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The Origin of Soviet Education for Librarianship

The Role of Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, Lyubov' Borisovna Khavkina-Hamburger, and Genrietta K. Abele-Derman

John V. Richardson Jr.

In tracing the origins of early Soviet education for librarianship to the early part of the twentieth century, this article presents brief biographical information about three influential leaders in the field—the Bolshevik N. K. Krupskaya (1869–1939), the pre-Revolutionary figure L. B. Khavkina (1871–1949), and counterrevolutionary G. K. Derman (1882–1954). Furthermore, the ideological issues revolving around the state of public education, literacy and reading, the role of librarians and libraries, and the prototypic programs of librarianship in Russia are contrasted with American views.

“Without a book, without a library, without the skillful use of books there can be no cultural revolution for the reader.”
—N. K. Krupskaya

Many Western scholars of education for library and information science recognize the name of Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya as the first person to formalize library and bibliographical training in Russia during the early part of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, there is relatively little information about Krupskaya’s contribution in English, and Western scholars have been unable to draw extensively upon the rich literature that is available in Russian. In order to fill this knowledge void, this article proposes a prosopographical study of three Russian women—Krupskaya, Khavkina, and Derman, drawing from significant primary, as well as secondary, Russian source material.

Justification

The noted information scientist, A. Y. Chernyak, while writing in 1989 about the fiftieth anniversary of her death, declared that “A full evaluation of Krupskaya’s significance should be undertaken by library historians without delay.” I wish to argue, however, that Krupskaya’s work cannot be fully understood without addressing the work of two other Russian women—Derman and Khavkina. Furthermore, despite women’s dominance in Russian as well as in American librarianship, in numeric terms at least, the majority of LIS scholars have ignored these Russian contributions, in part due to language and access restrictions. Indeed, many Russian scholars have viewed
Krupskaya “only as Lenin’s spouse and not as a revolutionary and political official in her own right.” Fortunately, recent feminist scholarship in librarianship, which reflects a larger shift in American historiography, is beginning to make amends for this deficiency; this work is also an example of such an effort. Finally, this article explores the idea that we are part of an international profession involved with the promotion of certain ideals by making cross-cultural comparisons between the Russian and American approaches to education and their underlying philosophical assumptions.

Goals, Objectives, and Questions

The overall goal of this article is to provide an understanding of early Russian and subsequent Socialist formal education for librarianship. Specific objectives are (1) to identify the characteristics and contributions of Krupskaya, Khavkina, and Derman; (2) to pinpoint the ideological ideas and assumptions underlying their efforts; and (3) to argue that the history of early Soviet education for librarianship was influenced by those individuals and their ideologies. These multilevel objectives ensure an analytic approach to the topic rather than a simple chronology of events. Three key research questions include: What personal characteristics as well as organizational and leadership skills did Krupskaya, Khavkina, and Derman bring to the formative period of Russian education for librarianship? What were these women’s ideological ideas and assumptions, which resulted in their pioneering work of organizing formal educational programs for librarianship? And finally, how much influence did the earlier generation of librarian-bibliographers (including A. I. Kalishevskiy; A. A. Petrovskiy; and B. S. Bodnarskiy) have on their professional perspective?

Three Biographical Sketches

In contrast to the “Marxist disdain for exaggerating the role of personality in history,” I believe that people are often times more important than institutions in shaping the direction of historical events, at least in the short term. Therefore, the following three biographical sketches present the essential historical facts of Krupskaya, Khavkina, and Derman’s lives.

Nadezhda K. Krupskaya (1869–1939)

A variety of English language biographical sources provide the essential vital statistics regarding Krupskaya’s life. To date, the most comprehensive English language study available is Boris Raymond’s 1979 book. Based on all of these sources, it is known that she was born Nadezhda (which means Hope) Konstantinovna Krupskaya on February 14, 1869, to Konstantin Krupsky, an avant-garde artillery officer, in St. Petersburg. Krupskaya lived in the southeastern part of St. Petersburg on Staro-Neysky Street in the 1890s. Krupskaya’s father never recovered from twenty-two false charges (for example, speaking Polish, dancing the Mazurka, and not going to church) and the subsequent demotion he suffered in Poland, so one gathers that Krupskaya...
grew up in a distressed home. Nonetheless, she dreamed about becoming a school teacher and received a decent obrazovaniye (education):

First at the uninspiring government high school, [and then] later at a more stimulating private school, headed by Peter Struve’s father-in-law. Her initial ambition was to become a teacher, but since there were no jobs available, she enrolled for two months in the Bestuzhev courses [classes for women of nobility], leaving because she thought them too removed from real life (1889).

Krupskaya discovered “real life” in a small Marxist circle of students from the St. Petersburg Technological Institute. From 1891 to 1896, she taught Marxist thought to workers in her classes at the Smolenskaya Evening and Sunday School. Many of her students came from the heavily industrial district of the city called “Beyond the Nevsky Gate” (Nevskaya Zastava).

