



The Impact of the Federal Library Services and Construction Act

JOSEPH F. SHUBERT

THE FEDERAL Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) first enacted in 1956 as the Library Services Act, provided \$626 million to the states and territories of the United States for the extension and improvement of library services through June 30, 1974. This, the first in a succession of library aid programs to be enacted in the 1950s and 1960s, may turn out to be the most durable of library development programs. As Fry has detailed elsewhere in this volume, the legislation has been amended and the program expanded throughout the 18-year period. A full evaluation of the accomplishments of LSCA is yet to be made, and the purpose of this article is to identify some of the forces which have shaped the program, and to comment on aspects of the program which may be significant as the nation considers library services in its bicentennial year.

The current LSCA authorization extends through fiscal year 1976. Not only will Congress and the library community be discussing the LSCA program as it comes up for renewal, but it can also be expected that the program will be the subject of extended citizen discussion in 1976 as the states prepare for participation in the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

The Library Services Act program has been described in a number of articles and reports. A series of publications prepared by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education and issued over the period 1958-63 summarized the programs of the states and territories. The 1963 publications include printed reports from each of the states for the first five years of the program. The 1961 Allerton Park Institute on *The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential* produced papers analyzing the initial phases of the program.¹ In 1969, Jules Mersel and others at System Development Corporation produced a

Joseph F. Shubert is State Librarian of Ohio.

report for the U.S. Office of Education (U.S.O.E.) on the operation of the program in eleven states.² Summary articles by John Frantz and Nathan Cohen³ and Paxton Price⁴ of the U.S. Office of Education provide a useful overview of the first ten years of the program and an outlook for 1966.

The early U.S.O.E. reports on the program emphasize the extension and improvement of public library services, the strengthening of state library agencies in their library development role, and the organization of library systems and cooperative processing centers. They also report on varieties of in-service training, recruitment, scholarship programs, public information efforts, and research studies and surveys. Recurring in these documents and in the Allerton Park discussion was the great expansion of bookmobile service in the early years: bookmobiles, which opened library services to thousands of rural people across the nation, were purchased with LSCA funds in forty-five states within the first five years of the program.

Accomplishments under the LSCA program should be evaluated against the political and social background of the three major periods of the program: 1956-63, 1964-70, and 1970-75. The authorizations and accomplishments of each period are directly related to coincident major forces in the nation and in library development. Even a cursory examination indicates that program authorizations and priorities which were funded have produced important and widespread results, while those programs which were identified as priorities without appropriations of funds to carry them out have labored under great handicaps.

1956-63

The 1956-63 period began with an uneasy complacency, carried over from the bland and genial first term of President Eisenhower, but there were stirrings of what was to come. Russian achievements in space had cast a harsh light on deficiencies in American education and in its technological capacities, the Black thrust toward activism was foreshadowed by the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott, and new liberal faces were appearing in legislative halls. The second half of this period, marked by the Kennedy administration, accentuated the trend toward liberalism, and the seeds of the era of the "Great Society" were already planted.

It was against this political and social backdrop that Congress enacted the Library Services Act (LSA) in 1956 after more than two decades of American Library Association (ALA) work in Congress.

Library Services and Construction Act

This legislative success was based on sound, sustained political work, and research and public education by the ALA in the 1940s and 1950s.

The political effort, coordinated by a strong ALA Legislation Committee and the ALA Washington Office, was to a great extent the work of librarians and trustees who knew their Congressmen or found the time to meet them. These librarians and trustees kept their legislators informed of the library service needs of the 26 million Americans without public library service, and the 50 million more with inadequate service.

The research and public education work included the preparation and publication of such studies as "Postwar Standards for Public Libraries" (1945), "A National Plan for Public Library Service" (1948), "The Public Library Inquiry" (1949-50), and the report of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Conference on Rural Reading (1951).

As a consequence of these initiatives, the purpose of the LSA was the promotion of "the further extension by the several states of public library service to rural areas without such service or with inadequate services." Its basic provisions can be traced to the standards, the demonstration ideals, and the "larger unit of service" extension philosophy of that period. Similarly, the implementation of LSA was greatly influenced by the 1956 ALA publication, "Public Library Service, a Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards."

