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ABSTRACT
Focusing on the development of international librarianship in the interwar period, this paper uses the Paris Library School as a case study to explore the impact of new forms of internationalism on the development of the profession globally. Administered by the American Library Association from 1923 to 1928, the Paris Library School offers a unique view of the evolving international network of library and information professionals that formed such organizations as the International Federation of Library Associations. Through this historical case study, international librarianship is viewed in the context of globalization theories that focus the advent of international non-governmental organizations, growth of global networks, and impact of transnational cultural flows. This analysis places international librarianship in the context of the wider social and technological developments that contributed to the economic and cultural phenomena characterized as globalization and provides a new theoretical basis for examining the growth, impact, and flow of international library development.

INTRODUCTION
Historians are increasingly interested in the rise of internationalist activities in the early twentieth century as an alternative to a focus on the advent of the modernist nation state and the nationalism that fueled two world wars. Much of this work focuses on new institutional forms through which professional organizations and advocates for social and political change collaborated across national and cultural boundaries through knowledge networks (Gorman, 2012). These activities include developments such as the international peace movements, international women’s organizations, and attempts to cooperate in medicine and health (Matysik, 2006).
The new international institutions and structures created during this period are considered the initial roots of international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), which are often linked to the transnational and global forces that define today's world. (Iriye, 2002; Gorman, 2012). The library profession was not immune to these developments and participated in this movement, gravitating to the INGO as a mechanism to develop a transnational professional network that transcended nation-focused objectives.

Though the impacts of globalization on information sharing and networking are often cast as a new technical phenomenon and social form, international networking activities are by no means new within libraries and have been central to the distribution of knowledge from the time that book collecting and organizing began. As Glynn notes, the increased internationalization within librarianship through recent technical advances is “for the most part a rapid acceleration of trends in library practice that have been important parts of the profession from its beginnings (2004, p. 1). In conjunction with the rise of INGOs as a new organizational form, global librarianship became a true reality in the twentieth century through the rise of new international groups that institutionalized international cooperation (Glynn, 2004, p. 9). Through the development of these organizations, international activities within the field coalesced into a broader professional world view that situated librarianship as an international profession that requires coordinated structures and activities to promote information dissemination and knowledge production on a global scale.

The study of globalization and the rise of global librarianship in the context of information history is an important means to better understand the role of libraries and knowledge production in societal change (Davis, 2010; Black, 2006). Several fields of inquiry attempt to explain the phenomena in which librarians and international library organizations participated actively in the early twentieth century. These phenomena are the rise of international nongovernmental organizations in what is referred to by Iriye as cultural internationalism, and the advent of globalization as a term to explain the interconnected condition in which humanity finds itself (Iriye, 1997). Viewing international librarianship and the advent of new organizational forms within the field through the lens of these theories of globalization provides a means to see the profession as a partner or agent in what might be called the “globalization project.” Focusing on developments in international librarianship in the interwar period, this paper uses the Paris Library School as a case study to explore ways in which new forms of internationalism began to emerge in the library community, culminating in a transnational professional network. This analysis places international librarianship in the context of the wider social and technological developments that contributed to the economic
and cultural phenomena characterized as globalization and provides a new theoretical basis for examining the growth, impact, and flow of international library development and international library networks.

**Cultural Internationalism, Globalization, and the Paris Library School**

In 1951, Suzanne Briet published *Qu’est-ce que la documentation?* (What is documentation?), which advocated for documentationist methods for information organization and highlighted the profession’s role in binding humanity in a global information network. Throughout the work, Briet emphasized the “unification of humanity” that is supported by the informational work of “documentationalists” and other information professionals (1951). As noted by Maack, Briet had a longstanding enthusiasm for internationalism (2004). These sentiments are rooted in the period preceding and after World War One and conform to what is described by Akira Iriye as “cultural internationalism.” Iriye places many of the origins of cultural internationalism in the period between World War One and World War Two. This new variety of internationalism is distinct from the political and economic internationalism seen in the formation of the League of Nations and international trade agreements. Cultural internationalism focuses on the “variety of activities undertaken to link countries and people through the exchange of ideas and persons, through scholarly cooperation, or through efforts at facilitating cross-national understanding” (Iriye, 1997, p. 3). Central to the idea of cultural internationalism is the notion that the key to a sustained peace was cultural understanding engendered by education and exchange. These notions also focused on the growing sense of “global community in which all nations and people shared certain interests and commitments” (Iriye, 2002, p. 18).

