Fall 2009

California librarians and the Vietnam War, 1967--1972.

Daryn Eller
San Jose State University

CALIFORNIA LIBRARIANS AND THE VIETNAM WAR, 1967-1972

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Library and Information Science

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Library and Information Science

by

Daryn Eller

December 2009

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

The Undersigned Thesis Committee Approves the Thesis Titled

CALIFORNIA LIBRARIANS AND THE VIETNAM WAR, 1967-1972

by
Daryn Eller

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Dr. Debra Hansen,	School of Library and Information Science	10/27/09 Date
Dr. Anthony Bernier,	School of Library and Information Science	31 Oct '09 Date
Robert Boyd,	Santa Clara University	11/4/09 Date

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Associate Dean	Office of Graduate Studies and Research	12/4/09 Date

ABSTRACT

CALIFORNIA LIBRARIANS AND THE VIETNAM WAR, 1967-1972

By Daryn Eller

Just like other segments of society, librarianship was affected by the Vietnam War and the parallel antiwar movement, though in varying degrees. The war precipitated a debate among librarians about whether, in a profession that prides itself on neutrality, it is appropriate to speak out on political matters. In California, a state that was both heavily dependent on military spending and the home of a strong antiwar movement, some individual librarians did take a stand against the war, as did the California Library Association. Primarily, though, librarians concentrated on providing information to citizens to help them make informed decisions, coming up with innovative ways to serve patrons when material on the war was needed most. This research shows that despite their personal sentiments, California librarians endeavored to offer collections that showed both sides of the issue. The Vietnam War did not significantly change library philosophy in itself; however, as one of the issues that caused societal changes in the late sixties and early seventies, the war had an impact, perhaps even a lasting one, on library service.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis is a learning process, and I am grateful to all those who served as "teachers" along the way. Dr. Debra Hansen, an actual teacher, makes historical research alluring, and it was in one of her classes that I became inspired to delve into the life of librarians during the Vietnam War. She has been enthusiastic and helpful every step of the way and I am forever thankful for her guidance. Many thanks, too, to Dr. Anthony Bernier and Robert Boyd—Dr. Bernier for urging me to explore the meaning of neutrality, and Professor Boyd for graciously hopping on board at the last minute.

When you are just starting out, university archives can be daunting places. Monique Sugimoto at UCLA University Archives, my first stop, eased the way by being welcoming, instructive and insightful. I am lucky to have started my search under such gracious guidance. David Kessler filled a similar role at Bancroft Library. I am thankful for his patience, good nature, and for the help of the entire Bancroft Library staff. (And great thanks to Dorene Loew and Jennifer Brown and their son, Parker, for use of the best guest room in the Bay Area.) What little information I was able to include from Stanford I owe to Jenny Johnson, who went digging at the behest of an e-mail and made a great find.

Public library archives were harder nuts to crack and I appreciate the helpfulness of the staff at the San Francisco Public Library and of Rachel Foyt at the Santa Monica Public Library. I had just about given up hope of finding anything at the Los Angeles Public Library when I had the good fortune to come across Sheila Nash. Her help was

invaluable and I am grateful for all her work on my behalf.

My utmost thanks also go to Janice Koyama and Robert Eckert for looking back to the sixties and seventies and sharing their experiences. They both made me feel that librarianship is a wonderful profession practiced by inspiring people.

I'm fortunate to have the most supportive husband imaginable and a darling daughter (often) content to play with dolls while Mommy typed away. Andy and Aidan, thank you for always being there with love, tolerance, and good humor.

CONTENTS

TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Libraries have a history of responding to the nation's needs while at war. As I was writing an account of the Santa Monica Public Library's early years (1876-1920) I discovered that the institution paid quite a bit of attention to doing its "part" to aid the country's World War I efforts. And SMPL was not alone. According to Dee Garrison, "Library chiefs excitedly awoke to their new mission, anticipating that the value of their war activity would at last bring the public library the recognition it deserved as the capstone of the nation's educational system."[1]

How did library chiefs respond roughly fifty years later when the United States became involved in the Vietnam War? It is a question that has not received much consideration. While there is no shortage of historical literature on the social responsibilities movement among librarians, very little has been devoted specifically to libraries and the Vietnam War. Instead, anything having to do with Vietnam has mostly been combined with other social issues of the day. The aim of this study is to look exclusively at the impact of the war on California librarianship by examining the political sentiments of librarians, library students and administrators and whether those sentiments affected services to patrons. This study will also look at how the events—i.e., strikes and demonstrations—outside their doors impacted libraries' day-to-day operations, and whether this seminal time in the nation's history had any lasting impact on librarianship.

---

1. Dee Garrison, *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society*, 1876-1920 (New York: Free Press, 1979), 219.

PART I

THE WAR AT HOME AND ABROAD

The Vietnam War touched Americans of all stripes. Whether they were in favor of the U.S. government's attempt to head off communism in Southeast Asia, or were adamantly against the deployment of American soldiers in Vietnam, most people who lived through this controversial time in United States history could not help but be distressed by the way things were going, both at home and abroad. Even now, the Vietnam War rankles. Historian Robert D. Schulzinger has put it this way:

> So deep were the feelings that it took twenty years, until 1995, for the United States and Vietnam to resume full diplomatic relations, an action that subdued but did not put to rest the arguments over Vietnam. Indeed, the lingering animosities, regrets, second thoughts, and bitterness of the Vietnam era may die only when the last public official involved in setting Vietnam policy and every Vietnam veteran and antiwar protester have left the scene. The Vietnam War stands as the sort of watershed event for American politics, foreign policy, culture, values, and economy in the 1960s that the Civil War was in the 1860s and the Great Depression was in the 1930s.[1]

The war, as it was taking place, and the antiwar movement, in full swing, provide the backdrop for this period in library history. Like most Americans, librarians were undoubtedly aware of current events; perhaps even more so since keeping up on newsworthy happenings that might interest patrons is part of the job. As this study will show, just as the war created fissures among the American people, it also split librarians. Some spoke out within a professional capacity on the conflict in Southeast Asia; others believed that personal sentiments had no place in a profession committed to objectivity.

---

1. Robert D. Schulzinger, *A Time for War: The United States and Vietnam, 1941-1975* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), ix.

Chapter 1

Librarians At War With Themselves

When *Library Journal* editor Eric Moon summed up the year 1968—a year marked by extreme divisiveness over the Vietnam War as well as the murders of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr.—he noted that riots largely bypassed libraries. It was, he said, a mixed blessing: "It could be a sign of the low silhouette of libraries in important affairs," or that "librarians are doing a good job in both the colleges and the ghettos." Libraries in colleges, he also pointed out, were touched by student revolt only by chance. Overall, Vietnam scarcely affected the operation of libraries beyond threatening to drain away funds for building construction.[1]

It would be easy to take Moon's report at face value and conclude that, well, the sixties were wild, Vietnam was a mess and the whole crazy thing affected everyone, including librarians, though mostly just a little. But the events of one year do not begin to tell the whole story. Over the course of approximately five years, from 1967 to 1972, the Vietnam War tested librarians in numerous ways, Moon, as it happens, especially. A vociferous supporter of librarians speaking out against the war, his editorials in *Library Journal* incited a rash of angry letters—more letters than a decade's worth of missives on other topics combined.[2]

---

1. Eric Moon, "News Report: 1968, January 1, 1969," in *Library Issues: The Sixties*, ed. Eric Moon and Karl Nyren (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970), 373.

2. Kenneth F. Kister, *Eric Moon: The Life and Library Times* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002), 198.

Most famously, Moon, in a 1967 editorial titled "Voices on Vietnam?" called on his colleagues to sign a joint statement with the publishing industry asking the president to "stop destroying the people and the economy of Vietnam." While many letter writers were supportive of Moon's plea, the opposition were equally if not more passionate. "I don't contest anyone's right to dissent, and I do so myself," wrote Bradley Simon, library director of the Scottsdale Public Library in Arizona. "However, such a campaign by *LJ* very strongly implies acceptance by the library profession as a whole." Arless B. Nixon of the Phoenix Public Library put it more bluntly: "I regret that you have apparently found it desirable to lower the professional ethics of editorship to recruit librarians to support your personal biases. Using your esteemed position to incite organized dissent is far removed from accepted standards of librarianship."[3]

Moon also questioned why librarians, so willing to speak out on other social issues, were keeping mum about the conflict in Southeast Asia. Maybe, he mused, it was because "librarians properly assert that the library is neutral ground—in the sense that it represents (or should represent) *all* sides of public issues." As a result, Moon believed, it was assumed that librarians as individuals were neutral; thus they were rarely called on to participate in public protest.[4]

He may have been right at the time, but as the years and the seemingly endless war wore on, many librarians did become proactive. What's more, by the time Nixon

3. "Dissent from Dissent: Originally published in December 1, 1967," *Library Journal* 117 (May 1, 1992): S5.

4. Eric Moon, "Voices on Vietnam? October 15, 1967," in *Library Issues: The Sixties*, ed. Eric Moon and Karl Nyren (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970), 108-9; "The Book Publishing Industry and Library Profession's Advertisement on the Vietnam War, *New York Times*, December 26, 1967," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), appendix C.

pulled the troops out of Vietnam in 1972, the war had sorely tested the boundaries of objectivity in the library workplace. To Moon's biographer, Kenneth F. Kister, Vietnam was a seminal event in library history:

> The war had a profound impact on nearly every aspect of American life, and librarianship was no exception. Specifically, Vietnam affected the profession in two quite distinct ways. First, it helped radicalize a corps of young librarians and library students, who viewed the conflict not only as evil *qua* evil but symptomatic of all that was wrong with American society, including their chosen field. . . . In addition, the war had a chilling economic impact on American libraries.[5]

Granted, the war was not the only concern of librarians during the late sixties and early seventies. The unrest of the era "cut deep crevices into the nation's social and psychic terrain."[6] In addition to the turbulence caused by the Vietnam War, the decade shook and shuddered with the Civil Rights Movement, feminist and gay rights protests, the drive for sexual liberation and the freedom to "free" oneself with mind-altering substances. Authority was being questioned at every turn.

Not immune to the great upheaval around them, librarians contemplated whether the major issues of the day—minority rights, women's rights, gay rights and poverty, among them—should be on their agenda. It was the dawning of the age of social responsibility and many members of the profession felt librarians should be an active part of it. Others, of course, did not agree that civil rights, war or other hot button topics were library issues. "At the heart of the debate," wrote Toni Samek, who chronicled the social

---

5. Kister, *Eric Moon: The Life and Library Times*, 232.

6. Irwin Unger and Debi Unger, eds., *The Times Were a Changin': The Sixties Reader* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998), 1.

responsibility movement among librarians, "was the issue of professional 'neutrality." [7] The fight over expanding the activities of the American Library Association to include matters that some felt only tangentially affected librarianship lasted for years, eventually spawning the Social Responsibilities Round Table (a topic that will be discussed further later in this study).

Purpose of the Thesis

Did librarians speak out on the Vietnam War? Did the fact of the war—or their feelings about it—influence their choices of materials? Did the war affect business as usual in libraries? And what of academic libraries? How did war-related student unrest influence their operations? These are the main questions this study proposes to answer by focusing a lens on California libraries between the years of 1967 and 1972.

As to that first question, most of the instances of outspokenness documented here have to do with antiwar sentiment rather than the reverse. This is not to say that some librarians were not vocal about the need to support the presidents' foreign policies. They were, and some of those opinions are documented in this thesis, too. But those who broke the code of neutrality were much more likely to be on the antiwar side, often spurred into action (or at least reaction) by the brutality of the conflict and its seeming inhumanity. Moreover, unlike during World War II, when librarians were urged to create collections that would promote the government's point of view, no such call to arms

7. Toni Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2001), 1.

seemed to be issued during the Vietnam war.[8] Perhaps it was the way the war, years in the making, crept up on the nation. In 1969, one librarian even referred to the Vietnam War, which was never officially declared, as "a war that is not a war."[9] Further, the conflict in Southeast Asia—guerilla warfare fought against a third-world country—was different in nature from the World Wars.

Several factors make the topic of librarianship during the Vietnam War worthy of its own investigation. For one thing, there exists a small, but valuable body of literature chronicling the impact of World War I and World War II on American libraries. The Vietnam War, while not of the same scale as World War I and II, clearly impacted this country in a way that still reverberates today ("Is Iraq becoming another Vietnam?" Susan Page was prompted to ask in the April 13, 2004, edition of *USA Today*). This formal accounting of how the war in Southeast Asia and, especially, the antiwar movement affected libraries, librarians and their professional organizations continues the line of scholarship covering libraries in wartime.

While the question of how public and academic libraries acknowledged the turmoil in their midst is significant in the context of library history, it may also be significant in the context of the broader historical accounting of the American experience during the Vietnam War. Historian Charles Chatfield, who has written extensively on the antiwar movement, notes that, while there are good studies of activist groups like SANE and Women Strike for Peace, other groups such as government workers, lawyers, business executives, entertainers, mothers, students, academic professionals and unions should be

8. Patti Becker Clayton, *Books and Libraries in American Society During World War II* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 34.

9. Frederick Holler, "One Man's View of Vietnam," *RQ*, 8 (Summer, 1969): 251.

studied further.[10] One suspects that librarians are a group he would gladly add to the list.

The Vietnam era in librarianship also deserves attention simply because the war had a unique impact on the country. "Vietnam loosened the nation at all its joints," wrote Irwin Unger and Debi Unger in their introduction to *The Times Were a Changin': The Sixties Reader.* "A limited war, one without clear goals and of uncertain utility, it dismayed left and right alike."[11] A few generations later, Douglas Raber posed a question that could just as likely have applied to the days when the bloody battles of Vietnam were splashed across television screens and thousands of people were induced to march in the streets, rallying both for and against the war: "If librarianship's fundamental moral commitment is to the progress of democracy and democracy is threatened by social problems, including a war whose legitimacy is questionable, then does not librarianship have a moral responsibility to address these problems? But even if the answer to [this] question is yes, what is librarianship to do?"[12] This thesis amends the question slightly: What *did* librarianship do?

Attempting to answer that question in broad strokes is beyond the scope of this thesis. Rather, while it briefly covers how the war affected libraries and librarians around the country, its focus is on librarianship in California. Charles Wollenberg has argued that California was especially affected by the Vietnam War because of the state's "concentration of military installations and industrial capacity, and its role in the

---

10. Charles Chatfield, "At the Hands of Historians: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era," *Peace & Change* 29, nos. 3&4 (July 2004), via Academic Search Premier (accessed November 21, 2007).

11. Unger, *The Times Were a Changin': The Sixties Reader*, 6.

12. Douglas Raber, "ACONDA and ANACONDA: Social Change, Social Responsibility, and Librarianship," *Library Trends* 55, no. 3 (Winter 2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed November 21, 2007).

development of protest politics, countercultural activities, and grass-roots conservatism." For that reason, California's experience during the war was "both a microcosm and a magnification of the national experience."[13] That same description might be applied to California's libraries and library schools. Their story is told here primarily (but not exclusively) from the vantage point of the libraries at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) and Stanford University; public libraries throughout California, with particular attention paid to the Bay Area libraries and the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL); and the California Library Association (CLA). Their narratives provide a window on the experience of librarians around the country.

This study of California libraries and librarians asks four specific questions: 1) Was personal opinion about the war expressed, and if so how? 2) Did librarians attempt to maintain neutrality, and if so were they successful? 3) How did librarians use their training to respond to war-related events? In most cases, it was evident that the library staff did not want to sit back and observe—they wanted to play a role in those events. 4) If there was violence or disturbances within the library, how were they handled?

13. Charles Wollenberg, "California and the Vietnam War: Microcosm and Magnification," in *What's Going On? California and the Vietnam Era*, ed. Marcia A. Eymann and Charles Wollenberg (Oakland, CA: Oakland Museum of California, 2004), 14.

Literature Review

American scholarship has looked at the Vietnam War exhaustively and from all angles. Likewise, the peace movement precipitated by the war has been widely investigated by historians. As Charles Chatfield notes, there exist histories of "student protest, draft resistance, the new Catholic left, protest among soldiers and veterans, radical pacifism, liberal activism, media coverage, government repression, national politics and war policy as it related to antiwar protest."[14] The place of the library and the librarian in this period of history, however, has largely been ignored.

Many books and studies on the Vietnam era do focus on specific groups of Americans. In *Peace Now!* Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones considers the impact of African Americans, women, labor and students on the peace process. Kenneth J. Heineman looks at war-related unrest on campus through the lens of students and faculty at state universities.[15] Librarians could well have been members of any of the groups Heineman and Jeffreys-Jones examined, but they are not singled out. Likewise, librarians do not figure into the mix in broader studies of the era like Todd Gitlin's *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage,* Tom Wells's, *The War Within: America's Battle Over Vietnam,* or W. R. Rorabaugh's *Berkeley at War, the 1960s.*

Within the library literature, the shelves are slightly fuller. Librarians during wartime are a subject that has received a fair amount of attention—librarians during World Wars I and II, that is. In *An Active Instrument for Propaganda: The American*

14. Chatfield, "At the Hands of Historians," 484.

15. Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993).

Public Library During World War I, Wayne A. Wiegand reports on the eagerness with which librarians functioned as servants to the state. Arthur P. Young furthers the story of librarians during the First World War by focusing on library service to soldiers both at home and abroad.[16] And Patti Clayton Becker gives a thorough accounting of the programs and problems given rise to by World War II in *Books and Libraries in American Society During World War II.*

The effect of the Vietnam War on librarianship has also been covered, but only barely, and often in the context of the wider story of social and political upheaval. In her historical examination of intellectual freedom and social responsibility, Toni Samek covers the role the Vietnam War played in establishing the groups that tried to bring about change within the American Library Association, among them the Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) and the Congress for Change (CFC).[17] She does a thorough job of telling the story of how librarians lobbied for an ALA referendum against the war, and how the war was one of the driving forces behind the era's challenges to ALA authority. Her description of the events at the ALA's 1969 Atlantic City membership meeting is a prime example:

> The second CFC resolution—that ALA take a stand against the war in Vietnam—caused such a lengthy discussion it had to be postponed until after the second Council meeting at noon of the same day. Later that afternoon, over 500 people turned up for the final Membership session. "Tempers grew loud and ugly" over the resolution to oppose the Vietnam War, which was defeated 294 to 208.[18]

16. Arthur P. Young, *Books for Sammies* (Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu, 1981), 5-10.

17. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974*, 103-104.

18. Ibid, 65.

As informative as Samek's work is, it does not provide a sense of how the war affected individual libraries and librarians.

Other authors also incorporate part of the Vietnam story into their narratives. In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962*-1973, a compilation edited by Frederic Stielow and Mary Lee Bundy, several historical essays contain bits of information relating to the war. Bundy herself does a cursory roundup of the events at library schools around the country when students and faculty were confronted with antiwar strife. [19] Unfortunately, she provides few details.

Fay M. Blake's article about academic libraries in the Stielow-Bundy collection is more of a recounting of librarians' struggle for professional credibility (including the drive to attain faculty status) than a description of how other issues of the sixties—racism, sexism and the war—affected libraries. Blake also paints with too broad a brush when she states, "libraries on those campuses [subject to student unrest] seemed to stand aside from what was happening."[20] (Blake herself, as will be covered later, was something of an activist.) That may have been the case at San Francisco State College during the campus's violent strike of 1968 (which she covers in her article), a conflict more about the rights of minority students than it was about the war. The research for this thesis shows that that was not the case on other campuses during conflicts involving the antiwar movement.

---

19. Mary Lee Bundy, "The Social Relevancy of Library Education: An Accounting," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 88-89.

20. Fay M. Blake, "In the Eye of the Storm: Academic Libraries in the Sixties," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 61. For more on the San Francisco State College strike see the SFSU's special collection, http://www.library.sfsu.edu/about/collections/strike/index.html.

Stielow and Bundy's book also includes an interview with former *Library Journal* editor Eric Moon, who, as noted earlier, editorialized against the war. The Q & A lightly touches on Vietnam, but does not offer much in the way of Moon's thinking on taking a controversial stand.[21] Kenneth F. Kister's biography of Moon provides more detail on the topic, including a small overview on how librarians reacted to the war.[22]

Of the few secondary sources devoted exclusively to understanding the Vietnam War and libraries, the most comprehensive is Frederick J. Stielow's "The War and Librarianship: A Study in Political Activism," an essay included in his and Bundy's collection. Stielow (like Samek) follows the machinations of the ALA that ultimately led to its public declaration against the war, and he also sheds some light on what was happening on a state level as regional library associations grappled with the conflict. He delves, too—albeit only briefly—into the activism among librarians and library school students at various universities. By Stielow's own admission his "short exegesis" does not fully explore the range of activities and issues raised by the conflict and it leaves out incidences of student-perpetrated violence and vandalism in libraries.[23] There are several details, including the voices of librarians themselves, which would provide a fuller understanding of the challenges facing libraries and librarians during those days of rage. Yet Stielow makes an important contribution to library history by mining the literature for a look at the library during the Vietnam era.

---

21. Eric Moon with Frederick J. Stielow, "The Library Press and Eric Moon: An Interview," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 99-133.

22. Kister, *Eric Moon*, 231-33.

23. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship: A Study in Political Activism," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 31-41.

Another writer who directly addresses the subject of Vietnam is John J. Wayne, who published a short article about activities at the Library of Congress during the war.[24] Wayne largely deals with the events that coincided with the conflict (such as the debut of data processing) as well as war-related bibliographic and indexing work. He notes the armed service (and a few deaths) of certain LC staffers, and concludes that any impact of the war on the staff was manifested outside of work. Omitted from his research is an interesting side note: One of the organizers of Federal Employees Against the War in Vietnam, a group that rallied in front of the White House in 1968, was Peter Schanck, a lawyer with the Library of Congress.[25] Research also shows that some librarians at the federal library did lend their name to advertisements against the war and that many also declined to do so.[26]

Katherine B. Murphy asks an important question about librarianship during the Vietnam War: Was the war used as an excuse to censor material? Taking on the subject in her master's thesis, she examines writings in American library journals and compares censorship during Vietnam to censorship during World Wars I and II. Her findings show that *opposition* to censorship was much greater during the Vietnam era than during the World Wars. The phenomenon, Murphy writes, may be connected to the different nature of the wars. Vietnam "was seen as a localized heating up of the global Cold War, and thus did not engage Americans' full attention or energies the way the two World Wars had done." She also argues that by the time our soldiers were battling in Southeast Asia,

24. John J. Wayne, "The Library During Wartime: The Vietnam War," *LC Information Bulletin*, March 11, 1991, 79-80.

25. Ben A. Franklin, "U.S. Employes [sic] Set An Antiwar Rally," *New York Times*, March 31, 1968.

26. "Washington D.C. Librarians Join Vietnam Protest," *Library Journal* 93 (April 1, 1968), 1396.

librarianship had evolved. "By the 1960s," writes Murphy, "it was generally assumed within the profession that political censorship was wrong."[27]

Research Methodology

The original ambition for this project was to provide as complete a war-related social history of libraries, librarians, library schools and library associations as possible. Ideally, a study of libraries and the Vietnam War would look at both public and academic libraries (and perhaps military, too) from all over the country as well as include the stories of librarians far and wide. For the purposes of this thesis, however, such a wide-ranging view of the subject was prohibitive. Instead, I have narrowed my topic to the library profession in California, and pursued the subject through both secondary and primary sources.

The secondary sources for this discourse are a mix of library journal articles, historical books, and historical and sociological journal articles. The primary sources I've used are library records from the UCLA, UC Berkeley and Stanford archives, which include staff newsletters, meeting minutes, personal correspondence and memorandums. I've also consulted the records of the Los Angeles Public Library, the Santa Monica Public Library, the San Francisco Public Library as well as the records and communications of the California Library Association. Further sources include published writings of librarians and library school students; librarian oral histories; news reports; and personal interviews. The combination of these resources has provided insight into

27. Katherine B. Murphy, "Librarians and Censorship During Three Modern Wars" (master's thesis, Kent State University, 1996), 25-28, via Proquest Dissertations and Theses Full Text (accessed May 24, 2009).

the routine workings of the library when under duress; professional actions—and personal feelings—related to the war; and an insider's view of debates surrounding the issues of the day.

One related topic that is not covered here is library service to Vietnam soldiers (although this thesis will briefly touch on service to returning soldiers). According to *Library Journal* the service to soldiers abroad was quite extensive: 200,000 magazines and 200,000 books monthly, and 13,500 weekly military newspapers were at the disposal of half million servicemen, who had access to fifteen libraries in South Vietnam.[28] It is a subject no doubt worthy of its own treatment.

Conclusion

At times within the California library community, the Vietnam War was a contentious issue. At the very heart of the matter was how closely librarians needed to adhere to the principal of neutrality. But before looking at how this concept of neutrality fared during a socially and politically contentious time in American history, it bears investigating the premise itself. What is the expectation of neutrality in the library? Does it, it in fact, actually exist? Librarians have long taken pride in their ability to stay neutral, both out of fairness and the desire to be taken seriously as professionals. "The ability to separate personal interests from professional responsibilities is one of the hallmarks of professionalism," Jean L. Preer, a professor of library science, has

28. "Servicemen in Vietnam Get Books & Libraries," *Library Journal* 92 (May 1, 1967): 1784.

contended.[29] Evidence suggests, though, that the Vietnam War often made it difficult to adhere to this guiding principle.

Librarianship did not start off on neutral footing. As Mark Rosenzweig reminded us in his essay, "Politics and Anti-Politics in Librarianship," the idea of neutrality "so enshrined in today's library ideology . . . was alien to earlier generations."[30] Long before there was the American Library Associations' Library Bill of Rights, there was the 1895 ALA-sponsored program "Improper Books: Methods Employed to Discover and Exclude Them."[31] This lack of objectivity extended to wartime, too. During World War I, librarians were told that, "to be neutral now is to be disloyal."[32] Objectivity was not recommended during World War II either. ALA President Charles H. Brown counseled librarians to "abandon their customary reticence, political neutrality and routine" as well as to offer their assistance to the government in order to aid the war effort.[33]

However, by the sixties, neutrality was strongly established as a central tenet of the library profession. "Librarians of the 1960s were trained to create 'balanced' library collections representing many points of view and to provide access to these materials," reported Samek. "Both goals required that librarians take a 'neutral' stance and disregard personal moral persuasions."[34] By the sixties, the framework for the current Library Bill of Rights had also already been in place since 1948 (not withstanding several revisions

29. Jean L. Preer, *Library Ethics* (Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2008), 133.

30. In *Questioning Library Neutrality: Essays from Progressive Librarian,* ed. Alison Lewis (Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press, 2008), 6.

31. Dorothy M. Broderick, "Moral Conflict and the Survival of the Public Library," *American Libraries* 24 (1993): 447.

32. Young, *Books for Sammies*, 5.

33. Clayton, *Books and Libraries in American Society During World War II*, 7.

34. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974*, 1.

over the years), and the devotion to neutrality was such that librarians who opposed the creation of an ALA committee on social responsibilities made their case by warning it would kill the profession's commitment to impartiality. David Berninghausen, for one, famously argued that librarians should stay neutral on issues unrelated to the library. [35]

Today, library school students are still taught that it is the library's job to present all points of view as set forth by the Library Bill of Rights, Article II: "Libraries should provide materials and information presenting all points of view on current and historical issues. Materials should not be proscribed or removed because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval."[36] The ALA's Code of Ethics, Article VII, further states: "We distinguish between our personal convictions and professional duties and do not allow our personal beliefs to interfere with fair representation of the aims of our institutions or the provision of access to their information resources."[37] Yet despite these principles, many librarians—and within the library literature, they are the most outspoken—contend that it is not possible or even preferable to remain neutral. Some also believe that it is immoral for librarians to stay quiet under certain circumstances.

