
“Library As Place”

*Presentation to the 56th Biennial Conference
North Carolina Library Association
“Your Library: The Place to Be”
Benton Convention & Civic Center
Winston-Salem, N.C.
September 22, 2005*

by Wayne A. Wiegand

About this time last year, a friend asked me to write an essay for the *Blackwell Companion to the History of the Book* he is co-editing.¹ He even gave me a title: “Libraries and the Invention of Information.”² That might sound a little unusual to you, but because we were both working in a relatively new area of analysis called “book” or “print culture history,” I knew precisely what he meant. You see, for centuries historians have studied the information left by cultures across the globe in ages past. To people like us, every age is one of “information.” What separates the present from previous ages of information, however, is a particular set of technologies. Part of my job for the *Blackwell Companion* was to trace the role of libraries in the history of the book and explain how modern librarianship could define the “information age” as a phenomenon that began only in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

For me, that wasn’t difficult. I’ve spent most of my adult professional life as a social historian studying the library’s past. That’s what I’m trained to do. This training, unfortunately, has had two effects. First, it makes me a terrible bore at parties, where I ask questions like: “Wanna know why Melvil Dewey used multicolor pens?” Or, “Wanna know how many bearskin coats Lutie Stearns wore out as she trekked through northern Wisconsin winters in the early twentieth century to advocate for the establishment of public libraries?”

Second, however, it gives me a different way of viewing our profession’s past. Rather than looking at our history from the perspective of “user in the life of the library,” I tend to look at it from the perspective of the “library in the life of the user.” And by analyzing our past through this lens, I have come to believe that increasingly in the last century libraries worldwide have done three things very well. They have: One, made information accessible to billions of people on many subjects; two, furnished billions of reading materials to billions of patrons; and three, provided hundreds of thousands of places where users have been able to meet formally as clubs or groups, or informally as citizens and students utilizing a civic institution and cultural agency.

In the *Blackwell Companion* essay I argue that so much of librarianship’s professional attention has been devoted to the first of these three roles that we now routinely identify modern-day librarianship mostly with an “age of information.” And during the last quarter of the twentieth century many of our profession’s leaders worked very hard to redefine librarianship from an “education” to an “information” profession, and to position librarianship as a major player in this “age of information,” in which the very word “information” was redefined—one might even say “invented”—by a particular set of new information technologies.

By pointing this out, however, I do not intend to be blindly critical of the direction this has taken us. Librarianship is an important information profession, one of the few more concerned with access than control. If we don’t acquire and preserve information, and then facilitate, enhance, and protect access to it, I’m afraid no other profession will. At the same time, however, I think our focus on information largely from a “user in the life of the library” perspective has simultaneously had the effect of narrowing our understanding of the multiple roles libraries of all types have played and continue to play in the lives of our users, a lot of which takes place under two broad headings I call “library in the life of the reader,” and the “library as place.” Despite the predictions of many evangelists of information technology since 1980 that libraries and books would not last out the twentieth century, most of you today are looking at rates of circulation and turnstile counts that have only increased in the last 15 years. Why is this happening?

In March 2004, I had the pleasure of giving a talk to the Librarians’ Association at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill that I entitled “On the Social Nature of Reading.” In that talk (which, by the way, in revised form will be the lead essay in a forthcoming edition of *Genrelecting* that Barbara Ittner is promoting from the Libraries Unlimited booth at this very conference), I tried to harness theories currently grounding research in literacy studies, reader-response, ethnographies of reading, and the social history of print (among others) that help explain why and how people in so many ways use the act of reading as agency in their everyday lives.³ From these theories comes research that complicates definitions of words and phrases like “escape” and “recreational reading,” and adds words and phrases like “appropriate” or “poach from” a book, or “empower” a reader by enabling her to “manufacture meaning” unique to her own life.

