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“How to reach the busy men and women, how to carry wholesome and enjoyable books to the far-away corners of the city, how to enlist the interest of tired factory girls, how to put the working-man in touch with the art books relating to his craft and so increase the value of his labor and the dignity of his day’s work—these are some of the things which I conceive to be my duty to study, if I would help this public library to become what it is for.”¹—Gratia Alta Countryman

Think back to your high school United States History class. When studying the rise of Big Business in the late 19th century, you probably heard of famous wealthy men, such as Andrew Carnegie, John Rockefeller, and J.P Morgan, described as “robber barons” or “industrial statesmen.” The lessons focused on how these men exploited the working class by paying them low wages and poor working conditions. What your teachers most likely failed to mention was that these negative qualities did not present the entire picture of these men. For most of my school career, I had this same experience. It wasn’t until college, in an upper level history class, that I learned that many of these men used their power for good deeds; they each had their own philosophy of philanthropy.

Andrew Carnegie believed that America’s public libraries were the best place for his controlled gift-giving. He gave so much of his fortune to public libraries across the United States that he has been dubbed the “Patron Saint of Libraries.”² According to historians Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commanger, “the most effective impetus to the public library movement in the United States did not come from official sources or from public demand but from Andrew Carnegie’s generosity.”³ Another historian, Harold Underwood Faulkner, gave Carnegie even more credit, calling him “the greatest single incentive to library growth in the United States.”⁴ Carnegie eventually gave $60,364,808 to build 2,509 libraries across the English speaking world.⁵

As an extreme library enthusiast, I am fascinated with Carnegie’s beliefs in library philanthropy. As a Minnesotan, with an investment in the state’s libraries, I choose the Minneapolis Public Library for
my case study. From this, I developed my research question: to what degree did the policies of Minneapolis Public Library reflect Andrew Carnegie’s beliefs in philanthropy in the years 1904-1916 and why?

I chose the years 1904-1916 as a way to create parameters on my study. These years seem to be the years in which Minneapolis Public Library policies most reflected Andrew Carnegie’s philanthropy, in comparison to the years before. 1904 marks the year that Gratia Countryman became head librarian of Minneapolis Public Library, a clear change in the direction of the library. In 1916, the last of the Carnegie branches opened in Minneapolis. As such, 1916 marked the end of any direct Carnegie contact with Minneapolis Public Library.

Historians have been studying Carnegie exhaustively for years. These studies are comprehensive biographies, each addressing the economic, political, and social importance of this man, as well as Carnegie’s scientific philanthropy. There is a general consensus on why Carnegie believed in his philanthropic measures. Carnegie was part of a generation of businessmen that believed anyone with a strong work ethic and a desire to succeed could climb the socio-economic ladder. Rather than freely giving his money away for people to waste frivolously, he believed he must engage the public by providing them with a way to help themselves. In order to achieve this end, Carnegie attached stipulations to his donations.

Carnegie libraries themselves have their own historiography. Historian Abigail Van Slyck argued that “the Carnegie library is not a uniform symbol of American culture, but instead reflects each community’s diverse values and aspirations.” In other words, libraries across the U.S. fall on a spectrum on the degree to which they incorporated Carnegie’s policies. Where the historical research is currently lacking, is detailed analyses of individual public libraries and to what degree each library
actually accepted Carnegie’s beliefs. Within these case studies is where controversy exists. Minnesota libraries are noticeably absent from these reviews.

Secondary sources for Minneapolis Public Library as an institution are also abundant. The most noteworthy studies are biographies about Gratia Countryman, which also trace the significant trends and dates of the library. Most important for my study is a biography by Mena Dyste, who emphasizes Countryman’s importance as a nationally-influential librarian. This study relies largely on the Annual Reports of the library and the mass media’s portrayal of Countryman. Jane Pejsa found nothing to add to Dyste’s analysis of Countryman’s career. Rather, she studied Countryman’s personal papers, arguing that “in Gratia Countryman’s personal life lay secrets that could explain the incredible impact she had on a multitude of people…and on the community at large.” Together, these two works present a complete picture of Gratia Countryman and the Minneapolis Public Library in the early twentieth century.

The bulk of my primary research involved the The Gospel of Wealth and the Annual Reports of the Minneapolis Public Library. Carnegie wrote The Gospel of Wealth to explain his philanthropic beliefs and the importance of free public libraries. As a result, they were helpful in understanding his philosophy; what they failed to show was how Carnegie expected librarians to carry out these ideas, other than in attaining a Carnegie grant. My other primary sources, the Annual Reports of the Minneapolis Public Library contained careful details of Countryman’s beliefs and specific library policies. The Reports listed items such as budget details, hours of operation, and changes made in buildings or shelving space. What they did not tell me, was how the Library saw its work connecting with Carnegie’s philanthropy. In her Reports, Countryman laid out her policies as her own ideas about what was best for Minneapolis, and gave no credit to outside sources.

In my research, I intend to bridge the gap between Andrew Carnegie’s beliefs in philanthropy and the policies of Minneapolis Public Library. The Minneapolis Public Library’s policies reflect Andrew
Carnegie’s philosophy of philanthropy on three levels. First, the Minneapolis Public Library exemplified many of Carnegie’s greater ideals of free public libraries. Most importantly, this entails making books accessible to as wide a range of people as possible, at no cost. This is in large part thanks to the personal beliefs and work of Miss Gratia Alta Countryman, head librarian of the Minneapolis library system from 1904-1936. The second, and more fundamental, way in which Minneapolis Public reflected Carnegie’s beliefs was by following the protocol established by Carnegie for obtaining funds for Carnegie buildings. By following these requirements, Minneapolis Public Library system had four Carnegie branches by 1916. Third, as the Minneapolis Public Library carried Carnegie’s ideal of libraries into the new century, it enacted policies in addition to what Carnegie had entertained; thus, Carnegie’s library philanthropy had consequences beyond what Carnegie anticipated.

