UNEQUAL LEGACIES: RACE AND MULTICULTURALISM IN THE LIS CURRICULUM[1]

Christine Pawley[2]

Race remains poorly understood and inadequately represented in library and information science (LIS) education. Educators tend to avoid the term "race," preferring the more inclusive "multiculturalism." Yet these terms are far from equivalent: the various dimensions of multiculturalism, including race, ethnicity, class, and gender, have different histories and different theoretical explanations. Four models dominate LIS research and teaching: science/technology, business/management, mission/service, and society/culture. Each has left its own racialized legacy, invisibly influencing the field's current concepts of race. Drawing on recent research into "whiteness" and racial formation, I show that although each model transmits an inheritance that perpetuates white privilege, each also carries the potential for positive transformation. Arguing that courses in all four areas have the capability to foreground race, the article outlines ways in which faculty, students, and library practitioners together can make curricular changes that contribute to the creation of libraries as "nonwhite" or "race-neutral" spaces.

Introduction

At a 2004 conference of California academic and research libraries, John D. Berry was a panelist at a session entitled "Reference Service to Ethnic Minorities: An Intercultural Exchange." Near the end of the session, Berry (Native American studies librarian at the University of California, Berkeley) relates, "One academic librarian in the audience said and I paraphrase, 'So, if we just treat everybody nicely, that should do it.'" Berry comments that "this librarian did not mean this poorly, but they still apparently didn't

get it" and asks, "What exactly is necessary, to get across the ideals and values of diversity, not just in improved reference services, but profession wide?" [1]. Pointing to the concept of "white privilege" as a useful way of raising (white) librarians' consciousness, Berry paraphrases questions that Peggy McIntosh originally raised in an influential series of papers dating from 1988. "I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in every day, but about which I was 'meant' to remain oblivious," wrote McIntosh. "White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear, and blank checks" [2, p. 95]. Librarians should ask themselves whether a list of Berry's statements is true, including the following: "I can if I wish, arrange to be in the professional company of people of my race most of the time" and "If I should need to change jobs, I can be pretty sure of working in my library position in a library professionally staffed, primarily, if not exclusively with people of my race." A "yes" answer to most of these questions indicates possession of white privilege, says Berry.

That librarians are mostly white, and take this whiteness for granted, is hardly news. In 1999, library and information science (LIS) educator Claudia J. Gollop argued that current and future demographic shifts prompt an urgent need to increase the number of nonwhite LIS faculty and students, including doctoral students, and noted that the American Library Association (ALA) Spectrum Initiative was helping to ease the financial burden on students from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups [3, pp. 391–92]. With the mission of "improving service at the local level through the development of a representative workforce that reflects the communities served by all libraries in the new millennium," ALA set up the Spectrum Initiative in 1997 "to address the specific issue of under-representation of critically needed ethnic librarians within the profession while serving as a model for ways to bring attention to larger diversity issues in the future" [4]. Such an ALA initiative sends a message to librarians that increasing racial and ethnic diversity in the profession, and the closely related effort of fostering multiculturalism through developing ethnic collections, services, and programs, are a good thing—indeed, something to be celebrated.

That multiculturalism has also become a valued component of LIS research, teaching, and learning can be seen from the key document that the ALA Committee on Accreditation provides to guide schools seeking ALA accreditation—still the hallmark of quality in North American LIS education. The 1992 "Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies" requires that program objectives should reflect "the role of library and information services in a rapidly changing

multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual society, including the role of serving the needs of underserved groups" [5].

The term "multicultural" is hard to define, but during the 1980s and 1990s, a broad usage developed for the study of diversity "by such varied groups as Afro-Americans, Chicanos and Chicanas, Asian-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and gays and lesbians, and for the expression of concern about the representation to the majority society of the cultural identities of race, gender, ethnicity and sex, both currently and historically" [6, p. 354]. Although multiculturalism covers a variety of social dimensions, it is often used as a way of referring, in particular, to race and "ethnicity"— a pluralistic term that stresses the value of a great variety of different cultures—rather than to the often-polarizing term "race," with its dualistic overtones of "black" and "white."[3]

Although race is only one of several dimensions that compose the more inclusive concept of multiculturalism, it is also one of the most central— and the most contentious. LIS practitioners and educators tend to avoid the *R* word, and in LIS generally, race remains not only understudied but also poorly understood.[4] Few LIS classes include race in their titles and, while some researchers—especially library historians—have indeed put race and ethnicity at the center of their research agendas, they are relatively small in number.[5] A search for "race" in the titles indexed in the online database Library Literature and Information Science confirms the suspicion that the LIS community avoids overt discussion of race, while embracing talk of multiculturalism and diversity. "Race" produced only sixty-six entries (at least some of which were certainly false drops), while "racism" produced thirty-seven. "Multicultural" or "multiculturalism," however, produced 464, and "diverse" or "diversity" produced 555.[6]

