The objectives of this Institute are to: (1) understand basic factors in the building of public library systems; (2) become familiar with the Wisconsin social, governmental and fiscal bases in relation to which library systems may develop and (3) consider methods by which an area can build a library system. Major topics presented include: (1) Study of Public Library Development Through Systems, (2) Principles of Successful Systems, (3) Governmental and Fiscal Realities in Wisconsin, (4) What Do Librarians and Trustees Do Until Library System Legislation and State Aid Are a Reality, (5) The County Library Study and (6) Building Community Understanding. On the final day of the Institute, participants divided into four working groups to discuss the building of a library system in an imaginary four-county area for which data and special problems on situations are supplied.
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1:30 p.m. AFTERNOON SESSION Chairman: Laurance L. Sherrill

Greetings: W. Lyle Eberhart

Study of Public Library Development Through Systems: The Public Library Association Study: Eleanor Ferguson

Principles of Successful Systems: A Preliminary to Planning in Wisconsin: Margaret E. Monroe and Charles A. Bunge
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Participants will break into four work groups to discover appropriate action in an imaginary four-county area for which data and special problems on situation are supplied.
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3:30 p.m. Report of committees
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Thursday, April 25

12:30 p.m.  Registration
1:30 p.m.  AFTERNOON SESSION  Chairman: Laurence L. Sherrill

Greetings: W. Lyle Eberhart

Study of Public Library Development Through Systems:
The Public Library Association Study: Eleanor Ferguson

Principles of Successful Systems: A Preliminary to Planning in Wisconsin: Margaret E. Monroe and Charles A. Bunge

Coffee

Discussion
Eleanor A. Ferguson, Executive Secretary
Public Library Association, ALA

Ralph Waldo Emerson said a century ago, "Americans have only one defect—they have a passion for sudden achievement. The problems facing public libraries today have been developing ever since Emerson's day, yet we seem determined to solve them almost over night. It was just about twelve years ago that the Library Services Act was passed by Congress, the same year that the Public Libraries Division (as it then was) adopted its 1956 standards. Those two events laid the groundwork for finding solutions for the old problems of inadequate service, unequally distributed, poorly financed, badly housed and often provided by librarians with limited vision. We can, I think, be proud of our progress, the while avoiding the temptation to feel the job is done.

When the Library Services Act was passed, every one was surprised, delighted, and to some degree terrified. Our fears included but were not limited to the Act's limitation to just five years: lack of experienced staff; and the spectre of federal control. Later on, other difficulties arose. The first shock was the appropriation for the first year $2,000,000 instead of the $7.5 million authorized by the Act. Then, of course, there were delays in distributing the money, both because state plans had to be approved and because the Library Services Branch of the Office of Education had insufficient staff to do the approving.

Many states had no experience in planning on anything like the scale required by the Act, and looking back one can see that there were failures in assessing the feasibility of some of the early demonstrations—too many almost hopeless situations were given support.

There was a spate of revisions of state library laws because no legal authority existed to permit accepting federal money or to spend it in ways which had become customary but not authorized. And of course, having money to spend meant trouble with budget officers and auditors, not to mention elaborate bookkeeping systems that the previously available pittance supporting some state library agencies had not required.
The most serious flaw in the Act was the limitation to serving rural places, which almost mandated combining weak libraries in the hope of creating strength of service.

In spite of difficulties, most of the states did use the federal money well, did make substantial progress toward improving service and convinced Congress of the value of the Act. The evidence of that truth lies in the extension of the Act not only in time, but by the inclusion of urban areas in Title II for Construction in 1964. The addition of Titles III, cooperation, and IV A and B for service to the handicapped and inmates of state institutions in 1966 and to the evidence of accomplishment.

Looking back over the early state plans, some common elements emerge. The first and most essential was strengthening the state's own resources in staff and books, to increase its ability to act as a backstop and advisor to all the public libraries in the state. Secondly, there were a number of statewide surveys, to determine where the weaknesses lay and propose ways of remedying them. Thirdly, many states began to concentrate their efforts on the promotion of library systems, both as a result of survey recommendations and because the system idea was so firmly stressed in the 1956 standards.

It became apparent early in the 1960's that the Public Library Association had a responsibility to look at system development, to see how it compared to the concept urged by its own standards, and most importantly to see whether in fact the system was an effective means of providing service to public library users. Late in 1965, the Council on Library Resources made a grant to ALA for such a study, an advisory committee was appointed, and in July, 1966 a contract was signed with Nelson Associates of New York to carry out the work.

It should be said, I think, that while this was primarily a "status study", it examined a new phenomenon about which very little was known on a national-wide basis. Some things we would like to have done had to be given up because our funds were limited, but within its limitations, it really broke new ground. To my way of thinking, it will serve as a bench mark for many years to come; furthermore, the raw data will be mined for other studies of real significance. I am very proud to have had the chance to work on it with a fine committee, ably assisted along the way by all the state library extension agencies.

The study went through three phases, proceeding from the general to the particular. The first was to gather quite general information from as many systems as possible, to create a sort of inventory. The second looked at a small number of those systems in greater depth regarding their sources of support, governmental structure, the services they rendered, and what the libraries which were members of the systems thought about their performance. The third phase was
a series of six case studies, representing systems of various types and sizes, based on visits by a team consisting of an experienced librarian and a member of the Nelson staff who interviewed many of the staff, asked innumerable questions and generally made nuisances of themselves. This is probably the most interesting and readable part of the report, but since the object was to look for basic problems and obstacles to progress, it is sometimes critical and may cause the greatest amount of protest.

The first major problem which faced the Advisory Committee was to decide what the animal they were studying was. I think I should say that I have never worked with a better committee, one which did its homework, attended meetings, spoke its mind freely and courteously... made decisions which it stuck by throughout the whole study. You know very well how few committees deserve to have that sort of epitaph! One decision that was never really made, and as the data piled up, the obvious reasons became apparent, was a hard and fast decision about how to define a system. The first phase began with only two elements of a definition—that we were studying multi-jurisdictional (more than one governmental unit) systems, and only those in operation on January 1, 1964. We did not want to think about the system which is a city library and its branches, and we did want to look at those which had been going long enough to have made some progress. The first steps of the study were taken in the summer and fall of 1966, so all our universe was at least two and a half years old. With the help of the states, 1159 systems were identified, and a very simple questionnaire (we thought it was simple) was sent to them. Returns from this mailing produced 661 usable replies, but on examination, it was found that 40 had no stationary outlet open at least 10 hours a week with paid staff; and 130 others had only one. The Advisory Committee then added a further clause to its "system" definition by deciding not to tabulate those with less than two such outlets on the ground that their service potential was below what could usefully be examined.

My mental picture of a system, before the study began, was something like an area rug, where you could easily see what was on top and without much trouble could look at what it rested on. I also thought of it as a recent development (although Joekel had suggested the idea in the mid-30's) and that it served a quite specific geographical area. Most of this proved to be my error!

As it turned out, a surprising number were established before 1945, served areas of less than 1500 square miles (63.6%) and populations under 100,000 (62.7%). The questionnaire listed nine services, of which three-quarters of the respondents provided
five or more. The most commonly reported were referral of information requests to a resource library, centralized processing, centralized purchasing, systemwide users privilege, and bookmobile service. Just about half gave in-service training, and 45% had specialized system staff for adult and children's service for example. Their funds tended to come from municipal and county sources, with some state money evident.

The final questions asked whether the system or its member libraries had records of services and library costs in the geographical area for the year before the system began, and listed specific information wanted; and if the data were available would be willing to supply it? We hoped from affirmative answers to these questions to draw a statistically valid sample for the second stage of the inquiry, but, alas, it did not work out quite that way. Some seemed to have no records at all; some of the very old ones (Los Angeles County for instance) had nothing that far back; some no doubt felt unwilling to dig out the records. About 40 said they had the information and would let us use it but too many of those were in New York, and it was a far from representative list in other ways. By persuasion on the reluctant, by some compromises like accepting 20-year old figures from those whose history stretched far back, and with some help from some of the state people, we did get together a sample of 56. Two statewide systems, New Mexico and Hawaii, were added to represent a type becoming increasingly common.

It must be recognized that the sample was weighted somewhat toward the new, multi-county, large, urban-suburban system, predominantly composed of affiliated member libraries, with funds from state, federal and special district sources. Thirty three states were included, as opposed to 44 in the first phase. Thus the findings of phase two, in many ways the most significant of all, must be considered in the light of this bias of the sample. For the country as a whole the findings of the first phase are more generally representative, although limited in the extent of the information they supply.

The second phase, using the sample of 56 systems, addressed itself to looking at the governmental structure and sources of money; and at the quantity and quality of service provided by the systems in four annual stages: the year prior to system formation, the first year of operation, 1966, and a year midway between. In a memorandum I wrote for the Advisory Committee before their first meeting in January, 1966, I said one of the purposes of the study was to produce objective statistical evidence that systems increase services more than they increase costs, i.e. are they efficient means of providing service?.. Comparison of annual expenditures in the area served before and
after establishing a system is probably not too difficult. Objective measures of service may be... I'm quoting that as an exercise in humility, for both the last statements proved to be wrong, more or less.

The attempt to gather information about annual expenditures was defeated by several factors—the lack of data about pre-system conditions already mentioned for instance. An even more effective snag was that at least half the systems began as parts of a state plan and served from the beginning a large proportion of people who had had no previous service at all. Furthermore, systems show a startling capacity for growth, so that in each of the years for which we wanted information, the geographical area had changed. Systems serving part of a county became county-wide, and then multicity; one-county systems added counties, one after another, and small systems combined with other systems, sometimes for all services, sometimes for special services or joint hiring of personnel. What we have instead is data on the sources of funds, showing a lessening proportion from municipalities and growing support from counties; a shift from demonstration support by states to special purpose grants of state and federal money; and (the most complicated of all) contractual arrangements between municipalities, or unserved counties, or other systems for specific services. This results in the phenomenon called 'layering' by the report, where a system may receive money from others for centralized processing, pays another for film service, and is paid by a third county for bookmobile service plus walk-in service at its central library. It amounts to a bookkeeper's nightmare, and one wonders whether the cost-of-service calculations on which the contracts are based are at all adequate or realistic.

A great deal of information was collected on the structure of systems, in an effort to find out whether one structure was more effective than another. Summarizing that data is like summarizing a can of worms—no two seem to operate in exactly the same way. Some are made up of highly independent member libraries (or affiliates), each with its own funds and Board perhaps with a representative system Board, or perhaps not! Some are as fully consolidated as any city library. Others serve a combination of affiliates and full-operated branches with or without representative Boards. Some directors report both to a Board and to a County Commission—or several of them. The only conclusion seems to be that the structure is less important than a number of other factors in determining whether a system is effective, notably the ability of the director and the skill of the staff. It is no exaggeration to say that systems are about where automobile manufacture was 50 or 60 years ago, when each was the handmade product of one or a handful of men, without interchangeable parts or mass production. The report suggests that the unusual skill of the system administrators comes from the attraction a hard job has for the best people,
and from the fact that the administrative problems are so vast that directors grow to meet them or get out.

To me at least, the data on improved services is impressive. I hesitate to say it proves anything, but it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it tends to prove something. For instance, the population served by the 58 systems increased from a beginning 3.7 million to 16.2 million in 1966, while the number of volumes in their collections grew from 9.4 million to a healthy 21.9 million. As it happens, the median first year is 1957, the median mid-year 1961, approximating the national statistical collections of 1956 and 1962; so a comparison seems justified. Nationally per capita number of volumes increased 5.4% in 6 years; for the systems, the figure for 4 years is 57.1%. Circulation per capita grew nationally 12%, for the systems 52%. The mere fact of access to more books and greater use of them may well prove to be the greatest contribution of systems up to now.

The growth of professional staff is another evidence of service. Centralized processing performed by 78% of the large sample and 85% of the 58 systems can hardly fail to have improved the quality of that aspect of service. For 1966, the 58 systems averaged one library school or college graduate on the staff for every 9,100 people served; the figure for the year before the systems began was 1 for 13,700 people. Only 1 of 58 systems had neither a college or library school graduate in 1966.

Balancing the tendency of systems to grow in area is the possibility for members to withdraw. 48 of the 58 systems permit that. Only seventeen have had withdrawals, and one library has since returned.

The comments of member libraries about the system are of particular interest, since they balance the natural tendency of headquarters staff to assume everything is lovely if it suits them. Questionnaires were sent only to affiliated (formerly independent) libraries since it was assumed that in consolidated systems, the branches would be unable or unwilling to comment freely on their supervisors. I'm not so sure this is true, or that it was wise to make the distinction, but made it was. The only exceptions were the regional libraries in New Mexico and Hawaii, because of their special relationship to their systems. Three hundred and twenty-seven of those libraries returned replies. The evidence is strong, though not conclusive, that funds from local sources have increased for those libraries since they joined the system; they also recognize that they have benefited financially by transferring some work to the system and through state funds to the system. 86.9% felt that the system had improved their reference service, and an almost equal number mentioned improvement in circulating materials both in variety.
and quality. Contrasting with the 280 who thought reference service improved, only 26 mentioned improvement of inservice workshops and professional advice. Centralized processing was mentioned very frequently as the greatest benefit, but also drew the most votes for the greatest disappointment, usually because it was felt to be slow. It's hard to tell whether this complaint arises because the respondents have forgotten how long it took them, or whether it really is slow. The systems which make the greatest effort to involve member libraries in book selection appear to be the slowest, but the members may not always recognize this as a benefit! In reply to the question 'Have the operations of the system significantly affected your library?' 240 said it had improved things, and another 39 said their library did not exist before the system. Only 3 thought there was no improvement, and 23 saw no particular change. No disappointments at all were mentioned by 149, and 300 did not answer a question about major drawbacks of their system—surely a "massive vote of confidence", as the report says. The "best" systems serving the most sophisticated member librarians were most criticized—rural libraries or weak ones were grateful for most of what they got, though critical of "paperwork" on occasion.

The case studies are important because of the opportunity they gave the staff to check the conclusions drawn from the questionnaires against realities in the field. The six are:

Three Rivers System, New Castle, Colorado
North Central Regional Library, Wenatchee, Washington
Fairfax County Public Library System, Virginia
Wayne County Federated Library System, Michigan
Memphis & Shelby County Libraries, Tennessee
Pioneer Library System, Rochester, New York

All are relatively well supported for the size of population and type of area served. That was a deliberate choice made by the Advisory Committee because we felt that if those systems had identifiable problems, it would not be possible to shrug them off as due to lack of money. Two are rural, serving sparse population in large geographical areas; two are suburban; and two serve a major city and its suburban and rural areas. They are typical of large segments of the systems examined earlier, but are not necessarily models—in fact, it would seem impossible to select "models", so diverse is "the system". They have varying organization and governing structures, and are funded in ways representing the variety shown by the questionnaire replies.

They seem to show quite clearly these characteristics:
The importance of the director's ability and leadership—it is likely that the way the system has developed is more related to his personality than to any other single factor. One of the unanswered questions is what happens when he retires, for in almost every case, these are 'first generation' administrators.

There is evidence of lack of understanding of system policy in the branches and member libraries. Ignorance of standard procedures or a reluctance to use them sometimes defeats the system's service objectives, although performance at the local seems better than an independent library of the same size would give. This leads to the conclusion that far more inservice training is needed, in spite of what must seem to the directors like a great deal of time spent on it.

In theory, a system offers the reader in a small community the use of a more varied assortment of books than would otherwise be available. In practice, there seems to be very little interchange of books—those once sent to a branch or member library appear to be thought of as permanent parts of its collection, and any sort of massive rotation of titles is missing. Films are interchanged much more, perhaps because of their higher cost and lighter weight. While the visiting teams made no searching study of the member libraries' collections, it seemed that they were very similar throughout a system. One wonders whether centralized purchasing may not in fact tend to suppress differences among individual collections. There is no evidence of specialization among member libraries. One piece of data that would be useful here is the number of titles represented by the number of volumes reported—but unfortunately we do not have it in this study—or anywhere else in the library field. The similarity appears to hold good both for the highly centralized selection practices of Fairfax County and for those systems which emphasize participation by the member libraries, such as Wayne County.

Some reluctance is shown to use new tools such as telephone, TWX, photocopying and so on to serve readers, even though most systems have them. What is missing and badly needed is more adequate location tools (and the know-how to use them) in the member libraries. Too frequently, a reader's request is not met because the local librarian failed to interpret it correctly because she did not have adequate bibliographic access to the system collection.

One of the questions that come to one's mind in connection with the growing use of contracts for specific services, calling for money payments, is the adequacy of
On the other hand, small population regardless of area is directly correlated with a small number and variety of services that can be offered. The too-small population is simply unable or unwilling to make the financial effort required to supply enough expertise at the system level, or to develop the back-up book collections occasionally needed. The directors of small population systems are well aware of the difficulty, for all those below 50,000 population and 75% of those serving 50,000 to 100,000 favor enlargement of their systems. There is some evidence of a point around 130,000 above which number of services increases significantly. This may be the point of 'critical mass' where momentum is sufficient to overcome inertia, and the same amount of effort produces visible results.

Taking these findings together, the report recommends states which have populations below a million direct their most serious efforts toward state-wide, state-supported systems. Let me just say, that if you have to combat either large area or small population, area seems to offer fewer pitfalls than trying to work with small segments of the state's population.

Looking at the systems as a whole, there is very little evidence of developing ties with outside resources except with the state, although some real progress has been made about that in some states since the data was collected. There are states which have adequate resources to act as back stops to all their libraries, but there are many more which could benefit considerably by making greater use of university and other specialized collections. Furthermore, only a small minority of the systems show evidence of adapting their services to the large proportion of student users, or of taking the lead in developing coordinated programs with school libraries and college libraries to serve them.

