

LSA AND LIBRARY STANDARDS: TWO SIDES OF THE COIN

Lowell A. Martin

We all know that the Library Services Act and new national standards for public libraries came on the scene about the same time. In a sense the standards established goals, and LSA provided fresh, new means to achieve goals. It is therefore natural after five years to compare aims with accomplishments.

A few disclaimers are in order at the outset. This will in no way be a definitive evaluation of the federally sponsored program. Its workings have reached into 50 states and three territories, hundreds of counties, and thousands of communities. Who would be hardy or foolhardy enough to pronounce judgment on this rich variety?

These are no more than impressions. I have read the reports of the state library agencies several times over, year by year, across the nation for each year, and across the board on specific topics. I have tried in the process to be both sympathetic and critical. In one way or another I have been able to see at first hand aspects of the LSA program in a dozen states. I have tried at all times to hold the national standards in my mind's eye, asking not only whether there was more library service but also what kind.

This has led to certain recurring impressions and questions. Not judgments. Not even conclusions. Impressions and questions.

Further, I am quite conscious of being a coach on the sidelines, not a runner in the race. The runner and his judge may have different standards. I thought of this recently when my son won the mile race in a college meet only to be met by the coach's sour comment that he was still under the school record.

Lowell A. Martin is Vice President and
Editorial Director, Grolier, Inc.

My point is that any comment on the achievement of LSA is a matter of viewpoint. One could say without hesitation that it has made for definite progress, a position which could hardly be challenged. But one could also say that LSA has definitely not led to achievement of national library standards across the country, and stand pat on that.

Bench Marks in Judging LSA

Before trying to add up the score, we need a few bench marks--frames of reference I had better call them in a university setting--on which I believe we can agree. If we are going to judge LSA, we had better remind ourselves what it was set up to accomplish. Stripped to essentials, the aim has been to bring library service to many Americans in rural areas with no facilities and to raise the quality of service in many rural communities that clearly had substandard libraries.¹ It was hoped along the way to bring a new federal-state-local partnership into being, and to use federal funds to prime the pump for more state and local money.

And what in brief do the national standards envisage? The 70 guiding principles and the 191 standards come down to resources, personnel, and service able to meet the needs of an educated democracy under challenge, and to do this by means of coordinated units strong enough to come up to standards.²

I feel a responsibility to add a word here about my own personal viewpoint on the standards, and thus on the level which library service should achieve. One can think of the standards as eventual goals to be attained perhaps in the next 25 or 50 years. I think that will be too late. Too late for what? At most, too late to help preserve our way of life. At the very least, too late to maintain and expand the public library's position as an adult education agency. The national standards are not pie-in-the-sky which we might get to in some millenium, but necessary and indeed minimum and immediate requirements if that agency is not to slip into obscurity.

I am sure that some of you react by saying to yourself that I should see sections of your state, with no or very little library service, and I would not talk of achieving national standards in the near future. It is precisely because I have seen such areas that the urgency of rapid progress impresses itself upon me. And I need hardly remind this group that the national standards did not simply say that each separate community and library should by itself somehow pass a miracle and achieve high standards, but this is to be accomplished through library systems, coordinated intercommunity effort of many sizes and shapes.

One final bench mark. We are considering a four-year, \$75 million program aimed at over 70 million Americans. The \$75 million figure is the total of federal, state, and local funds that have gone into this national project. Four years rather than five should be used because no grants were made in the first six months after the federal legislation was passed, and a number of states did not enter until the second year.

Advances Under the Federal Program

Has LSA brought service to rural people who lacked it; has it improved existing facilities in rural areas? Of course it has. Here is no more than a partial review of accomplishments.

