MLIS Portfolio

Of

John Roblee Tieszen

MLIS Candidate Class of 2020.
Department of Information Science.
UCLA GSE&IS.

Spring 2020.

Advisor: Gregory Leazer.

Website Link for Digital Portfolio: Jacktieszen.com

A Word of Thanks.

I would like to take this page and offer thanks to everyone who has helped me in the process of not only writing this extensive piece of text but those who have helped me through the two years of this program. I would first like to start with a massive thank you to my advisor Gregory Leazer, who has been exceptionally helpful with my questions, exceptionally patient with my writing, and exceptionally accommodating with my lack of ability to stay within the word count of any assignment.

Next, I would like to thank the other educators within the IS department. Thank you to both the media archives professors and the library professors who helped me to develop my skills and expand my knowledge in the LIS field to the point where I feel prepared enough to enter into the workforce, a mindset that I didn’t have when walking through the doors on orientation day. Every teacher that I have had within this program has taught something that I can take with me and implement either into my future work or into my life. For these pieces of wisdom, I am forever grateful.

Finally, I would like to thank my cohort, the class of 2020, which includes some of the kindest, smartest, and most remarkable individuals that I have ever had the pleasure of sharing a space with. The support that I have received from them has been crucial to my success within this program and I am incredibly lucky to have been in such a wonderful cohort. I am excited to see what they all accomplish in the future.

Table of Contents

50 Word Summary

The current discourse related to the concept of library anxiety is limited due to its focus on systems and librarian/patron relationships. The space of the academic library both physically and theoretically needs to be addressed in tandem with the previous discourse to either expand proposed solutions or create alternative ones.

Longer Proposal:

The literature created after Constance Mellon's 1986 article Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development is predominantly focused on the relationship between students and library systems and how the anxiety felt by this group within an academic environment should be dealt with. Many of these articles are based around the statistical analysis taken from students about their experiences in libraries, dealing with topics such as system/technological literacy, comfort with staff, and information overload (a hefty amount of the work done in this area can be attributed to scholars Qun G. Jiao and Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie). The phrase "barriers of use" is often employed in these discussions as an umbrella term to denote these various anxiety-inducing elements. However, one barrier of use that isn't often mentioned within these articles is the physical space of the academic library, something that is repeatedly mentioned in Mellon's foundational text. So using literature such as The Academic Library as Crypto-temple by Stephan Bales, The Library as Heterotopia by Jessica Lingle, Marie Radford, and Gary Radford, and Hegemony's Handmaid by Christine Pawley amongst others, I will expand previous ideas on the cause of library anxiety to include the academic library as a physical space that has the potential to reinforce hegemonic ideologies within an academic institution. A possible solution to this would be in an attempt to demystify the library by allowing students to engage with this space beyond using it for required research/production.

Issue Paper

(Dis)quiet in the Library: Anxiety as Created by Space in the Academic Library.

At its core, library anxiety is a broad feeling of fear associated with the library. It can stem from inadequacy, social interaction with librarians, or a variety of other sources. While the concept may seem simple, the discussions over what causes it and its varying solutions have been extensive, lasting over thirty years since the term was canonized by Constance A. Mellon in 1986. Within the academic library, the discourse has discovered a multitude of troubling features from the fact that over 70% of students feel some form of this anxiety during their tenure, to the problems of procrastination and student failure that are linked to this concept. While the previous discourse has focused on aspects of systems and communication, one barrier that is often overlooked is the space of the library and how often that can be overwhelming and anxious inducing to students. On many levels, the size, structure, and architectural aesthetics of the library can lead to effects like fear or confusion for those who aren't familiar with the building. How a library's space can hide workers, books, or information access has a significant consequence on how students relate to, and engage with it. Thus it should be critiqued in order to establish methods of reducing library anxiety. In addition to this, the theoretical aspects of library space and the ideological notions behind its functions within the framework of the academic institution also bring forth many different areas of criticism that tie space into anxiety. In essence: the physical and theoretical space of the academic library is a significant factor in the causes of library anxiety for students who use it.

Utilizing historical analysis and textual criticism, this essay will address the responsibility of spatial elements on anxiety in three parts. The first section will be a literature review of this topic in order to introduce the discourse as is and its limitations. The second section, split into two parts, will be on the physical and theoretical aspects of space and how they can fit into the library anxiety discourse. The last section is composed of the solutions that will be proposed in order to alleviate anxiety created by space.

Part I: Library Anxiety: The 30 Year Discussion.

In order to adequately understand library anxiety and how it has been standardized over the years, it is important to look at the previous literature and assess what has been discussed on the issue. In 1986 Constance A. Mellon wrote *Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and its Development* which introduced the concept into LIS scholarship. She finds that library anxiety in students stemmed from four specific causes: the size of the library; the lack of knowledge about where things were located; how to begin; and what to do (Mellon 1986, 162). She further discusses how these elements presented issues in personal feelings towards the library, stating that students felt a level of academic inadequacy through their lack of ability to utilize the systems that make up the library (1986, 160). This inadequacy was perceived as shameful to the students tested, therefore, if a student were to address this lack of knowledge through communicating with a library professional, it meant revealing this personal failure which could potentially cause more anxiety within the student. This inadequacy element is important as it displays not only this dissonance between what the student know versus what they don't know about the library within the context of preparedness to be in an academic environment, but more importantly it shows why library anxiety continues to persist despite the existence of librarians who would otherwise be able to answer the questions about use.

After Mellon's foundational text the trajectory of the discourse can be distilled into two major categories. The literature that focused on testing how library anxiety affects the academic population, and the literature that focused on the solutions to library anxiety. The former literature can be traced to Sharon Lee Bostick with her article *The Development and Validation of the Library Anxiety Scale* which studied five components: "barriers with staff, affective barriers, comfort with the library, knowledge of the library, and mechanical barriers" (Van Kampen 2004, 29). This was expanded upon Doris J. Van Kampen in her article *Development and Validation of the Multidimensional Library Anxiety Scale* to address elements like academic level achieved and gender with regards to anxiety. Quin Jiao and Anthony Onwuegbuzie are perhaps the most prolific authors who perform tests utilizing these scales with articles that study the effects of library anxiety on various populations as well as things like the effects of technological integration on the library, student perception, and librarians (Jiao and Onwuegbuzie 1997; 2017; Jiao, Onwuegbuzie, and Lichtenstein 1996; Onwuegbuzie 2000).

These approaches to the discourse are more methodologically focused and therefore rely heavily on statistical analysis to create conclusions, which is what brings forward articles proposing solutions.

Much like the trajectory of the discourse itself, solution-based articles can be split into two categories. In the first category includes articles like *Reducing Library Anxiety in First Year Students* by Anna M. Van Scoyoc and *Trending Now—Reference Librarians: How Reference Librarians Work to Prevent Library Anxiety* by Leslie J. Brown (Van Scoyoc 2003; Brown 2011). Both articles propose that libraries could utilize already existing methods to reduce library anxiety within the student population (2011, 316; 2003, 337).[1] The second category features authors such as Elizabeth DiPrince, Amber Wilson, Chrissy Karafit, Amanda Bryant, and Chris Springer whose article *Don't Panic! Managing Library Anxiety with a Library Survival Guide* suggests the creation of new modes to teach students how to use the library, such as an individual "survival guide" that is created by the library and given to newer students every year (DiPrince et al. 2016, 289). These solution articles take the theories presented in the previous discourse and attempt to put forward real-world solutions in comparison to the statistical analysis of the other literature mentioned. The discourse being fairly young present many exciting prospects for the future. However, despite the existing articles on the subject there is an issue at present with the discourse being far too limited in scope concerning to what it could address. This critique can be found in Appendix 1. Library systems have been discussed ad nauseam in this discourse while space has been either reduced significantly in importance or been removed entirely from the discussion, so to remedy that, this text will address the spatial elements of the academic library, how they are effectively creating barriers for all students, and what solutions can be determined that address spatial aspects.

Part II: Space: Practical and Theoretical Understandings of the Library as a Space.

Physical Space.

As it was discussed in the last section, spatial elements are referenced within the discourse of library anxiety, but only in briefly despite Mellon's paper indicating that students in her study routinely mentioned the "large size" of the library (Mellon 1986, 162). If you look at

[1] Bibliographic instruction and reference desk workers to be precise about the existing methods.

all of the causes behind library anxiety within her text, space contributes to most of them. The general barriers of use have multiple ways in which one can analyze them and space, for one reason or another, has been pushed to the side when compared to the likes of systems or population analysis. But before further connections between library anxiety and space are made it is important to define what space is and present the framework of how it will be utilized within this text.

Space within this issue paper will be defined in two manners. The first is practical/physical space or the finite area which is free, available, or unoccupied. This aspect includes elements like layout, architecture, design, geography, and material placements. The second way in which space will be defined is through a theoretical lens, the infinite/continuous expanse which is dynamically created and re-created on a daily basis. This aspect includes elements of social and knowledge construction, along with presentations of the library's internal ideology both by itself but also of how it fits into the larger institution. It is important to note that the separation is not due to any perceived distinction between the practical and theoretical elements. Henri Lefebvre himself wrote in his seminal text *The Production of Space* that "space considered in isolation is an abstraction" which refers to the idea of space being collectively physical, mental, and social. Each of these definitions leads into each other and should realistically be referred to through the unitary lens of "space" as a singular definition (Lefebvre 1974, 12). Physical existence is reproduced daily through use and the lens of what is being addressed looks at the practical as the tip of the theoretical iceberg, with both mutually reflecting upon each other and signifying a collective element of space as being determined by its physical presence, its social use, and its theoretical representation. Everything determines everything and the separation noted here is for textual analysis only. With this stated, let's lead into the physical library and its issues with regards to anxiety.

The academic library functions as a place of knowledge creation[2] and therefore as a space the building should be structured in order to easily facilitate the transaction between patron/student and library materials. Yet, despite this goal, navigation in the academic library remains difficult for students. George Freeman in his essay *The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use* makes this clear by stating that "despite

---

[2] Or knowledge production when looking at the ideology of an institution.

their handsome exteriors, the interior spaces (of libraries) were often dim and confining, the buildings were difficult to navigate, and specialized services and collections were inaccessible to all but the serious scholar (Freeman 2005). Scholars Gale Eaton, Michael Vocino & Melanie Taylor have studied navigation in physical spaces and have found that many environmental factors relate what they refer to as "environmental legibility" (Eaton, Vocino, and Taylor 1993, 82). These included the simplicity of arrangement, visual access, and a lack of visual clutter. Despite the acknowledgment of these things as important, academic libraries find difficulty in resolving these problems within their buildings. An assessment by Doctor Angela Zoss at Duke University's libraries presents a real-world example to this analysis (Zoss 2019). Zoss writes that a majority of the issues concerning navigation within the three libraries on campus stem from building confusion and hidden rooms, both of which tie to the "where things are located" antecedent brought forth by Mellon. She further discusses the navigation of space in that depending on things like commonly used routes and where a student enters, it may make areas in the library more difficult to find. "There are still common destinations that are difficult to see from stairwells, elevators, and main hallways" she states (2019). This article is uniquely applicable to Duke university, but the same issues can be extended to other academic libraries. Powell at the University of California, Los Angeles, is a veritable maze of sorts in how difficult it is to navigate from high traffic areas if one isn't previously familiar with the space. Reference desks are slightly hidden from view, labels are often difficult to read from distances, and there are no visible maps within the main areas of the building such as the entrance lobby or the reading rooms.[3] But difficulties in navigation can refer to just more than how the hallways or elevators hide elements of the library. The places in which materials are located, and how the unique library reflects its "ideal use" have much to do with this as well.

The location of materials can be viewed as a form of library knowledge space as it references how libraries utilize the various catalogs/systems of organizational knowledge in how they represent their book stacks/other materials within the space. This organization of material follows these knowledge patterns in that things will likely be placed near each other within the library or in a (somewhat) intuitive shelving system, but where and how these stacks are placed become more individual to the library. Furthermore, the knowledge space can also reflect biases

---

[3] There are maps within the space but they are in odd places or are out of date.

within structures such as subject classifications that misrepresent or unconsciously denigrate marginalized identities. This topic has been discussed extensively by authors such as Ellen Greenblatt (Greenblatt, 1990). This can lead to newer, more pointed, and ideologically violent forms of anxieties that target underrepresented students. To read further critiques of physical space, see Appendix 2.

In conclusion of the physical elements of space, multiple issues have been raised that relate specifically to the concept of patron anxiety. First, through the lens of environmental legibility it has been determined that navigating academic libraries is an issue for students who aren't familiar with the space due to aspects like building confusion, hidden rooms/materials, and a lack of visually accessible wayfinders. Second, the manifestation and reflection of knowledge through organization both with regards to the textual materials associated with the library but also digital applications and non-library inclusions compound upon each other to further complicate the system. This inherently produces barriers of entry and accessibility into the library for many of the academic patrons that may utilize it thus presenting an environment conducive to the anxieties referenced in the previous section. If the space is difficult to navigate for students on the basic physical level, then the systems that would otherwise help these students to utilize the library become more difficult to engage with either because they can't find them or, more likely, because they force the confrontation between what the students know versus what they don't know about this space. This is the manifestation of the inadequacy antecedent which thus connects physical space to library anxiety. In essence, space determines how one engages with the systems within, so if the space causes anxiety, the students will likely not attempt to take part in the systems or will have difficulty if they do. However, "to reduce a library to simple architecture, bricks and mortar, is a mistake" (Radford, Radford, and Lingel 2015, 738). As hitherto expressed, the physical element is only a singular side to the discussion of space and its connection to anxiety. The theoretical portion is also a significant element that needs to be addressed with how the space of an academic library can create anxiety for students.

Theoretical Space.

The discussion of physical space presents a transition into the theoretical aspects as the social and ideological purposes of academic libraries are manifested within by seemingly physical elements including aesthetics, architecture, and geography. The purpose of a library and how it is utilized or seen by the student population is oftentimes reflected through these physical elements both as an individual library but also as a part of a larger academic institution. The theoretical property, therefore, must be addressed as an extension of the physical as expressed earlier through the evocations of Lefebvre. However, not all academic libraries are the same in the manner of physical characteristics. There is a historical trajectory within the United States of how these particular libraries are built and their reflection of building aesthetics upon use. The trajectory, therefore, reflects ideological aspects and should thus be placed into a framework before the discourse is to continue. For this essay, academic libraries will be split into three major categories, determined by when they were built. Given the constraints of this paper I will be discussing only a single category. If you wish to read on the other two categories of libraries, see Appendix 3.

The first category of academic libraries will be referred to as Crypto-temples. These libraries are generally built before/around the 1930s with a particular church-like aesthetic. This includes UCLA's Powell library (1929), Cornell's Uris Library (1891), and the University of Washington's Suzzalo Library (1926).[4] The library as a "temple" isn't an uncommon association within the field. George Freeman in his *Library as Place* article referenced in the previous section writes that the library has assumed an "almost sanctified role reflected both in its architecture and its sitting" (Freeman 2005). Since the rise of Universities during the age of enlightenment, the academic library has presented itself as a central component[5] to knowledge creation for its population and the building itself aesthetically reflects this importance. But this importance isn't entirely virtuous as the library can function simultaneously as a symbol of scientific/academic progress and as a tool of dominant control enforcing the hegemony of the institution (Bales 2014a, 141). Perhaps the most prolific individual who has written on this connection between the library, its temple-like aesthetics, and the ideological issues present is author and academic librarian Stephen Bales. In his article *The Academic Library as Crypto-temple: A Marxian Analysis,* Bales provides a historical analysis of academic libraries both to explain why exactly these buildings were built in such a particularly religious way and how this style has been shifted over the years to reflect alternate dominant ideologies. Historically,

---

[4] Also includes Johns Hopkins University's George Peabody Library (1878), and the University of Michigan's Cook Legal Research Library (1931).

[5] Sometimes literally with the building being geographically located at the center of campus.

academic libraries were built to be "explicitly politico-religious entities," serving similar purposes to that of churches (Bales 2014b, 7). These were communal places where people could go to engage in knowledge creation for either God or the state/institution. However, the post-war secularization of American Universities led to the separation of the politico-religious aspects and transferred the purpose of the academic library to the engagement of scholarly research and education (2014b, 8). However, since these buildings were structured and built around/to elicit a dominant ideology[6], when the religion was "scrubbed" away it didn't remove this dominance, rather it shifted it and allowed for other secular ideologies to enter into the space as an addendum to the sacred elements. These religious characteristics that suffused through the space therefore never actually went away but were left primarily through the architectural design. They were thus made implicit rather than the previous explicit intentions. This unintentionally bolstered these newer ideologies which while different, functioned in the same manner of instituting status quo hegemony for the populations that used it. Whether that hegemony is through the lens of capitalism, colonialism, neoliberalism or other such critiques that have been placed upon the academic library as an ideological institution, the hegemony makes itself known and apparent through the building's aesthetics. The academic library also managed to distract from these newer ideologies, presenting the sacred aesthetics of the space as an important aspect while the function of the library downplayed the historical connection to religion, once again making it implicit. All of this offers a connection between the sacred aspects of the institution and how these buildings are utilized in the modern era. But how does this affect students who enter into the space both in general and concerning library anxiety?

Bales continues his discussion on the Crypto-Temple academic library to display the relationship that these structures, through the circular physical/ideological connection, present to those who enter into the space. He writes that patrons at Evan[7] position themselves in relation to a "hierarchal, crypto-religious ideological institution" that has separated itself from the framework of the library as a functionally religious building while still maintaining sacred characteristics (2014b, 11). He further writes that patrons implicitly assume the role of a supplicant in relationship to this institution and asks why this occurs. Bales answers this by

[6] Mainly that of Christianity.

