

funds without perceptible plan or regard for use and need. He sought and secured from his staff, from the faculty, and from the administration, a new awareness of the potentialities of a library to a university. In his careful meticulous way he bought books for Arizona, beginning with our bibliographical and reference collection, going on to strengthen our Southwest collection to which Mr. Gjelsness had contributed so greatly, and collaborating with the faculty in planning the library's book expansion so that it bore some relation to the curriculum.

He read the antiquarian catalogs daily as they came across his desk and his order librarian felt the dynamic impact of his selection policies instantly. He did not waste his time choosing among best sellers and the engulfing flood of second-rate current stuff, but husbanded our financial resources and his own book perspicacity for the important acquisitions that will distinguish certain parts of our collection forever. And another thing I remember about Mr. Carlson, a simple thing you may say, but few chief librarians do it nowadays: he used to go into the stacks. Often he went to look up something for his own information, or sometimes he took one of us along to discuss something, or occasionally he roamed up and down the aisles just looking, absorbing the peculiar atmosphere of

thousands of books. We never knew when we would run into him there, but it always made us feel good when we did. Now by this I do not propose that the small university librarian run his library from the stacks, but I do maintain that neither can he run it exclusively from the sanctuary of his office.

Mr. Carlson grayed considerably in our service, but I think he loved us nonetheless, for we had responded to his philosophy of bookmanship. (Show me a staff who loves the bright young mechanical man whose bible is his time and motion studies and whose badge is his organization chart, and I'll walk back to Tucson reciting chapter headings from all the books ever written on university library administration as penance.)

What does all this add up to? The observations of one assistant librarian about different kinds of chief librarians do not make a handbook for guidance. Yet these experiences are probably typical of a small university library. I would say at least, if someone should ask me which librarian I would like most to be marooned with in a library, that he should, if possible, happily be both administrator and bookman. But with female stubbornness, I reserve the final right to insist that if he can be only administrator, and not bookman as well, he forsake librarianship and leave me alone with the books.

By MAURICE F. TAUBER

## Librarians as Bookmen

*Dr. Tauber is professor of library service, Columbia University.*

ROASTING AN OLD CHESTNUT is an appropriate title for this meeting. If one goes back into library literature, in fact, to the first number of the *American Library Journal*, issued September 30, 1876, he will find in Melvil Dewey's discussion of "The Profession" reference to the problem under discussion. He wrote as follows:

It is not enough that the books are cared for properly, are well arranged, are never lost. It is not enough if the librarian can readily produce any book asked for. It is not enough that he can, when asked, give

advice as to the best books in his collection on any subject. All these things are indispensable, but they are not enough for our ideal. He must see that his library contains, as far as possible, the best books on the best subjects, regarding carefully the wants of his special community.

Dewey continues with his thesis that a librarian should know books, and that he should use them as a teacher.

The time *was* when the library was like a museum, and a librarian was a mouser in musty books, and visitors looked with curious eyes at ancient tomes and manuscripts. The time *is* when the library is a school, and the librarian is in the highest sense a teacher,

and the visitor a reader among books as a workman among his tools. Will any man deny to the high calling of such a librarianship the title of profession?

Some forty-two years ago, William Warner Bishop, writing in *The Sewanee Review* (July, 1912), discussed the problem of "Training in the Use of Books." Dr. Bishop uses Thomas Jefferson as his pivotal point in focusing attention on the increase in the size of libraries since Jefferson did his collecting. Jefferson's 7,000 volumes were collected with meticulous care from the bookstores of Paris and other centers. He even maintained standing orders for works relating to America from the book-marts of Amsterdam, Frankfurt, Madrid, London, and other cities. Today, we have similar junkets on the part of university librarians who visit foreign centers collecting books for the libraries under their care. But Bishop's major topic of discussion was not Jefferson and his collecting. Bishop was interested in how anyone was going to gain control over the deluge of books. Jefferson's day had passed.

The scholar of to-day is ever fearful lest he shall have missed the latest treatise on his little specialty, which yet, despite its limitations, has a literature of its own. The average man of intelligence is well-nigh helpless before the mass of books even in a minor library. The craze for the "latest" novel, the "most up to date" reference book, is the characteristic note of the present demand for books. How, in the face of this flood, shall the young man of our day find his bearings; how shall he ride the flood a master; by virtue of what training shall he make it serve him, carry him to his goal, aid him in his life work? How shall he avoid being overwhelmed by numbers, misled by cheap newness, misguided by advertising, and lost in a wilderness of printed matter when he essays to work in a modern library or to attempt the mastery of any important question? This is my theme: *Training in the Use of Books*, the acquiring of a scholar's attitude toward the printed page.

