

A Philosophy of Librarianship

図書館学の理念

Louis Shores

ルイス・ショアーズ

要 旨

真実の探究のために有用性を尊重するかぎりにおいて、図書館員が実用主義的であるからといって責めるのは当を得ない。図書館員は明らかに技術的な面を重視しすぎるが、その奥にひそむ原理を追究しようという信念をもつ。図書館業務は補助的役割しか果たさないというコンプレックスは現今の知的・精神的思想に影響を与える一般的否定主義の適例である。

しかし、図書館職は知的・精神的に尊重されている数少ない専門職であり、学問の到達すべき目標とのかかわりをもっている。図書館職は人類にとって最も重要な知識の記録を保存し、配布し、調査し、解明することに専念する専門職である。ここにいう知識の記録とは人間のコミュニケーションの可能性を拓げる総体としての“広義の図書”である。

今日、非図書資料と定義されるものが図書館に入ってきてつつあるという主張は歴史的にみて正確ではない。歴史的にみた場合、印刷術の発明以前には、泥土板とか、パピルスとか、羊皮紙とか、それぞれ図書館の図書と認められていた時代があったのである。15世紀には、写本だけが図書館の図書であると主張し、新しく生産された活字印刷物は非図書資料であるとする図書館員がいたのである。

以上のような広義の図書概念をとりあげることが筆者の原理追究の一部をなしており、媒体の形態的特質がコミュニケーションのあり方に影響を与えるという考え方から、図書の形態的分類、図書選択の基本的な考え方などが生まれてくる。

図書館学は過度に専門化される傾向を示す諸科学が求めている普遍主義に貢献する有利な位置を占めている。Snow のいうように、“二つの文化”があるとすれば、図書館学はこの二つの文化を総合することを認めなければならないだろう。20世紀中葉の思潮には、科学的方法を過度に重視する傾向があるが、それだけが真理探究の方法ではない。図書館員は哲学者と同じように、専門分化されている学問のあいだのバランスをとる義務がある。筆者はこのような考え方によって、これまで数多く発表した所説の位置づけを行ないながら、一人の図書館員としての自分の原理的な考え方を展開している。

(M.N.)

Louis Shores, Ph. D., Dean Emeritus, School of Library Science, Florida State University, U.S.A.; Editor in Chief, *Collier's Encyclopedia*.

ルイス・ショアーズ：フロリダ州立大学大学院図書館学研究科名誉主任；Collier 百科事典編集長

I

If love of wisdom is the etymological beginning of a definition of *Philosophy*, then I contend there is more philosophy in our library literature of the world than it has been fashionable, in the past, to admit.

After more than half a century of practice in, what I have called many times in my writings, our *Profession of Destiny*,⁴³ I am convinced there is hardly a librarian I have had an opportunity to converse with for longer than passing who has not revealed to me some professional beliefs, often keenly and feelingly. Perhaps in terms of depth and profundity the professional philosopher might discount many of our practitioners' reflections. But it would not be becoming to one who claims to be a "lover of wisdom" to dismiss arrogantly the beliefs of any one, no matter how naive and proximate.

Nor would it be fair to accuse librarians of total commitment to *pragmatism*. If the professional literature has tended to espouse *value in use* as the real test of truth that tendency deserves some compassion, at least, in the face of many adverse cultures, throughout history, that have exaggerated the *material* in their quests for the ultimate. Admittedly, there has been a disproportionate attention to technic, especially in the "how to" literature, and in the commitment to *survey* which has dominated practice in recent decades. But tucked away in even such practical writings there have been snatches of beliefs and hunches, of conjectures and futures, of suggested innovations and experimentations, that have suggested philosophy.

There is more than a chance that we overlooked, or underestimated, professional beliefs in our literature. Perhaps this is part of our general climate of protest, of forever identifying problems, of finding relief in the excoriation of scapegoats, of celebrating what's wrong with something. Our own professional specimen of the general negativism that affects the current intellectual and spiritual climate of the world is what I have often referred to as the *Li-*

brarian's Ancillary Complex.

In composite, the Ancillary Complex, relished by even some of our leaders, insists Librarianship has no discipline of its own. Our education for the profession has been so frequently and vehemently denounced in "letters to the editor" that, at times, it has appeared that all one needed to allay *campus unrest*, generally, was to reform *library school*, specifically. A key point in the *ancillary* stance is that the literature of Librarianship is of such *low* quality that, to borrow from the earlier American evangelist Billy Sunday's bombastic diatribes, the library author would have to fly an airplane to enter hell. And as for philosophy, declares the *ancillarian*, librarianship has had almost none. Perhaps so.