[7] Texas A and M library.

detailing both topics of hegemony as well as analyzing the emotional reaction that one has when entering these specific styles of spaces. Both of these, much like physical and theoretical space, tie into each other significantly.

Hegemony is defined by a concentrated dominance over a population. "According to Antonio Gramsci, a powerful group achieves hegemony when it gains control over a range of values and norms, to the extent that these are so embedded in society that they receive unquestioned acceptance" (Pawley 1998, 127).[8] Philosopher Louis Althusser expanded upon this concept to explain that a social class cannot hold power until it exercises this hegemony over and through what he referred to as an ideological state apparatus (ISA). The library as a crypto-temple can fit into this definition as it not only a formalized educational apparatus[9] but it also combines a variety of hegemonic cultural norms about both the church and academic libraries that present a "knowledge" of its functions to patrons such as the rules and the purpose of an institution. However, it does not present the lesson in how to actively use it outside of the dominant framework, thus masking the acting nature of universities as engines for reproducing hegemonic ideologies, or capitalist thought (2014b, 12).

When one enters into the space they are confronted with this hegemonic knowledge, i.e. the importance of an academic library, the rules for patrons, its function within the greater academic institution, etc. and have this knowledge ratified and represented through the crypto-temple aesthetics. High ceilings, ornate images, and century's old hallways are impressive to those who have never experienced such a place and therefore the heightened importance of the space can be assumed through entering into the building. Furthermore, those who are familiar with spaces similar, such as churches, unconsciously position themselves as supplicant in the hierarchy according to previous knowledge. By being awed by the academic library, a patron "has acted appropriately in relation to the ideology of the library and has entered into the library's hierarchical space" where they know nothing beyond surface-level values and production of knowledge aspect of the space (2014b, 16). This emotional reaction expresses a particularly important aspect of library anxiety that was mentioned earlier within this text. That

[8] The church is perhaps the most often used example as religious control over societies is ever present and continuous, which presents another reason as to why the sacred elements of the libraries couldn't be fully removed from the library due to architectural design.

[9] A specifically mentioned institution within Althusser's writing.

is the dissonance between what the student knows about the library versus what they don't. What a student entering into an academic library knows about the library is produced, and re-produced through cultural hegemonic knowledge that provides the heightened importance of the space within the context of the academic institution as well as presenting a combination of dos and don'ts with how to engage in the space. This knowledge is gained through life experience or other social osmosis means and likely introduces patrons to the idea of an academic library and its purpose before they even set foot on the property. So when they enter into the space and this knowledge ratified in importance by the aesthetics of the space it forces the confrontation between this knowledge and the lack of knowledge on use. This puts students into the supplicant role where they are forced to ask those with the "correct" knowledge[10] on how to engage with this intellectual church. Since this requires exposing inadequacy to professionals, students choose not to engage and either try to learn the library by themselves or avoid the library altogether. All of these responses have the potential to create anxiety, and all of which were caused by the crypto-temple aesthetics of the library and what that represents. More importantly, this anxiety is immediately introduced to the student upon entering the building or potentially by just seeing it from the outside. This is against the idea that anxiety is bred solely by students using the library systems, and broadens the framework for when anxiety occurs within the academic community.

This entire section may seem hyper-critical of the academic library as an ideological space. However, it is important to understand that the three types of academic library spaces as represented through this framework present a positive truth about these institutions: academic libraries are constantly shifting. While the shift in the physical is easy to establish such as a shift in aesthetics and architecture, it can be applied to a shift in function. Author Karen Nicholson in her article *On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy* writes on theoretical, socially constructed space as something that produced and reproduced on a daily basis. Citing geographer Tim Cresswell she states that places like universities or libraries "are never established" and are created by "people conforming to expectations about what people do" at these given spaces (Nicholson 2018, 3). More succinctly to relate this back to Lefebvre: "(social) space is a (social) product" (Lefebvre

[10] I.E. librarians.

1974, 26). If this is true and space is reliant on human intentions and engagement, that means shifting the space to encourage non-hegemonic thinking and knowledge creation is a possibility (Molotch 1993, 887). If one shifts the space both physically and theoretically than the problems that link library anxiety to these spatial elements can be tackled.

Part III: Ways to Reduce Library Anxiety.

With all of the elements that create anxiety within the academic library space represented in the previous portions of this essay and further discussions that can be tied into this discourse such as the alienation of the student population and procrastination, the work that needs to be done to change the space is vast.[11] While it may seem as if the author of this piece wishes to destroy the space and start from scratch as the theoretical aspects are heavily ingrained into these buildings, understand that this isn't the intention of this essay. As expressed earlier things can be shifted and important elements both physically and theoretically can be changed. Keep in mind that in similarity to the "solution" articles mentioned within the literature review as well as the three pronged theory discussion, the library is not a monolith of spaces and ideas, therefore individual decisions must be made within these unique spaces. The solutions that will be proposed are broad enough to start discourses but should not be used as exact guidelines. Furthermore, as expressed in the literature review section many of the previous ideas and solutions have shown to be beneficial and just need to add space as an element so that will not be a part of this area of discussion. The first solution that is proposed is to create a function where the library acts as a third place.

Bernard Frischer in his article *The Ultimate Internet Café: Reflections of a Practicing Digital Humanist about Designing a Future for the Research Library in the Digital Age* writes that "users of physical libraries will want to experience something in a library that cannot be had in the office or home, and that something is the drama of community" (Frischer 2005, 17). This is almost the exact definition of a third place. This concept is defined entirely through distinction from other locations. It is the natural evolution from the first place (one's home) and the second place (one's work). Third places encapsulate zones and buildings and set social and communal tones that distinguish themselves from other locations and present opportunities for community

[11] See Loneliness in the Neoliberal Age: The Use of Libraries to Alleviate Alienation by Jack Tieszen as reference.

inclusion. Marcela Cabello and Stuart M. Butler write on this community building in their article *How public libraries help build healthy communities.* They write that the important elements that make libraries into third spaces are location, accessibility, and trust (Cabello and Butler 2017). There are certainly other characteristics that can be discussed for instance all the ones in Ray Oldenburg's seminal text *The Great Good Place* (neutral ground, low profile, etc.) but for the sake of academic libraries the three that Butler and Cabello bring up are important to dissect and implement into the space. The first element of location is easily achieved as academic libraries are generally geographically located at the center of campuses but accessibility and trust present some requirements for change. Accessibility is an issue of physical layout and can be dealt with through the inclusion of better signage and maps as discussed by Gale Eaton or through changes to benefit students with disabilities. Trust centers itself around the connection between students and those who work within the library, which as addressed previously doesn't always occur due to preconceived ideas of professional busy-ness or fear of showcasing inadequacy. To build trust between the librarian and students who use this space is imperative in reducing library anxiety as it bridges knowledge gaps and allows students to learn the systems and space with ease. The instruction classes mentioned in Anna M. Van Scoyoc for instance would be good programs to put into place to deal with this issue. This method of turning the library into a third space brings forth a few negative qualities as well, for it is not free of criticism.

Beyond the fact that many of these third space discussions are on public libraries which are different spaces than academic libraries with regards to multiple factors (communities, hierarchies, relationships to institutions, etc.) the idea of a third place puts a significant amount of value on the social aspects of a building rather than the communal. Author Jeffery Gayton discusses this distinction by stating that the social model envisions the library as a collaborative space which while good, can undermine the quiet, serious usage of the library as a location for knowledge creation (Gayton 2008, 60). A powerful attraction of the academic library "is the unique pleasure of being alone, in a quiet place, while simultaneously being in a public place associated with scholarship" (Demas 2005, 29). By making an academic library a place where social activity is privileged it presents issues of distraction referenced by both the crypto-temple and modern academic library.[12] This doesn't help with anxiety as it only gives students a place to

[12] See Appendix 3.

be social rather than a place to create knowledge/engage with the space. Furthermore, there are plenty of other places on campus that can act as social spaces beyond the library so privileging this aspect can only lead to the library hegemonically fitting into the larger university on a social level. A way to distinguish the library from the rest of the university is through counter hegemonic programming. It is necessary to acknowledge the library as its own institution rather than as one that is solely connected with the goals of the university. The connection doesn't need to be separated but a differentiating factor should be put into place if one is to view a library as a full third space. If that is addressed than the third place framework can be a good introduction into building trust between the students, librarians, and library systems. Once this trust is introduced then counter-hegemonic programming can truly begin.

The next solution will be referred to as "library as play" and unlike the third space discussions it is more ideologically focused in dealing with space and library anxiety rather than physically focused. The framework in which play will be discussed will be through an analysis of Foucault's Heterotopia as examined by Gary and Marie Radford, and Jessica Lingel in the article *The Library as Heterotopia: Michel Foucault and the Experience of Library Space.* Heterotopia conceptually as Foucault wrote on it, is something that can be directly tied into many of the theoretical elements of the library that have been previously discussed. By definition it is a cultural, institutional, or discursive space that is somehow other, being transforming, disturbing, intense, or contradictory. These are places that evoke "significant and memorable responses for those who enter and interact" with them (Radford, Radford, and Lingel 2015, 734). The space of the library through this lens lies in an odd theoretical place beyond the discussions of ideology presented earlier as through this framework the transformative aspect are in the notion that one enters the library to enter into endlessly expansive knowledge spaces as created by the materials housed within the walls. The library exists as a mirrored world where patrons get lost in a "mixed joint experience" being "neither in one place or another" but experiencing "multiple places at once within the same physical space (2015, 736). The physical space, the literary space, the patron mental space, the ideological space, and others amalgamate into singularity within this lens. This can, of course, be considered as a big cause of personal anxiety but why it was placed here instead of within the second section of this essay is with the introduction of play.

Radford states that when looking at David Macey's biography *The Lives of Michel Foucault* the dominant image from Foucault's activity in the library was him treating the research as play and “the library as a terrain in which play can take place, and which makes the play possible” (2015, 745). This is further extended by the statement that “having spaces become or contain “other spaces” is what children do in their games” (2015, 745). But what exactly constitutes play? Critic Roger Caillois discussed the characteristics in his book *Man, Play, and Games* by stating that play is: free, separate, uncertain, unproductive, governed by rules, make believe, and a voluntary activity (Caillois 2001, 7–10). To present these ideas within the concept of counter-hegemonic programming at the library one needs to understand why people go to this place: for knowledge creation/production in efforts to succeed within the academic system which often times uses a neoliberal ideological framework. This presents the library as a space where people, through the classes they take, are encouraged/forced to enter into the library for the sake of successful productivity in a neoliberal context. To counter this, alternative ideas of the library’s purpose that structure these ideas with library use need to be put into place. One needs to bring patrons into the library for a sake outside of production, something that encourages self determination and pushes against the alienation of the individual through fun methods that evoke Caillois theories. This can be through things like workshops that are voluntary for first year students or guidebooks as previously discussed. However, an underutilized concept within the academic library is the explorative aspect that libraries are fondly known for. As Sam Demas wrote “anecdotal evidence from students and faculty confirms that serendipitous discovery is a common and treasured experience in libraries” (Demas 2005, 32). This serendipitous discovery through exploration needs to be encouraged so that students can not only familiarize themselves with this expansive physical and mental space, but to present them alternative modes of success that exist outside of the production requirements of the university (Beilin 2016, 18). This can be achieved with multiple methods such as programming, improved communication, and better signs to make the navigation easier. Familiarization is perhaps the most key thing to work on as it allows students who experience anxiety through overwhelming space or confusing systems to engage with the library to the point of expertise, but familiarization can also be extended further into demystification which, while mainly appropriate for crypto-temples, needs to be addressed. To read additional solutions, see Appendix 4.

Conclusion:

When discussing the issue of library anxiety within an academic institution there are a variety of characteristics of the library that must be brought up. In the past, the various confusing systems and disconnect between librarians and patrons were viewed as important elements that led to this anxiety but unfortunately, they have been the sole focus of the discourse. Spatial elements have been left under-discussed within the discourse. The space of the academic library physically through characteristics like the layout, geography, signage, and location of materials need to be addressed as the key elements of library anxiety deal with a feeling of inadequacy or a lack of ability to navigate the space. If the physical is simplified or made more intuitive than library anxiety could be reduced. Theoretical space is an extension of the physical as it deals with the reflection of hegemonic knowledge and dominant institutional thought, all of which help to bolster feelings of fear and inadequacy. It also condenses the potential use of the academic library to a specific framework, whether that be through neoliberal requirements of production or any other dominant exclusionary principal. Considering these elements brings forth either the ability to add space into the solutions that have been discovered previously or allows a framework few newer, more alternative solutions that can be proposed. The solutions offered within this text, following third-place discourse and making the library into a "play" space are just some of the possible options that an academic space can pursue depending on what they are allowed to change within the library spatially and through programming.

Bibliography:

Atlas, Michel. 2005. "Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won't Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian's Rant." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 44 (4): 314–19.

Bales, Stephen. 2014a. "Every Thing Determines Everything Embracing the Flux of Academic Librarianship to Co-Author Meaningful Change." In , 16. Brock University, Saint Catharines, Ontario.

———. 2014b. "The Academic Library as a Crypto-Temple: A Marxian Analysis." In *Class and Librarianship: Essays at the Intersection of Information, Labor and Capital.* Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press.

———. 2015. "The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship A Critical Approach." *Litwin Books & Library Juice Press* (blog). 2015. https://litwinbooks.com/books/the-dialectic-of-academic-librarianship/.

Beilin, Ian. 2016. "Student Success and the Neoliberal Academic Library." *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1 (January): 10–23. https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v1.24303.

Brown, Lesley J. 2011. "Trending Now—Reference Librarians: How Reference Librarians Work to Prevent Library Anxiety." *Journal of Library Administration* 51 (3): 309–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.556950.

Cabello, Marcela, and Stuart M Butler. 2017. "How Public Libraries Help Build Healthy Communities." *Brookings*, March, 4.

Caillois, Roger. 2001. "The Definition of Play." In *Man, Play and Games*. University of Illinois Presss. https://www.press.uillinois.edu/books/catalog/64rcw3ts9780252070334.html.

Demas, Sam. 2005. "From the Ashes of Alexandria: What's Happening in the College Library?" Council on Library and Information Resources and Library of Congress.

DiPrince, Elizabeth, Amber Wilson, Chrissy Karafit, Amanda Bryant, and Chris Springer. 2016. "Don't Panic! Managing Library Anxiety with a Library Survival Guide." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 55 (4): 283. https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.55n4.283.

Eaton, Gale, Michael Vocino, and Melanie Taylor. 1993. "Evaluating Signs in a University Library." *Collection Management* 16 (3): 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v16n03_06.

Freeman, Geoffrey T. 2005. "The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use." *Council on Library and Information Resources* (blog). 2005. https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub129/freeman/.

Frischer, Bernard. 2005. "The Ultimate Internet Cafe. Reflections of a Practicing Digital Humanist about Designing a Future for the Research Library in the Digital Age." *Council on Library and Information Sources*, 27.

Gayton, Jeffrey T. 2008. "Academic Libraries: 'Social' or 'Communal?' The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34 (1): 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.11.011.

Greenblatt, Ellen. 1990. "Homosexuality: The Evolution of a Concept in Library of Congress Subject Headings." In Gay and Lesbian Library Service, edited by Cal Gough and Ellen Greenblatt. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *The Production of Space*. Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Mellon, Constance. 1986. "Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development." *College & Research Libraries*, no. 47: 160–65.

Molotch, Harvey. 1993. "The Space of Lefebvre." *Theory and Society* 22 (6): 887–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00993685.

Nicholson, Karen. 2018. "On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy." *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 2 (1). https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v2i1.86.

Novak, George, and Ernest Mandel. 1970. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press.

Pawley, Christine. 1998. "Hegemony's Handmaid? The Library and Information Studies Curriculum from a Class Perspective." *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 68 (2): 123–44.

Radford, Gary P., Marie L. Radford, and Jessica Lingel. 2015. "The Library as Heterotopia: Michel Foucault and the Experience of Library Space." *Journal of Documentation* 71 (4): 733–51. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2014-0006.

Sontag, Susan. 1964. "Notes On Camp." *Partisan Review*.

Van Scoyoc, Anna. 2003. "Reducing Library Anxiety in First-Year Students: The Impact of

Computer-Assisted Instruction and Bibliographic Instruction." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 42 (4): 329–41.
Zoss, Angela. 2019. "Where Do Patrons Get Lost? A Study of Library Navigation." *Bitstreams: The Digital Collections Blog* (blog). December 6, 2019. https://blogs.library.duke.edu/bitstreams/2019/12/06/where-do-patrons-get-lost-a-study-of-library-navigation/.

Issue Paper Appendix

Appendix 1:

Michel C. Atlas critiques this discourse in his article *Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won't Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian's Rant.* His criticisms focus heavily on the previous studies of library anxiety and especially on their findings. Atlas mentions Bostick's development of the library anxiety scale and its conclusion that there is a perception of library professionals being intimidating, aloof, and too busy to provide assistance in utilizing the library (Atlas 2005, 315). He takes this conclusion and applies it to the trajectory of library anxiety discourse, stating that many of the articles that followed the creation of this scale put the onus of reducing anxiety squarely on librarians when the reality involves issues of perception and student populations as well. There is an implication that he notes within this discourse that librarians, and only librarians, need to work harder to elicit a feeling of safety or warmth in the communication between themselves and patrons. He refers to as offensive and narrow-minded (2005, 317). The main point that he is inferring to within this text is this: the focus on systems and librarians within the discourse on library anxiety is myopic and can oftentimes lead to either restricted solutions that aren't viable for all who enter into the library at best or the re-mystification of the library at worst (2005, 316). By refusing to address alternative creators of library anxiety such as space, the discourse around and attempts to solve library anxiety are limited to a small field.