Bishop's prescription for developing a sense of values in books makes good sense even today. Perhaps it was Bishop's training in cataloging which accounts for the ingredients of the prescription—to know authors, to know titles, to know contents. He starts with the young child, as one should, and outlines a

program that involves the elementary school teacher and the high school librarian. We shall see later that Bishop's prescription, carried further into college and the university, would do what critics of librarians today would like to see done—to prepare librarians who know books for their values and their uses.

But let us turn to the current problem—to the more specific problem of making our librarians more effective as bookmen.

Ernest J. Reece, writing in 1949 of *The Task and Training of Librarians*<sup>1</sup> described the various responsibilities of personnel in modern library service. In his discussion of skills for the task, he wrote as follows:

Naturally the abilities relating to books claim prominent attention. Among them, facility in judging, learning, and reducing to usable order what is recorded in printed and other forms stands first, since it underlies many of the professional librarian's preoccupations.

Power to evaluate books was widely thought to be deficient in the graduates of library schools. Those so reporting did not allege that schools ignore it or are uninterested in it, but apparently believed that the efforts to nurture it are superficial and too slight. They alluded to the part the judging of printed materials plays in building, balancing, and limiting collections, choosing items for readers, presenting the contents of books to individuals and to audiences, and defending policies in selection. They spoke of it as a calling for discernment in appraising literary quality and significance, as well as in distinguishing fact, theory, bias, and propaganda, and in interpreting reviews and the estimates of new publications supplied by experts in particular fields.

If the power of over-all evaluation is inadequate, much the same must be said about the competence in mastering and dealing with the contents of books for purposes of use. The prevailing view is that there is insufficient readiness in unlocking the vaults of knowledge, to say nothing of the sleuth-like pursuit of clues which often is necessary, the handling and construing of research resources, and the utilizing of all pertinent resources and media, within and without a given library. The result is mediocre effectiveness in disseminating information, furnishing requested material, and promoting

<sup>1</sup> New York, King's Crown Press, 1949.

contributions to the world's store of learning.<sup>2</sup>

A basic assumption of the following discussion is that it is essential for professional groups to take stock constantly of their educational and training programs. Much of the discussion in the literature as to what constitutes a "Librarian" or a "Bookman" has generally resulted in the generation of more heat than light. Professor Reece's conclusions regarding the observations of practitioners on the competencies of library school graduates in book knowledge perhaps is as inclusive as one might possibly gather in a similar survey if conducted today. The deficiencies listed have been singled out before, and together they represent those important segments of library service which have been subject to the criticism of some librarians and others outside the profession. This criticism is desirable. A check of the literature will reveal that training for other professions, such as medicine, law, engineering, pharmacy, and teaching also has been subject to reappraisal at frequent intervals. The appointment of a non-career librarian to an important library position, however, is pointed out as a tangible demonstration of the failure of the profession to produce the right man at the right time. There are, of course, other reasons why such appointments are made.

My contribution to this discussion is concerned with a major part of the training and background of librarians—their knowledge and capacity as bookmen. What, then, makes a bookman? It is certain that the definition will depend on the person defining it. Is it subject knowledge in a specific field, such as astronomy, mathematics, economics, Byzantine art, or American literature of the 19th century, or the works and influence of Ben Jonson? Is it collecting all the works of a particular author? Is it knowledge of books in the sense of a McKerrow, Esdaile, or Fredson Bowers? Is it knowledge of book bindings in the sense of a Cockerell or a Goldschmidt? Is it knowledge of books in the sense of a Rosenbach or other internationally famous collectors? Is it knowledge of printing in the manner of an Updike or a Stanley Morison? Is it being bibliography-wise, in the sense of knowing at first hand the sources

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19-20.

in Mudge, Winchell and other guides so that scholars can be helped promptly in their quest of information? Is it knowing books in all languages and on all levels so well that catalogs, indexes, and abstracts can be prepared so soundly that scholars will accept them without question? Is it the ability to sit down with bookdealers and discuss books in their various editions, with emphasis on minutiae of format and previous owners? Is it the ability to trace the effects of one author upon another, and how they both influenced a third? Is it the type of infection which has been described as bibliomania, or the unquenchable desire to acquire books? Must one be a Diderot, Delisle, Medina, Eames, or Wing to be considered a bookman? What is the place of music, maps, manuscripts, archives, and other forms of communication in the background of the bookman? What indeed makes a bookman?

