

Letters

To the Editor:

The editorials in the May and July 1973 issues of *CRL* neatly complement each other, illustrating the dilemma of the ACRL. If we are unhappy about the subordinate role ACRL is playing within the ALA constellation, we must ask ourselves which role ACRL has played during recent years to warrant a more important role. If the drive for excellence exists, then which other division within ALA could inhibit ACRL from performing its self-determined goals?

Should we admire bigness as Richard Dougherty would make us believe by saying "time and events have shown clearly that the achievements of ARL have far exceeded the size of its membership" without comparing its achievements to the size of the institutions involved, the economic and political clout at their disposal, the number of librarians and staff members connected with them and the funds made available to them through grants and foundations for research? Then let us bow down to these large institutions, accept their findings and edicts and live happily ever after.

This certainly should not be the aim of a broadly-based membership organization in which members should have equal opportunities to participate in the formulation of its objectives, policies, and activities, regardless of the size of the institution with which they are associated. In fact ACRL boasts two different sections for colleges and universities based on name, yet the large conglomerate state college systems have much more in common with many of the large universities and in turn the small universities often have more in common with some of the smaller colleges. Let us then critically examine our internal organization before we blame our failures on the competition with other divisions within ALA. Indeed let us acknowledge the interdependence of all types of libraries by asserting that library research must cut across any one of the organizational patterns adopted by the library profession in order

to take care of activities and special interests grouped around particular kinds of library institutions and library activities.

When academic librarians report that their recently hard-won status has come under attack it may well be that they fail to emphasize the performance of a valuable academic service to their academic community. The demand for recognition of faculty status for librarians is then based on equal contribution with that of any other faculty member to the academic excellence of the institution whether they be actively engaged in classroom teaching or not. Indeed, when it was recently found in our college that the existing faculty status of librarians had never been properly documented, the faculty council unanimously endorsed full faculty status and professorial ranks for librarians on the basis of the contribution that the librarians had made to the mission of our college. It was simply a recognition that free exchange of ideas and cooperation between all those charged with the academic function of our college, the only reason for which a college exists, could take place only if we all could be working on the same footing.

Michael Harris quotes Jesse Shera in saying: "Research is an activity largely foreign to a profession oriented toward service rather than analysis of bibliothecal phenomena or introspection of its own activities," but he fails to mention how much of our rapid progress has come about as the result of library research. He also fails to mention how much effort and money went into misdirected research and, indeed, into duplication of research activities which took place while librarianship prided itself on being an information science. There is nothing wrong with using some intuition and practical technical experience to give research activities direction and establish a list of priorities. Then let us initiate systematic, aggressive, and long-term research, which is needed, and let it be supported by the library profession as a whole; backed

by all and not only by the five hundred top universities and college libraries which are reeling under the impact of limited full-paying student enrollment and under inflationary pressures, such as the \$500.00 subscription increase of Chemical Abstracts just announced. This must be a research effort in which all librarians may participate, regardless of the size or type of institution with which they are connected. With the adoption of such programs ACRL may assume again its proper place within a composite, comprehensive, and professionally-oriented organization. We cannot afford to go our separate ways.

*Leo R. Rift
College Librarian
Ithaca College
Ithaca, New York*

To the Editor:

I have read Dr. Moffett's article, "The Academic Job Crisis: A Unique Opportunity, or Business as Usual?" with great interest because, although I do not have a Ph.D. in my subject area of geology, I do have considerable graduate work in it, a master's in teaching natural science, and eighteen years of experience in geology in industry, university teaching, and governmental work before studying library science. During the library science training, I heard clichés about higher salaries for subject specialists, and more job opportunities. To state that my experiences as an academic subject specialist have been disappointing would be an understatement. True, one's associates are in the "academic world," which is quite apart from the rest of the world.

As I read Dr. Moffett's article a number of questions came to mind. He states, "men and women who have already done advanced work in subject areas. . . ." Is he really considering both men and women?

Is Dr. Moffett's experience with academic librarianship only in library school, or has he actually worked in an academic subject departmental library? From the article I gather that the former is more likely to be the case. Has Dr. Moffett not heard that the academic job crisis also affects librarians?