Having made the acquaintance of Vladimir I. Ulyanov in January 1894, Krupskaya helped him organize the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class (also known as the Union for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class) in 1895. Arrested in August 1896, she was finally sentenced in 1898 to a three-year exile in Ufa Province, Bashkiria. The government, however, permitted her to spend her term with Ulyanov, who was in exile in Shushenskoye (Eniseysk Province), 2,300 kilometers further southeast in western Siberia. There, they married on July 10, 1898, and they worked together reading, translating, and discussing various ideas. In other words, they were truly revolutionary partners. He did not adopt the pseudonym Lenin until 1901 and did so to hide his postexile clandestine activities. And, between 1898 and 1924, Krupskaya’s activities closely paralleled his. They lived in Munich (1901–1905), returned briefly but illegally to St. Petersburg from November 1905 to the end of 1907, then moved to Kuokkala, Finland, and later to Repino, Russia. Thereafter, they lived in Geneva (1907–1910); in Longjumeau, just south of Paris (1910–1911); Kraków (1912–13); and in London (1912–?). After reading about the Petrograd street battles in the Zurich newspapers, and then a few days later about Czar Nicholas II’s abdication, on April 3, 1917, they returned to Petrograd via the Finland Station, along with more than thirty individuals (including nineteen Bolsheviks, six Jewish Bund members, and three international Mensheviks). During the civil war that followed, they lived in Petrograd and in the village of Razliv, a retreat outside of the city.

Increasingly interested in popular education as she had seen it abroad, Krupskaya also studied American education and published her work Narodnoye obrazovaniye i demokratiya (People’s Education and Democracy) in 1917 (the second and third editions appeared in 1919 and 1921, respectively) and was elected to the Collegium of the Commissariat of Education of the Russian Federation (RSFSR) in 1917. While living in Switzerland, she was influenced by Pestalozzi’s ideas on intellectual-moral-physical education. In 1915–16, she joined the Pedagogical Society. As deputy to Anatoliy V. Lunacharskiy, the Russian Minister of Education, Krupskaya was positioned to influence educational reform. During the period 1917 to 1920, she worked on Lenin’s decree “On Organizing Librarianship” in the RSFSR, which called for the introduction of the Swiss-American system. After a series of strokes, Lenin died in 1924; Krupskaya died suddenly on her birthday in 1939. According to unconfirmed rumors, the
Kremlin poisoned her because she intended to use her birthday as an occasion for making an anti-Stalinist statement. Krupskaya’s work on librarianship between 1918 and 1938 is discussed at length in a later section.

Lyubov’ Borisovna Khavkina-Hamburger (1871–1949)

Khavkina was born on April 12, 1871, in the town of Khar’kov (now in the northeastern part of Ukraine) to the family of a prominent physician. From 1890 to 1912, she served as the librarian of her hometown library and was a member of its board starting in 1902. In 1903, Khavkina founded the first Scientific Department of Librarianship within the library. Responding to a recognized need, in 1904 she authored a fundamental textbook titled Biblioteka:ikh organizatsiya i tekhnika (Libraries: Their Organization and Techniques). She continued to be a prolific author of descriptive works, which went into multiple editions, and she flourished in the 1910s. In 1913, she initiated library courses at Shanyavsky People’s University in Moscow and served as an instructor as well as secretary of the coursework, which involved keeping track of students.

Krupskaya paid much attention to Khavkina’s ideas, especially those in her 1918 work entitled Kniga i biblioteka (The Book and the Library). Although Krupskaya thought it had value, she expressed concern about its Cadet tendencies. In particular, Khavkina argued for open access to the library shelves and simpler, easy-to-use libraries. The most troubling point for good socialists, however, is that Khavkina believed that materialistic and idealistic theories could co-exist (see ideological discussions below). During the 1920s she traveled widely, lecturing at the Institute of Public Education in Tver’ from 1921 to 1922, and holding seminars in both Odessa in 1925 and at the Middle Asia State University in Tashkent during the spring of 1926. In 1920, Khavkina headed the Scientific Research Office of Librarianship (OB) in Moscow. In 1924, Glav nauka (i.e., the state establishment for scientific institutions) appointed a committee to investigate the OB’s activities in order to determine whether it should become an institute (a more prestigious arrangement). In February of that year, Khavkina was fired and replaced with a trustworthy Communist named I. F. Pavlovich, a member of the committee. In March 1924, however, she was allowed to return to her post. Based on Glav nauka’s recommendation, the OB was renamed the Institute of Librarianship (IB) later that year.

As director of the newly renamed Institute of Librarianship at the Lenin Library, Khavkina taught five courses: (1) librarianship in Russia, its republics, and abroad; (2) classification; (3) methods of work with readers (notably exhibits); (4) systematic and subject cataloging; and (5) synthesizing applied librarianship. She also published the first polyglot dictionary of library terms in Russian, English, German, and French (published in Moscow, 1928). During her lifetime, Khavkina made three trips abroad to Western Europe (in 1925), the United States in which she visited four library schools (1926), and Canada (1929). Her death on June 2, 1949, in Moscow, was ignored by the American library press.

