

University Librarianship—Notes on Its Philosophy

J. Periam Danton is librarian of the Sullivan Memorial Library, Temple University.

THE READERS to whom this paper is addressed have heard every variation of the thought that the library is the *sine qua non* of a university. To be sure, those who speak of the true university as a collection of books and of the library as the "heart" of the institution often fail, when appropriations are made, to realize that so vital an organ requires much nourishment. But here at least the point need not be labored that educationally and administratively the library is, and must be recognized as, an integral part of the institution it serves.

In view of this self-evident relationship, it is obvious that any consideration of the philosophy or policy of the library (or, indeed, of any other part of the university) cannot be independent of the philosophy and policy of the institution as a whole; the philosophy of the university library (and hence the functions derived therefrom) must be related to the educational and administrative philosophy of the university. To say this is, of course, to state in a broad way a philosophy of university librarianship. The applicable dictionary definition of *function* is "the activity appropriate to any business or profession," and that of *philosophy*, "the body of prin-

ciples or general conceptions underlying a given branch of learning . . . and the application of it . . ." (i.e., of the body of principles.)

Before proceeding, it is important that one basic issue or criticism be frankly considered. The proponents of the point of view underlying this criticism maintain, in effect, that there can be no such thing as a philosophy of librarianship, let alone a philosophy of university librarianship.¹ Using the definition just given as a starting point, this school of thought holds that, whereas it is perfectly possible to have a systematic body of *general* conceptions about even the narrowest of topics or realms of discourse, there exists a great divide between questions essentially non-philosophical and ones essentially philosophical. Assuming for the present the validity of this statement, we may follow the reasoning further. The argument runs that "philosophic discussion takes place upon the level on which the ultimate questions are being raised . . . where it becomes necessary to confess ignorance or to posit pragmatic assumptions or to call upon faith . . ." and that, "conversely, any realm of discourse is not primarily philosophical if it proceeds within a framework

¹ The writer is much indebted to Mr. Reuben Peiss, of the Harvard College Library, for a logical and lucid exposition, upon which the following outline is based, of the chief points in the argument denying the possibility of a philosophy of university librarianship.

of general conceptions already determined for it, though the establishment of this framework may itself have been a philosophic enterprise." Thus then, it is reasoned, biology and physics, raising, as they do, fundamental problems of the nature of life and knowledge, are philosophical sciences, but dietetics and hydraulics are not. Thus one may legitimately speak of a philosophy of education and perhaps even of the philosophy of a university—but not of the philosophy of the university library, since the librarian merely determines, within the limits of the already existent philosophy of his university, the policy and activities of the library.

This last statement, the tenor of which will be further considered at a later point, seems incontrovertible; it is with its interpretation that this paper disagrees, the interpretation which maintains that, since the librarian must operate within the framework of the university philosophy, there can be no distinct—even though related and dependent—philosophy of university librarianship.

Use of Term "Philosophy"

The term "philosophy" is variously employed but for the purpose of this paper it refers to a system of principles or concepts drawn from some branch of learning, and intended to be functionally useful to it. Thus, we speak of the philosophy of government, of law, or of education.

Influence on Other Philosophers

It seems to the writer that the arguments against the existence of a philosophy of university librarianship break down rather badly at two or three points. Those arguments imply, for one thing, that the philosophy of the university is something already fixed and final—not

necessarily in an absolute sense, but at least relatively, with respect to its component parts and to other institutions. Yet we are all familiar with the ways in which the philosophy of one institution can influence the philosophies of others. And there are even some instances in which a revitalized library program—which means, we maintain, not merely new energy and forceful, imaginative administration, but also a broadened philosophy—have markedly influenced the philosophy of the college or university. In other words, the philosophy of a university is itself no separate, unrelated thing, but a fluid product of the philosophy of other institutions and, necessarily, of its own component parts. The constant impact of all upon it are essential if it is to be meaningful. Let no one think when a university librarian successfully works for a large increase in his appropriation or for a new policy that he is not in the first place evidencing an independent philosophy and, in the second place, affecting somewhat the existing philosophy of the university.