As the second richest man in all of history, Andrew Carnegie is the ultimate epitome of the dream of rags to riches, popular in American culture. As one of the captains of industry in the late 19th century, he was a real business tycoon. Carnegie played a key role in the formation of the U.S. steel industry. Born into a poor family in Dunfermline, Scotland in 1835, his family later immigrated to the United States in 1848. Carnegie built the Pittsburgh Steel Company, which later merged with the Federal Steel Company to create U.S. Steel. After he had amassed a great fortune, Carnegie sold his steel business and gave away his fortune to cultural and educational institutions across the United States.
The America in which Carnegie lived was a new era in history; something was happening that allowed a select few individual men to accumulate wealth that ran into nine figures. Carnegie believed that in order for a man to stand out, he must do more than merely accumulate a fortune; his philanthropy was a way to justify his life to himself. This motivation prodded him to ask the question, “What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few?” This search for the proper administration of wealth stemmed from his determination that he would not engage in handouts for the needy, but would have some long-lasting influence. As a result, he designed his method of “scientific philanthropy” or what others have referred to as his “philosophy of giving.”
Carnegie set out to explain his scientific philanthropy in his *Gospel of Wealth*. In his work, he sets out to explain three different kinds of philanthropy that one can engage in. These three modes are to leave surplus wealth to the families of the descendents, to bequeath it for public purposes, or for the possessors of wealth to administer it during their lives.”\(^{11}\) The first mode he rejects as misguided affection, saying, “The thoughtful man must shortly say, ‘I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar,’ and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires legacies.”\(^{12}\) He also rejects the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, because “The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted.”\(^{13}\) He also points to the state’s view on this form, saying “By taxing estates heavily at death, the state marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire’s unworthy life.”\(^{14}\)

After rejecting these two improper modes of giving, Carnegie moved on to propose his solution, the “proper administration of wealth.”\(^{15}\) This solution is for the rich man to distribute his wealth during his life, for this is the method that is “by far the most fruitful for the people.”\(^{16}\) He proclaims his ideal:

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of wealth: To set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and, after doing so, to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the many which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.\(^{17}\)

Carnegie’s ultimate aim was to avoid indiscriminate charity, which only serves to “encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy.”\(^{18}\) Instead, through his method of trusteeship, the surplus wealth
of the few can be made into “the property of the many” and will be “made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if distributed in small sums to the people themselves.”

The concept of stewardship that Carnegie formulated was not a new one, but he took the concept to new levels. None of his predecessors in philanthropy had ever analyzed it to the degree that he did. Also, he differed from previous philanthropists in that his beliefs “rested less on the religious principle of duty to God than on the ethical imperative of responsibility to society.” His stewardship concept was grounded in the Social Darwinism of his generation, the ideology that competition among individuals drives social evolution and the advancement of mankind.

From this Social Darwinism, he believed that his duty was to advance the race by placing “within the reach of the capable the opportunities which would enable them to develop their natural gifts.” Carnegie believed that in his philanthropy the main concern should be to help those who help themselves. For Carnegie, the library was the best way to exact cooperation from the public.

After considering his philosophy of giving, Carnegie moved on to a discussion of what the best gift to a community would be. His conclusion was that “a free library occupies the first place, provided that the community will accept it and maintain it as a public institution, as much of the city property as its public schools.” Libraries met his most important test of scientific philanthropy. A tablet on the central building of the St. Louis Public Library bears these words: “I choose free libraries as the best agencies for improving the masses of the people because they only help those who help themselves.”

He believed the Library to be a public necessity, built out of philanthropy, but maintained as public trust. An important piece of this belief was a desire to avoid making a community dependent upon charity, “pauperizing” it. To make a community dependent on his funds violates his maxim requiring the recipients of his aid to help themselves. Then, he said, “Everything has been done for the
community instead of its being only helped to help itself, and good results rarely ensue.” 28 Most importantly, the public quickly loses interest in their institution.

Carnegie understood the value of libraries as the primary institution for the cultivation of the mind and for upholding American democracy. He said, “No city could sustain progress without a great public library—and not just as a font of knowledge for scholars, but as a creation for and of the people, free and accessible to all.” 29 Especially because he himself was self-educated, he saw the public library as the best means for popular education, which ensures an enduring society, as well as gives people the opportunity to rise in their careers. 30

Carnegie may have had some more personal reasons for choosing public libraries as an avenue for philanthropy. Not only did free public libraries meet his requirements for wise use of wealth, but they also appealed to his emotions and memories. 31 At a young age, in Dunfermline, he had listened to the adult men read aloud and discuss books borrowed from Trademen’s Subscription Library, an institution that his father had helped create. 32 After moving to the U.S., Carnegie was unable to pay the subscription fee of two dollars a year to borrow books from one of the country’s first public libraries. There, Carnegie learned, “public does not always mean free.” 33 Even further into his teenage years, after a year working as a messenger for the local telegraph company, some of his peers introduced him to Colonel James Anderson of Allegheny. Every Saturday, Colonel Anderson opened his personal library to any young worker who wanted to borrow a book. Years later he credited Colonel Anderson as being his inspiration in establishing free libraries for the working class. 34 However, as Theodore Jones claims, “while these facts explain a personal interest in libraries, they do not necessarily provide a motivation for constructing a nationwide series of public libraries.” 35 Carnegie’s beliefs in the value of philanthropy for free public libraries may also have been influenced by other library philanthropists, Ezra Cornell and Enoch Pratt, who we know he studied intensely. 36 Still, most importantly, it was his Gospel of Wealth
that provided that motivation and led him to draw the conclusion that the public library “outranks any other one thing that a community can do to help its people.”  