The act of reading also functions as an agent to construct community. Some of you have just come from Nancy Pearl’s “Book Lust”

luncheon talk. Besides being a very effective speaker and a superb model for the Marion the Librarian action figure, Nancy has, I am convinced, struck a deep chord with librarians on the subject of reading that reconnects us to a past we haven't given much attention in recent years. I would argue that Nancy's richly deserved popularity is a powerful example in our own profession of how the social nature of reading constructs community. She draws big audiences who want to hear what she says about reading, and because they share her perspectives they feel connected to others in those audiences.

For today's talk, however, I want to concentrate on "library as place," that second broad heading I use to analyze the "library in the life of the user." And just as I sought theory to help explain "the social nature of reading" in Chapel Hill, I also seek theory to help explain "library as place" here in Winston-Salem. These days one cannot talk about place without considering the concept of a "public sphere" articulated by philosopher Jurgen Habermas.⁴ In the eighteenth century, Habermas argues, the growing middle classes carved out a sphere of influence between governments and marketplaces in which they established a variety of institutions (like political parties and the publishing industry, including newspapers, periodicals, and books), and a variety of places (like parks, coffee houses, pubs, and libraries of all types). Places in the public sphere have also been referred to as "civic space." In his book *The Good Citizen*, Michael Schudson says "public sphere" refers "both to a public forum independent of government and to private associations beyond the household where people come together to discuss public affairs." The "public sphere," he concludes, "is the playing field for citizenship."⁵

While the term "public sphere" certainly helps explain why these civic spaces evolved as places, it does less to deepen our understanding of the many ways people use civic space for their own purposes. I would argue that not only is it important to understand how library as place functions as a playing field for citizenship, it is also essential to understand how library patrons use this public space in their everyday lives. And library users have been doing this for centuries. Thus, just as we have to move beyond a vocabulary that focuses on words like "literacy" and "recreation" to "appropriate" and "empower" in order to deepen our understanding of "the library in the life of the reader," we also must also develop a vocabulary that moves us beyond the concept of the public sphere or even "library is the place to be" to deepen our understanding of the multiple roles "library as place" plays in "the life of the user."

Several books published in the last 15 years can be helpful. None are definitive; all provide analytical frames that may shed light on how and why people use the library as place. Let me start with Tony Hiss's *The Experience of Place*. Although there is no formula for experiencing places, Hiss says, there are commonalities. "One part of experiencing places has to do with changing the way we look at things, diffusing our attention and also relaxing its intensity—a change that lets us start to see all the things around us at once and yet also look calmly and steadily at each one of them." Quiet spaces can do that, Hiss argues. They "invite people to redistribute their attention." But so can more active spaces, which seem to "welcome experiencing." Hiss notes that some public places, like parks, contain both kinds of spaces. People frequenting a park can choose how to experience the place (and in the act of choosing exercise personal power), and then seek the space that suits their particular needs at the time.⁶

Hiss also summarizes previous research on experiencing place, which demonstrates that people like environments they are used to, that enriched environments do stimulate brain activity and thus help the brain grow (or at my age, retard its deterioration), and that because attractive environments create positive feelings and ugly environments create negative feelings, place automatically affects judgment. Hiss also cites the research of Jay Appleton, who identifies two human preferences in landscapes: "prospect," which encompasses a "long sweeping vista" where "viewing is unhindered" and where individuals can "take in information for miles around;" and "refuge," which functions as a "hiding place" where individuals can "see without being seen" and can "gain information without giving away information" about themselves. Both, Hiss notes, offer individuals environmental stimulation, but in different ways and for different purposes.

Hiss's review of the literature analyzing American cities is also informing. In *City People*, Hiss notes, Gunther Barth argues that European immigrants learned how to become citizens in the late nineteenth century by experiencing particular kinds of places, including apartment houses, department stores, baseball parks, and vaudeville houses. At the baseball park these immigrants learned that "freedom [exists] within fixed parameters," and that success depended upon teamwork and team alertness. At the vaudeville house they learned the importance of "timing, tempo," and the "high degree of organization that finally characterized" this popular cultural form. At the department store and in their apartment houses they learned to function in multicultural environments in an orderly and socially acceptable manner. To these physical places Barth adds another—the newspaper, a reading site which made manifest the social nature of reading I noted earlier, and in the words of Benedict Anderson, helped construct "imagined communities" among thousands—sometimes millions—of readers who never met each other.⁷