✓ Local rural areas lacking library service have been given a start, from Halibut Cove, Alaska, to Orange County, Florida. Actually the figures here are more modest than one might expect. New libraries to serve a little under two million additional rural people have been created under the federal program. To this modest figure would have to be added the greater number of people who gained practical access to facilities which existed before 1956 but which were beyond their reach. If I were to turn the coin this early in the game, you could ask how much of this extension would have occurred anyway. But there can be no doubt that LSA gave an impetus to the extension movement both to unserved areas and to people living at a distance from central facilities, just when library extension on a national scale showed signs of running out of steam. To keep this matter in balance, we must remember that there still are over 20 million Americans, mostly in rural areas, without direct library service.

✓ New county libraries, and to some extent multicounty libraries, have been created under LSA. Once again the figures are moderate rather than spectacular. After three years, 65 counties and an equal number of New England towns in the continental United States had new service.³ Some of these new county units have become parts of multicounty systems. Valid totals for multicounty units are not available, but the state reports indicate that they have been a regular feature. We are justified as we go forward in this evaluation in giving a good hard look at county units--not just new ones but older county libraries in the program--because they form the organizational base for the LSA enterprise.

✓ Guidance and training of local personnel by state agencies has been substantially increased. This has taken a rich variety of forms--from traditional field visits, to a remarkably large

number of district institutes, to the first real appearance on the national scene of state fellowships for professional study of library service. Here again, to keep the picture in balance, one must ask how much of this field training was directed to nonprofessional or part-time staff members, some of whom may already have left library service. But this is simply to say that these programs have had to work with existing human resources.

Interlibrary loan and reference facilities for all libraries, another state service, have also been noticeably strengthened.

While this service is not so visible or dramatic as new bookmobiles following the back roads, it is nonetheless an important element in the state structure of service. Indeed, as I have studied state programs, more than once I have wondered idly whether we really need to go through the travail of regional organization, whether strong state collections and reference staffs, coupled with the wonders of present-day communication, would not more directly provide the elements of a library system--that is, a local outlet with most-used materials backed up by a central collection from which materials as needed can be rushed to the locality on short notice. Perhaps this dream of an efficient and simple order must be abandoned when we recall the strategic importance of a collection of some depth to which better readers should have direct access. Be that as it may, book collections at the state level have been increased by several million volumes, and there are now after five years approximately twice as many staff members to get these books out into the state. The backstopping function of the state agencies has been strengthened, and this is no small accomplishment.

LSA has stimulated the provision of increased funds for library service at the state level. Of course there sometimes has been some pretty fancy financial juggling to enable states to match federal funds. On the other hand, federal funds and resulting programs may well have been a factor in the first provision of state aid to public libraries in at least six states and in substantial state aid increases in others. State appropriations for rural library service almost doubled from 1956 to 1961, from \$6 million to \$11 million. Certainly the argument cannot be advanced against LSA that it dried up state financial provision, that the states simply shifted the burden to rich Uncle Sam. The effect on provision of local funds is less clear. The figures for a definite conclusion on this point are not available, because the "local" funds reported by the U. S. Office of Education are only those monies used to match the federal grants within states. It is interesting to note that the program is now financed on a 35-45-20 basis as between federal, state, and local contributions.

One of the unanswered questions is whether the federal grants and state appropriations have stimulated commensurate local funds or whether they have in part replaced local funds.

There have been many other accomplishments under LSA, tangible and intangible. Centralized processing has sprouted. Broad public relations programs have appeared. A workable partnership among the federal, state, and local levels of government has taken hold. Among the less tangible results, I would cite the growing spirit of purpose, of optimism, of accomplishment among state extension workers.

A special word should be given to the high quality of the administration of the Act by the Library Services Branch of the national government. I will content myself here simply by saying that there has been a nice combination of leadership and cooperation, of high purpose and flexibility, of light stepping among red tape.

Further Analysis of the LSA Program

For purposes of further discussion, let me now reduce these many developments to three broad headings, which together reflect the overall thrust of the program:

1. LSA has strengthened state library agencies.
2. It has stimulated extension of service in the traditional pattern, by means of bookmobiles and county libraries.
3. It has fostered experimentation with new forms of library systems, designed to improve rather than to extend service.