However, in a twist of irony, Atlas doesn't offer a solution beyond restating already existing librarian jobs in reference work and pedagogy as well as ending the paper by telling patrons to just "get over" library anxiety, which isn't the best manner of addressing the issue (2005, 318). With regards to space, Atlas does reflect slightly on how modern academic libraries have opted to include things like coffee bars, gift shops, and "finals resting places" amongst other spatial uses (2005, 317). He doesn't have a positive view on these inclusions, however, this inference is highly reductive in that it doesn't mention that all of those are "non-library uses" or non-traditional library inclusions, none of which help people learn how to use the space therefore not even addressing the main antecedents of anxiety within this institution but rather looking solely at the statistics of how many people enter (Demas 2005, 32). By stating that reducing library anxiety and getting people into the library through non-library inclusions like coffee bars are part of the same field of study presents a false narrative that infers that library anxiety can be reduced by solely bringing people into the space. While the ability to come into and exist within the walls of the library is an important starting point and the inclusion on non-library uses has value, it is engaging with the space and its various library uses that can bring forth the reduction in the particular anxiety that is being discussed. When Mellon states that "the library can be an overwhelming place to someone who doesn't understand how to use it," she meant that if the space and systems are difficult to navigate, then it leads to anxiety (Mellon 1986, 163).

Appendix 2:

Continuing with the discussion on Powell library in the context of knowledge space the two major book stacks are located on differing floors according to the online floorplan. On the first floor holds the stacks with call numbers from A through G, using the Library of Congress Classification system. The ground floor holds the literature with the call numbers H through Z. The problem with this is that the locations are difficult enter, especially the first floor stacks which require that patrons enter through the computer lab or through two back entrances. The full map of the building (found online) doesn't include the special collections within the main reading room on the second floor beyond the reference collection. Entering into the space physically outside of the presented map is a slightly different experience. From this description, it seems as if the knowledge organization of Powell isn't exceptionally navigable for students regardless of if they have seen the digital maps or not. The layout of the materials is confusing and once again, reiterating upon the ideas within the literature on library anxiety if students don't understand how to utilize the space or even where to begin it causes confusion which leads to the feelings of inadequacy.

This confusion about where things are located can certainly be applied to the integration of other items into the space such as digital technologies, and the non-library inclusion within these spaces. With the former, a digital resource/catalog might give a student the information of the library material like its call number, but if it doesn't correspond to a location beyond the library with which it exists in it makes finding the material more difficult than it needs to be if things like maps and signs aren't included or are difficult to understand for students. Furthermore, if the material is located in multiple buildings that can present some confusion if the system doesn't make the specific buildings clear, even more so if the buildings are functionally different, are differing sizes, or are located in different places on campus. This was referenced as a major issue within the Zoss article. When this finding aid technology is integrated into the space i.e. using computers or tablets with access to catalogs, the conflict of placement comes into view, especially if the number of computers is limited to a single floor. Of course, this aspect can be mitigated if students have access to smartphones or personal computers but that is an assumption that a library can't make of its patrons.

The latter confusion mentioned, the non-library inclusions such as coffee-shops, while not a major issue in comparison to other problems, could potentially hide the location of rooms or change the routes of students to focus on these elements in the library rather than learning how to actually use the space. While these particular inclusions may not be as influential in comparison to the organization of knowledge or even the structure of the building itself, they are additional compounding factors that make navigating the library a potentially difficult thing to accomplish. To reiterate Mellon's hypothesis, not knowing where things are located or what to do are major elements that lead to library anxiety.

Appendix 3:

The second category will be referred to as Warehouse Libraries which were built/renovated during the 1960s through the 1990s. These include UCLA's YRL (1964), New York University's Bobst Library (1973), and California Institute of Technology's Millikan Library (1967).[13] These libraries are oftentimes more aesthetically simple when compared to the crypto-temples but are more likely to contain a larger amount of materials within them. Lastly, the third category encompasses libraries built around the year 2000 and after, these will be referred to as Modern Libraries and include Southern Oregon University Hannon Library (2004), Loyola University of Chicago's Klarchek Information Commons (2005), and University of

---

[13] Also includes Brown University's John D. Rockefeller Jr. Library (1964), University of Pittsburgh's Hillman Library (1968).

Chicago's Joe and Rike Mansueto Library (2001).[14] These particular libraries tend to reflect the growing digital landscape and focus on communal or social usages rather than the storage of materials. This isn't a comprehensive list of libraries and it would be remiss to express that all libraries fit into each timeline perfectly or into only three categories, but for the sake of brevity, this is what is being presented. Furthermore, all of these libraries function in the same hegemonic way as they are all classified as academic libraries, but these distinctions in architecture and aesthetics reflect different elements of this hegemony and should be discussed using differing angles.

The warehouse-style of academic libraries may not have the same crypto-temple aesthetics, so the inherent ornateness that places people into a bottom tier hierarchical position is removed. That being stated, these particular libraries still fit under the ideological state apparatus tent as libraries and are therefore beholden to the same issues as the crypto-temple such as hegemonic dominance. The distinctions in aesthetics and presentation of the warehouse-style library must be critiqued as they present alternative reflections of an institution's dominant ideology. In many ways, the warehouse-style is a polar opposite to the crypto-temple library. The spaces are closer together and closed off. There are often more book stacks than open areas. The outsides are generally grey and non-descript, nothing about the place exudes the sacredness of the crypto-temple beyond perhaps being surrounded by sculptures or gardens. The warehouse is benign. But it is this benign nature where the ISA is more apparent. Bales writes in his book *The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship: A Critical Approach* that the ISA's "manufacture acceptance – whether it be cheerful, grudging, or indifferent – towards the existing power relations through teaching the "rules of good behavior" and ultimately "the rules of the order established by class domination" (Bales 2015, 117). If the crypto-temple manufactures acceptance through an awed or fearful reaction to the space that muddles the modern hegemonic ideology through sacred architecture, then the warehouse manufactures acceptance through indifference by displaying the production aspects of the academic library front and center to its patrons. Whereas the reaction between the student and the crypto-temple is one of awe, the reaction to a warehouse is nothing of the sort. It is, as expressed, benign, stale, and cold. Free of any emotional connection and thus used solely as a warehouse for knowledge production. It is a

[14] Also includes North Carolina States James B. Hunt Jr. Library (2013), and California State University at Fresno's Henry Madden Library (2011).

simulacrum of the temple and in a way a crypto-prison, a place that seems less like it is for human use and more like a storage building for material knowledge. Yet, despite this difference, the warehouse produces the same hierarchical knowledge pressure on students as the crypto-temple due to its similar academic library function. Through this similarity, the small space thus becomes claustrophobic and suffocating and the increased number of seen materials present the same issue as the crypto-temple just in the opposite way. Whereas the crypto-temple forces students to navigate large spaces that dwarf the books and other materials within, the warehouse-style forces students to navigate small spaces where the walls are covered with textual materials. If one doesn't know where to start or how to navigate this, anxiety is bred.

With the modern changes to the academic library due to the increase in the digital sphere, the space of the institution has seen a few changes as well. The modern library, or the examples designated earlier present an alternative to the crypto-temple and the warehouse model in the focus on this digital aspect as well as social space. Modern academic libraries through their design are attempting to create spaces that house access to knowledge creation but also allow alternative uses of the space such as computer labs built for the space rather than just integrated and non-library inclusions like coffee shops. These spaces become less about previous incarnations of the library and more about how to adequately reflect student needs through a series of relationships between these various library and non-library systems. When analyzed, this can almost be viewed as similar to what Bales stated in his article *Everything Determines Everything.* He states that when a dialectic approach is adopted to librarianship, the library "becomes a set of relationships of people, ideas, and places that are as materially real as Bales the person or as real as everything else in this room." (Bales 2015, 117). The relationships are no longer just between students and the library but between students and everything that has been included within, such as these computer labs. While this seems like a step forward for using space there are still concerns, both of which are addressed in author Jeffery Gayton's article *Academic Libraries: "Social" or "Communal?" The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries*. Gayton's concerns with the modern library are that non-library functions don't meaningfully increase the use of the libraries and that new services can potentially distract from the original functions of the library (Gayton 2008, 63). These concerns are directly tied in with the physical functions of space in that they deal with the inclusion of these alternative elements that are common within modern libraries and while this was referred to in the literature review through

Atlas as a discussion of the distinction between bringing people into a place versus having them use it, these concerns present the theoretical issue of the modern library through a singular term: distraction.

The distraction can be read as a distraction from the library's main knowledge creation use but it can also be analyzed in a similar manner to the crypto-temples distraction method, where the digital focus and large communal spaces serve to muddle the hegemonic ideologies that are propagated due to the institutional use of the space. The library in the modern age has thus unintentionally cycled back to the aestheticized form, but instead of an ancient church, it is now a digital temple. The space may be built differently, but the hierarchies and overwhelming spatial aspects that were so common within the crypto-temples have returned. And once again this brings forth issues of inadequacy and anxiety that are common across all forms of academic libraries, in addition to digital literacy anxiety given that these modern institutions are more focused on computer technologies and visual literacy. The distraction can also be broadened to the distraction of students from the awareness of their own condition within the context of existing in a capitalist academic institution which leads to anxiety and alienation in a similar manner to the crypto-temple (Novak and Mandel 1970, 49–50).

Appendix 4:

The last solution that will be offered is to demystify the space and it is the authors belief that with regards to the crypto-temple the sublime extravagance of these temples aesthetics falls under a certain level of Susan Sontag's definitive camp though it is not solely related to the crypto-temple style. The spirit of extravagance and too muchness of the century old academic library defined through its aesthetics and vastness of its space is ripe for critique (Sontag 1964, 7). As an extension of the previous solution, this solution, which will be referred to as the "camping of the library," should encourage students to question the severity of the spaces that they work within and therefore question the hegemony that is placed upon them. Not only would allowing students to criticize the status quo of the library and its control over the population demystify the aesthetics and physical aspects of the space, but if they can become "frivolous about the seriousness" than that would make working within the library's complex systems much less anxious inducing and possibly more fun, leading back into the aspect of play (1964, 10). Gale Eaton states more people tend to use the library when they become familiar with the space

(Eaton, Vocino, and Taylor 1993, 85). Demystification is just familiarization with additional ideological barriers being broken and for the crypto-temple specifically that is extremely important to make note of.

Appendix Bibliography:

Atlas, Michel. 2005. “Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won’t Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian’s Rant.” *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 44 (4): 314–19.

Bales, Stephen. 2014. “Every Thing Determines Everything Embracing the Flux of Academic Librarianship to Co-Author Meaningful Change.” In , 16. Brock University, Saint Catharines, Ontario.

———. 2015. “The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship A Critical Approach.” *Litwin Books & Library Juice Press* (blog). 2015. https://litwinbooks.com/books/the-dialectic-of-academic-librarianship/.

Demas, Sam. 2005. “From the Ashes of Alexandria: What’s Happening in the College Library?” Council on Library and Information Resources and Library of Congress.

Eaton, Gale, Michael Vocino, and Melanie Taylor. 1993. “Evaluating Signs in a University Library.” *Collection Management* 16 (3): 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v16n03_06.

Gayton, Jeffrey T. 2008. “Academic Libraries: ‘Social’ or ‘Communal?’ The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34 (1): 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.11.011.

Mellon, Constance. 1986. “Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development.” *College & Research Libraries*, no. 47: 160–65.

Novak, George, and Ernest Mandel. 1970. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press.

Sontag, Susan. 1964. “Notes On Camp.” *Partisan Review*.

Professional Development Statement

My Background & Path to UCLA.

During my undergraduate at the University of Iowa, I double majored in film studies and geography along with getting a minor in informatics. I had initially been interested in pursuing film archiving as my topic of interest and potential career path but I was unqualified for many of the jobs that I was interested in due to my highest academic achievement being a bachelor's degree and an overall lack of experience within that industry. This is what led me to look at graduate schools that offered such training. UCLA eventually was what I chose as my school due to its proximity to the film industry as well as its connection to the rest of the information science school, unlike other options that were solely focused on moving image archiving. After the first few quarters were over I realized that my interests began to shift more towards librarianship than archiving. I felt that working in a library would allow me to pursue multiple disciplines whereas an archive would force a choice in a single area of interest. With that mentality, I switched my goals completely and began to focus on librarianship during my second year.

My Coursework.

My course work reflects this initial trajectory and shifts over time. When I began at the program I was only taking archiving classes amongst the core courses. These taught me a host of skills in film handling, critical research, and media cataloging. I have taken coursework that has provided me with experience in home movie description, digital archiving and restoration, transcription, and professional development within the media archiving field. When I switched over to the library track I shifted the type of coursework that I was taking as well. I have taken classes in children's library services, public libraries, library programming, descriptive cataloging, and contemporary issues within the libraries. By taking an interdisciplinary approach to my coursework, I have been able to learn a wide range of curriculum that has exposed me to theories of the different disciplines and that has enabled me to learn much about a variety of areas within the field.

My Work Experience.

While in school I was able to take two internships at different academic institutions. My primary internship was at the University of Southern California's VKC library where I worked on the digitization and georeferencing of government planning documents for the city of Los Angeles. In this role I researched these government documents in order to correctly catalog them, digitized the textual and visual material, and through QGIS added the maps to an OSM file in order to publish this material through GitHub. The purpose of this project was to take materials that would otherwise be locked within a desk and publish them so that students within and outside of USC can access them for future research. My second internship was at Antioch University where I was a reference librarian for students. This position mostly entailed working with students to help them meet formatting requirements for APA and MLA citations however my job extended much further than that. I was able to help students with their assignments, essays, and research questions. This position was much more collaborative than the USC one and it allowed me to put what I've learned in the classroom into use. A unique thing that occurred in both of these positions during my work was the shift to remote work due to the pandemic. The shift forced me to focus on how to complete what I was doing without the same resources that I had when I was located in the physical location of each position. In addition to these two work experiences I had the ability to volunteer my time at places such as UCLA Powell Library's AV Preservation Lab where I was given the ability to work with media materials in an professional archival setting.

My Experience in Professional Organizations.

While my jobs and coursework have provided me with knowledge of and experience in the library and information science field, I have also taken on active roles in organizations related to the field, including my roles as the President of OUTReach, Treasurer of UCLA's ALA chapter, Social Chair of the Student Governing Board, and member of a number of groups including AMIA, SLA, Artifacts, SCA, and Horn Press. For these organizations, I have been able to assist in the planning of events on campus from community-building programs to academic conferences. This experience has allowed me to meet other students and professionals in the field and to gain experience in event planning, program creation, and networking which I believe are all critical for any position in the library and information science field.

My Future Plans.

My goals for the future are tied to academic librarianship. My main professional interest would be in collection development/curation because I want to work in developing strong library collections for institutional research as well as be able to show them off to the academic community at large. I would also be fine with visualization or reference and instruction librarianship as possible paths of opportunity in my professional life. I believe that the actual job title doesn't necessarily matter when it comes down to what I want to achieve within a university setting. My main project as an academic librarian would be in the outreach that would connect the library to a specific program within the university, basically an inter-departmental collaboration effort based around research for the specific program. To put this into example if the collaboration is between the library and the geography department then connecting the students to map-based government documents within the library would be good for expanding research. In addition to this I intend to keep up with the major LIS organizations that I am currently a part of such as the American Library Association and the Special Libraries Association amongst others. I also hope to publish my work, either articles that I have written or articles that I wish to write in academic journals in the near future.

Major Paper

Course: IS 213: Issues in Librarianship (Libraries: Values, Barriers and Interventions)

Justification: In the last quarter of my first year, I had a small crisis of faith concerning archiving. I had taken a variety of archiving/media archiving classes in the previous two quarters but I wasn't being as intellectually fulfilled by them as I would have liked to. Furthermore, I began to think about my future in the industry and I realized that I didn't necessarily want to limit myself to working in archives. So I decided to make the switch to librarianship on a whim and it ended up helping to get me out of my perceived academic stagnancy.

The final assignment for this course was 40% of the grade and we were allowed to either do a group project assignment or pursue an independent term paper topic.

The prompt was as follows:

You (individually) will propose, research and write a term paper of roughly 15-20 pages that covers a topic directly discussed or inspired by the themes and guiding questions of the course.

Given that I was researching the neo-liberalization of academic institutions for the class I wanted to continue that pursuit and address the topic of alienation in student communities and how the library can either bolster it or work against it. I felt it important to put this paper into my portfolio not only because the ideas that I researched impacted my issue paper but also because it showcases the shift I had from media archiving to librarianship within the UCLA MLIS program.

Abstract:

The decline in social interaction and participation has been occurring for a few decades according to Robert Putnam's book *Bowling Alone.* The trend of social disengagement leading to mass alienation can be blamed on multiple areas within society but a certain aspect that requires further exploration is the increase in neoliberalism within the United States. A good place to discuss the connection between the two is the modern research university as it functions as a microcosm of society in its combination of work, leisure, and student living. Utilizing Marxist alienation discourse and applying it to the university at large, one can assess ways in which the academic library can fight against neoliberal forms of thought to prevent future student alienation and isolation through open space, social programming, and information literacy education.