To argue that there can be no such thing as a philosophy of university librarianship because the library must operate within the university philosophy is somewhat the same as arguing that a state university may not have a philosophy because it operates within the framework of the philosophy of the state—a contention which might be technically valid from the point of view of the legislature and the taxpayer but, in the light of practical state political principles, would be rather sad for state systems of higher education.

Unify Philosophies

Since the sciences have taken much of the subject matter from an earlier concept of philosophy, one of the chief tasks of the

philosopher has been to piece together the various and sometimes conflicting principles of the different sciences, and the differences within a given science. In the same way the library philosopher may try to bring together, coordinate, and unify the philosophies of many university libraries to the end that they—and the universities themselves—may be more nearly perfect.

The philosophies of Antioch and of St. John's, of Chicago and of Pennsylvania, obviously differ; so, therefore, do the philosophies of their libraries. But one library philosophy may gain from another and *still not go counter to the broad philosophy of its institution*; and, within the broad philosophies of universities, there are many opportunities for divergences of library philosophies *with regard to matters which are more or less common to all libraries*. One of the purposes of the philosophy of university librarianship should be to coordinate and reconcile such divergences as well as conflicts between library theory and practice.

Finally, and perhaps most important, is the fact that philosophy has to do, in part, with notions of value and procedure. The librarian, whether he call himself a philosopher or not, is inevitably and constantly faced with decisions concerning the greatest good of the greatest number, involving nobler and meaner courses. Even if he has no recognized philosophy, his daily conduct is the overt expression of one, for philosophizing is implicit whenever assumptions are questioned, generalization is attempted, decisions or choices between person and person made, or the "good" solution sought. Indeed, the librarian is employed in part because of a (presumed) outlook, point-of-view, and attitude—in short, philosophy—toward his profession

and his work. The more reasoned, the more intelligent, the more grounded that philosophy is, the more will the university be in his debt. "It is one of the noble tendencies of the human mind . . . to work at something that has permanent value. Therefore a scholar who is really devoted to his calling . . . experiences the need of drawing from his special knowledge some lessons which may be generally useful in life. The [scholar] strives to relate for the benefit of humanity how the universe in general and human life in particular look to him, *in the light of his special studies . . .*"² [Italics added.] Although this quotation brings in a new and broader aspect of the librarian-philosopher, it is obvious that a philosophical approach of the sort indicated must presume as a prerequisite a philosophy of the subject—e.g., law or librarianship.

This *apologia* represents an effort to indicate why and from what points of view discussion of the philosophy of the university library is legitimate and to suggest that the subject is not simply one for polite word juggling but is of some genuine significance.

Base for Philosophy

We may now return to a discussion of the close relationship between the philosophy of the university library and that of the university itself. Briefly, the reason for assuming that the philosophy of the university library should be based upon and stem from the philosophy of the university is this: the library, as a part of the university, is presumably established and operated in the belief that it can and does supply an indispensable need of the institution. The library is thus felt to be

² Demiashkevich, Michael. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. American Book Company, [c1935] pp. 25-26.

essential from the point of view of the activities of the university. If this be so, it is clear that the library cannot or at least should not exist, as it were, in a vacuum, nor can it, if it is to serve the university intelligently, evolve a "body of general conceptions" or carry out a program based thereon, without due regard to the policy, program, and needs of the institution.

If the aims and objectives of the university as a whole must be kept in mind in the evolution of the philosophy of the library what can be said about these aims? Perhaps of paramount importance is the fact that, however similar they may be in broad outline, no two institutions have precisely the same detailed policies and objectives. It follows, therefore, that, in theory at least, there can be no such thing as a single philosophy of the university library and that each library must evolve its own, based on the aims of the institution it serves. To a considerable degree this is actually as well as theoretically true although, since the broad, general aims and objectives of most universities may be fairly definitely stated, a philosophy of the university library—or perhaps two or three basic philosophies—founded on generally recognized objectives, may be formulated, even though individual institutions will evidence varying adaptations. For each activity, each resource, each service of the library is a reflection of some aim or function, expressed or implied, of the university.