Minneapolis is one such community that agreed with Carnegie as to the importance of a public library for its citizens. The history of the Minneapolis Public Library begins in 1859. That year, a private citizen created a trust for the Minneapolis Athenaeum, a local subscription library. Herbert Putnam became head librarian. For some time, it served the needs of the citizens. However, as the Athenaeum was owned, and, in general, operated for the benefit of certain fortunate groups in the city, for some, it wasn’t enough. The growing prosperity of the nation and the rise of labor unions brought shorter working hours, more leisure, and the financial ability and personal desire among all classes to support libraries. Individuals, such as T.B. Walker who pursued the goal more than anyone else, pushed for a public library. In 1879, the Minnesota legislature passed a law allowing cities to create libraries and to levy a property tax to support them. Five years later, the city council created an elected library board and permitted issuing of bonds to build the library.

After a long wait and much anticipation, Minneapolis was finally able to achieve its goal of a free public library. The Minneapolis Public Library opened on Monday afternoon, December 16, 1889. As Pejsa claims, the Minneapolis Public Library became the pride of the city’s residents, “perhaps the single most unifying institution within an increasingly diverse population.” From the beginning, strong ties existed between the Athenaeum and the public library, so it was quite natural that Dr. Herbert Putnam became the first head librarian. He later was succeeded by Dr. James K. Hosmer. Both men both played a large role in getting the library on its feet in the early years. However, they remained concerned with building the library at its center, reflecting one of two opposing views as to the role of a public library. The question was, should it be a place for scholarly research or should it be a source of education and indeed recreation for the broader public? Putnam and Hosmer leaned towards the
scholar, but T.B. Walker, chairman of the library board, pushed for broadening the library’s role to serve the people. No doubt it was this belief that led Countryman to align herself with Walker. 46 This is especially true, because it wasn’t until Gratia Countryman became head librarian of Minneapolis Public library that it began to reflect the trends of the modern library development. Under her leadership, the Minneapolis library took on all the new features of library service.

I do not intend for this to be merely a study of Gratia Countryman. My desire is to analyze the policies of Minneapolis Public Library as an institution. However, it would be naïve to ignore the fact that Gratia Countryman played the largest role in shaping the institution. Her importance is demonstrated in the statement by a friend and co-worker, “The Minneapolis Public Library was built by Miss Countryman.” 47 Through Gratia Countryman, the Minneapolis Public library would develop with, and go beyond, the modern library movement that Carnegie became a part of. 48

Gratia Alta Countryman was born on Thanksgiving Day, 1866, to immigrant farmers Levi and Alta Countryman. It was a promising time to be a girl child born in the United States. Across the country, a new mindset was emerging about the expectations of females. A woman in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was “to be the guardian and defender when it came to child labor, education, industrial conditions, prostitution, social welfare among the poor, and above all, temperance in alcohol, which was viewed as both cause and effect of all other evils.” 49 Much as Andrew Carnegie came to a country of expanding industrial opportunities, a cultural and economic boom opened up multiple opportunities for women to test these expectations. 50
These new expectations for females promised to provide challenges and opportunities for nurturing women. At the same time, the new idea of a special women’s public sphere was coming into being. Entering the world of work during the Progressive Era when reformers confronted the problems of unbridled industrialization, rapid urbanization, and immigration, these [women] were part of a generation pulled in one direction by nostalgia for simpler values and in the opposite direction an enthusiasm for science, technology and efficiency. As one historian observes, "Progressives exuded confidence that human beings could ameliorate the deficiencies of the national life while remaining within a traditional American framework." As social critics, these women shared a faith in progress and
looked to moderate reform as the answer to the country’s problems. Their drive combined romantic ideas of reform, democratic principles, genteel liberalism, and the missionary impulse with their own frustrated desires for greater status and standing.  

Librarianship quickly became one of these emerging feminized service professions of the late nineteenth century, regarded as one aspect of the general movement for social reform and moral uplift. Within the framework of a progressive society, the modern public library was expected to provide resources for an informed citizenry complementing the work of the schools, serving business people and laborers, offering a means for "wholesome" recreation to rich and poor, and spreading cultural enrichment to the whole community. These ideas played a large role in shaping the life of Gratia Countryman.

Across the land, a “New Woman” was being born. The “New Woman” was a protest against the notion of protecting women by maintaining their indoor domesticity. Instead, she pursued intellectual goals, played outdoors, exercised, learned sports; and was physically robust. For Countryman, her quest towards the “New Woman” began at the start of her college career. Reflecting the new ideas of womanhood, as well as her father’s obsession that his daughters received the education he had so passionately sought but failed to receive, in 1884 she began taking classes at the University of Minnesota, although somewhat irregularly. She was also substitute teaching, at Fort Snelling, often for weeks at a time. Countryman’s experiences as a substitute reflect conventional expectations that women occupy a nurturing role. In the fall, she enrolled as a full-time student as a sophomore, due to the courses already taken. In 1885, again Countryman’s university plans were altered. Along with a dear friend Etta, Countryman decided to teach summer school. She took the Dakota County licensure exams, received a rural assignment at Pine Bend, and began April 1. She returned in the spring of 1887, where she would finally devote full attention to her studies. By the middle of Gratia’s senior year,
her accomplishments had become common knowledge, evidenced by her election to the Phi Beta Kappa honorary fraternity.\textsuperscript{57} She graduated in May 1889.

