

In considering Table 7, the figures must not be taken too literally. For example, the table shows that Kentucky has ten libraries giving service to Negroes and that 38 per cent of the total Negro population live within these service

TABLE 7\*  
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE TO NEGROES IN 1939 FROM  
LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

STATE	TOTAL LIBRAR- IES IN STATE†	LIBRARIES IN STATE SERVING NEGROES‡		NEGRO PERCENT- AGE OF TOTAL POPULA- TION	NEGRO POPULA- TION	NEGROES WITH SERVICE	
		Number	Per Cent			Total Number	Percent- age of Negro Popula- tion
Alabama.....	20	4	20.00	35.70	944,834	138,565	14.67
Arkansas.....	42	2	4.76	25.80	478,463	56,814	11.87
Florida.....	56	8	14.29	29.41	431,828	117,612	27.24
Georgia.....	93	4	4.30	36.83	1,071,125	169,515	15.83
Kentucky.....	70	10	14.29	8.65	226,040	87,870	38.87
Louisiana.....	29	3	10.34	36.94	776,326	169,941	21.89
Mississippi.....	37	3	8.11	50.24	1,009,718	66,633	6.60
North Carolina.....	80	16	20.00	28.98	918,647	244,320	26.60
Oklahoma.....	79	8	10.13	7.19	172,198	44,809	26.02
South Carolina.....	32	4	12.50	45.65	793,681	122,117	15.40
Tennessee.....	57	4	7.02	18.25	477,646	225,513	47.21
Texas.....	114	19	16.67	14.68	854,964	249,626	29.20
Virginia.....	65	14	21.54	26.85	650,165	189,790	29.19
Total.....	774	99	12.79	26.07	8,805,635	1,883,125	21.39

\* All total population figures are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*; all other data are from questionnaires and personal visits unless otherwise stated.

† Based on the *American Library Directory, 1939* (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1939).

‡ These figures represent *libraries* as governmental units, not separate *agencies* of service, such as branches or stations.

areas. South Carolina has only four libraries giving service to Negroes, and only 15 per cent of its total Negro population live within library service areas. On the surface, Kentucky appears to be far more progressive in terms of library service for Negroes than is South Carolina. Actually, the situation in Kentucky is not nearly so advanced as it seems. Four of the ten library units listed as giving serv-

ice to Negroes do so by offering partial service at the main library; and the Negro populations of these four cities—Lexington, Newport, Paducah, and Paris—constitute 29 per cent of the total Negro population of Kentucky in library service areas. Since it has been shown that partial service for Negroes at the main library is definitely restricted and since these institutions do not publicize the fact that service is available to Negroes at the main library (which is necessary in a region where public services are normally separate for the white and Negro groups), the conclusion must be reached that service of this kind cannot be rated as equivalent to service of a different sort. Thus one comes to the final conclusion that even though South Carolina may retain its rating as listed in Table 7, though the service may be inadequate in comparison with facilities in other areas, the standing of Kentucky should be interpreted in terms of additional factors. The suggestion is made, therefore, that Table 7 be analyzed and also interpreted in terms of Tables 4, 5, and 6. Though the figures are to be interpreted with caution, it may be concluded that one-fifth of the total Negro population in the southern area had some degree of library service in 1939.

For purposes of comparison with service in former years, a table taken from Wilson's *Geography of Reading*, has been reproduced here and numbered Table 8. In comparing Table 7 with Table 8, it may be seen that the percentage of Negro population served is increasing—10.46 in 1926, 18.44 in 1935, and 21.39 in 1939. The percentage of increase during the nine-year period between 1926 and 1935 was 8 per cent, and the increase between the four-year period 1935–39 was 3 per cent. The Census of 1940 will, of course, permit a recheck of these figures.

