around the world. But an online digital presence arguably can be a useful first step for other collections interested in this sort of pursuit.

V. ACE as an Archive?

Thus the question stands: is the Alan Lomax Archive still an archive? By disposing of our physical collections to a larger institution and placing digital surrogates in regional repositories around the globe, have we rendered ourselves obsolete? Or are we a new kind of archive, with our digital collections (and their natural link to the physical collections at the AFC) keeping us relevant and useful? Although the AFC are now stewards of Lomax's original materials, ACE and the Lomax Archive are still relevant as authorities on Lomax and his work. What are the limitations of analog collections that are primarily available in digital form? Will researchers ultimately wish to consult the originals? Will digital copies always be considered inferior to their original counterparts? Is there lasting value in ACE serving as digital liaison to original documentary materials? Are we merely a clearinghouse, as we said before – a publishing house – for digital media?

While answers to these questions with effort – or luck – will reveal themselves in time, asking the questions is helping us establish a model of what we hope the Alan Lomax Archive is, or will come to be.

In closing, here are three specific dimensions that our model suggests. We hope that they will remain viable for us and for our work, and that they may prove useful in theory or in practice to other small organizations like ourselves that are undergoing the analog-to-digital metamorphosis, peering as they might be into an uncertain future.

Collaborative and Symbiotic Partnerships

Digital technology encourages archives, libraries, and museums to plan for sustainable digital asset management, but it also provides new opportunities for independent repositories to sustain operational capacity. Small archives like ours can share financial and research burdens with larger partner-institutions while freeing themselves to pursue their specific missions in their specific communities and on behalf of their specific constituencies.

Flexible and Dynamic Outreach Projects

As archives become increasingly technologically proficient and similar in theory and in practice to libraries and museums, they are — owing to advances in technology — also capable of advocating for cultural outreach and social change through creative initiatives and dynamic projects. Our mission requires that of us; our flexibility makes it feasible.

Expanded Archival Reach

Diversification of archival practice leads to a diversification of archival reach. This kind of public involvement, we hope, can help promote the real (as well as the perceived) values of archives – be they analog or digital.

Hybridity is the Future: Negotiating Life as an Archive-Library
Aaron M. Bittel, Archivist-Librarian, University of California at Los Angeles, USA

I have chosen to title this paper with an intentionally bold statement about the future of archives; in the case of my home institution however, hybridity is just as much our past and our present. In this brief report I will describe our existence as a library-archive, and the present environment in which we and similar institutions find ourselves – that is, the environment of research libraries within the American higher education system. Finally, I will present my own ideas about how the UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive can navigate these waters going forward, suggesting some questions and observations that apply more broadly to research archives and audiovisual archives generally.

I. A Short History of the UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive

In the autumn of 1960, ethnomusicologist Mantle Hood established the Institute of Ethnomusicology at the University of California at Los Angeles. Although not the first center of study for this discipline – whether it was called ethnomusicology, *vergleichende musikwissenschaft,* or something else – the UCLA Institute of Ethnomusicology established a model for numerous other programs that followed it in the United States and elsewhere. The structure of the UCLA model distinguished it from its forerunners: a three-part formula emphasizing balance between performance, theory, and research (Hood 1972). This structure is reflected in components of the Institute: performance by the musical instrument collection, theory by the seminars, and research by the archive and laboratory. Thus, the Ethnomusicology Archive has been an integral part of the structure and philosophy of the Institute of Ethnomusicology (now the Department of Ethnomusicology) from its inception.

This bit of history is relevant to my topic here, because it has in large part defined the functions and roles of the Ethnomusicology Archive. We are a research archive to be sure, serving the needs of researchers in ethnomusicology and any number of other fields, from UCLA and beyond. But as part of an academic department that now teaches ethnomusicology majors at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels – as well as hundreds if not thousands of students from other disciplines who take our survey classes – education holds a principal role in the archive's mission. And as part of a public university campus eager to engage with its home city (one of ten such campuses in the greater University of California) we have a mandate to reach out to our surrounding communities.

These conditions prompt us to probe the definition of an audiovisual archive, and whether our operation truly fits within that definition. We might start our questioning from the traditional notion of an archive as a repository of procedural records or other evidentiary documents generated by an individual or organization. Although we do serve this function for the Department of Ethnomusicology, these materials form only one among our many collections. But my consultations and conversations with fellow archivists, as well as recent visits to a number of audiovisual archives in Europe and Turkey, have underlined the point that there are as many formulations of audiovisual archive as there are entities that call themselves such. So why and how can these varied organizations consider themselves to be archives in the first place? Tony Seeger reminds me often that an archive, rather than being a place or a collection, can be understood as a set of functions. Although we have always called ourselves an archive, the UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive has assumed nearly as many library as archive functions. And in as much as we hold photo and textual documentation of the department's instrument collection and work toward making parts of it available in online exhibitions, we begin to serve some basic museum functions as well.

