Introduction: A Fusion of Disciplines

Edward A. Goedeken, in his article, “Our Historiographical Enterprise: Shifting Emphases and Directions,” challenges library historians to affect changes beneficial to the development of their discipline as a whole.\(^1\) Primarily, he hypothesizes that “several streams of [interdisciplinary] scholarly investigations can and should come together to create a new synthesis of scholarship about libraries and the intellectual framework in which they thrive. These would include 1) the history of reading, 2) book and printing history, 3) the history of libraries as cultural institutions, 4) the history of information, and 5) the relationship of libraries to archives and museums.”\(^2\) In addition, Goedeken urges library historians to abandon traditional feelings of timidity in response to the development and explication of legitimate scholarly paradigms attempting to explain the origins, evolutions, and manifestations of library traditions situated within specific sociocultural, politicoeconomic, and historiogeographic contexts.\(^3\) By partnering with relevant disciplines within the social sciences, library historians can be more confident when attempting to model theoretical paradigms predicated on lessons engendered by library history. The purpose of the following discussion is to demonstrate how library science and library history can effectively synthesize the theoretical approaches of the social sciences into a aggregated whole that is ultimately mutually beneficial to all disciplines involved. To accomplish this task, Goedeken’s call to analyze “the history of libraries as cultural institutions”\(^4\) will be answered by the active integration of theoretical paradigms arising from the discipline most focused on a holistic understanding of culture, anthropology.

Anthropology, in its broadest sense, can be simply defined by analyzing the Greek roots of the word itself: the first segment, ἀνθρώπος (anthropos), can be defined as humans or humanity, and the second, λογία (logia), is commonly rendered as logical study. Thus, the compound, ἀνθρωπολογία (anthropologia), is the discipline charged with logically studying “what it means to be human.”\(^5\) Considering the depth and breadth of such an endeavor, the discipline has been divided into four primary subfields spanning both the social and biological sciences; each contributing unique insights to the collective understanding of what constitutes humanity.\(^6\) All anthropological inquiry is predicated upon the realization that Homo sapiens, as a species, is unique in that its evolutionary trajectory is not propelled by biological determinism alone. Instead, humans have the singular ability to construct, project, and impose meaning on the natural world, thereby engendering culturally specific worlds within physical
As such, human populations must undergo Natural Selection, as defined by classic Darwinian models, in addition to Cultural Selection: the two influence one another in ways unseen in the evolutionary history of other species. Anthropologists, then, do not limit their extrapolations to reductionist models often seen in many of the biological and social sciences (for example, biologists tend to reduce most human phenomena to biological factors, while social scientists, on the diametrically opposite hand, reduce the same phenomena to sociocultural factors). Instead, anthropology recognizes the mutual and equal contributions of both, while at the same time recognizing that each influences the other. In other words, biological factors influence the cultural, cultural factors influence the biological, and both influence the evolutionary patterns of Homo sapiens.

Considering the importance of both biology and culture within human societies, anthropologists tend to view cultural expressions within a relativistic paradigm. Both macrocultural processes and their subsequent microcultural expressions are artificially constructed phenomena that are unique to the specific nexus of spatial, temporal, and historical circumstances of every human culture-group. There does not exist a single cultural monolith from which all cultures are derived, and as such, all cultural expressions should be judged firmly within the context in which they arise. It is inappropriate to judge cultures against one another, and even more so for anthropologists to judge their subject-cultures in response to their own cultural biases. Thus, objectivity is a prerequisite for anyone wanting to make valid observations via anthropological methodologies, and when coupled with the study of library history, which investigates the specific manifestations of library traditions within defined cultural contexts, greater objective understandings about subjective realities may arise.

