

Reflections on Academic Libraries in the United States in the Sixties

60年代における米国の学術図書館

Guy R. Lyle

ガイ・R・ライル

要 旨

60年代の学術図書館は、援助の増大と高度成長によって特徴づけられよう。

1963年の高等教育施設法は大学図書館建設ブームを招いた。67年から69年までの3年間に新築・増築・改築された大学図書館の数は210館に及び、その費用は4億3千6百万ドルに達した。HarvardのLamont図書館が先鞭をつけた学部学生用図書館の分離が、このブームのお陰で数多くの大学で実現を見、高校図書館と研究図書館の懸け橋の役割を演じ、学部における教授法にも変化をもたらした。この建築ブームも、60年代の終りには政府の援助が削減されるにつれ、急激にしぶんでしまった。

1965年の高等教育法による補助金は、学術図書館の図書購入費と蔵書数の急激な増加を招いた。蔵書数は16年間で倍加するといわれていたが、学術図書館全体の蔵書は、1億7千6百万冊から3億2千4百万冊へと、60年代の10年間でほぼ倍増した。補助金の総額は3年間で7千万ドルに及んでいる。

60年代の学術図書館に大きな変革をもたらしたものにコンピュータがある。それは原爆にも等しい威力をもって学術図書館界を席卷した。あるものは、図書館は一夜にしてコンソールとプリンターにとって代られるであろうと信じ、あるものは、自分の失職や無用の長物化を恐れた。過大な期待と恐怖の渦の中で、コンピュータは幾つかの顕著な貢献を示した。MARC配布サービスや、目録情報、逐次刊行物所在情報の全国的データ・バンクなどがそれであり、また個々の図書館においては、貸出、収書、逐次刊行物管理などの業務にコンピュータが利用され、その処理能率を著るしく高めた。

60年代の後期に、大学は学生騒動の嵐に見舞われ、多くの図書館が直接の被害をこうむった。学生問題対策の一つとして、多くの大学が十分な用意もないままに開館時間を延長し、サービスの質を低下させた。民主化は図書館評議会にあらゆる利用者層の代表を参加させ、ために評議会は巨大化し、その機能を喪失するに至った。

ある人は60年代を“振子の時代”と表現した。図書館に対する財政援助は次第に高まりを見せ、そしてまた衰弱した。とはいえ、60年代に図書館が消費した金額は前年代に比し251.65%の増加を示している。図書館はビッグ・ビジネスと化し、ライブラリー・スクールを卒業しただけでは、もはやその運営の任に堪えられなくなった。60年代はライブラリアンシップの一時代の終焉と、別の時代の始まりを告げたといえよう。

Guy R. Lyle, Director of Libraries, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, U. S. A.; 1957 Visiting Professor, Japan Library School, Keio University.

ガイ・R・ライル：エモリー大学図書館長；1957年慶應義塾大学図書館学科訪問教授

もともと学術図書館は伝統的・保守的な企業であり、30年代から50年代にかけては、さしたる変化は見られなかった。その平穏は60年代の初期まで続いた。しかしながら、60年代の後半は、ある人によれば、建設が始まって混乱に終わった。誰しも何が起るかを予想しえず、また予想した事は予定どおりには起らなかった。不遜な反応が許されるならば、それは“忌わしい時代”であった。(I. A.)

What really happened to academic libraries and librarianship in the United States in the sixties? A year ago there appeared a small book entitled *THE LIBRARIAN SPEAKING* (University of Georgia Press, 1970) in which the writer stated that “the 1960's would appear to be in the middle ground between the basic values which have made librarianship what it is today and the planning for the technological changes of tomorrow.” This appraisal suggests perhaps the idea of gradual change as well as a general pattern of change. Yet it must be confessed in looking back on the ten years preceding 1970, turning over the deposit they left behind in journals, institutes, meetings, and all the learning, yearning, and churning of a decade, the events that took place reveal variation rather than design, a gallop rather than a trot, and at times an almost unbearable uncertainty rather than assurance.

All the accepted indices of library progress continued to rise. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 ushered in the greatest boom in college and university library housing since WPA days. “The past two years,” wrote Dr. Jerrold Orne with reference to 1967 and 1968, “probably represent the highest peak of academic library construction in history.”¹⁾ His annual summaries of library construction in the *Library Journal* beginning in 1967 show that 210 new buildings, additions, and renovations of existing buildings were completed in the three-year period 1967 through 1969 at a cost of 436 million dollars. Federal funds were made available on a matching basis for both private and publicly supported colleges and universities. And, as Dr. Orne points out, the general affluence of the country in combination with the federal library grants “led also to private benefactions, both individual and collective, of extraordinary proportions.” By the

end of the decade, however, federal funding was cut back and library construction dropped off sharply.