The ideals described as cultural internationalism provided fuel for the growing trend toward international cooperation through International Nongovernmental Organizations (INGO). The organizations often bypassed or even subverted state-driven agendas of intergovernmental organizations and nations by working from the assumption that “cultural and social questions knew no national boundaries and that they required an international framework for solution” (Iriye, 2002, p. 25). It is during the interwar period that many new organizations and international networks formed to promote the exchange of knowledge and ideas. INGOs proliferated, and according to the League of Nations 1929 *Handbook of International Organizations*, almost four hundred of the nearly five hundred groups listed were private INGOs. These included the International Confederation of Students, International Federation of University Women, World Association for Adult Education, International Research Council, and International Society for Microbiology. In addition, comparable
service organizations took root, including the International Council of Women, Save the Children International Union, and Service Civil International. By the late 1920s, when nationalism was again on the rise, these INGOs represented the “conscience of the world” and became the core tool for the networking of individuals and ideas that became the basis of some theories of globalization (Iriye, 2002).

Members of the library profession were clearly engaged in promoting this emergent form of internationalism. For example, in 1915, George Bowerman advocated at the American Library Association annual conference that libraries should avoid becoming agents of propaganda and should rather engage in more activities to work toward collections and educational activities that promote international understanding as a means to foster world peace (2006 [1915]). Similar sentiments were provided in 1924 to the Library Association’s meeting in Glasgow when W. Dawson Johnson, who was librarian of the American Library in Paris, opened his address by stating that “every problem is an educational one, and that every educational problem is an international one” (1925, p.1). His speech then proceeded to describe the role of libraries in informing readers of international affairs and international relations, describing in detail the “International Mind Alcoves” promoted by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace as a means to promote international understanding.

It is also during this time that the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) was established. The evolution of IFLA was influenced directly by the Paris Library School. As explained by Rayward, organizations such as the IFLA, Paul Otlet’s International Federation for Information and Documentation (FID) in Brussels, and The Union of International Associations were key centers of international library and information activities that contributed to the evolution of this global network (1981)1.

Suzanne Briet, who studied and worked in Paris during this period, supported her argument for the role of information organization in an interdependent and interconnected world upon the work of her colleague Paul Perrier, who trained as an archivist and paleographer at the École des Chartes and spent his career at the Bibliothèque Nationale. In 1932, Perrier wrote a history of human civilization entitled L’Unité Humaine, which Briet quotes throughout her 1951 work to support the very contemporary notion of a universal humanity bound together and reliant upon a world-wide informational network. Clearly, within this region there was a growing and active network of internationalists contributing to the growing network of international librarianship.

From these associations emerged a novel network of international librarianship that led to a worldwide library profession and establishment of an international organization that continues to support library develop-
ment across the globe. Paris in the 1920s thus presents a unique intersection of individuals, organizations, and activities that provide a glimpse of the profession’s move away from the nationally oriented activities toward cultural internationalism and the INGO as means to promote the role of information and knowledge production in addressing international social problems. Analysis of the Paris Library School offers a lens through which to view the continued movement toward cultural internationalism and the subsequent development of an international professional network to promote these ideals as a binding agent within a global profession. Although this network’s initial members consisted of only North American and European participants, it developed in a manner that emphasized cultural understanding, interconnectedness, and transnational perspectives that echo throughout current theories of globalization.