1964-70

This period was one of increasing social ferment—violence, disorders, and riots—arising out of an awareness of the contradictions in the American system: the Great Society vs. the escalating involvement in Vietnam, and the melting pot of America vs. rival racial, ethnic, and cultural groups of all kinds—students, the poor, middle Americans, hard hats, women, Chicanos, the gay, the intelligentsia. Government commissions investigated, reported, recommended and disbanded. Congress responded by appropriating money. Prosperity and inflation partnered with increased consumption and discontent.

In the 4-year period 1960-64, the Gross National Product had grown by \$128 billion and per capita production by more than \$500. State spending for education had increased by 33 percent or \$8 billion, \$6 billion of which was used for salaries. The National Defense Education Act provided almost twice as much money in 1964 as it had in 1960: \$216.3 million in contrast to \$118 million. Life expectancy was slowly increasing, rural population rapidly decreasing. Women were

responsible for nearly one-half the increase in the labor force during this period.

The federal government began to assume major responsibility for human services which had formerly been almost entirely the domain of state and local government. In 1964 Congress authorized amendments which broadened the scope of the LSA program.

The criterion of "rural" was deleted from the original legislation, thereby extending the program to urban areas. The impact of new and improved services in the 1958-63 period had generated a wider awareness of the need for library buildings to accommodate new service programs, increased numbers of users, and materials; U.S.O.E. data showed that 38 percent of the publicly-owned public library buildings at the time were more than forty years old. As part of the 1964 amendments, Congress also authorized Title II to assist in the construction of public library facilities, and LSA became LSCA.

The LSA had pioneered services to rural people, many of whom were disadvantaged. Additional library services to the disadvantaged (later named by Congress as a priority in the 1970 amendments) were developed in the states as a consequence of the 1964 removal of the rural limitation, and as an increasing national awareness of the needs of the poor and disadvantaged emerged. The New York State Library used \$688,766, or 51 percent of its FY 1965 funds, to develop services to disadvantaged neighborhoods in Brooklyn, Buffalo, New York, Queens, Rochester, and Nassau County. In FY 1966 the State Library of Ohio granted \$116,436 to the Cleveland Public Library to initiate the Reading Centers project. Similar programs were developed in some other states in the 1960s under LSCA Title I, and in the 1967-70 period the ALA, state library agencies, and others sought specific authorizations and new funds for services to disadvantaged persons under a specific title.

Considerable impetus for specific authorizations for service to the disadvantaged came from the ALA-PLA (Public Library Association) Metropolitan Area Services Committee, headed by Henry Drennan. Meetings in New York and San Francisco and a "hearing" on the problem of urban library services in Detroit in December 1967 heightened awareness of needs, and led to discussions with the ALA Legislation Committee.

In the 1960s the ALA Legislation Committee was increasingly concerned with all types of libraries. In 1962, Congressman Cleveland M. Bailey of West Virginia, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Education, introduced and held hearings on LSA amendments which

Library Services and Construction Act

would have added an LSA Title II for state-based programs "establishing and maintaining programs of library service in public elementary and secondary schools" and a Title III authorizing grants by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library "books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials (including necessary binding)." In the words of the bill, this broadening of LSA was intended as a "coordinated program of library development" needed to bring about "maximum availability and utilization of library resources." It failed to pass, but parts of it became the basis for library assistance in such later legislation as the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The ALA continued its discussions of omnibus legislative approaches which would address themselves to the broad problems facing all libraries. This, along with the national concern with social and education programs, and the willingness to use federal dollars for change and development, were reflected in the 1966 LSCA amendments which further expanded the program to include two new titles. Title III authorized funds to establish and maintain local, regional, state or interstate cooperative networks for the "systematic effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers." Title IV provided for specialized state library services to persons in state institutions and to the physically handicapped.

1970-75

Concern for the environment and fear of the consequences of uncontrolled technology began to emerge as powerful forces affecting the political scene, yet the demand for energy and for goods did not appreciably diminish. A compliant but stiffening Congress became more sensitive to allegations of its default in decision-making responsibilities. The administration succeeded in the enactment of revenue sharing as part of the "new Federalism." The bills from Vietnam and the Great Society came in for payment. The President's resignation, a feverish rate of inflation, drastic and fragmented prescriptions for its cure, a substantial recession and finally a vitamin injection of federal money into the economy (with still uncertain results) brings us to the present.

