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Dewey, it is categorically stated by his biographers, was a genius. That he was an extraordinary man, this indefatigable, pertinacious, brilliant librarian and educator, whose achievements in the course of a long and turbulent life, are of lasting significance, is indisputable. He initiated enterprises which have been continued into the present and which are basic to the profession of librarianship. He may indeed be described as a great man, because even though the times were ripe for many of the things he did—it was he who did them. His actions, then, created for him a special measure of personal responsibility with which his posterity, in seeking understanding and guidance, must confront him.

Much of what has been said of Dewey as the Father of American Librarianship is hot with an adulation, a partisanship which expresses little more than delight, compounded in equal measure of surprise and gratitude, at the demonstration that what he did could be done at all. Time, however, by the dissociation and perspective it permits, has robbed the Dewey demonstrations of something of their revolutionary brilliance; they thunder a little less loudly now, and no longer out of an apparently blue sky. But to be removed from the impact of Dewey's powerful personality, to have lost a sense of the breath-taking novelty of his achievements, to abandon simple contemplation of the triumph that anything was done, and instead to be critical, to consider what was done, is not necessarily to seek to diminish Dewey's stature—it is to define it.

The School of Library Economy

One of Dewey's most significant achievements, however viewed, was the establishment of the School of Library Economy at Columbia
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College in 1887, from which event formal education for librarianship in America is generally dated. In the setting up of the first library school there were three shaping forces: Dewey—as initiator, as motivator, as effector; the American Library Association—as referent, modifier, sustainer; and, finally, Columbia College—as receptor, as victim, in a sense, as dupe.

Dewey's genius may be considered, despite his bold assertion that librarianship is a profession, to have been that of a technician. His Decimal Classification is, in a way, the greatest library gadget of them all. The "Notes and Queries" section of the Library Journal, a special and, one imagines, extraordinarily useful feature, reflects Dewey's concern with the specific, technical problems, the minutiae, of library operation, as an analysis of its contents over a ten year period shows. It is little wonder then, given the general context of technical education in which Dewey thought and acted, that his first idea about education for librarianship should be for an apprenticeship system. But apprenticeship "on the job" he conceived as merely a preliminary step toward training in a "normal school" of the kind used to prepare teachers, a school necessarily attached to "some considerable library." He looked forward to the establishment ultimately of one central "finishing" school like that set up at Columbia eight years later—a school, as it turned out, providing little more than what he himself called "systematic apprenticeship."

Dewey's idea of the school, was the opposite of the more broadly based professional school of today. When he dropped, so casually, the idea of setting up a library school at Columbia at the 1883 Buffalo Conference of ALA, he clearly described the course as not needing to be "greatly extended as only the technical parts of the work would require treatment in it." In the Circular of Information of 1886-87, he said that the aim of the course is entirely practical; to give the best obtainable advice with specific suggestions on each of the hundreds of questions that rise from the time a library is decided to be desirable till it is in perfect working order, including administration.

In this circular he specifically eschews the idea of attempting to include in his courses matter which might give them a broad intellectual base. His school, he says:

confines itself strictly to its peculiar work, and makes no attempt to give general culture or make up deficiencies of
earlier education...this school is a short and purely technical course, coming after the general education of the student is completed...”

And yet, while the school and its curriculum inevitably reflect Dewey himself, it is just to observe that the character of the school may well have been the product of political compromise. Dewey's abiding conviction was that the existence of the school was necessary. Its ultimate character was, as far as he was concerned, rather less a matter of personal conviction, and more the result of a conscious appraisal of what would be acceptable to the library profession as represented by ALA, on the one hand, and to Columbia College on the other. It is probably undeniable that without the support of both these bodies, or that with active resistance from either one, the existence of the school would have been not merely jeopardized, but impossible. In the existence of the school, we may see Dewey as the statesman of librarianship; in the nature of the existent school we may see him as the astute, rather wily politician.

THE ALA

How, then, did Dewey try to root his individual effort in general ALA consensus? He was scheduled to read a paper at the Buffalo Conference on the “New Building and Plans of the Columbia College Libraries.” Instead, he introduced to the conference his idea of setting up a library school at Columbia. The resultant effervescence he used skillfully to his advantage. After a fairly lengthy discussion which was at once troubled and divisive, he reassured the conference that he merely sought opinion and advice on which to base his future actions. The whole affair was as yet, he stressed, vague, tentative, and in the very earliest stages of negotiation. But because of the interest shown, he requested that a committee be appointed “to secure and tabulate opinions and perhaps suggest in outline the course of instruction.” He got his committee and, also diffidently solicited, a rather tepid resolution by the Association as a whole of interest and “gratification.”