As Goedeken correctly observes, libraries, by their very nature, are cultural institutions; thus rendering them microcultural expressions predicated on and influential to macrocultural processes. In other words, libraries and cultural contexts exist within a mutually-dependent, reciprocal relationship influencing the progression of both components. This, then, makes the study of libraries and library histories fecund breeding grounds for anthropological analysis and the development of culturally sensitive theoretical paradigms. Generally speaking, the current work attempts to demonstrate how these two disciplines may be fused together to enhance scholasticism in both fields. Specifically, it attempts to investigate the role libraries play in two culturally-driven phenomena often studied by anthropology: language and hegemony. The
former, language, is a thoroughly cultural manifestation of patterned symbolic communication that has the power to shape the very thought patterns of sociolinguistic groups, which, in turn, influences how individuals perceive, interpret, and understand reality. Libraries, as organized collections of information predicated on discreet classificatory schema, are institutions engendered by encoded language in written formats. Therefore, it is being argued that one cannot truly understand libraries, the information they provide, and the impact they have on sociocultural Weltanschauungs without understanding the nature of language itself. Thus, the following discussion is an attempt to bridge that understanding by placing theories held by anthropological linguistics into the discussion of library history.

The latter concept, hegemony, is also an important topic within the discipline of anthropology. Briefly (it will be discussed in further detail below), it is the mechanism by which dominant culture-groups impose biased ideologies on the masses through the active manipulation of cultural manifestations. This process often results in the inculcation of subjugated masses with the very ideologies legitimizing and perpetuating their own subjugation. Libraries, as important cultural institutions charged with collecting and disseminating information predicated on specific language patterns, have been actively utilized throughout history as a thoroughly hegemonic processes. It is the hope of the current author that by demonstrating the importance of 1) language within the construction of sociolinguistic worldviews; 2) the necessity of language to the existence and missions of libraries; 3) the impact hegemony has on perpetuating subjugation and oppression; and, 4) the ways libraries have been utilized as institutions of culturally-patterned language to fulfill hegemonic process, that a better understanding of the benefits of a marriage between the social sciences (e.g. anthropology) and library history will emerge.

This article is divided into three primary sections. The first, *Anthropological Linguistics: A Relevant Theory of Language*, outlines some of the most important theoretical discussions concerning the nature of language and its ability to influence and shape thought and cultural patterns. The second, *Cultural Domination: Hegemony, Language, and Library History*, explores how culture-groups perpetuate dominance *via* hegemonic processes of cultural and intellectual inculcation. Not only is the importance of language to this process addressed, but so too is the role libraries play in the subjugation of the masses. Examples of libraries’ importance to hegemony are elucidated in two further subdivisions: *Censorship: Colonialism and Totalitarianism* and *Controlled Language: Classification and Heteronormalcy*. The final major
section, Conclusion: Towards a Scholastic and Vocational Synthesis, explores the ways library history and anthropology may better serve their own disciplinary needs by the active integration of the other in both scholastic and vocational practices.

**Anthropological Linguistics: A Relevant Theory of Language**

While it is true that many species utilize forms of communication, *Homo sapiens* is unique in its construction and use of symbolically patterned languages predicated on set rules of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. These languages constitute a learned aspect of sociocultural phenomena that is neither natural nor intuitive to the human biological condition. Instead, they are purposefully and culturally constructed to encode the vastness of human experience into a mutually recognizable form that allows for the diversity of individual human perspectives. Briefly using a theory of semiotics outlined by one of the most influential philosophers of Late Antiquity, Augustine of Hippo, language, as culturally constructed signs based on mutual agreement, form an imperfect bridge that allows one human mind, which is fundamentally unknowable to any other person *via* direct access, imperfect and indirect access to another. Not only does language allow for this kind of communication between individual subjective agents, but it also forms the basis upon which subjective agents experience and understand the objective world. This latter fact is illustrated in how individuals internally reflect on external experience using the language system inculcated since birth; in other words, human beings think internally in the very language they utilize to externally communicate subjective experiences to one another. Thus, it would be improvident to suggest that such a deeply rooted element of culture, to which language naturally belongs, does not impact and limit psychosocial development and expression.

