

For Type II schools to qualify to give instruction in this area, high standards of curriculum, support, and faculty (at least three full-time full professors are specified) would be set for accreditation. Dr. Danton suggests that a number of super-professorships are desirable in our library schools. He says that "the prestige and quality of professional education would be enormously increased by four or five such professorships, at \$10,000 to \$12,000 each" (p. 34).

As part of this program of reform, the Type III library school would cease to exist. This proposal will not please those who have recently been arguing for an increase in their number.

The basic question Dr. Danton has posed for us is whether or not we have a middle service in our libraries. For if we grant this, the educational aims of our library schools can be clarified accordingly and their instructional programs be made so much the more effective. The Germans recognized such a level of service and planned their library school programs with definitely limited aims. But we have left the question unanswered, although we have discussed the matter from time to time, until now it is put before us in a forcible way; and we should not rest content unless we win through with a satisfactory answer.

I believe that Dr. Danton is on right ground entirely when he proposes his three levels of instruction. It makes sense to say that we ought to turn to terminal education to provide trained personnel to take care of the routine operations of our libraries, just as we ought to exploit high schools, manual training schools, and filing schools for clerical workers of various kinds. With the emphasis on routines so removed, existing library schools could then be strengthened and developed to prepare people for the middle ranks. And last but not least, we need to develop new and specialized programs for library administrators and subject specialists. How we are to do this, and where it should be done, are important matters that call for clear thinking and sure action.

We may not agree with Dr. Danton in regard to all the details of the triple program, especially the administrative-specialist part. But at this stage details should be kept in the background so that we may concen-

trate on the broad issues. The author has done education for librarianship a distinct and important service by presenting these fundamental issues for our serious consideration.

The pamphlet should be read and studied carefully by librarians generally, whichever branch of the service they may be in. They will find in it many topics of interest not touched upon in this review, such as, for example, the proposal for national certification of librarians.—*Andrew D. Osborn.*

Education for Librarianship: Criticisms, Dilemmas, and Proposals. [By] J. Periam Danton. [New York City] Columbia University School of Library Service, 1946. 35p.

The opening paragraph in which Dr. Danton limits his inquiry especially to academic librarianship disturbed me. If this restriction was necessary because the broad scope of training problems required some delimiting I have no questions to raise regarding the author's approach to the subject. If on the other hand it implies that present training is more inadequate for the reference-research services than for the general community educational services, my observations impel me to object quickly. For the Detroit Public Library which operates what is tantamount to two distinct libraries—one for reference and research purposes and the other for the furtherance of mass education—it has been more difficult to recruit and develop a staff competent to appraise the needs of heterogeneous library patrons and to stimulate and guide in a meaningful way the reading of such people than it has been to secure and develop a staff of comparable excellence for reference-research work, except in a few unusual subject fields. The more definitely defined knowledge requirements of the reference staff, the more highly developed tools and methods used in that service, and the *relatively* similar character of the patrons to be served—in short, the intensity of the latter type of work—contrasts sharply the extensity of knowledge of books and of people required for true professional service in the former type of work. I know this point of view will not be readily accepted by many of our professional colleagues, largely I believe, because many leaders high in professional circles are without an understanding of the basic philosophy funda-

mental to a popular educational service. They see that service in terms of book circulation, whereas I am referring to a professional service of a type too rarely achieved in public libraries of today.

Beyond Dr. Danton's first paragraph, however, I found myself in almost complete accord with the author. He has defined the problem admirably and the framework of his proposals can be readily adapted to meet the training requirements for general public library service. In fact, if I were to characterize the monograph in a few words, I would call it one of the most important documents issued on this subject within my professional experience. Certain differences of opinion exist, of course, but they are not fundamental.

Three points in particular I wish to underscore as appearing important to me:

1. The effort to have one curriculum, with slight leeway for electives, serve all our professional needs has persisted too long. Inevitably in such a system the training objective is low, for it is influenced by the mediocrity of average standards of performance in the profession.

2. The sharp differentiation between skilled technicians and professional librarians is eminently sound. Small libraries will probably never be able to maintain three levels of staff members—clerks, technical assistants, and professional librarians—but the larger institutions cannot achieve their best development without such a plan. The recommended training program set up by Dr. Danton I am not competent to judge. It appears plausible, though my own thinking had led me to visualize the training for professional librarianship as something that would be secured after two or three years of successful experience in actual library service.

3. The fear that libraries will not provide opportunities for the highest level of professional competence to me seems ill-founded. Libraries can and will adapt their staff organizations once superior people become available. I am sure, however, that they cannot and will not accept even the superior training here referred to as the total of preparation required for filling key positions in our larger institutions. Experience with the public, with a staff, with book collections, is important for leadership. I stress this point because I have at times detected in some educators a feeling of resentment because able students with more than average training and native ability are not immediately placed in positions of command when they leave school. For various reasons that would be

impractical and it should be so recognized by faculty advisors.

In concluding this brief comment let me say that until some significant change is achieved in training—something as basic as the plan proposed by Dr. Danton—we cannot expect salary levels in libraries to move far beyond their present status. The past few years have brought important changes in the matter of compensation for librarians. From this point on a high level of professional performance will be necessary to secure the larger recognition we associate with other professions. As in all activities, proven competence must precede the claim for greater rewards. Dr. Danton's proposals point a way to divorcing the clerical and skilled activities from what we now broadly refer to as professional librarianship. Once this is accomplished and the elements of true professionalism in library service will begin to mature, the inadequacies we now complain of will gradually and naturally disappear.—
Ralph A. Ulveling.

Progress & Problems in Education for Librarianship. By Joseph L. Wheeler. [New York City] Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1946. 107p.

The library profession in America, and indeed everyone who is concerned to any significant degree with libraries and their services, is again indebted to the Carnegie Corporation for a vivid and illuminating essay on the training of librarians. The report prepared by Joseph Wheeler in 1946 will take its place alongside the Williamson report of 1923, as a careful, intelligent appraisal of the conditions which exist today, and, if Mr. Wheeler has nothing so concrete as Williamson's recommendation that library schools be moved to universities, his report nevertheless embodies suggestions of potentially far-reaching consequences to American librarianship.

In attempting to grapple with any problem and find a solution to it, it is frequently desirable to set down as compactly as possible all of the criticisms or problem areas involved. This service is performed admirably by Mr. Wheeler, who seems to know, or to have heard at first hand, all of the faults and shortcomings which are ascribed to training for librarianship as it is found today. To a