*Comparison of service to white and Negro populations by*

states.—For purposes of comparison, Table 9 shows the number and the percentage of the white population receiving library service from local agencies during the same

TABLE 8\*  
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE TO NEGROES, 1935

STATE	NEGRO POPULATION	NEGROES WITH SERVICE		TOTAL LIBRARIES IN STATE	LIBRARIES IN STATE SERVING NEGROES
		Total Number	Per Cent		
Alabama.....	944,834	106,890	11.31	18	2
Arkansas.....	478,463	19,698	4.12	19	1
Florida.....	431,828	84,374	19.54	44	4
Georgia.....	1,071,125	162,843	15.20	53	5
Kentucky.....	226,040	90,531	40.05	64	14
Louisiana.....	776,326	169,941	21.89	16	3
Mississippi.....	1,009,718	47,210	4.68	22	2
North Carolina.....	918,647	134,422	14.63	64	11
South Carolina.....	793,681	122,117	15.39	53	4
Tennessee.....	477,646	225,201	47.15	34	5
Texas.....	854,964	289,582	33.87	58	16
Virginia.....	650,165	139,918	21.52	46	8
Total, 1935....	8,633,437	1,592,727	18.44	491	75
Comparison with Service, 1926					
Total, 1926....	8,291,698	866,910	10.46	.....	45
Increase.....	341,739	725,817	8.00	.....	30

\* Source: L. R. Wilson, *Geography of Reading* (Chicago: American Library Association and University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. 33, Table 8.

period and for the same states as shown for Negro service in Table 7. It is therefore possible to compare the percentages for the two groups. For the southern states as a group the percentage of the white population receiving service is twice as great as the Negro population receiving

service. Moreover, the percentages for the white group are consistently higher in every state except Kentucky and Tennessee. These two states will always make a more favorable showing than some of the other states because

TABLE 9\*  
COMPARISON OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE TO THE WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATIONS IN 1939 FROM LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

STATE	TOTAL WHITE POPULATION	WHITE POPULATION WITH SERVICE		PERCENTAGE OF NEGRO POPULATION SERVED
		Total Number	Per Cent	
Alabama.....	1,701,414	472,879	27.79	14.67
Arkansas.....	1,376,019	429,609	31.22	11.87
Florida.....	1,936,383	496,784	47.93	27.24
Georgia.....	1,837,381	889,564	48.41	15.83
Kentucky.....	2,388,549	801,413	33.55	38.87
Louisiana.....	1,325,267	658,630	49.70	21.89
Mississippi.....	1,000,103	278,023	27.80	6.60
North Carolina.....	2,251,629	1,089,504	48.38	26.60
Oklahoma.....	2,223,842	819,146	36.83	26.02
South Carolina.....	945,084	485,639	51.39	15.40
Tennessee.....	2,138,910	929,002	43.43	47.21
Texas.....	4,969,751	2,230,995	44.89	29.20
Virginia.....	1,771,686	1,089,080	61.47	29.19
Total.....	24,966,018	10,670,268	42.73	21.39

\* "White" here refers to all others than Negroes; population figures from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*.

their Negro population is concentrated in the larger cities. Several of the Kentucky cities offer partial service to the group from the main library, with the result that the total Negro population of these cities is included in any count of Negroes served in the state of Kentucky.

*Service statistics for urban and rural Negro population.—*

In any comparison of the accessibility of public services to urban and rural populations it has usually been found that the balance is in favor of the urban group. Public library facilities are no exception, and it has been concluded that America's greatest library problem was the provision of effective public library service for the one-third of the total population who live on farms and in the small towns and villages of rural America.<sup>1</sup> This conclusion was based on the fact that "of the 45,130,098 people in the United States who are without library service, 39,673,217, or approximately 88 per cent, live in the open country or in towns of less than 2,500 population"; and these 39,673,217 rural people without service constitute 73.7 per cent of the total rural population. On the other hand, only 5,456,881, or 12 per cent of the total number without service, live in urban areas, and this number constitutes only 7.9 per cent of the total urban population. Without question, it may therefore be said that public library service is less accessible to the rural than to the urban dweller.

