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ABSTRACT
This study argues that African Americans were largely excluded from education for librarianship in northern schools during the earliest period of library training programs in the U.S. (1890-1940). This practice of exclusion was enabled by leaders of educational institutions and the American Library Association that did not integrate library schools in the north. This project is based on archival and published research, notably a letter found in the Pratt Institute Archives that shows that its library school had an explicit practice of not admitting African American students for its first fifty years of existence.
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Introduction

This project was prompted by a letter found in an archive. In 2015, Pratt Institute archivist Paul Schlotthauer showed me the carbon copy of a typewritten letter in the archives of Pratt Institute’s School of Information. As context, the school traces its roots to 1890 Brooklyn, when Pratt Institute first began offering courses in library economics and book cataloging. The archival records from which this letter was drawn document the organization’s movement from over a 125-year period.\(^1\) The letter was dated December 5, 1939, and it was addressed to Charles Pratt, the president of Pratt Institute and grandson of the Institute’s founder.\(^2\) I will excerpt it for brevity, but particularly salient parts—those that form the impulse for this project—are repeated below:

The placement situation is less favorable this year than usual. As a rule all graduates are placed by September, but at present three from a class of 35 are not. We are finding the racial question more acute, but we shall attempt to solve this by trying for a class which is representative of this country as a whole. An exception for the present will be negro representation, which leads to my next subject.

The Hampton Institute Library School is now closed, as we are having more applications from negroes than before. In a school as small as ours, we hesitate to bring possible student dissension into the student body. The question is not one we must answer at once, but sooner or later we shall have to ask the Institute for its opinion.

This letter is astonishing for several reasons. Although not signed but certainly written by the school’s new director Wayne Shirley shortly after taking the lead of the school in 1938, it reveals firstly that the school had a shared understanding among the leadership of the school and the
Institute that it was not admitting African American students. The student records of Alice Roberts, who was admitted in 1942 and became “our first and only Negro student at the Pratt Institute Library School,” support this interpretation. Further, the letter draws explicit connections between the school’s practice of non-admission and the role played by Hampton Institute, which was the first historically black college to offer a library training program, closing in the year the letter was written: 1939. Lastly, the letter is significant in that it tries to explain why the practice of exclusion continued to exist, and signals the beginning of the breakdown of this fifty-year exclusion, which collapsed in 1942 with the admission of Alice Roberts.

This paper will attempt to put this letter in a wider historical context, and draw connections to what it might mean for our understanding of education for black librarianship, especially in the northern parts of the U.S. during the earliest days of education for librarianship (1890-1940). In particular, I will posit that African Americans were excluded from education for librarianship in the north out maintaining segregation in education and work environments as was common across all sectors of society in the north. This arrangement of segregation was sustained not only by leaders of educational institutions but also through the complicity of associations like the American Library Association (ALA).

**Hampton Institute and Library Schools in the North**

Modern accounts of the civil rights struggle often emphasize activities in the south, with most detailing activity after the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which effectively ended the public policy of “separate but equal.” Less attention is paid to the civil rights struggle in the north in the early period of the Great Migration, where African Americans moved from the south and by the 1920s numbered in the millions. Relatedly, the literature in the LIS domain tends to focus on activities in the south, with much less focus on this earlier period in the north. For example, Cheryl Knott’s *Not Free: Not for All: Public Libraries in the Age of Jim Crow*, provides a wealth of detail on public library services in the south. Relatedly, library science education activities in the south such the formation and the dissolution of the Hampton Institute’s Library School is particularly well documented through dissertations and journal articles. As background, the Hampton Institute—today Hampton University on the south coast of Virginia—is a historically black college and was the site for the first black library school,
beginning in 1925 and shutdown in 1939. The *Directory of Negro Graduates of Accredited Library Schools 1900-1936* makes clear that during Hampton’s short lifespan it supplied the vast majority of the black librarians in the United States.\(^8\) Based on counts from this source, by 1936 Hampton supplied 123 of the 183 black librarians in the U.S. (67%), which points to Hampton’s pivotal role. This statistic supports Lucy Cambell’s assertion that “one cannot assess librarianship and black librarians without a retrospective glance at the Hampton Institute Library School.”\(^9\)