“During the first half of the twentieth century, two American anthropological linguists noted that the grammars of different languages often described the same situation in different ways. Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf were impressed enough [by this observation] to conclude that language has the power to shape the way people [actually] see the world.” This observation led to the development of the influential yet controversial linguistic relativity principle (conventionally known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis), which concludes that the very nature of patterned languages influence the way native speakers perceive, interpret, and understand external and internal realities. The controversy arising from the Sapir-Whorf
Hypothesis stems from some proponents’ extremist interpretation of just how much power language has to shape subjective reality, and their resulting hypothesis of *linguistic determinism* illustrates this extremity. Linguistic determinism “is a totalitarian view of language that reduces the patterns of thought and culture to the patterns of the grammar of the language”\(^\text{17}\) spoken. From this perspective, the components of individual languages determine subjective experience, and psychosocial reasoning cannot escape formative linguistic structures.

The problem with extreme paradigms is their tendency to reduce complex human phenomena into discreet, concretized categories that do not allow for the very complexity trying to be described. For example, opponents of linguistic determinism have argued that if the hypothesis was indeed valid, people would not be able to learn additional languages in adulthood due to the very conditioning of the original languages learned during childhood; or, if they were able to learn additional languages, the resulting psychosocial patterning would engender multiple – and sometimes, antithetical – ways of perceiving reality based on the language being used at any given moment.\(^\text{18}\) Experience of multilingualism, then, invalidates the soundness of this particular interpretation of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis because people have and do learn multiple languages throughout life, and polyglots are not cursed with schizophrenic views of reality that forces them to switch between two or more modes of thought when switching between languages.\(^\text{19}\) Similarly, it has been argued that if linguistic determinism was valid, then cultures utilizing language patterns with sharp delineations between *masculine* and *feminine* grammatical constructions (consider German, Greek, Latin, and all Romance languages), in addition to having specific pronouns for the sexes (i.e. *he*, *she*, *him*, *her*, etc.), would have resulting social patterns reflecting this gender-based divide.\(^\text{20}\) It is further argued that such languages are responsible for creating typical male-dominant sociocultural orders often seen within the history of Western Civilization. However, if linguistic determinism has merit, the opposite would hold true for cultures utilizing languages without gender differentiation (e.g. Mandarin Chinese). In other words, gender-neutral language patterns should preclude sharp distinction between the sexes, effectively resulting in more egalitarian social orders in terms of males and females. Yet, as the Mandarin Chinese example clearly illustrates, as it forms the linguistic basis for a rigidly male-dominant social order, the absence of gender-specific language patterns does not ensure equality between the sexes.\(^\text{21}\)
Proponents of the linguistic relativity principle who oppose linguistic determinism have outlined a weaker interpretation of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis.\textsuperscript{22} Language, in this view, does not concretize psychosocial thought patterns and cultural expressions, but directly and intimately influences them in fundamental ways. Using the aforementioned male-female binary as a further example, “grammatical gender might not determine a male-dominant social order, but it might facilitate the acceptance of such a social order because grammatical distinction between he and she might make separate and unequal gender roles seem ‘natural.’”\textsuperscript{23} Thus, language encodes, influences, and normalizes sociocultural expressions, which allows for the inculcation and perpetuation of sociocultural norms throughout successive generations.

It is important to note that “neither Sapir nor Whorf favored linguistic determinism,”\textsuperscript{24} and “Sapir argued that language’s importance lies in the way it directs attention to some aspects of experience rather than to others.”\textsuperscript{25} Again, as will be discussed in subsequent sections concerning libraries and language, this power to direct attention is ultimately what engenders and perpetuates the psychosocial recognition of normalcy (whatever that might be) in response to perceived aberrations. Think, for example, of how the complex and rigidly hierarchical social strata of Japanese culture are encoded and reinforced within the Japanese language itself: when one person addresses another, both the speaker’s and addressee’s positions within the social hierarchy are encoded and manifested within the very language used to communicate everyday, mundane expressions. Thus, the underlying social order of Japanese culture is normalized and perpetuated by individuals when speaking to one another, and this directly influences thought and cultural patterns as they manifest within everyday experience.