Finances are a common problem, though one not limited to systems. Some of the questions that need attention are equitable reimbursement to the central library, which may have to dilute its service to its residents to meet demands of the system; a tax policy to supply the needs of poverty-stricken areas; and greater recognition that incentive for local support, without mandated local effort, will lead some communities to benefit without contributing their fair share. There seem to be free-loaders everywhere!

The report closes with a long series of recommendations, first to the personnel of systems, then to the state extension agencies, and finally in the field of further research urgently
needed in the light of the findings. I've tried to select those most pertinent to your immediate problem of planning for a statewide system of systems.

1. More attention should be paid to "the predicament of central cities," which frequently have to starve the service to their own taxpayers to meet the demands of systems for which they act as headquarters. One way of easing the problem is basing tax support on the largest possible political unit e.g. the county or state.

2. A system must serve a population large enough to provide competent system staff and real depth of resources.

3. More attention should be directed to identifying and analyzing library needs of communities, taking into account other resources in the area, the users of each type of library, and possible changing trends in use, for instance in library use as opposed to circulation.

4. In planning systems, remember that all the needed professional skills are not library skills -- there are professional management, personnel, financial, public relations skills which are also needed.

5. The extremely flexible nature of contracts should be exploited to the full, although complete reliance on contractual service may make it difficult to find money for experiment or innovation.

6. A system needs enough staff to allow time for planning. Just enough people to man the desks may prevent looking ahead to the future.

7. Centralized cataloging offers the greatest economies when organized on a state or interstate basis. Everything possible should be done to deter the local library's correcting the cards prepared centrally, for this effectively eliminates the economies.

8. The whole staff needs strong in-service training programs, geared to the experience, professional training, and system-wide influence of each segment of the staff. Personal relationships between the clerk who wraps books for the member library and the clerk who unwraps them at the other end are important. So is the understanding of the reference staff of the limitations of the branch resources.
9. Particularly in systems covering wide area, book selection might well be entrusted to a small group who can meet often, or areas of responsibility in acquisition more sharply defined to allow for greater specialization in the total book collection. There should be recognition that weeding is as important as selection. One of the least frequently available services, with the greatest potential benefit, is centralized storage of little used material.

10. Closer ties should be developed with other types of libraries, greater sharing of resources, more information about the programs of all, and the like.

11. Means of evaluating service should be built into every system, and the results used for annual budget justification and long-range planning.

12. Finally, the time has come for the library profession to identify the essential common elements so that systems can move from the stage of 'let's try it and see if it works' to something approaching standardization. If systems are to cover the nation, rapid development will require patterns which may be mass-produced for comparable situations everywhere. Furthermore it seems likely that a quite different pattern from our present one will have to be worked out for areas where population, resources, and geographical spread are markedly out of balance in comparison with the urban places where public libraries and systems were first developed.
the cost-of-service data on which the charges are based. If the community paying the charges really questioned them seriously, could they be documented? In view of the complexity of the financial structure most systems seem to operate with, one is tempted to wonder whether the bookkeeping is sufficiently detailed to give a very clear picture of where the money goes. It is most unlikely that a performance budget could be developed by most systems, or that a cost-effectiveness ratio could be developed.

Let me turn now to some of the common problems which seem to be documented by the study, for it appears that many of them are represented in some areas of most states. When you go back to reread the material from which the concept of systems was derived, it is clear that the system was originally seen as a way to give the whole country what the dweller in a large city has. Among the unanswered questions is whether rural people do need or can afford the same kind of service. I know this sounds like heresy, but many of the weaknesses the study shows up are particularly acute in areas of sparse population, long distances, and small resources. I'm not saying that libraries aren't needed— I'm just saying that the system, as we have been thinking of it, may not be the way to do it.

One obvious finding is that combining weak libraries leads to a weak system; there must be one strong library if the system is to result in genuine service rather than "something is better than nothing." That one strong library contributes access to its book stock, and the professional background of its staff even when the individuals are not directly involved in system operation.

A second is that large geographical area does not necessarily reduce service to readers: careful planning of book mobile routes, telephone service and photocopy transmission of information, new books reaching the member libraries regularly, even a modest use of interlibrary loan appear to please the local citizen and make him feel he is getting his money's worth. Whether growing sophistication as users adapt to new services will increase demands above this level remains to be seen. However, what does seem to create problems in large areas is the difficulty of frequent face-to-face contacts between headquarters staff and the staff at the local level. Both advisory consultation, and the very necessary in-service workshops and staff meetings for book selection and the like tend to suffer, when compared with what can be done by systems with smaller areas to cover.
Miss Monroe: One of the obvious things about our program is enormous flexibility—when we get new data, we reorganize. We have some wonderful new data, some very interesting facts, that have come from the Nelson Associates study. I can't wait to get my hands on a copy; and I'm sure you can't wait to get into the questions.

Charles Bunge and I decided that we had very little new to bring in except perhaps some educated questions. We'd like to raise a few and then have the floor open to you to raise questions.

When we started our thinking about systems, we thought maybe there's a shift that has to be made between the national view and the planning for Wisconsin, and we are here to prepare the way for that shift in gears. I have a feeling that there's no barrier of understanding between what we see at the national level and what we're taking into account as we plan here. What we'll do then is first to raise some questions with Miss Ferguson.

I'd like to start by putting together two facts that Miss Ferguson reported. We have been talking in Wisconsin about using the county as a building block to a system, knowing that no county, or maybe only one, that of Milwaukee, would be really large enough to merit full system development. Now, we have a nicely verified new piece of information: 150,000 population seems to be the critical mass at which things get moving. The plan that we are working with and that you have in your hands indicates that we are ready to settle at the beginning for 100,000 but that we recognize that in a short time we are going to have to have the 150,000 population base for a good system. So maybe we're getting some verification here. But what about this matter that counties indeed do seem to have a dominant role in systems of public libraries—what relationship does this have to population base? Would you like to comment?

Miss Ferguson: I think one thing that you must remember about counties is that their stature and their responsibilities vary from state to state. It seems to me that I recall being at a meeting here in Wisconsin a number of years ago when quite a strong plea was made for the fact that counties in this state were being given tasks to do by the state and thereby strengthened. In your case it may be that the county is the unit that is important. In other parts of the country I'm sure it isn't, but this doesn't make any difference in your planning.
Probably most of you are aware that the states in the Old South began library service largely on the county basis. In Georgia, South Carolina, Florida (to an extent), Louisiana, and Mississippi, the county is an important unit of government and library service began at that level rather than on a village or city level as it did in New England and in this part of the country. So they had a great many county libraries and a lot of the very small systems we have discovered are actually city-county operations. The progress that's been made in those areas apparently has come largely by combining the small counties into systems. Now this I think would probably be a valid concept for you. There's certainly good reason for trying to build systems on trading areas or special districts or something other than the county, but this just means one more wall that has to be battered down, and probably you have trouble enough without going into that.

Miss Monroe: Mr. Bunge had some questions earlier that we were hoping to raise. Do you think that any of these remain relevant as we look at the county building block in the development of systems?

Mr. Bunge: One thing that interests me is whether or not the Nelson Study looked at the effect of systems on statewide coverage. It seems to me that in doing some background work for the committee that has worked on this plan, one of the reasons that we plugged for the county is that the county gives universal coverage to the state; if all of the counties are covered, therefore all of the state will be covered. On the other hand, in Wisconsin, the counties are relatively small and there's a chance for pockets to develop with counties snapped off here and counties snapped off there, leaving unserved areas between. I was wondering if the Nelson Study found that system development tended to cover the state fairly well or to leave this kind of pockets, or if they didn't go into this.

Miss Ferguson: I don't think the study went into this. I think this is where there has to be some very strong language in the law authorising the state to insist that a piece of the state can't be left out in limbo this way. If it is a poverty-stricken area that neither of the adjoining systems wants, then the state must finance its getting into one or the other.

I think one of the things that comes out very clearly is that our extremely permissive attitude towards systems is going to have to change. The New York Study says this in so many words. In the last ten years all of us have been working so hard to get systems started that we really haven't required very much of anybody. If they'd just be willing to play they could get away with murder. But I think as more state money goes into library service and as the sums of money going in become larger, more careful scrutiny will be given to them. We will have to show that the planning actually will provide full coverage. Otherwise you are going to have these pockets.
Now most systems however successful have a few holdouts. These are sometimes very poor libraries that are proud of being independent and they are sometimes very strong libraries which feel that the system will be a drain on them. This may not be too bad if you have other strong libraries to take their places. There may be occasions when the whole system is not valid if you don't have some of these strong libraries involved, and then the state may have to say, "If you want a system, go to the board of trustees and tell them we can't any of us do this without you."

This kind of thing may have to be done. If the state takes this kind of attitude and if the state makes it worthwhile, then I think you will have no trouble. For one of the case study libraries — the Three Rivers system in Colorado — the case study points out that the benefits from the state for joining the system amount to so little that it's hardly worth the library's while to join. If you join you get $3000 let's say, and if you don't join you get $2500, so why bother if you don't want to? This is the kind of difference that has to be built into the law, I think.

If you recall the 1958 New York law (maybe it's not tactful to keep referring back to New York but they have more experience with this than anyone else) that law goes through this long statement of benefits to systems and without even an adding machine you can figure that you're going to get $50,000 or $60,000 from the state if you form a system, without doing any more than just putting your name to a piece of paper. Then the last clause of the law says "any library which chooses to remain outside a system will continue to receive a hundred dollars a year as previously." They don't labor the point at all; it is right there in black and white.

Miss Monroe: I've been looking over my notes trying to recapture all the multitude of fascinating things you said. We in Wisconsin have been working in an attempt to see the general principles that will guide us in developing system concepts here. One of the concepts that I thought I heard, one that we have dealt with, is the idea that a system is indeed a more thriving system, having a longer life and more effectiveness, if it has a great range of areas in which it has joint programs, joint participation. Did you come up with that?

Miss Ferguson: I think there's some evidence that certain services don't need to be performed by every system just as certain services don't need to be performed by every library, for example, cataloging, which we appear to be on the way to doing with computers from the Library of Congress. It might very well be handled in a state or a multistate basis. True, it probably takes longer, but there are ways around this. Best sellers don't take much cataloging — let's face that!
There are other services, film service, for instance, that may take a different level of population than direct book service. If we could analyze in more detail what the needs of our population are and how best to serve them, we could probably arrive at a number of things which could be done either at the state level or by a half or a third of the state rather than at every system level. There are certainly places for intersystem contracts.

Miss Monroe: Intersystem cooperation!

Miss Ferguson: An example of that is Wayne County in Michigan which now has contracts for service for quite a number of libraries outside the county and will probability continue developing in that direction.

Mr. Bunge: I was interested that you seemed to indicate that the Nelson Study found evidence elsewhere than New York that a system which is, as you say, very permissive has no way of demanding a minimum level of service from the local libraries in the very loose federated or cooperative system, and that this sometimes means that one library will become a freeloader, and the strongest library in the system, since it's required to serve all patrons in the system, will be very used without any compensation. The local libraries might not only be not encouraged to develop but will be encouraged just to stay as they are if they're getting a free ride and I wondered if this did happen other than in New York.

Miss Ferguson: Oh, yes, I think that there certainly is evidence of this. One example might be in the weeding of collections. Everybody wants new books but hardly anybody wants to take the time to throw away the old ones. Among all the services that are listed in the questionnaire the one that I think is at the bottom of the list, that fewer systems have developed, is centralized storage of little-used materials. Now this would be to my mind extremely important because this is one way of getting all the old tatty books off the shelves, but most of the systems don't have much of a way of doing this unless the local library invites them to come in and help with it. This is true in many cases. If I may use Wayne County again as an example, and I think I'm still talking on your point, Wayne County is almost entirely supported by the purchase of services by the local communities from the county service. This means that the local community buys only what it wants to. When it comes to developing an experimental program there is almost no money to do it because some of the other counties are not going to put their money down for the county library to let the county library play. More control from headquarters, of the staff and the operation of the local library would undoubtedly improve all the local libraries considerably, but if you start saying that too early in the game of course you're going to have a lot of holdouts because they don't want to be improved. They're perfectly satisfied with their little libraries--it's just the way it's been ever since they were little girls and boys and they like it that way.
Mr. Bunge: One thing that really impressed us when we did some of these background cases was that there's a very real tradeoff between the system that's very easy to join because you don't give up a thing to join it, and the system that has the greatest potential for being effective and efficient, in which you give a little on one side and you get a little on the other side. I think New York has found that perhaps in their zeal to get systems going they gave a little much on the side of permissiveness, although previously they had demanded a little much on the side of consolidation. It seems to me they pointed out rather dramatically some of the mistakes that might be avoided by states younger in terms of system development, in this very real tradeoff. It seems inevitable that you have this kind of tradeoff.

Miss Monroe: Well, I wonder if that is really true, because I heard something else that I would like to have you explore the meaning of a little bit. That is that the difference between consolidated and federated systems was not as great in their method of organization as it was in the strength and quality of the leadership and staff. Now how does that fit in?

Mr. Bunge: Let her answer that. I'm no mathematician!

Miss Ferguson: Certainly it was our expectation that there would be more difference between the consolidated system and the federated system than we actually found. Now, of course, it's always possible that we asked the wrong questions, and I may say that this study has a rather poor statistical base. None of us really claimed that our returns are definitive because we didn't have the money to follow up on all the things we wanted to know. But persuasion goes a long way, particularly if it's backed by some money. If you look around at the state extension agencies who by and large have had no weapon at all except persuasion you'll see they have managed to do very well with it. I think this leadership may explain it partly, and the fact that most of these systems, or at least a large percentage of them, are new enough so that they are still exciting and interesting to be parts of. And this is quite influential I am sure. People are interested enough to want to do what is expected of them. In the long run, however, I can't help feeling that there has to be something beyond simple persuasion and just what it will be I'm not sure.

Mr. Bunge: You didn't have in your sample a completely cooperative system which lacks a strong headquarters library staff, did you?

Miss Ferguson: No; this is one of the questions that the report had, what happens if you develop a system containing half a dozen reasonably strong libraries, none of them outstanding, as might well happen in an area where you have quite a lot of medium sized libraries? This is something that we just don't know and I think that's what you're getting at. There are some cases, for instance the North Bay Cooperative in California where six or seven libraries got together and one of them
provides the services of its children's librarian to help all of the others in children's work and another one does the film service for the whole group and this sort of thing. I don't think we really know enough about that kind of system yet to know.

Mr. Bunge: One of the reasons that I posed that question was that in New York, experience seems to show that there is a necessity for a strong backup headquarters library in order to make a viable system. One of the compromises between permissiveness and consolidation that the committee built into the Wisconsin plan that's being developed is that even in the federated system there would at least be a designated headquarters library, a chief systems librarian and a library board given some edges in persuasion at the top level.

Miss Ferguson: I would agree with that. It's awfully difficult for me to conceive of bolstering the book collection in three or four libraries. Let's say one builds a strong science collection and one a strong arts collection and one something else. This is fine for the people who understand the divisions between but what happens to the general public which is looking for material and doesn't know where are literature and art, for instance? It almost seems to me that you need one big collection to which all the others turn.

Miss Monroe: Particularly in the light of one of the findings, and that is that systems collections tend to uniformity and not to diversity. This is a very interesting phenomenon.

We could go on here for quite awhile. Why don't you all in the audience come in? What questions do you have? What would you like to raise as problems?

Lyle Eberhart: One of these days we will have money and will need trained personnel. Does Miss Ferguson have anything to suggest on the development of the great number of very competent staff members who are obviously necessary for system development?

Miss Ferguson: Even after I've heard the question twice I still am not sure I know the answer! But one thing I believe I didn't say it and I meant to stress it and will take this opportunity of doing so is that not nearly enough of intensive in-service training is being done. We've tended to think of in-service training as being for those people up there who don't know anything about libraries. I can't help but feel that all of us in this room and our peers need a lot more in-service training than any of us have been willing to undergo. For instance, I keep seeing mentions of courses on how to be a change agent. Now if there is one thing that a systems director needs it's to be a change agent, and maybe
a three weeks course just on persuasion and how you do it is one of the things that are needed.

As I think I did say, sometimes the problems take care of their own weeding because the people who can't make the grade just quit. But one of the criticisms that does come fairly high on the list, not at the top but fairly high, is unsympathetic or unpleasant headquarters staff. This is terribly important and I don't think it's limited to the professional headquarters staff. It carries right down to the switchboard operator and the girl who unpacks the package of books that's come to pieces in the mail and then calls up and says why don't you tie them up decently! It's a top to bottom in-service training problem, I think.

Miss Monroe: Did the study show any tasks on the part of people involved in the system that are new kinds? Or things to do or new relationships that might require the best of us, in the new situation, to acquire new skills or new knowledge? Did any of this come out in any documented way in the Nelson Study?

Miss Ferguson: Only in a negative sort of way, in the fact that the member libraries apparently didn't altogether understand what the system was all about. I think the ability to transmit policy, teaching skill if you want, is certainly something that many librarians are going to have to learn if this is to go on to be as successful as we hope it is. Another point the study makes is that all the skills that are needed to run a system are not necessarily library skills, that management skills are equally important and that if we're going to get the kind of people we want we'll have to stop calling them subprofessionals or paraprofessionals or something else. The purchasing agent, the budget officer, the personnel officer may not be a librarian but he's a professional in his own field and this is one of our little snobberies that we're certainly going to have to do away with.

Gerald Somers: Would it appear that the larger system would have to have a staff of professionals other than librarians?