**Paris Library School**

In 1922, Jesse Carson, an American librarian, directed the library-focused programs of the American Committee for a Devastated France (ACDF). The ACDF, which was financed by philanthropist and women’s rights advocate Anne Morgan, sought to develop a very focused summer course to train French citizens to carry on the libraries that it had developed in the aftermath of the First World War. To achieve this goal, Carson turned to the American Library Association (ALA) and the American Library in Paris for logistical aid and expertise. Beginning as a summer training program aimed at providing a limited number of people with the skills needed to manage the American-styled public libraries, the program was a quick success, training twenty-nine students in “modern librarianship” its first summer. Demand for the program led Carson and ALA leaders, who had worked to support the war effort in France, to pursue a permanent American library school in Paris.

Initially, ALA took on the challenge of running the school as an opportunity to promote American ideals in librarianship, which were perceived as providing superior technique and a novel approach to public libraries. These ambitions fell in line with the dominant strain of internationalism within the United States, which focused on exporting what many believed were America’s unique contributions to culture and society (Witt, 2013). The initial French collaborators in the venture viewed the Paris Library School as a chance to support the growth of the library field and to develop a new public library system in France. Ernest Coyocque, who was the inspector of libraries for the city of Paris (Inspecteur bibliothèques de la ville de Paris) and president of the Library Association of France (ABF), valued the school for its potential to train French students and supported quotas on the number of non-French students that could enroll.

When the ALA Executive Board approved plans to establish the Paris Library School, the emphasis was mainly on training of librarians and pro-
promoting American practices in Europe. \textsuperscript{8} Milam asserted that the ALA was “naturally interested in making certain that library training which represents America shall really represent the best American library practices.” \textsuperscript{9} In this same letter, he also established that the “proposed connection with the library school will result in personal contacts which should help American librarians to profit from the experiences of their European colleagues.” \textsuperscript{10} The Paris Library School was not formally established to promote the lofty ideals of cultural internationalism expressed by Bowerman and Johnson. It was very focused on the converging national goals of the U.S. and French organizers.

French detractors of the Paris Library School saw the new program as an American imposition, labeling it the “Chartist School of the Far West” (Poulain, 1996). For many, the school was clearly conceived and directed initially with American library methods presented as superior (Poulain, 1996). Despite this, the Paris Library School assembled a cohort of French collaborators, who were keen to fill the need for trained staff in libraries across the country. Leaders in the French library community such as Eugène Morel, a librarian at the Bibliothèque Nationale de Française (BNF) and former president of the ABF, and Ernest Coyecque provided essential support and advice on successfully establishing the school. Morel, for example, offered strategic advice to the Paris Library School directors on how to focus its curriculum and training in order to decrease opposition from the prominent French Library School, l’École des Chartres. \textsuperscript{11}

At the same time that the school was serving the localized, national interests of the U.S. and French library communities, it was placed in the context of wider library developments in the region establishing its connection to the developing network of international library activities. Charles Milam, secretary of the ALA, noted in his memo to the ALA Executive Board that the school coincided with the establishment of the American Library in Paris, the six ACDF libraries, the newly established League of Nations Library in Geneva, and other libraries in Belgium and France being built through Carnegie support on the “American Plan.” \textsuperscript{12} This ferment in the region soon impacted the school and opened the way for the development of a broader internationalist agenda.

When the Paris Library School opened in 1924, it was neither an American project to export its version of the library profession nor a French training school. It had become a hybridization that provided for both American and French needs within an internationalist milieu. Coyecque was consulting director, and more than ten prominent French librarians provided lectures and directed courses on topics ranging from bibliography to reference work. In addition, many curricular changes were implemented to serve French needs. The subtle shifting from American model to hybridized French and American school is explained by Arjun Appadurai in \textit{Modernity at Large}. Appadurai argues against the notion of globaliza-
tion as leading to “Americanization” or cultural homogenization. Instead, Appadurai argues, these homogenizing forces of globalization are “absorbed into local political and cultural economies, only to be repatriated” to create new and unpredictable landscapes (1996, p. 42).

