

Progressive Librarian

Issue #10/11

Winter 1995/96

Editorial	1
Articles	
Service Undermined by Technology: Gender Relations, Economics and Ideology <i>by Roma Harris</i>	5
Information Technology and the Future of Work <i>by Stan A. Hannah and Michael H. Harris</i>	23
Technology and Library and Information Science <i>by John Budd</i>	43
The "Enola Gay" Controversy as a Library Issue, and Bibliography <i>by Elaine Harger</i>	60
IFLA and Human Rights <i>by Al Kagan</i>	79
Documents	
IFLA Resolution	83
Resolution on NYPL's SIBL	86
LIWO Statement	87
Poem	
Searches With No Direct Hits -- Words <i>by Jessica Grim</i>	90
Book Review	
<i>Into the Future</i> by Michael H. Harris and Stan A. Hannah <i>reviewed by Henry T. Blanke</i>	92
Notes on Contributors	

CALL FOR PAPERS

Articles, book reviews, bibliographies, reports, documents, and poetry that explore progressive perspectives on librarianship and information issues are wanted for future issues of *Progressive Librarian*.

Typewritten manuscripts are welcome.

If you use a wordprocessor, please submit an IBM compatible, high-density disk with an ASCII file.

Use current *MLA Handbook* for in-text citation style for references.

We reserve the right to edit all submissions.

Submit manuscripts to:
Progressive Librarians Guild
PL, Editors
P.O. Box 2203, Times Square Station
New York, NY 10108

PROGRESSIVE LIBRARIAN Issue #10/11 Winter 1995/96
Published, produced and distributed by Progressive Librarians Guild
3 issues per year ; ISSN 1052-5726
Indexed in *Alternative Press Index*

Editors:

Henry T. Blanke, John Buschman and Mark Rosenzweig
Managing Editor: Elaine Harger

Subscription/membership rates:

\$25 individuals; \$35 institutions; \$40 inst's overseas firstclass
Checks and money orders in US\$ to Progressive Librarians Guild

All correspondence, manuscripts, subscription requests to:

Progressive Librarians Guild
P.O. Box 2203, Times Square Station, New York NY 10108
Tel: (212) 647-7833 or (212) 865-6925

EDITORIAL: A BLAISE WITH INDIGNATION

In a recent article in the journal *Libri* called "Shibboleth and Substance in North American Library and Information Science Education" (1995, V.45 #1, pp. 45-63), Blaise Cronin slaps around just about every radical and/or progressive impulse in librarianship - including six editors and authors represented in this very issue of *PL*. It is an article full of indignation, sophistry, and language that can only be described as Erudite Lite.

Why is Blaise unhappy? In his words, it is because "Fundamentalism, inertia, resistance to change, fetishism, inbreeding, feminization, censorship, social activism, clutching at straws, and intimations of xenophobia constitute the principal [sic] elements in a dispiritingly self-critical catalog of what is awry in the LIS field." The source of these problems is pretty clear to Blaise: us. "Although the problematique I intend to highlight may be associated with only a minority of LIS faculty and others within the professional ranks, this minority exerts disproportionate influence on public perceptions of the field, in particular its scholastic credibility, and deflects attention from notable initiatives."

If this line sounds a little familiar, that is because it only lacks the standard conservative nostrum on the "failed Big Government social programs of the Great Society and the New Deal." What we have here is our own library equivalent of a hybrid of conservative attack specialists. Think of Blaise as a kind of Newt Grammbaugh. Unfortunately, this twaddle is coming from the dean of a large library school and it has to be taken at face value: "if existing schools cannot be purged of the dysfunctional attitudes and monothetic rhetoric which have retarded growth for too long [then we will see a] progressive decoupling of librarianship programs from

information science/information management programs. . . ." While Blaise is busy slapping us rads around, he conveniently overlooks, misrepresents and avoids some central issues. Here are two samples:

1) The professionals who engage in social activism are "politiciz[ing] their principle professional association." Such "patently pyrrhic efforts to shape social and political issues" is characterized as "grabbing at straws, of which political activism is among the most fashionable." At base, "none of this has anything to do with librarianship, as traditionally or reasonably conceived." (If you had not guessed, the June 1994 *American Libraries* piece on social issues written by Elaine Harger, Mark Rosenzweig and myself is the prime example of such "ludicrous" efforts and arguments, although at the time, each of us was unaware of our vast influence on library education and the profession.)

Of course what Blaise ignores is a central point. He is attacking those within the profession who are simply holding ALA to its own policy statements and acting on those policies. Apparently, he is quite comfortable for ALA to state such policies, but for librarians to actually do something about them is quite a different matter. Researchers and practitioners must disengage and pretend that the process of arriving at our current state of affairs was a fair, neutral, and bias-free process if we are to "save" librarianship and establish our field more firmly in research universities. What we have here is Melvil Pangloss. Of course, its easier to flog the rads than it is to stand up in a national meeting in front of colleagues and peers and argue that ALA should remove its policy statements against economic discrimination in providing services or collections, against opposition to discrimination towards lesbians and gays, and against U.S. government support for censorious and abusive foreign governments.

2) There is a particular analysis of librarianship which draws a special brand of Blaise's ire: "seriously misguided feminist thinking" which is a "blend of spurious reasoning and arrant speculation." In attacking Roma Harris' work as "infirmity feminism" he hauls out the old line that this kind of analysis ghettoizes women and women's occupations, and the scholarship is only a reaction "against the perceived masculinity of traditional, objective, mathematically inclined. . . research." How can one even begin to take seriously a critique which ignores a central point Roma Harris makes? To fully "professionalize" a traditionally feminized field like librarianship has always meant disempowering women within the field. The economic burden of such a process (read loss of jobs or job autonomy) falls on women. When a formerly empowered field is automated and deskilled, the process is reversed - men leave and women take up the less desirable jobs. The rethinking of the professionalization of fields - especially those dominated by women - is too easily dismissed by Blaise as "propelled by dogma." There are other, practice-oriented fields which are in something of a crisis. For instance, many MBA programs have suffered large enrollment declines since the 1980's. But since this is a field that has traditionally had a great deal of economic power behind it - and one which has never been defined as women's work - there are no questions about a "research base" or the dangers of feminist analysis. But then, Blaise already has an answer to this if you accept his argument in #1 above.

Of course, what I have been neglecting is the humor laced throughout this article. When Blaise writes that accreditation of library schools should be done away with, he suggests instead that libraries be accredited. This would enable benchmarking, consumer comparisons, and in a line that should become immortal, "It would also motivate library directors in the field to meet quality standards and aspire to 'best of breed' status." Not many authors can weave

references to the cult of Demming and the Westminster Dog Show into the same paragraph! Less humorous is the self-promotion in which Blaise engages. He positions himself as a "real" (as in not trained in the LIS field) scholar who is unafraid to ask the hard questions and be the kind of innovative administrator a library school needs. Blaise wants us to be grateful that he is loaning his prestigious credentials to our shaky field, calling all who question his knowledge of librarianship "xenophobic." All who do not heed his call consign themselves to the "lumpenproletariat . . . lacking the resources, imagination and will to reposition themselves for the twenty-first century."

Blaise is, of course, not the first to notice that librarianship is in turmoil and on the brink of an uncertain future, but he practices the sloppy scholarship he attacks in caricaturing the positions and problems he identifies. Is all scholarship in the LIS field excellent? No. Are all forms of feminist scholarship of uniform high quality? No. Are all social issues central to librarianship? No. Nobody has actually taken these positions, but then Blaise isn't actually interested in engaging the ideas and scholarship which deal with those issues. Perhaps he has done us a service here by provoking a response.

We (librarians and library school professors) do need to have a discussion about first principles. So far, ALA has given mostly lip-service to its progressive policies. Those who have tried to put them into action have faced what I can only call a backlash within the organization. Debating how librarians should be educated -- and for what purpose -- is about as fundamental as it gets. What is needed is a little less pretense about the "objectivity" and "neutrality" of these kinds of arguments against progressive policies and actions in the profession.

by John Buschman

SERVICE UNDERMINED BY TECHNOLOGY: AN EXAMINATION OF GENDER RELATIONS, ECONOMICS AND IDEOLOGY

by Roma Harris

Libraries are fascinating places to study at the present time. These institutions face the combined impact of increased public demand for information services, financial pressures arising from the downsizing of the public sector, and rapid changes in workplace organization that inevitably accompany the introduction of a vast array of new technologies and information products. In libraries, one sees played out the conflicts inherent in a society in which the economy is based more and more on information-for-profit and yet, in which there is a growing recognition that access to knowledge is a public good, one might even call it a public trust.

Librarianship as Women's Work

Historically, North American librarianship has been very much a female-intensive enterprise. However, while women have been numerically dominant as laborers, their work has been controlled, to a large extent, by male administrators both within and outside the library systems in which they are employed. This male control continues, although its form has shifted somewhat in recent years. For instance, due largely to the corporate impetus to commodify information, the female-identified role of care that public sector libraries have played as social institutions in their communities is being undermined through attempts by systems-oriented librarians, senior library administrators, local politicians and vendors (usually male) to redefine these organizations as "information centers" in which

access to information is increasingly restricted and sold to those (usually male) who can pay.

This transformation of public sector libraries reveals a shift in emphasis not only in the types of services that are offered, but in the very nature of the communities to be served by these institutions. For example, while at one time the primary emphasis in public libraries was on services for women and children and for student and faculty scholars in university libraries, in both settings one now sees an increasing preoccupation with providing service to business customers. Thus, the public sector library (indeed, the entire occupation of librarianship) is rapidly developing a culture in which what is most valued are technical functions in support of wealth creation rather than caring functions in support of the individual growth of all members of the community.

Why is this happening? The transformation of librarianship cannot be understood without looking at the much broader forces acting on society as a whole. Therefore, the remainder of this paper is devoted to a discussion of technology within the context of economic imperatives supported by the political rhetoric of prosperity and individualism.

A Preoccupation with Technology

Private and public sector organizations are devoting increasing amounts of their resources to new technologies. A recent report released by Statistics Canada suggests that, in 1994, Canadian companies had increased their level of investment in "soft assets," by this they mean computers, telephones and plant equipment, to 33 per cent of *all* their fixed assets (*Globe and Mail*, 1994). Even in the public sector investment in machinery and equipment has climbed to 12 per cent of all fixed assets, such as roads, bridges,

buildings, etc. Accompanying this rapid increase in the use of new technologies is a profound change in the organization of the workplace and in the nature of employment.

This preoccupation with technology is driven by the widely held assumption that future economic prosperity is dependent on the rapid development of national electronic infrastructures. This is reflected in the United States, for example, in the heavy promotion of the National Information Infrastructure. The economic imperative served by technology is evident in Canada as well. To give just one example, the Advisory Committee on a Telecommunications Strategy for Ontario (1992) developed a blueprint for economic renewal in Canada's largest province that hinges on the notion of the information highway. The Committee promotes its vision by playing on a sense of urgency about the future. As is true of other such initiatives, committee members claim that economic prosperity is dependent on technological change.

Just as the highway system was the infrastructure for the industrial economy, so our telecommunications networks will be the highways for the new economy. Without a state-of-the-art, electronic infrastructure, our businesses, organizations and society cannot succeed (p. 4). . . . We can only achieve this vision of economic renewal and sustained social development by exploiting the capabilities of the new information technologies to reshape what we do and how we do it. In the new knowledge-based economy, individuals will create wealth by applying information, human intelligence, effort, and technology to manufacturing, agriculture and services. This new economy will be part of the larger information society -- the social and economic organization of the information age. In the information society, the purpose of wealth creation will not simply be profit for a few, but a more equitable and more prosperous society for all (Advisory Committee on a Telecommunications Strategy for the Province of Ontario, 1992, p. 10).

This perspective is not entirely new. It has, as we learn from historians, formed the underpinning of the vision of development in Western societies for many years. What is new about this version of an old theme, however, is captured nicely by Howard Segal, an historian of technology who notes that:

high tech has spawned a new generation of technological utopians whose principal allegiance is not to the public sector, unlike earlier such visionaries, but to the private; whose favored institution is not big government but the big corporation; and whose principal motivation is not serious social change but personal gain -- or prophecy for profit's sake (Segal, 1994, p. 165).