A brief characterization of what is meant in this paper by a university may not be out of place here. Although the detailed aims or characteristics of the university differ somewhat with different institutions, a general statement of them may be made.

The most important, as well as the most obvious, characteristic of a university, and the one which most unmistakably distinguishes it from other educational institutions, is its research program. The university, *qua* university, is devoted to the discovery and advancement of knowledge. A university, as President Hutchins has said, is a community of scholars. It is an institution devoted to the search for wisdom. It carries on its program through the research work of its faculties and by educating students in the highest reaches of scholarship. Thus Flexner implies that the university should have four major concerns: "the conservation of knowledge and ideas; the interpretation of knowledge and ideas; the search for truth; the training of students who will practise and carry on."³ It may also be mentioned that the university idea generally includes, in addition, attention to a great many fields of learning and presupposes professional and vocational, as well as "academic," education.⁴

The university implements its primary aim chiefly by means of the scholarly training and ability of its faculties, the written and printed materials in its libraries, and its laboratories.

Requisites of a University

Although this concern with the "higher learning" and research is the chief one, we are forced to recognize the practical fact that virtually every university in the country also embraces the functions and program of a liberal arts college. Indeed, so fundamental and—in view of our pre-

³ Flexner, Abraham. *Universities: American, English, German*. Oxford, 1930, p. 6.

⁴ Flexner, of course (*ibid.*, for example, p. 28), and Hutchins in several of his writings, hold that the university should not undertake vocational and other "non-academic" types of education. But we are considering here the situation as it actually exists rather than a sought-after ideal.

sent educational structure—so nearly indispensable to the university is its college program that one writer has said, "The first requisite of the university is that it have a good liberal arts or science college. The second requisite calls for one or more affiliated professional schools. The third . . . is a recognized graduate school."⁵ Quantitatively, this aspect of the university program is usually much greater than its fundamental and distinguishing one, since the undergraduates working for bachelor's degrees ordinarily far outnumber students and faculty engaged in advancing the bounds of knowledge. Accordingly, in considering the university, it is apparent that we must also bear in mind the coexistent college and its aims and purposes.

There are, of course, scores of definitions of the liberal arts college, and most of them, *as far as educational aims and objectives are concerned*, are equally applicable to the college program of the university. Meikeljohn says: "The liberal college is usually defined in relation to the term 'intelligence,'" which term he then discusses at length.⁶ The aims of a number of liberal arts colleges are given in Reeves' *The Liberal Arts College*,⁷ and a discussion of the four-year college may be found in *The College and Society* by Ernest Hatch Wilkins.⁸ Hopkins says that "the liberal college accepts as its main objective the establishment of a habit of mind. It is interested in the wholeness of life and in all human thinking and in all human activity."⁹ But

however many different definitions there may be, we may assume a general understanding of the objective of the college. That objective, to put it simply, is the giving of a not easily definable something which is called a "liberal education." In its strictly educational aspects, this generally means the inculcation of an understanding and appreciation of man's scientific and cultural achievements and the inspiring of a love for truth, beauty, and reason in order that students may be equipped for satisfactory living and good citizenship.

Program for a Liberal Education

How does the college program of the university attempt to impart this liberal education? It does so, obviously, even as the separate liberal arts school, through a variety of courses designed to cover, more or less completely, the basic fields of human knowledge, and through providing instructors who are able to teach and direct the students in the various courses. Teaching methods, of course, differ widely with institutions and instructors, but the aims, for example, in a given course in English history are, in each case, approximately the same even though emphasis as well as results are likely to vary. This curricular program is usually supplemented, in the effort to give a "liberal education," by the provision of "general" or "outside" lectures, concerts, facilities for recreational (as well as required) reading, and so on.