Gratia Countryman soon found herself immersed in the new feminized library profession. After graduating from the University of Minnesota with a Bachelor of Science degree in Education, Gratia Countryman began what was to be a 47 year career with the Minneapolis Public Library. In 1890, she became head of the Catalog Department, developing a catalog system that could serve the library collection. This great responsibility conferred on Miss Countryman, just a year after graduation, only serves to show the great potential Countryman had for placing her stamp on Minneapolis Public Library.

For years, Countryman continued to influence library development in her subordinate roles. Late in 1891, Herbert Putnam announced his resignation as librarian which would take effect on January 1, 1892. Countryman’s comfortable working relationship with Putnam, one that allowed her free reign to develop the catalog system as she saw fit, was coming to a close.\textsuperscript{58} James Kendall Hosmer became the second librarian of the Minneapolis Public Library. More so than Putnam, Hosmer was a scholar. During his time at Minneapolis Public, he was so busy with his research and writing, he gave little attention to running the institution. Instead, in December 1892, he recognized Countryman’s talent, created the position of assistant librarian, and appointed her to fill it.

Countryman’s opportunity for even more authority in the library came soon enough. In 1903, Dr. Hosmer submitted his resignation as librarian of the Minneapolis Public Library, in order to devote full attention to his research.\textsuperscript{59} His legacy for the library was a period marked by stagnation rather than growth of the Library. In fact, circulation numbers actually dropped during his time as head librarian, despite huge population growth in Minneapolis.\textsuperscript{60} In his retirement, again however, he made a good decision in recognizing Countryman’s continuing potential, and recommended to the Library Board that she replace him as the head librarian of Minneapolis Public Library.
The Board recognized Countryman’s talent and selected her to fill the executive position of head librarian, the first woman to do so. On November 7, 1903, Gratia Countryman was selected as the new head librarian of the Minneapolis Public Library. As historian Mena Dysste wrote, “Well endowed...thoroughly equipped...specially trained...this was the young woman who took upon her shoulders the guidance and control of one of the country's finest libraries.” 61 As a result, the year 1904 marked a new era for the Minneapolis Public Library, the beginning of phenomenal growth. 62 After a year-long probationary period, she was elected permanent librarian by the Library Board in January, 1905. It was “the first time that such a responsible position in public library work has been conferred upon a woman,” and the point in which Countryman was able to begin the pursuit of her philosophy of what a Public Library should be. 63

Gratia Countryman’s philosophy for libraries was largely a philosophy of outreach, and of making the public library useful to more people. She saw her library as a great institution for public education, so necessary at the juncture in U.S. history which the public was facing:

The modern library is a great, live, working school for the education of all the people; it is the one free, democratic public institution which carries to every man and woman an educational opportunity so greatly needed at this new epoch of the world’s history. But the modern library is not only a great democratic school, it is a propagandist for education; it believes in the widest dissemination of knowledge, it pushes itself into notice, it offers its services continually, it advertises its vast store of material, it constitutes itself a large bureau of information, it welcomes every new avenue of approach to its community. 64

Part of this philosophy required an extensive rather than intensive method of acquiring books, which gave more people a chance to benefit from the library, rather than that only scholars have a perfect service. 65 Countryman emphasized that the “nature” of the library had not changed in the new age, but had only “broadened its scope;” the library was still for the serious scholar, but in addition was adjusting
to the needs of the community, which demanded easily accessible and free public educational facilities.\textsuperscript{66}

Not only did Gratia Countryman see the library as a program for self-education, but, like Carnegie, she saw it as the best institution to give people, who did not previously have the opportunity, the opportunity of education.\textsuperscript{67} She said, that the library is ‘the school for adults, the school in citizenship for the foreigner, the school in crafts for the artisan, the school in business for the tradesmen and merchant, the general school for the education of those who have missed the regular school opportunities.’\textsuperscript{68} This became one of her favorite mantras throughout her career, and she was trained in education so this follows.

In addition to the emphasis on libraries as an educational institution, Countryman also saw it as her duty to provide social services to the people of Minneapolis. Because, like the founder of Hull House, she saw her work as a social mission, she has been referred to as the “Jane Addams of libraries.”\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{69} In an article on librarianship as a career, she stated “library work combines the attractions of educational work with those of social service. It uses books, not simply as educational tools, but as a medium for bringing about better social and moral conditions.”\textsuperscript{70} This concept she would develop in her policies in much more detail than Carnegie himself did, although he would have approved. She saw her library not only as an institution for the dissemination of ideas, but as “the center of all the activities of a city that lead to social growth, municipal reform, civic pride and good citizenship.”\textsuperscript{71} Countryman provided a strong example for other modern libraries that were looking to develop their libraries as “an agency offering surcease from care, brightening the lives of the wretched; the library combating moral evils; the library offering good leisure time activity for the idle victims of hard times.”\textsuperscript{72} In this instance, it should be noted that while these ideas of library as social worker may reflect Carnegie’s belief in stewardship, we should be careful not to give him too much credit.
Carnegie and Countryman both emphasized that libraries should not discriminate who could receive the benefits of the institution. Carnegie’s self-stated goals were to “cultivate the habit of reading in all classes of society” and to “place books in the hands of every man, woman, and child.” Gratia Countryman goals sound very similar, saying she desired, “to bring the helpful influences of good reading within children, to the foreigner, to the working man, to the scholar, to the man out of employment, to the idle pleasure seeker or to whosoever would reap profit or pleasure from books.” On another occasion, she restated this desire to develop the library “for the instruction and pleasure of all people, young and old, without age limit, rich and poor, without class limit, educated and uneducated, without culture limit.”

