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Abstract:
This paper is an introduction to progressive librarianship (also known in North America as socially responsible librarianship, activist librarianship, and radical librarianship, and in Europe as critical librarianship). Progressive librarianship is contextualized within a broad international movement, with an emphasis on the United States (U.S.) cultural perspective. Concrete examples are given to show how progressive librarianship deals with select intercultural problems in the U.S., such as international relations and public forum. Special attention is given to the role of the Internet in the rise of progressive library discourse.

Agenda:
Introduction
Chronological Formation of Key Progressive Library Groups Around the World
Method
Research Base
Significance
Historical Roots of Progressive Librarianship in the U.S.
Vehicles of Discourse: First Wave (Select Chronology of U.S. Print Titles)
Vehicles of Discourse: Second Wave (Alphabetical List of Internet Resources)
Internet and Library Movement
Conceptual Framework for Progressive Librarianship
Defining Characteristics and Intent of Progressive Librarianship
Progressive Library Influence
Closing Comments
Author’s Note
Acknowledgements

Author:
Prof. Toni Samek:
• University of Alberta, School of Library & Information Studies, 3-15 Rutherford South, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J4
• 780 492-0179, toni.samek@ualberta.ca, http://www.ualberta.ca/~asamek/toni.htm
Librarians have a choice between an instrumental view of their profession or principled engagement. Colin Darch

Introduction
Unlike “native on-line movements (e.g., the Electronic Frontiers Foundation),” the progressive library movement is a “pre-existing” movement that has taken its agenda to the Internet where it can organize and coordinate, be open and participatory, and tap into the online potential for persuasion and consensus building.¹

Progressive librarianship (also known in North America as socially responsible librarianship, activist librarianship, and radical librarianship, and in Europe as critical librarianship) has a tradition that dates from the late 1930s in the United States (U.S.). Dating back to 1939, with the introduction of the Progressive Librarians’ Council Bulletin, progressive librarianship has produced its own vehicles of discourse with a network base in Argentina, Austria, Germany, Mexico, South Africa, Sweden, the U.K., and the U.S. This discourse gained significant momentum in the late 1960s/early 1970s in the U.S. and elsewhere in the 1980s. In the last decade, the decentralized and multidirectional technology and communications infrastructure of the Internet has greatly enhanced relationship building, grassroots democratic organizing, and the development of “new citizenship groups” around the discourse and practice of progressive librarianship.²

Chronological Formation of Key Progressive Library Groups Around the World

1939 Progressive Librarians’ Guild (PLG), U.S.

1969 Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) of the American Library Association (ALA), U.S.; Bibliotek i Samhälle (BIS), Sweden

1983 Arbeitskreis kritischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare (KRIBIBI), Austria

1988 Arbeitskreis kritischer BibliothekarInnen (AKRIBIE), Germany

1990 Progressive Librarians Guild (PLG), U.S.; Library and Information Workers Organization (LIWO), South Africa

1994 Information for Social Change (ISC), U.K.

1997 Social Responsibilities Discussion Group of International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), International

2000 Círculo de Estudios sobre Bibliotecología Política y Social (CEBI) -- International; Study Circle on Political and Social Librarianship, Mexico

2001 Progressive Librarians’s International Coalition

2007 Grupo de Estudios Sociales en Bibliotecología y Documentación (GESBI) -- Social Studies Group on Librarianship and Documentation, Argentina

Despite a progressive library movement that has been building for decades, scant scholarship has been produced on the subject. As Al Kagan noted in 2001, “There is a proud but sometimes hidden tradition of progressive librarianship in the United States” [and elsewhere].³ Colin Darch went so far as to say that the progressive library movement proudly reclaims the library tradition that “we see in the writings and in the practice of such largely forgotten figures as the Danish librarian Thomas Doessing (1882-1947), the American John Cotton Dana (1856-1929), or the Briton Ernest A. Savage (author of A librarian looks at readers).” This “brand of library leaders” promoted variety in collections, all points of view, and democratic culture -- hallmarks of progressive library discourse.³ Lack of intellectual curiosity for this library discourse has contributed to marginalization within its own institutional and cultural context. The intention of this paper is threefold: (1) To disseminate key elements of the author’s recent unpublished original work on progressive librarianship and the Internet. (2) To promote dialogue about progressive librarianship. (3) To spark interest in foundational scholarship on progressive librarianship.

Method
The author’s conceptual historical research is shaped by exploration of the following topics related to the development, discourse, practice, and impact of progressive librarianship:

- Historical roots of progressive librarianship.
- Conceptual framework for progressive librarianship.
- Defining characteristics of progressive librarianship.
- Intent of progressive librarianship.
Participants in progressive librarianship.
Vehicles of discourse for progressive librarianship, with special emphasis on the Internet.
The question of to what extent progressive librarianship has influenced library policy and practice, and the larger environment, with special emphasis on intercultural contexts.

Research Base
While there is little scholarship on progressive librarianship, a vast research base exists. The intellectual content of this paper is built on a diversity of material (with a heavy concentration on English language), including:

- ALA archival materials, such as paper petitions and manifestos.
- Autobiography and biography.
- Conference presentations, workshops, and study group resources.
- Historical, theoretical, and foundational works from within and without LIS.
- LIS association rhetoric and policy.
- Websites.
- Weblogs.
- Listserv postings, such as open letters of protest posted on the Internet.
- Bibliographies, reviewing sources, reference works, and awards.

Significance
The importance of this work is to: help understand library citizenship and agency, and the democratizing potential of the Internet therein; help understand diversity and contestation within LIS; help understand the importance of history in librarianship’s development; explore moral understanding in the context of LIS; provide identity to progressive librarianship; and identify the origin, development, and influence of progressive library ideas and concepts.