University librarianship is thus seen to have, in actual practice, a two-fold obligation: to scholarship, research, and the professional schools, on the one hand, and to undergraduate education on the other.

⁵ Ade, Lester K. "The Function of the Modern University." *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 15:133, Jan. 1940.

⁶ Meikeljohn, Alexander. *The Experimental College*. Harpers, 1932, p. 5 ff.

⁷ Reeves, Floyd W., et al. *The Liberal Arts College*. University of Chicago Press, 1932, pp. 8-18.

⁸ Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. *The College and Society*. The Century Co., 1932, Chapter XI.

⁹ Hopkins, Ernest Mark. "Attributes of the Col-

lege of Liberal Arts." In Schilpp, Paul D., ed. *Higher Education Faces the Future*. Liveright, 1930, p. 157.

The duality involved has been aptly characterized, in a different connection, by Harvie Branscomb: [the purpose of the research library is] "to make available a great collection of books to a relatively few research workers. The college problem is, however, exactly the opposite, to make available a smaller collection of books to a relatively large number of undergraduate students."¹⁰ How the university library—understood here to include the library service which the university provides for its undergraduate program—is best to reconcile these two almost diametrically opposed parts of its *raison d'être* provides a difficult problem. It is not within the province of this paper to consider solutions, either present or possible, but rather to re-emphasize what is fairly common knowledge, namely, that the American university as it actually exists makes this double demand on the university library.¹¹

Research and "College" Libraries

At first glance it would appear that the implications for the philosophy of the university library of the research and scholarly aspects, rather than those of the "college" aspects of the university, would be the more complicated, the less easily defined. It is possible that this may not be the case simply because of the more specific and inclusive nature of the separate demands which go to make up the research program. If a member of the faculty or a graduate student is engaged on a study of the development of race

feeling in Nazi poetry we know (1) that the worker has some idea of the type of material he wants, as well as a knowledge of how to use it; (2) that anything which he needs must be secured, if not now owned, either by loan or purchase; and (3) that anything in print on the general topic is grist for his mill. And so with any piece of work. On the other hand, no one seems to know what books or how many are best for the teaching of any single undergraduate course, whether students will really be able to understand a given book, etc. The research program presents a far more difficult financial problem but would appear to offer less of a philosophical one. Possibly the chief question here will be how much money, time, effort, and service should be devoted to the "research," as opposed to the "college," function—and the answer can only be in terms of the emphasis and philosophy of the institution.

Obviously the two overlap to some extent; for example, general reference service and resources, and general periodicals will very likely serve undergraduate as well as graduate needs. So too will certain other activities, some of which are mentioned below. Taking a part of its philosophy from one of the aims of the institution it serves, the library will do what it can to promote the liberal education of undergraduate students because that is an objective of the university. If a symphony orchestra is to give a Beethoven concert on or near the campus it is as appropriate, though perhaps less essential, for the library to supply and call attention to works on the life and compositions of Beethoven, on symphonic music, and on the symphony orchestra as it is to supply collateral reading for a course in French drama. Similarly, the library can justify browsing

¹⁰ Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching with Books*. Association of American Colleges and American Library Association, 1940, p. 10.

¹¹ Most of this material on the duality of the university and its library was written before the appearance of an article, by Harold L. Leupp, containing much the same thought: "Probable Trends in University Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 1:52, Dec. 1939.

rooms, reading lists, and so on, because it is assumed (with what validity we need not question here) that these contribute *either directly or indirectly* to that liberal education which the institution, and hence its constituent parts, aims to give undergraduates. Again, these services may be equally useful to graduate students.

Primary Function

The *primary* function of the library of a university, considered as a university and not as a college, must be to secure, make available, and conserve the materials of research needed by members of the faculties and graduate students. No matter what other activities the library prosecutes or how well it does so, it is not true to its main job if it holds not this function first. Perhaps supplementary, perhaps only secondary, depending upon the level of instruction, is the provision of materials for class instruction in the ordinary meaning of the phrase.

