

THE WHITE HOUSE
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Minutes of Meeting

Corrected and Approved

Session: Second

Date: January 7, 1967

Place: Orleans Room, Roosevelt Hotel
New Orleans, Louisiana

National Advisory Commission on Libraries
Minutes of Meeting

January 7, 1967

The Commission was convened for its second meeting at 10:00 a. m. on Saturday, January 7, in the Orleans Room, Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana. Dr. Douglas M. Knight, Chairman, presided.

Commission members present were:

Dr. Estelle Brodman
Dr. Launor F. Carter
Mr. Verner W. Clapp
Mr. Carl Elliott
Dr. Alvin Eurich
Dr. Herman H. Fussler
Dr. Caryl P. Haskins
Dr. William N. Hubbard, Jr.
Dr. Douglas M. Knight (Chairman)
Dr. Carl F. J. Overhage
Dr. Wilbur L. Schramm
Mrs. George Rodney Wallace
Dr. Stephen J. Wright

Absent was:

Dr. Harry H. Ransom

Also present were:

Mr. Melville J. Ruggles, Executive Director,
National Advisory Commission on Libraries
Dr. Daniel J. Reed, Deputy Director, National
Advisory Commission on Libraries
Mr. Roger V. Mosely, Reporter

I. Minutes of Preceeding Meeting.

The Chairman called the meeting to order and asked for corrections to the minutes of the preceeding meeting or for approval thereof. Upon the recommendation of Dr. Hubbard, the minutes were corrected on page 12, last paragraph, to read: "the practitioner is not interested in the hierarchal pattern" instead of "the researcher is not interested in". Upon the recommendation of Mr. Clapp, the minutes were corrected on page 9, first paragraph, to read: "a report on libraries prepared in 1876 by the U. S. Office of Education" instead of "a Presidential report prepared in 1964". The minutes were then approved as corrected. The Chairman reminded all members of the Commission that minutes are always subject to correction in matters of fact, even after approval.

II. Additional Members.

The Chairman reported that the President's staff at the White House had under consideration the names of a number of additional possible members of the Commission, including nominees of the Commission itself, and that he, the Chairman, awaited news of the President's selections. The Chairman continued that, with regret, he must report the resignation from the Commission of Mr. Theodore Waller.

III. Defining the Commission's Work.

The Chairman directed the attention of the members to a further definition of the principal problems, and a discussion of techniques available for exploring them. He suggested that perhaps panels, sub-committees or experts on particular problems would be useful to the Commission. He expressed his hope that the Commission would, after it had established major categories on the one hand and procedures on the other, find a way of relating the major problems to available solutions. A "pairing" of problem and solution must be sought. Several members concurred and added that the approach should, however, be three-dimensional, that the pairing of problems and solutions (two dimensions) should be seen in a time perspective (a third dimension). They suggested that frequently the solution of one problem leads to new problems or at least to a new environment which produces, if not new problems, new situations for institutions such as libraries.

The discussion made it clear that the Commission is limited only by the limits of its imagination. It was agreed that it must conceive of

both its problems and its solutions as dynamic rather than static.

Dr. Carter asked about the implications for the traditional library in the development of radical new technology in the field of communications. The development of such things as educational television and communications satellites will, one would think, have an impact on library procedures. Perhaps paperbacks or quick single-copy photocopies will take the place of the traditional format of materials.

Dr. Wright listed five problems that the Commission should consider seriously for inclusion in our final report:

- 1) the problem of access to libraries on the part of the people of this country;
- 2) the impact of modern technology on the libraries;
- 3) the "explosion of knowledge" and the difficulties libraries have in coping with it;
- 4) the identification of those dynamic forces in our society which are now affecting and will in the future affect libraries in a serious way;
- 5) the provision of sufficient money to solve the problems facing libraries and to insure that they will meet the needs of the nation for a generation to come.

The Chairman added that the Commission must not forget its mandate to review the expenditures of the Federal Government on behalf of libraries.