Genrietta K. Abele-Derman (1882–1954)

The paucity of English language material on Derman is compensated by secondary Russian sources, the best of which is a Festschrift on the 110th anniversary of her birth. This work contains several articles, and a chronology and bibliography of her works. The next best source is an article by E. V. Seglin.
The second daughter of Karl Abele, a river raft driver, Genrietta was born on August 8, 1882, in Riga, the third largest city of Russia (after 1918, part of independent Latvia and known as the Paris of the Baltic). In Riga, she studied at the Lomonosov Women's Gymnasium and graduated with a red (Honors) diploma. Passing the examination for home teacher (or tutor) in 1903, she moved to Moscow to avoid being arrested; there, she enrolled in higher women's pedagogical courses. Graduating in the summer of 1905, she returned to Riga. On October 5, 1905, she married another public teacher and critic named Vilis Derman—her comrade in party work. Arrested for revolutionary activity, they were released due to lack of evidence. From St. Petersburg, they immigrated to Germany by way of Finland in 1914. Expelled from Germany that same year, the Dermans immigrated to the United States by way of Sweden and Denmark.

In late autumn 1914, they arrived in Boston, Massachusetts. Genrietta Derman worked as a tutor and enrolled in Simmons College as a “special condition” admit in 1916, then graduated in the summer of 1917. From 1918 to 1921, she worked at Harvard University’s Library and then at the Library of Congress with their Slavic and Yudin Collections.

In late 1921, Derman returned to Latvia, stopping in Moscow to give a talk at its Library Institute on “Librarianship in America.” Her speech emphasized how the Library of Congress subject cataloging system could play a role in Russian libraries. Back home in Latvia, she was arrested. As part of an exchange of political prisoners (of which she was one) between Latvia and Soviet Russia, she found herself back in Moscow in 1922. From 1922 to 1928, she focused on librarianship and joined the cataloging committee of the institute. By 1923, Derman headed the two foremost libraries in Moscow: the Library of the Socialist Academy, the leading ideological institution in the country (from 1923 to 1934), and the Rumyantsev Library, renamed the V. I. Lenin Library/Institute (from 1923 to 1931). In 1924, Derman organized the first All-Russian Library Congress, giving a talk on the centralization of cataloging. In August 1930, she became the founding director of the Moscow Library Institute (MBI)—the first independent establishment devoted to the higher education of librarians.

From 1930 to 1937, Derman published numerous articles about the organizational structure and activities of the MBI. Following her proposal, the MBI offered evening courses for librarians in September 1931. In the fall of 1933, the MBI also established a department to train librarians for children’s work. On December 13, 1933, the head of Narkompros (i.e., The People's Commissariat of Enlightenment) added “head of the department of librarianship” to Derman’s list of responsibilities. On April 26, 1934, the MBI and the IB (a part of the V. I. Lenin Library) merged; Derman became head of this new unified Library Institute that took the MBI name. After the merger, Derman requested that the IB’s responsibilities for preparing post-graduate studies instructors in librarianship be continued in the MBI.

Despite the harsh political climate, Derman was active internationally; she attended the First International Library and Bibliographic Congress in Rome-Venice in 1929. In mid- to late May 1935, Derman took part in the Second International Library and Bibliographic Congress in Barcelona and Madrid. There, she talked about “Informational-Bibliographic Work of Soviet Libraries” and “Professional Training for Librarians.” On the fifth anniversary of the MBI’s founding, Derman was appointed to the Narkompros’ Committee on the Determination of Professional Status of
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Librarians and MBI Instructors. In 1936, the program moved into the Khimki campus on the west side of the Moscow River, in the northern part of the city. Derman asked for, and received from Narkompros, a special train platform so that students would be able to attend school conveniently. During most of 1937, she worked on designing a new building for the MBI that included a dormitory for students and thirty-two flats for instructors in a separate building. In early December 1937, her husband was arrested on the basis of forged evidence for counterrevolutionary activities; on January 5, 1938, she too was arrested. Imprisoned in May 1939, her husband died in a labor camp at Vorkuta on the northwestern slopes of the Ural Mountains (Pechorskiy Basseyen) on January 18, 1955. Shortly thereafter, Derman was “rehabilitated,” meaning that her good reputation (including her heir’s rights and privileges) was restored.

Ideological Assumptions

Consider the socialist struggle. For example, before the turn of the twentieth century “The emperor of all the Russians is an autocratic and unlimited monarch. God himself commands that his supreme power be obeyed, out of conscience as well as fear.” With the capitulation of Tsar Nicholas II in February 1918, the thoughtful Russian’s task of educating the masses in the late 1910s and early 1920s was not enviable.

Writing in 1923, Lenin coined the phrase “cultural revolution,” which meant the process of spiritual transformation of an old-fashioned, backward, semiliterate society that he inherited from the former regime. For example, this cultural revolution implied such goals as moving the working class out of “spiritual slavery and darkness” toward a socialist system by establishing public education, developing socialist literature, supporting and popularizing science, re-educating the bourgeoisie intelligentsia, strengthening an atheistic world view, and reconstructing mores.

