urgently than before assistance in
the exploitation of the library's resources. Acquisition of materials
and their cataloging and classification remained important library
functions, but emphasis on reference has gained steadily through the
years. Mainly to have more time for public service activities, some
libraries turned to commercial cataloging, thereby freeing staff for
assistance to the user. Service to the user was also enhanced by the
democratization of education which became especially pronounced
after World War II. The admissions policies of many institutions,
especially of community colleges, were made increasingly flexible.
Students who were provided with all kinds of learning materials often
required and received assistance in selecting the media which would
be most helpful in their learning efforts.

Over the years there has not been unanimity among librarians as to
the depth and extent to which assistance should be rendered to the
student. Some have advocated mere guidance to the sources—the
conservative position. Others have advocated that the librarian not
only find the information but also vouch for its accuracy—the liberal
position. Still others have taken a stand between these two extremes.
Quite apart from the fact that the reference staffs of the college and
university libraries would not be large enough to render service in the
liberal mode, most librarians and instructors believe that such help
could be undesirable in the many instances in which the process of
finding the information is an essential part of the student's learning
experience. If the method of discovery is an integral element of an
assignment, the librarian would generally not provide the needed
information, but would rather lead the student toward finding it for
himself. The librarian would keep in mind that the same inquiry may
require different handling, depending on the status (undergraduate,
graduate, faculty) or level of academic competence of the inquirer.

In both theory and practice there is no longer any doubt that
reference service is one of the most important activities a library can
perform. This service is now placed on such a comprehensive and
inclusive basis that the term information service might better describe
the wide range of activities college libraries are expected to assume
today on behalf of faculty and students. Assistance to the individual
user, as well as group instruction in the use of the library, has been
given due consideration in the 1972 guidelines and in the 1975
college library standards. The responsibility of institutions of higher
education to provide a full range of information services is unequiv-
ocally established in the document entitled "A Commitment to In-
formation Services: Developmental Guidelines."
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LIBRARY ORIENTATION AND INSTRUCTION

It seems unusual that in 1876, Professor Robinson held the view that the librarian might perhaps be better qualified and be more successful than the teacher in developing in students an understanding of books and reading. Robinson urged that librarians openly offer systematic instruction in the use of the library, a task until then performed only in a "loose and irregular way."43 Included in the kind of lectures advocated by Robinson was information on how to get books, how to keep them, how to use them, how to read (when to skip and when to go through a work thoroughly), and how to judge the reputation of an author and his place among other writers.

Gradually, some libraries, especially those serving institutions which encouraged collateral reading, began to offer instruction in the use of the library. However, even in the 1920s there were few who presented comprehensive programs of library instruction. Lack of staff, time, funds and space were reasons given by institutions who failed to give instruction or who offered merely one or two lectures during orientation week.44

In 1913, the Bureau of Education distributed questionnaires which dealt with various aspects of library economy (including "any instruction in the management of libraries," ) to 596 institutions of higher learning and to 284 normal schools.45 Normal schools will be omitted from our consideration since at these institutions library instruction was part of the professional training. Replies were received from 446 of the 596 institutions. Of these, only seven required courses with credit toward graduation. Elective courses with credit were offered by another nineteen colleges.

In 1936, in a review of surveys undertaken in the preceding twenty-year period, Evelyn Little found that library instruction varied widely among various institutions.46 Up to 50 percent of the participants included in some of the surveys did not have any library instruction at all, not even brief library orientation. The methods of instructing students in library use were of varying scope, depth and intensity: one or two orientation lectures explaining the layout of the facilities, instruction consisting of five to six lectures (usually without credit), library instruction integrated with a subject course such as English, and independent courses consisting of fourteen to sixteen lectures (usually elective and for credit). Among the approximately 200 colleges William Randall surveyed, one or two library lectures during orientation was the most usual offering.47 Randall observed
that students were deficient in the use of bibliographic aids other than
the catalog and he was convinced that they would benefit greatly from
taking courses in bibliography and bibliographical methods. This
attitude is also evident in item 27 of the Carnegie standards issued in
1932: "Formal instruction in the use of the library and in the use of
bibliographical aids should be given by the librarian or other compe-
tent instructor, and required of all students." Subsequent practices
of libraries have nevertheless continued to vary, still ranging from
those giving library orientation in one or two lectures to those
offering full-semester courses.

The controversy over whether library instruction should be inte-
grated with a subject course or whether it should be independent also
persists. In recent years some institutions have utilized films, film-
strips, slides and other nonbook media as devices of instruction. In
some institutions these materials can be consulted at any time and at
various locations on campus. They are frequently intended to replace
actual walk-through tours. The 1959 "Standards for College Li-
braries" and the 1960 "Standards for Junior College Libraries" assert
that instruction in the use of the library greatly facilitates student
learning. The former document states: "The effectiveness of in-
struction in the use of the library given by the staff will be reflected in
how well the students avail themselves of the library resources", wording in the 1960 standards is similar. The 1972 guidelines note
that the learning resources program should provide services which
include assistance to faculty and students with the use of learning
resources. The 1975 college library standards are more specific and
stipulate that proper services shall include "the provision of continu-
ing instruction to patrons in the effective exploitation of libraries; the
guidance of patrons to the library materials they need." Library
instruction today must sensitize the student to the shift in the biblio-
graphical scene, a shift which has made available increasingly varied
bibliographies by modern, computer-based retrieval methods. The
obligation to provide bibliographic instruction is now clearly estab-
lished in the document entitled "Toward Guidelines for Bibliographic
Instruction in Academic Libraries."

INDEPENDENT STUDY

Usually reserves constitute only a small portion of the total library
collection. Since many students do not consult any materials but those
placed on reserve, various measures have been employed to draw
Service to College Students

students to the rich, full resources of the whole collection. For instance, books of general appeal were taken out of the stacks and shelved in attractive, inviting browsing rooms. It was doubted by some, however, whether it would be justifiable to spend so much money and energy on work which is extracurricular. These critics felt that the efforts should be directed to a deeper involvement of students in curriculum-related reading. Gradually most browsing rooms were discontinued, although some of their features were incorporated into the library's whole operation. In newer buildings, efforts have been directed toward making the whole library a pleasant, comfortable place in which both curricular and noncurricular learning can be pursued.

Other elements which increased general library use were tutorial programs, honors courses, and senior theses. As mentioned earlier, such programs favoring independent study and use of many materials were designed for the superior learner. More recent instructional developments have extended individualization of teaching and learning to the entire student body. This is especially true for community colleges—the "open-door" colleges—which usually have a heterogeneous student body for whom the library must provide various kinds of learning materials of varying levels of difficulty. As already noted, similar provisions must also be made for the students who enter college by enrolling in open-education programs.

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY AND OTHER UNDERGRADUATE PLANS

When a library serves several levels of students there is a tendency to favor those who are advanced. Graduate students are thus frequently given more consideration than undergraduates. Even if there should be completely equal treatment of all students, the beginner might find it awkward and confusing to make his way through a very large collection, for most of which he has no use.

Awareness of the special needs of the undergraduate is not new. Records of Harvard dating back to 1765 stipulate that a part of the library shall be "kept distinct from the rest as a smaller Library for the more common use of the College." A definite proposal for the establishment of an undergraduate library at Harvard was submitted by Andrews Norton as early as 1815; however, the Lamont Library was not completed until 1945. Harvard undergraduates worked for this goal for many years. They complained about Widener, the main library, as being a cold, business-like place "which only the skilled
graduate can rightly use." The situation at Harvard was not unique; similar situations had developed at other universities. As graduate enrollments grew and as the libraries became larger, various measures were taken by some universities to provide services tailored to the needs of undergraduates.

An important device was the establishment of undergraduate collections; these were usually (but not necessarily) housed in the main library. The University of Chicago and Columbia University, for example, had such collections. Many other institutions had less comprehensive plans designed to help the undergraduate library user. Most of these "undergraduate plans" provided for one or two floors, or if the institution was smaller, for one or two rooms. The undergraduate collections were of various kinds and varying degrees of inclusiveness: amplified reserve collections, browsing collections with fiction and non-course-related items, and collections of only course-connected materials.

The collections housed in the main library, while providing some help to the bewildered undergraduate, were insufficient. Separate undergraduate libraries were subsequently established. They are distinguished by an inviting, informal setting and are easily accessible, providing most of the books to which the undergraduate should be exposed, items required for his course work, and general cultural material. The undergraduate library has often adopted a broad concept of library service, assuming the responsibility for supplying films, filmstrips, records, tapes and other types of media which are usually not found in the university's main library. Service to the student is the main concern and extraordinary efforts are often made to satisfy the many diverse expectations and needs of the students by providing a very wide range of services and facilities. Norah Jones, recounting the experiences at UCLA, cites measures used to interest the undergraduates in their library, such as: (1) inviting faculty members to discuss their specialties; (2) making the library the crisis information center which handles inquiries on current political matters; and (3) introducing library games for disadvantaged minority students based on data relating to their ethnic background.