Concurrently with the expansion of the physical plant, librarians in the sixties were devising new activities to give increased depth to undergraduate education and to alleviate the difficulties of underclassmen using the complex facilities of large research libraries. A great deal of enthusiasm was derived from the success of the Lamont Library of Harvard, constructed in the late forties. Michigan followed in 1958, establishing a pattern for public as well as private institutions. Lamont and Michigan primed the pump for the separate undergraduate libraries of the sixties: some housed in their own buildings such as Texas (1963), Stanford (1963), North Carolina (1968), Pennsylvania State (1969), Illinois (1969), Tennessee (1969), and Nebraska (1969); others in converted and remodeled main library buildings such as Cornell (1962), University of California at Los Angeles (1966), and Emory (1969); while still others shared separate quarters in a new main or graduate library facility such as the University of Pennsylvania (1962), Boston University (1965), and the University of Pittsburgh (1968). Beyond providing a bridge between the high school and research library, additional study space, and the potential for expanding general education programs, the separate undergraduate library afforded opportunity for changes which librarians had often talked about but seldom had been able to effect. Education experimented increasingly in the sixties with new teaching devices, thanks to communication—film, radio, television—and other modern teaching aids. The separate undergraduate library provided the flexibility and working arrangement to make possible a break with the traditional lecture-textbook

method, and educators were not slow to take advantage of the opportunity. A little federal money went a long way.

A third measure of progress is the number of volumes held by libraries and the amount of money spent for books, periodicals, and binding. It has been estimated at various times that academic libraries double in size every sixteen years. In the turbulent sixties, they doubled in ten. At the beginning of the decade there were 176 million volumes in academic libraries; at the end there were 324 million. The rate of growth was staggering. In 1960 the libraries were adding some eight million volumes a year; at the end of the decade, they were increasing at the rate of 24 million volumes.²⁾ This increase reflects not only larger appropriations by their respective governing authorities but to an even greater degree the impact of federal grants received through the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under the terms of this Act basic grants were awarded for books and journals for the first time in 1966 to 1,830 libraries in the amount of 8.2 million dollars. The following year supplemental grants increased the basic allocations another 11 million dollars, and these were extended by special purpose grants in smaller amounts for cooperative library undertakings. In the last three years of the sixties these grants added approximately 70 million dollars to the buying power of college and university libraries.³⁾ In the Southeast, not infrequently regarded as benighted and semi-illiterate by its eastern and western relatives, the average expenditure for books and journals of the twenty-six member university libraries of the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries increased 291 percent between 1959 and 1969. At the beginning of the decade two of these libraries possessed a million volumes each; at the end of the decade ten of the libraries had passed the million volume goal.

No new development in modern academic librarianship was quite so revolutionary as the sixties' great gift to libraries: the computer. Technology before the 1960's, to be sure, was far from negligible, witness the advent of

microfilm and copying services, but the pace was slow and allowed time for rumination, evaluation, and experimentation without too much investment in either staff time or money. The computer, on the other hand, came along like the atom bomb; it grew bigger and mushroomed so rapidly and expensively that it almost wiped out one university library. According to its most extravagant proponents at the time, it promised to relieve the librarian of all clerical and routine tasks, and even held out the hope of relieving him of the more burdensome task of thinking.

Speaking of the use of the computer in libraries, Connie Dunlap of the University of Michigan made the apt comparison that the subject of automation in libraries in the late fifties and early sixties was somewhat analogous to the subject of weather—everyone was talking about it, but no one was doing much about it. Here were some of the super-claims of the proponents of the computer:

The future reference library may not have a single book in it. *Science News Letter*

There will be a network of bookless libraries—study booths, electric typewriters and TV screens in which a small college will have a better library than Harvard. *Time*

Computers In, Books Out. *Atlanta Constitution*

And it was not just the popular journals and Sunday supplements which provided such generous journalistic appraisal. In 1965 the Massachusetts Institute of Technology published a study⁴⁾ sponsored by the Council on Library Resources under the leadership of a prominent information science expert, Dr. J.C.R. Licklider. A typically unreadable specimen of research, it outlined the requirements for what was described as a "procognitive" system to harness all technical and scientific information in a single computer memory. Many college and university professors and presidents seemed to think that the library would "dwindle away to a console and printer overnight." What they overlooked when urging their harassed librarians "to get with it"—the vogue phrase of the day—was that

the "future" in Licklider's published work was intended to mean the year 2,000. By the end of the sixties, the view most widely held by academic librarians was expressed by Connie Dunlap, who noted that "while the 1960's are proving to be the beginning of a kind of revolution in the re-evaluation of library methodology and in the thinking of the library profession, it remains for subsequent decades to witness what will surely be a radical departure from the traditional forms of library operation and management."⁶