Miss Ferguson: I would think so, yes. Just as an example, the LSCA Title II construction funds--this is on another level but it's an example--have required many of the states to hire consultants who are architectural engineers and teach them enough about libraries so that they can judge a library building. This would seem to me to be a very natural trend and it may very well be that this is a service which should be given on a state level. As we get deeper and deeper into computer technology, for instance, we are certainly going to need experts in this field to help us use the machines for our purposes instead of adapting our purposes to what the machine would like to do which in some cases
is what we're doing now. I would think that certainly business management skills are desperately needed. The fact that we couldn't find libraries that had statistical materials that we needed, and they were not complicated, they were dollars of support, circulation, things of that kind that you would have thought would be available, indicates to me that we really don't know exactly what we're doing in many cases. We do it because the folklore says it has to be done. If we're going to be spending five million dollars of State money we're probably going to have to know a good deal more about it. We're also, I think, going to have to decide whether for a given sum of money you get more service from sending a bookmobile around or from putting a book collection into a community. These are the kinds of things that we really haven't explored, this cost effectiveness ratio. Business is beginning to develop a means of doing this. I think we're going to have to, too.

Forrest Mills: In other fields it is possible to measure results—how many children has a social agency placed for adoption, how many students in schools. When a library has x dollars of cost what are you getting from it? How can you measure the results? How measure the effectiveness of a bookmobile?

Miss Ferguson: I'm awfully glad you asked me that, Mr. Mills. This gives me a chance to talk about one of my other pet hobbies. We have a project which is now before the Office of Education for funding which is called "Measurement of Effectiveness of Public Library Service," which is aimed at developing new measurements for this kind of thing. We have a principal investigator for it, who did some studies for the State of Pennsylvania a number of years ago, and he is tremendously interested in measurement of all kinds of library techniques, and just dying to get started on it. All we need, I think, is $175,000. What we hope is that these measures, if we can develop some of them that will be valid, may possibly take the place of some of the statistics we keep now which we all agree are relatively meaningless but we keep them because we have nothing else. Now I think this may be a step in the right direction, at least we'll start thinking this way. I agree with you but I think you've got to take the intangibles into account with social work just as well as with library work. You're not going to measure every single thing that you're doing.

Forrest Mills: A social worker makes an adoption placement and follows the results. We lend a book but don't know the effect on the reader. We give information, but don't know how it is used.

Miss Ferguson: Well, I'm not sure that we're ever going to know because when you read a book its influence doesn't always affect you right then and there. It may be years afterward when your own life arrives at a point where what Tess of the D'Urbervilles says really has some meaning for you, but I think we could do far better than we do, in measuring what we're up to. If only we could work out a way of defining a reference question in keeping track of how many we do every day and how
we do them, this in itself would be an accomplishment.

Mr. Mills: I don't question the effect of reading--I've seen the effects of Marx, Darwin, and others.

Mr. Bunge: You've lived through the age of Darwin, have you?

I think this is an area where again the specialist might come in. I take it there are strategies for doing some of this decision-making at the budget level and at the accounting and record keeping level. In the area, let's say, of defense planning I hear occasionally of a colloquium being offered over in the Economics School where they discuss this kind of thing and balance helicopters against ships and school buildings where they might know that neither the helicopter or the ship will ever be used for defense purposes. I think here again there's probably a lot of specialized information the librarians don't know about because it isn't our field of direct expertise.

Mr. Mills: To get answers about the effects of reading we may have to go to depth interviews.

Leonard Archer: I question the right of anyone to question a reader about the use or effect of that person's reading. What you read is your business. I resent the government's probing a person's reading.

Miss Monroe: If I understand the question from Mr. Mills, maybe instead of talking about analyzing the reader, we're really talking about analyzing the professional process of the librarian in providing a service. You want to measure results but you're interested here in looking at the service aspect of this to some extent. Do you want to comment on this, Miss Ferguson?

Miss Ferguson: Well, I was just going to say, I don't know whether you've seen a preliminary feasibility study that has been done on the availability of reading in large cities which includes libraries, bookstores, and various other sources of material. It included some perfectly fascinating depth interviews with people about what they read and why they read it. Now these were volunteers; obviously, they were people who were happy to talk about what they were reading and I don't see any theoretical or ethical objection to reproducing what a person says when he is anxious to talk about what he's just read. I think what we're after is not the thing that you're complaining about; as I understand it, it is not what does Mr. A read but what do people like Mr. A read, how do we find out, how do we get it to him? Presumably in a population of two hundred million there are a great many Mr. A's and if we could find out about just a few of them we would be better able to serve all the others.
I think one of the things that has hung us up about the various kinds of research, and I've been very aware of it in working with Nelson, is their faith in sampling. I think it's very hard for me at least to agree that what is done in Virginia necessarily has any implications for Nebraska, or vice versa, and yet with really good sampling apparently you do get relevant results or at least empirical judgment leads one to think that they are relevant. So I would hope that we could go on doing more and more of this.

Somebody sometime today mentioned some piece of research they were thinking of repeating in another state--this I think is something we need to do very badly. We need to do more research that's comparable in its methodology, and its format, so that the results can be compared. What has happened--you've already made library surveys, I am sure--is that each investigator starts from a different point. He plans his study differently and the results are so different that you can't say, "Here are ten surveys; they all show similar results or they contrast the situation because the methodology was enough alike so that if there were similarities, you'd bring them out." So I would hope that more of this kind of thing could be done as we get more sophisticated about how to do research.

Richard Wolfert: Would you elaborate from your own experience and from the Nelson Study--do rural people need the same service as city services?

Miss Ferguson: Dear me, I was afraid somebody would ask me that.

Miss Monroe: Mr. Wolfert is now in Bismarck.

Miss Ferguson: I think this is an implication that arises from the Study because the systems which are effective and demonstrate their effectiveness are the larger systems which have an element of suburban and urban population within them. The ones which are in strictly rural areas are having a tough time. Now that North Central System in Washington, for example, is running right up against their tax ceiling, which is almost impossible to change because it's a property tax. Property is owned by very large landowners and an increase of one mill in the tax rate means a thousand dollars on their taxes. This is the same situation you have, I am sure, in North Dakota.

I think we need to think very carefully about perhaps not less service but service provided on a different basis. For instance, I was talking to somebody during the coffee break about televised teaching in rural schools. This kind of development may be something we need to do. In Hawaii where as you know there are great stretches of water between one part of the state and another they've been using facsimile transmission of magazine articles from headquarters to the islands. That is still pretty expensive and I understand it's not terribly successful but it may be that we have to look ahead to this kind
of thing for the one person in a county who wants something of that kind. When you think of Southeastern Idaho where the population is one per square mile on an average, how can we possibly carry conventional library service to that kind of area? There are all kinds of pockets in the country that we need to think about. I think they certainly do need something.

In a way it's the same problem that the metropolitan areas are running into in serving the poverty areas where the conventional branch with its reference resources and its literary collection is just not used. There they are beginning to think in terms of reading centers which have paperbacks, which have comics, movies, jazz concerts, things that haven't been considered respectable library activities at all. Not that I'm suggesting these for rural North Dakota, you understand, but the pattern that has suited the library user, the 30% of the population which has traditionally used libraries, may not be the pattern for some of the other groups that we'll have to find ways to serve. I wish I knew the answer. I tried last weekend to persuade the Western State Extension Agencies that this was something that they ought to give real thought to, and they're the ones that have to cope with it so maybe something will come of that.

Gerald Somers: The Wisconsin Library Bulletin for March-April has articles about the role of the state library agency. Maybe direct service from the state is best.

Miss Ferguson: That's one of the recommendations of the study, actually what they're suggesting is a statewide system, directly administered by the state. Simply, at least in part I'm sure, because there just are not professional librarians available who either will go into sparsely settled areas or which we can afford to pay in areas of very sparse population. Again it's a matter, I'm sure, of finding an intelligent person whose family live in these areas, who likes to live there, giving her sufficient training so that she knows what the resources are and providing the needed guidance while she does the job. It's not necessarily poorer service, it seems to me. In fact, I've known some awfully good untrained librarians in my time; I've known some very poor ones, too, but then I've known some mighty poor trained librarians. This I think is a real possibility and it's the only way I see that it can be done.

Leonard Archer: Even Melville Dewey never went to library school.

Miss Monroe: He just started one.

Miss Ferguson: And a good many things that Melville Dewey said could be dropped down a deep well and forgotten! For instance, never cut a string on a parcel—always untie it and save the string to use again!
Miss Monroe: I'd like to make a comment if I may and get a reaction from Miss Ferguson. I think that we've had a whole series of questions that seem to revolve around something that might be phrased as the standards for service in systems. It began with the question of whether we are looking at the right things and if we indeed are just going to establish those services which we now count. If we're counting the wrong things, let us not perpetuate our error by establishing systems and doing greater and greater quantities of things that are not as significant as some of the things we aren't counting. I think that the question from North Dakota really is whether people are different in the city and the country, and if we're going to have to set up different kinds of services? I assume the Nelson Associates Study was very comparable to the Public Library Standards in this regard. Did they assume common interests, concerns, and library needs no matter where people are, and that this definition of a combination of urban-rural systems is primarily a convenience of administration and a sufficient tax base, etc., not a real discrimination between people in their needs? Or is it that people in the rural areas lacking the city-urban stimulation require something different? What is the real nature of the difference that you're pointing to here?

Miss Ferguson: I think it's largely a question of tax base, administrative convenience, etc. You probably have a lower level of library sophistication in rural readers simply because they haven't been brought up with libraries. On the other hand one of the things that I'm astounded by when I go to a state meeting in the West for instance is the trustee who says to me, "I grew up at the Enoch Pratt Library and I just can't stand the library in my town so I just have to get on the board so I can do something about it." It's not that the needs are any different-- it's just that the demands are. In the city you may have a dozen people who want a certain bit of information; in a rural area you may have a whole county with only one person wanting it. This is why I say that I just don't think that we have quite thought through how to give rural service. Now it may be direct telephone service to a state library or a university library or something of that kind, which we haven't thought of as being financially feasible, may be far more financially feasible than to build a building and put 5000 books in it for a community which is not going to need more than a very small part of them with any degree of frequency. Some of these patterns which all of us in my age bracket have grown up with may just not prove to be right in dealing with the wide open spaces.

Jane Younger: Did the case studies tell anything about composition of the boards?

Miss Ferguson: No, not really. Some of the systems do have boards chosen to represent the boards of the member libraries but we don't have any statistics, as far as I recall on how many of those there are. In some parts of the country the librarian reports directly to a government
official such as a county manager or a county commission. We certainly have no information as to what sort of people there are on the boards. It just isn't part of the study. I must apologize for not bringing the report with me. I may say that it's 525 pages of typescript in one volume about this thick and another volume of appendices about this thick and I just didn't have the strength to bring it!

Phillip Sullivan: Does the report include anything about the qualities of systems administrators?

Miss Ferguson: Other than that they're successful, not a great deal. Except that they are innovators and see the job of extending service as being interesting and challenging.

Miss Monroe: An area for future study?

Miss Ferguson: I think so. As a matter of fact it seems to me that I have seen a study recently which I haven't had time to read on personality of library directors and what they do and how they see themselves. Is that a Rutgers Ph. D. thesis?

Miss Monroe: I think that some portion of the University of Maryland's study will be in the area of effective administration. Not any one study will do all things.

Miss Ferguson: No; this really was aimed primarily at funding, government and services, and while it's obvious that personnel affect these extremely, just what characteristics are needed are left to the imagination of the reader.

Forrest Mills: I've been struck by the fact that book collections in systems libraries are permanent. Why?

Miss Ferguson: I gather that it is largely possessiveness on the part of the member library; partly I'm sure it is because some of them are young enough collections that they're still fairly new. But I still think that it's very significant. I think that most of the thinking of systems had contemplated very substantial interchanges of book collection and this just doesn't seem to take place. Now I know that books are mighty heavy to move around but anyone who's moved from a new library knows that you have to move far more books than any member library's apt to want to give up at any one time. And it certainly does seem as though more rotation of book collections would be desirable. Anyone who has used a small library regularly knows how extremely boring it is to come in and see exactly the same books on the shelves. And when I worked with the small libraries in Connecticut, I was surprised to find that one of their real problems was that their nonfiction didn't wear out to the point where
they could throw it away. It got shabby and looked very ratty on the shelves, but the inside was alright because it hadn't been read by enough people.

Miss Monroe: It might have been out of date, of course.

Miss Ferguson: Yes, it might and this is one of the reasons that I think this idea of storing things that aren't in active use so that someone at headquarters could quietly dispose of the extra copies of, for example, some of the minor Scott novels in unreadable print might be almost a first priority for systems. As a matter of fact in many cases extensive weeding was done. In the North Central Region they said quite frankly that they threw away half of their member libraries' collections right in the beginning. But it's not always possible to do this. It does seem to me that this emphasizes one of the failings of systems. Certainly in relation to its theoretical base.

Mr. Bunge: It was interesting that in the New York Study they found that the most successful systems were the systems that had achieved a good balance between what they called exposure to fresh material at the local level, which is this rotating of collections, on the one hand, and, equally important, on the other hand the development of the strong central collection, which to some extent works against the exposures to fresh material out in the local area. It was very important to strike a proper and effective balance between these two or you didn't have a viable system.

Miss Ferguson: I wonder if I could add something to that. If you recall the interim Standards for Small Public Libraries, we made a statement in that 10,000 volumes was the minimum book collection. And it just so happened that in the same week I got a report from a meeting of the system directors in New York all of whom agreed that 10,000 books owned by member libraries were far too many. This was predicated on bringing in fresh material from systems headquarters. The same week I got the North Dakota Newsletter which stated that they had adopted this 10,000 minimum as a requirement for certain kinds of benefits from the state library. Now this just points up the difference in the character of the areas and the needs, but I thought that it was very significant that in one area 10,000 was regarded as essential and in another one it was regarded as perfectly unrealistic.

Miss Monroe: I think maybe what we need to have in hand is that 525 pages of typescript which I gather is going to take 300 pages of print and be available sometime in August.

Miss Ferguson: We hope.

Miss Monroe: From the American Library Association. We might as well stop our plans until we get our hands on the data. This has been fine and thank you so much, Miss Ferguson. We enjoyed it enormously.
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GOVERNMENTAL AND FISCAL REALITIES IN WISCONSIN

Douglas Weiford, Secretary
Wisconsin Department of Local Affairs and Development

Bernard Schwab, chairman: During the past two years in the deliberations of the library and legislation committee of WLA one of the most critical factors in the discussion has been the projection of the role of local units of government in library systems development. Closely related to this factor has been the matter of financing local services, including the financial responsibilities of different levels of government. These issues are, of course, not unique to library development, and we have therefore invited four knowledgeable gentlemen to share with us their views on the evolving patterns of governmental units and approaches to the financing of services performed by these units. As one important development in the reorganization of state government there has been established a new Department of Local Affairs and Development. The first secretary of this new department, Mr. Douglas Weiford, has served as city manager of South Boston, Virginia and Eau Claire and has been director of training of the International City Managers Association. The work of this department will vitally affect the future of local government in Wisconsin, and we are pleased that the task of directing it has been entrusted to such an outstanding professional administrator. I am very pleased to introduce to you Mr. Douglas Weiford, Secretary of Local Affairs and Development for the State of Wisconsin. Mr. Weiford.

Mr. Weiford: Ladies and Gentlemen: I am delighted to have this opportunity to chat with you tonight, for this indeed is what it will be—a kind of informal chat with some random observations. But first, a very brief word about the Department of Local Affairs and Development. When the Kellett Task Force on the reorganization of State government was successfully terminated, a wholesale remodeling and restructuring of State government was accomplished without a constitutional convention, a truly remarkable achievement. Or put another way, it was the first time, to my knowledge, that any state legislature anywhere in the United States, organized on bipartisan lines, was able to overhaul its entire state government by consolidating numerous separate agencies, into a small number of departments, regulatory agencies and organizations of higher learning. Out of all of this there was a single new department created, the Department of Local Affairs and Development.
Some existing agencies were transferred into the Department of Local Affairs. There was, for example, the Division of Economic Development, which is organized to work with communities in strengthening their economic base, to draw in and maintain industries and stimulate other forms of economic development. There was also included the opposite side of the economic coin—the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its problems involve us in many ways, not only in the pattern of poverty and programs that you're familiar with, but in some unique and extraordinary ways, some of which have never been tried before in the United States. We could spend an evening just chatting about these innovations but tonight we have other business.

The Department of Local Affairs includes some unusual organizations—the State Fair for example. If anybody had told me five years ago that I would find myself in charge of the State Fair I would have demurred. But the Legislature did transfer the State Fair and the Olympic Ice Rink to us along with the Bureau of Local and Regional Planning and the Division of Emergency Government. The Legislature also directed that a new division of State-Local Affairs be created. It directed this new division to serve as an information clearinghouse for local governments, and to advise them concerning State and Federal aids; it directed us to become a one-stop agency for local governments to all of the very substantial resources of State government; directed us to assist the governor in coordinating all of the State agencies as their programs relate to community affairs. We were directed to encourage the areawide provision of governmental services, to be interested in local government structure, and their financial interrelationships, to try out demonstration projects, to innovate and to experiment.

As the first secretary of this department, I view this mission as a kind of personal adventure. And I view the department, if indeed it is to do anything at all, to be a catalyst of constructive change.

Whether we like it or not major change confronts us. There is no question but that from now on as far as we can see government is where the action will and must be. Many of you being librarians, and students of research, know this better than I, but the immensity of it staggers the mind. We're told, for example, that it took 350 years for this country to reach a population of 100 million people from that point it took only 52 years for us to become 200 million strong. And more significantly, we are told that within another 30 years we will become a nation of 300 million. To a considerable degree we have created national patterns without design or form. We have concentrated some 70% of all of our people within about 1% of our land area, and if these same trends prevail, in another 30 years we will have another 100 million people, about 95% of whom, as though drawn by magnetic force, will cluster around existing metropolitan areas. And so, ladies and gentlemen, the passage of a single generation will bring dense, human population settlements, single cities if you will, stretching in an unbroken stream of humanity from Portland, Maine all the way...
way to Florida and then all the way around the gulf coast, and up the west coast, and around the Great Lakes. Similar clusters will form from Green Bay to Chicago. The problems resulting from this will be very great indeed. Who knows how to govern such huge entities or manage their services or educate their people, or house them or furnish library services to them? The immensity, the enormity of this, indeed staggers the mind.