Dr. Eurich suggested that the Commission has a whole spectrum of library problems ranging from the masses of our citizens who lack access to any kind of library service worth the name to the elite of scholars and scientists who are overwhelmed by the mass of published information and are concerned with managing it. He concluded that the Commission has before it completely different kinds of problems at the two ends of this spectrum. The Chairman added: Yet we may be able to create accessibility for the masses by the same highly sophisticated machinery that one now uses to retrieve the most esoteric kind of knowledge.

Mr. Clapp described the same spectrum in a slightly different way. At one end is the problem of information affluence, or glut, facing the specialists in fields like science and technology; at the other end is the dearth of library materials and facilities mentioned by Dr. Eurich.

Mr. Clapp added another color to the spectrum, namely, the peculiar fact that many libraries hold a vast amount of information that is never, or seldom, used. Should we not seek to have the dormant resources of libraries better used when they might be helpful or needed?

Dr. Fussler and others then discussed the technical abilities now available or in prospect to meet many problems facing libraries but questioned whether or not society is willing to meet the considerable costs entailed. Society should inevitably compare the costs of the radical new facilities with the costs of conventional means of dealing with library materials and services. Mention is also made of the use that society might make of the apparatus which is now possible in the management of vast stores of information. It was suggested that some of the citizenry would not really be capable of, or interested in, coping with sophisticated computers and other apparatus. It was also suggested that some of the materials might not deserve such elaborate and expensive equipment. Dr. Overhage, however, contended that the Commission should concentrate on providing access to recorded knowledge and should not concern itself with the possible use or abuse made of the machinery under discussion. The Chairman reminded the Commission that this was a very important matter for its consideration and asked if it was not time to undertake a specialized study as an appendix to be used in the Commission's final report. Should not this special study take up two things: First, what is really being invested in libraries at the moment? And, secondly, what is predictably feasible for the future?

Dr. Burich referred again to the many levels of library service which the Commission must review. The levels are:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1) The pre-school child | 2) The elementary school child |
| 3) The secondary school child | 4) The college and university student |
| 5) The college and university faculty | 6) The general adult population |
| 7) Specialized researchers in industry and government requiring "special libraries". | |

We should analyze, he continued, the economics of each of these levels of library service separately and entirely in order to reach a clear picture of how far we can go with each segment of the population for which we are trying to provide service.

Dr. Fussler added that there are at least two additional dimensions to the problem of library economics. One is the analysis of the costs to the user seeking access to information in a large sophisticated library. Two is the "institutional cost" to the provider, or retailer, of library service. Seconding earlier remarks by Mr. Clapp, he too feels very strongly that there is a potential accessibility to information in libraries that has not been fully exploited. This is in part because too much is required of the user to obtain the information he needs. There is, moreover, an appalling lack of knowledge in our society about the value of information contained in our libraries. Obviously, we have no idea how great a change in our society and economy might result from the full and efficient use of the information stored in the nation's libraries. Admittedly, this would be very difficult to determine but it is very important in an economic analysis and a balancing of costs against returns in the nation's libraries.

Mrs. Wallace seconded these remarks with special reference to the potential of public and school libraries, provided they were given adequate financial support.

The Chairman summarized the discussion of library economics with the conclusion that any special report of the subject made for the Commission and appended to the Commission's report ought to be sufficiently sophisticated to take into account the subtle, hidden costs as well as the obvious costs.

This led the Chairman to turn to a discussion of the nature of the Commission's final report. He asked the members if the report should not assume the form of a fairly brief general statement of perhaps thirty, fifty or sixty pages to which would be appended a number of longer, special studies--really solid pieces of work done by outstanding experts. Dr. Carter, however, asked several fundamental questions about the general concept of the Commission's work and the report to follow. In particular, he asked what kind of study we are going to have done for the Commission. Is it to amass new information, summarize existing information, state philosophical positions, or attempt something else?