Nevertheless technology made notable contributions during the decade. A major contribution was the Library of Congress' MARC Distribution Service which provided subscribing libraries with a machine-readable version of the Library's current output of printed cards for English language titles. Another important accomplishment, representing the combined efforts of the Library of Congress and the National Libraries of Medicine and Agriculture, was a cooperative program for developing a national data bank of machine readable cataloging information and a similar bank of information for the location of serial titles in American research libraries. At the institutional level, college and university libraries succeeded in demonstrating that a variety of library operations from circulation to the routines in acquisitions and serial record keeping could be handled most satisfactorily by the use of the computer. In reference work the computer speeded up both the production and timeliness of reference works but added considerably to their cost. Ruth Walling observed that "computer-produced concordances are opening up new possibilities in textual criticism for scholars...Other indexes have been speeded up. The subject index for *Biological Abstracts* used to appear about three years late, and now appears monthly...Enough abstracting and indexing services are now working toward putting their indexing on tapes for computer searching to indicate the condition of the future."⁷

Among the lesser but significant accomplishments of the decade should be mentioned the

rise in the average income of librarians; the revision of the federal depository act to extend the number of library depositories and to provide additional fringe benefits; the enlargement of the Library of Congress' cataloging and card printing services, including cooperative steps with other national library services to establish a more efficient bibliographic control of the world's printed resources; increasing recognition of professional librarians as a distinct group of academic staff members; and the appearance of various forms of mechanistic gadgets such as the xerox machine and the "band-aid" lettering and marking machine. The American Library Association grew bigger but scarcely more effective. The Association's officials and the chief officers of its boards held conferences at frequent intervals in widely scattered parts of the globe, expenses paid. More overtired librarians were flying around in overloaded planes on consulting missions than ever before. As for the campaign against prudery and puritanism, it was so completely banished by the shining warriors of intellectual freedom that the talk at an American Library Association convention can only be described as fashionably foul. A few far-sighted librarians suggested to the Council on Library Resources that it might be wise to ask where librarians were going and what they were supposed to do there rather than merely how fast they were going. Verner Clapp, the high octane president of the Council in its formative years, was typical. In 1963 he delivered the Windsor Lectures at the University of Illinois, in which he spoke clearly and logically about the purposes and problems of university libraries. He saw research library growth dominated by two principles—"the principle of self-sufficiency and the principle of sharing the resources." In his look into the future,⁷ he saw high-reduction microphotography as a key to the solution of the first problem and improvements in the arrangements for identifying and locating texts, as well as rapidly in getting the material to the user, as the answer to the second. An American Council on Learned Societies' *ad hoc* committee on re-

search libraries completed a study of the problems and needs of research libraries in 1969⁸⁾ which suggested a number of potential solutions including increased support from the federal government which has not been forthcoming under the present administration.

Most thoughtful librarians, close to the day to day operations of the library, recognized that the major problem of the university library lay in its isolation from the administration and faculty. A major frustration continued to be a lack of information concerning matters that vitally affect the library's work. There was poor communication with the top administrators. "Consultation between librarians and other administrators occurs all too often only when there is a crisis or an urgency or an isolated need for information or action."⁹⁾ Likewise, professors encouraged an expansion of graduate programs without demanding an upgrading of library resources and staff with the result that the quality of library service suffered by the effort to do too much.

For many librarians it was difficult to know when the sixties began and when they ended. If it may be said that they began with the library building explosion triggered by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, it may also be reported that they ended in the catatonia of student revolt in 1968. Different people will fix the era's change from construction to confusion by their own special campus trauma, but it was in the last half of the sixties that most librarians saw the beautiful days of the early decade fade into premature harshness.

The strains were mainly of two kinds. The first, as part of the obsession with the whole apparatus of technology, was simply that the newest and most powerful of all new gadgetry—the computer was beginning to exercise a special glamor of its own in resolving the library's problem—a kind of fantastic hallucination that gave cosmic authority to automation as against the human concerns of librarianship. The "Sun God" of the machine "dazzled, blinded, and confused." No less than 200

articles and a never ending listing of institutes and conferences on automation and the computer filled the index of library writings for 1967 alone. The librarian who did not think, eat, and sleep with automation was considered a reactionary, a traditionalist, a man on the way out. The older librarian, especially, felt frustrated, misunderstood, and unappreciated. He was not so much concerned about the headlines "Computer takes over the librarian's job," although the fear of losing his job undoubtedly existed, but rather that he might be losing his usefulness. He wondered if he were committed to a profession which had lost its place, or perhaps the reason for its place. The thought that the library was becoming increasingly the prisoner of an all-pervading technological demon, running out of control, may in retrospect seem silly and unwarranted, but at the time it overshadowed almost every aspect of the librarian's work, his writings, his meetings, and even his leisure time.