The value of this preliminary sally was two-fold. In the first place, he had planted an idea and enough time was to elapse for it to take firm hold. In the second place, he had, in bringing into being the Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy, put a foot in ALA's institutional doorway through which in 1889 he was almost able to drag after him the whole school. He had
brought the Association, though divided on the issue, to commit itself, however tentatively, to the School, without—though he faced a great deal of criticism for it—having to commit himself to very many specifics. As a result he had room to maneuver in his negotiations with the other interested party: Columbia College.

It is interesting to observe the use to which he was able to put the Association's resolution of interest. The resolution was:

That this Association desires to express its gratification that the Trustees of Columbia College are considering the propriety of giving instruction in library work, and hopes that the experiment may be tried.\textsuperscript{11}

In President Barnard's 1884 Report to his Trustees, in a carefully prepared though not actually misleading context, this becomes:

[The School] has awakened a more general and more lively interest among those whom the proposition concerns than has been anticipated. With the Association of American Librarians, the scheme of such a school, to be somewhere established, has been for some years a subject of discussion and of favourable consideration. The prospect of the early realization of that idea by the action of this institution has, therefore, afforded them gratifications as promising to supply a want of which they have a clearer appreciation than any other class of persons in society.\textsuperscript{12}

Apart from the phrase "lively interest," there is here no suggestion of a most influential group of suspicious, elder librarians led by the acid-tongued, reactionary, highly respected Poole, who had been opposed to the notion, and who would very much have preferred to wait and see. They wanted more details of the scheme, and more time to consider them.

The clearest example of Dewey's attempt to bring the whole of the ALA behind his school, and for the school to embody as much as possible of leading ALA opinion, is provided by his summoning of a meeting of the Committee on the Library School, a committee actually no longer having formal existence as its initial charge had been fulfilled, at the Boston Athenaeum in the Spring of 1886. The time for the School to emerge was approaching and Dewey wanted to discuss the date of opening, the nature of the curriculum and other matters with the Committee. In reporting on this meeting to the Milwaukee Conference of ALA that year, Cutter observed that
"the results of the afternoon's discussion are embodied in the 'Circular of Information' issued a few days ago. The Committee has nothing to add to them," though Cutter has himself a few humorous reservations as to the efficacy of the ambitious program envisaged. One imagines Dewey quickly rising to dispel any doubts arising from Cutter's remarks.

The Committee, he says is very anxious to shape the school so as to further the library interests of the country. We wish the ALA to feel that this school is its school..."\textsuperscript{13}

He could not have been more plain.

Just how much the *Circular* is the result of Dewey's persuasiveness, and how much the result of compromise, cannot be determined. Nevertheless, it is possible to posit the areas of effect that Dewey's attempt to involve ALA in the planning of the school might have had. The fundamental issue turned on the nature of library work and the best method of training for it. From the beginning the concern of ALA was with the need for practical training in actual libraries. The two groups into which the Association divided after Dewey's introduction of the notion of a formal school disagreed only on the point that "school" training might be useful somewhere in the preparation of librarians. Dewey, therefore, in a sense, had to placate his supporters as well as convince his opponents. And so at the very first meeting concerned with the school, one finds him assuring Samuel Swett Green, and through him the rest of the ALA, that a "laboratory" was a central part of his concept of the school, thus making provision for the apprenticeship training Green wanted to see established in connection with it.\textsuperscript{14} In the latter stages of planning for the school, this tendency within ALA probably encouraged Dewey to follow his own natural bent towards the immediate and practical as the basis for instruction within the school.

The other important issue to ALA was that of qualification for entry into the school. Here Dewey may have been forced to compromise, not simply because of pressure within ALA but out of the need to obtain a sufficient number of pupils to justify opening the school at all. Again, at the outset, one finds him establishing his position to suit the widest possible ALA base. In reply to a question on this matter at the Buffalo Conference, he said:

Anyone young or old of sufficient intelligence to get good from the course ought to have the chance. We hope for edu-
icated candidates, especially the undergraduates of Columbia College.\textsuperscript{15}

His 1886 \textit{Circular} is hardly more specific; and he had later to make do largely with high school graduates. This was actually more appropriate to "a short and purely technical course" than rigorous or high standards would have been.