When public library service for the Negro is viewed from the same standpoint, it is also quite obvious that urban dwellers have a decided advantage over those who live in rural areas when advantages are measured in terms of public library facilities. Table 10 presents a tabular résumé of service to both groups by states, and it may be seen that in no instance is there as high a percentage of the total rural population served as of the urban. Were these differences relatively slight, little importance would be attached to the finding, but when the total percentage of the urban population served is approximately ten times greater than the total percentage of the rural population served, 56 and

<sup>1</sup> L. R. Wilson, *Geography of Reading* (Chicago: American Library Association and University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. 31.

5 per cent respectively, the finding must be considered as significant.

*Negroes without service in places with public libraries.*—In addition to knowing the number of Negroes served by public library facilities in the southern area, it is equally

TABLE 10\*  
LIBRARY SERVICE TO URBAN AND RURAL NEGROES

STATE	POPULATION RECEIVING SERVICE					POPULATION NOT RECEIVING SERVICE		
	Urban	Per Cent	Rural	Per Cent	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Alabama.....	132,367	34.34	6,198	0.92	138,565	253,083	670,186	923,269
Arkansas.....	25,861	29.00	30,953	7.95	56,814	63,301	358,548	421,849
Florida.....	117,612	55.93	0	0.00	117,612	92,680	221,536	314,216
Georgia.....	158,958	50.20	10,557	1.40	169,515	157,679	743,931	901,610
Kentucky.....	80,285	68.88	7,585	6.93	87,870	36,276	101,894	138,170
Louisiana.....	158,885	61.71	11,056	2.13	169,941	98,578	507,807	606,385
Mississippi.....	35,800	26.72	30,833	3.52	66,633	98,187	844,898	943,085
North Carolina.....	166,865	67.77	77,455	11.52	244,320	79,372	594,961	674,333
Oklahoma.....	44,809	66.09	0	0.00	44,809	22,992	104,397	127,389
South Carolina.....	69,353	43.62	61,764	9.42	122,117	78,001	593,563	671,564
Tennessee.....	189,768	79.01	35,745	15.05	225,513	50,400	201,733	252,133
Texas.....	226,607	68.70	23,019	4.38	249,626	103,222	502,116	605,338
Virginia.....	146,440	68.61	43,380	9.93	189,790	66,991	393,384	460,375
Total.....	1,544,580	56.26	338,545	5.48	1,883,125	1,200,762	5,838,954	7,039,716

\* Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932* (Washington Government Printing Office, 1935); Tables 4, 5, and 6.

important to know the number who are without service although they actually reside in places with public libraries. The complete statistics on local public library service in the area, presented in Table 11, will be of assistance in following the computation of this figure and of certain other figures which are natural corollaries to it. Of the 8,805,635 Negroes in the thirteen states under consideration, 6,922,510, or the total Negro population in the area minus the total Negro population receiving service, are without public library service except that provided by state library

agencies or private enterprises. Of this total population of 6,922,510 Negroes, 1,966,870 (shown in the next-to-the-last column in Table 11) live in areas where local library agencies provide service for the white population. Thus, approximately 2,000,000 Negroes actually have no public library service in the South, although they reside in areas which provide this service for the white population. Therefore, the figures reported for library coverage in the South are, in fact, 2,000,000 in excess of the correct total.<sup>2</sup> When the figure 1,966,870 is subtracted from 14,520,262, the total population of all library service areas in the thirteen states, a substantial reduction is effected, making the total actually served 12,533,392<sup>3</sup> rather than 14,520,262, the figure ordinarily cited as the total number of people receiving public library service in the South.

POSSIBLE CAUSAL FACTORS

A study of library service in another region has shown that such factors as economic ability and urbanization materially affect the extent to which public library service is made available.<sup>4</sup> This section will point out some interesting observations along a similar vein in regard to service for Negroes, though no attempt has been made to investigate exhaustively this phase of the problem.

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.*, chap. i.

<sup>3</sup> In making this calculation, population statistics for forty-eight library service areas whose total populations were less than 1,000 in the group giving no service to Negroes were omitted, as the Negro populations of these places are not available in Census statistics. Since the total populations were available, it was possible to make the following estimates which may be added to the computations in Table 11 if desired, although the totals given in the table are accurate within two-tenths of 1 per cent (0.19). Total population affected: 28,112; estimates: white—21,084; Negro—7,028.