Carnegie was limited to providing lasting gifts to the communities in the form of Central and Branch buildings. For Countryman, however, that was not enough; the guiding principle for her libraries was that library service be extended to more and more people. As a result, she took it upon herself to find innovative methods of spreading books to as many people as possible, including “through Branches and Stations, through school room libraries, through story hours for children, through illustrated free lectures, through response to the various activities in the city, through special book purchases for this trade or that.” She set up a successful extension service by placing Stations in factories, engine houses, hotels, hospitals, and jails, in addition to the traditional branches. Stemming both from her personality and her profession, she believed it was not enough just to provide the building and the books, although she was grateful for Carnegie’s doing so. She believed the library had a great duty to play an active role in the community, by reaching out to the people.

Both Gratia Countryman and Andrew Carnegie were clearly aware of the need for libraries to adapt to their individual communities. As Carnegie said, “The library that is free gives access, not to books—merely books in general—but to those particular books that most effectively meet the everyday
needs of each individual” in the categories of education, occupation, and recreation. Countryman showed this same careful attention, “anxious that the library provide services which were suitable to divergent needs, to differing ways of life, to all levels of society.” Much like Carnegie, she was intent on opening opportunities that had previously been restricted to the rich, to even the poorest citizen.

Gratia Countryman also believed that the library should be supported by the public. Where Carnegie saw the obligation falling on the public to gain their individual interest, however, she saw it as an obligation of the library. Countryman believed it was the library’s duty to seek out and maintain that public support, in order to keep the library funded. She believed as long as the library remained a vital part of civic life, helping to determine the best ways to develop Minneapolis society, that support would stay stable.

Gratia Countryman’s rhetoric largely reflects the philosophies of Andrew Carnegie. On one previous occasion, they have even been compared. According to a colleague, Countryman was said to be a similar personality of Carnegie, “because of ‘her forcefulness…her hearty outlook…her genial friendliness…her familiarity with people in all walks of life…her readiness to throw herself into one viewpoint and then another with wholehearted sympathy.” They both spent lavishly for the good of the public; Carnegie spent his wealth, while Countryman spent her “tireless physical and mental effort” in library work. As you can see, the rhetoric and ideas of Gratia Countryman and Andrew Carnegie connect on many key issues. While Carnegie only provided the funds and the corresponding stipulations, however, Countryman had the opportunity to enact these ideals on a real practical level. Many of the policies of the Minneapolis Public Library, enacted by Countryman, directly reflect Andrew Carnegie’s philanthropy. Others still take Carnegie’s ideas a step beyond what Carnegie could ever have imagined or anticipated. And others still, may be in direct contradiction to Carnegie’s will.
While Andrew Carnegie and Gratia Countryman both had a great impact on the library world of the early 20th century, their philosophies differ in several key areas. Both Carnegie and Countryman saw the library as providing the means for members of a community to rise, but Carnegie was more judgmental than Countryman. Despite other statements which affirm his desire to spread books as far across a community as possible, as Carnegie library historian Bobinski said, “He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy...for in almsgiving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.”

Vices such as poverty or crime were not to be fought once someone had fallen into them; Carnegie emphasized prevention rather than reform. He believed that reform was the function of government. By contrast, Countryman expected books to keep people out of trouble, serving as “protection,” but also hoped to ease the lot of those already in trouble, the homeless, aged, orphaned, lonely, and poor, by providing a good influence. Countryman stressed that “the books belong to the people” and the librarian must learn “to be of the people, not apart or above them.” As librarian, Countryman saw herself serving as an intermediary for the people; as a business executive, Carnegie saw himself as responsible for being their trustee. He believed the people were not capable of making good decisions for themselves; he certainly was above the people.

Beyond her rhetoric and philosophy, Gratia Countryman worked hard to bring her beliefs of reaching out to the people into the Minneapolis Public Library by enacting policies parallel to her ideas. One of Countryman’s beliefs was that the public needed to become more aware of the libraries. She believed that people, who do not use the library, don’t use it because they don’t know the benefits the library can offer them. In addition, she believed that fifteen percent of the people, who do use the library, do not know one-tenth of the available resources. Out of this belief sprung her plan for an extensive advertising campaign. The first part of this plan was to host an open house for the public. Minneapolis Public Library had not hosted one since the library’s grand opening in 1889. She hoped the
open house would illustrate the library services to old and new patrons, making them familiar with the library and providing a personal claim to it. Other measures of advertising campaign included newspaper publicity, “placards placed in elevators, stores, and wholesale establishments, advertising the nearest branch and its special features; notices to be given to working men with their paychecks, and to be sent with water bills, advertising all departments; special notices sent out through labor organizations and other civic groups, advertising special departments; postcards about music materials sent to music teachers and organizations.”

Whereas Carnegie assumed that if he provided the funds for buildings and required the city to pay for maintenance through taxes the community would be invested enough to use the library services, Countryman realized the need to reach out to the public to maintain such support. By 1907, Countryman considered it time to engage the property owners on whose taxes her budget depended; she contrived a new method of advertising, directed towards this special group of patrons. To gain their support, she sent out sixty invitations to the wives of the Minneapolis power structure, inviting them to her library office. The plans were to discuss a Women’s Departmental Club, which would include Home and Education; Philanthropy and Civics; and Art and Literature. Countryman saw the women’s club as a way to raise community awareness among its members and to give them an opportunity to give back something to the community. Countryman also believed that such an organization would give the women opportunity for socialization and a broader cultural education, and hoped to engage and inspire the “New Women” of Minneapolis. After the first meeting, the Women’s Club of Minneapolis had officially been created.

