

THE WHITE HOUSE
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Minutes of Meeting

Corrected and Approved

Session: Seventh

Date: June 25 and 26, 1967

Place: Rosewood Suite
San Francisco Hilton Hotel
201 Mason Street
San Francisco, California

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Minutes of Meeting

June 25-26, 1967

The Commission convened for its seventh meeting at 10:15 a. m. , on Sunday, June 25, in the San Francisco Hilton Hotel, San Francisco, California. Dr. Douglas M. Knight, Chairman, presided.

Commission Members present were:

Dr. Estelle Brodman
Dr. Frederick H. Burkhardt
Dr. Launor F. Carter
Mr. Verner W. Clapp
Dr. Alvin C. Eurich
Mrs. Mildred P. Frary
Dr. Herman H. Fussler
Mrs. Marian G. Gallagher
Mr. Emerson Greenaway
Dr. Caryl P. Haskins
Dr. Douglas M. Knight (Chairman)
Mr. Dan M. Lacy
Mrs. Merlin M. Moore
Dr. Carl F. J. Overhage
Dr. Wilbur L. Schramm
Mrs. George Rodney Wallace
Dr. Stephen J. Wright

Absent were:

Mr. Carl Elliott
Dr. William N. Hubbard, Jr.
Dr. Harry H. Ransom

Also present were:

Mr. Melville J. Ruggles, Executive Director
Dr. Daniel J. Reed, Deputy Director

Others:

Mrs. Marlene Morrisey
Précis Writer

Dr. Frederick Wagman, Director
University of Michigan Libraries
Observer

Luncheon Guests: June 26, 1967

Miss Maryann Reynolds
Librarian
Washington State Library

Miss Lucile Nix
Library Consultant
Georgia State Department of Education
Public Library Unit (Library Extension Service)

Mrs. Carma Leigh
Librarian
California State Library

Executive Session

Dr. Reed reported that Mrs. Marlene Morrisey, whose report on the Commission's meeting in the Library of Congress has been filed, has been asked to prepare reports on this and the remaining meetings of the Commission. She is an experienced conference staff officer and has written reports on a variety of technical and professional meetings, including many library conferences. The minutes of earlier meetings of the Commission are still in preparation; some require further editing and others have to be compiled from the tapes. The staff is giving attention to this as rapidly as possible together with their other pressing duties.

Mr. Ruggles reported on results of a recent poll on available dates for future meetings. After discussion the following schedule was agreed upon:

September 7 and 8, 1967 (Thursday and Friday) -
Washington, D. C. (A cordial invitation from Mrs. Gallagher to meet in Seattle has had to be declined.)

October 9, 10, 11, 1967 (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday) -
Durham, North Carolina
(Three days scheduled, at Dr. Reed's suggestion, so that members could arrange to be present for at least two of these days)

November 27 and 28, 1967 (Monday and Tuesday) -
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Knight indicated that a draft of part of the Commission's report would be reviewed at the September sessions, with continued discussion of the content of the full report. It may be desirable also at that time to discuss plans for the report with Messrs. Cole, Knox, and Keeney. In October the Commission will review a draft of the full report, excluding the special studies, which are to be appendices to the report. In November after revision of the draft as a result of October discussions, the final copy of the 60-page report should be ready for approval.

Although it is uncertain yet when the Commission's report might be released, Dr. Knight felt the Commission should aim toward a December 31 deadline. It may be possible to arrange for a ceremonial presentation of the report to the President, although the initial presentation will, of course, be to the President's Committee (Secretary of HEW, Secretary of Agriculture, Director of Office of Science and Technology, Director of National Science Foundation, and the Librarian of Congress).

There was discussion about method of duplication of the Commission's report; some reports of this type are printed by Government Printing Office; others are multilithed. The Commission could submit a good final typed manuscript. The reproduction and distribution of that manuscript is then the concern of the President's Committee and the White House.

The possibility of a December meeting the week of the 18th or 19th was mentioned, or perhaps a meeting between December 27 and 29 in Texas, or a January meeting after the New Year.

Budget matters were reported on by Mr. Ruggles, who brought the welcome news that the budget, with slight revisions, that the staff had submitted had been approved. This will make it possible to have needed additional staff and to have more leeway in planning for the various requirements during the next six months. Plans can now go forward for the regional hearings Mrs. Moore and Mr. Elliott have proposed and the Commission has approved. From the original request of \$110,000, a total of \$97,600 has been granted.

Mr. Ruggles explained that these funds will permit the Commission to employ additional needed staff -- an editor to assist in handling the mass of data coming to the Commission and to work on the Commission's report; an assistant editor to aid in this work and to work on the minutes of previous meetings; an additional secretary and an additional stenographer. The budget includes \$6,000 for travel by Commission staff, which is probably more than will be needed, and \$9,300 for travel in connection with the regional hearings. A liberal sum has been allowed for stenographic services; \$6,000 has been allotted for printing of the report. The amount of money available for stenographic services for regional hearings will

be less than the \$5,000 estimated, and some of the travel for these meetings will have to be curtailed. Some of the longer trips -- such as meetings in Anchorage and Honolulu -- may have to be eliminated.

Regional meetings have been suggested for Louisville, Kentucky; Helena, Montana; Manchester, New Hampshire; Bismarck, North Dakota; Portland, Oregon; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Houston, Texas; Madison, Wisconsin.

Mrs. Moore indicated that it would be preferable to have fewer hearings and have staff available to report on them rather than to have additional hearings without staff. Mr. Lacy mentioned that Commission members could, of course, not be expected to get to all of these places. Also inasmuch as regional hearings will need to take place between July 15 and September 15, it may not be possible to have so many of them.