<sup>4</sup> G. G. Purdy, "Public Library Service in the Middle West" (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, 1936), chap. v.

TABLE 11\*  
LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN THIRTEEN SOUTHERN STATES

STATE	POPULATION		TOTAL POPULATION OF ALL LIBRARY SERVICE AREAS	POPULATION OF LIBRARY SERVICE AREAS WITH SERVICE TO NEGROES			POPULATION OF LIBRARY SERVICE AREAS WITH NO SERVICE TO NEGROES			TOTAL NUMBER RECEIVING SERVICE†
	Total	Negro		Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	
Alabama.....	2,646,248	944,834	714,691	409,680	271,115	138,565	305,011	201,764	103,247	611,444
Arkansas.....	1,854,482	478,463	605,949	145,833	89,019	56,814	460,116	349,590	119,526	486,423
Florida.....	1,468,211	431,828	680,382	437,842	320,230	117,612	242,540	176,554	65,986	614,396
Georgia.....	2,098,506	1,071,125	1,403,378	472,950	391,435	169,515	930,428	586,129	344,299	1,059,079
Kentucky.....	2,614,589	226,040	925,042	654,653	566,783	87,870	270,389	234,630	35,759	1,889,283
Louisiana.....	2,101,593	776,326	1,002,437	564,875	394,934	169,941	437,562	263,696	173,866	828,571
Mississippi.....	2,009,821	1,009,718	566,240	126,563	59,930	66,633	439,677	218,093	21,584	344,656
North Carolina.....	3,170,276	918,647	1,544,274	811,897	567,577	244,320	732,377	521,927	210,450	1,333,824
Oklahoma.....	2,396,040	172,198	885,761	428,295	381,486	44,809	457,466	435,660	21,806	863,955
South Carolina.....	1,738,765	793,681	805,940	308,502	186,385	122,117	497,438	299,254	198,184	607,756
Tennessee.....	2,616,556	477,646	1,263,722	775,747	550,234	225,513	487,975	378,768	109,207	1,154,515
Texas.....	5,824,715	854,964	2,582,689	1,754,546	1,504,920	249,626	828,143	726,075	102,068	2,480,621
Virginia.....	2,421,831	650,165	1,539,758	614,608	424,818	189,790	925,150	664,262	260,888	1,278,870
Total.....	33,771,633	8,805,635	14,520,263	7,505,991	5,622,866	1,883,125	7,014,272	5,047,402	1,966,870	12,533,393

\* Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*; Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7.

† This figure is arrived at by subtracting the total Negro population of library service areas with no service to Negroes from the total population of all library service areas.

*Economic ability.*—Few statistics are available by which economic abilities may be compared when the group considered consists mainly of individual cities. However, it is possible to secure the number of income tax returns registered for each city whose population is more than 1,000,<sup>5</sup> and some indication of economic ability may be gained from these figures. In a comparison of the average number of income tax returns per library service unit for the group of cities and counties giving service to Negroes with the average number for the group which provides service for the white population only, a great inequality was found to exist. The average number of income tax returns for the first group, consisting of ninety-seven city and county library units which do provide Negroes with service, was 3,797, while the average was 271 for the group of library units which maintain facilities for the white population and none for the Negro. It is thus evident that the total economic ability of the first group is approximately fourteen times greater than that of the second.

Table 12 presents a comparison of the economic ability of each state based on the number of income tax returns reported for the state and the availability of public library service for Negroes in each state based on the number of libraries giving service. The *number of libraries* was chosen as a basis rather than the percentage of the population served, because it was felt that it would be a more accurate indication of the extensiveness of interest throughout the state in regard to the provision of public library facilities. A large percentage of the total Negro population could be registered as receiving service simply because a few localities with large Negro constituencies provided service of

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue, "Individual Income Tax Returns for 1936" (May, 1938). (Mimeographed.)

some kind for the Negro group. This, however, would be no guide as to what was being done in other sections of the state.