It is not by accident that I put the strengthening of state agencies first. Has it occurred to you what a gamble was taken in LSA from the beginning in depending on state library agencies for this program? I know that there have been a few strong agencies at the state level for some years. But the picture five or more years ago in state after state was not just one of some shortage of staff or some weakness in collection, but of downright deficiencies which made the state the weak link in the proposed chain of library development. The state agencies--including the weak state agencies--met the challenge. And of course this means that in the beginning the one or very few senior state library officers rose to the occasion. What human stories of gathering of forces, of downright hard work in the small hours there must be behind this magnificent response! Then I meet with you state people here, wondering if the campaign has ground you down, and I find on the contrary that you look fit as can be and ready for more.

What I am trying to say is that in my view the achievement under LSA which is least open to challenge is the strengthening of the state level of library service in this country. Yes, more important than bookmobiles, more important than the county libraries, more important than the increased money as such. I know that staffs are still short, that collections have weaknesses, that many a midnight you find yourself driving back home over lonely roads. But we begin to have state library agencies equal to the responsibilities our fine plans have placed upon them from the crop of statewide blueprints in the thirties, to the National Plan of the forties, to the recent standards.

I do not say this to be flattering in any way. However, I do hope you will remember this opinion of state personnel as I go on to discuss library extension and county libraries, parts of which will be neither flattering nor complimentary.

An Old or a New Pattern?

In substance, in the bulk of its activity, the LSA program falls under the second and third headings above. It is an extension program, the provision of facilities where they were lacking and of better facilities where they were weak. In my view, a fundamental question in evaluating LSA thus far is the extent to which its primary effect has been over on the side of traditional extension by means of bookmobiles and county or multicounty libraries, or over on the side of emerging forms of regional organization which hold some promise of bringing service up to national standards.

To what extent has LSA been more of the same, ending up in clearly substandard facilities? To what extent has it opened a new road toward better library facilities? Is it the end of the old or the start of the new?

No final answers can be given to these questions at this stage. It is in this regard that I have had recurring impressions as I studied the state reports. I offer them here for what they may be worth, and with a reminder again that it is precisely here that the viewpoint of the observer colors his conclusions.

When there are people without library resources, we know from standards that we ideally would like to provide two levels of facility--the strong central library with collection and staff in depth, and branches or bookmobiles to bring some part of library resources close to people. In real life, because of limited funds, we must often choose between these two.

The evidence shows that under LSA the prevailing choice has been the provision of a small part of library service in a

nearby location. This is what library extension has meant for 50 years. Fragmentation and convenience. Before roads and automobiles they were achieved in the village library. Now they are achieved with the bookmobile.

I feel justified in the statement that bookmobile-type extension has comprised the largest single activity in the LSA program. Over 250 bookmobiles have been purchased,⁴ stocked, staffed, and put on the road--now for two or more years in many cases. Remember that there is a little under \$60 million of federal and state money involved (the remainder of the \$75 million coming from local sources). Over \$5 million would be needed to purchase and stock these mobile units, at least an equal sum each year to staff and operate them, plus time of central staff and overhead. A conservative estimate is that one-third of the federal and state money has gone into the bookmobile program.

These mobile units of course have been used in a variety of ways--as direct service units of state agencies, as demonstrations in unserved areas, as a means for getting out into rural areas by established county libraries.

In short, while other community services are using roads and automobiles to bring people in to facilities that achieve standards, we often are using the road and the automobile to bring substandard service out to people. They are using increased funds to build a wing on the central unit (whether hospital, church, or school) or to add special personnel (whether the anaesthetist in the hospital or the guidance counselor in the school)--that is, to come closer to quality standards. We are using increased funds to buy a bookmobile and hire a bookmobile attendant--that is, to come closer to accessibility standards.

