



INFORMATION ETHICS AND THE CORPORATIST ACADEMIC ENTERPRISE: CRITICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION WORKERSⁱ

Toni Samek

**Professor of School of Library and Information Studies
University of Alberta - Canada**

ABSTRACT

Examines information ethics in the 21st century University and cautions that it is in danger of following the path of information literacy in service of the state. She addresses disturbing trends that influence the type of information ethics education that future library and information workers currently receive in North America, including new managerialism; market values set by students as customers and their market demand for courses; a vocational orientation to train people for jobs without a context of a broader education; civil discourse and respectful workplace policies used in a way to fundamentally threaten academic freedom; growing national security; the race for internationalization; and, the unbundling of academic work. Toni's words prompt us to discuss the extent to which social responsibility in library and information education can survive repressive tolerance. And she argues for the human condition to feature prominently in our field's contributions to the future landscape of migrant and digital information labour.

Keywords: Information Ethics; Social Responsibility; Information Education; Information Workers.

Please accept my gratitude for the invitation to visit and to speak here. I do not know how you encountered me or my work, but I am happy that you did. I owe a special thank you to Marta (as well as Cristiane, Jose Antonio, Fernando and Oswaldo) for all of the generous and gracious energy directed my way. I cannot offer enough mutuality in one speech, so please call on me (if you want to) now and in the future for conversations and collaborations. I will be most happy to work and learn alongside you. Canada to Brazil and back is a costly journey when we consider sustainability and all of the resources that went into bringing me here. I hope you will understand if my speech is a little bit dense. I prepared my words with the intention to

maximize what I can communicate in one hour. (Of course, I apologize for my need to talk in English.) Please note that my text draws both on some of my previous writings and select, as yet, unpublished pieces. The combination brings to light the direction of my scholarshipⁱⁱ.

I begin my address now with an excerpt from scholar Henry Giroux's powerful writing "Making Democracy Matter: Academic Labor in Dark Times": "Understanding higher education as a democratic public sphere means fully recognizing the purpose and meaning of education and the role of academic labor, which assumes among its basic goals promoting the wellbeing of students, a goal that far exceeds the oft-stated mandate of either preparing students for the workforce or engaging in a rigorous search for the truth. Harnessed to the demands of corporate and military interests, higher education has increasingly abandoned even the pretence of promoting democratic ideals. The needs of corporations and the warfare state now define the nature of research, the role of faculty, the structure of university governance, and the type of education offered to students. As federal and state funding for higher education is cut, universities are under more pressure to turn to corporate and military resources to keep them afloat. Such partnerships betray a more instrumental and mercenary assignment for higher education, a role that undermines a free flow of information, dialogue and dissent. When faculty assume, in this context, their civic responsibility to educate students to think critically, act with conviction, learn how to make power and authority accountable, and connect what they learn in classrooms to important social issues in the larger society, they are often denounced for politicizing their classrooms and for violating professional codes of conduct, or worse, labelled as unpatriotic. In some cases, the risk of connecting what they teach to the imperative to expand the capacities of students to be both critical and socially engaged may cost academics their jobs, especially when they make visible the workings of power, injustice, human misery, and the alterable nature of the social order"ⁱⁱⁱ.

Our conference theme supports significant topics. And the sessions are in line with a recent Call for Papers for a special issue of the *Journal of Information Systems Education* on Ethics and Social Responsibility in IS Education which caught my attention when posted to the listserv for the International Center for Information Ethics on April 1, 2011. The timely and relevant call reads as follows: "There has

been a growing appreciation in recent years of the need to afford the topic of ethics and social responsibility a prominent place within the educational curriculum. In the era of globalization, the responsible stewardship and governance of businesses, government and society impacts the lives of everyone. Information systems are now ubiquitous and pervasive, often delivering benefits but also potentially or actually having detrimental impacts, thus presenting challenges and dilemmas as regards ethics and social responsibility. It is imperative that Information Systems students gain a critical appreciation of social, political, technological, environmental and global issues as a fundamental learning outcome of their college education. Contemporary issues of importance include privacy and data protection, social inclusion and the digital divide, lifelong learning, equal opportunities, gender issues, sustainable computing and “green IT”, globalization, mobility, usability and accessibility, social media, Internet propaganda and censorship, digital media rights and controls, public advocacy and activism, and IS education in developing countries”.

Some of the topics included in the posting are: integrating ethics and social responsibility issues into the IS education curriculum; preparing IS graduates as responsible citizens within society and the professional workplace; service learning and civic engagement in IS education; social inclusion, classroom diversity, and the digital divide in IS education; philosophical issues of ethics and social responsibility within IS education; approaches for teaching ethics and social responsibility within IS education; cultural aspects of ethics and social responsibility in IS education; absenteeism issues within IS education (e.g. monitoring practices, student motivation and responsibility, etc.); ethical issues with the use of social networking, virtual communities and e-learning technologies in IS education; human rights issues in IS education; standards of acceptable behaviour and conduct in IS education; and, academic honesty within the discipline of Information Systems.