It may be seen from Table 12 that the economic rank is relatively consistent with the library rank in each state

TABLE 12\*  
COMPARISON OF ECONOMIC ABILITY AND LIBRARY SERVICE

STATE	INCOME TAX RETURNS 1936		LIBRARIES IN STATE SERVING NEGROES		NEGRO POPULATION SERVED	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Texas . . . . .	160,314	1	19	1.0	249,626	1
Virginia . . . . .	63,142	2	14	3.0	189,790	4
Oklahoma . . . . .	52,425	3	8	5.5	44,809	13
Georgia . . . . .	50,112	4	4	7.5	169,515	6
Tennessee . . . . .	47,308	5	4	7.5	225,513	3
Kentucky . . . . .	44,482	6	10	4.0	87,870	10
Florida . . . . .	45,335	7	8	5.5	117,612	9
Louisiana . . . . .	44,482	8	3	11.5	169,941	5
North Carolina . . . . .	42,799	9	16	2.0	244,320	2
Alabama . . . . .	32,146	10	4	7.5	138,565	7
South Carolina . . . . .	20,275	11	4	7.5	122,117	8
Arkansas . . . . .	16,935	12	2	13.0	56,814	12
Mississippi . . . . .	16,708	13	3	11.5	66,633	11

\* Sources: U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue, "Individual Income Tax Returns for 1936" (May, 1938) (mimeographed); Table 7.

except in North Carolina. When the coefficient of correlation was computed for the group,<sup>6</sup> it was found to be a +0.75, which shows that there is a significant association between the two factors and adds statistical support to the logical assumptions that economic ability is a probable

<sup>6</sup> The rank-difference method was used. The formula is:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

causal factor in the provision of library service. The smaller degree of association in North Carolina may be partly accounted for by one outstanding factor. In this state there is a very progressive state library commission which has lent its full support for many years toward the establishment of public libraries for the Negro group.

TABLE 13  
CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARY UNITS ACCORDING TO TOTAL  
POPULATION AND NEGRO LIBRARY SERVICE

POPULATION GROUPS	TOTAL NUMBER OF LIBRARY UNITS	NUMBER OF LIBRARY UNITS WITHOUT NEGRO SERVICE	LIBRARY UNITS WITH NEGRO SERVICE	
			Number	Per Cent
2,500-4,999.....	262	256	6	2.29
5,000-9,999.....	117	114	3	2.56
10,000-24,999.....	144	121	22	15.28
25,000-49,999.....	83	62	21	25.30
50,000-74,999.....	27	15	13	48.15
75,000-99,999.....	9	1	8	88.89
100,000 and over....	27	1	26	96.30
Total.....	669	570	99	14.80

*Total population of library service units.*—Another interesting group of questions arises in connection with the possible causal relationship between the size of population and the provision of library service to Negroes. Table 13 indicates the population classes into which library service units which provide public library facilities for Negroes fall, and also the population classes of library service units which do not provide service for Negroes, though they do maintain facilities for the white group. The majority of the units which do not give service to Negroes fall in the lowest population groups. When the percentage of units in

each class providing service for Negroes is considered, it may be seen that there is a constant progression as the populations increase. This supports the generalization that urbanization and size of population influence the development of public library service for Negroes in a positive di-

TABLE 14  
CLASSIFICATION OF CITIES ACCORDING TO TOTAL POPULATION  
AND LIBRARY SERVICE TO NEGROES AND WHITES

POPULATION GROUPS	NUMBER OF CITIES	NUMBER WITH LIBRARY SERVICE		PERCENTAGE WITH LIBRARY SERVICE	
		Whites Only	Negroes and Whites	Whites Only	Negroes and Whites
0-4,999.....	420	409	11	97.38	2.62
5,000-9,999.....	145	136	9	93.79	6.21
10,000-24,999.....	106	84	22	79.25	20.75
25,000-49,999.....	33	15	18	45.45	54.55
50,000-74,999.....	16	2	14	12.50	87.50
75,000-99,999.....	5	0	5	0	100.00
100,000 and over..	19	0	19	0	100.00
Total.....	744	646	98	86.83	13.17

rection and bears out conclusions already reached in a general study of library service in another region.<sup>7</sup>