I don't want to repeat this ad nauseam, but let me say it just once more: we are in the stage of extension, putting our time and money into taking fragmented library service out to people; other educational and community facilities are in the stage of consolidation, putting their time and money into bringing people in to stronger central resources.

Role of County Libraries

I am sure that you are anxious to turn the coin back to the right side. What is on the other side? The county library. The bookmobile, you no doubt are thinking, is based on the county library and draws sustenance from it. Those people who want to get in their automobiles and go into a county library headquarters may do so just as they go to the district hospital or the supermarket or the consolidated school.

All right, then let's look at the county library. You recall that it is one of the main vehicles for action under LSA.

I suddenly realized recently that I have lived with a quarter century of county libraries. I went to library school in the 1930's. Carleton Joeckel was pushing the larger-unit concept. The many WPA and PWA state library plans of the 30's were based on systems of county libraries. I know that for a considerable period I simply assumed that the county, being larger than the village, was the answer to the problem of organizing effective library systems.

My first contacts with county units confirmed this hope--in the metropolitan counties such as Cuyahoga and Wayne, and in the well-conceived California county libraries. But then I delved a little deeper in state after state--first in the 30's, then after the war, recently in several state studies. This proved to be a disillusioning experience.

Now county libraries are of course by no means all the same. They differ as much as municipal libraries. But for hundreds of them, conceivably for more than a thousand of them, this thumbnail sketch holds true: a collection only a little stronger than a small-town library but not as strong as a small-city library, one professional librarian whose time and attention are spread from dealing with the county commissioners to dealing with the janitor, one or more bookmobiles. The bookmobile, incidentally, is as likely as not to make a major portion of its stops at schools. Is this a library system providing standard-level service?

If the county is sparsely settled and the county seat quite small, the county library may serve all or most of the county, including the town in which headquarters is located. In many of the somewhat more populous counties, where the city library or libraries were first established, the county unit is separate and serves the areas outside the cities. In these cases the county library is not a larger unit in the sense of an agency covering all of an area and unifying or simplifying the service structure. Rather, it is another library on the scene, in many instances another weak library.

Are the county libraries used under the LSA program of this substandard type? I do not have the evidence on which to base a statistical answer. But if county units have been weak, and LSA had to start with what was there, it follows that such units have formed an important base of operations. It is almost by definition the more sparsely-settled counties in which the newest units have been established during these five years, the more populous having organized earlier. While in some cases

the new county library is integrated with pre-existing city units, in city-county libraries--an added wing built on a strong foundation--this combination is rare enough to be noted as exceptional in the various state reports.

Some of you, who may share my concern about the emphasis upon extension and about the shortcomings of county libraries, probably feel that I have lost touch with the political reality of the situation. How does one develop support for a service, among both voters and legislators, except by bringing it close to people and making it tangible to them? And how else can this be done except with bookmobiles and county libraries? With this start, you may say, we can then build toward fine standard libraries. I know of the appeal of the bookmobile. That it necessarily has more appeal than a strong central unit open to rural people I do not know. We seem to be saying that there is something different about library service--in contrast to other community services--that necessitates this extension emphasis. What is different, we seem to assume, is that this is the one service that rural people will not use unless it is brought very close to them, an assumption which needs testing before an extension system is built on it.

Has the strategy of starting with people where they are, giving them a fragment of library service conveniently as a first step, actually put us on the road to standard-level support for county libraries? For those county libraries organized in the past five years it is too soon to say. A few have caught hold of the state-sponsored demonstrations and now support them at a good level. Some county demonstrations have continued under local support but, according to the state reports, at a discernibly reduced financial level. And by looking carefully at the reports it becomes clear that in some states certain demonstration areas did not respond to the bait and turned down or failed to act on a county library tax.