Historical Roots of Progressive Librarianship in the U.S.
“Taking sides on whether or not the profession is neutral is a debate about the nature and ideology of librarianship.” Despite the dominant view that librarianship is a neutral profession, Colin Darch has observed, “librarians have always been politically engaged, despite themselves.” Historically, progressive librarianship has been a key site of this engagement.

Progressive library discourse is rooted in the 1930s progressive library movement in the U.S., when library activists of the 1930s pressured the ALA to be more responsive to issues put forth by young members involved in such issues as peace, segregation, library unions, and intellectual freedom. By 1940, a new group called the Progressive Librarians' Council emerged in order to provide a united voice for librarians who sought change in the association. By the end of its first year, the Progressive Librarians' Council had 235 members. Many were involved with ALA's Staff Organizations Round Table, formed in 1936, and Library Unions Round Table, formed in 1940. In addition, the Progressive Librarians' Council Bulletin provided a forum for activities on behalf of freedom of expression. The Bulletin printed outspoken opinions "not tolerated" by the traditional communication organs - Library Journal, Wilson Library Bulletin and ALA Bulletin. Eventually, after ALA's Staff Organizations Round Table and Library Unions Round Table gained momentum and the number of round tables in general increased, the Progressive Librarians' Council disbanded.

Increased ALA responsiveness to its membership was a central issue for activist librarians in the 1930s and again in the 1960s. While comparing radical librarians of the 1930s with the rebels of the 1960s, library educator and scholar Jesse Shera noted that "the actors are different, but the script is much the same." The nature of library activism of the 1930s mirrors the 1960s in a number of ways: (1) activists called for ALA to operate democratically; (2) criticized the homogeneity of the professional discourse; and (3) paid attention to the needs of the librarian, not just of the institution.

Like progressive library discourse, American library rhetoric on intellectual freedom also dates back to the 1930s. Starting in the late 1960s, however, advocates of an alternative library culture based on the concept of library social responsibility, that included the librarian’s right to freedom of
expression, lobbied the ALA to extend the concept of intellectual freedom to include library practitioners as well as library users. For example, these alternative library culture advocates believed that while, as professionals, librarians have “the responsibility for the development and maintenance of intellectual freedom,” as citizens, librarians have the fundamental right to freedom of expression (e.g. library employee freedom of speech in the workplace on professional and policy issues and freedom of the library press).11

Progressive librarianship is inextricably linked to the concept of intellectual freedom and the more “universal” concept of human rights. But as Al Kagan wrote in the context of the ALA Intellectual Freedoms Committee’s opposition to an international boycott of an apartheid regime, “many intellectual freedom supporters do not appear to recognize that all human and political rights, including intellectual freedom, are constantly impacting on each other and as a consequence none are absolute.”12 Indeed, progressive library discourse is a site of contestation for various stakeholders in the dominant culture of the profession, because it challenges librarianship to re-conceptualize the traditional ethic of intellectual freedom.

In the context of contemporary American librarianship, the phrase intellectual freedom is widely understood to mean “the right of every individual to both seek and receive information from all points of view without restriction.” Intellectual freedom “provides for free access to all expressions of ideas through which any and all sides of a question, cause or movement may be explored” and “encompasses the freedom to hold, receive and disseminate ideas.”13 Traditionally, this interpretation of intellectual freedom has been applied to libraries’ public(s).

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, when social protest movements in larger society were mirrored in American librarianship, progressive library discourse flourished against the backdrop of the urgent politics and culture of “Sixties” society. While the nation was divided by deep philosophical debates over the Vietnam War, librarians themselves were arguing over library neutrality, the personal versus the professional, the librarian versus the institution, all in the context of profound social issues such as war and peace, racism, and sexism. The arrival of the social responsibility movement in librarianship, marked by such events as the formation in ALA of a Round Table on the Social Responsibilities of Libraries in 1969 and the Black Caucus of ALA in 1970, signified a new library era. Meanwhile, the very notion of library culture was transforming -- so was the library press.

A one-page entry titled “The Library Free Press,” published in Booklegger Magazine in 1974 noted that “Our profession has finally birthed its own alternative press, with the voice of change publishing ideas, hopes, demands. There are at least five totally independent, adventurous library mags. [Booklegger Magazine, Emergency Librarian, Sipapu, The Unabashed Librarian: A Letter for Innovators, and The Young Adult Alternative Newsletter.] They are not slick with ad money and please-everybody. They are home-grown, in touch, labors of love. Staffs are paid in freedom of expression and its warm response.”14

These new alternative library titles were “a political use”15 of print culture because they were intended to foster a “universe of discourse.”16 For example, they allowed progressive librarians, “and implicitly, though indirectly,” librarianship, “to debate the burning issues of the day,” to “define and promote shared meanings,” and to encourage freedom of expression.17 Perhaps the single-most influential print “index” to the new library culture is a book titled Revolting Librarians, published by Booklegger Press in 1972.18

Edited by Celeste West and Elizabeth Katz, the daring anthology took the field by storm with its diverse collection of library workers’ uncensored voices on topics such as the librarians’ image, library schools and education, professionalism, mainstream bias and representation in Library of Congress subject headings, undemocratic library work practices, paraprofessional issues, homophobia, alternative libraries, alternative education, young adult services, libraries for migrant workers, and the library press. Revolting Librarians “sold 15,000 copies in about three years with virtually no promotion.”19 Despite the “underground smash,” however, life above ground was mostly business as usual.20

Print culture scholar Rudolph J. Vecoli asserted that “rather than simply serving as transmitters of information, communication media” are “forces actively constructing social reality and identity in the minds of their audiences.”21 Based on Antonio Gramsci’s concept of ideological hegemony, Vecoli noted that, “communication is viewed as the means whereby the ruling element manufactures and secures consensus to its view of the world among subaltern groups. Since such hegemonic conceptions are subject to challenges by oppositional views, the
media become the site of ideological contestation of a struggle over meaning.\textsuperscript{22} Contributions to Revolting Librarians (e.g., essays, articles, poems, fictional stories, and fables) were aimed at library administrators and managers, not just workers. Indeed, a key purpose of the book was to “oppose the influence of the dominant culture” of librarianship and its publications -- “that is, to subvert the hegemony.”\textsuperscript{23}

In 1972, ALA was the world’s oldest and largest national library association and its complex structure and slow pace presented an impediment to anyone who wanted quick action.\textsuperscript{24} Following two quieter decades, however, progressive library discourse gained a new momentum sparked by the many social, cultural, political, legal, economic, and philosophical issues introduced by an emergent digital and global society in the 1990s.