When total populations of cities where public libraries are located are used as a basis for population groupings, as shown in Table 14, rather than the populations of the library service areas as shown in Table 13, similar results are evident. Here, too, the percentage of cities offering service to Negroes increases as the total populations increase. This table also gives additional information which permits an interesting observation. Percentages for the number of

<sup>7</sup> Purdy, *loc. cit.*

cities in each population group which give service to the white population only have been included, as well as the percentages for the number of cities which serve both the white and the Negro populations. When these two percentages are compared, it is obvious that public library service is far more likely to be available to the white population in a small city than to the Negro group. This is one of the points at which a dual system of library service for the two races operates to the marked disadvantage of the Negro.

*Negro population of library service units.*—Again, when Negro population figures are subjected to a similar classification as that applied to total population figures, the same conclusions are indicated. These facts are presented in Table 15. They further emphasize the point that size of population, whether total or Negro, is a decisive factor in the establishment of public library units which serve Negroes.

*Negro percentage of total population.*—It might be expected that the proportion of the Negro population to the total population would affect the existence of public library service for the Negro. When, however, there is a successive arrangement of the percentages representative of the Negro population served by the ninety-nine library units which provide service for the Negro, it may be seen that this factor actually plays no important part in the establishment of service. The Negro percentage of the total populations of the library units providing service for Negroes ranges from 1.81 to 77.40 with practically no breaks in the succession until 58.73 is reached. After this percentage is reached, only one other figure remains. Therefore the general pattern would remain the same, that of a gradual progression from low to high. This would indicate

that neither a low, a medium, nor a high percentage of Negro population to the total population has any special

TABLE 15\*  
CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARY UNITS ACCORDING TO SIZE OF NEGRO  
POPULATION AND NEGRO LIBRARY SERVICE

POPULATION GROUPS	TOTAL NUMBER OF LIBRARY UNITS	NUMBER OF LIBRARY UNITS WITH- OUT NEGRO SERVICE	LIBRARY UNITS WITH NEGRO SERVICE	
			Number	Per Cent
0-4,999.....	497	467	30	6.04
5,000-9,999.....	66	48	18	27.27
10,000-14,999.....	39	26	13	33.33
15,000-19,999.....	24	15	9	37.50
20,000-24,999.....	12	7	5	41.68
25,000-29,999.....	8	5	3	37.50
30,000-34,999.....	3	1	2	66.66
35,000-39,999.....	8	0	8	100.00
40,000-44,999.....	2	0	2	100.00
45,000-49,999.....	1	0	1	100.00
50,000-54,999.....	4	1	3	75.00
55,000-59,999.....	0	0	0	0
60,000-64,999.....	1	0	1	100.00
65,000-69,999.....	0	0	0	0
70,000-74,999.....	0	0	0	0
75,000-79,999.....	0	0	0	0
80,000-84,999.....	0	0	0	0
85,000-89,999.....	0	0	0	0
90,000-94,999.....	0	0	0	0
95,000-99,999.....	1	0	1	100.00
100,000 and over....	3	0	3	100.00
Total.....	669	570	99	14.80

\* No library units whose total populations are less than 2,500 are included.

effect on the existence of Negro library service.<sup>8</sup> This point is further substantiated in Table 16, which summarizes in tabular form the influence of certain factors on the existence of public library service for the Negro.

<sup>8</sup> See Appen. A for actual figures.