There is one other definition of a bookman. Robert B. Downs, speaking to the Southeastern Library Association, October 30, 1952, had as his object the disinfecting and deodorizing of horsefeathers, or delusions, in librarianship. He writes:

A fourth popular delusion or class of horsefeathers is more personal in nature. That is the belief that librarians cannot read or write, and know only the outsides of books. There is an insinuation here, though perhaps not a direct charge, that librarians are illiterate; otherwise, the critics suggest, we would take more interest in knowing what is between the covers of the books we handle.

Evidence to confute this calumny are all around us. How could our thousands of able reference librarians carry on their jobs without the most thorough knowledge of the contents of books? Not only must they have read, but they must retain an almost uncanny memory of everything they peruse and where they saw it. Tomorrow, next week, or next year, someone will come along and ask questions for which the information will be needed. There are thousands of special librarians, serving business, industry, medicine, law, and a multitude of other specialized interests, who are accustomed to having at their fingertips a vast array of facts and figures on the most unexpected and unlikely subjects. Their background has been acquired through a minute acquaintance with books, journals, pamphlets, and unpublished data. These reference and special

librarians would hardly last twenty-four hours in their positions without a comprehensive familiarity with the printed word.<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Downs goes on to single out groups of traditional librarians, such as acquisition librarians and catalogers and classifiers, who make specific contributions through knowledge of books—of their insides as well as their outsides. Downs also points out that there are some librarians who are capable writers, regardless of the observations that there is a prominent gap in this area.

It is doubtful if a definition can be arrived at which will be satisfactory to all. It is doubtful if the old chestnut that is being roasted here will be palatable to anyone. But the question needs airing. I have taken as my part of this panel the discussion of three aspects: (1) what library schools consider their role in helping to build up book and bibliographical knowledge of students, particularly in connection with *uses* of books; (2) what a group of scholarly bookmen—recognized as such by other bookmen and also by librarians who may or may not be described as bookmen—consider to be the role and potential of the library school in the development of their counterparts; (3) how may any deficiencies which are present in library schools be corrected.

#### LIBRARY SCHOOL TRAINING

In an effort to obtain some data on the pattern of instruction in the so-called book courses in library schools, letters were sent to the deans and directors of schools accredited by the ALA. The response was gratifying. Only two library school directors failed to write. It would take more time than that allotted to me to write fully of the library school programs designed to assist students to strengthen their backgrounds in book knowledge. In general, one must conclude after reading the correspondence that library school directors and their staffs are much concerned with their graduates being "bookmen" in every sense of the term. "As I grow older," one writes, "I feel we need more bookishness." But some of the younger deans and directors are seriously disturbed about not being able to do more than they are

doing now with the general product that comes to library schools. If one were to categorize the problem of the library schools in terms of factors, there would be three that deserve attention: (1) the courses, (2) the students, and (3) the faculty.

*Courses.* By and large the curricula of library schools disclose earnest attention to the importance of so-called book courses. Most of the library schools now offer introductory courses in the literature of the several grouped disciplines—the humanities, the social sciences, and science and technology. The usual types of courses in book selection, reference, bibliography in various phases, children's literature, materials for adolescents, popular fiction, government publications, maps, serials and continuations, rare books, and manuscripts are provided. Some schools provide an opportunity to specialize in subject fields, such as medicine, law, music, business and fine arts. General courses in library backgrounds, libraries and librarianship, history of books and libraries, books and ideas, history of books and printing, libraries and publishing, acquisition of library materials, resources of libraries and cataloging and classification are also singled out as pointing towards the enriching of the backgrounds of students. Advanced courses and seminars are also available for those who bring to library school more than the usual knowledge of books learned in the liberal arts curriculum in colleges. Any library school course, technical or otherwise, should contain content dealing with books and other library materials. Over and above the required and special courses in books and book knowledge, several library schools have focused attention on problems of books, bookmen, scholars, publishing, and bookdealers through symposia, workshops, institutes and lecture series.

It is difficult to discuss the merits of these courses, except in terms of practical success of the graduates in library service. The discussions or summaries of Danton, Wheeler, Reece, Beals, and Leigh all published in the last seven years, offer some basis for concluding that we are not as successful as we would like to be in turning out individuals who would be classified *as* bookmen *by* bookmen. But it may be worth while lingering for a few moments to examine comments on book courses by two library school directors.

<sup>3</sup> Downs, Robert B. "Some Current Delusions, or Horsefeathers, in Librarianship," *Southeastern Librarian*, 3:24, Spring, 1953.