The literature details the heavy involvement that ALA had in the formation of the library school at Hampton. Robert Martin and Lee Shiftlet describe an active partnership between ALA and three philanthropic organizations in a “crusade to establish a library education program for African American in the South.”\(^10\) According to the literature, the work between ALA and these philanthropies, which include the Carnegie Corporation and the Rosenwald Fund, was part of a “southern strategy” of which establishing Hampton Library School was an important part.\(^11\) Lee Shiftlett describes the tight connection between ALA and Hampton, noting that “from its beginning in 1925, the library school at Hampton was operated under the sanction and almost direct control of the American Library Association.”\(^12\) Despite the research that the authors work brings to clarifying the relationship between ALA and Hampton Institute, some of Shiftlet’s questions remain unanswered. For example, he writes:

> The question of why a library school for Southern blacks became a central focus of the ALA and the foundations rather than other alternatives has not been satisfactorily answered. For example, a plan for the foundations to fund scholarships for black students to Northern library schools seems to have had support from members of all interested factions but failed to receive serious consideration.\(^13\)

What remains unsaid, but what the Pratt letter strongly indicates, is that northern library schools were by and large not admitting African Americans students. As I will argue here, an integral part of the “southern strategy” was to relieve pressure on northern school to admit black students by making available alternative opportunities in the south. The Hampton Institute played the
crucial role of relieving northern schools from this pressure, and as the Pratt letter indicates with its dissolution in 1939 the pressure returned. This strategy also kept northern schools from creating a pool of graduates that needed job placement in northern libraries. Graduates of Hampton could go on to serve in segregated libraries in south—where such existed—and northern libraries would not have to entertain interviewing and hiring African Americans.

Pratt was not the only northern school not to admit black students. In the introduction of the *Directory of Negro Graduates of Accredited Library Schools 1900-1936*, the editor writes the following:

> The data for this directory was secured first by communicating with twenty-one of twenty-six library schools listed in the American Library Association Handbook, 1936. […] Of the twenty-one schools responding, seven stated that they had no Negro graduates…\(^{14}\)

In this list of schools that never had a black student, Pratt was certainly one of them. However, other schools that had been offering library training for a similarly long time, including Drexel Institute in Philadelphia (beginning in 1891, now Drexel University) include no names.\(^{15}\) Other schools have very few names, which indicates a practice of deliberately admitting few. These include Syracuse University (1 student), Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh (1 name), Simmons College (4 names), University of Wisconsin Madison (1 name), University of Michigan (3 names) and Western Reserve in Cleveland (now Case Western, 5 names). The only northern schools graduating a sizeable number of African American beside Hampton Institute include Columbia University (22 names) and University of Illinois, Urbana (15 names). These discrepancies cannot be explained by population differences but by practices of exclusion. Populous areas with sizeable African American populations during the 1920s and 1930s, such as Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Pittsburgh, had few or no graduates.

Literature that makes use of archival sources, such as the ALA archives in Urbana, indicate that there is ample evidence that ALA had information that northern schools were not admitting African American students. In 1929 the ALA Board of Education for Librarianship surveyed the
policies for admitting African American students. Of the fourteen library schools surveyed in the North and West, only four agreed that they would admit African American students without reservation. In response to the survey, a Pratt Institute representative wrote the following:

New York State forbids any tax-exempted institution from discrimination against students because of race. Therefore the policy of Pratt Institute is not to refuse admittance to negro students. The School of Library Science, however, must limit the class in size and needs to make careful selection of students. No negro applicant has ever measured up to the standards of the School of Library Science and none has, therefore, been admitted.16

Ten years later, with Shirley’s letter to Pratt, it was clear that the qualifications argument was no longer sufficient and other arguments were needed, such as the possibility of “student dissention.” The School was also clearly not too concerned with New York State’s non-discrimination requirement. Drexel’s response echoed Pratt’s: “In common with other private schools in the section, it has been found inadvisable to admit colored students for day collegiate work. However, they are admitted in the evening school. Applications to the library school have in all cases been referred to Hampton Institute.”17 Since there were no Drexel graduates listed in the 1936 directory of negro librarians, there is no evidence that the “evening school” produced any graduates. The Carnegie School in Pittsburgh also uses the requirements argument, noting that “Negro applicants have not been able to meet the requirements of this School.”18 Several schools mention the housing issue that inhibits admission. For example, a Syracuse representative writes it is “difficult to find satisfactory places for women students to live.” Other issues raised include the job placement issue; both Western Reserve and University of Michigan representatives raise this issue. The response from Simmons evades the question entirely: “It is advised that all applicants for admission make personal inquiry of the Director.”19

Rosemary Ruhig Du Mont quotes the director of the school at the University of Michigan, William Warner Bishop, who writes in a response letter to the 1929 survey that “My own impression is that the school at Hampton Institute should be quite sufficient to provide such colored librarians as are needed for some time to come. It seems to me that the Board of
Education will do far better to send students to Hampton rather than urge them to come to other institutions where their presence is a distinct embarrassment.’” This statement supports the notion that the prevailing orthodoxy at the time and part of the “southern strategy” was to push African American students to Hampton rather than integrate them into northern library schools.