3. See the discussion of multiculturalism and antiracism in [7].
4. In Wayne A. Wiegand's terminology, race is an LIS "blind spot." See [8, p. 23].
5. It is not unknown, however. For example, in 2002, at the University of Wisconsin–Madison's School of Library and Information Studies, students read Peggy McIntosh's article [2] in a required foundation course, titled Information and Its Use In Cultural Context, taught by Louise S. Robbins and Ethelene Whitmire (Robbins, personal communication, May 3, 2004). For a thorough overview of scholarship on multiculturalism in library history, see [9]. See also the bibliographic essay in [10]. However, as Patterson Toby Graham points out, "Librarianship lacks an interpretive scholarly literature on segregation and integration of public libraries. It is simply a topic library historians do not know much about" [10, p. 182].
6. Using the database's thesaurus produced similar results. Although the subject term "multiculturalism" ("use for cultural pluralism, cultural diversity, ethnic diversity") produced 632 hits, a search for "race" in the database's controlled vocabulary brought up only thirty-three hits, thirty-one of them resulting from the specific subject term "race discrimination in employment." "Racism" as a subject-heading component brought up 102 records, of which ninety-seven were accounted for by the heading "Children's Literature/Evaluation/

Yet race and multiculturalism are far from equivalent, and the component parts of multiculturalism have different histories and different theoretical explanations, although important parallels can be found among them, and overlap exists between, for example, race and gender. Moreover, the concept of multiculturalism is itself controversial. In a 1995 article, LIS educator Lorna Peterson (2003–4 chair of ALA's Committee on Education) pointed to ways in which multiculturalism and diversity can trivialize issues of equality. Acknowledging the increased popularity of these terms, she also warned that, although they may have a comforting feel to librarians, unthinkingly applying them to any kind of difference and treating all differences as somehow equal overshadows issues of equity and justice. "In the diversity vernacular," Peterson wrote, "the multicultural are women, gays, the disabled, Asian Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and African Americans; and in one library workshop I attended, knitters were included as the different and therefore 'multicultural'" [11, p. 30]. Emphasizing the structural and institutional, rather than the individual, nature of racism, Peterson pointed to the history of "race" in the United States as a social construct. "Difference has traditionally meant racial difference in America," she argued. "It is a deep wound in the American consciousness. It has meant belief in white superiority and black inferiority, and has brought about the marginalization of African Americans along with the belief that it is deserved" [11, p. 31].

From a very different standpoint, Blaise Cronin (long-serving dean of the School of Library and Information Science at Indiana University, Bloomington) has asked, "*Can* You 'Celebrate' Diversity?" "'Celebrate diversity!'" he wrote in 2003, "is a vacuous exhortation, yet it has become the rallying cry of a depressing number of muddled, though presumably well-meaning, participants at library (and other) conferences across the nation" [12, p. 40]. Voicing concerns that both liberals and conservatives have raised, Cronin complained, "We're all so busy slicing and dicing ourselves into ever-smaller groups that the ties that bind are being frayed. . . . In Libraryland multicultural and other special interest groups are proliferating at a disconcerting rate, fragmenting the whole and creating increasingly balkanized, discourse communities" [12, p. 40]. Cronin here expressed a familiar value—a myth that is enshrined in the national pantheon. "We, the people" of the United States, may be e pluribus, but we are nevertheless unum—we are, despite our differences in descent and life experiences, "one nation." To even call attention to these differences, Cronin hinted, is to threaten this unity, to endanger "us," to build "unwittingly,

Racism," reflecting the historical phenomenon that a major—perhaps *the* major—area in which librarians have confronted racism is in depictions of racial minorities in children's books.

a Tower of Babel in the name of diversity" that will "serve us ill in the long run. Hardly grounds for celebration" [12, p. 40].

What are LIS students and faculty to make of this discord? How are they to both heed the call for diversity and multiculturalism that ALA mandates in LIS education and make sense of the criticisms of influential colleagues such as Peterson and Cronin? In this article, I contend that substituting multiculturalism and diversity for race allows the library community to evade confronting racism as—still—a defining dimension of American society and, in this way, helps perpetuate it. Without a clear and intellectually rigorous understanding of race as perhaps the major component of multiculturalism, we will fail in our teaching and research to go beyond what Peterson has decried as a "feel-good definition of difference" and will continue to trivialize a feature of American society that is deeply destructive [11, p. 33].

To achieve clarity, LIS educators need to recognize the roots of our racialized thinking and the ways in which these are still discernable in the LIS curriculum. I start by outlining four paradigms, or models, that dominate research and teaching in LIS—science/technology, business/management, mission/service, and society/culture—and show how each model incorporates past experience in ways that have left a racialized legacy to the present day, invisibly influencing the LIS educational community's concepts of race. Drawing on recent research into "whiteness" and an influential theory of racial formation, I go on to suggest that although each model transmits an inheritance that perpetuates white privilege and presents barriers to racial diversification in LIS, each also carries the potential for positive transformation. I conclude that faculty members teaching in all four areas are responsible for foregrounding the issue of race in their courses. We can start by conceiving of libraries as "race-neutral" or "nonwhite" spaces, places where whiteness is no longer central and people of color are no longer marginalized. I argue that only by carrying on a continuous discussion about race can we achieve this transformation in LIS imagination and that some elements of this conversation should include ways in which we can

- dismantle the umbrella term "multiculturalism" and treat as separate entities its constituent components, especially race;
- make alliances with, and even recruit, faculty with a scholarly interest in race;
- set aside the faculty-as-expert model of curriculum development and practice in favor of the principles and methods of critical pedagogy;
- seek inspiration and ideas from other types of organization; and
- above all, prioritize race as a matter of urgency (just as LIS prioritized technology in the last two decades of the twentieth century).