When our curriculum underwent extensive revisions about five years ago, we decided that primary emphasis should be placed on books and less stress on administration and organization. I think we have succeeded pretty well in this aim. In my opinion, however, library schools cannot do the job alone, in what is ordinarily a one-year program. We need to have good college preparation on which to build and, of course, a keen interest in books on the part of students themselves.

We are not, however, under the illusion that anyone can be turned into a bookman in one year. Those who have been reading avidly since childhood probably have a pretty good start; we hope our introduction of materials and ideas will encourage them to continue and to grow to be bookmen. Similarly, we hope that others will build on what we are able to give them and will develop a reading background. At the same time we recognize that, regrettably, many will never reach real bookmanship. No course can do it all for them. We believe that what we offer is a sound basis; but the outcome depends on what the individual builds on that basis.

These two comments are typical of similar ones made by the directors and faculty members who wrote. Within the year's program of a library school, there is obviously a serious limit as to what may be done in the training of students. The recognition of this aspect of the problem by library school administrators and faculty members has been emphasized by the bookmen themselves.

*The Students.* What about the students who come to the library school? Are they much different from the students of the past? This particular problem was not investigated systematically. One respondent indicated that they were not equal to the students in other graduate departments of his university. I have been personally impressed, however, with the calibre of many of the students I have met in library school. While I am not acquainted with the backgrounds of students in all library schools, I have observed, for example, an increasing number of young people entering Columbia who have master's degrees in subject fields, or who have a sense of books that is beyond what may be expected under present undergraduate instruction in colleges. The several students who have indicated interest in building special collections, in pub-

lishing and printing, and in bibliographical control demonstrated their earnestness by their willingness to go beyond the call of duty. This is important, as will also be seen by the comments of bookmen. There must be a basic drive within the student himself. The learning process is not merely an instructor lecturing and a student taking notes. The student must take an active part of the process of learning. This was Bishop's prescription.

The question of recruitment for library service, particularly university library service, has been discussed many times. The part that must be played by university librarians themselves in this program of directing attention of qualified persons to librarianship as a career cannot be stressed too often. Some of the young people who have gone into libraries with strong backgrounds in books have been sent to library schools by librarians. Mr. Powell, in his paper in *Education for Librarianship*, the proceedings of the conference of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School, in 1948, referred to it as part of a positive program in strengthening library personnel. If the students who are attending library schools do not meet the expectations of employing librarians, it might be speculated that the librarians themselves have not demonstrated through their own contributions and services that they are in a calling that demands the best minds of the land. The examples set by librarians in their professional lives and in their library administrations are exceptionally good instruments for influencing young people who are concerned with the selection of satisfying careers. The blame placed on the schools and faculties should be qualified to the extent that there is a dual responsibility of both schools and libraries to select those individuals who have shown an affinity for books and library service. There is no place in librarianship for a person who merely tolerates books or who resists reading.

*The Faculty.* The third part of a program for training bookmen is the library school faculty. The letters from the several directors of the schools, as well as those from some faculty members who wrote, indicate a definite recognition of the role of the teacher in this important program. I wish there were time to include these letters completely. To draw conclusions on how well the faculty members

succeed in carrying out the programs which are described so well there would be required a detailed study of the performance records of the graduates of each library school. In the several courses which were listed earlier, however, there are pedagogical techniques which are designed to accomplish the aim of developing the students' interest in and concern for books and other materials with which librarians have to deal with in their work with patrons.

Anyone who has taught in a library school knows that there are serious problems in selection and recruitment of faculty members, their preparation in educational and professional experience for particular assignments, their teaching loads, their scholarly productivity, their associational and other responsibilities. Keeping close touch with the field may sometimes be a difficult task for the faculty member, but it is an essential one. That there is criticism of library school faculties for losing touch with libraries and problems in the field is well known.

One of the primary recommendations of the Williamson report on the training of librarians was the placement of the library school in an established university. This was proposed for a number of reasons, but basically it was designed to make it possible for both faculty members and students to become a real part of a larger whole which was concerned with knowledge in all its phases. The extent to which students take advantage of their opportunities by being at a library school located in a large university will determine to some extent their growth as bookmen. Even though full-time library school students spend only a year, or possibly less, at their professional training, the observation on getting to know books and their authors made by several of the bookmen is relevant. It is possible to become specific on this point. A student at Columbia University's School of Library Service, if he so wills, can not only become acquainted with books in the general library stacks in Butler Library, but with those in the 32 departmental libraries of the University. The Department of Special Collections itself contains dozens of the types of collections that generally affect the saliva flow of bookmen. The bookshops and collections of New York are open to him. Students at other library schools have, but perhaps not to

the same extent, similar advantages to enjoy if they would only do so.

