NPS Form 10-900-b
(Jan. 1987)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

RECEIVED
OCT 30 1990
NATIONAL REGISTER

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

CALIFORNIA CARNEGIE LIBRARIES

B. Associated Historic Contexts

Carnegie Library Development in California and the Architecture It Produced, 1899-1921

C. Geographical Data

Boundaries, the State of California

☐ See continuation sheet

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

X Kathryn Gualtieri — 10-22-90
Signature of certifying official — Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

for Antoinette J Lee — 12/10/90
Signature of the Keeper of the National Register — Date

E. Statement of Historic Context: Carnegie Library Development in California and the Architecture it Produced, 1899-1921

In the same year that gold was discovered in California, the nation's first legislation permitting tax support for a free public library was passed in Massachusetts; in 1850 in England the Public Libraries Act allowed cities with over 10,000 population to levy a tax in support of libraries. The evolving concept of free public libraries was not merely transplanted to the new settlements in the West, however. Rather, two centuries of New England library development were replicated in California over a period of about twenty-five years, beginning with the establishment of social libraries and reading rooms in many of the new communities of the state. In 1878 California passed enabling legislation for tax supported free public libraries. Typically, however, even the new municipal libraries were housed in temporary and inadequate storefronts, upstairs lodge rooms, and city hall basements. When, in the closing years of the nineteenth century, Andrew Carnegie initiated his most widely known philanthropy, providing funds to cities and towns for the construction of library buildings, California communities were ready to join older communities across the nation in the quest for buildings for their libraries. Terms of Carnegie building grants required that communities provide the land for the library building and a prescribed level of tax support.

California library historian Ray Held chose the year 1917 to close his record of "the rise of the public library in California" primarily because America's involvement in World War I slowed the growth of the public library movement, and also because it was the year of the sudden death of James Gillis, eminent California library leader whose accomplishment in initiating a statewide system of county libraries was recognized throughout the nation. "The year thus marked the end of an era in the evolution of the California public library."[1] Additionally, during the war years the Carnegie Corporation deferred grant applicants. After the war the Corporation redirected its library efforts and no further building grants were offered, although it was not until 1921 that the last of the previously funded library buildings was completed. In 1919, when all but six of the California Carnegie buildings were planned or completed, approximately 84% of California's public libraries were in Carnegie buildings.[2] The case can be made that by providing the library building--frequently a distinguished civic building--and by energizing a constituency to generate taxes and other funds for the library, the Carnegie program created a high level of popular and civic commitment to free public libraries that persists after more than half a century.

1. History of Public Libraries in California, 1849-1922

In his definitive studies of California public library history before the first World War, Ray Held identifies two major periods: 1849 to 1877, and 1878 to 1917. During the first period, many of the state's new communities sought to solidify their American status and accommodate

the personal or group cultural needs of a growing population, by the initiation of small libraries. Social libraries were most often formed from the sharing of the private library of an individual or group. They were termed membership libraries when a fee was charged; when the fee was substantial, as in a more specialized or scholarly library, the term "proprietary" or "subscription" library was used. Lodges, women's improvement clubs, temperance organizations, and library associations of like minded individuals figured prominently in the establishment of early social libraries, typically run by a volunteer and located in a rented or donated room.

The Rogers Act of 1878 enabled incorporated cities and towns to levy a tax to maintain free public libraries and reading rooms, and to acquire property and erect buildings for that purpose. Of special importance to towns and cities with already established social libraries was its provision that municipalities could accept the property of a previously established library and allow the donor library to name half of the trustees of the new municipal library. The Rogers Act thus provided an incentive for library associations, lodges, and other groups, to donate their collections as the nucleus of the new public library, and provided stability and continuity to independently established small libraries. It was upon the foundation of municipal ownership of libraries that the Carnegie program was later to be predicated.

a. Social libraries, 1849-1878

The first social libraries were initiated in 1849 in Monterey and in several mining communities. The Monterey Library Association was organized by the Reverend Samuel Willey, who upon his arrival from New England deplored the lack of Protestant churches, schools, and libraries, and set about to provide all three.[3] In the mining towns too, new arrivals felt the need for news, a supply of reading material, and symbols of home. Even though the latter were mostly short-lived endeavors, similar libraries and reading rooms appeared and reappeared in many parts of the state when there were sudden spurts of population. Other early libraries were in San Francisco; the three River towns of Sacramento, Marysville, and Stockton; towns surrounding San Francisco Bay as far north as Santa Rosa; and in the south at Santa Barbara and San Diego.

Particularly notable was San Francisco's 1851 Mercantile Library. Like its English and New England counterparts it was organized for and by the merchant class, with the goals of providing a meeting place away from temptation for its many young men, and to promote culture and learning. A number of other libraries were soon formed in San Francisco with similar goals and directed at various populations, including the 1853 Athenaeum, organized by and for "Negroes," and the 1854 YMCA which provided the only free reading room in San Francisco.[4] The Odd Fellows library, for members and families, and the Mechanics Institute, incorporated by

craftsmen, began in 1855. Even the largest and most secure of these experienced the problems typical of all social libraries: lack of adequate space, temporary locations, and unstable financing.

Marysville's library became a municipal agency in 1858 without benefit of permissive state legislation, and it too continued to exist in various temporary rented quarters, including the city hall.[5] San Jose, Oakland, Vallejo, Benicia, Napa, Petaluma, and Sebastopol soon began libraries, as did coastal cities such as Watsonville and Los Angeles.

Not all of the libraries formed in the early period were the direct antecedents of later libraries in the same community. The particular significance of the early reading rooms and subscription libraries is found in the social history of the individual town. Notable among the groups who initiated many of the early community libraries were the Odd Fellows, temperance groups, and women's groups seeking either to improve their own cultural climate or to alleviate a community problem.

After 1865, the number of social libraries began to increase significantly. State legislation passed in 1863, enabling certain types of groups to incorporate, had begun to be used by libraries, increasing their stability. Also, the period following the Civil War saw economic and population growth in the state as a whole, though library activity in the mining communities slackened. In San Francisco in 1868 the Mercantile Library built its own building, as did the Sacramento Library Association in 1871; such instances were rare, however, and the debt incurred contributed to their later financial problems. Libraries were formed in the Sacramento Valley at Colusa, Woodland and Davis, and at San Rafael, Tomales, San Mateo, Woodside, and Alameda; in the North Coast communities of Mendocino and Arcata; along the Central Coast in Santa Cruz, Hollister, Gilroy, Pescadero, Salinas, and San Luis Obispo; and in the South at Ventura.

b. The Rogers Act of 1878

By the 1870's libraries in the larger cities were experiencing not only perennial financial problems and the inadequacy of temporary housing, but, to the degree that they were successful and their collections grew, they found they needed additional space. Library leaders began to consider the advantages of using the tax base of the municipality to fund their libraries. Previous library legislation had been limited to establishment and support of the State Law Library, authorization of certain types of fund raising, and permission to incorporate. In 1874 the legislature passed a law specific to Los Angeles, authorizing $15,000 in bonds for the purpose of buying property and erecting a library building, although it did not specify that the library need be free. For various reasons the city did not act under its provisions.[6]

In San Francisco, Andrew Hallidie, an immigrant Scotsman who had established the first factory to manufacture wire rope to move cable cars, had become president of the Mechanics Institute in 1868. Like fellow immigrant Scotsman Andrew Carnegie, he was a firm believer in the educational value of libraries, particularly as a means to reduce the temptation to young men of drinking and gambling. He also believed in the necessity for a well-stocked reference library. Among the many ways by which he attempted to expand the Mechanics Institute library and increase its public availability and influence were reduction of fees from $5 to $1, building the endowment, and opening the library to visitors. He may have attended the first meeting of the American Library Association, in Philadelphia in 1876, and did in that year visit major libraries in the east. When he became convinced that the answer lay in a free public library, he resigned from the Mechanics Institute presidency to work to campaign for public libraries, "with State Senator George H. Rogers serving as chief spokesman."[7] After the Rogers Bill became law, Hallidie served on the board of trustees of the San Francisco Public Library.

Less is known of the commitment to libraries of San Mateo legislator Rogers, who had earlier represented the foothill community of Columbia, and San Francisco, in the legislature. In 1877 he introduced Senate Bill Number 1, "An Act to establish and maintain free public libraries and reading rooms." Originally intended as special legislation for San Francisco, it was expanded to enable incorporated cities and towns to levy a tax, not to exceed one mill on the dollar, to maintain free public libraries and reading rooms, to acquire property, and to erect buildings to house the libraries. Cities and towns other than San Francisco would be permitted to accept the property of another library and let that library name half of the trustees of the new municipal library. Although two years later it was revised in order to conform to the 1879 constitution, the Rogers Act was a major turning point for libraries in California and its effect was profound. The foundation for municipal libraries was laid. All towns did not take immediate advantage of its provisions; social libraries continued in many towns and new ones were formed. However, as a result of the Rogers Act the context of expectations was significantly altered.

c. Municipal and social libraries 1878-1917

The first city to form a municipal library under the Rogers Act was Eureka, which had not previously established a library. Also using the new law in its first year were Los Angeles, Oakland, Ventura, and Petaluma. Together with Marysville, which had already formed a municipal library without benefit of Rogers, there were by the end of 1878 six municipal libraries in California. San Francisco itself, prohibited by the Rogers Act from taking over any of the existing libraries in the city, took longer to become established.[8]

Generally, the library-supporting municipalities were the largest cities. All eight cities shown by the 1880 census as having a population of more than 5000 had tax supported libraries by 1885. These were San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, San Jose, Los Angeles,

Stockton, Vallejo, and Alameda. Eight of the ten cities with populations of between 2500 and 5000 in 1880 had libraries by 1885: Marysville, Santa Cruz, Napa, Santa Rosa, Santa Barbara, Petaluma, Eureka, and San Diego. The exceptions were Nevada City and Chico, both of which had earlier libraries but were without libraries at that time.

Although the 1878 legislation marked the beginning of widespread municipal support of libraries, in terms of housing the library collection, it meant only that the city paid the rent, or that the library was moved to a corner of City Hall. In Santa Rosa, the library was allocated space in City Hall just above the fire department where horses were stabled; the odor was said to be as objectionable as the frequent ringing of the fire bell; fortunately, after two years the city built a new fire station. A few more cities did erect separate buildings: San Pedro's first library building dates from 1888, Santa Barbara's from 1892, and Escondido's from 1894. Each of these communities later applied for and received Carnegie funding. With the help of a bequest, Stockton built a city library, and when in 1891 another philanthropist provided additional funds, a new and larger one was built and named for its benefactor. Carnegie funding was never sought.

Library historians Jesse Shera and Sidney Ditzion have identified ten causal factors of successful library development nationwide. As refined by Lewis Stieg, and applied to the first generation of municipal libraries in California, these factors were: the existence of a previous social library, favorable library legislation, economic stability, urban population, universal public education, scholarship and historical research, self improvement, religious and humanitarian groups, local pride, and leadership.[9]

More recently, California library historian Ray Held has applied Stieg's factors to social libraries in California before 1878, based on his own later comprehensive gathering of data for that period. He found that all the factors were to some degree important, especially where applied to a particular library; however, he found that certain factors in combination were particularly significant, whereas other factors had much less effect on pre-1878 library development.[10]

Held concluded that in California before 1878 there would be a library when there was a congruence of the forces of pride in community; the desire for the self-benefit to be derived from a center for books and reading; individual and, more especially, group leadership; and most important of all, "moralistic or uplift drive." If those forces were strong enough, the library would be sustained.

On the other hand, Held found that scholarship and research were far less significant in early library formation than perhaps they had been in the East. This was true in spite of the fact that there were specialized collections such as law libraries, the scientific collection of the Mechanics Institute (especially under Hallidie), and Bancroft's collection. The latter, though

available to the public, was not considered a public library. Held also felt that legal status was a less significant causal factor; he contended that its lack had not stopped the initiation of libraries, and it had been provided as the need arose. The population and economic wealth of the community were helpful but many libraries thrived with far less than others. He found the effect of schools in relation to libraries to be indirect.

In considering the period after 1878, Held found that population of a certain size and density, and the existence of a previous subscription library, were the best indicators that there would be a municipal library. Social libraries continued to be formed, but in the context of a variety of new legalized options. Population also correlated closely with library collection size as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Education in 1885; an exception was Los Angeles with a very small collection.[11]

Studying the income and services of California libraries in the period between 1900 and 1917, Held noted that libraries began to offer more services and longer hours There were more children's rooms, books were selected in a more scholarly fashion, and many libraries developed special collections. Larger libraries instituted branches, outreach programs, and public relations. But in the case of both large and small libraries he found the the most profound change was the advantage of a having a library building, and this came about primarily due to Carnegie funding.

Held noted that in California, as in the rest of the nation, in the last decade of the century there was an increase in both wealth and social concern, as well as growth of established urban areas and formation of new municipalities.[12] Southern California expanded with the incorporation of many new small communities. Between 1882 and 1894, library numbers jumped from four to eleven in Southern California. In the same period, the number of libraries in the greater Bay Area increased from eight to ten, and in the Sacramento Valley from three to five.

This surge in library development was matched and then exceeded in the next few years, especially in many smaller towns that were exhibiting rapid growth. In Southern California between 1894 and 1903, fourteen libraries were established, seven in towns that had populations of less than one thousand at the previous census. Population increases of 30% to 50% were not uncommon; Long Beach was exceptional with a population increase from 2,252 to 17,809 between 1900 and 1910. During the same years, communities in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley, and many in the Sacramento Valley, demonstrated significant growth in population and numbers of libraries. With the development of water delivery systems to the Imperial Valley, several new communities were established and libraries were incorporated in the two largest almost immediately.[13]

Municipal libraries and branches were meeting the needs of the urban population, and formed the basis for the growing professionalism in librarianship, but township libraries and

travelling libraries, designed to serve the rural population, were not proving as successful, providing insufficient services and proving too diverse to administer. Legislation passed in 1909 permitted the formation of library districts, and after 1911 a library could be established within an existing high school district. District libraries and county libraries accounted for most new libraries established after 1910 in unincorporated communities. An intensive effort to organize county libraries grew out of the efforts of James Gillis, State Librarian from 1899 to 1917, to bring State Library services to remote areas.

Although county libraries had been established by the legislature in 1850 as document repositories in each county seat, they existed in name only. Gillis' answer to the need for equal library service in rural areas was to expand the county library concept, with branches as needed, administered by the Board of Supervisors and backed by the resources of the State Library. Permissive legislation was passed in 1909 and revised in 1911. Teams of "library organizers" travelled throughout the state, county by county, enlisting the support of women's clubs, Farm Bureaus, parents and teachers, and the Supervisors themselves. Many of the new county libraries flourished, but a few counties have never formed a county library and instead contract for service with an adjacent county. The record of the travels and encounters of county library organizers Harriet Eddy and May Henshall provide a remarkable insight into California library development in the first two decades of the century.[14]

2. Andrew Carnegie and Library Philanthropy, 1886-1917

Philanthropy began to be a significant factor in library development in the last half of the nineteenth century. Earlier philanthropy had most often involved the gift or bequest of books from a private library, or initiating or enhancing a university, social, or municipal library. The Harvard Library, Boston's first public library, and numerous New England town libraries exemplified this private benefaction. Public library enabling legislation usually provided for the acceptance of such gifts. In the years following the Civil War, philanthropy became increasingly important and also more controversial. With the rise of the great industrial fortunes there was not only more concentrated wealth, but there were more poor. Library benefaction was viewed by some as reflecting the democratic belief in education, and by others as an attempt at social control.[15]

Major philanthropic gifts of John Jacob Astor and James Lenox were eventually combined with Samuel Tilden's to form the basis of the New York City library system. Enoch Pratt's Baltimore library philanthropy was specifically cited by Andrew Carnegie as his own model, demonstrating that "the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise."[16] One of the major legacies of Carnegie's library program was its encouragement to other potential benefactors throughout the nation. Carnegie became the symbol of library philanthropy.

a. Andrew Carnegie and buildings for libraries.

Andrew Carnegie, Scotch immigrant and self-educated millionaire industrialist, had already endowed several libraries by 1889 when he wrote "Wealth; " it became more widely read after its republication in 1900 as the title chapter of the more widely read The Gospel of Wealth and Other Essays. In it he advocated disposal of "surplus wealth" by attending to its distribution while alive. Libraries exemplified Carnegie's own self-help concepts; "The fundamental advantage of a library is that it gives nothing for nothing. Youths must acquire knowledge themselves."[17] This philosophy is said to have developed from his own youth when a private library was made available on Saturdays to the young working men of his community. In 1900 Carnegie sold his steel holdings to what would become U.S. Steel and began his philanthropy in earnest; the program was administered through the Carnegie Corporation after 1911. Of the Carnegie philanthropies, libraries were a proportionately small part but are probably the best known.

The library building itself became the focus for Carnegie funding, again as an aspect of the concept of self-help. Many communities had established social libraries or municipal libraries but continued to be handicapped by the vagaries of volunteer staffing and the difficulty of securing adequate housing for the books. Even under city management, there was a tendency to locate the collection in temporarily available, often inconvenient quarters.

Carnegie's earliest library philanthropy was more representative of the paternalistic philanthropy of the newly wealthy in the last quarter of the century. Typically, a home town or principal residence of the donor received a library, not requested by the recipient, fully endowed by the donor on a site selected by him, and dedicated with elaborate ceremony in his honor. The first Carnegie library gift was to his native Dunfermline, Scotland, in 1881. Between 1886 and 1896 he endowed several libraries in Pennsylvania, in what he later termed his "retail" period of library philanthropy.

By contrast to the more usual style of philanthropy, in the "wholesale" period beginning in 1898, Carnegie provided all or substantially all of the funds needed for a building, at the request of the community. The community was required to provide a specified level of tax support for the book collection, staffing, and building maintenance, and to provide a site; selection of the site was left to the community. Later, Carnegie did reserve the right to approve plans.

There was considerable contemporary criticism of the Carnegie program. Some members of the emerging profession of librarianship believed it inevitable that small libraries would be inadequately staffed and lacking in literary and informational resources. Some believed that

the public library movement was expanding too rapidly, propelled more by Carnegie's personal conviction than from public demand; others, including cities with strong labor movements, were critical of the source of the Carnegie money. These views appeared in article and speeches, in satire and cartoons.[18]

Little or no architectural precedent existed for the small community library building. Typically, outside of the large cities, few architects designed more than one. However, some architects became Carnegie specialists, such as Patton and Miller of Chicago, who designed more than one hundred Carnegie libraries for midwestern towns and colleges.[19] In California William Weeks designed twenty-one Carnegie libraries. Large civic buildings were the frequent model and community pride led cities to demand library buildings as extravagant as their neighbors'. During most of the Carnegie period the style of the buildings was directly influenced by the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exhibition and the City Beautiful movement, where Daniel Burnham had re-introduced classical design; it was spread by subsequent exhibitions at Buffalo and St. Louis, and later San Francisco. The earlier Greek Revival had been "so widely popular that it entered the vernacular."[20] Carnegie funding of library buildings in many small and medium sized cities in the period immediately following the exposition contributed to a similar proliferation of the classical revival style.