The Chairman and several members continued a discussion devoted to the sources of an enormous demand for library services of some kinds and at certain levels as opposed to the failure of demand for other kinds of library services at other levels. What are the conditions which tend to limit the efficiency and the effectiveness of those who are now seeking

information in libraries? There was some concern expressed for the person who approaches a library, especially a research library, and finds that it requires too much effort and time on his part to use it, and he retreats from it immediately. How does a study find this user? How many such users are there? And why do they retreat? What would this user do if the library he approached were a quite different thing? It was suggested that a study of this problem would be extremely difficult, lengthy, and complicated, so much so that it is one of those matters which the Commission should commend to its successors for further investigation.

At this point, Dr. Wright expressed his wish for a table of contents or an agenda which would in some way order the many topics which the Commission members have discussed in a random fashion at the first and second meetings. The Chairman answered that a table of contents would be very desirable but up to this point the discussions had been, as it were, sinking shafts, sampling a wide area in order to determine just how many topics there might be, how complex they might be and which ones deserve the special attention of the Commission. Dr. Hubbard answered further that the Commission had already seen at least three tables of contents followed in the course of which Dr. Brodman submitted the following outline with the suggestion that other members of the Commission might fill it out:

1. Present status of libraries, broken down by types, by users, by services, budgets, controls, and any other facets which seem pertinent.
2. Uses to which libraries are put.
3. Needs of society for:
 - a. information transfer in general
 - b. inspiration and recreation
 - c. learning

and the place of libraries in satisfying these needs now and in the next 20 years.

4. Needs of libraries to satisfy these needs:
 - a. resources
 - b. budgets
 - c. personnel

5. Possible relationship of various elements of society in bringing about library goals, such as public vs. private sector, federal vs. state and local governments, commercial vs. educational groups, etc.
6. Motivation for and education in use of libraries and their services in the future, if steps to ideal situations are taken.

Mr. Elliott suggested that the Commission agenda or table of contents should be thought of in three parts: 1. What does the nation need? 2. Is it possible to get it? 3. Can we or are we likely to afford it? Mr. Clapp suggested that we could take a table of contents directly from the executive order which created the Commission. Dr. Overhage and some other members urged that we think not simply of what the nation needs as one single goal but that we think more dynamically of several goals on which we can advance at various cost levels. In this way we might present a picture that would grow with time and with availability of money. Mr. Elliott insisted that the country could afford to spend more on libraries than it is now doing.

Mr. Clapp then expressed concern on two counts. First, how do you limit the scope of something so immense as the Commission's assignment? And, two, or second, for whom are we writing this report? His latter question brought forth several answers. The Chairman replied that we are writing it for the President of the United States. Mrs. Wallace replied that we are writing it for the people as represented by the President. Mr. Elliott replied that we are writing it in effect for the representatives of the people, for the Congress of the United States, where the record will be for some years the basis for Congressional action toward the improvement of library services in the country. To be sure, it will go to the President, but he will refer it immediately to Congress. As a result, Mr. Elliott insisted that we do not write for technical groups, for research librarians or any other special interest groups. He urged the Commission to have a report written as a basis for legislative action. He recommended strongly that the report be brief, simple, and understandable.

The Chairman noted that this definition reinforced the opinion expressed earlier by several Commission members that the report be brief, clear, simple, yet eloquent and that it be reinforced with an appended series of special reports written at length and with great thoroughness by experts. The report should also be of interest to state legislatures and foundations,

who would especially like to see the nation's library needs projected, along with the capabilities to meet these needs. Some attention must be paid to the possibilities of new technologies and some estimate of the cost of various steps required to attain the eventual goal. Mrs. Wallace added that the report must include recommendations for legislation.

Dr. Hubbard led an exchange of views about the great range of library users, from pre-school child to advanced researcher, who must concern the Commission. The Chairman concluded that the Commission has to think of an array of library functions and therefore of structures because the Commission is talking about several main audiences and the modes of information which they require. Dr. Eurich explained that when the Commission is considering a pre-school problem, for example, it is dealing with a completely different kind of problem, to be solved by entirely different materials, facilities, and equipment, than is the case when dealing with the researcher's problem.