At the outset of this period, the 1970 LSCA legislation authorized new programs and priorities in a consolidation, rather than in an expansion, of the program as had been authorized in the 1966

amendments. Instead of enacting specific titles for services to the disadvantaged, assistance to metropolitan resource libraries, and strengthening state library agencies as suggested by ALA and the state library agencies, the Congress, dealing also with administration's counter-proposals for consolidation and reduction of programs, went in the opposite direction: the LSCA program was extended but Title IV was merged with Title I and the language in Title I was broadened. At the same time, appropriations for the program were leveling off and there appeared signs of increasingly uncertain funding.

The 1970 amendments which merged Titles I and IV added to the scope of the legislation. Not only was the original purpose of the act maintained as "the extension and improvement of public library services in areas of the states which are without such services or in which such services are inadequate," but language was also added to authorize "special programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged persons in both urban and rural areas." Title I funds were also authorized "for making library services more accessible to persons who, by reasons of distance, residence, or physical handicap, or other disadvantage, are unable to receive the benefits of public library services regularly made available to the public, for adapting public library services to meet particular needs of persons within the states, and for improving and strengthening library administrative agencies." Title I also specifically authorized the use of LSCA funds for "strengthening metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers" and for what had been a central part of LSA and LSCA from the start—the strengthening of state library agencies.

In May 1973 a new Title IV, "Older Readers Services," was added to LSCA as part of the Older Americans Act of 1973. This title authorized funds for a variety of programs designed to provide library services to elderly persons, including payment of salaries of elderly persons working in library programs for the elderly, outreach and in-home library services, and the furnishing of transportation to provide the elderly access to library services.

In August 1974 the LSCA was again amended as part of the Education Amendments of 1974, to ensure that priority would be given to programs and projects serving areas with a high concentration of persons of limited English-speaking ability. However, by 1970 historic confrontations were shaping up between Congress and the President on matters of national goals and spending priorities. For FY 1971 (the midpoint of which was December 1970, when the legislation was passed), the administration recommended a cutback in LSCA

Library Services and Construction Act

funds and delayed release of funds until April 1971. In January 1973, after his re-election, President Nixon recommended the termination of LSCA appropriations, effective July 1, 1973. The will of Congress and court decisions on the impoundments⁵ resulted in a continuation of the programs. However, by March 1974 the U.S. Commissioner of Education was exploring with library leaders a "phase-down" of LSCA and other administration alternatives.⁶

BASES FOR EVALUATION

What are some of the bases on which LSCA might be evaluated? The act today retains significant language which was written into the 1956 legislation: "The provisions of this Act shall not be construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions." This, along with the matching fund requirements, implies a test of state and local initiative and capability.

The bases for judging state and local initiatives are different, and it may be useful first to examine local initiative. This might be measured by: (1) the number and kinds of project proposals initiated below the state agency level; (2) the "real dollars" committed locally to such projects to initiate them and to carry them out for the project period; (3) the extent to which local funds have been used to continue successful service programs after the LSCA grant assistance ended; (4) the degree to which grant-assisted projects are identified with the local library's basic service program; and (5) voter response to library initiatives for tax levies or increased appropriations.

Reports by the state library agencies to the U.S.O.E. do not include data for the first criterion noted above, and while some information may be available for some states, no papers reporting on this have been identified. It may safely be said that some libraries have been more imaginative and aggressive than others in preparing applications for LSCA funds, and that the degree to which state library agencies have stimulated and provided technical assistance to libraries has varied from state to state. New Mexico and other states held workshops and training programs designed to help applicants develop their needs assessment, planning, and project development skills. Such programs became particularly important as state library agencies worked with

local libraries to develop programs responding to the priorities enumerated in the 1970 LSCA amendments.

Uncertainties and delays in LSCA funding, including impoundments, continuing resolutions, and late release of funds caused frustration on the part of applicant libraries and tended to undermine local initiative in developing project proposals.