Yes, many noises are made about the need for and use of subject specialists in academic libraries, but did Dr. Moffett make a survey to find how many are in

charge of subject departments in academic libraries and what they do? How many people who have gone to the effort of obtaining a Ph.D. are going to stay in a job where they have to train new undergraduate student assistants every three months, train new clerks every three, six, or eighteen months, be told that "a library clerk doesn't have to be able to type," decide whether a publisher has made a typographical error if the volume or issue number of a serial does not fall in order, answer questions about the date when one word in a serial title changed, make sure the right words are in the right order and place on requisitions, ascertain whether fold-outs in serials are whole or cut in parts by the binder when edges are trimmed, determine how to get along when budgets are cut, and on and on with all of the enormous amount of minutia that makes up academic librarianship? Apparently he does not realize that the subject specialist is so busy with the multitudinous petty details, just as any other librarian is, that there is no time to keep up with subject literature or library literature, let alone do anything about it.

In my opinion the talk of the use of the subject specialist in libraries is merely giving lip service to a thought. Perhaps males find it to be otherwise.

*(Mrs.) Harriet W. Smith
Geology Librarian
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign*

To the Editor:

Mr. Robert Balay's rather thoughtful if not probing questions and commentary (*CRL*, July 1973) on my article "That Inordinate Passion for Status," (*CRL*, March 1973) seemed appropriate to make the picture more clear. My aim here will be to answer them as thoroughly as I can.

His first argument was a little misleading in that it sounded as if I had voiced an opinion that librarians at our college qualified in their preparation better than the teaching staff when he said: "It may be as Mr. DePriest states, that the amount of preparation required of librarians in the state colleges of Pennsylvania is greater than that of faculty." From there he went on to show why it would be unwise for librarians in the Big Ten or the Ivy League

institutions to try to base the extent of their training alone on their request for faculty status. It left the connotation that I was claiming a superior education for our library staff than for that of our teaching faculty. I think I was explicit both in the text and in footnote 16 that it was *entrance* requirements I was concerned about—nothing else. I must say here that I agree wholly with our entrance requirements for librarians but have questioned why entrance for teaching staff was not equally as rigorous. I would hardly be so obtuse as even to compare the preparation of our librarians favorably with our teaching staff. About 50 percent of our teaching staff have the doctorate and none of our librarians have the formal doctorate, though I believe ALA would agree one or two have the equivalent.

As for entrance requirements for teaching personnel, I am sure that the B.S. degree plus fifteen graduate hours minimum is merely reserved for outstanding young graduates well-known to the institution whom I would assume made the agreement with the institution that they would continue as soon as possible to finish their preparation through the doctorate. But at the same time the difference has been there, e.g., the B.S. plus fifteen graduate hours for teaching faculty and the B.S. or B.A. plus the M.A. in librarianship at an accredited library school.

In his second question Mr. Balay questioned why I was silent on the subject of catalogers of whom he said "no such cases can be made for librarians in cataloging or acquisition work, many of whom do not see a student or faculty member except at a distance, for days at a time." It is true that I touched but lightly on catalogers. I did mention that catalogers do research and many write and publish (things usually required of faculty). Then in my closing remarks I stated: "In the end the question of status eligibility is not really whether one teaches or how much he teaches in a classroom . . . but whether one renders a direct scholarly service to the institution," and this I believe is just what the catalogers and acquisition personnel do. May I say here that we reference personnel would do a very poor job indeed were it not for the catalogers, not only in their logical arrange-

ment of knowledge but in the valuable advice we get from them from time to time.

Mr. Balay's third objection was that "not all librarians are employed by academic institutions. For librarians in public or special libraries the issue of academic status simply does not exist and one imagines that they must take a very detached view of the entire controversy." Then he went on to say that academic librarians concerned about faculty status "must decide where their primary loyalty lies, with their own profession or with some other." He indicated then that he had more in common with librarians at other institutions than with faculty at his own.