Four Curricular Models

The two major activities that together constitute the LIS curriculum—
teaching-and-learning and research—typically draw on methods and ideas
that the field has inherited, sometimes from the quite distant past. These
methods and ideas cluster into four curricular paradigms, or models: sci-
ence/technology, business/management, mission/service, and society/cul-
ture. These influence one another and even overlap, but at the same time,
they have distinct and separate characteristics and compete with one an-
other for legitimacy in the field. All draw on past experience in ways that
have left a legacy to the present day, influencing how we conceptualize or
imagine current issues and naturalizing ideologies that once were far from
taken for granted. A student entering a master's program in LIS in North
America is likely to take courses that draw language and content from each
of these models, and it is one of the strengths of LIS education as it is
currently constituted that it provides a variety of lenses through which
students may view their chosen profession. But how successfully do these
curricular experiences introduce students (the great majority of them
white) to new ideas—such as the concept of "white privilege"—about race,
and how well do they prepare students for the challenge of transforming
librarianship into a diverse profession?

   During most of the twentieth century, the scientific model was the Holy
Grail of, first, library science and, later, library and information science.
With its stress on measurement, feedback, rationality and systems, science
successfully presented itself as value free, objective, cumulative, and the
generator of "progress." The major areas of the LIS curriculum that draw
on the science/technology model include the organization of information,
information systems, database design, research methods, and information
storage and retrieval. Courses in these topics are often required curricular
components, indicating their centrality in LIS teaching and learning. A
glance at the proposed classification scheme for LIS research areas also
indicates a large number of areas that model themselves on the sciences,
including all the subspecialties of two major clusters: organization of in-
formation and information systems and retrieval [13]. But elements of the
scientific approach are discernable in many other courses and research
areas too, especially as the quantitative methods of the social sciences
continue to be the gold standard for LIS research.

   In recent years, the science/technology model has had to battle for
ascendancy with a relative newcomer to LIS: the business/management
model. Drawing on capitalist principles associated with classical liberalism,
this model depicts the information world (including library services) as
one of supply and demand and of production and consumption by ag-
gregates of individuals: information is a commodity, information users are

consumers or customers, and librarians are in the "business" of giving people what they want. Curricular elements that draw upon the business/management model include, of course, classes in management, marketing, strategic planning, program evaluation, and type-of-library (public libraries, special libraries, etc.) courses, as well as courses that take a business-oriented approach to information production and organization, such as knowledge management [14, pp. 130–31]. Research areas that draw from the business model are clustered in the LIS classification scheme under the headings "Management/Administration" and "Types of Libraries and Information Providers."

In contrast to the business/management model that depicts library and information users as consumers or customers, the mission/service model casts them as clients or patrons, while librarians are service providers whose job it is to assess and help meet patron "needs." In fulfilling their service role, librarians draw inspiration from their "mission" and "faith" in libraries' educative role as a public good. Introducing the first issue of the *American Library Journal* in 1876, Melvil Dewey used the language of Christianity as a rhetorical device that his readers must have found very familiar: "[The journal's] founders," he wrote, "have an intense faith in the future of our libraries. . . . Will any man deny to the high calling of such a librarianship the title of profession?" [15, pp. 5–6]. Nearly seventy-five years later, authors of the *Public Library Inquiry* noted that the library faith, as expressed in the belief that reading is inherently good, that reading to learn is a useful and a moral behavior, and that the public library is a means of democratic progress precisely because of its relationship to books and reading, was still firmly entrenched in the library community [16, p. 67]. LIS curriculum and research areas with a mission/service orientation include many (although not all) of the topics included under the LIS classification scheme heading "Services to User Populations," such as "Reference and Information Services," "Serving Multicultural Populations and Information Needs," and "Behaviors/Practices."

The society/culture model also has a long history in LIS education. Culture as a concept is notoriously hard to pin down. During the nineteenth century, writers commonly referred to culture in the same breath as "civilization," while "cultural uplift" was a goal of civilizing institutions such as schools, libraries, museums, concert halls, and art galleries. In contrast to this normative usage, social anthropologists used "culture" in a technical and quasi-scientific sense, as referring to the primary data of their field. Uses in LIS have veered in both of these directions. Courses in book arts and studies, history, collection management, and the "literatures" of various fields, as well as courses on reading and literacy, center on the concepts of culture and society, as does research into these topics.

In contrast to the science/technology and business/management mod-

els, courses and research in the society/culture model tend to adopt the values, methods, and practices of the arts and humanities. Library "users" are depicted as "readers," while librarians are expected to be "culturally competent" through an expert knowledge of books, journals, and other library materials. They may also be expected to be "socially aware" or "sensitive" to the expectations and values of cultures that differ from their own. Rather than seeing information as a commodity for which individual users must pay, this model argues that information is a social or public good, one that should be provided for free in the interests of society as a whole. And just as science/technology and business/management models overlap in their emphasis on systems and rationality, the mission/service and society/culture models overlap in their appeal to the common values embedded in words such as "civilization" and "citizenship." Although they have their origins in the relatively distant past, the society/culture and mission/services models are also home to research and teaching in newer areas, including multiculturalism. For instance, the research heading "Services to User Populations" includes a topic called "Serving Multicultural Populations," while courses in literature and services for children and young adults frequently contain units on multicultural materials.