Today, in general, progressive library discourse reflects the divergent voices on the margins of librarianship (both in the U.S. and elsewhere), “both inside and outside of the ‘official’ library organizations,”\textsuperscript{25} that question the absolutism of the library ethic of intellectual freedom. These (primarily leftist) voices generally concur that the core value of library neutrality (on which the ethic of intellectual freedom is based) is unrealistic in the context of library practice. In particular, however, these voices have represented a range of viewpoints on a continuum that spans from an anarchist stance to varying degrees of a social responsibility perspective. The Progressive Librarians Guild, “the (self-styled) ‘left-wing’ of SRRT,”\textsuperscript{26} for example, defines its purpose as follows:

Progressive Librarians Guild [PLG], an affiliate organization of the Social Responsibilities Round Table of the American Library Association, was formed in January 1990 by a group of librarians concerned with our profession’s rapid drift into dubious alliances with business and the information industry, and into complacent acceptance of service to the political, economic and cultural status quo … Current trends in librarianship assert that the library is merely a neutral mediator in the information marketplace and a facilitator of a value-neutral information society. Members of PLG do not accept this notion of neutrality, and we strongly oppose the commodification of information. We will help to dissect the implications of these powerful trends, and fight their anti-democratic tendency.\textsuperscript{27}

Progressive library discourse is shaped through a variety of communication media. In the U.S. alone, for example, vehicles of discourse include alternative monographs (e.g., Zoia! Memoirs of Zoia Horn, Battler for the People’s Right to Know), monographic series (e.g., Alternative Library Literature), publishers (e.g., CRISIS Press), journals (e.g., Progressive Librarian: A Journal for Critical Studies & Progressive Politics in Librarianship), websites (e.g., Anarchist Librarians Web), news digests (e.g., Library Juice), newsletters (e.g., Social Responsibilities Round Table of the American Library Association Newsletter), and listservs (e.g., PLGNET-L). These media are the descendants of the original pioneers (the first wave) of alternative library press outlined below.

**Vehicles of Discourse: First Wave**

(Select Chronology of U.S. Print Titles)

Forerunner 1939 Progressive Librarians’ Council Bulletin

1967-1973 Synergy

1969 *Bis : Utgiven av föreningen Bibliotek i Samhälle

1969-1975 Liberated Librarian’s Newsletter

1969-1979 Women Library Workers--continued as WLW Journal until 1994

NON-LIS BUT INCLUDED FOR HISTORICAL CONTEXT 1970- Alternative Press Index

1970-1995 Sipapu

1970- Women in Libraries

1970 Top Secret

1971 Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People

1971-1980 Alternatives in Print

1971- Unabashed Librarian

1972 Revolting Librarians

1972-1980 Current Awareness-Library Literature

1973-1976 Booklegger Magazine

1973-1979 Young Adult Alternative Newsletter

1973-1998 *Emergency Librarian--continued as Teacher Librarian (1998-)

1975 The living Z : A Guide to the Literature of the Counter Culture, the Alternative Press, and Little Magazines

1977 On Equal Terms: A Thesaurus for Nonexist Indexing and Cataloging

1977-1978 Collectors’ Network News

1978- VOYA, Voice of Youth Advocates


1980- Feminist Collections

1982 Alternative Materials in Libraries

1984- Alternative Library Literature

1985- Social Change and Information Systems

1990- Progressive Librarian

1990-? *LIWOlet: Newsletter of the Library and Information Workers Organisation of Natal

1993- Librarians at Liberty

1994- *Information for Social Change

1994- Alternative Publishers of Books in North America

1995 Zoia! Memoirs of Zoia Horn, Battler for the People’s Right to Know


1997- Counterpoise: For Social Responsibilities, Liberty and Dissent

1998 Poor People and Library Services

1998- *HERMÉS: revue critique

2003 Dismantling the Public Sphere: Situating and Sustaining Librarianship in the Age of the New Public Philosophy

2003 Revolting Librarians Redux: Radical Librarians Speak Out

Just as “print media” enabled a shift in library culture (including the first wave of progressive print titles) in the U.S., the Internet has enabled new forms of library culture and media, “community, and identity,” as well as “new forms of connectivity at transnational levels.” 28 These are reflected in the second wave of vehicles of progressive library discourse – the Internet based media outlined below.