When we think of the university library serving the college program of the institution we have an almost reversed picture. William Warner Bishop, in an article, "The Library in the American College," says that the two primary functions of the library of a liberal arts college are to offer aids to class teaching and to develop habits of intelligent reading among students; all other activities are secondary to these.¹² This is as true of the library service to the college program of a university as of the separate liberal arts college. Wilson's more detailed statement does not differ in essentials.¹³

A subtitle for this paper might be "With Reference to the Functions Derived from

¹² Bishop, William Warner. "The Library in the American College." *College and Reference Library Yearbook* 1, A.L.A., 1929, pp. 1-12.

¹³ Wilson, Louis Round. "The Emergence of the College Library." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 25:439-45, Sept. 1931.

That Philosophy," for no broad philosophical declaration on the university library can be of practical value unless it is intimately bound up with the library's functions—present or future, existent or hoped for, real or implied—and unless a library philosophy be so bound up and so practical it is worthless except as a mental exercise. It will be useful, therefore, to make a general, inclusive outline of present-day university library functions, proceeding on the known facts and upon the assumptions thus far stated.

It will be noted that these are largely end functions and that the means by which they are achieved *are in the main* omitted. As an example, the obligation of the library to provide various classes of books and other reading materials may be cited. This function is included under several rubrics in the list, but the processes or methods, such as the maintenance of acquisition and exchange departments, which make possible the carrying out of this function, are not included.

Functions of a University Library

Because of the overlapping of services and functions, as between what the library does for the research and scholarly program of the university, on the one hand, and what it does for the university's college program, on the other, all functions are incorporated into one list.

THE FUNCTIONS OF A UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

- 1) To furnish material for the scholarly and research work of members of the faculty and graduate students
 - a) Books, pamphlets, monographs
 - b) Journals
 - c) Manuscripts
 - d) Films, photostats, slides
 - e) Other material, such as maps, pictures, plans, and the like

- 2) To furnish material for (undergraduate) instruction to students
 - a) Material for "reserve" or collateral reading
 - b) Material required for the more advanced work of honors students and majors
 - c) Current periodicals and their files in the departments of study
 - d) Reference books in the departments of study
 - e) Other material, as needed, e.g., maps, pictures, slides, etc.
 - f) If correspondence, radio, or extension courses are given there should be provision for making available to those taking such courses, items "a" to "e" above, since such persons are students of the institution
- 3) To furnish general reference books such as are not connected directly with departments of study. (This is probably in the main an academic distinction, as the combined departments of the university would require, for the adequate carrying out of their work, a fairly complete general reference collection)
- 4) To make materials available through
 - a) Staff services
 1. General bibliographical, reference, and research
 2. Circulation, "reserve," periodical
 3. Professional and departmental library
 4. Specialists for (other) special collections
 - b) Tools, guides, facilities
 1. Card, including union, catalogs
 2. Printed catalogs
 3. Periodical and other indexes
 4. Interlibrary loan
 5. Exhibits
 6. Photostats, films
 - 5) To develop habits of intelligent reading, to promote leisure reading, and to develop and further general reading interests through
 - a) The provision of general, cultural, and recreational literature, both book and periodical
 - b) Browsing rooms
 - c) New-book shelves
 - d) Displays
 - e) Publicity
 - f) Dormitory libraries
 - g) Student libraries
 - h) Prizes
 - i) Reading lists
 - j) Readers' advisory service
- 6) To furnish reading room and other space for study and recreational reading
 - a) Seminars, carrells, special rooms for graduate work and faculty research
 - b) General reference and periodical rooms
 - c) Undergraduate "reserve" reading rooms
 - d) Departmental libraries
 - e) Professional school libraries
 - f) Browsing rooms
- 7) To provide instruction in the use of books and the library, and, if not elsewhere provided for in the curriculum, in bibliography
- 8) To acquire and preserve the records and reports of the university, the materials of immediate local history, and similar materials
- 9) To provide for alumni education through
 - a) The preparation and dissemination of reading lists
 - b) The lending of books to alumni
- 10) To provide materials and service for other individuals or groups which may have a legitimate demand upon the university (e.g., in the case of a state university, other educational institutions in the state, departments of state government)
- 11) To promote general library development and improvement locally, and in the state and country, through
 - a) The provision of library literature
 - b) Participation in local, state, and national library associations
 - c) Coordination and cooperation with other libraries, e.g., in the matter of defining "fields of concentration," eliminating unnecessary duplication, etc.
 - d) Publication
 - e) Instruction in librarianship
 - f) Library experimentation and research