A request for a Carnegie grant was as simple as a letter to Andrew Carnegie, New York, New York. The answer would come from James Bertram, hired by Carnegie to be his private secretary in 1897 when his library and church organ philanthropies had attracted sufficient attention to need personal supervision. Bertram soon had devised a questionnaire designed to elicit information about the town's population, its existing library if any, and its finances. The questionnaire carried a clear implication that the response should come from a city official, and subsequent correspondence was usually carried on at that level. Upon the receipt of an adequately prepared questionnaire, an offer would be made, with the amount based on population, and accompanied by the stipulation that the city must provide the site for the library and commit itself to an annual amount equal to 10% of the grant for maintenance of the library.

Over time there were some changes in the process. Bertram required that the city pass a resolution to verify that the land acquisition had been completed and that the tax had been voted. After 1907 Bertram required that all building plans be submitted for approval. In 1911, after consultation with library and architectural leaders, Bertram devised and sent to all applicants his "Notes on the Erection of Library Bildings."* The "Notes" suggested ways of achieving the primary purpose of the building design, "to obtain for the money the utmost amount of effectiv

**Note: The word "bilding" is an example of the simplified spelling, introduced to Carnegie by Melvil Dewey, originator of the Dewey decimal system of book classification and first president of the American Library Association.*

accommodation, consistent with good taste in bilding," offered six efficient library floor plans designed for different shaped lots, and, in passing, provided an example of simplified spelling used in all of the Carnegie correspondence. Bertram stressed one story and basement as most practical, and he insisted on a large well-lighted reading area, with high windows to leave wall space for shelving. Fireplaces were discouraged, not because of fire danger but because they occupied too much space; the building could be heated more practicably from the basement. Architectural style was not specified, nor were communities asked to use the name "Carnegie" on the building.

Only after Bertram's final approval was the treasurer of the Carnegie Corporation authorized to release funds, usually in increments of a few thousand dollars on certification of completed work. In later years, cities were required to indicate by resolution, prior to release of any funds, their understanding that the grant was to cover the completed building ready to function as a library. They were also asked to send a photograph of the completed building.

Bertram insisted that all communication be by letter; personal interviews were rare. The Carnegie Corporation files, arranged alphabetically by city and now on microfilm, provide a fairly complete record of transactions. Unfortunately the original correspondence was then destroyed, and the microfilm of the fragile old letters, and of the thin carbon copies of Bertram's replies, is very difficult to read. Each file usually contains one letter from each of the respondents representing each stage outlined above, plus as many additional letters as it took for the city to correctly supply the requested information, or to ask for and usually be denied extra funds, or to achieve plan acceptance. In rare cases there is even a thank you letter.

Less rarely, a series of later letters will ask about appropriate future building use or the city's rights in regard to building alteration or disposal. Earlier in the program the response was that the building had been given for a library, and other use was a breach of faith. Later, communities were told that the building was theirs to use, sell, or destroy, but that it was the because it was long overlooked,custom in such cases to affix a plaque to the new building identifying the Carnegie history. The files contain no plans; they were returned to the cities. There are no photographs in the files and their fate is less clear; however, correspondence indicates that relatively few cities complied with this request once the building was complete.

In 1916 the Carnegie Corporation Board of Trustees commissioned an independent evaluation of the library program, resulting in the Johnson Report, which noted the important accomplishments of the program but advocated that in the future more funds should be provided for library service and less for buildings. The Board shelved the report, but two years later stopped accepting requests for building grants. In response to inquiries, Bertram cited the war as the reason for the interruption of funding; after the war it was simply not resumed. Subsequent Carnegie Corporation library funding focused on substantial contributions to the

American Library Association, the Library of Congress, library schools, academic library programs, and studies and conferences in the United States and the United Kingdom.

Controversy over the value of Carnegie's contribution has not entirely abated. Writing in 1968 about the Wisconsin Carnegies, Macleod criticized Carnegie for providing library buildings only, without attempting to influence library policy in areas such as minimum standards in the hiring of librarians or in book selection. He contended that most cities just accepted the building without any sustained commitment to improve library service, and concluded that the course of library development would not have been much different without the Carnegie philanthropy. In a review of the Macleod book, Bobinski asserted that his extensive study of Carnegie libraries nationwide had documented the program's direct impact on public libraries by helping speed their development and growth; indirectly the Carnegie philanthropy stimulated other library benefaction, and the terms requiring adequate city tax for library maintenance led to a more general acceptance of the principle of government funding for public libraries.[21]

b. Carnegie libraries in California

As previously noted, a few California libraries had constructed their own buildings before the beginning of the Carnegie program, including the San Francisco Mercantile Library, Sacramento and Oakland library associations, and libraries in San Pedro, Santa Barbara, and Escondido. However, by 1917, according to Held's studies, a "very large majority" of California public libraries were in their own library buildings. Most of those libraries had survived the years as struggling social libraries, followed by additional years as tax supported city libraries, moving from temporary rooms in a lodge hall to the not always more secure room set aside in City Hall. Approximately one-fourth were new libraries, formed with the expectation of a gift building to launch the project. Philanthropy thus offered security to and stimulated the expansion of the public library.[22]

Between 1886 and 1917 Carnegie donated over $41 million for 1,679 library buildings in 1,412 communities in the United States. He funded another 830 library buildings were constructed in Canada, the British Isles, South Africa, Rhodesia, India, Mauritius, Australia, New Zealand, and Fiji.

The first Carnegie grants to libraries in California were made in 1899. San Diego was offered $60,000 in July of that year, followed by Oakland ($50,000 in Augustf) and Alameda ($35,000 in October.) The next offer was to Fresno in 1901, and thereafter in every year until 1917 at least one California community learned that its request for a Carnegie library had been approved. Although applications were not accepted after 1917, some buildings were not completed until as late as 1921. In the fewer than twenty years between 1899 and 1917, Carnegie funding contributed to the construction of 142 library buildings in 121 communities

in California, second only to Indiana's 164 buildings in 155 communities. In total funds allocated, California ranked fourth among the states with $2,776,987. When this figure is applied to the population, California was eleventh, with $48.9 per 100 population. [23]

The grant amounts listed for San Diego, Oakland and Alameda suggest a higher expenditure per library than came to be the case. In general, earlier libraries were granted larger amounts, though there were exceptions. The smallest grant for a municipal library was $5000 to Biggs in 1906; In 1914, Sacramento received $100,000, the highest sum allocated for one California Carnegie.* San Diego's $60,000 was the second highest. Of the fourteen libraries funded before 1903, only one received $10,000 and the average allocation for the other thirteen was $32,000. Beginning in 1903, the sum of $10,000 appears more frequently, and by the end of the program fifty-six libraries had been granted that amount, with funding for the remaining libraries divided approximately equally above and below.

The majority of the library grants went to small cities; in the larger cities, branch libraries were emphasized.** The largest grant, $750,000, went to San Francisco, half designated for construction of the main library and half for construction of seven branch libraries. Oakland received $50,000 toward construction of its main library and, later, $140,000 for four branches, and Santa Cruz and Santa Monica received additional grants for branch libraries long after construction of main their libraries. Los Angeles received $190,000 for six branches. Some Carnegie cities "disappeared" and their libraries became branches. East San Jose was a city for only five years before annexation to San Jose, during which time it constructed its Carnegie library. East San Diego also constructed its Carnegie prior to annexation to San Diego. Eagle Rock, Hollywood, San Pedro, and Watts, all cities when their Carnegies were built, were later annexed to Los Angeles and their libraries all became branches of the larger city system.

Additional funds were occasionally granted, especially in the earlier years, for expansion and earthquake repair, but almost never to meet any unexpectedly high costs. Sometimes communities themselves provided extra funds to construct a grander library, or to complete the library as planned even though costs had exceeded original estimates. These variables, not always reported in consistent fashion, lend a degree of uncertainty to statements of the cost of a given library.

Later, smaller grants often went to new towns, or to smaller towns which had previously hesitated to undertake the commitment required for a Carnegie grant, but which later found the

**The exceptional example of San Francisco, funded with its branches, is discussed elsewhere.*
***The number of branch libraries in California corresponds fairly closely with the number nationwide. In California, the 142 public libraries were built in 122 cities; 14% of the Carnegies were branches. This compares with a national figure of 16% if New York City's sixty six branches are counted, 12% if they are not.*

way opened by California legislation permitting library formation within high school districts and special districts. Also, some smaller cities applied for Carnegie grants through the county library system and were established as branch libraries. The three smallest grants, $2500 each, were for branch libraries in what were in 1915 very small communities in Contra Costa County: Antioch, Concord, and Walnut Creek. Of thirteen grants for $5000 or less, all to small towns or branch libraries, all but three were granted after 1913.

Site selection, left to the discretion of the towns as an aspect of their obligation to provide the site itself, was sometimes a source of controversy. In most towns with an antecedent social or municipal library located in a retail, civic, or fraternal building, a site in or near the downtown was easily decided upon. San Anselmo, Eureka, Grass Valley, and Hollister are examples. Some town, alternatively, created a "library park," as in Livermore, Exeter, and Orland. A site was sometimes donated or sold at less than market value; frequently, fund raising to meet the partial or full price would dominate the newspaper social pages for months. However, the newspaper, as well as trustee minutes, and sometimes even the Carnegie correspondence, also reveal disputes focused on the motives of the donor of a site, or a debate between rival sites. In the case of branch libraries, decisions even more political, involving decisions between rival factions and neighborhoods. Bertram rarely entered those controversies, the exceptions occasioned by a site, usually a gift, too far from a population center. Van Slyck explores these issues in two chapters entitled "The Beacon in the Slums" and "A Temple in the Park."[25] Her example for the former was Oakland and the role of developers in site advocacy. Ultimately two branches were located in established working class neighborhoods, and two in outlying, sparsely settled, new middle-class neighborhoods.

Siting problems highlighted some of the basic divisions about the purpose of the library.* To "help people to help themselves," it needed to be located near those who needed help, including new immigrant populations. In the large cities, many of the most energetic proponents of public libraries, for themselves and for others, were relocating in newly developing residential areas. The cost of lots for branches in large cities posed a substantial problem. San Francisco built its first branch in the just developing Richmond district on a large city-owned lot, and its second in

**Enunciated in the 1852 report of the first Boston Library Board of Trustees was the concept of the free public library as providing people with the means to formulate their political ideas independently. To that end, the most popular works of fiction were to be provided to attract readers to the library, and the library should be located where fully accessible to all. It accommodated the goal of assimilation of immigrants, and was seen as a counter to "dangerous" forces seeking to organize working classes, and so is seen by some as an exercise in social control.[26] Also enunciated in the Boston statement, but then as now occupying a secondary role, was the public library as a resource for scholars. The relative emphasis given to meeting the needs of the several library user populations is still the subject of date.*

its most populous district, the Mission, paying $12,000 for property 117'x60'. Like Oakland, San Francisco divided its Carnegies, albeit somewhat unequally, between its oldest and most populous areas (Mission and Noe Valley), an area of predominantly Italian and other foreign populations (North Beach, now Chinatown), and its wealthier and newer areas (Golden Gate Valley, Presidio, Richmond, and Sunset).

Geographical locations were diverse, ranging from Alturas, Yreka, Eureka, and Ferndale in the north, to Calexico at the Mexican border. There were clusters, especially near Los Angeles and around San Francisco Bay, but Carnegies were located in thirty-eight of the fifty counties. There were twenty-one in Los Angeles County, ten in Alameda County, eight in San Francisco County, six in Tulare County. Seven counties had five Carnegie libraries and twelve counties had just one. California counties in which no Carnegie was built were Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, El Dorado, Inyo, Kern, Lassen, Mariposa, Sierra, Sutter, Tuolumne, and Yuba. In Yuba County, Marysville was the only incorporated city during the period of Carnegie philanthropy and already had its own building. In Kern County, the only city besides Bakersfield was Tehachipi with a population of just 385. There was no incorporated town in Calaveras County and in each of the other counties there was just one incorporated town, very small.

c. Carnegie-funded academic libraries in California

In addition to public library buildings, Carnegie funded more than one hundred college and university libraries. Carnegie library contributions to educational institutions began as early as 1900 with funding of a $32,000 library building at Grove City College in Pennsylvania, and a $20,000 building at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. Most building grants were given between 1900 and 1906, though a few were granted as late as 1915, and in several cases funding that had begun earlier was continued into the 1920's. The number of educational institutions which received grants for library development, mostly for books, exceeded the number receiving library buildings, but the $4.2 million for buildings was almost double the total given for library development. In California, Carnegie funded library buildings at Pomona College and at Mills College.[24]

Pomona College was offered $40,000 in 1905, on the condition that the college raise another $40,000 in new endowment to provide for its maintenance. After a successful fundraising campaign, the cornerstone was laid in 1906. The design by F.P. Burnham called for reinforced concrete. The collapse of a reinforced concrete hotel in Long Beach resulted in last minute revision of specifications; the substantial added cost of the building was borne by the college. The library opened in 1908 and served as a library until 1953 when the interior was remodelled to house the departments of economics, government, sociology, education, and oriental affairs; additional interior remodelling and exterior repair took place in 1968.

The early days of the pre-Carnegie Pomona College library were similar to those of many California community libraries. The nucleus of the collection was the 1889 gift of a personal library, and reading room space was provided in the YWCA alcove of one of the college buildings. Subsequently the collection was moved twice, occupying space in classroom buildings until completion of the Carnegie.

The college was asked to provide the same information as were towns; because there was no municipality they emphasized their endowment and the solid character of the college trustees, "that body being composed of some of the strongest business men in Southern California." Carnegie and Bertram may also have been persuaded by the fact that the college library was open to the residents of Claremont, which at the time of application was unincorporated. Also, the proposed Carnegie location was a public park donated by the town to the college "on condition that the college library be free for the town and no other building be placed on it."[27]

Mills College was granted $20,000 in 1905, and the Margaret Carnegie Library was dedicated November 17, 1906, its original dedication date of May 5, 1906 having been postponed because of the earthquake. The building was named for the daughter of Andrew Carnegie. Designed by Julia Morgan, it was the only California Carnegie building designed by by that noted architect. The senior gift of the Class of 1906 was the Panthenon frieze surrounding the wall of the vestibule. Located on a prominent campus site between the administration building and the camponile, the building still serves as college library, although considerably expanded by addition of a separate wing.

d. "Non-Carnegie" libraries: Other Philanthropists, and Towns that did not build Carnegies.

Local library philanthropists predated Carnegie in California, although Carnegie's early library giving elsewhere may have influenced the donors' decisions. In Stockton, two separate benefactors, in 1883 and 1891, left money for a library building. The Smiley brothers of Redlands were active sponsors of their library even before donating land and funds for a building completed in 1898; in 1906 they contributed additional funds for a new wing. The family of Truxton Beale in Bakersfield donated a library in his honor in 1899. Some gifts more contemporary with Carnegie's California library benefaction were in Marysville, Napa, Oroville, Red Bluff, and Modesto. Red Bluff and Modesto both applied for and were offered Carnegie funding, but it was declined presumably when the local philanthropy materialized. Oroville later applied for Carnegie funding and it was granted.

Other larger cities which did not apply for Carnegie funding include Pasadena and Santa Clara. The library association together with the city funded the Pasadena library before 1900. In Santa Clara, the matter of starting a library or applying for a Carnegie grant was the subject of

debate over a period of years, with the newspapers listing names and amounts as other cities received grants. It was estimated that Santa Clara would be eligible for $10,000. In response, the President of the Board of Trustees wrote in his 1902-1903 report:

> The Library proposition crops up yearly. It is not considered the proper caper by the Board of Trustees to invite Mr. Carnegie to invest his money in a library building in Santa Clara when the Town possesses no books to fill the shelves. . .But the physical impossibility of raising the amount of money per annum which Mr. Carnegie demands, when the provisions of our charter do not allow us to levy a tax in excess of three cents for library purposes, presents itself. . .At last year's assessment basis, we could ask Mr. Carnegie for an appropriation of less than $4,500. . .an amount entirely inadequate.[28]

A short while later, the Santa Clara News published a telegram purportly from Carnegie:

> Editor News, Santa Clara, Cal.--I regret that you are unable to raise $1000 per annum for maintenance of library. I fully realize the great hardship it would be for your people were their taxes to be raised ever so little while the prune market is so very dull. I would gladly endow the library were it not that this would cause jealousy in the other places where I have established libraries. I have been spending sleepless nights trying to think of some way in which the library could be maintained without being any or much expense to your citizens. Will not some public spirited business man perform the duties of Town Treasurer without the salary, leaving the $800 to go towards the support of the library. If there is any one in your town looking for a job, he might be appointed librarian and receive the $800 for his services. If he had any spare time he could act as Town Treasurer also (gratis). This would leave but $200 to be raised, which amount might be raised by a high license on the telegraph and telephone companies and on dogs. Rather than my plans should be frustrated, if you cannot find anyone willing to act as Librarian and Treasurer I would be willing to undertake the arduous task myself if you you can find some place for us to live until the new hotel is built.[29]

Benicia is an example of a town which applied for and received the promise of Carnegie funding, and then did not use it. Application was in 1903 at the instigation of the Women's Improvement Club. The City Trustees voted to provide a 50'x50' portion of City Hall grounds for the library, but a year later decided to submit the issue to the voters. The vote was then postponed until a special election to avoid confusion with other city issues on the ballot. The special election apparently was never held and it was 1906 before the city formed a free public library, again under pressure from the Women's Improvement Club, and 1910 before they provided space for it in City Hall.[30]

It appeared for some time that San Francisco would be among those which did not accept a proferred Carnegie offer. In a 1901 handwritten letter from Andrew Carnegie to Mayor James Phelan, $750,000 had been offered for a main library and branches. It was 1912 before the Board of Supervisors voted to accept the money. The Labor Council, opposed to accepting money "tainted" by the Carnegie Steel anti-union reputation, then took the matter to the voters whose ratification of acceptance was reported as follows in one publication:

Carnegie's Money is Good

> San Francisco, through its Board of Supervisors, has finally announced itself as pleased to accept $750,000 of Andrew Carnegie's money for the construction of a public library. The board is willing to forego any careful scrutiny of the method by which Carnegie accumulated his millions by trust manipulation and under paying laborers, if he will only make good his offer of 11 years ago. His wealth is not looked upon as loot, and is therefore not so tainted but what San Francisco's self-respect does not forbid it to accept the gift.[31]

e. The Carnegie Correspondence

Review of the correspondence leading to the construction of each of the Carnegies in California would contribute a great deal to the understanding of the Carnegie period in California. For most libraries there are two forms: (1) Bertram's record of application date, correspondent, and grant amount, date, and terms; and (2) the form completed by the city with requested information about population, assessed evaluation, and current library facilities if any, Unfortunately, the latter form is usually illegible on microfilm. Some correspondents included a review for Carnegie's and Bertram's benefit of the town's history or its library history, and a picture of current civic expectations, as well as names and signatures of city and library officials. The personality of James Bertram emerges as dedicated to Carnegie's principles that the library program should operate in a climate of thriftiness and self-reliance, and holding the line against the tendency of some civic advocates to oversell their case. The correspondence is not always complete and is very difficult to read, but from it can be gleaned many examples that

typify issues that arose as a city sought a building to provide a permanent home for its library and to symbolize its civic and cultural advancement.