Mrs. Moore reminded members that they had indicated earlier that they would be willing to commit themselves to at least two hearings each. She will send to members information about the dates and places for regional hearings after arrangements are firmed up, and members can then indicate those they can attend. Mrs. Moore and Mr. Elliott were designated by Dr. Knight as the administrators of this special program; they will make final arrangements and communicate directly with Commission members. Mr. Ruggles explained final commitments cannot be made until the appropriation is available.

Returning to the matter of staffing, Dr. Knight reported on the possible availability of a very able, experienced technical editor, and was authorized by the Commission to proceed with the effort to employ her. It was the consensus that because of the demand for competent editors, she should have no difficulty in finding another position upon the termination of this project. Mr. Lacy indicated that he would be glad to see a resumé of her background.

Upon motion of Mr. Greenaway, seconded by Mrs. Wallace, the Chairman and Executive Director were empowered to work out the necessary budget allotments and other budget and staffing details.

Mr. Ruggles reported that contractual negotiations have now been completed for 17 special studies. The caliber of the principal investigators and their staffs is uniformly high, and despite the short deadline (completion dates vary, but all are scheduled to be completed by the first week in October), good results are anticipated.

Dr. Eurich reported briefly on a 2-day meeting of the group studying library buildings and facilities. This study group was inclined to consider that Xerox had made the greatest major development affecting library operations in recent years. The group considered transmission of full text by computers to be fairly slow in coming, and indicated that at this time it would be easier to make predictions for 30 years hence than for ten years ahead.

The time limitations under which the Commission is working and the diversity of the studies and the contractors engaged for them led Dr. Fussler to suggest that the Commission as a whole review the reports on these special studies as they come in before they are incorporated on appendices to the final report. The Commission has a responsibility, he pointed out, to make sure that findings are sound and to decide whether the reports from the special studies should be incorporated in full or appear at all in connection with the Commission's official report.

Dr. Knight agreed that the Commission must review these and be able to assure the quality of these appendices. Dr. Wright mentioned the heavy volume of material coming to members; it would be helpful if abstracts of the studies could be prepared and distributed. Dr. Carter felt it would be strongly in the Commission's interest for members to read each of these reports in full and subject them to critical analysis. They should be made available in draft at the earliest possible time. Dr. Fussler agreed that review of the reports has to be carried forward as a fairly formal process. Mrs. Frary told of some of the problems that have developed in some of the studies; it is important for the Commission members to give attention to these at an early stage. Mr. Ruggles explained that several studies involve committees other than Commission members; in addition, members of the Commission have agreed to take some responsibility for monitoring the various studies. Mr. Ruggles then read the preferences for such assignments resulting from a poll of the members.

After further indication by several members of preferred assignments or their willingness to work in any assigned area, Messrs. Fussler, Wright, and Greenaway were asked by Dr. Knight to rework the monitoring assignments for the special studies in accordance with this discussion and in cooperation with Messrs. Ruggles and Reed.

At a later point in the meeting, therefore, Dr. Fussler reported the results of these reassignments. There were a few later modifications. The list of special studies and the monitoring teams follows:

<u>Subject of Special Study</u>	<u>Commission Monitoring Team</u>
(1) Impact of Social Change on Libraries	Dr. Haskins, Chairman Dr. Wright Dr. Eurich Dr. Schramm
(2) Library Economics	Mr. Lacy, Chairman Mrs. Moore Mr. Greenaway
(3) The Federal Government and Libraries	Dr. Hubbard Mr. Lacy Mr. Elliott
(4) Manpower for Libraries	Dr. Brodman, Chairman Mrs. Gallagher Dr. Schramm
(5) Library Statistics	Dr. Carter, Chairman Dr. Brodman Dr. Burkhardt
(6) Inter-Library Cooperation and Networks	Dr. Overhage, Chairman Mr. Clapp Dr. Fussler
(7) Use of Libraries	Dr. Schramm, Chairman Mr. Greenaway Dr. Wright Mrs. Frary

- | | |
|---|---|
| (8) The Public Library | Mr. Greenaway, Chairman
Mrs. Wallace
Mrs. Frary
Mr. Elliott |
| (9) State Libraries and Agencies | Mrs. Moore, Chairman
Dr. Burkhardt
Mr. Elliott
Mr. Greenaway |
| (10) Junior College and
College Libraries | Mr. Clapp, Chairman
Dr. Wright
Mrs. Gallagher |
| (11) School Libraries | Mrs. Frary, Chairman
Mrs. Moore
Mrs. Wallace
Mr. Greenaway |
| (12) Research Libraries | Dr. Haskins, Chairman
Dr. Hubbard
Mr. Clapp
Dr. Eurich |
| (13) Library Buildings and
Facilities | Dr. Fussler, Chairman
Dr. Eurich
Mrs. Wallace
Dr. Wright |
| (14) Technology and Libraries | Dr. Brodman, Chairman
Dr. Burkhardt
Dr. Fussler
Dr. Overhage |
| (15) Libraries and Industry | Dr. Carter, Chairman
Dr. Haskins
Mr. Clapp |
| (16) Special Libraries | Dr. Overhage, Chairman
Mrs. Gallagher
Dr. Hubbard |
| (17) Extra-Library Information
Dissemination Systems | Mr. Lacy, Chairman
Dr. Hubbard
Dr. Carter |

Dr. Fussler indicated that members who wish to volunteer to be associated with additional monitoring groups may do so, and that chairmen may add other members. This report on assignments was accepted by the Commission.

Dr. Knight emphasized that monitoring teams would have a responsibility to make certain that contractors understand that the Commission will be evaluating their reports to determine whether or not they are acceptable. Dr. Burkhardt mentioned that it may be desirable to extract specific parts from a report and include these in the Commission's final report. Dr. Knight stressed the need to strive to get as high quality work from the contracted studies as possible.

