Marjorie Hlava (MH)

Interviewed by

Gloria Zamora (GZ)

December 16, 2009

GZ: This is Gloria Zamora and I'm here with Marjorie Hlava. I will be referring to her as Margie since I have known her for the past 30 years. It is the 16th of December 2009 and we are interviewing for the Voices of SLA, an International Oral History, at Access Innovations, Margie's company office, headquartered here in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Now, I'm going to ask Margie to review her SLA Association level offices, because there are so many in all of the different areas. And I'd like her to go through them. Then we'll get started with the interview.

MH: OK. I've been a member of SLA since 1976, and how that came to happen will be covered later. The Rio Grande Chapter (RGC) of SLA makes it easy to get involved and I became involved pretty quickly, first with special projects. In that case it was a publication. Then as Employment Chair for the Chapter, then Membership and

Career Counselor, then Nominations Committee, and so on over the years. I was RGC President, 1979 to 1980, and I've held many miscellaneous positions as needed throughout the years.

On the Association level, starting back in 1981-1982, I chaired the first Long-Range Planning Committee for the Association in 1981 and 1982. (George Grinader asked me to do that.) In 1984, I was Chair of the Directory Committee for the Joint Cabinet and upon its completion; I was chair of the Division Cabinet Electronic Mail Committee. Electronic mail was very new back in 1984 and we had to figure out what to do with it and how it was going to impact the Association. In 1986, I was the Chair of the Nominations Committee, which gave me a very interesting insight into the workings of SLA. I served as the Chair of the original DACOLT Committee in 1989-1990. DACOLT, an acronym for the Division and Chapter Officers Leadership Training Committee, was established to teach potential leaders within the Association not only how to be better leaders but, also, as leaders, to know what to expect in the Association. We built a two year curriculum to train new leaders in both Cabinets in the ways and requirements of the Association. I served on the Board of Directors as

a Division Cabinet Chair Elect, and then as the Division

Cabinet Chair, in 1990 to 1992. I chaired a Special

Committee on Non-Serial Publications, such as the SLA

Bulletin, Special Libraries, and other publications of SLA,

in 1992. From 1992 to 2001, I was Chair of the Technical

Standards Committee. It was a long tenure, but it was very

rewarding. I believe that it was because of the work with

the Standards Committee that the Association honored me

with the President's Award. I should mention here that

during my tenure as Chair of the Technical Standards

Committee, I also served as the SLA voting representative

to NISO, the National Information Standards Organization.

I was on the SLA Board of Directors as a Member-at-Large

from 2001 to 2002, and during that entire tenure, served on

the Finance Committee. I consider that Committee that it

gave me the best insight into the activities throughout the

Association of all the committees I have served on in SLA

I was on the Ad Hoc Committee on Committees, 2003 to 2004,

the By-Laws Committee 2004 to 2007, and went on to Chair

the By-Laws Committee in 2005-2006.

I've also been pretty active on the division level. My

home division is the Information Technology Division-ITE,

and I was Division Chair in 1984 and on the ITE Executive
Committee from 1983 to 1989. I actually chaired ITE
Nominations twice, 1985 and 1991. I was a member of the
Networking Committee, an Association-level committee, from
1988 to 1990, and I'm currently the Archivist for both the
Information Technology Division and the Rio Grande Chapter
of SLA.

For the Information Technology Division, I published a
book, through SLA Monographs Series, Private Database
Creation. It was an Association publication that went
through nine printings. All of the royalties from it went
to the ITE Division. I've also presented and taught a lot
of continuing education workshops over the years, and
donated all of the proceeds of the CE workshops to the
Information Technology Division. Both of these helped the
Information Technology Division treasury to grow and allow
the Division to become more flexible.

This year, with colleague Janice Keeler, we formed the
brand-new Taxonomy Division, which began in 2009. I'm
proud to say that I am its first Chair.   I think that
sums it up; there were a few other little things along the
way. When I became a Fellow I helped Convene the meeting,

established a dinner gathering and I hope pushed to get the
Oral History Project moving.