What I've been saying means in essence that the nation in these 30-odd years must duplicate its entire present stock of physical facilities, must build what amounts to a second America. And if we build this second America to the same pattern as the first, with the problems of sprawl, of congestion, of separation—racial, economic and spatial— the population explosion may well become a social explosion that the nation cannot survive, at least not as a democracy.

Yet there is at present no national plan to break the pattern, no national policy to deal with population growth and movement. We seem content to sit bemused and affluent and watch it all happen. We're told, as we sit and watch it happen, that we will shortly become a nation like Australia with vast regions of population around our peripheries, but with the center of our country remaining relatively unpopulated. And, we are told, our existing institutions will have to undergo profound change if we are to cope even partially with the enormous problems that will beset us. I suppose these comments are disturbing in the sense that institutional change is uncomfortable and is usually resisted. But change they must and will.

How do libraries fit into the great patterns of social change and upheaval? In one sense you have become quite disenchanted with the boundary lines which hem you in and you long for the establishment of an areawide or district arrangement for the provision of service. Some of you would even like to see separate taxing powers given to areawide library boards. You are saying, "We need to break down the artificial barriers for library service. We need to remove the constrictions of city or village boundaries so we can serve the people wherever they might live." No more of this business of denying service to the person who lives across this artificial boundary. We need a broader taxing base, and all this sort of thing. I dare say that a very substantial majority of you have reached this decision and in fact will fight for it, nevertheless in other ways you may also fight against it. Consider this: you live in suburbia and the city wishes to extend its boundaries to encompass the people who derive their livelihood within that city! As a suburbanite you vote against annexation.
We see a faint gleaming of an understanding of what is taking place in terms of the various special interests which exist, but not in terms of the need for development of some kind of overall urban philosophy. To date, each special interest which has broken away from its ancient boundaries has set up new boundaries in a unilateral manner, with no regard for a broader need to coordinate general governmental services. I fear that the library people will follow the same course.

As a case in point the school districts have broken out and have reduced the number of school districts in the state over the past 35 years from 7,500 to under 500 now. These new school districts are not co-terminous with any other unit of government. As all of you know they have also created the Cooperative Educational Service Agencies and there are 19 of these scattered around the state. In another direction the vocational schools have broken out and have created their own district pattern unlike any other. The public health people are now in the process of breaking out and will likely seek to establish districts unlike those of any other governmental agency. On top of this, unless some new kind of rational urban growth philosophy is developed and soon, we will spring up with metropolitan sewerage districts and all kinds of other special purpose districts with overlapping boundaries and this will be realized within the next decade.

For a couple of years I lived in Illinois where urban patterns far exceed ours. In my village--30,000 strong--there were some 14 units of local government which levied taxes on my property, the boundaries of no two of which coincided. I see Wisconsin now poised on the threshold of the same kind of endeavor, and I also see attempts at rational planning and new multipurpose districts contested bitterly as they always have been.

You ask me, for example, should library service be rendered on an areawide basis? Should we break out of the boundaries of the village or of the city? Of course you should. You ask me should the State be involved in the financial problems of libraries? I reply to you that the library system is a part of the educational system and as such is not a purely local institution any longer. It must indeed be considered in terms of the State's role and policy in its educational process. You ask me if you need broader financial support to do all of this? I say of course you do. But I caution you not to create a new set of library districts which will stand alone, and which will merely constitute another overlapping special purpose government.
Largely as a result of its reorganization, the state with its cabinet system is coming up with a uniform districting plan for State services. Formerly, any time a unit of State government had to do this, it set about it as though no other unit of State government had ever existed, and proceeded to perform this function unilaterally. We hope that this practice has come to an end, and that a cohesive plan can be developed whereby the State can marshal its resources, coordinate them and apply them in a more rational way to the benefit not only of State agencies but to the people who are the targets in all of this. If this can be accomplished I would propose that the feasibility of using the uniform substate districts for areawide library purposes be seriously examined.

The framers of the constitution did not mention local government in that document and ignored the whole subject in their debates. Jefferson, among the most brilliant of men, wrote on one occasion that cities are sores on the body politic; he dreamed of an agrarian society. Our institutional forms were developed with this thought—through all of the years to the present they have been developed in this way.

Now all of a sudden, contrary to all of this, we find ourselves in a veritable age of density and of cities. If the projected population increases come to pass, within another generation in Wisconsin there will be another 1 1/2 million people. There will be around the Milwaukee area substantially more than one million additional people. Yet we have at the present time no urban growth philosophy, no state or national pattern to guide this growth in an orderly manner. Characteristic of all of this, the special interest groups, librarians as a case in point, recognize what is happening within their own framework, struggle against their bonds, attempt to educate their boards, and finally develop a unilateral plan. And what has happened in the past is that when this is finally achieved, it does little more than fragment still further the process of government, of citizen understanding, and participation.

The governor vetoed a bill which passed handsomely in both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature in the last session. I want to describe what it was as a case in point. The bill would have made the formation of metropolitan sewerage commissions much easier. Had this been signed by the governor, town boards could pass a resolution asking the county judge to hold a hearing and if he felt that a metropolitan sewerage commission should be formed, he would order it to be formed. The county judge would then determine the area to be served. He would appoint the governing body of the commission, and when their terms expired, the county judge would reappoint the governing body. And the county judge in this remarkable piece of legislation would also have
had the power to prescribe the operating rules and procedures of this special government.

Now what I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that in the absence of a rational coordinated plan, this kind of thing will proliferate in all kinds of directions as urban problems beset us and we will be like other parts of the United States with these powerful units of government hemming us in—governments run by nonelected people, hidden from view—faceless—and yet with the power to condemn property, the power to levy taxes, the power to issue bonds, the power to extend patterns of growth without approval of those who must provide the services. I do not think that this is in accordance with the traditions of this country or the basic principles of democracy, and I think as a people in Wisconsin we can do better.

Well, I have talked at some length and at random. Library people I think have underestimated themselves in our society for a long, long time. You have too often been passive people. You are tremendously important people, a keystone of our educational process. As you proceed to consider the need for area-wide planning and rendering of library services it is my hope that you will take the broad view and fit your new patterns of operation within a framework designed to accommodate other functions of government as well. The starting point, I believe, should be a thorough and objective examination of the sub-state district plan to see if it can meet your needs.
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Chairman Bernard Schwab called upon Senator Chilsen to discuss what he feels the attitudes of the members of the Legislature are toward this new approach to local planning on a statewide basis, and what his own views are in this field.

Senator Chilsen complimented the Library Development and Legislation Committee on doing an excellent job so far.

The big problem as he saw it was that there is no money now on any level of government. It is going to Vietnam and civil rights programs. States had begun to talk about and to get support from Washington Senators and Congressmen for the idea of Federal tax sharing–sending money back to the states. Congressmen Laird and Byrnes have pointed out that this is not going to come until the Vietnam situation is settled and attention given to metropolitan problems.

Wisconsin has just had a no-tax-increase budget of which the administration is proud. It does not seem likely that it can be done again, though legislators want to do it to attract new industry to Wisconsin. Most of the money goes for education and welfare purposes. There were strong demands for a school aids increase last time and a minimum increase was finally passed; surely there will be another strong push. Librarians must be as active as they possibly can on behalf of the library program.

The library plan suggests that one of the contributions of a public library systems organization lies in the full range of public library services from a headquarters library, with local community libraries adapted to the special needs of the particular community. A good selling point for members of the Legislature is that this is an economical way of giving service. Industrial executives look at libraries as well as schools before moving into a community.

One problem that legislators will bring up is that once you set up a state system with State aids and State coordination, there will be State standards. Many legislators shy away from State standards. The answer to them is that this often is used as an excuse to do nothing. Say this to them more subtly and they may be receptive.

Wisconsin's six years of experience with public library systems are a good basis for judgment. The plan includes State aid as a key element in stimulating the growth of systems, a necessary financial supplement to
local funds. Some areas of Wisconsin need supplementary funds for equal
development of systems; some can provide their own.

Of course the Legislature will very quickly inquire how much money is
being asked for. The conservative Joint Finance Committee will look over
any program very carefully. Over 300,000 persons in the state without legal
access to library services in 1966 is an appalling situation--it can be pointed
out as a crisis situation.

The emphasis on local financing of public library systems is good. Counties
should provide the large bulk of the financing. The Tarr Committee will
probably recommend consolidation of services in towns and counties. Prob-
ably some of that Committee's recommendations will make the Legislature
more receptive to the library systems plan. There's no question that library
systems covering a wider area can be brought about, but it's not going to
happen overnight.

"You all have to become political activists. You have to contact your other
legislators now. There's 133. You've got one down and 132 to go! I'll do what
I can, but don't expect me to be a Moses. I'll need a lot of help!"

Mr. Eager related that about three years ago the Rock County Board of
Supervisors had set up a library study committee to consider
a county plan. The attorney general has given the opinion that the county
system is feasible and legal, but the organization of it has been delayed. A
majority of the 40 Rock County supervisors could be opposed to the system
because of the financial impact upon the townships. The problem arises
because the cities and villages have been supporting the libraries and a
countywide system would increase the rural levy. One town which has been
paying $1000 for library support would be asked to pay over $5000.

A question that needs an answer is: what are the economies and advantages of
systems? They look fine in theory but need to be seen in terms of dollars and
cents.

The third problem is the lack of public interest in the public library--no
one has yet come to ask for more funds for the public library system. If
these three problems could be solved, Rock County could probably have a
county system.

Mr. Quinlan came from a background of service in Colorado and Oklahoma
and felt that more study and research is being done on a
statewide basis in Wisconsin, with a more sound approach to consolidation,
than he noticed in the other states. Per capita funds provided in his Colorado
county were felt to be too low but not as far out of bounds as the contracts
Beloit has with townships. Even with the costs slashed 60%, townships resist
contracts. Disliking single purpose districts, he supports the county system.

People in Oklahoma City which had just gone into a system program felt that the money was being spread a little too far over other cities, and the suburbs felt that the services were not as good as they had when they had their own facilities. He suspected that what was happening was that they were all getting a little better service but were suffering from the loss of power and authority and the pride of saying "this is mine,"

Consolidation and areawide efforts are good but there are precautions, too. Single purpose districts must be avoided. Enough flexibility must be maintained that programs can be tailored to local needs. What is equitable on a state level begins to restrict the capability possible on the county level. Libraries, like other agencies, need not revolution but aggravated evolution.

All the wrong people are at meetings like this. Everyone here is in agreement—back home, nobody is. Like Mr. Eager, Mr. Quinlan had not received much comment regarding library services. In two neighborhoods where costs for library services were 50 cents per capita and $2.50 per capita there was no difference in the number of complaints or comments.

People don't really know what services libraries are performing. Library people have been too passive; they must go out and work hand in hand with business and industry, letting people know what they have. It seems that people who read just keep reading more and those who don't just keep doing it more!

When it comes to presenting the library systems program and getting action on it, more information is needed on how the plan works and how it is financed.

The key to getting from the local to the areawide service is to work primarily through the administrative officials and then let them work through their respective boards. Where there are county planners and city planners working together and presenting their programs to their respective commissions, there is more success than where one political body works with another political body. Administrators can get together, compromise and work out good programs and then proceed through normal channels—saying that this is good for our community and it just so happens that our neighbor is doing something in almost the same way and almost simultaneously. When there are fights in the news media, legislators have to assume a role and can't back off.

Mr. Schwab: In terms of the foreseeable future, what key units or building blocks do you see for building systems for libraries, sewage districts, etc.?
Mr. Weiford: This road is fraught with peril. First, the typical American citizen doesn’t care who is furnishing the service so long as it is present when he needs it and the quality is acceptable. Economic forces in our society have followed the people, and as economic forces have become integrated, the problem of political fragmentation has become worse. Library people involve cities in a conflict situation when they want to provide service free to people who do not pay taxes to support the service. City people realize that service should be provided, but every time a service is provided by the core city and the costs are borne by the core city it takes another step toward destroying itself.

Home rule wears different garments at different times. Milwaukee has a bursting population and a ring of suburban communities demanding a liberalization of annexation laws. But each community has a right to zone itself and can create a ghetto in reverse for the wealthy. Mayor Meier says that there is a higher rule of law which should prevail—the state should take over and demand diversification.

With the pressures of the Federal government toward areawide review and control over grants made for local projects, local government is likely to move gradually into an areawide conformity. Where there are properly constituted regional plan commissions, utility systems could first be operated on an area basis by utility commissions.

Libraries will be wise to bed down with education, asserting that they are part of the educational system. Libraries don’t have any political muscle. They can draw up the best framework that ever existed and not get anywhere with it unless they interest a lot more people than they have up to this point.

Mr. Quinlan: Building blocks will be by function. We’re more apt to see functions taken from city government and passed on to county government. This would have been done faster if we’d had a more up-to-date county government. In the seeking to get more equity on the basis of who’s paying the money and who’s receiving the benefits, the move will come, and then on to area government if such is established.

Mr. Eager: We haven’t heard much in Wisconsin about intergovernmental or regional councils which are being discussed nationally. I think the cities are receptive to these because of the unfair financial burden on them, carrying the load at the city level and a large percentage again at the county level. Will these come about on a legislative basis or as a matter of informal cooperation?

Mr. Weiford: I express extreme pessimism about the validity of the Council of Governments in Wisconsin. COG is a voluntary association of elective representatives of general purpose governments which does not have policy power, but they get together in a wide area, one representative from each unit, for a kind of forum and then go back to their individual communities to seek to achieve united effort. The Federal government thinks
sufficiently highly of COGs that it has moved areas with them to the top of the priority list for Federal funds. We cannot use this device in Wisconsin because of the large number of towns, in addition to cities and villages, in any given county. The large number of representatives would make the COG unwieldy. The Fox Valley has one COG consisting of a few cities and five towns but I do not see this as a device which we can pursue here.

Senator Chilsen: One other new concept may be pertinent for the strong urban areas, a more rapid evolution into metro districts. Philadelphia no longer has a county government at all, but a metropolitan system of government; in Milwaukee this would probably avoid a lot of duplication.

The president of the Stevens Point university has a new concept for more rural areas—the ruralplex in which communities reduce their competition and duplication, and each community emphasizes one facility such as education, industry or medical care.

Forrest Mills: I understand there is a possible new level of government for urbanized municipalities, in which districts would be permitted to assume all local government in the district with the consent of the local governments. Does the Tarr Committee have a target date for submitting its report, and if legislation of this kind resulted from its report what chance is there for passage?

Mr. Weiford: The report is due January 15, 1969.

Senator Chilsen: I wouldn't think that a proposal like that has much chance of passage in the near future. We aren't at that stage of crisis yet.

Lyle Eberhart: What makes a properly constituted regional plan commission? Is a county planning body a regional plan commission?

Mr. Weiford: Regional plan commissions come into existence by local initiative in which areas get together, pass resolutions and ask the governor to set them up. We have a haphazard pattern that I do not find favorable. We have six regional plan commissions in Wisconsin, the best-operating one in the southeast. Others range in size up to ten counties. Vast areas of the state have no area planning. I think it will be necessary for the State to take initiative using its perspective and lay out logical planning districts, considering some financial subsidy to stimulate their creation and maintenance. Under new Federal legislation there are kinds of grants that a city can't get unless an areawide planning agency has certified that the applications are in conformity with the area plan. I object to this because it doesn't seem to fit in with the democratic process.
Muriel Fuller: When you mentioned working with administrative people, Mr. Quinlan, did you mean city managers?

Mr. Quinlan: City managers or the administrative official who will be making recommendations to the legislative body.

Mr. Schwab: What effect will the rational organization of statewide services have upon local government in relation to area-wide services stemming from local sources?

Mr. Weiford: I think that logical planning districts will follow state administrative districts. That will make data from every State agency available about any particular geographical area. Any attempt by an agency to district itself unilaterally would be a grievous error. An agency such as libraries should make a voluntary alliance at the outset with the Bureau of State Planning which is developing a statewide computerized information system. You should do this in conjunction with the Department of Local Affairs, to study your problems, your clientele and ways that libraries of the future can best serve the state as a whole.

Mr. Schwab: Does this fit with the present vocational school districts?

Mr. Weiford: No.

Mr. Schwab: What will happen to the present overlapping districts, that have no relation to the proposed pattern?

Mr. Weiford: School districts have all kinds of strange little fingers running out, and I do not see any change in this. It would be possible for vocational school districts to be altered, but I don't think that anything we do is going to be an improvement over the past. I don't think there's going to be a strong move to upset anything like that.

We do not cut across county lines and there is no question but that we will increasingly look to the county to perform services which it has never performed before. I feel that the county will reconstitute itself quickly as a result of having new duties thrown upon it.
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WHAT DO LIBRARIANS AND TRUSTEES DO UNTIL LIBRARY SYSTEM LEGISLATION AND STATE AID ARE A REALITY?
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Abstract of Comments

Eleanor Ferguson and Muriel Fuller

Charles A. Bunge, chairman: Yesterday we heard Miss Ferguson tell us that systems seem on the basis of research to be good and useful things. They seem to get done what librarians would like to get done. In the evening we heard Mr. Weiford and other members of the panel say that our present plan for forming systems here in Wisconsin seems generally well conceived if admittedly cautious. Then we heard the disturbing news from Mr. Eager and Mr. Quinlan to the effect that these two facts together, persuasive and comforting as they are to present company, don't necessarily mean that the road ahead is as rosy as we'd like.

This morning we're going to talk a little bit about a step that can be taken, plans that can be made, and strategies that might be pursued to make use of the roses that are on that road and avoid undue impediment from the thorns—sort of what to do until the systems are a reality and functioning smoothly, or until we get the wherewithal from the State even to put systems into effect. To lead off the program, Miss Ferguson and Miss Fuller are going to talk about community involvement in library development by way of having a conversation on the library community project.