His view that "not all librarians are employed by academic institutions" is perfectly obvious but it had no relation to what I was trying to say. Maybe I am too close to the woods to see the trees, but if an academic librarian, writing about an academic subject, addresses himself to academic librarians through an academic medium, then he must be speaking to academic librarians alone. Who else?

What I had tried to convey generally was the need for an integration of the library system with the teaching process. Believe me, this means a great effort on librarians and teachers alike. But I cannot believe that the two can go their separate ways in their own little separate vacuums, one herding students and the other dealing out his "magical" services to all. On p. 151 I say:

. . . Here we are not dealing with any old library, but a significant unit of an institution of higher learning whose sole purpose is the support of the program of that institution, whose every important move is to be made not simply for the sake of a general service, no matter how clever or magical but in terms of a *college* service—a special kind of college with a specific kind of patron, specific curricula, course offerings, aims, methods of teaching, ratio of graduates to undergraduates, and a specific overall philosophy of higher education.

This means that the academic librarian must know the purpose of that institution his library serves if he is to be effective in his library service. Again I tried to emphasize this when I said (p.151):

If we can agree that the library is, or ought to be, at the vortex of academic in-

quiry—a learning tool for the student who does his most serious work investigating a specialized field—then how are we to furnish this kind of service unless we are concerned with and cognizant of the subjects that are studied, the educational policies being observed, the methods underlying our teaching, the plans of courses being taught, the general academic planning being done, and the very aims of higher education itself?

This means of course first that, for effectiveness, our preparation must be far in excess of the fifth-year degree in library science and consist of academic subjects; that we must serve on important committees including that of the faculty council; that we must establish and maintain a rapport with our teachers; that our opportunities for leaves, study, and travel be as readily available to librarians as to teaching staff. My library exists solely for the academic goals of its institution. My loyalty is to the special clientele of that institution—the students and faculty.

Mr. Balay infers that there are many kinds of libraries. Of course, that is just the point. They range from those of engineering firms, newspaper plants, and marine biology to the special religious collections of our many church institutions. They all have their particular purposes which cannot be ignored. This is why I believe an academic librarian, especially, if he is to be effective, must in some way be something of an academician, himself.

Mr. Balay is correct in his suggestion that further study of the problem be done. Since the problem seems to be, at least in part, that of naming, permit me to make a modest suggestion. First of all, to the public, a librarian is anyone who works in a library, even if it is simply stamping books. The name of librarian should be given only to the chief, because he is directly concerned with not only the service but with buildings, furniture, equipment, personnel, and all else about the premises, including maintenance of such equipment. The other professional personnel are concerned with the classification, the preparation, the acquisition, the interpretation, and the finding of all kinds of knowledge. These personnel are not librarians at all. They are bibliographers.

So we would have only one librarian for an institution—or director of libraries—with, of course, the directors of branches having the same name. Clerical aides would be Library Assistant I, II, III, etc. A special study by each institution could analyze the work of the bibliographers and work out an equivalency of each position corresponding to his teaching peer, so that each could have his academic title, each title being an accurate description of what that person does, thus:

<i>Title of Employee</i>	<i>Academic Equivalent</i>
Bibliographer I	Instructor
Bibliographer II	Assistant Professor
Bibliographer III	Associate Professor
Bibliographer IV	Professor

Perhaps this should eliminate calling most library personnel by their wrong names and even eliminate the ostentatious attitude of which some bibliographers are accused.

But let it be clearly understood that the rights and privileges of the library faculty be identical with the teaching faculty, for they form a team with the same objectives. Who knows? The "profitless debate about faculty status" Mr. Balay speaks of may have brought us to where we now are—over 50 percent with faculty status, if I remember correctly. Meanwhile, at this stage we should welcome the discussion of the Columbia project Mr. Balay mentions, and at the same time the idea of faculty status will not just go away because it is unpleasant to some. Let us have dialectic, not regression.

Raleigh DePriest

Humanities Librarian

Mansfield State College, Pennsylvania

To the Editor:

It is too bad that the review of E. J. Josey's compilation of essays, *What Black Librarians Are Saying*, is concerned almost exclusively with form and not meaning. It is as though the racial dichotomy of our society, which is reflected in our profession, does not exist, or is merely an academic question which merits a few condescending remarks. Apparently, the impact of what the black librarians are saying is lost on Mr. Lederer.