Dr. Carter reminded the group that they had not included a statement of basic propositions, or fundamental assumptions, that one has about the nation's libraries and their responsibility to the citizenry. He continued with a recommendation that the Commission set down these fundamental propositions insofar as it endorses them. These could stand, as the ultimate goals chosen by the Commission. Once these are stated then the means to achieve them would follow logically. Dr. Carter recommended for the Commission's consideration the set of propositions at the opening of the COSATI report. Some members agreed that there should be no confusion between basic propositions, or assumptions, which relate really to goals on the one hand and to functions on the other. Dr. Fussler explained that assumptions suggest functions, and functions imply instrumentalities. The Chairman added that we might even identify certain postulates for which there are no instrumentalities or functions. As an example, Dr. Overhage recommended to the attention of the Commission the American Library Association's publication entitled Public Library Service (1956). He thought it an instructive model.

Drs. Haskins and Carter added that if we could set down the nation's library needs in one column, and the available instrumentalities in another, wherein these two columns do not coincide would be an indication of needs remaining unmet. Both agreed that the needs of the people are met with a series of instrumentalities such as the library, the classroom and even television. The Chairman concluded the morning session with a summation.

IV. Summation.

He suggested that the members had been in the course of the morning discussing essentially four things:

1. The question of postulates. What does society need and in what order of priority? These should be set forth, it was agreed, with a broad brush, that is, precise yet boldly and in large terms.

2. A description of present library situations to be used as a benchmark. This should include some account of facilities and abilities available, along with agencies now responding to the nation's library needs.

3. By comparing what is desirable with what is available at the present, we arrive at a difference which is, in large measure, the goal to be set forth by the Commission to be achieved in the next twenty years.

4. Recommendations for action, the listing of obligations of government at various levels and of private agencies including universities, schools foundations and the like.

The Chairman concluded: the task before the Commission is to point out the route from the basic postulates to a set of concrete, practical recommendations for the present and the future.

Mr. Elliott added that the Commission must eventually concern itself with the question of whether or not there is to be a continuing commission on libraries succeeding this temporary body.

The meeting adjourned for lunch with the famous and appropriate Hippocratic dictum on therapy cited here by Dr. Hubbard: "In the first instance, do no harm".

The Commission adjourned for lunch at 12:10 p. m.

Lunch

The Commission reconvened in the afternoon. The afternoon discussions were devoted, almost exclusively, to two large subjects: first, methods of procedure for the Commission; and second, the nature of the report to result from the Commission's work.

Procedure

Special Studies

On procedure, the first topic mentioned was "special studies to be conducted by experts for the use of the Commission." This led to a question from the Chairman about funds that might be available from the Office of Education for the purpose of contracting with experts for the required studies. Mr. Ruggles agreed to inquire and to report to the Chairman as early as possible and to the Commission at its next meeting. At this point, Dr. Schramm asked two questions about the use of experts: Should not the Commission first identify and define the "various problem issues" before the Commission and then assign these to experts? Second, should not the Commission have these experts appear before it early in their work with their plan, or prospectus, of what they intend to do with their assignment? This, he explained, would assure the Commission that the experts would proceed on the correct course to the goal which the Commission has in mind.

Later in the afternoon it became clear that the following studies were already in sight:

1. the impact of technology on libraries;
2. new library organizations or supra-library organizations, such as "networks";
3. the present situation in the nation's libraries measured against the postulated goals set forth by the Commission;
4. access, in the various ways it was defined and described at the first meeting.

The discussion of studies and the engaging of experts led quite naturally to a consideration of certain specific and well-qualified

individuals. The Chairman concluded this discussion by asking the members to send immediately to the staff the names of six or eight experts which the individual member recommends to the Commission. A final selected list would then be drawn up.