The monitoring teams will have responsibility for guiding discussion and review by the Commission of the special studies. Commission staff should also participate in this overall review.

The monitors should make the contractors fully aware of the fact that interested Commission members are overseeing the studies. The monitors should make certain that the scope of individual studies is what the Commission desires it to be; they should make certain that contractors meet the terms of the contract and deliver the product the Commission expects. Copies of the contracts will be sent to the appropriate monitoring groups, which should review the contracts and then arrange to meet soon with the individual contractors. The monitors will read the first drafts of the study reports, suggest needed changes to the contractor, and review again if necessary. The final reports from contractors will then be distributed to all members of the Commission for review and discussion, with designated monitoring teams leading the discussion of the particular reports.

In response to an inquiry about control over independent publication of contractors' reports, it was indicated that the Commission staff would review the contracts on this point. Dr. Fussler urged that every legal effort be made to prevent independent publication by contractors.

Dr. Knight explained that a major consideration at this executive session is the range of principal topics that should be touched upon or dealt with in some detail in the final report.

The outline of major topics distributed to members was prepared as a preliminary list for purposes of discussion. The outline includes topics suggested in earlier discussion as being of major concern; it is not to be interpreted as a final list of topics or as a recommended order of arrangement of topics. Dr. Reed emphasized that this list was prepared solely as a basis for discussion and further analysis by the Commission as it deals with the question of what the 60-page report should include. The topics are not to be regarded as binding. There are others that could be added, and there may be some here that the Commission will want to delete. At an earlier discussion, Dr. Hubbard had made a plea for the treatment of a few subjects very profoundly. This raised a basic question as to whether the 60-page report should deal in depth with a few topics or say a little about many items. Mr. Greenaway concurred in having a few subjects thoroughly discussed, with a listing of other topics which a continuing commission should study. The report should point up the most critical library problems facing the nation even though solutions cannot always be proposed without longer study. Mrs. Moore emphasized the importance of strengthening State libraries -- in her view this is absolutely essential if we are to develop a sound library program in this country. Dr. Wright mentioned that the final report must be responsive to the areas included in the President's directive, and others later agreed with this view. Mr. Lacy suggested it might be worthwhile to think in terms of questions the report should attempt to answer -- such questions as: Should the Federal Government make a substantially larger appropriation of funds to support library education? Should such support continue to be at the Master's degree level or should there be more support at the Baccalaureate level?

Dr. Brodman reminded the Commission that there are a number of substantive issues still to be debated. For example, there has not yet been real discussion of the value of State libraries and the possible alternative patterns of structuring library services at the State and local levels. Dr. Carter agreed that these fundamental issues need full discussion before one can determine the conclusions to be stated in a final report.

Dr. Reed mentioned the postulates set down by some members, including Dr. Brodman, earlier. These could be stated early in the report, perhaps, followed by discussion of broad topical areas. Other questions that need to be dealt with

include: Are the resources currently spent on libraries being expended in the best way possible? If we conclude that there really is a shortage of manpower, why does this situation exist? Is education of librarians the fundamental problem? Dr. Overhage expressed concern about the preoccupation with getting Federal support for the education of librarians -- is the Commission really going to recommend this? What is it going to say about the Library of Congress and its role? These are hard questions on which there are variances of opinion. The decisions as to what to recommend in the report are going to be tough decisions to make.

Dr. Brodman referred to the rather frequent adverse comments about the present structure of the Office of Education. There should be more discussion of this; some are not agreed that the present structure is wrong. If we feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility to provide library service to every individual, do we want to say that taxes should be increased to assure this? Mr. Greenaway mentioned that a decrease in what is being spent on the military could take care of this. Dr. Brodman repeated that definite positions have to be taken on these questions, and to do this there must be more opportunity for full discussion of the pros and cons on these substantive questions. Perhaps a list of topics could be drawn up and scheduled for solid discussion with the Commission expert in a particular area taking the lead in the discussion. Dr. Wright urged that alternatives be considered fully before the content of the report is decided.

Dr. Knight agreed, but added that there has been some discussion of a number of issues, although we have not yet come to firm conclusions on every issues or to the ultimate majority-minority opinions. It is important, he explained, to feel free to express ourselves in the final report even without consensus. Full consensus is not the ultimate objective. There may have to be majority-minority opinions, and this can be so stated when it is the situation. This is much better than softening the entire report and the recommendations. A first step now, Dr. Knight suggested, is a review of the draft list of topics. From this review we can develop a list of questions that we want to ask -- such as the question about State libraries and the matter of an information network -- is the latter really the best way to invest 100 million dollars? Dr. Brodman referred to a list of issues she submitted

earlier; some of these problems must be faced. Dr. Knight remarked that one of the principal points learned through the testimony to which the Commission has devoted much time is how very few people have faced the hard questions. There has been no intention, however, to avoid facing these questions within the Commission. This is the reason for the development of the draft list of topics, which can help us determine which areas must have further attention for inclusion in the report and which perhaps need not be covered or mentioned only as problems requiring further study. The Commission will have accomplished a good deal if it can identify the half dozen most critical problems, indicate whether solutions are possible now, whether there is a need for more information about some of them, whether certain conclusions can be agreed upon, and whether there are sharp divisions of opinion on some questions. It was agreed that tomorrow's session would proceed along this line.