Questions concerning "real dollars" from local sources, or local institutional commitment to LSCA-financed or LSCA-assisted projects, and the extent to which local funds have been used to continue services after termination of the LSCA grant funds have been widely debated. The most dramatic test of program commitment probably took place in most states in 1973 when the administration impounded FY 1973 funds and sought to end the LSCA program in July. Ohio's experience was perhaps not untypical:

The commitment of local libraries to services which had been supported by LSCA funds was tested in two ways as the State Library Board and public libraries faced the realities of sharply reduced funds: (1) Special project grants for service to the disadvantaged approved in May 1973 had to be matched by increased local cash, and the total in-kind and local cash matching funds for such projects had to total at least 35% of the total project. While three projects met this guideline in the original applications, another revised plans to meet it; (2) Some libraries which had carried out projects with LSCA assistance in FY 1972 and earlier years made decisions on the continuation of these services with local funds. The Cleveland Public Library, for instance, revised its budget plans to incorporate a major share of Project INCLUDE in its regular operations supported from local funds after June 30, but another metropolitan public library terminated its two year project at the halfway point when further LSCA funds were not available.⁷

The role of LSCA funds as a factor in demonstrating services which were subsequently supported by increased local funds, particularly through voter response to library initiatives for tax levies or increased appropriations (including allocation of revenue-sharing funds), should be examined. The early period of LSA produced many such successes, particularly in voter response to tax levies for continuation of bookmobile services, library programs, and system development initially demonstrated with the help of LSA funds. LSCA Title II funds provided a powerful incentive for communities to raise matching

Library Services and Construction Act

money for construction, and for adequate support of expanded library services from such new buildings.

At the state level, different tests have been suggested: (1) increase in the number of states providing state aid, and the size of state aid appropriations; (2) appropriations from state funds for the maintenance of state agency functions which have been assisted by LSCA; and (3) the degree to which state agencies have been successful in addressing themselves to the priorities established in 1970 without the aid of major new funds.

In FY 1957, the first year in which LSA funds were available, twenty-three states had programs of direct state aid to local public libraries. Of these, fifteen had available more than \$40,000, the basic allotment under LSA at the time. State aid appropriations for FY 1957 totaled \$5.4 million. By 1974, thirty-six states had state aid programs. Of these, twenty-eight had available more than \$200,000, the basic allotment under LSCA Title I; total state aid appropriated for the year was \$81.7 million.

Igoe⁸ and others have pointed out that a large proportion of the LSCA funds have been expended at the state level, rather than having been used as grants to local and regional library programs. Given the reporting system developed by the U.S.O.E., it is difficult to evaluate this and to measure trends in state initiative in LSCA-assisted programs. It is relatively easy to identify the amounts of money the state agencies have used for grants to local and regional libraries, but it is more difficult to classify and interpret the variety of uses of the funds expended at the state level. At times expenditures have been designated interchangeably for "strengthening the state agency" or for "administration." Yet these also may include expenditures for the operation of a union catalog or computerized network development—a service which in one state might well be administered by a major public library or a consortium, in another by a university library, and in another by the state library agency. The first instance might be commended as a Title I expenditure; the second, as a Title I or Title III expenditure; and the third might be suspected to be a state library agency "drain" of LSCA funds.

However, the impact of the 1973 events—in which FY 1973 LSCA funds were impounded and the President recommended termination of funds at the start of the FY 1974 year—clearly indicates that many state library agencies were heavily dependent upon LSCA funds for normal operations. The action of state library agencies, state

administrations and legislatures at that time may serve as some indication of state dependence on LSCA funds in a crisis situation: twenty states substantially increased their appropriations from state funds for state library agency operation, but ten of these provided for a reimbursement should LSCA funds later materialize.

A December 1974 report of the General Accounting Office was critical of Michigan and Ohio LSCA Title I program expenditures for statewide purposes.⁹ The report concluded that this action reduced the amount available to provide "new and improved services at the local level." Any careful reader of statehouse news knows that state administrations and legislatures generally seek maximum federal funds in any program, with minimum state matching funds. State library agencies have generally found the matching fund requirements and interpretation given by the U.S.O.E. of little help in securing the funds needed at the state level.