This is evident in the composition of the Ontario Advisory Committee on Telecommunications which includes in its membership representatives from the Canadian Information Processing Society, the Canadian Advanced Technology Association and the Information Technology Association of Canada. The profit-making orientation of such groups and their influence on government policy both in Canada and the United States is not surprising when one considers that since the 1960s the sale of information, information technology, and related products has been growing into a booming business and is, in the eyes of many, the foundation of the new economy.

Segal has much to say about the prophecies of high tech gurus, of whom Alvin Toffler, advisor to Newt Gingrich, is a good example. In Canada, we have our own Tofflers who are not at all shy in making extravagant claims about the future. One such example is George Fierheller, Chair of the Information Technology Association of Canada and senior executive with the large Canadian company, Rogers Communication. In describing the global information network Fierheller claimed, in a recent speech, that

What we are creating is a fabric of intelligence: a supercomputing network that will weave the next human renaissance... The new revolution amplifies brain-power. . . the information revolution associates each of our minds within a unified global brain -- an electronic commonwealth of human thought... This revolution vastly increases the mental potential of each unique human (Fierheller 1994, p. 32).

Encapsulated in Fierheller's remarks are some of the main features of contemporary technological discourse.

Technological Utopianism

In the vast literature about computing and its anticipated social impact there are, essentially, two primary themes; one that reflects a utopian view and another that is anti-utopian. Fierheller's unified global brain obviously falls into the utopian category. "Technological utopianism portrays specific technologies. . . as being the key enabling elements of an ideal world. . . . It refers to a kind of narrative that makes technology, even simple ones, the key elements to a lifestyle that is admired as being fundamentally good and eminently desirable" (Kling and Dunlop, 1993, p. 6). In contrast is "technological anti-utopianism [which] is almost a mirror image of technological utopianism. In a technologically anti-utopian narrative, technologies are a key cause of human suffering" (Kling and Dunlop, p. 7).

Typical of the anti-utopian perspective is the work of Vincent Mosco (1989), who refers to the "information society" as the "pay-per society." According to Mosco, the essence of computer communications systems is to "measure and monitor information transactions for control and profit" in the form of the "pay-per telephone call, pay-per view video, and pay-per bit, minute, screenful or page in the information business" (p. 114). The pay-per society involves

what Mosco describes as "a fundamental process in contemporary capitalism" which is "the commodification of time and space" (p. 114). Mosco argues that today's "new technologies are specifically built, not to increase the productivity of workers, but to eliminate them" (p. 116) and he warns that "if unemployment and deskilling continue to lower the cost of labour they will also diminish the potential for mass consumption that the system relies on for expansion" (p. 124).

Mosco is not the only anti-utopianism writer on the scene. Other analysts, too, warn about the dangers of the new technologies, particularly the ways in which consumers can now be "captured" through their television sets and personal computers.

These electronic/information consoles are capable of penetrating the deepest recesses of the home, the most private and inaccessible sphere to date, offering entertainment, purchases, news, education, and much more round the clock -- priced, metered, and monitored by corporate suppliers. In these ways, 'free' time becomes increasingly subordinated to the 'labor' of consumption (Robins and Webster, 1988).

The antiutopians expect the electronic invasion or "colonization" of home life to have a powerful effect on public space, public life, and public institutions and describe a rapidly approaching future in which the focus of people's lives will become their own private, secure home space in which it is possible not only to be entertained, but to work, be educated and shop. In other words, the private home will replace the city as the centre of commerce and culture. This is already evident in the United States where citizens who can afford to buy their own homes are intensely preoccupied with protecting them and maintaining their isolation from other citizens who are less economically advantaged.

Accounting for Economic Disadvantage

There is a new level of mean-spiritedness evident in the class war that is now being waged between rich and poor. In an attempt to explain this, economists Harrison and Bluestone suggest that

the allure of the Democratic Party agenda that included anti-poverty programs, subsidized housing for those with low incomes, public transit for those without autos, welfare for those without jobs, and affirmative action for those of the "wrong" color or sex did not pale because Americans became more selfish and greedy or more racist and chauvinist. Its appeal diminished when the agenda had to be financed by the redistribution of wealth rather than by growth (p. 170).

In the absence of economic growth one finds a redirecting of resources away from the most disadvantaged members of society. One small example of this is the way in which public sector libraries are being retooled to support the interests of business people over those of other members of the community. In other papers, I have described this phenomenon with the phrase "abandoning care" (see, for example, Harris 1994). However, this term is probably incorrect. Rather, the problem of which this shift in the library's mandate is symptomatic is that North American society is in the process of abandoning "share" as the fundamental ethic behind the provision of public services.

In 1988, Harrison and Bluestone argued that, in the United States, it will be necessary

to rebuild and restructure many of the social welfare programs that were gutted by the Reagan administration in the course of eight years. Industrial policies, democracy in the workplace, new union organizing drives, and the rebuilding

of our infrastructure all will benefit those who gain the major part of their incomes from the labor market. But they will do little directly for those who, for one or another reason, cannot work or are restricted in the amount they can do. For these families, it is necessary to improve public assistance, provide more public housing, increase access to daycare for children and the elderly who can remain at home with their families, and expand family and work skills. Anything less will condemn at least the bottom fifth of the population to an ever-smaller proportion of total national income (p. 189).

Sadly, in 1995, these recommendations have not been followed and it appears that the downward spiral in social support and public infrastructure continues and is being mimicked in Canada. The lack of public outcry against this failure to share resources is supported by what Michael Parenti calls American "political mythology" of which one strain is New Age ideology.

According to Parenti, "in place of political impotence, New Age enthusiasts teach a kind of personalized omnipotence, reducing social problems to a matter of interior mind-set" (1994, p. 15).

In the diverse array of enthusiasms that come under the New Age rubric, two general orientations might be discerned. There are the "inspirationists," who focus exclusively on benefits in the here and now, and the 'spiritualists,' who tell us that the material world is but a passing shadow compared to the mystic realm beyond, where transcendent bliss awaits us (p. 16).

Such mythologies emerge as a way for people to cope with the social and status changes wrought by a turbulent economy. According to Dudley (1994), "America's 'success ethic' has always portrayed economic advancement as a matter of individual effort, hard work, and perseverance" (p. xix). Thus, economic hardship can be viewed

as a just outcome for those whose individual habits or choices are lacking in some way, i.e., are "wrong" or "immoral."

Meritocracy replaces the idea of divine reward for hard work with the idea that an individual's ability to master and overcome the forces of the marketplace should determine who wins and who loses in life. In this updated version of the Protestant ethic, it is not God but the economy that rewards people of good character while punishing the shiftless and improvident (p. 74).

Dudley describes the bitter experience of workers in the auto producing town of Kenosha, Wisconsin when the big AMC factory closed. When a plant closes,

not only must workers cope with the economic hardship incurred by unemployment, they must also leave behind a distinctive way of demonstrating individual capacities and skills. When a plant closes, workers lose a social structure in which they have felt valued and validated by their fellows. When they are stripped of their workplace identities, dislocated workers face an external culture that no longer seems to value, or grant social legitimacy to the kind of work they do (p. 134).

This seems to me to be very much analogous to the impact on workplace culture that is taking place in the transformed library. As technological skills come more and more to predominate in information work, "old-style librarianship" and those who practice it are no longer valued. While there are many women in the field who embrace the new technology and participate just as much as their male colleagues in shaping the "virtual library," traditional librarianship is seen, nevertheless, to be the domain of women. On the contrary, the new librarianship, also known as information management or "infopreneurship," falls much more within the purview of men who have claimed technology's mantle of status because of their

widely touted fixation with "gizmos" (see, for example, Cockburn and Ormrod, 1993). Just as the auto workers of Kenosha are denigrated by their middle class neighbors for failing to anticipate the changing economic times and clinging to an old way of life, librarians who are slow to embrace the new technology and the changing mandate of public sector library work are castigated by info-gurus in the field and blamed for being lazy, out of touch, incompetent and unprofessional.

This hostility is not limited to librarians and auto workers. Today,

the basic premise driving the success ethic - an expanding economy - has ground to a standstill. The stable world system that gave postwar America a steadily growing middle class has, since the 1970s, turned volatile and unpredictable. People are unsure where they stand in today's economy, and many fear that their present positions are far from secure. The American dream, for a substantial percentage of the population, has become an illusion" (Dudley 1994, p. xxi).

Under these conditions, the potential for social unrest is enormous. Therefore, it is no coincidence that conservative politicians pressing an economic agenda that is of benefit to only a relatively small elite disguise the dismantling of the public sector infrastructure in the language of opportunity and distract those who might benefit most by banding together in organized collectives by a campaign of blame waged against the most disenfranchised members of society. The poor, racial minorities, gays and lesbians, are easy scapegoats.

According to Parenti,

capitalism rewards the impulses of exploitation, accumulation, competitiveness, ruthless self-interest, individualized aggrandizement, scarcity psychology, and indifference to the sufferings of the disadvantaged. Such impulses make it

conducive to gender and racial oppression and make sexism and racism functional for capitalism. [C]apitalism relies on sexism as a diversionary force. Conservative leaders seize upon irrelevant foes to channelize popular discontent away from socioeconomic conditions and toward "cultural" controversies. They use "non-class" issues like abortion, affirmative action, the traditional family, pornography, homosexuality, and sexual morality to preempt any critical examination of who gets what, when, and how. Feminists are targeted by conservatives as one of the groups that represent what is wrong with America (1994, p. 149).

In many respects the technological utopians are like Parenti's new age inspirationists. Their rhetoric encourages us to ignore political and economic realities and to buy into techno-hype by adopting a path to self-improvement that hinges on our own initiative, supported of course, with a fast new personal computer. We are encouraged to see our financial successes or failures as due entirely to our own actions. If successful we can take pride in our accomplishments, if we fail we must accept the shame of defeat. Viewed from this perspective, policies that support the sharing of resources with all people are seen as counter to the interests of the whole group. As Dudley points out, "the Darwinian imperative cautions against charity by putting the onus of survival squarely on the shoulders of the individual . . . If the strong slow down to let stragglers catch up, the whole society will soon find itself mired in mediocrity" (p. 75).

Everyone is supposedly the author or his or her fate. . . Such notions can be carried to chilling extremes by right-wing ideologues. Thus Eileen Marie Gardner, special assistant in the U.S. Department of Education during the Reagan administration, maintained that even the handicapped and disabled make their own destiny[:] "nothing comes to an individual that he has not, at some point in his development, summoned. Each of us is responsible for his life situation. . . . There is no injustice in the universe. As unfair as it may seem, a person's external circumstances do fit his level of inner spiritual

development. . . Those of the handicapped constituency who seek to have others bear their burdens and eliminate their challenges are seeking to avoid the central issues of their lives." (Parenti 1994, p. 18).

Information Technology and Employment

Are single mothers, old-fashioned librarians, feminists and the disabled entirely the authors of their own fate and responsible for the economic troubles facing North American society? Probably not. It is more likely that "capital flight" has something to do with the widespread displacement of workers and the geographic shifts in wealth that are evident across the globe. As Dudley explains, during the 1980s,

overseas investments strategies of United States corporations changed dramatically. Instead of investing in domestic production for foreign markets, major industrial firms began producing goods abroad for import back into the United States market. During the late 1970s and 1980s, disinvestment in domestic operations showed up on corporate balance sheets as "excess production capacity," and thousands of idled factories were closed. (1994, p. 37).

Adding to the displacing effects of the rapid movement of capital, the nature of work itself has changed dramatically as a result of change arising from new microelectronic technology. This technology, upon which the information economy depends, "has distinct characteristics for which there are only a few historical precedents. . . . It is not a technology which is restricted to one sector of industry or one occupation, but can be described as a 'heartland' technology which pervades the world of work and society generally" (Gill and Krieger, 1992, p. 331). Indeed, it is because of its very pervasiveness that information technology can change the economic

fortunes of entire nations and enhance or disrupt the lives of millions of workers.

