

020.715

A 434

No. 13

cop 31

FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARIES

Allerton Park Institute

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

OCT 22 1968

LIBRARY

The person charging this material is responsible for its return on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

University of Illinois Library

ALLERTON

Nur

MAR 31 1969

JUN 13 1969

JUL 23 1974

JUN 29 1974

L161—O-1096

FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARIES

Papers presented at an Institute
conducted by the
University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library Science
November 6 - 9, 1966

Edited by
Winifred Ladley

Distributed by
The Illini Union Bookstore
Champaign, Illinois

Copyright © 1967 by
Winifred Ladley

OTHER VOLUMES IN THIS SERIES

- The School Library Supervisor* (Allerton Park Institute No. 1), 1956.
The Nature and Development of the Library Collection (No. 3), 1957.
The Library As a Community Information Center (No. 4), 1958.
The Role of Classification in the Modern American Library (No. 6), 1960.
Collecting Science Literature for General Reading (No. 7), 1961.
The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential (No. 8), 1962.
Selection and Acquisition Procedures in Medium-Sized and Large Libraries (No. 9), 1963.
The School Library Materials Center: Its Resources and Their Utilization (No. 10), 1963.
University Archives (No. 11), 1964.
The Changing Environment for Library Services in Metropolitan Areas (No. 12), 1965.

NOTE: The papers from Institutes 2 and 5 have not been published.

Available from the Illini Union Bookstore, 715 S. Wright Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820. \$2.00 in paper covers, \$3.00 in cloth covers.

Lithographed in U.S.A. by
EDWARDS BROTHERS, INC.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

FOREWORD

The ten years which have elapsed since the passage of the Library Services Act of 1956 have been ten years of stupendous development in library service in the United States. In the belief that a major factor in the library development has been and will continue to be federal legislation for libraries, the Graduate School of Library Science decided to review, in its Thirteenth Annual Institute at Allerton Park, federal legislation directly or indirectly related to libraries, with a view to evaluating past benefits and formulating guidelines for the future.

To this end, participants were asked to study for background information the brochure "Federal Library Legislation, Programs, and Services," reprinted from the February 1966 ALA Bulletin; and speakers were asked to discuss the impact of federal legislation, to criticize constructively the administration of present programs, and to suggest possible improvements to enable all librarians to deal intelligently with the opportunities and responsibilities proliferated by federal legislation related in any way to libraries and librarianship.

Discussion sessions, which were lively, tended throughout the conference to emphasize the necessity for "thinking big" in planning programs and expenditures, for fearlessly pushing implementation of library service to all in every possible way, especially including efficient cooperation among all types of libraries, not merely among libraries of the same type within a given area. Repeatedly, by speakers and by discussant pronouncement, librarians were reminded of the necessity for a national library services network, the necessity for coordinating programs to serve a unified purpose if there is to be wise spending of funds available from so many separate legislative acts—if there is to be true realization of the aim: superior library service to all.

Throughout the Institute participants were reminded that, whether librarians approve or not, libraries have become a part of the political process, with emphasis upon money as the essential ingredient of all progress in library service. To cope with this political aspect of librarianship, with the explosion of knowledge, with the ever-increasing use of automation in performing library services, a new type of librarian is needed. To produce this new model is the responsibility of library education now and in the future.

The committee planning the program for the Institute is especially indebted to Dr. Herbert Goldhor, Director, Graduate School of Library Science, who helped so materially in determining the scope

and development of the Institute proceedings. Faculty colleagues by their advice and participation also contributed much.

Arrangements for the Allerton institutes are traditionally handled by the Division of University Extension. The committee is particularly grateful to Mr. Timothy Sineath, who holds an appointment in D.U.E. and who is a candidate for the Certificate of Advanced Study in the Graduate School of Library Science. Thanks are also due to Mr. Eugene H. Schroth, Assistant Director of Allerton House, and to his colleagues.

Winifred Ladley, Chairman,
Planning Committee
Oliver T. Field
Guy Garrison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	v
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A PARTNER Orville G. Bentley	1
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON PUBLIC LIBRARIES S. Janice Kee	7
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON SCHOOL LIBRARIES Cora Paul Bomar	22
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON ACADEMIC LIBRARIES Edmon Low	33
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION Margaret E. Monroe	41
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON GOVERN- MENTAL AND SPECIAL LIBRARIES James E. Skipper	48
IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS THROUGH PROPOSALS Burton W. Adkinson	60
PROPOSALS AND PROGRAMS—THE INFORMAL ASPECTS Dorothy M. Crosland	66
THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION IN FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARIES Carma Leigh	76
FEDERAL AID FOR LIBRARIES—SOME COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE FUTURE Frederick H. Wagman	89

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A PARTNER

Orville G. Bentley

As a nation, we are philosophically and pragmatically committed to the proposition that economic and social progress will be sought through the development of scientific knowledge which in turn provides the lifeblood for new and more sophisticated technological progress. This commitment touches every facet of our life, from leisure time through the working day, with obvious implications interwoven through business, commerce, government, national defense, and the nation's international posture. The ramifications of this national moire are many in terms of physical comfort to people, changes in living standards, the use and development of resources, and in the value judgments held by people for a philosophy of progress through scientific change, vis-a-vis a society where maintaining the cultural and social status quo is a highly valued objective.

The spin-off from the national scientific establishment began to gain momentum during and immediately following World War II. In World War I Germany had shown the world that science was a defense asset. I need only cite their near monopoly on the dye industry won through German scientific prowess in the field of organic chemistry. A new science of biochemistry and its application in fermentation processes had given Germany a new source of precursors in the production of explosives. By World War II the armaments of the leading powers had incorporated new sensing devices and new and more powerful weapons, and had begun to utilize computerized systems to replace manpower in conducting warfare.

Such dramatic breakthroughs as the atomic bomb, guided missiles, and the application of electronic know-how in communication systems dramatically heralded a post-World War II scientific and technical age. Besides its obvious impact on industry and the consuming public, these developments brought revolutionary changes in our national attitude toward science and the scientist. As one would expect, many of World War II developments fed on basic science discoveries accumulated in the world's literature from previous decades—for example, the release of energy from the atom studied by the world renowned Italian scientist, Fermi, in the '20's and '30's. It became apparent that, as the storehouse of science was used up in the

Orville G. Bentley is Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, Urbana.

crash programs of World War II, there was a need for a speed-up in research on every front in the United States.

The federal government's initial approach to this broader support of science was primarily directed toward the achievement of specific missions, with only a limited consideration of the need for pure science and the broad educational base that would nourish the total establishment. Soon the shallowness of the short-range approach was widely recognized and Congress, state governments, and private industry began to think more in terms of the scientific foundation for such mission-oriented programs as the peaceful use of atomic energy, the support base for the massive space program dramatized by such objectives as placing a man on the moon by 1970, and sustaining our highly efficient agriculture.

Even the skeptics had come to realize that it was a sound investment of public funds to support science and technology as a part of the educational effort of the United States. As our science program became of age the federal government provided increasing support for science on a broad basis, on the assumption that the pay-off will benefit every segment of our society and provide a basis for continued economic growth. Perhaps it should be emphasized that there is still a strong motivating factor from the defense requirements in the continuing armament race that has plagued our world for centuries.

Annually the National Science Foundation compiles a tabulation of federal appropriations for research and development, which is now commonly referred to in the alphabetical potpourri as "R and D" expenditures. A review of these figures is revealing indeed.

In 1940 these appropriations amounted to a total of \$74 million (about 40 percent went for agricultural research). By 1966 the expenditures for "R and D" will be in the magnitude of \$15.4 billion. Incidentally, now less than 2 percent going for the federal support for research is spent on the agricultural sciences. Another striking aspect of these statistics is that about one-half of the total expenditures of federal "R and D" money—\$125 billion—has been spent in the past five years, which suggests that we have now geared up a substantial research apparatus that will, if it is to stay intact, demand continually larger slices of the federal resources.

How the federal "R and D" money is being spent is of considerable interest. According to the National Science Foundation, 32 percent of the federal expenditure is made by profit organizations and 68 percent by educational institutions, government, and non-profit and other domestic and foreign organizations. It is equally interesting to take a look at the fields of science in which the expenditures were made. Twenty-four percent of the money was spent in life sciences and 67 percent in engineering and the physical sciences proper, leaving only 2 percent of the expenditures being made in psychological sciences, 3 percent in social sciences, and 2 percent in other sciences.

These huge expenditures are generating new scientific information at a prodigious rate. An ancillary effect has been the increased demand for new concepts to facilitate the recording, storing, and retrieval of information. Operationally, research and development organizations, both public and private, require systems designed to provide scientific and technical information pertinent to their mission or scientific endeavor. The federal government itself had obligations for scientific and technical information of an estimated \$259 million in 1966. In addition, the various agencies of the federal government are planning to spend \$354 million for general purpose scientific information on various natural and social phenomena so as to service the variety of users including the public agency, general public, and research investigators.

The purpose for citing these figures is to illustrate the magnitude of the federal research program currently underway in the United States and to describe in terms of dollars just one aspect of the scientific and technical information service created in the past few years by the huge increase in federal support for "R and D."

Private investment in research likewise increased substantially, nurtured by rising demands for consumer products combined with a demand created in part by the annual federal expenditure for the hardware and systems approach used in probing space by NASA and the defense establishment. New ideas and products breed new demands too. For example, agricultural chemicals is a multi-billion dollar business which was spawned by basic research in chemistry, biology, and agriculture.

The rapid expansion of enrollments in educational institutions, together with the scientific expansion, has made it obvious that libraries must grow in size and sophistication. It is equally obvious that a massive infusion of support is needed if the American library is to accumulate, store, and provide a data retrieval system commensurate with the growth in the knowledge-producing capability of the new national research establishment. Such help has been forthcoming through several congressional acts with which you are familiar.

The first step has been made—public recognition of the real need of the libraries for staff, facilities, and research on the effectiveness of the system. The next step is to learn how to live with these new concepts of service and to provide the benefactor with the resources needed to create and sustain these services. I am not a librarian or a specialist in procedures for acquiring funds under any of the federal programs open to libraries; but I can tell you about a hundred years of federal partnership in a concept for support of education in the land-grant philosophy and seventy-five years of joint program-planning and support in agricultural research, plus over fifty years of a cooperative effort in a nation-wide extension or continuing education program.

One of the unique characteristics of agricultural research and education is the cooperative role of the federal government in the support and planning of research and extension education programs in agriculture and home economics. What is the federal role in these activities?

First, federal legislation gave birth to the idea. The Hatch Act of 1887 authorized the payment to states on a matching basis for the purpose of assisting them to establish a research program for agriculture at the land-grant college, then frequently called the agricultural college or the college of agriculture and mechanic arts. About thirty years later the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 extended the principle of joint funding, only now there was a tripartite composed of the federal government, the state, and the local government. Usually a county was involved. The Smith-Hughes vocational education legislation was aimed at joint support for vocational education in the secondary schools. Philosophically, all of these activities had these common characteristics:

(a) Joint funding of the states and the federal government.

(b) A substantial program thrust directed toward a segment of the population that felt itself somewhat educationally and economically deprived. Rural America was characterized by a large number of small entrepreneurs isolated by limitations in communications, travel and contact with social and cultural advantages generally more abundant in urban centers than in areas of dispersed population.

(c) Mutual recognition that local leadership was responsible for program development and direction.

This joint effort has been immensely successful. Why? It is hard to point out a single reason for the success of these programs, but it seems to me that one of the fundamental reasons is that there was and is a recognized need, both nationally and at local levels, for a program of research that would deal with agriculture, agri-business, and the people involved. It is not necessary to recount for you the events leading up to the passage of the Land-Grant Act of 1862. Here a minimal amount of federal support encouraged the establishment of a system of colleges whose educational philosophy was to teach, in addition to the sciences and humanities, "agriculture and the mechanic arts and military sciences." The success of these institutions is a legend and one of the truly American innovations in education. The soundness of the decisions to create institutions that would be supported from state and federal funds is indicated by the fact that these embryonic colleges of the 1860's developed into some of the largest comprehensive universities of the world.

During the past seventy-five years a number of procedural devices have evolved to facilitate cooperative planning in the communication of ideas and work plans among agricultural research workers

and administrators. All these procedural plans have emphasized co-operation among local, state, and federal agencies, with lines of communication and autonomy clearly drawn.

Need is a key factor in generating support and program continuity. The libraries have a need to extend knowledge to the disadvantaged in both rural and urban America; there is a need to build for intellectual excellence, so eloquently articulated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner. There is a need to do research on the new systems of knowledge distribution and on an evaluation of these programs. Are libraries making a meaningful impact on the disadvantaged? Can we be more effective with the intellectually average student and can we challenge that top 2 percent of the intellectual giants of our country to help shape them into the geniuses we need to keep our increasing computerized and programmed society moving?

Need alone will not bring support automatically. We have found that as a partner with the federal government, the Congress wants to be informed about programs, how appropriated money is being used, the progress or output function, and plans for next year. Through communication and presenting such views, conceptualizing needs, with evidence of program leadership, need can be articulated. Money will not be allocated in a vacuum. The agricultural experiment stations and the state cooperative extension services of the land-grant universities have a strong and respected voice won by action and participation in policy making and planning. We have a partner in the federal establishment in the form of the USDA, but our voices are heard directly in the Congress, too, as we seek to represent the needs of the people we serve.

The parallelism between federal support programs for agricultural research and extension education suggests that the libraries might find it to their advantage to familiarize themselves with the various planning and philosophic approaches used by the colleges and the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Though programs differ markedly, there is a common thread of purpose and goals: education, people, and service.

As you will recall, throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the trend in population movement was from the farm to the urban areas. Many leaders envisioned this trend as one that would deplete rural America of its leadership, leaving a residue of people who would be subject to some of the educational disadvantages that were inherent in some of the more sparsely populated areas. It is a tribute to our Congress, and to our society in general, that they recognized the merits of an informal educational system that would have as its philosophical base the "grass-roots professor" who would provide educational leadership at the local level.

As the American library system begins to gear itself for expanded educational programs, the spirit and some of the educational concepts found to serve a useful function in the educational efforts utilized by the Cooperative Extension Service might well be considered. Our experience has shown that the federal government is a valued partner not only because of its financial benevolence, but programmatically as well.

In summary, I suggest some guidelines which you might find useful in developing a more meaningful relationship in your partnership with the federal government in a program of mutual endeavor —namely, the extension, development and enrichment of the American libraries as institutions and in the quality and scope of the services they can provide.

A. The program must be articulated in such a way as to have meaning and understanding at both the national and local levels.

B. Devices for communicating joint planning efforts must reflect the views and recommendations as seen at the grass-roots level and must preserve local autonomy in program building, personnel selection, and budgetary decisions.

C. Federal support will bring constraints and program guidelines, but help build them to suit your program objectives. To accomplish this objective, you will need to spend time and effort on planning and coordination required to assure communication, program review, and planning by libraries at the local level. Libraries must take it upon themselves to give imagination to programs and such devices that will help build cohesive units at the county, multi-county, and regional levels within the state and on an interstate basis. They can likewise show their capability to develop mutually acceptable multi-state regional projects.

The federal government and its multitude of agencies ultimately reflect the thinking of individuals. Ideas, concepts, and imagination are the motivational factors of people in the federal agencies and for state and local programs alike.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON PUBLIC LIBRARIES

S. Janice Kee

The Problems

In studying the origin of the word, "impact," and successive definitions from Oxford to Webster, I found that it was first used in the sense of binding; later in the more forceful sense of striking or hitting. Webster defines it in terms of contemporary usage as follows: "force of impression of one thing on another, concentrated force producing change, an especially forceful effect forcing change." This led me to another technical question. Are we using the word impact in this conference in terms of what it denotes or connotes? In other words, am I to consider the more specific changes or marks of library progress which might be attributed to federal legislation? Or, am I to attempt to point out the forces which are not so clearly denoted but which may be associated with recent federal legislation? One might ask if there is a distinction between the changes in public libraries which have been produced and those which are being forced by federal legislation. This is a fascinating question, and perhaps a related one is whether we can assume that all the social and economic forces in modern society which affect library development can be analyzed, and that the degree to which federal legislation produces change can be determined. And finally, I have been greatly troubled by the question of whether it is possible to determine the effect of federal legislation on one single type of library without the careful consideration of the interdependence of all libraries.

These questions, and perhaps others of equal or more importance, suggest the complexity of the topic assignment. It is immediately obvious that this paper will raise more questions than it answers, and this may be its one useful purpose. It is based on a review of the literature, which is scarce or generally of little relevance, and two opinion surveys, which will be explained as the results are reported. An effort has been made to approach the subject in terms of the forces of federal legislation as they have hit or struck public libraries, as distinguished from a discussion of what has happened as a result of the collisions.

There appears to be more that we do not know than that we think we do know about the impact or force of federal legislation. For

S. Janice Kee is Lecturer, Department of Librarianship, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.

example, while we have Stanford's appraisal of the Works Project Administration's library assistance program, written in 1942, we have no knowledge, based on research, of the long-range effect of this program of federal aid to libraries.¹ If one person's impression of its effect in one state is typical, we might generalize that in some counties the WPA demonstrations were highly successful and paved the way to the development of a good modern library operation, as in Shawano County, Wisconsin. In other counties, the demonstration had a very different effect. It fixed in the minds of at least one generation of taxpayers a resistance to rural library development on the basis that the bookmobile, alone, was the whole library.

We have no way of knowing how public library development has been affected by the great build-up of independent, generally unrelated government libraries in Washington, and, according to Temple's study in 1954, of their general policy of service to localities on a "when-ever-feasible" basis.² State librarians often ponder the question of the influence of the policies and programs of the Department of Agriculture on public library extension.³ We know very little about the effect of the federal laws regulating government documents on the information function of public libraries. The numerous services of the Library of Congress, used and unused, doubtless affect the services of local public libraries, but to what extent we do not know.

Considering the inclusiveness of my topic, there was a strong temptation to limit absolutely this discussion to the Library Services Act of 1956 and its major amendments. This federal law was the first and is the only one which is aimed directly at the establishment, improvement and extension of public library services. Consequently, major emphasis is placed on the LSA and LSCA in this paper, though other recent legislative measures, which are considered as indirectly affecting public libraries, are mentioned. The principle reason for this is obvious. We have had ten active years of hard-hitting experience in implementing the LSA and LSCA and have developed at least some opinions on its impact on public library development.

Before these opinions are given, it seems appropriate to reflect briefly on some historical aspects of public libraries in the political process.

The adoption of the Constitution of the United States might be considered the first federal act that has affected the development of public libraries, for at that time, when our system of government was established, it was the firm belief of the political scientists of the day that the federal government should have greatly limited powers, and the states should have many responsibilities, including the education of the citizenry. The states, in turn, delegated in great measure this large task to local governmental jurisdictions.⁴ We will never know what the results would have been if the power to provide education had been assigned clearly to the federal government in the Constitution.

We do know, very well, the poor record of public library establishment and support by local and state governments since 1787, and it need not be recounted here. The 1965 National Inventory of Library Needs tells this dismal story, which is one of neglect of public responsibility at these levels of government.⁵

Historical Notes

The greatly increased activity of the federal government in the affairs of the states and localities in recent decades requires us to re-examine the original concept of inter-governmental relations, and many people are asked to alter deeply ingrained beliefs on this subject.

The public library is traditionally a local institution responding well or poorly, as it so desires, to the needs of a compact community. It is now being called upon to undergo changes considered drastic by a good many people. It is asked to widen its service base, share its resources and accept financial support and leadership from two or three levels of government. Library boards are to be persuaded that library cooperation is a virtue and local - state - federal "partnership" is something different from federal control. While library leaders have been generally successful in their efforts to effect changes in the structure and government of public libraries, progress has been slowed down in some states. Rigidity of thinking on the meaning of the constitutional phrase, "for the common defense and general welfare" has been hard hit by recent federal legislation. To include educational and library benefits under this broad umbrella is difficult for many people. This problem, with all its implications for public library development, represents a major impact of recent federal laws.

Another reason to reflect on early American history in this discussion is related to the basic objectives of the American public library.

Oliver Garceau, in The Public Library in the Political Process, sets forth social beliefs underlying public library support which stem from the long process of formulating the ideas in the Constitution. Garceau expressed these beliefs in these terms:

every person should have an equal chance to fulfill his abilities; every man can and will do so if given the chance; the individual shall be free to develop as his inclination and capacities guide him; and society will progress as the enlightenment of citizens advances.⁶

The justification of the existence of public libraries has been based on this ideology since the middle of the nineteenth century. (This was when the New England states led the nation in authorizing local government to support community libraries with tax funds.)

Since the creation of the first state library extension agency, service for all has been emphasized. Our working slogans have been "equal chance," "books for all" and library "coverage." These are the noble ideals around which public and state librarians have rallied for seventy-six years—or should I say seventy-four years?

Recent Legislation Affecting Libraries

It was in 1964 that the "war on poverty" became an active war, with the signing of the Economic Opportunity Act. Vice-President Humphrey promptly challenged public librarians with this statement: "Next to our schools, our public libraries are potentially more important in the 'War on Poverty' than any other of our public institutions."⁷

I believe it is fair to say that public librarians were struck by this finger-pointing statement and their immediate reactions were of three kinds. There were those who, with little thought, assumed an attitude of "Who, me? I am too busy trying to achieve my goal of books-for-all." Others openly expressed concern in these terms: "What should be the goal of the public library? To do a better job with established users or spread efforts in the direction of the hard-to-reach?" And finally, there were public librarians scattered across the country from east to west coasts whose reactions were positive and enthusiastic, as expressed by a trustee of the D. C. public library when he said, "The Public Library is not a conscientious objector in the War on poverty, but has in fact already prepared its own dug out for the battle."^{8,9}

Isn't it possible that the greatest impact of federal legislation on public libraries may come from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and other similar domestic legislative measures, which encourage the use of public library facilities by new and different types of users?—and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other educational laws having the purpose of building up school and college libraries, which will change the character of public library service to students?—and the Higher Education Act of 1965, with its provisions for expanded adult education programs, in which public libraries should have an active part?

The thrust of these laws, which may seem to affect public libraries indirectly, may, indeed, have a great effect upon their future as public cultural institutions. The community programs under these laws will compel public librarians to turn a searchlight upon themselves; to re-examine the purposes of public libraries; to evaluate existing programs and practices; to find ways to coordinate library services; and, in all probability, to adjust to a role of the public library which more clearly represents its original purposes, symbolized by the slogans, "equal chance" and "continuing education."

It must be recognized, of course, that this adjustment will be furthered by other strong societal forces which affect library development, but I expect the flow of federal funds into community education programs will be the sharpest spur to action. Already we are seeing signs of wholesome unrest among public librarians as they react to the book, The Public Library and the City, and to some of the recent speeches of Dr. Kenneth Beasley, Ralph Blasingame and others.^{10,11,12}

And now, in 1966, with the passage of Title III, LSCA, the Congress has established interlibrary cooperation as a national public policy.

There is indication that the reaction of public librarians at large to this development ranges from apprehension to high enthusiasm. The law establishes a program of grants to the states for the "establishment and maintenance of local, regional, state and interstate cooperative networks of libraries." Its implementation calls for adjustment to a fact of life that a broadly stated national library goal has been actually formulated in the political arena rather than in deliberative conferences of representative librarians from all types of libraries; and it calls for the demonstration of "joint planning" and coordinated services among libraries of all types which has been, for the most part, only in the talking stages for many years.