GZ: Boy, I'm glad you do that, Margie, instead of me. But I
guess it really gives an insight into how much the
Association has changed over these past years. I also think
it will show how much it is going to change in the future.

So in thinking about the future, our students and our
newest members, I'd like you to give them some advice about
why you think they should be joining this profession and
consequently this Association.

MH: Well, for people just joining the profession, I would
advise that they be active and engaged. When they are
engaged, it's important that they be engaged both
professionally and intellectually. Those two areas to me,
go hand-in-hand, but a lot of people get involved for just
the doing. They are checking off boxes on their resume.
Much of what we do can be professionally challenging and,
from my point of view, that's the real fun of it.   So,
watch and read the literature so that you can discuss the
trends and the impacts of technology and regulations and
policies on what we do every day. By doing this, you stay

attuned to what's happening with companies and with the people. Obviously, for me, it's what's happening with or to the standards. Staying up-to-date does give you a really good idea of which way things are going - or not. Don't be afraid to try something new, non-traditional stuff. I mean, SLA is really a group of non-traditionalists. We are people who are not in the traditional library setting or in the traditional information setting for that matter. So, push the envelope. Avoid the fads but push the envelope.

GZ: Would you agree that it's very easy to get involved at any level of the Association?

MH: I have found it very easy to get involved at all levels, obviously, but people don't always ask you to do a job. Sometimes there is something you'll see that needs to be done, i.e., the Oral History Project. So, you need to take it on and get people to join you and move forward with it. It was the same thing with the Taxonomy Division. I think we found that there's a big need for that Division, just by getting on board and getting started. People are keenly interested but, still, someone has to take the leadership role, and SLA is very good at empowering people to do just that!

GZ: So some of the most exciting things then for you are where you saw that there was a need and you stepped in and made an attempt.

MH: Absolutely. Absolutely.

GZ: So let's skip back, you mentioned your early career with SLA, so can you tell us how did you get involved with SLA and has it met your expectations?

MH: I was working on a Master's Degree in Botany at the University of New Mexico and was given a graduate student job as an Information Engineer at the NASA Technology Application Center (TAC). I was the only female Information Engineer and, over time, I became the person in charge of all of the Information Engineers. Then, I was the only woman in management at TAC as well. A librarian there named Craig Likness strongly encouraged me to join SLA. He told me that it was the type of Association where I would meet a lot of people that were working in information areas and doing jobs similar to mine. And it was true. I found a very welcoming and supportive group. They were intrigued with what I was doing; I was intrigued with what they were doing. It didn't matter to them that I wasn't working on an MLS or didn't have one because the

Association didn't require a union card (MLS). It was more
about the fact that you were working in an information
area. You were doing library-like things.

The people I met at SLA encouraged me to be active and I
began learning a great deal. It was a very inclusive
group, and they seemed happy to have us.

GZ: Remind us again what was the time -- what was the year.

MH: 1976.

GZ: And so do you think that this early involvement met the
     expectations that you had at the time?

MH: Well, I honestly didn't know quite what to expect, except
     that I didn't have any formal training in information. I
     had worked in libraries. I worked at the University of
     Wisconsin for four years in the Biology Library, and I
     worked in the high school library and was fortunate to get
     a lot of orientation and training from the people who were
     my supervisors there. But, we were cutting new ground with
     the things that TAC did. Working as a NASA installation,
     we were trying to do a lot of technology transfer. I was
     able to search 20 hours a week on the brand-new, cutting-
     edge library market, on online databases, that people were

8

just beginning to bring on board. I became a beta tester for the NASA Recon System, which eventually morphed into what we know today as Dialog, for example. They were really exciting times. It was very heady stuff. There is something I didn't mention when going through my early activities in the information arena. During this time that my involvement with other information professionals and issues originated. I chaired the National Online Circuit, which eventually became the Online Round Table, and later was included as a section within the Information Technology Division. It was exciting and I was learning a lot about the new things going on.

GZ: And there still are. Can you tell us about what some of the major issues were that SLA was involved in and what your role was in those issues?