Sometimes issues of siting were discussed in the correspondence, but Bertram usually left that issue to the cities unless there was a particularly inappropriate location. Most correspondence deals with Bertram's efforts to obtain from the cities proper verification regarding provision of the site and tax support, and the cities effort to obtain from Bertram an approval for their plans, after his careful review of their plans with an eye to eliminating any wasted space with the potential for wasted money.

Many cities hoped that Carnegie could be enticed to visit "his library" on a 1910 trip to Southern California with his wife and daughter. Santa Barbara and Long Beach are two cities they did visit. A common misconception about Carnegie libraries is that all were required to advertise the name of Carnegie. No instance of the subject was found in the correspondence reviewed. San Diego, Escondido and Imperial are among the several libraries that did bear the Carnegie name.

3. The library profession and the roles of women

Both men and women, as members of organizations and as individuals, were instrumental in the establishment of the early social libraries in California. Among the many groups involved were the International Order of Odd Fellows, temperance groups, YMCA, ministers, formal and informal women's groups, and groups of concerned citizens. Masons provided space in their lodge rooms for a number of social libraries, and ceremonies conducted by Masons made civic occasions of the cornerstone laying of many libraries. When reported in the newspapers, with background descriptions of the events preceding the auspicious day, these news stories can provide a fascinating if not always totally accurate record of the early library history. Library boards of trustees traditionally presented the officiating Masons with silver trowels symbolic of the occasion, many of which are on display in Masonic buildings. All of these groups, perhaps particularly the IOOF and WCTU, deserve additional study.

Because women appear to have played a more significant part in the support of California libraries than was the case in the eastern states, because their primary position changed over time from volunteer initiators to trustees and librarians, and because their influence was long overlooked, the role of women merits particular attention. Shera and Ditzion, library historians writing in the mid 1940's, and from a national perspective, give little credit to contributions by women to the library movement. Held, studying the development of public libraries in California, and noting the importance of men's organizations, adds that "community women's organizations were most often a prime factor in planning and sustaining a library;"[32] and Mussman believes that women were more influential than acknowledged by Held.[33]

a. Development of the library profession

Many early social libraries were staffed by volunteers, but there was considerable variation, geographically and over time, in this and other matters including responsibilities and hours of library service. Some might be open two hours each week night, others from 2 p.m. till 4 p.m. two days a week. A salary of $20 a month was average to generous. Some librarians were expected only to shelve the books and sweep the floor, while in other cases retired scholars maintained the library with considerable attention to the quality of the collection.

In California, it seems clear that women played a more prominent role in the development of libraries than was the case nationally. Libraries were becoming established in California at a time when women's clubs nationally were taking the initiative in starting and sustaining libraries. Members of women's clubs frequently volunteered in the social libraries, and after the 1880's the number of women as librarians increased. Legislation passed in 1901 enabled women to serve as library trustees.

A national movement toward the development of the profession of librarianship dates from 1876 when the US Bureau of Education collected library statistics and published the "monumental library compendium" Public Libraries in the United States.[34] Library Journal also first appeared that year, and a national library conference in Philadelphia, under the leadership of Melvil Dewey, resulted in the organization of the American Library Association. The organization's 1891 conference was held in San Francisco; out of that meeting grew the formation of a Southern California Library Association and, in 1898, the California Library Association. Under the presidency of James Gillis from 1906 until 1917, the California association played a major role in professional development, especially in education for librarians.

Until 1891 the only available professional library training was in the East, such as the school in Albany, New York, established by Melvil Dewey. Then the Los Angeles Public Library established a program to train its librarians. Intermittent summer programs followed in San Francisco, the University of California; a program at San Jose was conducted by the State Library. Other libraries started their own, notably that at the Riverside Public Library under Joseph Daniels, and the State Library conducted a library school in Sacramento between 1913 and 1917. The beginning of the School of Library Science at the University of California dates from an undergraduate program in 1918, and the graduate program began in 1926.

Later the County librarian became influential in California, and many women were appointed to that post. James Gillis' county library concept was effectively promoted by a corps of library organizers, all women, who travelled throughout the state, meeting with public and private

individuals and groups. Testimony to the respect they earned was the number of times boards of supervisors asked them to serve as the county librarian, an offer they always declined, believing that local librarians could best promote the library once established. Sarah McCardle, Fresno County Librarian from 1911 until 1945, was one of the more notable of the county librarians.

Gillis' county library effort did not meet with universal approval. One of the most outspoken opponents, Riverside's city librarian Joseph Daniels, formed a unique contract arrangement through which the Riverside Public Library provided services to the whole county. His distrust of the county library program was rooted in his distrust of the Southern Pacific Railroad and James Gillis' previous political role with it. Partly through Daniels' efforts, the county library law was revised and improved after its first year, but Daniels continued to lobby against county organization and for the provision of countywide library service through contract with municipal libraries. His work in Riverside, including Riverside's school of librarianship, themselves contributed to the advancement of library education and library service.

b. Roles of women: initiators of libraries, trustees, and librarians

Musmann in 1982 traced the role of women in founding libraries in 114 incorporated municipalities that had public libraries between 1878 and 1910 and found that women established antecedent social libraries in 63.44% of those cities. Men and women working together accounted for another 15%. These social libraries included reading rooms and social libraries established by the WCTU, women's clubs, or an individual woman. She also concluded that the goal of the libraries was primarily to influence moral values and to control social behavior.[35] Of the 114 communities in Musmann's study, seventy obtained Carnegie libraries, and women established antecedent social libraries in 65.71%. Men and women working together accounted for another 12.85%. Additional evidence of women's efforts in establishing libraries was gathered in this survey of California's historic Carnegie libraries. However, calculated on the basis of all 142 public libraries, it appears that approximately 42% of the pre-Carnegie libraries were established at least in part by women or women's groups.

In her 1989 study of eighty-five Carnegies nationwide, Van Slyck also noted the significant role of women. She found many instances of women establishing libraries and promoting application for Carnegie funding, and she pursued the subject further in a paper given at a 1989 meeting of the Vernacular Architecture Forum. In this work she concluded that women participating in the women's club movement, and carrying that activity into the establishment of libraries, did not do so with any intention of challenging the status quo. Rather, they created a harmonious setting in line with women's role to nurture and educate. Van Slyck attributes the acceptance of inadequate temporary quarters for the library as indicative of women's unwillingness to engage

in more than the ladylike fundraising which yielded money sufficient for maintenance but not sufficient to provide a building.[36]

Women's efforts to establish libraries were usually expressed in terms of social and moral issues, often through the temperance movement, but self-improvement was also a frequent goal of the women's clubs. The meetings of many clubs featured essays by the members, necessitating a good library.

Women also served as trustees and as librarians. Responses to the Carnegie survey provided numerous examples of women as trustees of early libraries in towns including San Jose, Long Beach, and Lincoln. The 1907 library board for the new East San Jose Public Library was composed entirely of women, and all but one were wives of the several men who had brought about incorporation. In the same year in Long Beach, three women who as trustees had worked in behalf of the Carnegie library found that after Long Beach changed from its previous sixth class city government to become a new charter city, only qualified electors could serve as trustees; though ineligible, the women continued their efforts in behalf of the library. In Lincoln, the librarian was also a member of the board of trustees and was a prime mover in obtaining Carnegie funding. Outside opinion was sought as to the legality of serving as both librarian and trustee, with the response that one role or the other should be selected. The dual service continued for many years, however, apparently without further challenge.

By the Carnegie years, many women were working in libraries, and a few had professional training. Two examples from Sonoma County are not atypical. In 1884 Santa Rosa trustees appointed their first woman to serve as librarian, and upon her retirement in 1890 they appointed Bertha Kumli, Sonoma County's first professional librarian. After seeing the new Carnegie library to completion in 1904, Miss Kumli hosted a State Library Association meeting there, and the next year took a leave of absence to catalog at the State Library. Subsequently she joined the State Library permanently as a public library organizer, and her name appeared frequently in Eddy's and Henshall's accounts of small town library formation until she became Kern County's first county librarian.

In another Sonoma County town, Healdsburg, "Miss Provines" was appointed librarian in 1905 and Miss Frances Provines was her assistant and substitute. When Frances resigned in 1907, Miss Mary Provines was appointed. In 1909 Mary was given a leave of absence to attend the State Library Class in Sacramento and Miss Eloise Provines was appointed. When Mary resigned later that same year, however, Miss Zoe Bates was appointed to replace her.[37] Mary Provines later served as head of the catalog department at Fresno County. Cornelia Provines, probably related but at some distance, was the long-time head of the Sacramento County library.

4. Summary

The California Carnegie libraries are notable buildings in their communities, often the only civic building of the period, sometimes the only civic building. Many are noted for their architecture, craftsmanship, or the renown of the architect. Even more significant is their social history. The product of a remarkably short period of development, libraries profited from the commitment of individuals and groups, who sought both to counter potentially negative influences in the newly settled communities and to provide for themselves the benefits to be derived from a shared collection of books and a place to read them. Even after municipalities assumed responsibility for the collection, in nearly all cases a satisfactory long-term location was elusive. The libraries' plight fortuitously intersected with the philanthropy of Andrew Carnegie to construct buildings for publicly supported libraries, "Free to All." He advocated the library as the epitome of his self-help philosophy and, after endowing several, required the city's official commitment in the provision of a site and a prescribed level of tax support. The effort of individuals and groups in the community has continued during and after the Carnegie period to be the vital factor in sustaining that public commitment. Now, the age of those Carnegie libraries, their unique public architecture, and their local and regional history combine to focus attention on the extant Carnegie buildings, individually and as a group, and to highlight the need for more in-depth study of these valuable examples of community history.

ENDNOTES, SECTION E

1. Ray E. Held, The Rise of the Public Library in California (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), 147.

2. This figure is derived from reports in "Quarterly News Items," News Notes of California Libraries 14:3 (July, 1919) 304-345. Information on the library buildings themselves, including their source of funding, was gathered only occasionally, the last previous report being in 1906. At the time of the 1919 report, 136 of the eventual 142 Carnegie buildings were included as completed or planned. The report also included twenty-five other libraries with buildings costing at least $2500, the amount of the smallest Carnegie grant, and funded by a local benefactor or city tax. Carnegies then represented 136 of 161 libraries, or 84.47%. Also included in the 1919 "News Items," but not in these calculations, were numerous small libraries, branches, and stations, meeting in an "old church," or "built by husband of custodian in their front yard," at costs typically less than $500.

3. Ray E. Held, Public Libraries in California, 1849-1878 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963).

4. Hugh S. Baker, "Rational Amusement in Our Midst: Public Libraries in California, 1848-1859," California Historical Society Quarterly, 38 (December 1959) 303-4.

5. Held, Public Libraries 1849-1878, 26.

6. Held, Public Libraries 1849-78, 79.

7. Fulmer Mood, "Andrew S. Hallidie and Librarianship in San Francisco 1869-79," Library Quarterly 16 (July 1946) 202-3.

8. Held, Public Libraries 1849-78, 88.

9. Lewis F. Stieg, "Notes on the Origins of Public Libraries in California, 1850-1900," Library Quarterly 22 (July 1952) 262-69. Reference is also made to:
Sidney Ditzion, Arsenels of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Public Library Movement in New England and the Middle States from 1850 to 1910 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947) and
Jesse H. Shera, Foundations of the Public Library: The Origin of the Public Library Movement in New England 1629-1855 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

10. Held, Public Libraries 1849-78, 113-135.

11. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 9.

12. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 31.

13. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 35-52.

14. Harriet G. Eddy, County Free Organizing in California 1909-1918 (Berkeley: California Library Association, 1955) and May Dexter Henshall, County Library Organizing (Sacramento: California State Library Foundation, 1985).

15. Ditzion, Arsenals of a Democratic Culture, 153.

16. Andrew Carnegie, The Gospel of Wealth and Other Timely Essays (1900). Reprint edition, edited by Edward C. Kirkland (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962) 27.

17. Andrew Carnegie, Autobiography (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1920) 45.

18. W.D. Howells, "Examination of Library Gift Horses," The Library Journal (October 1909) 741. Reprinted from Editors Easy Chair, Harpers Magazine (September 1901). Robert Johnson, "Public Libraries and Mr. Andrew Carnegie," The Library Journal (October 1907) 440. Reprinted from The Academy, London (August 31, 1907).

19. Paul Kruty, "Patton and Miller: Designers of Carnegie Libraries," Palimpsest 64 (July/August 1983) 110-122.

20. Roger G. Kennedy, Greek Revival America (New York: Stewart, Tabori & Chang, 1989) 3.

21. David I. Macleod, Carnegie Libraries in Wisconsin (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin for the Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1968). George S. Bobinski, "Review of Macleod," Library Quarterly 39:220 (July 1969).

22. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 129.

23. George S. Bobinski, Carnegie Libraries: Their History and Impact on American Public Library Development (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969) 17-20.

24. Florence Anderson, Carnegie Corporation Library Program 1911-1961 (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1963), 69-87.

25. Abigail A. Van Slyck, "Free to All: Carnegie Libraries and the Transformation of American Culture, 1877-1917" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1989), 178-191.

26. Michael Harris, "The Purpose of the American Public Library: A Revisionist Interpretation of History," Library Journal (September 15, 1973) 2510-2511.

27. E. Wilson Lyon, The History of Pomona College (publication data not provided), 90. George A. Gates to James Bertram, January 14, 1905. Copy from Pomona College Office of Public Affairs.

28. Kathleen Gleason Worsley, "A History of Public Library Service in Santa Clara, California," (M.A. thesis, San Jose State College, 1966) 31-33.

29. Worlsey, "Santa Clara Library," Appendix C, quoting from the Santa Clara News, March 17, 1903, p.1.

30. Sally Soderblom, Benicia Library Board of Trustees, letter to author, September 30, 1989.

31. "Carnegie's Money is Good," Architect and Engineer of San Francisco (July 1912) 113.

32. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 27.

33. Victoria Kline Musmann, "Women and the Founding of Social Libraries in California, 1859-1910" (Ph.D. diss, University of Southern California, 1982) 108.

34. Held, Rise of Public Libraries, 89.

35. Mussman, "Women and the Founding of Social Libraries in California," 113.

36. Abigail A. Van Slyck, "A Room with No View: Women's Clubs and American Town Libraries, 1890-1910," paper presented at the Vernacular Architecture Forum Meeting, [location not cited on paper], May 1989.

37. Minutes, Healdsburg Library Board of Trustees, 1906-1911.

F. Associated Property Types

I. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE: California Carnegie Library Buildings

II. DESCRIPTION

A. Styles

A variety of factors tended to create some uniformity of design among Carnegie library buildings. However, their diversity of geographical location, cost, and date combine to suggest that the commonly held assumption, "All Carnegie libraries look just alike," is an exaggeration. The period of Carnegie funding followed soon after the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893, which had captured the national imagination. The promise of a "free" public building in the community provided an opportunity to demonstrate civic pride and cultural sophistication and, not least, to equal or outdo neighboring towns in the elegance of the new library.

In California, the Carnegie Library period began in 1899 when grants were offered to Oakland, San Diego, and Alameda for buildings which were constructed in 1901 and 1902. The last grants were offered in 1917, but in many cases planning was not begun until after the war, and the last building was not completed until 1921.

In the earlier years of the program, funding was freer and oversight minimal; municipalities were able to indulge their civic pride with more elaborate buildings. Gradually, application procedures were formalized. After 1907, municipalities were required to submit architects' plans for approval before funds were released and, beginning in 1911, cities were sent copies of "Notes on the Erection of Library Bildings"* with suggested floor plans, stressing principles of practicality and efficiency.

Population growth, as well as California's pioneering 1909 county library legislation, resulted in an increased number of applications for libraries in smaller cities, and for city and county branch libraries. Later, applications were accepted from rural areas which organized as union high school library districts, and district libraries. As funding amounts were based on population, many of the later grants were smaller. Through 1907, the average California grant was $16,666; of forty-two libraries funded, only three received

** The spelling of "Bildings" is an example of the simplified spelling favored by Andrew Carnegie and used in much of the Carnegie correspondence. "Notes" are attached as Appendix B.*

less than $10,000. After 1908 the average grant was $13,478; ninety-two libraries were constructed and thirty-two received less than $10,000.[1] Generally simpler styles resulted.

In California, the following styles were represented by one or more Carnegie library buildings: Richardsonian Romanesque, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Classical Revival, Mission/Spanish Colonial, Italian Renaissance, and Bungalow/Craftsman. Classical Revival was the predominant style. Three buildings will be discussed under "Other." Aspects related to the buildings as a group, such as current use, architects, interiors, additional funding, alterations, and future prospects, are also discussed.

1. Richardsonian Romanesque

Six California Carnegie libraries exemplified the Romanesque in that they were round arched, of rock-faced masonry, with lintels and other structural features emphasized by use of a variety of stone, combined with a simplicity of form. Both arched and straight topped windows are found, divided into rectangular lights by stone mullions and transoms. Towers, arches or lintels supported by colonnettes, ribbon windows and wheel windows are also frequent.

These buildings were all constructed between 1904 and 1907: Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa, constructed in 1904 with grants of $20,000 each, are no longer standing. Hanford, constructed in 1905 with a $12,500 grant, represents this group on the National Register of Historic Places. San Luis Obispo, and Chico, also constructed in 1905, and Nevada City in 1907, all received $10,000 Carnegie grants. Four are extant.

Hanford, San Luis Obispo, and Nevada City buildings exhibit the significant characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque. In each the style has been executed with notable craftsmanship, and their integrity has been maintained through the years. They are relatively simple and compact, and convey the weight and massiveness of the Romanesque in a building of smaller scale. Except for differences imposed by the two sites, Nevada City is almost a mirror image of San Luis Obispo as it was prior to an entrance portico addition of 1910. The San Luis Obispo building is constructed of locally quarried granite and sandstone. Nevada City is faced with man-made concrete blocks, while the foundation, arches, lintels, corners, and spaces between the windows are emphasized by blocks with the rough finish of cut granite.