The hybridity of our Archive was in fact part of its design, if not explicitly stated as such. Both Institute founder Mantle Hood and founding archivist Ann Briegleb have indicated that the Ethnomusicology Archive was meant in the first instance to be a source of depth, collecting relevant sound and print documents in support of the research and studies of early graduate students and faculty in the Institute. For a student who wished to focus on Japanese Gagaku

court music, the archivist would respond by purchasing as many commercially available recordings and published books on the subject as possible, in order to create a resource library to support that student's study and eventual fieldwork. That student would in turn (it was hoped – this didn't always happen) deposit the results of that fieldwork in the Archive, providing more resource material for future students. However the long-term vision for the Archive was that it would achieve a kind of breadth as its collections grew in this manner, with each student passing through the program contributing a new area of emphasis or expanding a current one. It was never meant to be a comprehensive archive of the musics of the world, though, as Hood had more modest goals for the Institute itself (Hood 1972, Briegleb 1972). Thus the Ethnomusicology Archive was built to function more as a collection of small resource libraries. As collection development paralleled research and teaching in the Institute, the (perhaps unintended) result was a kind of record – an archive – of ethnomusicological activities at UCLA.

And while the collection has grown and our practices have evolved alongside the development of the audiovisual archiving field, the Ethnomusicology Archive has continued to serve simultaneously as a library and an archive. As an archive, we continue to accept collections of unique audio and video field recordings and associated documents, for which we perform archival processing and storage of the originals, digital preservation and access to the contents, and descriptive access in the standardized Encoded Archival Description schema. And as a library, we continue to develop a collection of commercially produced audio and video for which we create item-level, library-standard MARC cataloguing made available through OCLC's WorldCat, and we regularly provide access to the recordings for users in the archive as well as instructors in the classroom.

Alongside the library-archive hybridity we have come, as have most audiovisual archives these days, into an analogue-digital hybridity. While the migration of content from analogue to digital carrier and the resulting commitment to long-term digital stewardship are now long established as central to audiovisual archiving, few of us have reached the point where our primary job is that of digital curator. Even those of us who reach digital Nirvana (if such a state exists) will still have responsibility for the analogue originals for as along as they exist. To the members of IASA this is a statement of the obvious, but it has been my experience that for many of our colleagues in other information-related fields, not to mention the general public, this is a point that bears emphasis and repetition. A fundamental misunderstanding of the implications of an entirely digital information environment seems to define the current climate in which our archive and others like it must function.

II. That current climate, especially within US academic libraries

Putting aside for a moment our own functional hybridity, it seems to me that any collection that has entered the digital domain encounters another hybridity: that of digital libraries and digital archives. Separated – if not at times diametrically opposed – in philosophy and purpose, the two are increasingly subject to blurred boundaries and great expectations. To many, even professional "digital librarians," everything that is digital is online, and everything that is online is freely available to all without regard to ethical consideration. Otherwise, they ask, why would you digitize it? And once it's digitized, why keep the analogue original, which after all is just taking up valuable space that could be used for a coffee shop or a student lounge? This viewpoint now appears to be dominant in American university libraries, which often control the purse strings if not the very existence of academic audiovisual archives. The result is increasing pressure for the digital reformatting activity of archives to serve more than just research and preservation functions. In some ways this is good, as it spurs us – particularly those of us with a hybrid mandate – to better engage our users as we pursue the education, access-provision, and outreach parts of our mission.

I should emphasize, however, that, as I've mentioned before, the Ethnomusicology Archive is not a part of a university library system, but rather a part of an academic department. This may seem a narrow distinction, but in our current climate it makes all the difference. Those who have some familiarity with the current direction of libraries within American

research universities will have some experience (perhaps first-hand) of just how politically contentious the situation is. The fact that I work for an academic department allows me a certain measure of freedom to speak on these issues affecting the field as a whole, that I would not otherwise have.

For those less familiar with the situation, you may have thought my remark about replacing collections with student lounges and coffee shops was a joke. This is in fact occurring at an alarming rate – usually over the objection of librarians, faculty, and yes, even students – at an alarming number of highly respected research universities, and despite the fact that there is most often already a coffee shop within a hundred meters of the library. A group of university library administrators calling itself the Taiga Forum has publicly released a number of predictions on the future of university research collections. These include the following directly quoted statements:

- Google will meet virtually all information needs for both students and researchers.
- E-books and e-book readers will be ubiquitous. Standards will have magically made this possible.
- Collection development as we now know it will cease to exist as selection of library materials will be entirely patron-initiated. Ownership of materials will be limited to what is actively used.
- Libraries will provide no in-person services. All services (reference, circulation, instruction, etc.) will be unmediated and supported by technology.
- Library buildings will no longer house collections and will become campus community centers that function as part of the student services sector.
- There will no longer be reference desks or reference offices within the library... Metasearching will render reference librarians obsolete.
- There will be no more librarians as we know them. Staff may have MBAs or be computer/data scientists... the average age of library staff will have dropped to 28.