*Summary of the influence of certain possible causal factors.*  
 —We may now summarize some of these causal relationships. Table 16 attempts to show in statistical form certain factors which seem to be significantly associated with the

TABLE 16\*

RELATION OF CERTAIN FACTORS TO THE EXISTENCE OF LIBRARY SERVICE FOR NEGROES

PART I. CITIES WITH NEGRO LIBRARY SERVICE

GROUPS	TOTAL POPULATION		TOTAL WEALTH†		PER CAPITA WEALTH‡		TOTAL NEGRO POPULATION		NEGRO PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION	
	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank
1.....	14	14	14	14	8	8	14	14	1	1
2.....	13	26	14	14	12	24	11	22	7	14
3.....	12	36	11	33	11	33	11	33	6	18
4.....	7	28	7	28	8	32	6	24	5	20
5.....	7	35	6	30	7	35	5	25	8	40
6.....	4	24	4	24	4	24	3	18	8	48
7.....	4	28	4	28	4	28	3	21	6	42
8.....	3	24	2	16	6	48	3	24	7	56
9.....	1	9	4	36	4	36	4	36	8	72
10.....	3	30	2	20	4	40	6	60	6	60
11.....	2	22	3	33	3	33	5	55	5	55
12.....	2	24	1	12	1	12	1	12	5	60
Total..	72	300	72	288	72	353	72	344	72	486
Average rank.	4.17		4.00		4.90		4.78		6.75	

\* Only cities of 10,000 population or more are included.

† Based on number of income tax returns for each city for 1936 obtained from U.S. Bureau of Internal Revenue, "Individual Income Returns for 1936."

‡ Based on number of income tax returns per capita (same source).

extent of library service for Negroes. The factors—total population, total wealth, per capita wealth, and Negro percentage of total population—were analyzed for all cities of 10,000 population and over in the thirteen southern states. The cities included were divided into two groups, those with Negro library service and those without Negro library service. For each possible causal factor selected, *one* rank-

order succession, including both cities with and without service, was arranged according to each factor's numerical representation. This resulted in five rank-order successions, one for each factor considered. Each of these se-

TABLE 16\*—Continued

PART II. CITIES WITHOUT NEGRO LIBRARY SERVICE

GROUPS	TOTAL POPULATION		TOTAL WEALTH†		PER CAPITA WEALTH‡		TOTAL NEGRO POPULATION		NEGRO PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION	
	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank	Number of Cities	Cumulative Rank
1.....	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	13	13
2.....	1	2	0	0	2	4	3	6	7	14
3.....	2	6	3	9	3	9	3	9	8	24
4.....	7	28	7	28	6	24	8	32	9	36
5.....	7	35	8	40	7	35	9	45	6	30
6.....	10	60	10	60	10	60	11	66	6	36
7.....	9	63	9	63	9	63	10	70	7	49
8.....	11	88	12	96	8	64	11	88	7	56
9.....	13	117	10	90	10	90	10	90	6	54
10.....	11	110	12	120	10	100	8	80	8	80
11.....	12	132	11	121	11	121	9	99	9	99
12.....	12	144	13	156	13	156	13	156	9	108
Total..	95	785	95	783	95	732	95	741	95	599
Average rank.	8.26		8.24		7.71		7.80		6.30	

quences was then divided into twelve groups, Group 1 being the highest, and Group 12 the lowest.<sup>9</sup> In even this rough calculation it is evident, merely by inspection, that the cities with library service for Negroes generally fell in higher groups for each factor than did the cities without Negro library service. The one outstanding exception to this result was in the case of the distribution of cities according to the Negro percentage of the total population. This factor seemed to have no weight, since cities in both

<sup>9</sup> See Appen. B.



groups were scattered fairly evenly throughout the twelve groups.

When these findings were put in a more precise statistical form, Table 16 was the result.<sup>10</sup> This table shows for both groups—cities with and cities without Negro library service—the number of cities which fell in each of the twelve groups and the cumulative group rank for each factor. The cumulative rank in each case was obtained by multiplying the number of cities by the rank of the group. The table also shows the total rank and the average rank for each factor for each group. When the average ranks for Part I and Part II are compared, it may be readily seen that the average rank for each factor in Part I is numerically lower than the corresponding averages in Part II, with the one exception already noted. This indicates that the cities in Part I, as a group, have relatively higher group ratings for each factor than do the cities in Part II. The average rank for the Negro percentage of total population, however, is approximately the same in both Parts I and II, which denotes that the proportion of the Negro population to the total has little influence on the existence of public library service for the South's minority group.