The several elements affecting library service which were considered in the preceding discussion demonstrate very similar tendencies i.e., evolving from a book-centered toward a user-centered library. A library policy which was mainly aimed at enlargement and preserva-
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tion of the collection, regardless of its suitability for the student, was gradually replaced by a policy taking fully into account the needs of the user. The resources have not only been enlarged, but also enriched in quality, and amplified by newer media. Reader services have been expanded and individualized, all aimed toward establishing and improving contact between the student and his library.

Organizational changes, such as the establishment of undergraduate libraries, have been undertaken to create attractive and functionally effective units in which the student finds most of the materials he may wish to consult. No efforts are being spared to make the library a true instrument of teaching and learning. The modern college library permits the application of new concepts of teaching, and it can be said that the library “now serves also as a complementary academic capability which affords to students the opportunity to augment their classroom experience with an independent avenue for learning beyond the course offerings of the institution.”
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Adult Services: "The Book That Leads You On"

HERBERT BLOOM

Adult services is a broadly defined term which implies delivery of materials, use of their contents by the librarian for some educational goal, and provision of information. Both adult services and adult education have been used interchangeably on the assumption that the service function itself is an educational one. Academic librarians base their claim to faculty status on this assumption, and public librarians believe themselves to be educators because they provide educational materials. The distinction between materials and their contents is emphasized neither in library practice nor in the literature. However, the concern with the organization of reading to achieve objectives, together with a librarianship that determines the needs of its patrons, is a theme that does appear in the literature. Librarianship as practiced appears unfortunately to make little distinction, although for the public it is an important criterion for the distribution of prestige and remuneration.

Distinction shall be made in this paper between adult education, which seeks to discover and satisfy needs within an intellectual context, and adult services. It need not be made only because of a value judgment that assigns greater importance to consultation with patrons and the intellectual context of reading than to information location and delivery; it is made to determine the status and direction of adult education in the first one hundred years of librarianship as an organized vocation. Its status, the forms it took, and the ramification it had are matters worth considering. A focus on education within the broader adult service area will allow us to isolate the educational configuration in public library service to adults and perhaps to nourish that which has proven to be viable over the course of time.

How was the educational function of librarianship defined in the early years? We know that public libraries were founded to educate

Herbert Bloom is Senior Editor, Publishing Services, American Library Association.
through the power of the written word. From the Protestant Reformation had evolved a formula permitting a redefinition of the purpose of reading (and education) from one of insight into divine order to one of insight into social truth. The first report of the Boston Public Library trustees stated:

Under political, social, and religious institutions like ours, it is of paramount importance that the means of general information should be so diffused that the largest possible number of persons should be induced to read and understand questions going down to the very foundations of social order, which are constantly presenting themselves, and which we, as a people, are constantly required to decide, and do decide, either ignorantly or wisely.¹

The application of reading to personal rather than political ends became more prominent with the growth of the reform movement that began after 1900. The reform of society was powered by an awareness of the discrepancy between private moral ideals and actual social conditions. While action more direct than reading had to be used to solve the problems of corrupt institutions, reading became joined with Victorian moralism as a means of maintaining personal purity. Putting people in contact with the eternal verities in books would enhance the quality of their lives. Thus, the earliest library literature of adult education is characterized by a portrait of the library patron as striving for personal betterment, possessing an interest in uplifting himself, and proving amenable to improvement. The librarian provides access to high-quality books by which one can transform himself. The concept of the librarian's role as a guide in a setting marked by good and evil is illustrated in the quaint "Directing the Taste of Casual Readers."² The author tells us that the way to improve reading tastes is to remove the low-quality books, substitute high-quality ones, and habituate the reader to using them by emphasizing typographic attractiveness and prominent display of titles. The ability of the librarian to exert influence can be attributed to the innate amenability of the reader. If we display the good books and make them typographically inviting, they will be used. Other implications are that we are to reject from the collection any material of poor quality, the absence of which will never be noticed. Where less than the best books must appear, the rationale is that they will induce the reader to improved selection of titles and eventually to the reading of the good books.

The concept that there can exist a stable core of good books
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selected by the librarian has succumbed before the complexity of the twentieth century; librarianship, through its subsequent acceptance of diverse contents in library collections, has improved upon this notion of an earlier time. Yet the idea that people will seek to improve themselves through reading has persisted, deriving sustenance from various sources. After World War I the practical benefits of education became quite visible. In the movement from a rural to an urban society, people became either advantaged or disadvantaged according to the vocational skills they possessed. While the aspiration of the educators, including the Carnegie Corporation, remained idealistic and was keyed to the entire range of knowledge, the interests of the students were intensely practical. Some 80 percent of those enrolled in adult education programs were pursuing vocational courses. Similarly in accord with what was then viewed as the library's purpose, the public impulse toward education was interpreted as other than practical. A close look at actual interests would have conflicted with the moralistic connotations that were entertained about reading. The idealistic view of the librarians accorded with the prevailing sentiment of the adult education movement.

In the early 1920s the interest of public libraries reflected the prevailing climate and was justified as a continuation of ALA's War Service Program. Carl Roden's 1923 presidential address singled out for reproof the passive concept of library service. Placing books on the shelf and recording their use together with the generating of the other customary tabulations is a substitution of means for ends. Rather than using the motto of library mass production—"the best books for the greatest number at the least cost"—the personal formula stressing the matching of book to reader is to be preferred. Roden was not the first to underscore the capacity of the library to offer individual attention, but he had connected it with the new vista for library service. No other agency, he said, was so well suited to shape the future of the human race as the public library. The absence of curriculum, entrance requirements or specific educational doctrine in the library's agenda for learning is an advantage. These features could propel the library forward while presenting no departure from its natural function. "What is the outlook for adult education in the library?" asked Charles H. Compton. He answered that it is equivalent to the future of the library and the future of democracy.4

From Roden's remarks we easily conclude that the day of the reader's advisor had arrived; one year earlier the Cleveland Public Library had organized an Extension Division for Adult Education.
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Just as its School Department would provide books for the schools and familiarize students with its resources, a parallel approach was made for the classes in adult education. One distinction of the adult service was that a reader’s advisor was available to direct the reading of adults, thus maintaining the one-to-one relation between learner and advisor. This medium of library service came to be viewed as the cornerstone of service to adults. It was selected as the most suitable among alternative forms of service.

In seeking to define the true nature of library service, Judson T. Jennings was able by means of the advisory service to project a dynamic definition of the public library functions, without needing to accept many of the innovations that were occurring. According to Jennings, housing art collections and slides and sponsoring lecture courses are examples of inappropriate activities because they are not directly connected with books. The type of adult education that he favored is connected with books, but it is not, on that account, passive. The key term is informal education. Readers' informal education could be advanced by making available reading courses and reading guidance; the means to this would be the reader's advisor. A one-to-one educational program would be effected by seeking out adults through their membership in outside groups.

Jennings had been appointed as chairman of the ALA Commission on Library and Adult Education, and his remarks prefigured the conclusions of the commission reached in 1926. This was so because its report was merely a classification of the practices then in effect. The report emphasized service to groups that could be said to have needs amenable to adult education. Services to industrial workers, the institutionalized, members of adult education classes, and rural inhabitants were discussed, and library relations with them were structured. In this outreach effort, however, the special interests of ethnic groups were not considered; neither was there interest in the needs of the disadvantaged.

The purpose of reaching given groups was not, as in later years, to build collections and services reflecting their interests, but rather to support education. The importance of readable books, which the committee emphasized, is a case in point. Traditional subjects in more readable presentations were sought. The importance of the reader's advisor in this report was secondary to the extension of library service to existing groups, but the role of the reader's advisor was protected in the outreach process. Any recognition of service to groups implied then—as it does now—a need for librarians who would be sensitive to
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personal needs. Furthermore, the commission recommended adult education training for librarians, but the aspects of guidance to individuals and the criteria for suitable courses were not clearly defined. As suggested earlier, the concept of service to groups was conditioned by the assumptions that group members had needs that could be met by traditional bodies of subject knowledge.