But I dissent. Because I agree with the late novelist Jan Struther that librarianship is one of the few professions for which can, today, have intellectual and spiritual regard. I begin with a declaration of faith in Librarianship as "the profession of destiny." I base this on my acceptance of Paul Tillich's definition of *faith* as "concern with the ultimate." It is my belief that the profession of *Librarianship*, the *Library Art*, come closer to concern with the ultimate than most of the professions and disciplines to which so many librarians feel ancillary.

In what follows are some extracts from the developing philosophy of one librarian, who has written and published thousands of words of library philosophy, despite the lack of recognition, by some, as related to a philosophy of librarianship. A fuller statement is in preparation for a book.

II

Librarianship has had no lack of definition. Our several professional dictionaries and glossaries, in many languages, have gone beyond the identifications found in general dictionaries and encyclopedias. Not entirely satisfied, some of us have augmented these definitions with declarations of belief about the profession, as a whole, and about such major divisions as

classification and cataloging, selection and acquisition, circulation and dissemination, reference and its modulation to information science, to cite what we have some times designated as the four major divisions of library service. Furthermore, we have supplemented with philosophies for each of the four library types: *academic, public, school, special*. The literature of *library education for use and education for librarianship* abounds with philosophical concerns for the preparation of the next generation. And if further evidence is needed that librarianship is deeply concerned with philosophy, especially non-pragmatic, review the growing literature in two of the newest library school concentrations; *library history*, and *comparative librarianship*.

I have spoken with hundreds of librarians all over the world, in my professional life time. With almost all who have conversed on our profession for even a few minutes, uninterruptedly, philosophy has interposed. I dare not even begin a directory of library philosophers, because the list would be so long, but I will try an experiment. As I think back over my last "Around the Library World in 76 Days,"¹⁰ on a philosophical quest for what I call, "The Quiet Force," I begin in Tokyo, at Keio University's School of Library and Information Science. Perhaps Professor Sawamoto will recall our animated dialogues on a philosophy of *Library education*.

Retracing the route, in Manila, we compared our beliefs, Potenciana David, librarian of the Far Eastern University, and I, on the ultimate place of the library in higher education. From there, back to Canberra, Australia, where Sir Harold Leslie White, then National Librarian, expressed an ultimate about library relations to government. Back across the Indian Ocean, some 26 hours away by air, Rene Immelman at the University of Cape Town deliberated with me on the relation of freedom to responsibility in a library philosophy of book selection. There was an all-African library congress at the University of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and diverging library philosophies expressed especially by some representatives of "new nations"

would have disturbed confirmed ancillarians.

Almost with nostalgia, I recall the evenings on *reference* philosophy with Olga Pinto, in Rome. Then back to Marcel Thomas, intellectual director of the Bibliotheque Nationale's Manuscript Division. How much library-literary philosophical conversation hovered around his work on the Dreyfus case and Emile Zola's *J'Accuse!* Had the library a role in communicating the truth about a false charge? To London, and to several of those philosophical dialogues, that had begun as long ago as my Fulbright exchange in 1951, on national librarianship, on organization librarian, and, above all, on encyclopedism and its relation to librarianship's mission of information. Back home, philosophically deep-thinking Jesse Shera and I philosophized history from the standpoint of some new dimensions library history might contribute. There are other parts of the world I have visited previously and since where library philosophy have dominated conversation. Perhaps near the top of philosophical memories were my efforts to meet with Ranganathan during my two years as a soldier in India. Subsequently, rewards came in London meetings and in his visit to our Florida home, where I sat cross-legged on our carpet as he conversed from his lotus-leaf position. One of his disciples, A.K. Mukherjee has written thoughtfully about philosophy in his book on *Librarianship*.¹¹

If I have resorted to a librarian directory, after all, it is to clinch with only one example per nation the point that librarians think, speak, and write philosophy, all over the world, far more frequently than ancillarians recognize. And so to the philosophy of librarianship of one librarian.

III

For me, *Librarianship is the profession dedicated to the preservation, dissemination, investigation, interpretation of the knowledge most SIGNIFICANT TO MANKIND.*

Generally, libraries aim to acquire, organize, and disseminate the records of this knowledge most significant to the community served.