Following the conversation we'll have a discussion of county planning for library development from three different points of view.

Miss Fuller: Many of you in the room remember the Library-Community Project which was one of the activities that the American Library Association was responsible for organizing and carrying on with funds from the Fund for Adult Education. This project was basically designed to help librarians and library board members study their communities and study their libraries in order to plan good adult services in the community. As a result of the library community project a book was published by ALA, Studying the Community. It gives us an excellent, practical, how-to-do-it manual that librarians can use in studying the community, involving the citizens in library activity, etc.

Although involving citizens in the community is most important in carrying on any kind of library study we think that there are other people who must be involved even before the citizens.
Miss Ferguson: All of you have been talking about library systems for the last two and one-half years. You've been through the stage of doubts and uncertainties and most of you have arrived at a meeting of minds about how to get a system and what it will do. There's a great temptation at this point, to assume that because you know the answers other people know the answers, too. I'd like to suggest that among those you need to inform are such obvious people as your staff, for example. You have discussed this with your department heads, but does the janitor know what it's all about? Do the part-time pages know? They will want to know what it's going to do to their jobs.

You might want to analyze your own reasons for being in favor of systems: to increase the services to your community? or are you really out to be the head of the new system?

Your board is terribly important. No doubt your board has been kept informed but some of them are overenthusiastic about the idea. Promising too much is very discouraging to the people on the outside. On the other hand an apathetic member talking to the president of the Chamber of Commerce can lose you the Chamber of Commerce.

The next group you need to provide with information is the staff and the boards of the smaller libraries in the area. They can make or break the project because some of them are related to the legislator who's going to vote on this and if they're not heart and soul for it, you're going to be in trouble!

Miss Fuller: Librarians get so involved with what they are doing, their own jobs, that they don't see beyond. We're getting a little weary of the two and one-half years and want "sudden achievement."

Miss Ferguson: Only when you're sure that the librarians and the boards are fully informed would you want to go out and try to inform the community.

There's another warning note that needs to be sounded here. If you go out and inform the community in the frame of mind of selling "a package that we've developed that's going to be good for you," the reaction is just the same as with the child whose mother comes along with a dose of castor oil. What you need to do in informing the community is to look at community needs which this system can meet. Some of those needs you're aware of; a lot of them you're not and many of the people who have them are not too aware of them. Then find out what the library would need to do something about them,
Miss Fuller: We have a beautiful publication, Public Library System Development for Wisconsin. Isn't it a little past time to involve citizens in studying if we have all this ready for them?

Miss Ferguson: Yes, it is. It should have been done in the beginning. But it's never too late to start asking people their opinion and if it hasn't been done, then there's no time like the present.

Miss Fuller: We hope we know what we need and now are just about ready to have the means of answering these needs, if we can decide on what is the best way to provide this through systems, which seems to be the accepted way to do it these days.

After you've studied then you have to do something about it. We need to find out in our own communities which people are the logical people to work with us on a particular project. In the library community project, members of the library staff and library board were asked to list the names of ten people in the community who they thought were ones that the community turned to when they wanted to get something done. These lists were put together. These people were then asked to do the same thing, and there was the involvement of an entirely new cross section of people.

It is important to know the people who may oppose the idea. I found that the cooperative agricultural extension agent in the county was the most knowledgeable person about these people. If they're informed they very often become great supporters of your idea.

Miss Ferguson: I think a lot of us make a great mistake in talking to legislators only when they're meeting as a Legislature. It's a much sounder approach to involve the man who's going to Madison next spring, informing him before any question comes up of actual dollars and cents.

A number of years ago when I was working in Michigan the legislative committee asked the librarians all over the state to invite their legislators into the library for a cup of coffee. The reaction of the legislators was surprising. They were horrified that nothing had happened since they had been thrown out when they were in high school. How could you expect them to do anything for you in Lansing if the library meant absolutely nothing to them at home?

As you begin working into politics be sure that people on both sides of the fence are involved, and I don't mean that only in a political sense. If you're going to depend on the Catholic priest you must be sure you've got a good, strong Protestant minister in your group. If you're bringing in
the Woman's Club, you must be sure the Rotary Club is there. It should be the people who live across the tracks as well as the heads of industries.

Miss Fuller: Other people in the community don't see the same community that the librarians do. So involve people—we want to inform everybody. Then we need to have a group of people to work as members of a planning organizing committee who will see that there are many jobs that have to be done that will involve other people. We'll bring in the experts, also.

Here's our chance to have the countywide study going on at the same time as the community study because we're in these two levels of operation here. And so I think that was just a beautiful way to lead into the county library study.
THE COUNTY LIBRARY STUDY

Wisconsin Department of Local Affairs and Development: Emil Brandt
University of Wisconsin Extension: Richard B. Schuster
Division for Library Services: Jerry F. Young

Abstracts of Comments

Mr. Brandt: I am with the local and regional planning division of the Department of Local Affairs. Our basic charge is to provide professional planning service and advice to local communities, counties and regions in this state, for the comprehensive master plan sort of thing, looking ahead 20-25 years and taking into consideration all the various factors that come into play in the overall physical development of an area. The plans are prepared basically for the city or county planning commission, to advise the governing body on matters relating to the physical development. One thing we try to stress is the planning process, not the plan as an end in itself. The plan is just a document which has to be constantly worked with in the community, with the planning commission, with interested citizens' groups, to keep it up to date.

Most of our planning programs in the state are done with Federal planning assistance up to two-thirds of the cost, the local community providing the other one third. Programs are prepared with our own professional staff, or under our supervision by private planning consultants.

A typical planning program consists of three basic elements. First is fact gathering on such things as natural resources, soil, topography, forest, geology; social considerations; and growth, decline and composition of the population. I would think all librarians would be interested in this information. We also look at the economy, the land development considerations, housing and building conditions. Other elements include a public facilities analysis, including library facilities, fire service and police, parks and recreation, municipal buildings, transportation and public utilities.

After the research and analysis have been carried out, projections are made regarding future population, its distribution, etc.

Based on this information the next major step is the plan preparation and recommendations. Typically this will include four basic elements: land development (residential, commercial, highway, public parks); transportation (highways, airport needs); public facilities; utilities.
The next step is probably the most important, that of implementation. Plans tend to fall down after the plans have been prepared if there's not a good planning structure in the community. Basically the first element involved in the planning implementation is the development of ordinances, such as the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations and building codes, and the structure for administering them.

The capital improvement program, --the financial plan for the community-- enables the community to plan for public investments for the next six or seven years, based on priorities. Maybe a county or a community needs a new library or new utility lines or a new fire station. Fiscal capacities are measured and the elements are assigned by priorities to a given year. Each year the program is reevaluated and if the priorities seem to be logical then that program is put into the coming budget year.

Planning programs need the cooperation of newspapers and radio and have to hold many public hearings to explain goals. A great deal of the success of the program will depend on how much the local leaders are willing to work for it and I suppose a good part of their willingness to work for it will depend on how well the planner and the planning staff have worked with the planning commission and the council. It should be a program which represents both the community's thinking and the professional's thinking.

Since this is a general planning program the library recommendations are of a rather general nature. We work very closely with the Division for Library Services of the Department of Public Instruction. They help us in gathering the data, in making the analyses and in the development of recommendations. We evaluate such things as building site, the adequacy of the location, the types of services and resources that are provided, relying on local librarians or on the Division for Library Services for information. We also look at such things as the population which is served, which areas seem to be receiving the best service in the county and which areas are not well served. And based on this information we try to work together with the Division for Library Services to develop good recommendations as to what the county or the community can do in the future relating to library services.

Actually our whole planning program has been evolving. We now are trying to draw more and more parties into the planning process. The Federal government Department of Housing and Urban Development within the last year has made strong changes in the program, one of them being the requirement of a planning reconnaissance study. The whole process takes many months.

We hope in the future we will be able to work more closely with the library people, the Division for Library Services, possibly to coordinate your intent in developing your library systems. In a comprehensive planning program, the more detailed programs in each county could go hand in hand. It's a matter of timing.
Mr. Schuster: The topic that I have been asked to discuss is this matter of citizen involvement in planning for total resource development. It's significant that we say planning for total resource development, planning for library development rather than developing a library plan or a school plan or a total resource plan. In planning we are developing broad concepts, broad goals and broad understanding, and in developing a plan we're talking about developing the line items in a budget, the personnel, the things like this. When we get down to this, this is the job of the professional librarian and the library board.

There's no one way to do planning. It's done differently in every county. In many counties there are many study groups working at the same time. Intensive discussions by a small group, six, eight, ten at the most, not professionals, we have found are ideal. The professional has an extremely significant place, and this is to develop background information for these people so that they really can, and in many cases for the first time, understand the library situation in their particular county, or on a multicounty basis. The actual facts, the figures, the budgets, etc., are completely amazing to many of these people who have been interested in libraries but who haven't understood the situation. These are not the library board members. Composition of this committee is different in every county. It's not a case of position, it's a case of interest.

The professional provides study guides, meets with the committee as a resource person, stretches their imagination. What does a modern library do? How much service should it give? Can it give classes, loan records and pictures, etc.? What can our library do for us? What else do we need and where can we get these other services? In a multi-county unit, in a state unit, what are the possibilities?

We have learned an important thing: the professional person to a group serves better if he or she does not stay with this group all of the time. For these lay people, as they get down to the point of "I think maybe this is what we need," if they turn to the librarian and if the librarian says "Yes, I think you're right," then this immediately becomes the professional librarian's idea. We've also found that approximately 92% of the time, given adequate and proper background information and facts, a good citizen's study committee will come up with approximately the same decisions as the professional.

Another thing that we certainly stress is not to avoid any existing groups, any county library study groups that are now in operation. If you have a county welfare council with a county library section by all means make sure that they're represented. Maybe they're the nucleus and you expand for wider representation.
Nothing the planner or the professional can say will really reach people like the enthusiastic testimonial that a lay member of a study committee can give.

It's very important in using citizen groups that you don't forget them. They study, and they read, and they put in x number of hours—and things do happen. Reporting back to them, keeping them informed is extremely important. Call them back in in six months and say, "This is what you thought we should do, these are the situations you wanted changed and we've got real problems here. Maybe you can help. Why don't you go back to your communities and build up support?" Or, "We've had tremendous success because of your suggestions; we have done this, and this, and this." Maybe in a year or two you're going to want these people to come back on another major effort.
Mr. Young: When we talk about studying the county library situation there are several alternatives. Two of them have already been outlined, and I'm going to talk about a third. Section 43.255 of the Wisconsin Statutes says that in any county not having a county library board, the county board of supervisors may create a county library committee. It goes on to say that this shall be of seven to nine members and that not more than one county board of supervisors member shall be a member of this committee. The important thing that the law does, though, is to outline the duties of this committee. And I'd like to read from this:

"It is the duty of the county library committee to survey and study the needs of the county and to develop and report to the county board plans and proposals for improving library service within the county. It may promote cooperation between existing library units within the county and aid such units in working out contractual arrangements under existing law for the improvement and extension of library service. It may cooperate with similar committees or other proper authorities of adjoining counties in developing plans for the establishment of multicounty units of library service."

Over the past few years we've had quite a few counties that have taken this route of surveying their library needs and their library conditions. We have at the present time, I think, seven of these committees working throughout the state. They're in various stages of development all the way from the report stage that Mr. Eager described last night in Rock County to the formation stage that we have now in Monroe County. They are appointed by the county board chairman.

Basically the key word is study. The library committee involves a new group of people, normally citizens who have never had a great deal of contact with their library. The Division for Library Services has worked with them and provides a backstop of information.

The committee's study breaks down into three phases: first, they must determine what library services are available within the county; second, they study the current state of library development in the state and the standards for good library service; and third, they must decide if it is feasible to bring the present library services nearer to the recommended level and if so, they plan for implementing such improvements. Many of the committees have taken A Design for Public Library Development in Wisconsin and studied it almost line by line, some laying out in parallel the current situation in their county. At the end of this study, the county library committee is charged with making a report to the Division for Library Services and to the county board of supervisors. This committee continues until service is achieved.
Once the information is gathered, the committee must make a decision. They have talked with people throughout their community, with their local librarians, with the consultants from the Division, with the director of any area service in the territory. Then they face the questions, "How do you reconcile what we have with what we should have? Can we economically afford it and how should we approach it?"

Once they make these decisions, write a plan and submit it, this committee can and in most cases does follow through and work for its adoption through the county board.

Reports don't necessarily have to recommend any great changes. They can say that everything is rosy, but not very many of them have. This kind of study is complementary to any other kind of study that can go on in the county. It shows up strong points in an area as well as weak points, and is another method of orderly planning for improved library services for an area.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD.

Forrest Mills: In view of the new Federal requirements, do we assume that previous surveys missed something?

Mr. Brandt: I think most of the planning studies are quite well done. The basic concern of the Federal government was that after the program was done there wasn't effective implementation. This points out that you need to develop a better planning structure. The most effective way is having a professional planning staff available in the community to work on a day-by-day basis. We haven't always involved all the people that we now would like to involve. There needs to be more communication at the community, county, regional and state level.

Lucile Dudgeon: Sometimes the thing lacks knowledge locally. The local planning committee has not always informed the local library board that a study is going on.

Miss Monroe: How can we prevent this becoming a commitment to county not area structure?

Mr. Schuster: This is a problem not only with libraries but with many other things. County lines in Wisconsin with our form of government are very sacred, and population-wise (maybe not area-wise) counties are in most cases too small to provide many services that people really need if they're going to stay up with it. I think the answer to this is that they must understand what a good library could provide, then realistically say, "This is going to cost this county $x dollars a year if we really want this service. Providing the service that the Milwaukee library or the Philadelphia library gives is unrealistic so how can we get this? The only way we can get improved library service is to go beyond county lines--work with other counties, work with a statewide library system." Through their own evaluation of their situation they have to decide this for themselves. It's a slow process of education.

Miss Ferguson: I'm a little concerned about the emphasis on countywide planning. There's a three- or four-year-old study by the Council on Intergovernmental Relations which tries to rank various kinds of public services according to the size of area which it takes to do them effectively. The county, in most cases, is too small. I wonder if this doesn't handicap the planning department?

Mr. Brandt: We do plans for small communities, for counties, and we also have regional planning programs. There are some areas in which problems are looked at from a seven or eight county area, I think most of you have heard for example, the seven counties of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. But regional planning can do only so much--you have to then go down to the county level or in some cases the municipal level.
There's a real need in the state to plan for all the regions. When counties have a small population, you plan for four or five counties most effectively, but in Dane County, one county is enough. I think we'll see something happen in this area in the coming months.

Mr. Eberhart: There is danger if one county establishes service and the next county doesn't; for example Waushara and Green Lake work well but Fond du Lac didn't join. We still have to see whether divisions are wise. Planners are overconcerned with physical facilities—the Southeast is trying to develop a services plan as well.

Mr. Brandt: I think we're going to see planning take on a different image in the future. The model cities approach now to urban planning is probably going to be a breakthrough. In the past it's been basically physical planning. I think you're going to see more and more the physical, social and economic elements brought in much more closely together. It's going to take many more people getting involved in the program. But I think you're going to see planning going into different areas, doing things that they haven't done in the past.
Mr. Wiksell distributed a paper, "Improve the Acceptance of Ideas," which is reproduced below. Additional points brought out in his presentation follow.

We make decisions on the basis of little things we may not be aware of. In listening we have to re-invent what someone says. Don't expect instant acceptance of something it has taken months to prepare. If we talk with someone and a mistake is made, we used to feel that it was the listener's fault; now we feel that the error was on the part of the speaker.

There are different elements in getting a message across:

1. Personal appeals, influenced by:
   a. Appearance
   b. Source credibility; must have thorough knowledge
   c. Tact; know-it-alls lose the decision
   d. Enthusiasm; lack of enthusiasm is contagious
   e. Attitude; think of what other person can get out of it; be supportive
   f. Friendliness; smile; go out of the way to show interest in others
   g. Thinking new; create atmosphere of something new and different that will be a great advantage

2. Interpersonal appeal
   a. Talk it over with people—you might get some ideas! Get people to sell themselves. Listen.
   b. Know your listener and his interests. Provide written as well as oral material.
   c. Ask questions. Welcome suggestions. Questions and suggestions reveal our weaknesses and allow us to improve our presentation.

3. Message appeal, psychological and logical
   b. Clarity is of prime importance in logical appeal—can't argue with clear information! Organize information, support with illustrations, compare, contrast, give personal experience.

If you can get a few people committed, groups of their friends will go along with them. Undersell rather than oversell. Repeat important points. Give people a chance to think things over.

Our own behavior speaks more loudly than our words. Get coworkers or other people excited by stating goals or giving responsibility. Use visual aids. Put yourself in the other person's shoes and use language that he will understand.
IMPROVE THE ACCEPTANCE OF IDEAS

M. J. Wiksell

1. Provide time for the other person to digest ideas, facts, figures, plans, proposals. Leave listeners in no doubt about your proposal.

2. Remember that answering objections does not insure acceptance. You may need to build up your case if good will is to be maintained.

3. Do not expect "instant" acceptance of something we may have spent weeks or months to prepare. Comprehension is sometimes difficult.

4. Anything new to people may be sensed as threatening to them; therefore it will be resisted until it becomes a part of their own thinking processes with which they feel comfortable.

5. Curb impatience in yourself.

6. In some instances, let people convince themselves by having them mull over the plan or idea.

7. Different people have different rates of mentally digesting.
   a. Fast tempo may not be good - it may indicate gulping minds and mental indigestion may result.
   b. Deliberate minds may not be thorough minds.
   c. Let minds (individuals or groups) determine the mental tempo.
   d. Try to welcome questions rather than merely plodding through material you want to present.