Hiss also cites the research of German city planner Toni Sachs Pfeiffer, who argues that the experience of public space can only be enhanced when it meets two basic needs. First, it must be "spatially anchored," affording individuals ample opportunity to find "a little niche where she or he can stand or sit without being bothered by other people and without getting in anyone's way." Second, public space must give people reasons to frequent it—"the more reasons they have, the more secure they feel and the more time they'll spend there; they'll visit more often, and they'll make longer visits." Pfeiffer further notes two kinds of reasons for spending time in public places: passive reasons (people watching; drinking a cup of coffee while reading a newspaper); and active reasons (meeting someone, talking to friends, asking for information). Hiss is especially impressed with how Pfeiffer found all this out—she first observed "the totality of uses and experiences that occur in a public place."

So what can we take away from this brief reading of Tony Hiss's *Experience of Place*? As librarians, we've always been responsible for managing the library as place, but throughout our history we've mostly thought about library space in terms of collections, information services, and personal workspace. That's not necessarily bad; if we trust surveys of our users, we do a very good job. But do we always ask the right questions, especially the kinds of questions that would deepen our understanding of the "library as place ... in the life of the user?" Have we thought enough about the multiple ways people experience the spaces libraries make public? If we can believe Hiss, public places create experiences, and if we know more about these experiences we might be able to enhance our ability to—in Toni Pfeiffer's words "become a space" more people want.

So here's a list of questions Hiss might ask of this audience: To what extent are libraries places worth experiencing? What kinds of experiences would our users cite to address this question if we asked them? Are libraries frequented by users for passive and active reasons? Are they regarded as places to get away, to watch people, to meet someone, to talk to friends, to ask for information? What are the things we do now with our space that help and/or hurt our efforts to facilitate connectedness, something most researchers argue is an essential function of place? Are there things we could do with that space that might bring in non-users (who also need place), and increase our ability to connect people? What kinds of public spaces do our non-users frequent to experience place? Can we learn anything about the "library as place" from these observations? How can we expand the number of people for whom the library is a "favorite place" on their "mental map?"

Before I leave Hiss and move to another author, I want you to notice that this brief discussion of place has introduced a vocabulary somewhat foreign to library planning and policy. Words and phrases like "prospect," "refuge," "becoming a space," places that "welcome experience," are "spatially anchored" don't show up much in our professional discourse, and without such a vocabulary, we deprive ourselves of opportunities to ask the kinds of questions that would deepen our understanding of "library as place."

But on to our next analyst of public space, Ray Oldenburg, author of *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts and How They Get You Through the Day*.⁸ It's Oldenburg who introduced us to the phrase "third place" that is just now finding its way into our professional literature. Our natural first place, he argues, is home. It is the most important of places; it's also where we spend most of our time. The second most important place is the work setting, which gives us an income that directly affects the material quality of our lives. A "third place," however, is one of the "core settings of informal public life." (16)

Third places manifest a number of characteristics, Oldenburg says. They are places of escape from the home and work setting. They constitute "neutral ground" upon which people can gather, places where they feel comfortable with each other, where they are not required to play host, and where they can come and go when it suits them. Third places also function as "levelers," where social class differences seem less important and where by nature the mood of the place is inclusive rather than exclusive. In third places, entertaining and pleasurable conversation is the main activity, and all people in third places are expected to contribute, none to dominate. Third places are accessible and accommodating because they generally keep long hours that enable people to visit after they are released from the responsibilities of first and second places, and at the same time provide opportunities to mix and relax in good company. Third places always have "regulars" who are attracted to these places not because of management but because of other regulars. "It is the regulars who give the place its character and who assure that on any given visit some of the gang will be there."