The all too few black librarians, varied

in ideas, approach, and experience as they are, form a cadre through whom a larger black professional base can be built. No liberal rhetoric can play this role. It is incumbent on us white librarians to *listen*, and to help, where we can, to build this larger black professional base. If we white librarians do not understand this, the profession is doomed to be cut off from a significant part of the country's population, and our professed ideals of service to all are just that—professed.

Miriam Braverman
Senior Lecturer and
Coordinator of Federal Programs
Columbia University
School of Library Service
New York, New York

To the Editor:

Dr. Robert Stueart has made a worthy suggestion when he proposed the exchange of practicing librarians and library school faculty (*CRL*, Sept. 1973). He apparently hopes that such an exchange will help resolve the question of the orientation of library school courses: should the emphasis be more on the practical orientation, which Dr. Stueart associates with the practitioner of the "real world," or on the theoretical orientation, which he associates with the library school faculty in their "ivory tower"?

While such an exchange program is an exciting idea, and would surely breathe new life into tired programs in libraries and library schools, exchange, in itself, is not likely to be instrumental in resolving the question of the orientation of library school courses. The orientation question is only a manifestation of the real problem, which is the failure of the library profession to develop a sound general theory of librarianship, on which library schools could base their curricula. Dr. Stueart is indeed correct when he states that if a lack of education is occurring in library schools, it is "as much the fault of the practicing librarian as of the teacher." Both segments of the profession must share responsibility for failing to develop the theory which would give the curriculum a sound base, and which would enable librarianship to advance more logically and more rapidly.

A practicing librarian, who considers his purpose carefully, must conclude that a bet-

ter theoretical framework would enable him to understand his profession more clearly. So too, must a library school faculty member. These two segments of the profession are not really in opposition as to the relative merits of theory and practice. It is the library school student who aches for more practical material, and, in voicing his desire to the faculty, has perhaps instilled in the faculty concern that the curriculum emphasizes theory to the detriment of practicality.

It is likely that students' desire for more practical materials is caused by the difficulty they encounter when they attempt to absorb the mass of information they are exposed to in library school; to relate it in such a way that it forms a logically-structured whole. This inability to understand these various concepts as a whole is in turn caused by the lack of a substantial theoretical base of librarianship. If a general theory was well founded in a history of sound thought, and was based on principles accepted by the profession, students would be able to categorize specific concepts in terms of the *general theoretical principles*. While it is apparent that certain areas of librarianship, such as cataloging, have a well-developed body of theory, it is not apparent that this body of theory is usually understood as being based on a more general theory of librarianship.

While libraries and library schools (not to mention the individuals involved) would benefit greatly from the exchange Dr. Stueart proposes, the question of the orientation of library school courses will only be resolved when we can point with pride to a body of theory, and teach that body of theory to library students, confident that they can base their understanding of librarianship on what they are being taught.

James B. Taylor
Business Librarian
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

To the Editor:

In response to Robert Stueart's editorial "Exchange, Anyone?" in the Sept. 1973 issue of *CRL*.

Why doesn't ACRL set up a clearinghouse to match library schools that are interested in such an exchange with individuals who feel that it would be worthwhile?

Perhaps we could cut through the lack of communications between library schools and established members of the profession.

I also wonder why some library schools haven't tried to snare librarians on sabbatical leave as consultants for their faculty. Many colleges and universities would consider such a leave of value to their librarians.

Bruce E. Thomas
Head Reader Services Librarian
Lock Haven State College
Pennsylvania

To the Editor:

I read with interest Michael Harris' editorial "Intuition, Research and the Academic Library" in the July 1973 *CRL*. It seems to me that research/systems, or R & D, offices represent a critical need not only for research in librarianship in general, but, equally important, they represent a critical need in terms of ensuring that, as far as possible, the individual library is in a position to maximize its efforts and resources in meeting the needs of its own community.