One argument goes that having to communicate both sides of an issue just for the sake of neutrality is absurd. "Indeed, the very notion that both sides of an issue are inherently equal, and therefore entitled to an equal share of the public's attention, smacks of moral relativism. . . . The idea becomes secondary to the imperative to communicate

35. "Social Responsibility vs. The Library Bill of Rights," *Library Journal* 118 (September 15, 1993), S1.

36. American Library Association, "American Library Association Library Bill of Rights, 1996," http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/statementsif/librarybillrights.cfm (accessed May 27, 2009).

37. American Library Association, "American Library Association Code of Ethics, 1997," http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/codeofethics/codeethics.cfm (accessed May 27, 2009).

the idea," wrote Joseph Good.[38] There are those, too, who contend that librarians need to be partisan on social and political issues because it is the morally correct thing to do.[39] During the debate on whether the ALA should condemn the war in Iraq, ALA Councilor Ann Sparanese opined, "This type of 'neutrality' is not neutral. Our failure to add our voice to those demanding peace puts us, effectively and objectively, in the corner of those who consent to war."[40] Similarly, some librarians believe that refusing to commit to political values accommodates society's dominant political and economic powers.[41]

Steven Joyce has posed the idea that the concept of neutrality is as hollow as a Trojan horse. All librarians (like all people), he has written, make choices and judgments based on ideological biases, but that that does not mean they cannot uphold the principles of intellectual freedom. "Having a voice and using it to articulate deeply held convictions does not necessarily imply the silencing of other voices," contended Joyce.[42]

While Joyce's views are contemporary, they jibe with the final report of ACONDA, the Activities Committee on New Directions, a group charged with studying the scope of social responsibilities in 1969. The committee, which ultimately concluded that libraries should work toward solving social problems, also took on the topic of

---

38. "The Hottest Place in Hell: The Crisis of Neutrality in Contemporary Librarianship," *Progressive Librarian* 28 (Winter 2006/2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 6, 2009).

39. John-Bauer Graham, "Now's Not the Time to Be Neutral? The Myth and Reality of the Library as a Neutral Entity," *Alabama Librarian* 53, no. 9-11 (2003), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 6, 2009); John N. Berry, "The War Is an ALA Issue," *Library Journal* 128, no. 7 (April 15, 2003), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 15, 2009).

40. Ann Sparanese, "Activist Librarianship: Heritage or Heresy?" *Progressive Librarian* 22 (Summer 2003), via Proquest Alt-Press Watch (accessed September 14, 2007).

41. Henry T. Blanke, "Librarianship & Political Values: Neutrality or Commitment?" *Library Journal* 114, no. 12 (July 1989): 39.

42. "A Few Gates Redux: An Examination of the Social Responsibilities Debate in the Early 1970s and 1990s," in *Questioning Library Neutrality: Essays from Progressive Librarian,* ed. Alison Lewis (Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press, 2008), 52.

neutrality. Dismissing the claim to neutrality as dubious, the report noted that librarians had long supported democratic aims and taken liberal positions on social issues.[43] Further:

> Our institutions [libraries] are surrounded by pollution and violence and under threat of nuclear extinction. Racial tension and social unrest upset their daily routines constantly. For a national association to ignore these threats seems the height of folly. Yet we are daily advised by some of our members to eschew involvement with these dangers, lest we render ourselves subject to reprisals and tarnish our golden neutrality.[44]

During the Vietnam War, many librarians were quite cognizant of the perils of appearing biased: The debates that went on among them, showed that it was not easy to achieve a balance between neutrality and moral rectitude. And that's still the case, as the haggling over taking a stand on the Iraq War (discussed later) shows. Even now, there seems to be little consensus, thus the question remains: How do librarians best combine social responsibility with the principles of intellectual freedom? A look at librarians manning libraries in the late sixties and early seventies will show how that question was answered during a particularly contentious time in American history.

43. Raber, "ACONDA and ANACONDA: Social Change, Social Responsibility, and Librarianship."

44. Subcommittee on Social Responsibilities, Final Report (Chicago: ALA, January 1970), Appendix C-1-1, 33, quoted in Raber.

Chapter 2

The Vietnam War, At Home and Abroad

This thesis looks at the impact of the Vietnam War on libraries and librarians primarily during the years 1967-1972. It was during that time that American involvement in Southeast Asia escalated and the war became a familiar fixture on the nightly news. At the same time, protests became louder, larger and more heated as popular opinion on the war shifted dramatically.

American involvement in Vietnam, however, began long before 1967. This chapter provides a summary of events in Southeast Asia and a look at parallel antiwar events in the United States.

The War in Vietnam

During the 1950s, the United States supported France's efforts to maintain colonial rule over Vietnam. When French rule ended and the Geneva Convention divided the country into two republics, North and South Vietnam, America aided South Vietnam, hoping to thwart efforts by the communist Vietcong, who wanted to reunify the country. Eventually President John F. Kennedy, believing that the South Vietnamese leader was not strong enough to stand up to the communists, sanctioned his overthrow in an even greater effort to shore up democracy. There was little turning back. When Lyndon B. Johnson took office after Kennedy's assassination, he gradually escalated America's

involvement in the region. Then, in 1964, he asked Congress to pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, giving him the authority to offer even more aid to South Vietnam.[1]

A year later, the Johnson administration began a bombing campaign against North Vietnam, and by 1966 the number of U.S. troops in South Vietnam had grown to 190,000. By 1969 it would swell to 550,000.[2] One turning point in the war was the Tet Offensive in early 1968. The Vietcong and North Vietnamese vigorously attacked key points in South Vietnam and, although the U.S. held them back, according to Terry Anderson, "the offensive stunned Americans" who saw the bloodshed displayed on their TV screens. Suddenly a war that most Americans believed was winnable looked just the opposite. After Tet, Johnson's popularity plummeted and he announced he would not run for re-election.[3]

When Richard Nixon came into office he began Vietnamization, a policy that involved shifting responsibility to the South Vietnamese to defeat the Communists while slowly bringing American troops home and negotiating a settlement. Then, in the fall of 1969, it was revealed that, in the previous year, American troops had massacred innocent people in the village of My Lai, sending shock waves through an already divided American public.[4] That was also the year that, despite promises that he would not invade neighbors of South Vietnam, Nixon ordered the secret bombing of Communist camps in Cambodia. On May 1, 1970, U.S. troops invaded Cambodia, sparking demonstrations

---

1. Terry H. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 121-22.

2. "Vietnam War," *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, Sixth Edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), via Questia Online Library (accessed May 1, 2009).

3. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 184-90.

4. Public Broadcasting System, "Vietnam Online: Timeline," Public Broadcasting System website, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/vietnam/timeline/tl3.html#a (accessed May 1, 2009).

around the country. Three days later, National Guardsmen fired into a crowd of protestors at Kent State University in Ohio, wounding nine and killing four. At Jackson State University in Mississippi, white state troopers wounded twelve people and killed two black students.[5]

While peace talks began in 1970, and an accord was reached in 1973, the fighting did not end until 1975. During that time, the *New York Times* published the Pentagon Papers, revealing denials, contradictions and deceptions about the war perpetrated by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations.[6] The casualties were remarkable: 50,000 Americans lost their lives, as did an estimated 400,000 South Vietnamese and 900,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese.[7]

Table 1.1

Timeline of the Vietnam War

1954 **The Geneva Accord creating North and South Vietnam is signed.**
1955 **U.S Military takes over training of South Vietnamese troops.**
1956 **French leave Vietnam.**
1959 **North Vietnam begins sending men and supplies down the Ho Chi Minh Trail.**
1960 **The Vietcong take control of the insurgency in South Vietnam.**
1963 **The leader of South Vietnam is killed during a U.S. approved coup.**

5. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 349-51.

6. Ibid, 378.

7. "Vietnam War," *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, Sixth Edition.

1964
U.S. passes the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, giving President Lyndon B. Johnson the right to wage outright war on North Vietnam.

1966
B-52s bomb North Vietnam for the first time.

1967
Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara testifies that U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam have been unsuccessful.

1968
North Vietnamese and Vietcong fighters launch the Tet Offensive. While they are forced back by U.S. troops, they achieve a psychological victory as Americans begin questioning U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia.

General Westmoreland requests 206,000 more troops.

President Johnson announces he will not run for re-election; Richard Nixon is elected President of the United States.

The Paris Peace Talks between North Vietnamese and American negotiators begin.

1969
Nixon begins secret bombing of Cambodia.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird announces a policy of "Vietnamization" to shift the burden of defeating the communists to the South Vietnamese.

Americans learn that U.S. soldiers committed atrocities in the village of My Lai.

1970
U.S. Forces invade Cambodia.

The number of U.S. troops falls to 280,000.

1971
Lt. William Calley is convicted of mass murder at My Lai.

The number of U.S. troops falls to 156,800.

1972
The last U.S. combat unit leaves South Vietnam.

1973
A cease-fire agreement is signed in Paris by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho of North Vietnam.

1975
The last Americans evacuate as Saigon falls to the Communists.

Sources: Data adapted from Andrew Wiest, *The Vietnam War, 1956-1975* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 10-11, via Questia Online Library (accessed May 1, 2009); and Public Broadcasting System, "Vietnam Online: Timeline," Public Broadcasting website, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/vietnam/timeline/index.html (accessed May 1, 2009).

Public Opinion

"What the hell is going on? I thought we were winning the war." Television journalist Walter Cronkite, who uttered those words on national television after the Tet Offensive, was not the only one who was shaken by the turn of events in Vietnam.[8] Many people thought the Americans would prevail against communism in Vietnam, though perhaps because the Vietnam War has now been judged an unmitigated disaster, it is easy to think that most Americans were against the war all along. With images of the students rallying against the war indelibly printed on Americans' minds, it is also easy to assume that young people in particular were never in favor of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. However, neither of these assumptions has proved correct.

To analyze the policy preferences of Americans during the Vietnam War, William L. Lunch and Peter W. Sperlich looked at opinion polls conducted between 1964 and 1973. One thing their research showed was that few people were interested in the conflict when it first began. Surveys from around that time (1964) found that two-thirds of Americans paid little or no attention to developments in South Vietnam, even though there were already thousands of U.S. advisors in the country. As things escalated and it

8. Richard Falk, "Appropriating Tet," *Massachusetts Review* 29, no. 3 (Fall. 1988), via JSTOR (accessed June 4, 2009).

became clearer that the United States was committed to military action in Southeast Asia, the initial reaction was to support administration policy even more than before.[9]

"Uneasiness," as Lunch and Sperlich referred to it, did not begin to set in until 1967. With over half a million American troops in Vietnam and government spending hitting a billion dollars, more people began telling pollsters that involvement in the war was a mistake. Nonetheless, the majority of Americans still favored further escalation—at least for a little while. By 1968, preferences for withdrawal began to rise and by 1969, 80 percent of the people surveyed felt the war was a mistake. As American involvement in the war ended, a Gallup poll found that only 28 percent were opposed to withdrawal.[10]

Lunch and Sperlich's study also limned the demographics of war supporters and war detractors. The typical supporter tended to be white, male and middle class. More men than women favored the war; more blacks than whites opposed it. Less expected were Lunch and Sperlich's findings that, despite the images of young antiwar demonstrators depicted in newspapers at the time, people under thirty-five were actually *more* supportive of the war than people over thirty-five.[11]

As opposition to the war grew, sociologist Howard Schuman found that there was an ideological divide between college-based protestors and those in the general public who were disenchanted with U.S. foreign policy. While most college protestors objected to the war on moral grounds, the general public was more pragmatic. Their

---

9. William L. Lunch and Peter W. Sperlich, "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam," *The Western Political Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (March 1979), 22, via JSTOR (accessed April 6, 2009).

10. Ibid, 31.

11. Ibid, 32-35.

disillusionment seemed to spring "from the failure of our substantial military investments to yield victory."[12]

The Antiwar Movement

Demonstrations against the Vietnam War started out slowly. The first major antiwar march was held in 1965 in Washington, D.C., and drew, by some estimates, 25,000 people.[13] That year, many people also attended one of the hundreds of "teach-ins" held on college campuses around the country. The first was at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; the largest was at the University of California, Berkeley, which attracted more than 30,000 participants.[14] Yet those samplings do not really give an accurate reading of the still-fledgling movement. Despite the rally in D.C. and numerous teach-ins, only 1 percent of people demonstrated over the war in 1965—and most of those participants were in support of U.S. involvement.[15]

By 1967, though, the movement had gained in momentum. Draft resisters began publicly burning their draft cards and Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke out against the war.[16] In April of that year, 300,000 people attended the Spring Mobilization demonstrations, the largest public protest in U.S. history. And it was not just college

12. Howard Schuman, "Two Sources of Antiwar Sentiment in America," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, no 3 (November 1972), via JSTOR (accessed June 1, 2009).

13. James Max Fendrich, "The Forgotten Movement: The Vietnam Antiwar Movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 73, no. 3 (August 2003): 345.

14. Anita Louise McCormick, *The Vietnam Antiwar Movement in American History* (Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow Publishers, 2000), 37.

16. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties,* 140.

students. Businessmen, housewives, teachers, clergymen and clergywomen, war veterans and doctors all came out to denounce the war.[17]

The following year was one of great social and political upheaval. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy were both assassinated, and demonstrators protested violently at the Democratic Convention in Chicago.[18] The anger over events culminated when organizers called on Americans to engage in a one-day pause from business as usual on October 15, 1969. The event, called the Moratorium, consisted of teach-ins, discussions, vigils, rallies, class boycotts, and a massive march on the Mall in Washington, D.C.[19] Onlookers concluded that more than two million Americans participated.[20]

And it did not end there. In May of 1970, when President Nixon announced that he was sending troops into Cambodia, demonstrations started immediately.[21] After demonstrating students were shot by the National Guard at Kent State, outrage erupted on American college campuses and, reported Tom Wells in *The War Within*, "student protest swept like an out-of-control brush fire across the country." Five hundred and thirty-six campuses were shut down completely. "But it was not just students, professors, and administrators who were up in arms in May," wrote Wells. "Other Americans were demonstrating in city after city and town after town across the country."[22] As the war drew to a close, demonstrations waned, but not completely. In a study on the decline of

17. Tom Wells, *The War Within: America's Battle Over Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 132-33.

18. McCormick, *The Vietnam Antiwar Movement in American History*, 77-82.

20. Wells, *The War Within*, 371.

21. Ibid, 420-21.

22. Ibid, 425-27.

the antiwar movement, Joel Lefkowitz found that demonstrations continued until a week before the end of the war.[23]

Throughout the war, public opinion generally ran against the demonstrators. One poll found that 52 percent of people opposed even peaceful rallies; another found that 82 percent thought that student demonstrators should be expelled.[24] In Wells's estimation, "Some people hated the protestors...[and] may have backed the war longer and more strongly as a result of such sentiment."[25]

Whether the antiwar movement ultimately helped sway public opinion or helped end the war is a still a subject of debate. Wells, for one, has argued that it "forced the Johnson administration to reverse course in Vietnam in 1968" and that "the peace movement also exerted a substantial impact on the Nixon administration's policies in Vietnam. It fueled U.S. troop withdrawals."[26] In *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement*, Alan Garfinkle argued just the opposite, contending that the antiwar protesters gave comfort and motivation to the North Vietnamese, prolonging the war.[27]

---

23. Joel Lefkowitz, "Movement Outcomes and Movement Decline: The Vietnam War and the Antiwar Movement," *New Political Science* 27, no. 1 (March 2005), via Academic Search Premier (accessed December 12, 2007).

24 Wells, *The War Within*, 299.

25. Ibid, 258.

26. Ibid, 4.

27. Adam Garfinkle, *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

Conclusion

The war in Vietnam started slowly, but eventually escalated into one of the most divisive and tragic events in American history. Early on, the public supported the administration's policies on Southeast Asia, however, by 1969, most people thought the war was a mistake. The antiwar movement paralleled the Vietnam War, gaining momentum in 1967. The movement, too, was divisive and many people believed protestors were giving comfort to the enemy.

The effect of the Vietnam War on citizens of the United States was pervasive. Librarians could not help but be touched by the conflict, most certainly in their capacity as professionals, and most likely in their role as American citizens.

PART II

AMERICAN LIBRARIANS FACE A CONFLICT

Regrettably for posterity's sake, no one seems to have taken a poll of librarians to see where they stood on the Vietnam War. Nor have librarians been remembered by historians as either agitators against or guardians of U.S. foreign policy in Southeast Asia. But some librarians did, in fact, make headlines for standing by their war-related political and moral convictions. Many more quietly protested or defended the war. And for three long years, librarians battled to persuade the American Library Association to issue a statement condemning the war. Taken together, these actions indicate that Vietnam was a salient issue for librarians and, for many of them, a professional as much as a personal concern.

Chapter 3

The Argument For and Against Taking a Stand

In 1972, the *Wilson Library Bulletin* published a bibliography of books about the Vietnam War aimed at children and young adults. The bibliography was so blatantly antiwar that the journal's editors attached somewhat of a disclaimer in which they recounted their deliberations over running the piece. Could the *Wilson Library Bulletin* justify presenting such a partisan piece of work without offering a balancing factor? Not usually, their musings imply, but this was an exception. "There are issues, and this is one of them, concerning which we consider objectivity to be immoral." The editors then left it to their readers to identify for themselves what was and was not useful information.[1]

Because the bibliography ran at a date late in the war, the editors may have felt emboldened. Years earlier, though, a debate raged among librarians: Was it okay to speak out against the war in one's capacity as a library professional?

Speaking Out

It is hard to gauge the exact number of librarians around the country who took a stand against the war, or loaned their names to petitions protesting Johnson's and, then, Nixon's foreign policies. It is safe to say that librarians did not rally to the cause in numbers as great as students, however, many did band together in groups to take a position. And many, like Elizabeth H. Welch, author of the aforementioned bibliography

1. Elizabeth H. Welch, "What Did You Write About the War, Daddy?" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 46 (June 1972), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed November 7, 2007).

and a librarian at the Spokane (Washington) County Library, did what they could as individuals to protest the war.

There were, for instance, a "substantial" number of librarians from several government agencies in Washington, D.C., who signed an antiwar petition to be published in a Washington newspaper. The dissenters were not unanimous—the Library of Congress staff was split on whether signing was appropriate—but the fact that many government librarians were willing to go public with their position is worth noting.[2] Other outspoken groups included the Library Guild of Brooklyn and New York Public Library Guild, both of which favored a peace initiative. [3]

One of the seminal events of the antiwar movement was Moratorium Day, a 24-hour pause from business as usual held on October 15, 1969. The events of that day give a small window into how librarians were dealing with the controversy surrounding the war. *Library Journal* reported that many librarians felt obliged to keep their libraries open on that day in order to give people access to information on Vietnam.[4] Some, like the librarian of the Mamaroneck (New York) Public Library, put up pro-and-con displays on the conflict. In other New York libraries, librarians wore buttons and armbands, while the Farmingdale library on Long Island ran a film and discussion program on the war. Elsewhere, other small gestures were made. Some staff at the Brooklyn Public Library

2. "Washington D.C. Librarians," 1396.

3.. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship ,"38-9.

4. "News Report: 1969," *Library Journal* 95 (January 1, 1970): 35.

set up tables in front to solicit signatures on petitions against the war. Librarians at the Boston Public Library took two hours off to participate in local events. [5]

Some librarians were more proactive. Over 200 librarians calling themselves Librarians For Peace participated in demonstrations in Washington, D.C.[6] The New Jersey arm of the group—there were chapters in New York and California, too—also published a bibliography on draft counseling.[7] And in Wisconsin, the Oshkosh Public Library was decorated with a large peace dove and posters urging support of Moratorium Day. Its flag flew at half-mast and some of the library staff even wore black armbands. The library board was not amused and forbade the library director, Leonard Archer Jr., to take part in any subsequent controversial matter without board permission. In Madison, the public library staff formed a Library Committee to End the War and about half of the group of twenty-nine members took the day off to partake in Moratorium Day activities (since it had to come out of their vacation time, the other half declined).[8]

Occasionally, an activist librarian would make news. In late December of 1972, Pat Kirk, a children's librarian at Princeton Public Library, was among a group arrested for pouring concrete onto a railroad switch connected to a bomb casings factory. Far from dissociating her actions from her profession, Kirk said "As a librarian, I have a responsibility to my profession to speak out not only as a librarian, but as a human being

5. "News," *Library Journal* 94, no. 21 (December 1, 1969): 4329.

6. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974,* 77.

7. "Librarians for Peace," *Synergy* no. 28 (July-August 1970): 11.

8. "News," *Library Journal* 94, no. 22 (December 15, 1969): 4471.

concerned about other human beings. . . . We should work not only for the freedom to read, but for the freedom of life."[9]

More well known, perhaps, is the case of Zoia Horn, who at the time of an imbroglio that landed her in jail was head of the Reference Department at Bucknell University. In 1971, at the home of a friend, Horn was introduced to Reverend Philip Berrigan, the antiwar activist who was subsequently arrested for allegedly planning to kidnap Henry Kissinger and blow up steam tunnels. Horn also allowed two of Berrigan's associates, Sister Elizabeth McAlister and Sister Sue Davis, to stay overnight at the house she shared with her mother. She knew them only slightly.[10]

The colleague who had arranged the meeting between Horn (as well as another reference librarian, Patricia Rom) and the people who later became part of the group known as the "Harrisburg Seven," was a young man named Boyd Douglas. Douglas turned out to be an FBI informant. "On a small campus, my strong feelings against the Vietnam War were not secret," Horn wrote in a letter from jail to fellow librarian Page Ackerman. "It was this, perhaps, that drew Boyd to me."[11] By the time she received a subpoena requiring her to appear as a government witness in the trial of the Harrisburg Seven, Horn had married Dean Galloway, a librarian at California State College, Stanislaus, and was working as a librarian at the Stanislaus County Library in Modesto.[12]

9.. "Children's Libn. Jailed in Anti-War Protest," *Library Journal* 98 (February 15, 1973): 584.

10. Zoia Horn, *Zoia! Memoirs of Zoia Horn, Battler for the People's Right to Know* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1995), 294 and 142.

11. Ibid, 294.

12. Ibid, 137.

Once on the stand, Horn called the procedure a "black charade" and the judge immediately ordered that she be taken away and jailed. Charged with contempt of court, she was sentenced to twenty days. She was out in four, released on bail, but her appeal was subsequently rejected and she went back to jail to serve out her term.

Support for Horn came from different corners. The *New York Times* published an editorial on her behalf, wondering how "justice will be advanced by further victimizing a librarian whose name appears in no indictment."[13] The New Jersey and California Library Associations tried to help by sending resolutions to the ALA urging financial relief for Horn, but it was slow in coming. The ALA, in fact, initially denied her funds, but then reversed the decision and sent $500 for bail (she also got $500 from the ALA's Social Responsibilities Round Table).[14] Once it came around, the ALA went even further, condemning the use of spying in libraries and the use of grand jury procedures to intimidate antiwar activists.[15]

In her letter to Ackerman, Horn explained her actions as being intrinsically linked to her profession: "It seemed to me that I had to say 'No' to the misuse of power by our government in the area of my professional as well as personal concern."[16]

---

13. "Handcuffs in Harrisburg," *New York Times*, May 8, 1972, via ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851-2005) (accessed April 30, 2009).

14. Horn, *Zoia!* 153.

15. W.R. Eshelman, "Zoia Horn: Charade to Puppet Show to Drama," *Wilson Library Journal* 46 (April 1972), via Library Literature & Information Science Retro (accessed September 24, 2008).

16. Horn, *Zoia!* 294.

The ALA and the Vietnam War

It is not often that squads of policemen, both uniformed and plainclothes, are enlisted to stand guard at a meeting of the American Library Association. But there they were, lining the halls of the Hilton Hotel in San Francisco, and marking one of the premier events to roil the waters of ALA complacency.[17] The event in question was the ALA's 1967 annual meeting, which featured General Maxwell D. Taylor, a former ambassador to South Vietnam, as an invited speaker. The thinking behind the choice is unknown (according to Stielow, conservative forces in the ALA made the selection[18]), however, it seems that Taylor was brought in to speak about the war. A group led by San Francisco librarians boycotted the speech and tickets for the event were notably low, but it went on as scheduled.[19] As Taylor stood at the podium giving a pro-war address, librarians demonstrated at the entrance to the banquet room. Another 150 people (not all of them members of the ALA) rallied outside the hotel.[20]

The Taylor incident firmly signaled that the ALA establishment could not ignore the antiwar sentiments of many of its members. Nor, for that matter, could they brush off the other social and political issues of growing concern among librarians. Many members were pushing for librarians as a group to discuss and help solve problems of race, violence, and the inequality of justice and opportunity.[21] Their voices would grow louder as time went on, but the controversy surrounding General Taylor helped the social

17. "The Sounds of Pickets: Gen. Taylor's Viet Report," *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 27, 1967.

18.. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship," 34.

19. David Swanston, "Proposal for Pornography in Libraries," *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 26, 1967.

20. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974,* 48.

21. Kenneth Duchac, "A Plea for Social Responsibility; Originally Published in August 1968," *Library Journal* 117 (May 1, 1992), S6.

responsibilities movement gain momentum. "The fact that some took a stand on a so-called non-library issue was significant," writes Samek.[22] A year later, more than 270 ALA members signed a petition calling for the establishment of a Round Table on the Social Responsibility of Libraries (SRRT). Once again, the war weighed on their minds. Speaking for the group, Kenneth Duchac, a library consultant to the Maryland Department of Education, wrote:

> It is our judgment that [there is] not enough expression of concern . . . in this year in which an American military adventure, which has already cost us the lives of more than 25,000 young men, which has bludgeoned the economy and our sense of international responsibility and morality, has pursued an undeclared war which has perhaps irreconcilably divided our people.[23]

In their original plea for recognition, the SRRT committee never asked the ALA to take a stand on any particular issue.[24] (The round table was officially established in 1969 and continues to exist today.[25]) But by 1969, many librarians were clamoring for the organization to officially condemn the war. When local SRRT groups began forming, some of them also began speaking out against the war, too. Many members of the Detroit SRRT, for instance, marched for peace both in Detroit and Washington.[26] Two years later the ALA would finally take a stand on the Vietnam War, but not without a copious amount of infighting and rancor.

---

22. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974*, 3.

23. Ibid.

24. Raber, "ACONDA and ANACONDA."

25. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974,* 53.

26.. "From Reports of Affiliate Groups," ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter, April 10, 1971.

Workers Unite

If librarians felt some pressure to speak out as a cohesive faction, it may have been because so many other professional groups were taking collective action. [27] Indeed, Americans in a range of fields were issuing public statements and even taking to the streets to drive home their position—whether that position was for or against the war.

Labor unions were first among them, though that is hardly surprising: unions have a long history of taking a stand on foreign policy. What *was* surprising, though, was the vehemence with which they pressed their case. In May of 1970, a group of 200 hardhat workers violently attacked students at an antiwar demonstration in New York City. Two weeks later, blue-collar workers rallied again, albeit peacefully, when a collection of 100,000 teamsters, longshoremen, plumbers, bricklayers, steamfitters and ironworkers took to the streets of Manhattan in support of the president's policies. [28] There was also a vocal faction of union workers who detested the war, most notably, those in California. Shortly after the New York demonstrations, the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union and the Teamsters placed passionately worded ads in San Francisco's two daily newspapers stating, "We want a cease-fire—Now! We want out of Cambodia—Now! We want out of Vietnam—Now!" [29]

Collective action was not confined to the working class. Among the early dissenters was the American Sociological Association. In an open letter to President Johnson in 1967, 1,300 members urged the president to cease bombing North Vietnam,

27. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship," 37.