In 1939 the Chico Carnegie was drastically remodelled and may now be considered an example of Mediterranean Revival. The integrity of the "new" Chico Carnegie has been maintained for more than fifty years.

During the short time that Richardson designed in the Romanesque style, between 1872 and his death in 1886, his contributions were numerous and influential. Harold Kirker, in California's Architectural Frontier, paraphrased the 1888 inaugural address of the new president of the San Francisco chapter of the AIA, to the effect that Richardson restored "integrity of materials and perfected a unified style system into which every building need could be harmoniously fitted." 2

Especially in the East, there was significant identification of the style with library buildings. Its association with Carnegies began as early as the 1886 invitational competition for the Allegheny City library. Several of the entrant architects had been connected with Richardson and the winning design was Richardsonian.

Three of the California Carnegie buildings constructed in the Richardsonian Romanesque style were among the works of W.H. Weeks, who later became more strongly associated with Classical Revival buildings. Stone & Smith, architects for Chico, and McDougall, architect of Hanford, each designed additional Carnegies in the Classical and Spanish Revival styles, while the Santa Rosa building was E.M. Hoen's sole Carnegie.

The 1939 Chico Carnegie remodelling was under the direction of Louis Brouchoud of Story & Brouchoud, well known in Chico both for his local buildings and his use of decorative tile. Reoriented and simplified, its tower and portico removed and tile roof and decorative tile added, it provides a unique example of an adaptation from the Romanesque. It is located in the downtown area, a few blocks from the Chico State University campus.

The other extant examples are similarly located. The Hanford Carnegie is surrounded by historic civic buildings in that city's large Courthouse Square park. San Luis Obispo also downtown, is adjacent to the Mission, Surrounded by the Victorian, Mission, and Spanish architecture that characterize that city, it is notable for its use of colorful local stone. The Nevada City Carnegie is located next to the County Courthouse and the old Searls Historical Museum, just a block from the historic downtown.

2. Colonial Revival

Just one California Carnegie represents Georgian Revival architecture, with its strictly symmetrical facades, rectangular plan, and minimum of minor projections. Roofs are generally hipped, double pitched, or gambrel, but gables are also present. Tall, one story, and symmetrical, Oakland's Golden Gate branch has a central traditional Georgian

entrance, a gable roof with stepped gable ends, and a cupola. Constructed in 1918 for $35,000 as part of a grant obtained for four branch libraries in Oakland, it is essentially unaltered.

Oakland had been a California pioneer in locating branch libraries in the neighborhoods, but branches of municipal libraries, without their own buildings, were as subject to frequent moves as had been the earlier social libraries. In 1914, Oakland city librarian Charles Greene requested Carnegie funds for branches; $140,000 was granted. Constructed in 1918, the Golden Gate branch was the fourth of four built under that grant. It and the third branch, Alden, were located in what were then working class neighborhoods, characterized as homes of clerks, laborers, and mechanics. In contrast, the first two, Melrose and 23rd Avenue, were designated for the developing new middle class areas east of Lake Merritt.[3] Both Golden Gate and Alden were designed by Donovan & Dickey, who had designed Oakland's 23rd Avenue Branch the year before. In Golden Gate's neighborhood, commercial now outweighs residential. All four branches represent a significant community presence, and the buildings themselves are unique public structures.

3. Tudor Revival

The fanciful "Old English" style, characterized by leaded windowpanes, exposed timbers, sloping roof, and asymmetrical design, was more typical of residences than public buildings. Landscaping was usually a contributing factor. There were two Carnegie examples. No longer extant, the Hollywood Carnegie, constructed in 1906 with a $10,000 grant, resembled a rose covered cottage in its garden setting.

The remaining example, Oakland's Alden Branch (now the Temescal Branch), is less clearly Tudor and identifies itself more surely as a civic building. Its asymmetrical L-shape, under a steep gable roof with a tall, angled, many-windowed bay, and a double row of eight windows, contribute to its romanticism. Although one story over a raised basement, it is small in scale. The building is faced in brick; there are no exposed timbers. Windowpanes are not leaded. There have been no significant alterations.

The Alden branch, constructed in 1918, was the third of the four Oakland branches constructed with a grant that provided $35,000 for each . The Alden Branch neighborhood is still a working class residential area with a variety of commercial uses, where the library is still a significant public structure.

4. Italian Renaissance

Elements of the Second Renaissance Revival were used in larger-scale buildings, often faced with stone or marble, with emphasis on simplicity and order. California Carnegie libraries exemplifying the Italian Renaissance are generally urban, more sophisticated, often built adjacent to the street.

Numbering nine, they are the main libraries of Oakland, Sacramento, and San Francisco; San Francisco branch libraries in the Mission, Golden Gate Valley and Chinatown; and Los Angeles branch libraries in Cahuenga, Lincoln Heights, and Vermont Square. Oakland Main is already listed on the National Register; Los Angeles branches are included in the Multiple Property National Register listing of the Los Angeles branch libraries.

Of this group, all are extant and all are important civic buildings in their urban areas. All but Oakland were built between 1913 and 1920, and all are among the more expensive of the extant California Carnegies. Oakland was built in 1902 with a $50,000 grant; Sacramento received $100,000; San Francisco Main used about half of San Francisco's $750,000. The San Francisco branches averaged about $53,000 and the Los Angeles branches averaged about $35,000 The group is characterized by the elegance and simplicity of their classical detailing, and use of stone and terra cotta, with the branches reflecting the same qualities on a somewhat smaller scale. Important local architects designed the buildings.

All are basically unaltered. However, Oakland was damaged in the October, 1989, earthquake and has not reopened. The Sacramento main library is currently undergoing a major renovation and expansion. Of the San Francisco libraries in this group, only the main library was seriously affected in the recent earthquake. San Francisco and Los Angeles branches are expected to soon undergo renovation and restructuring to meet seismic codes.

A significant, national example of the Italian Renaissance style, the Boston Public Library, designed by McKim, Mead & White near the end of the nineteenth century, may have influenced its use in the major urban California Carnegie libraries. San Francisco Main was an important structure in the plan for the civic plaza and reflects the influence of the City Beautiful movement. The use of the Renaissance style in the smaller but elegantly styled branches carried civic and cultural pride to the neighborhoods.

The branches are also important in that they represent the commitment of Andrew Carnegie himself to branch libraries and small local libraries. In offering to build a main library and branches in San Francisco, Carnegie wrote to Mayor James Phelan that one half of the money should be for the branches and one half for the central library, then added

parenthetically, "no more, I think less."[4] Years later, when San Francisco wanted to divert more money to the main library, Carnegie stated in another letter to Phelan, then on the library Board of Trustees, that large cities could finance their central libraries and that his commitment was to "bringing books close to the homes of the people."[5]

5. Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival and Mediterranean Revival

Many California Carnegies reflect Spanish and Mission influences: arches, usually semicircular, sometimes segmental, without moldings; tiled roofs, low pitched, hipped or gable with curvilinear gable ends, or behind parapets; walls plastered, and usually smooth. Frequently there are balconies, towers, or turrets, capped by domes or tiled pyramid roofs; less frequently, there is sculptural ornament.

However, relatively few California Carnegies are true examples of either style, fewer of the Spanish Colonial than the Mission. In more cases, Spanish or Mission details are mixed with Classical elements. Of those here classified as Mission and Spanish Colonial, fourteen are extant and thirteen are no longer standing. This group spans the period from 1902 to 1918. Grant amounts range from $2,500 to $50,000, with the majority built with grants of $10,000. The $50,000 grant to Santa Barbara met only half the cost of construction and was matched with city funds.

Riverside, Santa Ana, and Hayward, constructed in 1902, 1903, and 1906 and all since demolished, incorporated towers with domed and pyramidoidal roofs, balconies, arches, and curvilinear gable ends, and were much more exuberant representatives of Mission style than any that remain.

The extant buildings most clearly Mission in style are Woodland, St. Helena, Monterey, and Eagle Rock, constructed in 1905, 1908, 1911, and 1915, respectively. Woodland is symmetrical with projecting portico and curvilinear parapets, while St. Helena is asymmetrical with several curvilinear gable ends with arched windows and a generous arched entrance. Both Woodland and St. Helena Carnegies are on the National Register. Eagle Rock, with its modified curvilinear gable, is included as part of the Los Angeles Branch Library multiple property listing. The Monterey Carnegie is symmetrical, with a low hipped roof, curvilinear central element with quadrifoil above the entrance. The Santa Barbara Carnegie, constructed in 1917 and several times remodelled, more closely exemplifies the Spanish Revival.

Extant Carnegies incorporating Classical detail with Mission and Spanish elements are Mills College, Pacific Grove, Dixon, Corning, San Anselmo, Exeter, Oakland/23rd Street, Oakdale, and Calexico. These are all symmetrical and faced with plaster or stucco; most

have or had tile roofs, either gable or hipped; arches are used in entrances or windows; tile or other decorative material is used to suggest Mission style. Mills is the oldest of this group, constructed in 1905; construction dates of the others cover the years from 1908 (Pacific Grove) to 1918 (Calexico).

A slightly larger group with these same characteristics is no longer standing: Los Gatos, Palo Alto, Visalia, Selma, Fullerton, Porterville, Coalinga, Inglewood, Chula Vista, and Concord, with construction dates from 1903 (Los Gatos) to 1918 (Concord).

Also incorporating some Mission elements are thirteen buildings (nine extant) to be discussed under "Classical Revival, Type C," in an application of the classification devised by Abigail Van Slyck in her 1989 UC Berkeley Ph.D. dissertation, "Free to All: Carnegie Libraries and the Transformation of American Culture, 1886-1917."

The Mission style was a significant California statement, an indigenous style to counter the domination of Eastern influences, strongly advocated by Lummis and Polk before the turn of the century. Whiffen associates the Spanish Colonial Revival with the work of Goodhue at the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego, noting that it takes its themes more directly from the Spanish influence in Mexico.[6]

Mediterranean Revival is represented by two early libraries that now exemplify this style, following extensive remodelling. Re-design of both the 1905 Romanesque Chico in 1939 and the 1908 Classical Revival South Pasadena in 1930 was planned by well known architects and the resulting buildings have long been important community structures.

6. Bungalow/Craftsman

Buildings here described share with bungalows their Craftsman detailing, often present in the projecting rafters and wood columns, as well as their affinity for a milder climate and informal life style, their lower cost and smaller scale. Four Bungalow/Craftsman Carnegie libraries were constructed in California, all small, low, one story frame buildings; three are extant. Yolo and Riverbank are examples of Craftsman detailing in rafters, window trim, porch columns, and, in the case of Riverbank, window boxes. Orosi features the use of random stone in a fireplace. None has been significantly altered. Santa Cruz/Eastside, no longer extant, and Yolo, were designed by W.H. Weeks, and were almost exact duplicates. Each was constructed with a $3,000 grant, Yolo in 1918 and the other three in 1921.

These buildings are significant because the Bungalow and Craftsman styles are rarely associated with civic buildings. Also, they reflect Carnegie's support for branch libraries. Santa Cruz/Eastside was a branch of a municipal library. Yolo, Riverbank, and Orosi are

county branches, products of the statewide program to bring service to California's small rural communities. The establishment of a county library system , and the achieving of a branch in a given rural locality, were processes that involved extensive grass roots organizing and intense community participation.

7. Classical Revival

The Classical Revival style as represented in California Carnegie library buildings achieves a monumental effect, but in most cases the buildings are surprisingly small. Their size may be a reflection of the community's population, and therefore the size of the grant it received, while their classicism displays its cultural achievement. Symmetrical, with few angles or projections, their roof lines are generally level, or slightly hipped, and mostly unadorned. Greek orders are used more than Roman, and pedimented porticoes are frequent. Beaux Arts paired columns appear only in San Francisco Main.

Not all of the California Carnegie library examples can be said to incorporate "fine materials" more generally associated with Classical Revival. Perhaps these are among the reasons that the Carnegie libraries are seldom listed in area architectural guides. The small buildings may have been considered more parochial and imitative, and many are designed by less generally well known architects, notwithstanding their considerable local reputations at the time.

Lintelled windows and doorways are frequent among the Classical Revival Carnegies, but many have incorporated round arched windows; those buildings are listed here as "Classical Revival (C)," again referring to Van Slyck's classification. While smooth or polished stone surfaces are frequent, brick and, later, concrete and plaster were used in many of the California buildings.

In her nationwide study, Van Slyck concluded that similar designs were used in many communities because local trustees lacked confidence in their own ability to deal with the architect, and so chose to copy designs they admired in other cities.[7] In California there do not seem to have been as many instances of nearby towns having similar libraries as perhaps was the case elsewhere, though there was considerable competition to achieve the superior building. The hardest problem faced by the communities was to get a building they wanted within the funds allocated. The choice of Classical Revival may have been a "safe" choice on both counts. The influence of the City Beautiful was widespread and easily recognized.

Many attribute the symmetry of a majority of Carnegies to the library planning imposed by Carnegie secretary James Bertram. The first three of the six floor plans in "Notes on the

Erection of Library Bildings" are symmetrical, and the fourth is symmetrically oriented around a corner door, and the fifth and sixth are asymmetical. Few California Carnegies were built along the lines of the latter three plans. Although the "Notes" specifically address the smaller library, Bertram focused on the efficiency of plans for the largest as well as the smallest of library buildings. He seldom commented on the exterior appearance, but gave as much attention to the arrangements for stairs, restrooms, and boiler rooms, as he did to the space for books and location of the librarian's desk.

Perhaps because of the guidelines, Van Slyck concluded that "aside from a handful of unique designs, the majority of Carnegie libraries fall into one of three compositional categories, or their closely related variations. In all three, the buildings are symmetrical . . . with a dominant central motif giving them all an overall A-B-A rhythm. What distinguishes one category from another is the treatment of the central element."[8] Her categories:

Type A: "The central pavilion is modeled on a Roman triumphal arch, that is, four or five columns (either free-standing or engaged) serve to subdivide the central pavilion into three bays, and at the same time support an entablature and attic. San Diego, California, built such a library in 1899, as did Taunton, Massachusetts, in 1902, both evidently seeking to emulate the non-Carnegie New York Public Library which had such an entrance pavilion and which was under construction in those years. In one variation of this type, the central pavilion maintained its tripartite composition, but instead of stepping forward from the lateral wings, was subsumed within the mass of the building . . .Another variation. . .the central pavilion stepped forward, but lost its tripartite composition and did not rise higher than the roof line of the lateral wing."

Type B: "The central pavilion was dominated by a temple front, that is, with a triangular pediment above the entablature. Here, there were even more variations than there were in the first category. [Some] temple fronted libraries. . .had centrally placed domes, although this was a practice condemned by Bertram as an extravagance, and which did not continue past 1908 when Bertram began approving plans. Whether they had domes or not, temple fronted libraries could have either four or more free-standing columns,. . .four or more engaged columns,. . . two or more free-standing columns in antis, . . . or two or more engaged columns in antis . . .As in the first category, the central pavilion could step out in front of the building or it could be subsumed within it. . .In a less common variation on this theme, the entablature and pediment were not supported by columns at all, but either by piers or with an arched opening."

Type C: "The central element can hardly be called a pavilion at all. Instead it is more correctly a three-dimensional door frame which extends forward from the flat plane of the rectangular building, and which does not break the roof line. . .It was a style that easily accommodated a variety of stylistic vocabulary. . . Colonial Revival. . .Mission Revival. . image of the Tudor. . .What is more, it became increasingly popular in later years, as recipient towns found rising material costs undercutting the buying power of their Carnegie grants."

In Van Slyck's system, the remaining styles are grouped into one category:

Type D: "Those buildings that fit none of the three main categories, and accounted for less than 10 percent of the buildings in the sample.

Examples of Type D are discussed above under Romanesque, Colonial Revival, Tudor, Italian Renaissance, Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival, Bungalow/Craftsman, and, later, under "Other."

Following is an application of Van Slyck's Classical Revival compositional categories to California Carnegie buildings.

Classical Revival Type A (Triumphal Arch)

California examples of Type A (triumphal arch) span the state's Carnegie history from the first year (San Diego, completed in 1901) to the last (San Francisco/Presidio, one of the four Carnegie libraries completed in 1921.) However, fewer were constructed in the later years. This group is not represented on the National Register for Historic Places. Twenty-four California Carnegies were constructed in this style. Eight were constructed prior to 1908 when Bertram initiated his plan review, and none of these remain. Extant are seven representatives of the style and two that have been drastically remodelled.

Those no longer standing, in chronological order of construction, are San Diego, Pomona, San Jose, San Bernardino, Fresno, Tulare, Watsonville, Monrovia, Long Beach, San Leandro, National City, Glendale, Los Angeles Arroyo Seco and Vernon, and East San Diego. San Jose and San Bernardino, and perhaps others, were domed. The earliest of this group to be demolished was San Diego in 1952, and the 1950's saw the largest share of these buildings destroyed. These were usually substantial buildings. The smallest Carnegie grant among them was $10,000, received by only four. San Diego received $60,000, San Jose $50,000, Fresno and Long Beach $30,000, and Pomona $15,000. By contrast, among those extant, San Rafael received the largest individual grant, $25,000, and five received $10,000.

Extent representatives of Type A are San Rafael, South Pasadena, El Centro, Hollister, Upland, Grass Valley, Oakland/Melrose, South San Francisco, and San Francisco/Presidio. All except the Presidio Branch are judged in fairly good condition. Some have been altered to provide additional library space or to meet subsequent uses. Grass Valley, Oakland/Melrose, and San Francisco/Presidio are essentially unaltered. El Centro was substantially altered due to earthquake repair as well as expansion. South Pasadena has been expanded and restored several times and few if any elements of the Carnegie remain.

Classical Revival Type B (Greek Temple)

Type B (Greek temple) California Carnegies were built between 1902 and 1915. This group is represented on the National Register by Alameda, Colton, Eureka, Gilroy, Healdsburg, Oxnard, and Petaluma. Fifteen are no longer standing: Santa Monica, Vallejo, Covina, San Pedro, Ontario, Corona, Whittier, Orange, Imperial, Salinas, Santa Marina, Azusa, Escondido, Hemet, and Watts. Santa Monica and San Pedro, along with the extant Eureka, featured domes. As a group these buildings received smaller grants than the Type A and were generally smaller. Top amounts were received by extant Alameda ($35,000), and Eureka and Vallejo ($20,000); then various lesser amounts down to $10,000, received by twenty-one communities; and four grants for less than $10,000, the least being East San Jose's $7,000. In 1978 the Corona building, which had been on the National Register, was demolished; no California Carnegie has been lost since that date.