I venture to say Title III of LSCA will have a very great impact on public libraries, as well as on other types of libraries.

Historical Notes on LSA and LSCA

Against this fragmentary background of admission of ignorance, historical notes and projection of my views, I ask you to turn your attention to the considered, commonsense opinions of some fifty librarians on the impact of the Library Services Act and Library Services and Constructions Act on public libraries.

As we know so well, the American Library Association had been on record as favoring federal assistance to public libraries for thirty years, and its Washington office concentrated for the last ten of these years on one bill to provide only terminal aid. The successful climax came on June 19, 1956 when President Eisenhower signed the Library Services Act and thereby recognized the public library as an educational agency of national concern.

There is a considerable amount of literature related to this Act, its legislative history, the plans and projects of the states and the accomplishments that have been attributed in whole or in part to the availability of federal grants. It is not the purpose of this paper to review and appraise the ten year program under LSA and LSCA. The Allerton Park Institute of 1961, at the end of the first five years, aimed to examine objectively and critically the record of progress and to speculate on the future course of library development.¹³ While

there may be some question as to how successfully the conference carried out its objectives, the published proceedings are a valuable contribution to the literature, particularly the Martin paper on "fragmentations and convenience" in library extension. (I dare say this paper has had an impact on state-wide library planning, and I hope I am right!) Also there is now in print an excellent factual and statistical review of progress under LSA and LSCA for the ten-year period, done by John C. Frantz and Nathan M. Cohen.¹⁴

Not to be overlooked in studying the history of LSCA are the Senate and House hearings (including the messages and letters from the states) and the floor debates on the bills as recorded in The Congressional Record. In any consideration of federal legislation, the intent of Congress is all-important and it is drawn from this literature.

Perhaps a few reminders, taken from the history of LSCA, as recorded to date, would be useful in focusing this discussion.

(1) The purpose of the LSA of 1956 was to extend library services to rural people who were deprived of public library service. The emphasis of this law was on "coverage" and "books for all." And each state library extension agency had its traditional method of getting books to people.

(2) The 84th Congress of 1956 responded to the need for public library service for 27 million people without libraries and the additional millions with poor libraries, with the understanding that the program would terminate in five years.

(3) The state plan devised was introduced to state library extension agencies as a requirement for federal grants. As a whole, state extension librarians were not experienced planners.

(4) There was a nation-wide need for public library improvement, but library conditions in the 48 states of 1956 varied greatly. Each state had to start (and rapidly, in order to produce results) from where it was at that time.

(5) The report of major and tangible achievements under LSA and LSCA, as given by Frantz and Cohen unquestionably shows that great progress had been made since 1956 in establishing library operations of various sizes and capabilities, in getting books of all kinds to people, and in securing increased local and state library support.

According to the purpose of LSA and LSCA, all fifty states are on the move toward better libraries. They are moving at different speeds according to the directions of fifty different plans. Also, because no two states started at exactly the same line, they are at various points in their race for universal library service of quality.

All of these facts and circumstances should be kept in mind as we consider the reactions of the state librarians and others on the question of impact of federal legislation. In addition, it is well to remember that the most effective state and national developmental programs generally move slowly. It was only ten years ago that the state extension librarians were called upon to blaze a wilderness trail through the tedious local-state-federal relationships, essential to the administration of federal funds for library improvement and development. These librarians, in 1956, were confronted with this new and challenging, but complex public responsibility for which they had not been educated. (All librarians are now in this boat, and I am sure they are welcomed aboard by the pioneers.)

Results of Questionnaires

We all know the limitations in the questionnaire as a data-gathering device and the opinion survey as a means of assessing a national situation. Yet, in the absence of more authentic evaluative knowledge, who is better qualified to express useful opinions on the impact of LSA and LSCA on public libraries than the state librarians who are administering the program?

In February of 1966, the ALA Washington office asked state librarians the question, "In your opinion, what is the most significant achievement(s) in your state as a result of the LSCA?" The responses from forty-seven states throw a light on the subject of impact of federal legislation on public libraries.

Without exception, the states reported some variant of improved and expanded library service as the most significant achievements; e.g., "more and better books," "increased number of qualified staff," "improved building facilities," "development of larger and more functional units of service," "added bookmobile services," "development of library systems," "stronger state library agency," etc.

About half of the states added increased cooperative effort as a significant achievement; e.g., "interlibrary cooperation, now a reality," "cooperative processing centers," "cooperation of libraries of all sizes and kinds," "upgrading of services through sharing of resources," etc.

Ten states considered significant the federally supported programs of education and training of library personnel—study grants, scholarships, conferences and workshops.

Fifteen states recognized the significance of surveys and research activities as a basis of better state-wide planning and therefore more nearly unified focusing on goals of library development.

While the Frantz and Cohen report shows an increase of local and state funds for public library purposes between 1956 and 1964, ranging from 99 percent in the southeast to 156 percent in the North Atlantic region, only fourteen states attributed the increases to LSCA.

Ten states listed more wide-spread interest and activities of library trustees and other citizens as significant achievements attributable to LSCA.

Six months after the Washington office had circulated its questionnaire, I asked state librarians to consider a similar question (see Appendix): "What are the greatest products of change in state and public libraries that may be attributed to federal funds (at least, in large measure)?" Forty state librarians responded to this question in almost the identical terms they had used earlier in the year, as if to say the changes are significant achievements. The replies also indicated that most of the major changes and achievements in public library development may be attributed to LSCA.

But what about impact? Can we identify the forces that have produced the changes? What is back of the achievements?

Again, opinion is all I have to offer in answer to these questions—opinion gleaned from the replies of state librarians to the two questions quoted above, eight letters from seven active public librarians and a trustee and the results of a questionnaire completed by forty-four state librarians. In this material about a dozen forces were named that are believed to be producing change in public libraries.

Unquestionably, money—federal money—is at the top of the list. In the past ten years, according to Frantz and Cohen, over 100 million federal dollars were spent under LSCA for services, including personnel, books and other materials, and the operating costs of programs and projects. Though this is far less money than is needed to bring public libraries up to standards, the federal expenditures have served to stimulate substantial increases in local and state library support in many states. Essential as it is, money, alone, is not all that is needed. Neither is it all that LSCA has brought, according to the librarians who completed the questionnaires.

Intangible, but ever so powerful in producing change, are some by-products of the federal expenditures. For example, one state librarian said, "It (LSCA) has given the local library user, the librarian and trustee a feeling of HOPE"; another called it incentive; another, "raised expectations for rapid improvement." And still another wrote, "I would say that the single most outstanding effect (of LSCA) would be that it has made our librarians think big."

The improvement of the climate for library development was mentioned by a number of librarians as being a significant force. One called it "attitude, for lack of a better word," defining "attitude" as "the uplift to the profession, a new sense of purpose and an improved image of libraries and librarians in the eyes of the public." Another spoke of the development of a "climate of opinion" favorable to library improvement.

Public libraries have gained this new place in the sun through the recognition of their value in community life in the platforms of the two major political parties, in the endorsements of three different U. S. Presidents and through the several actions of Congress since 1956. This national recognition, in itself, is a force in producing change; and it has filtered down to most of the states, where the work of state library extension agencies is being recognized as never before. One state librarian said, "Prior to the advent of federal funds for libraries, we were almost a minus quantity in the Department . . . but now as a force in the field of education, we are involved as we never were before." Others wrote, "The state agency has assumed some esteem through its expansion"; "The state Library's leadership role is now recognized"; "New liaison opportunities with local government officials are now possible"; and the "State Library, through its expansion of services, has increased its status as a leader." This recognition, which has been achieved in the large majority of the state governments, is an important contribution to the favorable climate in which we are now operating.

There seems to be almost unanimous opinion among the respondents that there is an increased awareness of library services and library needs on the part of librarians, trustees and citizens at large; and that this is a potent factor in the development of libraries. Doubtless the new federally supported activities, including demonstrations, survey and research reports, improved state publications, training programs and state-wide conferences—all these have contributed greatly to this awareness.

In general, local people are more aware of national trends in education, government and economics; more aware of the interdependence of libraries in meeting the information needs of people; more aware of the necessity for library research and planning, and shared financing of libraries.

It was noted that the work of state and national library associations (particularly the ALA Washington office) and the National Library Week committees has played a very important part in creating interest in library improvement and in achieving a better informed library public. The LSCA, however, has been a multi-million dollar alarm clock for awakening the country to library needs.

Awareness has led to involvement of more and different people in library planning and action programs. Active participants in National Library Week have become permanent friends of the library. Members of state-wide Citizens' Committees and Councils have become effective spokesmen on library needs. Governors' Conferences on Libraries have stimulated the interest of library trustees, including many younger men and women who have recently received appointments to library boards. Added services of the libraries, such as film programs, stepped-up interlibrary loan and reference services,

and special programs for the culturally different, have attracted new public library supporters. We must recognize that widespread involvement of people in library activities is a force in producing change.

Awareness and involvement, with library plans and library standards as guides, have advanced the practice of library cooperation. Three important forces in producing change are named here: plans, standards and cooperation.

Public planning, as a means of preparing for change, is a growing business in this country. All kinds of communities, small and large, are now engaged in planning activities (or in the controversies that accompany the published planning documents.) It is granted that all state library agencies are still learning the process of state-wide library planning, but they have moved a long way toward mastery of the responsibility in the past ten years. The recent USOE-sponsored conference on the subject of Statewide Long Range Planning for Libraries was helpful.¹⁵

The direction and purpose provided in a state plan are recognized forces in library improvement and development. More than half the states gave a high rating to the benefits of surveys, research reports and state plans as effective means of advancing library goals. Public library standards, calling for inter-library cooperation in systems of services, have provided the basis for state plans. Many state librarians said the greatest benefits of LSCA are attributable to planning and cooperative action.

Effective cooperation has taken many forms: among public libraries, among different types of libraries, between state library and local libraries, between state library and state library association, between state library and a school of library science, and among all kinds of library organizations and other organizations with related interests. One state librarian, in pointing out how planning, standards and cooperation work together wrote, "State library extension agencies have accepted a planning and development role, which is now more important than their old service role. By-and-large, in this planning role, state agencies have secured the help and good will of librarians in the state. As a consequence, a success is being made of the much talked about federal-state-local partnership, to the end that the library system network concept has broad acceptance."

With all these forces at work, we have the mighty power of momentum. One state librarian said there had been instituted "a really enthusiastic new library movement." There is the effect of a "simultaneous push in all of the fifty states," said another.

And finally, I would not overlook the work and dedication to responsibility of the state librarians. With all the shortcomings of state library agencies, which in all cases reflect the shortcomings of

state government, we have no reason to minimize or underestimate the force of the 40 to 75 hours per week of work of the individuals who administer programs financed with federal funds.

What is back of the great achievements under LSCA? Money, to be sure, but also a new hope, a favorable climate, recognition, awareness, involvement, plans, standards, cooperation, work, dedication to responsibility; and it all adds up to a powerful national library momentum.

Recommended Changes in Federal Legislation

There is an old Greek proverb which says that if you chase two hares both will escape you. If this is true, I've been trapped by the program planners! In addition to the task of assessing the impact of federal legislation, I was asked to comment on desirable changes in or additions to federal laws affecting public libraries.

Sixty-five librarians were asked this question: "What changes or additions in federal laws do you think should be made?" Thirty-seven commented. I trust I will not be taking undue liberties with the replies if I place them in three broad categories:

(1) There were those who want no changes or additions but only a chance to do a good job with the laws now in force.

(2) There were more whose suggestions were related to the administration of the laws—federal rules, regulations, guidelines and services of administrative personnel.

The greatest problem, as reported, is in working with terminal legislation and the time lag between authorizations and appropriations. One suggestion for eliminating this problem was offered by five states—simply make LSCA permanent.

Another problem in this category is related to the lack of needed directions and services from the USOE Library Services Branch. For example, needs include: "more frequent visits to the states to assist state librarians in maintaining high standards"; "more competent nation-wide consultants to work with us on our programs. The Library Extension Specialists just check our paper work"; "more publication of descriptions of federally supported library projects." One state librarian wrote, "It is probably not the fault of the people in LSB that we are not getting leadership, exciting and stimulating ideas, which would spur us on, the kind that Francis Keppel gave to formal education."

(3) Then there were those who made suggestions for the changes in existing laws as follows:

A. A majority of the respondents would like to see all laws related to all libraries pulled together with the aim of achieving better coordination of state and local library programs. One librarian wrote, "We should think of federal legislation for

libraries as one topic; we have passed the time when we should think of (library) legislation in segments related to the type of library." Others said: "Laws should tie programs of libraries together"; "While we strive to eliminate fragmentation, the administration of the library laws at the federal level tends to force fragmentation." One city librarian said, "We must break down barriers between types of libraries"; another, "The library legislation is in too many different packages."

B. Eight state librarians believe there should be more stringent matching and other requirements for local and state governments, while one state suggested fewer requirements than presently exist. The ugly fact is that in too many states considerably more federal than state funds are made available for library purposes.

C. Three states expressed serious concern about the merging conflicts of interest among federal programs involving libraries. State library plans and state library professional leadership are being by-passed by some administrators of federal programs which include book and other library services. One state librarian said, "We would like to see requirements that the state library agency review all applications for federal grants from localities if library programs are included." A related concern over inconsistencies in the laws was expressed by a state librarian: "If federal funds in other programs are to continue on a non-matching basis (Title II, ESEA) then I feel that money for materials for public libraries should be provided on a non-matching basis."

D. Three states strongly urge a specific provision in the law for strengthening the state agency as in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. On the other hand, one urban library director wrote, "The strengthening of the state agency is being taken too literally."

E. Three state librarians suggested that all service Titles of LSCA be brought together and the construction Title be completely separated from services.

F. Two specific revisions of the Construction Title of LSCA and the regulations were suggested: (1) "Provision should be made for the purchase of existing buildings which are qualified for public library use." (2) "The purchase cost of buildings to be remodeled should be allowed as local matching funds."

G. Additions to federal library laws that were suggested include: (1) federal support of library services to government, (2) funds for training institutes and other educational opportunities for public librarians, (3) grants to state libraries for research and development, (4) minimum standards for library service applicable in activities supported by federal funds,

(5) a merit system for professional librarians working in federal programs, (6) grants for special library activities directed toward disadvantaged groups, (7) support of a program which would effectively link state libraries with national libraries. One state librarian suggested "the codification of a national library program."

A National Library Program! A program in which access to library resources and networks of library services are realities, not just ideas. A program in which goals are in focus and in which local, state and national library resources are considered in the aggregate in formulating standards for levels of community library service, rather than by type of library; a program in which the boundaries of political jurisdictions (municipal, county and state) are no longer the barriers to qualified library service that they are today—a national library program!

This is the high note on which I am satisfied to conclude this presentation. It suggests a reasonable goal which we may expect to reach, if our present momentum continues, in five years—or should I say two years?

APPENDIX

Questionnaire sent out by S. Janice Kee

August 15, 1966

To: 50 State Library Extension Agencies-Received 44 replies
13 Public Librarians in 13 different states-Received 7 replies
2 Public Library Trustees in 2 different States-Received 1 reply
From: S. Janice Kee
Department of Librarianship, KSTC Emporia, Kansas 66801
Subject: Federal laws affecting public libraries

This is an opinion survey. I have agreed to write a paper for the Allerton Park Institute (November 6-9, 1966) on Federal Legislation Affecting Public Libraries. My invitation said: "What we would like to do is evaluate the legislation, consider its impact on public libraries and recommend desirable changes or additions. . ." I am sure you will agree this is a big assignment, and I desperately need your help! I will have access to all pertinent data at the Library Services Branch and the information collected this year by the PLA Legislation Committee. I am in contact with the current chairmen of PLA and ASL Committees on Legislation. After all this, it seems imperative that I call upon you.

I hope you will find time before September 9 to send me your opinion on two questions:

- (1) WHAT ARE THE GREATEST PRODUCTS OF CHANGE IN STATE AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES THAT MAY BE ATTRIBUTED TO FEDERAL FUNDS (AT LEAST, IN LARGE MEASURES)?
- (2) WHAT CHANGES OR ADDITIONS IN FEDERAL LAWS DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE MADE?

For your State, how would you rate the following generally accepted benefits of federal assistance:

- More purpose, direction and momentum to library development (forced planning, studies and funds to experiment. . . and to establish. . .)
- More working together—How do you react to someone's statement, "Money buys cooperation"?
- More wide spread awareness of library needs brought about through surveys, studies, publicity, publications, training sessions, etc. which have been financed with federal funds
- More status for the administering library agency in state government
- Wider horizons on the part of public librarians, e.g., increasing sophistication in planning, inter-governmental relations, taxation, the poverty-stricken, etc.
- Extension of public library services to previously unreached users, illiterates, minority groups, etc.

I will be working on this paper in September, and I will greatly appreciate having your response in time to include it. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

REFERENCES

1. Stanford, Edward B. Library Extension under the WPA; An Appraisal of an Experiment in Federal Aid. A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate Library School in candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 1942. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1944.
2. Temple, Phillips. Federal Services to Libraries. Chicago, American Library Association, 1954.
3. Mohrhardt, Foster. "National Systems," Library Trends, 2:44-62, July 1953.
4. Toepel, M. G. "Legal Responsibility for Public Library Development," Library Trends, 9:6-18, July 1960.

5. National Inventory of Library Needs. Chicago, American Library Association, 1965.
6. Garceau, Oliver. The Public Library in the Political Process. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949.
7. Humphrey, Hubert Horatio. "Spiritual Quest: Librarians have a Vital Role in the Anti-Poverty Program," Library Journal, 89:3243-45, Sept 15, 1964.
8. "Time for Self-Renewal." A special issue on the anti-poverty program, Pauline Winnick, guest editor. Library Journal, 89:317-353, Jan. 15, 1964; and "The Unifying Theme." An issue related to the anti-poverty program, Henry T. Drennan, guest editor. Library Journal, 89:3241-3273, Sept. 15, 1964.
9. Peterson, H. N. "D. C. Public Libraries Anti-poverty Program; Plans, Projects and Proposals," D. C. Libraries, 37:63-69, Fall 1965.
10. Conant, Ralph W., ed. The Public Library and the City. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1965.
11. "Library Cooperation for Reference and Research; Analysis of Social and Political Factors Involved." An unpublished speech by Kenneth E. Beasley, New York City, July 12, 1966.
12. Blasingame, Ralph. "Equalization of Opportunity," and comments by Lowell Martin, Harold S. Hacker, Robert R. McClaren and Emerson Greenaway. Library Journal, 90:2071-80, May 1, 1965.
13. The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential. (Allerton Park Institute, No. 8). Ed. Donald E. Strout, Urbana, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1962.
14. Cohen, Nathan M., and Frantz, John C. "The Federal Government and Public Libraries; A Ten-year Partnership, 1957-1966." Health, Education and Welfare Indicators, July 1966, pp. 1-21.
15. Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries. A report of a conference, Sept. 19-22, 1965. Sponsored by Library Services Branch, U. S. Office of Education.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Cora Paul Bomar

Not too many years ago a dream was born in the Hotel Congressional in Washington when the ALA Committee on Legislation invited a few public, school, and college librarians, and consultants from the Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education, to meet with the Committee to discuss the Nation's library needs and how the Federal government might help the states meet these needs. This unpublicized informal conference fashioned a dream that was somewhat revolutionary. The group established the concept that the Federal government did have a responsibility that went beyond the limited Library Service Act which at that time provided not more than \$7 million for rural public library service. The committee on school libraries was the bravest of the sub-committees for it proposed a Federal program for school libraries calling for an appropriation of \$40 million annually, which was far greater than the \$7 million authorized for LSA. And this was asking for the moon! It planted the seed that flowered in 1965. From this brave assertion that the Federal government's share in the support of school libraries should be at least \$40 million annually, this past fiscal year over \$250 million of Federal funds were committed for printed and audio-visual school library resources alone, according to estimates made by the U. S. Office of Education.

Scope

The need for Federal legislation providing support for school libraries was recognized long before 1965; however, the perpetual arguments against Federal aid to education always emerged to block the way to enactment of Federal aid to school libraries. The popular refrains: "separation of church and State," "Federal control," "stifling of local initiative," "education is the sole responsibility of the states," were chanted even though, many years before, the Smith-Hughes Act had been enacted providing Federal funds for vocational education.

In 1958, a major step was taken toward broadening the base of Federal aid to education with the passage of the National Defense Education Act. This Act provides funds to strengthen instruction in

Cora Paul Bomar is Director, Educational Media & ESEA Title II, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina.

specified subject areas by the acquisition of equipment and instructional materials, by the provision of training institutes for professional personnel in the specified subject areas, by providing scholarship loans, by providing State level staff to administer and supervise the Act, by providing local staff in guidance and counseling, and by encouraging educational research.

Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in an address before the National Conference on Library Statistics in Chicago on June 6, 1966, stated that there had been tremendous progress in recent years in achieving Federal aid for improved library services and that there are now over twenty Federal programs, supplying over one-third of a billion dollars, to one aspect or another of a total library program. One could go further than Dr. Halperin and state that the school library is definitely "in."

With the emerging concept that quality of education influences our national welfare and that achievement in school is related to quality in school library programs, there is an awakening of the public to the unique contribution the school library makes to the education of children and youth. This realization reached national importance on January 12, 1965 when President Lyndon B. Johnson stated in his education message to Congress:

"I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private elementary and secondary schools."

He further stated in this historic education message:

"... our school libraries are limping along."

The causes of this nationwide recognition of the school library—its services to education, its weaknesses, its potentials—have never been clearly identified. Belief in the school library by a small group of dreamers may be the real stimulus. Others would assert that standards—local, state, regional and national—are the factors causing this revolution. Still others would claim it is a combination of several things including: the knowledge explosion necessitating a moving away from a single textbook, the urgent need to know, a rebirth in the humanities, new teaching techniques, the commitment to fostering the development of human dignity by all, and quality education in the broad context. Suffice it to say that within the last ten years the school library has attained a place in the sun. This is reflected in State and Federal legislation, in State, local and Federal expenditures, and in private foundation support for school libraries.

When one examines Federal and State library and education legislation there is little to identify as school library legislation. In

fact, I know of no single Federal law that can be classified as school library legislation, and yet, there are few Federal aid to education laws that do not offer opportunity for school libraries. This is the phenomenon that baffles those who must have things tied up in neat identifiable packages.

As one studies this phenomenon and as one reexamines the single purpose of the school library, reason and logic obliterate the phenomenon. One recognizes that the library is an integral part of the school and as such is part and parcel of every facet of the school. The school library, like the school of which it is a part, has as its single purpose the education of children and youth. In fulfilling this single purpose, it supports the school curriculum by providing instructional materials and library services for all pupils and teachers in the school, by offering instruction in library and study skills, and by serving as the learning resources laboratory for the individual, as well as for class groups. Therefore, it is logical that Federal legislation recognize the contributions the school library makes to education by providing financial support for school library materials, personnel, and facilities as a part of Federal education laws.

As an integral part of the school, the library should support all education programs for elementary and secondary schools. So, rather than focus attention on what Federal legislation has to give to school libraries, there must be concern for what the school library can contribute to the attainment of the educational objectives set forth in specific Federal education legislation.

Since this Allerton Park Conference is concerned primarily with Federal legislation affecting libraries, what are the various laws that relate to school libraries?

At least ten major sources of Federal aid to education, in addition to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provide, directly or indirectly, assistance to school libraries and for the education of school librarians.