This Record of Civilization I have described as the GENERIC BOOK. Compactly, I have defined the GENERIC BOOK as the *sum total of man's communication possibilities*. It comprises all *subjects, levels, and formats*. In an essay for the US *Saturday Review*,⁶⁾ which the editors chose to make the editorial for the first National Library Week, I philosophically suggested that the profession of librarianship, almost alone among all of the professions; and Library Art, almost alone among all of the disciplines, dealt with the only evidence we have of life.

During World War I, it is reported, after a battle in which the toll of French soldiers had been especially heavy, one soldier asked, tragically, upon the loss of his closest friend,

“General, *What is Death?*”

Any one who has served in the armed forces and experienced the death of a comrade, who one moment is beside him talking and the next moment is struck silent, will appreciate the General's spontaneous response to the question.

“*Death,*” said the French General, “*Death is sudden incommunicability.*”

Concerned as this librarian has been for as long as he can remember with *the meaning of death*, he has never found a more meaningful definition; not even in Herman Feifel's monumental symposium²⁾ on the subject by 18 of the world's leading thinkers. But more importantly, this incident helped to define the meaning of LIFE for him.

For, if Death is *incommunicability*, as he believes it basically is, then LIFE must be the opposite. All of a sudden, the evidence of LIFE became to this librarian *communicability*.

From this philosophical starting point, the librarian proceeded to the question how does man now prove that he is alive, and not dead? How has man in the past given evidence of being alive and not dead? The inevitable answer: through his *communication*. Which led to the next question: in what form or forms has man communicated? In a range of forms involving all of the known five senses, and, who knows, even in those extrasenses

which persist in disturbing science's comfortable faith in its “method,” as investigation continues in the parapsychological and psychological laboratories of some of the great universities of the world. The sensory forms communicate with man's gustatory, olfactory, and tactile senses, through such formats, for examples, as food, perfume, and cloths, respectively, Perhaps even more importantly communication is effected orally and visually through speech and graphics.

As this librarian pondered the evidences of life in man's communicability, and considered the range of forms in which man had communicated, from the beginning of, at least, the record of civilization, it became apparent that the *sum total of man's communication* equalled the evidence of life as distinguished from death. He was excited. This sum total also equalled the GENERIC BOOK.

IV

As this librarian reviewed the history of the book, he placed the printed page in its proper historical perspective. The contention by some librarians, especially in the United States, that there was something coming into libraries that had to be designated “non-book materials” was historically, at least, inaccurate. The stubborn insistence in the library literature on an artificial separation of print and other media formats into “book” and “non-book” materials was the underlying cause for a long and painful crusade this librarian had undertaken to bridge the gap that had developed between librarians and audiovisualists. His book *Instructional Materials*,¹⁾ in 1960, was the culmination of a series of shorter writings advocating unity among all who worked with the GENERIC BOOK. Included in these shorter writing were debates with separatists among not only librarians and audiovisualists, but among educational administrators, as can be read in the million-circulation *NEA Journal*,⁶⁾ for example.

As one philosophical part of the GENERIC BOOK concept, this librarian formulated, in

preliminary form, his *format classification* of the GENERIC BOOK. Historically, he first pointed out that long before the invention of printing there had been a recognized library book. In the libraries of Babylon and Nineveh, perhaps nearly six thousand years ago, the book was a baked clay tablet covered with symbols that had been pressed into the wet surface. Later, also perhaps, the Egyptians found a better way to produce a book. They used the *papyrus* plant which grew wild along the banks of the Nile, stripping the bark, and pasting the layers into a kind of paper. Several of these sheets were formed into long strips, sometimes as long as over 100 feet, rolled into a papyrus roll which could be unrolled a little at a time to reveal hieroglyphic writing, done in narrow columns, with a reed pen. To be consistent, would the separatist insist that because they were not printed these papyrus rolls, or the vellum parchment formats that followed were "non-book" materials? On the contrary, there was a 15th century librarian, in a monastery, who insisted that only the manuscripts were books fit for a library, and that the print coming from some new-fangled machine called a printing press, were "non-book."

The *format classification* this librarian proposed aimed to classify the physical makeups of the GENERIC BOOK— to reveal the range of physical formats through which man has given evidence of life, representative examples

of which can be found in the libraries of the world. In the basic summary of the format classification, library media are divided into six major divisions: (See the table below).