Dewey's "ALA politics" were from the beginning doomed to unsuccessful issue. While he partially engaged ALA in his endeavours, the Association limited its engagement by a certain aloofness, a certain wariness of commitment and interest. What Dewey probably wanted from ALA was open backing and support. Had it fully endorsed his plan he could have abrogated to it part of his personal responsibility for the School, certainly from no lack of self-confidence, of which he had an over-abundance, but from a sense of the expedience of one institution dealing, not with an individual, but with another institution. The ALA, despite the later enthusiasm of its Committee on the library school, resolutely refused any full endorsement. All Dewey got was a committee to watch what he did, to receive information and report it back to ALA. This was at least a connection and he exploited it as best he could. But even in 1889 there was admitted by the Committee no real shift of responsibility, only an admission of intimate conversation.

This cautious, non-committal attitude of ALA was not merely a reflection of the natural conservatism of a large, relatively amorphous organization at whose summit was a complex and varied leadership. Nor did it merely reflect a concern over its reputation, a fear of being damaged by fly-by-night schemes whose failure could only weaken its influence and authority by leaving it divided. Yet, at first glance, this would seem to be all that was involved. By 1889, Samuel Swett Green felt himself able to assure the St. Louis Conference of ALA that the experiment ALA had been watching "is an assured success," that it is patently doing valuable work, and, having experienced a major upset without undue suffering, (transplantation from Columbia to Albany) that the ALA "ought to give formal assurance of our interest in the school to the regents and encouragement to the secretary." He recommended, therefore, that a Standing Committee on the School be added to the other ALA Standing Committees.

But Professor H. P. Smith, speaking on Green's motion, went further, and there is, if the present reading of Dewey's politics is plausible, considerable irony in what he had to say:
It seems to me better that the ALA express its gratification at the action of the regents...and let them know that it has formed a committee to render any practicable aid desired in making the school as successful as possible.

Green's motion and the first part of Smith's motion were entirely consonant with earlier ALA practice with regard to the School. But Smith was suggesting a most significant departure from that practice, urging, in effect, the ALA's open involvement, even participation, in a venture now demonstrably successful. Green's motion was passed unanimously; Smith's was, according to normal practice, referred to a Resolutions Committee.

The outcome of that committee's elaboration of Smith's resolution brought to a crisis the matter of ALA vs. Dewey. Part of the resolution reads:

with a desire to aid in securing the greatest efficiency of the school, the Library Association appoints a committee of three as a committee of correspondence with the school.16

So far so good and no conflict with earlier practice. But the resolution goes on in a revolutionary form:

Said committee is hereby instructed to inquire in what way they can be of service in promoting the objects for which the school is conducted, and to render such service to the extent of their power.17

This was passed unanimously. Here in a sense, though a little late, is victory for Dewey. Given a reasonably liberal definition of "extent of their power," the committee would not have a passive, reportorial function, but would become an active and responsible party to his library school venture.

The committee, however, was promptly emasculated by Winsor, Cutter and Poole, turning what was apparent victory for Dewey into implicit defeat. The explanation lies in a controversy that had troubled ALA for a number of years, one arising particularly out of the work of the Co-operation Committee. The source of the trouble was the question of the ALA's power to endorse, which in turn related to the basic issue of what kind of an organization ALA was intended to be, or, at least, now saw itself as being. What were its functions? How was its power to be defined? What kinds of corporate action could it be expected to take? One of the important
factors in bringing these questions into focus at this time, was the action taken on Dewey's library school. But other equally important factors were spelling reform, abbreviations, especially of common names, and the promulgation of cataloguing rules. One can observe the issue gradually reaching a climax with Smith's motion as returned by the resolutions committee acting as a kind of straw to break the camel's back. And one can see Dewey, deeply concerned, exposing the anatomy of the problem with a perspicacity and a clarity turned ultimately by his opponents to his own confusion.