Race: Evolution of a Social Construct

"Multiculturalism" is a term that has inspired much debate outside librarianship, as well as within it, a term that has its roots—at least in part—in the adoption of ethnicity instead of race as a classifying construct. Historian Matthew Frye Jacobson explains how a twentieth-century understanding of racial classification that included the apparently scientific term "Caucasian" developed over time out of a nineteenth-century debate over whiteness and citizenship. The period of massive European immigration from 1840 to 1924 (the date of the Johnson-Reed immigration law that set up a restrictive quota system based on race), says Jacobson, "witnessed a fracturing of whiteness into a hierarchy of plural and scientifically determined white races." Jacobson recounts the story of how "Celts, Hebrews, Slavs, and Mediterraneans became Caucasians" and thereby eligible for citizenship, while law and practice excluded people of color, and these formerly commonsense multiple racial categories became transformed into the national or "ethnic" categories of Irish, Russian Jews, Poles, and Greeks [17, pp. 6–9].

   At the same time, social Darwinist theories of race prevailed that posited "racial inferiority as part of a natural order of humankind" in which "white skin was the norm, while other skin colors were exotic mutations which

had to be explained," note sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant
[18, p. 15]. In the late nineteenth century, biological theories of racial
difference joined with a powerful eugenics movement that believed that
the wealth of the white upper classes resulted from their superior heredity
to strongly influence the United States' restrictive immigration policy dur-
ing the 1920s. Omi and Winant's theory of racial formation shows how, in
the early decades of the twentieth century, ethnicity replaced the earlier
biological theories, as sociologists began to develop an alternative, social-
scientific theory of race based on an analogy between groups based on
race and European immigrant groups. Key components of the ethnicity-
based theory were contact, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation,
which ethnicity theorists saw as forming the four stages of a race-relations
cycle. Subsequently, during the New Deal and World War II, ethnicity
theory, with its emphasis on social and cultural processes that included
religion, language, and politics, largely succeeded in replacing biologism,
at least for the time being. Yet this new paradigm of ethnicity, Omi and
Winant point out, "was solidly based in the framework of European (white)
ethnicity, and could not appreciate the extent to which racial inequality
differed from ethnic inequality" [18, pp. 15–16].

    Prior to the civil-rights era of the 1960s, issues of race were usually cast
as a matter of prejudiced attitudes on the part of individuals and of dis-
criminatory policies on the part of organizations and institutions. Yet, if
ethnicity theory tried to define civil-rights progress in terms that defined
racial minority groups as latter-day immigrants whose main task was to
assimilate into mainstream society, such groups themselves did not always
see the issue in the same light. By the end of the 1960s, the founding of
more militant radical movements, such as Black Power and the American
Indian Movement, drew attention to structural features of racism in the
United States, many of which came to be included, along with racist at-
titudes and discriminatory policies, under the overall term, "institutional
racism." In the post-civil-rights era, despite the legislative gains of the 1960s,
racism has persisted through continuing residential segregation, unequal
education and employment practices, racial stereotyping, and the discrim-
inatory use of state agencies, such as the police, the courts, and the prisons,
resulting in a skyrocketing rate of arrest and incarceration, particularly of
African American men [19, esp. pp. 72–77].

    At the beginning of the twenty-first century, race remains a contested
concept. There are those who still see race as a fixed and objective reality—
perhaps in an updated form as a genetic term (despite the scientific evi-
dence to the contrary). Then there are those—including neoconserva-
tives—who claim that race exists only in the eye of the beholder, that it is
basically an illusion, and that discussion of race should take place (if at

all) at the subjective, individual, level.[7] Yet others see race as only one of a number of social dimensions that fit under the umbrella of "multiculturalism," a pluralistic concept that values cultural diversity, and yet it owes much to earlier ethnicity theories that at least implicitly supported assimilation, including the very idea of cultural pluralism. Finally, there are those who see race as encompassing continuously socially constructed and politically contested meanings of racial categories, racial identity, and racialized experience.

An influential example that falls into this last group, Winant and Omi's theory of racial formation, encapsulates two related aspects: race as "the subject of struggle and contest at the level of social structure" and race as a "contested theme at the level of social signification, or the production of meanings" [22, p. 15]. Their theory encourages the LIS community to ask, How has the development of American libraries contributed to the production and maintenance of "hierarchical social structures based on essentialized racial categories"? and How does it still do this? How did libraries help European immigrants become "Caucasian," while constituting non-European people of color as racially "Other"? In the pre-civil-rights era, Jim Crow policies that denied African Americans the same library services as whites made a negative structural contribution to racial formation. In the current LIS context, policies that encourage recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students make a more positive structural contribution (although neoconservatives might disagree). But what other structures support the normalization of whiteness in libraries and library education—structures perhaps so familiar that many of us take them for granted? And, how does the LIS curriculum contribute to the maintenance of racist significations—those "ways in which race is culturally figured and represented, the manner in which race comes to be meaningful as a descriptor of group or individual identity, social issues, and experience" [22, p. 15]?

Race in the Four Curricular Models

Paradoxically, it is the comparatively hospitable mission/service and society/culture models that, in addition to making space for courses with multicultural content, have also incorporated racialized thinking into LIS in ways that white librarians and educators rarely acknowledge today, perhaps because these models first influenced librarianship in a more overtly racist but relatively distant past. One of the ways that structures and significations of early racial formation in librarianship had a lasting, if hidden,

7. One of the most famous, if controversial, books is [20]. See also [21].

influence, was through widespread acceptance of the assimilationist service and mission metaphor—a metaphor based on a practice that (as historians have pointed out) contributed both at home and abroad to an imperial ideology that defined people of color as inferior [23–24]. Drawing on religious injunctions that Christians interpreted as a call to "give service to" the "less fortunate," the nineteenth-century invention of charitable or philanthropic service turned on its head social practices whereby (inferior) servants gave service to (superior) masters.