Given its potential impact, it is not surprising that there is no topic over which the ideological split between the technological utopians and antiutopians is more pronounced than with respect to employment. Information technology's proponents argue that it presents the best opportunity for future participation in the work place, while its detractors worry over its potential for deskilling and the eventual elimination of many kinds of paid work, as mental labor, as well as physical, is replaced by machines. Fears about information technology's potential for job elimination are usually countered by economists who predict a balancing effect in workforce distribution that will result, eventually, in a zero net gain/loss in employment due to the technology's combined impact of increased efficiency (i.e., lowered rates of employment) and economic growth (i.e., job creation). To date, the evidence indicates that information technology does bring with it the opportunity for occupational upgrading through the creation of some new high tech jobs. However, there is also little doubt that many people are being displaced and deskilled as a result of technological change in the workplace. As one analyst put it, "in short, instead of replacing bad jobs with good jobs, computers are likely to create some good jobs, some bad ones, and eliminate a lot of others" (Kraft 1987, p. 100). Even some computer programmers find themselves driven out of work by the very technologies they helped to create.

Probably the best way to characterize the long term outlook on employment levels is that it is uncertain. Unfortunately, "the romantic appeal of high-technology occupations far exceeds the real prospect of employment in those fields, and most people will have to hope for jobs in more familiar areas. The problem will be to find such jobs as industries' demand for labor declines" (Dolbeare 1989, p.

23). "The question is whether the rate of job creation will equal or exceed the rate of job consolidation and elimination. [So far] no one knows" (Chamot 1987, p. 28). We do know, however, that "there has been a dramatic decline in the creation of [well]-paying jobs since the early 1970s. From 1963 to 1973 almost nine out of every ten new jobs created paid middle-income wages. From 1979 to 1986 that figure shrank to only one in two" (Dudley, 1994, p. 33). Today we find ourselves in the midst of a "jobless recovery." Companies that are making vast profits continue to trim their payrolls by reducing the number of employees, even in the communications sector in which the promise of high-tech employment is supposedly greatest.

The Commodification of Information

Downsizing is also rampant in the public sector. For instance, over the past decade, the capacity of public sector libraries to maintain reasonably open access to information for all who wish it has been seriously undermined as a result of underfinancing. In the United States, the depository programs through which public access to government information is supposed to be maintained are inadequately funded and provide "minimal training and support for assisting users in accessing technologically based information." Furthermore, less and less information collected at the public's expense is available in print form and materials preserved in electronic formats are not part of the depository system (Gray 1993). As well, government information itself is increasingly becoming the object of commercial interest.

As more information is commodified and as microelectronic technology proliferates, not only has the price of materials traditionally purchased by libraries risen sharply, but there is increasing pressure to acquire or buy access to a myriad of other information

products. To cope with the strain this places on operating budgets, many library administrators have not only tried to reduce labor costs by reducing the proportion of professional librarians on staff, but they have also introduced user fees, thereby reducing the quality of service to the majority of users and bringing the public sector library into direct competition with vendors and compromising its mission to ensure universal access to information.

The human system that we have relied on for many years for our information infrastructure, has been made up of what are, for the most part, public institutions -- government bodies such as national libraries, data gathering agencies such as Statistics Canada, as well as thousands of public, university, and school libraries. What is now being touted in public policy promulgated by private sector interests is an enthusiastic pitch to replace this system with a new electronic infrastructure. Inevitably, this will have a deleterious impact on all but the most advantaged members of society. As Schiller explains,

In the reallocation of information resources now occurring throughout the economy from one set of users (the general population) to another (mostly corporate business users), one principle prevails. It is the market criterion -- the ability to pay. This determines who will receive and who will be excluded from the benefits of the information-lubricated economy. . . . Transforming information into a saleable good, available only to those with the ability to pay for it, changes the goal of information access from an egalitarian to a privileged condition (Schiller 1989, p. 75).

The more information is commodified, the greater the schism between the information "haves" and "have nots" as the public institutions that formerly played a role in closing this gap, including public sector libraries, become less and less potent. With commodification, "the principle of public knowledgeability, of the availability of information resources as a public service -- an ideal imperfectly

realized at the best of times -- will be undermined." This parallels "the subversion of public service broadcasting . . . and the dismantling of publicly owned communication systems (Robins and Webster, p. 64). It also corresponds to the promulgation of a new ideology in public education. As education theorist Henry Giroux's points out,

education for self and social formation gives way to a view of schooling reduced to the imperatives of corporate self-interest, industrial psychology, and cultural uniformity. Underlying the social relations that inform this notion of education is a view of the public as an aggregate of competing consumers whose commitment to justice, freedom and human worth is defined primarily through the logic of material and economic considerations (Giroux 1988, p. 18).

Conclusion

In our own profession, old-style librarians who advocate for the library as an important social institution and physical place for all citizens are denigrated for being "old women" (whether they are male or female). In favor now are the new, male-style information specialists who promote a vision of the virtual library in which direct human contact is replaced with access to fast computerized information networks, financed on a per-use basis.

The undermining of a shared-service ethic and those who espouse it in librarianship and other feminized professions cannot be understood without reference to changing global economic patterns which are supported by public policies shaped by a widespread faith in the self-regulatory powers and inherent goodness of free market forces. This faith is bolstered by high-tech gurus and others who promulgate the ideology of individualism. One effect of this has been to undermine the public infrastructure which has been built

over the years in order to share collectively our resources with all members of society. Those of us who resist the present redirection of resources are silenced by those who cast us either as villains or incompetents. Their fear, of course, is that we will interfere with an economic imperative that benefits only a small, advantaged group in our society.

WORKS CITED

- Advisory Committee on a Telecommunications Strategy for the Province of Ontario. (1992). *Telecommunications: Enabling Ontario's Future*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications.
- Chamot, Dennis (1987). Electronic work and the white-collar employee. In Robert E. Kraut (ed.), *Technology and the transformation of white-collar work*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 23-33.
- Cockburn, Cynthia and Ormrod, Susan. (1993). *Gender and technology in the making*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dolbeare, Kenneth M. (1989). The nature of economic transformation. In D. Stanley Eitzen and Maxine Baca Zinn (eds.), *The reshaping of America: Social consequences of the changing economy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, pp. 19-23.
- Dudley, Kathryn Marie (1994). *The end of the line: Lost jobs, new lives in postindustrial America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fierheller, George. (1994). A fabric of intelligence--how our supercomputing network is weaving the next human renaissance. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 19, 31-38.
- Gill, Colin and Krieger, Hubert. (1992). The diffusion of participation in new information technology in Europe: Survey results. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 13, 331-358.
- Giroux, Henry A. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gray, Carolyn. (1993). The civic role of libraries. In John Buschman (ed.), *Critical approaches to information technology in librarianship*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood.
- Harris, Roma M. (1994). Abandoning care: Information technology and restructuring of Canadian public sector libraries. *Proceedings of the fourth International Symposium for Informationswissenschaft*, Graz, Austria, 600-606.
- Harrison, Bennett and Bluestone, Barry (1988). *The great U-turn: Corporate restructuring and the polarizing of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles R. (1987). *Federal information policies in the 1980s: Conflicts and issues*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

- Kling, Rob and Dunlop, Charles. (1993). Controversies about computerization and the character of white collar worklife. *The Information Society*, 9, 1-29.
- Kraft, Philip. (1987). Computers and the automation of work. In Robert E. Kraut (ed.), *Technology and the transformation of white-collar work*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 99-111.
- Mosco, Vincent. (1989). *The Pay-per society: Computers and communication in the information age*. Toronto: Garamond.
- Parenti, Michael (1994). *Land of idols: Political mythology in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Robins, Kevin and Webster, Frank. (1988). Cybernetic capitalism: Information, technology and everyday life. In Vincent Mosco and Janet Wasko (eds.), *The political economy of information*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Segal, Howard P. (1994). *Future imperfect: The mixed blessings of technology in America*. Amherst Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Schiller, Herbert I. (1989). *Culture Inc: The corporate takeover of public expression*. New York: Oxford University Press.

The research described in this paper was funded by a generous grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (grant no. 410-92-0024).

[Editors Note: The above article and the two that follow were presented as papers at the Association of College and Research Libraries' 7th Conference in Pittsburgh, PA, on March 31, 1995.]

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND THE FUTURE OF WORK

by Stan A. Hannah and Michael H. Harris

Virtually all students of the information age suggest that the nature of work, and work arrangements, will be dramatically impacted by what Daniel Bell has defined as "intellectual technology."¹ That is, the emergence of a "computer-assisted 'theoretical knowledge' universalized by telecommunications" (Archer 1990, p. 107) has the potential to revolutionize the nature of work in the post-industrial era. As H. V. Savitch (1988, p. 5) recently noted: "Boiled down, post-industrialism is a broad phenomenon that can be gauged along multiple dimensions. It encompasses change in what we do to earn a livelihood (processing or services rather than manufacturing) as well as how we do it (brains rather than hands) and where we do it (offices rather than factories)."

Ironically, while Bell (1980) argues that the post-industrial era may well have a "decisive" impact on "the character of the occupations and work in which men engage" (p. 501), he offers very little serious analysis of how he feels the technology will impact on the workplace. Numerous scholars have noted this blindspot in Bell's scenario, and have gone further to suggest that his brief remarks on the question are hopelessly utopian and too often contradictory. Margaret Archer (1990) notes that the result is an unconvincing and casual attempt to rewrite Emile Durkheim's (1984) classic *Division of Labor in Society* "with a happy ending" (p. 101).

A careful student of Bell's work will find it full of provocative and often contradictory comments on the nature of work in the post-industrial era, but little can be found in the way of thorough

projections. Perhaps the most forceful and suggestive remark Bell (1989) has made on this fundamental question is the following:

If character is defined by work, then we shall see a society where "nature" is largely excluded and "things" are largely excluded within the experience of persons. If more and more individuals are in work situations that involve a "game between persons", clearly more and more questions of equity and "comparable worth" will arise. The nature of hierarchy in work may be increasingly questioned, and new modes of participation may be called for. All of these portend huge changes in the structures of organization from those we have seen in older models (p. 171).

The implication seems to be that the post-industrial era will mandate an end to the rigidly hierarchical organization structure so characteristic of contemporary life, and will rather naturally lead to the undermining of the long-standing and institutionalized exclusionary and discriminatory practices so commonly reflected in gender and racial labor market segmentation in 20th century America. Even more clear is the fact that the post-industrial era will dictate a change in "the places where people work" and "the kind of work they do" (Bell 1973, p. 134).

Judith Perrole (1991) has noted that Bell's adherents "argue that computers will enhance the quality and working conditions of intellectual labor, freeing humans from the drudgery of routine mental activity and freeing them for creative thought" (p. 222). They do not fear the computer, for they endorse Bell's belief in "growing egalitarianism" in the post-industrial workplace, and insist that "knowledge engineering applications should not reduce the wages, autonomy, or skill of employees in the professional, managerial, and higher level technical categories" (p. 223).

While many students of the post-industrial workplace have found Bell's suggestion that the information age will mandate new organizational structures of use in analyzing our future, others are troubled by his adamant opposition to affirmative action and quota programs designed to reduce deliberately the extent of racial and gender discrimination in the workplace. While all hope that his optimistic conclusion that the end of smokestack America and the emergence of the information and service economy will herald the creation of a safer, more rewarding, and more meritocratic working environment, many still fear that long-standing discriminatory and exploitative workplace relationships will remain in place unless deliberate and forceful action is taken to eliminate these practices. It should come as no surprise to find that women and people of color are less sanguine about the post-industrial workplace than are well educated white males.

*Contra-Bell: Harry Braverman and the Degradation and
Deskilling of Work in Post-Industrial America*

One year after the publication of Bell's *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* sociologists of work encountered another book which was to stimulate a firestorm of debate and a tidal wave of research. Harry Braverman's *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century* (1974) appeared at the very moment when workers and sociologists of work alike were awakening to the problems and potential of the post-industrial workplace. The stage was set for a major confrontation between Braverman and Bell, for Braverman's work directly contradicted Bell's scenario in almost every particular. That is, where Bell forecast a significant reorganization of the workplace in the new "game between persons," Braverman saw only further centralization and management authoritarianism. Where Bell projected a workforce that would be considerably "upskilled," Braverman insisted that the

workers would be further "deskilled." Where Bell glimpsed only more rewarding and fulfilling work, Braverman noticed intensifying worker alienation and the steady "degradation" of work. What became all too clear to serious students of the sociology of work in American society was that one of them had it wrong. But which one?