The twenty-one extant public library representatives of this group range from medium sized to small, with probably Alameda the largest and Lincoln the smallest. Alameda, Eureka, Petaluma, Colusa, Pomona College, Colton, Auburn, Gilroy, Healdsburg, Lompoc, Willows, Livermore, Oroville, Roseville, and Vacaville are essentially unaltered, though several have been renovated and interior adjustments made to accommodate new uses. Major extensions to Oxnard, Lodi, and Richmond have been carefully incorporated in terms of style and materials. A small addition to the rear of Paso Robles was also well integrated. In both East San Jose and Beaumont, separate buildings, simple in style, were constructed and then connected to the original building. A mansard roof was added to both the old and new sections of the Beaumont library, and the portico significantly altered. Their space needs seem to be fairly satisfactorily met at this time, but Vacaville, privately owned and currently vacant, seems potentially endangered.

Classical Revival Type C

As described by Van Slyck, the type lends itself to incorporation of elements of other styles. In California, the type can be divided into (1) the more purely classical, (2) those incorporating Mission elements, and (3) other. Possibly those few buildings listed as Tudor and Colonial Revival could have been included under Type C. In many cases the line was very thin between classification as Classical Revival Type C with Mission elements, or as Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival with classical elements.

The Anaheim Carnegie building represents Type C on the National Register. Thirty-two buildings are included in this group and twenty-three are extant. Reasons for the high survival rate of this type are ambiguous. They are generally more modest buildings, as reflected in their size, cost, and materials. Regarded as a whole, the group spans approximately the same time as the previous groups, 1903 to 1921. However only three of the libraries were constructed prior to 1908 when Carnegie Corporation secretary James Bertram instituted more careful scrutiny of library plans. Berkeley and the metropolitan library branches, all at approximately $40,000, are unusual in having received substantial grants. Seventeen grants were less than $10,000, and the least was $2500. Berkeley was demolished in 1929, the first California Carnegie to be lost. Most of the other destructions occurred about equally through the 1960's and 1970's.

Examples of Type C that are more strictly Classical, without extensive incorporation of elements from other styles, total sixteen with twelve extant. Symmetry and a central entrance element, projecting, but lower than the roof line, or recessed, characterize the group, with an assortment of segmented pediments, columns, pilasters and parapets. Redwood City is the only one of the group built prior to 1908. With the exception of two metropolitan branches, Santa Monica/Ocean Park at $12,500 received the largest grant; below that were five grants of $10,000; the remainder range from $2,500 to $8,000. No longer standing are Redwood City, San Mateo, Huntington Beach, and Sebastopol.

The extant examples of the type are Ferndale, Mill Valley, Sonoma, Willits, Yreka, Antioch, San Francisco's Noe Valley and Sunset branches, Santa Monica/Ocean Park, Bayliss, Newman, and Alturas. All are in good condition. Yreka, Ferndale, and Santa Monica/Ocean Park have been expanded. Alturas has been substantially altered, inside and out, and now more closely resembles the Moderne style. Others are unaltered; none seems unduly threatened.

Also in this category, although less clearly Classical, are three other Carnegies, of which two are extant. Redding, constructed in 1903, was asymmetrical and somewhat Classical with an arched loggia and tall parapet; it was destroyed in 1961. Lakeport and Ukiah are

both symmetrical, simple and dignified. Ukiah has also been described as "Prairie" and "Modern." Each was constructed with an $8,000 grant, Ukiah in 1914 and Lakeport in 1917.

Examples of Type C with Mission elements total thirteen, with nine extant. Symmetry and a central entrance element, projecting or recessed but lower than the roof line, characterize the group; arched and tile openings, tile roofs, hipped or gable rooflines, curvilinear gable ends, wide arched windows, are variously present. All, with the exception of Berkeley, were constructed after 1908. Those which have been demolished are Berkeley, Sanger, Dinuba, and Los Angeles/Boyle Heights. Extant examples are Anaheim, Lincoln, Santa Cruz/Garfield and Santa Cruz/Seabright, San Francisco/Richmond, Turlock, Gridley, Orland, and Patterson. Excepting the metropolitan branch, this group is bracketed by Anaheim and Turlock with grants of $10,000, and the Santa Cruz branches and Patterson at $3000. However, the amount of the grant is not always the cost of the library, as will be discussed later; Patterson is a notable example, as that community raised an additional $8000 to construct their library. All are in good condition, and, with the exception of Santa Cruz/Seabright, are essentially unaltered.

8. Other Styles

Three Carnegie buildings at Biggs, Clovis, and Walnut Creek, do not exemplify a particular style but demonstrate considerable craftsmanship and community effort. The extant examples, Biggs and Clovis, are important community buildings.

The Biggs Carnegie, small, brick, one story over a raised basement, is almost a cube under a low hipped roof. An original recessed front porch extending across the front of the building is now two-thirds glassed in; the remaining one-third remains a recessed porch. Notable for its brick craftsmanship, it was constructed with a $5,000 grant in 1908, a small amount for that period, but large considering that its population was less than 500.

The Clovis Carnegie, built in 1915 with a $7,000 grant, is stucco, under a low hipped roof, with a projecting central entrance also under a hipped roof. It has been remodelled after a concerted community effort, and the projecting entrance altered somewhat.

The Walnut Creek building, demolished in 1961, was a one story stucco structure having two wings placed at an angle with an entrance between, each with its own gable. It was a product of the county library system; grants of $2,500 each for Walnut Creek, Antioch and Concord, all then small Contra Costa communities, represented the cooperative effort of the county Board of Supervisors, the town, and the townspeople.

In Appendix A, three Classical Revival buildings have been listed as "Classical Revival/Other," to indicate that alterations have substantially changed their character. Alturas was remodelled to a version of the Moderne style by a private owner for its new use as an office building. A mansard roof was added to Beaumont. El Centro was "wrapped in steel bands" following earthquake damage and then plastered over, then a new wing was constructed adjacent to it. All are extant.

9. Summary

Using Van Slyck's classifications, the California Carnegies may be summarized as follows:

Summary of California Carnegies, Van Slyck classifications

	# of Buildings	% of 144	# Extant	% Extant in Type
Type A (triumphal arch)	24	16.67	9	37.50
Type B (Greek temple)	36	25.00	21	58.33
Type C (Simplified classical)	32	22.22	23	71.88
Type D* (All other)	52	36.11	34	65.38
	144	100.00	87	
*D Romanesque	6	4.17	4	66.67
Colonial Revival	1	.69	1	100.00
Tudor Revival	2	1.39	1	50.00
Italian Renaissance	9	6.25	9	100.00
Mission/Spanish	27	18.75	13	51.85
Bungalow/Craftsman	4	2.78	3	75.00
Other	3	2.08	2	66.67
	52	36.11	34	

As noted earlier, the line was very thin between classification as Classical Revival Type C with Mission elements, as opposed to Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival with Classical elements. Following, the numbers are re-grouped. Buildings with Mission elements are removed from Classical Revival Type C, Mission Revival is removed from Type D, and the

two are combined. The new "Mission" group totals forty, with twenty-three extant, a somewhat higher rate of survival than the Mission/Spanish group alone, but lower than Type C considered as a whole.

	# of Buildings	% of 144	# Extant	% Extant in Type
A + B (Classical)	60	41.67	30	50.00
C (Classical only)	19	13.19	14	73.68
C with Mission + D Mission	40	27.78	23	57.50
Other D	25	17.36	20	80.00
	144	100.00	87	

Also, examining classical alone:

	# of Buildings	% of 144	# Extant	% Extant in Type
A + B + C	92	63.89	53	57.61
A + B + C (Classical only)	79	54.86	44	55.60

The predominance of the Classical Revival among Carnegie library buildings may be traced to nationwide enthusiasm for the City Beautiful movement. Inspired by Daniel Burnham and his design for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, architects and fairgoers brought the City Beautiful to all parts of the country. "Grand in scale, monumental, symmetrical, luxuriously appointed, with a broad and richly pictorial vocabulary of Classical ornament. Its mode was noble, for it was the architecture of a society that sought reform, progress--perfection."[9] It lent itself to "civic monuments," including libraries. Van Slyck studied a sample of 85 Carnegie libraries in towns and cities nationwide which received a Carnegie grant for a single building. She identified buildings in each category, and then grouped them before and after 1908, the year when Bertram began requiring that plans be submitted.

Van Slyck's Sample of 85 libraries	1899-1917	1899-1907	1908-1917
Type A (triumphal arch)	22.4%	22.6%	21.7%
Type B (temple front)	48.3%	53.2%	34.8%
Type C (simplified)	20%	14.5%	34.8%
Type D	9.4%	9.7%	8.7%

In the following comparison for California, academic libraries are not included because they were not subject to the Bertram plan review; the total number of libraries here is 142.

California Carnegie Public Libraries	% of each category constructed between 1901-1922	1901-1907	1908-1922
Type A (24)	16.90%	18.60%	16.17%
Type B (35)	24.65%	30.23%	22.22%
Type C (32)	22.54%	9.30%	28.28%
Type D (51)	35.91%	41.87%	33.33%
Total = 142	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Of the above, those extant	% of extant in each category constructed between 1901-1922	1901-1907	1908-1922
Type A (9)	10.59%	0%	12.00%
Type B (20)	23.53%	50%	20.00%
Type C (23)	27.07%	0%	30.67%
Type D (33)	38.82%	50%	37.33%
Total = 85	100.00%	100%	100.00%

Van Slyck's sample of 85 Carnegies and the California Carnegies both demonstrate that when cities erected the building of their choice, that building was often a "temple" Type B. Van Slyck surmises that Bertram offered cities smaller amounts of money in the later years to bring about a more modest architectural style.

In California, among the buildings identified as Type C, thirteen used classical elements in such a way as to suggest a Spanish style. This characteristic was most notable in buildings of the later years when, in addition to Bertram's closer scrutiny, there was the added fact that smaller cities, counties, and assessment districts were able to apply for branch libraries, and they received less funding based on their population. Included in Type D are, from the earlier years, several buildings influenced by H.H. Richardson's Romanesque style, plus a number of Spanish Revivals, and a few examples of Cottage and Tudor; from the later years, several examples of the Craftsman and Bungalow styles appear.

B. Extant libraries and their uses

In 1967, 103 of California's 142 Carnegie-funded public library buildings were still standing, according to Bobinski's nationwide survey of Carnegies. In 1989, 85 remain. Testimony to the esteem in which the buildings are held, and to the increasing effectiveness of the preservation movement in California, is the fact that since 1978 none has been demolished. In only two counties have all of the Carnegies been lost -- San Diego which had five and Shasta which had one. Communities with the remaining Carnegies increasingly express awareness of a community Carnegie treasure.

In California communities, extant libraries are used in a variety of ways, with public library still the predominant use. (See Appendix A, sorted by use.) Following is a summary of current uses of California's extant Carnegies, including the two academic libraries, bringing the total to 144.

Richardsonian Romanesque: (6 in group, 4 extant)
Hanford, San Luis Obispo and Chico (now Mediterranean) are museums; Nevada City is a library; all are in public ownership.

Colonial Revival: (1 in group, extant)
Oakland/Golden Gate is still a public library, and also houses the Northern California Center for Afro-American History and Life.

Tudor Revival: (2 in group, 1 extant)
Oakland/Alden is a public library.

Italian Renaissance: (9 in group, all extant)
Sacramento, San Francisco Main, and the San Francisco and Los Angeles branches are public libraries; Oakland Main contains city offices, but has been closed since the 1989 earthquake. San Francisco Main has not fully reopened since the earthquake and planning has already begun for it to house the Asian Art collection upon completion of a new library. Renovation and seismic upgrade is planned for San Francisco and Los Angeles branches; Los Angeles branch operations will move to nearby alternative locations in Spring 1990 while this work is being completed. Sacramento is undergoing renovation and expansion. All are publicly owned.

Mission/Spanish: (27 in group, 14 extant)
Woodland, Pacific Grove, Dixon. Santa Barbara, and San Anselmo are public libraries. St. Helena and Exeter are community centers; and tentative plans call for the now vacant Eagle

Rock to become one. Oakland/23rd Avenue, also vacant, is to become a book storage area; Calexico is used for city storage. These buildings all are in public ownership. The future of the latter two may be somewhat precarious.

Corning and Oakdale are office buildings; Monterey is a library for the Institute of International Studies; the Margaret Carnegie Library at Mills College still serves, with an addition, as the school library. All appear to have satisfactory occupancy with the possible exception of Corning, which has vacancies.

Bungalow/Craftsman: (4 in group, 3 extant)
Yolo and Orosi are public libraries; Riverbank houses the Chamber of Commerce and a small museum. All are publicly owned, but Orosi may be in some danger due to a shortage of county funds for libraries.

Classical Revival, Type A (Triumphal arch): (24 in group, 9 extant)
San Rafael, South Pasadena, El Centro, Grass Valley, Oakland/Melrose, San Francisco/ Presidio, and South San Francisco still serve as public libraries; Hollister is a City Hall, and Upland is vacant but a library-related use is planned. All are in public ownership. (Following remodelling, South Pasadena and El Centro no longer represent the style.)

Classical Revival, Type B (Greek temple): (36 in group, 21 extant)
Alameda, East San Jose, Paso Robles, and Beaumont (though no longer representative of the style) still serve as public libraries. Petaluma, Oxnard, Colton, Gilroy, Healdsburg, Richmond, Livermore, Lompoc, and Willows, are now museums, in whole or in part. Colusa and Oroville house civic departments, Auburn an art and senior center, Lodi a civic meeting hall, and community use is planned for Roseville. Eureka is used for library administration and book storage, and Vacaville is vacant. The Pomona College Carnegie houses several academic departments. All but Vacaville and Pomona College are in public ownership. There is evidence of community commitment to preserve all of the buildings, but in the case of the privately owned and vacant Vacaville, this may be somewhat harder to exercise.

Classical Revival, Type C (with classical elements): (19 in group, 14 extant)
Still used as public libraries are Ferndale, San Francisco/Noe Valley and Sunset branches, Santa Monica/Ocean Park, and Bayliss. Newman is a museum, Antioch is a museum and historical society, Sonoma houses the Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Center, Willits is being used as a office for a city-owned cable TV, and Yreka is a police department. Lakeport is vacant; plans to restore it and surrounding park landscaping have been delayed. These buildings are all in public ownership. Privately owned are Mill Valley, now a residence, Alturas, leased back to the county for offices, and Ukiah, housing profit and non -profit activities. There appears to be a concensus of commitment to their protection.

Classical Revival, Type C (with Mission elements): (13 in group, 9 extant)
Lincoln, Santa Cruz/Garfield, and San Francisco/Richmond still serve as public libraries. Santa Cruz/Seabright is a museum, Turlock an art and crafts center, Orland a community center, and Gridley is vacant. These buildings are all in public ownership. Gridley is county-owned, so concern about its welfare is once removed from the community. The Patterson Carnegie is privately owned and new owners are in the process of planning its restoration.

Other Styles: (3 in group, 2 extant)
Biggs is a public library, with basement offices for the city government; Clovis is a community center with basement offices for the Chamber of Commerce. Both are publicly owned and well used.

Summary of uses: (144 in group, 87 extant)
Seventy-seven of the extant Carnegies are in public ownership: thirty-eight are public libraries (including one which shares space with city offices); one is used for library administration and book storage; five are community centers for seniors and arts and crafts; three house Chambers of Commerce as the primary use, with other uses sharing the space also; six are used exclusively for major city functions, although one of those, Oakland Main, is temporarily closed due to earthquake damage; two provide space for lesser city activities (city cable TV equipment and city storage); thirteen are museums of history or art; three others, also museums, share space with activities such as Chamber of Commerce and senior center; six are vacant, with future plans including historical library, community centers, and book storage.
Ten of the extant Carnegies are privately owned: one is still the college library; one houses college administrative offices; one is a residence; one is the library of a private institute; four house office buildings; one is being renovated for professional offices; one, formerly a restaurant, is now vacant.

C. Carnegie architects

There were a few "Carnegie specialists," and most Carnegies were designed by architects who designed only one; this was true nationwide and in California. Probably the most prolific of the specialists were Patton & Miller of Chicago, who designed more than one hundred Carnegies in the Midwest and as far afield as Wyoming and Louisiana. They were said to have designed one in every six of Iowa's Carnegies. In California, William H. Weeks designed twenty-one Carnegies, approximately 15% compared to Patton & Miller's 16% of Iowa Carnegies. F.P. Burnham and Burnham & Bliesner accounted for another eleven

Carnegies. Four architects designed three each, ten architects designed two each. Over fifty per cent of the Carnegies were designed by architects who designed just one Carnegie library.

In addition to being numerous, the Carnegie libraries of William H. Weeks span nearly the entire Carnegie period from 1902 to 1921 and demonstrate the chronological evolution of style over those years. Three of his earlier commissions, in 1902, 1903, and 1904, were in the Romanesque style. The fourth, his 1903 design for Watsonville, was an elaborate variation on the triumphal arch theme. From 1906 through 1911 he designed eight Classic Revival Carnegies, of which seven were the pedimented type, and one Spanish Revival building. Between 1913 and 1921 he built just six Classical Revival libraries, two in the triumphal arch style and four in the more minimalist style, as well as two Craftsman cottage libraries.

For his first library commission, Santa Cruz, Weeks designed a building in the Richardson style. At $20,000 it was one of the more expensive libraries he designed. Santa Cruz had in fact been expecting a grant of $30,000 to $40,000 and had envisioned a splendid building, but Carnegie offered only $15,000. In one of the rare instances when Bertram granted a personal interview to a petitioner, a Santa Cruz advocate, aided by a shared Scotch ancestry, won the increase to $20,000. Weeks' design won in a competition against eight other architects and its construction used the entire Carnegie grant. Additional funds to furnish the building were raised through public subscription and benefits.[10] Weeks' other two Romanesque libraries, in San Luis Obispo and Nevada City, were on a smaller scale but are notable for their use of natural and man-made stones.

Nine of Weeks' Classical Revival libraries are extant, including all seven of his "temple style" buildings, pedimented and columned, mostly of brick with quoins. As a group, these are the familiar "look-alike Carnegies." They are Gilroy, Paso Robles, Livermore, Lompoc, Richmond, Oroville, and Roseville. Some were saved after considerable local effort. One is listed on the National Register for Historic Places; one is still a library; four are museums, and one is maintained by its city and houses public works departments, one has recently been renovated and is expected to become a community center, possibly including a museum. Weeks' "triumphal arch" Oakland/Melrose, and South San Francisco Carnegies are both libraries; but the San Leandro and Watsonville buildings have been demolished.

Other Weeks' Carnegies include the Spanish Revival Monterey library, the smaller Classical Revival buildings designed for Santa Cruz/Garfield, Santa Cruz/Seabright, Yreka, and Orland, and the Yolo Craftsman cottage, all extant. Yolo's duplicate, Santa Cruz/Eastside, is no longer standing. In all, seventeen of the twenty-one Weeks Carnegies are still standing, as is his 1915 addition to Woodland.