Instead, the social and cultural missionaries who "ministered" to immigrants, the working class, and racial minorities thereby laid claim to their own cultural and social superiority. The language of the cultural mission infused nineteenth- and early twentieth-century librarianship. While undoubtedly benign in intention, the legacy of this missionary spirit lives on in LIS language that tends to cast all library patrons, but especially those belonging to minority groups, as deficient and in need of remediation by (normally white) librarians [25–26]. In a 2004 *Library Journal* article, for instance, journal staff writers described Cynthia Chadwick of the Arapahoe library district (Centennial, Colorado) as "The Missionary" for her work supervising "the homebound service, an early childhood literacy program, and an unusually imaginative program that helps parents in jail connect to their children" by which they "record themselves reading books aloud, and the library sends the books and tapes to the children" [27]. In this example, the missionary librarian "improves" the lives of those in disadvantaged circumstances—shut-ins (usually elderly and disabled people), the very young, and the incarcerated.

Also influenced by the language of the mission, the society/culture model has historically embedded racialized thinking in LIS through the acceptance of normalized white, anglophone collections and professional practices. Library collections themselves constitute a kind of legacy—one that successive generations of librarians inherit and tend to take for granted. During the period of rapid library expansion, collection developers accepted as normal an assimilationist role that dominated public library service during the period from the 1890s to the 1920s [28–29]. Those Progressive Era librarians who embraced with enthusiasm the role of supporting the cultures of foreign immigrants through foreign-language collection building and program development were displaying selective cultural pluralism—an ideology that was consistent with their role as contributors to the construction of a single white "Caucasian" race. Cultural pluralists welcomed the retention of superficial cultural differences (e.g., in food or national customs), while holding to a theory of social power that depended on individual, rather than social, structural factors, thereby failing to take account of structural causes of the unequal distribution of power and resources [30]. Yet librarians were selective in their adoption

of this liberal attitude. Andrew Wertheimer notes that in the early twentieth century, West Coast librarians failed to develop extensive outreach programs for Japanese immigrants (unlike those that East Coast librarians developed for European immigrants) and concludes that anti-Asian racism was firmly entrenched in the 1920s [31, pp. 17–30].

It is also from within the society/culture model that one of the most successful and sustained attacks on racialized collection management has been mounted: that of multicultural children's literature. In 1965, the International Reading Association's former president Nancy Larrick drew attention to "The All-White World of Children's Books," but even before the publication of this landmark article, some librarians recognized a need for a multicultural approach to providing children's services and collections. And from the mid-1960s and 1970s on, a great push for multicultural inclusiveness in children's literature ensured that attention to diversity now constitutes a standard element in courses on children's and young adult's literature [32; 33, p. 693; 34].

Through the creation of controlled vocabularies, the metaphor of the mission has also influenced activities that nominally fall within the science/technology model. Language that permits white library students and practitioners to refer to nonwhite patrons as "those people" and that contributes to the normalization of whiteness in libraries and librarianship remains a problem [35–36]. The controlled vocabulary employed in *Library Literature and Information Science* provides an illustration of a built-in assumption that minority groups are inherently needy. The subject heading "Public libraries/Services to minorities" expands to eight further headings:

    Minorities/Reading,
    Public libraries/Services to Asian Americans,
    Public libraries/Services to blacks,
    Public libraries/Services to Italian Americans,
    Public libraries/Services to migrants+,
    Public libraries/Services to North American Indians,
    Public libraries/Services to Polish Americans, and
    Public libraries/Services to Spanish Americans.

While much thought has no doubt gone into using names for minority groups that pay attention to the current sensibilities of the groups concerned, librarians need also to be alert to the linguistic construction "services to," one that divides library practice into two groups: the (knowing) service providers and (unknowing) recipients. Note, too, the telling absence of specialized services to groups of northern-European descent; German Americans or Swedish Americans, for instance, are presumably too well absorbed into the librarians' mental model of the "normal" American to need special designation along with the supposedly more disad-

vantaged Italians, blacks, Asians, and so on, while the very idea of the "British American" probably makes little sense in this context.

In other ways, too, the science/technology model—ostensibly value (and prejudice) free—has failed to provide an encouraging environment for the fostering of racial diversity. On the contrary, a large literature attests to the marginalization of women and "underrepresented minorities" in the normally white male world of science, technology, and engineering, both institutionally and structurally and in signifying terms of language and other forms of symbolic representation [37–38]. Scholars of gender and race have invented the term "chilly climate" to refer to the normalization of the white male experience in scientific and technical fields, along with practices that produce "microinequities" for women and racial minorities and contribute to their status as outsiders. Is it possible that the science/technology model promotes a corresponding chilly climate in LIS, one that by normalizing white experience contributes to the marginalization of librarians and library patrons of color [39–43]? Yet it is also in the science/technology model that some of the most provocative work, most notably by Sanford Berman, has alerted librarians to the signifying work of controlled vocabularies in contributing to the normalization of whiteness [44]. Hope A. Olson, too, has drawn attention to the ways in which hierarchical subject headings marginalize racial and ethnic minorities, as well as women [36].