The empirical work stimulated by the obvious contradictions in the theories put forward by Bell and Braverman has grown into a significant corpus of scholarship which is increasingly hard to concisely categorize (for a variety of maps see Kai Erikson and Steven Vallas, 1990). One should not be surprised to learn in advance that the results of empirical work designed to test the theses put forward by Bell and Braverman have tended to run at some highly eccentric angles.

In trying to sort out this huge, and rapidly growing, body of research we might best begin with the observation that Braverman's ideas initially met with a surprisingly positive reception given their dark and foreboding predictions about work in post-industrial America. Within a decade the "Braverman thesis" had generated a large body of research along a wide ranging front all gathered, by students of the subject, under the rubric of "the labor process school" of the sociology of work.² Braverman had insisted that what was most striking about the post-industrial workplace was its similarities and continuities with the industrial workplace. Building on Marxist scholarship, he reminded his readers that the essential dynamic of the capitalist system was the profit motive. He carefully documented the extent to which capitalists tended to maximize profits by exploiting workers. Braverman suggested that this was most commonly done by "Taylorizing" work. By this he meant that employers were always tempted to simplify work tasks, utilizing a variety of systems analysis techniques, and once this process was

complete management would rob the workers of their skills and replace skilled workers with a more pliant and less expensive workforce. Braverman viewed the emergence of information technology as "an integral part of the struggle between labor and capital" which lead to "proletarianizing" of the workforce (Webster and Robbins, 1986, p. 129). The outcome, virtually inevitable, was that workers would be steadily and consistently deskilled and the quality of work in American society would be continuously degraded. He implied that professionals were not immune to this deskilling and degrading of their work, and he suggested that it was only a matter of time before professionals would encounter the fate of craft workers in the capitalist workplace.

Immediately upon publication of Braverman's work a large number of scholars, skeptical of Bell's upbeat scenario for the post-industrial workforce, set out to test the "Braverman thesis" in every corner of the post-industrial workplace. Judith Perrole (1991, p. 225) summarized the research agenda in this way:

If information itself is seen as a commodity produced for profit by the rational organization and mechanization of intellectual labor, then information can be produced by the computer in the same way that products were made by the factory machinery of the first industrial revolution through the alienation of laborers from the production process.

Other studies seemed to confirm much of the Braverman thesis. For instance, Philip Kraft (1979) studied the impact of IT on computer programming and concluded that:

It is clear. . .that programming has experienced a steady process of fragmentation and routinization while programmers as a group have experienced a rapid deskilling. These trends call into question the major claim of technology advocates,

that increasingly sophisticated technology in the workplace creates jobs that are better than those it displaces (p. 17).

Kraft's conclusions were supported by Aronowitz and DiFazio (1994, p. 21), who noted that the development of computer-aided software now threatens "the most glamorous of the technical professionals associated with computer technology programming. . . ." Although there will remain a need for "superprogrammers" to create new and innovative software, the majority of computer programmers are likely to be replaced by intelligent software that is already capable of automatically writing most of the low-level, routine programming turned out by today's programmers (Aronowitz and DiFazio, 1994, p. 21). They gloomily concluded that computer technology is now so sophisticated that an increasing number of white collar jobs are at risk (Aronowitz and DiFazio, 1994):

each generation of technological change makes some work more complex and interesting and raises the level of training or qualification required by a (diminishing) fraction of intellectual and manual labor, for the overwhelming majority of workers, this process simplifies tasks or eliminates them, and thus eliminates the worker (p. 20).

The logical result of Aronowitz and DiFazio's dark vision of a world headed inevitably towards massive underemployment - the ultimate end of deskilling - is summarized by the following apocryphal story that captures our most basic fears of information technology. In this story the factory of the future's entire staff consists of one employee and a dog. The employee's sole responsibility is to feed the dog. The dog is there to make sure that the employee does not touch any of the machines.

It must be quickly noted that the picture has become less clear with time. As more and more studies have accumulated testing the Bell

and Braverman theories, we have been able to develop a more detailed and complex picture of the emerging post-industrial workplace which confirms (and undermines) aspects of both theories. Paul Attewell (1987) summarizes the evidence as follows by pointing out that Braverman's "notion that deskilling is the dominant tendency across the whole economy" is not borne out by the evidence (p. 325). He notes that while "few scholars believe that deskilling never occurs" it is apparent that deskilling is not the "secular trend" identified by Braverman, and that it has not been the fate of the workingclass in the post-industrial era (p. 341). William Form (1987) agrees and notes that while deskilling does, indeed, occur, it does not seem to be the dominant theme in the post-industrial workplace.³

Thus, we find that the research is as contradictory in 1995 as it was in 1974. As Magali Larson (1980) noted early in the debate, "we may now be facing either the proletarianization of new social categories . . . or the ascension of a new class [of information professionals] or both things" (p. 171). Judith Perrole (1991) noticed the same ambiguity in the current workplace environment when she wrote:

In both an economic and cultural sense, and regardless of the outcome of the deskilling debate, the spread of knowledge engineering will devalue some kinds of mental labor. In the economic sense, professional, technical and managerial employees who do the kind of thinking that machines do (or that inexpensive labor does with machines) will see a relative reduction in their wages and salaries unless they can acquire new tasks to protect their existing areas of expertise from automation (p. 231).

Part of our uncertainty about the effect that information technology has had on the nature of work can be traced back to the considerable uncertainty about the definition of our key dependent variable:

skill. Braverman, as Attewell (1987) notes, developed his argument by contrasting two ideal types of worker - the craft worker and the detail worker. As Scarbrough and Corbett (1992, p. 103) have correctly pointed out, this formulation is ambiguous because neither specialization nor routinization necessarily imply a deskilling of work. About all we can say is that the introduction of information technology changes the nature and type of skill used in the workplace, but without a shared, operational definition of skill, we have no means of judging if the net effect of computerization has been, in fact, to deskill the workforce. In the next section we will change our focus and look at individual cases in which information technology has been used to change the nature of work. By focusing on the way in which the work force is involved in information technology projects, we will, hopefully, be able to arrive at a more realistic and balanced view of information technology's effect on the workplace.

*Shoshana Zuboff on the Informed Workplace
of the Information Era*

In 1978, Harvard Business School Professor Shoshana Zuboff set out to attempt to resolve the contradictions inherent in the theories of Daniel Bell and Harry Braverman. Convinced that the American workplace was on the "edge of a historical transformation of immense proportions" as the result of the emergence of "information technology" in the workplace, Zuboff (1988) wanted to understand the way in which worker's lives would be transformed in the post-industrial era:

assumptions about knowledge and power, their beliefs about work and the meaning they derived from it, the content and rhythm of their social exchanges, and the ordinary mental and physical disciplines to which they accommodated in their daily lives (p. xiii).

She was troubled by the extent to which Bell's views on these questions were limited to "sociological abstractions," and she launched an ambitious series of empirical studies of the changing American workplace in order to:

understand the practical problems that would have to be confronted in order to manage the new computerized workplace in ways that would fulfill the lofty promise of a knowledge-based society and to generate knowledge that would be instructive to those charged with that managerial responsibility (p. xiv).

The result, after ten years of work, was the publication of her extremely influential book entitled *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power* (1988). In this work Zuboff concludes that information technology promises to transform the American workplace fundamentally. She readily admits that Braverman's insistence that the dynamic of organizational management tempts managers to extend their "exclusive control of the organization's knowledge base" is clearly in evidence, but that the "informed" workplace promises to undermine such rigid and hierarchical control as it becomes increasingly clear to managers that the old emphasis on certainty and control is becoming decidedly unproductive. That is, while she acknowledges the validity of Braverman's insistence that managers attempt to generate profit by exploiting labor, she also insists that Daniel Bell is correct in arguing that the new "computer-mediated" workplace demands a new approach to organizational structure.

Based on her careful empirical work she concludes that while management may well resist change in the organization and control of the production process, the post-industrial era mandates "innovative methods of information sharing and social exchange" that will eventually lead to "a deepened sense of collective responsibility and

joint ownership, as access to ever-broader domains of information lend new objectivity to data and preempt the dictates of hierarchical authority" (p. 7). She argues that the informed organizations of the post-industrial era will transcend the "stale reproduction of the past" and will, instead, take advantage of this "historic opportunity to more fully develop the economic and human potential of our work organizations" (p. 7).

The key insight in Zuboff's work seems to be the notion that while the bottom line will continue to control organizational structure and management style that same attention to the profit motive will mandate the more affirmative and participatory workplace organization hinted at by Daniel Bell. In short, the old hierarchical and rigidly centralized management structures that so characterized American capitalism in the industrial era will prove inefficient in the post-industrial era, and the profit motive will drive managers to adopt more participatory styles.

Evidence for Zuboff's Informed Organizations

For the last century the traditional, hierarchical, "command and control" organization has been unrivaled as the dominant organizational model for both profit and nonprofit enterprises. The hierarchical organizational provided a means of dealing with large and complex organizations; it provided elaborate mechanisms for monitoring and supervising employees so that they did not shirk their duties or take advantage of their employer, plus it provided coordination across independent tasks and functions (Pfeffer, 1994, p. 43). Within the last decade, however, advances in information technology and research on worker performance have caused most management experts to question the effectiveness and efficiency of the venerable bureaucratic model.

Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot summarized the main strictures of the traditional organization as follows (1993):

In today's complex and intelligence-intensive world economy, it is becoming obvious that, in organizations as in nations, totalitarian governance and bureaucratic management are incompatible with high performance. Bureaucracy is dying because it produces organizations that lack the systems for assembling a collective intelligence to think both globally and in local detail, both near-term and long-term, and in terms of both freedom and community (p. xvi).

Although the details of the new organizational model remains unclear, there is little doubt that our nineteenth-century organizations are no longer capable of coping with twenty-first century challenges (Tomasko, 1993, p. 1). After losing more than \$32 billion in 1992 alone, even the former masters of hierarchical coordination such as IBM, Sears, and General Motors are now struggling to replace their bureaucratic and hierarchical organizational structures with decentralized, participative, and team-oriented models (Loomis, 1993, p. 37).

What Tapscott and Caston (1993, p. 13) refer to as the "new organizational paradigm," aims at nothing less than a complete rethinking of worker-management relationships. The reasons underlying Tapscott and Caston's rather startling assertion can best be understood by looking at one of the most famous case studies in management history.

In the 1980s General Motors spent \$40 billion to automate its factories. In fact, GM spent enough money on capital equipment to have purchased both Honda and Nissan (Pfeffer, 1994, p. 8). An analysis of the results of this massive investment revealed that (McKersie and Walton, 1991):

First, the performance of the GM plant with high technology but no work reform was not significantly better than that of the low-tech plant that continued traditional organizational practices. Advanced technology by itself clearly made little difference. Second, the NUMMI and Honda plants, with their moderate investments in technology but fundamentally reformed work organizations, dramatically outperformed GM's high-tech/traditional plant. Both required approximately 45 percent less time to assemble a car and produced 45 percent fewer quality defects than the GM plant. Third, compared with the NUMMI and Honda plants, Nissan's slightly more automated and slightly less advanced organizational design achieved comparable quality but significantly lower productivity. Again, the technology advantage appeared to be more than neutralized by a lag in organizational upgrading. The upshot is that advanced technology by itself fails to achieve performance gains. Only when innovation in work organization accompanies technological innovation do we see significant performance advantages (pp. 249-250).