Jack Tieszen
6/13/19
IS 213: Final Paper

Loneliness in the Neoliberal Age: The Use of Libraries to Alleviate Alienation

According to Robert Putnam's article *Bowling Alone*, social interaction and participation on a wide scale are declining and isolation has become a massive issue within American society. This decline has been occurring for the past few decades and will continue if left unchecked. Why this matters is that isolation is seen as a social ill within modern industrial society. It often can lead to significant negative psychological effects, which can, in turn, affect other aspects of one's health. But what exactly causes this "social capital" decline, why is it occurring at such as fast rate, and why is this a recent phenomenon (Putnam 1995, 3)? Putnam somewhat blames the rise in new technology stating that "in the language of economics, electronic technology enables individual tastes to be satisfied more fully, but at the cost of the positive social externalities associated with more primitive forms of entertainment (Putnam 1995, 13)." While this denunciation towards social media and other recent technological advancements that promote individual use isn't entirely without justification, it is perhaps too limited when looking at the full range of societal disengagement. Isolation isn't caused by individually used technology but rather by what produces that individualistic framework in society. What creates that framework, according to David Harvey in his book *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, is the rise in neoliberal attitudes in those that hold power not just politically but also economically (Harvey 2005). Neoliberalism as a concept has thus placed people into a society in which monetary gain and competition hold more weight than collective engagement, which helps to isolate them from their work, their social relationships, and society in general. Nowhere is this more evident than in modern American research universities, which have taken to neoliberal attitudes on a similar timeline to Putnam's social disengagement observations. Furthermore, universities can be viewed as a microcosm society and through this framework these links of isolation and neoliberalism become apparent. So what is the solution to fight against this increase in isolation? Putnam says more research is necessary while other academics discuss widespread social reform. Both of these responses are either insufficient or long-range solutions that don't help those currently suffering from isolation within the neoliberal institution. A short term solution to alleviate the problem can be found within the library of these colleges and universities. Through open space, social programming, and information literacy education, libraries and librarians can fight against the encroaching social isolation caused by neoliberal practices through engaging the student community. This paper will be split into three distinct sections to discuss the issues at hand. The first section, titled Alienation and Neoliberalism: A Broader Understanding will assess the concepts of alienation through a Marxist lens and link it to the history of neoliberal practice. The second section, The Modern Research University and Alienation will address these ideas and how they affect these learning institutions and the students who exist within. Lastly, Within the Neoliberal Institution: The Purpose of the Library will assess the impact of libraries and librarians both positively and negatively with regards to alienation.

Part I: Alienation and Neoliberalism: A Broader Understanding.

Before addressing the various ideas of alienation and the social changes that neoliberalism accounts for, it is important to understand Robert Putnam's concept of "social capital" (Putnam 1995, 3). Putnam writes on this framework as one that stems heavily from differing fields of social science, all intent on understanding social phenomena. "Social capital" conceptually is likened to physical and human capital, but "refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam 1995, 3). What he means by this is that areas within an industrial society that facilitate social interaction such as volunteer organizations, club activities, sporting clubs, or community meetings amongst other things that promote this type of social organization. It can also relate to areas within a democratic society that engage communities such as voting or political organization. Social capital is something that someone has when they individually or through a group engage in these interactions on any scale. When that engagement diminishes or isolation occurs, either self-imposed or externally introduced, then social capital is individually lost. In essence, social capital relates heavily to one's ability to communicate with others and feel like they are engaged with a community, thus creating trust or bonds. Putnam explains this further by saying that social capital relates to the "tools and training that enhance individual productivity" in a social situation though unlike physical capital these tools are not tangible (Putnam 1995, 3). That doesn't mean that they aren't researchable, as Putnam writes within a statistical framework to display overall disengagement and a loss in this social capital over a period of a few decades. However, what this indicates is that unlike physical capital it is difficult to point to the exact causes of a decline when it happens. When millions of people are withdrawing from social activity and the "affairs of their communities" in the short time of two decades (at the time in which Putnam's text was written) despite cultural growth such as higher levels of education, one can question what exactly is leading people en masse to disengage (Putnam 1995, 4). The answer can be found by examining the Marxist concept of alienation as that idea engages with a broader social framework.

Alienation as an idea takes on a variety of forms according to Tom Moody in his essay *The Alienation of Women Under Capitalism.* It can be cultural, ideological, political, psychological, or religious and the concept of individual isolation applies to each of these forms (Schmitt and Moody 1994, 58). Personal estrangement does not exist solely within a singular state which is why determining the cause is a difficult task. Marxist theorists work around this difficulty by looking at alienation as not a constant state but rather as a "historically created phenomenon," with the origin and continuation being linked to the particular alienation in labor as the primary aspect which integrates itself into the other forms mentioned above (Novak and Mandel 1970, 7). George Novak writes in the introduction to his book *The Marxist Theory of Alienation* that "alienation expresses the fact that the creations of men's hands and minds turn against their creators and come to dominate their lives. Thus, instead of enlarging freedom, these uncontrollable powers increase human servitude and strip men of the capacities for self-determination and self-direction which have raised them above animals" (Novak and Mandel 1970, 7). This trajectory from alienated laborer into an alienated individual is further discussed by Ernest Mandel in his essay *The Causes of Alienation* to which he cites three historical forms of alienation that make up this route. The first two forms are the introduction of wage labor and the refusal of access to the means of subsistence, but the third and final form concludes this by separating the worker from their work (Novak and Mandel 1970, 20–23). This final form is where alienation permeates the psychological and social forms mentioned by Moody. Mandel writes that:

> "The alienation of the worker and his labor means that something basic has changed in the life of the worker…Work is no longer a means of self-expression for anybody who sells his labor time. Work is just a means to attain a goal. And that goal is to get money, some income to be able to buy the consumer goods necessary to satisfy your needs. In this way, a basic aspect of human nature, the capacity to perform creative work, becomes thwarted and distorted. Work becomes something which is not creative and productive for human beings but something which

is harmful and destructive… At this point the notion of alienation is extended from a purely economic to a broader social phenomenon" (Novak and Mandel 1970, 23).

By linking this historical phenomenon about labor to the concept of alienation, Marxist theorists provide insight into the causes behind the social and psychological forms of isolation that can be seen within civilized society. The benefit of this discourse is that it gives us an understanding of how this can fit into a neoliberal context and also how it can fit into the framework of a university.

Neoliberalism as a concept is defined in a similar way to Marxist alienation in that it is viewed through a historical lens as a multifaceted notion, effecting a larger scope beyond the political identity it is often ascribed to. David Harvey writes that neoliberalism is "a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey 2005, 2). The role of the state within this environment is to preserve a framework appropriate for these practices while also minimally (or selectively) interfering with the markets. This focus on money over all else, according to Marx, is the exact environment in which alienation is destined to occur. The worker in the neoliberal institution isn't working for the sake of productivity or creativity, but rather as a means to attain the goal of gaining money. Through this, they are estranged from the work they do and that self-estrangement leads into other areas of their life according to Marxist theory. But beyond this theoretical connection to Putnam's ideas of disengagement one can find an interesting timeline connection.

Harvey explains that neoliberalism saw its main starting point in the 1970s, with the emphasis on deregulation, privatization, and withdrawal from the state (Harvey 2005, 3). The 1970s timeline is referenced within Putnam's article on the loss of social capital as the beginning of the major social decline within the United States. It is of note that this disengagement continues to become a problem as neoliberal ideas increase in their influence. However, it would be incorrect to assume that neoliberalism, social isolation, and their connection is an entirely recent idea. All of these are historically created phenomena that have been bolstered to high degrees through the extremities of neoliberal practice, but social isolation can be linked to the practices of classical liberalism which presents the historical understanding of how these concepts becomes intertwined.

Liberalism as a political ideology has a major focus on the autonomous individual and human rights. The problem with this concept in liberalism and by extension neoliberalism is that this framework does not have the capabilities to deal with alienation when Marxist theory is applied. Liberalism, by itself, fails to account for it by confusing alienation for a conflict of rights rather than a conflict of systems and behaviors. Richard Schmitt discusses this in his essay *Why Is the Concept of Alienation Important?* by stating that liberalism in fact "conceals alienation," by insisting that "we are separate individuals who can transcend social pressures and influences with effort" (Schmitt and Moody 1994, 15). Neoliberalism has this conflict of rights issue embedded within it, but it pushes further into potential alienation by focusing on the primacy of the individual and faux freedom. The freedoms that neoliberalism "embodies reflect the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital" rather than that of the community, and individualism is pushed to make sure that these interests are kept up (Harvey 2005, 7). When this disjointed freedom is applied to all of the other aspects mentioned before, the connection between neoliberalism and alienation is more than just a timeline coincidence. It is correlation equaling causation as the neoliberal institution creates an environment prime for this social disengagement.

Putnam's question on what causes alienation is thus answered through the lens of the encroachment of neoliberal policy both through the Marxist theories presented previously but also through the timeline connection. The best step forward is to discuss how this affects real-world institutions and how a neoliberal focus on monetary gain and privatization has changed the purpose of a modern research university.

Part II: The Modern Research University and Alienation

The discussion of neoliberal alienation within the framework of the institutional university requires a specific focus as to who is being alienated. While much discourse can be had for faculty and staff members within the academic institution, this paper will be specifically about students. Within the framework of the university as a societal microcosm, the comparison between students in an academic setting and the alienated worker represented through Marxist theory are noticeable. The student, much like the alienated worker, works within their environment to attain a goal rather than for their own sake or self-exploration, this goal in both situations is to make money. The difference is that within the university the goal is attained over a longer period of time (a degree) than within a workplace environment. Furthermore, the university student often times must supply their own funding (consequently going into high levels of debt) to attend the institution for the hope of receiving a higher monetary standing than if they never attended, with no guarantee that this will work out in their favor. This wasn't the initial goal of the research university, but through neoliberal policy, these institutions have begun to look at their students not as those who are there to benefit from knowledge transfer, but as revenue providers and capital investments. Regardless of these differences, the alienation of the student body within a university comes both from their separation to the institution itself (money makers rather than members of a community) but also from their lack of ability to self-direct and create their own agenda. A student in most cases does not have much influence over the trajectory of a university in the same manner that the alienated worker has no influence on the industry they sell their labor to. From this comparison the university thus becomes a microcosm of society where alienation can settle in much faster with the population. So why was the university setting prone to this shift when the original ideas of the institution were non-neoliberal?

According to the book *Organizing Enlightenment* by Chad Wellmon, the modern research university was heavily inspired by the German model which itself was "a response to a pervasive Enlightenment anxiety about information overload" (Wellmon 2015, 4). While this instance of anxiety occurred in the 1800s, its continuation through disruptive innovations in knowledge allowed for modern research universities to apply similar standards of organizing these various forms of knowledge, reinventing itself for the sake of new media. "By the late nineteenth century, the research university had become the consummate technology for organizing knowledge. It had also come to stand in for a whole way of configuring, managing, and cultivating the impulse to know" (Wellmon 2015, 3). The ability to organize knowledge according to Wellmon, allowed the research university to become "the central institution of knowledge in the West," presenting society with new forms of knowledge research, capture, and storage (Wellmon 2015, 6). This method maintained by the research university accomplished a variety of feats including establishing the "ideals of academic freedom and the unity of teaching and research" (Wellmon 2015, 8). It also gave rise to "the logic of intellectual specialization that continues to form the contemporary university" (Wellmon 2015, 8). The ethos of the university was thus focused on individuals with specialized knowledge as a way to combat the encroaching excess of information during times of media transition. This is important to mention because of the fact that neoliberalism has a heavy focus in "liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework," but this liberation through specialization continues the money over all else mentality (Harvey 2005, 2). The focus of specialization in the university through this monetary framework according to Mandel is problematic and prone to alienating people. In an industrial setting "commodity production and a social division of labor (is) pushed to the limits of overspecialization. As a result, people in a particular job or doing a certain activity for a living will incline to have an extremely narrow horizon. They will be prisoners of their trade, seeing only the problems and preoccupations of their specialty" (Novak and Mandel 1970, 25). Overspecialization, while having value in knowledge organization also has the potential to alienate those by stripping them of their ability to communicate with others (Novak and Mandel 1970, 25). Universities through the focus in overspecialization for knowledge creation unintentionally play into industry and neoliberal thought, making the transition of the university into a neoliberal institution smooth from a social perspective. But this just shows the theoretical similarities in the ethos between the historical research university and neoliberal thought. The actual practice and introduction of neoliberalism in higher education perhaps used this similarity to a starting point, but the main contributing factors were economically based.

Author Gaile S. Cannella and Professor Mirka Koro-Ljungberg start their essay *Neoliberalism in Higher Education: Can We Understand? Can We Resist and Survive? Can We Become Without Neoliberalism?* With the statement that "for the past 20 years, those who have paid attention to changing demands and particular types of expectations associated with higher education have become well aware of the "corporate university industrial complex" (Cannella and Koro-Ljungberg 2017, 155). This corporate industrial complex is a "neoliberal incursion" on higher education which has changed the focus of colleges and universities from knowledge makers into profit makers (Cannella and Koro-Ljungberg 2017, 155). This has "resulted in a focus on money over all else" within the institution and that has far-reaching effects for the future of education as well as the role of students within (Cannella and Koro-Ljungberg 2017, 159). Institutionally, this affects how the school is run. Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhodes refer to the structure of a neoliberal institution as one that follows "academic capitalism," or when universities act like capitalist enterprises through investments and money-making operations as a major defining point (Slaughter and Rhoades 2000, 73). While the institutional changes related to neoliberalism affect many portions of the university, the changes to the way in which the university sees the students are perhaps the most germane under the framework of alienation.

An area that affects students is the neoliberal change in education policy allowing universities to focus on “high-stakes standardized testing, increasing privatization and commercialization of the education system and assaults on subject areas and teaching methods that are seen as superfluous or radical” rather than serving their original purpose of knowledge organization societal service (Slaughter and Rhoades 2000, 76). This on a systemic level pigeonholes students by refusing them education in topics of interest and engagement beyond capital creation (such as in the humanities) without their input. It forces them to engage not in critical thinking or other socially beneficial ways of learning, but with means to make capital. On an individual level, it turns the role of the student from someone who learns about civic engagement to a capital product. In the neoliberal institution, “individuals are judged as smart, competent, and valuable to the institution if they generate (and do not critique) money” (Cannella and Koro-Ljungberg 2017, 159). Students are reduced to capital instead of being seen as members of a community. Furthermore, the individual aspect of the institution is constructed in neoliberal policy and pushed through things like artificial competition between students meaning that neoliberalism “co-opt all forms of knowledge” for the sake of a capitalist competitive atmosphere (Cannella and Koro-Ljungberg 2017, 156). By atomizing the population through the focus on the individual, universities convert larger institutional issues into personal failures to disguise the systemic failings mentioned above (Ghamandi 2018, 6). A student that cannot generate money for the institution is, in the eyes of the neoliberal, effectively useless and this is framed as a problem for the student, not for the university. On the opposite side, students that can accomplish this are separated from their work and achievements and are known only as capital revenue. Students, therefore, are “fragmented” from themselves by the view of the university, objectified into potential value (Bartky 1994, 72). This separation or estrangement from the realization of potential beyond monetary value that students face is, as expressed, before no different from the alienation discussed in Marxist literature (Schmitt and Moody 1994, 58). As Richard Schmitt puts it: “Marx observed that the alienated find themselves in a world not of their making, a world in which they are not active participants but the victims of impersonal force. Hence the alienated do not feel themselves to be at the center of their lives” (Schmitt and Moody 1994, 7). Since students are reduced into the money framework within the university, falling victim to alienation is almost guaranteed, even more so when other aspects of individualism such as overspecialization are a part of the academic culture. All of these varying aspects of a neoliberal university push individualism to high levels, and as Ernest Mandel puts it "individualism pushed to the extreme also means loneliness pushed to the extreme" (Novak and Mandel 1970, 28). Stripping students of their agency through non-participatory university systems, of their community through competition, and of their ability to communicate with others through overspecialization are all examples of how neoliberalism allows for alienation to become a common feature within an institution.

The picture that this essay creates is fairly bleak, however, alienation is "not an inescapable and irremediable curse of mankind" according to Novak and this is true for alienation caused by a university (Novak and Mandel 1970, 6). While the neoliberal institution as a whole may not fulfill its social responsibility to its students regarding social transformation, areas within the university might be able to accomplish that (Ghamandi 2018, 7). The proposal of this essay is that the library effectively represents the embodiment of social capital generation that Putnam asked for through not only its ability to engage students in ways that the university cannot, but also in its ability to present a space to students where the neoliberal estrangement is alleviated (Putnam 1995, 13).

Part III: Within the Neoliberal Institution: The Purpose of the Library

So what exactly is the role of the library within an institution beyond a place for research facilitation and how can that help ease student alienation? Ian Beilin discusses this question in his article *Student Success and the Neoliberal Academic Library* by addressing the notion of success and how libraries can differ from the universities in which they preside. Success in a neoliberal institution is to gain money and so to separate students from this pressure, librarians need to "encourage alternative definitions of success" based around other ideas (Beilin 2016, 18). This doesn't necessarily mean that librarians need to work against the systems they exist in, as Beilin offers a two-level approach to success. One level uses the neoliberal definitions of success to help students survive in a professional setting, and the other level is based in alternative methods that allow students to define success in their own terms (Beilin 2016, 18). These alternative methods are linked to the instruction of information literacy to students which would allow them to question the structures they live within along with presenting them with the ability to create their own agenda. Allowing this pursuit of alternate modes of success shifts the focus of the library to the students rather than viewing them through the same neoliberal lens that the broader institution has. However, this is a single role for librarians and libraries and there are many other ways in which the space and programs can help fight against institutional alienation.