Hearings

Mr. Elliott led the Commission in a full discussion of hearings it should hold. He recommended that approximately fifty witnesses, experts, representatives of groups, and citizens in general be called to "testify" before the Commission. While the members agreed with Mr. Elliott in principle, many of them thought that hearing the testimony of fifty witnesses was beyond the capacity of the Commission. In reply, Mr. Elliott suggested that the Commission divide into "subcommittees" for this purpose, or perhaps sit through a solid week of hearings. As this part of the deliberations ended, there seemed to be agreement that twenty-five witnesses would probably be too few and fifty would probably be too many for the Commission to hear. The general agreement was that the exact figure would be left to the Chairman to determine, after further experience with this procedure.

All the members agreed with Mr. Elliott and Mr. Clapp that care would be required in the selection of witnesses. It was understood that the Commission will invite those known to be essential to its work and that these would be selected by a complex process, involving members of the Commission, the Chairman, and the Staff. Other witnesses can be expected to offer to testify. Some of these will be welcome and some will not be, but all would be asked to submit in advance written statements of their views, which would then be screened and evaluated. The Commission would decide further whether to have the author of the statement appear or to let the paper suffice as representative of his views. If the volunteer witnesses have nothing to add to what the selected witnesses presented earlier, there would be no reason to hear them. The consensus was that this technique would serve as an excellent screen and protection for the Commission. All agreed that those to appear before the Commission must submit a short written statement, approximately two weeks in advance of their interview. The witness would not read his statement to the Commission, but be questioned by the Commission freely and extensively.

Dr. Fussler urged the Commission to include as witnesses some very important and prominent thinkers, members of government

and of the professions, in order to ensure a wide representation of views and interests. Dr. Brodman supported the wisdom of this by insisting that libraries are too important to be left to the librarians alone. A wide variety of views, it was agreed, must have an opportunity to be heard by the Commission.

The Chairman warned against leading some groups into taking a position on the record too early in the Commission's deliberations. Such groups might later feel unable to abandon or shift their position easily. The Chairman returned to the suggestion previously made by himself and Mr. Elliott that the Commission divide itself into committees as the only way to cope with the large number of interviews which it must hold in the months ahead. Mr. Elliott warned that the Commission will hear many of the same things repeated, but we must remember that to the persons appearing before the Commission their testimony is not redundant. To them it is stated for the first time and it is extremely important. He reminded the Commission that repetition is not necessarily something to be avoided since it may indicate very often those issues on which social pressure is greatest.

The Chairman added that the Commission should hear from not only the best traditional representatives of the field but also spokesmen for the unusual, the novel, the unrepresentative and the radical.

Mr. Elliott recommended that the Commission hold as many of its hearings as possible in Washington because it is the seat of government and because it has excellent press coverage. He stressed the importance of a good press not only for the present but also for the future of our recommendations. A good press will greatly enhance the likelihood that the Commission's work will have a worthwhile influence on Congress and the Nation. In concurring with Mr. Elliott, the Chairman asked the staff to ensure the efficient machinery and good relations with the press necessary to have the work of the Commission known across the country.

The Chairman then asked if the Commission would like to divide into committees at this time in order to handle the work of future meetings. He assured members that their preferences for assignment to certain committees would be respected whenever possible. He explained further that it was his plan to have the committees of the Commission reassemble once or twice each day while in session, probably at the end of their hearings, in order to bring one another abreast of their separate accomplishments. No final decision was made on this question.

In the course of the afternoon's conversation about procedure, Mr. Clapp reminded the members that libraries are full of information on the proceedings and experience of other commissions--British, Canadian and American--working in similiar situations. He suggested that their work might help the Commission. In quite another vein, he suggested that members of the Commission could be called upon, as individuals, to make formal statements to the Commission and to be questioned as witnesses.