Learned's report to the Carnegie Corporation placed the reader's advisor at the center of his community intelligence center, which combined reference service with reader guidance. The report stated that an inquiry for information should not be answered with simple facts, but rather with material prepared to arouse progressive interest. Flexner and Edge offered a detailed report of the reader's advisory service at the New York Public Library. The aim of this service was to provide systematic reading to individuals and interest groups. "Systematic reading" involved interviews and the preparation of lists. It gave to the library a position in relation to education that could not be considered as ancillary. The title of this paper is taken from one of the poster announcements of this service. As Jennie Flexner wrote elsewhere, the deeper purpose of the library is to circulate ideas through work with individuals, classes and clubs. This was accomplished by interview and reading lists. In the interview the advisor obtained information regarding the educational level, interests, and reading level of the patron. Once he had become more familiar with the experiences and interests of the patrons, the advisor would recommend subjects to be studied and prepare lists of readings.

This service, like many educational activities, was only moderately effective. Fewer than one-half of those who received the reading lists ever used them, and those who read the books read only one-third of them, or an average of four books for each user. Whether these findings are encouraging or discouraging is impossible to determine objectively. Proponents of the service were optimistic and, aware of the demand for it, proposed expansion of this service. It could prove vulnerable, however, when placed against the measures of book circulation.

Although there was some opposition, the idealism of the society of that time supported conscious library involvement with adult education. The objections of John Cotton Dana were characteristically practical and in conflict with the visionary spirit of his colleagues. Adult education had for the past fifty years characterized library work. The survey of the commission had simply described ongoing
practices and was operating under the assumption that new terms possessed new meanings. Another objection was that since other departments were involved in adult education, there was unnecessary overlap with a risk of rivalry between departments for jurisdiction over a single area. In time Dana’s arguments would prevail. The Board on the Library and Adult Education could suggest ideas (as it did in its annual reports) and set for itself projects that could influence adoption of adult education programs by more libraries. Its magazine, *Adult Education and the Library*, could record the adult education services being initiated—but all was dependent upon what libraries could or would do. With the curtailment of public services as a result of the Great Depression, there was scant opportunity for the strengthening of public library service in any of its forms. It could then be accepted that the advisory function should be diffused among the entire staff and experts could appear sensible when favoring curtailment on grounds of inefficiency.

The economic recovery in 1936 brought a revival of interest in adult education. Moreover, the possible usefulness of the library in the spectrum of government-sponsored adult education programs suggested a new role for it. Mary Rothrock recognized this role as central from her experience as Supervisor of Library Service for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). She felt that the library was the institution best suited for the integration of other agencies’ activities with the varied adult education activities of the TVA. Because of its need to create a productive work force and its interest in the enhanced humanization of the Tennessee Valley population, the TVA had fostered a variety of informal activities—job training courses, lectures and discussion groups on cultural and practical topics—and associations for civic involvement. The cooperation of the library took several forms. For training classes there was consultation with teachers to provide the books and lists suited to the subjects being studied in class. Libraries assisted in the organization of general education activities such as forums and study clubs.

Most far-reaching, however, were the opportunities for planning reading matter which would integrate the different programs. From his central vantage point it would appear that the adult services librarian must be trained and practiced in a great deal more than the technical problems of handling books and administering a self-contained library. “He must first... be conversant with the fundamentals of general educational theory. And in addition... he should be a specialist in the technical aspects of reading.”
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These staff meetings were equivalent to sessions of an adult education council. The adult education councils consisted of representatives of all agencies in a community offering educational opportunities to adults. Their purpose was to achieve coordination among the agencies, which they accomplished by advising each agency of courses others were giving. If a new agency were considering a program or service, the council could furnish advice. Some also maintained a listing of courses, provided information to members, and handled publicity.

How much the library was entrusted by the council members to assume the responsibility of coordination was a serious question. When Malcolm Wyer invited representatives of the adult education agencies in Denver to form a council, the library assumed—in theory—Rothrock's key role and the council was headquartered in the library. However, according to Robert Hudson, a council coordinator, the public library lacked the strength to be other than a weak member. It had to be prodded to take its seat; but having done so, it benefited from having the council refer to it the numerous individuals needing reading guidance, the chairpersons needing program planning assistance, and the groups needing book review programs. The Denver Public Library conducted with support of the council public conferences and neighborhood adult education programs in its branch libraries. As a result of its relation to the council, the library developed a department for library programs, which in turn initiated library adult education activities.

Library adult education, as seen from its cooperation with local adult education councils and with its awareness of community interests, assumed during the 1940s a strong interest in community development. The Tennessee Valley and the Back-of-the-Yards movements, as well as the New Deal interest in social renovation, suggested that democracy was most effective in a decentralized political system. The focus of World War II on democracy as a value system generated interest in community life, which offered to some a setting for the pure practice of democratic politics.

These interests surfaced first in the papers of The Library in the Community, edited by Carnovsky and Martin. The papers of Munn and Ulveling are most explicit in describing the possibilities of creative involvement. They relate knowledge to action and librarianship to social responsibility, and seek to forge a connection between library service and community improvement. Russell Munn writes about an effort to arrest the progressive decay in a Cleveland neighborhood.
where conditions dictated action. First, a neighborhood where people owned their own homes was sought so that municipal zoning changes and private maintenance could reverse the decline. When a suitable neighborhood was located, a branch library was established and a community council formed. The council was composed of the branch librarian and representative members of the community. It made recommendations on rezoning, rebuilding, and removal of physical nuisances. Because the war had drained staff and leadership resources, however, little was accomplished. Such interest on the part of the Cleveland Library had led to its representation in the Postwar Planning Council, which included representatives from business, labor, education and social services, and was designed to improve the quality of life in the greater Cleveland area.

Ralph Ulveling discusses social responsibilities and educational aims within the framework of group work. His thoughts on the library and community are remarkable for their view of the group as the basis for reaching both upward to the community and inward to the individual. Knowledge of the community is requisite to recognition of individual interests. It is only by analysis of the community with respect to its social organization that esthetic appreciation and education—the goals of the library—can be imparted. Social organization implies the existence of groups and work with them. Work with some groups entails organization on the part of the library and, more efficiently, cooperation with groups outside the library. The groups outside the library represent the purposes of the community; the library benefits society by helping these groups. With this emphasis on working with groups, we would not expect the circulation of books to be the object of staff work. Rather, in the course of librarian interaction with group leaders or council members, it became clear that the librarian assigned to the group needed first to immerse himself in the aims of that group; to conceptualize these aims he had to consider information needs and resources.

Enough has been said about the importance of the community in public library thinking to recognize that the community survey, as an instrument for devising library service for adult education and collection policies, received its impetus from a cultivation of community relations. Library use of social surveys had been occurring from the beginning of the twentieth century; ethnic groups dwelling in larger cities had special information needs for assimilation and identity. Nevertheless, from the 1920s until the mid-1960s librarians consid-
ered community groups not in terms of ethnicity or relative disadvantage, but in terms of socioeconomic homogeneity, with groups being characteristically viewed merely as social, civic and educational.

The first recorded survey of a Brooklyn neighborhood was made in 1908 and contained information on population density, income, religion, nationality, education, vocation, and organizational membership. The visible result of the social survey was a map, color-coded to show the distribution by district of registrations, loans and significant socioeconomic features. With these data the librarian can hypothesize why some groups are under-represented as users of the library.

It was assumed that population characteristics would indicate something about voluntary reading interests. To an important extent that is true, but there is insufficient clarity in relating groups in general to a reading disposition. Education is believed to be related to reading level, but beyond the educated (as a group), members of civic associations are believed to have reading interests reflecting their affiliation. Various age groups, no matter how individualized the interests of their members, share developmental needs in common, and members of professions will read in areas related to their calling. To an important extent, however, some groups have no special significance for the public library. Industrial trade and white-collar workers do not relate to the library as members of these groups; neither do city dwellers, suburbanites, and rural residents. Community surveys, however, do not make any such distinction; the community library, eager to justify its usefulness, often imagines a connection which may prove only tenuous. A lack of genuine understanding of the relationship between categories of groups and reading interests is thus perpetuated. While surveys can be useful in the identification of patterns of use and nonuse, it is not clear exactly what changes can be expected.

Also questionable is the success of an adult education program which is built on the findings of a survey. The ALA publication Studying the Community illustrates the problems of transforming survey findings into a program of adult education. It first seeks to focus attention on library purposes in order to foster a broad understanding of the library's mission to disseminate knowledge. To that end statements of purpose are selected which assert the active function of library service. Such phrases include: "opportunity and encouragement," "maximum of assistance," and "the library works..."
closely with groups, organizations and other educational agencies." After the study is completed, educational objectives with implicit priorities can then be fixed.