One of the most important features of a library that is often overlooked is the physical space, how it is utilized, and the perceived openness to the community outside the library doors. Marcela Cabello and Stuart Butler refer to libraries as a third place or a place that is not the home or location of work within their article *How Public Libraries Help Build Healthy Communities* (Cabello and Butler 2017). University libraries sit within a strange area because they find themselves connected closely to the "first" and "second" places (home and work respectively) when the discussion is about those living within student housing. Students live within the dorms and use the university as their pseudo-vocational position, so physically the library is not much different from any other building on a campus and the proximity between these spaces doesn't help this case either. Cabello and Butler add on to this by stating that "location and accessibility are important, of course. But so are trust and a sense of neutrality" (Cabello and Butler 2017). Trust is paramount in how one is to view a third place, and institutional libraries must create a sense of trust within the community as a step towards getting students to come in and use the space. Trust inherently indicates a connection between students and the library/librarians. On the other side of this, neutrality as used within the quote warrants some criticism. Neutrality shouldn't mean that a library or librarian remain neutral in a political or activist stance because that has the ability to reflect as not caring about the users of the library, causing further alienation within this space. "Neutrality" needs to be defined differently to where it is more seen as neutrality towards static ideas such as the defined method of success in a neoliberal context. Not critiquing dominant modes is a form of neutrality but not abiding by them is also a form of institutional neutrality, therefore the "neutrality" must be towards the institution rather than the users. This "neutrality" to dominant modes of teaching allows librarians to work in alternative ways to put those who use the library, mainly students and researchers, first. When these two ideas are established within the library, it becomes more than just another university location, it becomes a free space for students to define themselves and their own agenda.

The idea of free space is one that philosopher Harry C. Boyte praises in his essay *Public Freedom*. He writes that free space is one "where people develop the capacity to define their own agenda in a world surfeited by professional language" (Boyte 1994, 237). A library at any location offers this, but a library within an institution can use this free space mentality as a means to fight against the metaphorical reduction of students through neoliberal policy, and therefore fight alienation. Boyte furthers this anti-objectification idea by stating that a space for public (or community in this case) freedom "suggests the process through which people become creators of the world, and no longer objects" by actively engaging with the community as more than just a source of revenue (Boyte 1994, 244). This active engagement is facilitated through the openness of the library and this is particularly how trust and neutrality become key factors in differentiating this space from the broader institution or how the university library becomes the third place for students. But openness is one thing, utilizing it through programming is another way in which a library can go against alienation.

Richard Lankes writes on participatory programs and the ways in which they are effective in bringing together a community in his book *The New Librarianship Field Guide*. A libraries job within a university may be to facilitate knowledge for the sake of research, but to accomplish things beyond that, "librarians must build systems that allow for learning" through community participation (Lankes et al. 2016, 53). This involves not only bringing people into the space through programming but also focusing on systems of engagement to promote communication between students which would help to create a sense of trust within the library. But what is suggested to accomplish this feat? Lankes writes that a library must create the pressure to participate through their programming as that would bring people into the space. This pressure is split into five aspects, but the most important of these are the pressures "to converse" and the pressure "for social interaction" (Lankes et al. 2016, 54). The former pressure elicits a desire for students to be heard by the institution because unless the students "can converse, many participants will refuse to use the tools you provide" (Lankes et al. 2016, 54). The latter is more based around the connection of individuals to the broader community as "human beings are (always) social creatures" (Lankes et al. 2016, 57). This means that in order to fulfill these two roles, libraries must create systems that allow for users to be heard (either through the creation of the system or through the ability to customize it) as well as create systems that "take into account members' connections to their communities" (Lankes et al. 2016, 58). Building a system or programs that specifically meet the needs of students within the academic community allows for libraries to fix socially what the broader university is failing at. If done correctly, students will be allowed to communicate freely with others, use the space for their own needs rather than for the purpose of attaining a goal, and engage with participation programs which would therefore help in self-determination. All of these elements grant students clemency to the alienation caused by neoliberalism and presents them the ability to raise their social capital in a specific space. That being said, the library is still a part of the institution and therefore isn't entirely separate from the neoliberal policies that affect the other areas. A library can very easily become a neoliberal institution itself and to avoid these pitfalls the problems involved with existing in a neoliberal environment should be constantly critiqued by the library.

A neoliberal library according to Beilin is "simply one whose policies are guided by the imperative of the market in the strictly economic sense" (Beilin 2016, 14). Beilin determines fours key aspects that make up a library neoliberal. First is the need to constantly justify the library's existence. Second is the removal of "protections from those parts of the library that serve no widely used purpose" (Beilin 2016, 14). Third is the idea that information literacy should "serve the need of industry and government for skilled and competitive individuals" (Beilin 2016, 14). Lastly, the neoliberal library will urgently "call for management strategies that improve performance, value and return on investment" (Beilin 2016, 15). These all fall under neoliberalism in that they all explicitly serve to gain capital or remove things that do not serve that singular endpoint. On the broadest level, it is easy to see how this type of policy can undermine the "goal of providing library services in the open and democratic manner" that many libraries strive for (Beilin 2016, 15). One could argue that if you remove these aspects or value programs in the library that go against the "capital as end goal" process that one can make the library a non-neoliberal entity. Because of this perceived simplicity, critiques of neoliberalism in libraries ignore how these policies "help shape the ways in which academic libraries conceive of and approach information itself, and how this warps the democratic mission of the library" (Beilin 2016, 15). Therefore, a method in critiquing and moving away from neoliberalism in the library would be in how the library deals with the outer institution. Beilin suggests:

"Librarians should question the eagerness with which they are rushing to prove their indispensability to administrators and faculty. In order to allow for some critical distance in their pedagogy, they need to put some space between themselves and those other groups, even though working with teaching faculty is considered one of librarians' first responsibilities" (Beilin 2016, 16).

This separation can be attained through the free space student-oriented programming discussed in the previous paragraphs. As expressed before Beilin argues that a library could do both, on one hand existing within the neoliberal framework of working with external institutions to survive and on the other going against it through their own work with students, thus making a slight barrier or connection depending on how it is framed, between the student body and the larger institution. However, even if the library manages to fully separate themselves from a neoliberal framework within a university, the library must be made aware of how their own participation programs might lead to more alienation as students themselves aren't as separate from the larger institution. Mandel writes on this specifically stating that "alienation can be overcome through a "sense of participation" or a "work ethic" however this has the potential to insidiously remove awareness of one's condition which will only further alienation" (Novak and Mandel 1970, 49–50). A librarian must be constantly critiquing how their programs function within a neoliberal space and make sure that those who working and living within these spaces are not made to ignore the systems they fit into outside of the library. Participation is great, but participation without awareness can only lead to alienation in the words of Mandel, which is the exact opposite of what the library should attempt to accomplish.

Conclusion

Robert Putnam's discussion on the loss of social capital and the rise of alienation can be closely linked to the rise in neoliberalism when one looks at both the time periods of decline/rise and the external discussions on what causes alienation. Marx's notion of alienation being a historical phenomenon of workers being separated from their work by those who own the means of production can be applied directly to neoliberalism's monetary end goal framework. The university as an institution has recently come into itself as one that follows neoliberal goals which are distinctly different from the knowledge organization that universities were originally created for. Because of this, students that live and work within this institutional framework are prone to alienation as their existence from the perspective of the university is to provide money. Despite the reduction of students, areas within the institution such as libraries can help to alleviate potential alienation while also working within the neoliberal framework through having students use their free space, social programming, and information literacy education. Libraries must, however, constantly critique the structures they work within as a way to not fully become neoliberal entities themselves as allowing that to occur would only hurt students and their ability to generate social capital, thus causing alienation. Through self-critique and programming, the library can become a place of engagement and a physical embodiment of social capital generation rather than another addition to the alienation inducing institution.

Citations:

Bartky, Sandra Lee. 1994. “Narcissism, Femininity and Alienation.” In *Alienation and Social Criticism*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

Beilin, Ian. 2016. “Student Success and the Neoliberal Academic Library.” *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1 (January): 10–23.

Boyte, Harry C. 1994. “Public Freedom.” In *Alienation and Social Criticism*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

Cabello, Marcela, and Stuart M Butler. 2017. “How Public Libraries Help Build Healthy Communities.” *Brookings*, March, 4.

Cannella, Gaile S., and Mirka Koro-Ljungberg. 2017. “Neoliberalism in Higher Education: Can We Understand? Can We Resist and Survive? Can We Become Without Neoliberalism?” *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 17 (3): 155–62.

Ghamandi, Dave S. 2018. “Liberation through Cooperation: How Library Publishing Can Save Scholarly Journals from Neoliberalism.” *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, no. 6.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Lankes, R. David, Wendy Newman, Sue Kowalski, Beck Tench, Cheryl Gould, Kimberly Silk, and Lauren Britton. 2016. *The New Librarianship Field Guide*. Mit Press.

Novak, George, and Ernest Mandel. 1970. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. “America’s Declining Social Capital.” *Johns Hopkins University Press* 6 (November): 17.

Schmitt, Richard, and Thomas E. Moody. 1994. *Alienation and Social Criticism*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. 2000. “The Neo-Liberal University.” *Sage Publications* 6: 8.

Wellmon, Chad. 2015. *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Core Coursework

Course: IS 212: Values and Communities

Justification: The final assignment was based on a group presentation that was given earlier in the course. My group focused on the ONE National Gay & Lesbian Archives and in doing research on this I wanted to write on the topic of community archives merging with larger institutions. I felt that this paper in comparison to the others within the core course load is relevant due to the discussion of academic institutions and how materials are treated within different spaces.

Abstract:

Throughout the years various institutions have been able to procure community archives through mergers such as the one that occurred between the ONE archive and the University of Southern California in 2010. These mergers bring forth a variety of fears for the community archive such as losing accessibility to materials, decontextualization of archival property, and user/community alienation due to the institutional reach being far beyond the community that the archive originally served. However on the other end of the spectrum the possibilities of increased funding and the ability to make marginalized information more broadly accessible is a boon to the community archive. The pros and cons of a merger should thus be addressed by all parties as a means to achieve mutual productivity without one party gaining power over the archive while the other loses it, something that can occur within the merging of the community and institutional archive.

Jack Tieszen
6/12/19
LIS 212: Values and Communities Final Paper

A Discussion of Fusion: Institutional and Community Archive Mergers

The ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives is the oldest existing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender organization in the United States and the largest repository of this community's materials in the world. Founded in 1952, ONE's original purpose was publishing a self-titled LGBT+ periodical in California. From those beginnings, ONE's history in downtown Los Angeles has been filled with expansions, moves, mergers, and other things that have helped it to become the significant archive it is today. In October 2010 the ONE archives "became part of the University of Southern California Libraries system when it essentially donated itself to the university to secure its future and its ability to provide access to the archives for its community members" (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 302). Judging from the press surrounding the recent move, the merger of this community archive into a larger institution seemed like it was beneficial for both parties. Since this merger, the archive has only grown which indicates a positive trajectory for the historical repository. However, an interesting thing to note from the literature surrounding this move was USC was not the first choice for an institutional merger. There was another university interested in acquiring the material that ONE had. The problem with this was that they wanted full possession of it rather than allowing ONE to maintain ownership of their artifacts (Boxall 1995). This addition to the story of the move from a community archive to an institutional one presents a debate extending beyond ONE about the differences between these two types of repositories and what happens when a merger occurs. The gains and losses of the community archive are at the forefront of this discourse, especially when the archive houses material and history from a socially marginalized group. While there are many ways in which a community archive can merge into an institutional one, ONE archive's own merger with USC provides a real-world example to discuss and critique Angela DiVeglia's concept of "mutually productive partnership," an idea involving the collective engagement of all parties in collaboration to help each other (DiVeglia 2012, 77). Mutual productivity is certainly a goal, but beyond discussions of ownership and costs that come with mergers, one must dissect "mutual" further in order to understand the archival gains and losses represented earlier. With any merger between a community archive and an institutional one, there are areas that the merging parties must take into account, benefits and setbacks that require discussion as the two types of archives are not identical nor do they have the same level of power and influence. Areas such as the representation of materials through cataloging, access to the community, increasing user base to broaden knowledge, and reducing user alienation are all things that one must consider before a merger is to occur.

Before addressing the discourse with mergers it is important to outline ONE as a community archive, the history behind it, and the changes that have occurred after the USC connection. This is important to display as it presents a real-world example of what happens when two different institutions come together in this particular manner. As expressed before, ONE was created to disseminate information about queer life through a magazine in Southern California. Eventually, ONE began to expand from the magazine publisher business and founded the archive and library with education and community outreach as the main goals in mind. According to the article *Archivist as Activist: Lessons from Three Queer Community Archives in California,* ONE's creation was specifically linked to "the lack of queer materials held in public libraries and academic archives" (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). From there the archive and library grew through "donations and through mergers with other community archives such as the International Gay and Lesbian Archives in 1995" (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). These contributions by the greater queer community in Los Angeles as well as the community archive mergers were further bolstered through the archive obtaining "multiple grants" which supported the continuing push towards collection accessibility (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). Around the end of 1995 ONE "changed its focus from being primarily educational to a focus on its library and archives" which were built previously (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). This shift allowed ONE's library to begin consistently appointing trained librarians to its staff, positions which have helped the space expand enough to warrant "the creation of the division of libraries" and establish it as one that is professionally run and cataloged (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 300). The archives are similar to the library in this respect, however, professional archivist positions are a much more recent addition to the ONE workforce (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). The grants discussed earlier were a huge help for the archives in particular as they "allowed ONE Archive's to hire professional archivists who processed numerous collections. Making its finding aids available via the Online Archive of California (OAC)" (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). This has made ONE archive's much more visible and accessible to the public than it has been in the past.

This is not to say that ONE didn't suffer from the common problems associated with community archives. For instance, financial problems were the explicit cause behind the merger with the IGLA. Not only does it bring up the fact that the merger between ONE and USC wasn't an entirely new venture for the community archive but it also provides context for the reason why the merger even occurred. According to *Archivist as Activist*, the reason for this union was "to secure its future and its ability to provide access to the archives for its community members," the same reason provided for the previous mergers (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 301). But how is this different from the USC archives? What separated the community approach from the institutional one beyond financial and logistical if the cataloging and archiving practices were coming from a similar professional source? To answer that one must look broadly at the definitions and differences related to community and institutional archives, as subtle changes that might not be noticed make huge differences in the grand scheme of archives and how they relate to the communities they serve.

From the basic outline of ideas presented one can surmise the definitions of community and institutional archives quite easily. These definitions are related to who owns and operates the archive. Institutional archives like Universities operate within the parameters of whatever institution runs the space. This means that the decisions made within the archive are led by those employed within that space. On the other side of this, community-based archives are more open to the communities that they serve, allowing higher levels of access to those who wish to use the archive for research. According to Michelle Caswell in the article *SAADA and the Community-Based Archives Model: What Is a Community-Based Archives Anyway?* community archives "serve as an alternative venue for communities to make collective decisions about what is of enduring value to them, to shape collective memory of their own pasts, and to control the means through which stories about their past are constructed" (Caswell 2012). This doesn't necessarily mean that institutional archives are fully closed off to the public as many of them work towards open access to users. Rather, the structures of community archives function differently and often work on building new models for how they treat and store records. Caswell discusses this difference in her article by writing on how an institutional archive might treat a record when compared to a community-based one using a 1907 Letter from A.W. Mangum, Jr. written to his mother. Caswell writes that an institutional archive might be more inclined to represent the letter through areas of expertise and research interest beyond the individual letter. In a different environment such as a community archive like SAADA, the archivists would be inclined to represent the content of the letter through the lens of the person who wrote them, in this case, a South Asian individual writing on the Bellingham Riots (Caswell 2012). This difference is rather influential in how an outsider of the archive is to look at the materials, and furthermore how the community itself is represented to these users. If a marginalized community lacks this representation, or the representation is incorrect/biased, as the LGBT+ community has been in the past, then that reflects broader cultural misunderstandings (i.e. cisgendered heterosexual assumptions on queer identity) that can lead to further alienation or violence levied against the marginalized group.

The distinction between community and institutional presented above might make it seem as if they are two fundamentally opposing archival practices with no links which is an incorrect assumption as the two are quite closely related. A community archive will often maintain the same standards or practices of an institutional one, going so far as to employ those who are institutionally trained to handle the work of organizing and cataloging the archive. The ONE archive when it hired its first librarians made sure to hire ones that were fully educated and trained to create a systematic inventory of the libraries holdings so that it functioned correctly (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 300). These librarians, once hired, taught the community by holding "library workshops" to make sure that people within the community had access to the working methods that the library used (Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge 2013, 300). However, this doesn't mean that these standards aren't critiqued within the community archive. As Lindsay Kistler Mattock writes in her article *Where is the Archivist in Community Archiving?* "while professional archival standards may inform the practices in these organizations, communities often establish their own standards based on their philosophies and values" (Mattock 2019). This trajectory of standards and how the community archive chooses to manipulate or not manipulate these practices presents the community archive not as an opposing separate entity, but rather as an extension of the other existing archive forms. The community archive takes information on how to function from the institutional and shifts it to suit the needs of the community. Whether the institutional can implement these changes from the community archive into their own archive through an acquisition or merger is where the ideas of mutual productivity start to show themselves. It is also the main contention regarding community archives merging with larger institutions as relinquishing control to the materials and how they are displayed can lead to potential distrust between the different archive models if the institutional archive neglects the work that had been done previously (Mattock 2019). In order for an institutional archive to merge correctly with a community based one, the various cons that allow for this distrust must be addressed and dealt with.