Since Congress did not change the basic purpose of LSA/LSCA in 1970 but merely added more purposes and priorities without increasing appropriations, the state library agencies were, in effect, faced with the problem of dealing with new responsibilities with reduced amounts of money. The authorizations for the expanded priorities indicated a larger need and were based on testimony documenting that need, but the gap between authorization and appropriation began to widen.

Earlier commitments of LSCA funds also affected state agency capacity for dealing with the new priorities. Although the full implications of decisions made as new funds became available in 1957, 1965 and 1968 may not have been known at the time, those determinations of the use of LSCA funds reflected a position in each state as to whether the funds would be considered short- or long-term. Consequently, in 1970 and 1973 some states were heavily dependent upon LSCA funds to meet continuing obligations to locally or regionally administered service programs—or even for state agency operations. Those states had difficulty in meeting new priorities.

The interest and commitment of local libraries to the additional purposes and priorities established by Congress in 1970 is a factor in measuring state agency response and effectiveness, and is directly related to the nature of the LSCA funds and the policies and plans developed in the late 1960s. Filing of the long-range program required by the 1970 amendments was not required until June 30, 1972; U.S.O.E. technical assistance to the states for development of the

Library Services and Construction Act

program was provided by the Ohio State University (OSU) Evaluation Center from October 1971 to May 1972.

As indicated above, the incentives and assistance given local libraries in responding to the priorities through grant-assisted projects varied from state to state. The influence of the OSU Evaluation Center training program led to replication of this needs assessment, program planning, and evaluation programs in other states. Regrettably, the U.S. Office of Education, which had granted Higher Education Act Title II-B funds to initiate the OSU training program, abandoned the program at the point at which its influence might have reached further.

The degree of success with which state library agencies have addressed themselves to the priorities established in the 1970 amendments appears to have depended upon several factors: (1) the level of LSCA funds available for expenditure, (2) the nature of earlier commitments in each of the states, (3) the interest and commitment on the part of local libraries to the priorities established by Congress, and (4) the degree of interest on the part of the state legislatures and administrations.

There was continual discussion in library circles about the difficulties of long-range planning and effective program implementation. However, given the changing and uncertain levels of LSCA support, as well as the delays in release of funds when Congress and the administration did not agree on funding levels, it was not until 1973 that the state administrations and legislatures were fully confronted with the problems of financing and continuing LSCA-initiated services at the state and local levels. Some responded by increasing state appropriations both for state agency operations and for state aid programs; others provided conditional appropriations for operations and, in some cases, for grants programs. The spring of 1975 is too early to determine the long-term results of the 1973 crises, but it is apparent that some statewide development programs and state library agencies may have been strengthened by direct confrontation of the problem. If the purposes of Congress are to be carried out, other states may at least serve as examples of the need for amendment of the act.

Matching fund requirements under LSCA, except for the requirement that expenditures not be reduced below the "floor" of the second preceding year, do not appear particularly significant. Local as well as state funds were used for matching in eight states in FY 1958 when the appropriation was \$5 million. By 1961, when the appropriation was \$7.5 million, eighteen states used local funds, in

part, for matching; in FY 1965, when LSCA Title I funds were increased to \$25 million, twenty-nine states used local funds for matching.

Since 1956, the act has placed upon the states and their local subdivisions the responsibility for determining the best uses of funds and for setting these forth in a state plan or (since 1970) a long-range program. While one critic has described this as a nebulous legislative prescription, its use in the mid-1950s and throughout the 1960s antedates what has been generally cited as desirable in the 1970s: state and local determination of programs. In fact, unlike some of the federal library legislation which succeeded it, the LSCA has provided a kind of "revenue sharing" for library purposes, resulting in a mixture of local and state use of LSCA funds in each of the fifty states.