The State of Public Education

To appreciate the primitive state of affairs in Russia, readers should know that the 1897 census found that 73 percent of the Russian population nine years or older were illiterate. With somewhat more hopeful statistics, Rashin estimated 25 percent of the population were literate in rural areas and perhaps three-fourths in urban areas. By 1914, the human and bibliothecal populations had grown to about 160 million people and 76,000 libraries (primarily seminar school libraries holding 46 million books and journals). By the October Revolution of 1917, “14 of the 17 million illiterates in the country were women. Illiteracy was essentially a woman’s problem.” Not surprisingly, something needed to be done about this situation.

Thus, the Communist Party Program of 1919 proposed: (1) a preparatory system of residential homes and kindergartens as well as children’s colonies for children under the age of four in order to emancipate women for productive work and self-culture; followed by (2) a free, equal, compulsory, unified, and single-gradated education from seven to seventeen; and (3) development of specialized vocational training in technicums for young adults after age seventeen. Furthermore, the program proposed to open the existing universities (and other institutes of higher education, such as polytechnics and laboratory schools) to the working class and provide instruction (that is, mass adult education) for others.

Previously, the Russian (i.e., tsarist and Kerensky) educational system had
been open only to the wealthy. Such a system prepared the next generation’s technical-managerial class of controllers (that is, the captains of industry) who esteemed wealth, renown, personal comfort and who, most importantly, could be counted upon to maintain the status quo. Judging from table 1, one can see that the tsarist system depended upon “popular ignorance to be the main prop of the autocracy.”

Any proposed system of education, however, would confront the “Woman’s Question.” For Kruskaya, the answer had to include equality with men as well as a conception of woman as mother and worker. By instituting детские сады and ясли (a voluntary crèche system for babies two months old and upward, followed by preschool for children ages three to seven), parents were taught that children did not belong to them but to society—that home schooling was no longer a necessity or superior to public education. In school, children were taught respect for authority and self-reliance. And, perhaps most importantly, mothers were emancipated.

Fundamentally, Kruskaya was thinking about the issue of time—time for women to shop as well as questions of where to shop if goods were in short supply. For many Russians, living a life of mild poverty was not only difficult but also time-consuming. Under the rubric Советское воспитание (which means Soviet upbringing) Kruskaya believed that “training in skills without ideological upbringing is a means without an end, while ideological upbringing without modern training in skills is an end devoid of the means for its fulfillment.” While outlawing religious instruction, Kruskaya and Lenin had to deal with the fact that the Russian people were highly superstitious compared to Western standards.

However, there were relatively few “good” schools, so Kruskaya thought the educational role depended upon the library, which in turn meant that literacy was a fundamental concern.

**Literacy and Reading**

As part of the first five-year plan, Kruskaya proposed to reduce the amount of illiteracy among eighteen- to thirty-five-year-olds by 1927, the tenth anniversary of the revolution. Of course, they needed something to read—something published and disseminated—for libraries to have a significant role in the education of an emancipated person or new society. There was a dramatic growth of interest in reading; in 1919, based on his firsthand observations, Reed argued that “all of Russia was learning to read, and reading—politics, economics, history—because the people wanted to know” about what was going on around them. What Kruskaya wanted was for these new readers to begin reading about the party and the Soviets.
In Odessa, based on his 1926 survey of 500 women (workers and nonworkers alike), Kogan found, however, that working women read less because they had less time than nonworkers. Furthermore, these women were not interested in reading scientific literature (as encouraged by the Leninist party line) or about war and revolution; what they wanted was something they did not have—something cheerful—and they complained that librarians did not give them such works. Fiction was the most popular genre, followed by some history, political and economic topics, as well as hygiene, geography, and art. They preferred translated American literature (such as Jack London and Sinclair Lewis), followed by British authors, then French, and finally their own indigenous Russian literature. Though Kogan primly concluded that people should read propaganda (for example, real worker stories), his survey clearly demonstrates that Russians did not do so. This philosophical issue is a dialectical one—high culture (where one reads quality literature) versus low culture (such as fairy tales or trash fiction). One might argue that high culture takes a position of moral superiority while ignoring the emancipatory nature of reading—what some might call “read the word, read the world.”

Krupskaya did not appreciate the so-called “value free” or bourgeois library science popularized in the United States, which advocated selecting books of all political perspectives and making them equally available to readers. In her system, only the best books should be recommended and circulated; transferring, removing, and even destroying bourgeois books was not a dilemma or ethical consideration because, in her view, they were either reactionary, too constrictive, or so obsolete as to be useless. Illustrative of her ideological orientation, Krupskaya argued: “give every village important books... We need books that arm us, give us power.” The philosophical issue is again dialectic—one of choice (i.e., a subjective approach where one reads what one wants for pleasure, happiness, or satisfaction) versus control (i.e., a “recommendatory” approach where one reads what someone else thinks one needs). The well-trained socialist librarian would argue by analogy that the physician does not necessarily give the patient pills that taste good but rather ones that help the patient. The extreme American view would be quantity (that is, we will bury you in books) over quality (a handful of the best titles). Admittedly, however, early twentieth-century American librarianship...
was still emphasizing high culture over popular taste, and the issue of what fiction was appropriate was also hotly debated. Perhaps this situation can best be summarized as the tension between one's attitude toward human progress—a liberal, permissive society of extreme individualism versus a centralized, restrictive socialist one (see table 2 below). As the primary moral principle, Western civilization places "respect for persons" above a collectivism, where the greatest good for the greatest number of individuals exists.