What should one look for in a community? We look for racial and national backgrounds, income, vocations, age, education and organizational membership. What is discovered may have only limited usefulness for the library's program, however. Certainly, collections can be improved in accordance with the backgrounds and supposed interests of the various groups. The limitation of this approach has been stated. In regard to the adult education needs to be met, a study might show that a community's educational resources were lacking, or that existing resources were not being used to capacity. It might also indicate the cultural limitations of the community, or it might disclose problems pertaining strictly to community instabilities.

In a discussion of the applications of such a study, the exclusive emphasis is on relating the library's function more closely to community educational needs. For governmental departments this may indicate more effective communication of the services offered. Civic organizations may be encouraged to reach a consensus on the action needed to define and solve some community problem. This community study does not lead to concern solely with the solution of the community's educational problems. In *Studying the Community*, a unity of civic and educational concerns is assumed, to the extent that it holds up again the library's role as a catalyst for the improvement of community life. The fact that some problems are not amenable to solutions based on information is however, a limitation. If a community becomes unstable as a result of either unwise planning, a broader pattern of social mobility, or simply conditions beyond its control, the library has no role to play. It is quite possible that findings of the library-sponsored survey prompt action which does not involve the library. However, where community life can be enhanced through information, awareness and discussion, the concerns with the life of the community observed in the 1940s reached their apogee with the application of the community survey to the community as a field of social forces.

Recognition of the library both as a source of printed information on matters of community interest and as an instrument to encourage discussion and action are explicit in *Studying the Community*. But lacking was the awareness, appearing in subsequent literature, that providing relevant information and directing the utilization of that information for community improvement through work with groups
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are distinct parts of this process. This unity between acquisition and delivery could be also posited for a wider segment of library resources. The social change movement in the late 1960s was interested in making materials of value accessible to the disadvantaged, but the formula of books, groups and social change was not inapplicable to this group and transmitted. The 1960s emphasized information rather than education.

Education for librarianship, in terms of programs of service based on the needs of the library's constituency, also becomes affected by these surveys. Initially, the effect on library education did not include guidance of groups or educational methods. Miriam Tompkins wrote in 1937 that successful guidance of readers requires that the librarian be a scholar, sociologist and psychologist.21 This rather overwhelming prerequisite can only mean the application of the principles of these disciplines in the one-to-one relationship between advisor and patron, and in the provision of materials to groups viewed as collections of individuals held together by shared interests. Within this framework, Tompkins's program emphasized book selection and reading interests of adults. Sample courses in adult education were described. At Emory University students were asked to choose an organization, analyze the reading interests its members would be presumed to have, and compile a list of books. The interest in serving organizational interests is visible in the course at Columbia, "The Public Library in Adult Education." In this course the need for organizing county and rural library service was viewed in combination with the need to work with groups in the interest of promoting cultural activities. The tasks comprising work with groups were not specified. Reading habits of adults were also reviewed, although it was unclear what useful applications could be made with this knowledge. The methods of adult education were ignored.

In contrast, Asheim22 developed a succinct but comprehensive approach based on a dynamic definition of adult education at a 1955 Allerton Park Conference. The conference approach was based on explicit recognition that supplying and informing were not part of adult education, and that planning, advising, training, and acting were.23 From this special grouping of library services, adult education was defined as the purposeful and guided use of library materials derived from an analysis of adult needs and interests. Training was to consist of three phrases: attitudes, knowledge and skills. Since knowledge and skills were not then part of the library school curriculum, and since the library did not clarify how the conferees defined
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education, attention had first to be paid to attitudes. Students needed to gain a conviction that the librarian is an educator and that the library has a responsibility for adult education. The milieu of the library offered no basis for this faith, and the conference recognized that library school courses themselves could not impart attitudes. So they chose to regard these attitudes as assumptions implicit in the subject matter they would choose for instruction. Just as general library school instruction presupposes a widespread public need for printed information and a variety of reading matter, so there was assumed public interest in informal but purposive learning. Knowledge necessary included an understanding of psychology of personality, learning theory, and social psychology. Necessary skills of organizing and leading groups, and evaluating the results, were specified. At the close of the conference, specific recommendations were made for the library schools and the practitioners in the field so that the conclusions reached at the conference could be implemented.

The literature of the 1950s was providing direction for an active educational program more explicitly than had ever been done before. Unfortunately, a review of the literature suggests (by the lack of response) that the Allerton Park conference definition was either not understood or, if understood, was not accepted. Just as the Princeton conference of 1939, sponsored by the American Association for Adult Education, had led to no action, so too did this conference disappear without leaving a trace in the field. To a great extent the interests of the leadership had, as evidenced by these advanced conclusions, proceeded beyond the possibilities of the profession. However, even this conclusion could not have been reached until the participants at this conference had made themselves heard.

The emphasis on adult education in the 1950s, while proceeding from the library's recognition in the previous decade of the need for responsiveness to community problems (and, as a result of the war, to world problems), received financial support from the Fund for Adult Education, an agency of the Ford Foundation. Over its ten-year life the fund extended grants to many enterprises concerned with adult education, including the Adult Education Association and the ALA.

In January 1948, the ALA Council adopted a program that would utilize the capacity of libraries for the solution of problems of the postwar world. Libraries were to spread information and stimulate citizen action. The four-year goals proposed a sharp change in the intensity and direction of information by advocating a direct contribution. By selection of subjects and programs it would influence
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people to think about the problems of society. Within the four-year goals the Great Issues Program opted, and at the time was considered a test case of whether the broader program itself would take hold.

How many libraries actually carried out the Great Issues Program, how did they do it and what was its success? Asheim sent 1,067 questionnaires to public libraries serving populations of 10,000 or more. Only 367 usable replies were received; of these, 51 carried some kind of Great Issues Program. Of the 51, only 18 percent sponsored lecture or discussion groups and 4 percent held film forums. Five percent of the total sample reported discussions and lectures and 5 percent held film forums. It is evident from these findings that the library was not assuming leadership or creating interest. With only 14 percent of libraries reporting programs, planning by ALA staff and leaders of the Great Issues Program was not justified. A similar reaction could be made to the four-year program, which did not appear to generate any sustained interest but which did project on a national level the interest of librarianship in adult education. Since the withdrawal of Carnegie Corporation support in 1933, adult education support had been receiving diminished funding from ALA headquarters.

The first grant was made by the Fund for Adult Education in 1951 to support the American Heritage Project. Subsequent grants were awarded for several research studies, the ALA Office of Adult Education, and some special adult education programs. In 1956 it funded the Library Community Project on the basis that libraries, being intimately connected with their communities, could assist in meeting their educational needs.

As a reaction from the field, an A.L.A. Bulletin panel of April 1954 contained the viewpoints of two administrators, one favoring and other opposing implementation of adult education programs and specifically of group discussion. John Cory approached the subject from an abstract viewpoint. Noting that there are some organizations interested in their own goals and others in civic and cultural goals, he observed that the library can serve this latter group by providing information. Cory further supposed that there are people with common interests not served by an organization. These people can be organized by the library.

The idea of the complementary nature of organized and unorganized groups can be found elsewhere in the literature of the 1950s. It was also observed that working with groups can provide another
means of reaching individuals and thus can extend the usefulness of the collection. The Adult Education Department of the Akron (Ohio) Public Library, for example, reports two basic functions around which the specific services operate. First, there is service to existing groups, which is supported by a program planning service, a speakers bureau, and audiovisual and book-receiving services. Secondly, the department takes a role in organizing groups. Sponsorship of library-organized groups focuses on planning of group discussion programs, such as the American Heritage discussions, and panels on literature and the arts.

Despite the justifications, the question arose of whether the organization of groups by the library was an appropriate function. Harold Hamill pointed out that the Los Angeles Public Library had no adult education program; educational activities for groups could be handled by the city's educational institutions. Furthermore, discussion groups enlist only 25 percent of the population, while circulation records show that 25 percent of the population borrows books. It would appear that libraries should improve upon their strengths. After they solve problems of service to individuals, they might then consider service to groups.

Hamill's conclusion was indirectly supported by Dan Lacy. There is indeed an increasing use for education; and numerous groups, organized and unorganized, depend on information to pursue their tastes and interests. The communications media have diversified to a great extent to accommodate these interests. In addition, many organizations themselves issue pamphlet material. The proliferation of special-interest literature, we may conclude, special-interest groups have been increasing in number. It would appear that the literature already being received by them could be supplemented by the resources of the library. If the proposition regarding the growth of interest groups holds true, then libraries should not seek to organize their own groups but to serve those already in existence.