The NUMMI plant is particularly noteworthy. Originally the plant was run in the same authoritarian and bureaucratic fashion that auto assembly plants have used since Henry Ford started assembling Model Ts. When a new system of management - based on teams, worker participation, extensive training, and the elimination of special parking and cafeterias for management - replaced the traditional command and control structures, productivity almost doubled. The importance of the NUMMI case is that the dramatic gains in productivity, worker satisfaction, and reduced absenteeism, were achieved with the same physical plant, the same employees, and virtually the same technology (Pfeffer 1994, p. 69-71). Because so many of the usual external variables remained unchanged, an MIT study was able to conclude that the organizational features of the NUMMI plant accounted for up to half the performance differences (Katz, Kochan, and Gobeille 1985, pp. 98-99).

Although the results of the NUMMI study remain the most startling, the failures of the traditional bureaucratic organizational structure have been well-documented in many other studies (Scarborough and Corbett, 1992, p. 122; Heller, 1989; and Piore and Sabel, 1984). There is clearly enough evidence to concur with Peter Keen's observation that (1991):

IT is most effective when it redeploys human capital -- when it cuts out unnecessary bureaucracy, leverages skills, and transforms the quality of work in an organization. If jobs stay the same or are tinkered with at the margin, innovation will be damaged. If jobs change but people either will not or cannot, stress, alienation, and incompetence will result. If jobs and people change, but not managers, expect a loss of trust and respect (pp. 29-30).

As Jeffrey Pfeffer (1994, p. 113) observed, "It seems almost axiomatic that the work force is unlikely to be used efficiently and effectively in an atmosphere of distrust or adversarial relations."

Organizational Inertia: Power, Technology and Organization Structure

Despite the mounting evidence that the principles of scientific management are flawed, systems designers, in all too many cases, persist in designing systems that use information technology to reduce work to drudgery - an almost certain recipe, in the opinion of Scarborough and Corbett, for failure in knowledge organizations (1992, p. 132). While few would question that "the logic of computers and networking makes obsolete many of our cherished notions of the past," research on the utilization of information technology in corporations has repeatedly found that "the main impact of computing has been to reinforce existing structures of communication, authority and power in organizations" (Kraemer, 1991, pp. xi, 172). Kraemer continues, "although information technology has long

been viewed as capable of bringing about organizational change, it has never been shown to play this role in reality." (1991, p. 167)

While we may, on an intellectual level understand that the "emphasis on authority and control is antithetical" to building the kind of organization that can thrive in today's environment, the realization that most organizations, including libraries, continue to retain their hierarchical and bureaucratic structures, clearly indicates that the changeover is both complex and difficult. First of all, any change away from the command and control approach used in traditional organizations would overturn the social relations and power in organizations. Because of this political dimension, those groups whose power base is threatened have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo - and with it, their authority. As a result, the transformation of organizations into decentralized, team-based, participative organizations remains more popular in management literature than in practice (Scarborough and Corbett, 1992, p. 89).

In addition to the political dimension, the task of converting a traditional organization into a flexible organization more attuned to the needs of the Post-Industrial economy is further complicated because we cannot change just one aspect of an organization. If we want the new organizational structure to work, we must simultaneously change the social, technical, and cultural systems as well (Weisbord, 1987, p. 66).

Some Tentative Conclusions

We can now see the outlines of an emerging consensus. While Braverman's thesis explains the industrial workplace, it is Daniel Bell who appears to have glimpsed the changes mandated by the post-industrial era. Management scholars agree with Zuboff when she insists that the very dynamic of a capitalist system will mandate

this change as managers seek to increase productivity and profit margins. While we are clearly in a transitional stage where both management styles are in evidence, it seems clear that computer-mediated work in the informed workplace will require a "major restructuring of work-roles" (Strassmann, 1985, p. 245). Larry Hirschhorn (1984) saw the same trend when he demonstrated that "postindustrial skill" will demand that workers be constantly involved in "the process of active learning, direct intervention in the machine system, and progressive widening of their knowledge" (p. 163). Lee Sproull and Sara Kiesler (1991), after an intense study of the networked workplace, concluded that while we are clearly in a transitional phase, the wave of the future appears to mandate:

a flexible, internally motivated, continuously learning work force; a strong internal culture to support information sharing and participation in problem solving; delegation or shared responsibility in recognition that dispersed activity requires local action and flexibility. . .and creation of dynamic procedures, structures, and groupings to amplify expertise and technology (p. 175).

Both the technological optimists and the technological pessimists posit extreme assumptions about technology and human behavior. While the "simplicity of these storylines gives them great clarity and makes them easy to grasp," they both err in their assumption that technology is the dominant force in shaping organizations (Dunlop and Kling, 1991, p. 28). The available evidence indicates that technology is only one of the many factors that influences an organization. By polarizing the debate over the organizational implications of computerization, both sides have ignored what research studies have repeatedly discovered: that the way the technology is implemented is as important as the technology itself.

Because organizational goals, organizational culture, social mores, and technology are all interconnected, organizations cannot simply

implement, without any planning, a particular piece of technology. "Research has shown," Venkatraman (1991) points out, that organizations "must do so in context, that it must consciously align its business strategy and its organization with its technology" (p. 122). The importance of this point is underlined by numerous research studies that provide clear evidence that advanced technology, by itself, will not lead to performance gains. According to Richard E. Walton (1989), "it is foolhardy to follow a design process which assumes that the technology will automatically elicit the appropriate organizational response" (p. 149). In his review of research that examined the links between productivity and technology, Paul Osterman (1991) concluded that "high-technology strategies, in the absence of significant changes in human resource practices...produce no significant productivity or quality improvements" (p. 225). The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization.

Thus, once again we must conclude that the picture is not nearly as clear as some would have us believe. Information technology does, indeed, appear to be a fundamental reality in the future of library and information services in the United States and many other nations throughout the world. However, we have little foundation for claiming that we know much about the direction or extent of the impact of information technology in libraries. We have only begun to glimpse the promise and the pitfalls, and it remains to be seen whether the library profession can bring the technology, a clear sense of mission, and the competent personnel together in a successful attempt to bring library and information service into the post-industrial era.

Despite the need for caution, it does appear clear that organizational structures and management styles will have to change.

Hierarchical and centralized management structures will be steadily undermined by the constant demand for speed and flexibility. Shoshana Zuboff's (1988) claim that organizations will, by necessity, become more participatory and open seems supported by research in both the sociology of work and information technology. And, Hirschorn's (1984) insistence that such change will offer more rewarding and challenging opportunities for information professionals is also persuasive. With enhanced opportunity will also come new responsibilities. Library and information professionals will find that they must be constantly involved in both "the learning organization" and the decision making process. Information technology is no panacea. But properly deployed, it offers the potential to enhance both the professional opportunities of librarians and the quality of service offered to the clients who depend upon their services.

NOTES

- 1) Early pages of this essay are adapted from Chapter Five of Michael H. Harris and Stan A. Hannah, *Into the Future: the Foundations of Library and Information Services in the Post-Industrial Era*, (Ablex, 1993).
- 2) A very useful and thorough treatment of the "labor process" school will be found in Paul Thompson's *The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labor Process* (1983). Thompson traces the history of Braverman's work, relates it to other theories, and provides a balanced assessment of its progress. The most aggressive empirical defense of Braverman can be found in Zimbalist (1979), and more recent assessments of the explanatory power of the "Braverman thesis" can be found in Attewell (1987), Form (1987), and Perrolle (1991). For an imaginative, but generally ignored, application of Braverman to librarianship see Estabrook (1981). Finally, for a current comparison of the various "sociologies" of work see Grint (1991), and for a troubling reaffirmation of Braverman see Stanley Aronowitz and William DiFazio (1994).
- 3) See also M. Baethge and H. Oberbeck (1989); and P. B. Doeringer et al. (1991).

WORKS CITED

- Archer, M. 1990. Theory, culture and Post-Industrial society. In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. M. Featherstone, 97-120. London: Sage.
- Aronowitz, S., and W. DiFazio. 1994. *The Jobless Future: Sci-tech and the Dogma of Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Attewell, P. 1987. The deskilling controversy. *Work and Occupations* 14, 323-46.
- Baethge, M. and H. Oberbeck. 1989. The future of the white collar worker. In *Information Society and Spatial Structure*, ed. H. Ernste and C. Jaeger, 117-29. London: Belhaven Press.
- Bell, D. 1973. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture In Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- _____. 1980. The social framework of the information society. In *The Microelectronics Revolution: The Complete Guide to the New Technology and Its Impact on Society*, ed. T. Forester, 500-549. Cambridge: MIT.
- _____. 1989. The third technological revolution. *Dissent* 36, 164-76.
- Braverman, H. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Doeringer, P. B. et. al. 1991. *Turbulence in the American Workplace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunlop, C. and R. Kling. 1991. The dreams of technological utopianism. In *Computerization and Controversy: Value Conflicts and Social Choices*, ed. C. Dunlop and R. Kling, 14-30. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1984. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Trans. W. D. Halls. New York: Free Press.
- Erikson, K. and S. P. Vallas. eds. 1990. *The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Estabrook, L. 1981. Productivity, profit, and libraries. *Library Journal* 106, 1377-1380.
- Form, W. 1987. On the degradation of skills. *Annual Review of Sociology* 13, 29-47.
- Garson, B. 1988. *The Electronic Sweatshop: How Computers are Transforming the Office of the Future into the Factory of the Past*. New York: Penguin.
- Grint, K. 1991. *The Sociology of Work: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harris, M. H. and S. A. Hannah. 1993. *Into the Future: The Foundations of Library and Information Services in the Post-Industrial Era*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Heller, F. A. 1989. Human resource management and the socio-technical approach. In *New Technology* ed. by G. J. Bamber and R. D. Lansbury. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Hirschhorn, L. 1984. *Beyond Mechanization: Work and Technology in a Post-Industrial Age*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Katz, H. C., T. A. Kochan, and K. R. Gobeille. 1985. Industrial relations performance, economic performance, and QWL programs: An interplant analysis. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. 37.
- Keen, P. G. W. 1991. *Shaping the Future: Business Design Through Information Technology*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Kraemer, K. L. 1991. Strategic Computing and Administrative Reform. In *Computerization and Controversy: Value Conflicts and Social Choices*, ed. C. Dunlop and R. Kling, 150-66. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Kraft, P. 1979. The industrialization of computer programming. In *Case Studies on the Labor Process*, ed. A. Zimbalist, 1-17. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Larson, M. S. 1980. Proletarianization and educated labor. *Theory and Society* 9, 131-75.
- McKersie, R. B., and R. E. Walton. 1991. Organizational change. In *The Corporation of the 1990s: Information Technology and Organizational Transformation*, ed. M. S. Morton, 244-77. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Osterman, P. 1991. The impact of IT on jobs and skills. In *The Corporation of the 1990s: Information Technology and Organizational Transformation*, ed. M. S. Morton, 220-43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perrolle, J. A. 1991. Intellectual assembly lines: The rationalization of managerial, professional, and technical work. In *Computerization and Controversy: Value Conflicts and Social Choice*, ed. C. Dunlop and R. Kling. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1994. *Competitive Advantage through People: Unleashing the Power of the Workforce*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pinchot, Gifford, and Elizabeth Pinchot. 1993. *The End of Bureaucracy & the Rise of the Intelligent Organization*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Piore, M., and C. Sabel. 1984. *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.
- Savitch, H. V. 1988. *Post-Industrial Cities: Politics and Planning in New York, Paris, and London*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Scarborough, H., and J. M. Corbett. 1992. *Technology and Organization: Power, Meaning and Design*. New York: Routledge.
- Sproull, L. and S. Kiesler. 1991. *Connections: New Ways of Working in the Networked Organization*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Strassmann, P. A. 1985. *Information Payoff: The Transformation of Work in the Electronic Age*. New York: Free Press.
- Tapscott, Don, and Art Caston. 1993. *Paradigm Shift: The New Promise of Information Technology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, P. 1983. *The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process*. London: Macmillan.
- Tomasko, Robert M. 1993. *Rethinking the Corporation: The Architecture of Change*. New York: AMACOM, 1993.