Students, of course, complain that they are too burdened with the task of reading library literature, of writing term papers or theses, or working twenty or more hours in a library. Working students, of course, have an opportunity to become acquainted with books in a real sense. The bookmen who are librarians focus attention on the value of spending time in the stacks of libraries studying individual books as well as collections. Bookmen frequently get lost in the stacks.

#### BOOKMEN ON BOOKMEN

It seemed to your participant that one of the ways by which some guidance might be obtained on possible ways to strengthen the programs of library schools in their efforts to help students build their backgrounds in books would be from suggestions of a group of bookmen themselves—librarians of special collections in universities, librarians of well-known special libraries, and others who have established reputations as bookmen. To these 26 individuals a letter was sent.<sup>4</sup> Twenty-two commented on the four questions which were as follows:

1. How did you develop your knowledge of books?
2. Is it the type of background that could be developed by students in a library school?
3. If so, what might the library schools do to develop courses in this direction? In general, what would be the content of such courses?
4. What should be the characteristics of the faculty members teaching such courses?

*Developing Knowledge of Books.* Let us turn to an examination of the traits deduced as uniquely characteristic of bookmen, according to the descriptions by bookmen themselves. How did bookmen become bookmen? Although there was some disagreement with the definition of "bookmen" as represented in

<sup>4</sup> Among those who provided information were the following: Charles M. Adams, Roland Baughman, Curt F. Bühler, Rudolf Hirsch, William A. Jackson, Karl Kup, Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, Harry M. Lydenberg, David C. Mearns, Stanley Pargellis, Howard Peckham, William B. Ready, Felix Reichmann, Joseph B. Rogers, Colton Storm, Lawrence S. Thompson, Edwin E. Willoughby, Donald Wing, Richard Wormser, Louis B. Wright, Lawrence C. Wroth, John Cook Wyllie.

the letter, the interpretations by the respondents indicated general acceptance of "knowledge of books" to mean both bibliographical and subject knowledge. One bookman asks:

How did I develop my knowledge of books? By reading some of them. In this pursuit, there is, I'm afraid, no alternative to reading. Not even listening to the broadcasts of the extraordinary Mr. Highet can be a satisfactory substitute. When I first went to work in the library thirty-five years ago, I supposed, in my innocence (having had no professional training), that its henchmen should have some respect, even veneration, for the wards on its shelves. Being still uneducated, I still cling, a little obstinately, to the notion. In those far-off days, there were no restraints on the reference staff, in terms of routines, procedures, and time limitations. We were assigned to an enquiry and were expected to come up with the solution. This meant going far beyond a quick search of a catalog, a thumbing of an index, a glance at an encyclopedia, or recourse to the most obvious compendium. It meant going to the stacks—to the books themselves. It meant applied imagination. There was a rather fine spirit of competition. It was shameful not to bring in an affirmative report. Of course many of the books were unresponsive, but with persistence it was sometimes possible to come upon the right one and force it to divulge the secret. There is no satisfaction as complete as the satisfaction of discovery combined with recognition. And so, you will understand, what little I have learned of books has been haphazard, distressingly miscellaneous, and shockingly thin. But it has been great fun, and I have been grateful for having been permitted to live among them.

The question of self-education in books appears prominently in the discussions of the bookmen. Another bookman comments on this particular aspect as follows:

I believe "knowledge of books" is a direct and necessary result of emotional disturbance characterized by ability to derive pleasure from reading, handling, owning, or seeing books, or some kinds of books, like pockmarks on a face are the result of having had chicken pox, or, as an ornithologist has been a bird watcher because he is a bird lover. How may the person become initially infected? Some people have been vaccinated against the thing. Others are naturally immune. The chance of infecting the susceptible I think is increased by exposing them

regularly and systematically to those who are suffering from (and/or enjoying) it.

How did I develop my knowledge of books? I don't know for sure what the answer is. From watching children, I suspect that book loving is not congenital infection, or if it is, it must remain latent to teen age. I was much earlier interested in reading than I ever was in books as physical objects, but this is not relevant really because I had no early opportunity to see or enjoy beautiful books. My earliest recollections in this direction came from opportunities to see public and private collections formed by great bookmen, and some of the greatest stimuli have been these plus bookmen in the trade.