With the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the Amended Act P.L. 88-665, avenues were opened for strengthening school libraries although the Act was specifically designed for the purpose of strengthening instruction in certain subject areas identified as being essential to our national defense. Through NDEA Title III, funds are provided on a 50:50 matching basis for the acquisition of equipment and instructional materials, including library resources, to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, English, history, civics, geography, and economics. Last year alone, North Carolina public schools spent \$4,718,590 for printed and audiovisual materials under NDEA Title III; 90 percent of the materials purchased were library materials.

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas laws, P.L. 874 and P.L. 815 enacted over fifteen years ago, are perhaps the oldest

Federal laws from which school libraries have benefited, although few people recognize these two sources. Over the years, schools receiving assistance from these two laws have spent Federal funds for library facilities, library personnel, and library resources.

A quick rundown of other Federal laws offering opportunities for school libraries includes:

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, P.L. 88-210

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, P.L. 88-452
with Amendment P. O. 89-253

The Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329

The Educational Television Facilities Act, P.L. 87-447

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, P.L. 88-352

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, P.L. 89-415

with Amendments, P.L. 88-214 and P.L. 89-15

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, P.L. 89-209.

Several articles provide a composite overview of the Federal laws cited.¹

Even though the ten Federal laws mentioned above provide many opportunities to strengthen the services of the school library in improving instruction in the school, it is to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, that we turn for the major Federal support of school libraries. However, it should be remembered that here again a Federal education law has as its primary purpose to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Only as the school library can contribute to the implementation of this purpose is it eligible to participate in ESEA.

Through the five titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, many avenues are open to schools and school districts for the establishment of well-stocked school libraries. Briefly: Title I provides financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families; Title II provides grants for the acquisition of school library resources and other printed and published materials including textbooks for the use of children and teachers in public and private schools, Title III authorizes funds to provide supplementary educational centers and services not now available in an individual school, including district and regional materials centers; Title IV amends the Cooperative Research Act by authorizing funds for the construction of national and regional research facilities where research in education, including school libraries, will be directed; and Title V provides grants to strengthen State departments of education, including State level school library services.

Not one single Federal act mentioned above is a school library law and only one specifically identifies the school library, that one being Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Yet these Federal laws offer opportunity to acquire school library resources in specified subject areas and categories by types of materials; to build library facilities; to staff libraries with professional and clerical personnel; to purchase audiovisual equipment; to train librarians, audiovisualists, library aides, and library and audiovisual supervisors; to strengthen library services in desegregating schools; and to utilize work-study students as library assistants.

Because Federal aid to school libraries is not tied up in a neat package, it then becomes imperative that the profession and the individual librarian be aware of the opportunities and limitations of the many Federal laws relating to school libraries. To attain such understanding requires study, planning, and coordination of programs. A general knowledge of the legislative process is always helpful in recognizing why a specific law came to be and why it is as it is. Many reasons may emerge, such as the tenor of the times, local and national politics, national security, the personal whim of a legislator, popularity of an individual Congressman, Senator or President, prosperity or lack of it, and a general feeling among the masses that it is time for the Federal government to participate.

Limitations

As a professional person and as an individual citizen each of us can influence the passage of Federal legislation; however, once legislation is enacted we follow the rules of the game in implementing the law. These rules and procedures for Federal education legislation are dependent upon: (1) the provisions of the Act, (2) the Federal guidelines interpreting the Act, (3) the State Plan for implementing the Act, (4) existing State laws and State boards of education policies, and (5) the local educational agency's plan for taking advantage of the provisions of a Federal law. Without knowledge of all of these regulations and procedures, effective utilization of Federal legislation will be weakened.

Limitations, as well as opportunities, included in specific Federal laws must be recognized. A few examples of limitations of some of the laws already mentioned are:

National Defense Education Act—Title III. Limited to acquisition of equipment and materials to strengthen instruction in nine specified subject fields. Materials may be placed in a public school library; however, funds cannot be used to purchase library equipment, including library shelving to house Title II materials. Federal funds must be matched by State and/or local funds on a 50:50 basis. Except for State administration and supervision, funds may not be used for personnel.

Economic Opportunity Act. Only those individuals included in the poverty category may benefit directly from EOA. School libraries may participate in EOA programs, such as Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Work Study, and Basic Education, only if the EOA project designs include school library components. EOA is a grant program with a provision that a contribution in money, services, or facilities be made by the participating State or local agency.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Title I. Funds are limited to financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families. The money can be used to employ additional staff, construct facilities, acquire equipment—including the employment of librarians and library supervisors, the renovation of library quarters, and the acquisition of precataloged collections of library materials only IF the local project design includes a school library component. Deprived students enrolled in private schools may participate in Title I programs.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Title II. Funds are provided only for the acquisition of instructional materials—school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Equipment, salaries, and supplies are not allowable except for State administration and supervision of Title II. Amount of Title II funds is insufficient to meet the needs for materials where significant inadequacies exist. Lack of Title II funds for staff at the local level places the burden for implementation of Title II on the existing staff, with the result that more technical and clerical work must be undertaken by the already inadequate library staffs, reducing their assistance to children and teachers in effective use of Title II materials.

All Federal library and education laws have specific regulations, governing expenditures and liquidation of funds. In some instances, all expenditures must be completed during the fiscal year in which commitments are made. In other instances, two year's time is given for liquidation of funds.

It has been said that one has to have legal training, have the mind of an economist, be an administrator, and be an expeditor of the first order to be able to take full advantage of Federal legislation offering opportunities for school libraries.

Coordination

Dr. Samuel Halperin emphasized in his talk before the National Conference on Library Statistics June 6, 1966 that the major task confronting the library and education professions is to relate Federal programs to one another to make them work effectively.

Many State departments of education and local educational agencies are coordinating programs with similar objectives. An illustration of such coordination is the blending of Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with other ESEA titles, with NDEA, and with EOA to the end that comprehensive library and instructional materials services will be accessible to pupils and teachers. North Carolina is cited as an example of this type of coordination. A brief description of the way North Carolina attempts to coordinate Federal programs follows:

At the State level

(1) NDEA. Staff served on planning committees to develop State Plan for ESEA Title II, using to advantage experience gained through participation in NDEA Titles III and V State level activities. Later the NDEA Title III Accountant and the NDEA Title III Instructional Materials Supervisor transferred to ESEA Title II. NDEA Title III and ESEA Title II staffs work cooperatively on procedures, project approval, and evaluation of both programs. NDEA funds help support two offices directly integrated with ESEA Title II. These two offices are Audiovisual Education and Instructional Materials Services.

(2) ESEA Titles I, III, and V. The Title I budget includes funds for instructional and professional materials administered through the Education Information Library and through the Center for Learning Resources. The Title I Auditor supervises the work of the Title II Auditor. ESEA Title II staff members serve on Titles I and II State committees. Three ESEA Title V projects relate specifically to library and audiovisual services, and are integral parts of the Educational Media Services.

(3) The newly created Educational Media Section in the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction offers a comprehensive media program including instructional and professional materials, audiovisual and library services. It is composed of four arms: Audiovisual Education, School Library Supervision, Federal Programs for Instructional Materials, and Learning Resources Services. The Section is funded through eight separate budgets: regular State budget, three NDEA Title III budgets, ESEA Title I budget, ESEA Title II budget, and two ESEA Title V budgets.

At the local educational level

(1) The usual pattern in North Carolina is for the local educational agency to coordinate ESEA Title II with ESEA Title I and NDEA Title III. The few school systems that have ESEA Title III projects and the school systems participating in the EOA Neighborhood Youth Programs coordinate these programs with ESEA Title II.

(2) One significant development is a Statewide recognition that ESEA Title II funds are not sufficient to meet the critical need for

more library materials, and that whenever other Federal programs can be used for strengthening the materials collections and the library services such components are included in project design. To illustrate, during fiscal 1966 the following acquisitions and commitments were made by North Carolina local educational agencies:

<u>Library books ordered through Federal Programs fiscal 1966</u>	
ESEA Title II	536,058 volumes
ESEA Titles I & III	622,000 volumes
NDEA Title III	438,000 volumes
Vocational Educational Act	5,300 volumes

It is significant to note that the 1,601,358 library books ordered through Federal programs fiscal 1966 for North Carolina elementary and secondary schools was 511,499 volumes more than the total 1,089,859 library books acquired through all budgets—local, State, and Federal—fiscal 1965.

Personnel added through Federal Programs fiscal 1966 ESEA Title I. Over 700 positions were funded for library or instructional materials supervisors, school librarians, and library aides.

Impact and Implications for the Future

The first year with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be remembered as the time a universal awareness of Federal aid to education evolved. Beginning with April 11, 1965, business as usual was no longer the order of the day. School libraries and school librarians joined the mainstream of Federal assistance to education and to libraries.

It is too early to evaluate the impact of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on the improvement of educational opportunities for the children and teachers in the public and private elementary and secondary schools of the Nation. It is quite evident, however, that ESEA has made school administrators more aware of the need to make more adequate provision for school library resources and services. There is also an increasing awareness of the need to strengthen State, regional, and national standards for school libraries. Local educational agencies are becoming increasingly aware of the need for qualified school librarians and adequate library facilities so that the library resources can be more effectively used by children and teachers. A cross section of comments noted throughout the year include the following:

"At last there is Federal assistance specifically designated for school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published materials."

"But it isn't enough. If all Title II funds were used for library books, there wouldn't be enough money to buy one book per pupil."

"Well, how about other Federal monies to add to ESEA Title II?"

"We need librarians for our schools."

"Never has so little caused so much interest in providing school library resources and services as has ESEA Title II."

"We do not yet know the best procedure to follow in making Title II materials available for use by children and teachers in private schools."

This first year with ESEA identified weaknesses of Federal programs offering assistance to school libraries and also recognized unmet needs, such as the following:

(1) The maze of red tape with separate guidelines, procedures, and offices for each segment of a Federal program.

(2) Duplication of efforts for similar Federal programs. A glaring example is NDEA Title III and ESEA Title II.

(3) Lack of adequate Federal assistance for increasing personnel through recruitment, training, and employment.

(4) Lack of coordination with the Library Services and Construction Act.

(5) Diversity of regulations for each specific piece of legislation necessitating duplication of administrative personnel and administrative costs.

In the days ahead consideration must be given to such areas as the following:

(1) Evaluation of existing Federal assistance programs for school libraries. School librarians must collect, compile, evaluate, and interpret statistical data to identify unmet needs and to evaluate the impact of existing Federal programs in order to justify their continuance.

(2) Consolidation of Federal legislation with similar provisions. Consolidation of existing Federal programs is imperative if the voluminous red tape is to be decreased as it should be. Elimination of multi-State plans, different guidelines, different cut-off dates and filing periods, separate accounting and auditing is sound economics, while at the same time consolidation would permit a State agency to do overall planning for comprehensive services. Would that the day may soon arrive when a State educational agency would have only one State Plan for all Federal assistance programs!

(3) Realization that personnel must be recruited, trained, and employed if school library resources and services are more adequately to support effective education programs. A new breed of school librarians must evolve. The school librarian of this breed must know the world, what it is like and why; he must possess a

liberal education; and he must have a broad understanding of the general spectrum of librarianship. He must have the vision and the know how to plan, to recognize opportunity, to carry out programs, to try new ideas, and to see into the future. He must be an administrator, an educational planner, a business manager, and a supervisor, along with being a librarian committed to service to students and teachers. If this be true, then it follows that education for school librarianship must change. A library education program to train the new breed may well be the profession's most critical need.

(4) Revision of national, State, and local standards for school libraries. Staffing patterns to include the subject specialist and the library aide must be delineated. Standards for facilities and library collections to serve 40 to 50 percent of the student body at one time cannot be overlooked. It is hoped that the American Association of School Librarians will work expeditiously until standards have been developed that envision a school library program that will offer all the services the education and library professions have said embodied quality school library service.

(5) Recognition of the value of experimentation and demonstration. Federal and foundation funds have opened the way for each state and each local educational agency to search, to try out, to evaluate new and better ways of providing effective school library service. The few states that are using ESEA Title II funds to establish demonstration school libraries and the well-known foundation financed Knapp School Libraries Project, as well as ESEA Title III library related projects, have opened the door for experimentation and demonstration.

(6) Stabilization of relationships with private schools. Public education can no longer be oblivious to private schools. Dependent upon Federal court decisions, the extent of the formal relationships is yet to be decided; however, the commitment to librarianship places responsibility on the school librarian to work toward adequate school library service for all pupils and teachers, whether they are in public or private schools.

(7) Coordination of all library services available to the individual. It is encouraging to note that amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act and amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act recognize the need for coordination between public and school libraries and require that cooperative planning be done. This requirement could very well become the most important single component of existing Federal programs for public and school libraries. It could contribute immeasurably to the development of a national plan for comprehensive library service.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that Federal library and education legislation has as its objectives supplementing, adding to,

establishing and improving State and local programs. Without an already existing program or without sound educational and library planning, effective utilization of Federal funds may be impossible. Money will be wasted and criticisms aimed at Federal aid to education will become valid.

The Federal government has provided fantastic opportunities for strengthening and expanding school library services. The extent to which these opportunities are realized will depend upon the understanding, the imagination, and the cooperative approach of all concerned.

REFERENCES

1. ALA Bulletin, 60:2, Feb. 1966. "A Special Issue, Federal Library Legislation, Programs, and Services." (Reprint available); "A Schoolman's Guide to Federal Aid," School Management, 9:94-95, June 1965; Bomar, Cora Paul. "Legislation and the School Library," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 50:89-95, Jan. 1966.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Edmon Low

Federal aid to libraries is a fairly recent phenomenon in the library field. Librarians began their first serious bid for some funds to help extend library services to rural areas just after World War II and, after about a decade of effort, succeeded in getting the first Library Services Act in 1956 which thus became the first of a considerable body of federal legislation dealing with libraries of various kinds.

As I try to describe the impact of the various bills on a particular type of library—in this instance, the academic library—an important consideration must be kept in mind; namely, that a bill for one area which paves the way for or influences the action on a subsequent bill relating to another area provides an impact on this second area which is just as vital and real as if the bill had been originally designed for that area.

This certainly is the case with the Library Services Act. Then few seemed really interested in libraries: no administration would put the item in its budget, sponsors had to be searched out and persuaded, and even many of our friends were hesitant to come out and vote for libraries, partly because many still did not realize what books and libraries could do and what they could mean to people.

Apparently almost no one at that time anticipated how popular library legislation would become, and it was not until about five years ago, when the extension of the Library Services Act was voted out of the House Rules Committee by the most overwhelming vote ever given such a measure in the House, that people in and out of Congress, including the Administration, suddenly realized it was a popular thing to support libraries. From there on, library bills have multiplied and have been Administration bills, and the question has been not whether or not to support, but how much and how wide the application will be.

Therefore, although the Act authorized only \$7.5 million annually and only \$2.5 million was actually appropriated for the first year compared with the billion dollars authorized by the second session of the 89th Congress just closed for all types of

Edmon Low is Librarian, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

libraries, we must not underestimate this humble beginning ten years ago, for it was on this foundation stone that our significant successes in the intervening years have been built. In this way this Act has had a vital impact on all types of libraries, including academic libraries.

In this paper I shall review briefly several acts which have had a direct and easily recognized impact on academic libraries, and then offer a few comments on the more subtle but perhaps the more significant impact on the thinking and attitudes of college and university presidents and administrators and librarians—the individuals whose decisions determine the position and policies of our academic libraries and in a large measure their importance and effectiveness in the educational scene.

To begin at the beginning, although I shall not always hold to a chronological order, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 may be mentioned first. Although varying considerably over the years in subjects included and not intended for libraries as such, it did, through its scholarships and fellowships to individual students with stipends to the institutions partly to cover instructional costs, provide considerable extra-budgetary money, a portion of which was very justly passed on by many institutions to their libraries. This was apparently used mostly for acquisition of materials and to help offset the constantly and rapidly rising prices, particularly of periodical subscriptions.

Following closely came Public Law 480 providing hard dollars to the Library of Congress to pay necessary costs of acquisitions of materials in certain countries with so-called "counterpart funds"—money owed to the United States but which had to be expended by it for materials in these countries. It must be noted the U. S. money was not used to pay for the materials—this was done with the counterpart funds—but for personnel to go to these countries to find and locate what was being published and purchase and ship it to the U. S. With a distribution of materials acquired somewhat similar to that of the Farmington Plan (the cooperating libraries were much the same in each case), a total of almost 6,000,000 pieces of material hitherto unknown and unobtainable has been brought to the Library of Congress and other research libraries and made available to scholars throughout the country. Obviously only the large research libraries were involved here but many other academic libraries benefited indirectly from this activity.

Following this also, in 1962 the new and expanded Depository Library Act was passed, permitting almost double the possible number of depository libraries, creating regional depositories, and providing for and directing the acquisitions of non-GPO documents by the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to depository libraries. The results of this acquisition of non-GPO materials, while fairly substantial when measured by the total of additional documents

distributed, have been disappointing when compared to the total potential involved. Since over two-thirds of the present 850 depository libraries are college or university libraries, this Act is significant to this area and, as procedures are gradually worked out, the impact will be correspondingly greater on these libraries.

To go back slightly, in 1960 came the beginning work on what finally became the Higher Education Act of 1965. Since I was rather intimately involved in this, I hope you will pardon the recital of a few details of the birth pangs of this important legislation which will help illustrate some points I wish to make.

I became President of the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1960 and some of us, including the members of the Executive Board, thought we should seek some federal assistance for academic libraries to help meet the spiralling costs and added burdens being imposed on them by burgeoning enrollments, increased emphasis on research, the explosion of knowledge resulting in a rapidly increasing number of publications, and the rising costs of each item published. I, accordingly, as President of the Association, took a proposal in October 1960 to the Committee on Governmental Relations of the American Council on Education asking for support of it by the Council in the forthcoming session of Congress. This plea was not successful, but that is another story. Then on the advice of Mr. Jack Forsythe, the Counsel of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and one of our good friends on the Hill to whom we are all indebted for his interest in libraries, I sought the aid of Congressman Carl Elliott of Alabama, then Chairman of the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I did not know Mr. Elliott but I knew that Dr. William Hoole, Director of Libraries of the University of Alabama, was a good friend of his. I therefore asked Dr. Hoole if he would try to arrange an interview. He graciously consented and arranged a meeting at his home in Tuscaloosa on a Sunday afternoon in December of that year. I drove to Alabama and had a most pleasant visit during the afternoon and evening, along with dinner, with Mr. Elliott, during which time Dr. Hoole and I presented the case for the legislation. The upshot of it all was that Mr. Elliott generously agreed that, if we would get the proposal introduced in the upcoming session of the Congress and referred to his Sub-Committee, he would sponsor it and endeavor to get it through his Committee and its parent Committee on Education and Labor, and aid as he could in its progress through the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House when it came to a vote.

The plans of mice and men "gang aft agley," as the poet says, and when Congress convened in January, President Kennedy tapped Mr. Elliott to become a member of the Rules Committee, taking him away from Education and Labor, and thus our labor all went down the

drain and we had to start all over again. Similar frustration for various reasons came time and again during the years before final success was achieved in 1965.

This legislation when introduced in 1960 had the very significant aspect in that, so far as I know, it was the first to propose direct aid across the board to academic libraries in privately supported as well as in publicly supported institutions. This, often referred to as the "church-state issue" although it is broader than this term implies, was a subject of hot debate during these years and the discussion of it in relation to this measure had considerable impact on other legislation which followed. An incident during a hearing on this proposal in 1962 before the Senate Sub-Committee on Education may well be related here. I happened to be one of the witnesses and, after I had completed my testimony, I was handed a note asking me to step into the hall outside to see Senator Yarborough of Texas. The Senator was a member of the Sub-committee and a good friend of libraries. He said to me, "You have an excellent proposal and I think the attitude of members of the Committee in general is favorable toward it. However, the Committee will convene in executive session immediately after this hearing and I do not think it stands a chance of approval unless I can insert an amendment saying that none of this money for material shall go to a seminary or other kind of institution whose major purpose is training for the ministry of any faith. Will you give me authority to add such an amendment and to say it meets with your approval?" I told him I had authority from the Association to give such approval and this provision agreed upon that day in the hall of the Senate Office Building now stands as part of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I cite the above details to emphasize four points covering legislation which are often not recognized: (1) legislation of any sort must first be an idea in the mind of an individual or of a group and then be formulated on paper as a proposal, (2) the completed bill always represents the work and thinking of many individuals both in and outside of Congress and often is radically different from the original proposal, as was the case with the Higher Education Act, (3) several years, some say the average may be as much as ten, may well elapse from the proposal of legislation to the passage of the completed bill; and last and most important from the standpoint of this paper, (4) the impact on the thinking of the people involved, librarians, presidents, and educators as well as laymen and Congressmen, as hearings and discussions on a bill are held which provide information and expose different points of view, is very real and significant. Indeed, these people cannot discuss libraries for five years without coming to better understand their needs, their problems, and their basic importance, and thus to acquire an appreciation of them never held before.

In the meantime, and partly as a result of this discussion of library needs, sentiment began to develop for federal aid for buildings for colleges and universities. This was not only for libraries but for buildings of all kinds. This had a much shorter period of gestation and resulted in the highly significant Academic Facilities Act of 1963. The significance of this lay in the fact that it was the first act passed which provided money for both publicly and privately supported schools and, as such, is a landmark in our educational history. It was deliberately pushed ahead of the proposal for materials because an election was coming up in 1964 and Congressmen, always so aware of the need to be reelected in order to maintain or acquire seniority and influence, are naturally hesitant to support controversial issues. It is true both proposals cut across the church-state issue but books are much more susceptible than buildings to attacks in other ways. For instance, whoever heard of a communistic brick or a Catholic column or a subversive door or a pornographic window? We simply do not think of buildings in these inflammatory terms, yet they are applied with some frequency to books. Books contain ideas, they are explosive and therefore, from the viewpoint of a Congressman facing election, more dangerous. It is also true that, to many members of Congress, a building represents a completed thing which can be seen and understood, and is without further implied encumbrance on the budget, while requested aid for acquisition of materials seems to imply an ongoing, and probably increasing, expenditure year after year into the future.

So it is easy to see why buildings were put first, with quiet assurance to us that, if the Congressmen were not made martyrs on account of this in the impending elections, books would then be pushed. Even so, however, although the House had passed the bill for buildings without restrictions as to type of building, the Senate felt impelled to limit it to buildings for the popular natural sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, and libraries, a testimony again to the growing appreciation of libraries and their needs.

The bill passed, the Congressmen were not martyred; indeed, much to their surprise, the chief plaint was, "Why did you give us money for library buildings and then provide no aid for putting anything inside them?" and so the stage was set for the passage of the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the following year. They were surprised too, as was a good portion of the educational community, that of the total funds made available under this act the first year, almost 40 percent was devoted by the presidents to libraries in competition with these other popular categories, and this last fiscal year, when the categories were removed and any kind of academic building could be built, about one-third was devoted to libraries in competition with all types of buildings. The greatest impact of this act, however, remains in its

successful bridging of the gap and bringing together all types of academic institutions both publicly and privately supported for aid and the consequent influence on legislation which followed.