As the school continued to develop, its hybridity fostered an internationalism that grew in importance. In time, this new form of internationalism became a central feature in the school’s mission through the promotion of international activities for the purpose of aiding scholarly cooperation and furthering cultural understanding. Much of this internationalism came about through the merging of French and American perspectives. Many French internationalists from within the library community embraced the Paris Library School. Paul Periere, who is noted previously for his internationalist historical writing, helped to promote the program among colleagues. At the school’s opening in June of 1924, Periere was seated at the head table with representatives of the French library community, the ALA, and Morgan’s ACDF. Seated with Periere was Gabriel Henriot, a French librarian who joined the school’s faculty and was central to the school’s international developments. Also in this group was Mary Parsons, the school’s resident director. Parsons, a librarian from New Jersey, was to become a key interlocutor between the French internationalists and the American administrators of the program in the ALA Chicago office.

From the beginning, Gabriel Henriot had much broader ambitions for the school than his colleague, Coyocque. He envisioned an international school that could work in conjunction with Paul Otlet’s Institute of Bibliography in Brussels. The school’s resident director, Mary Parsons, recounted her initial meeting with Henriot in which she informed him that the school has the potential of becoming either a French or international school. She noted that Henriot hoped it would become international and that she had never encountered anyone with as clear a vision “about international library ideas.” This was the first of many exchanges between Parsons and Henriot regarding the international trajectory of the school. Over time, the international dimension of the school and its role in facilitating internationalism came to dominate discussions of the Paris Library School’s importance and contributions to the profession.

Even for some of the most strident supporters of the promotion of the “American model” abroad, such as the School’s director from the ALA Chicago office, Sarah Bogle, the international exchanges afforded by the school became central to promoting its continued existence. Bogle claimed in a discussion of the initial impact of the school that “there is no question but that the school is at present the leading factor in international library development.” This internationalization was even attributed later to the harmonious work of the students. Parsons reported to Bogle that “perhaps one of the reasons why this year’s students work well
together is that no one nationality predominates. The number of students of each passport nationality is as follows: French 4, Norwegian 3, American 2, Polish 2, Austrian 1, Belgian 1, Danish 1, Greek 1, Hungarian 1, Palestinian 1, Turk 1.”18 The international character increased annually with a total of twenty-five nations represented among the alumni by the time of the school’s closure (Henriot, 1943).

The increase in international students and the international nature of the school was to a large degree credited to the efforts of French faculty, such as Henriot, who requested that the original quotas limiting the number of non-French and non-American students be eliminated.19 It is during this development and through the necessary collaboration with French librarians to make the school a success that the homogenizing forces of American librarianship were repatriated to France, transforming the school in the manner described by Appadurai.

The school soon began to serve as a clearing house for international exchange, providing information on library techniques and receiving numerous requests for advice on organizing libraries, especially special libraries serving industry, from across Europe. What developed out of Paris and the school can be described in the language of Castells as a hub in the growing network of international librarianship. Castells describes the networked social structure as the “interaction between the revolution in information technology, the process of globalization, and the emergence of networking as the predominant social form of organization” (2009, p. 548). Within Castells’s conception of a global society, cultural life, policy making, technical standards, and economic exchange are increasingly organized in a network structure. Castells states that within this network, “society is constructed around flows, the expression of processes dominating our economic, political and symbolic life” (p. 124). These flows are amplified by technology; principal geographic nodes like universities, global cities, and financial centers or universities; and highly mobile, social groups. The network surrounding knowledge production that Castells describes is particularly relevant to the development of international librarianship. These networks are primarily located in universities and the public research system, and this “system is global, depending on continuous communication in the form of publications, conferences, journals, seminars, academic associations” (Witt, 2011, p. 20). The Paris Library School had in a short time become a geographic node for a growing network of internationalism within the profession.