In the proceedings of the 1889 conference of the ALA at St. Louis lies considerable and improbable drama, beginning over a matter of absurd insignificance and growing out of all proportion into a revised constitution for ALA and a definition of a self-concept not to be radically changed until after the First World War. A discussion on the use of hyphens in cataloguing was provoked upon the presentation to the Association of the Cooperation Committee's cataloguing report. The assembly grew noisy and excited in a debate conducted in a hot and stuffy room. A call was made for a vote. The delegates very significantly were asked to “accept” rather than “adopt” a majority report. They did so. But when it came to taking a separate vote on the matter of hyphens, Cutter took a stand and objected vigorously. He doubted if half the people present knew what the issue at hand was, “and I am sure,” he said, “that in such matters we have no right to pass a resolution that shall in any way bind the Association or be quoted hereafter in favour of any set of rules.” He had thus, out of a particular instance, drawn the general terms of the “government’s” policy.

Later, after more discussion, Dewey, perhaps in exasperation, lucidly and at considerable length, defined the real issue being debated. “Every year or two,” he said, someone usually holding a minority viewpoint, “objects to any expression of opinion by the ALA, and contends that its object is simply to exchange views... these objections assume that if the majority expresses its preference for a given method the minority are in some way being coerced.” But he pointed out that the constitution adopted in 1876 ruled on this very matter. He quoted the relevant passage, which stated as one of ALA's objectives that of reaching conclusions. “We were thus organized not alone to exchange views, but to 'reach conclusions' on just such points as we have before us today.”18 This, then, was the opposition's platform. And Dewey had specifically located the source of disagreement in the three simple words “to reach con-
clusions." A controversy so simply based could be as decisively settled. The very next afternoon, the Resolutions Committee having in the meantime returned Smith's Resolution on the Library School, Winsor offered two further resolutions to the Conference:

voted, that the words in our constitution "to reach conclusions" are not to be understood to mean the adoption by vote of the Association of any principles of action or usage, the endorsement by such vote of any schemes, views or plans, either opposite or inopposite to the purposes of the Association.

voted, that in the future the formal receptance and subsequent publication in the records of the Association of the report of any committee on matters of library usage be regarded as sufficient and final action of the Association on such matters.19

The motions were as a matter of course referred to a committee, and the whole matter was deferred to the next meeting. Significantly, however, the words "to reach conclusions" were struck out of the revised constitution.20 In the face of such motions, such powerful opposition, Dewey's Committee was made more or less powerless, relapsing into an earlier state, that is to say becoming merely a committee of correspondence. Winsor and his reactionary party, despite the obscuring institutional and procedural machinery, had won the day.

One must view Dewey's struggle to root his library school in the ALA as doomed from the start, although the real reason for his failure, for the stand taken by ALA, does not become clearly apparent until 1889. The real reason was that ALA, or a significantly powerful section of its leadership, at that time saw itself only as an instrument of intra-professional communication, a forum for ideas. It could not legislate; it must not endorse. It would do no more than informally suggest; be prepared to discuss. Dewey had attempted, skillfully and perhaps bravely, to buck a system whose watchdogs were a Poole and a Winsor.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE

What of Columbia College? That standards of admission to classes held under its aegis, and the curriculum to be taught in those classes, should be determined without its active participation, seems difficult to accept. Yet, of the three influences bearing on the
nature of the School of Library Economy as it first materialized, Columbia College was by far the weakest. Once again, Dewey, the pragmatist, engaged in politics to secure his ends, politics having unfortunate and far-reaching consequences. He arrived at Columbia with a high reputation, and enjoyed powerful patronage. Moreover, President Barnard, independently acquainted with him through the Metric Bureau, was firmly convinced of the value of establishing a school to train librarians. Perhaps he was inspired by Dewey's fervour. But the profession of librarianship also attracted mainly women, and Barnard may well have seen the proposed Library School as a most useful device for achieving one of his own goals—women students at Columbia. Initially the reaction of his Trustees to the suggestion that they should establish such a school was, if not actually enthusiastic, by no means hostile. Their permissive resolutions of 1883 appear to express no reservations, yet there is an interesting sentence in a letter from Barnard to Dewey which shows how the wind was blowing by 1886. The vexed question of admitting women to the college had, of course, been raised in connection with the school, and Barnard feared that one of the Trustees, by forcing this issue, could ruin their plans. Apart from this, he apprised Dewey, "there seems to be no general interest in the school among the Trustees," though, he continued, "some, I think, disapprove it. Let them have their way for the time being."

