The Impact of the New Dues Structure

When I made my "inaugural" speech as ACRL president last July in San Francisco, I said:

Each ACRL President appears to specialize or emphasize certain issues during his/her term of office. When I was elected, someone asked me what was going to be my theme, or my claim to fame, I suppose. My response was that I didn't even think it would be necessary to try to identify any special theme or issue because history was going to do it for me. The very fact that during my term of office such issues were coming to a head as the move toward a stronger identity for ALA divisions and the implementation of the new dues structure would mean that such important concerns were presenting themselves just in the natural course of events that I would not have to go out and seek other issues to address in order to "make my mark" as ACRL President.

At this point in time, more than ever, I'm convinced of the validity of those remarks.

When the ALA Council authorized the revision of the association's dues structure several years ago, most of us Council members did not realize that that single action would have such wide-ranging implications for ALA politics, policy, procedure, and organizational structure. The mere fact of offering basic ALA dues for $35.00 and dues for each division for $15.00 raised a question of allegiances. Would librarians view themselves as ALA members first and foremost, or was their membership in ALA held primarily due to their interest in the divisions? Would librarians opt to pay the $35.00 and join no division, or would they sign up for one or more divisions? Would ALA headquarters "go down the drain"—or would the divisions?

The answers to some of these questions became obvious as we moved into implementation of the new dues structure: the allocation of dues to the respective divisions served as a stark showcase which displayed those divisions that were "pulling their weight" and those that were not. Members from divisions that were shaky financially showed paranoid leanings, while members from more prosperous divisions were "on the muscle." The ensuing tensions spawned thoughtless talk of "seceding" or buying divisional services elsewhere. One staunch ACRL member told me about a year ago: "ACRL can make it on its own—we ought to..."
just pull up stakes and leave ALA." But, over the months, time—and cooler heads—prevailed, and most of us are able to view the scene with a bit more balance now.

But, the impact of the new dues structure is just beginning to be felt—I suspect it will widen and grow, much like the ever-widening circles of a pool. We are clearly in a transitional period in the evolution of the American Library Association. This is the time for us to look at where we have been and decide where we wish to go; to review and re-evaluate our past practices, traditions, and systems.

Already the new dues structure has effected a subtle realignment of relationships. A couple of divisions are sharing an administrative office; the division presidents have formed an informal group, Division Interests Special Committee (DISC), now called Division Interests Discussion Group, to discuss common problems and serve as a communication link between the divisions and the ALA executive director and Executive Committee. Questions on the role, relationship, and responsibility of the division president, executive secretary, executive director, and Executive Committee are coming to the fore—as well they should be.

For ACRL's part, I think we have reached the time when we need to seek the answers to some of those questions. With over nine thousand members, ACRL is, as you probably know, the largest of the thirteen divisions of ALA. We are one of the fortunate divisions which received a surplus of revenue under the new dues structure. For this, I think our attitude should be a grateful rather than a gloating one. In addition to maintaining and developing our own division, we should seek ways in which to lend our strength and leadership to the association as well as to the profession.

But, we can do this better if we get ourselves together. Now is the time to take a look at the roles of our division, its membership, its president, its executive secretary—to revise and update the authorization for those roles. What can you, the ACRL member, do to help? You can get new members; you can join a chapter; if there is no chapter, you can start a chapter; you can attend our Midwinter and Annual Conference meetings; and you can keep those cards and letters coming.

Meanwhile, the American Library Association's budget is back in the black again. At Midwinter, the treasurer's report showed a surplus of about $12,000. This augurs well for the association. ALA is still not rich, but things look much better now than they did in the dark days leading up to the implementation of the new dues structure.

To what do we owe this solvency? We owe it to the leadership and persistence of Edward C. Holley, who was determined to preside over an association which had a balanced budget; to the ALA members who became alarmed at the extent of the association's deficit; and finally, we owe the solvency to the discipline, determination, and herculean efforts of Robert Wedgeworth, ALA executive director, and his staff—the people who have labored over the past two or three years to implement the policy of fiscal responsibility initiated by Holley. The association's members owe a vote of confidence to Holley and Wedgeworth for that feat.
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