

[« Police Taser Student in UCLA Library](#) | [Main](#) | [Graphic Novels for Teenage Girls](#) »

Delete Library 2.0 from Wikipedia?

The [Library 2.0 entry in Wikipedia](#) is being considered for deletion. Please feel free to add your thoughts on this at [the article's entry](#) on the Articles for Deletion Page.

Some of the comments:

- *Yet Another Web Neologism. From the article: The term "Library 2.0" was coined by Michael Casey on his blog. Says it all, really. A neologism coined by a blogger and used by bloggers, not notable.*
- *I'm unfamiliar with this topic, but looking at the extensive references the term "Library 2.0" appears in the title of articles in both Library Journal and School Library Journal (among the other web or blog references) and appears to be a known academic concept, not a neologism. I'd say this should be kept unless proof of a lack of notability could be shown, or other proof that this is some sort of odd fringe concept. Notability isn't based on where a term originates, but where it ends up.*
- *From what I can see, the term is used only in Library-related publications, and on the web.*
- *You mean only the experts on libraries use the term? Then it must be useless, of course.*
- *I never liked "Web 2.0" and "Library 2.0" is even worse. However, the term has quite a bit of traction in publications already, and I won't support the deletion of an article just because I find its name silly, the concept fuzzy, or its origin too bloggy. We should have a decent article about this.*
- *This looks like a well-referenced article demonstrating that the term is in use among library professionals. If there are any actual problems with the article, the nominator has not explained what they are.*

[edit - 11/24/06 10:30AM Additional entries added below]

- *This entry should be kept as it has garnered so much attention, not only in the library community. Students are writing papers on it, library schools are dedicating full semester classes to it, entire conferences are built around it, and the theories are well grounded. It's very real, the subject of much discussion, and should stay in Wikipedia.*
- *This entry should be kept! The term has been used for over a year in the library community. It has been morphing into a description of new ways to think in the library community - different ways of putting the customer first, new ways of serving a library's community, and new ways to even think about librarians and training. Also - if this term is removed, I'd say that Office 2.0, another wikipedia entry, should be removed too - since they're both offshoots of the term web 2.0.*
- *While "Library 2.0" began as a bloggy term, its recent popularity in the field of Library Science has helped clarify its meaning and now has an academic "life of its own." This is an incredibly useful concept for those trying to communicate the changes in library technology. Is the name silly? Sure, but so is the Klingon language. Is the concept fuzzy? A little, but Wittgenstein made part of his career clarifying concepts such as "family resemblance" and this is no different. It's origin may be bloggy, but how is this different from the origin of many words from other technologies? It's not just a bloggy term anymore. I don't think the "origin police" should go after concepts solely because of a less-than-high-falutin origin.*

[Article discussion page here.](#)

Posted by Michael on November 24, 2006 07:19 AM | [Permalink](#)

I'm on your side on this one (and have already added my comment to the "delete page"). I may not be wild about some uses of the term, but it's absolutely gained prominence and proven useful as an umbrella. Maybe librarians aren't geeky enough for Wikipedians?

Posted by: [walt crawford](#) | [November 24, 2006 11:27 AM](#)

→ Post a comment

(If you haven't left a comment here before, you may need to be approved by the site owner before your comment will appear. Until then, it won't appear on the entry. Thanks for waiting.)

Name:

Email Address:

URL:

☐ Remember personal info?

Comments: (you may use HTML tags for style)

Preview

Post