Still another tension arose when the student revolt in the late sixties emerged. A precondition for running a library is that the library building should be occupied by students who come to learn and not to shove other students out of their reading room chairs, light fires, break windows, spray paint, pour glue in card catalogs, or set off cherry bombs. There is, therefore, a responsibility upon the students to accept the purpose of the college or university as a place of learning where there are those who are qualified to transmit knowledge and advise in matters of learning and those who come to learn. The process of learning is not a passive affair; it may involve active dissent in class discussion, the learner challenging views or statements of the instructor or the authority which he has read in the library. By late 1968, it became clear that the traditional pattern of dissent had been replaced by anarchistic demonstrations. The fall semester witnessed an increasingly violent "protest" movement directed mainly against the university administration although largely inspired by forces outside the university such as racialism, war, and the draft. A succession

of attacks were made on libraries:

(University of Illinois). During a week in February, shortly after the beginning of the second semester, cards in the catalogs of the University Library were removed and destroyed. In a random manner cards were taken from the catalogs of three departmental libraries and the main card catalog. Although some of the cards were completely destroyed, a greater number were torn in pieces or partially burned; the remnants of these cards were recovered from various places on the campus. February 1969. *Newsletter for Intellectual Freedom*.

(San Francisco State College). There was a book-in. It came midway in the strike and was aimed at making the library shut down. The students didn't bother with checking out books, but merely wandered around our open stacks pulling off the books and placing them on the floors, or on the tables, or on other shelves or even on different floors of the building...We had stink bombs. For those of you who have not yet been treated with such things, these so-called "bombs" are really small laboratory bottles filled with a clear liquid which has an extremely vile odor and can be nauseous. The technique was to bring the bottles in brown paper bags, take to a stack area, open the bottles, dribble some of the liquid on the floors and then walk off leaving the open bottle, lid, etc., on the book shelves or on the floor...the smell was so vile that for all practical purposes library work in the chosen area came to a halt. *Library Journal*.

(New York University, Engineering Library). Destroyed were A.E.C. microfilms, and some 30,000 cards from the public catalog were strewn around and damaged. April 25, 1969. *Wilson Library Bulletin*.

(Indiana University). A fire of incendiary origin caused serious damage to the main library building, and book collections at Indiana University, Bloomington, on May 1, 1969. This was the second fire in less than eleven weeks to devastate the collections and buildings. The first fire occurred on February 17, 1969. The fire originated in a basement room shelved with oversized volumes. It spread to three adjoining areas on the basement floor as well as to the circulation lobby on the first floor... Library

officers estimated book and journal losses from the fire of May 1 at 40,000 volumes totally destroyed and 27,000 volumes damaged by heat, smoke, or water. *College and Research Libraries News*.

(University of Washington). An explosive charge equal in force to two boxes of dynamite did about \$300,000 damage to the University of Washington's Suzallo Library and Administration Building on Sunday, June 29, 1969. *Library Journal*.

(Beloit College). Results of disturbances at the college's Morse Library were damage and theft of music-listening equipment, flooding due to the plugging of rest room drains and open faucets, deliberate slashing of furniture, and missing volumes. *Library Journal*.

These were but a few of the more extreme manifestations of the protest movements as it affected libraries. The mood to which it gave expression seemed negative rather than positive, a mood of frustration rather than revolt, which proved pervasive and disruptive to members of the staff without whose informed and faithful services the library would go to chaos. Librarians suffered as much from fear and concern of harassment as they did from vandalism itself. Library hours were extended by temporizing, half-hearted administrations, without adequate provision for the additional staffing required, with the result that the whole quality of library service was lowered. With democracy raising its ugly head, the library committee grew larger and larger in order to accommodate every type of library user until its very size rendered it impotent. In their eagerness to acknowledge the rightfulness of every student petition and complaint, some faculty members encouraged an indifference to library policy with results that led to a steadily declining civility as well as disregard for library regulations and property. Book theft and mutilation became a problem of serious proportions. Any assumption that the beauty and comfort of the newer library buildings and furnishings would insure their care by students was rudely dispelled by the antics of a new breed of patch-jeaned, shock-headed,

human golliwogs. Some regard appearance of no importance, but the image the new breed projected made palatable manners and actions which a few years previous most students would have found impossible to contemplate, much less swallow.