Vehicles of Discourse: Second Wave (Alphabetical List of Internet Resources)


KRIBIBI - Arbeitskreis kritischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare (Working Group of Critical Librarians), Austria http://www2.bvoe.at/%7ekribibi

Activist Librarians and Educators http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/actlib/index.html

Alternative Press Center http://www.altpress.org/

Anarchist Librarians Web http://www.infoshop.org/librarians.html

BIS (Bibliotek i Samhälle) (Swedish radical librarians) http://www.foreningenbis.org/

Collection Building by the Seat of Your Pants http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/7423/collectio nbuilding.html

Counterpoise and CRISES Press http://www.liblib.com/

Critical Media Literacy in Times of War http://www.tandl.vt.edu/Foundations/mediaproject/

Cuban Libraries Solidarity Group http://www.cubanlibrariessolidaritygroup.org.uk/

Daniel Tsang’s Alternative Research Page http://sun3.lib.uci.edu/~dtsang
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Electric Sandy ("The Sanford Berman website")
http://www.sanfordberman.org/

The GATS and libraries http://libr.org/GATS/

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Round Table
http://calvin.usc.edu/~trimmer/ala_hp.html

IFLA Social Responsibilities Discussion Group
http://www.ifla.org/VII/dg/srdg/index.htm

Information for Social Change http://libr.org/ISC/

Information Professionals for Social Justice
http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/%7Ebishop/new_social2/index.htm

Labadie Collection homepage
http://www.lib.umich.edu/spec-coll/labadie/

A Librarian at Every Table: Librarians and Community Initiatives
http://www.cas.usf.edu/lis/a-librarian-at-every-table/

LibrarianActivist.org
http://www.librarianactivist.org/index.html

Librarians Against Bush
http://www.librariansagainstbush.org/

Librarians for Peace http://libr.org/peace/

Librarian.net (Jessamyn West's "daily [or so] weblog of things librarian"...source of image at right)
http://www.librarian.net/

Library Juice (library-related news, web site alerts, letters, documents-in-process, etc., with an activist focus)
http://libr.org/Juice/

Library Workers of Radical Reference
www.radicalreference.info

The Modified Librarian (Eek! A librarian! Pierced, tattooed, and scarred library workers)
http://www.bmeworld.com/gailcat

MSRRT Newsletter: Library Alternatives (c. 1996-2000; for activist librarians & others)
http://www.cs.unca.edu/~edmiston/msrrt/

Progressive Librarians Around the World: A directory of organizations and people
http://libr.org/international/

Progressive Librarians Guild and their journal
http://libr.org/PLG/

Progressive Librarians Guild Ten point program developed by Mark Rosenzweig for the groups which met at the Vienna Conference of progressive librarians sponsored by KIRIBIBIE in 2000.
http://www.libr.org/PLG/10-point.html

Renegade Librarian (includes links to special collections: comics, radicalism, lesbigay, etc.)
http://www.renegadelibrarian.com/

Revolting Librarians (selections from the 1972 book edited by Celeste West and Elizabeth Katz)
http://owen.massey.net/libraries/revolting/index.html

Revolting Librarians Redux (info about the new book)
http://www.librarian.net/revolting/

Social Responsibilities Round Table (ALA)
http://libr.org/SRRT/ including:

Oregon SRRT http://www.olaweb.org/org/srrt.shtml
Washington State Library Association SRRT
http://www.wla.org/srrt/ and its links page
http://www.wla.org/srrt/links.html ("Internet Resources: Libraries, Information, & Social Responsibility")

SOL-PLUS - Spanish in Our Libraries,
http://www.sol-plus.net/

Street Librarian
http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/7423/

Study Circle on Political and Social Librarianship (Mexico) http://www.cebi.org.mx/

Grupo de Estudios Sociales en Bibliotecología y Documentación (Argentina) and Círculo de Estudios sobre Bibliotecología Política y Social (México) Together working on Foro Social Información Documentación y Bibliotecas
http://www.cebi.org.mx/indexsf.html

**Internet and Library Movement**

Much has been written about the Internet and democracy and the potential of universal access.
Perhaps less has been written about its limits. But these limits should be noted and taken into account in any study on the Internet and the progressive library movement. As well it is important to consider that “the forms, organization and goals of social movements are dependent on their historical context.”[29] For example, although it is accepted thinking that “the rise of global social movements is rooted in the secular trend of the expansion of democracy and civic activism over the last three centuries that has become intertwined with the new technologies of communication,”[30] online radicalism is both compelling and yet no so powerful as to destabilize highly concentrated forms of corporate control.”[31] This point of view is reinforced by Michael Apple’s assertion that “while pluralism, individual difference, and the local are upheld in postmodern rhetoric (and to be realized through networked technology and media), information capitalism is a leading drive toward global cultural standardization and consumption.”[32]

With limitations and historical context in consideration, one can critically explore benefits of the Internet to social movements. For example, while Langman and Morris observe that the “Net is the means through which global firms move capital, finance investments, conduct business, coordinate branches, design/produce, sell goods/services and sustain profits,” they also note that the Net can also be used a medium for resistance. “Through internetworking and cyber-activism, net-based organizing enables social actions and mobilizations in which progressive social movements confront globalization through new forms of community building, resistance, and mobilization.”[33]

An Internet notice for the Summer Institute for Digital Empowerment (July 8-9, 2004) at Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York describes the Internet as a place where researchers, scholars, activists, and grassroots organizers can pursue social and political engagement. Other common themes identified include the Internet and political institutions, the Internet and the development of social capital, teaching civic engagement, institutional vs. counter-cultural Internet movements, and wiring minorities and creating empowerment. And as I write this paper, the Internet is being used with the intention of social action for the Barcelona Forum 2004, which concentrates on cultural diversity, world peace, and economic sustainability. The event, held in Barcelona May 9 to September 26, 2004, anticipates the participation of approximately five million people “through worldwide television broadcasts, webcasts, and ongoing interactive web sites.” The “progressive exchange” offers “a powerful ongoing means of global cross-cultural communication and action.”[34] In the library context too, Tuula Haavisto noted that the Internet “has qualities that seriously challenge traditional professionalism within the libraries.”[35]