Finally, by 1908, Countryman had arranged for a series of free lectures, which provided great advertising for the library as well as “an incentive to study” which “consequently created interest in
These measures reflected Gratia Countryman and Andrew Carnegie’s desire to extend library service to more and more people.

Yet another example of Minneapolis Public Library moving towards the modern library ideal is in the policy of open shelves. On September 24, 1904, less than a year after Countryman became head of the Minneapolis Public Library, the open shelf room opened. Prior to the opening of open shelves, patrons attained their books by consulting a catalog, and then waiting for a page to bring them their selection. Now, they could browse the stacks themselves, choosing their books “by sight and handling.”

Carnegie certainly would have approved of Minneapolis Public Library’s open shelf policy; it reflected his desire for easy access to books for the public. More than that, Carnegie libraries across the nation were leading the trend towards open shelf privileges. A survey was conducted in 1902, which showed that “Carnegie-financed buildings tended to put greater emphasis on rooms devoted to public service” than their non-Carnegie counterparts, “with only forty-four percent using closed stacks, while forty percent allowed open access. In comparison, a true majority (68 percent) of non-Carnegie libraries maintained closed stacks.” Carnegie libraries were 25 percent more likely to allow open access privileges. At a time when many American libraries were still doubtful of open shelves, Minneapolis joined the new trend, thanks to Gratia Countryman.

Carnegie and Countryman both advocated pleasure reading as well, an idea that was gaining popularity at this juncture in history. Carnegie believed that novels inspire generosity, self-abnegation, purity, and devotion to duty and to country. Carnegie also added, “When exhausted in mind and body, and especially in mind, nothing is so beneficial as to read a good novel. It is no disparagement of free libraries that most of the works read are works of fiction. On the contrary, it is doubtful if any other form of literature would so well serve the important end of lifting hard-working men out of their prosaic
and routine duties of life.” Countryman wholeheartedly agreed. As librarian, she began to emphasize fiction, directing more library resources towards purchasing fiction.

Under Countryman’s watchful eye, Minneapolis Public Library placed a great emphasis on reaching out to the children of the city. This was achieved through two large policy changes. The first policy change was in card registration. When the library first opened, no one under the age of fourteen could check out any library materials. Their parents were allowed to check out materials for them “at their discretion.” Later, children were allowed to have their own library cards if parents came to the library to fill out an application. However, for Countryman, this still wasn’t enough; she “wanted to encourage more use of the library by making it easier for children to get cards.” Countryman recognized that some parents were unable to make it to the library during the open hours, due to work or other obligations. As head librarian, she changed the rules so that teachers could send applications home from school with the children, encouraging juvenile registration.

The second policy which advanced Carnegie’s belief of encouraging children’s reading was the opening of the children’s room. She advocated reading as being “of vital importance in the mental, emotional, and spiritual development of children” and saw it as her goal to “increase and improve the quality of children’s reading in the city.” Immediately upon becoming head librarian in 1904, Countryman began to plan a large children’s reading room. To convince the Library Board, Countryman said, “The child reader of today becomes the adult reader of tomorrow. Unless he is encouraged to read and carefully guided in his reading, the community will suffer in the future. A body of intelligent, well-read citizens is a body of good citizens.” Two years later, the Children’s room opened. Again, the Minneapolis Public Library was ahead of the game in library development; the Minneapolis Public Library is credited with having the first children’s room with open shelf privileges, a special attendant in charge, and from which books could be borrowed for home use.
As an immigrant himself, Carnegie had a special place in his heart for foreigners. According to historian Vartan Gregorian, Carnegie “brought to the doorstep of a largely immigrant population not only the means for self-education and enlightenment, but opportunity for understanding our democracy, for the study of English, for instruction in new skills, for the enjoyment of community, for the exercise of the imagination, and for the pleasure of contemplation and silence” through his library philanthropy. 101 Countryman too, saw immigrants as a unique group needing the special assistance of the Minneapolis Public Library. According to her Librarian’s Report for the year 1912, Minneapolis had a foreign-born population of 86,000, plus 90,000 born here of foreign-born parents. These combined to a 58% of the total population of 301,000. Many of them did not speak or read English. 102 In order to ease their transition, Countryman began a policy of developing foreign book collections around the city, attempting to give them the opportunity to read in their native tongue. Countryman paid careful attention to develop the collections according to the distribution of nationalities among the branches. To do this, she kept an ethnic map of the city in her office, showing the neighborhoods where different nationalities lived. Her librarian’s report for 1912 proved the policy to be working; it showed the circulation of these tend to be higher than that of general nonfiction. 103 By the end of 1914, there were books available in twenty different languages. This is just one of the examples of Countryman creating policies that no one else had dreamed of before; Minneapolis was the first city in the U.S. to establish special library collections for foreigners. 104

Finally, and most importantly, was the development of the extension service. As Minneapolis Public Library grew, it was Gratia Countryman who was responsible for its weight in library policy. She saw branches as “the most important part of the Public Library...because through them the library serves the people best.” 105 When Countryman became head librarian in 1904, there were only three branches and ten stations. Under her guidance that year, however, a collection of public library books was set up in two different factory locations—one at the Twin Cities Telephone Company and the other
on the Cream of Wheat premises.\textsuperscript{106} In 1906 Countryman placed collections of public library books in each of the city’s fire stations.\textsuperscript{107} By 1911, the factory/business library outlets would grow to twenty.\textsuperscript{108} When she retired in 1936, there were twenty-one branches, including four Carnegie buildings, fifty-three business house and factory stations, and fifteen hospital libraries.\textsuperscript{109} These branch libraries and distributing stations came to be an important part of the social services that Countryman and Carnegie advocated.

