

edited by LEE KINGMAN

# Newbery and Caldecott

Medal Books: 1956-1965

*with Acceptance Papers, Biographies  
& Related Material chiefly from the*

HORN BOOK MAGAZINE



THE HORN BOOK, INCORPORATED • BOSTON • 1965

THE CALDECOTT AWARD 1958

# Time of Wonder

illustrated by ROBERT McCLOSKEY  
written by THE ILLUSTRATOR

published by THE VIKING PRESS 1957

## FORMAT

SIZE: 9" x 12", 64 pp.

ARTIST'S MEDIUM: Watercolor

PRINTING PROCESS: Offset lithography

ILLUSTRATIONS: Front matter, full color doublespreads throughout

TYPE: Goudy Modern

## BOOK NOTE

THROUGH rhythmic words and full color paintings the artist shares with the beholder his love of a special island off the Maine seacoast. But as he shows the changes of tide and seasons, the elemental force of a storm, and wonders where hummingbirds go in a hurricane, his book encompasses far more than a song of praise for one special place.

## CALDECOTT AWARD ACCEPTANCE

by *Robert McCloskey*

THANK you very much, Mr. Melcher and Children's Librarians, for awarding me the Caldecott Medal a second time.

I must tell you that in awarding *Time of Wonder* a prize, you are really awarding a prize to May Masee. It is her book, almost as surely as if she had held the brush in her hand. Without her it never would have been done. Without May Masee I should never have dared think in terms of so much color and so much paper. Without her patience and faith, I might never have finished the job.

As you are librarians, I think that you know enough about how picture books are made, so I've decided to say something that needs saying right now.

"What this country needs" is a phrase that keeps popping up. What this country needs is more exercise, or more religion, or a good five cent cigar, or, as of the moment, better education and more scientists.

With everyone clamoring for more scientists, I should like to clamor for more artists and designers. I should like to clamor for the teaching of drawing and design to every child, right along with reading and writing. I think it is most important for everyone really to see and evaluate pictures and really to see and evaluate his surroundings.

Stop for a moment and think how much time we all spend looking at and learning from or being influenced by pictures: pictures in magazines, pictures in newspapers, pictures in books, pictures that move, in movies or on TV. Think how much our lives are influenced by these pictures! We read these pictures. They add to and even supplant the written and spoken word. The widely quoted saying "A picture is worth a thousand words" may be true, but a picture is really worth only as many ideas or words as someone puts into it with his brush or pen or snap of a shutter.

Suppose we could produce a picture worth ten thousand words. It is of little use to the person who views it if he hasn't enough visual sense or experience to absorb what the picture-maker put into it. It is important that we develop people who can make worthwhile pictures, and it is important that we teach people to "read" these pictures. That is why, in my opinion, every child, along with learning to read and write, should be taught to draw and to design.

But, you answer, every child has Art classes now; you are asking for something we already have. What I am proposing is NOT Art; it is drawing and design. It is not Art any more than learning to write is Literature. This would be a course of study to teach design and to develop a visual sense. All too often our Art classes are used for occupational therapy and to help keep Johnny busy because he can't read. Clay modeling, finger painting, weaving, daubing and dribbling and expressing oneself, all have a place in this program, but teaching people to draw, to design, and to really see would be the object of my proposed course.

You may be sitting back in your seats and saying, "What nonsense! I certainly *can* see, and I know *what* I'm seeing when I see it!" Since you are an audience predominantly of ladies, let me give you this example. In a recent issue of a national magazine there was a double-page spread of seemingly casual photographs of a woman who had lost pounds and pounds of weight with the help of a jiggling machine. And in every one of these pictures the lady was altered about the middle by a retoucher's brush. In almost every issue of the magazine section of a large eastern newspaper, there are ads for "foundation garments" and other ladies' clothing. No woman alive ever had armpits such as appear in some of these photographs. Some are missing half their rib cages, and some have waists and hips that outside an altered photo would send a woman to the hospital. This same newspaper would never dream of printing in words something so misleading and so far from the truth as the photos in these ads.

About ten years ago I knew a sculptor who eked out a living

making manikins for displaying women's clothing. Along came one of those new looks that always seem to be coming our way from Paris. And with the clothes came new proportions to be used in making the new-look manikins — a necessary precaution so that the clothes would fit.

You say this doesn't mean anything? How many women do you know who diet and thump and jiggle and take pills, trying to match the impossible? You can take a special lens and photograph a woman to make her look taller and thinner — a handy little bit of equipment; you can turn it at right angles and photograph a car to make it look lower and longer. Or you can have an artist slice a low-priced car in half on paper and add three feet across the middle, making this modest piece of transportation look like the luxury car. The auto makers in Detroit have managed to make their products match the picture.

Watching a candidate for election deliver a speech on television, would you know that cunningly contrived lighting and camera angles were responsible for making the poor man look like a bug-eyed monster?

Do we know when someone is fooling us with pictures? With so many of our ideas being formed by pictures, it is important that we know.