MH: You know, I read that on the question sheet and that's a hard one to answer. There are the association/organiza- tional kinds of issues. I served the Association during interesting times under four Executive Directors. So there was David Bender, who, of course, had the longest tenure; Lynn Smith, who served in an interim position, then Rebecca Schafer and now Janice LaChance. Each of them has a very different style and because we, as an Association, adjusted

to them and they adjusted to us. Each surfaced a different
range of organizational issues. Because there are so many
changes in technology that have happened over the life of
my association interaction -- we first had mostly books and
journals and then we had online services primarily from the
secondary publishers, and then we had CD-ROMs, and then we
had electronic journals and along the way we had XML and
ASCII and the Internet -- all of these have had very
profound effects on the profession and on what we do in our
daily lives. It's meant that there have been opportunities
for SLA, some of them championed and some of them missed,
as we went forward. I remember there was a time when we
(SLA) were discussing whether we should merge with ASIST,
the American Society for Information Science and
Technology, and we did not. I think it would be a very
different organization today if we had merged. The Society
for Competitive Information Professionals split off and
went another way. We saw the rise of a whole new industry
with online and SLA's Online Section was parked under the
Information Technology Division and did not grow there. It
presented a strong entrepreneurial opportunity to the folks
at Information Today who made an entire business out of all
of those things in which SLA was not too interested.

But, we've had some other challenges. For instance, in the 80s, a lot of organizations were closing libraries because they were viewed solely as an operating expense. Their reasoning was the library was an expense so just dump it. We (SLA) fought back by proving the ROI of libraries and did that actually pretty effectively. Today, we have the "dump-the- library-because-we-have-the-Internet" approach. I think we must approach that movement very differently. That's a very different threat than the one that we faced before.

So, some of us are still fighting the battles that we fought in the 80s, but I think the battleground is different, now. Some libraries tend to think of themselves as a persecuted, underappreciated group. The front has changed. I think that we have found some profound differences in the outlook and approach needed to reframe the library role. Many members have metamorphosed into business intelligence, knowledge managers or data mining, for example, but these are just new buzz words for existing skills. Our focus has just changed over time and rightly so.

Many librarians I've talked to were really not too interested in taking Cataloging and Classification in

school. If they could avoid that class, they did. But if you look at what taxonomies do and information architecture and all the related skills and capabilities, those are the skills in which librarians are very strong. Now, we have a Taxonomy Division. They're hot at the moment. I think a new trend will come along very soon. I think that the reference interview is incredibly crucial to successfully finding business intelligence. It's just casting ourselves differently with whatever the situation is for the moment, and, we have to constantly redefine our role.

As for my own business, I used to do a 10-year plan, a limited project plan, and then a three-year plan, and now I'm lucky if a plan lasts me 18 months. Like other members of my profession we need to constantly redefine ourselves and keep up with what is happening in technology and the marketplace.

GZ: It just lets me see how fast things are changing in information technology. We all have to face that. So that sort of leads us to the next thing. So what rationale would you give for professionals who are thinking about joining an organization? Why should they join SLA?

MH: Well, people have lots of different reasons for joining, obviously. I think they may join to get involved. They may join to learn. Traditionally, associations and societies do really well in recessionary times because people are looking for networking and learning how to do new things on the job and learning for continuing education. They might join just to get a job and that's probably not the best reason. Joining to network and to stay attuned to the trends and standards and issues and threats within an industry, that's a really strong reason to join an association. Also, to hear other ideas, regardless of whether you hear them around coffee or at a reception or in a plenary session. Those are the kinds of things that you can implement in your own workplace. You get new and cutting-edge kinds of ideas. I really think that the more active you are, the more you will get out of your membership. So, if you just join and sit in the back and attend the sessions, then you're not going to get much out of your involvement. I also think that being active helps sustain the organization, which gives back to you. You get more than you give if you're active. I would recommend people not do it just for the recognition or because it looks good on their résumé. I've heard an increasing number of people say, 'Oh, I want to do X

because it will look good on my résumé'. If that's the

only reason you're doing it, your involvement will quickly

become suspect by your colleagues. But, you *can* tailor

your involvement to your needs, and I think that's the best

reason to be involved.