As the hour passes, you will notice that a number of these topics surface in my speech. They present an important opportunity to think about who defines, redefines and perhaps even confines the meaning of the words “ethics and social responsibility.” Our thoughts on this are very important. If we do not create these definitions, someone will do so for us. And if we have a common or universal interest in democratic education then finding space for unfettered teaching and learning in the shift from knowledge production and preservation to knowledge economy and

cognitive capitalism or academic capitalism, and a new limited emphasis on STEM (science, technology, engineering and medicine) requires our advocacy on those very conditions that we see eroding in higher education. These conditions include, but are not limited to, academic freedom, shared governance, affordable tuition, broad education not limited to vocation, and autonomy from business and government.

Indeed now with the dwindling core curriculum and rising tuition sovereignty, it is no longer our curriculum committees who determine what courses run in North America, but rather our students who (essentially) vote for courses by virtue of their registrations. If they choose not to register for a particular elective in adequate faculty to student ratio numbers, then the course is cancelled. This pattern has significant impact on education when we consider how very few required courses remain on our academic books. Information ethics and social responsibility, for example, are typically not subjects required of our students; *professional ethics* is, of course, a topic that is often embedded into our introductory foundations courses. But professional ethics is not the sum total of the broader information ethics and social responsibility terrain. Will students opt to study information ethics and social responsibility in the face of vocation driven continuing education? And if we teach about absenteeism, can we assume we also instruct on access to education?

I understand from the writings of Andrés Bernasconi, Maria de Figueiredo-Cowen and others that higher education in Latin America and the Caribbean is undergoing a lot of change, as I know is the case globally. In preparing my thoughts for today, I was greatly aided by reading “Library Education in Latin America and the Caribbean” by Adolfo Rodriguez Gallardo^{iv} and taking a snapshot of publicly accessible information on the web about library and information studies education in Latin American and the Caribbean. These tasks reveal high school to doctorate level activity – although not in each country – in the form of courses, programs, licensing, certification, and degree granting in the overlapping fields of librarianship, information science, archival studies, documentation, information management, and information science and technology. Some courses are apparent on our conference theme, for example, Ethics for Librarians in Argentina, Ethics and Information in Brazil, Social Problems in Mexico, and Information Related Rights and Duties in Peru. But who

pushes for what and why in the negotiation of the Latin America and the Caribbean curricula I cannot say.

I do not have an informed or balanced understanding of the deeply complex and diverse cultural, economic, political, ideological, economic, technological, legal, philosophical, and historical factors that underline higher education and thus frame library and information studies in the region. So I will not focus my comments on your situation so much as my own in North America. Let us keep in mind, of course, that as educators we share a common interest in library and information studies education and education more broadly. Ideally, my students are your students and your students are mine; we share the responsibility for them in the big picture.

To quickly immerse you in the current library and information studies situation in North America, I will share with you a book review I was invited to contribute to the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) *Bulletin* in January 2011, because it summarizes the state of affairs at home clearly and succinctly^v.

Library and information education has had an evolving relationship with the university for more than a century. The *Demise of the Library School* by Professor Richard J. Cox, lead educator in the 'University of Pittsburgh School of Information Sciences' archives, preservation, and records management specialization, is a well-written volume of personal and professional thoughts on the state of professional graduate library and archives programs in higher education today.

While there is an abundance of published commentary about the traditional library school's transition to the information school or iSchool of the 21st century, Cox's work is fresh because he anchors it in the changing tides of higher education and provides a sophisticated context for the variation. Much of his treatment is rooted in economic explorations such as decision making based on corporatist efficiencies. While the book is billed as "personal reflections," those contemplations are based on years of experience in the academic trenches and so the content is more universal than the book's label suggests.

Although engaging, the monograph is long-winded and could benefit from further editing. There is too much repetition and reiteration in the text. The essential message, however, is well worth considering and the book's audience should be wider than those teaching, learning and labouring in the library and information studies communities, including archives groups.

Cox makes a strong case for how the success of the academic enterprise rests, in no small part, on the high functioning of its library and information systems. Indeed, all of us in the academy have a vested interest in access to information, privacy and confidentiality, intellectual property, stewardship and preservation of library and special collections and archival materials, intellectual and academic freedom, the free flow of people and ideas, open Internet access, maximum user access to database content and so on (Just think how many of us are on high alert over Access Copyright on the eve of 2011).

Perhaps the most urgent audience for this book is people who are new to the academy and who may not know to what extent the time-honoured institution is now wavering. They can learn some important lessons about how higher education is being transformed by a transfer from education to vocation, the new ubiquity of distance delivery models, an eroding professoriate, the rise of the contingent worker model, increase in the number of adjuncts in relation to faculty, full implications of tuition sovereignty, new integrity and civility codes, and emergent distributed faculty.

Perhaps of greatest interest — and what I view to be the heart of the book's intellectual contribution — is Cox's assessment of how professional schools have been the first to devolve in this fashion and arguably with library and information studies at the lead in no small part due to the focus on technology (not technology education) in related programs.

In his words: "It might be that the professional schools have lost some of their edge because the rest of the university looks more like them. Now, professional schools are asked to count students as customers, make decisions enhancing revenues, and to take on work that generates additional funds. For sure, some of the work at solving practical problems continues, but the process of deciding what problems to consider is now heavily influenced by business factors. This means serious trouble for the future of library schools" (COX, 2010, p.129).

