

tural Marketing Administration, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Foreign Markets Division, the Marketing and Marketing Agreements Division, the Marketing Services Office, and the Surplus Marketing Administration. Which of these shall have *Marketing* as the entry word, and in which shall the preceding adjective be considered of primary significance? All these agencies deal with agricultural matters, but only the first two have any indication of that in their titles. Under direct entry, the subordinate functions of the Department of Agriculture will be scattered throughout the alphabet. I hold no brief for the Superintendent of Documents classification, and my objections are on record, but it seems to me that to abandon arrangement by major agency is likely to result in confusion worse confounded. The fact that under this system the entry word must in numerous cases be a matter of the classifier's choice is an added hazard, recognized indirectly in Miss Markley's comments on one of the notation systems she describes.

In treating of the recording procedures to be followed, Miss Markley describes an "all-weather" file, devised by Dr. Raynard Swank, designed to include not only the customary bibliographical information, but to serve also as a serials control and binding record. Having observed such a file in use, I am led to the conclusion that it is better to specialize a bit, in records as in provisions for the weather. My observation has been that the time necessary to set up a separate checking file for currently and frequently received serials and a separate binding record is abundantly repaid in increased efficiency and time saved in locating cards for the daily routines of entering new acquisitions, and in the specialized procedures of binding.

Space does not permit an adequate description of the very fine bibliographies that conclude this study, and add much to its value in any consideration of the difficult problems of organizing and servicing a collection of government publications.

Miss Markley states that her study is a synthesis of the opinions and practices recommended by numerous documents librarians. She has done the profession a great service in organizing and presenting this material, with a clearly stated and practical attack upon the problems presented. Many problems remain

to be solved, and it is to be hoped that we may soon see more of such signs of progress as this one.—*Ellen Jackson, University of Colorado Libraries.*

Library History

Charles Coffin Jewett. By Joseph A. Borome. Chicago, American Library Association, 1951, 188p. \$3.50.

The Librarians' Conference of 1853: A Chapter in American Library History. By George Burwell Utley. Edited by Gilbert H. Doane. Chicago, American Library Association, 1951. 189p. \$3.00.

A profession which merits the dignity of being called a "profession" must have an abiding interest in its own past. No one need demonstrate that what has been is the condition of the present as vitally as the present, in turn, provides the matrix of future development. A doctor, a lawyer, a scientist in any field, or a librarian who believes that he is shaping knowledge or practice single-handedly out of amorphous present stuff has delusions of divine power. Few librarians so delude themselves; yet fewer make a conscious practice of acknowledging their debts to professional precursors.

The American Library Association has happily taken upon itself the task of reminding its membership at appropriate intervals that history merits attention. The seventy-fifth birthday of the Association, celebrated last year, is such a reminder. The publishing of a *Library Pioneer* series as well as of other volumes bearing on the history of libraries and librarianship serves the same purpose well. The American Library Association deserves special commendation for encouraging the study and writing of history in a period like ours when *doing* threatens to drive *learning* underground; when "where does it get you" is so much more important than "how did you get that way."

Still another welcome sign is the growing emphasis on writing library history from broad source materials rather than from a compound of reminiscence as has been too often the woeful approach in this field. Library "science" is presently struggling, in this and in many other respects, to strengthen its scientific foundations. One reason for this

late awakening is that education for the profession has been, and still is, largely vocational; moreover, the satisfactions and rewards offered for such research and writing have been slight. Hence the neglect of a deeper inquiry into social and historical foundations. However, were all professional factors favorable, there would still remain tall barriers standing in the way of thorough research in library history and biography by reason of the fact that source materials are generally elusive and unavailable. Too few of our forebears, it seems, engaged in extensive correspondence of the informative sort; very few indeed took pains to preserve such materials for posterity. In short, librarians have exhibited an abnormal collecting propensity for everything but that which pertains to themselves.

Circumscribed by limiting factors like these, history-minded librarians up to recent times were inclined to venerate library heroes and their accomplishments rather than to describe the professional past accurately. Both the Utley and Borome books strive mightily to write really adequate history. Utley's strength is in his use of contemporary press accounts along with the papers of Seth Hastings Grant, secretary of the 1853 conference. Dr. Borome, who is an historian by profession, is somewhat more successful in getting inside his subject *via* the study of personal and official sources, drawing also on the full range of materials generally depended upon by students of history. It is obvious that he has wrung his sources dry—perhaps, on occasion, too dry.