I should like to speak for a moment about design. What are some of the elements of design? *Repetition*: as in a tree of apples, a herd of horses, a pattern of like marks made by a man with a brush or by a weaver in the cloth. As like as peas in a pod — alike, yes, but are they *exactly* alike, such as articles punched out by a machine? *Rhythm*: the rhythm of seasons, of growing shells and plants, of waves on the water and of grass in the wind. Is it the rhythm of pistons and machines? *Color*: as in the rainbow, the rocks and hills, the sea and sky and flowers, the colors of nature. Is it the color of neon lights and the colors that fluoresce? *Texture*: the textures of wood, of clay, of sand and stone, and of natural fibers. Are these like the textures of plastic, chromium and cellophane, made by machine? *Form*: the forms of plants and animals, the forms made by natural forces of wind and water, contrasting

with the forms suggested by the machine — what the machine can make quickly and easily. *Space relationship*: how all of these various elements are used in relation to each other. This is the most important part of design and I should like to elaborate.

As you are librarians, I will start with a printed page. The design of a printed page of type is the relationship of the area occupied by the type to the margins, or the space around the type. The type has texture; we consider that, and if it is in color, that too influences our design. If this relationship is not well thought out, we shall have a page that is not pleasing to the eye. The area *around* the type is as important as the type itself. This page is a two-dimensional design.

Now let us consider a three-dimensional design — a picture that has height and width and also depth, a picture, let us say, of a child in a library. The three-dimensional space *around* this child is as important to the success of our picture as the child himself.

Now consider a sculptor designing a pair of lions to be placed before a library. He considers carefully the site for his lions and designs them accordingly. The space *around* the lions is as important to their success as the way the lions are sculptured. Think how carefully a museum displays its pictures and its sculpture. The space *around* these works of art is as important to the overall effect as the works of art themselves. If we were to cover a wall with old masters hung canvas to canvas, the visual effect would be much the same as that experienced looking at a comic strip.

"Interesting," you say, "but how does this affect my life?"

Until a few years ago, almost all design had its roots and inspiration in nature. But now there is another inspiration — the machine with its forms, its repetition, and its rhythm. Modern chemistry is providing new colors; electricity is providing new light sources. Every day there is a new material, a new texture to add to a long list. A generation of designers has been influenced by the machine and what the machine can do. Artists, architects, landscape architects, sculptors, painters, and even choreographers and musicians have been influenced by the machine. A generation of industrial designers has been busy designing furniture, gadgets, houses, filling

stations, knives and forks, and skyscrapers that are easy for the machine to make. A generation of highway designers has been busy altering the look of our land with the help of machines, bulldozers and earthmovers, to make it easy for cars and trucks to speed from place to place.

I'm beginning to fear that with our machines, and machine-made materials, we are designing nature right out of our environment. In this country we have been designing, building, making things with machines, without paying the vaguest attention to the space around what we've produced.

How is a car designed? In secret, off by itself like a tremendous piece of mechanized jewelry. How do the ads show them? *One* car, zooming up the road with hardly another car in sight, or *one* car, before a velvet backdrop. How do they look bumper to bumper? How do they look side by side in a parking lot? Like the toy counter in the ten cent store on a grand scale. They look like hell!

Consider the Ranch type, Cape Cod, Salt Box, Williamsburg, Spanish Colonial, Modern house rendered on the architect's drawing board. Consider it in the photos and drawings in the magazines. The renderings: one house, carefully designed in relation to the page it is rendered upon; in the photos and pictures of the magazines, carefully selected, arranged and designed *in relation to the size of the page*. Sometimes there is a car in the garage. Have you ever wondered where the people are, in these pictures of houses, in these "machines for modern living"? And how do the houses look, lined up row after row, aerial to aerial in the housing development of an unimaginative builder? They look like hell.

What do you think of the shopping centers, used-car lots, motels, gas stations, drive-in theaters, all lined up, elbow to elbow, neon lights blazing out over acres of asphalt, glass, plastic, cement, wires, tubes, chromium, aluminum, cars, trucks, blinkers, flashers, signs, traffic circles, overpasses, underpasses, and development after development of houses with picture window after picture window facing the highway? What do you think as these things spread out from the cities until they meet? Do you shed a bitter tear, not

from the noxious smell of truck exhaust, but because you deplore what is happening to the look of America?

We're designing things without designing the space and the area around them. We are building an environment unfit for human beings to live in. Our land with governing an environment of the people, by the people, for the people is fast acquiring an environment of machines, by machines, for machines.

Yes, I think every child ought to study design and drawing right along with reading, and writing, and arithmetic. I can't think of a scientist, minister, politician, bulldozer-operator or any other professional man or job-holder who would not be a better citizen for having had this training.

I get mad when I see this important part of life shoved way over to one side in our curriculum and labeled "Art." You cannot look at the face of our country without being painfully aware of the result.

We need a number of new professions: scientist designer, politician designer, anthropologist designer, social-scientist designer. Let us teach design, and let us get it out of the museums, let us get it off the pages and drawings boards and let us put it to work.