GZ: What's the most important thing that SLA has done, or

putting it another way, what are the most important changes

that you've seen at the Association?

MH: I think I referred to it earlier in that there have been a

lot of changes in focus over the years. Some of them lost

opportunities; some of them things that have helped us a

lot. SLA, to me, is a special group of non-traditional

libraries. It was not traditional when I joined it, and

then sometime later, it swung toward kind of an ALA-wannabe

organization. It has swung back from that now to be more of

a special and inclusive group. What I mean is, there are

people who are perhaps peripheral to us. We might look

like a VENN diagram, because we've got the information

architecture people and the Web people and the competitive

intelligence people. We need to look outward at the

profession, and the way it's changing, and not inward.

Historically, we have a tendency to look inward and we need

to look outward at what's going on in the world of

information in general. That way we'll have a better focus

14

on where we need to be. There's been a great deal of focus

lately on the name change, and I think that now we need to

focus on where the profession is going and what we can do

for it.

GZ: And how can we do that?

MH: There are a number of ways. We (the Association) are very

rich in entrepreneurial spirit within the membership.

There are many members who are doing that kind of thing.

Traditionally, librarians are fairly low-risk and high

security. (This is stereotypic but, forgive me, as I count

myself as one of us.) I think they are personally

conservative but they are, generally and socially, fairly

liberal. So those who are consulting or the vendors or the

entrepreneurs or the businesses have often been on the

periphery. The vendors are accepted now as "real" members.

SLA even has an incoming president in the next year who is

a vendor. Personally, I think that's incredibly good for

SLA. But I can remember a time when vendors were not

treated well. They were considered outsiders and targets.

It was okay to get money from vendors, but there wasn't

much respect for them. The vendors are a huge membership

market for us. They are the people who really do a lot of

market studies to figure out where things are headed. I

think embracing them as we have been for the last few

years, at least at the national level, is a really good thing. It's still hard for me, not at my chapter level, but Association level, I think, to be embraced as an equal. It's self-defeating for members to think that because somebody is the employee of a corporation, they're better than somebody who employs people. It's a very weird orientation that many SLA members have and I think we need to get over that. I think we're headed the right direction. I think we're thinking about rehabilitation or promotion of the skill sets that we bring, in showing how flexible they are and how they can apply in different markets, and how we can bend with the needs of the marketplace. We'll be very strong with SLA.

GZ: So are there things that you think SLA should have done, you would have liked SLA to do, and that they've not done the way you thought it should be done?

MH: Yes. Well, I think I said that already. SLA sometimes missed the market. Primarily because they were navel-gazing instead of looking outward.

GZ: Now, I know you've been involved in many other organizations, so just kind of tell me overall how the

participation in a professional organization of any kind
influenced your career.

MH: It changed my career direction. When I went to those
initial Rio Grande Chapter meetings, I was working on a
Master's in botany. My thesis topic was the re-vegetation
of mine dumps, particularly at the Chino Copper Pit in
Silver City, New Mexico. And had I not gotten involved in
the combination of the job that I had at TAC and the Rio
Grande Chapter, I would probably be doing something very
different today. I mean, I've moved -- I like to think --
from an up-and-coming botanist to information professional.

GZ: It's interesting how those things come together and can
really change your life and your attitude and a lot of it
just depends on the people that you meet. So, getting into
that, we'll just ride into these questions about people.
You certainly have known a lot of the members of the
Association. Can you talk about a few of the people who
really influenced you in your roles at SLA and your career?