Before delving into examples of how internalized linguistic constructions can directly impact subjective experience, it is worth engaging in a brief tangential discussion on the ways language can directly influence biological development and evolution as proof of its power. Any person who has attempted learning a second or third language in adulthood, especially languages fundamentally different from one’s native tongue, can attest to the validity of biocultural adaptation \textit{vis-à-vis} language patterning and development. From birth to the first five to six years of cognitive formation, human beings are capable of producing and perceiving every sound that can be made within the human vocal spectrum.\textsuperscript{26} After this initial period of development, however, this remarkable ability slowly diminishes into fixity around the language or languages learned since infancy. The brain (i.e. the underlying source of vocal production and sound
perception) becomes accustomed to only those sounds frequently used within what becomes one’s native language or languages, and effectively shuts off other possibilities. In the case of native English speakers, sound cognition bottlenecks to encompass approximately only 38 sounds out of the total possibilities inherent within the vocal-audio spectrum of sound production. As monolingual English speakers age, it becomes increasingly difficult to recognize sounds outside of these 38, and therefore renders learning new languages more difficult. Native English speakers, for example, struggle with recognizing and producing the myriad tonal elements of Mandarin Chinese, differentiating between Russian’s Ж, Щ, and Ъ (all different versions of the English sh sound), and reproducing Japanese’s pronunciation of ː and ɾ. The brain literally cannot recognize the differences, so approximations must be used; which, much to the chagrin of many linguaphiles, means forever having non-native accents. On the diametrically opposite hand, however, an infant who is exposed to all of these languages will be able to recognize, differentiate, and reproduce each sound within each language, and will be able to switch between native accents as needed. Thus, the cognitive capabilities of the brain, at least in terms of language recognition and production, are directly impacted by the actual languages learned in the formative years of infancy.

As the preceding paragraph suggests, if Homo sapiens neural biology can be affected by specific language patterns learned in childhood, it is not unreasonable to conclude that psychosocial thought and cultural patterning are also intimately affected by native language constructions. This, of course, serves to validate the weaker interpretation of the linguistic relativity principle outlined by Sapir and Whorf. For the purposes of this discussion, as will be addressed in the subsequent section, the uses of language to pattern the development of psychosocial identities, and the ability to reinforce hegemonic processes of dominant cultural identities (again, more on these concepts below), are directly relevant to library and information science as it exists as both a legitimate academic discipline and practical vocation. Before embarking on this discussion, however, it is worth noting that some scholars have concluded that even the sciences – the idolized objective mother of all scholarly disciplines – are subject to the conditioned patterning engendered by linguistic relativity. Thomas Kuhn, a renowned philosopher of science, has theorized on this concept when researching the nature of scientific revolutions. The rhetoric used within the sciences is that advancement ultimately stems from the gradual progression towards a greater understanding of the true nature of reality, and the
observations engendered by scientific discourse consistently build upon a dialectical process of one paradigm to the next. Kuhn, however, argued that “if our understanding of reality is the product of a dialectic between experience and language (or, more broadly, culture), then ambiguity will never be permanently removed from of the symbolic systems that human beings invent,”

32 and scholasticism itself is nothing more than another example of these symbolic systems. Since paradigms, theories, and explanatory models are intimately linked to the sociocultural Weltanschauung of scientists and scientific communities, which utilize and depend on the use of language and metaphor, changes are not ultimately linked to a subtle progression towards greater truth, but instead “are fundamentally incommensurate ways of viewing the world”

33 through adapting sociocultural lenses and linguistic interpretations.