Mary Parsons was well aware of the development of this type of knowledge production network to which the Paris Library School was attached. In a paper presented to the Prague International Congress in 1926, she described the internationalization of research and proliferation of international library organizations. She characterized the collective work of the International Institute of Bibliography in Brussels, Concilium bibli-
ographieum at Zurich, Library of the League of Nations, Section on International Relations of the American Library in Paris, and International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation as moving the world in the direction of international cooperation in research. She concluded that “we are realizing that research work in the twentieth century can rarely be done satisfactorily without the use of publications and often the libraries in a number of different countries.” Librarians such as Parsons were keenly aware that they were both adapting to and helping to create the new communication and technology paradigms driving knowledge production. The librarians in this network turned to the ideals of cultural internationalism and the INGO as a means to cultivate and support the evolving nature of knowledge production and librarianship as they strived to support wider social needs for information sharing and cultural exchange.

In addition to Castells’s theories on the network society, Appadurai focuses on the notion of being connected to a wider network and flow of power through globalization. Appadurai describes structures of global flows that include rapidly changing technology, mobility of people, increased trade, the ability to produce and disseminate information, and the movement of ideas (1996). For Appadurai, this creates scapes of globalization that do not constitute a single, homogenizing process. Alternately, Appadurai ascerts that these scapes create opportunities for diversification when ideas, people, and technologies are shared. According to Appadurai homogenization is weakened, and even the State is powerless in controlling the impacts of a free flow of “people, machinery, money, images and ideas” (p. 33). Appadurai’s observations are also visible in the actions of internationalists such as Henriot, Otlet, and Briet, who aimed to develop information networks and systems that would create opportunities for organizing and sharing knowledge across national, cultural, and disciplinary domains.

The desire to be attached to this growing network was soon infused throughout the Paris Library School. This is evident in a guest lecture to students given by a Mr. Varran, an alumnus who managed an industrial library in Oslo. Varran remarked that the chance to earn a professional diploma has been helpful, “but also it gives a feeling of solidarity among librarians in different parts of the world. . . . Next year I shall be writing for instance to Jerusalem and to other classmates in other countries.”

This narrative of the school promoting international collaboration and participating in a growing professional network was repeated to prospective donors and supports of the school as the ALA solicited funding.

Similar sentiments of internationalism are clearly advocated by Charles Belden, who was ALA President during the formative years of the Paris Library School. He gave a speech at the 1928 ALA Annual Conference in rural West Baden, Indiana, a scene far removed from the lights of Paris. Belden outlined the evolution of international library cooperation from
the late nineteenth century to early twentieth century, charting its course toward permanent institutional structures to support international co-operation among libraries. Within this history, Belden ranks the Paris Library school as “one of the most effective contributions of American librarianship toward international co-operation” (p. 350). The growing institutional structure for which Belden advocated and tied to the activities of the Paris Library School was the establishment of the IFLA during the Prague International Conference. As reported by Zivny in *Library Journal*, Henriot of the Paris Library School and in the name of the Association des Bibliothécaires Français made the motion to establish “a permanent international library committee to represent the national organizations” (1927, p. 304). The movement of cultural internationalism within the library profession and advanced through the activities of the Paris Library School had begun to coalesce into an INGO and further extend the network of international library cooperation and exchange.

The overarching message of Belden’s address, however, was that funding was needed to support these international activities. In December of 1927, Carl Roden, who was then president of the ALA, convened a meeting in Chicago to determine “what is going to become of the Paris Library School.” A lack of a sustainable funding model was threatening the existence of the school, and the ALA was attempting to generate interest in its support from universities and funding organizations. During this meeting, the ideals of cultural internationalism and power of the international network dominated discussions related to whether and how to sustain the school. The promotion of American library techniques and values no longer resonated in conversations, and the benefits provided by the international exchange afforded by the school became the focal point of the conversation.