For those of us who have been around campus for a time, Cox's discussion of the swings in university life and labour will be familiar. His disclosure of faculty meetings devoid of intellectual matters is almost painful to read in its matter-of-factness. We can recognize all of the competitive signs of survival in Cox's iterations: cost recovery models, ever new programs for undergraduates and doctoral students, "innovative" certificates for professionals, the race for internationalization and its

companion fee structure, dwindling cores in curricula, labour restructuring (e.g., educational technologists designing courses for teachers to facilitate or moderate), speech codes, and management movements toward post-tenure review.

And for those of us in the overlapping fields of library and information studies, we can interpret Cox's description of the modern corporate university through our own crossings from library schools, to library science schools, to library and information studies schools, to iSchools. Cox is fair-minded and does not promote one over the other — and he is not resistant to change. But he does question what education these programs stand for in the present day — what is their “grand narrative” — apart from unit survival on campus that is?

Most of us come to the academy to contribute in our chosen field. These days, it is harder to do that without also tackling “information.” In my view, this book wisely cautions us to pay attention to the library we want, the open Internet access we want, the databases we want, the archives, special collections, book and record depositories, digital repositories [...] and the list goes on, because they are partially in the hands of current and future students in the library and information studies programs. Some of our expectations rest in their hands.

Probably many of the other parts of our prospects lie in the hands of those in the other professional schools (e.g., MBA, law). And for that reason alone this is a book worth reading. Cox raises our awareness of how risk management and information technologies — and the relationships between the two — are setting the future directions of the academy, beginning, for example, with interdepartmental communications (e.g., email systems).

Cox is a seasoned academic with a stated commitment to quality education, community, ethics, social responsibility and public good. His questioning voice is rational and informed. We do not have to be archivists to understand the basic politics around saving the human record — what records get saved, by whom and why. It is the same for academics more broadly — what programs and disciplines will survive, who decides and how.

The future of library and information studies is in the balance and thus so is knowledge and its organization. Any of us engaged in negotiating the future of a field can see how it is, in part, wrapped up in the wiring of campus information systems. This then is a big book in more than one sense of the word.

Why do students come to university and what do they experience when they get there? What are our responsibilities to cultivate intellectual curiosity, reading, writing, literacy in all its forms, critical thinking, intellectual freedom and open and frank debate, continuous learning, knowledge dissemination and public policy? To what extent will such fundamentals be determined by current models of computer literacy and information literacy in service of business and the marketplace? And what role therein will the library and iSchools play both consciously and unconsciously? This is what I am left pondering after reading this book.

Cox writes: "Given the nature and mission of LIS (library and information studies) schools, I wonder just why it appears that we hear so little about such matters of academic freedom in the classroom in these schools. Considering what we teach and what our students are preparing to do, one might guess that the old library school and its successor could be a beehive of controversy. Generally, however, they're pretty quiet. Why is that?" (COX, 2010, p.41).

Subsequently, Cox observes: "Over the past century we have watched libraries and archives being destroyed because they represent symbolic identity and community memory. Destroy them, and you destroy a people's identity" (COX, 2010, p.59). What is the future of academic identity? Is it delivering (not teaching) technical information competency credentials, workshops, institutes and in-service training programs? Is information security akin to knowledge stewardship? Is information a specialty? Is the professional school with curricular flexibility and course-based graduate programs inherent to the modern university?

That is what this book asks. And the questions are good ones.

Moving forward from the review, let us recall that information ethics emerged as a concept in the library and information literature in the late 1980s, when both Robert Hauptman in the USA and Rafael Capurro in Germany used the term independently. According to Hauptman, information ethics can be understood as the point where "the creation, discovery, dissemination, and application of information intersect with ethical considerations". In pushing for information ethics, Hauptman cautioned library and information workers: "information is power. Uncontrolled information corrupts. That is why ethical considerations must mediate as one accumulates, accesses, or applies what one knows"^{vi}. The field, at minimum, exposes local, national, and international issues related to the "production, collection,

interpretation, organization, preservation, storage, retrieval, dissemination, transformation and use of information” and ideas^{vii}.

Contemporary contributions to information ethics occur between disciplines, across different disciplines and even beyond disciplines. Teaching and learning in information ethics includes examination of numerous timely topics, including knowledge economy, indigenous knowledge, imposed technologies, public access to government information, information rights, and accelerated extinction of languages. The editors of the *International Review of Information Ethics* wrote in v.14 December 2010 that: “In fact, Information Ethics itself as a discipline has gone through such a development - and very quickly so. It started with concerning (mainly) the Internet (as cyberethics etc.) and was closely related to professionals (particularly computer professionals and LIS professionals). Very quickly it became clear that the issues raised in Information Ethics affect the society itself and cannot be restricted to issues of professional ethics (any-more). It finally became evident since the Internet itself developed from a technology and professional tool into a social space itself. Thus, more and more not the core and inherent questions of Information Ethics like freedom of speech, copyright, privacy etc. had to be dealt with in Information Ethics but the everyday life of people became the subject. That broadened the scope of "information" beyond the field of knowledge (its storage, transmission etc.) into other areas and disciplines so that IE became an interdisciplinary topic and - it goes without saying - an intercultural as well”^{viii}.