Arthur Clinton Gunn, who wrote his dissertation on Hampton, notes that there was a “common attitude that discouraged the enrollment of blacks at library schools in the North” and that leaders of ALA “knew that black would not be welcome at Northern library schools.”

In the library literature, there were occasional rumblings of the fact that library schools were not admitting African Americans into their programs. Louis Shores, in an article in Library Journal, writes “there are now more library schools than the opportunities warrant; but the Negro community is still untouched.” By the end of the 1930s, the lack of training for black librarians started to become more apparent. In an article in the New York Amsterdam News—a black newspaper—a reporter writes that “…despite thickly populated Negro sections in Brooklyn, there are no Negro librarians in the entire borough…”

**Black Librarians: Employment and the Profession**

In the north, a self-perpetuating system of exclusion existed which inhibited black librarians from entering the profession. Libraries would not hire black librarians, and there were no black librarians to hire since schools would not train them (or if they did, only very few). In the first roundtable of ALA’s “Working with Negroes Roundtable” in 1922, a survey was sent to 122 institutions to get a sense of the library services that were offered to African Americans, and 98 surveys were returned. In looking at results of this survey, Klaus Mussman notes that “none of the surveyed libraries employed African Americans educated in a library school.”

A Library Journal report from this roundtable offers some insight into the thinking at the time. A representative from New York Public Library (NYPL) “spoke of the North coming rapidly to a problem similar to that in the South” with regard to segregation. This representative noted that NYPL did not have African American library assistants other than at the 135th Street branch, which is later to become the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. Even there, this arrangement was considered an “experiment.” She wonders out loud if the branch should be
“made a colored branch or whether colored assistants should be put in other branches.” Despite this representative’s interest in doing something about segregation, the discussion signals that hiring black librarians were not even being considered; rather, only black library assistants. As has been discussed here, there were few training opportunities for black librarians in the north. The literature indicates that the only reliable job path for a black librarian was at a historically black college, and those largely existed in the south. At the roundtable, a chilling comment is offered by a Southern attendee, who expressed that “…negroes [need] to think and listen and say little” as “…the majority rules, the white race is in control and the practical problem remains to arrange complete co-operation with the least friction.”

Donnarare MacCann finds that libraries outside of HCBUs generally did not employ African Americans, citing the case of Kansas City, where no black librarian had ever been hired even in the “Negro branch” because “they had ‘never found an efficient one.’” Further, not only did libraries not employ African Americans, but they often provided them with differentiated (often inferior) services. MacCann notes a survey from Fisk University librarian Louis Shores, who surveyed public libraries in 80 cities in 1930 and found that while some libraries admitted African Americans, “absurd restrictions were placed on those visits: the Black patrons were not to sit down; they were to request only those materials that were not available elsewhere; and they were to agree that ‘no publicity [would be] attached to these occasional exceptions.’” MacCann notes that these examples “suggest a link between the library profession’s reluctance to service the Black public and its failure to welcome African Americans into the profession.”

MacCann contrasts the extensive services that were offered to European immigrants, such as Czech immigrants in Cleveland, and the lack of related investment in African Americans arriving from the south. She finds that “Cleveland librarians took it upon themselves to assist, as well as Americanize, foreigners and to explain their needs to mainstream groups,” providing services such as story hours, library youth clubs, and buying books in foreign languages. She notes “Librarians were noticeably creative in their attempts to smooth the path of the [European] newcomers”; however, the “profession mobilized itself for the sake of advancing immigrant, but not African American, interests.” Clara Chu reaches a similar conclusion, noting “Librarians set policies to encourage basic educational opportunities for immigrants and discourage the
availability of such opportunities for Blacks.”

Cheryl Branche echoes this sentiment, finding that “Unlike immigrants, blacks, as slaves and former slaves, were not eligible to benefit from the services offered in the early libraries.”