The Nature of the Report

The Author

The second major subject treated in the afternoon meeting was the nature of the report to result from the Commission's work. Mr. Elliott, at one point, urged the Commission to hire promptly a professional writer who should be immediately and thoroughly immersed in its work and set to writing the text of the report at an early date. However, the Chairman preferred to defer this matter awhile in order to see how the Commission envisages the report in another month or six weeks. He suggested further that he might want to have a hand in writing the report himself, with the assistance of his staff. He repeated what he had said several times before, namely, that he had in mind a report which in essence would be short and eloquent, addressed to the President of the United States, the people and their representatives in Congress, particularly for the eventual use of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (This is "where the action is!") The Chairman agreed with suggestions that the report should be prefaced with a letter of transmittal and followed by several longer, thorough, expert studies of various major aspects of the library problem. These would stand as appendices to the report, possibly in a separate volume or volumes. After some discussion, it was agreed that the final report must be officially addressed, in the first instance, to the President's Committee on Libraries, which was created simultaneously with the Commission. Nevertheless, the report would still be addressed, in fact, to the President, the people, and the Congress.

Dr. Hubbard voiced his wish that the report be not excessively compartmentalized but that it indicate progression from the past, through the present, into the future, and that it suggest the evolutionary development of a dynamic library community in a dynamic society.

In a number of contexts the subject of "basic postulates" recurred. Drs. Carter, Haskins, Schramm and Overhage insisted that a definition of these postulates or needs of our society, is the first essential item of business. Against these postulates the Commission could measure the past, the present, and expectations for the future of the American library community. Dr. Schramm requested the staff to list for the review of the Commission as many of these postulates as possible. The Chairman repeated the request he had made several times for each member of the Commission to send to the staff immediately his own list of suggested postulates. It was understood that the staff would combine as many of these as it received, supply as many others as it could from its own contemplation and combine them into one list.

Some Historical Background of the Commission

During the afternoon, while discussing another matter, Mr. Clapp related a piece of the Commission's history. He told how the White House in January 1961, and again in July 1962, discussed the creation of a National Commission on Libraries. At that time, there were many in the Executive Mansion who had high hopes for such a Commission and its role in American life. But President Kennedy's assassination interrupted the hopes and plans of those interested in the Commission, and, after a time, it was believed by interested groups that there would be no such Commission in the foreseeable future. The idea seemed to be abandoned. However, between that time and 1966, a great deal of legislation regarding libraries was passed by the Congress. This was noted in the White House, and, as we now know, the President appointed the present temporary Advisory Commission.

Adjournment

After discussing a number of details about the Commission's schedule for the following day, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p. m.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes and attachments are accurate and complete.



Douglas M. Knight
Chairman, National Advisory
Commission on Libraries

Corrected and approved by
the Commission at its third
meeting on February 13, 1967,
in Room 3065, South Building,
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Melville J. Ruggles
Executive Director
National Advisory Commission on Libraries

Appendix A

STATEMENT OF THE ARL LIAISON COMMITTEE TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

presented to the National Commission at
New Orleans on January 8, 1967.

INTRODUCTION

The Association of Research Libraries, representing 80 of the largest university, federal and public libraries of North America, welcomes the opportunity to present its views to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries with respect to the areas that should be of major concern to the Commission. It is assumed that the Commission does not wish a catalogue of every conceivable problem but rather an identification of the principal obstacles to success in making information readily available to the research community.

Librarians are not complacent about the present state of research libraries. On the contrary, they are acutely aware of shortcomings in existing methods of operation and are keenly desirous of finding more effective ways of serving users. At the same time, it seems fair to state that many people have done a disservice to the entire research community by oversimplifying the library problem, usually in the form of fanciful solutions involving computer technology. As a result of effective but limited applications already achieved, librarians are convinced that the computer will play an increasing role in research libraries; it appears equally clear that this role initially and for many years will be one of rationalizing, integrating, and speeding the response of the bibliographical apparatus. The intellectual content of large, encyclopedic research libraries is not likely to be reducible to a small black box or a desk drawer for many years, if ever, and therefore the traditional book will continue to be a reality with which we must deal.