Apart from the actual debate on the proper role of the librarian in adult education, some of the practical investigations of adult education programs are worth reviewing from the standpoint of their educative effects. In Library Adult Education in Action, Eleanor Phinney selected five libraries with outstanding adult education programs. In her introduction she states that these programs should provide activities that will have continuous and cumulative effects. These activities are to be based on a collection of materials that fulfill community needs. Discussion groups and specific subject collections
are outgrowths of policies designed to extend both service to individuals and the general usefulness of the collection. Phinney’s close analysis of adult education as a library process indicates that her model libraries do respond to community needs in their service policies. However, the libraries do not have the kinds of programs that suggest cumulative and continuous effects. Contents of the discussion and film programs are frequently influenced as much by circumstances as by the unique needs of a community. The availability of an art instructor, the educational interests of trade unionists, or the receipt of an American Heritage grant were some of the unforeseen variables that influenced the content of educational programs. The programs, nevertheless did tie in with the community. Librarians maintained relations with groups, took advantage of radio and newspaper publicity, and held open houses. These lines of communication encouraged responsiveness, and the result was an effort to fill perceived needs. In this process, however, education is not as visible as service. Library adult education in action consists of building good relations with the community so that the resources of the library can be developed and used. Once adult education was viewed in action, it was not adult education but adult services that became the preferred term. From this practical view there is no reason to suppose that any improvement in library service should do other than stress the development and delivery of library resources. The discontinuation of the Office of Adult Education in 1957 could be justified with little difficulty in view of the changed understanding of adult education.

The object of adult services for all of its past history has been a readership that was middle-class in outlook. While it became recognized that foreign-language and easy-reading belong in a library’s collection, the subject matter range was constant. The current period of adult services is characterized by interest in the economically disadvantaged nonuser of the library. In order to reach him, thought has been given to modifications of library service or “outreach” and to the determination of his reading interests and social outlook.

The origin of this interest lies in the Johnson administration’s War on Poverty. Community social welfare organizations were funded to develop programs to improve vocational skills, including literacy. Popular participation was mandated by law. In 1965, Bloss observed that the library needed to identify organizations in the community associated with the War on Poverty and to review its own materials, facilities and personnel. Needs not formerly recognized were to be
addressed, and new forms, notably storefront library branches and community participation, appeared as particularly beneficial means.

The special needs of the disadvantaged were emphasized by Monroe. Contrasted with the needs of the disadvantaged, the services of the library can be viewed as middle-class, while the librarian is detached by his position from the survival preoccupations of this public. Monroe's distinctive framework for reader's service programs to this group consisted of five functions: (1) stimulate an awareness of their value; (2) provide guidance and support for the user; (3) provide information for everyday needs; (4) provide reading-readiness programs; and (5) emphasize continuous two-way communication. Articulation among these program elements is not discussed, for this program is a composite of the principal elements of separate programs. Except for the reading-readiness programs occasionally sponsored by libraries, the parts fit together. The inadequate management and failure of library-sponsored reading programs are documented in *The Right to Read and the Nation's Libraries*.

Service to the disadvantaged carries with it an implication that cultural values must be recognized in book selection. It is widely accepted that ethnic groups each have their cultural values and that they would like to see these values reflected in what they read. These values, as well as subject matter and reading level of books, must be understood by librarians. Annotated holdings or study of holdings in these terms will make it possible to relate books to readers with a great likelihood of effectiveness.

The concept of groups with particularized needs suggests that communities with many specialized groups may require services keyed for each group. Lowell Martin based his survey of the Chicago Public Library on this premise. Martin found that the library was out of touch with the city because the educational level was rising while library use was declining. He viewed the city as consisting of a wide range of groups, all upwardly aspiring, but few regarding the library as an essential service. Therefore, presumed Martin, library service must add scores of subject specialties, and special libraries must be created within the framework of the larger institution. The existence of upwardly aspiring members of competency-based vocational groups is a tenuous assumption. Whether there are such groups whose economic advance can be aided by the library, rather than by employer-sponsored school programs is questionable.

The current emphasis on the library as information provider is
modified by the position that the library may have in assisting with independent-learning educational programs. Nontraditional education may have a variety of structures and sponsors, but if it presupposes independent learning, there is a role for the library to master. When independent study is administered by a neighboring college, faculty members, counselors, and librarians must relate to one another on the basis of mutually understood responsibilities. Thus, coordination among these agents is necessary where they are involved, as they were in the Independent Study Project of the Dallas Public Library.

There are three innovative aspects of the independent study program currently promoted by the Office of Library Independent Study and Guidance Projects. First, the librarians committing themselves to independent-learning programs must build a collection of educational materials suitable for independent learning. These include study guides, subject indexes, directories, and catalogs. Second, they provide referrals to available community educational programs, as well as study materials leading to the College Level Examination Program examination. Third, they recognize the importance of counseling. In the author's opinion, this is the most salient form of librarian intervention in the learning process since the use of the reader's advisor.

The requirements for the librarian in independent study programs have been noted to consist of interviewing skills, knowledge of the adult learning process, assessment of adult needs, and interpersonal sensitivity. It is also assumed that librarians know books. Furthermore, familiarity with the negotiation process when reference questions are answered becomes subsumed within this broader framework of counseling.

In the Independent Study Project sponsored by the Office of Library Independent Study and Guidance Projects, the Dallas Public Library cooperated with Southern Methodist University in a program to prepare students for the college level examination. This examination was to be taken by individuals who had had the equivalent of two years of college education. The public library, because of its accessibility to the community and its own resource capacity, could serve both as an information and advisory center. As an information center, it could distribute materials publicizing the program and answering inquiries. As an advisory center, it could provide assistance in selecting materials and using the library. Counseling, tutoring and
workshop services would be provided by the university. Although these distinctions appear clear, in practice they posed problems, for the distinctions were not initially workable.

Librarians were allowed to give academic advice but not to counsel. The difference between the two lies in the definition of the former as providing factual information—credits, tests, and referrals—together with reading guidance. Although it was felt that the advisory function was within the purview of the librarians, it was found that the librarians felt competent neither in this role nor in recommending suitable alternative readings. While it would appear that improved orientation into the structure of the independent study program and greater knowledge of books are proper functions of librarianship, it also appears that advisement and counseling are not as separate as was supposed by those in Dallas who conceived of the separation of these functions. These problems rightly suggested to the authors the inadequacy of the librarians' training and outlook.

Counseling has not and does not promise to become a generally accepted aspect of librarianship, but its relation to librarianship has been explored by Patrick Penland. For Penland, the reference function, when properly administered, permits librarians to assist in the cognitive and emotional growth of the patron. This is true because the unformulated information needs of patrons handicap their functioning successfully in society, with the consequent loss of social enrichment and self-fulfillment. When needs are clarified and the information that has been needed is given the unique arrangement that can satisfy that need, a new level of intellectual perception is reached. From that level it becomes possible to move to other levels. This identification of the psychological and cognitive aspects of growth permits Penland to explain the counseling implications of the librarian/patron interaction.

From a review of the past century, a conceptual basis may be formed for the practice of an active adult-service librarianship. This basis consists of advising readers, and planning programs with recognition of the diverse groups in the community. These services relate both to information needs and informal education needs. To a large extent, active library service for satisfying the educational needs of individuals has been stimulated by outside educational foundations. When those agencies have discontinued their support, the librarian loses his impetus as a teacher or counselor. Yet, if we are interested in identifying the elements of durable programs, we can observe some trends that have been relatively successful—as well as
Adult Services

others that have been less so. Programs in which the librarian has served in a counseling role have not lasted; neither have those in which the library organizes its own groups. It would appear that a realistic direction for adult services can now be charted and the contents of an appropriate educational program for future librarians considered.
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Special Libraries: Putting Knowledge To Work

ELIN B. CHRISTIANSON

Although the term special library embraces specialized libraries and specialized collections of many types, the strength and vigor of the special library movement have come from the libraries serving business, industry, and government. These new forms of special libraries, founded as working collections to provide efficient information service, emerged in the first decades of the twentieth century as a vigorous new movement, sharply differentiated from both the mainstream of librarianship at the time and from special libraries of earlier years. In 1928, Frederick Austin Ogg wrote, "The growth of special libraries is the outstanding feature of library history in the past twenty years."¹ This statement was reaffirmed years later by Jesse Shera, who characterized the twentieth century as the era of special libraries and specialized services.²

EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURY PROTOTYPES

While the special library movement dates from the rise of business and technical libraries and the development of the concept of specialized information service in the twentieth century, prototypes of these special libraries could be found in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Professional association and government department libraries which served as on-the-spot working collections were most directly related to today's special libraries. Legal and medical collections predominated, because in both professions a considerable body of literature had developed and professional training and practice dictated its use.³ Early legal collections for state and federal government and collections in medical societies and hospitals date from the
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eighteenth century and continued to develop through the nineteenth century. During this time, a few early company and trade association libraries also appeared, concerned with scientific, legal or statistical literature. These latter libraries, however, were virtually unnoticed until later reports dated the establishment of their collections. Other early special libraries have a less direct relationship to the modern special library. Scientific and historical society libraries which specialized by subject were also established in this period, but they usually operated as leisure-time libraries for their membership.