Haavisto’s examples of potential benefits of the Internet to librarianship include: communications between decision-maker and citizen, easier international communication, information production by the library and its users, new international relationships at the grass root level, and keeping a more effective eye on the authorities. Indeed, as noted earlier in this paper, in the last decade, the decentralized and multidirectional technology and communications infrastructure of the Internet has greatly enhanced relationship building, grassroots democratic organizing, and the development of “new citizenship groups” around the discourse and practice of progressive librarianship. However, echoing Bushman and Apple, Colin Darch noted that a “tradition of engagement has a long history within the [library] profession, valuing such concepts as freedom of expression and human rights, [but that] this is now challenged by a view of information as capital and processes of commodification and privatisation.”[38] And of particular importance to librarianship, Christopher Merrett, recognized that “in this age in which information has not only become a commodity used increasingly for profit, it remains vulnerable to a host of forces that amount to censorship.”[39]

Progressive librarians deal with threats to intellectual freedom, and as Lennart Wetmark of Sweden’s critical library group BIS has pointed out on his welcome to the LIB-PLIC list, “We believe that there is a need for an international list for the purpose of exchanging views, submitting early warnings, sending signed petitions or other letters in urgent issues. There are many threats ahead: GATS, outsourcing, privatisation etc., which urge us to act internationally.”[40] On a global library scale, the efforts made by librarians to address these threats are signified by several important manifestos identified below.

Helen Niegarrd noted how the 1994 update of the UNESCO’s Public Library Manifesto departs from its previous 1949 and 1972 versions in several important ways. Monographs do not play a central role. Rather the emphasis is on “all appropriate media important to users in the so-called developed world” as well as “oral and aural transfer” common
in the “so-called developing world.” This is a significant step in shifting the manifesto from a western context to a more global one.41 Another important change is the directive for collections and information to be selected “on a basis of quality and standards, related to local demands without any kind of censorship.” The document emphasizes universal accessibility, recognizes the needs of cultural diversity, and gives special attention to oral and aural transfer of knowledge. And it endorses the concept of library services being free of charge.42 In essence, the 1994 manifesto “highly stresses that the local public library should be seen as the gateway to a national information and library network.”43

But it is important to note, as Martha Smith has observed, “although UNESCO seeks to influence members states, it does not exert governing or enforcement authority. Therefore persuasion and consensus building are its primary tools.”44 A parallel in U.S. librarianship (and others in the Western tradition) is that rhetoric such as the ALA Code of Ethics45 and the ALA Library Bill of Rights46 are directives that carry no sanctions when violated. As Shirley Wiegand brought to light in her legal analysis of the Library Bill of Rights, “the ALA has no authority over library administrations.”47

Like UNESCO, IFLA is a leader (not an enforcer) in both supporting human rights (see Statement on Libraries and Intellectual Freedom approved by the Executive Board on 25 March 1999) and through its Free Access to Information and Freedom of Expression Committee (FAIFE). IFLA launched FAIFE in 1997 to promote and further intellectual freedom “in all aspects, directly or indirectly, related to libraries and librarianship.” For example, FAIFE “monitors the state of intellectual freedom within the library community worldwide, supports IFLA policy development, co-operates with other international human rights organisations, and responds to violations of free access to information and freedom of expression.” In recent years, this has had a heavy emphasis on technology and the information society.48

FAIFE’s 2003 Annual Report FAIFE stated that “library associations should more directly be involved in the promotion and advocacy of IFLA politics implementation.”49 One of these advocacy efforts is the UNESCO World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). Through its connection to WSIS, FAIFE “helped advocate the role of libraries in the information society and the inclusion of Article 19 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights as a core value of the WSIS declaration.” Two key IFLA policy statements both prepared by FAIFE: (1) The Glasgow Declaration on Libraries, Information Services and Intellectual Freedom and (2) the Internet Manifesto are referred to in IFLA’s WSIS contributions underlining the federations’ commitment to intellectual freedom.50 Both documents push for human rights and emphasize the inherent connection between human rights and intellectual freedom.51 The Internet Manifesto, for example, states that “unhindered access to information is essential to freedom, equality, global understanding and peace”, pushes for “richness of human expression and cultural diversity in all media”, demands that “access to the Internet and all of its resources should be consistent with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 19, and that “access should neither be subject to any form of ideological, political or religious censorship, nor to economic barriers.”52

A contemporary example of such an approach is the Budapest Open Access initiative, described as an effort librarians should promote “before their working milieus, management, authorities, and propose laws and acts before their legislations so citizens and all individuals in society have assured their free, free of charge, unhampered, egalitarian, democratic and expedite access to open access scientific and scholarly publications as any other basic social and human right.”53

The connection between human rights and librarianship is underscored in IFLA library policy, as well as other association policy such as that of the ALA (e.g., Resolution on IFLA, Human Rights and Freedom of Expression).54 Such policy is of great value to the progressive library movement because it opens the doors for librarians to use the concept of intellectual freedom as a viable means to taking a professional interest in social and political issues such as war and peace, torture, destruction of cultural resources, and government intimidation. In the U.S. context alone, SRRT has expressed interest in topics such as:

- ALA Code of Ethics.
- Alternative Catalog Entries.
- Banned Books.
- Branding.
- Breaking Glass Ceilings.
- Censorship.
- Civil Rights.
- Community Activism.
Looking beyond the U.S. perspective, “the UNESCO initiatives are grounded,” Smith wrote, “in Western traditions although they seek to be open to other traditions and cultures. Little quarrel is made here with, although it could be, mainstream Western political thought with its bias in favor of democratic capitalistic systems and the value placed on private property and individual independence and autonomy. However, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UNESCO statement challenge some of these tenets. To be truly global, non-Western, communitarian, or other perspectives will deserve further attention.”