Cultural Domination: Hegemony, Language, and Library History

As members of a biocultural species, Homo sapiens are unique in their active forging of psychosocial identities in response to perceived – and often, actively created – otherness. This ability to create identity – whether it be personal, cultural, national, historical, professional, religious, ad infinitum – effectively allows humans to define themselves in what naturally exists as a set of highly fluid, highly contextual psychosocial processes. As discussed above, these psychosocial processes are intimately linked with linguistic patterns, which allow concepts of identity and normalcy to be inculcated and perpetuated throughout sociolinguistic groups. Anthropologists have long investigated the subtle yet pervasive mechanisms by which different identity constructions are engendered (a full discussion of these processes lies outside the scope of this present argument), and to fully understand the integral role libraries play within this active construction of meaning through language, the anthropological concept of cultural domination must first be cursorily explored. Historical and ethnographic experiences demonstrate that individual human groups, each predicated on a dominant psychosocial identity infusing meaning into its understanding of the larger world, will often vie for power in order to dominate over others. Once full domination is achieved, the established authority (understanding too well the tenuousness of maintaining absolute control vis-à-vis diversity) resorts to a number of different methods to ensure its position of dominance. A particularly useful method pertinent to this discussion is the attempt to legitimize authority by minimizing diversity – and therefore, potential dangers to the establishment – through the imposition and perpetuation of the dominant
group’s identity. The way by which this process often transpires is known to anthropologists as *hegemony* or *hegemonic processes*.³⁷

Hegemony utilizes educational systems “and other cultural institutions to disseminate an ideology justifying”³⁸ the prevailing identity paradigm of an otherwise heterogeneous group.³⁹ Thus, “cultural models are strategically manipulated”⁴⁰ to encourage inculcation. Based on the previous section’s discussion on the importance of language in shaping a sociolinguistic group’s worldview, it stands to reason, then, that hegemonic forces can be most effective by controlling the very linguistic patterns allowed to manifest. This is aptly demonstrated when the historian analyzes extreme cases of cultural identity and ideological domination as they appear in authoritarian genocidal regimes. These groups seek to not only exterminate defined subgroups but also try to inculcate official ideologies justifying their actions to the masses, and propagandist language is often utilized to this end. In order to justify and perpetuate genocide, the official rhetoric of the dominating regime often appropriates, adapts, and actively utilizes language to classify individuals and subgroups to impose greater, more deleterious distinguishing binaries that ultimately influence common citizens to participate either directly or indirectly. Examples of this inculcation through circulating discourse can be found in Nazi Germany’s active references to Jews “as a ‘disease’ that gave rise to social illnesses and woes,”⁴¹ and the dissemination of colloquial proverbs by Cambodia’s *Khmer Rouge*: e.g. “‘To keep you is no profit, to destroy you is no loss’.”⁴² The uses of such forms of language not only influences the demotic masses to participate in genocidal ideologies, as seen in the Nazi Germany example, but also have the potential to affect the psychosocial identities of victims in response to perceived worth, which is illustrated by the proverb perpetuated by the *Khmer Rouge*.

As both educational and cultural institutions responsible for the collection, organization, and dissemination of information, which is nothing more than encoded language, libraries assume an invaluable role within both the hegemonic process of identity perpetuation and the formation of subjective normalcy. “As symbols or counter-symbols, they can act as a powerful force to shape identity and create community even under adverse circumstances. They become agents (and not just repositories) of cultural memory not only because they physically preserve works of the past and transmit tradition but more importantly because they represent communities and symbolize values in need of defense.”⁴³ Thus, the control of libraries, which means the control of information encoded by language, ultimately means the control of one
important facet in the construction of cultural identity. This control may assume two distinct yet interrelated guises. The first is through censorship and the active suppression of certain forms of information (again, it crucial to remember that information is encoded language offering different perspectives within a mutually recognizable form); thus, the language allowed to circulate suppresses diverse perspectives for the strengthening of dominant ideologies. The second is by the methods the information is actively classified and organized, which in the case of libraries, often requires controlled language. The three following examples illustrate these two mechanisms of cultural domination through the uses of libraries.