28. "Workers' Woodstock," *Time*, June 1, 1970, 12; Homer Bigart, "War Foes Here Attacked By Construction Workers," *New York Times*, May 9, 1970. See also: Douglas Ireland, "Vietnam: Labor's Love Lost," *Commonweal*, December 1, 1967, 292-93.

29. Al Richmond, "Workers Against the War," *Ramparts*, September 1970, 29.

negotiate peace and withdraw American forces.[30] A few years later, one thousand New York attorneys—dubbed the "briefcase brigade" by *Time* magazine—traveled en masse to Washington, D.C., to press the case for withdrawal. Some of the lawyers were even from the firm in which Attorney General John Mitchell and President Nixon had been partners.[31] It was an event without precedent, according to former Chief Justice Earl Warren who told *The New Yorker*, "As far as I can recall, never in those fifty-six years [that I have been a lawyer], has any large aggregation of lawyers such as this gone to Washington in a body to make its political views known to our elected representatives on a great national issue."[32]

Some groups were smaller, but seemingly no less sure of their convictions. Twenty-six baking company executives formed the Pillsbury Committee to End the War and sent a petition to every congressmen and senator who supported the conflict. In response 298 employees of the company signed a second petition in support of the war.[33]

What reasons did workers have for taking a collective stand? The old notion that there's strength in numbers was undoubtedly in play. Colleagues who felt the war was morally wrong (or morally right) could speak in a louder voice if they joined together and presented a united front. In some cases, however, workers spoke out in a professional capacity because they believed continuing involvement in Southeast Asia threatened their ability to do their jobs well. A group of 500 employees of the National Institutes of Health, for instance, sent an antiwar petition to the White House through official channels

30. "The Protest Spreads," *The Nation*, November 27, 1967, 549.

31. "Briefcase Brigade; New York Lawyers Pleading for Peace in Southeast Asia," *Time*, June 1, 1970, 12-13.

32.. "Two Gatherings," *The New Yorker*, May 30, 1970, 23.

33.. "Pillsbury's Best," *The New Republic*, June 27, 1970, 8-9.

because, according to an article in *Science* magazine, " the sponsors felt so strongly that the protest was a 'work-related' matter." The war was undermining "their dedication to the enhancement and preservation of life."[34]

When a group of businessmen from big companies like Revlon and Twentieth Century Fox formed "Corporate Executives Committee for Peace," they professed to be troubled not only by the war's affect on humanity, but its affect on the bottom line. As one executive told *The New Yorker*, "The war has been bad for business, and what's bad for business is bad for the country."[35] Another business group, Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, had chapters in cities across the country and its leaders ended up on Nixon's enemies list.[36]

Librarians, it can be argued, must adhere to a different set of standards than businessmen, lawyers, sociologists and many other types of workers, who are not necessarily charged with being neutral. In that sense, librarians had a lot more to lose by taking a collective political stand, or even by speaking out as individuals. But so, too, did journalists and educators, two other groups that are generally expected to stay neutral. Nonetheless, many of these professionals did speak out about their political views.

In 1968, at the height of the war, 448 writers and journalists took out full-page ads in various publications proclaiming that they would not pay a proposed war-related tax increase or 23 percent of their income tax (the amount believed to be used for the war effort). Forty of the signees were employed by the *New York Times*—though the paper

---

34. J. Walsh, "NIH: Protestors Try Going Through Channels," *Science*, September 29, 1972, 1176.

35.. "Concerned Businessmen," *The New Yorker* , June 27, 1970, 26-27.

36.. Gladwin Hill, "1,600 Executives Form Group For a National Antiwar Drive," *New York Times*, February 27, 1968; Flickr, "About Richard Nixon," Flickr, http://www.flickr.com/people/richard_m_nixon/ (accessed June 6, 2009).

refused to run the ad.[37] The following year, journalistic objectivity was tested again when millions across the country participated in Moratorium Day. According to reports, rank-and-file newsmen "broke with tradition and became active participants in a controversial news event. Thousands across the nation signed petitions, attended rallies and wore Moratorium buttons. Many took off the buttons when they went on assignments but not all."[38] *Wall Street Journal* reporters marched with placards identifying themselves, and 100 staff members of the *San Francisco Chronicle* sent Nixon a petition.

Some journalists' participation in the antiwar movement undoubtedly fed Vice President Spiro Agnew's contention that the media was biased;[39] however, Melvin Small, a historian who has studied the antiwar movement, noted that evidence suggests most media supported official White House policy.[40] And even if they did not, some journalists were uncomfortable with their colleagues' display of bias. "Most everybody here is against the war," said one newsman at CBS, "but most of us are also against expressing ourselves publicly. If you advertise your biases, nobody is going to believe you."[41]

College and university campuses, of course, were central to the antiwar movement and many professors were on the front lines. But most academics were far from radical. In April and May of 1966, researchers in the Department of Social

37. "Part Way with Thoreau," *Time*, February 9, 1968, 61.

38. "Taking a Stand," *Time*, October 24, 1969, 59.

39. Anderson, *The Movement and The Sixties*, 331.

40. Melvin Small, *Covering Dissent: The Media and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 15.

41. Ibid.

Relations at Harvard University surveyed a sampling of professors at seventeen colleges to gauge their attitudes toward the war. Although the survey results showed that academics were more antiwar then the general public, it also proved that, as a group, they were not as liberal as commonly thought. "Many conceptions about the role of professors in the anti-war movement were exaggerated or just plain wrong." concluded the researchers."[42]

In fact, most colleges and universities, as institutional bodies, tended to avoid taking sides on political and social issues, though by the time the Moratorium rolled around in 1969, their ability to stay neutral was being increasingly tested.[43] Still, *Newsweek* reported that Glenn S. Dumke, the chancellor of the California State College system, sent a letter to the nineteen colleges prohibiting them from supporting the Moratorium. While nonetheless expressing personal animosity toward the war, the presidents of Columbia and Princeton also refused to support the Moratorium. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign did observe a half-hour pause on the appointed day, but did not close down to show support for the antiwar movement.[44]

Better Late Than Never?

By 1969, pressure on the ALA to address social issues, including the war, had escalated. In its review of the year's news, *Library Journal* reported that "the Vietnam

---

42.. Armor et al., "Professors' Attitudes Toward the Vietnam War," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (Summer, 1967): 175.

43. "Moratorium on Neutrality?" *Newsweek*, October 13, 1969, 77.

44. Ibid.

war was the hottest issue, and one which divided librarians severely."[45] That year, Congress for Change, an alliance formed by rebellious library school students, presented a list of demands to at the annual conference in Atlantic City. Among them was the insistence that the ALA take a stand against the war in Vietnam. The resolution caused such lengthy discussion that it had to be postponed to a later meeting. When the topic was broached again, the debate grew "loud and ugly," only to end in the resolution's defeat, 294 to 208.[46]

Fay Blake later noted that it was easier to speak out against the war within the confines of the "church or the fraternal organization to which one belongs" than among the librarians' group. Those who had tried to bring the resolution on Vietnam to the floor of the ALA heard "the war has nothing to do with libraries" and "ALA doesn't get involved in broad political issues."[47]

John Berry, the longtime editor of the *Library Journal*, openly pondered the risks of taking a stand on the war. One fear was that if the ALA campaigned for the end to war on the grounds that guns were taking away funds from libraries, librarians would be seen as "self-seeking and unpatriotic." Berry also worried that patrons would not be receptive to the idea. One New Jersey librarian, Berry observed, had already been denounced for displaying a poster urging participation in an antiwar march on Washington.[48]

---

45. "News Report: 1969." *Library Journal* 95, no. 1 (January 1, 1970): 35.

46. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974,* 60-65.

47. Blake, "Eye of the Storm," 63.

48. John Berry, "Escalation and Librarians," in *Library Issues: The Sixties* ed. Eric Moon and Karl Nyren (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970), 107.

If librarians as a group took a position against the war, their collections might even be considered suspect. "Hostility," wrote Berry, "may develop toward the local library when its traditional open door to all opinions welcomes material opposing the government's position on Vietnam." In some ways, librarians were in a tough situation. Even if they did not collectively oppose the war, by defending the right to read, librarians might seem to be protecting the dissemination of treasonous ideas.[49]

There were other fears as well. Some librarians were concerned the ALA would lose its tax-exempt status.[50] In a letter to *American Libraries*, a librarian from Antioch College in Ohio, presented the theory that taking a stand on nonprofessional issues might cause dissenters to resign; repeat the action enough times and the ALA would be reduced to a "small, politically single-minded group" which had succeeded in suppressing all intellectual freedom but its own.[51] Commentary, of course, went the other way, too. "Librarians should be professionally neutral while working in the library," Jack Forman, a librarian in Woodbridge, NJ, wrote to *American Libraries*. "Their expression of opinion as part of a national professional association does not interfere with this."[52]

In 1970, the year after the Congress for Change had made its case for condemning the war and shortly after the Cambodian bombings and Kent State killings, the resolution was brought up again at the ALA meeting in Detroit. A "vicious floor fight and subsequent walkout by protestors" followed but made little impact.[53] Members of the

---

49. Ibid.

50. Jack Forman, "Letter to the Editor," *American Libraries* 1, no. 8 (September 1970): 746.

51. Paul Bixler, "Letter to the Editor," *American Libraries* 1 (October 1970): 835.

52. Forman, "Letter to the Editor," 746.

53. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship," 37.

Social Responsibilities Round Table did not give up the fight and continued to condemn the war. The group's August 1, 1971, newsletter printed a copy of an agreement called the "Peoples Peace Treaty," which had been approved by the SRRT Action Council Committee. The treaty was set forth by Madame Binh, a member of the political arm of the Viet Cong, and was billed as a joint agreement between the people of the United States, South Vietnam and North Vietnam. It advocated total withdrawal from Vietnam and a hands-off policy toward Laos and Cambodia as well as the release of all military prisoners. Along with the treaty, the newsletter carried a cartoon lampooning the police at an antiwar rally and the handwritten words "Fuck War."[54]

Finally, that same year—just as the war was already winding down—the ALA issued this statement:

> Whereas, the stated objective of the American Library Association is the promotion and improvement of library service and librarianship, and Whereas, continued and improved library service to the American public requires sustained support from the public monies, and Whereas, the continuing U.S. involvement in the conflict in Southeast Asia has so distorted our national priorities as to reduce substantially the funds appropriated for educational purposes, including support for library services to the American people, and Whereas, continued commitment of U.S. arms, troops, and other military support has not contributed to the solution of this conflict, be it therefore Resolved, that the American Library Association call upon the president of the United States to take immediately those steps necessary to terminate all U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia and to insure the reallocation of national resources to meet pressing domestic needs.[55]

For those who had spent years urging the ALA to take a stand, it was a victory—of sorts. The Congress for Change had called for condemnation of the war on the grounds that librarians opposed 1) the destruction of human beings; 2) the neglect of

54. "Peoples Peace Treaty," *ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter*, August 1, 1971, 12.

55. "Up the Down Concourse: Dallas 1971," *American Libraries* 2 (September 1971): 805.

domestic problems; and 3) the brutalization of "everyone of us, but particularly of our young men who must kill in our name."[56] The ALA did not ask for an end to the war on moral and ethical grounds, but rather on the grounds that the conflict was draining money away from libraries.

Was it a cop out? Perhaps. The ALA did not, in the words of Frederick J. Stielow, "take a political position on an issue seemingly beyond the prescribed limits of the field."[57] Yet the organization's budgetary concerns were legitimate. Although Johnson had enacted the Great Society legislation—ambitious policies aimed at obliterating poverty, improving civil rights and bolstering education—the costs of the war drained dollars from the U.S. treasury, making the programs untenable. When Nixon came into office, he began reversing much of the legislation and in his first budget he drastically cut aid to libraries.[58]

The ALA resolution on Vietnam did not exactly showcase librarians' humanistic qualities, but it was in line with the pragmatic view that Shuman noted most non college-based dissenters held.[59] And while it might even be described as too little too late (Eric Moon had started calling for action four years earlier), it did show that the war was, in fact, a library issue. When all was said and done, Stielow concluded, "The anti-war stance proved a landmark in the history of the profession. Within that context it served as

56. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship," 36.

57. Ibid, 31.

58. Kister, *Eric Moon*, 232.

59. Schuman, "Two Sources of Antiwar Sentiment in America," 513.

the first issue to push American librarianship to take a formal stand outside of its historical pattern."[60]

Conclusion

Many librarians took part in antiwar activities and some individuals were even antiwar activists both within and outside the workplace. The Vietnam War was a contentious issue within the American Library Association and figured into a larger drive to get the organization to demonstrate collective social responsibility.

By the time the ALA took a stand on the war, the United States participation in the conflict was almost over. The group also spoke out only after much debate and only by couching its resolution in the financial needs of libraries. On a national level, the events surrounding Vietnam show that librarians were not all politically likeminded and that, despite the profession's commitment to neutrality, many of them were unafraid to be called biased.

60. Ibid, 40.

PART III

VIETNAM, PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Like other citizens across the nation, Californians were largely supportive of the Vietnam War in its early years, particularly because the state's economy was heavily dependent on defense spending. Yet California was also the site of some of the country's initial antiwar protests. The nation's first large-scale demonstration, in fact, was on the UC Berkeley campus in 1965.[1]

It was not, however, just students who were speaking out against the military conflict. In Los Angeles, in particular, the peace movement was more community than student based.[2] And between 1966 and 1968, three California communities—San Francisco, Mill Valley and Beverly Hills—held local referenda in opposition to the war. Voters approved the measures, condemning the actions of the government by 40, 56 and 56 percent respectively.[3]

In 1967, a television writer and producer named Barbara Avedon invited a group of women into her home to discuss ways to do something about the war. That informal get-together resulted in the formation of Another Mother for Peace, an organization whose classic poster ("War is not healthy for children and other living things" interwoven

1. McCormick, *The Vietnam Antiwar Movement in American History*, 15.

2. R. Jeffrey Lustig, "The War at Home: California's Struggle to Stop the Vietnam War," in *What's Going On? California and the Vietnam Era*, ed. Marcia A. Eymann and Charles Wollenberg (Oakland, CA: Oakland Museum of California, 2004), 64.

3. Harlan Hahn, "Correlates of Public Sentiments About War: Local Referenda on the Vietnam Issue," *American Political Science Review* 64, No. 4 (December 1970): 1189-90, via JSTOR (accessed April 20, 2009).

with a simple sunflower design) became an iconic symbol of the antiwar movement. Writing about the formation of the group in later years, Avedon highlighted the fact that many of those against the war were just common folk (albeit common folk, who were able to rally a number of Hollywood celebrities to their cause). "We were not 'bearded sandaled youths,' 'wild-eyed radicals' or dyed in the wool 'old line freedom fighters' and we wanted the Congress to know that they were dealing with an awakening and enraged middle class—voters, precinct workers, contributors." [4]

When the antiwar protests culminated in Moratorium Day, a one-day pause from business as usual on October 15, 1969, people turned out in hundreds of communities across California to demonstrate. A month later a quarter-million people marched against the war in San Francisco, "swollen by contingents from Fresno, Merced, Sacramento, and other cities."[5] By 1970, when national support for the war had all but collapsed, San Francisco (and Marin County) again voted to demand immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.[6]

As citizens of California, librarians were no doubt as interested—or as disinterested—in Vietnam as other inhabitants of their communities. That comes across in the records of individual libraries as well as those of the California Library Association during the height of the conflict and the antiwar movement. Librarians, though, also had a professional duty to be aware of current events and that duty is reflected in some of the collections and book lists created by libraries during this period. While not

4. "Vietnam Era Anti-War Group is Revived," *Santa Monica Mirror*, October 15-21, 2003.

5. Lustig, "The War at Home," 75.

6. Ibid, 77.

comprehensive, the following chapters offer a snapshot of public libraries, the librarians who worked there, and the library association that represented the

Chapter 4

The War Trickles Into California Community Libraries

Despite general public concern in California about the war, the lack of local newspaper coverage, a survey of the records of the California Library Association and an examination of some public library archives suggest that neither Vietnam nor the antiwar movement was first and foremost on the minds of librarians. There was, for instance, no mention of the war at all in the annual reports and meeting minutes of the Santa Monica Public Library. In 1968, the Santa Monica Nature Club, Legal Aid Society and Committee on Aging used the library meeting rooms, but not any antiwar or pro-war groups. No records show exhibits pertaining to the war either.[1] It's difficult to draw a definite conclusion without going through the records of every library in California, but the indication is that, save for an flare-up of activism in the Bay Area during the Cambodia crisis, Santa Monica's disinterest in the Vietnam War was the rule, not the exception.

A Smattering of Interest

On occasion, libraries were accidental "participants" in the antiwar movement, only because the library, as a well-known institution, proved such a good place to meet. For instance, on Moratorium Day in 1969, when Bay Area protesters set out to denounce the war, they gathered at the Community Library Center in the town of San Leandro

1. Annual Report, 1968-1969, Library Records, Santa Monica Public Library, Santa Monica, CA.

before marching off to City Hall.[2] A few miles away, dissenters stood on the steps of the Berkeley Public Library and read the names of those who had been killed in Vietnam.[3] Community college libraries sometimes fulfilled a similar need: When students attempted to initiate an antiwar rally at Pierce College in Woodland Hills, the departure point was to be the campus library at noon (only no one showed up and the rally was postponed).[4] The library also sometimes served as a spot where patrons could weigh in on an issue related to the war. In one such instance, citizens were directed to the city library in Pomona if they wanted to sign the City Council's petition urging Nixon to condemn cruel treatment of American war prisoners in North Vietnam.[5]

A few libraries also had exhibitions or showed films related to Vietnam and the war. The Hunt Branch Library in Fullerton showed an exhibit of drawings and watercolors called "Vietnam Sketchbook 1969" by an artist named Joseph A. Varga.[6] In West Covina, the public library presented a documentary film on an American Army platoon in Indochina.[7] Mary Norton Clapp Library at Occidental College displayed a collection of colorful presidential campaign posters from the election in Vietnam. The exhibit, brought back by a professor who had observed the voting in Saigon, was open to the public.[8]

---

2. "Bay Region Dissenters Spoke Out," *Oakland Tribune*, October 16, 1969.

3. "Moratorium Day Off to a Peaceful Start," *Daily Review*, October 15, 1969.

4. Sid Bernstein, "Pierce College Anti-Vietnam War Rally Fails to Attract Students," *Los Angeles Times,* December 1, 1965.

5. "POW Resolution," *Los Angeles Times*, November 12, 1970.

6. "Vietnam Sketchbook on Display at Library,,, *Los Angeles Times*, August 18, 1971.

7. "Footage in Vietnam," *Los Angeles Times*, March 15, 1970.

8. "Vietnam Posters on Exhibition," *Los Angeles Times*, October 22, 1967.

In 1972, just as the war was winding down, the main branch of the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) created an exhibit called "Dissent and Protest: An American Tradition, 1872-1972." Material relating to the Vietnam War figured prominently in the show of books, pamphlets, recordings and films, which the library stated was a "salute to those who hear the sound of a different drum." Dissent, the catalog noted, is an important part of this nation's heritage and the exhibit hoped to foster a comparison between the anti-imperialists protesting the war in the Philippines with the writers, congressmen, senators and students protesting the war in Indochina. Among the material on Vietnam that was included were *Two, Three—Many Vietnams: A Radical Reader on the Wars in Southeast Asia and the Conflicts at Home* by the editors of *Ramparts*; *At War With Asia* by Noam Chomsky; the documentary film *Vietnam Protest March to Washington, D.C.*; a tape recording of former Oregon senator Wayne Morse speaking on Vietnam at the Oakland Auditorium; a recording of a David Halberstam speech on Vietnam titled "One Very Hot Day"; and the protest music of Joan Baez and Pete Seeger.[9]

The efforts of California libraries, both large and small, to keep up with the times seemed to have created little if any controversy. However, in San Francisco, librarians found that broaching the subject of opposition to the war could bring about debate. In the sixties, San Francisco was known as a center of counterculture and liberal thinking. As mentioned earlier, the city voted to demand immediate withdrawal from the war and librarians from the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL) vociferously protested the

9. Los Angeles Public Library, *Dissent and Protest: An American Tradition, 1872-1972*, 1972, box 21, folder 63, Archives of the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, CA.

inclusion of General Maxwell Taylor in the American Library Association's San Francisco 1967 annual meeting. The same year that Taylor raised their ire, the librarians planned to display posters advertising an antiwar march, much to the dismay of some members of the library commission. "This material is not acceptable for a public library," commission member William M. Malone said of the posters, which featured a dove and announced the April 15 "Spring Mobilization" march. Others on the library commission had no problem with the postings, arguing that they'd simply be allowing the announcement, not approving the event. Ultimately the dispute was left to the city librarian to solve (no record of which way he went on the matter was found).[10] Later on, the SFPL's moderate interest in the war continued as it gave a platform for debate on "topics of community and national concern...such as Vietnam and Ecology."[11]

Bay Area Libraries and the Cambodia Crisis

When the United States invaded Cambodia and the National Guard killed four people at Kent State, antiwar sentiment around the country escalated. Many Bay Area librarians were also concerned about the turn of events, and when students from the School of Librarianship at UC Berkeley came calling with materials on the war, several libraries welcomed the chance to offer their patrons more information relating to the crisis.

---

10. "S.F. War Poster Puzzles Library," *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 5, 1967.

11. John F. Anderson to Joseph L. Alioto, September 18, 1970, California Library Association Records, box 8, San Francisco Public Library folder, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (hereafter cited as CLA Records).

As will be recounted more fully in Chapter 10, in May 1970, the School of Librarianship, like many other departments on the UC Berkeley campus, was in the process of reconstituting its curriculum so that students and faculty could devote time and energy toward ending the war in Vietnam. The students eagerly threw themselves into providing information on Southeast Asia and U.S. foreign policy to the campus and anyone else who needed it. As part of that effort, they established the Community Committee, a group charged with reaching out to public libraries in the Bay Area.

The Community Committee created a portable kit of materials that public libraries could display and offer to their patrons. The kit included books, pamphlets and a 500-title bibliography of works on Southeast Asia and the United States' involvement in the area. Once equipped with the kits, the students set out to visit library personnel in San Francisco, Berkeley, Richmond, Oakland, Alameda County and Contra Costa County.[12]

In most cases, the committee was met with a warm reception. At SFPL, the main library immediately engaged them in two joint projects, the first a forum on Southeast Asia with scholars and legal experts to speak, and the second, a list of articles on Cambodia.[13] A librarian from the Potrero branch, Audrey Wood, also worked with the students to create a film program on Indochina. Wood acknowledged that the program may seem biased, but it didn't dissuade her from offering it. "To present the kind of film program we have in mind may invite a critical attitude toward the war. Such are the facts. But this program would be most responsive to the community on Potrero Hill that

12. Dorothy Witt, Joan Schwartz and Luane Gilbert, "We Are a Birthplace," *Californian Librarian* 30 (July, 1970): 167.
13. Ibid, 168.

we serve," she said. "If residents of a different viewpoint wish to come forward with a request for another program, of course I will not turn them away."[14]

The branch libraries in the Alameda County system were also receptive to the School of Librarianship students. "They all accepted the poster, and most of the branch librarians have set aside a shelf or counter for a display of books on Indochina, and for our bibliography and pamphlets," reported Mary Stewart, whose activities were chronicled by her fellow students in the *California Librarian.*[15]

In Berkeley, reaction was generally good, although one librarian in North Berkeley declined the Community Committee's kit, explaining that her branch's patrons mostly worked at the university and so were already well informed on the matter. Two weeks later, though, the library did put up a display on Southeast Asia and the books were "snatched up" immediately.

Occasionally, the students unwittingly came up against library politics while trying to achieve their goal. The head of the Oakland Public Library, William H. Brett, asked his advisory board to attend a meeting with the students. One member of the board had lost a loved one in the war and was not sympathetic to the committee's obvious antiwar attitude. Although the library accepted the portable kit's Southeast Asia bibliography, Brett was warned by his board not to recommend that the display kit be used in the branches (he was, however, allowed to tell the branch heads of its existence). It was clear to the committee that Brett wanted to do a program on the war, but mindful that budget and salary increases were coming up, he admitted that he didn't want to

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid, 169.

antagonize members of the community who might be offended by any perceived antiwar slant. The realities of a library director's life resonated. "How better could a student learn how libraries are actually operated than by their Oakland experience?" asked Witt, Schwartz and Gilbert in the *California Librarian.*[16]

Personal Opinion

Certainly, many librarians had a position and perhaps even a strong position on the conflict in Southeast Asia, particularly by the time of the Cambodia Invasion and Kent State killings. Some of them were also undoubtedly personally affected by the war as Irene Lovdal, a Los Angeles librarian at the Sunland-Tujunga Branch, was. Lovdal had a son who was stationed on An Thoi, Phu Quoc Island in Vietnam. Her son wrote about the deplorable conditions on the island and librarians in the LAPL system, moved by the story, sent clothes, blankets and candy to its inhabitants. The librarians received a thank you letter from a lieutenant in the Vietnamese Navy.[17]

Whatever their opinions were about the war, few California librarians were public about their feelings. Of those who did speak their minds, sentiments varied. On one end of the spectrum were two librarians from Stockton Public Library who were irritated by Eric Moon's suggestion in *Library Journal* that librarians condemn the war. Passionately defending President Johnson in a letter to the editor, they wrote: "You are presumptuous

16. Ibid, 170.

17. "Vietnamese Village Receives Gifts from Irene Lovdal," *Los Angeles Public Library Broadcaster*, March/April 1965, 1.

to assume that only those opposed to the war in Vietnam are 'responsible citizens,' and even more so to claim to speak for librarians as a professional group."[18]

In Los Angeles, one librarian gave a hint of where she stood by submitting a piece entitled "Celebration of the Peace Symbols 1st Decade, 1958-1968" to *The Communicator,* the Librarian Guild's newsletter. The page of drawings and text gave the history of both the peace symbol and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. They were, the author noted, a response to oft-asked reference questions, but she also gave her article personal meaning by signing it (along with her family—it was published during the Christmas holidays), "Rally for Peace-Goodwill from Bill, Janice, Craig, Laurie, Scott."[19]

After the Cambodia invasion, Edith White, Western Regional Children's Librarian at LAPL, wrote a brief editorial relating to the war in *The Communicator.* When her young son asked her questions about the conflict, White spoke to him about the differences in attitudes between generations, then wrote the editorial about how the war and all the chaos surrounding it should be seen as a call to arms for librarians.

> I can't help but associate the turmoil in our land with the inner unrest in the libraries. Our younger librarians talk in terms of community involvement, of libraries as a communications resource; our tradition-oriented librarians speak of well-rounded collections and reference questions. Any institution that stands still is dead and doesn't know it.
>
> Libraries don't get burnt in riots. Banks or markets do. Obviously, we don't count. We are not important enough for anyone to react to. Libraries, like that 6th toe, will turn into a vestigial remain unless they respond to the needs of society....What price books if no one reads them? What matter brilliant ideas or discourse? T radition says we are a storehouse of knowledge; let people come in pursuit. I say, active

18. "Dissent from Dissent," S5.

19. Janice Scott. "Celebration of the Peace Symbol's 1st Decade 1958-1968." *Communicator*, December 1968, 5.

> participation, not passive observation should be our standard....My bewildered son thought we were at war and I told him this wasn't war, but it *is* social revolution. Is the library going to be part of the revolution?[20]

While White was incorrect that libraries don't get burnt in riots—to cite one example, the year before her editorial ran, a library at New York University was firebombed[21]—she echoed Eric Moon's contention that libraries have a low profile in important affairs. And in her opinion, they shouldn't. Although White did not weigh in on the Vietnam War specifically, the war seemed to inspire her argument that libraries be more assertive in addressing the issues at hand.

When UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship's Community Committee contacted Bay Area public libraries as part of their outreach efforts, they got some feedback on whether it was acceptable for librarians to take a stand on the war and other social issues. George Hertz, head of technical processing at the Richmond Library (and also an organizer of the Bay Area Social Responsibilities Round Table), was forthcoming on the subject.

> I don't think it's right for me to leave my political commitments at home. The idea that you should read and become informed and then not use that knowledge is wrong. To become an automaton for the time I'm at work is not right. By trying to remain objective, a librarian is unwittingly permitting himself to serve a biased viewpoint. Why shouldn't we honestly present the views our learning has brought us to?

Given Hertz's sentiments, it is not surprising that after the invasion of Cambodia, the Richmond Library displayed several photographs of the wounded and dying in Vietnam along with a selection of posters, books and pamphlets on the situation.[22]

---

20. Edith White, "Guest Editorial," *Communicator*, Midsummer 1970, 2-3.

21. "No Let Up Seen in Campus Disorders," *Independent Press-Telegram*, April 26, 1969.

22. Witt, Schwartz and Gilbert, "We Are a Birthplace," 170.

Conclusion

Many librarians in the Bay Area made a special effort to provide their patrons with material on the Vietnam War, even when some of that material seemed biased against U.S. foreign policy. Having the assistance of students from UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship undoubtedly made highlighting information on the war easier and one wonders if so many libraries would have made the effort without the students' help and urging. Still, many librarians took to the task at hand, and some seemed to welcome the opportunity to devote time and space to the subject.

A library-by-library investigation of all California institutions might reveal that more libraries than previously cited offered programs that involved the Vietnam War or the antiwar movement. The limitations of this study cannot confirm that supposition, however, if such programs were offered, a search of local and statewide newspapers shows that few were notable enough to generate any publicity. Further, those programs that were publicized were not particularly controversial. It can be said that, while Vietnam was not completely ignored, it did not greatly influence the operation of community libraries. Likewise, few if any Californian librarians spoke out for or against the war in a professional capacity, although some felt no compunction in bringing their personal sentiments to work with them and some, at the very least, let it be known among their colleagues where they stood on the conflict.

Chapter 5

Vietnam and Collection Development

As the Vietnam War escalated, it became increasingly clear that the American public would need access to information about the conflict, the countries involved, and other related issues. Librarians dutifully filled their shelves, although some of them may have faced the problem of how to catalog the material. Even as late as 1969, the Library of Congress still had not selected unifying subject headings for the Vietnam War. "Anyone examining the subject headings in the catalogs of libraries which follow the LC system of subject headings will make the astonishing discovery that an international war does not presently exist," groused librarian Fredrick Holler.[1]

Of greater concern, of course, was what material librarians should select for their patrons in the first place. As Stielow noted, there is little evidence to suggest that librarians tried to censor antiwar reading materials. Most of them, in fact, called for information on both sides of the issue.[2] But there was also a sea change going on in some libraries during the late 1960s and early 1970s, driven by the notion that ideas out of the mainstream had been given the short shrift. Some librarians began advocating the addition of more material from alternative presses in library collections, which would have included books and articles that expressed antiwar sentiments. As Samek explains it:

1. Holler, "One Man's View of Vietnam," 251.
2. Stielow, "The War and Librarianship," 34.

> Librarians who advocated social responsibility used the issue of the alternative press to redress a perceived imbalance in library collections, to provide enhanced information services to a broader public, to make the library more relevant to a changing society, and to show that long-standing library practices put the library profession in conflict with its own Library Bill of Rights.[3]

Many libraries in California tried to adhere to this updated notion of collection development. Their shelves showcased material from both sides of the ideological spectrum as it related to the Vietnam War and sometimes even included books that may have skirted the edges of legality.

Bay Area Librarians Leading the Way

In 1967, a group of librarians from the San Francisco Public Library founded BARC, the Bay Area Reference Center. The center's mission was to provide supplementary reference services to seventeen libraries in the Bay Area system. BARC's staff often communicated with the libraries by facsimile, a revolutionary new technology at the time. BARC also debuted a monthly newsletter called *Synergy*, edited by Celeste West, a SFPL librarian and outspoken feminist.

From the outset, *Synergy* used its voice to champion material produced by the alternative press and which, to its editors' minds, better served the needs of the San Francisco community, a "hotbed of social activity."[4] West believed that librarians were not trained to find information on topics that hadn't been covered by big publishers and

3. Samek, *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974*, 46.

4. Ibid, 46-47.

the mainstream media (or at least not covered in a timely fashion). Through *Synergy* she aimed to fill in the gap and even help librarians become agents of social change.[5]

The editors of *Synergy* did not disguise their left-leaning politics, and among the topics they raised was the Vietnam War. While the newsletter didn't devote a lot of space to the conflict, it did chronicle the actions of librarians who organized for peace and recommended books with an antiwar point of view.[6] One of those books was *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada,* a guide to entering the country and finding the most welcoming spots in Canada for Americans evading the draft. Also recommended was *To End War: An Introduction to the Ideas, Books, Organizations, Work That Can Help,* a book whose title is self-explanatory.[7] Yet it was not only the "radical" members of BARC that were promoting a book about ending the war: The California Library Association also published a favorable review of *To End War*, written by John Liberty, a reference librarian at Sacramento State College.[8]

Balanced Collections

A sampling of community library and college records suggests that many of them attempted to carry books and other material that fell on both sides of the ideological spectrum. Occasionally, a library would be accused of erring too closely on the side of the government, such as when John A. Buchanan, an associate professor of speech at Valley College in Van Nuys, accused the campus library of harboring propaganda. "One

5. Ibid, 47-48.

6. "Librarians for Peace," *Synergy* (July/August 1970): 11.

7. "Leaves of Change," *Synergy* (July/August 1970): 51-53.

8. John Liberty, "To End War," *CLA Newsletter*, March 1970, 5.

can imagine my consternation when, in view of my own meager materials, I walk into our school library and find an attractive rack loaded with military propaganda leaflets and booklets," he told the *Los Angeles Times*. "Obviously done at great expense, they urge my students to go out and join some branch of the military service, the activities which are bleeding education to a point of real danger."[9]

Following Celeste West's line of thinking, it's possible that Valley College's collection was slanted toward pro-war materials because those materials were easy to come by. Like West, John Berry, the editor of *Library Journal*, also questioned librarians' ability to find material that was out of the mainstream. In 1966, he did an interesting (if unscientific) study to test his theory. Berry had noticed that two polar-opposite books relating to the Vietnam War were quite popular. One was the *Handbook for Conscientious Objectors*, a tactical and legal guide for men who had decided to evade the draft. The *Handbook* was an underground bestseller that was in its eighth edition and had sold 50,000 copies. The other book was *Practice for the Armed Forces Tests*, a manual for achieving greater success in the military that was known among librarians as the "most stolen book." It was also a bestseller.

Berry telephoned fifteen public libraries across the country, including two in California, one in Glendale and the other in Oakland. Six libraries had the *Handbook*, fourteen had *Practice* and one had neither. Reasons for not having either book ranged from "We used to have [it] but it was missing so much that we gave up" (*Practice)* to "We don't think it would be appropriate to spend public funds for that!" (*Handbook*).

9. Kenneth Fanucchi, "Teachers Asked to Condemn War." *Los Angeles Times*, March 14, 1967.

Some librarians also said the *Handbook* was not reviewed, advertised or well known. Berry concluded that most librarians were not afraid of the controversial *Handbook*, however, they needed to be more adept at finding out about "fugitive" material (especially one like the *Handbook*, which, despite librarians' protestations otherwise, had received a lot of newspaper and television coverage). In the name of equal access, said Berry, librarians also needed to be quicker to include material that's "unacceptable to the majority."[10]

Books for Young Adults

Some librarians made an effort to include material about the Vietnam War in their collections for young adults (YA). They also placed the names of those books on YA recommended reading lists. Other librarians also suggested books on the conflict for a young audience, although to their colleagues, not directly to library patrons. The small sampling of examples I found showed that, in both cases, more antiwar books than pro-war books were recommended.

This phenomenon may have something to do with when the lists were created. The Los Angeles Public Library's Young Adult Annual Book List from the years 1965 to 1972 show that the creators of the list were more likely to suggest antiwar-related books as the war wore on. For example, the 1965 list suggested *Reserve Officers Training Corps, Students Guide to Military Service* and *Your Future in the Navy,* books that might assist teenagers thinking of military service. The following year, the recommendations

10. John Berry, "Caught In The Draft, February 15, 1966," in *Library Issues: The Sixties*, ed. Eric Moon and Karl Nyren (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970), 79-81.

leaned more toward explaining the war. *The Vietnam War: Why?* and *Dateline: Viet Nam*, a collection of newspaper columns from a war correspondent, were among the selections. In 1967, the recommended books tended to be more informative and less political. Among them were *To My Son in Uniform, Letters From Vietnam* and *Ten Vietnamese*, interviews with Vietnamese people.[11]

By 1968, the list included many journalists' accounts of the war, including *Two Shores of Hell*, written by a French reporter, and *Up Front in Vietnam*, vignettes of military action. But the list also started to include more material with an antiwar bent, such as *A Book of Peace*, a collection of prose and poetry, and *Fulbright: The Dissenter*, a biography of the famed senator who took an early antiwar stance.

In 1969, the LAPL list was very balanced. Right next to *A Young Man in Vietnam* and *The Student's Guide to Military Service* was *We Won't Go: Personal Accounts of War Objectors.* Finding middle ground, the list also included *Guide to the Draft*, billed as unbiased information for those making life-affecting decisions. By 1970, though, the selections promoted more of a left-wing way of thinking. Among the recommendations were *The Lottery and the Draft: Where Do I Stand*; *Poems of War Resistance*; *My Lai 4: A Report on the Massacre and It's Aftermath* by the well-known journalist Seymour Hersh; and *Songs of Peace, Freedom and Protest.* The list also suggested *The Draft*, a discussion by supporters and critics.

That same year, another book list with an antiwar slant was created as part of the Federal Young Adult Library Services Project in Mountain View, CA. The list was a

11. Los Angeles Public Library, ,,Young Adult Annual Book Lists, 1965 to 1970,,, Children's and Young Adult Services, box 12, folder 20, Archives of the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, CA.

collection of paperback book, magazine, film and record suggestions, imagined by its authors, Regina Minudri and Reed Coats, as part of a hypothetical, "model library." The two presented their ideas at the California Library Association's Annual Conference. Minudri and Coats made virtually no suggestions that were pro-war or pro-administration. Some of the titles were: *An Unfair and Obsolete Draft and What We Can Do About It*; *Moratorium: An American Protest*; *Vietnam: The Unheard Voices*; *We Won't Go: Personal Accounts of War Objectors*; *How to Stay Out of the Army: A Guide to Your Rights Under the Draft Law*; *G.I. Rights and Army Justice*; and *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*. In the history section, the authors selected *Vietnam* by Mary McCarthy, a writer who had visited Southeast Asia and was staunchly antiwar.[12]

By 1971, public sentiment had turned against the war and the LAPL's Young Adult Annual Book List reflected it. That year the selections included *No Easy Answers,* a novel about a teenage peace demonstrator who clears his Army colonel father of charges of treason; *They Can't Go Home Again*, a book about war resisters; *I Refuse*, a draft dodger's memoir; *A Child's Garden of Verses for the Revolution*; *If This Be Treason: Your Sons Tell Their Own Stories of Why They Won't Fight for Their Country;* and *Up Against the War: A Personal Introduction to U.S. Soldiers and Civilians Fighting Against the War in Vietnam.*

One year later, the list's recommendations began to show the aftermath of the war, even though the fighting wasn't quite over. One book LAPL suggested was called *Cross Fire* and told the "tragic" story of five humans caught in the war, including

12. Regina Minudri and Reed Coats, "Getting It Together or YAMAPAFAR," October, 1970, CLA Records, box 6, Young Adults folder, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Vietnamese children and an American soldier who was the sole survivor of an ambush. *Coming Out*, another suggestion, was written by David Harris and Joan Baez, and chronicled Harris's twenty-month prison term for draft refusal. *Standard Operating Procedure* was a transcript of testimony by Vietnam Veterans. Still, acknowledging that the war was not finished, the list also included *Handbook For Conscientious Objectors.*[13]

Book Selections and Personal Opinion

Did young adult book lists or any book lists, for that matter, reflect the political leanings of the librarians who prepared them, or the perceived interests of their patrons? It is impossible to say, however, the creators of the Federal Young Adult Library Services list most likely made their selections based on the feeling that teenagers were primarily interested in the antiwar side of the story. In the introduction to their bibliography, Regina Minudri and Reed Coats wrote, "It was decided that this [model] library would reflect, as closely as possible, the reading tastes and interests of young adults."[14]

Some librarians, though, were forthright about their political feelings when recommending books. As noted in Chapter 3, Elizabeth Welch admitted to the editors of the *Wilson Library Bulletin* that she did not use objectivity when creating a bibliography for schools and libraries on the Vietnam War. Thus, while her list wasn't lacking in unbiased books that tell the straight story of Vietnam and the conflict there, Welch's selections were weighted toward her own antiwar sentiments. Books like Noam

13. Los Angeles Public Library, ,,Young Adult Annual Book Lists, 1971-1975,,, Children's and Young Adult Services, box 12, folder 21, Archives of the Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, CA.

14. Minudri and Coats, "Getting It Together or YAMAPAFAR."

Chomsky's *American Power and the New Mandarins*; *One Morning in the War: The Tragedy at Son My* by Richard Hammer; John Kerry's *Vietnam Veterans Against the War;* and the essay collection, *Why Are We Still in Vietnam?* all spoke to idea that the government of the United States had made a tragic mistake.[15]

Although not a California librarian, Colonel James Hillard was another professional who made his personal opinion about the war clear when recommending books. Hillard's contribution is notable because he was a librarian at The Citadel, a military academy in South Carolina. Calling the conflict a "tragic blunder of American foreign policy" and contending that "we should have never have been inveigled into such a conflict in the first place, but having entered it, we should have pursued it more diligently," Hillard goes on to suggest books to librarians that might help their patrons have a better understanding of Vietnam. As someone who believed the country should have had either universal military training or an all-volunteer army, he nonetheless urged librarians to buy *The Case Against a Volunteer Army* and *Mastering the Draft* (emphasizing that the latter wasn't a book on how to avoid the draft). *The War We Are In* and *America on Trial* were two other Hillard choices. While he was admittedly partisan, the colonel's choices seemed to be aimed more at educating the public than pushing an agenda. "The current U.S. problems concerning Vietnam," he stated, "are caused by a lack of communication and understanding of why and how we got into the situation that we did."[16]

---

15. Welch, "What Did You Write About the War, Daddy?"

16. James Hillard, "ALA and Vietnam," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 46 (March, 1972): 594-95.

Conclusion

Unlike the controversy over works considered pornographic in library collections, the inclusion of "alternative" material about the Vietnam War did not seem to cause much debate among librarians, library boards, the public or the government. The Vietnam War occurred at a time when the status quo on a variety of issues was being challenged. There was a movement to give a platform to voices out of the mainstream, and that included voices calling for the end to the conflict in Southeast Asia. It is therefore not surprising that many California librarians confidently added books to their collections that may have seemed radical and even urged unlawful behavior (such as *Manual for Draft-Age Immigrants to Canada).*

Because young men of or approaching draft-age were arguably the ones who were most affected by the war, it makes sense that some of these books were on recommended reading lists for young adults. It is apparent, however, that librarians chose to weight these lists toward antiwar material, at least in the later years of the war. Was that because more antiwar material than pro-war material was being published? It's difficult to say, but evidence suggests that some librarians were swayed by their own political leanings and some assumed that teenagers were more interested in liberal and radical material.

Chapter 6

Keeping Up With the Times: The California Library Association

By 1969, the American Library Association's Social Responsibilities Round Table had spawned local chapters across the country. One of those chapters was the Committee on Social Responsibilities of Libraries at the California Library Association (CLA). The chairman was William L. Ramirez, principal librarian in the History and Social Science Department of the San Francisco Public Library. The purpose of the committee was to provide a forum for discussion on a wide range of issues, including race, violence, inequality, and war and peace.[1] The committee had various subcommittees, among them one on Peace and War chaired by a public librarian in Berkeley.[2]

At the time, it was evident that many of the younger librarians in the profession were dissatisfied with the lack of attention previously given to social concerns. But unsure of how they wished social concerns to be addressed, Ramirez conducted an informal poll among ten younger colleagues in San Francisco. He discovered that the librarians did want "a place and an opportunity to discuss Vietnam and the subject of law and order," but that they were far more interested in what Ramirez called "meaningful" library service. The younger librarians wanted to reach out to minorities and provide useful materials and information to all patrons, including senior citizens, the handicapped and young adults. They also felt that all librarians "should make every effort to

1. William L. Ramirez, "Social Concerns and the Library," *California Librarian* 30, no. 3 (July 1969): 174.

2. William Ramirez to CLA Newsletter, n.d., CLA Records, box 9, SRRT folder.

determine what people really need, not just what we, in our usually paternalistic fashion, think they need."[3]

Condemning the War

Perhaps goaded into action by the events of May 1970—the Cambodia Invasion and Kent State killings—the Committee on the Social Responsibilities of Libraries presented a resolution condemning the war in Vietnam to the Executive Board of the CLA. The Executive Board amended it slightly and asked that the council vote on whether the resolution should be formally adopted by the CLA. The resolution read:

> WHEREAS THE CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION is deeply concerned with the continued involvement in the Vietnam War, and
>
> WHEREAS we are concerned with the escalation of the involvement through the invasion of Cambodia, and
>
> WHEREAS we are opposed to undeclared wars, and
>
> WHEREAS we are disturbed at the bitterness and lack of trust that the President's action has aroused in the young people we serve,
>
> BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION is opposed to the continued involvement in Vietnam, and
>
> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the President be urged to immediately withdraw troops from Cambodia.[4]

There seems to be no record of whether the resolution passed or not; however, a year later, a second attempt was made by the Bay Area Social Responsibilities Round Table to get the CLA on the record against the war. Among the most activist and outspoken of the local chapters of the CLA's Social Responsibilities Committee, the Bay Area S.R.R.T. had barely been formed in late July of 1970 before all sixty-five members

3. Ibid, 174-75.

4. Memorandum from Stefan B. Moses to Members of Council, n.d., CLA Records, box 9, SRRT folder.

unanimously voted to issue a statement against the Vietnam War. And unlike the American Library Association, the Bay Area S.R.R.T. did not couch its proclamation in the idea that the war was bad for libraries. "We condemn the war in Southeast Asia," read the statement. "We urge all professional organizations, as a matter of conscience, to take a similar position." To publicize its proclamation, the group sent copies to the *ALA Bulletin*, the *CLA Bulletin*, the *Wilson Bulletin* and the *Library Journal* (which published a short piece about the statement).[5]

Several months later, the Bay Area S.R.R.T. attempted to get the CLA to pass a resolution condemning the war.[6] The suggestion was referred to the CLA Council (governing body), though the CLA's first response was not encouraging. "I feel I must point out to you that [the] Council is under no compulsion, and may not even be legally able, to act upon a recommendation from a body which is not a constituent part of the Association," wrote CLA President David Sabsay. He went on to suggest that the group ask a member of the Council to offer up the resolution so that it not fall victim to an "organizational problem."[7]

Apparently the organizational problem was avoided and the vote went forward. Of 40 ballots returned, 26 were ayes, 12 were nays and 1 abstained. Ten members did not vote. A Bay Area S.R.R.T. newsletter reported that the results would be printed in

5. Grace MacNeill to "Sir," August 20, 1970, CLA Records, box 9, SRRT folder; "Bay Area Library Group Takes Antiwar Stand," *Library Journal* 95, no. 18 (October 15, 1970): 3424.

6. "From Reports of Affiliate Groups," *ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter*, April 10, 1971, 2.

7. David Sabsay to Mary L. Roberts, May 24, 1971, CLA Records, box 9, SRRT folder.

CLA and ALA bulletins as well as professional journals, although those accounts never seemed to have appeared.[8]

The CLA and California Campuses

The California Library Association kept a watchful eye on the state's colleges and universities and reacted when war-related and other types of unrest hit the campuses. For instance, one of the presentations at the CLA's annual conference in 1969 was "Up Against the Library Wall," five case studies of attacks on libraries at UC Berkeley, San Francisco State College, College of San Mateo and San Francisco City College.[9]

After the student uprisings precipitated by the Cambodia invasion and Kent State killings, the editors of *California Librarian*, the official publication of the CLA, also commissioned articles from library school students at both UCLA and UC Berkeley that reported on their activities. For his part, Stefan B. Moses, Executive Director of the CLA, sent letters to several library schools noting that the organization's Executive Board had passed a resolution praising their actions. "We commend the program undertaken at the School of Librarianship at University of California at Berkeley and similar activities undertaken at other Library Schools," wrote Moses. The heads of library programs at Immaculate Heart College in Los Angeles, San José State College,

8. Notes of SRRT Meeting, July 13, 1970, CLA Records, box 9, SRRT folder.

9. "Conference, 1969, San Francisco," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 44 (January 1970): 493-4.

UCLA, University of Southern California (USC) and UC Berkeley were all recipients of Moses' letters.[10]

This wasn't the first time that the CLA had acknowledged difficulties brought about by student unrest. In 1969, UC Berkeley suffered violent protests over student demands for inclusion of more ethnic studies departments and minority recruitment. Ultimately, Governor Ronald Reagan called in the National Guard.[11]

The turmoil also seeped into UC Berkeley's Main Library when student demonstrators paraded through the building several times.[12] (A further accounting of events will be included in Chapter 9.) Because the governor had proclaimed the campus in a "state of extreme emergency" and because the violence presented a clear danger to the library staff, some UC Berkeley librarians requested help from the CLA. The Executive Board responded by passing a resolution asking that librarians who requested leave with pay be granted time off.[13] The idea, though, wasn't unanimous among the staff. Some worried that the CLA resolution was a sly way to support the demand of the librarians union (officially called the University Federation of Librarians) that the libraries be closed until calm was restored. Others considered it an underhanded way of supporting the People's Park strikers and in line with an attempt to get the whole

10. Stefan B. Moses to Lucille Whalen, July 14, 1970; Stefan B. Moses to Leslie H. Janke, July 14, 1970; Stefan B. Moses to Andrew H. Horn, July 14, 1970; Stefan B. Moses to Martha Boaz, July 14, 1970; Stefan B. Moses to Raynard Swank, July 14, 1970; CLA Records, box 8, Library Schools folder.

11. Marcus Wohlsen, "Liberating Voices: The Tumultuous Struggle to Bring Ethnic Studies to Berkeley," *Illuminations,* n.d., http://illuminations.berkeley.edu/archives/2005/history.php?volume=5 (accessed October 14, 2009).

12. James E. Skipper, "Student Protest and the Library," *CU News*, February 13, 1969, 1.

13. "Resolution Adopted by the Executive Board of the California Library Association," March 6, 1969, CLA Records, box 9, Social Responsibilities folder.

university to close down.[14] Ultimately, despite the CLA's resolution, some librarians who took leave were denied pay.[15]

Conclusion

The California Library Association created a platform for members concerned about social responsibilities, including the responsibility of librarians to talk about war and peace. The majority of the group's Executive Board and Council seemed to agree that it was proper for the CLA to speak out against the Vietnam War; however, there did not seem to be much effort put into making their voices heard as no record of the resolutions against the war could be found in the CLA's newsletter or journal. The CLA's main concern, as perhaps appropriate to its mission, was to speak up for the rights of Californian librarians. When social unrest, war-related and otherwise, impinged on those rights, the CLA was an active advocate on its members' behalf.

14. "Paid Leave During Strike Urged by California L.A.," *Library Journal* 94 (April 1, 1969): 1404-5.

15. Phil Hoehn, "Berkeley Rebuttal," *Library Journal* 94 (June 1, 1969): 2175

PART IV

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY SCHOOLS: IN THE CENTER OF THE STORM

In the early part of May 1970, a turn of events in Southeast Asia and the U.S. public's reaction to them triggered demonstrations and acts of violence at campuses around the country, sending higher education into crisis. The events that led to the uproar began a few months earlier when the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong moved into Cambodia. On April 30, U.S. troops countered by assisting South Vietnam in the invasion of Cambodia, widening involvement in the war despite Nixon's earlier statements that peace was at hand.[1] Reaction to the betrayal was swift and heated, especially on college campuses. Students took part in antiwar demonstrations at schools around the country, most tragically at Kent State. The governor of Ohio had already declared martial law as a response to student outbursts earlier in the week. When a group at Kent State held a noon rally on May 4 despite the restrictions, then resisted orders to disperse, the National Guardsmen responded with tear gas followed by bullets. Four people were killed, ten others wounded.[2]

If students were angry before the events at Kent State, afterwards they were enraged. What occurred next took on historic proportions. "For hundreds of thousands, even millions, of students, faculty, and staff at more than half of the nations' colleges,

1. "New Crunch for the U.S. in Indochina," *Time*, May 4, 1970, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,943780,00.html (accessed October 21, 2009).

2. "May 5, 1970: Police Violence," *UCLA Daily Bruin*, January 19, 1971.

'business-as-usual' became unthinkable," wrote Richard E. Peterson and John Alan Bilorusky in their account of that fateful month. It was, they declared, "a period of unparalleled antagonism to the political-social order and unprecedented renunciation of academic normalcy."[3]

To take some measure of the upheaval, Peterson, a research psychologist at UC Berkeley at the time, sent questionnaires to the presidents of colleges and universities around the country. His data, drawn from approximately 1,862 schools, showed that 89 percent of independent universities and 76 percent of public universities were the sites of peaceful demonstrations. Twenty-eight percent of public universities, however, also reported damage to persons or property. Many observers told Peterson that it was not just students who became politically active that May. Rather, it involved "people from parts of the institution that had theretofore never been known for any kind of political activism." Even some at the top spoke out: One in five chief campus administrators took a public stand as individuals against the war or invasion of Cambodia. Five percent took a neutral stand; less than 1 percent supported the Cambodian incursion.[4]

In particular, campuses in California reacted vigorously to the events of May 1970. College students all over the state were out in force chanting "On strike. Shut it down." Over four thousand marched at San José State College and at the University of California, Riverside, students withdrew all their money from local banks, declaring that they would not redeposit it until the war was over. In Santa Barbara, students burned

3. Richard E. Peterson and John Alan Bilorusky, *May 1970: The Campus Aftermath of Cambodia and Kent State* (Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1971), 1.

4. Ibid, 23.

their draft cards and in conservative Orange County, University of California, Irvine, students declared the campus a sanctuary for all servicemen and demonstrators. Even the students at Nixon's alma mater, Whittier College, took action by boycotting classes.[5]

Although at this point the antiwar movement had been raging for some time, it had clearly come to a head: Librarians, particularly those on campuses where the reaction to the Cambodia/Kent State catastrophe had been strong, could no longer ignore the crisis in their midst. The journal *College & Research Libraries* put it this way:

> Previously, it was accepted that while many individuals in the university community took political action, the university as a whole should not act. Now, for the first time, the role of the university is being interpreted in a wholly new light. Academic libraries and library schools, as part of the university community, are forced to reexamine their own position.[6]

To make known their position, 200 members of the staff at Harvard University Library sent a letter to the president of the university, deploring the escalation of the war and asking him to protest directly to President Nixon. Telegrams of protest signed by 350 staff members were also sent directly to Nixon and Massachusetts's senators.[7] Columbia University School of Library Service reacted by sponsoring a colloquium to explore the role of the library during times of crisis. Among the issues they considered: Should the library stay open if the university closes? Can or should the library remain neutral ground and how can it deal with clashing ideologies? Should the library allow librarians to devote their time to the crisis at the expense of their other duties?[8]

---

5. Kathy Johnston, "California Campuses on Strike," *Daily Californian*, May 6, 1970; Vic Lieberman, "Statewide Protests Continue," *Daily Californian*, May 8, 1970.