Conceptually, the tradition of progressive librarianship is inextricably linked to the development of American library rhetoric on intellectual freedom, first marked by the adoption of the Library’s Bill of Rights in 1938. Since then, Al Kagan noted, intellectual freedom concerns have “permeated” ALA and its Council has “depended on its Intellectual Freedom Committee (IFC). There is also a headquarters Office of Intellectual Freedom and an Intellectual Freedom Round Table open to all members. This is perhaps ALA’s most progressive aspect, but exponents of intellectual freedom come in all ideological shades, and the intellectual freedom community has many times over come into conflict with the Social Responsibilities Round Table. For example, the IFC opposed the international boycott of the apartheid regime.” [As quoted earlier in this paper, “Many intellectual freedom supporters do not appear to recognize that all human and political rights, including intellectual freedom, are constantly impacting on each other and as a consequence none are absolute.”]

In the digital and global society, issues of intellectual freedom naturally relate to such conceptual territories as information ethics, global information justice, and intercultural information ethics. Robert Hauptman proposed the phrase “information ethics” almost twenty years ago. It is now used widely in a variety of disciplines. Hauptman defined information ethics as “an applied, extremely broad, encompassing subdiscipline of ethics that takes all informational areas under its wing. Thus for example, medical, legal, journalism, computer science, business ethics, in this context are merely subsets of information ethics.” (Bernd Frohmann noted, “whatever is special about information ethics derives from the specificity of the information services provided to specific publics. It is therefore analogous to legal ethics, medical ethics, dental ethics, or the ethics of plumbers. Like these other fields, much of what is unique to it consists in applying ethical principles to the specific services it provides.”) Information ethics, Hauptman wrote, “concerns itself with the production, dissemination, storage, retrieval, security, and application of information within an ethical context.” Its five broad areas are: “ownership, access, privacy, security, and community.” Building on this conceptual work, in 2001, Martha Smith “restructured” and massaged information ethics into the concept of “global information justice,” at its most basic, a blending
of social justice and information ethics. It is intended as a counter to the standardization Apple cautioned against, or in Smith's words "the dangers of homogenizing world culture." 

“In the international arena,” Smith observed, “assuring access is seen as one way to equalizing the fortunes of the information poor with the information rich in order to move beyond the restrictions of ideological and geographical barriers. The other side of this coin is the danger of eliminating native cultures, languages, and identities in the rush to conform to a global standard. To assure intellectual freedom to impart ideas across boundaries, there is the challenge of conflicting ideas colliding and creating conflicts that would be difficult to resolve. In this sense, intellectual freedom may become a narrow street where crashes can happen and often will. Only mutual respect for diversity and tolerance for pluralism can safeguard peace when these freedoms are exercised around the globe.” 

And in his provocative and ground-breaking work on intercultural information ethics, Rafael Capurro states: "The key question of intercultural information ethics is thus far and in which ways are we going to be able to enlarge both freedom and justice within a perspective of sustainable cultural development that protects and encourages cultural diversity as well as the interaction between them."

Other key concepts that underpin the theoretical framework of the progressive library movement’s push for a “political, social, and humanistic profession” include:

- Authentic opinion.
- Citizenship.
- Coalitions
- Communication.
- Communication technology
- Compassion.
- Community.
- Cultural democracy.
- Cultural literacy.
- Democratic practice.
- Dialogue.
- Discourse.
- Diversity.
- Fragmentation.
- Global citizenship.
- Human rights.
- Human welfare.
- International protest movement.
- Internet.
- Peace.
- Politics of identity.
- Positive aggression.
- Principled engagement.
- Public communication, dialogue, and discourse.
- Public sphere.
- Right to know.
- Social movements.
- Social responsibility.
- Sustainable human development at the local level.
- Tolerance.
- Transparency.
- Virtual community.

### Defining Characteristics and Intent of Progressive Librarianship

Progressive librarianship has an international agenda that reflects numerous missions, responsibilities, and activities in many languages and cultures. Thus, the author’s characterization of progressive librarianship is drawn directly from the rhetoric produced by an international selection of progressive library groups and coalitions. For example, Progressive Librarian’s Guild (U.S.), Bibliotek i Samhälle (Sweden), Information for Social Change (Great Britain), Arbeitskreis kritischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare (Austria), Arbeitskreis kritischer BibliothekarInnen (Germany), Progressive Librarians' International Coalition (International), Study Circle on Political and Social Librarianship (Mexico), and Social Studies Group on Librarianship and Documentation (Argentina). Also helpful is the PLG Ten point program developed by Mark Rosenzweig for the groups which met at the Vienna Conference of progressive librarians sponsored by KRIlibie in 2000. According to the various rhetoric (much of which is excerpted directly below, with major segments cited), progressive librarianship:

- Is committed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related covenants, such as from UNESCO and IFLA.
- Rests on the basic assumption that librarianship has inherent cultural weight, political significance, and social value.
Admits to libraries “being contested terrains and points of resistance.”

Rejects a “neutral” library stance, recognizing that libraries are social structures, and political reality therefore determines, at many levels and in complex ways, the nature of their relationship to the rest of society.” As Colin Darch wrote, “librarianship is a social activity and therefore both the subject and the object of ideological struggle.”

Aims to make explicit political value choices.

Endorses information as a social good rather than a commercial good.

Prioritizes human values and needs over profits.

Promotes and disseminates critical analysis of information technology’s impact on libraries and societies.

Supports the expansion of free access across national borders to cultural resources.

Defends cultural distinctiveness.

Promotes diversity.

“Insists upon equality of access to and inclusiveness of information services, especially extending such services to the poor, marginalized and discriminated against.”

Opposes commodification of information, “corporate globalization, privatization of social services, monopolization of information resources, profit-driven destruction (or private appropriation and control) of cultural artifacts and the human record.”

Considers the librarian as well as the library institution.

Considers the librarian as citizen as well as the librarian as professional.

Supports democratization of institutions of education, culture, and communications. Therefore holds that “for libraries, internationally, to hold the line and be a force for democratic humanistic development, they themselves and the field of librarianship must be democratized.” And so encourages resistance to “the managerialism of the present library culture.”