Basically, of course, the student revolt was not directed against the university and its instructional program so much as it was against manifestations of a society they objected to in such university activities as ROTC, war-related government or industrial sponsored research, and university administration. As a consequence there was not too much in all the hue and cry about reform of teaching and strengthening scholarship. There was a good deal of claptrap about the relevancy of course offerings to the needs and interests of students, but nothing was said about colleges turning out students who could not read, who had no idea where to find news they could trust, who did not know how to tell facts from opinion, or even how to detect political propaganda or the political viewpoint of a paper or journal. These are some things in a search for intellectual improvement which might have had a great deal of effect on the importance of the library and how it might be used.

To be sure, there were some good results. Faculty and librarians became more alert, less complacent, less paternal, more aware of students' rights and responsibilities. More freedom of choice was granted to students in designing their educational careers and wider cognizance was taken of some obvious anachronisms in the educational system. The best teachers were stimulated by a more challenging spirit of dissent in the classroom. Perhaps the most damaging and fateful consequence, however, was the surfacing of a wave of anti-intellectualism among the older generation—parents, alumni, and friends of the university. Their patience was exhausted by the contempt which many members of the student generation and younger faculty showed toward the so-called establishment. Those who had supported higher education and spoke for it—from the federal government to the individual con-

tribution—cut back or discontinued their support. The effects upon the university may be far reaching, indeed are so already.

This is not the place to attempt a full description or reasoned analysis of all events that took place in academic librarianship during the Sixties, but looking about for a brief statement which would illustrate what may possibly be the two most significant traits of the decade one might with little fear of contradiction say "affluence" and a sense of the end of one era of librarianship and the beginning of another. Perhaps no decade in the history of academic librarianship had witnessed a more apparent and a more dramatic increase in growth and support. Someone has described the decade as the pendulum years, which accurately describes library support which began low, swung high, and finally slowed down to a point where many libraries were short of money again. The amount spent by libraries in the ten-year period, 1960-70, however, increased a staggering 251.65%, meaning that it more than tripled. Libraries were considered big business for unlimited exploitation. Reprint houses sprang up like mushrooms in a manure pile after a spring rain. Large numbers of librarians with specialized training in language and subject fields were added to library staffs to take over the faculty task of book selection. The amount of money required to support the new programs of instruction and research, particularly in rapidly growing graduate fields, mushroomed faster in many cases than the manpower necessary to make rigorous selection. The result was that large libraries placed blanket orders for all current books in certain subject areas and languages, replacing selection by title and specialization. The problems of management grew larger; government regulations sprouted; and housekeeping problems multiplied.

The second trait which seemed to the writer to stand out above all others during the decade was an all pervading sense that the old world of librarianship as he knew it was being shot out from under him. This impression came about partly because of the acceleration of

knowledge, partly because of the extraordinary growth in publication, and partly because of mechanical speed up and change. The imbalance between the old and the new caused tension and strain for which the librarian was ill-prepared. A single example may illustrate. Thirty years ago a librarian graduating from library school could continue in the same job until retirement without doing more than a modicum of outside reading and attending an occasional library meeting. Today no library school graduate can hope to leave library school and be competent to face problems of running a college or university library ten years from now without renewed formal schooling or some form of rigorous and systematic study by his own effort.

Academic libraries are traditional and conservative enterprises. Their course and direction had not changed much in the decades of the 30's, 40's, and 50's. The sudden changes of the Sixties, threatened or actual, could not be anything but disturbing. It was a decade in

which events were not anticipated and anticipated events did not appear on schedule. Consequently, everyone's resistance was low. If one may be permitted an irreverent echo, it was an abominable era.

- 1) *Library Trends* 18: 150 October 1969.
- 2) *The Bowker Annual*, 1970, p. 14.
- 3) *Ibid.*, p. 99-101.
- 4) Licklider, J. C. R. *Libraries of the Future*. The M.I.T. Press, 1965. Speaks on p. xi of "the study on which this report is based" as "sponsored by the Council on Library Resources."
- 5) *Advances in Librarianship*, 1970, ed. by Melvin J. Voight, p. 37-38.
- 6) In *The Librarian Speaking*. University of Georgia Press, 1970, p. 200.
- 7) Clapp, Verner W. *The Future of the Research Library*. Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana 1964.
- 8) American Council of Learned Societies. *Newsletter* vol. 20, No. 7, Dec. 1969.
- 9) Ingraham, M. H. *The Mirror of Brass*. University of Wisconsin Press, 1968, p. 210.