Weeks opened his office in Watsonville in 1894 and lived in and around that area until more distant projects dictated a move, first to Palo Alto and then to the East Bay. Among his varied projects were more than fifty civic and commercial buildings, more than ninety residences in Watsonville, and the Casino at Santa Cruz. His schools, libraries, banks, lodge halls, churches, gymnasiums, hospitals, hotels, and residences are found in more than 140 communities covering almost all of California north of the Tehachipi. He designed at least one building in Southern California, an orphanage in Pomona, and at least one non-Carnegie library, the McHenry Library of Modesto, funded by a local philanthropist.[11]

F.P. Burnham might have designed as many Carnegies as Weeks had he not died at a relatively early age in 1909. Already noted in the east, especially for his work on the State Capitol in Atlanta, Georgia, Burnham arrived in Southern California at the turn of the century and his work was concentrated in that region. Between 1901 and 1908, first as Burnham & Bliesner and later on his own, he designed eleven libraries, mostly in the greater Los Angeles area. In 1901, with Bliesner, he designed the Spanish Revival Riverside library; in 1902, the triumphal arch Pomona and San Bernardino libraries, the latter with a dome. All were relatively expensive buildings, with grants of $20,000, $15,000, and $20,000 respectively, and none remain. With the exception of the $30,000 Long Beach building, his last libraries, beginning in 1904, were all in the temple mode, and their grants were smaller: $12,000 for Oxnard, $10,000 for Whittier and Corona,* Ontario, Colton, and Santa Maria, and $9000 for Covina. Only Colton and Oxnard are extant, and both are on the National Register, as was Corona, later demolished. Burnham also designed the Pomona College library, built with a $40,000 grant and extant.

Several cities hosted competitions for the design of their libraries, San Diego and Fresno competitions were won by the New York firms of Ackerman & Ross, and Copeland & Dole. These early libraries were funded for the relatively higher amounts of $60,000 and $30,000, respectively, and both were substantial buildings in the triumphal arch style. Both were demolished in the 1950's.

Well known architects were enlisted by San Francisco when, after a 1912 public vote, it finally accepted its 1901 Carnegie grant. Bliss & Faville designed the first, the Richmond Branch. They had designed the Carnegie-funded Oakland Main Library in 1901, and their San Francisco buildings included the Southern Pacific and Matson Buildings, Geary Theater, St. Francis Hotel, Bank of California, and the State Building at the Civic Center. Also in 1914, George Kelham, Albert Lansburgh, Albert Pissis, and the Reid Brothers were invited to compete for the main library commission. Kelham's design was selected, the only

**Although Whittier and Corona grants were increased by Carnegie to $12,500 and $11,500, respectively).*

representative of Beaux Arts style among the California Carnegies and an important element in San Francisco's City Beautiful Civic Center plan. San Francisco's Russ Building and Shell Building are also attributed to Kelham. John Reid Jr., designer of many schools including Mission High, and Ernest Coxhead, known especially for his distinctive shingle -style residences and churches throughout the Bay area, were responsible for the Noe Valley and Golden Gate branches in 1916 and 1918. The remaining four branches, Mission, Sunset, North Beach (now Chinatown), and Presidio, were designed by G. Albert Lansburgh, noted for his design of theaters and auditoriums including, in San Francisco, the Warfield and Golden Gate.[12]

Of the other notable Carnegie architects, probably the best known today is Julia Morgan, whose sole Carnegie was the Margaret Carnegie Library at Mills College. Allison & Allison, who arrived in Los Angeles from Pittsburgh in about 1910, also designed just one Carnegie. They designed many Southern California schools and residences, promoted local manufacture of brick and used it extensively, and introduced schools with arcades or outside corridors. Their design for an "intellectual park" in the fast-growing city of Calexico drew widespread admiration, but when Carnegie funding was less than expected the building was severely compromised. Later, with Kelham, Allison & Allison planned the UCLA campus, and in the 1930's they designed a number of post offices.[13]

Many of the Carnegie architects were well known locally or regionally. Except for the branch designed by Weeks, the Oakland branches were the work of Donovan and Dickey. In Sonoma County, Brainerd Jones designed three Carnegies; locally honored, he has yet not been extensively studied and little is known of his work outside of Sonoma County. Stone & Smith of San Francisco designed three very different Carnegies, the Romanesque Chico, Classical Revival Colusa, and Spanish Revival Hayward. In San Jose, Jacob Lenzen designed many commercial, civic and residential structures in addition to the East San Jose Carnegie; he also designed the Salinas Carnegie. Both his brother Theodore and his son Theodore were architects, and apparently each sometimes worked with Jacob, making exact attribution difficult. Marsh & Russell designed Carnegies in Santa Monica, Hollywood, and South Pasadena, and Norman Marsh himself is associated with the layout of the canal concept for Venice, adjacent to Santa Monica. Benjamin McDougall designed the National Register Carnegie in Hanford, as well as Carnegies in Visalia and Pacific Grove, and the Federal Building in Oakland.[14]

Homer Glidden of Los Angeles designed the Upland Carnegie and the fire house adjacent to it, and was to also design the city hall; however, that building was not constructed until some twenty-five years later, and then as a WPA project. Locally, the contractor, John Gerry, was very well known. He constructed many buildings in Ontario and Upland, and his importance to the development of the community is widely recognized. He has been the subject of an oral history, on file in the library.

Many of the Carnegie architects and builders await more in-depth study. Not listed in the major reference works, they may be becoming better known locally and regionally as more communities complete historic surveys.

D. Library Interiors

When James Bertram began to exert more direct control over library planning, his concern was the overall efficiency of the building. The Carnegie goal, as expressed in capital letters by Bertram in his "Notes on the Erection of Library Bildings," was TO OBTAIN FOR THE MONEY THE UTMOST AMOUNT OF EFFECTIV ACCOMMODATION, CONSISTENT WITH GOOD TASTE IN BILDING. The apparent obstacle to that goal was the architect, who would direct his attention to architectural features and neglect interior practicality.

As noted earlier, only a few Carnegie architects, and certainly only a few library trustees, built more than one library. Also, few libraries were staffed by trained librarians with professional education, experience, or contact with other librarians; they lacked the knowledge and confidence to specify interior design for user satisfaction and library efficiency. Floor plans and admonitions provided by Bertram in the "Notes," designed to meet the needs of small and medium-sized libraries, were the result of his own consideration of "hundreds of plans," in the process of which he sometimes sought consultation from representatives of the newly emerging profession of librarianship.

The many-storied hall of European university libraries had been combined with the alcoves of the English university libraries to create the first real architecture of libraries in the United States, the 1854 Astor Library, "a three story row building. whose exterior was fashioned in the manner of a Renaissance palazzo,"[15] Its pattern was followed in the 1859 Boston Public Library, the 1861 Peabody Institute, and the 1874 Cincinnati Public Library.

Hall and alcoves were incorporated by H.H. Richardson in the Winn Memorial Library in Woburn, Massachusetts; his innovation was to plan spaces with shape and height appropriate to each function, and then allow the exterior to reflect that variation of shape and height.[16] The Richardsonian Romanesque style, as it developed in the design of three more libraries by Richardson, additional libraries by contemporaries, and many more by imitators, was the style of choice when the first Carnegies were built in the East.

The American Library Association had been organized in 1876, the same year that Richardson began work on Winn Memorial. At the fourth meeting of the association, in 1881, a panel of librarians discussed planning and was almost unanimous in its criticism

of the tall hall and alcoves of the Astor and Winn style of library. Specifically they noted that the very high ceilinged halls were a danger to the books because of the inevitable uneven heating, that time and energy were wasted in climbing staircases and ladders to retrieve books from high shelves, and that the alcoves were difficult to supervise. In general they criticized the placing of architectural effect ahead of library function.

Nor were practical interiors a major consideration in the Classical Revival buildings of the City Beautiful movement, inspired by the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition. Incorporated in civic plans throughout the nation, the style's popularity insured its application to many of the libraries which were built in such large numbers as a result of the Carnegie philanthropy.

Among the librarians who began to write extensively about interior library design was William F. Poole, present at the 1881 meeting, who in 1885 expressed many of the ideas to be put forth by Bertram twenty-five years later. Broadly interpreted, many are valid today. Number one was sufficient light and ventilation, from all sides; if lot size didn't permit that, he advocated a corner lot, with a skylight only if necessary. Reading rooms should be placed to benefit from north light. Although he specified reading rooms for ladies, gentlemen, reference, and periodicals, these divisions would be achieved by half -partitions so as not to block light; only the librarian's office and directors' meeting room would be separated by floor to ceiling partitions. He placed the librarian in the center, able to view the entire library. Above all, the counsel of librarians should be sought.

Also like Bertram, Poole called for one main floor over a basement; he also stressed the need for good basement drainage and a good heating system. He advocated planning from the beginning to enable future enlargement of the building, and a site selected to accommodate the expansion. In contrast to Bertram, he advocated a plan in the form of a cross, with expansion upwards to a second floor before extending one of the arms of the cross.

Poole also noted the importance of craftsmanship and quality in the building interior. Bertram did not comment on this aspect of design, but the Carnegies are generally characterized by interior architectural detail, workmanship, and well-made furnishings such as bookcases, tables and chairs.

Bertram's "Notes" were prepared for the library costing $10,000, "more or less." He seemed to recognize an innocence, except perhaps of pride, of library committee members who have "lackt time or opportunity to obtain a knowledge of library planning," and perhaps placed more responsibility on the part of architects, when he said that the committees "ar led" to select impractical or uneconomical designs. As for architects

themselves, some "ar liable, unconsciously, no dout, to aim at architectural features and to subordinate useful accommodation;" he also noted their lack of practical information about library functions.

Bertram specified a rectangular building, one-story and basement, with the main floor housing the books, check-out counter, and adult and children's reading rooms, the basement housing lecture room, heating, and "all conveniences for library patrons and staff." Assuming the presence of just one librarian, he recommended one large rectangular room,"sub-divided as required by means of bookcases," with a glass partition above if necessary for quiet. The basement should be four feet below grade, allowing natural light, with basement ceilings at nine to ten feet, first floor ceilings at twelve to fifteen feet. Rear and side windows should begin at about six feet to allow space for book cases below. The site selected should permit light from all sides and allow for later addition to the building, and Bertram found occasion to remind trustees who ignored this admonition that they should not expect to receive later money for a new library. He especially noted waste in entrance, cloak rooms, toilets and stairs. Regarding the exterior, "the community and architect may express their individuality, keeping to a plain, dignified structure and not aiming at such exterior effects as may make impossible an effectiv and economical layout of the interior."

The six floor plans that accompanied the Notes were basically all variations of the theme, adjusted for lots of various shapes and sizes. A and B are for wide lots, C for a deep lot; A, B, and C have central entrances; D, for a corner lot, has a corner entrance. The smaller E and F have the entrance to one side. D and E are square, the rest are rectangular.

With the exception of some Craftsman, the post-1911 small to medium buildings are rectangular with central entrance and are basically one large room. With the exception of the Tudor, Mission, and Romanesque, the same could be said of most of the small to medium pre-1911 buildings. The only California Carnegie that might be plan E is Biggs, built before the Notes were issued. Buildings with Plan D corner entrances pre-dated the plans and were also larger buildings. It is not possible to specifically allocate the various plans among the small to medium sized Carnegies built after 1911, or to compare a sufficient number of pre-1908 or pre-1911 buildings according to plan.

News Notes of California Libraries published reports on library buildings in their issues of July, 1906, and July, 1919.[17] However, libraries were self-described; two libraries might have listed five rooms, one library including in the count various small workrooms, while another listed as separate rooms the various spaces in an undivided large main room. It is probably safe to say, based on the file of Carnegie Corporation correspondence, that few libraries followed the plans exactly, but that most followed them in principle, often after considerable cajoling from Bertram.

News Notes included plans of several libraries, which are attached as Appendix E. Those shown in the 1906 issue are Corona, constructed in 1906 for $11,500*; Palo Alto, 1904, $10,000; Tulare, 1905, $10,000; Watsonville, 1905, $12,000; and Covina, 1905, $9,000. Interestingly, all are Carnegies, and all have been demolished. Though fairly open in plan, especially Palo Alto, all include workrooms and restrooms on the first floor. Later, trustees would have many debates with Bertram to establish the convenience and efficiency of locating these facilities on the first floor, and many succeeded.

In the 1919 issue, News Notes chose to focus on branch and county libraries. Plans are shown for Walnut Creek, 1916, $2,500; Bayliss, 1917, $4,000; Yolo, 1918, $3,000; Oakdale, 1917, $7,000; and Oakland/23rd Avenue, 1917, $35,000. Again, all are Carnegies; in this case, all but Walnut Creek are extant. Oakdale is a fairly accurate rendition of Plan B. Neither Bayliss nor Yolo had basements, and toilets are located on the first floor. In Bayliss, spaces are separated by large arched openings. The Craftsman Yolo building, and Walnut Creek, do not fit the plans. The Oakland branch was more expensive than those libraries covered by the Notes. As demonstrated by Oakdale, libraries that cost closer to the $10,000 are more likely to adhere to the plans.

Most new small libraries today are open in plan, and certainly light remains a major consideration. Most are located on one floor, and all are designed to be accessible to handicapped persons. The most often cited interior design obstacles to continuing use of the smaller Carnegie libraries have been size, basement, and inner stairs. Real problems arise, too, concerning lighting, wiring, heating and plumbing, and roof leaks.

A 1985 California conference for librarians, on the planning of both new buildings and renovations, included several workshops on pre-planning and working with architects.[18] The most emphasized renovation problem was space and the expense of achieving it, to accommodate more books, more users, more services, more technical equipment, and usually more than one librarian. The other area of serious problem noted was to provide for modern electrical needs. In some cases these problems have been met by building a separate building with the desired modern features, connected by an entrance element to the older building which is retained as a reading room, as in San Rafael, or children's room, as in East San Jose, where the amenities of the older building can be appreciated apart from the more efficient library functions.

**Some cost amounts vary from those listed in this report; see section E, "Grant amounts."*

E. Grant Amounts

When the first California Carnegie grants were made, to San Diego, Oakland and Alameda, many of the processes that later characterized the program had not yet been developed. Response to requests for more money is one example of this. San Diego was originally offered $50,000, but requested and received an additional $10,000 for steel book stacks. Alameda first accepted a $10,000 Carnegie grant, expecting to raise additional local funds to provide a "proper edifice," but soon went back to to Carnegie, and their grant was raised to $35,000. Fast growing Long Beach, offered $12,500 in 1905, was eventually granted $30,000. As that sort of request became more frequent, it was even more often rejected. Bertram eventually required that recipients sign a letter indicating their commitment to complete the building, ready for occupancy for the use intended, with the funds provided.

One supplementary request that was hard to deny was for earthquake damage. No Carnegie libraries had been built in San Francisco before the 1906 earthquake, but nearby many were damaged, and Carnegie granted additional funds for repair of several. Santa Rosa's two-year old Romanesque library lost its tower, and Carnegie provided $6900 for repairs, as well as for improved lighting. Other cities receiving additional funds for 1906 earthquake repair included San Mateo, $2500; Redwood City, $6000; and Hayward, $1750. The earthquake caused costly delay where it did not do actual damage. Petaluma's new library was complete but had not yet opened; repairs delayed its opening until November, but additional funding was not requested. In Colusa, many miles from San Francisco, completion of the new library was delayed because furniture and fixtures, ordered from San Francisco, were destroyed in the fire following the earthquake. In Nevada City, work was delayed, with disastrous results for the contractor, because needed workmen were engaged in earthquake repair. Later Los Angeles and Imperial Valley earthquakes also caused serious damage, eliciting extra funding in a few cases; the El Centro library, in particular, required drastic renovation.

The more recent October 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake resulted in the temporary closing of most of the San Francisco libraries pending an engineering check. Most of those soon reopened; the Presidio Branch remained closed for a longer period, and the Main Library opened even later and on a limited scale. Carnegie buildings in Hollister, Monterey, Pacific Grove, and Santa Cruz all survived with minor, if any, damage.

The granting of additional funds has led to some confusion about the actual cost of the buildings. Figures listed in the several sources vary, some including supplementary funding and some listing the original amount. The actual chain of events may or may not be found in Carnegie correspondence or library minutes. When libraries ran over cost, or when cities determined they wanted to spend more than the allotted amount, private fund

raising and city contribution augmented the budget, making it sometimes difficult to gauge the actual cost of a given building based on the reported Carnegie grant. When cities did report the real cost of the building, they sometimes added in the cost of the land, further confusing an attempt at comparison.

F. Later libraries

In the later years of the program, funding in California was not limited to municipalities. California legislation of 1909, revised in 1911, permitted formation of county library systems; after that, rural areas could meet the Carnegie prerequisites of a tax to support the library. The 1911 legislation also permitted formation of library districts and of public libraries in union high school districts. Municipal grants did continue, mostly to smaller towns, with the notable exceptions, in 1914, of Sacramento and Santa Barbara. Several municipalities also received later funding for branches, including the four branches for Oakland, three for Santa Cruz and one for Santa Monica.*

Beaumont is an example of a library district formed in an unincorporated area. A library had been initiated by the women's club in 1909, and in 1911 an election was held to establish a library district covering an area of 60 square miles.** Beaumont incorporated in 1912 but the library has remained a district library, serving the wider population.

Carnegie funds paid for libraries in union high school district libraries at Coalinga, Dixon, and Vacaville. The Coalinga building no longer stands. Vacaville's Carnegie became a restaurant, "The Library," but is now vacant. In Dixon the Women's Improvement Club organized the library in 1911, and corresponded with Bertram to obtain the library, but the Dixon Union High School Library District signed the deed when the library site was purchased for $10. The library continues to serve the area as the Dixon Unified School District Library District.

From 1915 until 1917 when the last awards were made, the majority of the grants went to county branches including Antioch, Concord, and Walnut Creek in Contra Costa County; Clovis and Sanger in Fresno County; Dinuba and Orosi in Tulare County; Oakdale, Patterson

**San Francisco branches, as noted earlier, were funded very early, but were not constructed until almost the end of the program.*
*** Only men were then allowed to vote; the library district was approved, 59 for and 27 against, a vote which seemed to strongly endorse both the library and the women's effort in its behalf. Two months later, however, women's suffrage barely passed in Beaumont, 71 for and 67 against.*

and Riverbank in Stanislaus County, and Yolo. In these cases it was the County Library which negotiated with Bertram.

In Yolo County the county librarian's request met with considerable resistance from Bertram, who questioned the proposed location and the equitableness of providing more funds for Yolo County. The Woodland library, originally funded in 1903, had in 1914 received from Carnegie an additional $12,000 for expansion of the building to meet countywide needs. Woodland's 1917 request for Carnegie funding of a series of branch libraries was at first refused, but after much correspondence, $3000 was granted for one branch, built at Yolo.