This summary of the GENERIC BOOK formats was only a beginning to a system of media classification which assumed that the physical makeup of the medium may influence communication. This assumption, introduced perhaps as early as 1935, when the first audio-visual course for librarians was developed at George Peabody Library School, anticipated, the current attention to the thinking of Marshall McLuhan.⁹ As subsequently developed in the Florida State University crusade for "unity of materials," the GENERIC BOOK concept advanced the theory that communication and learning might be affected not only by *subject* interest, and maturity *level* of the communicant, but by the *format* of the medium.

Again and again it was demonstrated that a pupil who had difficulty understanding a print communication could easily pick up a thought through a 16mm time-lapse motion picture, or from a transparency overlay, or with a field trip to a natural resource. When the "Listening Post" was introduced into the *Materials Center* idea for a school library, it was found that secondary school pupils who had difficulty appreciating a Shakespeare play from the visual reading of it were revealingly aided by the set ear phones that transmitted an aural reading by a distinguished Shakespearian actor.

Format Classification of Library Media

DIVISION	SUBDIVISIONS
PRINT	Textbook; Reference Book; Reading Book; Serial
GRAPHIC	Picture; Maps; Charts; Objects; Exhibits...
PROJECTION	Still (slide, filmstrip...); Motion (16 mm...); Micro (film, fiche, card, print; bio...)
TRANSMISSION	Disc; Tape; Radio (transcription); Television (kinescope, videotape...)
RESOURCE	Natural (mine, forest...); Social (museum, airport, hospital...); Human (inventor, traveller, poet...)
PROGRAMMED	Print (catechismal); Machine; Computer.

But *vice versa* was also true, despite the growing tendency of some media philosophers like Duhamel⁴⁾ and McLuhan to fear for the future of print. Many teachers have discovered with surprise that there are still many children in our schools who learn better from the printed page than from audiovisual or computer-assisted instructional materials.

The theory of the GENERIC BOOK opened many philosophical avenues to education, to librarianship, and perhaps even to that branch of philosophy known as epistemology. For example, the GENERIC BOOK suggested that for the first time in the history of education it might at last be possible to do something about "individual differences." The range and variety of media are now so considerable that it is possible to match individual differences in learners with individual differences in media. Out of this theory developed the augmented Carlylian movement of the 20th century, spear-headed by the LIBRARY-COLLEGE⁵⁾ concept for higher education, and the MEDIUM SCHOOL⁶⁾ concept for elementary and secondary education.

The theory of the GENERIC BOOK could have implications for librarianship at many points in its statement of aims and purposes. Take for example the critical aspect of *book selection*. Heretofore book selection in libraries had been based largely on *subject* selection. To a lesser degree, and more usually in young peoples' libraries, attention had been given to maturity *level* selection. But if any attention was given to *format* as a basis for selection, it was to admit audiovisuals as "non-book" supplementaries. GENERIC BOOK selection is three-prong. Selection is not only by *subject* and by maturity *level*, but by *format*, with commitment to the principal that physical makeup of a medium may affect communicability as much as either of the two criteria formerly dominating selection.

V

As much as any other component of this librarian's philosophy of librarianship, the

GENERIC BOOK concept has shaped his growing conviction that the Library Art has relations with other branches of knowledge quite unique. Unless it is philosophy itself, which has sometime been defined that way, the Library Art has the best claim of any discipline to being "the sum of all knowledge." Because librarianship serves all of the disciplines and has traditionally prided itself on its impartiality toward all, it is in a peculiarly strategic position to contribute that generalism for which an over specialized world of scholarship has covertly yearned.

To begin with, we must once and for all remove any lingering ancillary doubts that the profession of librarianship is based on a discipline. Under the simpler dictionary definition of discipline as "1. instruction; 2. a subject that is taught; a field of study..." (*Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 1963, p. 237), what constitutes the library school curriculum qualifies our claim. There is now a field of study, on which librarianship is based, so worthy of university instruction that no fewer than 50 graduate schools in the United States alone boast of an accredited program in library education.

A few comparisons with other disciplines will fortify our belief in the discipline on which our profession is based. If we agree with Sir Charles Percy Snow that there are "Two Cultures,"⁷⁾ and that Humanists have not yet taken the "Scientific Revolution" seriously, we will have to recognize what the library discipline has done to bring these two cultures together. Despite the fact that librarians have been accused of leaning toward the Humanist position in the quest for reality, there has been no greater commitment to the scientific method in the last three decades than is found in the library literature. Ever since this librarian's own orientation in the new Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, dating back to 1929, he has almost frighteningly, at times, tended to recognize but one culture.