A retired director of a great research library wrote as follows:

I developed my knowledge of books by trying to find out all I could about what they meant, what they said, why they were written, how they were made, how they were printed, how they were sold, in short, trying to learn the *ins* and *outs* of the book world on all its many sides. Yes, I admit that's a pretty big order, agree that I came far short of success, but knew that the more I learned the wider grew the circle of the unknown. Put it another way: by realizing that books meant much to me, by hoping to get other people to feel towards them as I did, by cultivating a lasting and never satisfied curiosity about books in all their sides and phases.

Those of you who remember Douglas Waples' paper, "On Developing Taste in Reading," will recall his comments on the difficulties of any program in developing taste in other people. Waples observes that a fund of experience is the basic element of taste, and out of this fund the individual learns to recognize excellence. How does a young person obtain this basic fund of knowledge which later impels him to pursue further the good experience? Waples writes as follows:

Given that kind of young person, the literary men who have written about literary taste tells much that will guide his further steps toward competence in literary criticism. We suspect that such people result from a happy selection of parents, plus the family interests such parents would create, plus several accidental and vivid exposures to literature in terms of life. We suspect also that such people are their own best teachers. But all this is small help. The masters beg

the question. As parents we can't afford to wait for such young people to happen in our families. As teachers we can't wait for them to blossom in the schools.

In most cases, a positive program is essential but parental and family influence apparently have been significant in the training of bookmen. One of the respondents wrote as follows:

The small knowledge I have of books was developed from reading them. My father was a non-college man, yet he was a careful and avid reader. He was like many men of his generation: he bought the books he thought he ought to read. Those books were all around us, as I grew up, and I read them just as rapidly as I could understand them (or, at least, thought I could understand them). The whole family read books and discussed them and believed that reading was fun. We went to the local public library weekly as a family and I went more often. Children were not admitted to the adult section of the library in my younger days, but we had a remarkable woman on the local staff who knew I needed something beyond *The Rover Boys*. She sneaked me into the adult stacks and I prowled the shelves freely. There was nothing directed about this reading—it was rather squirrel-like, clutching at random and burying hurriedly.

This same respondent states that he was an indifferent student in college, but always a good reader. "And read I did," he writes, "for more than two years, I was reading at the rate of two books each day. I'm not yet quite sure why I was graduated." We all know why he graduated—he undoubtedly knew more than his teachers.

Up to this point, we have discussed personal initiative and parental direction. Direction by others, such as members of high school and college faculties, librarians with the preferred book sense, and bookmen—bookdealers and book collectors—have helped young people to develop their background in books.

A current supervisor of special collections in a large university library writes as follows:

I became a bookman, as you put it, entirely by chance and in the time-honored tradition of "preceptor-neophyte." When I began my college career there certainly was no thought in my mind of becoming a librarian. And finding myself through force of circumstance

on the staff of a large research library in the effort to gain funds with which to continue my college work, I still resentfully resisted the tendency to put down roots, and for a number of years I considered my participation in the activities of a research library a strictly incidental interference with the proper eventual career in education, my chosen field.

Time and the influence of two men finally wore me down—plus the fact that I came to realize that of all such libraries I had by purest chance attached myself to the very best.

This respondent wrote in detail of the effect of these two men, his supervisor and the chief of the library, on his developing interest in books. He went on as follows:

To become a bookman requires a long and leisurely exposure to books and their users—books as objects and human documents, not call-numbers; and users as scholars and participators, not statistics. If I have any rightful claim to the name you have called me, it is due entirely to (1) the unparalleled quality of the collection with which I was thrown in daily contact for so many years; (2) the quality of the men with whom and under whom I worked, and (3) the quality of the readers whom my efforts served.

I could quote many more extracts from these most interesting and informative letters of other bookmen, but essentially the formula is the same. The bookman became a bookman because he was early thrown into the company of books and lovers of books. The background of bookmen appears to be similar, even though it manifests itself in different ways—as librarian, book collector, bookdealer, teacher. Also noteworthy is the catholic interests of the bookmen in all fields of scholarly endeavor. There is no concern about the separating of books into categories or disciplines, although this does not mean subjects are unimportant. In fact, the attitude appreciates both the runover of one subject into another and the special nature of each subject. Pierce Butler's spectrum of scholarship is quite evident in the blending of science, social science, and the humanities in the backgrounds of many of the bookmen.

*Relation to Library School.* Since several of the bookmen were not library school graduates, it is understandable that they might be reluctant to speculate on the possibility that



a bookman's background could be developed in a one-year professional program. A few declared outright that it was an impossibility.

One of our best known rare book men responded as follows:

I don't think I have much of use to say on the matter. When I was taught to read I started to learn about books. I, personally, have very little use for library schools and believe the best way to teach a person about libraries is to put him in a good library and make him work.