Dr. Knight asked for the Commission's suggestions on his address before the opening session of the American Library Association this evening. Dr. Knight outlined some of the principal points he planned to include: The meaning for libraries of the technical possibilities of the future; the enormous problems faced through the various kinds of user demands; the unspecialized user and the individual human being who needs information; the demands in the library resulting from the new interactions of knowledge that have not been worked out before -- anthropology for instance now ranges from a knowledge of art to a knowledge of anatomy; the rare but important questing mind that must have access to many varieties of information (Teilhard de Chardin is an example of such a user); the eccentric human being, such as Joshua Slocum (the first man to sail around the world alone ; he navigated by an alarm clock and use of the stars, and he took with him a distinguished library of 500 books); the need for some new types of librarians who will help us to regard libraries as positive centers for information, knowledge, and wisdom, and who will stress the dynamic function of libraries, which should not be regarded merely as storage centers of books; the ALA's responsibility to help to resolve the problems facing libraries in this technical age, including the education of librarians.

Commission members suggested that the address also bring out something about the Commission's view of these problems and the range of studies for which it has contracted. The point should be emphasized that there are many purposes for which

people go to the library -- extraction of information aided by technical measures is only one purpose. The Commission's view that the individual reader is important should also be underscored.

Dr. Carter explained arrangements for Commission members and staff to visit the System Development Corporation in Santa Monica on June 27 where they will see a time-sharing system, BOLD displays, large medical data bases, and the questioning by machine of other data banks of textual information. There was brief discussion of the fact that the development of hardware has progressed faster than software; there are some real problems in getting good programming; automated retrieval of information requires certain structuring of the data base, and this means that the questions have to be anticipated in advance. SDC has done some advanced work on the problem of storing material in one way and retrieving it in another.

Dr. Knight referred to the list of persons from whom the Commission indicated earlier it would like to hear. Time limitations require us to reduce this list considerably. Perhaps a few members could discuss library problems with some of these people at luncheon meetings in Washington. There was agreement that it would be desirable if the Commission could have the benefit of the ideas of Messrs. Cole, Keeney, Knox, Weisner, Licklider, Nichols, Sullivan, Houle, Orlan, and Louis Wright. Mr. Lacy suggested that time could be saved by writing some of these people and asking their view on specific questions. Dr. Knight indicated that this might be very useful in some instances, but some of these people should also be invited to meet briefly with a few members. Any other ideas concerning this should be submitted to Mr. Ruggles or Dr. Reed.

On Monday, June 26, 1967 at 9:45 a.m. the Commission reconvened at the Sheraton-Hilton Hotel.

Mr. Ruggles presented a proposal now before the Congress for establishment in the Library of Congress of a commission to study for a 3-year period the copyright problems involved in the use of copyrighted works in educational institutions, information storage and retrieval systems, broadcasting, and scholarly research. Dr. Carter mentioned similar problems with patents. Dr. Overhage referred to the conclusion of the EDUCOM Task Force on the

Copyright Revision Bill that copyright is not a suitable device for protection of computer programs. Patents, that group felt, would be more suitable, Mr. Ruggles read the assignment to the proposed "National Commission on Uses of Copyrighted Works for Education, Scholarship, and Research." "The purpose of the Commission is to study and recommend methods by which they are fairly entitled for such uses or of the exclusive rights necessary to insure that remuneration." The fields to be considered include the reproduction and use of copyrighted material in information storage and retrieval systems, performance and displays by means of broadcasting, other forms of transmission, and various forms of facsimile reproduction.

Commission members agreed that this area merited serious attention. Mr. Ruggles called attention to the possible need for the Commission to take a position on copyright; if more information is required for this purpose, the Commission staff should know. It was decided earlier that a special study was not needed on this subject because of the current availability of a good deal of information. Mr. Clapp suggested that the Advisory Commission's report might simply indicate in positive terms that library work should avail itself as fully as possible of the newer technologies, perhaps without going into the question of royalty payments to inventors of those devices or whether use of copyrighted materials for educational and research use should be free of royalties. Dr. Overhage suggested that the EDUCOM Task Force's report on this subject be recognized without plunging fully into it. The Commission has no choice, he felt, but to recognize that copyright revision is one of its appropriate concerns. The House Judiciary Committee report on this matter will also be distributed. The Register of Copyright's original report on copyright legislation would also be useful if the staff could distribute copies of it.

Dr. Burkhardt added that although the National Advisory Commission on Libraries cannot work out the technical issues, it can state the library's requirements for use of the access to materials, and explain that whatever patent and copyright system develops must provide for the libraries' special requirements.

Dr. Knight returned to consideration of the draft list of major topics and to identification of matters to be discussed in the Commission's final report.

There were a number of favorable comments on the comprehensive list of topics the Commission staff drew together from earlier discussions and suggestions from members, and a few suggestion for expansion of some categories were made. Mrs. Moore felt that the treatment of various types of libraries (research, State, public, etc.) should be as full as the outline indicated for "Libraries and Industry." Dr. Overhage questioned how much the report should go into library management matters-- perhaps these are outside the scope of the Commission's assignment. Also some of the items under "Libraries and Industry"-- such as "The new publisher -- Time-Life, Xerox, University Microfilms" may be outside the purview of this Commission. How much is it necessary to say about library buildings and facilities? Other ideas advanced in connection with the list of major topics were: p. 1, II. C., add "information regarding location of material"; p. 2, III. A., add costs to user -- human costs; IV. B., include also Federal Clearing House, NASA, Patent Office, AEC, DDC; IV. A., add State libraries and agencies as a separate category; IV. C., new addition, Location, Role, and Structure of a Federal Program; V. indicate the kind of person needed to administer the library of the future; p. 3, VI. A. 1., change "bibliographic control" to "bibliographic access"; include "In physical access, information storage and retrieval; p. 4, VII., add "F." Various bases for networks"; cover standardization, compatibility, decentralization vs. centralization, make it clear that "Resources" means "library materials."