But the reader will find little cause for complaint in that. For Borome's Jewett emerges, for all his wondrous bibliothecal accomplishments, a *man* rather than a saint or a superman of the Wagnerian variety. Charles Coffin Jewett (1816-1868) came to librarianship through the usual indirect pathway of his time. A full, leisurely education, some school teaching, plus graduate study for the ministry at Andover Theological Seminary were excellent equipment for bibliographical pursuits. Moreover, he had on more than one occasion had "library" contact with books. As an undergraduate he had collaborated in the classification and cataloging of his college literary society's collection. At Andover, he was for over a year the librarian (the practice

being to have a professor in charge of the library and a student to perform actual library functions).

When Brown University hired the twenty-five year old Jewett as its first full time librarian at \$600 per annum, it got a capable, learned man whose limited experience in libraries rather enhanced than hindered his fresh, experimental approach to the profession. Within a few years, Brown reverted to its former policy of having a combination professor-librarian. Jewett was given the newly established chair in modern foreign languages. Opportunities for professional growth in this job were tremendous. Working under Francis Wayland, a college president whose library consciousness was of highest order, Jewett traveled widely on book collecting expeditions, visiting libraries and librarians, learning of a great variety of library practice while he built up Brown University's bibliographical resources.

This meteoric career in teaching and librarianship, this fame as a bookman, a reputation for inventiveness in the manufacture of library catalogs—these accomplishments plus the friendship of several highly influential Washington statesmen won Jewett an invitation to head the library of the newly established Smithsonian Institution. Life in Washington was not nearly as charmed as it had been in Providence. Jewett had accepted the title of Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian believing that, as its librarian, he would be an autonomous officer with a free hand to develop a national library. He discovered to his dismay that not only was his position subordinate to that of the Secretary, Joseph Henry, but that political forces were shattering the dream of a national bibliographical center. Jewett was not one to yield easily. He marshalled his forces and gathered his weapons—which were not always the cleanest—and joined battle.

Coincidentally with the fiercest stages of the Smithsonian war, plans were being made by scholars, educators, librarians and other interested parties for a conference to discuss matters of common import to all bibliophiles. Jewett, then acknowledged leader of bibliographical America, was, of course, consulted as to plans and program. His interest was keen. He had much to contribute. He was eager to "sell" his ideas on 1) a union catalog,

and 2) his stereotype process (from an entry established according to accepted rules) for keeping library catalogs up to date. Moreover, such a conference promised much by way of mending his shattered ego. There was also the possibility that the conference might add public support to the national library idea.

The Conference of Librarians was held in New York City on September 15, 16, and 17, 1853. Jewett was one of eighty-two men who came from thirteen states to represent forty-seven libraries and a wide variety of professions. The calibre of this meeting may be estimated from the fact that, as Utley points out, thirty of the eighty-two appear in the Dictionary of American Biography. A further note of interest is that only eight of the thirty are listed as librarians in the occupational index of the D. A. B. It is a tribute to this group of the nation's literary elite that the promotion of popular libraries in villages, towns, and cities was given serious consideration a hundred years ago. The word "popular," as defined for the Conference by the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, has retained to this day the sense and standard of *real* use to the whole people.

The Conference set the long term flavor of librarianship in several fortunate ways; but it also advertised a stereotype which has rested unfortunately on the bowed back of the profession. Jewett and his confreres certainly made too much of their characterization of librarians as a quiet, unobtrusive, undemanding lot. This emphasis on negative qualities has encouraged budgeteers to disregard the just claims of librarians; it has permitted the rest of the professional world to admit librarians to a family position of mere half brothers and half sisters; it has habituated librarians themselves to low status aspirations and niggardly self esteem.

In Jewett's case, these protestations of un-aggressiveness were partly camouflage for a very aggressive fight he was currently waging against Professor Henry for a high place in the Smithsonian sun. Although neither Borome nor Utley presents evidence of an all over prepared strategy (Borome does indicate that the avowedly impromptu Jewett came to the conference with a couple of well prepared addresses) the conference was by some strange force raised to a tall pitch of enthusiasm for

the idea of making the Smithsonian America's national library. It also endorsed Jewett's several bibliographical proposals. If convention resolutions could steer the course of history, things would have gone well for Jewett. The Conference added a final stroke to the design when it resolved to reconvene as a permanent body in 1854, this time in Washington, D.C. itself. Conceivably it was thought that the army of bibliographers would strengthen the cause by marching into the very battle field.