And then came the Higher Education Act: aid for acquisition of materials, aid for training of librarians, for research into library problems and development, and aid to the Library of Congress in developing its shared cataloging program and acquisition of materials from all over the world. A whole paper could be written on this last topic alone with its great potential. It probably is the most important bibliographical undertaking to date by this organization, which is rapidly moving towards being our truly national library and is especially significant to the research libraries of the country. Likewise the promise of aid for acquisitions, particularly for the smaller and medium-sized academic libraries, and the aid for training of desperately needed librarians, will have a major impact in the academic area.

I phrase this last as a hope for the future, because the impact as yet has been less than hoped for because of funding. Fifty million dollars per year have been authorized for acquisitions, fifteen million annually for research and training, and five million and upward for the Library of Congress project. Last year only a little over one-fifth of this was funded; this year it rose to 50 percent, and hopefully further gains will be made in future years in both authorization and funding. The impact of this bill, then, is in its potential rather than in its accomplishment to date.

Finally, in reference to specific bills and their provisions, I wish to call attention to Title III of the recently passed Library Services and Construction Act providing for cooperation among libraries of all kinds towards providing the best library service possible for the people as a whole. I think this has particular significance for academic libraries. I think we librarians in this area, and this is my own area so I am criticizing myself also, have been very slow to recognize a wider responsibility which I think we all have outside our institutional walls. The time has come when we must all think not as a university librarian, a state librarian, a school or a public librarian, but simply as a librarian with an overall view towards better utilization of our total resources and getting the job done. The Higher Education Act, with its provisions for special matching grants, encourages cooperation among academic institutions, and presumably between their libraries, but this is cooperation between only one kind of library. In this Title III, it is for cooperation among all kinds of libraries. Only planning money has been granted this year and a small amount at that, but this may eventually have a very considerable impact on college and university libraries.

Finally, I believe that the most real and significant impact of all this legislation on academic libraries is not in the millions of

dollars already distributed, the buildings erected, and the books bought, but rather, as I said earlier, the impact on the thinking of the many individuals involved in these last half dozen years who hold the welfare of libraries in their hands. For instance, back in the beginning when I appeared before the Committee of the American Council on Education, I was given twenty minutes to state my case before a score of very prominent college and university presidents. I told them of the increase in publishing, the rising costs of serials, and that most of their libraries were then receiving regularly from 5,000 to 10,000 or more serials each. They could not believe it; each in turn kept asking me about his library and they kept me on the floor for more than an hour.

It was not the fault of their librarians that the presidents did not know this. These presidents were simply very busy men who had not read the reports of their librarians. I have seen this same surprise when they have appeared at hearings. The charts presented in hearings, showing dramatically how less than one fourth of the junior college libraries and less than one half of the libraries in four year institutions are meeting minimum standards, awakened not only college presidents and some librarians but also Congressmen and accrediting associations to how bad the situation really was. And there is nothing which attracts the president's interest more quickly than accrediting demands plus the prospect of some available money.

With the librarians themselves, there has been the most heartening awakening to the fact that they can accomplish results in the political scene if they will put their minds to it and work at it. The college and university librarians have been very ineffective in this area compared to their counterparts in the public library field but they are learning, as are their presidents. For instance, a comparison of the halting and ineffective efforts of ARL libraries in 1961 and 1962 on P.L. 480 to utilize the counterpart funds, with the really sophisticated efforts in 1965 which, under the leadership of Herman Fussler, James Skipper, and other ARL members, devised the shared cataloging plan and secured its adoption and funding by the Congress in record time, shows how knowledgable and interested they have become. Similarly, academic librarians all over the country, in libraries both large and small, are talking to their presidents, and the presidents are talking to their legislators and to their college benefactors, all urging greater support of libraries, and they are now receiving this support far in excess of what is being received or is in prospect from the federal government.

Dr. Wagman, in the final paper in this institute, will speculate on the wonderful promise of machines and other library developments of the future. Suffice it for me to say here that I think a parallel can be drawn between our libraries and our highway system. We have had highways for years, lots of them, of sorts, and a good deal of

local choice of where we got on and got off, how fast we drove, and where we wanted to make a driveway and build a hot dog stand or a filling station. This system, however, just couldn't get the job done: the roads became hopelessly clogged with traffic, the roadbeds could not stand up under the heavy trucks, and travel for a considerable distance was a nightmare. So we now accept, and welcome, the massive federal support which makes our burgeoning interstate system possible, and wonderful advances are being made. But when I get on one of these superhighways, I accept certain limitations: I have to drive above a certain minimum speed, I may not be able to stop off at some village that appeals to me, and I race across some sterile landscape when I might rather drive more leisurely down a winding, tree-shaded rural highway. So I accept certain limitations in return for the obvious benefits derived.

Our libraries are the same as our old roads. They are not getting the job done, and the principle of federal aid is somewhat the same. The promotion of multi-county libraries to serve sparsely settled areas, the necessity that academic libraries help undergird the many social programs of the Great Society, the demands that they support with their resources the tremendous programs of research under way, and finally the prospect of introduction of machines and computers and long distance transmission and proposed regional and national networks of information which may be as far advanced over our present library operations as the jet plane is over our superhighways, call for a whole rethinking of our concepts about the role of libraries of all kinds and I think we should gladly accept state and federal aid for our cause.

And therein lies the most fundamental impact of all of federal legislation: the fostering of the belief that we can now dream and plan far beyond our old horizons to build libraries and offer services not even thought of a decade ago and know that, if our dreams are good and our plans are sound, resources will be available to make these dreams come true in such a manner as to promote and preserve the greatest initiative in, and local control, of libraries in their wonderful contribution to our American way of life. This vision, I repeat, is the truly significant impact for us all.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION

Margaret E. Monroe

Almost all discussion of federal legislation for libraries ends, if indeed it does not begin, with the problem of support versus control. If support is desirable, is control inevitable? Library education has long taken for granted the control which state legislation requiring certification of librarians may impose on the curriculum. As a matter of fact, library educators have frequently been the proposers of such legislation, thus achieving control on their own terms. When professional vision outruns the legislators' insight—and is persuasive—then the profession is able to prescribe the control which society exercises over the individual librarian.

In the academic world of library education, the yang and yin relationship of support and control exists within the context of the scholar's leadership, with the faculty exercising its judgment to use available support to the best advantage of the students, within the limits—hopefully, the quite broad limits—established by the institution and by society.

Ideally, legislation for library education should enable the exercise of the best faculty judgment within the context of society's need and the legislative intent. But faculty judgment varies in competence. Legislation, then, must attempt to embody support for, and control within, the best available faculty judgment. State legislation specifically for library education has tended to limit itself to identification of the curriculum required for proficiency in librarianship; it generally involves setting minimums, and therefore has not been able to embody necessarily the best faculty judgments on the optimum program of library education. On the other hand, federal legislation, which has only begun to be directed toward library education, has tended to look toward optimums; the National Defense Education Act, for example, looks toward the best possible education for school librarians but allows faculty judgment to be determinative as to means.

There may be some inevitability about this distinction between state and federal legislation. States have the basic responsibility for controlling educational functions, for setting standards of library service, and, therefore, indirectly if not directly, determining the

Margaret E. Monroe is Director, Library School, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

nature of library education. Standards, minimums, and practical compromises tend to derive support from, but often to dilute, the best professional judgment. Federal legislation has been more freely used to set desirable direction, to support the sound innovation, and to release the energies of best faculty judgment.

Whether inevitable or not, there is evidence of some persistent distinction between the state and federal levels of legislation for library education. Almost uniformly, deans and directors of accredited library school programs, in responding to a recent inquiry which was made in preparation for this paper, indicated a limited role for state legislation, confining it almost universally to financing scholarships or grants-in-aid, sometimes rejecting a state role completely. On the other hand, almost universally the same group saw a wide role for federal legislation, some commenting that federal support should come for "all aspects" of library education. Of course, there could be, in these replies, the implicit expectation that federal legislation means support while state legislation means control.

Let us reverse the picture, then, and inquire what kind of control is exercised by federal legislation for library education? Federal legislation for library education has imposed no requirement upon library education programs. Rather it offers opportunities within the context of public need. No library school is required to conduct NDEA institutes for school librarians; it is not mandatory that every library school provide advanced study for experienced school librarians under the Higher Education Act of 1965. These programs are enabled, however, by the legislation; and library schools vie for the funds to conduct these greatly needed programs.

Sound professional judgment of librarians and schoolmen guided the drafting of the legislation; the practitioners have identified the problems, and the educators have suggested methods for their solution. The legislative framework permits a variety of activity.

Hearings conducted regionally on the Higher Education Act of 1965 explored the limits of the legislation and reflect the homage paid to professional judgment. Title II-B covers fellowships for library education and research and demonstration funds. At the Chicago hearing on the Act, a goodly number of representatives of technical institutes inquired about their eligibility for funds to train library technicians. The law simply says that funds are available for training "persons in librarianship." The U. S. Office of Education representative at this meeting answered that, "(1) We don't have the guidelines yet and so decisions on this are not available, and (2) We don't know what the ALA will say." It was eminently clear that although the text of the law did not exclude support for library technician programs, the best professional opinion would be determinative in the guideline interpretation of the law.

We have had some discussion at this conference of how professional opinion initiates legislation. Library education as a field has been poorly organized to be effective in such initiation. For five years the American Library Association has lacked an Executive Secretary for the Library Education Division—a lack now happily met with the appointment of Dr. Lester Asheim as Director of the new Office for Library Education. The American Association of Library Schools has been struggling to become an effective action organization as spokesman for the accredited library schools, but has not yet made its voice heard. The work of the library education specialist in the Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education has been limited to the implementation role of the executive branch, and has not been available in working toward proposed legislation.

Under the stimulation of the Library Services Branch, the Library Education Division of ALA requested its Legislation Committee to develop a statement on legislative implications of the USOE summary of 1963-64 data on library schools. The LED Legislation Committee presented a draft report in the LED Newsletter for September, 1966. This report recommends the full appropriation of the authorized \$15,000,000 for Title II-B support of library education as an essential immediate step. The \$1,000,000 appropriated for fiscal 1966 and the \$3,500,000 for 1967 are pitifully inadequate. The priority on preparation of library school faculty was seen in the Report as an unquestioned part of the guidelines. Nevertheless, the Report concludes that before making any creative proposals for additional legislation, library educators must frankly analyze the problems of library education and come to agreement on a plan for library education.

The failure thus far of the ALA Commission on a National Plan for Library Education to come up with a proposal has proven unfortunate. As a pivotal aspect of the profession, library education is unprepared to provide the leadership needed at a crucial moment. The blame lies less at the door of the Commission than in the long years of neglect of library education and failure of the profession as a whole to develop a sound theoretical structure, a well-researched body of knowledge, and a mutual respect between practitioner and educator for the role each plays in the evolution of the new professional librarian.

This is not a task to be accomplished in a night. Yet the crucial decisions being made by (or for!) library education during these next few years must be made with awareness of these lacks. To some extent the available federal legislation directly attacks some serious symptoms: (1) lack of fellowship funds to enable library science to compete in recruiting top flight students; (2) lack of well-educated faculty members with a comprehensive knowledge of librarianship and the ability to expand this body of knowledge through research; and (3) lack of specialized education for the practitioner that will

strengthen the texture of library service in the many aspects of an increasingly specialized field.

The foresight of state librarians in instituting scholarships for library education ten years ago under the Library Services Act has proved valuable, and we hope this program will not be lost by new administrative regulations. Hope, to use our current metaphor, rained on the arid field of library education with as great a welcome as in any other field in 1956, but the drought is not yet relieved. Fellowships under the Higher Education Act have brought another small, promising shower that, repeated and expanded, may save the crop throughout the United States.

Library education has also made extensive use of Economic Opportunity Act work-study funds, and now of Higher Education Act student assistance funds. These funds enable students to earn while they learn and enable faculty to have useful assistance from capable students. These work-study programs usefully supplement the scholarship programs.

The availability of research funds from the Cooperative Research Program, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and a multitude of federal agencies has fed the resourceful library schools with funds for faculty and doctoral student research. The body of research knowledge is becoming more firm and is filling out. There have been pleas at this conference for a unified federal library program but I, for one, wish to press the case for maintaining the diversity of sources of funds for library research. Libraries are key tools in each of the major areas of human enterprise. To require all support of library research to emanate from a single source will not only limit these funds in the long run but will separate the users of library resources from a close responsible relationship to understanding library needs. The Higher Education Act of 1965 brings a welcome designation of research funds for libraries, but it must not be assumed as adequate, in and of itself.

It is in the various specializations in library service that federal legislation has so far provided the greatest scope for library education. No broad planning body determined these specialties, but the urgent pressure of groups of special librarians and dissatisfied users has made the selection.

The titles of the National Defense Education Act which enable institutes for school librarians and instructional materials specialists have had the strongest impact. The skill of school librarians in securing acceptance within Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (both in "experienced teacher" and "prospective teacher" categories) has already begun to show notable effect in raising the vision of school librarians on the level of professional education needed for the task. Recruitment of that "new breed of school librarian" is easier with scholarships, status, and expanded program.

The Medical Library Assistance Act is enabling more library schools to offer special programs in medical librarianship; the Library Services and Construction Act Title IV may aid institution libraries by training librarians for correctional institutions, a sadly neglected and vitally important area of librarianship.

The inherent limitations of a practice of developing funded programs under pressures from special groups may be met by a general fund for specialized and advanced education such as an expanded Higher Education Act might allow. It is well within the appropriate function of Congress, however, to assess special public needs and to designate funds to meet those needs. It is up to the library educator to be aware of the opportunities, to weigh the priorities, and to choose his focus.

The success thus far of the very broad terms of the Higher Education Act of 1965 may be measured by the near unanimity of deans and directors of accredited library schools that a long-term federal legislation program should follow present lines. On replies to the letter of inquiry sent in preparation for this paper, almost all comments urged "full appropriation" and "more money for fellowships"—one saying (wistfully) "fellowships for one-third of the student body," and another "all aspects of library education need support." Mr. David Berninghausen of the University of Minnesota pointed eloquently to the "tragic imbalance" in appropriation of "only \$1,000,000 for library education but \$610,000,000 for books and buildings."

Other important recommendations by deans and directors of accredited library schools follow. Some asked that faculty positions be supported on a matching fund basis, others requested that funds be made available for state planning for library education. There were numerous requests that programs should be funded for several years to eliminate the time that annual proposals require. Support for development of new curriculum was asked. Larger institutional allotments for support of the fellowship program were universally requested, since the \$2,000 per fellowship falls below the NDEA precedent of \$2,500 per fellowship in institutional support.

These requests for expansion and change in Higher Education Act support for library education reflect the problems encountered in administering the first year of the program. Haste in selection of candidates was the chief difficulty; the second most serious was lack of time to study the Act and take advantage of its opportunities.

Directors and deans of accredited library schools identified the significant contributions of Title II-B of the Higher Education Act:

1. Favorable publicity on campus
2. Better competitive position for gifted students
3. Recruitment to librarianship through scholarships
4. Program development
5. Expansion of library science collections

Dominantly the impact in the first phase of the funds from the Higher Education Act is through enhanced stature for library education.

There has been little time thus far to judge the true importance of legislation directly in support of library education. The major program of the Higher Education Act is just under way. One million dollars of support has been distributed among approximately thirty library schools but this is just a beginning.

But the very existence of the Act, the availability of many other sources of federal funds, and the consultations that involve library educators in developing the guidelines, have been a stimulus to library education comparable to that first allotment of funds to public libraries through the Library Services Act ten years ago. Panic, delight, confusion, creativity in a moment.

The growth in library education in the last several years cannot be attributed solely to federal support. Sarah Reed's current survey of the growth of accredited library schools from fall 1964 to fall 1966, a period when little such aid was available, is nevertheless impressive. Salary budgets from 1964 to 1966 doubled in eight accredited library schools. In 1964, only nine accredited library schools had salary budgets of \$100,000 or more; by 1966, twenty-one schools met that level. In 1964 only five accredited schools had a total annual budget of over \$200,000; 16 schools in that year had a total annual budget below \$100,000. For 1966, 14 accredited schools report a total budget of over \$200,000 a year, while only four are still below \$100,000.

What accounts for such growth? All the factors forcing change in the profession are working to enhance library education—strong recruitment programs, improved faculties, higher salaries for librarians, and so on and on. One finally resolves the query to the ultimate question: is it the knowledge explosion that did it, or was it National Library Week? Probably both! The involved and intertwined causes cannot be singly measured. A multitude of matters must be attended to, however, if the gains are to be sustained. Among these are better standards for library education, better use of graduates for truly professional tasks, and increased attention to research in librarianship.

One final note. Two library school deans commented, in response to the inquiry in October, 1966, that federal support should go to the ALA to assist in revising the standards used by the Committee on Accreditation. Without opening that Pandora's box, let me, as Chairman of that Committee, confirm the COA's own intention of conducting precisely this kind of review. The changes in the library profession, the separation of semi-professional routines from true professional functions, the increasing complexity of the problems to be solved by librarians, and the steady trend towards specialization, support the demand for "a new breed of librarians" and perhaps a "breed" of library technicians to support them. The standards for

professional education must be used increasingly for constructive guidance of newly developing programs, and must be applied broadly to allow professional competence the freedom to explore new educational patterns. This is not a time to lower standards to meet demand, but to sustain and perfect standards to support the task of professional education.

Federal legislation for library education must turn to professional judgment for guidance. The standards of accreditation must embody the best professional judgment as a guide to implementing public purpose through public support of professional education. Library education has a task of major proportions at hand.

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON GOVERNMENTAL AND SPECIAL LIBRARIES

James E. Skipper

It has become increasingly obvious that libraries today cannot provide adequate service under conditions of local self-sufficiency. A variety of programs are required on the national level which cannot be provided by individual libraries or combinations of libraries. Few libraries can justify or afford the massive resource development which has been a responsibility of such institutions as the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine. None can finance the very expensive and complex bibliographic services provided by these national libraries. And practically none of our non-governmental libraries are in a position to assume leadership in implementing national bibliographic programs in the years ahead. These are the general reasons why our governmental libraries and the attendant legislative authorization are so critically important to the entire scholarly community.

It is not the purpose of this paper to consider the detailed development of our governmental libraries or library legislative history. It would be accurate to say that in the past this development has taken place under uncoordinated circumstances, frequently in response to ad hoc situations. There was certainly no grand design or master plan to shape the future.

This does not imply that librarians were limited in their vision or lacked the capability for basic planning. It is more a reflection of the fact that, at the Federal level, there has not been sufficient political support to allow more than one step being taken at a time.

Halting progress was made through the years with agency libraries becoming national libraries, such as the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. Despite repeated studies and recommendations, other governmental libraries have, until quite recently, existed with little relationship to each other or to national needs. Over the years, the Library of Congress was given additional authorization to become a de facto national library, although there are still vestigial elements in the legislative branch which consider this institution to be nothing more than a library for the Congress.

James E. Skipper is Executive Secretary, Association of Research Libraries.

Within the recent past this posture of bibliographic laissez faire on the Federal level has dramatically changed. There has been acknowledgement within government and without that adequate library service in the future will depend upon the creation of national information networks. These networks will have many of the characteristics of a modern public utility and it is probable that the national libraries will constitute the primary "generating stations," creating a more extensive bibliographic service which can be transmitted, refined, and utilized at the local level. As with electrical power, we can no longer afford to generate current in each basement.

Medical Library Assistance Act

The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 is the first example of a comprehensive national plan for library service. This program, administered by the National Library of Medicine, provides local construction, resources, training, research and development, and the establishment of a national network of regional medical libraries. The entire complex is based on bibliographic control through the Index Medicus, with access to the resources indexed being provided on a national, regional, and local level.

In supporting construction, the Act authorizes funding for medical school libraries, and libraries supporting schools of pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and optometry, as well as other health-related professions. Investigation is being conducted as to the best ways in which these facilities can be developed into learning-resource facilities or communications centers, utilizing all the modern techniques of information transfer, rather than being simply storehouses for books. A Facilities and Resources Committee of non-Federal consultants has been established to provide initial merit review of applications and make recommendations for approval to the National Medical Library Assistance Advisory Board.

The Medical Library Assistance Act authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million for construction for each fiscal year from 1967 through 1970 with a Federal matching ratio of seventy-five percent. Assistance for the construction of forty to fifty libraries is planned over the next five years.

The Act authorizes grants for local resource development which includes the acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion pictures, and other instructional materials; cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials; and the introduction of new technologies and methodologies in medical librarianship. The amount of the grants will be related to the annual operating expenses of the library and will decrease annually for a five-year period. The purpose of this approach is (1) to make a significant but relatively short-term grant to bring basic resources to a more useful level, and (2) to encourage increased

support to the library by the parent institution on a continuing basis to compensate for the decreasing Federal contribution.

It is planned in the first year of the program to provide approximately 150 medical libraries with some support for improving and expanding basic resources. Additional libraries will be added annually so that at the end of five years, approximately 1200 libraries will have experienced some assistance through this program.

The program anticipates that the initial phase of funding local resource development will provide the basis and the experience for subsequent major expenditures for the introduction of advanced technology for linkage and transmission among local library facilities. For fiscal year 1966, \$2,000,000 has been appropriated for resources and \$2,700,000 has been requested from the Congress for fiscal year 1967.

The third general area which will be supported by the Act concerns research in biomedical communications. What institutional components will be required for an effective national network for medical information? What should be the nature of the communications and relationships between the components of the network? What are the information needs of the various levels of medical education, including the area of continuing education and retraining? What role can the learning center play in improving the efficiency of medical education? How can the identification of medical information and access to the text be improved? How can new techniques of miniaturization, facsimile transmission, and computer application be used to improve medical information transfer? In addition to studying these questions, the National Library of Medicine is authorized to support the preparation and publication of bibliographies, handbooks, critical reviews, and other forms of essential publication.

It is obvious that no library program can succeed unless the manpower problem is adequately provided for. The Medical Library Assistance Act assumes that with the growing concept of a learning resource center in the medical complex, the library will no longer be limited to books and journals but will be responsible also for servicing new instructional media. These medical science information centers must be staffed with people who are skilled in such areas as the rapid retrieval of drug information, and provide specialized information in such areas as brain research and cardiovascular disease. The Act will provide training grants for schools of library science or other professional graduate schools to establish comprehensive interdisciplinary programs for individuals desiring advanced training at the graduate levels for careers in health science information service.

In addition, the program provides for medical library internships and for the retraining of medical librarians. With the rapid advances being made in the management and processing of biomedical information, many medical librarians find that they are not able to

take full advantage of new techniques because of deficiencies in their training and experience. In order to utilize this pool of manpower to the fullest in the future, it will be necessary to inaugurate programs for retraining librarians in new developments.

It is proposed that this program should support on the average one hundred trainees annually, although some trainees would continue for two or three years.

The National Library of Medicine has become convinced that adequate service to the national biomedical community could not be managed from one centralized facility in Bethesda. For this reason, the Medical Library Assistance Act authorizes the establishment of regional health science libraries either in existing facilities or by the creation of a new regional library where no other medical library is available to serve a given region. These new facilities will be branches of the National Library of Medicine.

The objective of the regional medical library program is to provide prompt access by any health researcher, practitioner, or student of the health sciences in the United States to library materials he may need, and to equalize opportunities for access despite accidents of geographic location.

It is anticipated that each of the regional libraries would provide a bibliographic search facility utilizing the MEDLARS tapes, as well as generating specialized bibliographic service that may be required to support health science activities in the region. Initially, two or three regional libraries will be established as test and demonstration centers. During the following five years the number may be expanded to ten regional medical libraries.