Continuing the discussion of issues to be brought out in the main body of the report, Dr. Fussler suggested that it would be useful if the group could decide whether the report is to be problem oriented (in which case problems would be identified and solutions proposed where possible) or whether the report should take a broad functional approach, dealing with needs of users and how they can best be met, or, as a third alternative, whether the report should take an institutional approach and be concerned primarily with the needs of institutions for staff, money, space. If we followed the draft list of major topics, we would likely end up with a textbook of information about a variety of matters, and this may not be our real goal.

Mr. Clapp referred to the President's directive to the Commission. The following is quoted from the September 2, 1966 statement by the President: ". . . We need to ask serious questions about the future of our libraries: What part can libraries play

in the development of our communications and information-exchange network? 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? . . .

"I have asked the Commission to appraise the role and adequacy of our libraries, now and in the future, as sources for scholarly research, as centers for the distribution of knowledge, and as links in our nation's rapidly evolving communications networks.

"I have also asked the Commission to evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private organizations-- and to recommend actions which might be taken by public and private groups to ensure an effective, efficient library system for the nation. . . "

And from the Executive Order establishing the President's Committee on Libraries and the National Advisory Commission on Libraries; "The Commission shall transmit to the Committee its independent analysis, evaluation, and recommendations with respect to all matters assigned . . . for study and recommendations The Commission shall: (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 and efficiently 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.

"The Commission shall submit its final report and recommendations to the Committee no later than one year after the date of its first meeting and shall make such interim reports as it deems appropriate for improving the utilization of library resources. . . ."

These broad directives -- the role and adequacy of libraries as sources for scholarly research and their adequacy as links in the communications network, the effect of public and private institutions on effective utilization of libraries, the efficient use of funds for the construction and support of libraries and library services, and recommendations for action -- could be chapter headings in the Commission's report, Mr. Clapp explained. The real task is evaluative writing, rather than preparation of an encyclopedia on library and information-handling matters. The report, in his view, should identify the critical problems and respond to these with the Commission's conclusions, with supporting evidence.

Mrs. Frary hoped the report could voice the view that every citizen has a right to have access to information. If this is the case, then the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that this is possible.

Dr. Knight recalled for the group the fact that the Commission has proceeded on the basis of the proposition that at every level there needs to be some attack on the problems of access and availability of information and materials. We do not want to modify the current emphasis, from multiple sources, on support of libraries. Dr. Brodman mentioned that if we conclude that the Government has a definite responsibility to assure library service for everyone, we will have to give the reasons leading to this conclusion. Dr. Knight and Dr. Fussler suggested that general premises of this kind would be appropriate in the introduction or prologue.

Mr. Lacy proposed for consideration the identification, in the main body of the report, of issues or questions of public policy on which decisions are needed, with recommendations wherever possible, of what those decisions should be. The introduction could include discussion of basic social goals, followed by functional questions and concrete recommendations. We should, therefore, begin soon to identify as many specific questions as possible if we are to try to give answers. Perhaps these could be developed from the following groupings:

(1) Library service in support of research.

(This would deal with Federal libraries, university libraries, endowed libraries, major public libraries, some private institutions. The point could be made that not even the greatest library can be self-sustaining; library cooperation is essential. There is great variety in national, State, and private institutions, but all are dealing with extremely large bodies of material, much of which may not be used frequently. Therefore, any unit of service is expensive. Cooperative acquisitions and cooperative service and bibliographic programs are therefore very important here.)

(2) Library service in support of teaching.

(Special problems here include service to undergraduates; supporting straight classroom teaching; the idea of building up a network (to enable small institutions to draw on the resources of larger ones) really defeats the purposes of library services because each campus should have what it needs for its own students; library collections are basic parts of the education institutions; the budgetary problems of libraries in educational institutions should be considered as part of the total educational budget.)

(3) Library services in support of public information.

(This section would deal principally with public libraries-- there would, of course, be some overlap with the other levels of service.)

(4) Special uses of libraries as instruments of public policy.

(Adult retraining programs; such special programs as Head Start; social pathology; sources of support for these.)

(5) A section concerned with how the Federal Government should best organize to deal with these different levels.

(How can we rationalize Federal legislation?)

(6) Manpower.

(This might be pulled out as a separate area although it is involved in each of the others, and each type of library, of course, has a special manpower problem.)

Mr. Lacy suggested that the questions he, Dr. Brodman, and others submitted earlier he brought together and distributed to all members of the Commission.

Dr. Burkhardt expressed interest particularly in how the Commission is going to get sufficient data to make a meaningful recommendation as to what the private sector should be doing and what the Federal Government should do. He expressed a desire to have institutions indicate more about their projected plans and the programs they would like to undertake if support were available. Mrs. Frary urged that the report emphasize the need for national policies and national support -- there are problems that cannot be solved at the local level, and the report should identify these. She pointed out also that it will be very difficult to get consensus of view on many of these major topics because individual members cannot be experts in all areas. Mr. Greenaway agreed, and urged a strong chapter on the problem of total library service -- this is really the central core of the problem. He would like to see two things coming out of the work of the Commission -- a recommendation for a continuing commission and a recommendation for a research program to deal with the problems we see that must have solution in the interest of building an effective, efficient library system to meet the needs of the United States.

Mr. Clapp remarked that the Commission can hardly make the flat statement that everyone should have access to libraries. We do not run them and do not own them. What the report can do is to name this as a goal and indicate that it is far from being achieved at the moment. Achievement of this goal depends upon certain arrangements and responsibilities that must be shared at Federal, State, and local levels. It would be useful for the report to identify a number of goals, evaluate the extent to which each has achieved, and indicate where the further burden lies to move closer to meeting each goal. Mr. Clapp suggested also that the word "problem" be replaced by "obstacle" in our writing.