- Venkatraman, N. 1991. IT-induced business reconfiguration. In *The Corporation of the 1990s: Information Technology and Organizational Transformation*, ed. M. S. Morton, 122-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walton, R. E. 1989. *Up and Running: Integrating Information Technology and the Organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Webster, F., and K. Robins. 1986. *Information Technology: A Luddite Analysis*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Weisbord, M. R. 1987. *Productive Workplaces: Organizing and Managing for Dignity, Meaning, and Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zimbalist, A., ed. 1979. *Case Studies on the Labor Process*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Zuboff, S. 1988. *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power*. New York: Basic Books.

TECHNOLOGY AND LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE: QUESTION OR ANSWER ?

by John Budd

When examining the history of anything some fundamental questions spring to mind: What drives history? How is the human element perceived in relation to the world? Does an optimism or a pessimism appear to govern the course of human development? These questions are certainly foremost in any inquiry into the role technology has played in human action. If attention is focused on the history of libraries and information, these questions are central, and they are joined by another, equally essential one: is this history convergent with or divergent from the path taken by history generally? In other words, do thought and action in the profession of library and information science reflect the same influences, embody the same prejudices and hopes, embrace the same foundations, as the history of the societies of which we are part? Or does the profession follow uncritically the ideas and ways of thinking that are dominant at any point in time?

In order to attempt answers to some of these later questions, what technology is must be clarified. The next step is to look, at least cursorily, at some moments from our past to see if the profession's notion of technology has been in concert with society's. Then, and only then, can the philosophy of technology be examined in order to glean what library and information science can learn from the serious thought that has been given to the place technology has in today's world.

Technology's Scope

First, it is important to make a distinction at the outset. When we speak of technology we tend to refer to the machine and its actions and products. This is the narrowest possible view of technology. Such a definition suggests almost an absence of a relationship between humans and human technology. Somehow, once created, the machine has its own will and determines its own action. Granted, speculative fiction has, for many decades, fed on just such a notion of the machine as Being (in the phenomenological sense). If we are to understand what technology is, we must grasp the reality that it is both a product and a kind of human activity. The error that seems to be most frequently made -- in library and information science (LIS) and, by and large, in the world -- is mistaking technics for technology. Technics are part of technology; they are the tangible manifestation of the totality of a design and application process. If it helps, imagine the differences between engineering and construction. Construction is, for the most part, technical; it is the application of design. Construction has its end product, the purpose, origins, and uses of which are secondary to the pouring, fitting, welding, etc. that go into the creation of the physical thing itself. Engineering, on the other hand, involves discerning a purpose for the product, imagining its use, and designing its construction. Technology employs technics to bring about a very particular end. In library terms, we can see cataloging as a technology and the catalog as technic.

A question that introduces itself early in the consideration of technology is what is the place of humans in technology? Is human technology natural or organic; is it part of the natural world, an outgrowth of what occurs naturally? For thinkers such as Martin Heidegger and José Ortega y Gasset human technology is decidedly not natural. Ortega, in *Man and People*, writes that

human beings are technical, are capable of modifying their environment to fit their sense of convenience because they take advantage of every respite that things allow in order to retire within themselves, to enter into themselves and form ideas about the world, about things and their relations to them, to forge a plan of attack upon circumstances, in short, to construct an inner world. From this inner world they emerge and return to the outside. But they return. . . with *selves* [emphasis in original] they did not have before. . . in order to impose their wills and designs, to realize in the outside world their ideas, to mold the planet according to the preferences of their interiority (1957, p. 20).

What is evident in Ortega's vision is that technology begins with human thought and is realized through human will. Ortega himself uses the word "impose"; the technology created by humans is some attempt at domination -- usually domination of nature.

Historical Views of Technology

The thoughts of Ortega thrust us a bit too far ahead in our discourse, though. Before examining formal modes of thought regarding technology, it is most useful to discern how it is envisioned in mundane (not used in any pejorative sense) terms, including those of the profession of LIS. In an essay entitled "The Neutrality of Technology: A Critique of Assumptions," Norman Balabanian quotes from the Guidebook to the 1933 Chicago World's Fair: "Science discovers, genius invents, industry applies, and man adapts himself, or is molded by, new things. . . . Individuals, groups, entire races of men fall into step with science and technology" (1993, p.15). As Balabanian points out, these statements are made with unambiguous (and probably with uncritical) satisfaction. But the excerpt deserves some close attention. It begins with "science discovers," as though there is some extra-human entity that is responsible for the entirety of inquiry, experimentation, and, finally,

discovery. Once discovery is made, human beings must adjust to a world that has been reshaped by this irresistible force. To infer a bit more deeply, science governs humans; it defines their lives; it determines their being, including their history. (This is a theme to which we will return.)

Why would people 100 years ago, 50 years ago, or today, cling to a view of technology that not only doesn't recognize, but negates, the human element? Perhaps it is a phenomenon that, if not peculiarly American, is more likely to be manifest here than in most other locations. It may have roots in the optimism that led to the colonization of North America, that spurred the effort aimed at independence, and that helped frame the foundation upon which the United States is based. From the beginnings of English settlement on these shores there was an explicit faith in what Merritt Roe Smith refers to as the "moral and material improvement" of the citizens of the colonies. "The optimism, the belief in the perfectibility of humans, was certainly an element of " Enlightenment thought (1994, p.3).

In America the emphasis on reason was manifest as an idea of progress, an idea espoused by the likes of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Perhaps it is most important to observe, as Smith does, that the moral and the material are not really distinguished from one another in this optimism. As Neil Postman states, "in cultures that have a democratic ethos, relatively weak traditions, and a high receptivity to new technologies, everyone is inclined to be enthusiastic about technological change, believing that its benefits will eventually spread evenly among the entire population" (1992, p.11).

The optimism, and its dual moral-material manifestation, continued throughout the nineteenth century in the form of a push to progress. Technology gave impetus both to the belief in progress and the confidence that progress is not merely benign, but healthy and

desirable. Part of the push to progress resulted in sweeping changes to education, especially higher education. First came some structural changes that reflected a much broader societal shift. In the 1840s the Sheffield Scientific School was founded at Yale and the Lawrence Scientific School opened at Harvard. Later in the century the university movement took its first unsteady steps, begun (more or less) with the founding of the Johns Hopkins University in 1876. The uniqueness of Johns Hopkins was that it was begun as a research university. Faith in technology and belief in progress was becoming, throughout the nineteenth century, institutionalized; it was insinuating itself into the formal structures of American life. The last quarter of the nineteenth century was also witness to what might be termed the rise of the professions, librarianship among them. Suzanne Hildenbrand (1985) writes of the connection between the genesis of Progressivism in the nineteenth century as it paralleled the rise of the professions. While she does not make explicit reference to technology, it is assuredly a component of the profession's knowledge base, the claim to expertise, and the sources of control that become a hallmark of the professions -- what Paul Starr (1982) recognizes as legitimacy and dependence.

Before continuing with discussion of technology viewed from within library and information science, an observation, not original here, must be considered. It could be posited from the example of scientific management that the place of technology in our world and in our lives is a component of the totality of our social system. Technology might be seen as a response to a specific reaction to the social situation--for instance, the thought that progress (however defined) would be enhanced if humans could devise new means of physical movement or of communication. Inherent in the reaction is a certain perception of the need, a perception that might vary from the possibility of increased industrial or agricultural production or of accelerated trade in monetary or commodity markets to the

provision of education or goods to a dispersed population. Also, once in place, the technology is part of the perceptual reality of those who employ it or are affected by it. In other words, technology, as a socially-constructed entity, is undergirded by motive and overlaid with perception. It is not pure object. The social importance of technology is clearly stated by Balabanian (1993, p.37): "Technology is not a neutral, passive tool devoid of values; it takes the shape of and, in turn, helps to shape, its imbedding social system." The transformative power of technology was earlier recognized by Karl Marx, who asked, "is Achilles possible when powder and shot have been invented? And is the Iliad possible at all when the printing press and even printing machines exist?" (1970, p.150)

The statements by Balabanian and by Marx present a conundrum for anyone pondering technology. The just-stated possible interpretations of technology as response depend on a social construction for technology. That is, there is an assumption that social and cultural forces define or determine technological development, that it is humans who create and apply technology for purposes governed by human or social need or demand. This particular view is opposed to that of technological determinism. Thomas Hughes offers the simplest definition of technological determinism: "the belief that technical forces determine social and cultural changes" (1994, p.102). This definition is simplistic; those who have addressed the issue of technological determinism have readily admitted that there is a social and contextual envelope, even for determinism. Michael L. Smith, for instance, says that "About technological determinism we could also argue that the issue is not really technology at all but rather a curious cultural and political fetishism whereby artifacts stand in for technology, and technology in turn signifies national progress" (1994, p.39). Robert Heilbroner also asserts that technological determinism is a conditional state,

and "is thus peculiarly a problem of a certain historical epoch -- specifically that of high capitalism and low socialism -- in which the forces of technical change have been unleashed, but when the agencies for the control or guidance of technology are still rudimentary" (1994, p.68). We happen to be living in just such an epoch. Even those mitigated assessments of technology in modern (and the word is used advisedly) culture is a subtle acquiescence to some deterministic force at work, whether that force be technology, society, or a combination of the two. Verification of true determinism is nearly impossible, yet there is a mode of thought which accepts that a course -- past, present, or future -- is removed from the individual (or even from the group) and is fixed by some overwhelming force.

Librarianship & Technology

If librarianship's claim to the status of a profession occurred during the eventful period of the late 19th century, why was it not able to achieve the status of, say, medicine or law? One possible reason for its failure to scale those heights may be that librarianship did not embrace a progressive technology. To go out on a limb, it may be that librarianship did not consciously incorporate any technology at all (including that of the book); rather it began to turn its attention to a set of techniques (technics). Klaus Musmann (1993) suggests that the emphasis on technics received a formal boost by the curriculum of the School of Library Economy, founded by Melvil Dewey at Columbia in 1887.

Some criticism of the school's first-year curriculum was voiced by Mary Wright Plummer. She was a member of the initial class and later became the chair of the Pratt Institute Library School. Plummer indicated that the curriculum consisted primarily of practice toward the attainment of a "library hand," the keeping of accession books, the writing of catalog cards, and some study of the classification. "Odd moments

were filled-up" by using a Hammond typewriter, practicing cyclostyling, and doing reference work. (p. 26)

There may be some dispute regarding technics in the first year of the program's operation. Francis Miksa's (1988) inquiry into the school's curriculum reveals that the first year of instruction (1887-88) was not characterized by a narrow offering of techniques; instead it emphasized a broad knowledge base. Miksa does acknowledge, however, that Dewey himself repeatedly spoke of the technical side of instruction; the question, admitted by Miksa, is to what extent Dewey's stressing of techniques affected instruction after the first year, and to what extent it may have influenced the other early library education programs.

Around the turn of the century it was evident that the applications of technology were having impacts on life in some very fundamental ways, for instance in transportation and communication. The effects of the applications were even more far-reaching than the surface of our material life, though. As an example, let us consider Frederick Taylor's espousal of scientific management. Taylor, and especially successors who embraced scientific management not merely as an ideal of human production but as a tool for the transformation of humans into productive forces, provided an articulation of a system in which such elements as human judgment take a back seat to calculation and measurement. Postman (1992, p.51) claims that scientific management asserts a principal assumption of a technological society: the belief "that the primary, if not the only, goal of human labor and thought is efficiency." In such a society the individual may be subjugated to the interests of the enterprise, whatever that enterprise may be. This notion was affirmed in no uncertain terms in 1909 by Arthur Bostwick (1909):

One can not go careering about eccentrically and unsystematically; the very purpose of organization is to stop all that;

but within the limits of motion and action assigned to a person as his part in the larger motion and action of the machine, there is still room for moving well or ill, for helping on the greater work or antagonizing it and throwing it out of order. If a cog-wheel thinks it is manifesting its originality in some meritorious way by making the whole machine creak and wobble and turn out an inferior product, that cog-wheel has power to do just this; but it should not complain if the machinist throws it into the scrap heap (p.477).

Bostwick openly equates the organization, specifically the library, with the machine, and implies that a library director may be likened to a machinist. The mechanistic metaphor employed in scientific management can be, as this statement illustrates, a thin disguise for a literal vision of human work and organization.