Aware of the near-monopolistic position of the scientific method in our mid-20th century

thought, this librarian has, in recent years, developed a growing concern for the near-abdication of librarianship's Humanistic tradition. He has, on rereading, indeed, questioned Snow's assumption that the Scientist knows more about the Humanities than the Humanist knows about the sciences.

As we look at the disciplines in our universities today, those championed by the various learned societies, it is frightening to contemplate how many have committed themselves to the scientific method as an approach to reality. The study of society, has for some time now imitated the natural sciences almost unquestioningly. It is with concern that this library historian has watched historiography tending toward a so-called scientific method in history. But even more discouraging is the increasing amount of computerized investigation in the Humanities. Word counts of various kinds, proliferations of questionnaires in literature and music, in the visual and auditory arts, and even in theology and philosophy, attest to the fact that the two cultures, daily, are tending to become one.

There is no intention here to underestimate Science and its method. Admiration and wonder underwrite the accomplishments of science for mankind. But as librarians, it behooves us, from our traditional position of tolerance toward all of the specialisms, to offer some balance, as between the "two cultures," and among the many disciplines. From our generalist perspective, we should be able to exert some of the caution that concerned contemporary philosophy expresses.

In the article on the "Scientific Method" which philosopher William Werkmeister wrote for *Collier's Encyclopedia*⁶⁾ (20:500-8) he refers to the "Bias and the Limitations of Science" in a concluding section. Commenting on the "physicalism" of an "unified science," Professor Werkmeister amplifies

"This is the view that, in principle at least, all knowledge must be statable exclusively in terms of physical objects and that whatever is not so statable cannot be knowledge."

There is a second form of science bias, in Dr. Werkmeister's opinion: "...that only the methods of science can yield knowledge and that there is no approach to reality except through science."

With Dr. Werkmeister, every student of the library discipline must reject both biases. As he points out

"...there are methods of investigation which are the proper procedure of philosophy, rather than of science, and which are foundational even to the sciences. Logical analyses the dialectical clarification of meaning and of the cognitive situation as a whole, the analysis of categories and their interrelations, the quest for first premises of the whole of human experience—for valuations no less than for knowledge—are some of the activities which, though indispensable to the advancement of knowledge, do not depend upon the method of science."

What the philosopher is challenging us with is to join him in restoring a balance between the two cultures; to reintroduce a *gestalt* among the frustrated specialisms; to protect the possibility that the "riddle of the universe" cannot be solved exclusively in terms of physical objects. Who, more than the librarian, has through the centuries aimed to disseminate, impartially, all of the approaches to truth and beauty man has dared to attempt.

That is the relation of the library discipline to the other disciplines, in this librarian's opinion: side by side with the philosopher, to provide a *gestalt* for all of the specialisms; to point to the inevitable unity of knowledge, the wholeness of the universe.

VI

How deeply the Library discipline is involved in what Dr. Werkmeister refers to as the quest for valuations in the current "information crisis." Adorers of the cliché as our activists are, we tend to celebrate an exaggerated "information *explosion*." What they are really saying is that the effort to "retrieve" the proliferation of separated bits of

fact have begun to tax human memory. To some extent, the electronic means of retrieval have almost kept pace with the cascade of minutiae being exhibited as evidence that contemporary man must be wiser than ever before. The protesters and their increasing protests, in most parts of the world should raise questions as to whether all of these bits and pieces of information we are now so passionately committed to "retrieving" have really increased man's wisdom at all, certainly on ultimates. More than ever before, it would seem, mankind is in need of a value *implosion*.

This librarian has meditated and reflected about the philosophy of information at least as far back as 1929, when he began work on what some of his colleagues have considered his major work—*Basic Reference*. The three books in the series¹⁾ and the nearly 100 shorter essays in *Reference* and in what he has referred to as the *modulation* to Information Science have represented an Information Philosophy of one librarian, however inadequate. This Information Philosophy is here briefly recapitulated. Because space compels extracts only, this section concentrates on four aspects of the *Basic Reference* concept: 1) *Redefinition*; 2) *Literature*; 3) *Encyclopedics*; 4) *Modulation*.