One of the best acquisitions men makes the following comment:

Bookmanship cannot be taught. You either have it or you don't. If you don't, you can still do good work in library school and you can administer. The worst library school attitude strikes me as an enormous confusion that can go like this: books=cards=merchandise=quantity. Teaching ends with the title-page.

But equally prominent members of the profession were not as pessimistic in regard to the library school's potentiality, if you have the right student and the right faculty member. One of our leading bookmen wrote:

I should like to express my conviction that the courses which you have in mind should be given only to students who have strongly expressed a personal interest in bibliographical procedure, deriving from former experience and broad educational background. I think the content of the courses should deal with the history of bibliography, printing, and textual criticism, and that they should comprise a rather rigid training in descriptive analysis of printed and manuscript volumes. There is no doubt in the world that the skill itself can be taught to one who wants to learn it. The question of whether this teaching creates a bookman is one that cannot be separated from the individuality of the student concerned.

Another makes the comment:

Yes, the background can be developed, but I am heretical enough to feel that it can be developed only if it is sought by the student as meeting a need that he feels is imperative. Force it as a "required course," and I doubt whether it's possible to be of lasting value. In the last analysis it seems to me essentially a matter of self education.

Guidance and suggestion may be offered, but they are useless if accepted as necessities for getting a number of credits.

*Development of Courses.* How should library schools develop courses to train bookmen, and what should be the content of such courses are questions which are difficult to answer, even by bookmen. But there are some specific suggestions which should be noted.

The director of a large research library writes as follows:

Several kinds of courses can be thought of. The antiquarian bookdealers in New York could be asked to get up a course among themselves. They would jump at the chance. At their best you get from bookdealers something like Goldschmidt's three excellent lectures on Renaissance books. Or someone not a bookdealer with a good scholarly knowledge of the history of the printed book could do it. I would like very much to see such a course run as a seminar, every student being given an assignment each week of finding out everything he can about a specific book. That would mean that he would have to get acquainted with bibliographies, with auction records, with the reasons for the importance of the book, and what has been written about it. What fun it would be to give a course like that. I'd like to do it myself.

Another comments:

It would seem to me desirable for library schools to emphasize courses in literature and history, even if some technical courses have to suffer. Members of library staffs have told me that they wasted a good deal of time in poorly taught courses in child psychology, book selection, and even some redundant courses in cataloging. This time, they felt, could have been better spent in courses which gave them knowledge of a particular discipline, like history or English literature.

A director of special collections in a university, not a library school graduate, who has taught in a library school, suggests the following program:

1. First and foremost, you should devise a system of tests that should identify those students who have a natural inclination toward being "bookmen." You must be very careful, though, that these tests distinguish between those who have a sincere, honest-to-God regard for the past and its contribu-

tions to human progress, and those whose "love of books" stems from a fear of reality or from a hormone deficiency.

2. Tie the curriculum in with other academic divisions of the university to provide such students with sound groundings in comparative religion, philosophy, science (applied and exact), and history—especially the history of ideas. Being a good bookman is not just memorizing, say, the points of issue of *Two Years Before the Mast*; it is in knowing the general areas in which important books are likely to occur, and how to recognize them as such.

3. Provide a course in analytical bibliography under a professor who is an able contributor to the field.

4. Provide a course in rare-bookology—the methods and care of preservation, exhibition techniques, the areas of collecting, correlation of the philosophy of current usefulness with that of the obligation to the future, requirements of staffing and housing, specialized classifications for rarities, etc.

5. Encourage actual research—literary, bibliographical, or historical (but not in library techniques)—with a view toward publication. Nothing will provide a budding bookman with a greater lift than learning that he is at one with both curatorship and scholarship.

6. Provide opportunities for in-service training in a rare-book library.

7. Provide a climate for rare-book shop talk—informal gatherings with dealers, collectors, and scholars, visits to rare-book libraries, attendance at bibliophile meetings, etc.

This program undoubtedly would help to develop the type of person who could take care of acquisitions, special collections, handling of rarities and exhibitions, and, in general, do the job of a certain type of bookman. Other programs suggested by bookmen include reference to specific historical courses in paper-making, sound recording, etc.

In this connection, one librarian writes:

I have been continually impressed in my professional library work with the general paucity of information possessed by librarians with respect to the development of the materials with which they work daily, the peculiarities of their physical form, the ways in which these characteristics affect standard library routines, and the influence of printing and other forms of recording ideas upon the progress of the world.