The legislative impact of the Medical Library Assistance Act is obvious. The National Library of Medicine will become the key-stone in a national bibliographic network. NLM will have a depth of resources which can serve national needs when information requests cannot be met on the local or regional level. NLM will also be the focal point for bibliographic control, indexing both books and periodical articles in depth, publishing and widely distributing selective bibliographic information in Index Medicus, while making the MEDLARS tapes available for more detailed inquiry.

National Agricultural Library

The National Agricultural Library is a prototype institution containing most of the classic elements required of a national bibliographic service center. It has developed a series of complementary programs which have great significance in improving its capability to perform more effectively as the national focal point for information transfer in the area of agricultural and biological sciences, excluding medicine.

To afford bibliographic access to its retrospective collections, NAL is now publishing a book catalog which will include its acquisitions from 1862 to 1965. In an effort to assure more direct participation in national bibliographic control, NAL has recently shifted to the Library of Congress classification schedule. Studies have been completed under Project ABEL to define the configuration for automating the internal operations of the library, and continuing efforts are being made to design a national agricultural library network. As a basic element for eventual automation of its current Bibliography of Agriculture, NAL is critically examining the vocabulary that is involved in indexing and cataloging operations and has published the Agricultural-Biological Subject Category List in an effort to standardize this element of bibliographic control. Funds have been appropriated for a new building to house the National Library of Medicine with its expanding collections and additional services.

Here is another example of a national library making a great impact on local library service. First is the capability for comprehensive collecting, followed by the publication of the retrospective bibliographic record so that people anywhere in the country can identify and locate needed information. Transmission is afforded through either lending the original copy, or sending a photoduplicate. Concurrently, NAL is hard at work analyzing the basic elements required to improve its services through an intelligent application of electronic techniques, and planning an organizational network that can utilize effectively the services that will be developed.

In addition to broad-based library support for research in agriculture and the biological sciences, NAL has also developed a "mission oriented" information service with the establishment of its Pesticides Documentation Center.

Public Law 480

Perhaps the first instance of direct Federal legislative action in support of libraries was the amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (PL 83-480), commonly known as Public Law 480. This law provides for the sale of surplus agricultural products to foreign countries with payment being made in local currencies as these nations lack U. S. dollars. Thus, in a number of countries, the United States has developed considerable credits not needed for diplomatic or military expenditures.

Mortimer Graves, representing the American Council of Learned Societies, visualized a solution to the problem of acquiring library materials from these countries—most of which did not have an adequate book trade or bibliographic publications which would permit acquisitions through normal commercial channels. Following intensive efforts by ACLS and the Association of Research Libraries, Congressman John Dingell of Michigan introduced an amendment to

PL 480, to authorize the use of counterpart funds for the purchase of library materials in countries where the U. S. Treasury had declared funds to be surplus. In 1958 the amendment was incorporated into PL 480 as Section 104n, authorizing the Library of Congress, within the appropriations specified, to acquire, index, abstract, and deposit library materials from designated countries.

Following Congressional refusal to authorize funds in 1959 and 1960 an appropriation was made in 1961 which included India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic. U. S. currency in the amount of \$36,500 and \$363,500 in counterpart funds was authorized to start the program. Depository libraries were designated, each of which agreed to pay a token sum of \$500 for the materials received and a self-funded centralized cataloging program was developed. In subsequent years Indonesia, Burma and Israel were added to the program and the current Congress is expected to approve the extension of PL 480 to Yugoslavia and Poland.

In 1965 approximately 1.5 million items were sent to a score of depository libraries participating in the various programs. Accessions lists prepared under the program are sent to a large number of libraries so that scholars throughout the country can know what is available.

The PL 480 program, imaginatively administered by the Library of Congress, is an example of the historical evolution of Federal support. The program was specific, and limited to countries with surplus currencies which were authorized by the Congress, but it was an important link in the continuum of national programs for resource development which started with the Farmington Plan and whose most recent chapter is Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Higher Education Act—Title II-C

The most recent and significant of the legislative programs concerning governmental libraries is Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This legislation had its origin in the concern of the Association of Research Libraries with the cost of cataloging, especially the expense of having to provide original cataloging for approximately 50 percent of the titles added to research library collections each year. The Library of Congress was, of course, acquiring a higher percentage of titles but owing to lack of staff, was not able to process them with sufficient speed to make the bibliographic information available at the time it was needed.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 contained Title II, which provided \$50 million in Federal funds to be used to support academic library resource development. The Association of Research Libraries' Shared Cataloging Committee, under the Chairmanship of William S. Dix, Librarian at Princeton University, testified before both houses of Congress in support of Title II. However, it was

pointed out that because of current inefficiencies in our national system of cataloging, a considerable portion of these funds would be diverted from their intended purpose. ARL proposed an amendment authorizing the Commissioner of Education to transfer to the Librarian of Congress, over the succeeding three years, \$19 million for the following purposes: (1) to enable the Library of Congress, so far as possible, to become globally comprehensive in acquiring all current publications of scholarly interest; (2) to provide cataloging copy for these materials as soon after receipt as possible, i.e., within 3-4 weeks; and (3) to distribute this bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means. Testimony also indicated that the amendment would make a material improvement in manpower utilization, especially with regard to scarce linguistic competence, and would serve as a base for automation of the bibliographic record. The amendment was accepted by both houses of Congress and became Part C of Title II of the Higher Education Act.

In implementing the program, the Library of Congress has been exceedingly imaginative. A test of the descriptive cataloging information contained in the major European national bibliographies revealed that this element was of sufficient quality to be used as it appeared for LC cataloging operations. The Library of Congress has met with the directors of European bibliographic centers to obtain their cooperation in accelerating the speed and comprehensiveness for conveying this information to LC. The availability of accelerated cataloging copy, plus the fact that all foreign acquisitions are to be sent by air, is intended to give the Library of Congress sufficient lead time to have copy available by the time current publications are processed by libraries in this country. It should be noted that this program to improve the availability of cataloging copy for LC will also result in the improvement of bibliographic service from each of the national bibliographies in their own countries.

At the present time arrangements have been made with a number of countries, and expediting offices have been established. The current Federal budgetary problem has resulted in limited funding for the Shared Cataloging Program but, with the future availability of increased appropriations, LC will be in a position to extend its operations to other countries.

While the basic orientation of Title II-C was to improve the cataloging situation, it has considerable implications in the development of resource availability. Under the program, the Library of Congress will approximately double its present rate of accessions, and this increase will take place primarily in foreign language publications, many of which will be obtained from the so-called developing countries. With centralized cataloging at the Library of Congress, the element of identification and location of books will satisfy one condition for bibliographic improvement. However, national needs

require more than one copy of these publications at the Library of Congress, and this desideratum leads to the next phase in national planning for resource availability.

Just as Public Law 480 receipts are now received and serviced by ten to twelve depositories, it is reasonable to assume that the titles obtained under II-C, especially from developing countries which lack an adequate book trade, should also be deposited in a number of research collections in this country. At present an ARL committee is working with the Library of Congress to formulate such a program.

It is obvious that a program as significant as that authorized by Title II-C of the Higher Education Act will have a considerable impact on the Library of Congress as the implementing agency, as well as on the entire library community.

The essential fact is that for the first time in modern history, we will have an institution with the capability of becoming the world center for bibliographic control. Comprehensiveness of acquisition and speed in providing cataloging information will place the Library of Congress in a position of international leadership.

While the present authorization under Title II-C is restricted to cataloging, there are good reasons to consider its eventual extension to indexing and abstracting. The Library of Congress now creates the most comprehensive index to Russian publications, the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions. The scholarly community also requires adequate indexes of African, Latin American, and Oriental periodicals.

National Commission on Libraries

From the papers presented at this conference, it is obvious that the Federal Government is becoming increasingly involved in library programs at all levels. It is equally obvious that there is some danger that these programs are not sufficiently coordinated. Federal programs are seldom comprehensive, but tend to be responses to specific legislative objectives and are subject to continual amendment and extension. We have had no comprehensive review of the national needs for library service and lack information on the strengths and weaknesses of present programs.

Recognizing this problem, on September 2, 1966, the President established a Committee on Libraries and a National Advisory Commission on Libraries. In establishing these groups, the President noted that the Federal Government will spend next year more than \$600 million in supporting libraries and said: "But money alone cannot do the job. We need intelligent planning and advice to see that our millions are spent well. We need to ask serious questions about the future of our libraries."¹ The following major questions were cited:

"What part can libraries play in the development of our communications and information exchange networks?"

"Are our Federal efforts to assist libraries intelligently administered or are they too fragmented among separate programs and agencies?"

"Are we getting the most benefit for the taxpayer's dollar spent?"

The President's Committee on Libraries is composed of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who will serve as Chairman; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Director of the Office of Science and Technology; the Director of the National Science Foundation; and the Librarian of Congress. The responsibilities of the Committee will be:

(1) To appraise the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the nation's rapidly evolving communications and information-exchange network;

(2) To evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations with reference to maximum effective and efficient use of the nation's library resources; and

(3) To develop recommendations for action by government or by private institutions and organizations designed to ensure an effective and efficient library system for the nation.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries is composed of Douglas Knight, Chairman; Verner Clapp; Herman Fussler; Carl Overhage; Theodore Waller; Wilbur Schramm; Launor Carter; Caryl Haskins; William Hubbard; Alvin Eurich; Stephen Wright; Harry Rasom; Carl Elliott; and Estelle Brodman.

The duties of the Commission will be to:

(1) Make a comprehensive study and appraisal of the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information systems;

(2) Appraise the policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations, together with other factors, which have a bearing on the role and effective utilization of libraries;

(3) Appraise library funding, including Federal support of libraries, to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively utilized; and

(4) Develop recommendations for action by government or private institutions and organizations designed to ensure an effective and efficient library system for the nation.¹

The Commission must submit its final report and recommendations one year after its first meeting. These recommendations will be of great significance to governmental as well as all other libraries in this country. This is especially true as we are increasing our dependence on the national libraries for resource and bibliographic services which they can provide most effectively.

COSATI

In addition to specific legislation and its effect on Federal libraries, it would be appropriate to speculate on the impact of Federal planning groups on governmental and special libraries. The most conspicuous of these is the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI), which reports to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Since Sputnik, several reports have been issued from high echelons of government in an effort to devise better ways to control the increasing flood of scientific and technical information. This problem has resulted largely from Federal support of scientific research and development, on which vast sums of money have been spent in the last decade.

The Baker Panel (1958), the Crawford Task Force (1962), and the Weinberg Panel (1963) all addressed themselves to the complex problem of scientific and technical information transfer. In the late fall, 1964, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, the President's Science Advisor and Chairman of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, established a special task group from COSATI, and charged it with the responsibility of designing a national information transfer system or systems which would provide more effective access to information for the scientific and technological community.

Following a comprehensive study of the problem by Systems Development Corporation, the published report, Recommendations for National Documents Handling Systems in Science and Technology, (November, 1965)² was used as the basis for task force recommendations. The specific items noted in the COSATI report are intentionally general. It was acknowledged that it would be premature to attempt at this time to design a national information handling system; however, immediate steps should be taken to plan in general terms and to begin the evolution of the present "system" into a more effective network.

It is highly probable that the eventual operating recommendations from COSATI will have a great impact on governmental libraries, as these are of critical importance to our present and future information activities.

Additional Programs

There are, of course, many additional instances of legislative impact on governmental libraries. Consider the implications of the State Technical Services Act of 1965, the computer-based abstracting and indexing services managed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautical and Space Administration; the National Standard Data Reference Center and the National Bureau of Standards; the Science Information Exchange at the Smithsonian and the Science Referral Center at the Library of Congress. These all have great significance for government libraries, as well as research libraries outside government.

The Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information is a good example of a special governmental library which is a prototype switching or repackaging center in information transfer. Each year some sixty to eighty thousand technical reports are issued by government agencies. These reports represent the information by-product of billions of dollars of research and development grants and contracts. If duplicate research is to be avoided and if the non-governmental scientific and technical community is to utilize the results of this work, the information must be easily accessible. This is the task to which the Clearinghouse addresses itself.

Created by the Department of Commerce, the Clearinghouse serves as a bridge between the Federal agencies which generate information and the non-federal community which has need for it. Thus, this agency has become the control center in an information network. The "raw product" is supplied through the technical reports of NASA, AEC, DOD, and other government agencies. These reports are evaluated, with the indexing and abstracting information being refined for the non-governmental user. Special bibliographies are prepared for dissemination on both a general and a selective basis so that, for example, the small fabricator of electronics parts can benefit from the most sophisticated research programs sponsored by the Federal government. In addition, the Clearinghouse has the capability to supply the text of these reports in either original format, electrostatic prints, or microfiche in response to any request.

Conclusion

This has been a very general review of the impact of federal legislation on governmental and special libraries. As said before, there has been no ordered or rational development. This is the task for the present generation.

REFERENCES

1. Library of Congress. Information Bulletin, 25:562-564, Sept. 8, 1966.
2. U. S. Federal Council for Science and Technology. Committee on Scientific and Technical Information. Recommendations for National Documents Handling Systems in Science and Technology. Washington, U. S. Dept. of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Institute for Applied Technology; distributed by Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Va., 1965.

IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS THROUGH PROPOSALS

Burton W. Adkinson

What some of you may be hoping for is a blueprint for getting federal support for library programs. I should warn you that there is no such blueprint, for the simple reason that there is no universal proposal. Every particular combination of proposer and federal agency represents a special case. So the best I can do is to sketch some general considerations that the library community might take into account in shaping programs and seeking federal support for them.

Another difficulty springs from the fact that library support has no one comfortable home in the government structure. It cuts across the roles and missions of many federal agencies. Unless it specializes in some one field or function it does not correspond too closely to any one agency's interests. The National Library of Medicine interests itself in libraries or parts of them that serve medical research or medical education. The National Science Foundation has responsibilities to libraries that support scientific research or education in the sciences, and to libraries in general where they intersect the general process of disseminating scientific and technical information. And so on. So, besides being unable to give you a color-it-yourself proposal, I cannot give you a good road-map of the Washington library-support area. In particular, I shall not speak to the specific interests of the Office of Education, partly because the discussion of recent legislation that you are to hear will no doubt cover this topic. Some of you may ultimately get some guidance at the end of the year's deliberations of the National Library Commission that has recently been set up, but in the meantime it would be presumptuous for me to pre-empt whatever government postures toward libraries, or vice-versa, the Commission may come up with.

For now, then, as I said, all I can do is offer some general ground rules that may help libraries establish communication with the various parts of the Federal establishment that are prepared to help solve libraries' problems.

A. Mechanics

Different agencies of course have different detailed requirements regarding proposals submitted to them. Furthermore, they

Burton W. Adkinson is Head, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C.

differ in their attitudes toward formal as opposed to informal proposals, the latter being usually preliminary explorations aimed at finding out whether a formal proposal may be welcome and if so what aspects of a proposed program should be stressed or eliminated. In general, however, a proposal must describe:

- . . . the work to be undertaken
- . . . why it is to be undertaken
- . . . how it is to be accomplished.

In addition, certain formal elements are required, such as:

- . . . vita of the principal investigator and at least the senior professionals to be associated with him.
- . . . reasonably detailed cost estimates.
- . . . statement of the proposed starting time and duration of the work.
- . . . approval by the organization under whose auspices the work is to be done.

The Air Force's Office of Aerospace Research has produced a very useful discussion of the proposal process in general called "As Long as You're Up, Get Me a Grant."¹ Our own needs are described in a pamphlet entitled "Improving the Dissemination of Scientific Information."² Other agencies have similar publications which are yours for the asking.

A final note on the mechanics of proposal processing: do not expect return-mail response. The time for review is more often measured in months than in days, and so is the time for processing a grant if the review is favorable.

Beyond the mechanics of submitting proposals lies the problem of how to go about creating one.

B. Relating Programs to Agency Missions

Probably the most important first step is to get a clear understanding of how any ideas you may have mesh with the interests of the agencies to which you might turn. This may not be easy, for reasons mentioned earlier—the agencies may not be sure where their responsibilities start and stop, and you may well have a plan that cuts across them anyhow. However, each of them does try formally to describe its area of concern, and you might do well to look over that description. A letter or telephone call will elicit them.

Then there is always an opportunity for direct discussion with agency management. Most of us nowadays are bound to unsolicited proposals, except when we are able to identify a job that we are prepared to justify as necessary, which is not often. But most of us are nevertheless more than willing to discuss our aims and yours, as long as you remember that this is in a real spirit of matching your

needs and our proper concerns and not any kind of dickering. Here you must remember that we are your agents trusted to match public needs to public funds, and we take this seriously. Therefore in informal discussion you must help relate what you have in mind to what we try to bear in mind, and not simply assume that your individual priorities match our necessarily broader ones.

Some insight into what federal agencies are doing in information dissemination may be derived from a series of publications that our office in the National Science Foundation has had produced. This series is called "Scientific Information Activities of Federal Agencies."³ There are thirty-four pamphlets, available from GPO. They do not have any particular library orientation, but they may help provide guidance to agency interests.

C. Identifying Program Objectives

Have some "feel" for what federal sector of library responsibility you are geared to, then try to pin down what kind of support you are looking for. Most federal agencies that might funnel public funds into this particular form of public service distinguish among several kinds of support. Here are some examples.

Are you looking for deficit financing, to get a fiscal injection that will let you dig yourself out of a hole that increasing demands for service and insufficient local funds have made?

Are you interested in research in library operations, or a pilot project that will give insight into some aspect of library operations in general? In this case, be prepared to defend the proposition that your findings can be generalized. You will not be shot down because you cannot prove in advance that your proposed research or project will pay off, but you may be if you cannot say who outside of your own operation will benefit if it does.

Do you want to set up a permanent operation that you cannot fund with local support? Say so, and explain why federal funding is justified when local support is absent. This opens a Pandora's box of questions about the federal versus the private or local role in support of services. In most cases, operating support will be forthcoming only when it is clear that the operation will discharge some clearly defined federal responsibility that cannot be met in any other way.

Are you planning an extension of more-or-less conventional or archival services, with more books and monographs and serials and space? If so, be ready to prove a real requirement that cannot be filled by reference to other services in the area, by borrowing less-used material from other sources, or the like.

Or, on the other hand, are you planning to branch out into new and nonconventional kinds of services that have not been offered in the past? There is a fair amount of interest in this sort of thing at present, although you will run into the difficulty of trying to prove that a service will be used when it has not yet been tried. What we are looking for is a new idea that has been thoroughly tested!

D. Establishing Background

A final pointer that may be helpful is the suggestion that any of you seeking federal support do his homework in advance. Those in Washington charged with channeling public funds to libraries do not pretend to be omniscient, but it is not safe to assume them altogether ignorant. Even if they were, they might turn to reviewers or referees who are not. Therefore to establish competence it is necessary for supplicants to show familiarity with major operations and research that parallel or relate to a proposed program. This is particularly true with respect to research and experimental efforts, but applies across the board. In weighing competing demands for support it is impossible to judge each suggestion strictly on its own merits without regard to the overall pattern, and federal sources need all the help they can get in fitting any specific plan in with related ones.

In addition to the specific suggestions offered so far, I might briefly discuss two broad subjects not so much by way of offering advice as to bring some perspective to library trends that will probably affect any plans you make that involve federal support.

E. Automation

In view of the proven contribution that computers can make to library housekeeping, it is likely that many of your plans will include them. There are three points that need to be made in this regard.

First, there is an enormous amount of activity currently going on in the automation of libraries, without too much evidence of coordination. The spectre of duplication of experimenting, systems design, and even programming is rising, and inter-system compatibility needs are becoming more and more obvious. In this atmosphere, it is clear that the homework referred to earlier is really essential.

Second, there is a certain lack of realism about what automation can do. For housekeeping detail, record keeping, and even manipulating files as an aid in searching through them they are probably invaluable. The day when they will provide a complete reference service without human intervention is still far down the road. Failure to recognize this limitation, and resulting over-optimism as to manpower savings and reference efficiency, is not likely to sit well with government grantors. Most of them have been burned by certain projects that did not pay off as promised.

Third, there is nevertheless a promise in automation that often goes unrecognized. That promise is the potential for exchanging and sharing the housekeeping records. Most of you are probably familiar with computerized catalog cards and the National Library of Medicine's ventures in experimenting with files on magnetic tapes. These are examples of computer potential, though admittedly still in the developmental stage. Any plans that involve library automation had better show careful consideration of the possibilities and implications of connecting any one computer-based record-keeping system with others that are engaged in parallel efforts. This is the more true as plans for national systems with emphasis on automation emerge. Any one system proposal that ignores the problem of ultimately looking into ultimate national configurations may be looked at as potentially schismatic.

Two good reviews of this area are: "Cooperation, Convertibility, and Compatibility Among Information Systems,"⁴ recently issued by the National Bureau of Standards; and an article by Black and Farley on "Library Automation" in the American Documentation Institute's Annual Review of Information Science and Technology.⁵

F. Load-sharing

Another general principle that potential Federal supporters of library programs have to take into account is the increasing requirement of cooperative load-sharing arrangements—at local, regional, and national levels. This is a tired horse to beat, but it is so much a part of future library operations that perhaps its importance cannot be overemphasized. For an overview of the numerous load-sharing efforts now under way, see Carrington's "Bibliography of Library Cooperation" in Special Libraries.⁶ The doctrine of local self-sufficiency is dead, and proposals based on it alone will likely get into trouble.

As I warned at the beginning, I have not been able to produce any very concrete courses of action that will lead with certainty to federal support of any specific programs. I expect, though, that if you bear in mind the various factors that I, at least, think should be kept in mind, you will not have much trouble in obtaining the increased support that recent legislation intends you to have. I wish you luck.

REFERENCES

1. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Office of Aerospace Research. As Long as You're Up, Get Me a Grant. AFOSR 65-0392. Washington, D. C., The Office, March, 1965.

2. National Science Foundation. Programs for Improving the Dissemination of Scientific Information. NSF 64-22. Washington, D. C., The Foundation, Sept. 1964.
3. National Science Foundation. Scientific Information Activities of Federal Agencies. Nos. 1-32. Washington, D. C., U.S.G.P.O., 1962-1966.
4. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards. Cooperation, Convertibility, and Compatibility Among Information Systems. NBS Misc. Pub. 276, Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., June 1966.
5. Black, Donald V., and Farley, Earl A. "Library Automation." In Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, Vol. 1. New York, Interscience Publishers, 1966.
6. Carrington, David K. "Bibliography of Library Cooperation," Special Libraries, 57:6, 395-399, July-August 1966.

PROPOSALS AND PROGRAMS—THE INFORMAL ASPECTS

Dorothy M. Crosland

When Mrs. Ladley's letter came last winter inviting me to participate in this conference concerning federal legislation for libraries, I had just returned from Washington, which had been covered with a heavy snow. Her letter read: "We invite you to give one of the papers on Tuesday, November 8, on the art of getting to know one's way around in Washington." I laughed because "How does one get around in Washington when there is an unexpected snow storm?" I had no trouble when I visited a private donor, for a car was sent for me, but to get to government offices which spread from the City of Washington into Maryland and Virginia is not too easy. One must depend on the doorman at a hotel or stand near a building where a cab might discharge a passenger, or wait on a corner where traffic flows two ways and pray that an empty cab will stop. I must admit that even after many years and many visits to Washington my sense of direction is not good and I am dependent on a cab. I am quite sure I did not think clearly when I accepted the invitation to appear on this program and tell people how to get around in Washington.