As noted by the Dean at Columbia University’s Teacher’s College, “the Paris Library School, in the long run, is going to be a flat failure if its primary purpose is to give to France, or to Norway, or any other country, something that we [Americans] know. In the same way, I think, it is going to be a flat failure as far as international relations are concerned if it is primarily an institution to give Americans something that [Europeans] have.” Roden summed up the tenor of the group’s position on the school when he announced that the group had “arrived at a point where we have less interest in the present performance of that library school in the present and the past than we have in its activities and its important and obvious possibilities as an instrument for international, or for the promotion of international culture, if not international relations.”

Although acknowledged for its success in promoting internationalization of the profession, the Paris Library School struggled to remain financially viable as an educational institution. ALA leaders such as Belden, Milam, and Bogle made various attempts to find a funding model that
would support the teaching functions and exchanges necessary for an international library school. Riding on the momentum of the Prague International Conference and Chicago meeting, Bogle made the rounds to foundations and philanthropists throughout North America, speaking to representatives from organizations such as Carnegie, Eastman, Kresge, Morgan, and Rockefeller. A frustrated Bogle noted in correspondence that William Wrigley, of chewing gum fame, “didn’t care about libraries” and another prominent Chicago philanthropist, MacAvinche, had “no interest in foreigners.” Despite clear support from within the profession for the aims of the Paris Library School and other internationalist activities such as the IFLA, the ALA was unable to attract either an American university partner or funding agency that fully embraced the hybridized professional and internationalist missions of the school.

Among the French participants of the program, there was unanimous support for the continuation of the school with an emphasis on its international character. There was, however, less enthusiasm among the French faculty for the school to be managed by an American entity. They hoped to establish a truly international school free of national control. Parsons, who seemed to share the perspectives of her French colleagues, reported to Bogle that running the school under the organizational structure of an American university “would change the character of the school and prevent it from making its unique contribution to librarianship through its international work.” By this time, the ALA’s library school in Paris had already been repatriated and recast in the image of cultural internationalism.

CONCLUSION: THE DAWN OF A GLOBAL PROFESSION
Although the Paris Library School closed in 1929, the spirit of cultural internationalism it engendered and global network it influenced continued to flow throughout international librarianship. The increasing cultural internationalism of the school, its expanding international network, and the new organizational form that it took when “repatriated” in France were essential to the founding of the International Federation of Library Associations. It was the vision of Henriot and his colleagues from within the Paris Library School that propelled the founding of a permanent international nongovernmental organization that would “take care of the international relations among libraries and create the necessary conditions for the mutual international co-operation of librarians” (Malek, 1970, p. 223). After the closure of the Paris Library School, the network continued to support the growth of the profession through the mechanisms of globalization.

In August of 1930, the International Library Committee, which was the executive and directing body of the IFLA, met in Stockholm. During this meeting, Henriot made another proposal. This time, he called for the
creation of an “International Library School, based on the foundation of the Paris Library School” (American Library Association, 1930a, p. 686). The proposal was accepted by the IFLA, but the school never materialized. Sarah Bogle, who had not participated in international library activities until her work with the Paris Library School, was also in attendance as the representative of the American Library Association. She gave an address on library activities in the United States and Canada. Her opening remarks captured fully the globalized profession that had emerged and followed Castells’s description of network society. Bogle opened her talk by stating that “the elimination of time and space through means of communication and transportation has had its full effect on library work as seen by the American Library Association. Every activity in civilization has made its demand upon library service, be the activity educational, social, industrial, informational or recreational. . . . A universal library consciousness has made itself felt as never before” (American Library Association, 1930a, p. 834). Throughout this ALA report, the focus was on the vast international activities within the profession and the growing interchange of library organizations with various INGOs. She notes work with the Pan-Pacific Women’s Congress in Hawaii, library collaboration with the World Federation of Education Associations in Geneva, and library representation at the World Association for Adult Education. In addition, the growing activities of the international library network to develop technical standards and promote exchange are cataloged. These include plans to create an International Lending Library and Information Bureau for Librarians, plus work toward uniform statistics, terminology, and methods to present bibliographical data to “aid in effecting the international interchange of librarians” (American Library Association, 1930a, p. 836).