_Censorship: Colonialism and Totalitarianism_

In her article, “The Public Library as Instrument of Colonialism: The Case of the Netherlands East Indies,” Elizabeth Fitzpatrick explores how libraries were actively constructed in such a way to justify and perpetuate the ideologies used by the Netherlands to subjugate the area now known as Indonesia. The Dutch had first entered this area of the East Indies as early as the last decade of the sixteenth century to pursue its wealth in the then-lucrative spice trade, but unlike the other major colonizing empires of the day, lacked significant military strength to explicitly dominate areas under its control. This forced the Dutch to think outside of the proverbial box, and over the succeeding years of turmoil and power politics with other empires, the Netherlands adopted a thoroughly hegemonic policy (i.e. implicit methods) of domination. To accomplish this, the Dutch instituted education reform that was packaged in altruistic rhetoric. “On the face of it, the immense undertaking of teaching ordinary villagers to read and providing them with suitable material is praiseworthy indeed. But a colonizer’s effort to improve a colony’s lot is seldom purely altruistic,” and the ultimate goal was the inculcation of colonial ideologies. A new generation of literate masses, moreover, required suitable reading material. While an autochthonous library tradition certainly existed, the Dutch colonizing mechanism’s “response to [its] wild stew of literature, both performed and printed, which from its perspective tended to promote such negative tendencies as ethnic pride, nationalism, and immoral behavior, was to create a new corpus of government-sanctioned reading material.”

Thus, “Between 1918 and 1926 the colonial government of the Netherlands East Indies established the _Taman Pustaka_ (Gardens of Reading) system, fully 2,500 public libraries in towns and villages throughout the huge archipelago… Their small, heavily used collections
comprised magazines and almanacs, Javanese and Malay language translations of Western adventure novels, agricultural handbooks, simplified versions of stories from traditional epics and legends, and original novels in local languages. The popularity of the *Taman Pustaka* is made evident by circulation counts from 1918 to 1930, which witnessed a 614.85 percent increase. The materials were circulating *en masse*, and thus were being consumed. The newly literate classes clearly wanted to read and the Dutch government provided access to reading materials. However, the point to consider is the nature of the materials allowed to circulate by Dutch colonial officials. They were all works – some translated, some original – that instilled the principles of Colonialism within the subjugated populations by actively negating ethnic and nationalistic feelings of pride. By using language to re-forgé how native peoples understood their places *vis-à-vis* the world at large, the Netherlands colonial system of dominance was better able to retain its authority and control in the absence of direct military mechanisms of oppression and subjugation.

Perhaps a better-known and more recognizable example of this process is the Nazi regime’s attempts to engender a purely German identity by purging the country of deleterious literature. This process is encapsulated in the mass book burnings transpiring throughout the 1930s. “The Nazis had staged the book burning as a symbolic act. The bonfires were to ‘cleanse’ the German spirit of the ‘un-German’ influence of communist, pacifist, and, above all, Jewish thought. And as ever more books were banished from the shelves of bookshops and public and private libraries, the Nazis appropriated German cultural memory and denied that Jews had ever had a place in it.” Thus, by controlling the perspectives (again, encoded by language within literary materials) allowed to circulate within an authentically defined German context, Nazi ideologies, which themselves were encoded within permissible forms of literature, were able to construct an official language justifying and perpetuating the regime’s identity and dominance. If the average German citizen, especially those in adolescence, could only read language supporting a specific worldview, it stands to reason that said language would directly influence the thought and cultural patterns of how he or she structured and perceived reality; thereby directly contributing to dominant views such as anti-Semitism.