This illuminating discussion then led Dr. Knight to outline the different dimensions that could provide the link needed to unify the report: (1) A prologue in which our postulates and premises are stated; (2) discussion of major needs and goals; (3) identification of major obstacles preventing present meeting of these needs and goals. Then there can be discussion of the administrative, technical, and physical resources, present and future, that concern all of these, with conclusions and recommendations given wherever possible.

Dr. Carter referred to earlier discussion of the major problem of the requirements for dissemination of information and knowledge throughout the country. Our concern, in his view, cannot be only with libraries; we must also look forward to other means of dissemination of information -- television and computers as well as books.

Dr. Burkhardt appreciated this point, but called attention to the fact that this is a National Advisory Commission on Libraries. We can consider the effect of new developments for dissemination of information on libraries, but libraries have to be our major concern. Dr. Knight saw the possibility of taking cognizance of the overlap between libraries and other information-dissemination media, but explained the report could not deal with the other media in any detail. The impact of the other media on the libraries will, of course, have to be taken into account, as Dr. Carter pointed out, but the central theme of the report is, of course, libraries. It was agreed that "multiple communication must take sensitive cognizance of the role the other media will play and their effort on libraries."

Returning to the matter of the structure of the report, Dr. Fussler summarized the discussion thus far as suggesting that the Commission has an obligation to arrive at a fairly concise statement of general objectives and assumptions of library-information handling systems and the reasons for these objectives and assumptions. As a part of these assumptions, we must conclude that the system will evolve over a period of time -- the objectives will not be attained in a brief period. To the extent possible, the Commission should identify key instruments and structures in appraising the continuing effectiveness of the system -- a permanent commission, the location of agencies in the Federal hierarchy, the various other levels of supporting institutions. A series of statements

on specific problems and issues, with recommendations for actions would be appropriate, as well as indications of those issues on which the Commission could not get sufficient data within its short time but which require longer study.

Mr. Lacy agreed with this general approach and illustrated how this might be developed in the clear-cut area of elementary school libraries, as an example. The Commission knows a good deal about this area; it has the opinion of the library profession as to what an elementary school library should be; we know about State and local sources of funds for elementary school libraries, and what the Federal Government is doing through the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Act. Is there any further responsibility the Federal Government should carry for school libraries? If so, should the Government support instruction in certain subject fields or support all education, including school libraries, in areas facing special problems? Or should Federal aid to education and school libraries be general, with a view to bringing them up to minimum standards? Should these minimum standards be as high as ALA standards or something less? Should we pursue research in computer-aided instruction? If we began to approach ALA standards, there would need to be many more school librarians than are now available. How should this manpower problem be faced--by accepting subprofessional assistants? What should the Federal Government do about training library staff? Should Federal assistance be in the form of aid to education in general, as in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or should it be specifically for school libraries? What portion of the aid should be for equipment? Where should such a program be administered--in the Office of Education or as part of an activity concerned entirely with libraries?

Similar sets of questions can be developed on issues relating to other library problems and to other types of libraries, including research libraries. What kind of Federal support should be provided for research and area studies? To what degree should the Federal Government have responsibility for assuring wider accessibility of library materials to scholars? to students? to the public at large? It is this kind of detailed questioning in each major area of our concern that is needed.

Mrs. Gallagher spoke of the need to give attention to the matter of efficient administration of Federal grants and the need

to identify areas that do not appear to fall within the responsibilities of the Federal Government. Mrs. Wallace stressed the importance of a plea for the small libraries--the need for leadership in the grass roots--and the contributions made by State libraries.

Dr. Burkhardt saw good possibilities in developing the report along the lines outlined by Mr. Lacy. The report can state the facts about specific matters concerning libraries, the costs, and the recommendations for the future. Much of this data should come to us in the special studies; it can then be pulled out and served as the basis for recommendations.

Dr. Knight asked about the availability of hard data on the changing role of libraries and the changing use pattern. Do we have enough supportive data on this question? Do we really know how libraries and their clientele are changing? Mr. Lacy explained that some things are known--there is no doubt that per capita circulation in public libraries for other than students has declined. This has resulted in part from changes in library policies. There has been a noticeable decline in the use of fiction because of the availability of paperbacks; libraries are concentrating much more today on heavier materials. This shift is in response to broad social changes. The special studies should cover these points, as appropriate. It was agreed that Mrs. Morrisey would pull out immediately from the discussion yesterday and today the points that should be conveyed at once to the contractors for special studies, so that the Commission staff can communicate with each of them shortly.

Dr. Carter brought up the need to know more about how the users get materials and how libraries are organized for effective service. Also, we should point out the need for more research about libraries, including studies on the preservation of materials. Discussion followed on the research work on library problems currently being undertaken, including the grants given by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. Mr. Clapp remarked that there is a real need for more research about library work. It would be helpful if the Commission could give guidance in this area to agencies and other institutions with available funds for research programs. It was suggested also that it might be desirable to invite a representative of the Office of Education to

meet with the Commission at an appropriate time for further discussion of the urgency of allocating funds for more research into library problems. The fact that the Commission does not have all the basic data it needs is a solid reason for recommending continuing research. Dr. Fussler mentioned that the report should touch on the overlapping responsibilities that seem to exist in Federal agencies in supporting library programs.

Mrs. Frary spoke of the need for up-to-date information on State laws affecting libraries. (Later Mr. Clapp advised that these have been codified in a 3rd edition, 1963; supplement, 1965; 2nd supplement, 1967, in press.)