8. Agreement now or finishing the job of "acceptance" now may not be the best way to make progress or obtain acceptance. Remember, in a boxing match you don't need to win in the first round.
   a. Sometimes it may be wise to leave the idea with the people. Offer it for consideration, without pressure to accept. Leave it for digestion.
   b. A non-defensive mind is more open to receive a new idea.

9. Sometimes we are reluctant to accept a good idea from another because we didn't think of it first. Also, keep in mind credibility. All the persuasion in the world is of little value unless we have a good past record of sincerity.
a. If an idea can seem to have come from a group, the rejection of the personally conceived idea is lessened.

b. Group output needs to supersede the recognition of the individual's stake in the idea.

10. It is natural for others to meet the new with suspicious and doubt.

a. Welcome objections and doubts (remember permissiveness or free speech without "squelchers"--) it may be a slower process but it is more readily accepted (if it should be accepted).

b. If objections and doubts are not raised, we might be suspicious of our plans. There may be real flaws in our proposal yet to be exposed.

11. Sharing in the preparation of the plan distributes the responsibility in case of failure.

12. Sharing in the preparation of the plan increases the feeling of responsibility for seeing that it works.

13. Observe that if there are no objections or doubts, it may mean that a plan is not really understood.

14. Avoid too-positive positions -- often it is wise to "underplay" your position.

15. A lengthy stream of arguments may not help a person to understand an idea; such a "load" of material should be simplified for easy comprehension.

16. Wisecracks, sarcasm, ignoring a position or indicating that it is weak or ridiculous many times blocks contribution and acceptance.

17. Sometimes it may help to explore alternatives with people rather than defend but one position.

a. It will reduce argumentation.

b. It may show weaknesses in your own plan.

c. It may be that we need to allow more time for our own position to be established.

18. Make it easy for everyone to "save face"--if he once objected, you need to help him be able to accept, or to help him to retreat.
a. Review what has developed and dwell on any one point which was not quickly apparent, or which was a point which may have seemed less important earlier.

19. The "yes, but" technique may result in more "butters" than "yessers."

a. A "yes, butter" may be valuable, he may be agreeing with minor reservations. Listen to him, but do not be him.

b. A "yes, butter" may be stalling for a position to hold.

c. It could become a habit to avoid thinking, to become a resister, avoid these.

d. Get over on their side and discuss their reservations (acceptance) openmindedly and reasonably (sometimes they don't accept what you say when you agree by stating in your own words the same thing they said - they "yes, but" you again. Resort to mirroring, nondirective questioning, counseling technique of "I'm not sure I understand just what you mean." Ask questions to clarify, not to refute.

20. Authority does not force acceptance - it may only force some action. Therefore, do not give an impression of being infallible.

a. Exploration is better than authoritarianism in many instances.

b. May not be understood and appreciated by inferiors.

21. We FEEL before we THINK. Judgments precede thought. (If the idea or thought is not a part of our pattern we become insecure and FEELING results.)

a. Arguments, stifled discussions, etc. only intensify feeling - so further block thought.

22. A good leader puts another person in a position to give his viewpoints and feelings.

23. If a plan cannot stand a bit of "thinking over," maybe it is unsound and should be "thrown over."

24. People are often tolerant of that which they know; they are often suspicious of strange or new ideas.

25. People are often loyal only to that which they have helped to create.
26. People usually understand better that in which they have participated.

27. Since we usually Feel before we Think, use delayed judgments to be sure of our stand.

28. A minute or more for mental digestion may prevent an hour's mental indigestion.

29. It makes no difference how rich and wonderful it is to you, the other fellow can often see only that which he is prepared to receive.

30. The action you propose must be within limits of their capacity to do, buy, etc.

31. Proposed action must bring nearer some highly desired result for them.

32. The good persuader is sold on his topic and believes strongly in himself.

33. Try to find areas of agreement rather disagreement.
PROGRAM

Friday, April 26

1:30 p.m.  AFTERNOON SESSION  Chairman: Muriel L. Fuller

Work session on building a library system in a four-county area;
Participants will break into four work groups to discover appropriate action in an imaginary four-county area for which data and special problems on situation are supplied.

3:00 p.m.  Coffee

3:30 p.m.  Report of committees
Friday, April 26  Afternoon Session

1:30 P.M.

**PROBLEM:** To plan appropriate action which hopefully will move the contiguous counties of Bowker, Cutter, Dewey and Putnam toward building a public library system.

**DIRECTIONS:** Read the profiles of the individual counties and the description of the public library situations which have been provided in the kit. In a group discussion develop the plan for building the system describing the steps to be taken and indicating priorities.

**SAMPLE QUESTIONS:**

Is more data needed?
What "strengths" are available to build on?
What "weaknesses" must be recognized?
What questions have to be discussed before plans can be made?
What steps should be taken?
What priorities should be assigned?
The counties are contiguous. Their approximate geographic relationship is indicated on the "map". The population, economic, civic, and cultural backgrounds, as well as the current interests of the citizens of these four counties, vary.

Under fortunate circumstances, good timing and under wise leadership these counties offer possible building blocks for a public library system.
CUTTER COUNTY

Population, Cultural and Educational Information

Cutter County, in south-central Wisconsin, is strong in agriculture; manufacturing has increased as a source of employment in the last ten years with industry well diversified. The per capita retail sales are higher than the state average, reflecting in part the extensive resort and recreation industry.

Civic organizations are active. The University Extension community program is very active. The Homemakers group includes both rural and urban women, with at least 65 per cent being urban residents. Work with young adults and children through 4-H, boy scouts and girl scouts is very active. Adult education programs are carried on with the support of the University Extension and civic organizations. Brown, the county seat, is the center for the vocational, technical and adult education district. Both Brown and Melville have radio stations. Melville has an active theater group which has sponsored programs of Wisconsin Idea Theater. Wyer is the center of a flourishing summer recreation area which attracts tourists and has been able to support summer repertoire theater.

Population

1960 population 36,708; % of state 0.93
Density: 47.2 sq. mi.; state avg. 72.2
1950-60 change (%) 7.9; state avg. 15.1
1968 population (est.) 42,886
1960-68 change (%) 16.8; state avg. 21.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>6,829</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>5,205</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>3,902</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,249</td>
<td>18,459</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age 31.8; state avg. 29.4
### Population of Incorporated Places
(with indication of public library location and type)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>LSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>9,822</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexner</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larned</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville</td>
<td>8,467</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munn</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>LSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>LSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyer</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Resources

#### Elementary and Secondary Education

- **Private**
  - Melville Academy - Melville
  - College Preparatory

- **Public**
  - Elementary: 28
  - Junior High: 4
  - High School: 10

#### Vocational, Technical and Adult

- Board of Vocational, Technical & Adult Education
- Area School Districts Headquarters - Brown

* County Seat

The Melville Academy, a private preparatory school at Melville, has the reputation of giving quality education. The library resources to back the curriculum of the school are unusually good.

Five of the high schools have had school library programs for many years. The other high school libraries are improving rapidly. The junior high schools have library collections that are barely adequate at the moment but are improving due to good local support supplemented by federal funds.
The elementary school libraries are limited in both amount of resources and quality. There are only two elementary school librarians in the 28 elementary school libraries. The Vocational and Technical School is new and the library is only at an infant stage.
CUTYEN COUNTY

Highlights of the Public Library Situation

Public libraries in Cutter County have been supported entirely from local funds; there is no county assistance. The leadership, lay and professional supporting library cooperation is very limited.

The public libraries in the county are locally oriented. Only on the Melville Public Library Board are there trustees who recognize the need for a broader concept of library service. Their concept is concentrated upon county public library cooperation. At the county seat, Brown, the Public Library Board members and the librarian are alarmed by any talk of public library cooperation. There is fear that, if a county program comes into existence, the Brown Public Library will lose the support of even the limited funds which come from two adjacent townships. The small public libraries have taken little part in library development in the area. The number of hours they are open is most inadequate. Their library boards have not encouraged the part-time librarians to attend regional or county workshops. The amount of fiscal support these small libraries receive from the villages is exceedingly limited. Many of these small libraries have relied upon volunteer help and upon gifts from the Women's Club, from civic organizations and from individual donors for books and basic operating expenses.

The city of Brett has a handsome library building donated by a wealthy industrialist in 1917 and built according to his personal architectural idiosyncrasies. The city fathers have a hard time finding money even for minimum upkeep of this "memorial" building.
CUTTER COUNTY

Economic Overview

INCOME

Median family income, 1959

County, $4,874  
State, $5,926

Employment trends (residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% Distr. (Wis. in parens.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri., forestry</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>(11) 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(.2) .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>(5) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>(33) 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp., util.</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>(6) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td>(45) 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in farms (acres)</td>
<td>391,835</td>
<td>411,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of land in farms</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. size of farm</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>178.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. cropland per farm</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, land &amp; bldgs., per acre</td>
<td>$179.02</td>
<td>$159.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORESTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in forest</td>
<td>120,500 (acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of land area</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RETAIL TRADE

No. of stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales (add 000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$56,103</td>
<td>46,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita, '63, county $1,535  
State avg. 1,263
**MANUFACTURING DATA (continued)**

**Eight largest manufacturing employers—data as of March 1965**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Hosiery Co.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Seamless hosiery</td>
<td>200-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Summer, Inc.</td>
<td>Melvil</td>
<td>Women's outerwear</td>
<td>50-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James of Jewett, Inc.</td>
<td>Jewett</td>
<td>Millwork</td>
<td>150-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Glove Co.</td>
<td>Larned</td>
<td>Dress &amp; work gloves</td>
<td>100-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Plastics Co.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Misc. plastics products</td>
<td>100-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson River Foundry Co.</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Castings</td>
<td>150-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Scoreboard Corp.</td>
<td>Flexner</td>
<td>Ad signs &amp; displays</td>
<td>100-149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Three largest nonmanufacturing employers (private)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Telephone Co. of Wis.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Telephone service</td>
<td>50-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Distributor, dairy products, etc.</td>
<td>100-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Groceries, warehousing, etc.</td>
<td>50-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERVICE INDUSTRIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of establishments</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels, rec. camps</td>
<td>124 3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>19 0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receipts (add 000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of state</th>
<th>Hotels, (etc.)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$5,321</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>$1,632</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOVERNMENT FINANCE**

**Property assessment—Full value (1964)**

| All property       | $193,403,010 | 0.87 |
| Per capita         | 5,123        |     |
| State avg.         | 5,429        |     |

| Mfg. real estate   | 9,779,500    | 0.44 |
Government Finance (continued)

Tax levy $4,904,277 State avg.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>129.91</td>
<td>151.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full value rate (per $1,000)</td>
<td>22.50*</td>
<td>24.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County rate</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rate</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rate</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After tax relief

Income tax collected (1964) % of state

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$1,627,152</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporat</td>
<td>353,801</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State shared taxes (1964)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 958,158</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>209,458</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State aids (1964)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,682,931</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1,652,132</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>646,101</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outdoor Recreation Highlights

Water acreage--13,200 acres
Number, miles of trout streams--6, totaling 33 miles
Number, miles of smallmouth bass streams--2; 45 miles
Ski areas--Brown

Public Lands

**State**  
Land Commission--108 acres  
Wisconsin Conservation Dept.--13 acres  
State-owned public hunting and fishing grounds--9,507 acres  
State-leased public hunting and fishing grounds--2,571 acres

**County**  
County parks--44 acres  
Mudge Park--4 acres--southeast of Brown  
Melvil Memorial Park--40 acres--northeast of Brett

---
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DEWEY COUNTY
Population, Cultural and Educational Information

Dewey County, in south-central Wisconsin, is predominantly agricultural. A little manufacturing has developed in the area. Retail sales are stronger than could be expected, indicating a possible growth in recreational facilities in the area.

There are few civic organizations active in the area. The University Extension community program is the center of a growing interest in cultural and social affairs. Unfortunately, the home economics position has been vacant for two years and the Homemakers group, which was active, has been quiescent. The county seat of Legler is small with little visible cultural activity.

Population
1960 population 8,516; % of state 0.22
Density: 18.6 sq. mi.; state avg. 15.1
1950-60 change (%) -3.7; state avg. 15.1
1968 population (est.) 8,145
1960-68 change (%) -4.4; state 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age 37.2; state avg. 29.4
Population of Incorporated Places
(with indication of public library location and type)

Eastman 922 LSO
Legler* 1,021 LSO
Windsor 501 None

Educational Resources

Elementary and Secondary Education
Private 0

Public
Elementary 5
Junior High 0
High School 2

Vocational, Technical and Adult 0

* County Seat

Two of the elementary schools have the beginning of a good school library program. One of the high schools has a library small as to size but excellent as to quality due to the devoted and intelligent planning of an unusually able, professionally trained school librarian.
Public libraries in Dewey County are two in number. The public library at Legler, the county seat, is completely inadequate. Its librarian, backed by the library board, claims the library is not a public library and, therefore, is not responsible for making annual reports or meeting any state suggested standards. The amount of money allocated is so small, according to an informal study, that the loss of the report is not a great handicap, but the lack of interest in even minimum standards is sad. The small library at Eastman is in one room of the municipal building and is giving real service to the people of the village and the surrounding communities. None of the townships pay for this service. For the last two years, the city fathers have become more conscious of the value of library service and have relinquished part of their meeting hall to shelve periodicals and a section of the book collection.

There are no county funds. There is no understanding of library possibilities except on the part of the library board and the village officials of Eastman who are interested, but financially unable to do much more than they are doing at the present time.
DEWEY COUNTY
Economic Overview

INCOME

Median family income, 1959
County, $3,827
State, $5,926

Employment trends (residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% Distr. (Wis. in parens.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri., forestry</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>(11) 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(.2) .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(5) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>(33) 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp., Util.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(6) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>(45) 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in farms (acres)</td>
<td>189,853</td>
<td>213,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of land in farms</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. size of farm</td>
<td>243.7</td>
<td>231.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. cropland per farm</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, land &amp; bldgs., per acre</td>
<td>$81.51</td>
<td>$74.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators working off farms 100 days or more</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORESTRY

Area in forest 86,250 (acres)
% of land area 29.7 State avg. 44.2

RETAIL TRADE

No. of stores 1963 197
1958 160

Sales (add 000) % of state
1963 $16,938 0.33
1958 9,115 0.20

Per capita, '63, county $2,065 State avg. 1,263

RETAIL TRADE (continued)

By kind of business (1963) % of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lumber, hdw., farm eq.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. mdse.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnit., house eq.</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating, drinking places</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug stores</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHOLESALE TRADE

No. of establishments 1963 14
1958 8

Sales (add 000) % of state
1963 $3,838 0.07
1958 1,120 0.02

MANUFACTURING DATA

No. of establishments, by employment size, 1958

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment size</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-250 &amp; over</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods, beverages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood products, furniture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, petrol., rubber &amp; plastics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalworking, mach., transport. eq.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Stone products</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANUFACTURING DATA (continued)

Eight largest manufacturing employers--data as of March 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Poultry, Inc.</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Poultry processing</td>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Wis. Co-op Dairies</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Natural cheese</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman Co-op Dairy Assn.</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>6-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson's Pleasure</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Soft drinks</td>
<td>Under 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman Bros.</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Poultry processing, etc.</td>
<td>60-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Wood Working Co.</td>
<td>Legler</td>
<td>Misc. wood products</td>
<td>10-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legler Granite Co.</td>
<td>Legler</td>
<td>Cut stone and stone products</td>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legler Products Co.</td>
<td>Legler</td>
<td>Screw machine products</td>
<td>40-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three largest nonmanufacturing employers (private)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastman Produce Co.</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Farm &amp; garden supply store</td>
<td>8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Convalescent Home</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Convalescent services</td>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Store</td>
<td>Eastman</td>
<td>Dry goods</td>
<td>8-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICE INDUSTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of establishments</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels, rec. camps</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts (add 000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of state</th>
<th>Hotels, (etc.)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$1,572</td>
<td>$ NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Property assessment--Full value (1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg. real estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEWEY COUNTY

GOVERNMENT FINANCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax levy</th>
<th>$944,989</th>
<th>State avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>113.86</td>
<td>151.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full value rate</td>
<td>22.54*</td>
<td>24.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per $1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County rate</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rate</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rate</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After tax relief

Income tax collected (1964) % of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$214,680</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>26,302</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State shared taxes (1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$125,888</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>24,758</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State aids (1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$683,873</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>274,402</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>299,824</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTDOOR RECREATION HIGHLIGHTS

Water acreage--6,740 acres
Number, miles of trout streams--12, totaling 54 miles
Number, miles of smallmouth bass streams--2, totaling 2 miles
Canoe trails--Rock River Water Trail

Public lands

STATE State-owned public hunting and fishing grounds--6,014 acres
COUNTY County park--Garland Memorial Park--41.5 acres
Putnam County, in south-central Wisconsin, is a county with an economy based on strong agricultural and tourist business and, within the last five years, some manufacturing. The feeling of civic responsibility on the part of many citizens is strong. The organization of both men and women have taken great interest in cultural affairs. There are excellent working relations between urban and rural residents. The University Extension community program has been exceedingly active. A specialist in farm management has given excellent support to the expanding agriculture of the community. The officer in charge of the area conservation education has received enthusiastic support from all age groups. There is an active 4-H club program as well as numerous, well-handled boy scout and girl scout activities. Adult education programs, including organized tours to cultural centers in Wisconsin and neighboring states, have been well supported. The University of Wisconsin at Culver has made a notable contribution to the county as well as being one of the outstanding state universities.