Third places usually manifest a low profile and fit easily into the ordinary part of a daily routine. By Oldenburg's definition they are generally plain and modest, and tend to discourage the kind of pretension that marks socioeconomic class distinctions. Within third places the mood is playful, yielding pleasant communal experiences that visitors want to recapture again and again. Third places are also homes away from home, offering congenial environments that are often better than the home itself. In a third place people feel rooted, develop a sense of ownership of the place, find their spirit regenerated, feel at ease and free to roam about, and experience warmth. Finally, third places do well not because they advertise, but because their value is spread throughout the community by word of mouth among regulars.

Third places provide multiple benefits to people who frequent them. They provide novelty (often not available in the home or workplace) that is reflected in the unpredictability of conversation, the uncertainty of what will happen, and the diversity of people and experiences one may encounter. Third places also empower people by letting them decide whether to participate or only to observe the community action taking place there. And in third places, the right of free assembly is constantly on public display. This does not necessarily manifest itself in the form of organized associations, but more in the informal social associations that third places foster. Third places do not treat people as objects or customers; in third places people are empowered as individuals. At the same time, however, regulars in third places play very influential roles in controlling the third place activities of individuals, who over time learn habits of acceptable social behavior and civic responsibility by observing the interactions of others.

Time out for another vocabulary lesson. What words and phrases does Oldenburg use to describe "the great good places?" Among others, places that offer "escape," "neutral ground," and social "leveling," places that foster "conversation," that are "accessible and accommodating," and that invite free assembly, where people of either gender, all races, ages, creeds, classes, ethnic origins, and nationalities can by example learn to interact with each other. In libraries, we sense these kinds of interchanges happen every day; problem is, we have not carefully documented them, and we haven't figured out ways to measure their social benefits for the bean counters who want to set the rules for

identifying the value of library services.

Let me leave Oldenburg and turn to the last of my experts discussing “place”—Lyn Lofland, author of *The Public Realm: Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Territory*.⁹ “Realms,” she says, “are not geographically or physically rooted pieces of space. They are social, not physical territories.” Just as Oldenburg sees three kinds of places, Lofland sees three kind of realms—a “private realm,” in which individuals are united by ties of intimacy, a “parochial realm,” in which members are linked by a sense of commonality and involved in interpersonal networks, and a “public realm,” in which “individuals in copresence tend to be personally unknown or only categorically known to one another.” In the public realm, people are generally biological and frequently cultural strangers. The public realm is social territory that can sustain and support a variety of cultures in many ways. Unfortunately, Lofland notes, public realms are often viewed through moral lenses. Many who claim moral superiority comment negatively upon the presence of “the Unholy and the Unwashed,” the “mixing of the unmixable,” the “sacrilegious frivolity of uncontrolled play,” and perhaps worst of all, the potential for the public realm to facilitate “political anarchy.”

But Lofland suggests that the use of moral lenses always privileges the particular moralities behind the complaints, and blinds us to the numerous reasons the public realm is valuable to all members of the community. First, she says, it provides an environment for learning—not the formal kind we usually associate with education—but an informal kind that we usually associate with everyday life. Here people of all kinds learn how to relate to and live with each other. The public realm also provides respite and refreshment, where play is considered essential by those who choose to go there. The public realm also constitutes a center for communication—not the kind made possible by electronic technology, but the kind that creates and sustains a community living room in which people see and talk to each other face-to-face. Within the public realm people practice politics not the kind we observe in Washington and Raleigh, but rather a kind of informal civic school in which people who are not alike can learn to act together. Finally, the public realm facilitates cosmopolitanism. “The public realm is one of the very few kinds of social territories that, on a recurring basis, provides the opportunity for individuals to experience limited, segmental, episodic, distanced links between self and other. The public realm is, in fact, probably the locus for a significant portion of all noncommunal, nonintimate relations that humans form with one another.” Notice how Lofland here takes words we use to describe institutions—“learning,” “refreshment,” “communication,” and “politics”—and redefines them by relocating their value in the everyday lives of people who use and appropriate the public realm for their own purposes.