Some weeks later a more detailed letter came from Mrs. Ladley and I realized it did not matter transportation-wise how I got about in Washington; rather, it was how did I get into government offices, how did I meet the officials who might give me the information I was seeking. This paper has been a difficult one to write, for if I spoke frankly, it would be too personal. One does not mention the name of a friend who says: "You should know Mr. X. I shall call him or give you a note to him."

Recently, at the American Documentation Institute Conference, I sat with some friends at lunch. Two of the people were from government offices. I said I was worried about this paper, for it was far too personal. Since one cannot name names other than his or her Congressman, how does he then write about getting around in Washington—meaning, of course, how does one get to see the top man in a government office from whom information or assistance is needed? One of the government officials said: "You should have no trouble. You have the answer. I have known you less than an hour and I know you like people. When one knows you like him, he responds."

Miss Dorothy M. Crosland is Director of Libraries, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia.

Yes, I like people, but this does not get me a cab in a snow storm, nor does it open a door without a key. What keys have I used?

First, I do like people. I have a curiosity or eagerness to learn, and one learns from people no matter what business or profession they are in, from football to the top engineering and scientific fields. I want to know how and why the wheels go round. People should be liked for themselves, not just for what they may be able to do for you. A friend may help you, for he may have a close friend whom he feels you should know. An exchange of ideas may help both of you. One learns to give without thinking of what he will receive in return.

The second key is courage. One must have courage to open the doors of total strangers. Particularly was this true for librarians in engineering and science before World War II. Georgia Tech does not give degrees in the humanities. The Georgia Tech Library was not invited to participate in a meeting in 1939 on "Library Resources in the South." However, I attended to represent the University of Georgia at the request of Ralph Parker, who at that time was librarian. The chairman of the group who was also head of one of our larger libraries in the South said to me, when I questioned why Georgia Tech was not included: "Your resources are not important. We are interested only in primary sources, newspapers, the humanities." After World War II he was one of the first to write me and ask for help in building his collections in engineering and science. It has taken courage to open doors, for in the eyes of many librarians I was grouped with engineers who drove trains or worked in machine shops. I did not fit in a cultural field.

The third key, an important one, is conviction backed up with facts. A person must believe in the road he takes, but he must have good maps to guide him. Perseverance, faith with courage, and conviction with facts, will open the most stubborn doors.

A quotation I like from one of the late Charles Kettering's speeches reads: "Nothing ever built arose to touch skies unless some man dreamed that it should, some man believed that it could, and some man willed that it must."

Is there one among us today who has not dreamed of having a library building and collection which would provide all the space and information needed by our patrons, be they students, faculty, researchers, laymen, or top management? We set our goals. Perhaps they do touch the skies, for we know that men who achieve are men of vision and dreams.

We must never be content. In this complex world we live in today, we must dream, have vision, courage, and conviction. We must be true to ourselves. Armed with these tools, with an interest in people and what they are doing, courage to face them, and conviction

that the demands for good libraries are legitimate because they are backed with facts, one can open doors not only in Washington but throughout this world of ours.

At long last, it is very heartening that the Federal Government and industry are recognizing more and more the importance of libraries. In the past, funds could be acquired for scholarships, for laboratories, for expensive equipment and instruments, but for books and periodicals one knocked on many doors.

This conference is affording us the opportunity to look at current federal programs and to consider the implications of present and proposed legislation relating to libraries. My task today is to indicate some of the "informal" aspects of seeking federal funds. Consequently, I must speak largely of my own personal experiences and observations. I must try to match my own personal thoughts with the evolving patterns of governmental policy in making grants to educational institutions and, particularly, patterns of grants to libraries. Therefore, where does an interest in people, courage, and conviction mesh with the pattern of government grants?

We must recognize first that the Federal Government is interested in libraries because of their contributions to our total national capability and that grants to libraries are made to assist the government in achieving its goals. Secondly, we must recognize that the ability to attract federal money is presently concentrated in a few highly urbanized areas, academically oriented and industrially advanced, which dominate the direction of American education because of their excellence. In these areas are concentrated our most eminent scholars. It follows that here are initiated our most significant studies and also that most of the successful proposals for federal grants have originated here. We are all familiar with the overwhelming statistics of the dominance of the Northeast and the Far West in obtaining federal monies for research and development contracts. (Rule number one, therefore, must be: live in one of these fortunate areas.)

Most of us at this conference are from, let us say, the less fortunate areas. We are not going to change the situation by complaining about it and crying politics. It has often been suggested that agencies award funds for political reasons, and perhaps on occasion this is true; but may I point out that major allocations for scientific research are based on the clear, cold facts of capability and achievement. The world's challenge facing our government has made it clear that quality scientific research is power; and quality is the basis on which decisions are made. Without question the policy of award by merit, not by political influence, must be clearly recognized by all those seeking funds to implement their research proposals.

I repeat—complaining is not the answer. The road to change begins on your own campus—and in your own library. Only by building

our institutional capabilities up to that level where grants are warranted can we get our fair share. Being in the number two group means one must try harder and go the extra mile. This is a building process and there is no question that the Federal Government is encouraging the development of centers of educational excellence throughout the nation. Since September 1965, it has been the official policy of our government to allocate federal support to academic institutions which are hindered in growth by a lack of funds but which show potential for strength and significant contributions. Today the opportunity to develop our libraries is available with federal funds. It behooves us to make legitimate requests and, if successful in receiving a grant, to spend the allocated funds wisely. The climate for us from the less fortunate areas is improving, but the initiative remains with us on the institutional level. We need a plan to put into practice. This is where liking people, courage, perseverance, and conviction come to the fore.

The first level of attack must be made at home on your own campus. You must know your institution: its aims, its aspirations, its strengths, its weaknesses. You must participate fully in the councils of your institution. This is hard work, but rewarding. It means working at knowing people on your campus not only as deans, as teachers, as researchers, but also as individuals. You will find that many of your faculty associates will have a friend or a connection in Washington. It is not unlikely that some of your faculty members may at some time in their careers have served the government in one or more capacities. By knowing the people around you, by treating them as individuals, by being aware of the general interests of each one, you acquire a feel of the collective nature of your institution and of the ways and means of doing things on your campus. Such a program of knowing the people with whom you work is, of necessity, a long-range one, but it will place you, and keep you, in the mainstream of campus affairs. You are consequently able to represent your institution, formally or informally, whenever the opportunity presents itself. As a person coming from one of those institutions which does not have a representative in Washington, it becomes more important for me (and for you if you are in a similar position) to know your institution and its needs. You are often able to serve as liaison between a Washington official and one of your own faculty by making each one aware of his need for the other. Since my experience has been on an academic campus, I have used the term faculty. In a public, school, or special library the terms could be community, city or state school officials, or top management. A research grant is often the result of good communication and cooperation. All parties will be grateful to you and may, in return, assist you in seeking aid for your library.

By broadening this capacity for liking people with whom you come in contact to wider communities—to your home community, to your professional community, to officials of local, state, and national government—you develop a wide range of friends from whom you can seek counsel or, in turn, as a librarian provide counsel and information. The true by-product of these friendships is the assistance it provides in opening doors for you when you have made a meritorious proposal or plan that warrants serious consideration and deserves funding.

Congressmen and government officials especially need friends. Like all of us, they want to be liked and admired as individuals and not merely for the offices they hold. Remember your Congressman generally needs your help more than you need his. Helping education is foolproof and he is always looking for personal ways in which he can help education in his district or state. He appreciates being called on; he is grateful for your word of thanks. He is your willing servant provided your requests are legitimate and within his power, and time, to grant. I would like to quote from a letter dated November 28, 1958, from Senator Herman Talmadge:

I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for your generous remarks in my behalf and I am glad to know you approve of my senatorial service. It is my hope that I shall always be able to merit your trust and confidence, and you may be further assured I shall always strive to give vigorous and effective representation to the Georgia viewpoint to the best of my ability and according to the dictates of my conscience. Toward that end your advice and suggestions will be welcomed at all times. Let me know whenever I can be of service in any way, and I hope you will come to see us whenever you can.

It is, of course, desirable to live in an area in which long tenure in congressional office is reasonably assured. I have been most fortunate, for I have maintained one or two close congressional connections beginning in the New Deal days with the late Senator Walter George and extending until the present time with Senator Richard Russell.

The official in the executive branch also wants to be treated and liked as an individual. Sometimes call on him—briefly, of course—without your palm outstretched and without a petition for funds on your lips. Treat him like a friend. If you can help him by passing along useful information, take the time to call or write him. A favor is seldom forgotten. He may open that next needed door for you. I think the following anonymous quotation is applicable here.

I am a little thing with a big meaning,
I unlock doors, open hearts, dispel prejudices.
I create friendships and good will,
Everybody loves me.
I cost nothing—I am appreciation.

The cultivation of friends does, of course, help in getting you to the door, but to open it and keep it open is up to you. Once you have knocked and have been admitted to the inner office, you must prove yourself. This takes courage. You must speak your mind. If your ideas and plans are good, they will be heard. You will be listened to. The proposal, which may follow, may not yet have been fully developed, but you know your concept is good and is needed. If you adhere to the guidelines of accuracy, brevity, clarity, and courtesy, you cannot go wrong. Know your facts and distill them to the basic points. Know both sides of an argument, if possible, but by all means stick by your convictions. If they are sound, they will be accepted.

A most desirable attribute is to know what is going on in government. Nothing impresses your listener more than your obvious knowledge of up-to-date events. Some you learn orally from your friends, but most often far more comes from a systematic examination of your newspaper, from journals and reports. Like most of us, I have little time to read in depth but I do scan many publications which come to my desk from the president's office or from a faculty member or when they are received in the library and directed to my attention. I have attached to this paper a list of publications from which I gain much information. One particularly useful volume, recently received in our library, is House Reports v. 3-5, Reports of Select Committee on Government Research, 88th Congress, 2d Session, January 7 - October 3, 1964. It would be well for those of you seeking federal funds to examine this volume. I think it is a valuable reference tool for federal programs. The information garnered from whatever sources are available should be organized and indexed for easy retrieval and be kept up to date. Every minute spent on this activity pays off manyfold.

Sticking by your convictions and persevering, for years if necessary, are tremendously important. At my own institution I have lived through many lean years. Without being a braggart, I can say truthfully that my perseverance in building certain aspects of the Georgia Tech collection has provided regional collections of real distinction. For years I pursued the General Education Board for funds to develop our holdings for graduate study and research. Shortly after World War II research personnel on my campus urged me to develop a patent collection, both U. S. and foreign. At that time there was no patent collection south of Washington. Fortunately, the Commissioner of Patents was sympathetic, and personnel in his office encouraged me. A letter following a visit to the U. S. Patent Office reads:

It was indeed a pleasure making your acquaintance today and learning about your very progressive activity at Georgia Tech. I found your interest in patents and the patent system very rewarding and

I know that you will be doing your utmost to make patent literature available to those who are in need of it in Georgia and the surrounding states.

Today we serve in effect as a regional depository. Where can one find a better history of technology than in patents?

Similarly, my attention and doggedness in trying to develop a technical reports center at Georgia Tech eventually paid off, and today we have one of the better collections in the country. I believe I am the only head librarian of a university in this country who is the central agent on a campus for classified documents. If you work with those pursuing research, you know how important are both classified and unclassified documents. It has taken a lot of knocking on doors to acquire reports and documents from government agencies and research institutes, but it has been worth every minute it took, for it has led both to a fine collection and grants to improve it. The collection serves well not only Georgia Tech personnel but many throughout the South.

The development of the School of Information Science at Georgia Tech perhaps illustrates best the importance of the three points that I emphasize: (1) liking people, (2) courage, and (3) conviction. Since 1953 I had tried constantly to get interest aroused in better education for science librarians and information specialists. Formally and informally, I let my convictions be known. Finally, after nearly ten years (and Sputnik undoubtedly provided a tremendous assist), things began to happen in Washington.

The National Science Foundation and, in particular, Dr. Alan Waterman, Director, and Dr. Burton W. Adkinson, Head of the Office of Science Information Service, recognized that university and other research libraries constitute an important scientific resource. A group of scientists, research librarians, and administrators were invited to Washington on March 8, 1961, to discuss with the Advisory Panel of the Office of Science Information the problem of library resources, which included (1) facilities, (2) manpower (education and training of science librarians and science information specialists), and (3) adequacy and availability of collections of library materials. I was invited to participate. At the meeting the Chairman of the Advisory Panel pointed his finger at me and said, "Aren't you a member of the Engineering School Libraries Committee of the American Society for Engineering Education?" My answer was "Yes." He then said, "You do something. Call Dr. Eric Walker (President of A.S.E.E. and President of Pennsylvania State University) and tell him you need his help."

I returned to my campus and reported to the deans the directive I had received. Several members of my staff, certain faculty members of our science and engineering departments, and personnel from our Engineering Experiment Station began seminars to discuss

seriously the possibility of training students to work effectively in the handling of technical information. There were members of the library staff with doctorates who had taught in library schools and, with the interested faculty and research personnel, we felt we had the capabilities for training information scientists.

On May 16, 1961, I was invited, with a smaller group which included directors of four library schools, to meet again with the Advisory Panel of the Office of Science Information Service. One outcome of this meeting was a recommendation for a feasibility study on the problem of training science librarians and information specialists.

On June 27, 1961, a proposal was submitted to the National Science Foundation for a study on "Programs for Training Personnel for Scientific and Technical Libraries." On August 15, 1961, a representative from the Office of Science Information Service came to my office with a request that we hold two conferences, one before October 19, 1961, and one in the spring of 1962. With support from the Foundation, the conferences were held and the feasibility study made.

On January 21, 1963, a proposal was submitted to our Graduate Council for offering a master's degree in information science. This was approved in the spring and another proposal for support of the program was submitted to the National Science Foundation. With a grant from the Foundation, Georgia Tech opened its School of Information Science in September 1963, with seven students. This past September 32 new students were enrolled, making a total of 49 currently enrolled. Also, an undergraduate first year computer class was begun with 170 students. It is expected that 300 will be enrolled in the winter quarter.

In working toward the establishment of this school, which is not a library school, I feel that I have made a contribution to my country. Someone who believed, who had faith and conviction, had to come to the aid of engineers and scientists. Today there are many library schools which offer courses in information science, and many schools of mathematics have options in information science.

Because of my interest in information science more doors have been opened for me, not only in Washington but throughout the world. Yes, it took courage to do this job for the National Science Foundation but one goes the extra mile, strives harder, when people like Dr. Adkinson and Dr. Waterman believe in you.

I fear that this paper has given you little information on the "art of getting to know one's way around in Washington." The assignment is far too personal. It is not wise to name personally all the people who have helped open doors. My congressmen have been named and so have the staff of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Waterman (now retired), and Dr. Adkinson. I end by suggesting that you try using my keys to open doors. They have served me well. I am sure they will help you.

LIST OF USEFUL PUBLICATIONS

ACRL News (Newsletter Issue of College and Research Libraries). Monthly. Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611. Reflects concerns and interests of research libraries on government policies.

American Council on Education. Higher Education and National Affairs. Weekly (except summer). American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Newsletter on trends and developments in higher education; state, regional, and national.

American Council on Education. Special Report of Federal Programs. Monthly. American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Reports new legislation and administrative procedures relating to federal programs.

American Library Association. ALA Washington Newsletter. Irregular. American Library Association, 200 C Street, N.W., Washington 3, D. C. Reports on federal legislation, appropriations, actions affecting, or of interest to, the American Library Association.

College and University Reports. Commerce Clearing House, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10017. Brief reporter service on all aspects of the relationship between higher education and government.

International Science and Technology. Monthly. International Communications, Inc., 205 E. 42nd Street, New York, N. Y. 10017. Summary articles of current scientific and engineering developments, relationship of industry with government and universities. Aimed at management.

Library of Congress. Information Bulletin. Weekly. Card Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 20540. Provides information on programs and personnel of the Library of Congress.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Circular Letter. Irregular. Office of the Executive Director, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Outlines governmental and private programs of interest to land grant institutions. Lists personnel responsible for programs.

National Society of Professional Engineers. Legislative Bulletins. Monthly. 2029 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006. Newsletter analyzing governmental activities affecting the engineering community.

Science. Weekly. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20005. Reflects attitudes of the scientific community toward government.

Reports from the United States Senate. Irregular. Issued by Herman Talmadge, Junior Senator from Georgia. Most congressmen issue newsletters similar to this outlining their activities, pending legislation, etc.

Washington Science Trends. Weekly. Trends Publishers, Inc., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. 20004. Includes NASA Technical Briefs available from Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information. Reports and analyzes news of scientific interest, offers research development reports, technical trends, publications checklist, and research requirements.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents. Weekly. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C. 20408. Documents contains statements, messages and other presidential materials released by the White House up to 5 P.M. on Friday of each week.

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION IN FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR LIBRARIES

Carma Leigh

We who administer, implement, or are affected by the federal legislation for libraries enacted in the last ten years are inclined to assume that the federal government's relation to libraries began in 1956 with the passage of the first Library Services Act. Certainly, the impact of federal legislation on libraries has been more strongly felt in the last ten years than in any previous period. Yet a summary of the effects of the federal government through laws and services affecting libraries would have to go back much farther. True, the Constitution of the United States still has nothing whatever to say about libraries, and until 1956 there was nothing in federal statutes expressing concern with the need for adequate library services throughout the states or the intent of assisting the states to provide such services.

Yet it must fairly be said that there have long been federal laws affecting library interests that were concerned with such matters as the free importation of books, the distribution of various kinds of government publications, free transportation of books and talking book machines for the blind, and reduced postal rates for books loaned by libraries. In addition to federal laws that provide for these, several federal government functions have long been of direct or indirect benefit to libraries, for example, a wide variety of bibliographic services, a system of interlibrary loans, supplying government publications in large amounts free or at low cost, a system of printed catalog card distribution, and the periodic collection of library statistics.

Examination of library literature shows that library leaders were thinking of federal financial aid to libraries in the 1920's. The depression of the 1930's brought a number of emergency programs that demonstrated and extended public library service, such as some of the Works Progress Administration, The Public Works Administration, military training, and other projects. WPA staff assistants in libraries were provided in large numbers between 1932 and 1942.

In the decade of the 1930's there was considerable discussion within the American Library Association not merely of whether there

Mrs. Carma Leigh is Librarian, State Library, Sacramento, California.

should be federal aid to libraries but of the forms it should take, how far it should, would, or could go in requiring that certain standards of service must be maintained, conditions of eligibility, the federal agency that should administer federal aid, and the formulas that should or might be used. In these early discussions, particularly in the writings of Dr. Carleton B. Joeckel, we find the genesis of much that is now in the federal laws and regulations which make federal financial assistance available to public, school, and higher education libraries.

In 1935, the Committee on Federal Relations of the ALA prepared a statement entitled A Federal Library Agency and Federal Library Aid. The second ALA report on the same subject was prepared in 1936 by the Special Committee on Federal Aid to Libraries, of which Louis R. Wilson was chairman. In May 1936, when the ALA met for its annual conference in Richmond, Virginia, a resolution was adopted by the ALA Council by a large majority vote. It authorized the Executive Board of the Association to proceed with a formal request for a permanent system of federal aid to libraries. This decision was soon endorsed by nearly all the state library associations, and several citizens' organizations. Very soon after the 1936 ALA Council action which made the securing of federal aid to libraries the ALA official policy, thirteen state legislatures enacted laws authorizing the acceptance of federal aid if granted by the national government, and designating the state library agency to receive and administer such aid. Since that time, of course, all state legislatures have done so.

In 1937, a report on library federal relations by Carleton B. Joeckel was submitted to the federal Advisory Committee on Education and later published by the committee as one of its series of staff studies.¹

Beginning with the 1936 ALA official policy decision, the ALA sponsored a series of definite proposals for federal grants of funds to the states to be used for local library purposes. The first proposals were attached to bills for federal school aid in large amounts to be granted to state school systems. These amendments to the general federal aid to education bill proposed by the ALA were accepted by the bill's chief sponsor, the National Education Association, and were included in what became the Harrison-Thomas-Fletcher Bill, introduced in April 1938. Librarians campaigned vigorously in support of this legislation during 1938 and 1939. Forrest Spaulding, then Des Moines, Iowa, city librarian, represented ALA in Washington during those campaigns. There was close cooperation between the ALA, the NEA, and state library associations. The legislation failed to pass, but some public support was gained, and a pattern for future efforts was established.

In 1939, Wilhelm Munthe, in his American Librarianship from a European Angle,² wrote that nowhere in the world had the task of library extension been taken up with such determination and zeal as in the United States. "But," he said, "when we look more closely we discover that the credit for all this belongs neither to the federal nor the state governments. . . . Until recent years the federal government considered all library work outside the District of Columbia as none of its concern." It comes as a shock to us now in November 1966, that this could be said only twenty-seven years ago!

From 1940 through 1945 no federal library legislation was introduced by ALA for federal aid, due primarily to World War II. The literature shows, however, and some still-active librarians will recall that the subject was not dead, although it may have seemed so to many.

Dr. Carleton B. Joeckel continued to speak with a most reasonable, consistent, and persuasive voice for federal library aid and a national plan for library service. In 1944, even before the end of the war, while he was still Dean of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, he called together a Library Institute on "Library Extension: Problems and Solutions."³ The papers show the progressive program of topics. The first group of papers was concerned with the problem of organization of library service at the level of local government; the next moves on to the role of the state, and the last group to a consideration of state and federal aid to libraries. Participants in the Institute agreed that a thoroughly satisfactory system of library service cannot be established by the efforts of local government alone and that adequate state and federal aid will be necessary to attain a high minimum level of library service throughout the nation. Dr. Joeckel translated the group's conclusions into a simplified national library plan containing the following essential elements:

1. A system of perhaps not more than one thousand strong local public library units, embracing the entire territorial area of the United States.
2. Forty-eight [B.A.H.—before Alaska and Hawaii] effective state library agencies, with sufficient state aid within each state to insure a basic library program.
3. A nation-wide minimum level of library service sustained by grants-in-aid by the federal government.

This foreshadowed his amplified National Plan for Public Library Service published in 1948.

The first Library Demonstration Bill was introduced in 1946 by Congresswoman Emily Taft Douglas of Illinois. The record shows that from 1946 to 1956, when the first federal library aid bill reached final passage, ALA had committed itself to proposals separate from

general aid to education, for smaller sums to be granted state libraries for demonstration projects in one or more state areas over a period of four or five years, at each of the sessions of Congress. Thus, demonstration for limited periods, rather than permanent grants for equalization, became the current program for federal aid to public libraries.

Some of the reasons for this change are seen in the talk given by Carl H. Milam, then Executive Secretary of the ALA, before Dr. Joeckel's 1944 Chicago Library Institute, in which he urged the ALA to narrow its request. He suggested it would be good strategy for the Association to select and concentrate on that aspect of library service which most needs federal aid, and he suggested as that aspect complete public library coverage. He urged also that ALA frame its detailed proposals in cooperation with stronger political-action groups than librarians, such as farm organizations. This may have influenced the fact that the first federal aid was for rural area library service, as well as the fact that library service was weakest in rural areas. He urged also that the national plan for public libraries be completed, which was done, with Dr. Joeckel as principal author, in 1948. Mr. Milam stressed, too, that another important phase of the federal aid program was the continued strengthening of state library extension agencies, considering it inconceivable that federal aid to public libraries, when it came, would fail to lay a heavy burden of responsibility on these agencies. He urged all librarians of all types to be concerned about this, and to help the state library agencies improve their capacity to serve as primary agents when federal aid did come. He saw a special need for more detailed state programs which could be put into the hands of congressmen and others. Such state programs and plans now exist in all states, even if only in the form required to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education for LSCA grants, but they were nearly non-existent in 1944. Mr. Milam urged unity and drive, funds, and cooperation in presenting proposals to the public and to Congress.