6. "News," *College & Research Libraries* 30, no. 8 (September 1970): 250.

7. "Harvard Library Staff Protests Vietnam Escalation," *Library Journal* 97 (July 1972): 2326.

8. Ibid.

These were the questions that countless academic libraries grappled with in the spring of 1970. Interestingly, many of them, including the libraries at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) and Stanford University, responded to the challenges in remarkably similar ways. Librarians at all three schools (and library students at UCLA and UC Berkeley) rose to the occasion, instituting measures to help people find the information they needed and gathering information that might be needed in the future. The librarians also took a stand on the issues of the day, and endeavored to keep the libraries open even while other parts of the University were shutting down. What follows are the details of what happened at UCLA, UC Berkeley and, to lesser extent, Stanford, in that fateful month of May.

Chapter 7

UCLA: An Open Intellectual Sanctuary

Until the events of May 1970 brought the antiwar movement right to their doors, librarians at the University of California, Los Angeles, who opposed the Vietnam War often felt as though they were lonely ships in a sea of indifference. Fay M. Blake, who was a librarian at UCLA until 1970, then later on the faculty of UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship, recalls standing in protest on the UCLA campus with one lone professor. "The Vietnam War had started, and there was one professor standing alone, not saying a word—with just a sign opposing the Vietnam War. The next day or maybe the week after . . . I joined him, so there were two of us standing in line, opposing the Vietnam War. Nobody attacked us, nobody said, 'You're a Commie traitor,' but nobody did anything else."[1] Writing later about the experience, she noted, "Colleagues from the library passed by with heads averted."[2]

Yet UCLA librarians were not completely averse to taking a stand on political issues. In 1969, the University of California Board of Regents fired assistant philosophy professor Angela Davis because of her affiliation with the Communist Party.[3] Responding to the firing, the Librarians Association passed a resolution condemning the

1. Fay M. Blake, interview by Laura McCreery, 2000, "Information for All: An Activist Librarian and Library Educator at the University of California, 1961-1984," Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt1x0n98bx&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=d0e940&toc.depth=1&toc.id=d0e940&brand=oac&query=vietnam (accessed April 16, 2009).

2. Blake, "Eye of the Storm," 63.

3. Eileen Keerdoja, "Davis: Campaigning as a Communist," *Newsweek,* June 9, 1980, via LexisNexis Academic (accessed June 9, 2009).

regents' action (the UCLA faculty also voted 539 to 12 to condemn the regents[4]). It might be said, however, that the Angela Davis imbroglio hit a little closer to home than the war. As the former UCLA Librarians Association President Norah Jones said at the time, she and her colleagues had "an especially strong commitment to intellectual freedom, which is so closely tied to the principles of academic freedom, a central principle at issue in the Angela Davis matter."[5]

May 5, 1970

The university librarians' allegiances would be tested again when the UCLA campus erupted following the invasion of Cambodia and the Kent State killings. The crisis (as it was generally referred to, interchangeably with "state of emergency") began on May 5, which, as the school paper said at the time, was "a tragically memorable day in the half-century history of UCLA."[6] The fifth of May also happened to be Cinco de Mayo, a day of Mexican celebration. Chicano students had long-planned a fiesta and rally to mark the day as well a march to the administrative building in support of proposals sent to Chancellor Charles E. Young. Dissatisfied with the treatment of Mexican-American students, the group had presented the chancellor with a long list of ideas for expanding opportunities to Chicanos, but had not received a response they deemed sufficient.

---

4. "Chronology of the Angela Davis Case," n.d., Subject Files, Current Issues Center, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as Subject Files, CIC).

5. "Librarian's Association Emergency Meeting Re: Angela Davis Case," October 3, 1969, Librarians Association, Los Angeles, President's Files, 1967-1984, box 4, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as President's Files).

6. "May 5, 1970."

As the Mexican-American students were gathering, another rally was taking place in Meyerhoff Park, a spot that UCLA had designated as a free speech area. With angry students and some faculty already simmering on a low boil, one of the vice chancellors, David Saxon, addressed the crowd of about 400 people, expressing the university's shock at the events of the proceeding days and announcing that a day of mourning would be observed the following day. Then a campus convocation, he said, would be held the day after that. Saxon was heckled nonetheless and a group broke off, heading for the Reserve Officers' Training Course (ROTC) offices located in the men's gym. Once there, the demonstrators scuffled with campus police and wreaked havoc in the building, then left to join the Chicano students at the administration building where they smashed plate glass doors and windows and damaged the interior of the building. Violence had also broken out in other spots on campus, including the Social Welfare Building, home of the Aerospace ROTC office, and the Student Union. Eventually, the violence seeped its way into the library.[7]

The University Librarian, Robert Vosper, believed that the library should be a "haven of privacy, of quiet" and he strongly objected to any disruption. When, on an earlier occasion, students had noisily entered both main libraries to protest the treatment of the Chicago Seven, he was indignant, comparing it to the "befouling of Santa Barbara bay with oil."[8] So one can only imagine his dismay when the events of May 5 touched the library—quite literally.

---

7. Ibid.

8. Robert Vosper to Donald Hartsock, February 20, 1970, Administrative Files of the University Librarian, 1920-, box 180, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as Administrative Files).

By this point, a state of emergency had been declared and the Los Angeles Police Department had been called in for assistance.[9] Vosper was standing in the lobby of the Research Library when the police entered in pursuit of a group of students. At the same time, another student, this one well known to the library staff as a "wonderful and very bookish" young man, happened to walk through the turnstile at the library entrance.[10] When he innocently pointed out an open turnstile to an officer struggling to enter, the police attacked him, grabbing him around the neck and twisting his arm. The choking student managed to call out for Vosper and the library director came to his aid, telling the police that the student was an innocent bystander. The officers handcuffed him anyway and led the student out of the library. Meanwhile, the police continued to confront other students outside the library, at one point pulling out their guns when a cherry bomb went off. One of the librarians, William Bergeron, firmly calmed them down,[11] while another librarian, Everett Moore, went upstairs to the second floor to disperse students who were throwing rocks at the officers.[12]

Robert Eckert, who at the time was head of bibliographic searching in the Acquisitions Department, remembers crowds of students seeming to come from nowhere. "When I heard what was happening, I called my staff and told them to go home immediately," says Eckert, who was over in another building. "They didn't want to go, but I said, 'You don't want to add to the confusion.'" Eckert ran back to collect his

9. "May 5, 1970."

10. Robert Vosper to Page Ackerman, May 20, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

11. Robert Vosper to Vice-Chancellor Saxon, May 11, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180; Marian Engelke to Charles E. Young, May 12, 1970, Administrative Files, box 174; "May 5, 1970."

12. "May 5, 1970."

things and hustled another librarian—"a very tiny woman"—off campus and drove her home.[13]

Despite the violence, Vosper and his colleagues decided "on our own, without asking anybody's permission" that they would keep the library open, even if the campus closed down. They put up a sign on the front door that Vosper had written:

> The library is an open intellectual sanctuary. It is devoted to individual intellectual freedom. Its function is to provide free access to ideas and information. It is a calm and peaceful haven of privacy, a source of both cultural and intellectual sustenance for the individual reader. Since it is thus committed to free and open inquiry on a personal basis, the library must remain open, with access to it always guaranteed.[14]

Eventually, though, Vosper's greatest fear was realized. He received a call from the chancellor's office about five o'clock saying that the campus was officially closed. "I locked myself in my office," he remembered years afterward, "and, for the first time in mature years, wept at the prospect of the whole thing. The campus was closed. We had to close. It would have been absurd to stay open."[15]

The following day, the student who had been manhandled by the police returned to the library, distressed and with his broken arm in a splint. "I do wish to reiterate my strong feeling that the Library's responsible position on campus as neutral ground can only be seriously undercut by police intrusions," Vosper later wrote to the Chancellor's Commission on Police Violence.[16] The staff of the Research Library also wrote a

13. Robert Eckert, telephone conversation with the author, June 24, 2009.

14. Robert Vosper, interview by Dale E. Treleven, "Libraries and the Inquiring Mind Oral History Transcript, 1990-1991," 1056-58, Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles.

15. Ibid, 1059-60.

16. Robert Vosper to Page Ackerman, May 20, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

strongly worded letter to the Los Angeles Chief of Police denouncing the police "over-reaction."[17]

In an oral history recorded in 1990-1991, Vosper recalled May 5, 1970, vividly. "I was almost ill at the end of the day, ill in the real sense of the word, because the students were distressed and unhappy, protesting, the damned news reporters' helicopters were hovering over the campus all the time making a lot of noise and sounding threatening, sounding worrisome."[18]

Yet Vosper was seen as something of a hero for stepping into the melee. The UCLA Graduate Students Association passed a resolution commending him not only for keeping the library open during the State of Emergency, but for protecting someone on campus on legitimate business "WHEN NO OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL SHOWED THE SLIGHTEST CONCERN FOR THE LIVES, HEALTH, AND SAFETY OF THE CAMPUS POPULATION [emphasis theirs]." [19]

On Strike

After the debacle on May 5, the violence on campus died down, but the spirit of dissent did not. Fearful of what was to come, Governor Ronald Reagan ordered all twenty-eight campuses in the California university and state college systems and ninety-two community colleges closed for four days. (Reagan also asked private universities in the state to close.) Nationally, many other colleges and universities were shut down as

17. Members of the staff of the University Research Library to Chief Edward Davis, May 6, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

18. Robert Vosper, interview, 1057.

19. Barbara Alvarez to Robert Vosper, May 23, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

well, including eighteen campuses in the Pennsylvania State System and fifteen colleges in the New York metropolitan area.[20]

Reagan's decision made it clear that the library must lock its doors, too, but Vosper nonetheless lamented the closure. In a memo to the staff he contended that "the need for library access does not diminish; in fact it may be the greater for those who would educate themselves and seek to understand the world's distress."[21]

While the venting of student anger on May 5 along with the closing of the university quieted things down at UCLA, it did not diminish the drive people felt to "do something." Thus, even though the campus was effectively closed, its gates remained open and many students and faculty members gathered together to come up with ways to turn UCLA into "a non-violent center for education and action for the community at large." A group of professors adopted a resolution pledging their time and energy to stopping the war and ending the university's complicity in it.[22]

By the time school resumed on May 11, students and some faculty were clamoring for a campus-wide strike. The strike, or moratorium as it was also called, would allow students to preserve their academic standing while redirecting their activities to further several goals, including the immediate removal of U.S. troops from Southeast Asia, the abolishment of UCLA's ROTC, and an end to war-related research on campus. Many professors set up a "crisis curriculum," classes designed to research national problems and solutions. The redirection of purpose was meant to be ongoing, but the

20. *New York Times*, May 7, 1970, via LexisNexis Academic (accessed March 12, 2009).

21. Memorandum to All Library Staff, by Robert Vosper, May 11, 1970, Student Activism Collection, 1927-1986, box 11, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as Student Activism Collection).

22. "Many Students, Faculty, Staff Participate in 'Strike' for 'Educational Enrichment,'" *UCLA Reporter*, June, 1970.

centerpiece of the strike was to be a one-day suspension of business as usual on May 14. Both students and faculty approved the measure.

Over at the library, full-time library staff members gathered to vote on whether or not to support the strike amendment. They voted 170 to 11 in favor of striking, but an amendment to shut down all the libraries on campus failed, 134 to 76.[23] More specifically, the library staff pledged "our time, energy and commitment to halting the war in Southeast Asia, to ending the university's complicity with that war, to stopping the horrifying use of deadly force by governmental agencies, and to eliminating racism and political repression in our society." They further promised to keep the library open and dedicate themselves to the search for understanding and peaceful solutions to the problems confronting society. "We shall do this not only through our normal processes, but also, according to the dictates of individual conscience, through the imaginative application of specific proposals for individual and collective action by members of our library staff."[24] Ultimately, eighty-six out of more than 400 library employees observed the strike, most of them nonprofessionals and a few using vacation time.[25]

Had the librarians and staff declined to participate in the strike activities, they would have been lonely: Virtually every department at UCLA played a part in some way. So it was unsurprising that the library employees got into the act, doing their part by not only striking and, in some cases, giving up wages, but by setting up tables for petition signing and political information in front of the Research Library and in the foyer of

23. Hermann Loew, "Library Employees and the Strike," *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 2-3.

24. Donald Coombs, "Library Resolution Passed on May 12," *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 4.

25. Ruth Trager, "Moratorium History Committee," *American Libraries* 2, no. 11 (December 1971): 1157.

College Library, the undergraduate library.[26] (The creation of these auxiliary library service stations as well as one created by the library school called the Current Crisis Information Center will be discussed at length in the following chapter.) In another gesture of support, the librarians planned to move up the date of their annual book sale to earn money for the strike effort.[27] As Bea Siegel, assistant editor of the *Library Newsletter/UCLA,* put it, "If the library is really the heart of the University, it cannot remain aloof from the debate and protest which events of recent weeks have thrust us into."[28]

There was, however, still some reticence among certain librarians. In a letter to a colleague, one librarian confessed to having pent up anger over the war, the government and the silent majority of librarians. "I have tried very hard not to discuss the strike situation at all at work because I thought it was both dangerous and a waste of time. . . . I feel I can contribute to the Peace effort more effectively away from campus. That is my personal solution."[29] The librarian Robert Eckert, who may have written the letter (it is signed "Bob," but he has no memory of writing it), recalls feeling that it was inappropriate to discuss subjects like politics and religion at the library. "I was terribly opposed to the war; I think 99 percent of the librarians were opposed to the war," he says. "But I felt it wasn't our job to use our position to influence the students."[30]

---

26. UCLA Faculty Union, "Strike Activities: Department by Department," May 15, 1970, Student Activism Collection, box 11.

27. Larry Lauerhass, "Convocation for All Library Personnel," *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 1.

28. Bea Siegel, *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 1.

29. Bob to Ruth, n.d., Subject Files, Moratorium History Committee, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as MHC).

30. Eckert, telephone conversation with the author.

A Debate About Neutrality

For the most part, Robert Vosper was pleased with how the university librarians had conducted themselves during the strike. In a letter to the staff, he commended those who held to their moral convictions by taking a day without pay, though he regretted that a sign saying "College Library Staff on Strike" was hung at the entrance to the College Library. Since not all employees were on strike, the sign falsely gave the impression that the library was closed. Despite how proud of the staff he was, Vosper, though, wanted to be sure that the librarians had not forgotten about neutrality. His letter to the staff, also included this reminder:

> I trust that particular thought will be given to the underlying ethical questions centering on the point at which the provision of information on crucial social issues can appear to be so partisan as to interfere with the intellectual free choice of one or another group, or indeed or one dissenting individual. All told I think that, through your good judgment and tact, we can move into the future with an ability to deal appropriately with personal values and institutional values.[31]

Later, Vosper admitted that there was some "quality control" at the information field stations with regard to objectivity. Overall, though, the staff made a good effort to remain neutral. At a meeting of the Public Services Committee, for instance, the group revisited the American Library Association's Library Bill of Rights and reinforced the idea that all library resources should be made available to every patron who desires them, regardless of their beliefs.[32]

---

31. Robert Vosper to All Library Staff, May 15, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

32. Minutes of the Public Service Committee, May 19, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

Yet those promises of unbiased professionalism did not satisfy everyone. Janet Ziegler, a reference librarian, complained to Vosper on several accounts. She objected to the use of library supplies at the political information tables, lamenting the fact that, in the past, the librarians had sometimes been unable to order new supplies, yet now there was suddenly unlimited access to supplies for what was "clearly a politically partisan effort." Ziegler also believed it was wrong for some of the librarians who went on strike to use their vacation time, and opposed the use of library time for meetings in support of the strike and for manning what she believed to be politically biased information tables. Like Vosper, she was upset that the sign over the entrance to the College Library misled students by giving the impression that all library employees supported the antiwar position. Finally, Ziegler protested the use of proceeds from the book sale to support the strike.[33]

Discussions about whether or not the library was holding to its goal of neutrality continued for a while. A staff petition to the governor protesting political action in the UCLA library was even rumored to be circulating.[34] Then, a few days after Ziegler's complaint, another librarian, Johanna Tallman, wrote to the president of the UCLA Librarians Association informing him that a large number of library staff members were concerned about attempts to "erode the library's role as a non-partisan institution dedicated to providing balanced collections to all its users." To defeat that notion, Tallman had collected sixty-four signatures on a resolution affirming the librarians' commitment to the Library Bill of Rights (it was, she said, only a sample—she had not

33. Janet Ziegler to Robert Vosper, May 19, 1970, President's Files, box 4.

34. Robert Vosper to Charles Young, June 8, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

contacted everyone on staff).[35] Eventually it was also decided that only 50 percent of the proceeds from the Library Staff Association book sale would go toward strike efforts, while the other half would go toward scholarship aid for minority students.[36]

Summing Up the Library Situation

It is interesting to note that although people on campus may have been distraught over national events, many students were still going about the business of studying and using the library as they normally would. Book loan and reference question statistics showed that the week of May 11-17 was no different than the protest-free week of April 20-26. Students also used the library unwaveringly on May 5, the day the campus was in a state of emergency.[37] Former Librarians Association president Norah E. Jones recalled that the library was calmer than expected.

> There was a great deal of concern among the staff and among the administration that there might be efforts to wreck the library, because this had been done on other campuses as a symbol of protest. . . . I stood at the head of the stairs in the College Library the whole afternoon to see if anything was going to happen. And the students who came up the staircase were only coming to find places to sit down and read.[38]

Yet, as events at the Research Library confirmed, there is no doubt that the library, like the rest of the campus, had been stirred, shaken and challenged by the course of events. Despite user statistics that showed the week was relatively normal, the library

35. Johanna E. Tallman to Robert Collision, May 22, 1970, President's Files, box 4.

36. General Meeting of the Staff of the University Library and Faculty and Students of the Graduate School of Library Service, May 26, 1970, Student Activism Collection, box 11.

37. Vosper to Young, June 8, 1970.

38. Norah E. Jones, interview by Janet Tanner Shiban, "The Best of Times, Four Decades in the UCLA Library Oral History Transcript,1993," Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles, 133.

was also "uncommonly busy" in a way that was not reflected in the numbers.[39] The librarians also had had to face security concerns while figuring out how to address the needs of a student body hungry for a very specific type of information. They'd done so thoroughly, if hastily, but not without having to confront their own personal beliefs and professional standards as a result.

Summing up the year in his "Report of the University Librarian," Vosper felt UCLA's libraries had fared well compared to other academic libraries in terms of the amount of damage inflicted (College Library ultimately needed $5,000 worth of repair[40]). And while he acknowledged that the staff had struggled to find a "position of moral and intellectual integrity," he concluded that the library had maintained the tradition of fairness. He seemed particularly pleased that the library remained open (except for Reagan's mandatory four-day closure) and quoted a student who he believed said it best: "To close a library is like closing a book that someone is reading."[41]

The School of Library Service

Over in the Business Department, where they were reaching out to the business world for help in ending the war, the faculty had arranged a daily program of speakers and discussions, lasting until 11 p.m. The Engineering Department was facilitating "rap sessions" in professors' homes. The Art Department was redirecting student talent to the antiwar effort and teaming up with Stanford to collect art for a student show in

39. Vosper to Young, June 8, 1970.

40. "May 5, 1970."

41. Report of the University Librarian 1969/70 & 1970/71, Subject Files, Annual Report to Chancellor 1966-1970-71, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

Washington. The English Department had written to Police Chief Ed Davis asking for police representatives to come to a discussion session. The Psychology Department was leafleting; Linguistics was out in various neighborhoods getting signatures on a petition for the McGovern-Hatfield legislation requiring the end of military operations in Vietnam; History was working on a crisis curriculum.[42]

In other words, just about every department on the UCLA campus was doing something to respond to the crisis, and the Graduate School of Library Service was no exception. At a semi-official meeting of about sixty students, staff members and faculty, the school (though not unanimously) declared itself on strike. Much like the library, however, the school's version of a strike did not mean it was closing down.[43] I nstead, the students and faculty voted not to conduct classes as usual. When appropriate, special projects were to be undertaken relating a course's subject matter to the current issues, and time was to be provided for constructive activities and discussion. Most of the library school students wanted to act, but they did not want to participate in the violent actions perpetrated by other students. Those students who wanted no part of the effort in any capacity were entitled to complete their studies as usual.[44]

Ultimately, many students directed their energies toward staffing the Current Crisis Information Center, though none of them dropped a course to free up time for the pleasure. No one dropped a course to participate in political activity either and no class

42. UCLA Faculty Union, "Strike Activities."

43. 1969/1970 Annual Report, 347-348, Subject Files, School of Library Service, 1960-, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

44. Andrew Horn, "UCLA/SLA," *The CALibrarian*, Spring & Summer 1970, 4.

time was used for circulating petitions, or soliciting funds earmarked for political causes.[45]

In his annual report to Vice Chancellor David Saxon, the library school's dean, Andrew Horn, gave a full accounting of the faculty, staff and students' actions during the crisis. While he believed that peaceful demonstrations against the invasion of Cambodian and the Kent State killings were appropriate, and although he did not know if anyone from the school had gone to rallies, he told Saxon that no library students had participated in violence or vandalism. Horn defended the formation of the Current Crisis Information Center, explaining that the school had played a part in a "shift away from irresponsible action and rhetoric toward thoughtful, critical discussion of issues and the proposal of peaceful solutions." He went on to say that the school had good reason to pass a strike resolution and redirect their energies to the crisis.

> We were trying to say that we would not conduct business-as-usual because in the past through our passive attitude we had not tried to prevent acts of violence and vandalism for which the general public was condemning the entire University. We honestly believed we could do this and at the same time carry out our regular instructional program, and even enrich it or improve upon it. . . . I have tried to give an explanation. It is not an apology.[46]

Ultimately, fifty students, acknowledging that experience is a great teacher, declared that the library school's handling of the crisis had enriched or improved its program.[47]

---

45. 1969/1970 Annual Report.

46. Ibid.

47. Andrew Horn, "UCLA/SLA," 4.

Conclusion

In May of 1970, the atmosphere on the UCLA campus was heated and rife with antiwar sentiment. Many students and faculty were angry about the invasion of Cambodia and the killing of students at Kent State University. Under these conditions, a majority of librarians spoke out in such a way—calling for an end to the "horrifying use of deadly force by governmental agencies"—that cannot be mistaken for neutrality. The position of the librarians, however, did not preclude their professionalism. They sought to keep the library open and to make it a place where people could find information relevant to their immediate concerns. They also tried to be objective in their work and present a neutral face to the public, although it appears they weren't always successful.

The Graduate School of Library Service did not speak out directly against the war, but a majority of students and faculty supported the campus strike. They approached the strike constructively rather than perceiving it as an opportunity to shut down. Because they responded to the crisis by providing information to their fellow students and others in need of pertinent material the students were able to get more practical experience than they might have otherwise.

Chapter 8

The Current Information Center and Moratorium History Committee

The events of May 1970 were challenging for the librarians at UCLA. Besides deciding whether or not to support the university-wide strike and speak out against the Vietnam War, they had to cope with vandalism and violence. Yet as difficult as these challenges were, they seemed to energize the staff. Acting quickly and creatively, the librarians snapped into action. Concurrently with the UCLA Graduate School of Library Service, they first devised plans to make information related to the war and surrounding issues immediately and easily available to students, faculty and any others in need of material. Secondly, they wisely saw events for what they were—an important moment not only in UCLA history, but American history—and so wasted little time in gathering all types of information connected to the campus unrest.

The Library's Political Service

At times libraries are called upon to respond immediately to events. When a movie star dies, it is inevitable that patrons will come calling for biographies and DVDs featuring the star. In the wake of a tsunami, it would not be surprising to find a sudden demand for geological information. Accordingly, when the Cambodia/Kent State Crisis descended upon UCLA, the library was barraged with requests for materials relating to the war. As soon as Governor Reagan's forced closure was lifted and the school

reopened, an urgent need developed for "quick access to dependable current information."[1]

With considerable speed, the UCLA librarians set up several unofficial, experimental field stations to provide information on any subject relevant to the crisis. Although it is difficult to tell exactly who initiated these auxiliary outposts, it appears that two groups—the UCLA librarians and the library school students—ran separate information centers that eventually merged into one called the Current Information Center (CIC). But at the beginning, the library created the Political Information Center and the Political Information Service while the library school ran its own reference desk called the Current Crisis Information Center (CCIC).

Responding to the call to show support for UCLA's redirection, the librarians had pledged to supply needed information to the campus community as a way of working toward peace. Now, with the political information service in place, they were making good on that promise. Tables were set up in the foyer of the College Library and on the terrace of the Research Library. Staffing the desk was voluntary, but Vosper allowed the librarians small amounts of official time to devote to the cause.

The tables offered a range of materials. There was a chronology of the Angela Davis case, for instance, and a listing of political (from conservative to radical right) periodical holdings in the UCLA libraries. There were also detailed instructions on how

1. Robert Vosper to Charles Young, June 8, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180.

to send a letter to a state legislator.[2] In an article written for the *California Librarian*, Elaine M. Parker, a library school student at the time, provided a detailed description:

> These services supplied information on pending legislative action in Congress; lists of California congressmen, their districts and office addresses were distributed. Congressional district maps, newspaper clippings and calendars of campus events were posted on bulletin boards. Directories, petitions, literature received from campus organizations and other groups concerned with the strike issues were displayed. Paper, envelopes, postcards and stamps were provided by contributions from staff members and patrons so that concerned individuals could write to their representatives to express their viewpoints. As a result, well over a thousand cards and letters were written and mailed.[3]

Not long after the political information desks were created, the library also established an Indo-China Reading Room in the Rotunda of the College Library. The open area—which was stocked with books, magazines, pamphlets, newspaper clippings and other items related to the Southeast Asia—grew out of the librarians' involvement in a class called "Current Issues and Attitude Change 101." A by-product of the strike, the class had an enrollment of almost 1,000 and taught students about group dialogue and how to encourage political consciousness in the community.[4]

The Current Crisis Information Center

Students and faculty over at the library school were no less committed than the UCLA librarians to supplying needed political information. At a meeting on May 6, a group of about thirty-five planned and organized the CCIC.[5] Their mission was to

---

2. "Chronology of the Angela Davis Case"; "From Conservative to Radical Right: A Listing of Periodical Holdings in the UCLA Library," n.d., Administrative Files, box 174; "Suggestions for Letter to State Legislators," n.d., Administrative Files, box 174.

3. Elaine M. Parker, "Crisis on the UCLA Campus," *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 161.

4. Ibid, 161-62.

5. Parker, "Crisis on the UCLA Campus," 160.

answer reference questions quickly, compile bibliographies and do research relating to the strike on campus and Cambodia/Kent State crisis. Taking up positions on the second floor of the College Library and within the School of Library Service (as well as handling reference questions by phone), the fledgling librarians made their aid available to all students, staff, faculty and other interested people or groups off campus from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.[6] They publicized the Center on the radio and in the school newspaper, created work schedules and drew up a procedural manual to guide their service.[7]

As it turned out, the efforts of UCLA's library school were being echoed around the country. Just up the coast at UC Berkeley, students had created an information clearinghouse (which this study will cover at length in a later chapter). In New Jersey, students at the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers University held forth at information desks in the lobby of the library and the student center.[8] The students and faculty at Rutgers also voted to cancel classes and devote themselves to working with professional associations, professional publications, library schools, the publishing industry and political and community groups to end the war.[9] At the University of Maryland, library school students ran a non-partisan crisis telephone information service,

6. "Current Crisis Information Center," Graduate School of Library & Information Science, Administrative Subject Files, 1930-1981, box 18, folder 2, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives (hereafter cited as SLIS Admin. Files); "Library Service School Gives Crisis Information," *UCLA Daily Bruin*, May 13, 1970.

