THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON PUBLIC LIBRARIES

S. Janice Kee

The Problems

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

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

There appears to be more that we do not know than that we think we do know about the impact or force of federal legislation. For
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example, while we have Stanford’s appraisal of the Works Project Administration’s library assistance program, written in 1942, we have no knowledge, based on research, of the long-range effect of this program of federal aid to libraries. If one person’s impression of its effect in one state is typical, we might generalize that in some counties the WPA demonstrations were highly successful and paved the way to the development of a good modern library operation, as in Shawano County, Wisconsin. In other counties, the demonstration had a very different effect. It fixed in the minds of at least one generation of taxpayers a resistance to rural library development on the basis that the bookmobile, alone, was the whole library.

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

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

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

The adoption of the Constitution of the United States might be considered the first federal act that has affected the development of public libraries, for at that time, when our system of government was established, it was the firm belief of the political scientists of the day that the federal government should have greatly limited powers, and the states should have many responsibilities, including the education of the citizenry. The states, in turn, delegated in great measure this large task to local governmental jurisdictions. We will never know what the results would have been if the power to provide education had been assigned clearly to the federal government in the Constitution.
We do know, very well, the poor record of public library establishment and support by local and state governments since 1787, and it need not be recounted here. The 1965 National Inventory of Library Needs tells this dismal story, which is one of neglect of public responsibility at these levels of government.5

Historical Notes

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

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

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

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

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

The justification of the existence of public libraries has been based on this ideology since the middle of the nineteenth century. (This was when the New England states led the nation in authorizing local government to support community libraries with tax funds.)
Since the creation of the first state library extension agency, service for all has been emphasized. Our working slogans have been "equal chance," "books for all" and library "coverage." These are the noble ideals around which public and state librarians have rallied for seventy-six years—or should I say seventy-four years?

Recent Legislation Affecting Libraries

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

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

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

The thrust of these laws, which may seem to affect public libraries indirectly, may, indeed, have a great effect upon their future as public cultural institutions. The community programs under these laws will compel public librarians to turn a searchlight upon themselves; to re-examine the purposes of public libraries; to evaluate existing programs and practices; to find ways to coordinate library services; and, in all probability, to adjust to a role of the public library which more clearly represents its original purposes, symbolized by the slogans, "equal chance" and "continuing education."
It must be recognized, of course, that this adjustment will be furthered by other strong societal forces which affect library development, but I expect the flow of federal funds into community education programs will be the sharpest spur to action. Already we are seeing signs of wholesome unrest among public librarians as they react to the book, The Public Library and the City, and to some of the recent speeches of Dr. Kenneth Beasley, Ralph Blasingame and others.10,11,12

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

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

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

Historical Notes on LSA and LSCA

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

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

There is a considerable amount of literature related to this Act, its legislative history, the plans and projects of the states and the accomplishments that have been attributed in whole or in part to the availability of federal grants. It is not the purpose of this paper to review and appraise the ten year program under LSA and LSCA. The Allerton Park Institute of 1961, at the end of the first five years, aimed to examine objectively and critically the record of progress and to speculate on the future course of library development.13 While
there may be some question as to how successfully the conference carried out its objectives, the published proceedings are a valuable contribution to the literature, particularly the Martin paper on "fragmentations and convenience" in library extension. (I dare say this paper has had an impact on state-wide library planning, and I hope I am right!) Also there is now in print an excellent factual and statistical review of progress under LSA and LSCA for the ten-year period, done by John C. Frantz and Nathan M. Cohen.\textsuperscript{14}

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to the purpose of LSA and LSCA, all fifty states are on the move toward better libraries. They are moving at different speeds according to the directions of fifty different plans. Also, because no two states started at exactly the same line, they are at various points in their race for universal library service of quality.
All of these facts and circumstances should be kept in mind as we consider the reactions of the state librarians and others on the question of impact of federal legislation. In addition, it is well to remember that the most effective state and national developmental programs generally move slowly. It was only ten years ago that the state extension librarians were called upon to blaze a wilderness trail through the tedious local-state-federal relationships, essential to the administration of federal funds for library improvement and development. These librarians, in 1956, were confronted with this new and challenging, but complex public responsibility for which they had not been educated. (All librarians are now in this boat, and I am sure they are welcomed aboard by the pioneers.)