There is, of course, nothing new in all this, unless it is the bringing together of well-known facts. It is obvious, too, that few university libraries will carry out all of these functions, desirable or even necessary as any one of them could be shown to be, for a certain institution.

Librarian's Function

There is one other important consideration which should be mentioned. It has to do with a general policy of the university librarian, relates both to the philosophy and the function of the library, and is, in a sense, all-embracing. The librarian should be prepared to:

1. Serve as a check in advising the university administration of activities which for one reason or another
 - a) no university library can do
 - b) the particular university library cannot do
2. Suggest, perhaps as a result of new developments, and as a means of aiding further the aims of the university, extensions of the library's activities

Examples will readily come to mind: no university library can be expected to use its funds and energies to carry on general publicity work for the university, however important the institution may consider that work to be—and at some such point as this a library philosophy might conceivably conflict with a university one; a particular library might be prevented by reason of limitations of staff, space, or funds, from carrying out many useful functions, for instance, that of providing all alumni by mail with any book they wished (Item 9 above). Extensions of activities will frequently suggest themselves as a result of new university teaching methods or courses, new or re-emphasized university activities, improved library techniques, and hence capacities, and so

on. It should be a part of the librarian's philosophy and function to bring such matters to the attention of the university administration.

He who thinks philosophically about his profession—whether or not he consciously attempts to formulate a comprehensive philosophy of it—will of course be influenced by his philosophy of life. Indeed, "influenced" is not a sufficiently strong word, for a man's professional philosophy must of necessity stem directly from his general outlook on life. Consequently there exist in fact, even though not on paper, several philosophies of university librarianship, based fundamentally upon one or another of the principal philosophic theses: monism, with its two branches, materialism (or "naturalism") and idealism; skepticism; dualism and pluralism; and their various offshoots. No single library philosophy can be acceptable to all.

Means to an End

Whatever the roots of any philosophy of the university library, it must derive from two entities: graphic materials and readers. The university itself is the larger framework within which the library has its being; the library (i.e., staff, facilities, building, procedures, etc.) is only a means to an end, namely, the end of making recorded human experience available to students. And this "end," in turn, is a vital part of the university function to disseminate knowledge and advance its frontiers. Hence, even though the university library may have metaphysical implications of its own, the base of the library's philosophy must rest upon graphic records and readers viewed from the point of view of the function and objectives of the university as a whole.

It should be obvious that this paper

does not in any sense constitute a philosophy of university librarianship, nor has any effort been made to draw up even a broad statement of such a "body of principles." The attempt has been rather, one of justification and of presentation of some of the pertinent elements and considerations. We have, if the phrase be permitted, discussed "the philosophy of the philosophy" of university librarianship.

Criteria of a Philosophy

It may be appropriate, as a conclusion to these notes, to suggest certain criteria which any philosophy of university librarianship might reasonably be expected to meet. Some of these criteria have already been mentioned; others are adapted or modified from proposals contained in a provocative article by George S. Counts.¹⁴ It appears that any philosophy of university librarianship should be:

(1) Cognizant of the main aim of universities and of their two-fold function—i.e., the dissemination of knowledge to undergraduate as well as graduate students, and the advancement of knowledge.