This extension service was a success. The social work through the branches became a welcomed community activity, credited with doing good. For example, it was believed that the branch in the lodging district, which had writing and game tables, served as a preventative measure.\textsuperscript{110} As Countryman herself said:

\begin{quote}
The service to these homeless men is the comfortable, decent, well-lighted room in which they can pass their leisure time pleasantly and perhaps profitably. The service to the city is large; these men would, in many cases, be considered vagrants and sent to the workhouse; many of them would be drinking and doing themselves and perhaps others damage if they were not spending the evening in a warm and comfortable reading room.\textsuperscript{111}
\end{quote}

This was especially true after the law passed which closed the saloons on Sunday. According to Countryman, after the law passed, “there was a marked increase in the Sunday attendance...showing an attendance varying from 1,000 to 1,500 people per Sunday in the various reading-rooms.”\textsuperscript{112} Finally, an article in the \textit{Minneapolis Sunday Tribune} on October 1, 1911, also credits the library with helping the juvenile courts; it claimed that fewer girls were “going wrong” since the establishment of a number of branches and factory stations.\textsuperscript{113} The success of these branch services is due to Countryman’s careful attention to the “character of the neighborhood and the specific needs of each area.”\textsuperscript{114} Through it, Minneapolis Public Library served Carnegie’s philosophy of improving the community.
Both Carnegie and Countryman were efficient and effective administrators, something of benevolent dictators.\textsuperscript{115} Rodney Lehr said of Countryman, she “was a great organizer. She had the knack of finding the best people for all the jobs. She was pretty much a dictator...When she asked that something be done, it was always for the library, not for her.”\textsuperscript{116} Similar ideas have been held about Carnegie. This micromanagement is evident in his library philanthropy; when requesting funds, Carnegie specified certain requirements that communities had to meet to attain a public library. The Minneapolis Public Library, thanks to Gratia Countryman and the Library Board, would meet Carnegie’s requirements and attain the funds for four Carnegie branch buildings.

Andrew Carnegie gave gifts of libraries from 1886 to 1919.\textsuperscript{117} Apart from a few exceptions for communities that Carnegie had personal connections to, he held true to his motto that, “all that our cities require, to begin with, is a proper fire-proof building.”\textsuperscript{118} Out of his fear that endowments made a community dependent on the gifts and that they would not take an interest in the library, he provided the funds for buildings, but would not give endowments to maintain the library. It was in this environment that Minneapolis Public Library sought and received Carnegie branch libraries.

If ever there was a time of opportunity for the Minneapolis Public Library, it was the years 1911-1912. In these years, membership on the Minneapolis Public Library Board was considered the “most prestigious public service responsibility in the community,” so much so that members served extended terms.\textsuperscript{119} T.B. Walker provides a good example; he had served as board member and board president since 1885. In this atmosphere, Countryman was prepared to take full advantage of the Carnegie opportunity. With a very supportive library board, she applied for funds to build new branches in Minneapolis.\textsuperscript{120}

Carnegie and James Bertram, Carnegie’s secretary, were willing to consider any request for a grant, as long as it met their procedural demands. The first step for receiving a Carnegie grant was to
write a letter of request to Bertram, who was in charge of the day-to-day operations of the Carnegie library program from 1898 to 1919. 121 On August 8, 1911, Gratia Countryman wrote a letter of request to the Carnegie Corporation for the donation of funds. She requested $170,000 for six new branch library buildings. Letters of Request usually contained positive accounts of the community, such as descriptions of the citizens and population figures. In addition, the poor financial condition of the city was mentioned, which made the community unable to fund any new library buildings on their own. 122 As Carnegie found it desirable to deal directly with the city rather than with a library board, Bertram’s reply was that the mayor or council should write the application, stating what the community would be willing to do to provide a site and levy a tax for the maintenance of the library. In the case of Minneapolis Public Library, it was Countryman who was pushing for Carnegie branches. As a result, she carried on most of the correspondence, with the city council or mayor signing off on it.

On April 3, 1912, James Bertram responded to Countryman. Minneapolis would get $125,000 for four library buildings “providing the city agrees to maintain the buildings at an aggregate cost of not less than $12,500 a year and provide a suitable site for each building.” 123 This pledge of annual appropriation for books and maintenance that would amount to 10% of the Carnegie gift was Carnegie policy, based on the population of the community, usually $2 per capita. 124 Usually, the annual maintenance frequently came to a vote, since it usually meant an increase in taxes. 125 For the Minneapolis Public Library, Gratia Countryman and the Board were authorized to make the commitment of funds, as long as it fit within the general library budget. The Board voted to accept the offer and appointed Countryman to draw up resolutions accepting the gift. Immediately, the Board began to search for and select sites. 126 Carnegie offered little interference in site selection except to suggest that it should be satisfactory to the community, owned by it, and large enough to allow for expansion of the building if necessary. 127
Carnegie believed a library maintained with public funds could not afford to be elaborate; in order to ensure efficiency, Bertram sent with each monetary grant, a pamphlet titled, “Notes on the Erection of Library Buildings with Type Plans.” By 1908, Carnegie required that building plans be submitted for approval before construction began. The ideal Carnegie library was a one-story rectangular building with a small vestibule leading directly to a single large room, which could be divided by bookcases in order to store the library’s books. In this room were also the reading areas for adults and children. The plans also provided for a lecture hall in the basement. This architectural style, popularly known as Carnegie classic, quickly became easily identifiable for the public. As architectural historian Abigail Van Slyck said, “From the outside, the emphasis on symmetry helped identify the building as a public one; readers could enter freely, safe in the knowledge that they were welcome.”