Although the problems of research libraries are prodigious, much has been done in the last few years to bring greater understanding of, and the beginnings toward solutions for, these problems. The very existence of the National Commission is both symbolically and pragmatically of immense significance in a field that has been too largely neglected by the Federal Government.

PROBLEMS

I. Functionally, the first problem of research libraries is to acquire all necessary publications and other materials of value to scholars. We have heard much about the information explosion, and indeed there is no question about the acceleration of publication in traditional as well as in newly established centers of activity now extending from Ghana to Uzbekistan. But it is not the mere existence of this productivity that creates the library problem. There is a matching demand for information from the industrial community, from federally sponsored contract research centers, and from universities, both those newly established and those extending the range and intensity of graduate programs. The ARL Liaison Committee believes that the Farmington concept is no longer adequate. The Farmington Plan has, for years, attempted to bring into the country at least one copy of each publication of research significance. This responsibility has been shared by spreading the burden over dozens of libraries, each building strength in a delimited area. The time has come to recognize that the demands for information have reached a scale both in time and space that requires a more immediate response by the research library to its community. This means that publications must be more widely available and that the single-copy-within-the-nation theory has lost much of its validity, although there will continue to be materials in such infrequent demand that one or a few copies may suffice. With these factors in mind, one of the concerns of the National Commission might be stated thus:

What can be done to obtain materials in adequate numbers of copies in order that they may be reasonably available throughout the nation?

II. If research libraries can obtain the required materials, the next problem becomes the organization and control of these materials in order that a given item may be identified and expeditiously obtained. This seemingly simple proposition has numerous ramifications and complexities. It is in this area that libraries are most severely criticized -- and properly so. Libraries cover

monographic literature with limited but fairly effective methods. The vast and increasingly important array of serial and technical report literature is only marginally controlled. It is the suggestion of the ARL Liaison Committee that four areas of concern under the rubric of "bibliographical control" and "accessibility" are worthy of attention.

A. Automation

It is already evident that computer technology can free libraries of some of the crippling limitations of manual methods in administrative and bibliographic operations. Subject indexing can be applied in greater depth to a much wider spectrum of materials, and its terminology can break out of the fossilizing manual techniques that thwart flexibility and the application of new meanings and terminology to changed concepts. Perhaps most important of all, the way is opening to integration of controls now desperately fragmented. The need to search through multiple volumes of a published periodical index can be reduced to a single search, just as it should be possible to merge into a unified system, a multiplicity of indexing and abstracting services and library approaches to certain types of publications. More efficient access by the individual user, including remote access to the unified bibliographical record, can hardly result in anything but increased efficiency and greater demand.

B. Organization of Bibliographical Effort

Just as the system of access needs to be integrated and rationalized, so does the structure that creates the subject indexing and abstracting of publications. To achieve maximum usefulness of the bibliographical information generated by individual libraries and the agencies that contribute to the fund of bibliographical control,

certain standards must be established and followed, and a rationalized division of labor must be set up. This means a forceful central agency to direct and coordinate and probably to assist in funding a decentralized but coordinated system with, in all probability, a strong center of gravity such as the Library of Congress has provided for decades. While such a center will provide the largest single contribution to the totality of bibliographical control, many significant contributions will be made by individual libraries, by learned societies, and by indexing and abstracting services.

C. Communication of Bibliographic Information

Rapid access to the fruits of centrally organized bibliographical information will be of prime importance. It remains to be seen whether this will be best achieved by a single central repository tapped by long-line communication, by regional depositories, or by the maintenance of the complete bibliographical record in individual research libraries.

D. Access to Intellectual Content

It is the conviction of the ARL Liaison Committee that dissemination of the intellectual content identified by the bibliographical system will continue to be of prime concern. For many years, even for decades, the traditional book will probably be the basic vehicle for holding and transmitting knowledge. In consideration of this factor and in recognition of the mounting demand for information, it seems logical to conclude that a major problem will be the transmission of information from the conventional printed page. We reiterate our conviction that the Farmington concept is valid to a diminishing body of material and that there must be a much wider dissemination and availability of copies of a work. At the same time there will be certain classes of material that can be less generally available, and one or more regional or national agencies specializing in the collection and dissemination of such materials should be considered in order to lighten the burden imposed on individual research libraries.