But it was upon this very disinterest, and what may be thought of as a kind of institutional cupidity that Dewey and Barnard were to work to finally realize their aims. Barnard, in his 1887 Report, reviewing the conditions under which the school was ultimately established, enumerated them as:

1st. That the conduct of the school should involve no expense to the corporation.

2nd. That instruction in the school should be given by members of the library staff in addition to their ordinary duties.

3rd. That the school should be conducted in the library building with such accommodation as could be found there.

Not surprisingly, he observed that these conditions were a "little difficult."

Dewey himself made political capital out of a programme he had instituted in the library. His scheme was "to select from the many candidates the most promising, and give them opportunity for
training in our library with a very low salary." He viewed this as helping pave the way for the formal school, and he was proud of the dissemination of cheaply developed skill that resulted from it.

One can imagine what finally happened. The Trustees were pressed by the President, who was, in his turn, continually badgered by the pertinacious Dewey, to whose cause he was already friendly. Having committed themselves to a School of Library Economy in 1883, than having stalled to the point of Barnard's utter despair of anything ever coming of the idea, the Trustees finally yielded in 1887 and admitted it into the institutional purview of the college—but only upon terms.

The Trustees had been assured that a School of Library Economy would cost them nothing that could not be raised as small fees from the students. Dewey had encouraged them in the idea that the School would provide a source of cheap labor to get the work of the college library done—had, in fact, demonstrated it. In any case it was inevitable that Columbia College's library must be the School's "laboratory." The Trustees had been relieved of every responsibility that confronts an academic institution beginning a new program, or setting up a new school—the determination of standards of admission, the nature and content of the curriculum, even the degrees to be awarded. Dewey, in consultation with ALA, or on his own initiative, or with the tacit approval of Barnard, had decided all, it seems, without having required the College Government's formal commitment to anything. The Trustees, in effect, were subtly presented with the idea that they could pretend that academically the school did not exist, it was entirely their Librarian's affair, a library matter pure and simple. The school, then, was set up in a kind of academic limbo, and had Dewey been less bumptious personally, and had he not profaned the Columbia campus by introducing women onto it, perhaps it would have remained there. But because Dewey avoided any open confrontation with the College on any of the issues that are involved in the creation of a school, other than the basic one of whether it should exist, his actions in the matter rested on an assumption of unsanctioned personal authority. He left himself open to the smallest objection, and to the charge, whenever objection occurred, of insubordination. He gave into the hands of the college the very stick with which it later drubbed him and his School of Library Economy out of its gates.26
THE WISDOM OF HINDSIGHT

These, then, were the forces leading to the creation of the first library school, and some of the politics and compromises involved. In any consideration of them, one of the first questions that comes to mind is that, granted the necessity for a formal library school of the kind Dewey so skillfully was urging in the profession, why did it have to be attached to a university or college? No one concerned, least of all Dewey, expressed the idea of librarianship as being in any way an academic discipline. The concept of research seems to have been largely foreign to the profession at the time. The emphasis, as had been shown, was entirely on technical training. To be sure, such training needed to be associated with some "considerable library," and its advocate was Melvil Dewey. Therefore, the library which Dewey directed was the logical choice for the site of a training school. But Dewey was interested in Columbia College as something more than an institution conveniently having a library attached to it.

He viewed librarianship as a profession; therefore, education for it belonged in an academic institution. The key to his thinking on this matter may well lie in some remarks he made in 1883 after presenting the Circular of Information to the Buffalo Conference of ALA. In seeking the cooperation of the Association, he says:

We hardly over-rate the importance of the proposed undertaking to the library interests of the entire country in raising our work to the full rank of a regular profession, with its recognized courses of instruction, its certificates and degrees conferred by the university.27