I believe every administrator ought to be a bookman. As you can see, I am interpreting the word "bookman" to mean a person who is sufficiently well schooled in the development, uses, and influences of the various means by which information has been recorded and preserved to be able not only to interpret but to effectively translate into positive courses of action the needs of his community for library materials.

*Comments on Faculty.* The last point which may be discussed on this question of training bookmen concerns the faculty members of the schools. Since there is divided opinion regarding the practicality of the library school attempting to train bookmen in certain senses of the term, it would not help the situation too much to consider this matter in great detail, despite its prime importance. We have already referred to suggestions that faculty members may be recruited from the book trade, at least for seminars on books. We have other suggestions that faculty members should alternate teaching with working in libraries and with books. There is uniform opinion that the faculty members must be "instinctive bookmen themselves, able to excite enthusiastic followers by their own devotion and enthusiasm, able to teach as well as be examples of bookmen."

Is it just those who teach book courses who are involved? Not at all. Whether the course deals with reference, cataloging, or communications, the teachers involved have opportunities of carrying further the knowledge of books that students bring with them. Some of you may recall Ralph Beals' paper on Education for Librarianship given before the Eastern College Librarians' Conference in 1946 and published in *Library Quarterly*, October, 1947. This statement seems to me penetrating in its analysis of librarianship as a profession. The characteristics of librarianship—its breadth and scope, its reliance upon collections, its institutional setting—affect the educational program for training librarians. Beals also had a prescription for the training of librarians which involves the ingredient of getting at students earlier—at the end of the second year of high school—so that their general education could be controlled to some extent. This does not necessarily mean starting library school courses earlier; it does mean charting the course of education earlier.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

This report would be amiss if there were no suggestions for possible future action in regard to the question of bookmen in the library. First of all, it should be stressed that the chief officer of a library who is only a bookman is only half an officer. This point has been discussed before, and does not need repeating here. Assuming that the chief librarian is both a bookman and an administrator, he should be interested in the perfect blending of these two essentials in his supervisory officers and other professional staff, even though some of the latter may not have any real administrative responsibility.

The most striking and most comforting conclusion is that the library school personnel and the librarians have both been thinking of this problem of training in book knowledge. Deficiencies there are, and as libraries have grown in size and complexity, the day of the encyclopedic librarian is disappearing. Even bookmen recognize this limitation—many book dealers and collectors have become specialists. Library schools can do an efficient job if they will develop the sensitivity of students to books and other graphic materials which are essential for the scholarly work of researchers in the university library. The school librarian, the children's librarian, the public librarian will have to be just as aware of their materials and their uses.

The beginner must be given a chance to grow. There are several roads to becoming bookmen, according to the bookmen themselves. But "reading" is essential to all of them. While librarians have not always been generous with their staffs as to permitting reading on library time, this should not dis-

suade those who are really interested.

As I was completing my remarks on this topic, I chanced to examine a new volume which came across my desk, *Books and the Mass Market*, the Fourth Annual Windsor Lectures at the University of Illinois Library School. I was particularly intrigued with the paper by Harold K. Guinzburg, president of Viking Press and a friend of librarians. Mr. Guinzburg's paper is concerned with "Free Press, Free Enterprise, and Diversity," a topic which he covers admirably. But it is one of his closing paragraphs which is relevant to our discussion today. He writes as follows:

This [lack of interest in reading and buying books] seems to indicate that our educational system is at least in part culpable. The remedy may lie in improved methods of inculcating in students a love of books as a necessary adjunct to a satisfying life. Many teachers, well aware of the situation, are asking, "Are those whom we graduate going on with their education through reading? Are we producing cultivated adults who will find good books a *sine qua non* of the good life?" The system of required reading in schools and colleges might be changed so that young people are not forced to struggle through difficult 'classics' which bore and discourage them, but rather are given exciting contemporary writers which stimulate their interest in the book as a source of pleasure and lead them on toward more difficult reading—equally stimulating after proper preparation. Seeking satisfaction in good books must somehow be made automatic for an educated American. Only thus can the schools refute the statement recently made by George Gallup after a study, that "our educational system is admirably designed to keep our nation immature."

By LAWRENCE CLARK POWELL

### The Excitement of Administration

*Dr. Powell is librarian of the University of California, Los Angeles, and visiting professor of library service, Columbia University, 1954.*

UP UNTIL NOW I have kept my mouth shut about administration, believing it is something one does rather than talks about

doing. About books, however, I have done more than my share of talking, so that I have come to be branded as a bookman. I resent this, for I am proud of the administrative scars I bear, each one earned, I can assure you; honorable, yes, not honorary.

There has been a good reason for all the talking I have done about books. No matter