(2) In essential harmony with the philosophy of the institution to which it is directed or, in the case of a general philosophy of university librarianship, in harmony with the common denominator philosophy of universities as a group, in so far as such a denominator can be determined or validly assumed.

(3) Systematic in its foundations. That is, it must take into account, to as large a degree as possible, the implications as well as the results of scientific investigation, particularly in the fields of reading, education, psychology, and sociology; it must not ignore, either, the realms of

human experience and thought which are not amenable to scientific analysis, especially ethics and esthetics.

(4) Empirical in its bases or, in other words, derived directly from experience.

(5) Comprehensive in its outlook. To paraphrase Prof. Counts, a philosophy of university librarianship must face squarely and with a sense of proportion all of the problems and relationships of university librarianship; it must strike a careful balance between the demands of the individual and the demands of society (e.g., a reader versus *all* readers, or use versus preservation), between the rights and needs of undergraduate and graduate students, between those of students and faculty, and between those of users and staff. It must reconcile the local versus the regional obligation and the often conflicting demands of the various elements, agencies, or groups which the library serves or with which it otherwise comes in contact. All of this implies the necessity for consideration of the nature of the individual, of the reading and learning processes, and of the special place of university education and its libraries in the social structure.

(6) Consistent in its several parts. Here again, is a place for synthesis and the reconciliation, not only of theory and practice, but also of differing theories or varying practices. Can we justify the "reserve book" system with the most progressive ideas of present day higher education, the closed stack with the aim of giving students free access to many books, unrestricted choice by students of their reading with the knowledge that students are actually unequipped for making intelligent choices? We speak of the fostering of an inner love for reading as an important aim—and make available only

¹⁴ Counts, George S. "Criteria for Judging a Philosophy of Education." *School and Society* 30:103-07, July 27, 1929.

one or two copies of precisely those new books which students want to read and *will* read; we make "free" reading as natural, pleasant, and easy as possible through browsing rooms, publicity, long loans and the like, whereas the reading that is the "business" of education is little advertised, restricted, and confined to relatively less comfortable quarters.

(7) In harmony with the conditions of its time. If the conditions and problems of our life, the great educational and social trends of recent years and the *rapidity and extent of social change* are not recognized as part of the contributing and conditioning background, any philosophy must be doomed to futility and barrenness.

(8) Feasible in its provisions. This criterion does not preclude an idealistic point of view, but means that a philosophy

to have any real significance must be basically workable and possible.

(9) Satisfying to (some) adherents of university librarianship. It might be argued that a philosophy would not have adherents unless it were satisfying to them. This is perfectly true, but it is also true that there could be philosophies of the university library without adherents. The point is that any adequate and valid philosophy must be such that it *does* find favor with, that it *does* appeal to, that it *does* satisfy, and that it *does* appear true to at least a minority group.

(10) Ever mindful that the graphic record and the student-reader are the twin pillars upon which rest the structure and the being of the university library. There can be no library without printed or written records and persons to use them.

Microphotography Exhibit Available

AN EXHIBIT illustrative of some of the equipment and processes of microphotography was prepared by the University of Chicago Libraries at the request of the A.L.A. Committee on Photographic Reproduction to be shown at the A.L.A. Cincinnati Conference. After the conference it was made available for loan to any library requesting it, and willing to pay the cost of transportation (one box weighing a few pounds). It has been on exhibit and traveling steadily since early in the fall. At this writing it has been shown on both coasts, the Midwest, and North, and is soon scheduled for the South. Since a few libraries, which

wished to have the material on definite dates, could not be accommodated because of earlier requests, we are repeating this announcement for their benefit and any others who may have missed the earlier announcements. (See the column, "Library Photography," in the July, 1940, *Library Journal* for a description of the material.) Interested libraries should write to the undersigned, giving (1) the approximate dates at which they would like the material, and (2) the time for which they would like to keep it (usually 10 days to 2 weeks).

HERMAN H. FUSSLER, *The University of Chicago Libraries*