In December 2010, in the American Library Association accredited programs in Canada, USA and Puerto Rico, there was evidence of 21 Information Ethics courses in our 55+ Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS) programs. This development, I believe, in part, correlates with an initiative I undertook with some wonderful fellow scholar-activists in forming an Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) Special Interest Group for Information Ethics in 2006. In 2007, we proposed the ALISE Information Ethics Special Interest Group *Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education*, which was ratified at the ALISE Business Meeting held on January 10, 2008^{ix}.

The Statement states, in part: “As suggested by universal core values promoted by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions and other professional organizations and world bodies it is our responsibility to participate

critically in the global discourse of information ethics, as it pertains to, at least, the following articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

- Respect for the dignity of human beings (Art. 1);
- Confidentiality (Art. 1, 2, 3, 6);
- Equality of opportunity (Art. 2, 7);
- Privacy (Art. 3, 12);
- Right to be protected from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (Art. 5);
- Right to own property (Art. 17);
- Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 18);
- Right to freedom of opinion and expression (Art. 19);
- Right to peaceful assembly and association (Art. 20);
- Right to economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for dignity and the free development of personality (Art. 22);
- Right to education (Art. 26);
- Right to participate in the cultural life of the community (Art. 27);
- Right to the protection of the moral and material interests concerning any scientific, literary or artistic production (Art. 27).

And that, at minimum, the “curriculum should be informed by information ethics through a unit in the required foundations (or equivalent) course. This unit should appropriately include the following student objectives: to be able to recognize and articulate ethical conflicts in the information field; to inculcate a sense of responsibility with regard to the consequences of individual and collective interactions in the information field; to provide the foundations for intercultural dialogue through the recognition of different kinds of information cultures and values; to provide basic knowledge about ethical theories and concepts and about their relevance to everyday information work; and, to learn to reflect ethically and to think critically and to carry these abilities into their professional life”.

In retrospect, I sometimes question our work. Did it get away from us? I am disappointed by how the multiplication of information ethics courses might give the appearance of positive impact, but potentially mask how they can be easily co-opted by academic capitalism. Not violating copyright can be studied a lot; knowledge activism not so much. It is hard, still, to find social responsibility courses – most especially with a social justice orientation. There is only one course overtly on librarianship and human rights in the 55+ programs. It is offered at the University of South Florida by the formidable scholar Kathleen de la Peña McCook.

So perhaps it is fair to wonder to what extent our students might encounter, through formal reading, such works as *New tactics in human rights: A resource for practitioners*, which includes specific tactics for library and information work. For

example: empowering children with information, skills and support to advocate for their own rights; empowering people with information skills to use the legal system to exert their rights; protecting freedom of thought and the right to privacy by destroying records that could be demanded by the government; building effective libraries and employing librarians to effectively provide information support to advocates and activists; protecting cultural and economic rights of indigenous people by recording traditional ecological knowledge [and protecting it from exploitative patents]; mapping personal histories and mobilizing memory to reclaim a place in history and recover lost land; coordinating efforts to preserve archival information among several organizations and creating a system for accessing it; promoting justice by leveraging the legal rights to access victims' records; and, documenting records of abuse to promote healing and justice^x.

What might we expect the state of our programs to be in five and ten and twenty years? Will intellectual freedom remain as a core library ethic endorsed by IFLA? Will social responsibility be engaged to address human emancipation? Or will library neutrality and library education coalesce, as some have already predicted, to bond professional stagnation in the face of the dominant class and trade?

As I point out in *Librarianship and human rights: A twenty-first century guide/ Biblioteconomía y derechos humanos: Una guía para el Siglo XXI*, Rafael Capurro's evolving exploration of information ethics led him to develop the complementary idea of an *information ecology* (CAPURRO, 1990)^{xi} which we can take to urge library and information workers to practice "the art of friendship in the face of power". And building on Capurro's foundational work such as "What is information science for? A philosophical reflection" (CAPURRO, 1992)^{xii}, Martha Smith coined the phrase *global information justice* in 2001 in a groundbreaking paper titled "Global information justice: rights, responsibilities, and caring connections" (SMITH, 2001)^{xiii}. "The goal of global information justice (GIJ)," she writes, "is to conserve nature and to preserve humanity through the creative uses of the technologies of information, knowledge, and memory using the practices of rights, responsibilities and caring connections." A key aspect of GIJ, Smith asserts, is that: "Like the ideals in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ideal of global information justice calls for attitudes and actions that are hard to achieve. Implementation is only possible if individuals, groups, institutions, and nations are able to go beyond law and rights and move to mutual

responsibility and caring concern. The practical basis for this affirmation is concern for survival of the planet and all living beings, including animals, plants, and potentially sentient Machines". She observes that "like the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: the words of UNESCO may seem to be weak weapons when up against corporate capitalism, environmental degradation, and the chaos of war and poverty. However, in the long run, words may be able to exert the force of conscience on a wired planet where conflicts may not be amenable to conflicting value systems and competing laws and armies".