As the study for new or revised standards for academic libraries is getting underway, it seems to me that the ACRL Standards Committee might well consider the possibility of a research/systems, or R & D, unit as one of the requirements in the standards for the libraries of senior research universities, and as a strong recommendation for those academic libraries on the tier immediately below the senior institutions, and so on down the line. Justifications for such a standard leap to the mind by the dozens.

Should such a standard ever come to pass, the ACRL might eventually provide a research clearinghouse which could interface with both the output and the inquiry from such R & D offices at academic libraries, not to mention individual researchers in the field, research institutes (e.g., Illinois and California), and the graduate library schools in America.

As a doctoral candidate in librarianship, I am only too well aware that many seemingly "original" ideas or new ideas are, in fact, very old hat and have been reviewed and buried long since. In any case, sometimes even old ideas are worth taking off

the shelf and re-reviewing in terms of the present times.

Richard Leitz, Librarian
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
Laurinburg, North Carolina

To the Editor:

W. A. Moffett's *CRL* article (May 1973) and the resulting letters (Sept. 1973) raise a number of important issues. Perhaps the most critical single issue is the statement in Donald Morton's letter that "I think Dr. Moffett's article is useful because it focuses attention upon forces which are raising the normal educational requirements for librarians."

Sooner or later in some realistic fashion librarians will have to come to grips with the question of what the appropriate educational requirements for academic librarians should be. While librarians have become more insistent upon gaining faculty status with all its benefits, they at the same time seem to be trying to evade faculty standards for appointment and promotion. The final version of Standards for Faculty Status (*CRL News*, Sept. 1972) no longer contains the requirements of two master's degrees which appeared in the earlier draft (*CRL News*, Feb. 1971). Then the statement on appointment, promotion, and tenure goes one step further to enshrine the master's degree as the "appropriate terminal professional degree" (*CRL News*, Sept. 1973).

Obviously the profession was not willing to accept the doctorate as the requirement for librarians although it is the usual expectation for faculty members. Obviously too, librarians were not willing to accept two master's degrees. While two master's degrees are not equivalent to the doctorate, this certainly was a step in the right direction.

The tragic irony of all this is the fact that on the one hand we claim, and rightly so, that "the work of the academic librarian has become highly specialized and demanding" ("Standards for Faculty Status . . .," *CRL News*, Sept. 1972). On the other hand we claim that a master's degree, which in number of credit hours is approximately the equivalent of an undergraduate major, is enough. Can we really have it

both ways? Are we saying that we are a little scholarly but not very? Are we then willing to say that we deserve a little status in the academic community but not much? A few years ago I wrote an article which said:

To gain the recognition they deserve, librarians must become more academic. They must stress personal, professional development through further education and scholarly activity. Increasing emphasis on such activities from librarians themselves is one of the most encouraging trends in the profession. At the same time, if the faculty is truly concerned about improving the quality of library service, its best approach is to make librarians full participants in the academy. It would seem safe to assume that had librarians been accepted as full members of the academic community for the past twenty years, they would have been forced to a greater degree to adopt faculty standards of education and scholarship, and the nature of the profession at the present time would be very different. ("The Professor and the Librarian," *MPLA Quarterly*, 16:23 (Summer 1971).)

Surely librarians must have realized that by being more insistent about gaining faculty status, academic institutions would become more insistent upon improved qualifications.

If we are truly interested both in faculty status in any meaningful sense and in the development of the profession, we must be willing to pay the price. The AAUP paid librarians a great compliment by endorsing the "Joint Statement on Faculty Status" (*CRL News*, Sept. 1973) and I believe that faculty members generally are on our side. However, we dare not protest too much that we want to be totally accepted by the faculty while also insisting that librarianship requires only the master's degree, which by academic standards automatically implies that librarianship is only "semi-scholarly." Are we saying that librarianship is not quite scholarly enough to be worthy of doctoral study? Does that enhance our prestige? Can we expect to retain faculty support indefinitely with that stance?

And please, in arguing our case let us not use examples of architecture and engineering, both of which can be measured in a

much more immediate fashion as far as quality of performance is concerned. And please, let us not use home economics and nursing either, both of which for a variety of reasons have their own special problems.