On a national scale the figures for financial support of extension-type county libraries raise some questions. Some of you have heard me make the point that county libraries in Pennsylvania have lower per capita support than town libraries, which in turn have less support than city libraries. I made a similar calculation recently for my home state of New Jersey and once again find that county libraries--these agencies established many years ago by Sara Askew in high hopes for the future--are significantly below the separate town and city libraries in per capita support. It would be worth a careful national check on my hypothesis that the county libraries, other than in metropolitan counties, have on the average drawn less support than the more

local units. I know that there are many reasons for this, particularly the limited tax base when the city library and the county library stand separate, but such support certainly does not provide a foundation for library service remotely approaching the national standards.

The Multicounty Library

It is because many state library workers share this concern about the rural county library that almost one-half of the original state plans under LSA referred to the multicounty or regional units in one form or another, and others have experimented with such units even if they don't appear as such in the formal plans. For the most part the larger unit above the county has meant the multicounty library, with anywhere from two to seven or eight counties. Some of these may well have put themselves on the road toward quality service.

But I have an uneasy feeling that we might be caught in a numbers game. One county is not enough to provide the necessary population and tax base, so we add another substandard county. Two prove to be little if any better, so more are added. In the back of our minds is some such figure as 100,000 population as desirable. This numbers game can be just that--a gamble that does not pay off. I can readily conceive of a reasonably good county library serving 25,000 or 50,000 people that will actually be weakened by taking on several sparsely-settled counties. As we add counties we are adding one of the most expensive factors in library service--distance--and particularly expensive when the standard to which we give first priority is that of bringing facilities close to people.

Adding rooms to the house will improve it only if the foundation is strong. Whenever I hear of a multicounty library--which is a library like any other library except that it has the added load of distance and a more complicated governmental structure--I ask first to see the central unit, the foundation, the core of strength. Does it have a subject collection with depth, does it have a staff of professionals specialized in the several major aspects of library service? In substance, does it achieve to any reasonable extent these obvious--and not-very-fancy--national standards? Or is it just a larger substandard library? I am sure that some of the multicounty units used under LSA do have a sound foundation. But when I hear of a library covering several counties, with a limited population, and responsible for 15,000 square miles, I feel that judgment must be reserved.

Questions About National Program

Remember where we are in this discussion. I have said that the improvement in state library agencies is an unquestioned gain. Beyond that, the great thrust of LSA has been in library extension and county and regional units. If they show strength, LSA has moved us toward standards. If not, we are confronted with some solemn questions about the national program.

Note that I say questions--not necessarily conclusions. I do not feel that I know the situation in 50 states well enough to pronounce upon these points and set down a categorical judgment. But the very asking of the questions, along with any qualified answers that can be given at this stage, should serve to show the other side of the coin. I purposely put these questions in an extreme form, if for no other reason than to test ourselves to see if we can answer them.

✓ To the extent that LSA has meant starting service where it has been lacking, have substantial amounts of federal and state aid gone precisely to those areas that did not help themselves? Has this to any significant degree been a program for helping the stragglers who didn't care enough about library service to provide it for themselves? One can understand a federal and state aid program to assist districts which have tried but simply lack the local means to bring library service up to a reasonable standard. But what of those districts that over the 50 or 75 years of the public library movement took no steps to provide service even within their means? And what of those that have poor service simply because they did not choose to make the financial effort of their neighbors?

Now I know that this extreme position must be qualified. Some localities are really pauper poor. Others face special circumstances. Some just didn't happen to be blessed with that civic-minded leadership that gets an agency like the library started and keeps it developing, and had to wait until the recent federal-state program finally brought such leadership into play.

Granting all this, we do have to ask ourselves whether a considerable piece of money and effort has gone into rather rocky ground. And the going can get rockier in the next five years.

Which leads to a second major question. ✓ If the LSA program has stressed convenience of service to people who were unwilling to make a little effort to get it, has there consequently been less progress than we have a right to expect in making provision for whatever percentage of rural people need, seek, and would use a collection of definite scope and the specialized

services of professional librarians? I know that many rural people tonight, as a result of LSA, are reading a library book rather than a magazine or a paperback. I wish I were equally sure that the collection from which they made their choice and the aid provided them by qualified reading-guidance personnel have led them to reading something more significant than the magazine or the paperback.