Aims to strengthen individual responsibility of library employees.

Advocates for participation of library users in substantive decision-making in library work.

Applies the concept of intellectual freedom to library employees as well as library users. “If librarians are to be the guardians individually and collectively of the rights of intellectual freedom of others, they need to be assured that they themselves have those rights in their institutions. Progressive librarians fight for those guarantees, or at least do not accept as a given managerial prerogatives that interfere with the exercise of professional responsibility based on intellectual freedom in the work-place. Librarians, like teachers and professors, have a unique claim to such work-place rights insofar as their profession involves as a basic responsibility for the cultivation of an atmosphere of free inquiry and debate in which education and development can thrive.”

Supports library employees who take risks in the defense of intellectual freedom.

Provides a forum for exchange/debate of alternative and radical views.

Opposes “one voice” approaches, such as seen in U.S. and South African librarianship, seen to be used “as a tactic to continue to stifle unorthodox thinking and debate.”

Employs community coalitions and alliances between progressive librarians and with other like-minded groups -- within and between countries, while respecting the differences in social systems particularly in the developing world (e.g. use of the Internet for public forum via listservs such as lib-plico-progresistas, PLG-Net AND coalition via events such as the Social Forum of Information Documentation and Libraries: Alternative action programs from Latin America for a knowledge-based society held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, August 26-28, 2004 and to include electronic discussions, electronic resources, and a virtual forum in addition to live sessions.)

Progressive Library Influence

While this paper contextualizes progressive librarianship within a broad international movement, it emphasizes the development of U.S. based progressive library culture. There is little question
that U.S. progressive library discourse has had both successes and failures in pushing the profession to move from passivity to activity on central intercultural issues and to influence library policy. A few examples of this tension between success and failure are outlined below.

**Example 1: Getting on the Books**

On June 30, 2004 ALA Council adopted the Core Values Task Force II Report, which states that “The foundation of modern librarianship rests on an essential set of core values that define, inform, and guide our professional practice. These values reflect the history and ongoing development of the profession and have been advanced, expanded, and refined by numerous policy statements of the American Library Association. Among these are:

- Access
- Confidentiality/Privacy
- Democracy
- Diversity
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Intellectual Freedom
- Preservation
- The Public Good
- Professionalism
- Service
- Social Responsibility”

This adoption was a significant historical victory for progressive librarians in the U.S., because, as Rosenzweig noted, the Association formally highlighted social responsibility as central to librarianship. It is important to note that the original work of the Core Values Task Force I omitted both “intellectual freedom” and “social responsibility,” resulting in what Bushman called “a bland homogenization of euphemisms.” And progressive librarians were represented in greater number on the Core Values Task Force II than on the original. (As well, they widely disseminated critiques of the work of the Core Values Task Force I.)

**Example 2: International Relations**

On June 30, 2004, the ALA Council adopted the Resolution Against The Use of Torture as a Violation of the American Library Associations’ Basic Values (Submitted by Mark C. Rosenzweig ALA Councilor at large, seconded by Al Kagan, SRRT Councilor, [both long-standing and active library progressives]).

However, Kagan noted earlier that “between 1991 and 2001, SRRT sponsored over 120 programs and at least 3 demonstrations during ALA conferences.” SRRT approved approximately 66 resolutions during this time, while only 12 were sent to ALA Council. “Most resolutions were considered so far from winnable that they were not submitted. Most that went to Council did not pass ... As a practical matter, SRRT’s international efforts have usually concentrated on issues and countries that are directly tied to American foreign policy.”

(To identify some international resolutions that did not meet success, see http://www.pitt.edu/~ttwiss/irtf/resolutions.html.)

**Example 3: Politics and Patriarchal Culture**

“Another ‘Hysteric’ Librarian for Freedom” Button (October 31, 2003)

“Today the American Library Association (ALA) Office for Intellectual Freedom introduced a new product for the thousands of librarians who fight everyday to protect the privacy rights of library users. Another ‘Hysteric’ Librarian for Freedom button acknowledges this important work while referencing the recent misstatement by U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft. For the last several months, the attorney general has toured American cities, trying to drum up support for the USA PATRIOT Act, which gives law enforcement easy access to library records with minimal judicial oversight. In several of his speeches, he has described librarians—among the first to denounce portions of the act as giving unprecedented powers of surveillance to the government, particularly in libraries—as ‘hysteric[s].’ “To help raise awareness of the overreaching aspects of the USA PATRIOT Act, ALA’s Office for Intellectual Freedom will sell the buttons for $2 each. All proceeds support the programs of the office. To order the button, call the ALA Office for Intellectual Freedom...
This incident signifies the deeply gendered culture of the profession—a major obstacle to a human rights approach to librarianship (a feminized profession in the U.S. context). Related issues to monitor closely include: diversity, institutional racism and white privilege, and public forum.

**Example 4: Public Forum**

In 2002, Buschman wrote that in recent years, the ALA “has consistently acted, in a number of ways, to limit the scope and the meaning of intellectual freedom in the profession.” As example, he cited changes to repressive quorum sizes for ALA membership meetings, ongoing slippery-slope debates about what constitutes a library issue, an increased legalistic atmosphere “toward those portions of the association that do choose to speak out on issues well within their purview and purpose,” and a proposal to limit “discussion, topics, language and debate on ALA’s Council listserv resulting in a growing corporate sense of the needs for ALA not to behave like a democratic professional organization but rather to speak with one voice.”

SRRT has interpreted this as repression “aimed at preventing” its members “from disseminating its resolutions outside of ALA” and as a parallel to the South African library experience where three library associations at the time of majority rule were reduced to one.