The business/management model also sets up barriers to diversity through its structures and significations, while at the same time providing opportunities to expand diversity. With its emphasis on individual choice ("demand," in economists' terms) and achievement, the business/management model systematically ignores structural factors that have combined to keep groups of minorities and women at an economic disadvantage. Like science, business is touted as prejudice free; success in management supposedly depends on merit rather than race or gender in the allocation of wealth. But, the reality has been different. During the nineteenth century, legal restrictions on the rights of women and minorities to own property prevented them from taking advantage of the main route to wealth that white males enjoyed [45, pp. 37–38]. During the twentieth century, formal and informal residential segregation, along with discriminatory lending policies, continued to keep minorities from building home equity—still the main avenue to affluence for whites. In the United States, the labor market, too, has been segmented by race and gender in ways that still influence the question of who performs what job [45, pp. 56–92]. Thus, although exceptions exist in the form of affluent and successful individuals, the business/management model has in general failed women and racial minorities, en masse.

Yet, if at the structural level, the business/management model has persistently privileged white males, it is also at this level that this model has had a more positive effect. After all, it is through the creation and implementation of antidiscrimination policies that changes in the racial composition of higher education's student body have been achieved. In the fifty years since the Supreme Court's historic 1954 decision, *Brown v. Board of Education*, rendered the widespread practice of providing "separate but equal" educational facilities unconstitutional, a myriad of policies written and put into effect at the managerial level have helped change the field of educational opportunity for people of color in the United States. Indeed, ALA's Spectrum Initiative is itself a product of the business/management model. But as Cronin and others have pointed out, such policies can also go astray through a muddled and conflicted understanding of the fuzzy terms "multiculturalism" and "diversity" [46, p. 193].

Libraries as Race-Neutral Spaces

Current LIS students who experience all four of the curricular models may, unfortunately, go through their entire graduate course work without confronting what is still one of the most pressing issues dividing American society. Such students will be poorly equipped to further the library profession's goals of working toward justice and equity through libraries and, indeed, may unwittingly contribute to the persistence of inequity. But it need not be so. Just as "treating everyone nicely" is not an answer to the problem of white privilege in libraries, adopting a general attitude of goodwill is not an answer in LIS education.

I suggest that as a first step we should work on decentering whiteness in the LIS imagination by conceiving of libraries as "nonwhite" or "race-neutral" spaces. Historian David Roediger believes that to overcome the divisive and unfair structures and significations inherited from the past, Americans need to "theorize and historicize the concept of nonwhiteness in thinking about race."[8] Critical studies of whiteness have shown how "whiteness" became a kind of property for (European) immigrants in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These immigrants—correctly—saw achieving white identity as the path to privilege, success, and happiness, a process that has continued to the present day. "If the state, universities, employers, realtors, loan officers, judges, and police continue

8. Roediger recognizes that the term "nonwhiteness" has the potential to offend, in that it seems to exemplify "the tendency to place whites at the normative center of everything and to marginalize everyone else," but he intends for us to think about ways in which "the *nation* can become something other than white" [47, p. 17].

dramatically to privilege white people," Roediger comments, "we are very likely to remain a nation in which newcomers struggle to get into the white race and in which those already so classified opt to retain both whiteness and privilege" [47, p. 17]. As he argues, although it may be tempting to see the "opening up of whiteness . . . as on balance a positive thing, and certainly preferable to anti-immigrant racism against Greeks, Italians, Jews, Poles and others, . . . the process of inclusion into whiteness has always been predicated on accepting the exclusion of others" [47, p. 240]. Race is a relational concept, after all.[9]

What it means to decenter whiteness in LIS and how we go about this in practical terms are matters we need to take up as an urgent priority. The LIS field is indeed capable of radical transformation; we can tell this from the example of recent technological change in librarianship. During the 1970s and 1980s, it became clear that new computer technologies were mounting an urgent challenge to libraries and library education. Library educators recognized that to meet this challenge successfully they needed to learn from the developing field of information science and found ways to include information scientists in their schools and departments. The curriculum changed shape in drastic ways as courses heavy with techno-logical content became established and rapidly taken for granted as es-sential elements [48, pp. 29–30]. LIS educators achieved these changes because they perceived technology as vitally important and because they carried on a conversation about technology—about its role in libraries, how best to incorporate it into the curriculum, who should teach what courses and how, and what sort of research LIS should support—a con-versation that continues to this day.

With the right will, we can similarly prioritize race, and we can choose to carry on a conversation about how to create libraries as race-neutral spaces. Those of us who are LIS faculty members need to educate not only our students but also ourselves about race. We must start by recognizing that for the purposes of combating racism, our current concept of mul-ticulturalism is too general. Rather, we need to specify and theorize its component parts, including race, gender, class, ethnicity, and sexuality. Few of us probably feel that we have the skills and knowledge to undertake such a task. But just as library education recruited information scientists in tackling the issue of technology, so LIS can turn for help to those in academe who are currently carrying out exciting work on race, especially

9. As Evelyn Nakano Glenn explains, "Race and gender categories (such as black/white, woman/man) are positioned and therefore gain meaning in relation to each other. According to poststructural analysis, meaning within Western epistemology is constructed in terms of di-chotomous oppositions or contrasts. Oppositional categories require suppressing variability within each category and exaggerating difference between categories" [45, p. 13].

in sociology, history, law, and cultural and ethnic studies. Some will complain, with justification, that keeping up with developments in other fields is time consuming and perhaps beyond their competence. But we do not have to do this alone—we can look for help. The ranks of LIS faculty already include scholars with qualifications and experience in disciplines other than LIS and, in the future, will probably include more of these. At a time when a shortage of doctoral students in LIS is making filling faculty vacancies difficult, we can look for recruits with PhDs in, say, sociology and history. We can also make alliances across campus by actively making contacts with those departments that are already doing work on race.