[And perhaps most frighteningly,]
- Libraries will have abandoned the [analogue-digital] hybrid model to focus exclusively on electronic collections, with limited investments in managing shared print archives. Local unique collections will be funded only by donor contributions (Taiga Forum 2006, Taiga Forum 2009).

This group appears to be closely allied with library consulting firm R2 Consulting, which on its website advocates the removal of low-use collections that "occupy space that could be redirected to higher-value uses such as collaborative study spaces, information commons areas, writing centers, and even coffee shops" (R2 Consulting, at "The Problem"). In fact, while R2 claims to believe in the viability of what they call "unique content," they make it quite clear that low-use collections are in their sights. Those of us who work with unique content on a daily basis know that they are, by their nature, low-use. **Archives of all kinds have good reason to react strongly to this line of thinking.**

While the Taiga statements are thinly veiled as predictions – or provocations, as they call them – we can see that they are in fact self-fulfilling prophecies or statements of intent; the very same class of library administrators represented by the Taiga Forum has acted aggressively in recent years to make these visions a reality. The closing of branch libraries and the merging of archival and other special collections into a single so-called "service point," which often provides little service to users because the collections have been boxed up and sent away to storage with no digital surrogates for access, while subject specialist librarians have been reassigned to generalist or administrative positions, is only one of the more visible results of this movement.

Perhaps we should ask: can archives-as-function be entrusted to libraries? You'll forgive me for including a reference to Greek mythology. It seems like the thing to do when you're in Athens, so here we go. For hybrid institutions, our hybridity becomes the Scylla and Charybdis between which we find ourselves. On the one hand, as a library we are right to be wary of heads of Scylla: the first praises unique collections as a cherished resource, while a second devours library materials seen as unpopular (including a number of recorded

sound collections of historical value because they are on "passé" analogue grooved disc formats), and a third eyes us hungrily as a tasty morsel of cost-cutting. On the other hand, as a research archive, we risk being sucked into Charybdis's abyss by being declared obsolete, useless, or (in current parlance) not sufficiently entrepreneurial.

Archive, library, museum… does it matter what you, an institution that is really just an idiosyncratic assemblage of these functions, is called? And is this focused hybridity model sustainable in an era of consolidated information mega-institutions?

III. The hybridity model going forward

We are navigating dangerous waters to be sure. Dramatic metaphors aside, I believe that in the end hybridity is our strength. I don't feel I'm in the position to do any sort of fortune-telling or direction-setting for the audiovisual archives field, so instead, by way of wrapping up, let me explain how I see the future of our archive-library hybrid model. Because we exist as a bundle of specialized functions uniquely tailored to the needs of our specialized user bases, we fill a niche Google cannot. There is great value in such a repository being small and agile enough to adapt to changes in technology, environment, and most importantly the needs of our users, which are not to be confused with what is popular or trendy in the information technology and/or library world. There is equally great value in our remaining close to our users, rather than being hidden away in some giant agglomerated library entity. If the subject-specific collection (and the subject specialist to manage and provide access to that collection) is to survive in an age of mega-repositories, we will have to simultaneously take advantage of collaborative resources – especially in the areas of digital preservation management and distributed access – while remaining close to our home base of users and supporters.

For our archive in particular, I see the role of the teaching archive as one of our core missions. Not only will we continue to teach ethnomusicology students about archival research and fieldwork documentation, we hope to be actively preparing upcoming audiovisual archivists and preservation engineers. In our outreach efforts we will continue to teach (or re-teach) our users their cultural heritage, which implies a more active role than just being a repository. We will also be involved more and more, I hope, in teaching communities to document and preserve their own cultural heritage – a function already increasingly central to ethnographic archives as we seek to engage our communities. And as a specialized repository, we will serve as one node along the network of information and, more to the point, cultural content. After all, contrary to administrative vogue, we can't all be generalists.

References

Briegleb, Ann. Interview conducted in 1972 by Dustin Miller, Center for Oral History Research, Young Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles. Audio recording, tape no. 7, side 1; transcript, pp. 128-136.

Hood, Mantle. Interview conducted in 1972 by Dustin Miller, Center for Oral History Research, Young Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles. Audio recording, tape no. 1, side 1; transcript, pp. 11-14.

R2 Consulting. "Library Services. http://www.ebookmap.net/pages/Library%20Services.php (accessed 16 October 2009).

Taiga Forum. 2006. "Taiga forum provocative statements." http://www.taigaforum.org/documents/ProvocativeStatements.pdf (accessed 16 October 2009).

Taiga Forum. 2009. "Taiga 4: Provocative statements (after the meeting)." http://www.taigaforum.org/documents/Taiga%204%20Statements%20After.pdf (accessed 16 October 2009).