In considering the services and job opportunities for blacks in libraries, MacCann finds that “Blacks were to be treated as a permanent American underclass and library history shows the library profession’s culpability in sustaining that underclass status.”

The notion of whiteness is particularly useful here, which refers—among other things—to the post-World War II category used to categorize and describe Americans of European descent. Scholars such as Todd Honma argue that “…libraries have historically served the interests of a white racial project by aiding in the construction and maintenance of a white American citizenry as well as the perpetuation of white privilege.”

Examples such as the extensive services provided to European immigrants, contrasted with the lack of service to newly arrived African Americans, would certainly support this assertion. Further, perpetuating a system of segregation in education and work environments for librarians indicates the culpability of the early profession in sustaining a stratified society.

A further example of the reluctance of the profession, and by extension ALA, in fully inviting African Americans to participate in the profession can be found with the case of the 1936 ALA Conference in Richmond, Virginia. Although 25 black librarians attended, Rhuig Du Mont notes a letter to attendees showing that “Blacks would be able to attend most sessions, sitting in a segregated portion of all meeting halls, but would not be allowed to attend any meetings where meals were served, nor would they be able to obtain rooms in the hotels housing the white delegates.”

Although segregation was the law of Richmond at the time, the issue is how amenable the profession was to having black librarians when they would hold the conference in a city that enforced strict segregation. An article in the New Republic at the time asks, “Why should any civilized association, with Negro members, undertake to hold such a convention in Virginia or any other state that makes such distinctions?”

Rhuig Du Mont notes that there “was an apparent acquiescence to the policy of segregation in Richmond by both whites and the few blacks that decided to come.”

With regard to this case, Lorna Peterson finds that the “American Library Association has the honor of being a professional organization that was never
segregated, but at the same time it did not take a stance against prevailing segregationist practices.”

The lack of black librarians, or even black library staff, did not go unnoticed by the black community. In an article in the *New York Amsterdam News*, a reporter writes in 1937 about the “voiced resentment of many civic-minded person of this community who have long opposed the concentrating of almost all of the Negro workers in the library system at the 135th street branch, of which Miss Ernestine Rose, white, in in charge.”

**Putting the Letter in Context: Pratt’s Library School**

To better place the letter found in its historical context, more background on Pratt Institute’s Library School is necessary. Pratt Institute began offering librarianship courses in 1890, and was formally incorporated into a school in 1895 under the directorship of Mary Wright Plummer. Since Pratt Institute also offered free libraries services to the Brooklyn public through 1940, the library school and the library were intertwined, creating both trained librarians a workforce for staffing these libraries. In 1911 when Plummer left to direct the Training School at New York Public Library, Josephine Adams Rathbone was appointed vice-director, reporting into the library director Edward F. Stevens. Barbara Brand, in a study of the school, quotes a graduate Rice Estes, who notes “Miss Rathbone ruled the library school. And the whole country knew it, including Mr. Stevens.” She served in that position until 1938, when Wayne Shirley (the letter writer) assumed the directorship of the Pratt Institute library, which also included the responsibility of overseeing the library school. Importantly, both Rathbone and Plummer oversaw programs that excluded African American students, and both became presidents of the American Library Association (Plummer in 1915-1916 and Rathbone in 1931-1932), with Plummer becoming the second woman president.

ALA and ALA presidents are able to exercise a degree of control over library schools. Even today, the ALA president appoints all members of the Committee on Accreditation, which makes decisions on accreditations. Through the accreditation mechanism, ALA could have insisted that library schools admit African American students. However, as been shown here, ALA’s strategy was to invest in Hampton rather than force northern library schools to integrate black
students into their student bodies. To illustrate ALA’s influence on library schools, an early example from Pratt Library school’s history is illustrative. Barbara Brand writes about Pratt’s first accreditation by ALA in 1924, when the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) accredited the school at the lowest level, largely because BEL felt that the school focused too much on practical library work that could be done by paraprofessionals. She discusses the extensive work that vice-director Rathbone undertook to deal with this crisis, including lobbying in the profession, using high-level leaders in the field who were also alumni to lobby on Pratt’s behalf, among other strategies. Eventually, this classification got overturned, resulting in a new classification: “accredited, unclassified, but with high and acceptable standards.” This example indicates that ALA was able to compel library schools to act through the accreditation mechanism, yet it did not exercise such power in forcing the admission African Americans, nor is there any indication that this was something the association desired. To repeat Peterson’s earlier point, ALA “did not take a stance against prevailing segregationist practices.”