There has been an emphasis on statewide planning since 1956. The U.S.O.E. has provided technical assistance for state planning through (1) occasional meetings in Washington in the early years, usually in conjunction with review of draft regulations, (2) a 1965 conference in Chicago on long-range planning,¹⁰ (3) consultant service using program officers, and (4) the Ohio State University Institute on Statewide Planning and Evaluation in 1971-1972. As a consequence of these efforts and the initiatives of the state library agencies, the planning and evaluation competencies of state library agency people in some states equal or exceed those of other program areas. A 1974 study suggested that the state-plan approach to LSCA might be strengthened by "the kind of administrative-political clout required to reduce or cut off funds if the state plan or its implementation do not meet standards."¹¹

Another view of LSA/LSCA assistance to state library agencies is given by Kenneth Beasley in his paper, "The Changing Role of the State Library," in which he sums up the present role and effect of state library agencies:

The real centralization has come from the increased direct ties of the state library to the local political units in the state and other politically oriented state agencies. In relationship to local government, the state library has been an agent of gross centralization but under a guise of local self-determination. Increased state grants-in-aid have provided a base for this move, but much more important has been the added federal funds and the recodification of state library laws. In line with the general trend to enlarge the power of state agencies, the major characteristic of the recodifications were broader authority for state libraries to promote,

Library Services and Construction Act

develop and supervise library service for the entire state. At the same time, coercive power was kept to a minimum, usually through the process of allocating state and federal aid and by setting standards for establishing new libraries and joining systems and certifying professional employees. However, with a very few exceptions, the latter kind of direct authority has rarely been used as a major device to *direct* involvement—it has more often than not followed or reflected development.

The real power of the state library has come more subtly in the form of increased personnel who visited local libraries and helped shape their internal policies in line with state concepts, conducted conferences and in-service training to help build a cohesive and homogenous professionalism, established direct liaison with and often supported the state library association, recommended revisions in statutes and acted as a broker with the legislature, and worked with political leaders to get local changes. This kind of power cannot be beat. Of this increased personnel, the importance of the field worker cannot be underestimated.¹²

The influence of federal funds through provision of resources for such development in implementing LSA/LSCA objectives is acknowledged in almost every state.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

As one examines the accomplishments and strengths as well as the weaknesses and problems of the LSA/LSCA years, one notices first the disparity between the promise and the reality of the program, i.e., the gap between legislative authorization and appropriation. For more than half of the LSCA program's history, and despite work on long-range planning, this gap, fiscal uncertainty, and delayed appropriations have necessitated *ad hoc* decisions for both state agencies and local libraries. Difficult decisions had to be made to keep programs afloat and staff together in "lean" periods.

Another problem that has surrounded LSCA since its inception is that of insufficient collection of data and dissemination of information about the program. Assessment of program effectiveness has been somewhat fragmentary and much of what has been produced is buried in U.S.O.E. files. Fortunately, the 1956-63 period of LSA was well documented in U.S.O.E. *Bulletins*, but comprehensive data since that time is largely ungathered and unpublished. As administration policy on the program turned cool or hostile it seemed that less data was

released, although this may partially be accounted for by the decentralization of U.S.O.E. and the transfer of LSCA program officers from Washington to the regional offices in 1967. The problems of data gathering and dissemination require the attention of everyone involved in the program at all levels.

Since the inception of the program, the U.S.O.E. staff assigned to LSA/LSCA has been outstanding in its interest and commitment to a genuine state/federal partnership in library development. Unfortunately, the fluctuations of the library unit in the U.S.O.E. and U.S.O.E. reorganizations were such that a limited size staff has been unable always to provide sufficient technical assistance to the states.

The LSCA program placed new and major responsibility on the state agencies and provided new resources for carrying out that responsibility. In so doing, it thrust upon those agencies the challenge that moved many of them from a rural bias toward the development of statewide programs that involved larger libraries in planning. This is particularly true of Title III, which brought state library agencies into a new relationship with university, school and special libraries as well as with the major public libraries. LSCA-assisted programs shaped network development and caused major changes in interlibrary sharing and communications. Expansion and changes in interlibrary lending, particularly that which crosses type-of-library boundaries, can be traced in many states to LSCA influence.

Genevieve Casey has identified LSCA Title III as a significant stimulus to intertype library cooperation: "The legislation mandated that every state develop a plan with the help of an advisory council representative of all types of libraries, a proviso that in many states created the first real interaction between all library interests and put the state libraries in the center of intertype library planning. Funds could be spent for equipment, personnel, leasing of space, communication, but not for materials, a wise prohibition since it forced the linkage of existing resources and services, and a more creative approach to cooperation than the traditional shared use of a collection of expensive and/or esoteric materials."¹³

New responsibilities and resources caused state agencies to use effectively different techniques to assist in the development and planning of library services: more sophisticated workshops, use of research and experimental programs, expanded consultant and technical assistance. Yet the administration of the LSA/LSCA program has been practical and well attuned to political and library development realities.