As a historian, I can easily prove that the library as place has a very long history. In the third century BC, the Alexandrian Library functioned as a meeting place for Greek scholars. Separate space was designed into the buildings to facilitate communication. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the Royal Library in Paris was hosting discussions of the latest scientific information that scientists were generating. By that time Europe had also evolved libraries attached to bookshops and coffee houses, which certainly functioned as playing fields for citizenship.¹⁰ Now let me jump forward to the early twentieth century, when Andrew Carnegie was giving away a good share of his fortune to fund library buildings for communities across the North American continent. You’ve all been in one, but were you aware most were also designed to provide community space? Note the six models Carnegie and his minions recommended, when communities asked for architectural suggestions after receiving a grant. All include a community room, which is actually given priority over workspace for librarians. Carnegie libraries reaffirmed a long practice of library as place; its buildings established a tradition for public libraries.

And like Carnegie’s architects, librarians and library users also recognized the value of library place in the early twentieth century. Witness, for example, an article in a 1914 issue of *Survey* magazine entitled, “Small Town Rejuvenated: How a Social Center Has Succeeded New Community Spirit.”¹¹ A public library donated by a local wealthy family, author Arthur P. Kellog reported, included “a well-lighted and ventilated auditorium accommodating about 200 people” that hosted community entertainments, fairs, socials, youth physical education classes. Other services the library provided included a billiard room, domestic science classroom, community shower and bathtub, and a small bank to encourage children to save. Eleven years later the *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* argued “the library should be a social center” with an auditorium and at least one meeting room for women’s and girls’ clubs, Boy Scouts, and men’s debating societies.¹² In a 1951 article in the *Peabody Journal of Education*, Louisville Free Public Library Director (and at the time ALA president) Clarence R. Graham declared he was a “huckster of culture.” Besides dispensing books, he noted, his library also ran an FM radio station and had television receivers in the main library and all branches. “In Louisville, the library and not the corner bar is the place where groups can gather and watch favorite television programs.”¹³

Although I can cite many more examples to demonstrate that the library as place has functioned in multiple ways through library history, a cursory reading of our research literature over the past 25 years shows clearly that as a profession we haven’t thought much about this subject. I think I understand why. In the seventeenth century a new order we now call “modernity” emerged that separated people’s daily life experiences into work and leisure. Over time, those who established and ran libraries came to regard as most important the kinds of information that addressed questions related to work, or helped people become intelligent consumers, educated people, and better behaved citizens. In their collecting practices librarians clearly favored the kinds of information they and others labeled “useful knowledge.” With the establishment of the American Library Association in 1876, the phrase “useful knowledge” morphed into another that ALA captured in a motto it adopted that still exists: “Best Reading for the Greatest Number at the Least Cost.” Come the 1980s, however, librarianship quickly turned from an “education” into an “information” profession (some even argued “the information profession”), in which

“information” was defined by the technology.

All this time, however, the library has continued to serve user needs as place in multiple ways. Let me cite just a few very recent examples reported in the public press. In an October 1, 2002, story in the *Tacoma (Washington) News Tribune*, correspondent Peter Callaghan reports that local councilman Kevin Phelps wanted to eliminate local public libraries because “as we see them today” they “are somewhat of a dinosaur too intensive on bricks and mortar.” And besides, Phelps noted, it’s all on the Internet anyway. Fellow council members complimented him for thinking “outside the box.” But after Callaghan visited the libraries to see how they were being used, he disagreed. “Let’s think inside the box for a moment,” he argued, “because it is inside those bricks-and-mortar boxes where community lives. Tacoma’s ten libraries are the living rooms of 10 neighborhoods. They are places where latchkey kids can feel safe in the afternoons, where people without Internet access at home go online, where parents give their children the gift of reading.”¹⁴