As Gollop points out, LIS deans and directors need to provide (non-white) space in their already-crowded curricula [3, p. 391]. But courses on young adult and children's literature should not be the only—or even the major—arena in which students confront issues of racism. Courses in LIS foundations, research methods, and history are obvious candidates for this kind of critical reflection, as are issues-based courses similar to the intellectual-freedom courses implemented by (among others) Toni Samek [49]. But each of the models has the capacity to overcome the white-privileged legacies of the past and to help recreate libraries as nonwhite or race-neutral spaces. Race can—and in some schools already does—make an appearance in courses that fall into each of the four models, including the organization of information, cataloging and classification, and reference and collection management, as well as courses in public librarianship and academic librarianship. Peterson has helpfully suggested six activities for incorporating multicultural considerations in the LIS curriculum that she feels are particularly useful in introductory, reference, and management courses: "invite guest lecturers, use role playing and small group discussion relevant to activities cited in the literature, make lectures broad and inclusive, give gender/racial/sexuality/ethnic inclusive assignments, offer a separate course in multicultural librarianship, and deliver separate lectures on information sources and services in the areas of gender, ethnic sexuality, and area studies" [50, pp. 74–75].

LIS faculty can take another step in this direction by setting aside hierarchical models of curriculum development in which they themselves constitute the main source of expertise and curricular knowledge. Using the principles of critical pedagogy—that is, "the restructuring of the student/teacher/knowledge relationship based on the desire to create genuine inquiry rather than the desire to transmit unquestionable knowledge"—LIS faculty can make progress in partnership with each other, as well as with students, practitioners, and even library users themselves [51, p. 241]. Many students come to LIS with previous training in philosophy, history, sociology, anthropology, and the humanities; some already have the intellectual tools to bring to bear on issues of race and racism. Many

also have had life experiences that have caused them to engage in "critical reflexivity" (to borrow Cronin's phrase) on race and racism. And, at least part of the LIS curriculum should provide opportunities for faculty and master's, as well as PhD, students to produce and publish creative ideas about these issues.

Practitioners and library users, too, embody diverse experiences and knowledge—if only we can find a way to take advantage of these. Sharing ideas that we glean from other fields can add to our stock of knowledge and our repertoire of practical responses. Just as white individuals can "test" their white privilege by "unpacking the invisible knapsack," organizations, too, can assess their combat readiness in fighting racism. In a recent posting to the Social Responsibilities Round Table (SSRT) discussion list, for example, librarian Jonathan Betz-Zall passed on to list members an "Organizational Inventory for Combating Racism" consisting of some "straightforward and concrete steps" that an organization can take to dismantle racism [52, 53]. This inventory encourages groups to consider fifteen statements, including the following: "The organization has an ongoing 'change team' focusing on issues of dismantling racism and guiding the process for the group," and "The organization sees itself as a model for other organizations and is open about its process of struggle and change."

It takes political will, intellectual energy, and practical skill, first, to recognize the racist legacies of LIS structures and significations and, then, to devise ways to transform them. Only by deciding that racism is a problem that we can no longer afford to sideline can we even begin to tackle this monumental task. Whether LIS education is up to the challenge is up to us.

REFERENCES

1. Berry, John D. "White Privilege in Library Land." Message posted on SSRTAC-L discussion list, April 26, 2004.
2. McIntosh, Peggy. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies." In *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology,* edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins, 4th ed., pp. 95–105. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2001.
3. Gollop, Claudia J. "Library and Information Science Education: Preparing Librarians for a Multicultural Society." *College & Research Libraries* 60, no. 4 (1999): 385–95.
4. American Library Association. "Spectrum: New Voices, New Vision!" 2005. http://www.ala.org/ala/diversity/spectrum/spectruminitiative.htm.
5. American Library Association. "Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies, 1992." http://www.ala.org/ala/accreditation/accredstandards/standards.htm.
6. Standley, Fred L. "Multiculturalism." In *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory,* edited by Michael Payne, pp. 352–55. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
7. Erickson, Peter. "What Multiculturalism Means." *Transition* 55 (1991): 105–14.

8. Wiegand, Wayne A. "Tunnel Vision and Blind Spots: What the Past Tells Us about the Present; Reflections on the Twentieth-Century History of American Librarianship." *Library Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (January 1999): 1–32.

9. Malone, Cheryl Knott. "Toward a Multicultural American Public Library History." *Libraries & Culture* 35, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 77–87.

10. Graham, Patterson Toby. *A Right to Read: Segregation and Civil Rights in Alabama's Public Libraries, 1900–1965.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002.

11. Peterson, Lorna. "Multiculturalism: Affirmative or Negative Action?" *Library Journal* 120, no. 12 (July 1995): 30–33.

12. Cronin, Blaise. "*Can* You 'Celebrate' Diversity?" *Library Journal* 128 (September 15, 2003). http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA320854.html.

13. Association for Library and Information Science Education. "LIS Research Areas Classification Scheme." 2003. http://www.alise.org/research_class_guide.html.

14. Christine Pawley. "Hegemony's Handmaid? The Library and Information Studies Curriculum from a Class Perspective." *Library Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (April 1998): 123–44.