Obviously the question of the appropriate academic preparation for librarians is a complex matter which deserves much more discussion. As librarians we like to cite statements about the need for "life-long education," for education for "successive careers," and for opportunities for education to keep up with a "changing world." Are librarians to be excluded from this phenomenon? Is the master's degree the end for librarians? Is the master's degree earned in 1950, 1960, or 1974 enough to keep up forever with the complex, changing world of librarianship?

Yes, I had hoped that the trend toward gaining full faculty status would lead to an increasing emphasis on additional education for librarians. There is no question but that if librarians had more formal education both the profession itself and our ability to serve users would be enhanced. I also hope that as academic institutions and faculty members become more concerned about the librarians' academic qualifications, librarians will not reverse their positions to say that perhaps we don't want faculty status after all if we have to pay the price of meeting faculty qualifications.

Virgil F. Massman
Executive Director
James Jerome Hill
Reference Library
St. Paul, Minnesota

To the Editor:

A newly published book should, to a large extent, be evaluated in terms of the intent of the author and the purposes for which he intended it to be used.

The subtitle of my *Academic Library Buildings* is: *A Guide to Architectural Issues & Solutions*. It suffers from all the problems a guidebook necessarily contains. I stated in the preface that the book would not attempt to make case studies. I stated that it would be a "source book of information on how new buildings are planned, arranged and equipped."

Ms. Gloria Novack's criticisms (*CRL*,

Sept. 1973, p.286-87) of the photographs are justified for about four of the exteriors. It is also true that some of the interiors are dull and that not all of them tell their own story without the accompanying text. But if I had hired the photographic talent to make a few examples tell the story well, and alone, the resulting book would not have been a guidebook.

Nor would the book have served its purpose had I arranged the material by library rather than by issue and function with geographic organization of the examples. I agree that a book arranged as Ms. Novack suggests would be useful and lots of fun to do. But I felt that a guidebook should come first.

I am sorry indeed that the photographs had to be so small. Some indeed are dull, but some of the libraries were dull even though they do represent good architectural solutions—a debatable point. There are several academic libraries that have no more

than one or two good features in them. I wanted to guide people to those good features. Let someone with Dr. Ellsworth Mason's talent and interests do the total evaluations. But that would not be a guidebook.

*Ralph E. Ellsworth
Boulder, Colorado*

To the Editor:

The November issue of *College and Research Libraries* carried a rejoinder to a previously published review of *What Black Librarians Are Saying*, by E. J. Josey. This rejoinder was credited to Dr. Alex Ladenson, chief librarian, the Chicago Public Library. This is an error. This rejoinder was written by Donald Franklin Joyce, Curator, Vivian G. Harsh Collection on Afro-American History and Literature, George Cleveland Hall Branch, The Chicago Public Library.

*Donald Franklin Joyce, Curator
George C. Hall Branch
Chicago Public Library*

Statement of Ownership and Management

College & Research Libraries is published 17 times a year, bimonthly as a technical journal with 11 monthly *News* issues, combining July-August, by The American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. American Library Association, owner; Richard M. Dougherty, editor. Second class postage paid at Fulton, Missouri. Printed in U.S.A. As a nonprofit organization authorized to mail at special rates (Section 132.122, *Postal Service Manual*), the purposes, function, and nonprofit status of this organization, and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during the preceding twelve months.

Extent and Nature of Circulation

("Average" figures denote the number of copies printed each issue during the preceding twelve months; "Actual" figures denote number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing date—the September 1973 issue.) Total number of copies printed: Average, 16,235; Actual, 16,000. Paid circulation: not applicable (i.e., no sales through dealers, carriers, street vendors, and counter sales). Mail subscriptions: Average, 14,531; Actual, 14,524. Total paid circulation: Average, 14,531; Actual, 14,524. Free Distribution: Average, 1,134; Actual, 688. Total distribution: Average, 15,665; Actual, 15,212. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: Average, 570; Actual, 788. Total (sum previous two entries): Average, 16,235; Actual, 16,000.

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (PS form 3526, July 1971) for 1973 filed with the United States Post Office Postmaster in Chicago, September 28, 1973.