Role of Librarians and Libraries

A March 2, 1909, circular sent to all libraries by the Société de la Bibliothéconomie yields some insight into the contemporary Russian situation. Returns from 368 librarians indicate that the smallest library (such as an izba-chital'nya, the cottage or village reading hall) held 50 to 200 volumes while the largest reported 5,000 volumes; the typical library offered 200 to 400 volumes. Interestingly, the larger the library, the less the books were used on average. As for government assistance, 140 libraries (65 percent) reported receiving some assistance, ranging from 10 to 100 rubles a year. Regrettably, however, most librarians had added no new books since 1907, while some even said they had not done so since 1902. Working a wide range of two to thirty-five hours a week with an average of six to twelve hours per day, 38 percent of the librarians also indicated that they worked for free, although the maximum salary reported was 180 rubles a year. Furthermore, librarians ruled or lined their own paper. Given such conditions, it is not surprising that most librarians held a strong interest in better library organization.

In a comparative survey of one region between 1916 to 1917 and 1924 to 1925, Zvezdin reported actually having found fewer libraries in villages (i.e., 235 down to 180) after the October Revolution, although the number increased in towns from sixteen to fifty-seven. In 1914, 76,000 libraries, mainly within seminar schools, held 46 million books and journals. Most of these works, however, would not be considered appropriate titles for workers, soldiers, or peasants. So, during the revolution, many such books were appropriated from the bourgeois. In fact, a goal of establishing a network or web of 10,000 libraries was instituted by the party. They hoped that villages could get the peasants to assist in this effort voluntarily, especially if the people would only realize how much they needed a library.

It seems clear that as much as Krupskaya and even Lenin may have admired American libraries for their technical achievements, they certainly believed that socialist libraries should be part of the political process. The books placed on the shelves of the library should make the ideological power of the past clear; specifically, the library should fight religion and prejudices, idealism, and any sentimentalism. In fact, "the only question is how, not why, but that depends upon selecting the proper books and literature." There could be no such concept of objective book selection because no thoughtful librarian would recommend a book with monarchist ideas to readers since the librarian would know those ideas would be harmful.

Thus, for Krupskaya, the role of the children's librarian—who must be well informed in the party's objectives—is crucial in the moral and political upbringing of Russian children, because education takes ten years; whereas reading books could accomplish the same thing in a shorter amount of time. In fact, Krupskaya confessed that they had
underestimated the importance of the book in the Cultural Revolution.

As part of the party’s goal of popularizing science, Krupskaya envisioned an elementary physical and chemistry laboratory attached to every library because it was essential to understanding the materialistic nature of the world. Even with the literacy campaign of 1928–29, however, only 1 to 5 percent of the Russian population might be considered library users, much less laboratory laborers.63

In Krupskaya’s view, the role of massovyye (mass or public) libraries could not be overlooked. The bourgeois would always have their own personal libraries, but the worker could not afford to own books. Thus, the right books had to be on the libraries’ shelves, for she believed that “librarians must desire to make every library an ideological center which would help build socialism.”64 After all, libraries were meant to be ideological institutions that brought knowledge to the masses and helped form their consciousness and points of view. Libraries should serve the vital role to bring up a new people, for “without a book, without a library, without the skillful use of books there can be no cultural revolution for the reader.” While readers might wish to read books of their own preference, the socialist library would make it easier to read only approved titles by placing them on a special shelf along with annotated cards in the catalog. Thus, the reader’s path of least resistance was to use the recommended works. The librarians compiled these lists of recommended books because “a Soviet librarian must be educated scientifically and politically and be a responsible participant in constructing socialism.65

### Higher Education for Librarians

**Proto-Education for Librarianship in Pre-Revolutionary Russia**

Similar to the American experience, Russia organized professional societies, edited learned journals, and offered a series of informal courses prior to establishing a formal system of higher education for librarians. For instance, on March 18, 1908, the Russian Bibliological Society’s library section became the Society of Librarianship supported by thirty paragraphs of organizational rules.66 In 1910, the first Russian library journal, *Bibliotekar*, appeared with P. M. Bogdanov as its secretary, and it contained a current awareness bibliography of books and journal articles of interest to its audience.67 The following year, the First All-Russian Library Congress was held in Moscow, and for several years, well-heeled Russian librarians traveled to London and Oxford during Eastertide to meet with a host of other Western European librarians and to talk about their institutions and their situations.68 Remarkably, the earliest Russian attempts to organize formal programs of education for librarianship date only to the beginning of the twentieth century.