Ascribing belief is very difficult, but examining the language which is intended to communicate beliefs is possible. When it comes to technology and librarianship, there are moments in the past when the kind of determinism previously mentioned seems to influence, if not govern, the expression of thought. The implication here is not that there is an overt admission that technology is utterly divorced from the social purposes to which it is put, but there are examples of a stated willingness to relinquish to technology, or at least to technics, a control over its setting and its users. James Perry wrote in 1950, "Machines, either available now or capable of being designed, permit a finite number of relationships to be indicated in the coding itself. Such relationships are thereby made directly accessible to machine operations"(p.138). This statement, which ostensibly is intended to indicate uses to which technology may be put in the searching of databases, betrays a faith in the machine's ability to command action by autonomously allowing certain events to occur, including its own design. In 1965 Carl Overhage and Joyce Harmon wrote that "the librarian of 1975 will be less involved than now with the individual transaction between user and book. . . . The

librarian will be able to operate with greater freedom by having control over advanced machinery" (1967, p.94). While the writers assert that librarians control technology, it is the technology that makes possible the freedom experienced by the librarians. The freedom spoken of appears to be freedom from interaction with information users and their efforts at construction of meaning.

The examples of technological determinism continue in the present. In a recent posting to a library-oriented listserv one person wrote that "we were happy with the information NOTIS gave us on the use of bound volumes." Besides illustrating the excruciating semantic difficulties attached to the word "information," the implication is that an automated system is capable of intelligent action. Perhaps the most problematic excerpt from a discourse on libraries and technology comes from a recent *American Libraries* article, "Reference Services in the Virtual Library," by Judy Meyers (1994, p.635). In envisioning searching activity in the future, she suggests an outcome to a query on the article's title: "The computer is telling me 'Library' is a broader term than 'Reference Service.' There may be no direct connection between 'Reference Service' and 'Virtual,' but maybe I can get there through 'Future'" Why is this problematic? First, the excerpt betrays the same manifestation of determinism as the other examples; technology is defining, not only its uses, but also the means by which it is understood. More importantly, in Meyers' vision it is technology that embodies the primary cognitive force in a function such as reference work.

At the heart of any consideration of determinism -- whether we speak of the tacit acceptance of a history determined by an external force or we resist the allure of that force's capacity to define our thoughts and actions -- is the matter of control. Rosalind Williams (1994, p.220) succinctly sums up the locus of control in relation to a deterministic stance: "The most fundamental understanding of

what is possible and what is not -- of what is determined and what is not -- is bound up with the hegemonic order." A principle aspect of determinism is control of one entity over another, whether that control be exerted by the one, or abdicated by the other. Moreover, the establishment and ascendancy of any hegemonic order is closely tied to the legitimacy of meaning. Simply stated, a social construction is, in large part, a search for meaning in the ideas and actions of the players in the society. A hegemony, as an authority, is able to assert its desired meaning through cooptation, coercion, insinuation, or imposition. At least since Alexandria libraries have been an effective device of hegemonic order, at various times serving as a principle mechanism of the Church, the university, the state, or the democratic ideal (as determined by an elite's construction of working democracy). While this may sound ideological, we must remember that the library throughout history has seldom been self-determining.

Technology, Hegemony & Libraries

The technologies employed by librarians and for information have likewise been products of the hegemony. The authority of domination is based on control. In the modern world domination has been, in one form or another, based on reason. The importance of reason suggests that modernity dates back at least to the Enlightenment, and probably predates the seventeenth century. The technology that has been a product of such a reason-based hegemonic order has focused on the material lives of humans. These technologies, have produced the steam engine, the electric light, the automobile, and the airplane. As a new technology has supplanted an older one it has attained a privileged status, either as a property or a means of production. The new technology also redefines, just as travel by air provided humans with a different conception of time than that which was common with travel by rail or road. Information

technologies are no different. And, as John Buschman (1993, p.134) points out, "If there was any doubt, note that along with a healthy measure of social prestige, information technologies are firmly aligned with socio-economic clout as well." Such a notion characterizes well the material importance of technology in the modern world.

There is very good reason to believe, however, that the modern world has been replaced by a postmodern condition. Jean-Francois Lyotard, a foremost observer of this postmodern condition, says that,

it is fair to say that for the last forty years the "leading" sciences and technologies have had to do with language. . . . These technological transformations can be expected to have a considerable impact on knowledge. . . . Along with the hegemony of computers comes a certain logic, and therefore a set of prescriptions determining which statements are accepted as "knowledge" statements (1984, p. 3-4).

In such a state reason no longer reigns; it is replaced by an a-rationality which is identifiable in part by its ahistorical quality. The order that may have served to distinguish communication does not hold. Mark Poster describes the essential difference between the nature of communication past and present:

But the nineteenth-century novel differed from the television commercial in the crucial respect that it constructed the recipient of the communication in relation to the constraints of a relatively coherent bourgeois culture, whereas the advertisement does so within a postmodern mass culture composed of decontextualized images and signs, of floating signifiers and designer language (1989, p.135).

The decontextualization, for Poster, is recognized by a poststructuralist approach to language, in which there is a strong denial of the assumption that "theoretical discourse is a direct expression of a truth in the theorist's mind, that this truth in some way captures historical reality, and that the question of freedom entails the appropriation of this truth by historical agents and their subsequent action to actualize it" (1989, p.11). We should ask ourselves if the library, which may have some affinity with the novel in the nineteenth century, is now more akin to the television commercial. If this is so, it may be that the traditional image of the library, perhaps the one librarians wish portrayed or one that has redefined itself, has been decontextualized.

Conclusion

Where does this leave us? Is there anything that can help us to frame our thoughts regarding technology and librarianship? One thing should be clear at the point; technology is not the answer. We should probably return to Martin Heidegger, who spoke of the question concerning technology. That question is, in the end: what is the essence of technology? "Technology is not the equivalent to the essence of technology. . . . Likewise, the essence of technology is by no means anything technological. Thus we shall never experience our relationship to the essence of technology so long as we merely conceive and push forward the technological, put up with it, or evade it" (1977, p.4). This essence is elusive, because it is multifarious. Technology is a human contrivance, but it is not merely a simple means to an end. It may also be a cause in Heidegger's sense of bring-forth. In part this means that technology is instrumental to some action or product; the automobile transports, the computer calculates. But bringing-forth also connotes a way of revealing, a way of showing, not just process, but purpose. In this regard technology is related to knowledge. For Heidegger the essence of

technology is not simply a framework for thinking, but a challenging. The challenge arises partly through the revealing, through what is shown; in this sense the challenge is a call, an invitation. The challenge also arises through concealing, since if something is revealed, that revelation tends to obscure other things. In this sense the challenge is a warning. Heidegger's claim is that both senses of challenge are essential to technology, and we should not forget that the one always implies the other.

Carl Mitcham (1994) provides a very useful framework for us to begin the consideration of technology and librarianship. The framework is predicated on four modes of thinking about technology: technology as object, technology as activity, technology as knowledge, and technology as volition. Technology as object is the simplest of the four and the one which most frequently characterizes librarians' thinking. At the most basic, object signifies either the product of technology or the machine itself. One possible way of thinking about the latter may be the most indicative of the librarian's stance; that is, a view of the instrument (machine) as part of the world, but separate from ourselves. The aforementioned examples of librarians speaking of technology embody a language in which both the separation of human and machine and the combination of machine and world are evident. Technology as activity also has a simple and a more complex connotation. This simply refers to the use or employment of technology, to the "making" of something. In the more complex sense it refers to the activity of technology itself, to its influencing force. Put another way, it refers to the activity which technology dictates, how technology determines it uses.

Technology as knowledge embodies a giant leap from the merely technical to technology. The simpler frame of reference is the knowing and understanding how technology works, its design and purpose. This sense also includes Heidegger's notion of technology

as challenging, with the revealing and concealing that are part of the challenging. Technology as volition implies that there is a will behind technology's creation, a force that sees a purpose and brings about a realization, a tangible manifestation, of that purpose. Beyond this, though, technology as a challenging embodies a will and this will is most frequently (and most effectively) focused on control. The discussion earlier in this essay of control is an acknowledgment that technology as volition is a way of thinking that the profession of librarianship must recognize. Technology as volition includes an awareness that technology, at a fundamental level, is an imposition, through both the technic and the human uses of the technic, on nature or humanity to yield a desired product or outcome. Two things should be noted with regard to technology as volition: first, it is not the machine that wills; it is technology, with its purposes, design, and creators, that wills, second, the act of willing is, in itself, neither bad nor good.

This framework can be a tool that librarianship can employ to think further about the information technologies that are now an integral part of library and information work. A caution: thinking about technology is influenced by technology itself, because it has a transforming character, as many of the writers cited here can attest. Postman expresses the caution most eloquently: "New technologies alter the structure of our interests: the things we think *about*. They alter the character of our symbols: the things we think *with*. And they alter the nature of our community: the arena in which thoughts develop" (1992, p.20). The question asked earlier was why librarianship has not been able to achieve the status of other professions. Perhaps the answer lies in a failing, or a refusal, to recognize the distinction between technology and technic and to face Postman's caution. The task is to realize that technology is not passive, but is an active part (though not the irresistible force suggested in

the World's Fair Guidebook) of thought and behavior in any vision of the modern or postmodern world.

WORKS CITED

- Balabanian, Norman. 1993. The Neutrality of Technology: a critique of assumptions, in *Critical Approaches to Information Technology in Librarianship: foundation and applications*, ed. by John Buschman. Westport, CT.
- Bostwick, Arthur E. 1909. System in the Library, *Library Journal* 34 (November).
- Buschman, John. 1993. Issues in Censorship and Information Technology, in *Critical Approaches to Information Technology in Librarianship: foundations and applications*, ed. by John Buschman. Westport, CT.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lovitt. New York: Garland.
- Heilbroner, Robert L. 1994. Do Machines Make History? in *Does Technology Drive History?: the dilemma of technological determinism*, ed. by Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Hildenbrand, Suzanne. 1985. Ambiguous Authority and Aborted Ambition: gender, professionalism, and the rise of the welfare state, *Library Trends*: 34 (Fall).
- Hughes, Thomas P. 1994. Technological Momentum, in *Does Technology Drive History?: the dilemma of technological determinism*, ed. by Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Liotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: a report on knowledge*, trans. by Geoff Benington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minn. Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1970. *The German Ideology: part one, with selections from parts two and three, together with Marx's "Introduction to a critique of political economy,"* ed. by C. J. Arthur. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Meyers, Judy E. 1994. Reference Services in the Virtual Library, *American Libraries* 25 (July/August).
- Miska, Francis L. 1988. The Columbia School of Library Economy, 1887-1888, *Libraries & Culture* 23 (Summer).
- Mitcham, Carl. 1994. *Thinking Trough Technology: the path between engineering and philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Musmann, Klaus. 1993. *Technological Innovations in Libraries, 1860-1960 : an anecdotal history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Ortega y Gasset, Jose. 1957. *Man and People*, trans. by Willard R. Trask. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Overhage, Carl F.J. and R. Joyce Harmon. 1967. The On-line Intellectual Community and the Information Transfer System at M.I.T. in 1975, in *The Growth of Knowledge*, ed. by Manfred Kochen. New York: Wiley.
- Perry, James W. 1950. Information Analysis for Machine Searching, *American Documentation* 1.
- Poster, Mark. 1989. *Critical Theory and Poststructuralism: in search of a contest*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Postman, Neil. 1992. *Technopoly: the surrender of culture to technology*. New York: Knopf.
- Smith, Michael L. 1994. Recourse of Empire: landscapes of progress in technological America, in *Does Technology Drive History?: the dilemma of technological determinism*, ed. by Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Smith, Merritt Roe. 1994. Technological Determinism, in American Culture, in *Does Technology Drive History? the dilemma of technological determinism*, ed. by Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Starr, Paul. 1982. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books.
- Williams, Rosalind. 1994. The Political and Feminist Dimensions of Technological Determinism, in *Does Technology Drive History?: the dilemma of technological determinism*, ed. by Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

THE "ENOLA GAY" CONTROVERSY AS A LIBRARY ISSUE

by Elaine Harger

On January 30, 1995, the Right chalked-up another victory in the low intensity conflict that educational and cultural institutions in the United States have been stewing in over the past five years. Their latest win on the "culture war" front came when Michael Heyman, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, announced his decision to cancel an exhibit at the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum which had become the focus of a national controversy. The centerpiece of this exhibit was to have been the Enola Gay, the airplane that dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan, on August 6, 1945. That airplane represented for Air and Space Museum curators an important turning point not only in the history of aviation, but in the history of humankind, and they attempted to mount an exhibit that described the events leading up to the flight of the Enola Gay, the devastation the atom bomb's explosion wreaked on the city of Hiroshima, and the legacy of continued development of atomic weapons.