*Intangible factors.*—As no bare figures may describe completely the causes for the present status of any human institution, one must be somewhat cautious as to the entire acceptance of the figures cited. No evidence has been pre-

<sup>10</sup> A suggested procedure for reading this table is as follows: In Group 1 for the possible causal factor "Total Population" there are fourteen cities with Negro library service. Each of the fourteen cities, therefore, obtains a rank of 1, since this is the first group, and the sum of these fourteen ranks of 1 (or the number of cities multiplied by the group number) will give the cumulative rank of 14; or, for instance, in Group 5 for the possible causal factor "Total Wealth" there are six cities with Negro library service. Each of the six cities, therefore, would obtain a rank of 5, since this is the fifth group, and the sum of these six ranks of 5 will give the cumulative rank of 30, etc.

sented to show why even a limited number of library service areas in the lower population and financial brackets provide Negroes with public library facilities. Why do these library units offer Negroes service? The suggestion may be hazarded that the attitudes of head librarians in these cities and the efforts of crusading Negro women account for the largest number of such examples.

*State laws.*—That Texas has a greater number of libraries serving Negroes than any of the other states has been accounted for partially by the fact that the Texas county library law makes special reference to service for Negroes,<sup>11</sup> requiring that some provision be made by county libraries for Negro patrons.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, this law applies to county libraries only, and even in the case of these institutions 100 per cent results have not been obtained. This may be seen by the example of the Lubbock County Library, listed under "Minor Forms of Service,"<sup>13</sup> and the Collingsworth County Library, at Wellington, Texas, which gives no service at all.<sup>14</sup>

#### SUMMARY

Certain facts of basic importance regarding the number of Negroes to whom public library service is available in the thirteen southern states have now been enumerated. These data are entirely quantitative; they make no attempt at analysis of the quality of library service to the Negro population. Nevertheless, these mass statistics serve

<sup>11</sup> Doxey A. Wilkerson, *Special Problems of Negro Education* ("Staff Study No. 12," prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education [Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939]), p. 149.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 54-55.

<sup>13</sup> See p. 87.

<sup>14</sup> Letter from Katherine Boverie, librarian of the Collingsworth County Library, January 14, 1939.

to indicate the magnitude of the problem of supplying the reading needs of the Negro in the South. The major findings of the chapter may be briefly recapitulated in the following form.

Approximately one-fifth of the Negro population of the thirteen southern states included in this study are provided with public library service. Of the 8,805,635 Negroes in the South in 1930, only 1,883,125 receive library service, which is provided by 99 of the 744 public libraries in the South (Table 7).

The percentage of the Negro population served by public libraries has steadily increased since 1926 (Tables 7 and 8). However, the percentage of the white population with service is still twice as great as that of the Negro population with service—white, 42.73; Negro, 21.39 (Table 9).

Only 5 per cent of southern rural Negroes receive public library service, while public library facilities are maintained for 56 per cent of the urban population. Ten times as many urban as rural people, therefore, receive service (Table 10). This disparity between service to urban and service to rural Negroes is proportionally much greater than the similar disparity between the urban and rural population throughout the nation as a whole.

Over 6,000,000 Negroes are without public library service in the thirteen states considered. Two million of these live in areas where public library service is provided for the white population but none for the Negro population (Table 11). This figure, therefore, constitutes a correction for the usually accepted figure for library coverage in the South.

In an attempt to analyze certain possible contributing factors for the existence of public library service for the Negro, it was found that:

The greater the total and per capita wealth, the larger

the total population, and the larger the Negro population, the greater the probability for the existence of Negro library service (Tables 12-16).

The proportion of Negro population to the total population of a given unit seems to have little influence on the existence of public library service for the minority group (Table 16).

Finally, social attitudes and personal zeal, though intangible elements, are factors which also must be reckoned with in any interpretation of the present status of public library service for the Negro in the South. It is highly conceivable that they are fully as important as the statistics presented in this chapter.