Shera has suggested that, in a sense, some social libraries were special libraries in that they adapted to differences in reader interest by restricting their collections to certain subjects or by limiting their membership to a homogeneous group. However, these libraries are more directly related to the public library movement which eventually swallowed the survivors.

The mechanics' and mercantile libraries of the era are sometimes considered predecessors of special libraries. But in his study of the origins of company libraries, Anthony Kruzas has pointed out that these and the early factory libraries are only indirectly connected to later special libraries since the mechanics', mercantile and factory libraries were primarily general, popular collections and were educational or social in purpose. In contrast, the later special libraries were directed toward the support of company operations through provision of technical or business information. Although scattered references are made in mid-nineteenth century literature to libraries for scientific studies, professional scholars, or special collections for professional use, the newly emerging library profession was concerned with public and university libraries and with the organization and control of collections, and took a generally negative attitude toward the less accessible, poorly controlled, small, special collections with a doubtful life span.

ORIGINS OF THE SPECIAL LIBRARY MOVEMENT

After 1876 the climate for special libraries began to change. Three developments were to create an environment in which the special library movement would flourish: (1) the transformation of American scholarship which led to such profound changes for the universities, for research and publishing, and for libraries; (2) the expansion of business and industry; and (3) the rapidly developing library profession.
The broadening of the academic curriculum to include scientific, technical, and professional education and the assumption of research as a university function also affected the business and industrial community. Educated technologists as well as scholars were produced by the universities. The interest in research was carried beyond the university walls to industry which began to look to applied research for new approaches. Invention and technological innovation were moving from the workbench to the laboratory.

Along with the increase in scholarly publishing in fields of interest to industry, specialized business publishing houses were being established to disseminate business and financial news. The federal government and trade associations began to publish research results, statistics, regulations and guidelines which formed part of the literature for business and industry.

The business and industrial community was itself undergoing change. The industrial revolution brought unprecedented growth to industry, which in turn required not only more basic scientific knowledge and research, but also more and better management to assure progress and profit. The latter requirement led to the rise of the large business corporations, necessitating managerial, personnel and business information. More capital was needed to run these larger companies. Private businesses became public corporations; the financial community expanded to handle their needs and, in turn, developed its own need for information about the companies and industries it served.

As the library profession itself emerged, in the quarter-century following 1876 it developed theories and practices on which the new special libraries could draw even as they were to diverge from its traditions. The emerging concept of reference service and the trend to subject specialization had particular import in leading the way for the establishment of technical and business departments in the larger public libraries. The first serious proposal that the library might add service to readers to its custodial function was made in 1876 by Samuel Swett Green of the Worcester Public Library. Green's proposal that the librarian might make himself available for assistance to the inexperienced reader was generally accepted as desirable, but many librarians doubted that such a service was practical in terms of the time it would take. They also questioned whether it would be as efficient as better bibliographic techniques, or whether it was appropriate on a large scale or for scholars. Nevertheless, reference work, primarily of a directional or locational nature, gradually did become a
feature of library service and, by the turn of the century, was developing organizational forms and standard patterns of practice.\textsuperscript{14}

In the same period, subject specialization in collections was gaining favor as a means to better distribution of library resources, to facilitate acquisition of special collections, and to allow libraries to offer better service to special groups (and thus to gain more support from such groups). In the large public libraries, this trend took the form of technical and business collections or rooms to serve members of the general public who were interested in such topics, including the business and industrial community. Even more specialized services were tried in a few libraries in the form of municipal reference departments and medical collections, both designed primarily for professionals rather than for the general reader. Reference service was usually offered in the departments, and the department head or librarian was sometimes a subject specialist.

The Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh established the first technical collection in 1895 as a reading room, then in 1902 as a department headed by an expert advisor on technical literature. The success of the move was demonstrated when, after one year of operation, the reference use of books in natural sciences and industrial arts had increased to 32 percent of the total reference activity.\textsuperscript{15}

Another early technical collection was established in 1900 by the Providence Public Library, which hired Joseph Wheeler to provide "aggressive service" by which the library's service might be made more effective.\textsuperscript{16} Wheeler was later to become one of the leaders of the special library movement. Other early technical rooms were established in Cincinnati (1902), Brooklyn (1905), Newark (1908), Minneapolis (1910) and St. Louis (1910).\textsuperscript{17}

While public library technical collections had a body of literature to draw on and the technical reference rooms and departments found ready acceptance, counterparts to serve the businessman took longer to get underway. John Cotton Dana, the "founding father" of the Special Libraries Association, was a public librarian, and his efforts to develop business collections and encourage their use provide an interesting insight into the development of service to the businessman. He initially tried to interest businessmen in the services of the public library in his first position as librarian of the Denver Public Library. He promoted what he called "the literature of business" but appeared to have little success. The literature of business filled only a few shelves and users were equally scarce.\textsuperscript{18}

After Dana moved to Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1898, he con-
continued to explore means of serving the business community. Upon the conclusion of a survey of businessmen and librarians in 1899, he reported that: "Perhaps the business life, in this country at least, is so driving as to make it impossible for men engaged in it to continue an interest in books and literature." But, he suggested, if businessmen could not be persuaded to read books, perhaps they could be persuaded to use them.\(^{19}\)

It was in the use of books by businessmen that Dana at last achieved success in Newark, New Jersey. In 1904, as head of the Newark Public Library, he opened Branch Number 1 (later named the Business Branch) in downtown Newark. Dana later reported that although the library could only guess at first what might be of interest in addition to a general branch collection, it soon found there was a great deal more business literature, primarily nontraditional, than had been supposed. By collecting and organizing trade catalogs, government documents and statistics, maps, railway and telegraph information, and city, telephone and trade directories, as well as business books and periodicals, a utilitarian business collection was developed which gained rapid acceptance. Dana concluded: "We are only at the beginning of a work, the size and importance of which we did not realize at all when we began."\(^{20}\)

Newark's business branch was not emulated by other public libraries for several years, despite its well-publicized success. While combined business and technical departments were opened in some libraries, the second purely business department did not open until 1916 in Minneapolis.\(^{21}\)

Samuel Ranck of the Grand Rapids (Michigan) Public Library recalled that at the turn of the century very few public libraries had the material and personnel to serve more than a limited part of the community. Further, Ranck said that the public library "was dominated largely by the ideals of polite literature . . . but it had very little in the way of service for the men and women who were doing the industrial and business work of the world." Ranck further stated that although there was very little such literature in existence, too many librarians felt that such material was often beneath the dignity of a library for ladies and gentlemen.\(^{22}\)

The development of legislative reference bureaus to serve state governments was another factor that gave impetus to the special library movement through the legislative reference bureaus' development of extensive, analytic information service. Government law libraries at the national and state levels had a long history. The first
steps beyond the law collection toward legislative reference were taken when Melvil Dewey established a legislative reference section at the New York State Library in 1890. Reference services were offered and a number of publications—such as an index of state legislation, comparative legislation reviews and digests—were prepared. Even at that time, however, these services were not considered to be innovative since they were limited to collection and dissemination of information.

Ten years later, however, Charles McCarthy of the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau did, through his zealous efforts to provide legislators with accurate and impartial information, set the pattern for legislative information service. Ernest Bruncken, first legislative reference librarian for California, pointed out that the time was ripe for such service; the period from 1900 to 1915 was notable for public interest in and support of government reform, and there was a pronounced movement toward the enlistment of expertise in the governmental process, part of which the legislative reference bureau could provide.

McCarthy believed that successful government hinged on legislation based on complete and accurate information, and he actively sought out the legislators to learn their needs. The information prepared by his staff was analyzed and, if of general interest, was published as a booklet or issued in a bulletin. Under McCarthy, the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Department not only used standard legal sources but also resorted to clippings, pamphlets, and various outside sources. McCarthy's methods were widely copied in other states and his information service was to serve as a model and inspiration for the special library movement. By 1915, thirty-two states had some sort of legislative reference service, and in 1914 Congress passed legislation to provide such a service for Congress. Legislative reference work at the municipal level was the local counterpart (and often the copy) of the state bureau. Municipal reference libraries were established in a number of forms: as a separate agency, as a city hall branch, or as a department of the public library.