The first major issues to represent when discussing the merger between an institutional archive and one closely linked with a historically marginalized community is the loss of control for the community towards its artifacts and history. Mergers between the two spaces often involve a hierarchical dynamic in which the prominent institution has power (space, finances, etc.) over a struggling community archive. Andrew Flinn writes on this discrepancy of power under the framework of sustainability versus autonomy within his article *Whose Memories, Whose Archives? Independent Community Archives, Autonomy and the Mainstream*. He writes that if the achieving of sustainability is through the accessing of public funds or through collaborations with institutions, then it presents the trade-off of a loss of independence and autonomy (Flinn, Stevens, and Shepherd 2009, 80). Mattock repeats this sentiment when she states that “the institutionalization of the archive also means that the community group has relinquished some control over these materials” (Mattock 2019). Community archives are aware of this power dynamic between them and institutions and try to make it “very clear that they wish to retain their autonomy and independence in any relationship and participate in partnerships and project work very much on their own terms” (Flinn, Stevens, and Shepherd 2009, 80). This is why ONE refused to merge with the unnamed university because that institution wanted full ownership of the material which would have resulted in a loss of autonomy. Furthermore, it could have led to a significant amount of other issues including the decontextualization of their material and the input of dominant/incorrect forms of representation of the LGBT+ community. These aspects are important to discuss as they can occur after a merger even if full ownership of the material is left to the community archivists.

The contents of archives are powerful in how they shape the history and understanding of a particular group. They are constructed as monuments to a shared history and in the context of a community archive, they are created mainly because of a lack of representation within popular institutions. “Understanding that archives can be construed as an instrument of power, one begins to understand the complex and often uneasy relationship between archive and marginalized or oppressed communities” (DiVeglia 2012, 72). While the uneasiness within the context of this quote from DiVeglia is related to the power dynamics between archives, it also presents the understanding that an institution can either intentionally or unintentionally misrepresent the acquired merger materials. This issue was referenced earlier with the discussion on the treatment of records and how the frameworks can differ between community and institutional archives. However, that paper referenced only frameworks of representation rather than how these frameworks can affect the overall understanding of knowledge; as well as how misrepresenting materials can unintentionally continue dominant methods of thinking. This problem is found both systemically and individually.

On a broader systemic level, things like biased classification systems are easily noticed when one looks for them. Emily Drabinski writes about this in her article *Queering the Catalog* in which she argues that “the placement of materials in the classification can reflect prejudice about certain identities” (Drabinski 2013, 98). Classification placement has the potential to not only misrepresent (or present in archaic outdated language) entire communities but also alienate those from these communities who wish to use the archive. Caswell writes about this misrepresentation and the harm it causes in her article *‘To Be Able to Imagine Otherwise’: community archives and the importance of representation*. She states that absences or misrepresentation of community materials in mainstream institutions have “profoundly negative affective consequences” to those who are from a marginalized community who wish to use the archives (Caswell et al. 2017, 6). This systemic manipulation of the record directly impacts individuals resulting “in anger at, alienation from and disinterest in these cultural institutions,” which is not the intention of what an archive is attempting to achieve with its collections (Caswell et al. 2017, 14). It must also be made known that this miss-categorization isn’t always reflective of outside forces as knowledge and representation, especially in queer communities, changes over time according to Drabinski. “Central to queer claims about structures of identity is this idea that such structures are always already in motion, contingent, and subject to change” (Drabinski 2013, 103). An example of this quote would be that the classification of studies referring to homosexual behavior in the past was under the moniker of homophile studies before being changed (Boxall 1995). Homophile, as it is currently viewed, is an outdated term that isn’t often used in the context of queer studies and therefore reflects this inner community dialogue and its ability to shift. For those who are within the community and wish to study this material, coming across archaic classifications or highly debated terms such as certain self-identified slurs may cause similar alienation to the misrepresentation discussed previously. What this means is that constant critique of representation must occur within the archive to avoid these pitfalls and that this critique involves those within both the institution and community.

On an individual level, someone working in an institutional setting who is not a part of the community has limited experience and can be prone to using these classifications under the assumption of neutrality without understanding the problematic issues involved. These are “ways of seeing, organizing and knowing the world that have been externally imposed by structures of power” (Gilliland and Caswell 2016, 60). As Michael Brown writes “any perspective that is unreflectively locked inside its own experience is limited, and this is particularly so when that perspective reflects the dominant culture” (Brown 2003, 35). To avoid these issues an institutional archive and those who work within it must be made aware of the dominant structures of power and how their institution can unintentionally uphold these structures. They must critique the supposed neutrality of the archive and work with the community to represent these materials how they wish to be represented. If the merger deals with these particular issues, then the community archive stands to gain quite a lot from the equal partnership. The institution also has much to gain both for materials along with knowledge.

The benefits of community/institutional mergers are based heavily in what both areas have to gain through this connection. Those discussed earlier such as the benefit of a more permanent space or of more consistent funding allow for the collections of artifacts to have a sense of archival permanence. However, much like with the cons represented above, there are many pros to the merger that are not as obvious and require further discussion. An example of a merger having benefits to the community would be in how a merger like this represents the cultural shift towards broader representation. An LA Times article about the USC and ONE collaboration explains that this connection was important to the larger community because it was a testament to the “increasing acceptance of gay studies” within the context of a nationally known institution (Boxall 1995). This shows a broad cultural shift with the merger, one that has significant value for the sake of pushing towards the correct representation of archived materials (at least within the context of the merger between USC and ONE). However, beyond this culturally significant shift, there are other elements to discuss such as the research connections of the institution as well as the effect on students and users of the archives.

The impact of a merger between two different institutions is that the merger furthers connections made between both groups, those who work in/use the institution and those who work in/use the archives. These connections help to expand research capabilities in under-documented areas of interest. The community archive is merging with a broader set of users behind it, those who donate their artifacts and information for the sake of self-preservation. The institution is merging with a known set of researchers and those with connections outside of the community that could benefit from knowledge creation. María Cotera's article *Nuestra Autohistoria: Toward a Chicana Digital Praxis* discusses this type of connection through the context of the Chicana por mi Raza collective project, an archival project designed to preserve the memory of a specific community (Cotera 2018, 490). She writes that the scholars who worked on the project "used their connections to the institution" such as the systems, infrastructures, grants, and students, "to create a network held of discourse encompassing communities inside and outside the institution" (Cotera 2018, 489–90). From the community side, knowledge and artifacts are collected and preserved safely. These are two different backgrounds, but because of that difference, the group related to the archive becomes significantly larger and this can benefit all for knowledge creation.

With regards to students, the merger of a community archive related to their own community into their institution might alleviate the alienation discussed by Caswell. She writes that there is a "positive effect" for individuals when they find "complex and autonomous forms of representation" within their institutional archive (Caswell et al. 2017, 6). Students, both undergraduate and graduate, who see themselves and/or their extended communities represented correctly are more likely to feel connected to the institution which, in response, makes alienation less likely. The institution can push this by allowing open access to these community-based collections and by creating programs that reach out to students. ONE specifically does this through programming, exhibitions, and education initiatives open to the public.

While the representation of the ONE archive within this text has been a majority positive it isn't without criticism regarding the mergers between community and institutional archives. While one can notice instances of good outreach and archival practices from this merger, there are lacking aspects as well that the previous paragraphs on cons can help to fix. USC still acts administratively towards the archive which keeps the power dynamic between the two alive rather than having both institutions work in a more mutual manner. Furthermore, USC houses the items in a different location than the original area which removes a level of community accessibility. The area where these artifacts are housed inherently creates its own context for the materials within, especially if the context is institutional. USC isn't an inherently queer space in the same way that ONE was and that warrants external critique. This critique is based on the mutual productivity discourse in that it needs to involve a dialogue between the institution and the community in order to avoid incorrect recontextualization. In addition to all of this, it is key to understand that a merger will not fix issues already within the community archive beyond space and funding. For instance, if there are gaps in historical material a merger will not immediately fill them in. It will grow its base of users which could help to find these materials, but it could also distance people as well if not treated carefully (i.e. taking to long to catalog and organize materials might turn people off of giving them to a particular archive). Despite this, the relationship between the two institutions isn't supremely contentious and the issue of catalog misrepresentation and exploitative ownership are seemingly lessened, though the debate of how to define the community is still one where tension remains but that is a broader issue involving the larger LGBT+ community.

Considering the discussion there is no clear-cut solution when merging a community space with an institutional one. The fears of losing accessibility, decontextualization, and user/community alienation are valid for the community archive and can occur within the institution unintentionally even if precautions are taken to avoid them. The "archivist wield power in representing historical actors, whether they embrace this power or not," and in an institutional setting, this power can create problems with the community (Caswell et al. 2017, 8). On the other hand, the possibility of opening up the archive for broader accessibility and an increased user base for broader knowledge creation would be possible with an institution through their funding and space occupancy. It is important for the institution to understand the power that it holds within a merger and it must constantly critique itself to avoid the pitfalls discussed. On the community archive side of things, those who work with the space must be in contact with the institution so that the transition is smooth and continued archiving work isn't being decontextualized. Both the institution and community must work together to assure mutual productivity within the archive as a merger occurs and if they do this work correctly the archive will continue to grow in a beneficial manner.

Citations:
Boxall, Bettina. 1995. "Major Gay Archives Find Home at USC." *LA Times*, 1995.
Brown, Michael. 2003. "Of Fish and Water: Perspectives on Racism and Privilege," 32.
Caswell, Michelle. 2012. "SAADA and the Community-Based Archives Model: What Is a Community-Based Archives Anyway?" Text. South Asian American Digital Archive (SAADA). April 18, 2012.
Caswell, Michelle, Alda Allina Migoni, Noah Geraci, and Marika Cifor. 2017. "'To Be Able to Imagine Otherwise': Community Archives and the Importance of Representation." *Archives and Records* 38 (1): 5–26.
Cotera, María. 2018. "Nuestra Autohistoria: Toward a Chicana Digital Praxis." *American Quarterly* 70 (3): 483–504.
DiVeglia, Angela. 2012. "Accessibility, Accountability, and Activism: Models for LGBT Archives." Litwin Books, LLC.
Drabinski, Emily. 2013. "Queering the Catalog: Queer Theory and the Politics of Correction." *The Library Quarterly* 83 (2): 94–111.
Flinn, Andrew, Mary Stevens, and Elizabeth Shepherd. 2009. "Whose Memories, Whose Archives? Independent Community Archives, Autonomy and the Mainstream." *Archival Science* 9 (1–2): 71–86.
Gilliland, Anne J., and Michelle Caswell. 2016. "Records and Their Imaginaries: Imagining the Impossible, Making Possible the Imagined." *Archival Science* 16 (1): 53–75.
Mattock. 2019. "Where Is the Archivist in Community Archiving?" Americans for the Arts. May 15, 2019. https://www.americansforthearts.org/blog-feed/where-is-the-archivist-in-community-archiving.
Wakimoto, Diana K., Christine Bruce, and Helen Partridge. 2013. "Archivist as Activist: Lessons from Three Queer Community Archives in California." *Archival Science* 13 (4):

Elective Coursework #1

Course: IS 243: Public Libraries

Justification: In the fall of 2019, I took Robert Karatsu's public library course in order to broaden my understanding and knowledge of libraries. I enjoyed the class as it allowed me to learn a broad category of topics about public librarianship but it also introduced me to a variety of people within the field that helped to shape my own ideas on what I wanted to pursue as a career as well as what I could potentially pursue that I wasn't aware of prior to that class. Per the course syllabus, the final assignment wasn't a traditional paper but rather a programing proposal for the library that we were researching for a different assignment. I ended up proposing an archives space for SMPL that was inspired by LAPL's own archival space. I felt it important to include this particular set of papers because of their distinction from the traditional academic text. This paper was designed to be more in line with what I would be producing if I were actually working within these environments so their importance within this portfolio is to express my professional capabilities in the production of work.

Jack Tieszen
12/3/19
IS 423: Public Libraries Final Project

Memo: Santa Monica Public Library Main Branch DIY Archive Space

What it is:

The idea is to bring history to the people of Santa Monica through a participatory DIY space that allows the patrons of the Santa Monica Public Library Main Branch to digitize audio/visual materials such as photographs, film, and audio cassettes amongst others, as well as record and preserve oral histories. This will be modeled after the LAPL's DIY Memory Lab Station and therefore would be placed within a separate room in the library. Before a space can be fully dedicated to this archiving lab the suggestion would be to set up a temporary location to test it out either in the Main Library Community Meeting Room or the Multipurpose Room if more space is necessary.

Need for Santa Monica Public Library Main Branch:

The Santa Monica Public Library is one that has expressed an interest in the history of the city through things like the Santa Monica Collection Room, which contains a specialized selection of primary and secondary sources that chronicle the history of the Santa Monica Bay region, Southern California and the rest of the state. The Santa Monica History Museum is also located at the library. The focus on local history is a major part of this institution so the need for a project like this is to include the patrons in the collection of this history. Those who live in Santa Monica have materials to show and stories to tell and this DIY archiving space will allow them to not only bring these histories to a centralized location, but provide a space to digitally save what they have before it is unsalvageable.

What can further prove the need for a space like this can be found by looking at previous programs held at the library such as the One Story Project which was an oral history teen service that was run a few years ago. Externally speaking, one can look at the success of LAPL's DIY memory space, LAPL's Shades of LA program, or national oral history projects like StoryCorps to determine that people would like a space to accomplish this type of digital documentation.

Statistics and External Justifications:

StoryCorps oral history project has recorded more than 60,000 interviews among more than 100,000 participants over a period of 16 years, totaling 35,502,806 views on 221 uploads to their Youtube account along with an unspecified amount of views on their podcast.

Companies that offer scanning and digitization services such as Scan Digital and Scan Café are in high demand, the latter had 25,000,000 scans only after three years of being in business (as of 2009).

The popularity of Home Movie Day (globally running since 2005) showcases a vested interest in saving historical material.

Equipment Requirements:

The requirements of this space are to provide an area to record, scan, and digitize the individualized history of Santa Monica. Therefore, the technological requirements are based around the need for scanners that work with various audio/visual formats. Audio recording equipment such as microphones and photo/film/video scanners would be necessary along with those trained to use them. The correct software to utilize this equipment will also be necessary.

Depending on the space, sound proofing material for audio recording is a possible additional requirement.

Digital storage will need to be improved for the influx of new material.

Program Requirements:

Provide step-by-step instructions for DIY archiving space including bi-monthly workshops on personal archiving/digital preservation.

Build an online portal for the space to allow access to digitized materials for patrons as well as including instructional material/reservation options.

Train librarians and staff at SMPL Main Branch on how to teach the above-mentioned workshops/how to run the equipment.

System:

Patrons can use an online system (to be rolled out in the creation of this space) and reserve 1 to 2 hour sessions to digitize their obsolete/nearly obsolete formats.

Patrons can book 30 minute to 1 hour sessions within a separate oral history booth/space where audio devices will be set up to record voices. Voiceovers will then be placed into the digital collection at SMPL to be accessed online. Voiceovers can be connected to other materials being digitized to provide oral context or can be individual stories, separate from other materials. Patrons are responsible for creating their own titles and tags for recordings so that they can be placed into an easy to find digital space and for quicker metadata creation.

Staffing:

The archiving space when workshops are not being held should have at least one trained professional to help with troubleshooting/basic instruction to those who are using the space.

For the digitized material, both audio and visual, a trained individual would have to help write the descriptions so that the material can be place into the right location in the online portal.

Partnerships:

As this project is based on archiving and the collection/digitization of materials the SMPL Main Branch should look at partners who promote archiving practices in Southern California. The Society of American Archivists or the Society of California Archivists would be relevant partnerships to this concept.

In addition, because of the audio aspect with the oral history portion of this space, the Association for Recorded Sound Collections would be another Southern California chapter to look at.

Potential Outcomes:

A database of audio/visual materials and oral stories that can be accessed through the library's website and can broaden the understanding of Santa Monica's history.

Potentially bringing in an entirely new population to the library who haven't had access to self-archiving workshops in the city of Santa Monica.

Limitations:

Because of the size/weight of digitizing equipment the prospect of mobility between branches is unlikely beyond the oral history audio recording devices, which can be circulated upon request.

Due to the sheer number of materials patrons will be digitizing within this space, the ingestion of said materials into the SMPL digital collections may prove difficult with regards to correctly storing them.

Possible issues of copyright/what the library is allowed to publish from its patrons would require some type of release form.

Costs:

The cost of the equipment will be gathered through a grant of $5000 likely through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS).

Elective Coursework #2

Course: IS 431: Records, Archives, and Memories

Justification: In the fall of 2018 I took the Records, Archives, and Memories class with Professor Anne Gilliland. From the syllabus, the term paper for this class provided me three options to choose from, the one that I ended up choosing is as follows:

Identify a contested event or a contested memory site or monument or episode of "difficult history". Discuss the major arguments and evidence that have been put forward on each side. Then discuss, with reference to archival literature on professional ethics and activism, how you would suggest an archivist responsible for documenting a contested event/period, memory site or monument might approach this work.

I wrote about the Stonewall Riots and the many myths that surrounded the important event in 1969. I wanted to research the documented material and take a critical look at what had been written immediately after the initial bar raid as a way to understand why the event took place.