On July 31, 2005, *Boston Globe* columnist Sam Allis wrote about Geoffrey Freeman, local architect who specializes in the design of academic libraries. “College libraries are experiencing a renaissance,” Allis wrote. “This is counterintuitive when you consider that colleges have, with great fanfare, wired dormitories to provide Internet access to students in the privacy of their gamy rooms.” Why was this happening? Allis asked. Simple, Freeman responded. “Learning is a significant social phenomenon. You don’t learn in a vacuum. It’s not a monastic activity. Technology has allowed us to focus on the activity of learning and communicating. It’s nothing about architectural style now. It’s all about the user.” And the academic library, he argued, was the best place on campus for this activity to take place.¹⁵ Shortly after reading Allis’s column, the July/August issue of *Educause Review* arrived in my mailbox. Inside was an article entitled “Creation of the Learning Space;” three of the five pictures accompanying the story showed students studying and talking in academic libraries.¹⁶

On the same day the *Boston Globe* carried Sam Allis’s column on academic libraries, The *Washington Post Magazine* carried an article by Eric Wee that focused on the District of Columbia’s Southeast Neighborhood Library. In it Wee reports that every Tuesday night a homeless man named Conrad Cheek Jr. enters the library and sets up his chess board on one of the tables in the children’s room. Wee immediately noticed a transformation taking place. “No more ignored pleas” for this homeless man, he writes. “No averted glances. During the next hour, people will look him in the eye. They’ll listen to his words. In this down-at-the-heels library he’s the teacher.” Among his students was nine-year-old Ali Osman. As Wee watched this interaction, Ali’s mother explained that her son’s confidence had soared after playing with Conrad, that he was now bragging to friends about being a chess player. “We owe it all to Mr. Conrad,” his mother said. “We love him.” Wee reported that inside the Southeast Neighborhood Library, “They call him Mr. Conrad.”

Also frequenting this place were Jane and Doug Alspach, who 17 years earlier had moved to D.C. from Alexandria with their new-born daughter, Sarah, to get away from neighborhoods where most drove Volvos and shopped J. Crew. Unfortunately, Doug Alspach told Wee, the D.C. neighborhood around them was becoming as homogeneous as the one they had fled. Fewer places existed where people of different races, classes, and backgrounds mixed. But for the Alspachs, the library was different. “It’s one of the last outposts,” they told Wee, “where a cross section of people still come together. It’s where Sarah was reading in groups with kids from wealthy families and those who were just getting by. It’s where they gathered on holidays for parties, where they caught up with neighbors during the weekly story times. And it’s a place that remembers them.”

Wee also told the story of Catherine Stancil, a 69-year-old functionally illiterate grandmother who every Saturday for the past year came to the library to meet with a volunteer, 30-year-old attorney, Karen Dees. Catherine called Dees her “reading tutor.” Although Dees worried she was not doing a very good job, Catherine disagreed. Catherine, Wee reported “has started to feel different about herself. Her shame is gone.” Proudly, she told Wee, “Now I feel that I’m as good as you.”¹⁷

How do we measure the value “library as place” holds for people like Conrad Cheek, Ali Osman, Sarah Alspach, and Catherine Stancil? It’s not going to be obvious from circulation statistics, use of computers, even turnstile counts.¹⁸ Instead, we have to use words and phrases like “experiencing place,” “spatially anchored,” “neutral,” and “leveling,” and then redefine words like “learning,” “entertainment,” “communication,” and “information” from the user’s perspective. And as far as I can figure out, the best way to demonstrate this is by observing “the totality of uses and experiences that occur” in this place we call library, and then let users tell their stories. Across this country, I am convinced, there are thousands of stories that can conclude with empowering statements like: “They call him Mr. Conrad;” or “Now I feel that I’m as good as you.”

Time to conclude. I would argue that not seeing the value of the social nature of reading or the library as place robs us of a deeper understanding of the library in the life of the user, and automatically elevates information storage and retrieval to a higher plane in our professional services than it deserves. In the past 25 years, LIS discourse has generally overlooked public realm activities as less important, marginally relevant, and peripheral to a professionally self-assumed infocentric research agenda. And by concentrating on the user in the life of the library, it has also focused our attention much more on process than place. From a user’s perspective, however, life in a library is thoroughly social in many, many ways.