On October 14, 1944, Althea H. Warren, Los Angeles City Librarian, moved and the ALA Council voted unanimously to authorize a campaign to enable the ALA to maintain a representative in Washington and to set up a committee including representatives of the Executive Board, the Library Extension Board, the Library Extension Division, the Federal Relations Committee, and the Trustees Division, to lead the campaign and carry it through.

The Chairman of the Federal Relations Committee was Paul Howard, then head of the Gary, Indiana, Public Library. From the regular reports in the ALA Bulletin of those years, he also spent a good deal of time in going to Washington on a part-time basis to represent ALA and library interests. He and his committee worked on surplus property for libraries, rural library extension,

strengthening the Library Services Division of the U. S. Office of Education, and the campaign that had been voted to obtain funds for adequate representation in Washington on a full-time basis.

The financial campaign for what was called the Library Development Fund went into high gear in November 1944. A goal of \$105,000 was set with which to maintain the Washington office for a four-year period, each state library association accepted responsibility to raise a fair portion of the total, and personal contributions were sought. The state of Washington was the first to achieve and exceed its quota.

In the summer of 1945 Paul Howard was appointed to head the Washington office on a full-time basis, but, long before that, he had been supplying regular information to libraries throughout the country on action they could take to benefit libraries through the legislative process.

In November 1945, Muriel E. Perry, Library Development Fund Executive Assistant, stated that the inauguration of the Washington office had made a new epoch in professional history. That was one of the understatements of the time, considering the office's tremendous impact now felt by all types of libraries and library users in this country. Libraries and librarians have been and are most fortunate in the leadership and effectiveness of all of ALA's Washington office directors: Paul Howard; Margie Malmberg; Julia Bennett; and Germaine Krettek, and their staffs. In his report to ALA Council last July (1966) Emerson Greenaway said that if it were not for Germaine Krettek, libraries would be wandering around Washington with a tin cup, "minus their authorizations." Few librarians who have not worked closely with the ALA Washington Office can realize how complex and demanding are the problems they handle and work on for libraries. Most of us are really aware only of the legislation that affects our own type of library directly.

In the early years of the operations of ALA's Washington Office and the Federal Relations Committee of the Governmental Relations Section of the Library Administration Division of ALA, our legislative work was carried on under a charter for the ALA Washington Office, and authorized by various Council actions upon specific matters proposed by the Federal Relations Committee.

It was inevitable and essential that a federal legislation policy be developed for the Association, within which the ALA Washington Office could take action as promptly as possible in the name of the American Library Association. Julia Bennett, then director of the Washington Office, had begun to pull together all of the various authorizations by the Association into a tentative, unified federal legislative policy and to match these with the increasingly varied number of federal programs manifestly of importance to libraries, before she left the office in 1957.

Miss Bennett was followed by Germaine Krettek in that year, and a Special Committee of Five, with Frederick H. Wagman as Chairman, developed a document called Goals for Action of the American Library Association; at the same time the Federal Relations Committee, working with Miss Krettek, developed the first formal Federal Legislative Policy of the American Library Association. Both the Goals for Action and the Federal Legislative Policy were adopted January 29, 1959, by the ALA Council. Emerson Greenaway was President of ALA at that time. He wrote in the ALA Bulletin of April 1959:

Two important and far-reaching reports, stating ALA's goals for action and its federal legislative policy, were adopted at the Association's Midwinter Meeting held in Chicago. These two statements give each member of the Association sights to set for himself and official documents that can be used to inform lay people of ALA's goals and the legislation needed to achieve them.

Goals for Action emphasizes the requirements of the individual which a library can meet, the needs of the library itself, and the continuing defense of freedom of the press and freedom to read. The importance of a vigorous public relations program is also accented. This is a platform that can be used locally, statewide, or nationally to acquaint people with the needs and standards of modern library service.

The Federal Legislative Policy Statement presents ALA's present federal legislative program, points out where further legislation is needed, and proposes new legislation. Although some of these proposals relate only indirectly to libraries, all are vital to libraries and librarians. Position statements on policies and activities of the federal government affecting its libraries and on intellectual freedom are included.⁴

It was six years before the first revision to that Federal Legislative Policy was formally adopted by the ALA Council. This occurred on January 26, 1965, after the Committee on Legislation, which by this time had become a committee of the Association itself, rather than a committee of a section of a division, had sought and obtained the opinions of the divisions and committees of ALA on the matters in the Policy most directly affecting them.

By 1965 it was realized that the rapidity of legislative developments in Washington would probably call for revisions and updating of the Association's Federal Legislative Policy every year or two, at least for a period. I can report that [because I happen to be chairman of a Committee on Legislation subcommittee to prepare the second revision] a second revision is now nearly complete, and will go to the ALA Executive Board and Council at the January 1967 Midwinter in New Orleans.

The Federal Legislative Policy, kept up to date and reflecting the major concerns, attitudes, and positions of the ALA Divisions as well as the Association as a whole, is very important to the success libraries and librarians have been having in federal legislative programs these past several years. The ALA Washington staff has in the Policy clear authorization and directives from our more than 30,000 membership, across the whole broad spectrum of federal government action, to work constantly and according to Association's Policy in all matters that affect or could affect libraries of all kinds. The responsibility for revision as needed rests with the Committee on Legislation, but the policy comes from the divisions and Association committees as to the position our representatives are to take on a wide range of subjects subsumed under "Direct Services to Libraries," "Indirect Services to Libraries," "International Programs," and "Intellectual Freedom," and the many specific legislative actions and proposals under each that affect all kinds of libraries and the educational world of which libraries are part.

The Washington Office can act swiftly as needed in any situation and with confidence that the Association backs up its position with action and support, with the Policy as its guide.

The ALA Washington Office sometimes works on educational matters only indirectly of concern to libraries. This makes it possible to multiply the strengths of librarians, and this is needed because, numerically speaking, we librarians altogether are a small group as contrasted to many other national organizations seeking legislation. It is necessary continually to secure the support of other groups and organizations whose interests are also in the public interest and which we can or do serve, and whose interests serve ours. For example, I have noted, both in Washington hearings in which I have participated and those I have only read, that the American Council on Education, American Association of Junior Colleges, American Association of University Women, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and others, have also testified and worked for our library legislation. I know, too, that Germaine Krettek meets and works regularly with the representatives in Washington of organizations that work in the public interest field, so that she and her staff and those of us who work with her can be closely informed about programs for which those others are working, and they about library programs. When their programs move, ALA moves with them to see what libraries can do to help. Some of the other organizations with which she works are the Association of Land Grant Colleges, Association of American Colleges, and the American Association for the Advancement of Education.

Another strength of our federal library legislative programs is in the appointment of ALA Division legislative liaison people, either committees or individuals in the divisions, who are the specialists in

each field of library service. They advise and assist the Committee on Legislation, which is responsible for the total legislative program of the Association. It is to the tremendous credit of our members and divisions that we have maintained unity and professionwide support of all library legislation, even though we cannot, each of us, help being more knowledgeable and concerned about measures affecting our own types of libraries individually. The overall Committee on Legislation, particularly as our program grows more complex and diversified, establishes priorities, evaluates all proposals, and all bills that are introduced, in their relation to ALA Federal Legislative Policy.

Our Washington staff must and does concentrate its efforts on what seems most essential at a particular time, taking all elements into consideration, such as the White House, the temper and composition of Congress, and the national economy, to name some.

This means working together as a total profession, evaluating the realities, whatever they are in a given year, recognizing when to compromise, when to wait, and when to fight. This is part and parcel of successful legislative programs. I am sure librarians can continue to play a significant part in federal library legislation (and provide an example for carrying on state library legislative work) if we continue to recognize the realities as they are at a given time, act, and fight hard if it is the time to fight; wait if that is the necessity, even if it means waiting on our own direct interests. We have all seen fine examples of this, for example, the position taken by school librarians as soon as the Library Services Act was passed that it should not be diluted by attempts to make it cover school library service. Soon their turn came in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and we all worked for that, including, recently, its extension for another two years. The same is true of librarians in higher education, college and university libraries.

A word more about the ALA Division legislative liaison committees. Our legislative work requires quick and reliable access to facts. These liaison people have or can gather the variety of facts that enable the Committee on Legislation, the ALA Washington Office, and those who go to Washington to testify on bills, to speak with confidence and authority, and not to be shaken or uncertain when asked a complex or antagonistic, or loaded question. These facts also, basically, help to build the basis on which priorities are established, on which proposals are evaluated, and, ultimately, they shape the Association's Federal Legislative Policy.

Looking back, we see that ALA first voted formally to seek federal aid for libraries in 1936; in 1944 it voted to establish a Washington Office, and in 1946 the first Library Demonstration Bill was introduced in Congress but not passed until 1956, as the first Library Services Act. Then came further library legislation almost

like the breakup of a logjam or ice pack, the National Defense Education Act and Elementary and Secondary Education Act benefiting school libraries, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, and their most recent extensions with increased appropriations immediately and authorizations for the future. There are other library-related laws, too, now on the books, but these are the major new ones affecting all types of libraries.

What is ahead? Have we gained everything that libraries should and must have? Obviously not; we have really just accomplished the basic legislation, the legal authorizations upon which to build a great and complete national system of libraries. Our authorizations are also for such sums of money that, if appropriated on the ascending scales authorized for the years immediately ahead, can do much toward accomplishing our goals. Authorizations, however, are not appropriations. Appropriations have to be worked for every year, authorizations only as expiration dates approach.

The basic major library legislation is now probably fixed into the federal government. It will take many years, no doubt, for all these major programs to settle down. Our major task in the next year or two is to relate these new programs to one another and make them work effectively for enriching human life.

Some of the authorizations are not for as long as we would like, so librarians will have to fight to extend them when the time comes, as well as for continuing adequate appropriations. Different committees of Congress authorize legislation than those that appropriate the funds for implementation of authorized programs. The authorizing committees—such as House Education and Labor, and Senate Labor and Public Welfare—do not like to give unlimited authorizations, thus turning the whole thing over to the appropriating committees. We shall continue to have to report back and justify what we have done to the authorizing committees, toward the expiration dates of each of the acts, and then to work for their implementing funds, before the “money” committees and the total membership of Congress.

We shall surely have to work to refine the basic legislation in the light of changing times ahead. I mentioned earlier that we work for legislation and establish priorities according to the realities as they may exist at a given time. I know of no major library legislation that may be introduced in 1967. It appears that the next Congressional session will not be one of innovation where libraries are concerned. The question is: will it be one that constructively legislates to improve and refine the broad new programs which now require assessment and adjustment? We must, of course, be alert to see that nothing is done to dismantle or make unworkable the new programs which are just getting started.

We can take some satisfaction in the kind of thing Commissioner Howe said to the Committee on Legislation in September 1966:

"Libraries are popular in Congress as libraries are back home where the people are." Again, we are working in the public interest, and this is our great strength. Here, mention should be made of the caliber of people who come to our ALA Committee on Legislation meetings: the Commissioner of Education, Assistant Secretaries of HEW, division and bureau chiefs and staffs, postal officials, copyright officials. This is one measure of the respect in which our library legislative work is held.

In the national administration there seems to be some concern about how all the library authorizations and appropriations fit together. The appointment of and charge to the new National Commission on Libraries is one strong indication. It is practically certain there will be no major new library programs until the Commission reports, in a year. All the library appropriations and authorizations together equal a great deal of money with which to reach for first-rate library services to everyone spread equitably all around the land.

No one can see all that is ahead, or what the realities will be a year or two from now. There are two sets of variables: the fiscal question including the degree of inflation, whether there will be a tax increase, and the scale of the Vietnam war; and the "complexion" of the 90th Congress as decided by the elections held today, November 8.

Assuming that refinement and adjustment of the new social programs can continue, there are a host of possibilities for adjusting the present educational-library legislation. We have heard talk of a nationwide study to assess all professional manpower needs in the country, instead of just a few professions and occupations at a time. This would be a very broad assessment of what kinds of training are needed to do what kinds of jobs, seeking to lay the basis for every job having people trained to do it, and every person trained to do a job that needs doing. We understand there will be a rather large vocational education bill in 1967, seeking to man the industries and technical jobs that our society depends on.

Thirty years have passed since ALA voted to seek federal aid for library service. More progress than could have been foreseen has been made. The money involved, and the governmental relationships involved, both call for more thought about the question, what is the federal role in education? The federal government now puts up about 6 percent of the total spent each year in education, so it cannot do everything either for education as a whole or for libraries as part of education, therefore, priorities must be set. Is the federal role to: (a) help to provide equal educational opportunity? or (b) raise the quality of education? if so, its role is demonstration and innovation; or (c) to strengthen the quality of state and local education? If the latter is its role, then the federal government should provide leverage to states and localities to insure improvement.

These are questions we as citizens as well as librarians should be concerned about. We shall certainly have to work for appropriations for our basic legislation, but we can as the American Library Association also do the very useful thing of thinking through the kinds of changes that may be needed in existing law to make it work better. For example, amending Title II of ESEA to provide staff services—is this a needed and advisable project to undertake? In Title II of the Higher Education Act, I believe there are provisions both for special grants to develop major centers of excellence, and also for supplemental grants for this purpose. Could these be consolidated or simplified?

Why, in Higher Education Act Title VI, have college librarians go through their state departments of education for audiovisual material, and also in HEA Title II require them to go direct to the U. S. Office of Education for the same purpose? Dr. Samuel Halperin, who is Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs for the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, raised these and other questions with the ALA Committee on Legislation in September. He said there are three different state plans to provide audiovisual materials, and that we as leaders should look at the effects of these programs and seek to simplify and refine them. Do we really need separate state plans for all four titles of the Library Services and Construction Act? Would administration be simplified if state plans were abandoned? Congress seems to like the state plan idea. In the Manpower Development and Training Act, the states come in with a certification of how they meet the law and how they will use the funds.

We have seen the culmination not only of ten years of intensive effort to get library legislation passed, but actually of about thirty years altogether, of building up to this point, as the history shows. We have surprised ourselves and others with the legislative accomplishments, aided, of course, by countless circumstances, such as favorable administrations and Congressional leadership. Now comes the real test of implementation and administration at is at least as important as the law. We must make the legislation we have work. We should, of course, present new needs as we see them, uninhibited by attitudes of the administration, and we must keep the Congress informed continually of what we have done, are doing, and will do with the laws and the money they have given us. It is very important to get Congressmen in to visit the libraries and new services the Congress has made possible. They must see the results, better with their own eyes than only through letters.

Dr. Halperin told us that the next two years are not wholly propitious for new programs. He suggested that we examine laws already on the books that do not even mention the word "libraries," and see what they can do for libraries. He believes that real leaders can develop programs out of numerous federal titles, so far untapped.

Not only the major library legislation that has been enacted, but the mammoth programs of social legislation in other fields that have come into being—been unleashed is maybe the word—in these same recent years all call for a mammoth money outlay. No federal administration is going to have all the resources needed to solve all the problems that have been brought to general public view. This sharpens the competition and at the same time requires broad cooperation with those of like interests. Whatever political party is in power, and no matter how much it may or may not approve our aims and objectives, our experience will increasingly be like this year's, when we had to work with the Congress to obtain more money for the Library Services and Construction Act than the White House asked either be authorized or appropriated. The Bureau of the Budget and the White House requested \$57.5 million be authorized and also appropriated for the current year. They held to their lower figure right down to the closing hours. We worked and obtained authorization for \$88 million; then we worked and obtained—not \$88 million or \$57.5 million but—\$76 million. This is an example of the way ALA will have to continue to identify library needs and fight for them, not relying only on what may be offered. We shall increasingly have to fight for funds among a host of competing interests.

To sum up, the American Library Association does not work in a vacuum legislatively, but from a long-range legislative policy which is now annually, or nearly annually, modified by changing conditions. The policy is approved by Council but it comes up from the ALA Divisions. If one program seems to be moving ahead at any given time, and others standing still, it is only temporary, awaiting the propitious political climate, or temper of Congress, or economic conditions. The Divisions are not competitive with one another, but all work together for all library interests; our Washington Office represents the whole Association, and it works with both parties, members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Following this role and working in this framework, I believe librarians can meet the tests of implementation of legislation already achieved, refine and improve it, obtain the essential fair share of funds and reach for first-rate library services to everyone, accessible to everyone, and spread equitably all around the land.

REFERENCES

1. Joeckel, Carleton B. Library Service. (U. S. Advisory Committee on Education. Staff study, no. 11.) Washington, D. C., U.S.G.P.O., 1938. Prior to publication this study was issued by the Advisory Committee in mimeographed form under the title: "Federal Relations to Libraries."

2. Munthe, Wilhelm. American Librarianship from a European Angle; an Attempt at an Evaluation of Policies and Activities. Chicago, American Library Association, 1939.
3. Chicago. University. Graduate Library School. Library Institute. Library Extension, Problems and Solutions; Papers Presented before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago, August 21-26, 1944. Edited by Carleton B. Joeckel. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1946.
4. ALA Bulletin, 53:277, April 1959.

FEDERAL AID FOR LIBRARIES—COME COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE FUTURE

Frederick H. Wagman

One of the aphorisms that has become part of our folk wisdom asserts that knowledge of the past is essential for an understanding of the present. Another, equally valid and equally bromidic, holds that anyone who would predict the future had better be perspicacious about the present. We seem to have taken the latter apothegm to heart since our society may be the most self-conscious and introspective in the history of civilization if one judges by the number of analyses of its present condition published each year. I shall not presume to essay yet another analysis of the current Zeitgeist; nevertheless, since any viable social institution must reflect its time, it seems to me advisable to identify a few of the trends that are presently exerting a powerful influence on library theory and development and on the public attitude toward libraries. That I must refer to these trends separately and seriatim is a consequence of my being a product of the linear, rational tradition that evolved, Professor McLuhan tells us, from Mr. Gutenberg's invention. Obviously, however, they are all closely interrelated.

First of all, we seem to be more aware than any previous society of the dominance of the principle of change in human affairs. So convinced are we of the need for rapid adaptation to change that the charge of resisting it immediately puts an organization or a profession on the defensive. On occasion, mere commonsense questioning of proposed adaptations to new conditions or of the efficacy of new procedures leads to the accusation of reactionary thinking, and any profession runs the risk of being downgraded by society if it relies for public approbation on its distinguished tradition of accomplishment more than on its demonstration of receptivity toward the new and modern, even when the new and modern are untested and unproven.

For a number of self-evident reasons the impression is fairly widespread that librarians are essentially conservative by nature. We do have a responsibility to preserve the human record. We have an enormous investment in standardized bibliographical tools which have been developed at high cost over many decades, which are not

Frederick H. Wagman is Director, University Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

easily adapted to individual needs and which are rather inflexible. Despite our efforts to demonstrate that we too are responsive to the need for new and imaginative thinking, new procedures, and even new organizational patterns, we do not move rapidly enough to suit some of our critical friends who would like us to advance with greater celerity toward Utopia. Various people prominent in the scientific establishment have castigated librarians in recent years because they have not yet "solved" the problems of bibliographic control over the greatly increased output of scientific information. Even the President of the United States in signing the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 on July 19 indicated that there was need for a fresh look at the library problem in terms of improved technology:

We need to ask some serious questions. . . . What part can libraries play in the Nation's rapidly developing communications and information-exchange networks? Computers and new information technology have brought us to the brink of dramatic changes in library technique. As we face this information revolution, we want to be satisfied that our funds do not preserve library practices which are already obsolete.¹

Last February the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress in its report entitled "Technology and the American Economy," published the following statement:

There is an immediate question faced by the Congress of the country regarding the extent to which traditional major libraries are appropriate for the future in competition with information centers making relatively minor use of books and other graphic materials in conventional form. For example, should substantial funds be dedicated in the future for the construction of traditional library buildings, or should they instead be used for newer types of information storage and retrieval centers.²

In large part our sharp awareness of change is a consequence of the dramatic impact of our new electronic technology upon the information transfer process. This has had the effect of making the traditional library seem, to the unsophisticated, to be an antiquated and cumbersome mechanism. We can sit at home and witness an event in a foreign country at the instant that it is taking place, or see and hear instantly a discussion between pundits in foreign countries. By contrast, if we want to read a published account of that specific event or study a published record of that discussion, the procedure we must follow is exceedingly slow and complicated, not much different in fact from that required of a learned Egyptian who used the Alexandrian Library two millenia ago. Obviously this comparison ignores the fact that the television broadcast via Telstar does not respond to the specific information need of the recipient who merely

accepts what is given. It overlooks also the enormous hidden cost of the service shared involuntarily and indirectly by millions of consumers, and it ignores the absence of any highly centralized system for the publication of information and the dissemination of publications. But it does lead to the speculation as to why libraries cannot make greater progress in employing electronic means of transferring information on demand for public use. Similarly, although the telephone is not new, just a few years ago the oral transmission of information over long distances using telephone lines was time-consuming and costly, involving thousands of people to man relay stations. Today, it is an almost completely automatic and instantaneous system involving comparatively little human labor and benefiting the user at low cost. Moreover, it is now possible to transmit documents in facsimile over the same telephone lines, albeit slowly and at considerable expense. It is easy to imagine similar electronic linkage between libraries and even between libraries and individuals in their homes and offices. To the visionaries who are unaware of the genuine need, or lack of need, for such systems and who are unconcerned with questions of financing, we seem to be moving too slowly in taking advantage of these possibilities.

Even more in the public eye relative to its possible application in libraries is the rapid advance of computer technology. The eagerness with which so many speculate about the long-range potential of the computer not only for manipulation of data but for the gross storage and the retrieval of information has led to a widespread tendency to speak of future possibilities as though they were already operational, to extravagant claims regarding current capabilities, and to an increasing impatience because libraries have not yet made significant progress toward the digital storage of their informational content. By a curious synecdoche such critics equate information service to science and technology with librarianship as a whole. When they speak of "the library," but mean only the relatively small percentage of libraries that serve scientific research, they run the risk of misleading governmental and educational administrators who are anxious to make library service more efficient and, at the same time, less costly.

Moreover, fascination with the computer has led to shortsighted depreciation by some theorists of the book and its very great virtues—its compactness, portability, ease of use, and tremendous capacity for the storage of information. One brilliant and highly influential theorist of information science predicts confidently that in the very near future all information will be stored digitally. The fact is that the computer and the book have quite different uses which are not in conflict. The assumption of an "either/or" situation is misleading nonsense. The computer can be, and is, extremely useful for the purpose of storing, updating, and manipulating alpha-numeric data in

a central place when immediate access to that data from varied and remote locations is necessary. For example, the urgent necessity of having available at a moment's notice the latest information on the newest compounds produced in scientific or industrial laboratories argues for access to an on-line computer serving a poison center, since human life may hang in the balance between speed of communication and recency of information. Where up-to-dateness of information is not as crucial, or the need for speed is marginal, we shall continue to resort to the printed book even for the sort of information recorded in handbooks and directories. The telephone company in any city could perfectly well keep all its listings in an on-line computer; key punch promptly all changes of address or number, and all additions and deletions of listings as they occur; attach a terminal facility to each telephone; and let us have the most up-to-the-minute information always available for our use of the telephone system. Eventually it may do so, but I assume that for some time to come it will be more sensible to publish directories every year in book form and provide the marginal service on changes in listings by a special information service.