1. St. Petersburg/Petrograd/Leningrad

Most notably, however, in the fall of 1912, the St. Petersburg Pedagogical
Institute started offering optional book and library science courses (called theoretical librarianship) under the direction of its librarian, A. M. Belov, who later became librarian of the State Duma and wrote his own *Rules for Alphabetical Systematic Cataloging* (1915).

### 2. Moscow

Also in 1912, N. A. Shakhov gave 2,000 rubles to the Shanyavskiy People's University to offer short-term librarianship courses (about three weeks long) to about 200 to 400 students a year. Under the direction of Khavkina as head instructor, the other faculty members included A. M. Kalmykova, Professor Brandt, A. E. Gruzinskii, A. I. Kalishevskii, B. S. Bodnar'skii, S. O. Seropol'ko, A. A. Didrikhson, and A. U. Zelenko (see table 3).

The faculty's goal was for students to understand the four different types of libraries (that is, public, academic, special, and children's). Certainly, the program attracted more applicants than positions available, and so students were selected on the basis of their having a secondary education and a strong need for new information or knowledge. In fact, such courses were quite popular because of the low cost of instruction and the brief duration; many students came from rural areas where they worked the land and could not leave their families for long periods. During World War I, the ninety-six hours of total instruction, which included ten hours of Russian literature, were offered from April 13 to May 9, 1915. During this early period, typical instruction consisted of one four-hour lecture per day (for twenty-four days), followed by practicum visits to libraries. Instructors talked about model libraries, which were most often foreign libraries in the developed (Western European) countries. One criticism of these classes was that instructors tried to squeeze so much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Books</td>
<td>Professor Brandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Libraries</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature of the 19th and 20th Century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Literature</td>
<td>A. M. Kalmykova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of Work in Children's Libraries in America</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Librarianship</td>
<td>Khavkina or Kalishevskii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What a Librarian Should Know and Do</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Location Equipment</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Bibliography</td>
<td>Kalishevskii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Bibliography</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Organize a Library (Book Selection)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing and Bookselling Companies in Russia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf Reading</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Systems of Classification</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric System</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>Kalishevskii; assisted by A. K. Pokrovskaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Disinfection and Preservation</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing, Processing and the Use of Books: Administration of Reading Halls</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Statistics</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

information into such a short period of time that some students thought the classes were too compressed; almost all, however, agreed that the instructors were inspiring.73

**Formal Education**

1. *An Ideal Educational System*

While Lenin was writing about centralizing the practice of librarianship, Krupskaya worked out her idea for a two-year program of individual directed study for would-be librarians at a library seminary.74 In the first year of her ideal program, students would read twenty to thirty recommended books at home while also attending one of three level-appropriate evening courses at the Proletariat University. Ideally, students would have a large library nearby to find these recommended titles. Students would attend occasional lectures, while instructors would be working practitioners. At the end of the first year, a written examination would cover theoretical questions. In the second year, students would work with librarians who were willing to show students how their library worked and the general techniques of library work. Krupskaya further envisioned that only library seminary students would work in those libraries that contributed instructors. Krupskaya wanted these students to develop their skills in written and oral communication as well. At the end of the second year, she proposed that they make an oral report on their practicum; the librarian whom they replaced would be present at the exam. Logically speaking, however, if the librarian did not want to be replaced, this “in-and-out” replacement system would not work. Nonetheless, successful students could then apply for a certificate of eligibility to work as a librarian; those interested in becoming practitioner-instructors could do so by studying more library-related subjects beyond the second year. The concrete objective of the library seminar-training program was for students to analyze books by their appropriateness to readers and to predict what type of knowledge readers would need to possess in order to benefit from a particular title. According to Krupskaya, the overarching goal of this instruction was to understand the political and economic world and what is going on in nature and in social life. While Krupskaya’s plan was never put in operation as laid out above, Khavkina and Derman both benefited from its conceptualization.

2. *Leningrad Institute of Culture*

By Lenin’s personal decree, the Institute of Extra-Scholastic Education in Petrograd was founded on November 28, 1918, under the Russian Ministry of Education.75 Organizationaly, it contained a Book and Library Department, and on December 20th of that year, it opened its doors at 35 Ulitsa Nadezhinskaya. Initially intending to recruit students primarily from working-class backgrounds, the early student body actually included many petit-bourgeois intelligentsia because laborers and peasants could not afford the necessary time to study.76 Nonetheless, according to the institute’s regulations, its threefold goals were (1) to train instructors and specialists in extracurricular (that is, after-school or leisure-time activities such as clubs, amateur art groups, and recreation parks) education; (2) to solve problems scientifically and answer questions related to extracurricular education; and (3) inform workers about extracurricular education and self-education.77 The “Book-Library” department, one of four divisions, was directed by V. A. Zelenko as its head.78