In the Annual Lecture for the Library Association in Bournemouth England, May 1951,²⁾ this librarian redefined *Reference* as *promotion of free inquiry*, thus departing from the passive role of reference service which had dominated all three previous philosophies of Reference, before, identified by James Ingersoll Wyer³⁾ as "conservative," or "moderate," or "liberal." In the first the librarian did nothing for the inquirer that he could not do for himself. The second philosophy suggested a half-way relationship between the patron and the librarian in which the latter did some of the things the inquirer could do for himself, but less quickly and perhaps less expertly. The "liberal" went all out for the inquirer, doing everything possible, voluntarily.

But to this reference librarian all three schools of thought appeared to be dominated

by the ancillary complex of passivity-waiting for the inquirer to ask the question before undertaking to assist him to any degree at all, from conservative to liberal. From years of reference experience I was convinced that answering inquirers' inquiries would always be a significant aim and purpose in reference service for all types of libraries. But over and above the inquirer-initiated inquiries there was a professional obligation on our part to promote inquiry, not only by the lethargic part of our world mind, but even among those who are currently referred to as "activist." In every community served by libraries—academic, public, school, special—there was a creative obligation by our profession to promote the strengthening of the community mind, of the national mind, of the world mind by encouraging not only inquiry, but correct documentation of answers. By teaching correct documentation reference librarianship would guard against totalitarian brainwashing.

In this documentation a wider and better knowledge of the literature of reference was needed, not only by the librarian but by the patron he served. Concerned because the vast and rich literature of information had been comparatively neglected not only by fellow instructors in literature, a field in which I myself was then teaching, but by librarians, I set about in 1930 to arrive at a selection of the "basic titles" that librarians should master, and a smaller selection that laymen, based on age, interest, etc., should make a part of their life. Although I approached my initial selection quantitatively, by the overworked questionnaire method, described in the preface to the first edition of *Basic Reference Books*⁴⁾ (1937), the text of the book was qualitatively accented. It represented my inclination in the instructional dualism between *method* and *material* that has always confronted the reference teacher. My belief in the *literature of reference* as a discipline "for study" is perhaps another evidence that not all librarians favor the pragmatic. As a concomitant, I proceeded to augment the classification of types and subtypes of reference books, establishing some

new categories like "how-to" manuals, audio-visual sources, etc.

This categorization of types led to a concentration on the "queen" of reference types, on what the late, great Isadore Gilbert Mudge called the "backbone of reference"—the *encyclopedia*. From educational use with some new dimensions for myself and for my students I moved first to evaluation and review, and then to designing and editing major English language works in the United States, for world wide use. So began what I have called my *Encyclopedics*—the gateway to my information implosion. The essence of *Encyclopedics* is the principle that regardless of the proliferation of separate facts the information problem is still the same—selection, evaluation, and *gestalt*. Of all the traditional *Reference* and contemporary *Information Science* struggles with the so-called "explosion" the encyclopedist, over the centuries, back as far, at least as Pliny the Elder, has been closest to a solution. I have defined *encyclopedia* as a *summary or synthesis of the knowledge most significant to mankind*. It is this definition that has underlined my three decades of designing and editing several encyclopedias, including *Collier's*, to which I have devoted 25 years of my professional life. I have an increasing belief that both Reference and Information Science must restudy the encyclopedia from the standpoint of the information quest in which both aspects of librarianship are now engaged, often in isolation from each other.

VII

Which brings us to the *modulation*. Inherent in the librarianship I have practiced and principled for a half century is an evangelistic complex to reconcile. It accounts for my dissent with much of the current dissent; my contention that in the history of protests few have been more sterile, more lacking in positive solutions than the current marching band; my belief that no liberal can ally himself with the hypocritical "non-violence" of the contemporary hi-jackings, kidnappings,

forceful occupations of premises, demands for all of the "listening" time and the right to heckle or walk out when the other side has its turn. I believe a more significant protest can be accomplished by a positive attempt to reconcile inherent imperfections in man. On a small scale I tried to bridge the gap between librarians and audiovisualists. After my return from some involvement in the growing schism between the documentalists (forerunners of the Information Scientists) both during my Fulbright year in the United Kingdom and on the Europe continent, I resolved to forestall another such schism as I had experienced with the audiovisualists. I introduced into my basic Reference class, as early as 1953, a comparative unit on Information Science. I included an early week at the University computer center, key punching, KWIC indexing, and comparing counterparts and differences in subject headings and thesauri; heads and descriptors, Dewey divisions and sections with groups and fields, etc. It was my good fortune to recruit a topnotch Information Scientist to our Florida State University faculty—Dr. Gerald Jahoda, a distinguished chemist, before he went on to supplement with library science education. A deep thinker on the problems of information generally, and on indexing in particular, Dr. Jahoda readily entered into the dialogue on Reference and Information Science, with a mutual aim to reconcile.