It is conceivable that as the storage capacity of computers increases, and as that cost decreases, it will be feasible to store far greater quantities of information digitally than it is today. But whether it will ever make sense to store really vast quantities of information for infrequent use is questionable. Conversely, the storage in computers of extensive information that must be used with great frequency in a great variety of places would seem to be inadvisable, especially if this information must be used over any considerable length of time. Quite apart from the staggering input cost involved, such a system would chain the user to a cathode ray tube terminal or require the production of numerous, very extensive print-outs. For such use of information the flexibility, economy, ease of use, and information storage capacity of the book is still unmatched.

For the contribution that the computer can make, the library profession should look to it with high hopes. These lie in the area of data manipulation. For example, the Census Bureau, despite the endless statistical tables that it publishes after each decennial census, cannot possibly foresee every possible combination of data by region, state, county, municipality, sex, age group, level of education, race, employment status, type of employment, etc., that may be of interest to a social scientist, nor can such rearrangements always be effected from the published tables even at great inconvenience and cost. The computer offers a solution to this problem. Similarly, the voting records of all the various congressional districts in all elections in the United States over a long period of years can be assembled, key-punched, and then manipulated in a computer serving a single data bank so that combinations and comparisons can be produced on

demand in such variety as to make publication of them all impracticable. But from our point of view it is more important that the computer will rapidly become useful to the large library, and to complexes of libraries, in their basic bibliographic housekeeping; in the maintenance, if you will, of their bibliographic inventory controls, in providing information as to which publications contain any desired information, where they are available, and where they are at any given moment. The burden of routine activity in maintaining up-to-date records of library holdings, recording additions, withdrawals, transfers, relocations for binding, special use, home circulation, etc., are becoming insuperable in the large library and the advent of the on-line computer holds great promise for work simplification in this area. Furthermore, it should expedite the mechanics involved in the implementation of national indexing systems, in producing and maintaining union listings of various kinds, and in facilitating the work of providing researchers with special bibliographies on demand. If the slippery term "library automation" means anything at this stage of library development, it refers to such aspects of the complex task of providing bibliographic access to information. It would be constructive if more theorists would make this clear in their public utterances.

Another consequence of our electronic technology is the almost unconscious popular acceptance of the network principle. Libraries have, for a very long time, been loosely linked by ties of cooperation and mutual assistance and have utilized whatever means of communication have proved economically feasible. But the spread of information about the potentialities of long-distance utilization of on-line, shared time computers, the adoption of long-range telefacsimile communication systems by corporations and other institutions makes it increasingly easy to think of the libraries of the country in terms not only of cooperation but of actual interdependency.

Concomitant with this as part of the impact of the electronic development is the increasing acceptance of the idea of centralization of informational resources. The possibility of immediate electronic communications is bound to alter our thinking regarding the need for self-sufficiency of informational resources in multiple locations. The all-pervasive influence of television on our contemporary society would, in itself, affect our thinking with respect to the possibility of providing much more "information" from a central source. The high cost of television precludes the possibility of autonomous operation of local stations completely independent of the network, and the rising cost of library operations leads one to the hypothesis that, through electronic systems, libraries may also meet the needs of their users by service from a limited number of comprehensive sources.

It is apparent that this analogy between the information transfer process as represented by the television or radio networks on one

hand, and any conceivable library network on the other, also is misleading. Each user of a library has individual information needs and cannot rely on prearranged standard transmission of information as a substitute for the ability to query an informational source frequently, at varying times, for varying responses, and to receive great quantities of information. Moreover, it is not well understood that the total informational content of any television or radio program is negligible compared with the content of a book or even a journal article. Nor is the concept of a computer network as exemplified by Project MAC (in which researchers in different parts of the country store and manipulate information in a central computer at M. I. T. through linkage of telephone lines and terminals in their offices) directly applicable to a most important function of libraries; namely, to provide very extensive information repeatedly for use over long periods of time.

None of this is to deny that television and the electronic network utilizing central sources of information will prove extremely useful in library operations. My point is only that the proposition "if A, then B" is too simplistic in this case, and that the enthusiasts who are convinced that the codex and traditional library are doomed because we have overcome the problem of distance and time for some types of information transfer are premature. The tremendous possibilities inherent in electronic means of communication, in the computer, in the network model, in the idea of centralized sources of information, all are exerting and will exert very great influence on library development and operation but they will not solve all research library problems, nor are they likely within the foreseeable future to eliminate the need for many more traditional libraries of a sort that are never considered by the scientists who challenge us. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm generated by the developments of our electronic age has resulted in so much confusion that one of our smaller regional library associations recently devoted a meeting to the proposition that an electronic network should be established connecting the member institutions. The members meant by this, it turned out, that the time had come when they had to install telephones in numerous small libraries in the region which had never been able to afford them.

All of these interrelated influences in our present society would have little impact on public expectations regarding library development were it not for the very recent change in emphasis on the importance of education and the availability of information to support and help us manage almost all our activities. Education has become a national concern, information is now a national resource, and the library is quite suddenly charged with enhanced responsibilities in support of both education and research. Despite all criticism, the country at large seems quite suddenly to have accepted a thesis regarding the value of the library that our profession has advanced with

very limited success for half a century or more. The rather negligent, patronizing lip-service to the utility of the library that was commonplace a generation ago has become a searching interest in exploiting its potentialities in the public interest.

The effect of the current educational ferment and of the heightened sense of need for up-to-date pertinent information as a basis not only for research but for the management of all our affairs, has assisted us in persuading the federal government that not only the libraries of educational institutions, but the public libraries as well, have a significant role in shaping our society. The Congress has already authorized and appropriated very considerable sums for the increase of book and journal collections, the construction of library buildings, the training of librarians, and for research into library techniques and methodology. We have been assured of sympathetic attention by the federal government to our needs in almost every area of library concern.

If the quotations I read earlier reflect even moderate dissatisfaction with the extent to which librarianship has utilized contemporary technology to improve its procedures and services, if future technological developments are going to produce even sharper questions from the small percentage of people in the scientific establishment who are dissatisfied with current library practice, and if this attitude is likely to become more widespread and threaten the very favorable position that libraries now hold in public esteem, we had better assume an attitude that is reasonable rather than irritated or defensive, that reflects an understanding of current potentialities and is receptive to experimentation. First of all, however, we must make it clear to the uninitiated that when our critics among the administrators of science question the viability of the traditional library, they are not thinking of the school library, the public library, the college library, or even three-fourths of the university library, but only of very special libraries and of those parts of the general research libraries that are concerned with service to scientific and technological research. When they speak of information they refer usually to facts, to data, that are subject to measurement and manipulation, to expression through numerical or other symbols, to information that might better be transmitted between one person and another by means of symbolic representation rather than by language which introduces confusions of connotation and of style of expression. They usually are not talking of the overwhelming body of the published record which expresses theory, impression, emotion, insight, and idea, and which is not quite the same when it is paraphrased or summarized. Nor are they in the least concerned with the library as a humane, cultural institution. When they question the value of investing in traditional libraries they are in much the position of an engineer who would argue for diverting all funds for the improvement of roads to

experimentation with vehicles that substitute "levipads" and compressed air for the wheel.

Librarianship, like all Gual, if I may paraphrase both Verner Clapp and Julius Caesar, is divided into three parts: bibliographic access, physical access, and administrative arrangements. The knottiest problems of bibliographic access are of concern primarily to the research libraries, but the difficulties of physical access affect all libraries, the small even more than the large. The most troublesome of these difficulties of physical access is also the most obvious, and the solution is the least gratifying to the granters of funds because it is essentially a "more of the same thing" type of solution. I refer to the inadequacy of book and journal collections and of buildings in which to house and serve them, and to the scarcity of trained personnel to provide library service. Provision of funds to ameliorate these difficulties is the heart of the legislative program to help libraries and for a long time to come it will be the most effective part.

Neither the computer, nor any available LDX system, nor dependence on other libraries for publications, can substitute for an adequate collection and space in which to use it in any libraries other than a small number of information centers providing service to special groups on relatively limited quantities of data. The fact that we have made these needs our highest priority, along with the training of more librarians, and that current library legislation tries to provide for these deficiencies, testifies to our common sense and to that of the Congress.

This does not mean that the network principle cannot be useful in improving physical access, that planning within a metropolitan area or within a state is not necessary, or that such planning cannot extend the resources available to an individual library. Any confusion that may arise about this is a consequence of equating "adequacy" with "self-sufficiency." The establishment of local, state, regional, and national networks for the sharing of resources and bibliographical competence obviously will compel us to qualify our definition of "adequacy," to rethink the question of the extent and nature of resources needed by local libraries, and to reconsider what groups of users they should attempt to serve. But with respect to physical access to published information there is no magic in the network concept. It is useful chiefly in making more generally available the relatively less-used, more marginal publications which the individual libraries cannot afford and should not duplicate. Moreover, there is nothing intrinsic in any publication that places it in either the "basic" or "marginal" category other than frequency or extent of demand for it and this is very subject to change with the growth of the population, the elevation of the educational level of our people, the establishment of new industries and research enterprises, and the founding of new colleges or the expansion of existing ones. Despite the establishment

of cooperative networks, for a long time to come these tendencies will compel us to expand and increase basic local collections of books, journals, and other publications that are used with frequency and for lengthy periods of time. If a community college library needs seven copies of a popular book as required reading for a large number of students and has only three it is in no position to lend them to citizens of the same community because the local public library lacks a copy. On the other hand, if someone in that same city needs a little-used foreign doctoral dissertation available only at remote university libraries or at the Library of Congress he should have rapid access to it. This is a childishly obvious illustration but our fascination with the network concept makes us so conscious of the need for better systems to serve the latter purpose that we are apt to overlook the crucial importance of continuing to develop adequate local library collections to serve the former.

With the changing nature of instruction not only at the college but even the high school level, adequacy is certain to mean much more extensive collections both in the libraries of educational institutions and in public libraries that increasingly are called on to serve students at all levels. At the university level the concept of adequacy is certain to imply larger and more diversified collections of publications as new research programs are undertaken, as colleges and universities develop new graduate programs, and as interest grows in parts of the world which are poorly represented in the collections of our libraries. In short, long before technology is likely to help us to reduce the size of our libraries, or even to replace some of them through service from central sources, many new libraries will have to be established and those already in existence will have to grow rapidly. And to assist in this very necessary development federal aid will continue to be essential for a long time to come.

In our efforts to rationalize and improve physical access to publications through the establishment of cooperative arrangements, it seems to me that the significant problem we contend with is not the failure to employ technology more successfully but the absence of cooperative agreements between libraries of different types who find that willy-nilly they are now sharing service responsibilities with other libraries that had been expected to provide for them in the past. This is often less the fault of librarians than of the educators and administrators to whom they are responsible. Thus the public librarian finds himself trying to meet the book needs of high school students whose teachers neither conferred with the high school librarian nor with their principal regarding the new requirements their courses would impose upon the high school library. Both public and university libraries are asked to assist with library service to the students of junior colleges whose libraries are inadequate, and both are called upon increasingly to give special service to industry in or

near their areas without provision being made for staffing or budget to accommodate such services. It is convenience of access, we learned long ago, that determines which libraries will be used. In many communities, tremendous improvements might be effected if the librarians of the several institutions, the teachers, the educational administrators, and the governmental officials concerned would get together to determine the most efficient method of providing and funding library services where experience indicates that they will be called for, regardless of political jurisdiction or source of financing. Experience indicates that librarians must take the lead in demanding such joint consideration of their problems but the possibility of federal financial support for the development of new patterns and administrative arrangements should provide both stimulus and aid.

The effort to solve the problem created by the breakdown of strict lines between service demands on school, public, college, university, and special libraries will probably in some cases lead to the combination of formerly discrete libraries. To cite an example—in Flint, Michigan, both the Junior College and the Flint branch of the University of Michigan are served by a single library administered by the Flint Board of Education through the Director of the Public Library. Both the city of Flint and the University of Michigan provide the support for this library, and its director is advised by a committee comprising representatives of both institutions. The building was planned from the outset for such joint use and it is conveniently located for both institutions which share a single campus. Similarly, we all know of small communities in which the high school and public libraries are combined in one institution and manage to serve both publics more efficiently perhaps than two separate libraries could manage to do even with increased support. More often than not, however, as the population grows, as more accelerated courses are offered in the schools, as the independent study technique is more widely adopted in the schools and colleges, it will be necessary to provide for much greater duplication of frequently used materials in existing libraries.

As regards the university research libraries, the situation is much the same. It is folly to hope that within the foreseeable future improved methods of communication will reverse the trend toward giantism. They may slow the process but so will improved arrangements for handling interlibrary loans and for copying publications using existing equipment. The enthusiasts of the electronic age overlook the delays inherent in the process of identifying the publications needed, recalling them if they are in use, fetching them to the camera, preparing them for mailing or taking them to the telefacsimile transmitter. Too often the bibliographic searching involved is the most time-consuming and expensive factor. All services of this type and all costs involved are a charge against the library providing them

and, invariably, efficiency of interlibrary loan service can be achieved only at the cost of impairing local service. If interlibrary loan, and photocopying or telefacsimile services as a substitute for interlibrary loan, are to become a truly significant means of inhibiting the tendency of most university libraries to acquire more and more publications which are likely to be used only seldom, considerable support will be required from sources with broader responsibilities than university administrations, specifically state and federal governments.

If we are to plan a truly efficient national research library network, moreover, we shall have to assign more responsibility to the national libraries and even to new resource centers for insuring physical access to publications. The voluntary assumption of national responsibility by the research libraries, under the Farmington Plan, for assuring the availability in this country of all monographs of research value published anywhere was magnanimous and forward-looking, but the research libraries have lacked the acquisitions and cataloging resources to make the program truly effective. In part, the Farmington Plan has been replaced by the acquisitions and cataloging programs authorized under the Dingell Amendment to Public Law 480, utilizing the superbly efficient agency of the Library of Congress. In the national interest, this program with some modifications should be extended to many more areas of the world where acquisitions are difficult, whether or not counterpart funds are available. Beyond this, it is clear that the availability of a publication at one of the national libraries, or even at a few university libraries, is not necessarily enough to insure prompt access to it by researchers in all parts of the country. It will become more and more evident that to avoid the consequences of input overload at the national libraries we may have to establish additional national centers where little-used publications are available on demand. No research library can be or tries to be completely self-sufficient. Every one of them presently maintains large but fragmentary collections in certain categories that are seldom used and that they could discard if they could depend on national resource centers for prompt physical access to such publications when they are needed, to resource centers whose highest priority is to give precisely such a national or regional loan or copying service. The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago has now invited national membership and is steadily broadening its acquisitions to strive for comprehensiveness of holdings in an increasing number of such categories of publications. It would be very much in order for this Center to expand its program more rapidly with federal support. In the long run it might be advisable to make the Center for Research Libraries a national library or a branch of the Library of Congress.

One of the most pressing problems of physical access to published information is inherent in the effort to provide library service

to business, industry, and the professions. It is now commonplace for industrial firms to establish research branches in large university centers where they presumably can have access to expertise through consultation with faculty specialists and by consulting the published record of research in the university's libraries. In a number of instances large metropolitan libraries which maintain research collections find themselves called upon to serve industry located outside the boundaries of the political jurisdiction which provides their financial support. Even the largest industries or hospitals cannot maintain special libraries adequate for all their needs and are becoming increasingly dependent on the research libraries in their vicinity. Additionally, the growth and change of knowledge in many of the professional specializations compels the professional practitioner, the physician, the attorney, the engineer, to consult research libraries with increasing frequency. Until quite recently such service has been marginal and the large public and university libraries have assumed it without regard to its effect on their other obligations. In some localities the demand for library assistance of this type has reached such proportion as to require the strengthening of collections, special staffing, and subsidized copying service. Under existing federal legislation, financing can be provided for experimentation with new patterns of library cooperation to accommodate this need. One such experiment is under way in Detroit, managed by the Detroit Public and Wayne State University Libraries and supported by a grant from the Office of Education. It seems apparent that in the long run continued financing of such library service will have to be provided by the states, assisted by the federal government. The State Technical Services Act of 1965 may point the way to a solution for this problem.

Before we leave the topic of physical access to publications I must mention one of our most pressing problems—the threat that a very large part of the published human record will soon be lost through the deterioration of books published since 1870. Any rescue operation in this area of concern will be so massive and costly as to preclude the possibility of its being undertaken without federal aid. This is likely to be a very fruitful area for exploration in the application of contemporary technology (optics) to library problems. Conceivably it may be possible through photography at high reduction ratios and the production of positive copies in rather large editions not only to preserve a very great many of the publications that are already close to extinction but to make them available in microform at a very low per page cost. In this way several hundred university and college libraries might acquire excellent research collections which would occupy very little space. The Council on Library Resources, Inc., has been pursuing this line of investigation for some years. Eventually, however, even if the technical difficulties are overcome it may be necessary to look to the federal government for

support of a national undertaking to produce microform masters of the vast numbers of books already crumbling in our stacks.

I think I have made my conviction clear that in the provision of physical access to information, much as the work of our libraries may be aided by new cooperative service arrangements, statewide or regional systems, national resource centers, and even, eventually, by electronic networks, we shall be dependent for a long time upon strong local library collections. This conviction is supported by a recent survey of research library resources in Michigan conducted by the firm of Charles Nelson Associates. Their report, which is soon to be published, concludes that although some needs definitely can be met by interlibrary cooperation, nevertheless it will still be necessary to strengthen the individual Michigan college and university library collections to meet current demands.

When we turn to the question of bibliographic access, however, it seems to me equally clear that the key to improvement lies in the principle of national centralization and standardization, with federal support. After half a century of only partial acquiescence to this concept, the federal government has given us very heartening assurance in the past few years that it accepts responsibility for the development of central, indispensable bibliographic services. Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which will enable the Library of Congress to centralize cataloging for all libraries, is a pertinent example. So is the current effort of COSATI to develop a plan for a centralized and coordinated national system of indexing for all journal literature, extending the admirable work already performed by the National Library of Medicine and the National Library of Agriculture to the entire range of human knowledge. Additional examples are offered by the abstracting and indexing services of the Library of Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The list of such central national services will eventually include, I hope, a World List of Serials, preferably in machine readable form.

Undertakings of such complexity and magnitude require financing that can never be provided by the beneficiary libraries, but the library profession can contribute expertise in solving the complex problems of standardized indexing, in planning the national systems yet to be developed, and in recruiting and training personnel to man them.

I have already mentioned that in the area of improving bibliographical access to information, in bibliographical record-making and record-keeping, the computer is certain to be essential. But here, as in centralized cataloging, national standards and guidance from a central source are necessary to prevent a very great waste of resources and talent in individual, local experimentation. It would seem that the rapid implementation of the Library of Congress'

program to introduce "machine methods" into all the bibliographic work it carries on in its own behalf, as well as in behalf of other libraries, should be regarded as one of the highest priorities in the federal effort to assist the research libraries of the nation.

The problem of providing adequate bibliographic access to information cannot be solved entirely by centrally operated and financed national systems. There will undoubtedly have to be subsidiary systems helping libraries within states or regions serve their clientele in this respect if the national systems are not to break down because of input overload. Here too, as mentioned earlier, there is an emerging pattern of federal aid.

The MEDLARS Project in which the National Library of Medicine is supporting regional centers, based on existing medical libraries, to provide improved bibliographic access to current research information in the health sciences is the most striking illustration of a new pattern of centralized, federally-supported production of an extraordinary bibliographical resource plus federal assistance to regional library centers in making the benefits of this resource widely available. If this imaginative project succeeds, as it must, it should serve as a prototype for other similar undertakings in which the federal government and the research libraries of the country co-operate in surmounting age-old obstacles to rapid and efficient bibliographical access to vital information.

Neither improved bibliographic nor physical access to information will be possible without the mediation of skilled people, and here I think we face one of the most difficult problems, for the solution of which continued and increased federal aid will be necessary. Current experiments involving the use of computers for the retrieval of information by subject in response to specific inquiry seem to indicate that it will be a long time before we can dispense with the services of very highly trained specialists to mediate between the inquirer and the computer programmer. Moreover, it is apparent that library training today is not geared to the special needs of all types of libraries or of specialized activities within libraries and it is time that we examined our needs critically and not in deference to a priori concepts regarding either the length of the training period necessary or the validity of a core curriculum for all librarians.

To understand our present situation it might be helpful to imagine how the health sciences would fare if they offered a fairly standard course of short duration as formal training for everyone engaged in nursing, laboratory analysis, clinical medicine, hospital administration, and public health service. Librarianship as a whole is not one but many professions or specializations and our recent efforts to analyze the need for change in formal library training may be laggard because we have been trying to deal with it as a whole rather than by analyzing the needs of the various specializations within it. We are

more likely to attract our fair share of the talented young people who desire professional careers when we end both our own and popular confusion as to the various professions in the broad field of librarianship. Beyond this we shall have to provide rewards for specialization commensurate with the training required and competitive with other professions. Finally, we must be enabled to compete with other professions in the provision of fellowships to encourage able young men and women to enter the various fields of librarianship. For this as well as for the resources to strengthen and expand our library schools we shall have to look increasingly to the federal government for support.

Closely related to the problem of training for librarianship is the field of library research. Too often, alas, it is popularly assumed that the great need here is exclusively in the area of application of technological developments to library processes—but there are vast areas of ignorance about much more fundamental aspects of our work. Nor is this necessarily a consequence of the fact that librarians are not research-minded, as is sometimes assumed. Even the largest libraries find it difficult to set aside funds for research to improve their own operations. There are very few research professorships at library schools, and the total research time available to the relatively small number of faculty at all our library schools is not impressive. Additionally, we have so few candidates for advanced degrees that the collective contribution offered by their doctoral research is not of major consequence. Without question we must depend on the library schools for much more significant studies, whether they combine their talents and resources to establish statewide library research centers, as in California, or undertake major projects on their own. If the institutions which support library schools cannot staff them adequately to carry on the research needed, it would be a very worthwhile investment for the federal government to provide the necessary support, not only for specific undertakings but for the continuing maintenance of research staffs able to devote time and talent to the many investigations that can make librarianship more of a science than it now can claim to be. Nor would it be amiss if the national libraries all were enabled to establish their own centers for library research.

We have come a long way since 1946 when an Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives questioned whether the Library of Congress was indeed a national library and had responsibilities to any constituency other than the federal government. In the last few years the Congress has provided a legislative framework for support of our efforts in all the broad categories of librarianship. Most recently the President has appointed a National Commission to help us make the most of that legislation in meeting national needs. Never before have we had such opportunity to make our libraries as

useful as we know they can be. We are not likely to succeed by waiting for technology to offer us a philosopher's stone nor by expecting more of new cooperative systems than they can offer. But if we are alert to the possibilities that technology and new organizational patterns can offer, if we are sensitive to the changing needs of our society, if we can exercise critical judgment regarding our techniques and procedures, if we can plan together to overcome the limitations imposed by jurisdictional separatism and outworn service patterns, we can not only make the most of the federal assistance currently offered but insure its continuance in the national interest.

REFERENCES

1. "President Signs LSCA," Washington Newsletter, 18:1-2, July 21, 1966.
2. National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Technology and the American Economy. Appendix, Vol. 1, "The Outlook for Technologied Change and Employment." Washington, D. C., U.S.G.P.O., 1966, p. 239.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 071033366