15. Dewey, Melvil. "The Profession." *American Library Journal* 1 (September 30, 1876): 5–6.

16. Raber, Douglas. *Librarianship and Legitimacy: The Ideology of the Public Library Inquiry.* Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1997.

17. Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

18. Omi, Michael, and Winant, Howard. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

19. Bonillo-Silva, Eduardo. "The New Racism: Racial Structure in the United States, 1960s–1990s." In *Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism in the United States: Toward the Twenty-first Century,* edited by Paul Wong, pp. 55–101. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999.

20. Thernstrom, Stephan, and Thernstrom, Abigail. *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.

21. Connerly, Ward. *Creating Equal: My Fight against Race Preferences.* San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2000.

22. Winant, Howard. "Racism Today: Continuity and Change in the Post-Civil Rights Era." In *Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism in the United States: Toward the Twenty-first Century,* edited by Paul Wong, pp. 14–24. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999.

23. Hill, Patricia R. *The World Their Household: The American Woman's Foreign Mission Movement and Cultural Transformation, 1870–1920.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985.

24. Thorne, Susan. "Missionary-Imperial Feminism." In *Gendered Missions: Women and Men in Missionary Discourse and Practice,* edited by Mary Taylor Huber and Nancy C. Lutkehaus, pp. 39–65. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

25. Pawley, Christine. "Information Literacy: A Contradictory Coupling." *Library Quarterly* 73, no. 4 (October 2003): 422–52.

26. Todd, Ross J. "Information Literacy, Concept, Conundrum, and Challenge." Keynote address at the National Information Literacy Conference, Adelaide, Australia, December 1999.

27. "The Missionary—Cynthia Chadwick." *Library Journal* 21 (March 15, 2004). http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA385866.html.

28. Garrison, Dee. *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876–1920.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

29. Jones, Plummer Alston, Jr. *Libraries, Immigrants, and the American Experience.* Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1999.

30. Shapiro, Thomas M. *The Hidden Cost of Being African American: How Wealth Perpetuates Inequality.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

31. Wertheimer, Andrew B. "Public Libraries Behind Barbed Wire: Japanese American Com-

munity Libraries in America's Concentration Camps, 1942–1946." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin–Madison, 2004.

32. Larrick, Nancy. "The All-White World of Children's Books." *Saturday Review* 11 (September 1965): 63–85.

33. Vandergrift, Kay E. "Female Advocacy and Harmonious Voices: A History of Public Library Services and Publishing for Children in the United States." *Library Trends* 44 (Spring 1996): 681–718.

34. Lindgren, Merri V., ed. *The Multicolored Mirror: Cultural Substance in Literature for Children and Young Adults.* Fort Atkinson, WI: Highsmith, 1991.

35. Berman, Sanford. "Good Luck, Folks! Finding Material on 'Those People' (and Their Concerns) in Library Catalogs." *MultiCultural Review* 9, no. 2 (2000): 26–28, 48–52.

36. Olson, Hope A. "The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2001): 639–68.

37. Harding, Sandra G. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.

38. Harding, Sandra G. *The "Racial" Economy of Science: Toward a Democratic Future.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

39. Committee on Women Faculty in the School of Science. "A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT." *MIT Faculty Newsletter* 11, no. 4 (March 1999): 1–7. http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.html#The%20Study.

40. Bergvall, Victoria L.; Sorby, Sheryl A.; and Worthen, James B. "Thawing the Freezing Climate for Women in Engineering Education: Views from Both Sides of the Desk." *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering* 1, no. 4 (1994): 323–46.

41. Allen, Bern P., and Niss, James F. "A Chill in the College Classroom?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 71, no. 8 (April 1990): 607–9.

42. Sandler, Bernice R. "The Chilly Climate: Subtle Ways in Which Women Are Often Treated Differently at Work and in Classrooms." http://www.bernicesandler.com/id23.htm.

43. Freyd, Jennifer. "References on Chilly Climate for Women Faculty in Academe." http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/~jjf/chillyclimate.html#General.

44. Berman, Sanford. "Things Are Seldom What They Seem: Finding Multicultural Materials in Library Catalogs." In *Alternative Library Literature, 1990/1991: A Biennial Anthology,* edited by Sanford Berman and James P. Danky, pp. 132–36. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1992.

45. Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

46. Kors, Alan Charles, and Silverglate, Harvey A. *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses.* New York: Free Press, 1998.

47. Roediger, David R. *Colored White: Transcending the Racial Past.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

48. Stieg, Margaret F. *Change and Challenge in Library and Information Science Education.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1992.

49. Samek, Toni. "Introducing Intellectual Freedom Courses into the Canadian LIS Curriculum." *Feliciter* 47, no. 1 (2001): 40–43.

50. Peterson, Lorna. "Strategies for Infusing Multicultural Education into the Library Science Curriculum." In *Culture Keepers II: Unity through Diversity; Proceedings of the Second National Conference of African American Librarians; August 5–7, 1994, Milwaukee, WI,* edited by Stanton Biddle, pp. 73–76. Newark, NJ: Black Caucus of the ALA, 1995.

51. Elmborg, James, and Pawley, Christine. "Historical Research as Practice and Relationship: The Carnegie Libraries in Iowa Project." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 44, no. 3 (2003): 236–46.

52. Betz-Zall, Jonathan. "Organizational Inventory for Combating Racism." Message posted on SSRTAC-L discussion list, June 11, 2004.
53. Ayvazian, A. *Dismantling Racism: Workbook for Social Change Groups.* Northampton, MA: Communitas, n.d.