As mentioned earlier, in 1942 Pratt’s Library School admitted its first African American student: Alice Roberts (1921-2014). Her student records shows that she completed her B.S. from Hampton Institute in 1941 and took post-graduate courses at Howard University in 1942. Letters in her file, largely comprising of carbon copies of letters from the School’s associate director to prospective employers, and letters received back from those employers, indicate some of the pressures Alice faced being the first African American student in the program. Alice was unable to make Pratt’s required admissions interview—living as she did in Roanoke, Virginia—and thus was interviewed instead by a librarian at the D.C. Public Library, who delivered feedback on Alice in a letter to the school. The reviewer notes that “she is very attractive looking—pretty, light-complexioned and tastefully dressed.” This letter indicates how skin color, and even its gradations, were factored into Alice’s admission. These comments on her “light-complexion” and tasteful dress were likely delivered to allay the fears of a School that had never admitted an African American student.

After admission and seeking job placement for Alice, Associate director Hansen writes to a librarian at the Enoch Pratt Free Library that “Miss Roberts is our first Negro student, and since our class is small only one with poise and adaptability could make a success of it. This she has
done unquestionably, winning the respect of her fellows students as well as real liking.”

The letters make clear that Roberts made a positive impression during her time at Pratt, however, one can only imagine the strain of having to always behave to the “liking” of the white students and faculty. In a letter to Roberts’ father (a medical doctor in Roanoke, Virginia), Hansen writes that “Alice is our first Negro student in the Library School, and she is a credit to her race, her family and her college.” Although a very laudatory statement, it again points to the kinds of pressures placed on young African Americans, requiring extraordinary behavior or risk the possibility of “dissension.” It is reminiscent of James Baldwin’s discussion of the novel *Native Son* and the ways in which “… Negroes are controlled in our society and the complex techniques they have evolved for their survival.”

The letters in her file indicate that Roberts’ employment prospects post graduation was strictly in segregated environments. For example, she was “being considered by the New York Public Library for a position in their 135th Street (Negro) Branch,” as well as the Medical Library at Howard University. There was also interest in her taking on a role in the in a proposed “Langston Terrace branch for Colored and manned by a Colored staff” of the D.C. Public Library. Further, there is an expression of interest at the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, where they signaled “we have an appointment to make next month at a branch where we are changing over to a colored staff.” In these letters, there is always an indication of Alice’s race, either by explicitly stating that she is a “negro” or pointing out that she received her education from Hampton and Howard. Although the color wall finally fell at the school with the admission of Alice Roberts, the color wall persisted in library employment environments. As she left the school, she was in high-demand by employers, but only in segregated environments with all black staffs, or at HBCUs that served black students and faculty. These letters attest to Tracie Hall’s assertion that “libraries have often operated in environments critically informed by race.”

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this paper found that African Americans were largely excluded from education for librarianship in northern schools during the earliest days of library training programs (1890-1940). Leaders of educational institutions and professional associations such as ALA enabled
this practice of exclusion. To illustrate the interrelationships between ALA and northern library schools, it is worthwhile to note that two of Pratt’s library school leaders—who oversaw a school that effectively refused to admit African Americans for 43 years—both became presidents of ALA. To relieve pressure to admit African American students, a “southern strategy” was developed that allowed African Americans to receive training at the Hampton Institute Library School, where graduates could go on to serve in segregated libraries in the south (most notably at HBCUs), and not force the integration issue in northern education and work environments. By not graduating a pool of African Americans librarians, northern libraries were put under no pressure to force the issue of staff integration. Segregation of education and work environments reined in northern libraries and library schools, reflecting a society defined by organized racism.

In considering the exclusion of African American from northern library schools, it is not surprising to see recent books with titles like, Where Are All the Librarians of Color?61 Although the color wall at library schools like Pratt fell nearly 75 years ago, the aftereffects of such widespread exclusion linger. In the field of LIS—as captured by some of the articles referenced here—there is a growing interest in more open discussions of race. As the recent Black Lives Matter movement also indicates, this interest is not limited to LIS but is more widespread. This article suggests that digging into archives offers a glimpse into a world where widespread exclusion was not subtle, characterized by micro-aggressions or veiled discrimination, but rather ubiquitous and necessitating the complicity of a range of actors. Being able to reconstruct these historical practices can give a fuller picture of race and racism in LIS and provide a more full background for addressing questions like, “where are all the librarians of color?”
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