The library field was participating fully in the globalizing activities related to the advent of cultural internationalization, transnational exchange, and network building described by Iriye, Castells, and Appadurai. By 1933, the ALA’s New Year’s editorial fully enthusiastically embraced the power of this international network as the ALA attempted to strengthen the IFLA through the forthcoming Chicago conference. The editorial announces idealistically that “among librarians, each proud of the country which is home, there is no sense of nationalism which divides but a strong feeling of unity in the great work which makes that profession one of the great means of social advance and world progress” (American Library Association, 1933, p. 18). Though the world’s progress was soon halted by economic collapse and war, the globalizing institutions founded through the work of this Paris-based network survived to continue its mission of building the profession and supporting the expanding network of knowledge production.

By viewing the short history of the Paris Library School through the
lens of globalization theories that emphasize the development of INGOS, the role of networks, and the development of new transnational cultural forms, it is clear that international librarianship developed in the spirit of cultural internationalism and followed what Castells and Appadurai would later describe in their globalization theories. Phenomena that could easily be explained as simple cultural imperialism, the pursuit of nationalistic goals through professional bodies, or simply training librarians become far more complex and nuanced when viewed through these theories. In addition, it is clear that these international networks and projects provided space for cultural exchange and systemic change that moves well beyond the power structures and seemingly one-way flows of knowledge that appear at the surface. The use of globalization theory sheds new light on the impacts of long-standing international library organizations while helping to guide the development of new projects by ensuring that the flows of funds, technology, and culture happen in a manner that allow for positive repatriations and the development of new professional forms that contribute to successful outcomes with our globalized society.

Notes
1. For further description of the founding of these organizations and their impact, see the work of Rayward (1981; 2010).
2. Maack (1983; 1986a; 1986b; 2005) provides historical analysis of the development of library education and the role of women in France during this period, thoroughly documenting the leadership of women in the profession in important educational and international ventures.
4. Suzanne Briet is listed among the 1923 applicants to the school’s first class of students. The archival record is unclear regarding whether or not she completed the program or even enrolled. In June of 1924, Parsons wrote to Bogle that the school was trying to facilitate a six-month post for Briet in Brooklyn, NY. Other correspondence notes a similar offer to organize a visiting position in the U.S. for Suzanne Dupuy, Briet’s married name. According to Maack (2004), it is during this same period in 1924 that Briet was hired by the BNF.
5. ALAA.
6. Although France had a strong tradition of training librarians, its focus was on training archivists and bibliographers; there was little emphasis on service to the general public; see Gardner (1968).
7. ALAA, Report from Mary Parsons to Sarah Bogle, May 7, 1924.
9. ALAA, Milam to the ALA Executive Board, August 30, 1923.
10. ALAA, Milam to the ALA Executive Board, August 30, 1923.
11. ALAA.
12. ALAA, Milam to the ALA Executive Board, August 30, 1923.
13. ALAA, Sarah Bogle to Champenois, June 18, 1925.
14. ALAA, Mary Parsons to Bogle, June 4, 1924.
15. ALAA, Mary Parsons to Bogle, May 8, 1924.
17. ALAA, Sarah Bogle to Milam, October 17, 1924.
18. ALAA, December 11, 1928.
19. ALAA.
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21. ALAA, Mary Parsons to Bogle, December 2, 1925.
22. ALAA, Conference on the Paris Library School, December 8, 1927.
23. ALAA, Conference on the Paris Library School, December 8, 1927.
24. ALAA, Conference on the Paris Library School, December 8, 1927.
25. ALAA, Interview notes from Sarah Bogle, April 25, 1928.
26. ALAA, Mary Parsons to Bogle, December 20, 1927.
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