A later library that does not fit into any of the above categories, and which is perhaps unique in the United States, is the Bayliss District library. It is said to be the first instance of Carnegie funding of a library in a rural unincorporated community that was not part of any district, the only such library "built at a crossroad." The library grew from a travelling library established in the "Bayliss Tract" by the Glenn County Library, and became so important to the residents of the area that they sought a permanent building. Land was donated by the Sacramento Valley Irrigation Company and Glenn County guaranteed the tax support required for the $4000 Carnegie grant. University of California classes planned the landscaping. The library is staffed by volunteers.

G. Additions and changes

Many communities found themselves outgrowing their libraries within a few years. Much of the Carnegie correspondence relates to predictions by library and city officials that this would be the case, as they tried unsuccessfully to convince Bertram that population figures from the last census scarcely described their present size and expected growth, nor took into account the numbers of people from surrounding areas.

Homer Glidden, architect of the Upland Carnegie, defending himself against Bertram's criticism of his floor plan, explained that his plans would accommodate future expansion: "The only possible expansion for the building is directly to the rear and the rear wing was given entirely to the Stack room with the intention that the rear wall (which is of frame, veneered on the outside with brick) may be removed and a straight or Tee wing according to future requirements be added." [19]

The Glidden correspondence with Bertram is unusual because Bertram made it a rule not to correspond with architects. He wrote to the City Clerk of Upland that "We prefer to conduct our correspondence with you, the architect being responsible to you and you to us."[20] It is fortunate that Glidden did write to Bertram, because his letter is the only explanation found

for the fact that the rear wall of the Upland library is finished in a brick of lesser grade, and is without the fine detailing of the balustrade and cornice.

A number of other libraries did expand by adding directly to the back. Sometimes the size of the rectangle was more or less doubled by a rear extension which duplicated the building materials and design elements of the original building. Richmond, Lodi, Ferndale, Hollister, Oxnard, and San Anselmo are examples of this approach. At Oxnard, the interior of the original building remained the same, with columns and high ceilings, but in the new addition a lower first floor ceiling and an upper gallery provided considerable additional space. Second floor space in the Ferndale rear addition was accomplished by a slight adjustment to the roofline.

At South San Francisco, the addition is larger than the original, but is compatible and, even though visible from the front, is not a detraction. An addition to the rear of Dixon is less structural, less integrated, but is invisible from the front. In Alameda, a residential structure around the corner to the rear is used for additional library space. Santa Cruz/Seabright has been extended to the rear twice, but in such a way that its appearance from the front is much the same. Now an extension to the side is contemplated, which will be more visible. Pacific Grove is a unique example because its several additions have been to the front, while the back of the old building is still visible from the rear, and original elements of the first and second versions are clearly discernible in the interior.

The San Rafael, East San Jose, Santa Monica/Ocean Park, Mills College, Beaumont, and El Centro libraries are examples of a new wing constructed as a separate building, attached to the original structure by a connecting element which serves to differentiate between the old and the new. In the first four, the connecting corridor also provides the entrance to the larger building, and the original entrance to the old building has been allowed to retain its classic entrance facade.

At Beaumont and El Centro, however, incorporation of a new wing was accomplished by changing the character of the building. A Mansard roof now encircles both the old and new sections of the Beaumont building, with the intent of tying the two elements together stylistically. The El Centro library suffered severe earthquake damage in the late 1920's. Reinforcement was added to the old building, which was then plastered over, and classical elements removed. The effect is modern, and a new modern wing was added, placed at an angle to the original. The form of the original Classical Revival building is discernible in the large recessed window, which was formerly the recessed entrance.

Considerable community effort was brought to the 1985 restoration of the Clovis Carnegie, long vacant, resulting in the creation of the Clovis Chamber Community Hall, a social and meeting room upstairs, with the Chamber of Commerce downstairs. In the renovation the

front portico was somewhat restructured and new elements have been added. The building has been declared a Fresno County Historic Landmark.

Sometimes Carnegie funding was provided for additions, such as in Riverside, Pomona, San Bernardino, and South Pasadena, but more often the city was expected to use its own taxing and bonding powers once its original library had been constructed. In the case of South Pasadena, Carnegie funded only the 1916 addition. The original architect, Norman Marsh, served as consultant for a complete remodelling and change of style in 1930, and a representative of the firm he had founded served as consultant on the extensive 1981 renovation. The old Carnegie was never actually destroyed, but it is encompassed by the new building. South Pasadena does not consider its present building to be a Carnegie, and the remodelled building is a significant architectural asset in its own right.

If the revised and altered South Pasadena library is no longer perceived by the community to be a Carnegie, the question arises whether Eagle Rock, rebuilt on its old foundations, and Santa Barbara, remodelled several times, are still Carnegies. By contrast, Azusa provides an example of a library building being completely razed and then another building constructed on the site, while retaining the original setting.

The original Santa Barbara Carnegie, which opened in 1917, was designed in Spanish Revival style by Francis W. Wilson of Santa Barbara, with Pittsburgh architect Henry A. Hornbostel. An earthquake in 1925 severely damaged the eight year old building, collapsing two of its walls. Under the direction of Carleton Winslow, it was restored and somewhat altered the next year with city funds. Shortly thereafter the library received two gifts: adjacent land for an art gallery, and substantial funds for an art library. Architects for the new wing were Myron Hunt, who planned the Huntington mansion and library, and H.C. Chambers. The new building, in Egyptian style, is adjacent to the old and connected to it. A later bequest and substantial city and federal funding have permitted subsequent rehabilitation and remodeling in 1958 and 1977. It remains a building of considerable integrity, a significant contributor to the local architecture, and an important cultural resource in the community.

H. Planned changes, and threats to present buildings

Several libraries are now in the process of renovation, restoration, and expansion. In Sacramento, a full block "Library Plaza" under construction will contain the restored Carnegie, a compatible new library alongside the old, with a connecting element, a galleria behind the library and set back from the street, an office building, and a parking structure with retail space. In Lodi, library restoration is within a civic plaza, with unifying walkways. At Monterey, the Carnegie is now known as the William Tell Coleman Library of

the Monterey Institute of International Studies; it is being expanded with construction of a large new wing to the rear and off to one side. It appears that the original entrance will be maintained.

Some libraries previously expanded are now considering new buildings, incorporating later library design to accommodate expanded modern library functions. These include Alameda, San Rafael and San Anselmo, committed to preservation of the Carnegie building but in need of additional library facilities. Library buildings that have been adapted to other uses may again lack space to meet current needs. An adjacent storage building is being considered for the Petaluma Carnegie, now a museum. When buildings are occupied by city services, sometimes a shifting of departments can compensate if the present tenant outgrows the space, as in Colusa; then interior space must usually be rearranged.

Pending construction of a new library , the Nevada City Carnegie is expected to become Nevada County's historical and archival library. The Upland Carnegie has been vacated by its previous city tenant; there, an historical archival library is also an option being considered. Other Carnegies vacant at this time are Oakland/23rd (planned to become city storage), Gridley, and Vacaville. When ownership is private, as is the case in Vacaville, the building's lack of space or efficiency could potentially pose more of a threat for the building.

Privately owned Carnegies, in addition to Vacaville, are Mill Valley, Ukiah, Alturas, Monterey, Oakdale, Patterson, and Corning. All seem well maintained and in good condition. The Mill Valley building is a private residence; Patterson has been recently purchased and is being restored for professional office space. Corning and Oakdale have been restored for business use and their integrity maintained. Corning, however, lacks a sufficient number of tenants to insure its future prosperity.

Site is an important factor in the future of individual Carnegies. With the exception of the branches, most Carnegies were located proximate to downtown, as their pre-Carnegie predecessors had been. These buildings are now in or adjacent to "old downtown." Among the many examples of Carnegies located in towns which have been able to retain a viable downtown, or where an active preservation movement is restoring the downtown, are San Rafael, San Luis Obispo, Petaluma, Pacific Grove, and Santa Barbara. Some Carnegies that were located in residential areas and parks, such as Clovis, Turlock and Exeter, are well suited to community use. Branch libraries, although more often originally located in neighborhoods, or near small shopping areas, are similarly affected. The extant Santa Cruz branches and several of the San Francisco branches are in neighborhoods that have changed demographically but are still essentially residential.

When the old downtown or the neighborhood exhibits large numbers of vacant buildings, the options for the Carnegie, as library or in another capacity, are more limited. Examples include Gridley, Vacaville, and Richmond. Some neighborhood change is being accepted as a challenge. East San Jose, Oakland/Melrose , and Los Angeles/Lincoln Heights are examples of libraries meeting the needs of their new constituents with outreach programs and books in five or more languages. The neighborhood of Oakland/23rd Avenue has become primarily industrial and commercial, with evidence of potential vandalism in the high chain link fences surrounding the few residences and the vacant library building, which is scheduled to be used for storage. All extant Carnegies are on their original sites; only Hollywood, since demolished, was relocated.

The threat of earthquake is ever present for Carnegies, all of which predate current knowledge of construction methods for building in or near fault zones. Earthquake safety is probably the prime reason given for demolishing those buildings already lost, although earthquakes can be a handy scapegoat when economics and convenience are the actual motivators. New earthquake protections have been incorporated in many public buildings, and because of current legislation, many communities are surveying their pre-1934 buildings and appointing broadly based committees to draft local ordinances for building renovation and protection.

Probably the most threatened Carnegies at this time are Oakland/23rd Ave., Vacaville and Calexico. The editor of the Calexico Chronicle reports: "I trust the old library will be preserved as it is an important link with the past...it is also a serviceable building, but a local architect believes it is too expensive to remodel...there are some who wish to tear it down, others to remodel, others to use it as an additional office for city hall which is adjacent to it...some want it as a museum...I want it used and saved."[20]

III. SIGNIFICANCE

Carnegie Libraries are important in their respective communities under Criterion A in the area of Social History for the association with library development in California during the years 1849-1921. In the newly settled communities of California, the history of the public library was re-enacted within a few years as individuals and groups established reading rooms, formed library associations, and, after 1878, promoted municipal responsibility for libraries. However, few groups or cities could provide more than temporary and often inconvenient space for their library. The need for a library building was addressed by retired industrialist turned philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, who undertook the beneficial distribution of his "excess wealth" and perceived the gift of a library as a means to help people to help themselves. In accordance with this philosophy of "self help," Carnegie provided the funds for the building, while requiring the community to

provide the land on which it was built, and to maintain the library with an annual tax of at least 10% of the gift. Communities were energized to seek the funds, locate a site, pass the tax, and achieve a significant public building. Carnegie financed 2509 libraries throughout the English-speaking world. In California, 142 public library buildings and two academic libraries were constructed between 1901 and 1921 with Carnegie funding. As communities grew and library needs changed, some buildings were demolished, seldom without opposition from a library constituency which wanted to preserve its Carnegie. Today eighty-five of the public library buildings and the two academic library buildings are still standing. Thirty-eight Carnegies continue to serve as public libraries, while others now house museums, civic offices, community centers, professional buildings, and offices. The commitment to preserve those that remain has intensified.

The Carnegie Libraries are also important in their respective communities under Criterion C in the area of Architecture because they reflect the popular styles of the time and because they exemplify a particular and specialized building type which, stimulated by Andrew Carnegie's library philanthropy, was by 1921 to be found in approximately 84% of California's communities. Library buildings were constructed to provide a permanent home for the community's existing or anticipated library, and that home was seen as a civic structure, a demonstration of the community's intellectual and cultural status and of its prosperity. The City Beautiful movement added further incentive to communities to apply to Carnegie for an opportunity to unify progress and aesthetics. Later Carnegie policies emphasized the library role over civic pride; nevertheless, over the span of the program, workmanship, materials, and artistic values combined to produce a structure that today is identified as the Carnegie Library, often the community's only remaining civic structure of the period. Since World War II, the "information explosion," the building's structural or design limitations, and increased population have resulted in a demand for new and larger libraries with increased technological capabilities. Many libraries were expanded, and many others were demolished. However, since 1978 no California Carnegie has been demolished and commitment to preservation has led to more Carnegies being adapted to other uses. At this time there is an extant representative of each architectural style of Carnegie library building that was constructed in California.

IV. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

All of the buildings of the property type, California Carnegie Library Buildings, were built during the period of significance, 1901 through 1921. Each demonstrates some aspect of the historic development of libraries in California during the period and the social history of their communities, and will have served for some period of time as public libraries in their communities. Several architectural styles are represented in the property type.

Carnegie granted funds to cities, small communities and rural districts, with the amount based on population; grants for a single building ranged from $2,500 to $350,000. After 1908, building plans were reviewed prior to approval, with the goal of emphasizing efficiency of design. Buildings range from the very simple to the elaborate.

To be eligible for the National Register, a building should demonstrate architectural integrity. It need not be a clear example of one style, but must possess the essential elements of its style, and retain most of its original construction elements and other features, including original character forming features such as columns, friezes, pediments, and ornamentation.

It is recognized that libraries must serve the public by providing space for the collection, for reading and study, and ease of access. Since construction seventy to ninety years ago, they have faced increases in numbers and types of books and reference works, new library technology, user population, and sensitivity to the needs of handicapped citizens. Often it will have been found necessary to carry out alterations and additions. Carnegies adapted to other public and private use may face similar challenges. Insofar as possible, the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #4 regarding changes that are part of the history and development of the building, should be used as a guide.

Keeping in mind the above, alterations and additions are acceptable insofar as they are made only to the rear, and the proportions and mass of the building, as seen from the street or streets, appear to be compatible. The original entrance should be retained, though it need not serve as the main entrance. A new entrance should be easily located but not detract from the old. The original roof may be replaced with modern materials which appear to be similar to the original. If window materials are changed, fenestration patterns must remain. Any added windows or doors should be compatible with the existing patterns, or be replaceable. In cases where a separate wing has been built, it should not imitate the original building, but should be compatible; any connecting element should not be dominant.

Replacement of materials in kind is acceptable, as are minor alterations that do not impinge upon the historic character of the building. However, widespread use of new materials, such as stucco siding or aluminum windows, would render the building ineligible as long as those elements remain.

Stairs may have been replaced with similar stairs, and simple hand rails may be provided. Handicapped access ramps or elevators should be so placed as to be accessible to those who need them, yet not detract from the essential form or design elements of the building, and, if possible, should be removable without damaging the fabric of the building.

Presence of original interior woodwork, columns, window frames, moldings, ceiling, and library furniture, and outside elements such as light standards, may in some cases compensate for some less satisfactory alteration, especially for one that may be reversed.

Carnegie library buildings that have been remodelled in such a way that it then represents a different architectural style, the integrity of which has stood the test of time, may be considered under the above requirements.

Only one California Carnegie building, later demolished, has been moved from the original site and it is preferable that the building should be in its original location and setting. However, it is possible that in the future such a move might again be found necessary, and such a building would be eligible if its new location and setting were similar to the original and appropriate to the building.

ENDNOTES, SECTION F

1. This calculation does not include a 1901 grant to San Francisco which was not used until 1914-1921; the grant was offered pre-1907 and it was used post-1907. The amount of the grant, $750,000, exceeded the $700,000 total of all other California Carnegie grants between 1899 and 1907, and the amounts spent per building were also far higher than the average. To include either amount, in either chronological category, would skew the figures considerably. The San Francisco grant was an interesting anomaly in other respects as well:

   a. Andrew Carnegie offered the grant in a personal letter to then-Mayor James D. Phelan.
   b. San Francisco did not act on the offer until 1912. Then, when the Board of Supervisors voted to accept the offer, the Labor Council objected and took the matter to a vote of the people; however, the Board's action was ratified by the public.
   c. The 1901 offer was made before James Bertram had initiated the requirements for plan review which were in effect at the time the money was spent. Bertram acknowledged this and although he criticized the plans extensively, even referring them to consultants and passing on to San Francisco library trustees the criticism of the consultants, he wrote to San Francisco that under the circumstances he could "only appeal to the common sense" of the trustees (October 11, 1916). He reminded them that he did wish to review all of the plans, as "it is our rule to stamp plans with approval for identification." (January 15, 1917)

   Also not included in the above calculations were grants to two academic libraries. California received Carnegie funding for 142 public libraries and two academic libraries, at Mills College and Pomona College. Because public libraries were his subject, Bobinski used the number "142" for California's Carnegies. The historic context of this survey is rooted in the public library movement also, but the Mills and Pomona libraries are notable Carnegie buildings. They are included throughout Section F except in tables comparing library styles before and after 1908, that date referring to the beginning of James Bertram's close attention to the efficiency of library plans; academic libraries were not subject to this scrutiny.

   Additionally, elsewhere reference is sometimes made to Riverside's Arlington and Glendale's Grandview branch libraries as Carnegies. According to Ron Baker's Serving Through Partnership: A Centennial History of the Riverside City and County Public Library, 1888-1988, Carnegie funds were applied to a Burnham-designed addition to the main library, and city funds used to construct to the Arlington branch. In part this may have been because the Arlington Branch was to include a fire station, the type of combination definitely not approved by James Bertram.

Glendale librarians have referred to the Grandview branch, no longer extant, as a Carnegie building in two separate letters, one to the author in 1989 and one to Betty Lewis of Watsonville in 1985. However a Glendale branch is not listed by Anderson or Bobinski, and no reference to it was found in the Carnegie correspondence. Also, its completion date of 1926 is not consistent with Carnegie funding. In a phone call by the author to the Glendale correspondent, it was learned that unfortunately they have no documentation or articles about the building, but also no doubt that it is a Carnegie. Further research would be worthwhile. However, it is not included here.

2. Harold Kirker, California's Architectural Frontier: Style and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century (New York: Russell & Russell, 1960), 101.

3. Abigail A. Van Slyck, "Free to All: Carnegie Libraries and the Transformation of American Culture 1877-1917" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1989), 205.

4. Andrew Carnegie to James D. Phelan, then Mayor of San Francisco, dated 20 June 1901. Microfilm copy of handwritten letter, in Carnegie Corporation correspondence.

5. Andrew Carnegie to James D. Phelan, then Library Trustee, dated 23 [?] December 1912. Microfilm copy in Carnegie Corporation correspondence.

6. Marcus Whiffen, American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1981), 225.

7. Van Slyck, "Free to All," 283.

8. Van Slyck, "Free To All," 283-295.

9. Carole Rifkind, A Field Guide to American Architecture (New York: Times Mirror New American Library, 1980), 217.

10. Margaret Ann Souza, "A History of the Santa Cruz Public Library System" (M.A. thesis, San Jose State College, 1970), 18-29.

11. Betty Lewis, W.H. Weeks, Architect (Fresno: Panorama West Books, 1985), 16-18.

12. "Libraries Reflect the City's Values," Heritage Newsletter 16:4 (date unknown), 9-11. This is the newsletter of The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage; no author named.