Dr. Knight mentioned that the monitors of the study on interlibrary cooperation should make certain that models are included in the study and report.

The issue of centralization versus decentralization in Federal libraries was mentioned briefly.

Mr. Greenaway foresaw the need to anticipate the kind of library executives that must be trained for the future--how are they to be selected and trained? What roles do we expect from them in a changing society? This should have consideration in manpower studies.

Dr. Reed reminded the group that not too much has been said yet about acquisitions or preservation of materials, the scope of future collections, or the role of the Library of Congress and other Federal agencies in acquisitions. Mr. Clapp referred to ARL and LC's work on the preservation of deteriorating materials. There was mention of the effect of accelerating costs on library acquisitions, the problems of access to little-used or very specialized resources, the matter of the unique document that exists in only one place. The Commission's report should include mention of the special way in which unique materials must be handled and serviced.

The discussion of the content of the report was concluded with the designation of a subcommittee (Dr. Knight, Dr. Brodman, Dr. Fussler, Mr. Lacy, and, as an observer, Dr. Wagman) to develop a skeletal draft outlining the areas and issues

to be emphasized in the report. This draft will take cognizance of the points made in this discussion. It will be distributed to members of the Commission for their comment and further suggestions, which will then be worked into further revisions as the skeletal outline unfolds into a full report.

Dr. Knight thanked the members for their very useful contributions to this important session and for the time they have given to the Commission's work.

During the luncheon period earlier the Commission had the opportunity (arranged by Mrs. Moore) to hear from three State librarians, who graciously shared their interesting experiences with the group. Mrs. Moore explained that these librarians -- Miss Maryann Reynolds, Librarian, Washington State Library; Miss Lucile Nix, Library Consultant, Georgia State Department of Education - Public Library Unit (Library Extension Service); Mrs. Carma Leigh, Librarian, California State Library -- represent three different types of State library services-- service to State government, extension services, coordination and planning for State-wide programs.

Miss Reynolds spoke on the State library's functions in relation to State government; some States do not provide this service. A basic problem is the complexity and diversity of the structures in which State governments operate. This diversity is reflected in the different kinds of services at the State level that libraries are asked to perform. Coordination by a council or a higher agency in Washington is a basic need. All library functions should be channeled through the State library. State governments are faced with the same kinds of problems as the Federal Government -- ongoing research programs and outpouring of information, special problems arising from such programs as those carried on under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The State library agency may have responsibility for all State employees. The leadership role of the State library is very important. While the importance of regional library development is recognized, there are some activities that can be carried on best by State agencies. It is highly desirable that State libraries be less hampered by binding rules and regulations that interfere with their ability to develop programs in accordance with their particular needs. The Federal requirements should not be so stringent that they will not allow for this necessary flexibility. Miss Reynolds described the work done with State legislative groups, who need to know exactly what is going on in other States. Staffing patterns and resources vary

within the States. One cannot expect to have one Federal law fit into the individual tax structure and budget of every State. The Federal legislation should allow for more flexibility in the use of funds and operation of programs within individual States and thus help to enable State library programs to grow with the economy.

Miss Nix described the development of library extension services in her State. She reviewed the steps leading to the writing of legislation that resulted in the first Library Services Act. Library extension programs in some States were carried on as a separate agency, in others as a part of the State library, in some as a unit of the State Department of Education. Despite the differences in organizational patterns, the State extension library services all have a budget; they are responsible to a legislature; they promote the establishment of library systems and services where none exist so that more people can be served; they encourage and help local agencies to assume responsibility for financing the programs, getting legally constituted library boards, planning services, establishing book purchasing policies, etc.; they provide training opportunities. In Georgia this effort began in 1943 -- and since that time there has been concerted effort to make people realize that by pooling resources, more citizens could benefit. Miss Nix referred to the continuing need to work toward wider recognition by State institutions of the importance of good library services and the many "serendipity benefits" that accrue from it.

Mrs. Leigh described in some detail the complex State-wide programs for which the California State Library has planning and implementation responsibilities, such as the programs carried on under the Technical Services Act. She described the different levels of library service planned for the State of California local library service; systems of public libraries; cooperative and consolidated library collections; system reference centers; special research collections; and, at the highest level of State-wide leadership, the State library. She outlined the many ways in which the State library has worked for the strengthening and coordination of school library programs and the development of an effective network of library service. The State Library of California is the central law library for the State government; it provides consulting services and materials to county law libraries, aids public libraries, provides a legislative reference service, maintains a general reference collection (including a very large collection of Government publications), gives library consultant services, administers State and Federal grant programs, maintains important State historical collections,

provides services to the blind and physically handicapped, and has over-all responsibility for all State library functions except those in schools and correctional institutions. Mrs. Leigh reported on plans for automated centers at various points in the State and stressed the fact that the only library to which every state resident has the right of free access is the State library. She envisioned further strengthening of national library resources if State libraries could be tied in with a national system of lending libraries. In response to a question from Mr. Greenaway, she indicated that this seems an appropriate time to press for greater coordination and sharing of library resources throughout the country. Mrs. Leigh pointed to the need for better definition of responsibilities at the various levels of Government, the need to solve some of the organizational and other problems stemming from the regionalization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the desirability of transferring responsibility for distribution of Federal documents from the Superintendent of Documents to the Library of Congress.

Summary of Conclusions, Decisions, Assignments

- (1) The Commission will meet on:
September 7-8, 1967 in Washington, D. C.
October 9-11, 1967 in Durham, North Carolina
November 27-28, 1967 in Washington, D. C.

A December or January meeting may be scheduled later.

- (2) Additional staff can be hired for the Commission as soon as new appropriated funds become available. These will include an editor and assistant editor.