As I have noted on previous occasions and in other writings, the related lessons gathered are many; most suggesting that the most viable and authentic solutions to the cultural problems we face now will come in time and through multiple human engagements and interruptions, not as quick fixes or techno-managerial efficiencies. Notable Australian doctoral student Nathaniel Enright, in a new work coming out in the *Journal of Information Ethics* fall 2011 issue that I am guest editing, observes that information ethics "is a technology of management put to the service of capitalism; information replaces knowledge and technology replaces philosophy; we are eclipsing critical thought." We can ask if we observe those changes in our own programs and institutions? Do we see that "the commodification of information immediately forecloses on the possibility of an ethics of information"?

Nat asserts that "critical librarians have responded enthusiastically to the challenges meted out by information ethics. And yet the recuperation of resistance and critique is, according to Virno, one of the most innovative aspects of contemporary capitalism." The academy in its own way "subsumes resistance". Information ethics then "emerges and operates within the boundaries of the left-wing of capital [...] that space where the criticism of capital is allowable and even necessary - but where the critique stops short of articulating the possibility of its overcoming and cements in place the impossibility of its transcendence". I might now wonder if this is where my own work sits.

I have asserted several times that, in our field, within and without the academy, this is an important moment in time to seriously monitor the extent to which librarianship and archives, in particular, might be stripping and de-skilling its workers of their critical capacities to contribute to non-confidential professional and policy matters of public concern and critique library and information work in the context of

growing commercialization of the professions. And in so doing we must put ourselves in the circle of analysis by examining our own institutional cultures. For example, earlier this year I published an informal article titled “Talking about Information Ethics” in the *Journal Information for Social Change*, a short column titled “Tested Teaching” in the *Journal of Information Ethics*, and a longer article titled “Teaching information ethics in higher education: A crash course in academic labour” in the *International Review of Information Ethics*. I will now share some of my key observations primarily summarized best in the latter.

I think it very important that we our discussions into a deeper exploration of the academic labour that frames conditions for teaching information ethics from a standpoint of social responsibility and social justice. This is critical because the working conditions of faculty are the learning conditions of students. Some of the ill practices explored in information ethics (e.g., censorship) can also be apparent in the institutions in which we teach it. So we should recognize the political context of information ethics within the academy, a place undergoing redefinition in academic visions and plans designed to push faculty, staff and students harder in global competitions for university rankings.

Other characteristics of the contemporary university landscape include: new managerialism or the introduction of corporatist managerialism; more administrators who are not academics; market values set by students as customers and their market demand for courses; a vocational orientation to train people for jobs without a context of a broader education; civil discourse and respectful workplace policies used in a way to fundamentally threaten academic freedom; the growing national security; surveillance in campus-wide information systems; assault on tenure in medical schools; faith or ideological tests as a condition of employment; corporate consulting contracts; conflicts of interest and misconduct; the race for internationalization; and, the unbundling of academic work.

My words are written from the vantage point of teaching in an LIS unit in higher education for almost 18 years. But perhaps more importantly, my service over the last four years on the Canadian Association of University Teachers Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee informs my words this morning. Policies and issues of current concern to our national Committee include: respectful environment or workplace policies which serve to take grievances out of collective agreements;

custody and control of records, including email; contracting to the cloud; security and academic freedom; collaborations and donations; partners without academic freedom; and homogenous institutions and faith or ideological tests as condition of employment.

As I have noted before, in Canada, where I teach in a Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS) program, the academy of the 21st century is transforming by an increasing reliance on contract academic staff (the single biggest threat to academic freedom). “In the USA, more than 75 per cent of academic positions are off the tenure track and the number worldwide is close to 80 per cent. At the larger Canadian universities, the figure is reaching 50 per cent”^{xiv}. CAUT has been sending the warning that protecting tenure is building a fence around a dwindling core and suggests that we need to put serious work into pushing for contract language for contract staff that puts onus on university administrations to state their reasons for non-continuance of contracts and to build in offers of first refusal rights for courses. Otherwise, contract staff will continue to teach contract to contract with no job security; the obvious implications for academic freedom are serious. CAUT, it should always be noted, asserts that “academic freedom is the life blood of the modern university. It is the right to teach, learn, study and publish free of orthodoxy or threat of reprisal and discrimination. It includes the right to criticize the university and the right to participate in its governance. Tenure provides a foundation for academic freedom by ensuring that academic staff cannot be dismissed without just cause and rigorous due process”^{xv}.

While we do not have a duty of loyalty in the Canadian academy, academic freedom is *the* underpinning of the academy. Even for those of us with tenure rights and responsibilities, we should be mindful of how longstanding standard academic freedom contract language is now made vulnerable by new campus civility codes, such as the Human Resources Guidelines on Civil Conduct (University of Toronto). And academic freedom contract language can include directives to exercise academic freedom in a *responsible* way, with *reasonable* exercise of civil liberties, in the *proper* tradition, within *norms* of civil discourse, and consistent with the objectives and purposes of the university. The question is *who* defines, redefines and/or confines the meaning of “responsible”, “reasonable”, “proper” and “norm”? On this important foundation, I built my understanding of collegiality (participation in shared

governance) and its distinction from civility. And I could begin to recognize how, often on campus, collegiality and civility are mistakenly (and sometimes dangerously) conflated.