13. Myron Hunt, "The Work of Messrs. Allison & Allison," The Architect & Engineer of California 42:3 (September, 1915), 38-75.
Susan L. Richards and Sally R. Sims, "The California Post Offices of Allison & Allison," Prologue, 20:2 (Summer, 1988), 101-117.

14. David Gebhard et al, A Guide to Architecture in San Francisco & Northern California (Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, Inc., 1973) 285.

15. Van Slyck, "Free to All," 24.

16. Van Slyck, "Free to All," 26-36.

17. "California Libraries," News Notes of California Libraries 1:1 (July 1906) 94-127.
"California Libraries -- Quarterly News Items," News Notes of California Libraries 14:3 (July 1919) 266-274, 304-345.

18. Raymond M. Holt, ed., Talking Buildings: A Practical Dialogue on Programming and Planning Library Buildings. Proceedings, Building Workshop, October 1985 (Del Mar, California: California State Library, 1985), passim.

19. Homer W. Glidden, architect of Upland Carnegie Library, to James Bertram, May 23, 1912. Correspondence, files of the Carnegie Corporation, New York.

20. James Bertram to City Clerk, Upland, California, May 15, 1912. Correspondence, files of the Carnegie Corporation, New York.

21. John H. Stepping, Editor, Calexico Chronicle, to author, August 15, 1989. Correspondence, files California Historic Carnegie Library Project.

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

[XX] See continuation sheet

H. Major Bibliographical References

[XX] See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

- [ ] State historic preservation office
- [ ] Other State agency
- [ ] Federal agency
- [ ] Local government
- [ ] University
- [XX] Other

Specify repository: California Carnegie Library SurveyÑ Sonoma State University

I. Form Prepared By

name/title Lucy Kortum

organization (Sonoma State University) date November 1989 (rev. 4/90)

street & number 180 Ely Road telephone 707/762-6219

city or town Petaluma state CA zip code 94954

Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

I. THE SURVEY

The first task was to identify all of the California Carnegie libraries; the most widely known, recent, and accessible information resulted from Bobinski's 1967 national study:

> George Bobinski, Carnegie Libraries: Their History and Impact on American Public Library Development, published in 1969. The text is an excellent introduction to Carnegie and Carnegie libraries. His Appendix B lists all U.S. Carnegie communities (grouped in one alphabetical list) with date and amount of the grant, and whether a public library was established prior to the Carnegie grant. Available in most public libraries, this is the most commonly used resource on Carnegies. The 1967 survey found 103 extant California Carnegies but they were not identified. A telephone call to Dr. Bobinski revealed that the raw data was no longer available but that he was considering various ways of reviving his study.

There is an extensive literature on library philanthropy, Carnegie's program, and the buildings themselves. During this project I continued to follow bibliographic leads and to read on the subject. Carnegie libraries in Iowa, Washington, and Kansas have been the subject of individual reports, and The Best Gift is an outstanding report on Carnegies in Ontario, Canada. More directly related to the present study are the following:

> Florence Anderson's Carnegie Corporation Library Program 1911-1961, published by the Carnegie Corporation in 1963. Anderson has revised several earlier Carnegie Corporation lists, which were said to contain some errors, to produce this official list. All Carnegie public libraries throughout the world are listed by state or country, plus Carnegie academic libraries and other library-related funding to academic institutions and to professional and scholarly library organizations. For each library, Anderson lists only community, year of grant, and amount.

> Ray E. Held's Public Libraries in California, 1849-1878, published in 1963, and The Rise of the Public Library in California, published in 1973, are essential general resources for California libraries. Carnegies, of course, appear only in the second volume, which additionally provides, in its Appendix 5, a list of California Carnegies. Held's list contains a "notes" column showing, among other things, increases in the original grants (sometimes for earthquake repair) and explains some of the discrepancies between other lists and information from the libraries.

> News Notes of California Libraries, July 1906 and July 1919. The July 1906 issue is Volume 1, Number 1 of this important library resource. That issue attempts to list all of

the existing California public libraries. Occurring so soon after the April 1906 earthquake, it also serves as a report on losses for a number of libraries. Some libraries didn't respond and information isn't always comparable or accurate, but among its most valuable information is the notation of funding for the property and the building. Also the name of the architect, often omitted from news stories of the day, is generally included. News Notes apparently did not again provide this overview until the July 1919 issue.

The Carnegie Correspondence, some thirty-two rolls of microfilm available from the Carnegie Corporation in New York. This primary resource contains the extant correspondence between Carnegie private secretary (and primary manager of the library program) James Bertram, and the Carnegie communities worldwide, arranged alphabetically by community. Its perusal for verification of a list of California Carnegies would be duplicating previous work, and the information contained is not internally consistent or even always legible. However, it is an invaluable resource in terms of the program as a whole and for many individual communities. Its best general use is to get a feeling for the kinds of issues raised and how Bertram handled by them.

When the identified Carnegie communities were located on the map, something of a cluster effect was revealed (see map, Appendix C). Libraries centered in the areas surrounding metropolitan port centers of San Francisco/Oakland, Monterey Bay, Los Angeles, and San Diego; along the major north-south highways, and in the San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Imperial valleys. Except for the cluster in the Sierra foothill mining communities, most that were scattered farther field tended to be the result of the county library movement. Alturas, in the far northeast corner of the state, represents both mining and the county libraries, and was the only Carnegie library to be built east of the Sierra. Library locations corresponded closely to population densities; the few incorporated municipalities existing at the time of the Carnegie movement which did not seek and obtain Carnegie funding have been discussed in Section E. Two important resources which shed light on public libraries of the Carnegie period and the communities which supported them, as well as the county library movement, are:

Harriet G. Eddy's personal recollections collected in County Free Library Organizing in California, 1909-1918, published by the Committee on California Library History, Bibliography, and Archives of the California Library Association, in 1955; and those of her successor, May Dexter Henshall, in County Library Organizing, published by the California State Library Foundation in 1985. Carnegie libraries existed in incorporated areas only, and the county library system was conceived to bring library service to rural areas. However, the process was political, through Boards of Supervisors; professional, through librarians of existing (and frequently Carnegie) libraries; and cultural, involving individuals and groups such as Women's Improvement Clubs, PTA's, Farm Bureaus, and Granges. Each group had its share of proponents and opponents, and the records of Eddy and Henshall are lively and detailed. They should be of great interest to local historians of the

individual counties and communities, and they provide considerable information about the Carnegie libraries of the later years.

A draft survey form was tested by using it in the review of Carnegie libraries already on the National Register of Historic Places or the Historic Resources Inventory. It then was revised, was tested again by sending it to those who responded to an article in the Fall 1988 Historic Preservation Newsletter, and revised again. Appendix D is the version of the survey form that was then sent, along with a brief introductory letter and a copy of the Historic Preservation Newsletter article, to the Local History Librarian of the public or historical library (as listed in the current directory of public libraries) in Carnegie communities. The survey included all libraries, extant or demolished. Forms were not sent, however, for those Carnegies most recently documented for the National Register. Generally, forms for branch libraries were sent to the main library. When a library was not listed in the directory, the letter, enclosure and forms were sent to the county library. In some cases a library, because of limited staff time, referred the form to the county library.

Two particularly fortuitous responses to the Historic Preservation Newsletter article, in addition to those from libraries, were from:

Betty Lewis, local historian from Watsonville. Ms. Lewis had written a book on architect W.H. Weeks, who lived in Watsonville in the early part of his professional career (W.H. Weeks, Architect, Fresno: Panorama West Books, 1985). She is also an avid collector of postcards. In her research for the Weeks book, funded through grants from the Sourisseau Accademy, San Jose State University, Ms. Lewis had contacted the California Carnegie libraries and also gathered information from News Notes of California Libraries, 1906 and 1919, about each library, and she generously made available three notebooks. Two notebooks contained responses from the libraries to her questions (address, architect, is the library still standing or date of destruction) plus any clippings provided; one notebook contained a sheet for each library listing summary information, most often accompanied by an historic postcard. Ms. Lewis' collection was invaluable at the beginning of the study for an overview of all of the libraries, and was useful throughout to compare and contrast with other information received, especially in regard to early and later building appearance. Several pages from her notebooks have been copied for the project files, and are stamped "From the Collection of Betty Lewis, Watsonville."

Jane Kimball, reference librarian at the Social Sciences Library, UC Davis. Having become interested in Carnegie libraries in England and Wales, Ms. Kimball has taken color slides of about two-thirds of the California Carnegies, and had also read a great deal about them. Use of her slides was very helpful in gaining early familiarity with the buildings, and information exchanged was mutually helpful.

Articles about the study in the California State Library Newsletter (September 1988), the League of California Cities Small Cities Newsletter (February 1989), and Preservation Forum (Winter 1988-89), stimulated additional response. A second mailing, phone calls, and exploration of other sources, eventually elicited some response about all but four Carnegies.

II. EVALUATION

The quality of responses varied. The survey form itself was brief, but supplemental information was encouraged. A minimum response at least achieved the goal of a dated and signed record of the most essential information regarding that library; I then sought out further information from other sources. In some cases, the survey form inspired additional research on the part of the library; it was gratifying to receive comments like "The research prompted me to create our own file of these news stories for future reference, so the research has been doubly useful," and "This was fun." A library assistant who provided outstanding documentation for all four Santa Cruz libraries is just one of several examples of excellent participation from librarians, historians, Friends of the Library, library board members, and city representatives. Several libraries had already completed books and brochures on their libraries, most notably Ron Baker's excellent social history of the Riverside library. At least two masters theses have been completed on local library systems, including their Carnegies. Margaret Souza's history of Santa Cruz pubic libraries was completed in 1970 and updated; Robert Hook's 1968 history of the San Jose public library covers the dates 1903-1937.

However, deficiencies in the survey form also became evident. Dates that the building actually served as a library were not specifically requested and were sometimes difficult to accurately recreate from the information provided, necessitating a second contact. Identification of building material was not specifically requested, and few responded to the narrative request for it. Not all information required on the Historic Resources Inventory form was adequately addressed on the form. Too, most respondents felt free to skip unfamiliar questions. There should have been a direct question about the the library's or historical society's archival resources or the existence of building plans. However, most libraries seemed to reply to the extent that their resources permitted and expressed interest in the project, and many requested a copy of an eventual product.

Few provided photographs and it became evident that xerox, brief descriptions, and those few photos were insufficient, even with the help of the Kimball slides. An effort was made to visit most of the extant buildings but trips were, of necessity, rushed. In all too many cases it was not possible to time visits during open hours; photographs also suffered from noontime sunshine, dusk, and parked cars. One benefit of visiting the libraries was to see them in their

surroundings, in scale. Nearly all are smaller than they appear in pictures. Though some seem "worn," the quality of their workmanship prevails, and frequently a passer-by would comment on the remembered "old Carnegie."

A database had been set up with basic information from Bobinski and Lewis. That format, too, was revised several times to accommodate the nature and amount of information received; it includes all of the 144 Carnegies (142 public and two academic). All responses were double checked and supplemented as appropriate from Bobinski, Anderson, Held, News Notes of California Libraries, the Betty Lewis file, and Musmann. The latter resource provided more detailed information about the formation of those libraries where women had played a key role:

> Victoria Musmann, "Women and the Founding of Social Libraries in California 1859-1910," Ph.D. dissertation, USC, 1982. Ms. Musmann conducted a detailed study of the role of women in the founding of libraries, finding that in many cases the role of women was more substantial than had been credited by Held. Although her sample seemed unnecessarily small, she presented well documented evidence in those cases which she did study.

When considering the building styles, Van Slyck's work was especially helpful:

> Abigail A. Van Slyck, "Free to All: Carnegie Libraries and the Transformation of American Culture, 1886-1917," Ph.D. dissertation, UC Berkeley, 1989. Van Slyck's thesis deals in large part with Carnegie and his relationship to significant issues of the time including those of philanthropy, the role of women, and labor and reform movements. She selected ten libraries nationwide as examples. California libraries treated at some length were Oakland as an example of branch site selection, and Calexico for its cultural center plan. She also analyzed Carnegie library architecture, selecting eighty-five for more detailed study. As discussed in Section F, she found that they fell into four main categories, and she considered their occurrence in the earlier and later (post Bertram review) periods.

Both the historical importance and the architecture were considered in evaluating the merits of the Carnegie buildings. It is the intent of this paper to establish that all of the Carnegie buildings are important in terms of their social history as libraries established over time within their communities, for which buildings were provided through the philanthropic program of Andrew Carnegie. Monumental in style if not in size, generally exhibiting a high level of craftsmanship, often located in the heart of the old town, they testify to the early community's pride in its library. In many communities the Carnegie building is a unique example of its style. Though there is a preponderance of Classical Revival in its various manifestations, the buildings are diverse in their application of it, as well as in the choice of materials and in their siting. Even with the similarity of some of the Weeks' pedimented "Greek temples," it is safe to say that each can be recognized individually. Today the community

demonstrates that pride by its continuing commitment to preserve the building and to find innovative future use if its library function cannot be maintained.

III. SELECTION

Selection for National Register nomination was necessarily made prior to study of all of the extant Carnegie buildings. Ten were identified which appeared to demonstrate the diversity of the property type in terms of architectural style, architect, cost, building materials, date of construction, geographical location, individual community and library social history, alterations and additions, and current use. Only a few of those that seem obviously eligible are among the ten nominated, because the primary consideration was not preeminance but, rather, representativeness.

IV. FUTURE STUDY

Carnegie library buildings merit much more intensive study than was possible within this project. Some information is lacking entirely and some disparities remain unresolved, providing local history projects for many of the communities. Of particular future importance are the study now contemplated by Dr. Bobinski, and the engineering studies now being reactivated by the State following the October 1989 earthquake.

Dr. Bobinski wrote an article in Wilson Library Bulletin (May 1988) suggesting that the 100th anniversary of Carnegie library philanthropy be celebrated by a national campaign to identify and preserve at least one unaltered Carnegie and to make it a museum dedicated to the public libraries of the United States. This was a goal for 1989, one hundred years after the first Carnegie library opened in Braddock, Pennsylvania (the first one funded, Allegheny, did not open until 1890). Dr. Bobinski hoped to bring together a national conference to this end, but funding was insufficient; he now hopes to conduct a survey to update the information from his 1967 study.

The threat of earthquake has been a dominant one in the history of Carnegie libraries, and is probably one of the most often cited reasons for the abandonment of many Carnegies lost in the middle part of this century. Since the recent earthquake, efforts have been renewed to complete a statewide survey of unreinforced masonry buildings that was mandated in 1986. Many Carnegies may be facing very high costs of rehabilitation, in competition for funds with other buildings.

In terms of local history research, some areas for further study include expanded information about the architect, names of builder and craftsmen, the actual cost of the building, and sources

of additional funding. The amount of Carnegie funding was reported variously in different sources, including occasions when additional funding was requested to compensate for earthquake damage, when funds were granted several years later for an addition, or when funds for branches were comingled. Bobinski and Anderson generally but not always used a total figure without identifying the specific uses for which additional money was granted; the Correspondence is not always complete or legible, and libraries frequently rely on Bobinski for their information. Held's Appendix B notes come closest for accounting for subsequent library requests and needs.

Dates of the "earliest library" for a city may vary according to definition or to sources. In this study, the "early library" date was generally the earliest found, even if it proved to be transitory or intermittent. Also noted are later, more permanent attempts and then the assumption by the city of library responsibility. Held does not generally attribute later public library development in a municipality to the early community reading rooms and social libraries that may have flourished there in the past. The transient nature of the reading rooms, the multiplicity of their reasons for existence, and the frequent lack of documentation, make such attribution tenuous. However when it has been possible to locate sufficient records, newspaper articles, and reminiscences in a given community, a continuity of membership and even successive transfer of the book collection form old library to new, may be documented.

Railroad and company libraries were most often located in smaller towns and the subject was not pursued here, but at least one railroad library is still standing in Tulare (now used as a women's clubhouse) while the Carnegie that succeeded it is long gone. The role of women, as club women, librarians, and trustees, also merits further study, as do State and County libraries. Generally ignored in this study were library hours, size of collection, library fees and rules, available for many libraries in the News Notes. Also omitted are details of library financing as it related to the legal aspects California city incorporation at various levels and through time.

In respect to further study, two other resources should be noted, although they were not particularly helpful to this study of California's Carnegies. Preservation News of August 1985 referred to a California State University exploration of social and architectural aspects of Carnegie libraries, and named the project director, Constance Glenn. Eventually I located Dr. Glenn at CSU Long Beach, where she is director of the University Art Museum. Her survey had been nationwide; she requested copies of early photographs, inquired as to the architect and existence of plans, whether there had been an architectural competition, and how the building was now used. Response had been slight and the project had been put on a back burner, but she invited me to review her files. The numbers nationwide would probably constitute an interesting sample. However, the approximately 39% response from California, said to be higher than from other states, contained little that the survey had not already obtained. Auburn,

Beaumont, and Chula Vista indicated there had been a competition; Alturas, Beaumont, Calexico, Chula Vista, Gilroy, Glendale, Imperial, Lakeport and Roseville indicated that they had plans.

Also in 1985, Architectural Record carried an article by Timothy Rub entitled "'The day of big operations': Andrew Carnegie and his libraries." Reference was made to an exhibition at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, with Rub as curator, on the "social and architectural implications of Carnegie's patronage." Apparently no catalog was prepared for the exhibit, and I was able to obtain only a copy of the press release and, eventually, a check list of the items on exhibit and xerox copies of photographs made of the exhibit. California Carnegies represented were Azusa, with a watercolor, pencil and colored pencil elevation study, and Oakland Main, Oakland 23rd Street Branch, and Riverside with photographs. This exhibit or a version of it has been mounted as a SITES (Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service) exhibit, still available to libraries and museums for four-week periods for $800.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Anderson, Florence. Carnegie Corporation Library Program 1911-1961. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1963.

Bobinski, George S. Carnegie Libraries: Their History and Impact on American Public Library Development. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

Carnegie Corporation, files of correspondence between Carnegie representatives and those writing in behalf of the communities seeking Carnegie grants. Carnegie Corporation, New York.

Eddy, Harriet. County Free Library Organizing in California, 1909-1918. Berkeley: California Library Association, 1955.

Held, Ray E. The Rise of the Public Library in California. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Held, Ray E. Public Libraries in California, 1849-1878. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.

Kimball, Jane. Collection of slides of many of the extant Carnegie library buildings.

Lewis, Betty. Unpublished research regarding Carnegie Libraries, including collection of historic postcards.

Musmann, Victoria Kline. "Women and the Founding of Social Libraries in California, 1859-1910." Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1982.

Van Slyck, Abigail A. "Free to All: Carnegie Libraries and the Transformation of American Culture 1877-1917." Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1989.

Whiffen, Marcus. American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1969.