

National Advisory Commission on Libraries

Suite 6800 West

200 C Street, S. W.

Washington, D. C. 20204
202-963-4491

May 3, 1968

DOUGLAS M. KNIGHT
Chairman
Durham, North Carolina

ESTELLE BRODMAN
St. Louis, Missouri

FREDERICK H. BURKHARDT
New York, New York

LAUNOR F. CARTER
Santa Monica, California

VERNER W. CLAPP
Washington, D. C.

CARL ELLIOTT
Washington, D. C.

ALVIN C. EURICH
Aspen, Colorado

MRS. MILDRED P. FRARY
Los Angeles, California

HERMAN H. FUSSLER
Chicago, Illinois

MRS. MARIAN G. GALLACHER
Seattle, Washington

EMERSON GREENAWAY
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

CARYL P. HASKINS
Washington, D. C.

WILLIAM N. HUBBARD, JR.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

M. LACY
New York, New York

MRS. MERLIN M. MOORE
Little Rock, Arkansas

CARL F. J. OVERHAGE
Cambridge, Massachusetts

HARRY H. RANSOM
Austin, Texas

WILBUR L. SCHRAMM
Stanford, California

MRS. GEORGE R. WALLACE
Fitchburg, Massachusetts

STEPHEN J. WRIGHT
New York, New York

MELVILLE J. RUGGLES
Executive Director

DANIEL I. REED
Deputy Director

TO: Members of the Commission

FROM: E. Shepley Nourse, Editor **SN**

SUBJECT: Report of Commission Meeting of May 1, 1968

I. Purposes of meeting

A. Recapitulation of status to date

1. Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, who presided at the meeting, began with a brief sketch of previous events. The Summary Report of December 1967 was formally presented but the Commission's recommendations did not get into any of the President's messages. The Summary Report has not been released but it has been distributed to a number of governmental agencies for review and reactions.
2. Dr. Burkhardt stated that none of the agency reactions which presumably have been submitted to the White House office have reached the Commission in any formal way. There has been some informal reaction which has reached various Commission Members, particularly some feeling on the part of Office of Science and Technology people that the Commission's recommendations overemphasized the roles of the Library of Congress and the Office of Education. Frederick Burkhardt, Launor Carter, and Herman Fussler

were the Commission Members who had heard this at a gathering which included Science Information Council people and National Science Foundation people.

3. Dr. Burkhardt also stated that some Commission Members were worried about the broad and comprehensive approach which Commission Chairman Douglas M. Knight was planning. This concern centered on the problem of implying an official Commission position on every point to be included in the comprehensive volume.

B. Issues for discussion

1. Relationship of the present consensus Summary Report, a revised consensus report, and the planned larger volume.
2. The importance of distinguishing between official Commission position material and that which is related but not necessarily consensus.
3. Most important point of concern: That individual Commission Members might appear to be committed to views they don't hold, if the larger volume were to be presented as the Final Report.

II. Agreement reached at meeting

- A. There will be a larger volume as envisioned by the Commission Chairman Douglas M. Knight whose name will appear as Editor. Work, already well under way, will proceed according to the present Table of Contents--utilizing selected materials available to the Commission and several papers specially written by Commission Members. Units of text, edited into context with connective narrative, will be distributed to Commission Members for review. It was emphasized very strongly that this book will not be referred to as the Commission's Final Report (or Comprehensive Report) in order to avoid confusion with the official Consensus Report.
- B. The December Summary Report will be somewhat expanded to become known as THE Commission's Report. It will contain the official consensus material.

1. It was agreed that manpower was a serious gap in the original Summary Report and that the Commission could probably now add a consensus statement and/or recommendation on this subject. Carl Elliott strongly urged recommending new legislation establishing a national scholarship and fellowship program for a minimum of 5,000 library and information science students per year. Although Title II of the Higher Education Act does make assistance to students possible, it is not enough and the potential is "buried" in this legislation. There was some feeling among Commission Members that recruitment of potential professional students may not be the real problem or, at any rate, only part of the problem. There is a qualitative inadequacy in the schools of library science themselves which may or may not be alleviated by such devices as having each fellowship accompanied by some funds going to the schools themselves. Leadership training within the profession is another thing that might be encouraged as is the development of future faculty. Although some Members said that manpower was such a complex issue that the Commission might well simply recognize it as such and suggest it as a high priority for the new Commission, it was finally agreed that Frederick Wagman would be asked to pull together wording of a statement and/or recommendation on manpower. Mr. Elliott was asked to send Dr. Wagman a statement of his strong feeling on the desirability of a scholarship and fellowship program. William N. Hubbard, Jr., was asked to confer with Dr. Wagman in person.

2. A semi-formal statement of Library of Congress reactions to the Commission's original Summary Report and recommendations was distributed at the meeting. The Members appreciated having this statement and went through the comments carefully. It was agreed, however, that the only changes that would be made for the final Consensus Report would be the addition of the underscored statement at the bottom of page 2 of the handout and part of the underscored statement appearing on page 3. At Dr. Carter's request the word "many" was substituted for the word "all" in the fifth line from the top of page 21 of the original Summary Report.