The institute’s earliest faculty members included: M. N. Kufayev (1888–1948), an instructor in book science and
bibliography; N. P. Likhachev (1862–1936), an academician of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; A. I. Malein (1869–1938), an incunabulist at the Academy of Sciences Library, who taught “Foreign Bibliography”; and P. K. Simoni (1859–1939), a graduate of St. Petersburg University, who taught “History of Publishing.”70 Incidentally, Simoni was considered one of the three most prolific researchers in the book sciences. Starting in 1919, A. G. Fomin, a leading developer of bibliographic methods, started to give lectures as a professor of bibliography; from 1920 to 1923, he served as prorector of the institute. One of his colleagues called him “a born instructor who loves and knows his subject, who is interested and makes it interesting for students.”80

By 1924, the Leningrad Institute had reorganized and changed its divisional name to the Library Department with Fomin as its new head. The institute underwent further name changes when on August 28, 1924, it became the N. K. Kruskaya Pedagogical Institute of Politico-Educational Work, and in 1925, the N. K. Kruskaya Communist Political Education Institute.81 Along with these changes, the student body increasingly recruited peasants and workers, so that in 1926–27, fully 70 percent of the students came from these backgrounds and 52 percent were Communists. One of their notable graduates from this early era was O. E. Vol’tsenburg, who later became head of the Hermitage Library.

Kruskaya specifically wrote to these institute students, telling them to eradicate illiteracy, work together as groups, and self-administer tests to improve themselves.82 Another striking parallel with developments in the United States was Kruskaya’s insistence upon the social sciences (rather than the humanities) as the methodological basis for training highly qualified librarians. She wanted students exposed to what Russians call the “humanitarian” or natural sciences as well, because she was sure that such course work would enlarge the students’ sphere of knowledge and help them when working with readers or when recommending books. In fact, Sokov’s analysis of the Leningrad Communist Political Enlightenment (Educational) Institute’s course offerings reveals that their students did indeed include more subjects connected with social-political training rather than specialty courses in librarianship.

3. Moscow

After the October Revolution of 1917, there were three types of library-related course offerings at Shanyavskiy University: (1) short-term courses lasting three to four weeks; (2) one-year courses for public librarians; and (3) one-year courses for scientific librarians.83 Specific topics included cataloging, introduction to bibliography, summary of literature on librarianship, and foreign bibliography as well as training for teaching users how to use the library.84 Prior to 1920, these course offerings, along with the museum and the library, became a section later called the Office of Librarianship (OB) within the Public Education Department at the university.

After the university’s closure in 1920, the OB reported to Glavnauka, a state establishment for scientific institutions. In 1922, the OB merged with the Rumyantsev Library, but due to lack of space, course work was temporarily suspended. Instructors did, however, offer one seminar in statistics to eighteen auditors in a small reading room. In 1923, they received enough space to offer seminars in three different subjects. Up until then, the courses had been free of charge, but starting in 1923–24, students had to pay a small fee for these noncredit seminars.

In November 1924, Glavnauka restructured the OB, naming it the
Institute of Librarianship (IB), which then began to offer two-year courses for scientific librarians only. Administratively, Khavkina headed the pedagogical committee that consisted of all instructors and student representatives as well as three subject committees (social science headed by V. I. Nevsky; bibliography and book science headed by A. D. Eykhengol’ts; and librarianship headed by G. I. Ivanov). They received two more classrooms, and enrolled 101 new students, who were clustered into three groups due to a lack of space to accommodate them as one class. Students studied social science and were introduced to basic grammar and library terminology in English and German, which would allow them to read foreign professional literature. Starting in 1926, they had thirteen full-time instructors, all of whom had to be graduates of the IB in order to teach. In the 1927–28 academic year, the IB became a scientific research and educational establishment at the V. I. Lenin Library (formerly known as Rumyantsev Library), which enrolled substantially more students who hoped to train as instructors (see table 4 for list of courses).

After the 1918 establishment of formal education in the library department at the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute, Derman thought it was unlikely she could create an independent establishment of higher education for librarians in Moscow. However, on July 12, 1930, the Committee of the People’s Commissars (Sovnarkom) decided to approve the establishment of an independent library institute at the V. I. Lenin Library where Derman became the founding director of the Moscow Library Institute (MBI). Opening on October 1, 1930, the MBI had two staff members to develop a formal educational program for librarians. Its organizational structure was more reminiscent of Derman’s American experience, combining middle and higher education, a scientific research institute, and a library museum. Enrollment in the Lenin Library Institute prior to the 1930s was limited to members of the Communist Party. In the early 1930s, however, the MBI faculty included B. S. Bodnarskiy, K. R. Simon (1887–1986), Yu. V. Grigor’ev, A. D. Eykhengol’ts, L. A. Levin, L. N. Tropovskiy, Z. N. Ambartsumyan, and O. S. Chubar’yans, some of whom were non-Communists.