A very important issue to monitor in the coming months is that of library employee freedom of speech on professional and policy issues. Currently, a vociferous call is being made from American library activist Sanford Berman (and supporters) for the ALA to add a seventh point directive to its Library Bill Of Rights (first proposed in March 1999), which reads as follows: “Librarians should permit and encourage a full and free expression of views by staff in professional and policy matters.”

In July 2001, the Committee on Professional Ethics of the ALA adopted a special explanatory statement of the ALA’s Code of Ethics titled *Questions & Answers on Librarian Speech in the Workplace*. The document states, “Through the Library Bill of Rights and its Interpretations, the American Library Association supports freedom of expression and the First Amendment in the strongest possible terms. The freedom of expression, however, has traditionally not been thought to apply to employee speech in the workplace.”

However, in answer to the hypothetical question—“Since librarians have a special responsibility to protect intellectual freedom and freedom of expression, do librarians have a special responsibility to create a workplace that tolerates employee expression more than other professions?” -- the document states, “Yes … If librarians are denied the ability to speak on work related matters, what does that say about our own commitment to free speech? We need to demonstrate our commitment to free speech by encouraging it in the workplace.”

Unless the ALA’s *Library Bill of Rights* is amended, by the addition of the proposed seventh point directive, American librarians remain in a “catch-22” situation. This has implications for librarians around the world when it comes to intercultural issues.

**Closing Comments**

As indicated at the beginning of this paper, unlike “native on-line movements,” the progressive library movement is a “pre-existing” movement that has taken its agenda to the Internet where it can organize and coordinate, be open and participatory, and tap into the online potential for persuasion and consensus building. Because library rhetoric is not enforceable by sanctions, persuasion and consensus building are critical tools in furthering the agenda of the progressive library movement. The international scope of the movement is also critical in “getting librarians to work in concert as a coalition against the dominant consensus” of neutrality. As Smith said, “To be truly global” and include “non-Western, communitarian, or other perspectives” in the shaping of the profession. Indeed it has been argued that progressive librarianship is a counter to “the immobility and exclusion of sociopolitical issues from the agendas of library associations at both the local level as well as international,” which “have not allowed the creation of new proposals and the reproduction of the world’s recent social transformations within our profession.”

The Internet has been helpful to progressive librarianship. But the Internet alone will not further the movement. As Rosenzweig stated in a larger context, “Technological innovation does not lead inevitably to a democratic form of globalisation.”

**Intention** comes first and foremost.

Librarians with intention for principled engagement are the reason progressive librarianship exists. Some library progressives are best recognized within the progressive library community, while other’s
reputations cross the boundary between progressive and mainstream librarianship. Perhaps the most influential U.S. figure in the latter category is E. J. Josey, who is widely recognized for promoting library work that is built on the concept of “positive aggression”. Josey has been described in the following terms: “exalted library profession elder statesman”; “hero activist”; “gentleman from Georgia who wore neat, clean, gloves over his hard fists”; “ultimate insider who retains an outsider’s point of view”; “conciliator and a coalition builder who also retains the fervor of a positive troublemaker”; “not given to silence when he sees the need to speak out”; “synonymous with civil rights in librarianship”; “synonymous with civil rights in librarianship”; “lead gladiator.”

Another pioneer is Sandy Berman, often called the “guru of alternative librarianship.” Jenna freedman recently noted that “he’s actually well respected in mainstream library circles, too, as can be demonstrated by the fact that at this conference [2004] he was given the American Library Association’s highest award: honorary membership.”

From the icons to the lesser widely recognized figures (such as Celeste West and Jackie Eubanks), collectively, progressive librarians: challenge common understanding about librarianship; ask tough questions about the profession, its philosophical and ethical foundations, and its practices; work for change in library associations; provide leadership in the development of new library services; influence the practice of librarianship through writing, speaking, publishing, etc.; push policy efforts to support social, political, and humanistic library service; and, stick their neck out in the defense of intellectual freedom.

In recent years, progressive librarians “have taken part in protest actions at World Trade Organization summits; taken positions against expanding copyright legislation, threats to free access to libraries, and the privatization of education; resisted censorship and apartheid ... other issues include patents, vigorous attacks on fair use copying, impermanent and restricted access to purchased electronic resources, restrictions on end-users and facilitation of electronic micropayments, also termed “daylight robbery”. Indeed, a major challenge ahead is to keep a consensus building that is not fragmented by the proliferation of progressive library voices that have burgeoned on the Internet. (Related to this, Christopher Merrett cautioned about LIWO’s demise in South Africa: “It was ironic that there was an inverse relationship between an increasing power of electronic tools of communication and the need to set up national positions and attend meetings in desirable locations. LIWO made the fatal, and foreseeable, mistake of overstretching its human resources.”)

Individuals who participate in progressive library discourse encounter “a radically different definition” of library “reality” and culture than those who do not. Progressive library discourse both adjusts “our historical focus” of librarianship and continues “to offer alternative visions for the future.”

In the future, will a subset of librarians still have an intention for a more social, political, and humanistic profession? Will progressive librarianship be mainstreamed? Will librarianship have made progress on white privilege? Will library schools offer courses on principled engagement? Will librarians and professors have full academic freedom? These are the questions that keep me focused on the progressive library movement. I hope you will join me in my interest.

As I prepare to send this document to Germany, the newly posted PLGNET-L Digest 1891 reads: “Library workers of Radical Reference (www.radicalreference.info) and Librarians Against Bush (www.librariansagainstbush.org) will meet at 9am Sunday morning in front of the Humanities & Social Sciences library of NYPL at 42nd St. and 5th Avenue. We’ll rally together there for a bit and then make our way to the United for Peace "The World Says No to the Bush Agenda" protest. Please join us if you’re so inclined. Jenna.”

Author’s Note

This essay (especially pages 3-6) draws on parts of:
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