Even in his architectural style, Carnegie was concerned with making the library a place accessible to all members of society.

Minneapolis Public Library was careful to respond to these Carnegie architectural demands. The Franklin Branch was completed in 1914, costing $41,000. Located on land given by Sumner T. Knight, a local landowner, it was stocked with materials in Norwegian and Swedish, in a neighborhood of Scandinavian immigrants. In 1915, both the Central Avenue and Sumner Branches were completed, each designed with its neighborhood in mind. The Central Avenue branch moved to the new Carnegie building after costing $25,000. The Sumner branch cost $25,000. The Thirty-Sixth Street Branch was completed in 1916, costing $35,000. Gratia Countryman was the catalyst that moved this process along at an incredible pace.

One unique piece about the Sumner branch is its shape. Various plans for the branch were presented to the Board by architects Chapman and Magney. Because of the shape of the site, the board voted to send to the Carnegie Corporation the plans for an L-shaped building, instead of their preferred
rectangle, for approval. In response, the Building Committee reported that the Carnegie Corporation approved the L-shaped building provided that the City Clerk would sign an agreement that the building should not cost over the appropriation to $25000.00.

Carnegie’s ideas about libraries may have had some unintended consequences in the arena of Minneapolis Public Library. First and foremost, Carnegie was a man’s man. His Gospel of Wealth was written to advance the cause of men, so that they could be the successful leaders of society. What he did not anticipate was the rise of the New Woman, especially in the form of Miss Gratia Countryman. Countryman achieved great success in establishing a position of leadership in the male-dominated world of her time, a feat she was able to accomplish through her courage, professionalism, intelligence, and passion. Throughout her career she fought for women’s social, economic, and political equality. As a result of her success, she opened many doors for women in a variety of fields. In addition, the increasing prevalence of women in libraries profoundly affected the types of services public libraries across the country would provide.

There had been a long era in Countryman’s life, an era in which she turned to men as her models and mentor—her father, Herbert Putnam, and T.B. Walker. In fact, there had been times in her life when Countryman deferred completely to her father’s judgment. In looking over the first quarter century of Gratia’s life, a common cliché comes to mind: “Behind every great man there is a woman.” Carnegie would have preferred to keep it that way. Instead, Carnegie did not anticipate women such as Countryman to have strong ambition. She wrote, “I do so long to be more than an ordinary woman. I do so want to fill some high position in life.” By providing funds for so many new library buildings across the country, ironically Carnegie opened new job opportunities for females.

Countryman foreshadowed her ambition in her commencement at Hastings High School in 1882. Titled “The Vocation in Which a Woman may Engage,” she told the audience she was not concerned
with the particular sphere defined for women, as different from men, but rather, that the important thing was for a woman to pay attention to her duties and possibilities. In other words, women’s capabilities should not be limited because of their sex; they should have their choice of careers depending only upon their abilities and interests. Above all, Progressive women such as Countryman believed they had a social obligation. The Minneapolis Public Library served Countryman’s duties and possibilities greatly throughout her career.

Both Gratia Alta Countryman and Andrew Carnegie played an influential role in the development of free public libraries in the United States, each in their own way. In doing so, they exemplified the American dream. According to Wall:

Optimism is part of the American credo, and Carnegie was that credo’s unrelenting, untiring booster. He told Americans what they wanted to hear. They were a great people, their opportunities were unlimited, and perfection, if not just around the corner, was most certainly just up the hill they were all climbing.

Countryman also had this optimism and faith in the American public. In all of the communities to which Carnegie funds were given, Carnegie libraries “played a formative role in education, as well as civil politics, finance, and artistic and social developments.” The Minneapolis Public Library, from 1904-1916 was certainly no exception. Carnegie’s contribution to the transformation of policies within the libraries, though, was indirect. Most of these changes were the product of developments within the library profession itself. Countryman is a perfect example of this. As a major Minneapolis newspaper wrote:

Minneapolis loves and honors Gratia Countryman most because she traveled and tramped its street in the early days to study the reading needs of each of its little outlying districts; because she has had thought for the bed bound, the poverty bound, the trouble-bound, and has offered them her greatest solace, books; because she has believed and still believes that taking books to people who need them is her job; because she does that job was the sympathetic understanding which makes a book a benediction.
While her ideas and policies may reflect the beliefs of Carnegie’s however, they are not accredited to Carnegie, but rather come from her personal experiences, her personality, and her ideas about what a modern library should be. While Countryman and Carnegie’s philosophies certainly are similar, Carnegie did not play a formative role in the larger policies of the Minneapolis Public Library. The only thing he is directly responsible for from 1904 to 1906 is Countryman’s following procedural demands for receiving Carnegie funds. The rest is all her.

“We believe in books.
We believe in a free opportunity to read them.
We believe in a library which supplies the opportunity.
We believe in people who support the library.
We believe in bringing the people and the library together.
We believe in good services when the people come.
We believe in advertising our service.”

--- Gratia Alta Countryman
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Few major figures in American history provoked such a polarization of public opinion. One supporter described him as the possessor of "an enlightened mind and superior wisdom; the adorer of our God; the patriot of his country; and the friend and benefactor of the whole human race." Martha Washington, however, considered Jefferson "one of the most detestable of mankind"—and she was not alone.