It is ironic that our campus librarians should be devalued just at the time when the issues they work in are rising to the surface of university life and labour. The 2009 CAUT Librarians Conference and subsequent CAUT President's Column exposed the issue. In her column titled "Academic librarians are under attack", Penni Stewart wrote: "As the role of librarians becomes narrower and more managed, academic freedom is being whittled away. At some institutions librarians are reporting that management is seeking to supervise curriculum and course preparation, control access to governance activities and scholarly and professional conferences, and supervise librarians' scholarly work by reviewing papers and grant applications prior to presentation or publication"^{xvi}.

Like you, I rely on intellectual freedom principles in my own campus library system in order to properly function as an information ethics scholar. I rely on the free flow of people and ideas. And I began my immersion into these particular matters in the circumstance of the North American library and information studies curriculum. In the academic year 2000-2001 I developed a graduate course titled Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in Librarianship. Teaching this course was my entrée into teaching information ethics. In 2010, I added a new unit on academic freedom for academic librarians. This unit is designed to speak to the importance of a free flow of information in the global academic enterprise and to reinforce the American Association of University Professor's (AAUP) assertion that "College and university librarians share the professional concerns of faculty members. Academic freedom, for example, is indispensable to librarians, because they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of ensuring the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn. Moreover, as members of the academic community, librarians should have latitude in the exercise of their professional judgment within the library, a share in shaping policy within the institution, and adequate opportunities for professional development and appropriate reward"^{xvii}. This important work covers maximum access to information and ideas through diverse collections, technology licensing

agreements, open Internet access, library exhibits, library meeting rooms, research carrels, exhibit spaces and other facilities.

The course I teach, most recently in eClass format, takes in many urgent contributions. Students have examined such topics as 3M RFID contracted library services in the nuclear free city of Berkeley, California; deliberate destruction of cultural and intellectual property during war-time (including in Bosnia and Iraq); and, international debate of access to information in Cuban library/librarian context.

As you know, “around the world today, scholars are attacked because of their words, their ideas and their place in society. Those seeking power and control work to limit access to information and new ideas by targeting scholars, restricting academic freedom and repressing research, publication, teaching and learning. Scholars at Risk (SAR) is a growing international network of over 220 universities and colleges in 29 countries committed to promoting academic freedom and defending threatened scholars worldwide. SAR works to assist scholars and other intellectuals who experience persecution in their home country because of their research, teaching and writing. SAR’s work is rooted in the principle of academic freedom -- the freedom to pursue scholarship and research without discrimination, censorship, intimidation, or violence. Scholars at Risk aims to bring scholars facing severe human rights abuses in their home region to positions at universities, colleges and research centers in any safe country”^{xviii}.

The notion of scholars at risk has been on my mind especially since I began teaching online. Those of us teaching in the 21st century academy are very likely to be engaged in some form of distance education today or in the future. Both teachers and students involved in distance education may at times reside full-time or part-time in countries where information aspects of human rights are not enforced and protected as much as some of us may be accustomed to. These circumstances fuelled my interest in the internationalization of higher education.

The International Association of Universities Internationalization^{xix} asserts that the internationalization of higher education, at its best, involves universities and higher education institutions and organizations from countries around the world in debate, reflection, and action on common concerns and of policy development. This includes the intercultural exchange of information, experience and ideas, as well as the ethical mobility of students and staff. But at its lowest operational level,

competitive internationalization of higher education is simply about the act or process of buying and selling education as product to international markets. And while CAUT “is dedicated to the removal of barriers that traditionally restrict access to and success in university-level studies and to increasing equality and equity of educational opportunity”, it is also the case that “University employers may nonetheless misuse distance education techniques to increase managerial control over academic staff and/or as an innovative way to save money”^{xx}.

We can use this work to support the International Association of Universities’ internationalization recommendations, which can blend with teaching information ethics. For example, we can support the recommendation that “the curriculum of the university reflect the preparation of international citizens, through facilitating language competence; and understanding of global, international, and regional issues; preparation of experts in areas needed for such fields as information technology and science, peace and conflict resolution, and sustainable development, as well as the special curricular needs of international students”^{xxi}.

In addition to our best efforts teaching information ethics in the classroom and eClass, quality education demands that we complement that act by also teaching outside the traditional classroom. This can prove problematic in contexts where, as in the USA now, academic freedom is under intense scrutiny^{xxii}.

As I indicate in the *International Review of Information Ethics* article: in my view, those of us who teach information ethics, including academic librarians, should fully engage in this historical moment. The stakes are high. In many instances information literacy has been co-opted by the state. I suggest we try to save information ethics from the same fate – a fate that ultimately closes down rather than opens up new possibilities for effectively understanding human trajectories in the economy of ideas, commodification, monopolization, and war. We should always keep in mind that our teaching matter, library and information labour, is inherently connected to these broader issues. Our graduates, in many instances labour negotiating intellectual freedom, workplace speech, academic freedom, loyalty oaths, compelled speech, political speech, lobbying, advocacy, and activism – both in their own institutional culture and more broadly in society. If they are successful and move up at work, then expectation of loyalty to administrative leadership, cabinet solidarity, management rights or commitment to a team by administrators is their next reality.

Do our management courses acknowledge the difference between loyalty and blind loyalty?