I felt it important to include this paper to showcase my earliest work within the program. Not only is this paper a good representation of where I began within the MLIS program, but it also showcases my interest in Queer related issues that would be an introduction into my research focuses on similar topics in later classes such as Values and Communities.

Jack Tieszen
12/14/18
IS 431 Final Paper: Contested History

The First Raid at Stonewall: The Archivers Perspective

Abstract:

The initial raid of the Stonewall Inn, a club serving primarily homosexual patrons in New York's Greenwich Village, is an inconsistently represented event in American history. From police reports and heterosexual news outlets that narrate a story of illegal alcohol sales and violent patrons, to the oral histories of queer American's who provide stories about state violence and targeted harassment, it is clear that the events surrounding the raid, and the raid itself are highly contested. An archivist must be careful in order to not push forward the many myths attributed to the event. They must also look at the necessary contextualization surrounding it. Utilizing the existing stories and records, along with the histories of New York City law, the homosexual community, and the imagined, an archivist with the help of the LBGT+ community can represent this contested event.

Introduction: The Makings of a Riot

In the early hours of June 28th, 1969, a police raid occurred at a nightclub in Greenwich Village. The response to this raid was a violent retaliation by the homosexual patrons against the authorities that had come into its space. While this wasn't the first event related to LGBT+ reaction towards police officers in the United States (Cooper's Do-nuts in 1959 and Compton's Cafeteria in 1966), the raids at the Stonewall Inn are perhaps the most recognizable as a significant catalyst for the modern LGBT+ liberation movement (Gilliland and Caswell 2016, 64). However, recognizability doesn't equate to archived information, especially considering the group in question. Queer history has mostly been an oral tradition as a method against perceived wrongdoings by homophobic/transphobic figures of authority. Compared to other communities within the United States there are relatively few written records from the queer perspective. The byproduct of the oral method regarding record keeping is that the event that kick-started a major civil rights movement is overflowing with mythology and falsely contextualized information amongst the oral truth. Furthermore, non-homosexual published works such as records from police officers and news outlets lack similar contextualization while maintaining a perceived truth which one can use to produce a narrative about the event in opposition to the homosexual one. In short, Stonewall is more contested as a moment in history than one would initially believe, and problems come when attempting to archive and document it as a whole. What exactly does one do with conflicting material not only from multiple sides of a story (authority figures/newspapers/patrons) but from within a singular community (the differing accounts of the patrons)? Furthermore, how should the text from outside of the LGBT+ community such as newspaper articles and police records be represented in an archive that deals with this event?

The question that I am proposing is this: how can one archive materials related to an event that is contested by multiple angles, and how should these materials relate to each other within the context of an archive. In this essay, I intend to answer these questions by detailing the existing information in the context of the groups that they came from. I will first express the general understandings of the raid along with the cultural surroundings that led to it. After that is provided, my next process involves detailing the records from three particular groups: first the police, then newspapers, then the patrons of the club. From that point, I will compare all three of the accounts through the use of two valuable narratives and lastly suggest ways in which these materials and histories can be approached by an archivist.

Stonewall: As We Currently See It

The raid at Stonewall as currently represented by historical based websites such as the History Channel tend to exhibit a basic level of information about the events. The differences in how these websites describe these facts are of note in how they similarly follow the dichotomy between the three viewpoints. For instance, the connection between the Stonewall Inn and the Genovese mafia family or the fact that the police had a warrant for their activities are sometimes left out of the description which further removes important contextual information and adds to the mythologized aspect of the riot. But on a basic level what happened at the Stonewall Inn on that early summer morning?

The accounts of these websites detail a similar story with differing embellishments depending on the source. At 1:20 A.M. on the Saturday, police arrived at the doors of the Stonewall Inn, a club and a known hangout for the Greenwich homosexual community. They announced that they were "taking the place," or inspecting the club for alcohol due to a lack of liquor license (Carter 2010, 137). This was the second time that the bar had been raided within that week. From this point, the patrons were told to evacuate the bar. Instead of leaving the scene they decided to stay outside the building as individual workers were being arrested by police for the illegal sale of alcohol. The tense atmosphere of this police intrusion prompted the patrons to fight back, throwing items like coins and bottles at the officers. Eventually, the officers barricaded themselves in the club and the patrons continued the attack by smashing through the barricade and attempting to set a fire within the building. Reinforcements were called in along with firemen to calm the situation. In the end, thirteen people were arrested and four police officers were injured to the point where they were sent to the hospital. What followed was six days of rioting near the club as the event was publicized and the community rallied around the initial raid response.

From the paragraph above it is easy to determine that there are many details missing from the event itself, but also the causes leading up to that fateful morning. The 1960s was a transitional period for the greater queer community within New York City. The early years of that decade were rife with Mayor Robert Wagner's homophobic policies, many of which affected institutions like Stonewall that served primarily gay and lesbian patrons. The most relevant aspect would be the laws enforced by the state liquor authority, which while not explicit in their discrimination essentially forced the sale of alcohol to homosexuals underground due to the authorities' ability to revoke liquor licenses to places that may become "disorderly" (2010, 48). This, in effect, prevented safe zones for the homosexual community to congregate without harassment. Because of these laws, members of the mafia began to invest in and run illegal clubs to sell alcohol to this community without a license. These businesses also functioned as a plot for extorting wealthy closeted individuals (Nianias 2015). Furthermore, police efforts to entrap homosexuals utilizing laws against solicitation were commonplace and often provoked by the police (2010, 46). Once the mid-1960s hit and a new mayor was elected (John Lindsay) things started to change slightly. The Mattachine Society, a gay rights organization in New York, mobilized and confronted Lindsay about the entrapment practices along with the liquor laws, and in 1966 many of the previously established ordinances were overturned. Of course, other targeted laws, such as ones against wearing clothing attributed to the opposite sex, were still in place and enforced by police. Three years passed and certain businesses, like Stonewall, weren't able to procure licenses and continued to operate illegally.

These are the legal conditions that led to the raid and through these laws one can determine the hardships of the greater queer community in Greenwich Village at the time. Being gay or trans in New York in the 1960s meant that you were constantly bombarded by the possibility of being arrested. It meant that the spaces that were supposedly safe were open to constant raids. Even when thing started to change it was a slow shift against discrimination. This oppressive environment, when lived in for an extended period of time is conducive to violence and retaliation, which is exactly what occurred on the morning of the raid. But that is just a general perspective of the patrons and LGBT+ individuals involved in the riots. A perspective that is often times placed into a monolithic grouping rather than separated into individual stories. This can be attributed to the lack of written testimony as expressed earlier and that lack leads to certain problems when trying to represent this event as a historical moment. What is currently written about the event from the perspective of this community is scattered with bits and pieces of connecting information. This is where the perspective of the authority records comes into play. The police reports and newspaper articles can be used to further understand what happened as well as provide documented evidence to claims made about the riots.

Heterosexual Society and Stonewall

As expressed before there are three points of view to this story, two of which are classified mainly as the heterosexual viewpoint. One of these is a voice of authority and state power, while the other is an ostensibly neutral source. Both provide the important documentation from that night that is lacking within the third point of view. The police records and arrest reports from that event, not all of which have been released to the public, are perhaps the best documents to start with as they bureaucratically detail the efforts of the officers that morning. The records, nine in all, were published on the queer history website OutHistory.org by historian Jonathan Ned Katz in 2009 (Katz 2009). In these records are the names of police officers at the event, officers that responded to calls later, arrestees, and doctors at Saint Vincent's medical center located near the bar. The transcripts also include a summary of events. The main label of this infraction as denoted by the officers was under "unusual occ" or unusual occurrence, a vague description for the riots. Reading deeper into the records pieces of information such as timestamps and injuries are found. From this, it can be determined that the events started at around 1:20 A.M. when the police officers raided the bar with a warrant signed two days earlier and arrested a total of five people for "ABC violations" (Sibilla 2015). When attempting to leave the premises, the officers were confronted by a "large crowd" which became disorderly and tried to prevent the police from arresting the five. Four officers were injured in this altercation due to objects being thrown at them as well as other close combat attacks. At 2:50 A.M. a 10-41 signal was sent out for the Tactical Patrol Force, a highly trained, riot-control unit of the New York

City Police Department (2010, 173). The signal was canceled at 3:35. The records of individual participants in the riots indicate that they were arrested mainly for striking officers, throwing unknown objects, attempting to stop a lawful arrest, and resisting arrest. In the end, a total of 29 officers, 6 arrestees, and 2 doctors are named in these records. Four officers were injured enough to be sent to the hospital for lacerations, bites, general abrasions, and a bone fracture. All of the officers' names are censored, redacted by black ink in their presentation. The final bout of information is that a summons for "unlicensed cabaret, overcrowding, and unlicensed exhibition" was issued, most likely to the bar itself and its owners. The story of the event presented by the police was that this was a routine raid that turned violent due entirely to disorderly patrons.

Most of this information is verifiable through other documents, but as expressed earlier, there is little context within these authority records. For instance, there is no documentation of police retaliation for those who resisted arrest. In addition, the hour and thirty-minute interval between the initial raid and the call for riot police doesn't have much information beyond a written "disorderly conduct" note against the crowd outside. There is no writing detailing the police efforts whatsoever which brings into question what the records serve. The concept of purpose has been discussed by Ciaran Trace in her article *What is Recorded is Never Simply 'What Happened': Record Keeping in Modern Organizational Culture.* In her writing, Trace examines the "notion that records are more than purely technical facts," and that there are social elements and conditions that produce records like the Stonewall police citations (Trace 2002, 152). The records here produce a sense of validity for the raid, but they also show oversight in their lack of descriptive detail on anything except for the injuries sustained by the officers. In short, it's a one-sided story that if taken at face value makes the patrons of the Stonewall look as if they were attacking the police with deadly force unprovoked. What must be made clear is that documented records are not always a simple story of "what happened," and that there are more sides and contexts that should be added to untangle the chaos (2002, 152). This lack of information is generally where newspaper articles become particularly vital in the documentation, however newspapers don't always provide access to the other side of a conflict.

Reporters and Newspapers

Nationally this event had little news impact, so the surviving newspaper articles about Stonewall are all local to New York City. Most of these articles functioned as a way to further detail the information from the police reports. The New York Times, for instance, wrote a series of articles about the event expositing additional information such as the fact that the officers who were in charge of the initial arrests were in plain clothes rather than having on uniforms. They also provided the number of participants in the riots, which was around 500 or so people initially, later downgraded to 200. Another article by Dennis Eskow in the New York Daily News adds more information stating the police began clearing the bar "after 28 cases of beer and 19 bottles of liquor were confiscated" (Eastmond 2017). The officer reports' available don't mention the number of rioters nor do they mention confiscating materials from the building. None of these articles provide much description on the patrons beyond stating their rowdiness in the melee with the cops. Homosexuality is only briefly mentioned when the articles discuss the type of bar that Stonewall was, putting the narrative on the side of this event being a standard raid rather than a targeted act of discrimination. However, not every article followed this pattern of looking at the event that way.

Different articles went out of their way to establish the narrative of homosexuals versus the police. The ways in which they achieved this were different. Some determined the act of aggression by the patrons as unprovoked, like the Village Voice, which in one article used extremely homophobic slurs in their description of the events (Eastmond 2017). Others attempted to see the conflict from the other side. An article in the New York Daily News, written a week after the events by journalist Jerry Lisker, gave a small amount of credence to the gay patrons by explaining their fear when the police initially raided the bar. The article also addressed the idea that the homosexuals who frequented the bar never caused violence in the past according to those who lived in the area (Villarreal 2017). However, while this article examined that side of the conflict, it still maintained the police narrative of events as well as stating that the tactical force called in later were the rescuers of the situation, putting them in a generally positive light (Villarreal 2017). Regardless of the differences in writing all of the articles provide information that the police reports did not have. However, like the police reports, the written information is still lacking. The articles in essence are, a raid happened and then a riot occurred, giving more details to the violence itself than the individual events between the raid and the call for a tactical unit. In this absence, two distinct groups of voices are a necessity. The voices of the patrons and the voices of the reporters who were actually at the riot as it happened.

The LGBT+ Side

The story as told by police and by news reporters is an aggregation of records which is one-sided in its presentation of the event. The differences between what the police recorded and what the reporters wrote are minimal, which would prevent any debate regarding what happened if the patron viewpoint wasn't accessible. Fortunately, it is available, but unfortunately, the events of the first raid and retaliation weren't immediately put into writing by the patrons. Furthermore, the subsequent riots and growth of the LGBT+ rights movement caused the memory to become fractured, housing narratives that are difficult to verify and essentially mythologizing the history. Certain names and points have been attributed to different people/things. There are accounts that say that a brick thrown by Marsha P. Johnson, or a Molotov cocktail by Sylvia Rivera started the riot. Even more say that an altercation between Stormé DeLarverie and an officer was the catalyst for the riots. Further confusing the history, there are accounts that say that some of these figures weren't even in attendance during the first raid and showed up in the later protests. From what can be discovered in the patron records it is difficult to tell who was actually there, who exactly started the fighting, and what happened during that hour and a half time period. Regardless, the accounts presented by the patrons argue that while this raid was a standard (if targeted) operation, the riot itself was caused by police brutality and the patrons desire to fight back against the systems of oppression that led to this raid. First-hand accounts of people that have been confirmed patrons are perhaps the best way to fully understand what occurred, but even those aren't consistent and somewhat build on the idealized version of that morning.

Michael Levine was a patron of the bar when it was raided. His story mentions that the people who were most defiant towards the cops were the drag performers in that they attempted to enter into the bar after being kicked out, contradicting the reports of the bar being completely evacuated after the raid (Simon 2010). He also said in his interview that when he left the bar he saw "what look like 100 police cars facing the entrance and crowds of people." This also contradicts the records related to the amount of police present by the time the patrons were evacuated from the bar. Titus Montalvo, another person in attendance described the scene inside the club. In his memory, this was the second raid that evening, contradicting other histories stating that it was just the second raid that week (Musto 2015). Another account by patron Scott Brown specifically detailed violence, mentioning the throwing of objects like coins and shoes started right after a drag performer nudged a police officer, contradicting any of the other catalysts mentioned (Brown 2012). These contradictions make it difficult to tell what actually occurred, obfuscating the reasons behind the riots. In addition, many accounts and stories have been passed orally through time rather than being written down, which assigns them to memory. Memory, especially related to important historical events is often difficult to verify, and in a riot atmosphere that extended beyond the first night to a week of protesting, the veracity becomes even harder to determine. There is a quote within an interview of David Carter, author of *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution,* where he says Marsha P. Johnson's involvement was a "story that Robin Souza told me, that Morty Manford told him" (Musto 2012). Hearsay, especially through a line of multiple people, is difficult to fully verify. In his article *To Remember and Forget: Archives, Memory, and Culture,* Kenneth Foote writes that "in real life, people do sometimes choose to keep secrets, to lie, and to distort information to control others (Foote 1990, 384). It is possible that the impact of the event caused many narratives to change slightly, and even more so when the stories are passed down through generations. This can also be true for the police and reporters in their records, as absences can change the narrative just as much as embellishments. This necessitates that another voice is used as a base for all of these accounts, that is where Howard Smith and Dick Leitsch can be placed.

On Both Sides: Voices Beyond Authority

Smith and Leitsch are important figures in Stonewall given that they were both reporters who were in attendance of the event, but on opposite sides. The former covered the police and the latter was a member of the Mattachine Society. An archivist can use their stories as a base to confirm the series of events that occurred. While these accounts must not be viewed as more or less infallible than the others, both of them provide the immediacy that the newspapers and individual accounts don't have, and the perspective that the police reports lack, making them good bases. Smith's story, published as a column in the Village Voice, is entirely from the perspective of the police. Smith was with the police as a journalist and was in the building as the officers barricaded themselves in it. Much like the other stories of the night, Smith's account was similar in that it referenced the main turning point as when a lesbian (most likely Stormé DeLarverie) was forced into a patrol car before it was ordered to leave. After the caravan containing the arrested individuals left, coins began flying at the police officers as they entered back into the bar and barricaded themselves within. This act was met with heavier items being thrown outside as the door was forced open by the patrons. An officer got hit with an object and received injuries, causing three cops to run outside in an attempt to “scare the mob from the door” (Stuart 2015). The leader of the police unit, whom Smith refers to as Deputy Inspector Pine, then proceeded to grab a person from the crowd and dragged him inside before shutting the door again. The man, who in both the article and police reports expose as David Van Ronk, was beaten to the point of unconsciousness by the group of officers and handcuffed. The story ends with an account of a fire being set and put out within the club before the riot police showed up.

On the outside, Dick Leitsch, the only gay reporter to cover the story at the time, showed up when he heard that there was trouble brewing at the bar. His account, written immediately after he returned to the Mattachine society office verifies much of Smith’s story. The coins, the police officers trapped in the building, and the fire are all within his account. A difference to the Smith article is that Leitsch describes the police conduct before the rioting as violent and with “bad grace,” which he notes was the usual treatment for homosexuals by police officers (Garcia 2012). From all of the information given in the viewpoints, a few things are abundantly clear from the night. There was a raid with a warrant, a crowd gathered outside the bar after, items were thrown at the police proceeding a particularly difficult arrest, the police barricaded themselves in the bar, reinforcements were called, and the crowd eventually dispersed after a confrontation. These events are referenced in every single story on all sides of the narrative. Archiving the base truth is necessary to present what happened historically, however just inputting those truths risks diluting the event to core elements, removing contextual details. This returns us towards the question posited in the introduction: how can all of these conflicting narratives fit into an archive?