When I undertook to essay this modulation for the British yearbook *Progress in Library Science*,³⁾ Dr. Jahoda critically read the manuscript. My thesis was that both needed to look at each other more continuously than they have. Traditional Reference had much to learn from such concepts as "interest profiles" and "selective dissemination of information" as well as from certain indexing techniques, and from "Systems Design." But Information Science needed to look back, also, at systems design, for example, in basic reference books to rediscover examples that anticipated such things as "citation frequency" and inverted entry. Indeed, the good encyclopedia might

be worthy of restudy from the standpoint of its monumental indexing, alone. These are only telegraphic messages about the implications in the modulation concept.

VIII

Within the limitations of an essay, only extracts of a developing philosophy of librarianship can be indicated. Were there more pages they would be devoted to beliefs in the high role of librarianship in education as the trend to independent study mounts. Some indication of this can be found in the shorter published writings on the *Medium School*, and in the two books on the *Library-College*. If still more space were available, the philosophy behind the crusades for *Library History*, as begun with the doctoral dissertation and book, *Origins of the American College Library*,^{k)} and continued with the founding of the *Journal of Library History*, the American Library History Round Table, and the Florida Library History Seminars, would be unfolded. There would be pages, if not chapters, for the evangelisms on COMPARATIVE LIBRARIANSHIP and the belief that world librarianship must serve as the causeway to world understanding and peace; for tolerance by removal of such artificial barriers among humans as coloration differences, as witnessed by long involvement in what the United States used to call "Negro Library Service;" for using the public libraries of the world as positive forces for reform through dialogue to replace the current negative activism of protest; to unite all in the common cause of strengthening the world mind.

But, within this limited space, all that I have been able to essay is that this librarian, like most of my colleagues in world librarianship have been much more philosophically concerned with our calling than our library literature, generally, recognizes.

REFERENCES

((1-7) General: (a-1) by Louis Shores)

General

- 1) Mukerjee, A. K. *Librarianship: Its philosophy and history*. N.Y., Asia Publishing House, 1966.
- 2) Feifel, Herman, ed., *The Meaning of Death*. N.Y., McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- 3) McLuhan, Marshall, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. 1964.
- 4) Duhamel, Maurice, *In Defence of Letters*. 1939.
- 5) Snow, C.P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. 1959.
- 6) Werkmeister, William, "Scientific Method." *Collier's Encyclopedia*, 1969. V. 20, p. 500-8.
- 7) Wyer, J.I. *Reference Work*. American Library Association, 1930.

by Louis Shores

- a) *A Profession of Faith: First annual Mary C. Richardson Lecture*, March 27, 1958. Genesio, N.Y. State University.
- b) *Around the Library World in 76 Days*, Berkeley, Calif., Peacock Press, 1966.
- c) "Books: Continuous Communicability." *Saturday Review*, March 22, 1958. V. 41, p. 26 (Editorial)
- d) *Instructional Materials*. N.Y., Ronald Press, 1960.
- e) "Library and AV Center: Combined or Separate?" *N.E.A. Journal*, May 1958. V. 47, p. 342-3.
- f) *Library-College USA*. Tallahassee, South Pass Press, 1970.
- g) "The Medium School." *Phi Delta Kappa*, 1966.
- h) "A Frame of Reference." London, The Library Association, 1952 (The Annual Lecture, p. 98-105)
- i) *Basic Reference Books*. American Library Association, 1937; 1939; *Basic Reference Sources*. 1954.
- j) "Encyclopedias and Information Systems Design." *Progress in Library Science*. Ed. by Robert L. Collison. London, Butterworths, 1967.
- k) *Origins of the American College Library*. N.Y., Barnes & Noble, 1935; Hamden, Conn. Shoe-string Press, 1966.
- l) *The Journal of Library History, Philosophy, and Comparative Librarianship*, 1966- V. 1- (quarterly)