Population

1960 population 42,368; % of state 1.32

Density: 75.5 sq. mi.; state avg. 72.2

1950-60 change (%) 25.9; state avg. 15.1

1968 population (est.) 46,901

1960-68 change (%) 10.7; state 9.9

% Distribution
(Wis. in parens.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>7,731</td>
<td>7,278</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>37 (36) 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>6,932</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>32 (33) 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>20 (20) 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>11 (11) 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,214</td>
<td>21,354</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age 30.3; state avg. 29.4
Population of Incorporated Places
(with indication of public library location and type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>16,412</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostwick</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>LSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>LSO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Resources

Elementary and Secondary Education

Private
- Parochial
  - Elementary: 2
  - High School: 1

Public
- Elementary: 35
- Junior High: 3
- Senior High: 7

Vocational, Technical and Adult: 0

Higher Education
- University of Wisconsin - Culver

* County Seat

The parochial high school has had a good school library for a number of years and the administration has budgeted wisely for its continuation. In the public high schools, six have good school libraries; one has an outstanding instructional materials center. All three of the junior high schools have fair instructional media centers which are growing in quality rapidly. About half of the elementary schools have school libraries. The University of Wisconsin-Culver has a good library and an excellent staff.
PUTNAM COUNTY

Highlights of the Public Library Situation

Following a county library study a number of years ago, a county library, with headquarters in Bishop, was founded. Cooperation between the libraries has increased in quality and in coverage. The current problem is the need for stronger county fiscal support. This is difficult to achieve because some of the towns are paying fairly large sums to nearby village libraries and a number of the residents feel that an increase in county rate of library support would cause undue pressure upon the towns now supporting local libraries. The problem of town and county library rates being equated with double taxation is a serious problem and must be solved before a stronger county program can be evolved. The public libraries in the county have had excellent cooperation from the library collection and staff of the state university, but the growing sophistication in both manufacturing and in agriculture has increased the need for high level reference resources which cannot be met within the county.

Another problem which the county library leadership has not been able to solve is that of service to people across the county line. The village of Ferguson is 2/3 in Putnam County and 1/3 in Eberhart County which has no county library program. There has been serious discussion whether the good backstopping at the county level given to the residents of Ferguson should be precisely at the city limits or whether it would be possible to have some type of contractual arrangement with Eberhart County which would permit service to its Eberhart County citizens near Ferguson.

Another problem is that the northeast area of the county is not easily served from any of the established libraries. At what point should the county library program establish a bookmobile program and/or what are the criteria for establishing a new stationary library service outlet? At the present time, the citizens of this area have been served by the public library at Bostwick, but the result has been that a large proportion of the inhabitants of that area have not used any type of library service. This is particularly important since this area has migratory laborers and the desirability of giving some service, at least during the summer season, has caused a searching of the social conscience of the Putnam library community.
**PUTNAM COUNTY**

**Economic Overview**

### INCOME

**Median family income, 1959**
- County: $5,692
- State: $5,926

### Employment trends (residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1960 % Distr. (Wis. in parens.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri., forestry</td>
<td>2,743 (11) 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>26 (.2) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,297 (5) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5,747 (33) 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp., util.</td>
<td>939 (6) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>8,982 (45) 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in farms (acres)</td>
<td>297,600</td>
<td>306,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of land in farms</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. size of farm</td>
<td>171.3</td>
<td>159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. cropland per farm reporting any</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, land &amp; bldgs., per acre</td>
<td>$334.73</td>
<td>$271.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators working off farms 100 days or more</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RETAIL TRADE (continued)

**By kind of business (1963)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lumber, hdw., farm equip.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. mdse.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnit., house equip.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating, drinking places</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug stores</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHOLESALE TRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of establishments</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$24,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of state</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>25,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANUFACTURING DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of establishments, by employment size, 1958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment size</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>100-250</th>
<th>250+</th>
<th>Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foods, beverages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles, apparel, leather</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood products, furniture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, petrol., rubber &amp; plastics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalworking, mach., transport. equip.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Printing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other types</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FORESTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>34,100 (acres)</th>
<th>% of land area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in forest</td>
<td>9.5 State avg.</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RETAIL TRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of stores</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add 000)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita, '63, county: $1,523
State avg.: 1,263
MANUFACTURING DATA (continued)

Eight largest manufacturing employers--data as of March 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Levandowski</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Leather packings, etc.</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Tube Co.</td>
<td>Titcomb</td>
<td>Tubing and pipe</td>
<td>200-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth Pull Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>350-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everready Electric Co.</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Transformers &amp; power controls</td>
<td>250-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Electronics Co.</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>Electronic equip., tuners, etc.</td>
<td>1000-1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver Electronics, Inc.</td>
<td>Culver</td>
<td>Electronic equip.</td>
<td>200-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostequipment Corp.</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
<td>Clocks, fabrics, electronic instruments</td>
<td>900-999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Poole &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
<td>150-199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three largest nonmanufacturing employers (private)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Telephone Co.</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Telephone service</td>
<td>100-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Lodge, Inc.</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
<td>Recreational services</td>
<td>150-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateau</td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Recreational services</td>
<td>49-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICE INDUSTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of establishments</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels, rec. camps</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts (add 000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of state</th>
<th>Hotels, (etc.)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$12,123</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>$6,307</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>8,311</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property assessment--Full value (1964)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All property</td>
<td>$424,522,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>7,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.</td>
<td>5,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mfg. real estate                      | 14,565,600  | 0.65       |

PUTNAM COUNTY
GOVERNMENT FINANCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax levy</th>
<th>$10,040,564</th>
<th>State avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>185.09</td>
<td>151.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full value rate (per $1,000)</td>
<td>21.24*</td>
<td>24.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County rate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rate</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rate</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After tax relief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income tax collected (1964)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$3,089,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>518,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State shared taxes (1964)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,655,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>369,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State aids (1964)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,163,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>982,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>603,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTDOOR RECREATION HIGHLIGHTS

Water acreage--12,800 acres
Number, miles of trout streams--1 stream, 2 miles
Number, miles of smallmouth bass streams--1 stream, 8 miles
Ski areas--Indian Mound, Warren
        Far View, Bishop
        Holly Mills, Bishop
        Mt. Joy, Bishop
        Happy Mount, Bishop

Public lands

STATE
Putnam State Forest--7,922 acres
Fern Beach State Park--268 acres
State-owned public hunting and fishing grounds--807.5 acres
State-leased public hunting and fishing grounds--9,364 acres
Bowker County, in south-central Wisconsin, has grown rapidly. Manufacturing includes paper making, lumber products, shoes, appliances and commercial vegetable growing. The civic organizations are active, particularly the League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, Homemakers, Kiwanis and Lions. A continuing education committee of the county has been active in the last year and includes representatives of University Extension, vocational school, home economics, public health specialists and librarians.

Population

1960 population 59,105; % of state 1.50
Density: 72.8 sq. mi.; state avg. 72.2
1950-60 change (%) 17.0; state avg. 15.1
1968 population (est.) 66,514
1960-68 change (%) 12.5; state 9.9

Ages: Male Female Male Female
Under 18 12,007 11,846 (38) 41 (36) 39
18-44 8,974 9,765 (32) 31 (33) 33
45-64 5,606 5,546 (20) 19 (20) 19
65 & over 2,572 2,789 (10) 9 (11) 9
Total 29,159 29,946 100% 100%
Median age 26.6; state avg. 29.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of Incorporated Places</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(with indication of public library location and type)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryman</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana*</td>
<td>30,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydenberg</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbone</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>15,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitz</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Resources**

**Elementary and Secondary Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Catholic Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lutheran Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocational, Technical and Adult Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters of Vocational, Technical &amp; Adult District - Dana</td>
<td>Dana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Center at Thwaites (founded in 1966)</td>
<td>Thwaites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County Seat

Both private and public schools at the secondary school level are considered to have high standards. Two of the public high schools have an outstanding instructional materials center while the other schools have fair school library programs in spite of weak media aspects. The Vocational School at Dana has taken over the quarters of the discontinued County Normal and the program is growing both in coverage and in quality. The administration has assigned fairly large sums to be spent on the library and a second professional librarian was appointed in 1968. The University Center at Thwaites has a library which barely meets its curriculum needs; however, the administration is conscious of the importance of strengthening the library.
The Sunray Papers, Inc., has a large technical library with a professional librarian in charge. An excellent, but small, research art library, founded and given continuing support by a wealthy industrialist, offers special assistance to qualified researchers. Service to other patrons requires cumbersome introductions and appointment.
The public libraries in the county have only the two strong libraries in Thwaites and in Dana. Leadership for the small libraries has come from these two libraries. There is no county aid to any public library. According to a recent survey of the Thwaites Public Library, 51 per cent of the people using the library were residents of the city of Thwaites; 49 per cent lived outside the municipal limits. None of the villages or towns in which these people live were giving any support to the library. The development of this situation goes back to the early theory of the library board and the city council that enough trade came to the town to justify offering free library service. However, the present weight of increased library costs has caused a rather conservative board to re-evaluate the situation. There is every indication that the library board will urge the County Board of Supervisors to appoint a county library committee. Such action is supported by the library board of Dana. The boards of the smaller libraries are likely to go along with this action.

The small libraries in the county are open limited hours. None of them have professionally trained librarians. However, the librarians at Thwaites and Dana have given informal support and professional advice. The villages of Countryman and Sears have signed contracts with Dana Public Library for walk-in service. The amount of money covered in these contracts is so inadequate that Dana Public Library Board is questioning whether they can afford to continue with these contracts. On the other hand, the small villages feel that they cannot afford to pay at a higher rate.
BOWKER COUNTY
Economic Overview

INCOME

Median family income, 1959
County, $5,588  State, $5,926

Employment trends (residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% Distr. (Wis.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960 in parens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrl., forestry</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>(11) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(.2) .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>(5) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8,373</td>
<td>(33) 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp., util.</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>(6) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>8,162</td>
<td>(45) 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of farms</th>
<th>Land in farms (acres)</th>
<th>% of land in farms</th>
<th>Avg. size of farm</th>
<th>Avg. cropland per farm reporting any value, land &amp; bldgs., per acre</th>
<th>Operators working off farms 100 days or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>302,883</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>157.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>326,033</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORESTRY

Area in forest 185,560 (acres)
% of land area 36.2 State avg. 44.2

RETAIL TRADE

No. of stores 1963 703  1958 674

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales (add 000)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$80,299</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>67,596</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita, '63, county $1,311  State avg. 1,263

RETAIL TRADE (continued)

By kind of business (1963) % of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lumber, hdw., farm equip.</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. mdse.</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>18,793</td>
<td>13,681</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>13,681</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnit., house equip.</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating, drinking places</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug stores</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHOLESALE TRADE

No. of establishments 1963 81  1958 72

Sales (add 000) % of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales (add 000)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$53,322</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>47,437</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANUFACTURING DATA

No. of establishments, by employment size, 1958

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment size</th>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>20-99</th>
<th>100-250 &amp; 250 &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foods, beverages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles, apparel, leather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood products, furniture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, paper products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, petrol., rubber &amp; plastics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalworking, mach., transport. equip.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: printing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other types</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
MANUFACTURING DATA (continued)

Eight largest manufacturing employers—data as of March 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bauerman Co.</td>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>Plywood, lumber products</td>
<td>700-899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunray Papers, Inc.</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Paper products</td>
<td>1150-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydenberg Paper Co.</td>
<td>Lydenberg</td>
<td>Paper products</td>
<td>1050-1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunray Papers, Inc.</td>
<td>Roden</td>
<td>Paper products</td>
<td>600-899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydenberg Paper Co.</td>
<td>Countryman</td>
<td>Paper products</td>
<td>500-699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plyweld Corp.</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Laminated decorative plastics</td>
<td>400-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeway, Inc.</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Heating equip., appliances</td>
<td>400-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites Homes, Inc.</td>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>Mobile homes</td>
<td>400-499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three largest nonmanufacturing employers (private)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Wisconsin Motor</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Trucking service</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Motor Supply</td>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>Automotive equip.</td>
<td>250-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites Clinic</td>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>Medical service</td>
<td>200-299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICE INDUSTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of establishments</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels, rec.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts (add 000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of state</th>
<th>Hotels, motels, rec. camps</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$6,344</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property assessment—Full value (1964)</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All property</td>
<td>$338,980,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>5,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.</td>
<td>5,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mfg. real estate | 93,441,400 | 4.16         |
GOVERNMENT FINANCE (continued)

Tax levy $8,634,009 - State avg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>State avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>141.77</td>
<td>151.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full value rate</td>
<td>22.34*</td>
<td>24.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County rate</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rate</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School rate</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* After tax relief

Income tax collected (1964) % of state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$3,156,959</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1,423,337</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State shared taxes (1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,090,012</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>298,661</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State aids (1964)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,555,346</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1,047,345</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>858,300</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTDOOR RECREATION HIGHLIGHTS

Water acreage--9,110 acres
Number, miles of trout streams--4, totaling 24 miles
Number, miles of smallmouth bass streams--1, 29 miles
Ski areas--Dana Mound, Dana Powder Hills, Sears

Public lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>Central Wisconsin conservation area--2,485 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>State-owned public hunting and fishing grounds--10,509 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State-leased public hunting and fishing grounds--18,649 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>County forest--37,990 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County parks--640 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bowker County Park--333 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Bowker County Park--147 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powder Hill Park--160 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other State-owned and leased public hunting and fishing--24,164 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/68
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Group 1

I. Decide what the potential resources of the libraries are; more data needed:
   A. No knowledge of library support at local level except at Dana, etc.
   B. What are libraries' holdings? staff?
   C. What is educational level, racial composition, quality of population?
   D. Map needed showing cities in juxtaposition for areas of potential service

II. Set up countywide study committees in each county

III. Joint study for system

IV. Recommendation of planners
   A. State and Federal aid
   B. Equitable library tax in the four counties
   C. Study possibilities of bookmobile service for Dewey county
   D. Reference service could be done by the Type I library at Dana after additional funds build up reference collection and staff.
   E. Federated system for the four
   F. Dewey county would be served on a contract basis.

Group 2

Need:
1. Information on location of cities and villages to determine population distribution, distances between centers of population, etc.
2. Also traffic patterns.
3. Educational levels of population.
4. Present library expenditures.

Where does leadership come from? Perhaps Bowker and Putnam could take initiative - both have community leadership which might be interested in this project. Library boards of Dana and Thwaites (Bowker) and Bishop (Putnam) might get together. Also leadership of U. of W. at Culver (Putnam).

Selling job needed to get support of Brown (Cutter) librarian and board, perhaps with aid of state consultant; build on potential interest in Melville (Cutter). In Dewey County, work through Eastman, where librarian and city fathers see need.

Problem in persuading rural people to increase taxes to support service they may not see the need of.
Population total of four counties is sufficient to form a good system 146,697. Area as a whole, except Dewey County, is growing in population.

Total assessed valuation 992, + million, and again Dewey is least. Financial support of library services should be allocated to counties on basis of formula, such as used in Wisconsin Valley (equalized valuation, population, and state income taxes paid).

Establishment of new system would be greatly assisted by Federal funds to buy equipment, books, etc. (No State funds assumed!) Would like to have a library budget based on $3 per capita, about $441,000, once establishment of library is achieved.

**Group 3**

I. Set up county library study committees
   (Dewey is only county where there may be difficulty)

II. Each county to begin setting its library situation in order

III. Dana (Bowker county) to invite representatives from the other counties

IV. Form a joint committee

V. Set up subcommittees:
   - Finances
   - Services needed
   - Publicity efforts
   - Potential State & Federal aids

VI. Require reports in 6 months

VII. In the meantime efforts toward
   - Workshops
   - Bookmobile services
   - Reference and referral will help create more favorable public opinion

**Group 4**

1. Meetings to find out attitudes of librarians and boards toward cooperation in the area.
2. Public relations program, among librarians if needed and among citizens; development of friends of the library groups
3. Establish county library committees in 3 counties not having had library studies.
   Delegates from each of these groups plus those from Putnam to form a system study committee
4. This committee to determine the place of these 4 counties in the area and in the overall state plan
5. County Boards, as a result of studies, will be requested to apply for Demonstration funds for a 3-year demonstration of library services in the area. The 3rd year one third of costs to be supplied locally.
The Demonstration would provide:

1. Walk-in service from any library to any resident of the 4-county area.
2. Dana library as headquarters of the demonstration, with the Dana librarian as the demonstration coordinator.
3. A demonstration consultant to work with local libraries in such things as in-service training, weeding, book selection, etc., and act in public relations capacity.
4. Enlargement of Dana library collection to make it the reference and interloan center for the area—taking into consideration the other special libraries available in Dana area.
5. A book-mobile to serve the areas not served by local libraries on a once a month basis.
6. Delivery service to local libraries by a system-owned station wagon, to:
   - shift rotating collections
   - deliver inter-library loans, including films
   - return materials
7. Film circuit membership
8. Telephone credit cards to member libraries for reference service—all reference to be cleared through Dana library

During the demonstration local study committees will continue to meet and periodically would meet with the system planning group, to gradually work out fiscal problems, federation plans and to advise from the local level.

At the end of three years our target would be to have a system plan developed and have each of the 4 counties eligible for inclusion under requirements of the Wisconsin system development law.
PROGRAM

Friday, April 26

6:30 p.m.  DINNER SESSION  Chairman: Lucile Dudgeon

State Public Library Systems and the National Library Network: Verner W. Clapp

Adjournment: W. Lyle Eberhart
PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS AND THE NATIONAL LIBRARY NETWORKS

Verner W. Clapp, Consultant
Council of Library Resources, Washington, D. C.

My intention tonight is merely to introduce the library network idea and to see where it leads us.

There is, of course, nothing new about library networks except the name. Libraries have collaborated, either within or across jurisdictional lines for a long time, creating what is euphemistically called the library "system" of the country. The name does, however, as is so often the case, provide new dimensions to the idea.