7. Parker, "Crisis on the UCLA Campus," 160-61.

8. Mary Lee Bundy, "The Social Relevancy of Library Education: An Accounting," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, ed. Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 89.

9. Professional Task Force, Graduate School of Library Service to Colleagues, May 5, 1970, SLIS Admin. Files box 18, folder 2.

while students at Columbia set up an outdoor information table to distribute material on the crisis.[10]

At San José State College (later called San José State University), the Cambodia Crisis provoked a campus-wide strike, with the Faculty Senate voting to cease teaching classes for the remainder of the semester. Student representatives from the library school met with some of the library science faculty to determine whether they, too, should shut down. Ultimately, they decided to sponsor a series of lectures and films to illuminate the situation and to concentrate on finding ways for libraries to become involved in the antiwar movement.[11]

Back at UCLA, reference students set about building a file of materials to support inquiries as they came in.[12] The CCIC requests varied. They fielded questions about the cost of the Vietnam War, were asked to find dramatic quotations about the war from public figures, and queried about executive power vs. legislative power. "The indexes like the Readers' Guide are not recent enough for much of what the students are working on," Carolyn Dusenbury, a student involved in the CCIC told the *UCLA Daily Bruin*.[13] Patrons also asked for information on war-related industries, black activist and Black Panther Party co-founder Bobby Seale, exports from Southeast Asia, names and addresses of congressmen, the expiration date of the ROTC contract with the university

10. Bundy, "The Social Relevancy of Library Education," 89.

11. Debra Gold Hansen, *A Pioneering and Independent Spirit: The History of San José State University's School of Library and Information Science* (San Jose: San José State University School of Library and Information Science, In press).

12. Betty Butler to Library School Student Associations, May 15, 1970. SLIS Admin. Files, Box 18, Folder 2.

13. H.L. Owens, "Library to Investigate Feasibility of Creating Permanent Info Center," *UCLA Daily Bruin*, June 1, 1970.

regents, and the precise job descriptions of the chancellors.[14] The library students also worked on a research project for two professors from the School of Architecture and Urban Design.[15]

Some classes allowed students to work twenty hours at the CCIC rather than write a paper. While the decision was theirs, at least one teacher encouraged students to donate time to the Center, even if they chose to do a paper. "It is proving to be an extremely effective way of gaining practical experience and I think it is a far more valuable teaching device then a classroom lecture," wrote Professor Elizabeth Eisenbach to students enrolled in LS 422.[16]

Others agreed. In a letter to Eisenbach, Elinor Foster called the experience of working at the CCIC "an excellent chance to put to use what [we] had learned in the various library science courses." She reported that students were able to use their reference knowledge and that those who spent time acquiring and selecting material and planning subject headings were able to apply cataloging theory to real situations. "The entire operation makes it very clear that all functions are interdependent," added Foster. "In order to locate information, one must be able to rely on the subject headings assigned by the catalogers; this, in turn, depends upon the material which they receive."[17]

14. Betty Butler to Don Kunitz, May 25, 1970, SLIS Admin. Files, box 18, folder 1.

15. Ibid; "Library Service School Gives Crisis Information," 13.

16. E. Eisenbach to All Registered Students in LS 422, May 13, 1970, SLIS Admin. Files, box 18, folder 2.

17. Elinor Foster to Mrs. Eisenbach, June 4, 1970, SLIS Admin. Files, box 18, folder 1.

Making a Good Thing Better

The success of the library's Political Information Services and the library school's Current Crisis Information Center seemed to arouse the entrepreneurial spirit within both institutions. Less than two weeks from the information desks' debut, a proposal to merge the two efforts into permanent Current Information Centers (CIC) was on the table. As proposed by a committee of librarians, the combined service would carry ephemera of all persuasions on current political and social issues; have on hand information relating to the election process; collect copies of resolutions, statements, and petitions circulating on campus and in the community; and offer topical monographs of current importance. The library staff and library school students would be encouraged to contribute bibliographies and would also staff the centers.[18] The proposal passed 153 to 1.[19]

How feasible was it? The joint executive board of both the Library Staff Association and the UCLA Librarians Association (which included library school members) named a committee to find out.[20] Elsewhere, data processing students at the library school were charged with writing a proposal for continuing the service and incorporating its activities in the curriculum. They also hoped to have it funded by a federal government grant, a necessity perhaps because no additional funds for library

18. Minutes of the General Meeting of the Staff of the University Library and Faculty and Students of the Graduate School of Library Service," May 26, 1970, Student Activism Collection, box 11.

19. Owens, "Library to Investigate Feasibility of Creating Permanent Info Center."

20. Parker, "Crisis on the UCLA Campus," 162.

services had been allocated for the upcoming year.[21] Vosper, nonetheless, was in favor of adopting the proposal.[22]

Part of the discussion on whether the CIC was a viable entity centered around the ability of its staff to keep the service objective. Elinor Foster recommended that there be a concerted effort to present as many views as possible, not just both sides.[23] Janet Ziegler, the librarian who had earlier complained to Vosper about bias at the political information tables, asked that an amendment be added to the resolution for permanent information centers stating that the service would receive library support only if, and for so long as it was clearly non-partisan. She also wanted to add that no information included at the centers run counter to the policies of the United States government, but the addition was struck down.[24] When establishment of the CIC was agreed upon, it was noted that, "the centers endeavor scrupulously to avoid engagement in partisan political activity or in efforts to influence opinion; rather, they exist to extend and expedite reference services that have always been appropriate to librarianship."[25]

A trial permanent Current Issues Centers officially opened on Monday, June 8, at 9:00 a.m., with their staff promising to "respond quickly to the latest events which are of current interest to the University community by providing information which normally would not be available until long after the impact of an event."[26] One desk was in the Research Library; the other was in the Rotunda of the College Library under the direction

21. Betty Butler to Library School Student Associations.

22. Tom Sullivan, "UCLA 'Peace Center' Urged," *Evening Outlook*, May 26, 1970.

23. Elinor Foster to Mrs. Eisenbach.

24. "Jim Cox Presented the Following Amendment," *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, June 4, 1970, 3.

25. UCLA Library, "Current Issues Centers," June, 1970, Administrative Files, box 180, folder 2.365.

26. Ibid.

of Janice Koyama. Koyama, who was at UCLA through 1972 before heading to California State University, Long Beach, then later to UC Berkeley to head up Moffitt Undergraduate Library, remembers that the UCLA librarians wanted to find a better way to respond to all the requests and questions they were getting—some people didn't even know where Vietnam was. "There had to be a way as librarians not to be political but to respond and be a source for people to clarify what was going on," recalls Koyama. "What was new about the Current Issues Center was that we brought it out from behind the reference desk and created a single-issue reference point. It was remarkable that we got the support to do that. No library had done that to respond to a national crisis."[27]

Participating in the CIC was still voluntary and was limited to three hours per week of time diverted from a librarian's regular duties.[28] (Participation also remained open to library school volunteers.) There was a range of duties. Librarians staffed the desks (Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.); clipped, processed and filed newspapers and magazines; typed and lettered signs; collected material from Bruin Walk, the Student Union Strike Headquarters, candidate campaign headquarters and other points of action; attended campus functions to keep abreast of student and faculty interests; and assisted in compiling bibliographies or doing research on current issues.[29]

The CIC were only in operation for a short time before summer arrived. Initially, they attracted more users and also added new topics to its collection, including the Regents' refusal to rehire Angela Davis and the arrest of two editors at the *UCLA Daily*

27. Janice Koyama, telephone conversation with the author, September 29, 2008.

28. "Policy on Staff Participation in Library Current Issues Information Centers," June 11, 1970, Subject Files, CIC.

28. UCLA Library, "Current Issues Centers."

Bruin for publishing obscene material.[30] But as summer waned, so it seemed did interest in the service. Even so, its leaders asked that it be continued and that its bulletin boards, which were popular, still be maintained on a daily basis.[31]

When fall quarter came, three librarians submitted an ambitious proposal for establishing permanent Current Issues Center (it's name had now been reduced to the singular). They suggested that the CIC tackle only three to five major topics at a time and that they not be overly dependent on pamphlet and clipping files. In fact, it was preferred that the CIC look outside the mainstream for information:

> The original motivation which brought about the idea of a Current Issues Center in the first place was exactly born from the realization that both newspapers and official publications very frequently provide inadequate, if not outrightly [sic] incorrect information, and that for this reason a major research library located in a country and on a university campus in the throws [sic] of major and deep-rooted social and political convulsion . . . should endeavor to provide more adequate information regarding these convulsions.[32]

The proposal acknowledged that maintaining the center according to library standards would involve a lot of research on the part of participants. The librarians also recommended that it evoke an informal "living room" atmosphere, an environment that they believed would foster a good relationship between the staff and patrons. Some librarians were not nearly as sanguine. Writing a critique of the proposal, Janice Koyama noted that the types of materials it called for where not likely to fit the budget, and that it might make more sense to have one CIC station rather than two. She also suggested a less grand definition of the center. "Our aim is to reach the many people who want to be

30. Parker, "Crisis on the UCLA Campus," 162.

31. Ann Mitchell and Diane Kennedy to Mr. Moore, September 15, 1970, Administrative Files, box 174, folder 2.125.

32. Luanna Voeltz, Dianne (sic) Kennedy and Hermann Loew, "Proposal for the Establishing of a Current Issues Center, Administrative Files, box 174, folder 2.125.

informed citizens of this campus, not experts on oil spills, auto smog devices, the war, pollution, etc."[33]

None of it, however, was to be. In October of 1970 at a meeting of librarians, it was proposed that the CIC in the Research Library be closed and efforts be directed at maintaining the center in College Library.[34] Shortly thereafter, the School of Library Service announced that the centers in the Research and College Libraries were experiencing difficulties because of budget cuts. An idea of an information center being created and funded by the Graduate Students Association was tossed around, though it is unclear if it was ever established.[35] The following spring, a box of materials from the "brief but lively" Current Information Center, was combined with the collection gathered by the Moratorium History Committee. The Current Information Center had come—and gone.[36]

Collecting for Posterity: The Moratorium History Committee

The UCLA Library already had a collection of materials documenting student uprisings. In fact, they had two: one collection from the Paris student uprising and one from the Columbia University riots, both of which took place in the spring of 1968. "It seemed only proper that we collect as much of our own current history as possible before

33. Janice Koyama to Everett Moore, September 25, 1970, Administrative Files, box 174, folder 2.125.

34. Minutes of the Meeting of the Library Committee on Political and Social Issues, October 2, 1970, President's Files, box 4.

35. School of Library Service of the University of California, Los Angeles, "Departmental Announcements and Memoranda," November 12, 1970, Library and Information Science Publications, box 1, University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

36. Ruth Trager to Dean H. Keller, June 14, 1971, MHC.

it was swept into the trash, disappeared with the community into the heat of summer vacation, or was overshadowed by events to come," wrote Ruth Trager, the librarian who hastily spearheaded a project called the Moratorium History Committee to collect handbills, posters, and other ephemera during the Cambodia/Kent State crisis.[37]

The committee, primarily made up of librarians from the Research Library,[38] also proposed to collect national media reports on the campus unrest, and student papers produced in classes whose curriculum was redirected because of the strike. They hoped, too, that professors would share preparation for such classes.[39] They asked for help from the library school's Current Crisis Information Center as well. Hearing, for instance, that one student had asked the CCIC for the names and addresses of the ten richest Americans, they pondered the collecting the student's letter to tycoons and, potentially, their responses.[40]

Trager was a Librarian II with a split appointment in Slavic acquisitions and Slavic cataloging. As she readily admitted, collection development was a bit out of her area of expertise, but no one more qualified volunteered for the task and she saw the need for acting fast.[41] However, just to be sure she was not stepping on anyone's toes, she spent some time talking to the library's bibliographers, archivists, and social science specialists. The other librarians were receptive to her overtures (if not particularly helpful), and she continued on with her work.

---

37. Trager, "Moratorium History Committee," 1158.

38. "Moratorium History Committee," *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, June 4, 1970.

39. Ruth Trager to Unknown Recipient, n.d., MHC.

40. Ruth Trager to Mr. Moore, May 14, 1970, MHC.

41. Ruth Trager to James R. Kantor, June 17, 1971, MHC.

Trager's earliest efforts involved trying to publicize the call for material relating to the campus-wide strike and to try and convince faculty and students to contribute. She wrote a letter to the *UCLA Daily Bruin* and sent notes to administrators, faculty and branch librarians asking for help. Trager even made a foray into the Grand Ballroom of the Student Union, where many of the strike committees and interest groups were headquartered, then good-humouredly wrote about it for *American Libraries*. "Many of the active students had not slept for days and were sure they were hallucinating when this fat, little, middle-aged librarian started to make overtures to them on behalf of the library and posterity."[42]

By August, the Moratorium History Committee had collected four cartons of materials. Among them were bulletins, leaflets, announcements, posters, newsletters, publications issued by academic departments, news dispatches from other campuses, copies of letters received but not published by the *UCLA Daily Bruin*, and a few papers on Vietnam written by students. The cache also included a poem written by a professor, the "cry of a scientist seeing his student lying with his head on the Library steps."[43]

Despite assembling an impressive collection, Trager was still a little insecure about what she'd assembled, calling it "relative peanuts" compared to a similar collection assembled at Kent State University.[44] Yet the director of the Kent State University

---

42. Ibid.

43. Ann Mitchell to Hyman W. Kritzer, August 27, 1970, Administrative Files, box 18, folder 1; "Moratorium History Committee," *UCLA Librarian*, June, 1970.

44. Ruth Trager to Dean H. Keller.

Libraries did not seem to think it was peanuts: He asked UCLA for copies of Moratorium History Committee material for Kent State's own collection on campus violence.[45]

The Moratorium History Committee collection still exists in the UCLA archives today. And while Trager may not have been impressed by the overall collection she and her colleagues assembled, she did take some pride in their quick thinking and rapid action (and in her son's poster-snatching prowess):

> Our major experience has been that a fairly harmonious machine can be flexible under unusual circumstances and that it is gratifying that it can and does trust even its most insignificant components. Had we been forced to operate routinely through a complex chain of command and an even more ponderous network of committees there would have been a much better definition of scope and a much better procedure worked out for the handling of the materials, but by that time there would have been nothing to handle. This was a time to act, for the bulk and the choicest parts of our collection were obtained as a result of purely physical exertion.[46]

Conclusion

Both the UCLA Library and the Graduate School of Library Service acted quickly to meet the needs of both immediate patrons and those, such as historians, who would come later. Ruth Trager summed it up well by characterizing the library as a "fairly harmonious machine" that was "flexible under unusual circumstances." The two groups reacted with vigor to a situation that they were unprepared for, making it up as they went along. As such, they demonstrated that libraries (and library schools) could play a significant role in society by keeping current and responding to a crisis. They both filled a void in information services and helped capture the ephemera of a significant time in history.

---

45. Harold M. Mayer and Hyman W. Kritzer to Robert Vosper, July 13, 1970, MHC.

46. Trager, "Moratorium History Committee," 1160.

Energized by their success, the librarians aimed higher, hoping to create a permanent reference desk devoted to providing up-to-the-minute political information. Looking at the proposal from this vantage point, it appears well intended but impractical and perhaps even unnecessary. When a campus is in the throes of a rebellion, much current information is needed. When times are calm, the need diminishes sharply.

It is difficult to say whether or not the Current Issues Centers and their predecessors were biased, although it is clear that an effort was made to keep them objective. There seems little doubt that the materials offered were weighted on the side of antiwar ideology, yet that may be because antiwar sentiment had picked up considerably by 1970. There probably *was* more antiwar than pro-war information available. It was also likely that the majority of the library's patrons—students and faculty—were antiwar and looking for material related to their beliefs.

Chapter 9

A New Order of Business: UC Berkeley and Stanford University Libraries

The University of California, Berkeley, has long been known as a hub for liberal thought and radical activism. "Ever since [the Free Speech Movement] Berkeley has been synonymous with student protest and campus rebellion in the 1960s," wrote Terry H. Anderson.[1] Unsurprisingly, studies show that attitudes about the Vietnam War were considerably different on the Berkeley campus than they were across the nation. A comparison of polls taken in 1968 show that 49 percent of those surveyed at Berkeley favored withdrawal from Southeast Asia, while only 17 percent of all Americans did.[2] When the Cambodia/Kent State crisis occurred in May of 1970, students and some faculty, true to form, reacted forcefully.

Most of the librarians faced with a campus in revolt were no strangers to upheaval. Between September 1964 and June 1969, there were 14 disruptive and sometimes violent uprisings at UC Berkeley and in its surrounding neighborhood.[3] In February 1969, the campus had erupted in response to a group called the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF). The TWLF demanded that the administration establish departments for African Americans, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. It also called for more faculty appointments and student recruitment of minorities. As tensions peaked, a student strike and pickets ensued, the police and

1. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 89.

2. W.R. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War, the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 184

3. Ibid, 183.

National Guard were called in and Governor Ronald Reagan declared a state of emergency.[4]

Meanwhile, the Main Library and several librarians suffered. Rocks were thrown through library windows and cards stolen from the card catalog. S ome employees were tear-gassed and threatened.[5] Many librarians were concerned about their and their colleagues' safety and some sought help from the California Library Association, hoping to have the library shut down during demonstrations or at least allow those who were fearful for their safety to have paid leave.[6] Despite the CLA's support in the matter, neither goal was accomplished. Ultimately, several employees of the library brought suit against the University of California, seeking compensatory damages and lost wages.[7]

Later in the year, the campus was once again under siege and it affected both the libraries on campus and UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship. The uprising was over People's Park, a small parcel of land that the university reclaimed and earmarked for development, angering students who wanted to turn it into a public space. During the uprising, bullets literally flew. "There are three bullet holes in the window of the Humanities Reference Service and two holes in the metal frame," reported Nathan

4. Wohlsen, "Liberating Voices."

5. Edwin S. Budge, "Berkeley Rebuttal," *Library Journal* 94 (June 1, 1969): 2175; Levy and Van Bourg. Attorneys, "Edwin S. Budge et. al. V. University of California and the Regents of the University of California," September 10, 1969, Records of the Library, box 106, Strikes on Campus 1969 folder. University Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (hereafter Records of the Library).

6. "Memorandum to the Strike File," February 25, 1969, Records of the Library, box 106, Strikes on Campus 1969 folder.

7. Levy and Van Bourg, Attorneys, "Edwin S. Budge et. al. v. University of California and the Regents of the University of California."

Gordon McClure about the damage to the Engineering Library.[8] The entire faculty of the School of Librarianship was exposed to tear gas while in a meeting on campus. Alarmed by the violence, several librarians and student library assistants stopped work or refused to work in vulnerable areas of the library.[9] Those who stayed got detailed instructions on tear gas treatment.[10]

May 1970

The next time the campus would explode, in May 1970, the cause would be directly related to the Vietnam War. At the time, antiwar activity at UC Berkeley had waned. According to Celeste MacLeod, a graduate of the School of Librarianship, many students were turned off by the increased violence perpetrated by antiwar demonstrators (many who weren't even students) and believed President Nixon's assurance—just one month earlier—that peace was on the horizon.[11]

But when the United States invaded Cambodia and students were killed at Kent State, the antiwar movement at UC Berkeley was reenergized. Fifteen thousand students, faculty and employees of the university met and endorsed a plan to suspend classes and transform the school into "a center for struggle against the war."[12] The plan was based on the Wolin Resolution, drafted by the Ad Hoc Faculty-Student Peace Committee and

8. Nathan Gordon McClure to Miss Clayton, May 19, 1969, Records of the Library, box 106, Strikes on Campus 1969 folder.

9. "Berkeley, May 1969." *ALA Bulletin* 63, no. 7 (July/August 1969): 897.

10. "News Reports: 1969," 38.

11. Celeste MacLeod, "Berkeley—May, 1970—An Introduction," *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 165.

12. Alan Wald and Jean Savage, "Berkeley Struggle," in *May 1970: Birth of the Antiwar University* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971), 20.

named for Sheldon Wolin, a professor of political science and its principal author. The resolution pledged to use "our time, energy and commitment to stopping this war," and to "reconstitute the University as a center for organizing against the War in Southeast Asia." Reconstitution, as it came to be known, was approved and implemented by almost every department at the university.[13] "Even normally conservative sectors of the campus appeared to be in support of 'no business as usual,'" declared the *Daily Californian.*[14] Some, though, urged caution and struggled with the idea of abandoning neutrality. Members of the history department, for instance, "hotly debated" the idea of condemning the administration, with one professor arguing that the department "must always be politically neutral."[15] Still, two days later the *Daily Californian* remarked that the voice of UC Berkeley's community was unified, energetic, and—at least in the short run—effective; more so even than during the People's Park revolt.[16]

The Library (Essentially) Stays Open

The harmony and communal sense of purpose seemed to keep the campus relatively calm, especially when compared to UCLA, where the police had been called in. The library, too, was not the scene of any aggression or police action, although one frightening incident did occur. On May 5, a bomb threat was called into the Xerox room in the Main Library. The administration was informed, but no action was taken, much to the dismay of John Gage, who worked in the Xerox Department at the time. "[We]

13. MacLeod, "Berkeley—May, 1970—An Introduction": 165; Peterson and Bilorusky, *May 1970,* 103.

14. Craig Oren, "Students Strike, Classes Cancelled in Protest," *Daily Californian*, May 6, 1970.

15. Rorabaugh, *War at Berkeley*, 168.

16. Michael Hall, "War Crisis Unites the Campus," *Daily Californian*, May 8, 1970.

expected that the library would soon be warned and perhaps evacuated. When no warning came, there was sufficient anxiety among the staff to cause one of the women employees to become ill," wrote Gage, in a letter to University Librarian James E. Skipper.[17]

Several weeks later, Skipper replied to Gage and explained the library's bomb threat policy (the library had received many such threats in the past and during other disturbances the police had received as many as over a hundred a day). When the bomb threat designated a specific area in the library, evacuation would be immediate. But when the threat was less specific, if the professed bombers said, "the library" or "library system," only the police had the authority to decide which steps had to be taken.[18]

When Governor Reagan issued the order to close both the state university and college systems from May 7 to 10, UC Berkeley, like the other schools, closed its doors, or at least most of them. The campus in reality operated as if it was on a Sunday schedule and while all the branch libraries were closed, the Main Library was allowed to stay open and provide abbreviated reader services.[19] Skipper had actually recommended that the library be closed because of lack of manpower (many student assistants were apparently not showing up for work due to the crisis) and a reduction in security.[20] "As practically the only operational unit on campus for the next four days," he explained to Vice-Chancellor John Henry Raleigh, "the library becomes a very visible target and a

17. John Gage to James E. Skipper, May 5, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

18. James E. Skipper to John Gage, May 22, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

19. Memorandum by James Skipper, May 6, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

20. "Library Units Closed 5 May 1970 Due to Lack of Staff," May 6, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

symbol of 'business as usual.'" Skipper's wish that a study hall in Pauley Ball Room be substituted for opening the library was apparently not granted.[21] James D. Hart, director of the Bancroft Library on the UC Berkeley campus, was also concerned about safety. "He was having demonstrations in the Bancroft over his dead body," remembered Robert D. Harlan, formerly associate dean of the School of Librarianship.[22]

The Librarians and Staff Weigh In

With reconstitution fever sweeping the campus, it was inevitable that the UC Berkeley librarians and their support staff would eventually weigh in on the issues, and they did so in a democratic and methodical way. At issue was whether to support the Wolin Resolution as well as whether to advocate for closing the university. On Saturday morning May 9, a group of 135 librarians, library assistants and student assistants met and passed by a large majority a motion to endorse the Wolin proposal. They also voted to keep all the libraries open and reconstitute their efforts—though while staying in line with professional library standards and the American Library Association's Library Bill of Rights.[23]

---

21. James Skipper to Vice-Chancellor Raleigh," May 6, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

22. Robert D. Harlan, "History of the Book: Thirty Years at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship and Study of Early American Printers, 1963-1993," interview by Laura McCreery, Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt0v19n4c7&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=d0e144&toc.depth=1&toc.id=d0e144&brand=oac (accessed April 30, 2008).

23. "The Library Employees Met," n.d., Librarians Association of the University of California Division Records, box 1, Issues and Campus Disturbances folder, University Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (hereafter LAUC Division Records).

The balloting continued apace. The Librarian's Association of the University of California, Berkeley division (LAUC-B) took a vote after hearing arguments on both sides. Among the arguments *against* the proposal, as it was written, were:

- Any endorsement of the Wolin Proposal issued by this Association, short of a unanimous resolution, will be in violation of the rights of people who dissent from the views embodied in it.
- The coercion and disruption advocated by the resolution will and should arouse considerable antagonism even in that segment of the library community which is in sympathy with the anti-war movement.
- The library should strive to avoid any one-sided, partisan and limiting activity and continue to provide an extensive service based on immediate concerns and long range goals.

Of the 143 librarians who voted, eighty-five voted against the Wolin Resolution as it was written; the other fifty-eight approved.[24] Ultimately, the LAUC-B participated in the reconstitution, but took what LAUC-B historian William L. Whiston called a "moderate" stance on the issues.[25]

Yet this was not the last word from the library on the Wolin Resolution. Five hundred and sixty-eight career staff and student employees also voted on several related issues. Their feelings were strikingly different. Not only did they approve the Wolin proposal by a margin of 421 to 118, they also voted 481 to 73 to declare their opposition to United States involvement in the war in Vietnam. Further, the group approved a measure to allow them to utilize up to one-third of their work time to perform antiwar

24. "Results of Balloting, LAUC-B Motion to Endorse Wolin Proposal," n.d., LAUC Division Records, box 1, Issues and Campus Disturbances folder.

25. William L. Whitson, "Librarians, LAUC-B and the AFT: The Struggle for Academic Status University of California, Berkeley, 1963-1991," 8 (paper in the LAUC-B archives, http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LAUC/archives/index.html), Berkeley, CA, 1992.

work with pay and to contact other public and college libraries to urge them to take similar actions against the war.[26]

The librarians' union—called the University Federation of Librarians, American Federation of Teachers Local 1795—also weighed in on the Wolin Resolution and other aspects of the crisis. It recommended the UC libraries reconstitute themselves along the lines of the proposal and that they do so in several ways, including: compiling and circulating bibliographies on Cambodia, the war and related issues; setting up booths around campus to direct people to sources of information on current issues; sending volunteer library staff into the community to advise citizens on resources on and off campus; providing reference services to the non-university public on current issues; and closing the Main Library two hours a day to feature speakers on the war and permit staff research. Finally, the UFL/AFT recommended that the library staff support the "unprecedented U.S. student actions in this time of national crisis."[27]

While many records of group balloting exist, there are few documents recording the personal sentiments of individual librarians on the Cambodia/Kent State crisis or how the library should react to it. One librarian, however, did write an impassioned letter about the situation. Walter C. Crawford, supervisor of circulation control and the loan department in the Main Library, addressed his opinions to Mr. Skipper, the university librarian.

---

26. "Results of Balloting—Career Staff & Student Employee Motions," *CU News*, May 21, 1970, 9.