Ideally, our teaching and learning and practice will help to break down the constraints imposed by the myth of library neutrality that divorces library and information work from participation in social struggle, and makes the profession vulnerable to control networks. And to counter the profession's claim to library neutrality and to aid the development of more humanistic (and less techno-managerial) library work. In a very recent newspaper story in Toronto, it was reported that "Teacher-librarians have been among the first to be sacrificed when boards make cuts, and the digital innovations they help students navigate are now being used as the justification for eliminating their jobs, and Canada is bucking an international trend of investing in school libraries. Librarians fight for a role in a digital world"^{xxiii}.

According to a short documentary, *Writing on the Wall*^{xxiv}, 13% of Canadian public schools have a librarian. Over the last 25 years, full-time school library staff is down. Well stocked school libraries are down. Funding for school libraries is down. Parents in the affluent neighbourhoods are filling the gaps. Multilingual collections are paltry. In Alberta where I live in oil country and the hottest economy in North America, we had over 500 teacher-librarians working in the 1970s, while today we have 62, half-time ones (and only 15 of those are teacher-librarians who hold a diploma, Med or MLIS). Henry Giroux says in the film "that literacy is at the core of how you measure a society's healthiness". And that in Canada "there is a betrayal of such proportions that we are losing entire generations to forms of illiteracy [...] that people will not be able to engage the future or survive in it." He says that the school library is a sacred place, the one place that connects the classroom to public life." And that "we are severing the link from classrooms to larger society". Are we making the same mistake on campus? I have been asserting for years that our school library crisis will inevitably lead to an academic library crisis in Canada.

In 1990, Rafael Capurro identified the threats of technological colonisation of the life-world, cultural alienation, and oligarchic control of information resources. Library and information communities, including ours here today, have responsibilities to the past, present, and future.

As I say in the book, we are not neutral. Sometimes we are complacent, passive and complicit in ill effects of power – and provide the example of the power that militancy through library and information work holds as a potential force of social change is perhaps best illustrated by the anti-militancy that librarians and libraries demonstrated during the cultural cleansing that occurred in the Balkans in the early 1990s. Alex Byrne, former Chairman of the IFLA Committee on Free Access to Information and Freedom of Expression wrote that “For us, the question is the responsibility of librarians and libraries. What is the culpability of those library staff members who were directly involved in the decade long process? It was they who discriminated against their colleagues, they who identified materials for removal and organised their removal and destruction and they who changed catalogue records. Can they claim the Nuremberg defence, that they were ‘just following orders’? What about those who were aware of the process of cultural cleansing but stood by silently? Most of us were ignorant of those actions, should we have cultivated greater watchfulness? How can we ensure that such a pattern of events will never happen again?”^{xxv} Looking ahead, who stands to teach this question? Will we in the future?

Also indicated in *Biblioteconomía y derechos humanos: una guía para el Siglo XXI*, Wayne Wiegand warns that librarianship is “a profession much more interested in process and structure than in people”^{xxvi} (WIEGAND, 1999). Jack Andersen, meanwhile, cautions that “library and information studies have managed to create a metaphysical discourse that tends to favour technical and managerial language use. Such language does not invite critical consciousness and analysis as it is distanced from the objects it is talking about”^{xxvii} (ANDERSEN, 2005). Edgardo Civarello urges the field of library and information studies “to give up its silence, its marble tower, its privileged positions in the new knowledge society, its apolitical attitudes and its objectivity”^{xxviii} (CIVALLERO, 2004).

Christine Pawley concurs with these critical voices, and advocates that we carry our collective conscience into library and information studies education, because she finds that education “perpetuates rather than transforms the status quo”. “From a class perspective,” she asserts, the “failure of LIS education to confront societal questions is itself a sign of the power of the dominant class to exercise hegemony”. Pawley indicates we would better serve students by preparing them to

“tackle broader political questions relating to control of the production, distribution, and indeed, definition of information”^{xxix} (PAWLEY, 1998).

In closing, Argentine Nobel Peace Prize winner Adolfo Pérez Esquivel observed in his keynote speech *"Between the walls of information and freedom"* delivered at the Plenary Session of IFLA on 23 August 2004 in Buenos Aires: “freedom of the press is being threatened, as is the heritage of the peoples and their cultures which are being subdued by the prevailing globalization. Social and cultural resistance is fundamental for the sake of freedom and the rights of individuals and peoples [...] you, who are the ones in charge of preserving memory [...] can contribute [and resist] [...] an ‘only way of thinking’ [...] that leads to the destruction of identity and culture”^{xxx} (ESQUIVEL, 2004). Perhaps here and now together we can commit to measuring the accountability of the corporatist academic enterprise to global education of library and information workers against his singular wisdom. I suspect the task will lead us to consider our future contributions, for better and for worse, to: digital labour rights, information economics, digital deskilling, technological unemployment, digital slavery, digital revolution, cyberactivism, the digital human, mobility, and migrant life patterns on a planet in crisis.

Thank you for your time and patience. Merci, gracias e obrigado!

Notes

ⁱ Opening conference of IX EDICIC made on May 30, 2011, in the Marília city, Sao Paulo state, Brazil.