MH: Well, the first one I already mentioned, which was Craig
Likness. He moved on to other things in the library field,
principally in Texas, but his influence in bringing me on
board in SLA was profound. Then the members of the RG
Chapter, all of whom are very supportive. When I became

Chapter President, there was kind of a brat pack of other

SLA people who were baby boomers, leading edge of the baby

boomers, like me, that I met. Well, they're all still

friends of mine. Locally Gloria Zamora and Teresa

Connaughton. They were a good cadre to travel with. And

they included Jim Tchobanoff, Nolan Pope, Kurt Keeley, Jane

Dysart, to name a few. I also was fortunate because of

what I was doing to have another person who worked with me

at TAC, who is, and has been, my business partner for the

last 32 years, Jay Ven Eman, who has been very supportive

of my activity. Jay has a Doctorate in Organization

Effectiveness and Long-Range Planning. That certainly

helped us as a firm. Not all firms last this long (32 years

so far) but because of the help and mentorship that I

received from Jay, ours has. There were also a number of

people who were active in, initially, the online business

who were very helpful and supportive. People like Roger

Summit, Gene Garfield, Dan Wilde, for example, who were

very, very supportive, and taught me a lot, I learned a

tremendous amount from them, and they actually formed an

Advisory Board for a time for our company. And then within

the industry, I would say Buzzy Basch, Tom Hogan, Roger

Bilbo, have been very, very influential for me. Of course,

I looked up to some of the early people who were very

active in the Association, like Jo Ann Clifton, Frank

Spaulding, and others. They were fun to watch, and I could

pattern some of my interaction after things that they did

to help the Association.

GZ: It's a walk down memory lane for the two of us I think.

And I think -- you probably answered this -- but many of

these people, I think you would consider adept thinkers and

innovators in SLA.

MH: Yes.

GZ: Are there others, or would you like to further comment on

some of these people in that role of thinkers and

innovators?

MH: Well, on the information science side, there's quite a long

list that I came up with, for thinkers and innovators who

have brought our business to where it is today. They're

probably not everybody's list, but my list would include

Roger Summit and Gene Garfield (already mentioned) Carlos

Cuadra, who was a deep and perceptive thinker José-Marie

Griffiths, and Don King. Some of the librarians that I was

particularly impressed with were Calla Ann Pepmueller. The

things she and her team achieved at Sandia National Lab.

Also, Mimi Drake, and the things she accomplished at

Georgia Tech. There's a group of folks that includes Alvin

Weinberg and the work he did with COSATI (Committee on Scientific and Technical Information in 1964. Recently, there are Cliff Lynch, Gerry Salton with his SMART mapping, and Jean Aitchison and what she did with taxonomies. Dan Wilde has always been a great sounding board for me, as have Buzzy Basch, Tom Hogan, Steve Arnold, and Morry Goldstein. I have been very fortunate with the many people who have influenced me, mentored me. If you look at the varying roles played over the years, I'm sure the list is much longer. They've been incredibly helpful and challenging to my thought process.

GZ: Well, we talked a lot about people and we talked about where your career has gone. So let's turn to the future. I'd like to really find out where you think this profession is heading.

MH: Where is it heading? Well, I think we really need to be a more flexible and inclusive organization. The L word (library), as it's sometimes known, is quite OK with me, but the understanding of how people work outside the library is crucial and not so well understood. If you look at the number of job titles that are held by information people, they represent the diversity of application of this skill set. Other job titles should be okay, you know, can

we embrace database administrators or would we be willing
to have information scientists in our midst.) So, I think
being concerned about what we do is very important.

We, as a profession, have a similar problem as the new and
old media and/or change. So what are newspapers or
magazines going to do to survive? If the trend is to 'just
Google it', then why do I need publications or why do I
need a librarian? I believe the answer lies in the skill
sets that we have, because we believe in them and we use
them. World knowledge is supposedly being organized by
Google, but in fact, we have as big or bigger information
avalanche now as we had several times in the past. In the
1890s, it was so important and so difficult that Dewey and
Cutter invented classification systems to organize books.
Then in World War I, we had so many little pieces of
information in many languages, that a lot of the sci-tech
aggregators were formed, like Chemical Abstracts for
example, to try to organize and gather that information.
And we had another big round in World War II, but
particularly so after the Cold War. After the Russians
sent up Sputnik, the Council on Scientific and Technical
Information was convened by Alvin Weinberg, whom I've
already listed as one my heroes. He convened that group