Results of Questionnaires

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

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

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

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

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

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

While the Frantz and Cohen report shows an increase of local and state funds for public library purposes between 1956 and 1964, ranging from 99 percent in the southeast to 156 percent in the North Atlantic region, only fourteen states attributed the increases to LSCA.
Ten states listed more widespread interest and activities of library trustees and other citizens as significant achievements attributable to LSCA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Awareness has led to involvement of more and different people in library planning and action programs. Active participants in National Library Week have become permanent friends of the library. Members of state-wide Citizens' Committees and Councils have become effective spokesmen on library needs. Governors' Conferences on Libraries have stimulated the interest of library trustees, including many younger men and women who have recently received appointments to library boards. Added services of the libraries, such as film programs, stepped-up interlibrary loan and reference services,
and special programs for the culturally different, have attracted new public library supporters. We must recognize that widespread involvement of people in library activities is a force in producing change.

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

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

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

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

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

And finally, I would not overlook the work and dedication to responsibility of the state librarians. With all the shortcomings of state library agencies, which in all cases reflect the shortcomings of
state government, we have no reason to minimize or underestimate the force of the 40 to 75 hours per week of work of the individuals who administer programs financed with federal funds.

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

Recommended Changes in Federal Legislation

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

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

(1) There were those who want no changes or additions but only a chance to do a good job with the laws now in force.
(2) There were more whose suggestions were related to the administration of the laws—federal rules, regulations, guidelines and services of administrative personnel.

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

Another problem in this category is related to the lack of needed directions and services from the USOE Library Services Branch. For example, needs include: "more frequent visits to the states to assist state librarians in maintaining high standards"; "more competent nation-wide consultants to work with us on our programs. The Library Extension Specialists just check our paper work"; "more publication of descriptions of federally supported library projects."

One state librarian wrote, "It is probably not the fault of the people in LSB that we are not getting leadership, exciting and stimulating ideas, which would spur us on, the kind that Francis Keppel gave to formal education."

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

A. A majority of the respondents would like to see all laws related to all libraries pulled together with the aim of achieving better coordination of state and local library programs. One librarian wrote, "We should think of federal legislation for
libraries as one topic; we have passed the time when we should think of (library) legislation in segments related to the type of library." Others said: "Laws should tie programs of libraries together"; "While we strive to eliminate fragmentation, the administration of the library laws at the federal level tends to force fragmentation." One city librarian said, "We must break down barriers between types of libraries"; another, "The library legislation is in too many different packages."

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

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

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

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

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

G. Additions to federal library laws that were suggested include: (1) federal support of library services to government, (2) funds for training institutes and other educational opportunities for public librarians, (3) grants to state libraries for research and development, (4) minimum standards for library service applicable in activities supported by federal funds,
(5) a merit system for professional librarians working in federal programs, (6) grants for special library activities directed toward disadvantaged groups, (7) support of a program which would effectively link state libraries with national libraries. One state librarian suggested "the codification of a national library program."

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

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

APPENDIX

Questionnaire sent out by S. Janice Kee

To: 50 State Library Extension Agencies—Received 44 replies
  13 Public Librarians in 13 different states—Received 7 replies
  2 Public Library Trustees in 2 different States—Received 1 reply

From: S. Janice Kee
          Department of Librarianship, KSTC Emporia, Kansas 66801

Subject: Federal laws affecting public libraries

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

I hope you will find time before September 9 to send me your opinion on two questions:
(1) WHAT ARE THE GREATEST PRODUCTS OF CHANGE IN STATE AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES THAT MAY BE ATTRIBUTED TO FEDERAL FUNDS (AT LEAST, IN LARGE MEASURES)?

(2) WHAT CHANGES OR ADDITIONS IN FEDERAL LAWS DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE MADE?

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

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

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