Another question which grows out of this line of thought, or maybe a variation on the same question, is whether the net result of LSA thus far could be to add to the number of people getting substandard library service in the country. It would require a vast national study to balance the ledger with any accuracy. It is certainly to be hoped that some rural libraries have really been brought up to standard in these five years. Many more have moved closer to standard. But the record indicates that a substantial number of very weak county libraries remain and some new ones have been added. I would like to think that on balance there has been a reduction of substandard units. But I don't know. And the very fact that the record is not clear, four years and \$75 million later, is food for thought.

If one reads the state reports critically, a curious repetition of 50 years of library history in these five years becomes apparent, as though an historical pageant was being reenacted. In the first act of the pageant, there are localities entirely without library facilities, and the state comes on the scene to correct the situation. In the pre-LSA version, the locality was encouraged to establish a local library, often a weak library. In the LSA version, it is not the fragment of library service in the form of the village library that is used; it is the fragment in the form of the bookmobile. The second act, if local units already exist, is devoted to the county library--and I have said this is often a disappointing part of the drama. The third act is the multicounty or regional library. This act is not finished. Its outcome, in my view, will depend more on the strength of the service center on which it is based than on the size of territory or population served. Possibly the analogy of a three-act drama is not appropriate--perhaps these are simply successive rungs on a ladder.

Now my question is whether the historical drama must be replayed, whether the best way to the top is up a ladder that has not yet led to standard library service. We speak, quite properly, of the high level of the California system. I am struck by the fact that California 50 years ago skipped act one, and in many instances went directly to the county library. But for the rest of the country there was a trap in this California

surge forward. It was reasoned that if California could move ahead by adopting the county as a base, then others too would use the county. But there was a catch. The average California county is almost three times as large as the average county in other states--and California today is the most rapidly-growing state in terms of population.

New York provides another but quite different example of a new script, not bound by the three historical acts. New York started like other states, with the usual emphasis upon local libraries and in time it had some of the best and some of the worst public libraries in the country. It seemed as though New York would go through the usual lockstep, and it actually began a weak second act devoted to the county library. But then the pattern was broken, several rungs on the ladder were skipped. Before LSA, and with added impetus under LSA, New York struck out for coordinating library systems, covering anything from parts of counties to several counties. The units established are not there to provide more extension but to strengthen what extension already exists. Today New York presents a most interesting library phenomenon--it is our most populous state; yet it is now almost covered with the smallest number of systems. Get out your old National Plan for Public Libraries. New York is the only state that has got down close to the number of library systems proposed there within the several major regions.⁵ Most other states actually have more libraries today than 15 years ago.

One might interpret what I have been saying as an accusation that the state plans have not considered good library standards. This would be unfair. By actual count, 34 of the original plans mention the National Standards⁶ explicitly, and others clearly imply standards at this level. More than just mentioning standards on paper, most state agency people, I am convinced, have had reasonable criteria of achievement in mind.

Standards were clearly in the picture at the outset. But they have faded into the background in the state reports on the results of the first five years. Every state report displays optimism and enthusiasm for accomplishments to date. Yet only a handful of reports--not more than five or six--bring standards into the description of results after four or five years. Some may assume, without expressing it, an idea put neatly in one of the summaries--the belief that units established "show definite promise to grow toward maturity."

Perhaps here is the keynote I was asked to present. This has been a youthful period, these five years under LSA. Active, exciting, sometimes misdirected, yet withal promising as youth. Maturity may well be the goal in these next five years. That

would certainly be a record--to go through youth and into maturity in 10 years.