and out of it came an incredible amount of really good thinking and the pillars of what we are still implementing today. So the search systems, the basic methodologies for the Recons -- NASA, ESA and DOE Recon -- and the Dialog and SDC Orbit systems, BRS, Elhill (the basis of NLM Medline search), all of these systems had their genesis in that era, and they've made an incredible difference in what we're doing now. So, now, we are on the cusp, again, of helping people find and retrieve nuggets of information from big diverse collections of data. We haven't quite figured out yet what the best method will be, but it's a potentially very big competitive advantage for the SLA and its membership. I think that we are on the verge of another step forward, and I don't think Google is that answer. I think Google has been a great public relations machine in pinpointing the problems. SLA can take the lead in helping people find the solutions.

GZ: So you don't think we've ceded too much to the IT profession?

MH: I don't. I think we should embrace them.

GZ: So what can SLA do and how do we have to change to meet the challenges and what can we offer to our membership?

MH: I think the answer has to do with our skill and orientation set. I mean, we all follow a fairly common orientation to how we approach information. The pace is accelerated. We are living in real time computing and we need to start thinking in real time. We need to think in terms of what the implications are, both technological and financial. We don't always pay good attention to the cost. In fact, library schools only teach the expense side of a budget. They don't teach the income side of a budget, so we're taught to spend but we're not taught to make or earn money, which, I think, is absolutely criminal on the library school level. We have this huge amount of information, but we don't have people really skilled at vetting the quality of that information or the quality of the content. Who's going to judge it? I mean, I think the whole Iraqi War is an information breakdown. The decision makers got bad information. I've been to Russia 19 times; I can tell you that our information on Russia during the Cold War was also faulty. When I was over there and working in 1988, I thought, "God, we were afraid of these guys". I mean, it was just amazing to me the information delivery failure and the lack of ability to vet that information. We can, as a group, be known as the trustworthy source! People should learn to trust the SLA brand -- I'm an SLA member, trust my

brand. We can tell you where to go for a reliable source of information. I think that would go a long way. Google news is automatically generated. There's no vetting of that news or Yahoo news. It's the same thing with blogs. How do you trust that brand? We can become a trusted source. I think that's a huge advantage for us.

GZ: How come we haven't done that in 100 years?

MH: I think we have done that intermittently. I think we just don't think of ourselves as leaders and the trustable brand. We think of ourselves as underpaid and underappreciated. We do a salary survey but we never do PR for the profession. We are also, I suspect, still adjusting to the volume of resources. But, we're also not backing up and backing off long enough to look at the trends of the industry direction. Further, we haven't taken the time to do a long-range assessment of where the industry is going and where we fit. And I think -- and this is just off the top of my head, of course -- but I think one of the places we fit, whether we're in a corporation or an academic environment or somewhere else is as a trusted source.

GZ: We need to do less defending of what we do and more promoting of how good we are.

MH: Right. If you keep telling me that you aren't really

equal, after a while I'm going to believe you. So don't

tell me that anymore. Assume the sale! Empower yourself.

Think more about the substance of you and what you provide

and do less navel-gazing.

GZ: So what do you think are the most important skills and the

comparable ones that information people, knowledge

managers, will need as they move on in the future?

MH: Well, if I look at it just from my own point of view, and

building on that skill set I just covered, I try to

practice what I preach. I keep up with the trends, both

the technological ones and the business trends. And then I

want to see what actually works. So, I'm going to test it.

I'm not just going to believe what I read. I read an

article yesterday about the snake oil salesmen for social

networking and I think there's a lot to that. Social

networking is what, a year, two years old, and suddenly we

have industry experts. How do you become an expert in one

year? I mean, this is -- there's a bit of snake oil in all

of this. I think you have to test it. You have to work

with the standards and then with the early implementers,

the early adopters of new technology and standards. One of

the fun things about standards for me is that those are

people trying to look at where is this technology going and
what are -- what are the tests we're going to have against
this prototype or this guideline. It gives you real insight
into where things will be three years from now after the
standards process is complete. We have some early
implementers and then we have early adopters and then we
have a rollout to the whole -- to the industry at large.
And a lot of them fail. There are a few, I think, that are
on their way to failure now. For example, topic maps were
a big deal for a while, and you don't find anyone who has
implemented a topic map. But the genesis that was there
has been repositioned into other and newer technologies.
There's a lot of that happening and it's a good way to keep
an eye on what we're doing and where we are going.