I fully recognize libraries can’t be all things to all people, and that we have to make choices. But in making those choices, I argue here today, “library as place” needs to be central in our thinking. If we focus on it, we may be able to craft better arguments by citing numerous

stories of personal empowerment like Conrad Cheek, Ari Osman, and Catherine Stancil in order to confront the tunnel vision of the bean counters of our world. At the same time we may be able to broaden our own vision and see opportunities to change that will connect our libraries even more closely to our host communities. Libraries are indeed important places to be, but public sphere/civic space theory and research suggests they are important as places for many more reasons than we currently realize.

References

- ¹ Jonathan Rose and Simon Eliot (eds.), *Blackwell Companion to the History of the Book* (London: Blackwell Publishing, forthcoming).
- ² See, for example, Richaard D. Brown, *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusion of Information in Early America, 1700-1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); and Alfred D Chandler, Jr., and James W. Cortada (eds.), *A Nation Transformed by Information: How Information Has Shaped the United States from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- ³ Diana Trixier Herald and Wayne A. Wiegand (eds.), *Genreflecting: A Guide to Reading Interests in Genre Fiction* (Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, forthcoming).
- ⁴ Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- ⁵ Michael Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*, (New York: The Free Press, 1998).
- ⁶ Tony Hiss, *The Experience of Place* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990). Quotations taken from pages 34, 35, 41.
- ⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
- ⁸ Ray Oldenburg, *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts, and How They Get You Through the Day*, second ed. (New York: Paragon House, 1997).
- ⁹ Lyn H. Lofland, *The Public Realm: Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Territory* (New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1998).
- ¹⁰ Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge from Gutenberg to Diderot* (London: Policy Press, 2000), pp. 43-44, 66.
- ¹¹ Arthur P. Kellog, "Small Town Rejuvenated: How a Social Center Has Succeeded New Community Spirit," *Survey* 32 (May 16, 1914): 32.
- ¹² "The Village Library's Opportunity," *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* 21 (July, 1925): 171-172.
- ¹³ Clarence R. Graham, "Huckster of Culture," *Peabody Journal of Education* 28 (March 1951): 267-70.
- ¹⁴ *Tacoma News Tribune*, October 1, 2005. See also Gloria Leckie, "Three Perspectives on Libraries as Public Space," *Feliciter* (No. 6, 2004): 233-236; and Gloria J. Leckie and Jeffrey Hopkins, "The Public Place of Central Libraries: Findings from Toronto and Vancouver," *Library Quarterly* 72 (July 2002): 326-372. Gloria has joined with John Buschman to edit a series of essays on "Library As Place" to be published in 2006 by Libraries Unlimited.
- ¹⁵ Sam Allis, "Architect of Learning: The Reinvention of the College Library," *The Boston Globe* (July 31, 2005). See also Council on Library and Information Resources, *Library as Place: Rethinking Roles, Rethinking Space* (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, 2005), and especially an essay by Sam Demas, "From the Ashes of Alexandria: What's Happening in the College Library?" pp. 25-40.
- ¹⁶ Carole C. Wedge and Thomas D. Kearns, "Creation of the Learning Space: Catalysts for Envisioning and Navigating the Design Process," *Educause Review* 40 (July/August, 2005): 32-38.
- ¹⁷ Eric L. Wee, "Shelf Life," *The Washington Post Magazine* (July 31, 2005): 15-18.
- ¹⁸ Roberto A. Ibarra, Special Assistant to the Provost and Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of New Mexico, recognizes the potential of the library as place for promoting diversity. See his "A Place to Belong: The Library as Prototype for Context Diversity," paper presented at the twelfth annual meeting of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Minneapolis, Minn., April 9, 2005 (copy in author's possession).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Elizabeth H. Smith, Professor, Academic Library Services, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

Irene Owens, Dean & Professor, School of Library & Information Sciences, North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC

Wayne A. Wiegand, Professor of Library and Information Studies, Florida State University, Tallahassee FL

Joseph Thomas, Reference Librarian, East Carolina University Greenville, NC