- (3) Planning can go forward for regional meetings (except for a few distant meetings which probably cannot be arranged because of the need to conserve travel funds) but final arrangements cannot be made until new appropriated funds become available. There will likely need to be curtailment of staff to report on regional meetings because of budget limitations. Mrs. Moore and Mr. Elliott will have responsibility for all arrangements for regional hearings, including notifying Commission members of the schedule for hearings; members will notify them as to the sessions they can attend.

(4) The Chairman and Executive Director were authorized to work out all necessary budget allotments and handle necessary recruitment and other administrative details.

(5) Contracts for special studies will be reviewed by assigned monitors, who will also meet with contractors and exercise a watchful eye over study plans, procedures, and reports in order to assure the availability of valid, substantial data on which the Commission can base certain findings; it is anticipated that the reports on contractual studies, if acceptable (and the Commission reserves the right to reject them), will be appendices to the main report of the Commission. Contractors should not be permitted to publish independently the results of this contractual work. Monitors will read first drafts of the contractual reports, confer as necessary with contractors on revisions, and lead discussion in the full Commission when members review final reports.

(6) The draft outline of major topics for possible inclusion in the 60-page main report of the Commission was very useful as a basis for further thinking about the structure and content of the report; a few additions and changes in this outline were proposed.

(7) There was agreement that the report should concentrate in some depth on at least a few very important matters concerning libraries, giving hard facts where possible, discussing problems, and offering specific recommendations or alternative recommendations when possible. It was felt that the report should raise basic questions about the national library programs, facilities, and that it should also point up the most critical library problems even though solutions to all of them are not now evident.

(8) There were expressions of the importance of allowing adequate time soon for deeper debate on important issues, in order to determine what the Commission will want to recommend with respect to such matters as State libraries, national library responsibilities, education of librarians, assignment of responsibility within the Federal Government for library programs and grants, the degree to which the Federal Government has or should have responsibility for assuring the availability of free library service to all people, the extent to which the tax structure should be expected to support such responsibility, the feasibility of a national library-information network, what the private sector should be doing and what the Federal Government should do and the need for national policies and national support.

(9) It was concluded that the President's directive to the Commission specifically defines the information that will be expected to be in the report -- appraisal of the role and adequacy of libraries, present and future; evaluation of policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private organizations; recommendations to ensure an effective, efficient library system for the nation; appraisal of library funding, including Federal support. The report should identify the critical problems and respond to these with the Commission's conclusions, with supporting evidence.

(10) Issues or questions of public policy on which decisions are needed should be identified in the report, with recommendations wherever possible of what those decisions should be.

The introduction should include discussion of basic social goals, followed by functional questions and concrete recommendations.

Specific questions must now be identified, perhaps along the line suggested by Mr. Lacy and presented in detail in earlier pages of this report.

It was asked that lists of questions submitted earlier by Mr. Lacy, Dr. Brodman, and perhaps others be brought together and copies distributed to Commission members.

(11) A recommendation for a continuing national commission on libraries and a recommendation for a research program to deal with problems that must have solution should be included in the report.

(12) The report should identify a number of goals, evaluate the extent to which each has been achieved, and indicate where the further responsibility lies to move closer to attainment of each goal.

(13) "Obstacle" should replace "problem" in our thinking and in the report.

(14) The report might take the form of:

A. Prologue (stating of postulates and premises).

B. Discussion of major needs and goals.

C. Identification of major obstacles preventing present meeting of these needs and goals.

D. Discussion of administrative, technical, and physical resources, present and future, that concern all of these.

E. Conclusions and recommendations wherever possible.

(15) The report should take cognizance of the overlap between libraries and other information media, but it cannot go into discussion of other media in depth.

(16) A concise statement of general objectives and assumptions of library-information handling systems, and the reasons for them, belongs in the report. It should be noted that these cannot be realized within a short time but will evolve over a long period. Key instruments and organizational units required should be identified, including the assignment of Federal responsibilities, a permanent commission, and the various other levels of supporting institutions.

(17) If time permits, a representative of the Office of Education might be asked to meet with the Commission to discuss the urgency of allocating funds for more research into library problems. The report should touch on the overlapping responsibilities that seem to exist in Federal agencies for support of library programs.

(18) Acquisition and preservation of library materials, the scope of future collections, the role of the Library of Congress and other Federal agencies in acquisitions, and the special way in which unique materials must be handled and serviced must have attention in the report.

(19) A subcommittee was named to develop a skeletal outline of the areas and issues to be emphasized in the report. This will be distributed to members for their comment and further suggestions; further revisions will then be made, as the outline develops into a full report. The subcommittee:

Dr. Knight
Dr. Brodman
Dr. Fussler
Mr. Lacy
Dr. Wagman

(20) Arrangements should be made if possible for at least some members of the Commission to hear the views of Messrs. Cole, Keeney, Knox, Welsner, Licklider, Nichols, Sullivan, Houle, Orlans, Louis Wright. If necessary, some persons might be asked to give in writing their views on specific questions.

(21) While detailed discussion of copyright matters cannot be covered by the Commission, the report should state the library's requirements for use and access to materials and indicate that any legislation must provide for such use. The House Judiciary Committee's report on copyright and the Register of Copyright's original report on copyright legislation will be distributed to Commission members.

(22) State libraries vary in their organization, functions, and services, but they are basic to the assurance of free library service to all residents of the country. Their programs are diverse, but one common one is the urgent need for more flexibility in fitting Federal grant programs to individual needs.

Approved by the Commission
at its eighth meeting on
September 6, 1967 in
Washington, D. C.


Douglas M. Knight, Chairman