ⁱⁱ Note: Re published works, I draw mostly on:

SAMEK, T. *Biblioteconomía y derechos humanos: una guía para el Siglo XXI*. Gijón, España: Trea, 2008. 268p.

SAMEK, T. *Librarianship and human rights: A twenty-first century guide*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2007.

SAMEK, T. Teaching information ethics in higher education: A crash course in academic labour. *International Review of Information Ethics*, v.14, p.4-9, Dec. 2010.

ⁱⁱⁱ GIROUX, H. *Making democracy matter: Academic labor in dark times*. Available in: <<http://www.counterpunch.org/giroux03112009.html>>.

^{iv} RODRIGUEZ GALLARDO, A. Library education in Latin America and the Caribbean. *New World Library*, v.108, n.1/2, p.40-54, 2007.

^v COX, R. J. *The demise of the library school: Personal reflections on professional education in the modern corporate university*. Duluth (MN): Library Juice, 2010. 348p. Available in: <http://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?articleid=3187>. (Review by Toni Samek)

^{vi} HAUPTMAN, R. Information ethics. *Choice*, v.37, n.3, p.261, 1990.

-
- vii CAPURRO, R.; HJØRLAND, B. O conceito de informação. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, v.37, n.389, 2003.
- viii INTERNATIONAL Review of Information Ethics, v.14, Dec. 2010. Available in: <http://www.irie.net/current_issue.htm>.
- ix ALISE Information Ethics Special Interest Group. *Position Statement on Information Ethics in LIS Education*. In: ALISE BUSINESS MEETING, Jan. 10, 2008. Available in: <<http://www.alise.org/mc/page.do?sitePagelId=58273>>.
- x NEW tactics in human rights: A resource for practitioners. Available in: <http://www.newtactics.org/sites/newtactics.org/files/entire_workbook-_english.pdf>.
- xi CAPURRO, R. Towards an information ecology. In: WORMELL, I. (Ed.). *Information quality: Definitions and dimensions*. London: Taylor Graham, 1990. p.122-39
- xii CAPURRO, R. What is Information Science for? A philosophical reflection. In: VAKKARI, P.; CRONIN, B. (Eds.). *Conceptions of Library and Information Science: Historical, empirical and theoretical perspectives*. London: Taylor Graham, 1991. p.90-93
- xiii SMITH, M. Global information justice: rights, responsibilities, and caring connection. *Library Trends*, v.49, n.3, p.534, 2001.
- xiv STEWART, P. Nothing casual about academic work. *CAUT Bulletin*, President's Column, v.57, n.6, Jun. 2010.
- xv CAUT. *Academic Freedom*. Available in: <<http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=140>>.
- xvi STEWART, P. Academic librarians are under attack. *CAUT Bulletin*, v.56, n.10, 2009. Available in: <http://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?articleid=2958>. See also: Librarians confront threat to profession. *CAUT Bulletin*, v.56, n.9, 2009. Available in: <http://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?SectionID=1201&SectionName=News&VolID=290&VolumeName=No%2029&VolumeStartDate=2009/11/10&EditionID=30&EditionName=2056&Vol.EditionStartDate=&2009/01/09&ArticleID=2944>.
- xvii <http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/interpretations/ALA_print_layout_1_137618_137618.cfm>.
- xviii SCHOLARS at Risk. Available in: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scholars_at_Risk>.
- xix <<http://www.iau-aiu.net/index.html>>.
- xx CAUT. Policy Statement on Distance Education. Available in: <<http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=263&lang=1>>.
- xxi IAU Statement on Internationalization - Towards a century of cooperation: Internationalization of Higher Education. Available in: <http://www.iau-aiu.net/internationalization/i_statement.html>.
- xxii KUEHN, R. R.; JOY, P. A. Kneecapping. *Academic Freedom Academe Online*. Available in: <<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2010/ND/feat/kueh.htm>>.
- xxiii HAMMER, K. Education reporter. *Monday's Globe and Mail Published*, May 16, 2011. Available in: <<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/technology/digital-culture/social-networking/librarians-fight-for-a-role-in-a-digital-world/article2023169/>>.
- xxiv <<http://www.chapters.indigo.ca/loveofreading/template/index.html>>.
- xxv <<http://www.themarknews.com/articles/5037-no-controversial-figures-please-we-re-canadian>>.
- xxvi WIEGAND, W. A. Tunnel vision and blind spots: what the past tells us about the present; reflections on the twentieth-century history of American librarianship. *Library Quarterly*, v.69, n.1, p.24, 1999.
- xxvii ANDERSEN, A. Information criticism: Where is it? *Progressive Librarian*, v.25, n.7, 2005.
- xxviii CIVALLERO, E. *Indigenous libraries, utopia and reality: proposing an Argentine model*. Aboriginal Libraries Project. Córdoba: National University, 2004.
- xxix PAWLEY, C. Hegemony's handmaid? The library and information studies curriculum from a class perspective. *Library Quarterly*, v.68, n.2, p.137, 1998.

^{xxx} ESQUIVEL, A. P. Between the walls of information and freedom. In: PROCEEDINGS OF THE 70TH IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND COUNCIL, 70., 22-27 August, Buenos Aires, 2004. Available in: <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla70/ps-Perez_Esquivel-e.htm>.