As currently used, the term network appears to be borrowed principally from telephone practice, reinforced by allusions to systems such as those used for rounding up data needed for forecasting the weather or for detecting invasions by enemy airplanes, involving the data-processing capabilities of computers. In particular, Educom, an organization formed to promote interuniversity collaboration, has seized upon the computer as a principal tool. It has developed the notion of Edunet, a computer-based network for performing various operations of common benefit to universities. (Educom has suggested, for example, that Edunet might make available to university hospitals a daily set of computer-generated patients' menus.) In considerable part as a result of discussions of this kind, the President proposed to Congress last February that the Higher Education Act of 1965 be amended to incorporate a new program entitled "Networks for Knowledge." The bill provides $8 million for, among other things, sharing library facilities among university campuses based on computer techniques.

Now, as you know, valiant (and expensive) attempts are being made to bring computers into the daily work of libraries in such programs as the National Library of Medicine's Medlars (Medical literature analysis and retrieval system), the Library of Congress' Marc (Machine-readable catalog), and the New England Board of Higher Education's Nelinet (New England library network). Each of these is concerned with the computer processing of bibliographic information.

The Medlars program is in actual operation. With its use a computer processes the index entries made for journal articles (and some other materials) in current medical literature. A first product
of this processing is the printer's copy for the Index Medicus, the most
extensive record (in terms of numbers of items recorded) in existence
of the literature of a subject. Other products are specialized bibliographies
of various medical subjects. The use to which the highest hopes were
attached was for automatic literature-searching, and such searches are
actually being successfully performed.

In Marc the Library of Congress is carrying into practice the
conclusion reached more than 100 years ago by Charles Coffin Jewett,
the first librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, that the best way to pro-
mote library efficiency and to organize the library resources of the country
is to provide libraries with a common language or standard of bibliographic
description, to develop a technique for cooperative cataloging, and to devise
a mechanism for creating a union catalog of holdings as a by-product of
routine cataloging operations. This is what Jewett himself attempted to do
in 1850 with stereotype plates. It is what the Library of Congress made
possible with its printed catalog service, beginning in 1901. In Project Marc it
is merely substituting a machine-readable record for the printed. But
nearly a decade has elapsed since LC commenced its search for automation
and the end is not yet in sight.

Nelinet, in turn, assumes the existence of Marc. It proposes to
use Marc tapes in order to provide a variety of services to a regional
group of New England libraries, commencing with the libraries of the
state universities and extending to other libraries as feasible. Among
the services to be rendered would be the supply of sets of catalog cards,
book pockets, book cards and book labels, and the maintenance and
searching of a regional union catalog. This program has also been under
way for several years and is only beginning to offer basic services while
it is at some distance from adding new dimensions to library service.

Whether these and other computer applications are successful
or not, it is of course the fact that library networks did not come into existence
with the computer and are not dependent on it. They have existed for a
long time by dint of teletype, or telephone, or telegraph, or even the
postal service.

What are some of the characteristics of communication networks?
A communication network may, in the first place, be defined as a system
consisting of switching centers (this definition is obviously based on the
telephone exchange model). As thus defined a communication network is
not merely a distribution system, either linear, like a transcontinental
railroad, or hierarchical, like an irrigation system. The definition implies
that linkages can be established regardless of a principal direction of flow.
In a newspaper network the smallest subscriber may suddenly become the source of news of world interest. Distribution systems may, it is true, be attached to the network, providing it with a third dimension; thus each telephone exchange, which is the switching center, distributes information to its subscribers, some of whom, like large libraries, have many branches.

In speaking of communication networks, we should distinguish between content and channel. We are so impressed by the telephone as the archetype of the communications network that we forget that it is merely a channel, and that content means nothing. You may send anything over it that it is capable of conveying. You can swear into it or pour blessings into it. It will facilitate the chatter of teen-agers equally with the conferences of heads of state. It will convey pictures or music or information in digital form. We tend to forget, too, that the telephone no longer consists merely of the overhead wire, the telephone pole, the switchboard and the desk set, and that it is rather the type of any communication network employing electrical frequencies, whether by overhead wire, submarine cable, microwave or communication satellite.

At the opposite pole from the communication networks in which channel is everything, are those in which content is everything. Such are the networks that link the newspapers of the country, carrying news and news photographs between them as well as other material such as syndicated columns and cartoons. Here the network is named for the content rather than the channel, and the latter is of little moment, so long as it works, and indeed, in any issue of a newspaper, the use of a number of channels may be represented. There are many other communication networks in which the important element is the communicandum rather than the communicator - crops, weather, prices of stocks, race-track results, bank balance clearances, etc.

Another characteristic distinguishing networks from mere distribution systems, is the greater independence of the networks' members. They are not merely passive recipients or sources. They are reactive. They may initiate a communication, or respond to one, or participate with others in one. The system by which information typically filters up, down and horizontally in a large organization, usually referred to as "through channels," can usually only by courtesy be called a communication network. Only too frequently it serves as a device for impeding rather than facilitating the transmission of information.
An important element in the success of a communications network is its conspicuity; everyone should be aware of it and what it does. This is preeminently true of the telephone, and it is very tempting to take excessive advantage from the fact. In the process of performing its primary function the telephone was found to contribute certain other useful services—a list of subscribers' names and addresses, a subject listing (the yellow pages), and even, in most communities, the time and the weather. Where should it stop? In some places it furnishes musical pitch, and it could easily provide a wide variety of other information. Indeed, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company recently convened a meeting of consultants to consider what information services it should consider providing in connection with the new international trade center that is being planned in New York City. I would not be surprised if the decision was to offer none beyond those now offered; it is quite enough of an accomplishment to provide an efficient channel of communication without also taking responsibility for generating the information that goes over it. But the suggestion was a tribute to the conspicuity of the telephone. Meanwhile, others take advantage of it, and thus, by calling appropriate numbers, one may in many communities receive any of a variety of communications such as a schedule of airplane flights, a short sermon, a racist speech, or even a list of migrating birds recently seen in the vicinity.

Because of lack of simplicity and conspicuity many networks are not recognized as such. For example, chambers of commerce. The chambers of commerce of this country are closely linked by similarities of function, status, and interest, as well as by a national organization. They have perhaps unequalled capabilities for producing, comparing and disseminating information and for responding to inquiries. Yet I suspect that it would never occur to the ordinary citizen to turn to a chamber of commerce for information until other more conspicuous sources had failed.

Similarly with churches. They too are organizationally interlinked, with fantastic capabilities of assembling and transmitting information, of serving as components of a network. But this capability is suppressed. They prefer to serve either as components in a hierarchically organized distribution system or in a system deliberately organized on an anti-hierarchical principle of complete local independence. Both principles are antithetic to the reticular principle, the principle of networks.

Now to go to libraries. In the first place, each library constitutes a quasi-network in itself. I say "quasi" because the components of a
library, although they are interdependent members of a system of switching centers, are not alike in form or function. The catalog serves as one switching center, the collection of periodical indexes and abstracting services another, and still others can be recognized in the bibliographic apparatus collectively and the reference services collectively—in other words, the entire network which makes it possible for us to move about in the collections, now easily, now with difficulty, assembling material of interest, utility, pleasure.

But libraries are also inescapably components of larger networks. As soon as you discover in one library a reference that leads you to another library, or even to a book in another library, you have identified the essential filament, the uniting thread in the library network: it is bibliography. It was this that C.C. Jewett proposed to exploit in his 1850 attempt to organize the libraries of the country into a network based on stereotype plates; it was this that served as the connecting link when, 50 years later, Herbert Putnam accomplished with printed catalog cards what Jewett had failed to do with stereotype plates. It is still the thread whether the communication concerns cataloging or interlibrary lending or collaboration in development of library resources. Just as steel is the unifying material though the bridge be constructed of girders or trusses or cables, so bibliography is the stuff of printed catalog cards, or MARC tapes or union lists of serials, or whether the network is based on shared cataloging or interlibrary lending or collaborative development of library resources.

With libraries, it is obvious, it is the content rather than the channel that makes the network. For all kinds of channels are or can be used by libraries—the mails, railway express, telephone, teletype, microwave, coaxial cable.

But by the same token the library network is the simple conspicuity of, let us say, a network channel such as the telephone, or a network content such as stock market quotations, or to explain to a layman the working of the Farmington Plan or the value of the Center for Coordination of Foreign Microcopying, or any story. If you can hold his attention long enough to get a story across, you are sure to come back and haunt you in some oversimplified and inaccurate version such as the one propagated by Educom which is asserting that we now have a means of communication so effective that the daily patients of the National Library of Medicine can be made available in seconds to any physician in the United States.

The fact is that we have had for many years, as long as the dawn of history—increasingly effective arrangements which, if one
had the time, the energy and sufficient funds, an inquirer could secure
information in the form of library material from a distant part. Bibliog-
raphy and interlibrary loan weren't invented yesterday; examples of both
can be found in the fourth century B.C. and no doubt earlier. What suc-
ceeding centuries have done is to improve the system, by reducing the
amount of energy, time and expense required to make it operate and by
improving the quantity and quality of the information obtainable with its
use.

The fact is, however, that the existence of a library network
has only an academic interest for most persons because they lack realization
of its potential usefulness to themselves. And this in turn is because of the
lack of perspicuity of the library itself. As in the case of chambers of
commerce and the churches the network is lost to sight because of a
flooding of the channels. Everyone knows that you go to a library for books.
So far, so good. Unfortunately, people don't know, or too many people don't
know, what you can find in those books and how to find books that can be in
the widest sense useful, pleasurable, etc. In this respect, libraries badly need
a conspicuity that is still lacking -- how to convey a sense of the applicability
of their wares to the interest in hand, to the daily work of the world. "Even
the modern great library," said Vannevar Bush in his famous essay As
We May Think some years ago, betraying in that word "even" his own
faculty appreciation of the situation, "Even the modern great library is
not generally consulted; it is nibbled at by a few." The fact is that the
larger the library, the greater proportion of its collections go unnibbled,
so that in the very largest the custodians are frank to confess that a
significant fraction of the collection may forever remain unused. The
quantities of interesting books that lie on our shelves unread is only less
frustrating than the quantity of interests that go unserved for failure to use
those very books. How to bring these together?

I like to tell the story told on herself by Miriam Carnovsky who,
as an ex-children's librarian, felt she should have known better. She was
inviting a Hindu to lunch, and--to assure correct dietary etiquette--called
the hostess advisory service of the Chicago Tribune to inquire about
Hindu eating habits. The next day the adviser called back to say that they
had been researching the question in the Chicago Public Library, with
most interesting results. Mrs. Carnovsky was amused, but also mortified.

I can match her story from a recent experience. Having read an
interesting article in Science which mentioned knapping (a new word to me at
the time; it is the process of shaping by chipping stone implements such
as gun-flints and arrow-heads) I wrote to the authors for more information
about this art. As I should have known, I would have done better to have
gone directly to the library.

If librarians themselves do not always turn to libraries for the services which libraries can most effectively perform, can we blame the laity? We try to inform them by catching them young, by giving them reading lists, by exhibits and other ways, but not only do our arguments reach too few, but they forget them too easily.

Back in the mid-20's, shortly after I got into library work, the American Library Association, aided thereto by the Carnegie Corporation, took a very serious interest in adult education. As part of its adult education program it launched the "Reading With a Purpose" series, a succession of twenty-five cent pamphlet guides to serious reading on a wide variety of subjects. At the ALA Washington conference in 1929, Dr. Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation characterized this series as "one of the most notable pieces of work in the whole development of library service". I agreed, because I was at that time working at the reference desk in the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress and I knew at first hand how useful the series was in bridging the gap between "I don't know what there is in a library" and "I'm curious."

However, in spite of the yeoman's work performed by these little books, the program was allowed to terminate only a few years later. Long afterwards I tried to find out the reason for the termination, but failed. Carl Milam, then in retirement, remembered only that the program had been discontinued; and even the files of the Carnegie Corporation failed to described the reason. I had hoped that it might be possible to revive the series, but instead we have the "Reading for an Age of Change." This is not quite the same thing. As its title suggests it is addressed rather to a selection of important public issues than to a large variety of private interests, to such topics as space science, expanding population, biological frontiers, etc. Ten numbers have now appeared; they are available from the Public Affairs Committee, New York City, at sixty cents a copy; but I do not sense that they are as effective in providing a clue to the contents of libraries as did the older series.

What has this to do with networks?

We are currently being encouraged to talk and act like networks. State library systems are supposed to participate, in some manner dimly perceived but not quite specified, in a national network. When challenged as to what makes these networks, we are only too likely to fall back on tried and true elements--interlibrary loans, pickup and delivery services, regional union lists of serials, union catalogs, etc. But these are all old hat. These are the objectives of library work of a generation ago, and if they are only now achieving reality, that is because it has taken a
generation for technology and legislation and funding to catch up with ideals.

But it takes more than interlibrary loan and a pickup and delivery service to make a network. If a library network means anything it means a system which is regarded as such for the sake of the information which it provides, and not as a conveyor. By the same token its success will be proportionate to its conspicuity, to the degree to which it is recognized to be a source of useful information.

There is a difference, perhaps worth noting, between the library network and some others. Each local branch of the channel network—e.g., the telephone—brings new resources to the total network in terms of subscribers which are unique to itself. No other local, nor even the largest or wealthiest, can claim these particular subscribers. The case is different with libraries. Few can bring to the network resources in terms of library materials which are not already available to it. What it does bring is purchasing power—a contribution toward a consumer population large enough to justify an ample and varied service.

Libraries, like bookstores, are naturally anxious to exploit the stock which they have assembled at considerable expenditure of money and effort. It is irritating, to say the least, to have customers reject the particular life of Shelley or the particular edition of Sherlock Holmes that you have stocked in favor of another which must be sent for at additional capital investment.

But yet, taking a leaf from the book of the mail order houses, might it not greatly stimulate cultural communications if we encouraged readers to acquaint themselves with the totality of what is available rather than to assume that our necessarily limited collections represent the totality to which they may have access?

I used to toy with the idea of a book catalog store, similar in concept to the catalog stores maintained by mail order houses—places where you can place orders, though you cannot see the merchandise. My catalog stores would be at crossroads. They would be designated by blue pennants bearing the initial B, for books. All you would find there would be copies of Books in Print with its subject index together with other catalogs of a similar nature such as the Ulrich guide to periodicals, the lists of the Superintendent of Documents, the Schwann catalog of phonorecords, the Unesco list of art reproductions, the Library of Congress list of map reproductions, etc.—in other words,
the major tools for ascertaining the source of almost any kind of in-print library material.

Whether or not such a system could be operated by a public library, it is just such access to the cultural resources of the world that a library should provide. It should extend the minds, the interests and the ambitions of its customers, not restrict them within the compass of its own local collections, no matter how carefully selected. There would be difficulties of course. Interlibrary loan codes do not provide for lending in-print material, and few systems, no matter how wealthy, could undertake to secure all wanted in-print material for their customers. With respect to out-of-print material the picture is probably no easier. While interlibrary loans of out-of-print material are contemplated, they are not expected to be casual, and welcomes are quickly worn out.

Yet it is obvious that membership in a larger system, part of a network, could constitute a giant step toward access to the totality of resources. A number of devices for providing such access on a statewide basis has been contrived and is being tested, involving use of the resources of the state library, of regional or other resource libraries and contractual or other services. One result seems predictable from such programs: state systems will most certainly increase in self-sufficiency. With this increase other effects may in turn be foreseen. One is a relaxation of interlibrary loan demands upon the larger libraries which now receive too many of them, permitting them to be more hospitable to those that continue. For another, libraries will encourage their customers much more than in the past to feel free to request material not immediately available.

And if we handle the situation correctly, if we can prevent bureaucratic rigidity from nullifying the value of the service by delay and red tape, if we can instruct our customers in the art of identifying wanted materials or of asking the questions which lead to such identification, then I think we shall have gone much further than mere interlibrary loan and pickup-and-delivery, and shall be on the way to a new plateau of library service.
Wisconsin Free Library Commission
Institutes on Public Library Management

1. Institute on Public Library Management, Madison, August 23-25, 1948
   Sponsored jointly by the Commission and the University of Wisconsin Extension Division

2. Second Annual Institute on Public Library Management, Madison, July 25-27, 1949
   Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the University of Wisconsin Library School, and the Bureau of Government of the University of Wisconsin Extension Division

3. Third Institute on Public Library Management, Madison 5-7, 1951
   Sponsored jointly by the Commission and the Bureau of Government of the University of Wisconsin Extension Division

   Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the University of Wisconsin Library School, and the Bureau of Government of the University of Wisconsin Extension Division

5. The Public Library Building, Madison, April 13-15, 1953
   Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the University of Wisconsin Library School, the Wisconsin Library Association, and the Bureau of Government of the University of Wisconsin Extension Division

   Sponsored by the Commission and financed by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education and the American Library Association

7. Personnel Management, Madison, April 11-12, 1960
   Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the University of Wisconsin Library School, the Wisconsin Library Association, the Wisconsin Library Trustees Association, and the Bureau of Personnel of the State's Department of Administration

   Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the Wisconsin Education Association, the Wisconsin Library Association, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the University of Wisconsin Library School
9. Public Library Service to Adults, Madison, April 1-3, 1963
Sponsored jointly by the Commission, the University of Wisconsin Library School, the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Library Association, the Wisconsin Library Trustees Association, Wisconsin Library Film Circuit, State Board of Vocational and Adult Education, Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, Wisconsin Arts Foundation and Council

10. Part I, Building Book Collections for Reference and Information Services, Madison, October 6-8, 1964
Part II, Provide Statewide Reference Service in Wisconsin, Madison, April 5-7, 1965
Sponsored jointly by the Wisconsin Library Commission, the University of Wisconsin Extension Division, Department of Library Science, and the University of Wisconsin Library School

11. Impact of Federally Supported Programs Upon Public Library Service, Madison, March 2-4, 1966
Sponsored jointly by the Division, the University of Wisconsin Library School, and the University of Wisconsin Extension Department of Library Science