As it happened, the second conference was never held. Jewett's troubles were at their peak in the summer of 1854 and the nation's capital was obviously too "hot" a site for a library convention in which Jewett would play the leading role. Luckily, the Boston Public Library was currently in need of a superintendent to guide its expanding enterprise. New England stepped forward to rescue its son from ignominy and temporary unemployment. Professor Jewett was chosen for the superintendency and he retired quietly, though not altogether gracefully, to Boston in 1855. A permanent library association did not come into being until 1876. The reasons ascribed by Utley and Borome are similar. Jewett's defeat and dismissal from the Smithsonian deprived the librarians of leadership for a while; the pre-war depression was discouraging to cultural activities; the Civil War left no disposition for unessential preoccupations; and then the confusion of the reconstruction period further delayed the formation of a national association of librarians.

In a real sense, these two books add up to a significant slice of progress in librarianship in a period a century removed from us. In the realm we are now pleased to call "bibliographical controls," the Conference of 1853 discussed the promotion of Poole's infant periodical index and even heard the proposal to index the serial publications of learned societies. One enterprising bibliographer felt that a 125-year file of leading American newspapers could be indexed by some five workers in two years. Jewett alone, it would appear from Borome's story, either initiated, assimilated, or built from vague beginnings the ideas of a dictionary catalog, of branch libraries, of union catalogs, and cooperative cataloging. He was moreover the architect of a useable charging system, of a code of rules for cata-

logging, of principles of accurate bibliographical transcription, and more. Certainly it will enrich today's librarians to learn of some of the steps through which professional notions and practices evolved.

Again, on the profit side, the reader will find in these two works much quotation of source materials which give depth to history and suggest possible lines for new research. The Utley work, because it was edited and enlarged posthumously, is open to charges of "padding." For instance, Jewett's presidential address to the conference (p. 40-45) and the Reverend Samuel Osgood's speech on popular libraries (p. 50-53) both appear twice in the volume—once as quoted by Utley in his own text, and once as they appear in the proceedings of the convention which the publisher (ALA) decided to reprint in full as an appendix (p. 131-76).—*Sidney Ditzion, College of the City of New York Library.*

Montana Survey

Report of a Survey of the Library of Montana State University for Montana State University, January-May, 1951. By Maurice F. Tauber and Eugene H. Wilson. Chicago, American Library Association, 1951. 174 p. \$2.00.

This survey, following more or less standardized and well proven methods, is an excellent addition to a growing body of survey literature that has, in the past two decades, played an important part in strengthening and improving the college and university libraries of America. The libraries, large and small, endowed and state supported, which have, in this way, sat for their portrait and undergone expert analysis and diagnosis have themselves been improved and bettered, in varying degree, but it is safe to say that the considerable number of surveys of recent years have had influence and value far beyond the libraries surveyed. Through these studies libraries in similar categories have been able to see elements and factors of their own situation, and to profit, both from the comparative statistics included and the various recommendations made.

The Survey here under review is particularly welcome since it is the first to deal with the library of a smaller state university. It reflects, as is to be expected, both the peculiar problems and the dilemma of the

libraries of these institutions. The dilemma, at least in the opinion of this reviewer, arises from the fact that the average smaller state university spreads a relatively limited budget over a wide range of undergraduate and graduate offerings and also over professional schools as numerous or almost as numerous as in the larger and better budgeted institutions. Thus Montana State University, with a total budget of \$1,638,550 in 1950, maintains a College of Arts and Sciences, and Schools of Pharmacy, Business, Education, Forestry, Journalism, Law, and Music and offers graduate work, at the Master's level, in at least twenty-four different departments. Obviously the library implications of this extensive program approach those of larger universities.

The data gathered by the surveyors emphasize the financial problems of the smaller university libraries. Over a period of twenty-eight years the money that Montana State University has devoted to support of its Library has ranged from a high of 6.6 per cent of its total funds to a low of 4.0 per cent, with a median of 5.3 per cent. These percentages are considerably above the percentage library expenditures in colleges and universities generally, as published in earlier surveys and elsewhere. The larger university libraries have been able to develop strong library programs with lower budget percentages than this. Yet the surveyors find, and rightly, that the Montana percentages have not, over the years, been sufficient to support the Library adequately. What this actually means, this reviewer believes, is that the standards and norms of library support, such as budget percentages, and expenditures per student and faculty member need to be higher for the smaller universities than they do for the larger ones. Corollary to this the smaller institutions could be stronger and better and their library needs would be less burdensome if they would restrict themselves to fewer professional schools. This the western states, for the most part sparsely settled, have now recognized through the Western Governor's Regional Compact, cited by the Surveyors, for the cooperative maintenance of education for several of the professions.

This reviewer has been particularly impressed by the careful and detailed analysis of the resources of the Library made by the surveyors and their recommendations for im-