It is clear that what Dewey wanted above all was that the mantle of academic respectability be thrown upon education for librarianship. He was sufficiently astute to see that full professional status lay only within college walls. Yet his politics involved him in an unresolvable dilemma. His decision to anchor his school in the reluctant ALA necessitated his adoption of ALA's conception of the nature and needs of librarianship. As a body of working librarians trained in libraries, any consensus derived from ALA perhaps inevitably emphasized the pragmatic, the technical, the non-academic, the anti-intellectual. This meant that Dewey could not formulate his courses of instruction, had he so wished, or enunciate his philosophy of librarianship, had he something more closely rationalized
than a passionate conviction of value, in a manner suitable to an institution dedicated to the academic, the intellectual. For his school to have entered the academic world through the front door, he needed to invite objection, to confront it and to confute it directly, systematically, and at length. He needed to assert, and be prepared to demonstrate, the possibility of developing a body of professional knowledge capable of the kind of extension in breadth and depth, demanding the kind of investigation and codification, that only custodianship by an academic institution could provide. But he shirked one aspect of what was a double responsibility because of his single-minded commitment to the profession. He introduced the study of librarianship into the university to a very considerable degree surreptitiously, under false pretenses, by the back door.

This action of his may be thought to have created a critical issue in librarianship and education for it. Is librarianship a profession in fact—something more than a matter of techniques and skills? Removed from the aura of missionary fervour which surrounds the conversation of its practitioners, is there, in librarianship, an academic, a professional discipline? Dewey had an opportunity he ignored to establish at the outset of formal education for librarianship the propriety of its place in the university. In pursuit of an appearance, and in being satisfied with it, he ignored the necessity that there should be a solid reality beneath any appearance.

His actions also raise another important question, and that is the location of leadership for the profession. Does the library school follow the profession, embody it, reduce it to microcosmic form, or does it lead? Does it innovate? Is it conservative, or is it radical in relation to professional practice and thought? Between these extremes what balance is to be struck and how?

Dewey's actions create both questions, and as his answer to them, history must find something wanting. In any attempt at final evaluation of Dewey and his role in education for librarianship, one must be wary of one of the easiest fallacies of hindsight—to trace a present and highly complex situation to a single historic "cause." Yet it is true that a single historic "cause" may ramify extensively into the present. Dewey is such a cause. He began a pattern of education. His disciples went forth and set up in libraries and technical institutions schools similar to that in which they were themselves taught—technical training schools. These were what Dewey and the profession, as far as he could relate his school to its needs, wanted. But university schools, existing on the fringe of the aca-
emic world, ultimately had to demonstrate some essential difference by which they could be distinguished from other kinds of training schools. They had to justify their right to be on the university campus at all. Dewey, in avoiding the essential issue, simply deferred the hour of reckoning, and his deferment probably intensified the severity of its consequences.

In a sense, the 1923 Williamson Report on education for librarianship is the moment of reckoning. It is an indictment of the whole system of education Dewey began, and attempts to show how the listing ship could be righted. There was, and to a degree still is, in librarianship, a perspicuous disparity between an appearance of academic respectability and a reality empty of scholarly content. The resulting attitudes in the academic world of suspicion, or indifference, or amused tolerant condescension, have continued into the present. In a sense, the continuing call in the profession for a philosophy is revelant here, for it reflects an awareness of incomplete acceptance, of questioned quality. What is meant by philosophy is really little more than systematic, persuasive, rationalized justification—part of which must place professional education in the university, and admit it unequivocally to all academic prerogatives, practices, and distinctions.

In the final analysis to say that, though Dewey created formal education for librarianship, he set it back fifty years, is a paradox; it is only very little an exaggeration. He failed to realize he had a double responsibility—to the profession, which he saw incorporated in ALA, and to the academic world. One might wonder if his school—and so future education for librarianship—would have been much different had he not seen his greatest responsibility as being the need to relate his work to ALA, for he was one of those important in creating ALA opinion, and where he did not, he generally acquiesced in it. Indeed, he very well may have seen his role in ALA, to be oil both for creaking machinery and for troubled waters. In any case, his actions do reveal a sense of deepest responsibility to the profession; but he ignored or was unaware of the nature of his responsibility to Columbia College.

Throughout all his work for education for librarianship, indeed, there run two strands which provide clues to one aspect of his complex personality. He constantly avoided any confrontation, both in the ALA and at Columbia which would pin him down, commit him to detail. Nor did he care to consider the appropriateness of means taken to achieve ends of whose justness he was convinced. The
qualities reflect not merely the pragmatist, the politician, but also the misguided idealist. In this contradiction lies his ultimate failure as an educator for librarianship. In it lies his indubitable success.
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