New Patterns

I am not going to dwell upon my third major point of progress under LSA in new patterns of larger library organization, other than to say that there has been experimentation, and that in my view some of these new forms hold more promise for quality library service in the next five years than primary dependence on county or multicounty units. I have already mentioned the library centers in New York. California is not resting on its relatively strong county units, but is moving on with new patterns such as the North Bay Cooperative Library System. My own current contact with the Enoch Pratt Free Library, and its interlibrary and reference service for county libraries over the state of Maryland, is still another example of new forms of library coordination which takes a discernible step toward better standards. I cannot but conclude that the \$65,000 a year put into this facility, which strengthens the central county facilities available to every resident of the state, is money better spent than if it were put into two or three bookmobiles. Centralized processing fits into this pioneer fringe of new library forms. And, to my mind, one of the most promising and not necessarily new forms is the building of county units upon strong city libraries--the possibilities of which I hope can be fully opened by adjustments in the unreal urban-rural distinction that has existed in the federal act. I am pleased to see that the Library Services Branch is fostering studies of these various experiments, to help additional states adopt or adapt them.

The Second Five Years of LSA

The next five years provide an opportunity to move from youth to maturity. Growing up always involves some hard decisions. Here are some of the hardest that are inherent in the situation as I see it:

1. to re-dedicate ourselves to national standards, which often have become lost in the hard reality of these first five years;
2. to decide whether we will continue to select one standard, accessibility and convenience of service, or whether depth and substance will be moved into first place;
3. to build our foundations first, to add to strength rather than combine weakness, even if this means that we will not start as many new library units in these next

- five years;
4. to think twice and twice again before getting caught in the treadmill of starting weak county libraries, and then compounding the mistake by adding more weak counties;
 5. to look freshly and imaginatively at the possibilities for new forms of coordination so that we will consolidate our strength rather than extend our weakness.

I have one further and final thought about state library activities in these next five years. We all know that libraries are part of the educational system. In our governmental structure, education is the responsibility basically of the state government. We have found various advantages in local administration of education both in schools and libraries. But in schools we have come increasingly to recognize that the state cannot say it has the responsibility for education, pass this responsibility off to local units, and then look the other way when sub-standard facilities are maintained. State school agencies are beginning to demand as well as encourage a sound standard of local facility.

For two generations it has been the byword of state library agencies that they are supplementary groups which will seek to help with local facilities if asked to do so. I think the time is coming when state educational agencies, for libraries as well as for schools, will be expected to see that localities maintain adequate local facilities. This does not mean state dictation, nor does it mean taking over administration, but it is more than waiting to be asked to help. I think increasingly the state will set standards, will see that these standards are understood by those responsible at the local level for this educational service, will help localities achieve them, and with great regret but nonetheless with high resolve will step in to see that facilities are brought up to a proper level when certain localities lag behind. Which I suppose is a fancy way of saying--the state will withhold aid funds if localities do not do their share.

When the federal act was passed, just when new national standards were formulated, I said that this opened the prospect of a new era of library development. Has this happened in the first five years? You recognize from my remarks that I cannot give an unqualified "yes." There has been too much attention to old forms and methods, which we know did not lead to a sound standard of service. But let us hope these traditional efforts have enabled us to catch up. There has been vitality throughout the five-year program, and there has been experimentation.

There is momentum, and not necessarily in the same old rut. I still think LSA can usher in a new era in public library development in this country. In fact, having now spent a few hours with state library personnel, I am convinced it will.

References

1. U. S. Statutes at Large, Public Law 597, Library Services Act. 84th Congress, 2nd Session, 1956.
2. American Library Association, Coordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards. Public Library Service, a Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards. Chicago, American Library Association, 1956.
3. Moshier, Louise Marion. State Plans under the Library Services Act, Supplement 2. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1960.
4. Lorenz, John G., and Carl, Herbert A. "The Library Services Act after Four Years," ALA Bulletin, 55:534, June 1961.
5. Joeckel, Carleton B., and Winslow, Amy. A National Plan for Public Library Service. Chicago, American Library Association, 1948, p. 50.
6. American Library Association, op. cit.