Library Services and Construction Act

As an example of such realism, the political work of program administrators should not be overlooked. James S. Healey¹⁴ pointed out the work of Elizabeth Myer as an influence on Rhode Island Congressman John E. Fogarty who, with the cooperation of Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, secured full appropriations for the (Title I) program in the 1960-67 period. Each Congressman or Senator who has supported library legislation and appropriations has had such librarians in his or her home district.

Congressman Fogarty pointed out to the American Library Association: "Libraries do not stand apart from the American political process, and, therefore, their prospects are directly linked to legislative actions. Without a library bill that has the unified support of the profession success is slight. This support and understanding will be achieved only if the bill is carefully drafted to accomplish its goals and only if it is presented with imagination, with intelligence, and with enthusiasm."¹⁵ The careful, persistent work of the ALA Legislation Committee and the ALA Washington Office, supported by clean, productive administration of LSCA programs at the state and local levels, has proved that point. LSA/LSCA has been remarkably clear of the criticisms of red tape and federal interference in state and local affairs.¹⁶

This year 1976 marks the twentieth anniversary of the enactment of the Library Services Act and the technical expiration date of the current federal LSCA authorization. The program has broadened and changed substantially over the 20-year period. Looking ahead to the 1980s, renewal, amendment, abandonment, or new directions must be assessed in terms of changes in attitudes toward federal programs.

A 1975 report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identifies a trend toward consolidation of categorical grant programs into more broadly gauged block grants, and "where grant programs are not completely consolidated . . . Congressional and executive action to facilitate the packaging of separate grants."¹⁷

Consolidation of library grant programs within either education programs or community development programs will probably result in experience similar to library utilization of federal revenue-sharing funds—some notable successes, but a 1 percent record nationwide.¹⁸ Approaching LSCA from a broader point of view and recognizing its success in delivery of services and in maintenance of a continuing base of political support in Congress could relate the library aid program to the realities of the late 1970s. A new, properly funded LSCA

program—one which builds on the strengths of Titles I and II, broadens Title III, and provides for continuation of the kinds of programs made possible by Title II of the Higher Education Act—could respond to citizen and professional concerns and meet urgent needs.

The unevenness of state commitment to library service as expressed in appropriation of state funds for library systems development indicates a need for action in state legislatures to secure the kinds of funding needed for systems development, new organizational and financing patterns, support of major libraries which serve as resource centers, and encouragement of user-based services.

A new federal aid program responding to citizen and professional interest in resource sharing on a multi-type library basis, should be designed to elicit the kinds of state assistance needed for these purposes. Much of the discussion in 1975 is still too limited and parochial to accomplish these purposes, but almost twenty years of experience with LSA and LSCA indicates that:

1. Federal funds should continue to be an important part of library services development, and state funds must inevitably play a stronger and more closely connected role in this development.
2. Federal funds should continue to be state based, recognizing the federal nature of the U.S. governmental system. These funds should enable the states to strengthen local service programs, develop adequate systems, and participate effectively in national network developments.
3. Provisions for pass-through of federal funds should not repeat the mistakes of other programs in which funds are dispersed into fragments, but should be tied to development of expanded or new state aid programs for library systems, eliciting the kinds of appropriations needed to provide the services needed in each state.

New opportunities for such a program are suggested by the program of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and by the need for states to take more responsibility for the financing of public education because of court decisions which challenge the present system of financing public schools. Just as the LSA program triggered the creation or activation of state library agencies in some states, and as LSA/LSCA-assisted plans, studies and programs resulted in a number of major changes in library laws at the state level, a new program could be successful in securing needed changes in state support for library services.