3. Dr. Hubbard strongly urged the Commission to recognize that it had been inadequately responsive to the President's charge which is heavily oriented toward the scientific community. He referred both to the three questions in the President's statement (the role of libraries in communications and information-exchange networks, fragmentation of Federal efforts, and the benefit for the taxpayer's dollar), and to the four points in the Executive Order itself. The four points are itemized on pages iii and iv of the original Summary Report. Several possibilities were mentioned, including a completely new chapter, but the consensus appeared to be that the Commission's commentary on these points might better appear in the letter of transmittal on page iv. It was a clear consensus that the Commission had indeed been remiss in not stating candidly what it had and had not done with relation to the specific charge. Frederick Burkhardt and Dan Lacy were asked to serve as a committee to draft a statement drawing on statements which Herman Fussler and William Hubbard would send to them within the next few days.
4. It was agreed that a select list of the special studies deemed most influential by the Commission would appear in the official Consensus Report. This list will be compiled by staff from information in the files and submitted for review to the membership.
5. It was agreed that there would not be an official statement or recommendation concerning copyright, other than a revision of the statement that already appears in the original Summary Report on page 15 at the end of the third paragraph. This is the statement that Verner Clapp and Herman Fussler proposed as a substitute which apparently was accepted by the Commission:

Finally, it will be important in the public interest, whether under the present copyright law or under any revision that may be adopted, that arrangements for the protection of copyright proprietors do not unreasonably hinder access to and use of information.

(It is not clear whether this is intended to appear as the substitute sentence on page 15 or on pages 21 and 22 at the end of the recommendation on the Library of Congress; one of the added statements to the Library of Congress recommendation refers to its role in providing basic national copyright services; actually the statement could appear in both places but its original intent was in the physical access context on page 15.)

6. Some of the feedback Commission Members have heard refers to the original failure to specify a locale for the proposed research and development institute. There was some discussion on the possibility of mentioning that possible contractual arrangements could be made with universities or others, but it was finally agreed that a statement be added as the second sentence in the third paragraph on page 25 of the original Summary Report. It would read as follows: "We recommend that this institute be established within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."
7. It was agreed that the new official Consensus Report should make some statement on the term of office of the permanent Commission Members. This could probably be added as a final sentence to the third paragraph on page 18 suggesting a rotating staggered membership so that individuals serve for perhaps five years.
8. Other possible content
 - a. The Staff will study the last draft of Dr. Wagman's resource document (to which Dr. Wagman has subsequently added a few corrections on the basis of discussions at the November meeting) in order to identify possible points that were omitted from the distillation presented in the original Summary Report. This will be distributed for comment.
 - b. A simple list of the regional hearings might appear.
 - c. References to other Commission materials (e. g. content to appear in the big book) can be added.
 - d. A reprinting of the President's statement and the Executive Order itself might well appear in the official Consensus Report.

III. Other matters

- A. Informal feedback (not presented at meeting)

1. The Bureau of the Budget was going to submit a semi-formal document of reactions to the original Summary Report. Evidently when the writeup was submitted for approval it was not cleared and so we have only some informal comments from one member of their Education Unit. This cannot be interpreted as official agency reaction but for what they are worth his comments are:
 - a. Why didn't the Commission recommend closer cooperation among public libraries and public school libraries, a role-trading almost to the extent of making school libraries into branch libraries?
 - b. Why didn't the Commission present more dollars and cents priorities, who gets what and how?
 - c. Why did the Commission split its organizational recommendations so many ways and not mention where the institute was to go?
2. On the basis of an informal comment from OE it was wondered why the Commission recommended an Associate Commissioner for libraries but not a Bureau.
3. On an informal basis someone from the Library of Congress wondered what the Commission meant by the phrase "National Library System" which it did not want the Library of Congress to administer. Apparently different Members of the Commission have somewhat different interpretations of what the phrase means.

B. Suggestions for the larger volume

1. Dr. Knight's philosophy in planning a coherent volume was warmly commended by several Members, in spite of the initial concern expressed with relation to the confusion of consensus position material with other material. It was mentioned that it was important to provide a broad range of material for study by interested citizens, for this can stimulate the strong support that can lead to action.

2. It was agreed that Dr. Wagman would be asked to rewrite his paper on manpower, expanding it to provide more descriptive and analytic material. It will appear under his name and he should have freedom to express his own views.
3. It was suggested that the Pikeville and Portland regional hearing summaries were particularly good and might appear in toto in the larger volume.
4. With reference to the Table of Contents for the larger volume, it was suggested that the technology material currently designated for the Appendix be moved up to the position of Section B of Chapter 11 because of its importance.

C. Clarification

1. It was emphasized that the big book envisioned by Dr. Knight has been developed through the work of the Commission itself as revealed by its minutes, correspondence of individual Members, and even informal conversations. Selection of material to be included was not made capriciously but on the basis of documentary evidence. From the beginning it was intended to reflect the entire Commission but never to imply total consensus that might embarrass an individual Commission Member. No attempt will be made to refer to this big book as the Commission's Final Report--a semantic problem which has caused some of the difficulty that was clarified at this meeting.
2. It was clarified that the Commission materials financed by research funds from the Office of Education must be considered for inclusion in the ERIC system of distribution. It is not clear whether this also applies to the transcript of regional hearings but this will be investigated. At the time Commission materials are formally submitted for consideration for the ERIC system, the Commission's own recommendations concerning their disposition will be attached thereto, and it appears quite likely that such a document would receive careful consideration in the selection process through the regional centers.

- D. Before the meeting adjourned, the Members of the Commission expressed their appreciation to Frederick Burkhardt for the excellent meeting facilities and for the hospitality of the American Council of Learned Societies at the luncheon.