27. The University Federation of Librarians, AFT 1795, Memorandum, May 9, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

> I am returning to work in the University library. This does not mean I approve [of] the Indochina war. This does not mean "business as usual.". . .
>
> The library is not neutral. It serves only those who would use it. It provides support to adherents of any or all opinions who would search for information, for historical backing, for reasons. It serves those who would build and change with knowledge; it does not serve those who would do nothing, who would pay no attention to ideas other than their own.
>
> The library should not be asked to take the brunt of extremist pressure when other targets are closed. The library employees should not be asked to serve as policemen, scabs, or censors. But when movement and work for any goals is carried out in relative peace, the library should provide its vital and valid services to all those who require them.
>
> The library is not a symbol of normality, of business as usual. It is a center of learning, a place of service as possible under the circumstances. It offends those extremists of various shades who resent any thought other than their own, who would burn books, disrupt libraries, and destroy a society to uphold their own views. It supports all those who would listen, who would learn, who would heal the nation's wounds and build a stronger society.
>
> For these reasons I will carry on my work, to the best of my ability. I will use that work to build within, and go from that work to speed the nation to recovery without, until someday it is possible to proudly carry on business as usual.[28]

Skipper was impressed with the letter and concurred with Crawford's feelings. "I am responding to your sensitive and compelling letter," he wrote, complimenting the librarian's "well-worded statement of your concerns, which are quite accurate in summarizing my feelings about present social problems in our society."[29]

Reconstituting the Library

Despite mixed feelings about the Wolin Resolution, the library did in fact reconstitute itself, rising to meet the needs of the "new" university. Skipper set the tone

---

28. Walter C. Crawford to James Skipper," May 11, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

29. James E. Skipper to Walter C. Crawford," May 22, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

by informing his staff that the library now had the opportunity to "provide a series of effective and meaningful ways to relate the services and resources of the library to the solution of social concerns, whether they be the Cambodian crisis or racism in American society." The administration, he said, was open to proposals; however, he warned that the library must avoid inhibiting "the free flow of information so that our constituency is able to make independent judgments on the issues."[30]

The library administration encouraged department heads to solicit ideas from their staff on implementing programs that would support the social concerns of the students and faculty. Skipper also permitted department heads to give their staff an appropriate amount of time to put new practices into action—as long as their normal obligations were still fulfilled. "[It] will be an idle exercise if, for example, books are not shelved and records are not maintained," Skipper wrote in the library newsletter.[31]

Various departments strove to put their expertise to the task at hand. Although records do not show exactly what was accomplished, they do show that many new services were proposed. The Loan Department, for instance, planned to set up a "No-Business-As-Usual Desk" to aid political researchers, serve as a repository for leaflets from campus groups and provide fact sheets on the war. They also intended to give special stack access to people involved in the political research committee, who might not

30. James E. Skipper, "Present Social Concerns and the Library," *CU News*, May 21, 1970, 1.

31. Ibid, 2.

otherwise have access. Another idea was to copy entries on Cambodia from the subject catalog and post them on the wall for easy access.[32]

One of the Catalog Department's anticipated reconstitution activities was to rush cataloging of books on the war, economic and social conditions in Southeast Asia, student dissent and U.S. military policy. They undertook a special project to get the subject catalog filing up to date and compile a list of the subject headings used in the UC libraries for subjects related to war.[33]

Facing an energized population of students and faculty in those politically charged days of May, the library staff became a wellspring of ideas and good intentions. According to librarian Vincent Duckles, many staff members were finding it difficult to "relate the routine operations called for by their jobs to the burning social issues that are currently shaking the campus." As a representative of the Ad Hoc Steering Committee, a group formed to help implement the Wolin Resolution, Duckles recommended some ways that the staff might use their independent time. He suggested, for instance, that they create bibliographies or reading lists on war-related topics, extending to other social issues such as the environment. Compiling the voting records of legislators and creating chronologies of events on campus were other ways the staff could use their time.[34]

Duckles also noted that Bancroft Library already had two collections of ephemera related to campus unrest, protest, war and social change, and that they would welcome

---

32. The Loan Department Employees memorandum, May 8, 1970, Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

33. Vincent Duckles, "Ad Hoc Steering Committee Report," *CU News*, May 21, 1970, 6.

34. Ibid, 5-6.

contributions from the current crisis.[35] James Hart, the Bancroft's director did, in fact, send people out to collect ephemera during the Cambodia/Kent State crisis. The material is included in the library's Social Protest Collection, which contains items from 1969 to 1983 relating to everything from the Vietnam War demonstrations to the Black Power, Women's, Lesbian and Gay, and Anti-Nuclear movements.[36]

If these actions by the librarians and staff were good deeds, then, as the adage goes, they did not go unpunished. The librarians, along with all academic employees, were later denied a cost of living increase, retribution for having participated in the strike.[37] Meanwhile, like UCLA, UC Berkeley returned to normal by the fall of 1970. "Massive turmoil in May" turned to "massive calm" in September.[38]

Stanford University Reacts

UC Berkeley and Stanford University, its neighbor forty-plus miles to the south, enjoy a famous and longstanding rivalry. But during the events of May 1970, the two campuses were likeminded and even interactive: In just one example of working together in the midst of the turmoil, Stanford's Southeast Asian Study Group phoned the School of Librarianship to ask for its 16-page bibliography, a listing of the holdings of Bay Area public libraries on the conflict in Southeast Asia.[39]

---

35. Ibid.

36. Robert D. Harlan, "History of the Book"; Scope and Content Note, Finding Aid for the Social Protest Collection, http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=tf938nb3z5&chunk.id=scopecontent-1.3.5&brand=oac.

37. Whitson, "Librarians, LAUC-B and the AFT," 8.

38. Peterson and Bilorusky, *May 1970*, 115.

39. Celeste MacLeod, "Reconstitution For Peace and Relevancy," *Library Journal* 96, no. 7 (April 1, 1971): 1192.

Some measure of the severity of events on the Stanford campus can be taken from the letter UCLA's Assistant University Librarian, Everett T. Moore, received from Jack Plotkin, chief librarian in the circulation division at Stanford. Plotkin had hoped to visit UCLA, but was hamstrung by events. "I delayed writing," he noted in the May 13 communication, "because I did not know what our own situation would be. The militants are desperately working to stir up trouble so I'm not certain we are 'out of the woods' yet."[40]

Indeed, Stanford, like other campuses across the nation was in an uproar. At one point, students demonstrated in front of the Electrical Laboratories and research facilities on campus, shutting them down.[41] Students were also successful in shutting down the Hoover Institution Library and the Food Research Institute Library. Overall, though, the libraries at Stanford withstood the pickets and stayed open despite the difficult circumstances.

In the beginning of the most contentious days, May 4-7, members of the Stanford University Librarians' Association (SULA) did vote to go on strike; however, the resolution was rescinded in favor of a revised one. The new resolution urged that the Academic Senate pass a resolution calling for an immediate end to the war, that the ROTC on campus be terminated, and that non-violent action at Stanford be continued. The resolution also recognized the right of all individual librarians to "act according to

40. Jack Plotkin to Everett T. Moore, May 13, 1970, Administrative Files, , box 184, Visitors General Correspondence folder.

41. Lieberman, "Statewide Protests Continue."

his convictions," but advocated that the libraries stay open (ninety-six members of the library staff ultimately did go on strike).[42]

Once they had passed the resolution, the librarians at Stanford redirected their services to accommodate the new order of business. Meyer Library became a distribution center for materials prepared by the Institute of Political Studies and other campus organizations, and provided relevant books and articles for workshops held on campus. The library also operated a telegram service to the president and congressmen. Over at the Undergraduate Library newspaper clippings, films and bibliographies were being made available to students and faculty. Many of the libraries, including the Main Library's Documents Department and the Law Library, saw increased foot traffic. Staff members, with the blessing of the university administration, were allowed to devote two hours daily to address war-related information demands.[43]

Ultimately, at least in one librarian's opinion, it was all to the good of the university. "Whatever one's view is on the proper role of a librarian in a crisis situation," said SULA President J. Myron Jacobstein, "all will agree, I am sure, that the events did sharply reveal the vital importance of libraries to the academic community."[44]

Conclusion

Having dealt with a number of episodes of campus unrest, the administration of the UC Berkeley Library was justifiably preoccupied with the security of the library and

42. "Strike Week History and Chronology (May 4-7), *Stanford University Librarians' Association Newsletter*, May 18, 1970, 2-3.

43. Ibid.

44. J. Myron Jacobstein, "President's Column," *Stanford University Librarians' Association Newsletter*, May 18, 1970, 1.

the safety of its employees. The staff, too, seemed cautious and on high alert, given what had happened in the past. In this particular instance, though, it appears that very little violent disruption of library business or damage occurred.

Faced with a campus population that had declared the pursuit of peace as its new mission, the UC Berkeley librarians took quick and inspired action to respond to the university's needs. Likewise, the librarians at Stanford used their creative wiles to serve the changing needs of its patrons. Interestingly, and despite the campus' reputation as a university rife with radicals, the UC Berkeley librarians were more hesitant to speak out against the war and support the students and faculty's antiwar efforts than the librarians at both UCLA and Stanford. There is also little evidence that the librarians argued over the issue of neutrality, as was the case at UCLA. James E. Skipper, the director of the library, did not ignore the topic of impartiality, but there seemed to be no accusations of actions to the contrary.

It is difficult to assess whether the events of May 1970 changed the workings of either the UC Berkeley or Stanford University library over the long term. However, it is clear that within a short time frame, both libraries altered their day-to-day operations on short notice and used their professional skills to help feed patrons who were hungry for information on an urgent matter. Many librarians at both universities also stepped outside the boundaries of neutrality by declaring their opposition to continuing the Vietnam War.

Chapter 10

Remaking the School of Librarianship

In May 1970, the California Library Association received an unusual letter from students at the UC Berkeley School of Librarianship. The dispatch began with an arresting phrase typed in capital letters: THE DEAD DO NOT READ BOOKS. Now that they had the CLA members' attention, the students got to the point. The letter was first and foremost a plea to the library profession, asking it to take a position on the Vietnam War. "If we, as librarians working through our state and national organizations, do not take a stand we are, in effect, giving consent and taking a very strong stand," declared the students. "We must unite and say, NO MORE WAR: THE TIME HAS BEEN LONG OVERDUE FOR PEACE." They pointed out that libraries were receiving less money because funds had been "diverted to killing" and followed up with what might be perceived as a subtle threat. "If we are now silent as a profession, those of us who are entering the profession may well wonder if we have made the right choice."

The letter's other purpose was to ask the CLA and its members for financial help. In lieu of classes, the school had established an information clearinghouse that would, in line with the campus-wide reconstitution, allow the students to work toward peace as they continued their education. The students offered to supply CLA members with bibliographies and other materials on the war (including materials rewritten for children), then they made their plea. "HELP US WITH MONEY, PLEASE! HELP US WITH

YOUR EXPERIENCE! TAKE A STAND WITH US FOR PEACE." The CLA was supportive enough to reprint the letter in its monthly newsletter, though without commentary.[1]

Students and Faculty Speak Out

A year earlier, when the UC Berkeley campus was in an uproar over People's Park, "most library school students kept their heads in encyclopedias and cataloging rule," recollected Celeste MacLeod in the *Library Journal*.[2] Not this time around. When the Cambodia/Kent State crisis erupted and Governor Reagan closed the university, eighty-six students and members of the School of Librarianship faculty immediately gathered at an off-campus location to debate the merits of the Wolin Resolution, the proposal to repurpose the university as a center for working against the war. Eighty of them voted to endorse the resolution, three voted no and three abstained.[3] The faculty later officially affirmed the vote, and made a statement condemning President Nixon's actions in Cambodia as "unwise, immoral and dangerous."[4]

Emotions about the war ran high. Recounting those turbulent times, J. Periam Danton, a dean and professor at the School of Librarianship during the years 1946 to 1976, remarked that neither he nor other library school faculty engaged in active protest against the war—"I didn't stand on a street corner"—but that the day's events were omnipresent. "Many faculty—I know from the faculty I knew—were against it. . . . It

1. "The Dead Do Not Read Books," *CLA Newsletter*, May 1970.
2. MacLeod, "Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1193
3. MacLeod, "Berkeley—May 1970—An Introduction," 165-66.
4. "School of Librarianship," *Daily Californian*, May 20, 1970.

permeated the whole atmosphere mostly badly."[5] The students were even more overwrought, and the faculty sympathized. As Grete W. Cubie, who taught cataloging at the time, recalled, "There was no one in the library school that I ever remember feeling 'Why are they so bothered?' Everyone understood perfectly."[6]

By all accounts, the School of Librarianship students channeled their anger into constructive projects—as did many library school students around the country. In her study of the era, Mary Lee Bundy found that few library school students spent time actively protesting the country's foreign policy, but that they did find a way to advocate for peace. "Our research suggests that in many more schools library science students organized to effect curriculum or other changes," reported Bundy.[7]

The Campus Information Clearinghouse

Once the students and faculty agreed on reconstitution, the first order of business was to establish committees to help direct the reshaping of the curriculum. Three committees were created: the University Committee, assigned the task of working with other departments and groups on campus; the Community Committee, charged with contacting librarians in public libraries across the Bay Area; and the Professional

5. Periam J. Danton, "Dean and Professor at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship, 1946-1976," interview by Laura McCreery, Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley: 149-150, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt4f59n6x3&query=%22library%20school%22&brand=oac

6. Grete W. Cubie, "A Career in Public Libraries and at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship, 1937-1975," interview by Laura McCreery. Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 131, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt5k40046b&query=&brand=oac (accessed April 30, 2008).

7. Mary Lee Bundy, "The Social Relevancy of Library Education: An Accounting," in *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 91.

Committee, given the job of communicating with other librarians and library schools about reconstitution. The crisis—or perhaps just the antiestablishment tone of the era—precipitated a feeling of egalitarianism. "The committees were created in a spirit of participatory democracy," wrote MacLeod. "No hierarchies were established and none would be tolerated."[8] In fact, the heads of each group were called "janitors" rather than "chairmen."[9]

A recounting of the Community Committee's outreach to public libraries can be found in Chapter 4. The Professional Committee actually already existed before reconstitution; the year before, during the People's Park crisis, they had produced a paper on the events and sent it to every public library and branch in California. When called to duty again, they contacted the California Library Association (they were most likely the committee behind the aforementioned letter to the CLA), and got in touch with other library schools to share ideas.[10]

As part of its duties, the University Committee established what would become a center of activity for many of the students: the Campus Information Clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse, thrust into being by doctoral student Marcia Bates (later the associate dean of UCLA's Graduate School of Education and Information Studies), aimed to not only prepare war-related information on its own, but to prevent needless duplication of work by gathering information produced by others on campus. In a memo to all departments and organizations on campus, the students called for printed material,

---

8. MacLeod, "Berkeley—May 1970—An Introduction," 166.

9. MacLeod," Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1193.

10. Ruth Gordon, "The Professional Committee," *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 173.

including books, pamphlets, clippings and articles; "second-stage" materials, such as speeches and leaflets; bibliographies of materials available on and off campus; and lists of subject experts.[11] In the cataloging laboratory of the library school, students worked to index and catalog all the material the Clearinghouse received in response to its request. Ultimately, the collection grew to about 500 documents.[12] "What we're doing here fits in exactly with what we've just learned in our cataloging and information sciences classes," reported student Louise Cavanaugh.[13]

As part of its service, the Clearinghouse also offered a reference telephone line and made it available to anyone on campus or off who needed help. The students fielded questions on a range of topics related to the crisis. One call, for instance, came from a student at the San Francisco Art Institute asking for figures on government defense spending. Another came from the Italian Department looking for the names and addresses of Italian language newspapers so students could write letters in Italian opposing the war.[14] At its height, the Clearinghouse was logging an average of twenty requests for help a day (though they estimated that there may have been twice as many requests as were written down). Students were working around the clock.[15]

While the fledgling librarians appeared to attack the work in front of them with enthusiasm, they were not uniform in their approach to reconstitution. As MacLeod recounts, it the school established at the outset of the crisis that students and faculty who

11. Memorandum from Campus Information Clearinghouse to All Campus Departments and Organizations, n.d., Records of the Library, box 95, Campus Disturbances 1970 folder.

12. Marcia Bates, "Clearinghouse Committee," *The Page*, May 28, 1970, 1.

13. MacLeod, " Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1193.

14. Ibid, 1192-93.

15. Bates, "Clearinghouse Committee," 1.

wanted to continue classes in the traditional manner would not be penalized. The majority of students chose to participate in reconstitution in some way, but some were more involved with efforts like the Clearinghouse and committee work than others. And they had differing opinions about way things were going. One student grumbled to MacLeod that some of her classmates were more concerned about their coursework and even with remaking the curriculum than about the problems in Southeast Asia. Another wrote to the dean of the library school, Raynard Swank, to complain that she felt socially ostracized when she voiced her opinion that, although she'd like to see the war end, she didn't see what it had to do with her education as a librarian.[16]

It is notable that the library students took to reconstitution with such zeal. According to Peterson and Bilorusky, while many people put energy into reconstitution after Governor Reagan shut down the university, ultimately only about one-third of UC Berkeley students spent most of their time participating in reconstitution activities. One-third spent some time participating, and the other third was largely apathetic. While sympathetic to the cause, few faculty and staff members actually devoted time to reconstitution.[17]

Personal Antipathy, Professional Objectivity

Simply by endorsing the Wolin Resolution and endeavoring to remake itself, the School of Librarianship was taking a stand on the war. Reconstitution in itself was a rejection of neutrality, according to Patrick Wilson, a professor at the school and later its

16. MacLeod, " Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1195.

17. Peterson and Bilorusky, *May 1970*, 105 and 113.

dean. "As it faces outward," he declared, "the reconstitution movement implies, if it does not explicitly assert, a rejection of the claim that the University, as a community, must refrain from trying to influence the priorities and policies and actions of the larger society or its government."[18]

It was no secret where most of the students' sentiments lay. The banner that hung at the school's door—"Dead Men Don't Read Books"—as well as the similar phrase, "The Dead Do Not Read Books" that headed their letter to the CLA, just about said it all. The students also freely admitted that they saw the Clearinghouse as a way to fight the war.[19] Yet despite what might seem like a lack of objectivity, they also worked to present both sides of the issue. That was the mandate handed down by Dean Swank when he approved the creation of the information service—and the students held to it.[20] "Most important," wrote Marcia Bates, "we have collected information from all sides in this dispute, getting materials from everyone from the Students for a Democratic Society to the John Birch Society. We want to have a true library, not a propaganda center."[21]

The Benefit of Hands-On Experience

If reconstituting the School of Librarianship had any impact on the national state of affairs, it was no doubt tiny. But reconstitution did have a big impact on many of the students. "Preparing bibliographies about Southeast Asia at a time when events there are critical, answering reference questions at the Clearinghouse telephone desk, and moving

18. Patrick Wilson, "The Meaning of Reconstitution," *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 175.

19. Marcia Bates, "A Campus Information Clearinghouse," *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 172.

20. MacLeod, "Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1194.

21. Bates, "A Campus Information Clearinghouse," 172.

into the public and school libraries have brought alive the real work of librarianship," wrote students Witt, Schwartz and Gilbert in the *California Librarian.*[22] Attempting to classify the material they were offering also helped the students discover the importance of specificity. "It may sound silly or trivial to say that we discovered the need for specific classification, but it was not trivial when we experienced it," Bates reported.[23]

One professor, who taught a course in government documents, was amazed to see a new level of interest emerge among her students. She had continued lecturing, cancelled examinations, and given her students several options for credit, including committee work or bibliographic projects. Some students chose to do all of the options and attend lectures as well. "I think I've learned more about librarianship in the past two weeks than I had the whole year," proclaimed one student.[24]

Reconstitution, however, was not to last. Because the turmoil on campuses in the spring of 1970 was so heated, it seemed that interest in the remaking of the university might last longer. It was, wrote Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, "an outpouring of protest unmatched in earlier periods." But as Horowitz went on to note, when students returned to campus in the fall, "an era had ended. The ending of the draft and the winding down of the war . . . and ennui worked their way. Protest stopped."[25]

So, not surprisingly, did the Campus Information Clearinghouse and all other reconstitution efforts. The Clearinghouse had "quietly" closed its doors in the summer of

---

22. Witt, Schwartz and Gilbert, "We Are a Birthplace," 168.

23. Bates, "A Campus Information Clearinghouse," 172.

24. MacLeod, "Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1195.

25 Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, "The 1960s and the Transformation of Campus Cultures," *History of Education Quarterly* 26, No. 1 (Spring 1986): 33.

1970; there simply were not enough students to man it or enough demand for its services. Reconstitution, however, changed the library school's direction, according to MacLeod. A new curriculum was developed that revolved around the Core Course, a class that would introduce students to all phases of librarianship and allow them to work at their own pace. Instead of examinations, the course required two research papers.[26]

Some graduates of the School of Librarianship went on to work at socially oriented libraries and many joined action groups like the Social Responsibilities Roundtable of the American Library Association. Were some of them activists before the Cambodia/Kent State crisis turned the School of Librarianship upside down, or did reconstitution help set their course in life? It's difficult to say, but those days of hands-on library work undoubtedly made some kind of impression.

Conclusion

When many departments on the UC Berkeley campus decided to redirect their curriculum to make it a relevant part of the antiwar movement, the School of Librarianship voted to join in. This redirection gave students the opportunity to seek creative means to serve the public as well as the chance to gain experience that they might not otherwise have acquired while in school. Interestingly, the students and faculty seemed to work on their own, without much joint action with the university library. By contrast, the work of the School of Library Service at UCLA seemed to be more intertwined with the work of the university library during the Cambodia/Kent State crisis.

26. MacLeod, "Reconstitution for Peace and Relevancy," 1196.

Perhaps this was due to proximity. The School of Librarianship was located in South Hall, behind the library. At UCLA, the library school was actually *in* the undergraduate library building.

The School of Librarianship students (as well as some of the faculty) were outspoken against the war, but also pledged to offer both sides of the issue in the collection they developed for the Clearinghouse. It seems paradoxical, but their actions lend credence to librarian Steven Joyce's idea that one's personal opinions needn't preclude professionalism. As mentioned in an earlier chapter, Joyce commented, "Having a voice and using it to articulate deeply held convictions does not necessarily imply the silencing of other voices."[27]

27. Steven Joyce, "A Few Gates Redux, 52.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

At the outset, this thesis posed four main questions about California librarians and the Vietnam War. 1) Was personal opinion about the war expressed, and if so how? 2) Did librarians attempt to maintain neutrality, and if so were they successful? 3) How did librarians use their training to respond to war-related events? 4) If there was violence or disturbances within the library, how were they handled?

The answer to the first question was, yes, personal opinion about the war was expressed, although in varying degrees of openness. Some librarians marched against the war while proudly announcing their profession. Some felt free to advertise their personal sentiments against the war within their own libraries. Some librarians spoke out against the war—and some, taking the opposite position, spoke out in support of U.S. foreign policy—in print. But, it should be said, that most of these librarians whose actions were recorded for posterity, were not in California.

That, though, isn't to say that all California librarians were silent on the subject. Records show that the California Library Association passed a resolution calling for the withdrawal of troops from Southeast Asia. Librarians in the Bay Area, in particular, were passionate in their call for an end to the war. And many librarians in colleges and universities condemned the war forthrightly.

That these librarians spoke out in greater numbers than their public library counterparts can probably be accounted for in two ways. One was that they went to work every day in places that were a hotbed of antiwar activity. An individual might be more

likely to express sentiments about a social issue when everyone around her is doing so, especially when emotions are running high. The other possible reason for academic librarians' outspokenness is that their hands were somewhat forced. With their campuses in crisis, they were essentially being asked to take a stand. In some ways, taking a position on the war helped them get on with the business of being librarians, as was the case when the UC Berkeley campus voted to reconstitute its curriculum to work toward ending the war. (Although the majority of librarians actually voted *against* reconstitution, many of them did and, in the end, the library did remake itself despite the vote.)

Not all American students spoke out against the Vietnam War, and not all library students did either. But as people who were still part of a college campus and not yet professionals working in the field, many library students were openly antiwar. It was, in fact, library students who created the Congress for Change, a group that descended on the American Library Association and tried to get it to condemn the war. The students at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship were particularly outspoken against the war and, while UCLA's School of Library Service students were less so, they did openly support the antiwar strike on campus.

Throughout the Vietnam War, California librarians seemed very conscious of the idea that a library should seek material from all sides of an issue. At the war-related information centers created at both UCLA and UC Berkeley, the librarians and library students made a point of renewing their pledges to uphold the American Library

Association's Bill of Rights, and to resist becoming a "propaganda center."[1] Yet were the collections balanced? If "balanced" is defined as collecting information from both sides of an issue, but not necessarily collecting the exact amount of material on both sides, then yes, the collections were probably balanced. However, as the war dragged on, and during times of heightened antiwar feelings, libraries seemed to weight their collections on the side critical to U.S. foreign policy.

Central to this issue is whether there was more antiwar than pro-war material available in the latter years of the war. If a librarian was trying to keep up with the times, it's conceivable that his collection might then slant toward works critical of the war. Some studies of the media in the late 60s and 70s found that the media's coverage of the presidential administrations became more critical, however, most of these studies look at television and newspaper coverage.[2] That wouldn't account for the books that might be found on a Young Adult reading list, or pamphlets and magazine clippings found at a university war information center. In regard to academic libraries it's also important to acknowledge who the libraries' patrons were: students and faculty, a large number of whom were active in protesting the war.

Violence did occur in both the UCLA and UC Berkeley libraries, but no research shows that public libraries were victims of war-related violence and threats of violence. At UCLA, the librarians handled the violence stoically and it seemed to inflame their passion to keep the library open as an intellectual haven. At UC Berkeley, the librarians

1. Bates, "A Campus Information Clearinghouse," 172.

2. Daniel C. Hallin, "The Media, the War in Vietnam, and Political Support: A Critique of the Thesis of an Oppositional Media," *Journal of Politics* 46, no. 1 (February 1984): 2-4, via JSTOR (accessed October 16, 2009).

were less impassioned and, in fact, wanted to close the library. But circumstances were different at the two universities, with the librarians at Berkeley having withstood years of student unrest and violence.

Criticism might be lobbed at librarians who, by speaking out against the war, opened themselves to charges of losing objectivity. Some librarians, too, might be faulted for collections that did not offer enough material to achieve a truly balanced collection. Yet it cannot be said that librarians ignored their duty to provide information as it was needed. On several occasions librarians worked diligently and found creative means to supply their patrons with information on the war, sometimes at personal risk. At UCLA, UC Berkeley and Stanford University, librarians and library students responded to the crises on campus not by carrying on business as usual, but by setting up special information centers that, by all accounts, received a great deal of business. Some librarians also had the foresight to collect materials on campus that would help future generations understand what happened during those turbulent times.

After the fallout from the Cambodia Invasion and Kent State killings, some public librarians also rose to the occasion by providing programs, displays and added materials to their communities. Granted, except for in pivotal times, they did not seem too interested in the war, but public librarians did included books on the conflict in their collections and encouraged young adults, in particular, to read them.

A Lasting Impression?

The Vietnam War changed service in some libraries in practical ways. After the war ended, librarians would have two new groups of attend to: veterans returning from Vietnam and an influx of Vietnamese refugees.