The Archives and Stonewall

Archivists should seek to balance these stories, sifting through the contradictions in order to represent the full history of an event (Kaplan 2000, 148). Approaching this particular piece of history brings up many difficulties regarding the classification of information as well as how it is represented to those who will use it in the future. As Eric Ketelaar writes in his article *Archives, Memories, and Identities,* “an archive is not just a place for storage, but a process, a mediated social and cultural practice…Any archive is a site of trauma and of contestation where battles about the politics of memory are fought" (Ketelaar 2013, 157). Essentially, archives as institutions of historical knowledge are continuously acting, reacting and analyzing the knowledge that they have in order to engage with individual or collective memory. Emily Drabinski, while discussing queer theory in her essay *Queering the Catalog: Queer Theory and the Politics of Correction,* recognizes this sentiment stating that "knowledge organization structures are productive, not merely representative. They do not smoothly represent reality, but discursively produce it, constituting the field of potential identities users can either claim as true and authentic representations of themselves or resist as not quite correct" (Drabinski 2013, 102). We can't approach the archiving of a contested event as if it is a static narrative. Stonewall, like many historic LGBT+ events, was deeply entrenched in the power dynamics and laws of the time which affect both the written record and memories of the riot. The varying stories within both the homosexual community and outside of it bring forth different narratives to the ordeal, therefore the groups must be separated into distinct classification and context added to the documentation.

Angela DiVeglia, in her article *Accessibility, Accountability, and Activism: Models for LGBT Archives,* presents a few elements that LGBT+ archives should follow. Seeing how Stonewall is an LGBT+ event, transitive reasoning applies here. She explains that the archive as an institution is a place of influence and that the archivist "bears significant power over how and why materials will be used by researchers" (DiVeglia 2012, 71). This power is often a cause of mistrust between communities and institutions, so an archivist must keep that tense relationship in mind when they document this particular event. The article refers to concepts of visibility, self-determination, accessibility, privacy, accountability, and trust; and in approaching the documentation of a contested history these individual concepts prove valuable in representing Stonewall. Visibility and accessibility would help push against Stonewall's surrounding inconsistencies by allowing interaction with existing materials as well as continuous input by the LGBT+ community. Privacy and trust can help allow community members to provide new narratives without fear of unmasking or future retaliation. Accountability puts an archivist into an advocacy position, which when dealing with the historical dynamic of authority versus oppressed, is an imperative attitude in how one should represent the latter's history (2012, 84). While all of them have importance with regards to an LGBT+ archive, self-determination is perhaps the most significant relating to Stonewall as it would allow the community impacted by these events to be the ones in control of their representation. This means that queer stories and narratives are placed at the forefront with regards to accessibility and classified in a manner that refutes traditional homophobic/transphobic classifications of memory. This doesn't mean that the archivist should neglect to add police records or other such oppressive written texts into the archive. In fact, an archivist must also keep in mind the systems and records of oppression and how they were used in the past in order to represent and distort an event in the public eye. How an archivist classifies and catalogs these records has more value in this representation than just the record itself. So the inclusion of all records related to Stonewall becomes paramount in detailing what occurred on that morning. However, this just pertains to records that exist from the time period. As explained in the previous paragraphs, the LGBT+ community has a history of unintentional "counter-archivalization" and despite the initially recorded accounts, there are just as many that were written long after the events or weren't written at all (Gilliland and Caswell 2016, 56). What Anne Gilliland and Michelle Caswell refer to in their article *Records and their Imaginaries: Imagining the Impossible, Making Possible the Imagined* as the "imagined," must also play a role within an archive representing Stonewall (2016, 55).

In the article, Gilliland and Caswell argue that the imagined records "offer important affective counterbalances and sometimes resistance to dominant legal, bureaucratic, historical and forensic notions of evidence that so often fall short in explaining the capacity of records and archives to motivate, inspire, anger and traumatize" (2016, 55–56). This relates heavily to the non-corroborated narratives of the patrons. While many of these narratives were eventually recorded, they were done so years after the event, sometimes decades after and that prompts a discussion of veracity. This was mentioned earlier under the concept of memory and unintentional distortion but the important thing to understand from this is that these imaginings, though uncorroborated by the records, can and should be used as a way to push against the dominant narrative of the police. Representing the stories of Michael Levine or Titus Montalvo alongside Dick Leitsch would be a false comparison considering when they wrote these accounts. However, representing the former two's narratives as an imagined set of records to bolster the latter account would allow for the archive to document the history that is closest to reality. A history that shares a community perspective but allows for the individual voices to become heard. An archivist should use the narratives to reinforce or fight against the existing records from that evening. They should allow the researchers and users to view the history of Stonewall from beyond the "structures of power" that raided the bar (2016, 60). Through the help of the LGBT+ community to put in these narratives and classify them, this can be accomplished.

Conclusion

The history of the first raid at the Stonewall Inn is a difficult one to view objectively from a distance considering the various sides. Its contestation between the police records with news reports and the patrons with eyewitnesses is further pushed by a lack of context and narrative inconsistencies. The police and news records are directly recorded evidence but fail to report the cultural and legal conditions which led to this event. In opposition, the patron narratives include the context but are under-documented and represented mainly by retrospective analysis leading these records to be, essentially, imagined when compared to the evidence of the officers. From the few immediately documented eyewitness accounts that there are, it is possible to conceive of a more direct narrative that utilizes these contested accounts. For an archivist, the documentation of this event requires these specific records to balance out and contextualize the entire spectrum of perspectives before the process of classification can be addressed. Utilizing the elements of LGBT+ archives, as well as including the imagined records, an archivist can fully approach Stonewall for documentation.

References:

Brown, Scott G. 2012. “The Stonewall Riots, 43 Years Later: Reflections of One of the Oldest Surviving Veterans of the Seminal Uprising.” *Huffington Post* (blog). June 28, 2012. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/scott-g-brown/stonewall-riots-43-years-later_b_1632045.html.

Carter, David. 2010. *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution*. Media Tie In edition. New York, NY: St. Martin’s Griffin.

DiVeglia, Angela. 2012. “Accessibility, Accountability, and Activism: Models for LGBT Archives.” Litwin Books, LLC.

Drabinski, Emily. 2013. “Queering the Catalog: Queer Theory and the Politics of Correction.” *The Library Quarterly* 83 (2): 94–111. https://doi.org/10.1086/669547.

Eastmond, Dean. 2017. “LGBT+ History Month: How the Press Reported the Stonewall Riots in 1969.” HISKIND Magazine. June 2, 2017. https://hiskind.com/lgbt-history-month-how-the-press-reported-the-stonewall-riots-in-1969/.

Foote, Kenneth. 1990. “To Remember and Forget: Archives, Memory, and Culture.” *The American Archivist* 53 (3): 378–92. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.53.3.d87u013444j3g6r2.

Garcia, Michelle. 2012. “From Our Archives: The 1969 Advocate Article on the Stonewall

Riots." June 29, 2012. https://www.advocate.com/society/activism/2012/06/29/our-archives-1969-advocate-article-stonewall-riots.

Gilliland, Anne J., and Michelle Caswell. 2016. "Records and Their Imaginaries: Imagining the Impossible, Making Possible the Imagined." *Archival Science* 16 (1): 53–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z.

Kaplan, Elisabeth. 2000. "We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity." *The American Archivist* 63 (1): 126–51. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.63.1.h554377531233l05.

Katz, Jonathan Ned. 2009. "Stonewall Riot Police Reports." June 28, 2009. http://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/stonewall-riot-police-reports.

Ketelaar, Eric. 2013. "Archives, Memories, and Identities." In *Archives and Recordkeeping: Theory into Practice*. Facet Publishing.

Levine, Michael, and Katie Simon. 2010. "Personal View Of History: 'Stonewall Did That For Me.'" NPR.Org. June 25, 2010. https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128085183.

Musto, Michael. 2012. "Who Started The Stonewall Riots? I Have An Answer." April 10, 2012. https://www.villagevoice.com/2012/04/10/who-started-the-stonewall-riots-i-have-an-answer/.

———. 2015. "A Stonewall Survivor Spills All: 'It Was 70% People Of Color.'" August 24, 2015. http://www.out.com/michael-musto/2015/8/24/stonewall-survivor-spills-all-it-was-70-people-color.

Nianias, Helen. 2015. "How the Mafia Once Controlled the New York Gay Scene." *Vice* (blog). July 30, 2015. https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/gqmym3/how-the-mafia-once-controlled-the-new-york-gay-scene-616.

Sibilla, Nick. 2015. "How Liquor Licenses Sparked the Stonewall Riots." Reason.Com. June 28, 2015. https://reason.com/archives/2015/06/28/how-liquor-licenses-sparked-stonewall.

Stuart, Tessa. 2015. "Full Moon Over the Stonewall: Howard Smith's Account of the Stonewall Riots." June 26, 2015. https://www.villagevoice.com/2015/06/26/full-moon-over-the-stonewall-howard-smiths-account-of-the-stonewall-riots/.

Trace, Ciaran B. 2002. "What Is Recorded Is Never Simply 'What Happened': Record Keeping in Modern Organizational Culture." *Archival Science* 2 (1–2): 137–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02435634.

Villarreal, Daniel. 2017. "Read the Homophobic 1969 News Article About the Stonewall Riots." *Hornet* (blog). June 25, 2017. https://hornet.com/stories/1969-news-article-stonewall-riots-two/.

List of Courses Taken

Fall 2018

- IS 211: Artifacts & Cultures
- IS 260: Descriptions and Access
- IS 431: Archives, Records, & Memories

Winter 2019

- IS 270: Systems and Infrastructures
- IS 289: Moving Image Archiving
- IS 480: Media Archiving & Preservation

Spring 2019 IS

- 212: Values & Communities
- IS 213: Current Issues in Librarianship
- IS 289: Home Movies

Fall 2019

- IS 280: Social Science Research Methodology
- IS 423: Public Libraries
- 424: Storytelling

Winter 2020

- IS 400: Portfolio Design
- IS 461: Descriptive Cataloging
- IS 498: Internship

Spring 2020

- IS 427: Young Adult Services
- IS 462: Subject Cataloging and Classification
- IS 498: Internship

Record of Advising History

Fall 2018: During the orientation session for my cohort, I was introduced to my advisor Greg Leazer in an informal group discussion setting which occurred after the larger meeting between my cohort and much of the faculty. This talk was mainly to get us as students acquainted with our advisor and for us to ask any questions regarding the program, its classes, or the trajectory that we are to embark upon.

Winter 2019: On February 26 of 2019, there was a similar meeting to the previous one in that it was myself and all of the other advisees of Leazer's. This was a more in-depth discussion on the process of developing the portfolio and how they are assessed by the faculty. There was also a discussion on what to base the issue paper on such as issue advocacy and programming but a majority of this meeting dealt with the actual process of the portfolio and Leazer explaining to us the ins and outs of what we should prepare when it is time for us to present our work.

2019 - 2020: From this point on all of the meetings that I had with Leazer were either through email or meetings that happened by chance. I always had an idea of what I wanted to pursue with regards to classes so I never particularly felt the need to meet with Leazer all that often. Greg Leazer has been incredibly accommodating though and I have never had any issues connecting with him when I did need to reach out and discuss something. There was a meeting regarding an independent study that occurred before spring quarter of 2020 and while that meeting was fruitful in gathering information on what resources I had available to me if I were to pursue the study, I decided to not pursue it for the sake of taking a standard amount of classes and avoiding unnecessary stress during the pandemic.

Additional Advisors: I am currently interning at USC in the VKC library under Andy Rutkowski, who is the visualization specialist within the library. The advising that I have received from his is professional in nature as he is teaching me a variety of skills related to his specific career from digital skills to allowing me to present my work to other professionals as USC. He has been incredibly supportive within my internship is always open to offering advice or trying to create and offer opportunities for me to gain more practical experience in the field.

John R. (Jack) Tieszen

952-836-4275 | jacktieszen@gmail.com | Website: jacktieszen.com

Education

University of Iowa **Iowa City, IA**
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences **2013 to 2017**

- Bachelor of Arts in Geography, Bachelor of Arts in Cinema Studies, Minor in Informatics. May 2017

University of California, Los Angeles **Los Angeles, California**
Graduate School of Education and Information Sciences **2018 to Present**

- Master's in Library and Information Science, Libraries Track. Projected graduation date: June 2020.

Career Summary

University of Southern California **Los Angeles, California**
Intern: Visualization Librarian **January 2020 - Present**

- Developed a system to digitize, georeference, and add relevant metadata to maps and informational documents associated with Los Angeles community planning documents from 1991. This wasn't being done at the time and the documents were sitting dormant within VKC library.
- Utilizing current technologies, I created a working prototype map/website for patron/public access as well as established a documentation process for future interns/workers.
- Presented material and work to library professionals during open house sessions to showcase the work in a professional capacity.

Antioch University, Los Angeles **Los Angeles, California**
Research Specialist/Reference Librarian **January 2020 - Present**

- Increased library/research services within the Teaching & Learning center by filling a professional gap that existed within the department.
- Proactively sought out solutions to student quandaries during times of crisis/corona virus by immediately switching to digital research/instruction services. This also involved actively communicating with faculty and staff to ensure correct steps were being taken.

University of California, Los Angeles **Los Angeles, California**
AV Preservation Studio Volunteer **March 2019 – June 2019**

- Contributed to the inspection, repair, and rehousing for 16mm films in the Thelner & Louise Hoover Collection.
- Collected and documented metadata without error and on the timeline scheduled working both individually and in groups depending on the day.

University of California, Los Angeles **Los Angeles, California**
President of OutReach **September 2018 - Present**

- Organized events such as "archives day" at June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives in collaboration with other student organizations, planned meetings/tours at various Los Angeles libraries/archives, student community building events. This contributed to student life on campus and increased communication between MLIS cohorts as well as helped students with professional development in the LIS field.

University of Iowa Library **Iowa City, Iowa**
Special Collections Volunteer **May - July 2017**

- Began process of unboxing an examining the Lou Scarborough Collection, which included various forms of media (sketches, painted cells, film stock, note books, and other assorted items).
- Worked alongside special collections curator to prepare materials for future processing and cataloging.

Bijou Film Board **Iowa City, Iowa**
Chair of Horizons Committee/Marketing Liaison **October 2014 – July 2017**

- Met board goals in historical event research, outreach, and community engagement for FilmScene and Iowa City. Also helped other committees collaboratively with community outreach/sold out events.
- Created a successful biannual study abroad scholarship program for students through collaboration with University of Iowa International Programs and FilmScene, now in its fifth year.
- Trained new members on how to organize/run this scholarship program bi-annually.

FilmScene Movie Theater **Iowa City, Iowa**
Projectionist **May 2016 – July 2017**

- Contributed in theater event planning and film pitches, plus multi-format media projection for 60 seat/2 screen venue.

MarketingLab Inc. **Minneapolis, MN**
Retail Auditor **June 2011 – August 2013**

- Compiled regional data (physical, ISBN numbers, product sizes/counts, etc.) and researched seasonal retail trends within the greater Minneapolis/St. Paul area.
- Collaborated with Mead brand to develop a database to store written data.

Bakken Museum **Minneapolis, MN**
Museum Volunteer **May 2012 - September 2013**

- Contributed in planning, organizing, and setting up museum events during times of increased patron traffic.
- Led classroom sized instruction workshops aimed at children and pre-teens.

Skills

Technical:
ArcGIS/QGIS, Leaflet, Mapbox, LiDAR scanning, Virtual Reality (HTC Vive), Final cut pro/Adobe Premier, Adobe Photoshop, Microsoft Office Suite, Airtable, ArchivesSpace. Film Handling/splicing: 35mm, 16mm, 8mm, film projection (DCP and threading). Paper, cell, and photograph handling. GitHub, Webnode, Wordpress. Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Reddit, Tumblr, etc.), Class instruction experience.

Languages and Standards:
Familiar with Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), Library of Congress (LC), MARC 21, RDA, PB Core, Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), Encoded Archival Description (EAD), and Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS). Knowledge of Python, One Address Machine, Ruby, Java, C#, SQL, HTML, PHP, and XML.

Additional skills: 5+ years of customer service (in person, by phone, digitally), communication, problem solving, emotional intelligence, writing, independent work, leadership. Class instruction experience. Library reference desk experience. Event planning/event running experience.

Professional Affiliations

Student Government Board at UCLA: Social Chair 2018 – Present.
American Library Association UCLA Chapter: Treasurer 2018 – Present.
Artifacts at UCLA: Member/Conference organizer.
Association of Moving Image Archivists UCLA Chapter: Secretary 2018 – Present.
Special Libraries Association: Member 2019 – Present.
American Libraries Association: Member 2019 – Present.

Conferences

Queer/ing Animation at University of Hull, England.
- Symposium Speaker: "*A Queer Utopia: An Exploration of Queerness in the Golden Age of Animation*." July 26th 2017

Video Games Have Always Been Queer at UCLA.
- Colloquium Sponsor. October 24th 2019

Artifacts 2020 X New Directions in Art Librarianship + Archives at UCLA.
- Juror and Conference Organizer. April 2020

Archive as Cure: Critical Nostalgia and HIV/AIDS in Visual AIDS' Activist Archives at UCLA.
- Colloquium Sponsor. Date TBD.

Special Libraries Association Annual Conference in Charlotte, North Carolina.
- SLA Southern California Chapter Sponsored attendant. June 2020

Honors and Awards

Chad E. Smith Geography Award	2017
University of Iowa Deans List	2014 – 2017