*Controlled Language: Classification and Heteronormalcy*
The history of Western Civilization after the rise of Christian dominance in the fourth century has mostly held homosexuality and its expression as anathema vis-à-vis mainstream ideologies. Libraries, as important tools in the transmission of ideological traditions, reflected this subjective bias by promoting and perpetuating heteronormativity within the larger psychosexual landscape.\textsuperscript{49} This was, of course, a manifested example of hegemony; as homosexuals comprise only a fraction of the total population, and therefore, represent a minority view. Even after the American Library Association’s adoption of anticensorship policies following the horrors witnessed in World War II, gay-themed literature within libraries continued to be suppressed via active and passive methods of censorship for generations.\textsuperscript{50} For example, if gay-themed titles were included within collections, and it is important to remember they were not always (another example of suppression by way of censorship as outlined in the previous section), they were often housed in special areas restricting general access. This rendered the unfettered consumption of these works impossible.\textsuperscript{51}

Similarly, the controlled language used to classify library collections – as outlined by the United States Library of Congress – perpetuated the prevailing worldview of heteronormativity by delegating all works containing homosexual themes to the category of sexual perversion.\textsuperscript{52} This undoubtedly had two effects on the worldviews of those who utilized libraries. For the average heterosexual patron, seeing homosexuality relegated to sexual perversion reinforced his or her own culturally dominant assumptions on the normalcy of his or her heterosexual orientation. For the average homosexual patron, moreover, the same classification not only perpetuated the ideology that heterosexuality was normal, but also reinforced that his or her homosexual orientation was abnormal. Within the context of psychosocial identity formation, the controlled language utilized could have negative psychological effects for one struggling with identity defined by sexuality.\textsuperscript{53} These hegemonic techniques, in light of the theoretical discussion presented above, clearly demonstrate – if however briefly – how dominant cultural ideologies are tacitly transmitted and strengthened within specific library traditions.

It is interesting to note that the eventual shift to more humanistic language when dealing with homosexuality within library-engineered controlled language echoes the kind of scientific paradigm shift explicated by Kuhn. Since paradigms (and really, that is exactly what models of controlled language are) are predicated not on a greater understanding of reality and truth, but rather are intimately linked to cultural expressions of language and metaphor, the models and
criteria used to classify library materials are subject to change when new language and metaphors become dominant. For example, during the period when homosexuality was classified as sexual perversion, the Library of Congress favored diagnostic models predicated on the natural and clinical sciences. This was clearly a conscious choice on the part of cataloguers.

However, as social activists began opposing this methodology, and as the social sciences grew in eminence, the Library of Congress opted to reevaluate its overly-clinical paradigm of human behavioral classifications. From the social sciences and humanistic perspectives, it was inappropriate to classify individuals based solely on one aspect of their personhood; remember, human experience and identity is a multifaceted, complex phenomenon, and oversimplification precludes recognition of this complexity. Thus, adopting a new paradigm based on language and metaphor in terms of how people should be classified (i.e. a paradigm influenced by the social sciences), the Library of Congress began utilizing more open, more holistic classifications treating homosexuals and other minorities as multifaceted agents indefinable by only one characteristic.

**Conclusion: Towards a Scholastic and Vocational Synthesis**

As the preceding discussion hopefully illustrates, the fusion of library history with social science disciplines yields important observations on the nature and roles of libraries within the larger macrocultural processes within which they are set. These illustrations, in turn, are beneficial to both classes of disciplines in that they provide library scholars and social scientists greater insight into the very subjects with which both work. For library scholars and professionals, they engender a greater understanding of how their discipline is not only shaped by cultural forces, but also how libraries impact and influence cultural milieus. This undoubtedly will lead to greater awareness of how language is used within librarianship, which, in the end, can be affected to serve – both positively or negatively – patron users. Prescient librarians, then, can work diligently to ensure access to information is unfettered by linguistic conventions used to perpetuate biased ideologies. For anthropologists, the study of libraries as important cultural institutions allows for greater access to myriad ways culture manifests in the everyday lives of sociocultural groups. Of course, as all conclusions ubiquitously echo, further research is absolutely needed in this area of investigation, but the joint efforts of interdisciplinary techniques can and will lead to greater, more valid conclusions for all researchers involved.
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