After 1880, libraries began to emerge in earnest in business and industry. Two types were prevalent: libraries for technical and professional personnel, and libraries for business and commercial interests. They first emerged in certain instances where the size of the company or the nature of the business encouraged their development.

The technical libraries most often served research and engineering
Among the major pharmaceutical libraries established in this period were those of Eli Lilly (1880s), Parke, Davis & Co. (1888), and Abbott Laboratories (1888). Chemical libraries were found in such companies as the German Kali Works in New York (1890) and the Solway Process Company (1891). Among research, consultant, and engineering firms, the libraries of Arthur D. Little (1886) and Stone & Webster (1900) are of particular interest. Their respective librarians, Guy E. Marion and George W. Lee, were among the first special librarians to develop their libraries into information departments; both men were influential in the early years of the special library movement and in the Special Libraries Association.

Marion and Lee each emphasized the efficiency and economy of the library as the central source of information, drawn not only from the technical literature, but also from the company's own records and reports and from outside sources. Both insisted that the library staff must be aggressive in promoting the library as a "weapon of business rather than a storehouse for books."26

Insurance company libraries of the day were primarily professional collections in law and actuarial science, although they would later branch out into business and management subjects.

Business libraries based on commercial information were emerging in investment banking firms such as Lee, Higginson & Company (1880), Investor's Agency, Inc. (1885), Harvey Fish & Sons (1885), White and Kemble (1893), Blair & Co. (1892), and William R. Compton Co. (1904). They were followed after the turn of the century by the commercial banks and business service companies such as Babson Reports (1904), the Business Bourse International (1908), and Moody's Investors Service (1909). These libraries evolved not from working collections of books but from records: annual reports and other company documents, statistical data, government documents, pamphlets, clippings, and often company internal reports and correspondence which were accumulated in the course of business and were nontraditional materials for libraries.27

THE FORMATION OF ASSOCIATIONS

Dissatisfaction with minority status within the public and university library-oriented American Library Association led to the formation of separate associations for special libraries. This action drew attention to the newly emerging special libraries and gave further impetus to
the movement. The associations provided a means of communication, cooperation, and coordination of effort both among the members and with the professions they served, and it was soon discovered that there were far more special libraries than had been suspected.

The first subject association to form was the Association of Medical Librarians (AML). During the 1898 ALA conference in Philadelphia, a small group of medical librarians and doctors met to form the AML. While the AML was initially interested in the improvement and increase of public library medical departments, it soon appeared that the new association was attracting medical libraries from companies, medical associations, hospitals and medical schools, and from libraries in related fields. To reflect this wider focus, the AML was renamed the Medical Library Association in 1907 and its goals were directed toward the concerns of all types of medical libraries, development of bibliographic tools, exchange of material, medical library training and work, and contact with the medical profession.28

The second subject association to form, also at an ALA conference, was the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) in 1906. Exchange of materials, closer contact with the profession, indexing of legal works, and legal bibliography were its central concerns. A particular concern at the time was the removal of law librarian appointments from political influence. Although the AALL was invited by both the National Association of State Libraries and the ALA to affiliate, the law librarians felt, as had the medical librarians, that their problems were different and could best be served by a separate organization.29

The event which focused the attention of the library profession on the special library movement was the formation of the Special Libraries Association (SLA) in 1909 at the Bretton Woods (New Hampshire) ALA conference. The organizing committee consisted of John Cotton Dana, who was to serve as the first SLA president; Sara Ball, librarian of Newark's Business Branch; Anna Sears, librarian and F.B. deBerard, a statistician, from the Merchants Association of New York.30 Unlike the medical and law library associations, which were concerned with specific subject libraries, the SLA planned to cut across subject lines and concern itself with the promotion and increase of libraries engaged in information service to business, industry and government, regardless of their organizational nature or subject specialty. Although the ALA itself looked askance at the new association's vague scope and there was some doubt whether an organization of such heterogeneous interests could be made suffi-
ciently coherent to be effective, the new association did not lack leadership among prominent librarians or support from specialized libraries.

One of the primary concerns of the SLA during its organizational period was the identification of special libraries. Many of the charter members of the SLA were associated with the special departments in public and university libraries or with legislative reference bureaus. The identification of other special libraries was difficult and early announcements frequently carried lists of SLA member libraries to illustrate the scope of the association.51

The subsequent growth of the association showed that there were indeed special libraries in existence; a year later, Frederick Hicks of the Columbia University Library reported that: “In less than two years this association has justified its advent into the library world . . . and has more than one hundred special libraries represented in its membership.”52 Seven subject committees were organized within the SLA: agricultural, insurance, commercial associations, public utilities, sociological, technology, and legislative and municipal reference libraries. These early committees gradually formalized into groups and later into divisions as the heterogeneous interests sorted themselves out by subject.

The SLA also found the definition of special libraries to be of major concern. The pioneers of the special library movement made a sharp distinction between the old use of the term special library as a catchall and the new idea that they were promoting. Richard H. Johnston defined the special library as “a library to which one does not repair, but from which emerges anything and everything applicable to the needs of a business firm. It is a library that is applied, rather than applied to.”53 Johnston’s definition and John A. Lapp’s concept of “putting knowledge to work” (which has been the association’s motto for sixty years)54 expressed the unique characteristics of the new special libraries. There were also those within the SLA, as well as in the library profession, who did not make such a distinction, however, and the legacy of confusion has remained. Today the term special library exists in at least two senses: (1) the general, which includes specialized libraries and collections of many types, and (2) the specific, indicating the library which provides specialized information service in business, industry, and government.

THE GROWTH OF SPECIAL LIBRARIES

Although both business and technical libraries grew in numbers
between 1910 and 1940, the greatest growth came first in the business libraries which served commercial and managerial interests. In the business sector, libraries tended to form in fields where there was "print to manage." In advertising agencies, banks, business and trade associations, insurance companies, investment companies, newspaper libraries, publishing houses, and managerial departments of industrial companies, libraries collected and organized a broad array of sources, largely nontraditional. In these libraries, the central idea of the special library movement—information service—found its successful application. Dana's conjecture that the businessman would use books was proving correct. Special librarians in business libraries stressed the value of their services and the efficiency and economy with which they could provide information, saving the executive's time.35

Technical libraries, on the other hand, operated in a different environment. It was not until World War I, when industrial research became an urgent necessity, that conditions favorable to the growth of technical libraries obtained. Technical libraries were more traditional both in service and in collection. Their clientele were the scientists and technologists in research departments. Their collections included the traditional forms of technical literature—books, journals, and often patent files and technical reports.

Few companies had research facilities large enough to warrant a library. Another limiting factor was the nature of the use of the literature which limited the appeal of the service concept. It was assumed that the scientist/technologist was in command of the literature of his field and he himself should undertake the literature review. This left little scope for the librarian to provide much more than reference service.

This situation was to change after World War I. Government and National Research Council studies found that expenditures for research increased from about $29 million in 1920 to $235 million in 1940. The number of laboratories grew from 297 in 1920 to 2,224 in 1940 and the number with a staff of more than 50 increased from 15 to 120.36 This growth was paralleled by an expansion of library activity and it became an accepted practice to establish a library in conjunction with a laboratory.