One way the U.S. government planned on helping Vietnam Veterans make the transition to civilian life was through a Department of Defense program called Project Transition. The program's goal was to help servicemen learn a skill or reach high school equivalency to increase their chances of employment.[3] Libraries had a proposed role in the plan. According to a report in *Library Journal*, libraries were urged to carry materials on current events, American life and social and economic problems that could be used to help soldiers make the transition.[4]

Veterans Administration librarians were also called on to assist returning soldiers. In a speech to the librarians, Charles Stenger, a psychologist with the VA, discussed the unique circumstances that Vietnam veterans were finding themselves in. "Unlike those who served before him, the Vietnam veteran does not return to the assured respect and appreciation of his countrymen. Instead he typically returns to indifference, disapproval, and anger. He is all too frequently made the scapegoat of those who oppose the war." Stenger warned the librarians against imposing their standards and tastes on others, then concluded by telling them that they were part of the therapeutic treatment in VA

3. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), "Part I and II: How to Assist Members of the Armed Forces In the United States and Returning Veterans," July 1968, Folder 11, Box 09, Glenn Helm Collection, The Vietnam Archive, Texas Tech University, http://www.virtualarchive.vietnam.ttu.edu/starweb/virtual/virtual/servlet.starweb?path=virtual/virtual/materials%5Fnew.web&search1=ONUMN%3D1070911011 (accessed June 4, 2009).

4. "Plan Library Assistance for Vietnam Returnees," *Library Journal* 93 (April 15, 1968): 1570.

hospitals. Their mission was to help veterans by choosing reading materials that would "enhance attitudes in patients most consistent with feelings of well-being, enjoyment of life, and optimism toward the future."[5]

Service to veterans of the Vietnam War is a subject worthy of its own study—as is the subject of service to Vietnamese refugees. In the 1981-1982 annual report of the Foreign Languages Department at the Los Angeles Public Library, librarians noted that the number of volumes on the shelves in Vietnamese was 119 in 1981, rising to 183 in 1982.[6] When compared to the department's annual report of 1970-1971, when books in Vietnamese were not even on the list, it shows the changing postwar demographics of the city.

These are practical matters. But did the Vietnam War and the antiwar movement alter American or California librarianship in more fundamental ways? It would be a leap to say that either changed librarianship in any wholesale manner. The war and the animosity it caused toward the U.S. government came about at the same time as several other rebellions against paternalistic authority. The civil rights movement, the women's rights movement, the gay rights movement, and the exploration into free love and mind-altering drugs were all part of the same reworking of American culture. Together, these movements liberalized society and thus liberalized librarianship as well. Would libraries have carried *The Joy of Sex, The Anarchist's Cookbook* or *Heather Has Two Mommies* if not for the social upheaval of the sixties and seventies? The Vietnam War played a role

---

5 Charles A. Stenger, "Vietnam Veteran and Library Service," *FLC Newsletter*, March 1972), 1-3.

6. Foreign Languages Department Annual Report, 1981-1982. Archives of the Los Angeles Public Library. Los Angeles, CA.

in changing America, but cannot be credited with a significant change in library philosophy.

This does not mean, however, that the war didn't have an impact. One librarian, for instance, has argued that when the American Library Association took a stand against the Vietnam War, it sowed the seeds of the organization's modern-day liberalism. In 1992 *Library Journal* reprinted Eric Moon's "Voices on Vietnam?" precipitating a response from Patrick Tweedy, a librarian at the University of California, San Diego, who wrote to say he had always wondered how the library profession came to be "the leftist advocacy group that it is today." Moon's editorial, was a "fascinating link in that devolution."[7]

Others, though, have seen the link in a different light. Although he was writing way back in 1970, Morris Polan, a librarian at California State College, Los Angeles, contended that, as part of the larger student protest movement, the antiwar movement on campus helped to nudge academic librarians out of their complacency. "A lot of us over the past generations have been doing our thing, whether in the library, the laboratory or the classroom . . . according to a pace set by the music which *we* hear," wrote Polan. Librarians must reach out to the campus community, he argued, "to meet the needs of our students, and to prevent the library from becoming or remaining self-oriented."[8]

Portia Griswold, a member of the UC Berkeley School of Librarianship faculty, regarded the library's reaction to the war as a peek into the future. "The library is a central information agency and when an institution of its stature says it is important for us

7. Kister, *Eric Moon*, 233.

8. Morris Polan, "What Are You Doing After the Protest?" *California Librarian* 31, no. 1 (January 1970), 20.

to understand our world and the role of the individual in the political process, then the community will surely respond." Griswold called the library a "birthplace," presumably of ideas.[9]

In his study of the war's impact on librarianship, Stielow concludes that participation in the antiwar movement was ancillary to events in the sixties, but that "such activities must also not be underevaluated. At the least, Vietnam provided the portmanteau for elements in a significant chapter in the development of the profession."[10]

One thing that has definitely *not* changed since the Vietnam War is that librarians still cannot agree on whether it is their place to speak out on war. In 2003, a debate arose that curiously echoed the debate that rocked the American Library Association in the late sixties and early seventies. On one side were librarians asking the ALA to pass a resolution against the war in Iraq; on the other were librarians who said that the ALA, "like libraries" should remain neutral.[11] Just like the wrangling on that other war, the fight over Iraq featured familiar arguments (the place to express opinions lies outside the ALA, billions being spent on war could be used to enhance already impoverished library budgets), and it took years to come to a conclusion.[12] In June 2005, the 182-member governing body of the American Library Association called for the withdrawal from Iraq

9. Witt, Schwartz and Gilbert, "We Are a Birthplace," 171.

10. Stielow, ,,The War and Librarianship," 40.

11. John N. Berry, "The War is an ALA Issue," Library Journal 128, no. 7 (April, 15, 2003), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 15, 2009).

12. Whitney Davison-Turley, "Differing Opinions Need Not Apply," *American Libraries* 35, no. 8 (September 2004), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 15, 2009); Berry, "The War is an ALA Issue."

of all U.S. military forces. They asked, too, that the U.S. government shift funds to "vital" domestic programs—including libraries.[13]

13. American Library Association, "ALA Council Passes Resolution on Connection Between Iraq War, Libraries, August 2, 2005," American Library Association, http://www.ala.org/ala/newspresscenter/news/pressreleases2005/august2005/iraqwarresoltion.cfm (accessed April 15, 2009).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Administrative Files of the University Librarian. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

American Library Association. "ALA Council Passes Resolution on Connection Between Iraq War, Libraries, August 2, 2005." American Library Association, http://www.ala.org/ala/newspresscenter/news/pressreleases2005/august2005/iraq warresoltion.cfm (accessed April 15, 2009).

———. "American Library Association Library Bill of Rights, 1996." http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/statementsif/librarybillr ights.cfm (accessed May 27, 2009).

———. "American Library Association Code of Ethics, 1997." http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/codeofethics/codeethic s.cfm (accessed May 27, 2009).

Armor et al. "Professors' Attitudes Toward the Vietnam War." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (Summer 1967): 159-75.

Archives of the Los Angeles Public Library. Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, CA.

Bates, Marcia. "Clearinghouse Committee." *The Page*, May 28, 1970, 1.

———. "A Campus Information Clearinghouse." *California Librarian*, 31 (July 1970):171-72.

"Bay Area Library Group Takes Antiwar Stand." *Library Journal* 95, no. 18 (October 15, 1970): 3424.

"Bay Region Dissenters Spoke Out." *Oakland Tribune*, October 16, 1969.

"Berkeley, May 1969." *ALA Bulletin* 63, no. 7 (July/August 1969): 897-899.

Bernstein, Sid. "Pierce College Anti-Vietnam War Rally Fails to Attract Students." *Los Angeles Times,* December 1, 1965.

Berry, John. "Caught In The Draft, February 15, 1966." In *Library Issues: The Sixties*, edited by Eric Moon and Karl Nyren, 79-81. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970.

———. "Escalation and Librarians, January 15, 1966." In *Library Issues: The Sixties*, edited by Eric Moon and Karl Nyren, 106-108. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970.

———. "The War Is an ALA Issue." *Library Journal* 128, no. 7 (April 15, 2003), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 15, 2009).

Bigart, Homer. "War Foes Here Attacked By Construction Workers." *New York Times*, May 9, 1970.

Bixler, Paul. Letter to the Editor. *American Libraries* 1, no. 9 (October 1970): 835.

Blake, Fay M. "Changing Libraries?" *California Librarian* 32, no. 1 (January 1971): 27-28.

———. "In the Eye of the Storm: Academic Libraries in the Sixties." In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow, 61-72. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

———. Interview by Laura McCreery, 2000. "Information for All: An Activist Librarian and Library Educator at the University of California, 1961-1984." Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt1x0n98bx&query=vietnam&brand=oac (accessed April 16, 2009).

"The Book Publishing Industry and Library Profession's Advertisement on the Vietnam War, *New York Times*, December 26, 1967." In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow, appendix C. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

"Briefcase Brigade; New York Lawyers Pleading for Peace in Southeast Asia." *Time*, June 1, 1970, 12-13.

Budge, Edwin S. "Berkeley Rebuttal." *Library Journal* 94 (June 1, 1969): 2175.

California Library Association Records. Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

"Campus Groups Unite Behind Strike." *Daily Californian,* May 7, 1970.

"Children's Libn. Jailed in Antiwar Protest." *Library Journal* 98 (February 15, 1973): 584.

"Concerned Businessmen." *New Yorker*, June 27, 1970.

"Conference, 1969, San Francisco." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 44 (January 1970): 493-94.

Coombs, Donald. "Library Resolution Passed on May 12." *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 4.

Cubie, Grete W. "A Career in Public Libraries and at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship, 1937-1975." Interview by Laura McCreery. Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt5k40046b&query=&brand=oac (accessed April 30, 2008).

"The Dead Do Not Read Books." *CLA Newsletter*, May 1970.

"Dissent from Dissent: Originally published in December 1, 1967." *Library Journal* 117 (May 1, 1992): S5.

Danton. Periam J. "Dean and Professor at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship, 1946-1 976." Interview by Laura McCreery. Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt4f59n6x3&query=%22library%20schoo l%22&brand=oac

Davison-Turley, Whitney. "Differing Opinions Need Not Apply." *American Libraries* 35, no. 8 (September 2004), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 15, 2009).

Duchac, Kenneth. "A Plea for Social Responsibility; Originally Published in August 1968." *Library Journal* 117 (May 1, 1992): S6-7.

Duckles, Vincent. "Ad Hoc Steering Committee Report." *CU News*, May 21, 1970, 6.

Eshelman. W.R. "Zoia Horn: Charade to Puppet Show to Drama." *Wilson Library Journal* 46 (April 1972), via Library Literature & Information Science Retro (accessed September 24, 2008).

Fanucchi, Kenneth. "Teachers Asked to Condemn War." *Los Angeles Times*, March 14, 1967.

"Footage in Vietnam." *Los Angeles Times*, March 15, 1970.

Forman, Jack. Letter to the Editor. *American Libraries* 1, no. 8 (September 1970): 746.

Franklin, Ben A. "U.S. Employes [sic] Set An Antiwar Rally." *New York Times*, March 31, 1968.

"From Reports of Affiliate Groups." *ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter*, April 10, 1971.

"Gen. Taylor's Viet Report." *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 27, 1967.

Gordon, Ruth. "The Professional Committee." *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 173.

Graduate School of Library & Information Science. Records. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

Hahn, Harlan. "Correlates of Public Sentiments About War: Local Referenda on the Vietnam Issue." *The American Political Science Review*, 64, No. 4 (December 1970), 1186-1198, via JSTOR (accessed April 20, 2009).

Hall, Michael. "War Crisis Unites the Campus." *Daily Californian*, May 8, 1970.

"Handcuffs in Harrisburg." *New York Times*, May 8, 1972, via ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851-2005) (accessed April 30, 2009).

Harlan, Robert D. "History of the Book: Thirty Years at UC Berkeley's School of Librarianship and Study of Early American Printers, 1963-1993." Interview by Laura McCreery. Library School Oral History Series, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, via Online Archive of California, http://content.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId=kt0v19n4c7&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=d0e144&toc.depth=1&toc.id=d0e144&brand=oac (accessed April 30, 2008).

"Harvard Library Staff Protests Vietnam Escalation." *Library Journal* 97 (July 1972): 2326.

Hill, Gladwin. "1,600 Executives Form Group For a National Antiwar Drive." *New York Times*, February 27, 1968.

Hillard, James. "ALA and Vietnam." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 46 (March 1972): 594-95.

Hoehn, Phil. "Berkeley Rebuttal." *Library Journal* 94 (June 1, 1969): 2175.

Holler, Frederick. "One Man's View of Vietnam," *RQ*, 8 (Summer 1969): 251-257.

Horn, Andrew. "UCLA/SLA." *The CALibrarian*, Spring & Summer 1970, 3-4.

Horn, Zoia. *Zoia! Memoirs of Zoia Horn, Battler for the People's Right to Know.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 1995.

Jones, Norah E. Interview by Janet Tanner Shiban. "The Best of Times, Four Decades in the UCLA Library Oral History Transcript,1993." Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles, 133.

"Jim Cox Presented the Following Amendment." *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, June 4, 1970, 3.

Johnston, Kathy. "California Campuses on Strike." *Daily Californian*, May 6, 1970.

Keerdoja, Eileen. "Davis: Campaigning as a Communist." *Newsweek,* June 9, 1980, via LexisNexis Academic (accessed June 9, 2009).

Kister, Kenneth F. *Eric Moon: The Life and Library Times*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002.

Lauerhass, Larry. "Convocation for All Library Personnel." *Library Newsletter/UCLA,* May 15, 1970, 1.

"Leaves of Change." *Synergy* (July/August 1970): 51-53.

Liberty, John. "To End War." *CLA Newsletter*, March 1970, 5.

Librarian's Association, Los Angeles, President's Files. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

Librarians Association of the University of California Division Records. Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

"Librarians for Peace." *Synergy* (July/August 1970): 11.

Library Records. Santa Monica Public Library, Santa Monica, CA.

Library & Information Science Publications. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

"Library Service School Gives Crisis Information." *UCLA Daily Bruin,* May 13, 1970.

Lieberman, Vic. "Statewide Protests Continue." *Daily Californian*, May 8, 1970.

Loew, Hermann. "Library Employees and the Strike." *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, May 15, 1970, 2-3.

Lunch, William L. and Peter W. Sperlich. "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam." *The Western Political Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (March 1979): 21-44, via JSTOR (accessed April 6, 2009).

MacLeod, Celeste. "Berkeley—May, 1970—An Introduction." *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 165-67.

———. "Reconstitution For Peace and Relevancy." *Library Journal* 96, no. 7 (April 1, 1971): 1192-95.

"Many Students, Faculty, Staff Participate in 'Strike' for 'Educational Enrichment.'" *UCLA Reporter*, June, 1970.

"May 5, 1970: Police Violence." *UCLA Daily Bruin*, January 19, 1971.

Moon, Eric. "Voices on Vietnam, October 15, 1967." In *Library Issues: The Sixties*, edited by Eric Moon and Karl Nyren, 108-109. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970.

———. "News Report: 1968, January1, 1969." In *Library Issues: The Sixties*, edited by Eric Moon and Karl Nyren, 372-373. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1970.

——— with Frederick J. Stielow. "The Library Press and Eric Moon: An Interview." In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow, 99-133. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

"Moratorium Day Off to a Peaceful Start." *Daily Review*, October 15, 1969.

"Moratorium History Committee." *Library Newsletter/UCLA*, June 4, 1970.

"Moratorium History Committee." *UCLA Librarian*, June, 1970.

"Moratorium on Neutrality?" *Newsweek*. October 13, 1969.

Murphy, Katherine B. "Librarians and Censorship During Three Modern Wars." Masters thesis, Kent State University, 1996.

"New Crunch for the U.S. in Indochina." *Time*, May 4, 1970, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,943780,00.html (accessed October 21, 2009).

"News." *Library Journal* 94, no. 21 (December 1, 1969): 4329.

"News." *Library Journal* 94, no. 22 (December 15, 1969): 4471-72.

"News." *College & Research Libraries* 30, no. 8 (September 1970): 250.

"News Report: 1969." *Library Journal* 95, no. 1 (January 1, 1970): 31-38.

New York Times, May 7, 1970, via LexisNexis Academic (accessed March 12, 2009).

"No Let Up Seen in Campus Disorders." *Independent Press-Telegram*, April 26, 1969.

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). "Part I and II: How to Assist Members of the Armed Forces In the United States and Returning Veterans." July 1968. Folder 11, Box 09. Glenn Helm Collection, The Vietnam Archive, Texas Tech University, http://www.virtualarchive.vietnam.ttu.edu/starweb/virtual/virtual/servlet.starweb?path =virtual/virtual/materials%5Fnew.web&search1=ONUMN%3D1070911011 (accessed June 4, 2009).

Oren, Craig. "Students Strike, Classes Cancelled in Protest." *Daily Californian*, May 6, 1970.

Owens, H.L. "Library to Investigate Feasibility of Creating Permanent Info Center." *UCLA Daily Bruin,* June 1, 1970.

"Paid Leave During Strike Urged by California L.A." *Library Journal* 94 (April 1, 1969): 1404-5.

Parker, Elaine M. "Crisis on the UCLA Campus." *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 159-62.

"Part Way with Thoreau." *Time*. February 9, 1968.

"Peoples Peace Treaty." *ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter,* August 1, 1971.

Peterson, Richard E. and John Alan Bilorusky. *May 1970: The Campus Aftermath of Cambodia and Kent State.* Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1971.

"Pillsbury's Best." *New Republic*, June 27, 1970.

"Plan Library Assistance for Vietnam Returnees." *Library Journal* 93 (April 15, 1968): 1570.

Polan, Morris. "What Are You Doing After the Protest?" *California Librarian* 31, no. 1 (January 1970): 18-21.

"POW Resolution." *Los Angeles Times*, November 12, 1970.

"The Protest Spreads." *The Nation*, November 27, 1967.

Ramirez, William L. "Social Concerns and the Library." *California Librarian* 30, no. 3 (July 1969): 173-76.

Records of the Library. Bancroft Library. University of California, Berkeley.

"Results of Balloting—Career Staff & Student Employee Motions." *CU News*, May 21, 1970, 9.

Richmond, Al. "Workers Against the War." *Ramparts*, September 1970.

Schuman, Howard. "Two Sources of Antiwar Sentiment in America." *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, no 3 (November 1972), via JSTOR (accessed June 1, 2009).

"Servicemen in Vietnam Get Books & Libraries." *Library Journal* 92 (May 1, 1967): 1784.

"School of Librarianship." *Daily Californian*, May 20, 1970.

Scott, Janice. "Celebration of the Peace Symbol's 1st Decade 1958-1968." *Communicator*, December 1968.

"S.F. War Poster Puzzles Library." *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 5, 1967.

Siegel, Bea. *Library Newsletter/UCLA,* May 15, 1970.

Skipper, James E. "Present Social Concerns and the Library." *CU News*, May 21, 1970.

———. "Student Protest and the Library." *CU News*, February 13, 1969.

"The Sounds of Pickets: Gen. Taylor's Viet Report." *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 27, 1967.

Stenger, Charles A. "Vietnam Veteran and Library Service." *FLC Newsletter*, March 1972, 1-3.

"Strike Week History and Chronology (May 4-7)." *Stanford University Librarians' Association Newsletter*, May 18, 1970, 2-3.

Student Activism Collection. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

Subcommittee on Social Responsibilities. *Final Report.* Chicago: ALA, January 1970: Appendix C-1-1, 33. Quoted in Douglas Raber. "ACONDA and ANACONDA: Social Change, Social Responsibility, and Librarianship." *Library Trends* 55, no. 3 (Winter 2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed November 21, 2007).

Subject Files. University of California, Los Angeles University Archives.

Sullivan, Tom. "UCLA 'Peace Center' Urged." *Evening Outlook*, May 26, 1970.

Swanston, David. "Proposal for Pornography in Libraries." *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 26, 1967.

"Taking a Stand." *Time*, October 24, 1969.

Trager, Ruth. "Moratorium History Committee." *American Libraries* 2, no. 11 (December 1971): 1157-60.

"Two Gatherings." *New Yorker*, May 30, 1970.

University Library Archives. Bancroft Library. University of California, Berkeley.

"Up the Down Concourse: Dallas 1971." *American Libraries* 2 (September 1971): 805.

"Vietnam Posters on Exhibition." *Los Angeles Times*, October 22, 1967.

"Vietnam Sketchbook on Display at Library." *Los Angeles Times*, August 18, 1971.

"Vietnamese Village Receives Gifts from Irene Lovdal." *Los Angeles Public Library Broadcaster*, March/April 1965.

Vosper, Robert. Interview by Dale E. Treleven. "Libraries and the Inquiring Mind Oral History Transcript, 1990-1991," 1056-58. Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wald, Alan and Jean Savage. "Berkeley Struggle." In *May 1970: Birth of the Antiwar University*, 20. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971.

Walsh, J. "NIH: Protestors Try Going Through Channels." *Science*, September 29, 1972.

"Washington D.C. librarians join Vietnam protest." *Library Journal* 93 (April 1, 1968): 1396.

Welch, Elizabeth H. "What Did You Write About the War, Daddy?" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 46 (June 1972), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed November 7, 2007).

White, Edith. "Guest Editorial." *Communicator*, Midsummer 1970, 2-3.

Wilson, Patrick. "The Meaning of Reconstitution." *California Librarian* 31 (July 1970): 174-76.

Witt, Dorothy, Joan Schwartz and Luane Gilbert. "We Are a Birthplace." *California Librarian* 30 (July 1970): 167.

"Workers' Woodstock." *Time,* June 1, 1970.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Terry H. *The Movement and The Sixties.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Blanke, Henry T. "Librarianship & Political Values: Neutrality or Commitment?" *Library Journal* 114, no. 12 (July 1989): 39-43.

Broderick, Dorothy M. "Moral Conflict and the Survival of the Public Library." *American Libraries* 24 (1993): 447-48.

Bundy, Mary Lee. "The Social Relevancy of Library Education: An Accounting." In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-197,* edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow, 83-97. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Chatfield, Charles. "At the Hands of Historians: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era." *Peace & Change* 29, no. 3&4 (July 2004), via Academic Search Premier (accessed November 21, 2007).

Clayton, Patti Becker. *Books and Libraries in American Society During World War II.* New York: Routledge, 2005.

Estlund, C. *Working Together: How Workplace Bonds Strengthen a Diverse Democracy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Falk, Richard. "Appropriating Tet." *Massachusetts Review* 29, no. 3 (Fall 1988), via JSTOR (accessed June 4, 2009).

Fendrich, James Max. "The Forgotten Movement: The Vietnam Antiwar Movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 73, no. 3 (August 2003): 338-58.

Garfinkle, Adam. *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Garrison, Dee. *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876-1920.* New York: Free Press, 1979.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage.* New York: Bantam Books, 1993.

Good, Joseph. "The Hottest Place in Hell: The Crisis of Neutrality in Contemporary Librarianship." *Progressive Librarian* 28 (Winter 2006/2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 6, 2009).

Graham, John-Bauer. "Now's Not the Time to Be Neutral? The Myth and Reality of the Library as a Neutral Entity." *Alabama Librarian* 53, no. 9-11 (2003), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 6, 2009).

Hallin, Daniel C. "The Media, the War in Vietnam, and Political Support: A Critique of the Thesis of an Oppositional Media." *Journal of Politics* 46, no. 1 (February 1 984): 2-24, via JSTOR (accessed October 16, 2009).

Hansen, Debra Gold. *A Pioneering and Independent Spirit: The History of San José State University's School of Library and Information Science.* San Jose: San José State University School of Library and Information Science, in press.

Heineman, Kenneth J. *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era.* New York: New York University Press, 1993.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. "The 1960s and the Transformation of Campus Cultures." *History of Education Quarterly* 26, No. 1 (Spring 1986): 1-38

"The Hottest Place in Hell: The Crisis of Neutrality in Contemporary Librarianship." *Progressive Librarian* 28 (Winter 2006/2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed April 6, 2009).

Ireland, Douglas. "Vietnam: Labor's Love Lost. *Commonweal*, December 1, 1967, 292-93.

Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri. *Peace Now*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Joyce, Steven. "A Few Gates Redux: An Examination of the Social Responsibilities Debate in the Early 1970s and 1990s." In *Questioning Library Neutrality: Essays from Progressive Librarian,* edited by Alison Lewis, 33-66. Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press.

Lefkowitz, Joel. "Movement Outcomes and Movement Decline: The Vietnam War and the Antiwar Movement." *New Political Science* 27, no. 1 (March 2005), via Academic Search Premier (accessed December 12, 2007).

Lowe, Joan. "People's Park, Berkeley." American Friends of Service Committee. http://www.afsc.org/ht/d/sp/i/16082/pid/16082 (accessed September 25, 2009).

Lustig, R. Jeffrey. "The War at Home: California's Struggle to Stop the Vietnam War." In *What's Going On? California and the Vietnam Era*, edited by Marcia A. Eymann and Charles Wollenberg, 64-81. Oakland, CA: Oakland Museum of California, 2004.

McCormick, Anita Louise. *The Vietnam Antiwar Movement in American History*. Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow Publishers, 2000.

Preer, Jean L. *Library Ethics*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2008.

Raber, Douglas. "ACONDA and ANACONDA: Social Change, Social Responsibility, and Librarianship." *Library Trends* 55, no. 3 (Winter 2007), via Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (accessed November 21, 2007).

Rosenzweig, Mark. "Politics and Anti-Politics in Librarianship." In *Questioning Library Neutrality: Essays from Progressive Librarian*, edited by Alison Lewis, 5-8. Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press, 2008.

Rorabaugh, W.R. *Berkeley at War, the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Samek, Toni. *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2001.

Schulzinger, Robert D. *A Time for War: The United States and Vietnam, 1941-1975.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Sparanese, Ann. "Activist Librarianship: Heritage or Heresy?" *Progressive Librarian* 22 (Summer, 2003), via Proquest Alt-Press Watch (accessed September 14, 2007).

Small, Melvin. *Covering Dissent: The Media and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, 1994.

"Social Responsibility vs. The Library Bill of Rights." *Library Journal* 118 (September 15, 1993): S1.

Stielow, Frederick J. "The War and Librarianship: A Study in Political Activism." In *Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973*, edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow, 31-41. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Unger, Irwin and Debi Unger, eds. *The Times Were a Changin': The Sixties Reader.* New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998.

"Vietnam Era Anti-War Group is Revived." *Santa Monica Mirror,* October 15-21, 2003.

Wayne, John J. "The Library During Wartime: The Vietnam War." *LC Information Bulletin*, March 11, 1991, 79-80.

Wells, Tom. *The War Within: America's Battle Over Vietnam.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Whitson, William L. "Librarians, LAUC-B and the AFT: The Struggle for Academic Status University of California, Berkeley, 1963-1991." Paper in the LAUC-B archives, http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/LAUC/archives/index.html, Berkeley, CA, 1992.

Wiegand, Wayne A. *An Active Instrument for Propaganda: The American Public Library During World War I.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Wiest, Andrew. *The Vietnam War, 1956-1975.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Wohlsen, Marcus. "Liberating Voices: The Tumultuous Struggle to Bring Ethnic Studies to Berkeley." n.d. *Illuminations,* http://illuminations.berkeley.edu/archives/2005/history.php?volume=5 (accessed October 14, 2009).

Wollenberg, Charles. "California and the Vietnam War: Microcosm and Magnification." In *What's Going On? California and the Vietnam Era*, edited by Marcia A. Eymann and Charles Wollenberg, 13-21. Oakland, CA: Oakland Museum of California, 2004.

Young, Arthur P. *Books for Sammies*. Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu, 1981.

Tertiary Sources

Flickr. "About Richard Nixon," Flickr. http://www.flickr.com/people/richard_m_nixon/ (accessed June 6, 2009).

Public Broadcasting System. "Vietnam Online: Timeline." Public Broadcasting System website. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/vietnam/timeline/tl3.html#a (accessed May 1, 2009).

"Vietnam War." *The Columbia Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007, via Questia Online Library (accessed May 1, 2009).