Library Services and Construction Act

APPENDIX

LSCA APPROPRIATIONS, 1956-74 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

Fiscal Year	Title I	Title III	Title IV-A	Title IV-B	Total Services	Title II
1957	2.0				2.0	
1958	5.0				5.0	
1959	6.0				6.0	
1960	7.4				7.4	
1961	7.5				7.5	
1962	7.5				7.5	
1963	7.5				7.5	
1964	7.5				7.5	
1965	25.0				25.0	30.0
1966	25.0				25.0	30.0
1967	35.0	.4	.4	.3	36.1	40.0
1968	35.0	2.3	2.0	1.3	40.6	18.2 ^d
1969	35.0	2.3	2.1	1.3	40.7	9.2
1970	29.8	2.3	2.1	1.3	35.5	7.8
1971	35.0	2.3	2.1	1.3	40.7	7.1
1972	46.6	2.6			49.2	9.5
1973	62.0 ^a	7.5 ^b			69.5	15.0 ^b
1974	44.2 ^c	2.6			46.8	0
Total	423.0	22.3	8.7	5.5	459.5	166.8

^aOf this amount only \$30 million was released within the fiscal year; the \$32 million impounded was released in early 1974.

^bImpounded throughout the fiscal year, and not released until early 1974.

^cOf this, the major share was impounded the first seven months of the year and, until release of the full appropriation, funds were released on the basis of \$13 million.

^d\$27.2 million was appropriated but only \$18.2 million was allocated to the states.

References

1. Strout, Donald E., ed. *The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential* (Allerton Park Institute No. 8). Champaign, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1962.
2. Mersel, Jules, et al. *An Overview of the Library Services and Construction Act - Title I*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1969, p. 373.
3. Frantz, John C., and Cohen, Nathan M. "The Federal Government and Public Libraries: A Ten-Year Partnership, 1957-1966," *Health, Education, and Welfare Indicators*, July 1966, pp. 1-21.
4. Price, Paxton P. "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-511)," *Health, Education, and Welfare Indicators*, Sept. 1966, pp. 1-12.

JOSEPH F. SHUBERT

5. Frase, Robert W. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds," *Publishers Weekly*, 205:64-67, Jan. 21, 1974.
6. Ottina, John R. "USOE and the Library Role." Remarks presented to a group of leaders of the American Library Association and other library groups at the O'Hare Inn, Chicago, March 8, 1974.
7. Ohio State Library. "Summary and Evaluation of Ohio FY 1973 LSCA Program, Report to the U.S. Office of Education." Excerpted in *News from the State Library of Ohio*, 144:74, Oct. 10, 1973.
8. Igoe, James G. "Federal Grants and Public Libraries." In Melvin J. Voigt, ed. *Advances in Librarianship*. Vol. 3. New York, Seminar Press, 1972, pp. 137-65.
9. Comptroller General of the United States. General Accounting Office. *Federal Library Support Programs: Progress and Problems; Report to the Congress*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., Dec. 30, 1974.
10. Carl, Herbert A., ed. *Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries; Report of a Conference September 19-22, 1965, Chicago, Illinois*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1966.
11. Government Studies and Systems, Inc. *Alternatives for Financing the Public Library* (Study prepared for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science). Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1974, p. 55.
12. Beasley, Kenneth E. "The Changing Role of the State Library." In Melvin J. Voigt, ed. *Advances in Librarianship*. Vol. 2. New York, Seminar Press, 1971, pp. 197-98.
13. Casey, Genevieve. "The Public Library in the Network Mode: A Preliminary Investigation" (Commissioned Paper under the Commissioned Papers Project, Teachers College, Columbia University). Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, Division of Library Programs, 1974, pp. 8-9. (Unpublished)
14. Healey, James S. *John E. Fogarty, Political Leadership for Library Development*. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1974.
15. Fogarty, John E. "Laws, Law-makers and Librarians." Address delivered to the American Library Association, Washington, D.C., Jan. 19, 1965. Quoted in Healey, *op. cit.*
16. U.S. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Select Subcommittee on Education. *Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970*. Hearing, Ninety-first Congress, Second Session on H.R. 16365 and S. 3318, Sept. 10, 1970. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1970, pp. 75-79.
17. U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. *Federalism in 1974: The Tension of Interdependence*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1975.
18. For an interesting discussion of the "anti-institution building and anti-leadership consequence of revenue sharing, see Reagan, Michael D. "The Pro and Con Arguments," *Annals of the American Academy*, 419: 23-35, May 1975.