GZ: Well, let's look back a little bit. So would you join this
      profession again? If you were starting all over again now,
      knowing where we are right now, do you think SLA is, as you
      put it, a brand that you can embrace?

MH: You know, I honestly don't know. I had a coalition of, or
      rather, a coalescence of several things. The re-vegetation
      of mine tailing dumps and the files from hard rock mining
      remain interesting to me. Had I not had that job and had I
      not been introduced to SLA and that wonderful group of

supportive people, I can't say where I would have ended up. It was definitely a crossroads. But what I can say is that it's a wholesome profession. It's a wonderful group of people. It has a good image. I love what I do. It's really challenging work. It's unfortunate that it's frequently an impoverished profession at the bottom of the heap, below even R&D in terms of cutbacks. And so I think we really need to raise the image of the profession. We need to be inclusive, not exclusive. I'm not unhappy with the decision I made. I'm happy to be here and I'm happy to be active in SLA.

GZ: So knowing what you know now, what would you do differently? And we're talking about your education and job choices. A lot of it was what came together at the time and where you were, which influences many things that we do. But are there things that you would do differently in your information career?

MH: Well, it wouldn't be so bad to have taken a more lucrative direction I suppose, though I'm certainly comfortable so I can't complain about that. It's a fun area to be in and every job that we undertake is a new puzzle, and so it's always been challenging and I'm happy -- happy to be part of it.

27

GZ: Great. So what didn't I ask you that you were dying to tell me? Something you had a burning desire to share in this oral history that will not be retained forever, for people to read in posterity. So tell me what you think?

MH: Well, I've already probably hinted at the things that I'd like to get across. What advice would I give to SLA itself? That's assuming they would take it, which is not always the case. If you asked me that, then I would say that we need to raise the image. We really need to push to raise the image and, like I said earlier, we can't be defensive. We know that we do things very well and that the things we do are important. We're just not very good at translating the passion that we bring to the field into a more public image. We're good at what we do and companies that use our skills make better decisions and they're more profitable. At the Association level, we should be more open and inclusive. We don't need to have a secret handshake or password or a union card to be part of the membership. We are NOT ALA – let's make that clear. We need to embrace other forms of accomplishment within what I consider to be the Information Industry. It's not a bad thing to recruit from information technology, the IT professionals, for example, or Web professionals. They know how to make a computer work; how to make a Web site look

attractive, but delivering content is what those things are for. We know content. We understand how to get at it. We understand how to judge it. We know what the standards are, and we deal with them all the time. It's just second nature to us. And if we can learn to work hand-in-hand with those folks, then I think we're all better off. And, I guess, to members I would say that I think there's a need for balance and compromise. Some people get pretty passionate or wigged out, depending on how you think about it, and they take themselves and the professional bit too seriously when, really, they need to be more welcoming. You can be serious and move forward and get things done, but we don't want to be so serious that we are afraid we'll not be able to perform. This results in paralysis and inertia and nothing happens. So I think if we focus on what we know and why we're important, that will carry us a long way.

GZ: What are your plans for the future?

MH: Well, for example, people ask me if I'm going to retire. No, probably not. My dad didn't. I like what I'm doing so I'll probably just keep on doing this information stuff until my toes drop off someplace.

GZ: Well, Margie this has been a wonderful opportunity for me. You and I have known each other for many, many years, more than we probably want to remember, but I do appreciate your time and I appreciate all you've done for SLA also.

MH: My pleasure. And I just want the tape to know that Gloria followed me as president of the chapter in 1980 and then she followed my daughter, Heather, as president of the chapter and my granddaughter is now five, and so I think we can look forward....

GZ: I am not following the granddaughter.

MH: Thanks, Gloria.

GZ: Thank you.

END OF INTERVIEW