Although the presence of a librarian in the business library had proven an effective aid to the businessman, there was still a good deal of resistance to delegating a similar responsibility to the technical librarian. It was evident that an efficiency of effort was needed, but
who was the most efficient—the researcher, the librarian, or an intermediate subject-trained literature specialist? The result was a series of answers which included, in different companies, combinations of all three, applied in different patterns of service. Most libraries, however, are able to include preparation of bibliographies, acquisitions bulletins, abstract bulletins and translations in their services as well as conventional reference work.37

Special libraries for government agencies have generally followed the same patterns as those for business and industry and have been affected by the same factors. Government legal collections were among the earliest libraries in the nation and the legislative reference bureaus of the 1900s were models for the special library movement. As government agencies proliferated following World War I, so did special libraries to serve them. Anthony Kruzas's statistical report on special libraries in the United States found that of the 699 government special libraries in operation in 1963, 20.2 percent were established between 1920 and 1939. The comparable figure for 1,324 company libraries is 26.5 percent.38

POST-WORLD WAR II TRENDS

World War II and the information explosion which followed it had an immediate impact on special libraries. Special libraries increased at an unprecedented rate. According to the Kruzas study, over one-half of the 8,533 special libraries known in 1963 were established after 1940 and 30 percent were established between 1950 and 1962. Among company libraries, 68 percent came into being after 1940 and 44 percent between 1950 and 1962. Government library growth for the same periods was 64 percent and 34 percent.39

Special libraries were now well-established adjuncts to research facilities. As research projects became group rather than individual efforts, the role of the technical librarian as the literature expert of the group was more widely accepted, and technical library information services expanded accordingly.40

At the same time, the information explosion was increasing the problems of information organization and dissemination. Corporate and governmental special libraries with access to their organization's data processing and computer equipment were able to take the lead among libraries in experimenting with new methods of information handling. Records processing, circulation control, and journal control and routing, and the development of current awareness, bibliogra-
phic and abstract services arrived early in special libraries. More recently, machine-readable data bases have found extensive use in special libraries.41

Special librarians working at the various levels of SLA undertook cooperative projects to improve access to information. Union lists of periodicals held by special libraries in various areas were prepared by most SLA chapters in the 1960s. In 1963 the Translations Center was established at the John Crerar Library as an outgrowth of a location index of translations begun by the SLA Engineering-Aeronautical Section in 1946. SLA units also initiated such publications as the COPNIP (Committee on Pharmaceutical Nonserial Industrial Publications) List, Unlisted Drugs, Scientific Meetings, and the Dictionary of Report Series Codes.42

As the need for and awareness of information grew, more elaborate information services appeared in some of the larger, research-oriented organizations. The goal of the special library movement has been the provision of information from any source to users in connection with their work-related needs in the most useful form—whether document delivery or analysis and synthesis of information. In practice, the realization of this goal has varied in each special library according to the environment in which it operates.

Some special libraries use the term information service or information center (or in the past, information bureau) to describe their services more accurately. In the 1960s, however, the term information center began to gain wider use, and with a different meaning. Many commentators have tried, with various degrees of clarity and success, to assign the special library and the information center separate functions in the information complex. Most see the information center as a larger activity, primarily engaged in the analysis and synthesis of information, with the special library unit in this activity providing the collection, organization, and delivery of documents.45 The information analysis centers and scientific information centers which have been established over the past fifteen years are perhaps the clearest examples of this concept. In other situations, the information center refers to a larger unit in the organization that includes report- and technical-writing specialists and indexers. Such elaborate centers are, of course, limited to large organizations. In most organizations, the special library which provides extensive information service continues as the principal information unit within its organization and operates in effect as an information center.

Although some special librarians see the information center as a
competitor and foresee either the demise of the special library or its relegation to a custodial role, it is perhaps more logical to see it as the development of more intensive specialization and a greater "team" effort in information handling, just as science and technology have fragmented into many subjects and research has evolved from an individual to a group effort.

Public, university, and research libraries also experienced the increased demand from business and industry for information service in the post-World War II period, both from companies without special libraries and from special libraries which characteristically rely on outside sources for older, out-of-scope, and less-used materials. Although all three types of libraries had recognized a responsibility for sharing their resources with business and industry, the heavier demand for loans and a recognition of the need for more extensive services necessitated reassessment of their services.

Surveys of library service to business and industry in the 1960s provided a state-of-the-art report and brought out four important trends: (1) use by industry was increasing; (2) the heavy load of interlibrary loans was greatly diminished by the substitution of photocopies; (3) there was increased feeling among university and research libraries that there should be reimbursement for services; and, in consequence (4) more formal plans for service to industry were being studied.

The independent research libraries are heavily used by business and industry. The John Crerar and Linda Hall libraries, both directed to science and technology, estimated that in the 1960s three-fourths of their services were directed to industrial needs. These research libraries, which depend on corporate contributions for part of their support, usually offered membership services and were among the first to institute fee-based or contract information services, which were heavily used by industry. Crerar estimated that as much as 80 percent of its Research Information Service output was directed to industry or industry-related clients, the remainder being done for academic or institutional users.44

University libraries, particularly those in urban areas or where industrial or government agencies are located, also provide service to business and industry. While the general pattern of earlier years had been limited but free services, the more heavily used libraries were experimenting in the 1960s with nonaffiliated user charges or corporate memberships and several were experimenting with fee-based technical information services.45
Public libraries in large and medium-sized cities had continued the practice of establishing business and science/technology departments and provided some special services, the most common being lending privileges, company library cards, and reference service. A few public libraries offered more extensive research services or maintained outstanding collections in certain subjects. In general, however, public libraries fell far short of their goals of supplementing industry's resources, hampered by inadequate collections and lack of subject-specialist staff. While a few public libraries received financial gifts from industry, extra service fees were not in evidence.

Since the late 1960s, however, a few public libraries have been experimenting with fee-based services, a notable example being INFORM at the Minneapolis Public Library. Public, university, and research libraries have generally rationed or limited services to business and industry rather than institute fees. However, the desire to provide better service and the added capabilities made possible by new technological developments have gradually led to various charges where the cost is obvious. The introduction of computer-based bibliographic services into university and research libraries extended their capabilities for search services and generated more support for user charges. Librarians became aware of the proliferating commercial services and freelance consultants (among them many librarians) who were selling research services which libraries could provide with the added support of fees.

The philosophical and pragmatic implications of user charges have generated a great deal of debate within the library profession. While this debate may not be resolved for many years, it will certainly affect the quality and quantity of public, university, and research library service to business and industry in the future.

The character of the special library inherently fosters cooperation. Informal cooperation has always existed among special libraries. In the past few years, networks and other more formal special library cooperative plans have begun operation in some areas. Very large corporations and government agencies which support a number of special libraries have organized these libraries into systems.

Special libraries have followed the proceedings of the various government committees and commissions concerned with scientific and technical communications and libraries. Nevertheless, until the establishment of the current National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), special libraries have been largely
bypassed, except in the role of users, as active contributors to national information resources.

As recently as 1967, when the National Advisory Commission on Libraries prepared its report, the focus of attention was on the barriers to special library participation in networks. However, as interlibrary networks have formed, special libraries have strongly supported and participated in them, demonstrating that some of these barriers are not insurmountable.

Another barrier to special library involvement in systems and networks centers around the dual role of special library participation. While special libraries are readily identified as users by other types of libraries (and readily identify themselves as such), the potential contribution of the special library has not been recognized. Although special library use of outside resources has revealed their limitations to others, it has not revealed their strengths in in-scope coverage, the subject expertise of the special librarian, or in their experience in information service.\textsuperscript{48}

In discussions in 1975 with the NCLIS about special library participation in the national program for library and information services, SLA representatives stressed that: "In the broad spectrum of libraries, the special libraries are little known. Their anonymity has prevented a wider use of their resources. They are potentially valuable contributors as well as obvious potential benefitters from networks."\textsuperscript{49}

One hundred years ago, special libraries were virtually unknown and reference service was an idea whose time was yet to come. If 1876 was the landmark year for American libraries and the library profession, then 1909 was the landmark year for special libraries and special librarianship. The founding of the SLA in 1909 brought into prominence not only the modern special library in business and industry but also the "special library idea" of information service.

The factors behind the establishment of special libraries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the increasing size and complexity of business and industrial companies, the growth in both basic and applied research activities, and the increase in publishing output—continued to burgeon in the twentieth century and to provide a hospitable climate for the continued development and expansion of special libraries and special library services to business and industry. The annual increase in the number of special libraries in business and industry continues to be a significant development in the field today.

\textit{JULY, 1976}
The central concepts of the modern special library movement—the utilitarian management of print whether in traditional or nontraditional form, the librarian as subject or information specialist, the clientele as businessmen, scientists, professionals or other practitioners who use information in the course of their work, and above all, the ideal of information service as the primary function of the library—now have sixty years of special library application behind them.

The "information explosion" and "information discovery" of the post-World War II period has presented new opportunities as well as new challenges in information handling, not only to special libraries but also to public, academic and research libraries who provide services to business and industry.

Modern special libraries, despite their contributions to librarianship and to access to specialized literature, and despite their development of new information-handling techniques, have continued to be separated from the mainstream of librarianship. Special libraries are an information resource which is little known and poorly understood both by those not involved with special libraries and by special librarians themselves. Yet, in the past decade, significant moves have been made on both sides to bring the resources of special library collections, expertise and, perhaps most importantly, the special library idea of information service to bear on the library profession's future course.

The first sixty years of the special library's existence have shown it to be an effective part of the organization it serves. The next sixty years is a challenge to show the special library to be an effective part of the library community at large.
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