III. Support

The ARL Liaison Committee believes categorically that it is beyond the financial capability of the nation's research libraries as presently funded, or of their parent institutions, either singly or in concert, to achieve the kind of incremental improvement implied in this statement. Information must be recognized as a national asset and resources of prime importance, and Federal support must be brought to bear on the research library problem in a greater degree than heretofore.

If the matter of Federal support were simply a case of dispensing money to libraries, it would be relatively simple. It is not. There is a widespread conviction that a permanent Federal body is needed to give continuing attention to research library problems, to provide orderly, long-range planning, and to give effective guidance to Federal support as it may take the form of grants or services. By extension, this proposition is meant to convey that it is highly essential that Federal agencies, library or otherwise, that contribute to the solution of the problems enumerated herein should be so organized as to work toward established goals and not at cross-purposes. This assumption pre-supposes:

- A. A study of Federal agencies and their placement within the Government, their place in the national information picture, possible overlapping of missions, the integration of effort toward desired goals, budgetary support, grant-making power, desirable re-alignments and redefinition of missions.
- B. Weighing the effectiveness of existing legislation to assess its effectiveness and the need for amending existing statutes or advocating additional legislation.
- C. Determining the extent to which, and the methods by which, non-governmental organizations or instrumentalities may contribute to the solution of problems.
- D. Deciding the need for direct financial assistance to individual libraries.

IV Contingent and Subsidiary Problems

The above enumeration attempts to identify major problems, but the solution to such problems rests on the success with which certain subsidiary problems are attacked. Without exhausting the list, it is appropriate to take note of the serious absence of an instrumentality to deal systematically with research into the problems of research libraries. It is also apparent that such libraries to an increasing degree have need of specialized personnel. The intelligent and timely provision of linguistic, subject and technical talent may control the speed and effectiveness with which the research library problem is mastered.

Respectfully submitted:

Douglas W. Bryant, Harvard University
Warren J. Haas, University of Pennsylvania
James Skipper, Association of Research
Libraries
Frederick Wagman, University of Michigan
Stanley West, University of Florida
Rutherford Rogers, Stanford University,
Chairman.

RDR/eea

Appendix B

CONLIS

(Committee on National Library-Information Systems)

The Notes of Mr. Gordon Williams
Used in His Report of January 8, 1967
to the
National Advisory Commission on Libraries

Ad Hoc Joint Committee on National Library-Information Systems

Medical Library Association--Estelle Brodman
Association of Research Libraries--James Skipper
Special Libraries Association--William Budington
Law Library Association--William Murphy
Council of National Library Associations--B. N. Woods
American Documentation Association--Lawrence Heilprin
American Library Association--Gordon Williams

To: Propose a National Library-Information System and to represent the above associations in presenting this to appropriate federal and other agencies.

Written report is not yet completed, but main points in outline are:

1. It is in the national interest to assure that our citizens, scientists, engineers and researchers have ready access to any published information.
 - a. By national interest we mean that the nation, as a whole, and its citizens individually benefit.
2. Individuals must rely on libraries to provide most publications they need; they cannot buy all of them for themselves.
3. Even every library cannot afford everything.
4. The only system that can is one that will make it possible for every library to have ready access to what it cannot provide itself.
 - a. This requires bibliographic access in every library to the world's significant literature and thus access to the information material, as publications.
5. Such a system can only be arrived at by national planning and coordination to assure such coverage without gaps or unnecessary duplication.

6. Because it is in the national interest, the Federal Government should assure the existence of the system; no other organization is large enough and equally well represents our interests.
7. The first requirement, therefore, is the establishment of a national agency with responsibility to assure the existence of such a system, filling in and supporting private and other sectors as N.C.L.