**Criticisms of Higher Education**

In 1919, Krupskaya wrote about existing higher education for librarians, saying: “its work is not organized in the way it should be. What kind of instructor or librarian does our country need? He must not only know his specialties, but also be a propagandist. So, he must not only know the American system of librarianship, but also be able to analyze life that surrounds him. He has to be a politically conscious Marxist, a good revolutionary. Then, he will be of benefit to our country.” Apparently, her criticisms persisted long afterward, probably due to many instructors who were apathetic or wished to stay out of politics.

By 1931, the first published effort to criticize such course work appeared in the *Krasny Bibliotekar’* (Red Librarian). According to an anonymous author, of the 450 to 510 total hours of course work covered during nine months, there were too many courses on bibliography and the psychological aspects of readers or of people generally. Furthermore, many of the textbooks were inadequate because they were not arranged conveniently. In an effort to place the blame elsewhere, one researcher, (possibly, L. R.?) Kogan, was singled out for spending too much time researching peasant and bourgeois readers. Finally, the anonymous author acknowledged that a great amount of work had been put into organizing these
courses, but that the results were not worth such effort. Krupskaya herself echoed some of these same criticisms, saying that there were still too many subjects taught, but almost no really perfect textbooks, and no educational or visual supplies to support the kind of instruction she envisioned. Despite these criticisms, Krupskaya visited the Leningrad Institute in 1932, meeting with its students. On February 4, 1939, just three weeks before she died, she met with a group of former institute students in Moscow. A. F. Shishkin, who became a professor at the institute, reflected upon his experience as a student during 1922–1924, when he commented that “The Institute's study plan was multi-

Table 4
First-Year Courses at the Moscow Institute of Bibliography During the 1927/28 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Titles</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. State and Social Systems of the USSR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>V. A. Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Historical Materialism</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Z. G. Grinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Librarianship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Librarianship in Russia, USSR, and Abroad</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>L. B. Khavkina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Scientific Libraries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>V. A. Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied Librarianship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Stacks, Placing, and Preservation of Books</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yu. V. Grigor'ev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Classification</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>L. B. Khavkina and A. D. Treskina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cataloging (Alphabetical)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>G. I. Ivanov and L. V. Trofimov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Work in a Reading Room and Circulation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>V. A. Stein and Yu. V. Grigor'ev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Methods of Work with Readers (Exhibits)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L. B. Khavkina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Book Propaganda &amp; Politico-Educational Work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A. A. Pokrovskiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book Science and Bibliography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bibliographical Methods &amp; Russian Bibliography</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A. D. Eykhengol'ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. History of West European &amp; Russian Books</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N. F. Garelin and G. P. Georgiyevsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. History of Publishing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M. I. Shchelkunov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N. G. Grinevskaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. German</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>S. D. Konshina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excursions (5 trips, 3 hours each)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Hours</strong></td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: L.B. Khavkina, Uchebný Plan na 1927-1928 god (Program of Lectures for the 1927/28 Academic Year), 1928.
disciplinary. However, many of the disciplines were not essential for training future librarians or were taught so that they lost all their value.89 Other criticisms suggested that the lectures were over the heads of most students, that there was little interaction with instructors, and that some instructors had little practical knowledge of public libraries.

**Conclusions**

Together, Krupskaya, Khavkina, and Derman all seem to have had extraordinary vision and influence on the growth of Russian librarianship. Part of their vision came from traveling abroad, especially experiencing other systems. More particularly, Krupskaya envisioned equality between women and men and an innovative high-level study-work training program for librarians called a library seminary, which Derman and Khavkina, indeed, tried to realize in their own institutes. Throughout this early period (i.e., the late 1920s), literacy increased rapidly, especially among women, even if the “best” literature was not being read.

The parallels between Russian and American librarianship strike one in the way Russians developed their higher education for librarians and especially their awareness of other systems, particularly the American cataloging system. Although the first Russian faculties appear rather more bibliographically oriented than American programs, their common concerns about quality of instruction, textbooks, a social science methodological orientation, and what constitutes worthwhile research resonate with the American experience. Russians opened higher education to the working classes—something Americans are still struggling to do. Unlike the American system perhaps, the Russians viewed the public librarian, and especially the children’s librarian, as a pivotal part of the political process. Krupskaya certainly advanced the number of urban libraries, but to the detriment of rural ones.

Without a doubt, subject categories are the basic concepts, serving as the focal points for cognition of the world. The risk of creating ideological orientations as binary relationships, of course, means that fundamental unity may be missed. While one can talk about the relative merits of fiction versus nonfiction, the underlying discussion is about reading and its fundamental importance. Khavkina argued for open access to libraries, while Derman possessed a strong inclination to organize and advocate for subject cataloging. Her knowledge of “foreign” librarianship theories and practices, however, created trouble for her during the Stalinist regime. Her difficulty seemed to stem from Stalin’s distrust of those who were educated before the Revolution. One could further argue that the subject approach to cataloging in Soviet librarianship was delayed because no one else wanted to touch it, especially after it was labeled “formalistic and harmful.” Derman, however, stubbornly persisted. Together, Krupskaya’s, Khavkina’s, and Derman’s efforts in librarianship made the “Cultural Revolution” possible for the reader.
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