In attempting to tell these stories, museum curators came up against two powerful foes -- the personal memories of World War II veterans, and an array of organizations having either direct or indirect ties to the military including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and ultimately the U.S. Congress. Veterans expressed their opposition to the exhibit individually and collectively to the museum, to elected representatives, and to the media. An organization called the Air Force Association initiated and sustained organized opposition to the exhibit.

What does this fight between museum curators, historians, veterans, and the military have to do with librarians? What makes the Enola Gay controversy a "library issue"? What does this affair have to do with you, an individual librarian, or your library? And we might as well ask it now because someone certainly will sooner or later -- should the American Library Association be renting a room in a big Chicago hotel to allow this discussion to take place?

The cancellation of the National Air and Space Museum (NASM) exhibit is a library issue for several reasons:

- 1) It's a library issue because this is a case of censorship and librarians are professionally committed to opposing all forms and instances of censorship.
- 2) It's a library issue because libraries are institutions dedicated to the well-being of a democratic society and are responsible for informing their users about acts of censorship which threaten to erode our democratic rights. National and local media coverage brought the Enola Gay affair to the attention of millions of American, thus making the issue worthy of the attention of libraries nationwide.
- 3) It is also a library issue because, if the professional expertise of curators at the Smithsonian can be shackled so easily, if the Smithsonian's funding can be threatened by special interest groups, then who might be next? The Library of Congress? Your library? And how many instances of these debilitating controversies will it take before museums and libraries begin to practice self-censorship?
- 4) It is a library issue because the hidden heart of the fight between the Air and Space Museum and its opponents was about who

should have the power to influence public opinion and, thereby, win access to the public purse.

5) Finally, it is a library issue because ALA itself became a victim of the aftershocks, when the text for an exhibit about the Enola Gay controversy sponsored by ALA's Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) and Intellectual Freedom Round Table (IFRT) was itself censored!

Before I elaborate let me briefly introduce the participants in the Smithsonian controversy and provide a sample of the sort of criticism lodged against the museum.

First, the curators. In preparing an exhibit that would commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in a museum devoted to the history of aviation technology, an exhibit that would feature an airplane that played a central role in bringing that war to a close, NASM curators decided to provide the public with an opportunity to learn about the scientific, political and military processes that culminated in the Enola Gay's mission. They also wanted to examine the subsequent consequences of those processes with the intention of demystifying the story of the atomic bomb for the millions of people expected to visit the museum. So much of what the public knows about WWII has come via Hollywood, through war stories of veterans, from often incomplete or biased accounts written by scientists and government officials who participated in the events, and from historians and journalists interested in promoting one "spin" or another on the war. Air and Space Museum curators drew on the best historical scholarship available on the topic to allow the public to develop a more comprehensive understanding of these events and also an appreciation for the nuances and complexities of historical investigation. The curators knew full-well their exhibit would generate debate, and being of the

school that views debate as essential to knowledge and democracy, they did not shrink from presenting the facts of the Enola Gay's story as they are most fully understood today.

The next participants were individual veterans. Most of the individual WWII veterans who signed petitions and wrote letters to elected representatives demanding the exhibit be changed -- and then canceled -- never saw the exhibit script and only knew about it from TV and radio reports, newspaper editorials, articles in *U.S. News and World Report* and *Air Force Magazine*, and in communications from membership groups like the Military Order of the World Wars, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Order of Daedilians, Retired Officers Association, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., and American Ex-Prisoners of War. Most of these groups portrayed the NASM exhibit as a desecration of the Enola Gay, an offense to the sacrifices made by Allied troops who fought in WWII, and a further example of "political correctness" in American public institutions. Believing what they were told, the vets rallied to demand that the exhibit show respect and honor for the men who had fought the war.

Finally, the military. The third participant in the battle over the Enola Gay were organized groups of former and current military men, civilians and members of Congress. Foremost among these was the Air Force Association (AFA), a group founded in 1946 by General Hap Arnold to promote the creation of a permanent Air Force. (Not coincidentally, the NASM was founded that same year, also by General Arnold.) The AFA led the campaign against its sibling, and publicly presented itself as an advocate for the vets who, AFA claimed, were being betrayed by a museum that was established and directed by federal law to honor them. The AFA does represent veterans -- in part. But, while it assists individual members in locating old buddies, in sprucing up resumes and in decorating the den

with oil paintings of "flying fortresses," it also represents the interests of its 250-some industrial affiliates. Among these are: American Cyanamid, AT&T, Boeing, Corning, Digital Equipment Corp., Eastman Kodak, du Pont, GE, IBM, Honeywell, John Deere, Learjet Corp., Lockheed, McDonnell Douglas, Rolls-Royce, Texas Instruments, Thiokol, Unisys and Westinghouse -- all military contractors, and all members of what President Eisenhower dubbed the military-industrial complex. *Air Force Magazine* -- the AFA's equivalent of ALA's *American Libraries* -- advertises the products of these companies, announces trade shows and conventions which, also like ALA, include huge exhibits featuring the "tools of the trade" (Stealth bombers, Apache attack helicopters, F-16s etc.) and vigorously lobbies Congress for increased public funding for military research, development, and production.

What was the nature of criticisms against the Enola Gay exhibit? A good example comes from a spokesman for the 20th Air Force Association who wrote to Senator Sam Nunn, Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, in July 1994. "As now planned, [the Enola Gay] exhibit will be a national disgrace. It will slander President Truman and his military advisors. . . make victims of the Japanese and racists (if not cowards) of Americans, and leave ENOLA GAY'S crewmen as national outcasts. . ."

A reading of both the first and final exhibit scripts reveals that:

First, Truman was not slandered, but he and his advisors were shown as having more than just the saving of American lives on their minds when deciding to use the atom bomb. Two other elements entered into their decision -- the postwar political leverage that a demonstration of this new weapon would have in U.S. relations with the USSR, and the need to justify to Congress the \$3 billion spent on the top-secret Manhattan Project. All three elements

in the decision to drop the bomb were well documented in the exhibit from primary sources.

Secondly, the people living in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, most of them Japanese, were indeed victims. They were the first, and so far the last, victims of a direct atomic explosion. The exhibit did not portray the entire Japanese population as victims of U.S. aggression.

Third, the original script included material on the internment camps in the U.S. for Japanese-Americans, material on anti-Japanese propaganda, and noted the stereotypes many Americans had of the Japanese. The final script made no mention of the internment camps, but did retain material on both U.S. anti-Japanese propaganda and Japanese anti-American propaganda.

Fourth, the charge that the exhibit would "leave the Enola Gay's crewmen as national outcasts" does not stand up when one looks at the exhibit. While it is true that the crew were depicted as receiving special treatment during the war and as having a bit of rambunctious fun on occasion during their intensive training, the *official historian* of the Air Force declared that the original script's presentation of the crew was "good." In no way did the exhibit even suggest that the crew of the Enola Gay was to blame for the horror of Hiroshima or for the subsequent growth of the potential horrors of more powerful atomic weapons. The curators did not use the exhibit to make any moral judgments, or -- as many charged -- to apologize to Japan for the use of the bombs.

For those of you interested in the details of the Smithsonian controversy, I highly recommend Mike Wallace's article "The Battle of the Enola Gay" from the May 1995 issue of *Radical Historians Newsletter*.

In addressing the relevance this debate has to librarianship, I should hardly need to dwell on the censorship aspect of the affair. Librarians are opposed to censorship -- period. However, some will ask whether or not this was a case of censorship. Perhaps the NASM curators were biased or excluded important views on the issue. Perhaps their opponents did the museum-visiting public a service by forcing the exhibit's cancellation. Indeed, a colleague on the ALA Intellectual Freedom Round Table who assisted me in putting together the joint SRRT/IFRT exhibit, mentioned one day that ALA's Office of Intellectual Freedom was not certain that this was a case of censorship. To those who suggest that this is not a case of censorship, there is only one response -- pressure from military, civilian, and government bodies denied NASM curators, experts in their field, the opportunity to tell the full story of the Enola Gay and the public was denied the opportunity of learning that story and judging for itself what to believe about it. Threats to the Smithsonian's funding, inquiries into the political views of NASM curators, and Congressional hearings are most clearly acts intended to censor.

Librarians must be prepared to oppose the next attempt at censorship in the "culture wars" and be willing to confront challenges to our own personal views and opinions. I could not help but be struck during discussions of the Columbus Quincentennial at the ferocity with which many librarians refused to entertain any notion about the impact of Columbus' voyage other than the one presented in the nursery jingle that "he sailed, and sailed, and sailed, and sailed to find this land for me and you." It is painful to have one's cherished beliefs questioned. Challenges to beliefs are challenges to self. But fear of change is dangerous in today's complex and troubled world, and individuals must be open to new ways of seeing. As custodians of one of the few public spaces in our society where intellectual and ideological challenges can be conducted in a safe environment, librarians must individually and as a profession be

open to and learn to accommodate and become comfortable with the complexity, ambiguity, sophistication, nuance, logic and purpose of politics, culture and history. Librarians should be models of open-mindedness and courage in a society increasingly characterized by intransigence, intolerance, and mean-spiritedness.

Unfortunately, many librarians are feeling too beleaguered and ill-equipped these days to defend the library -- or museums or schools or professional associations -- as legitimate spaces for the debate of controversial issues. Certainly there are inspiring instances in which librarians courageously oppose would-be book-banners, but there are probably many more who avoid such confrontations by either quietly giving in to pressure or by practicing self-censorship in order to protect jobs and budgets. Libraries are under severe attack right now, the future of the library is in question, and we have a right to be protective -- but at what cost? Are silence and self-censorship appropriate in the face of a political movement whose primary commitment is to the "free market" and expresses this commitment by promoting economic policies that fund private enterprise at the expense of public services like libraries, schools and museums? One need only bring to mind the fact that the House of Representatives just last week voted on a budget that gives the Dept. of Defense \$9 billion more than the Pentagon requested, \$9 billion that will go into the coffers of the industrial affiliates of the Air Force Association! ALA's "Pass a Buck" campaign has been lobbying Congress to allocate from the federal budget a mere \$1 per person of the U.S. population -- that's less than 3/10 of 1% percent of the "bonus" the House wants to give the Pentagon. Aren't the libraries of America worth 3/10 of 1% of the money the Pentagon says it doesn't need?

What is the relevance of self-censorship and the federal budget to libraries and the Enola Gay controversy? Here are two examples

that highlight ways in which libraries shrink from engaging in intellectual freedom cases involving powerful political forces.

The New York Public Library is celebrating its centennial this year. As part of the festivities it has mounted an exhibit called "What Price Freedom?" It is an excellent and beautifully presented exhibit that describes the struggles against ignorance, intolerance, and injustice of people such as Galileo, Oscar Wilde, Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi, Margaret Sanger, the White Rose and the dissidents of Tiananmen Square. The exhibit celebrates human courage and describes the social ostracism, blacklisting, imprisonment and even execution suffered by individuals whose ideas challenged established power structures. However, the exhibit fails miserably in at least one respect. While NYPL uses contemporary illustrations of struggles for freedom from South Africa, China and the former-Czechoslovakia, it abstains from representing any recent threats to intellectual freedom here in the United States. The NYPL apparently could find no recent example of American censorship, so visitors might well leave the library's exhibit believing that the U.S. is free of any threats to our First Amendment rights.

While library curators in New York City were planning "What Price Freedom?" their museum colleagues in Washington DC were engaged in what will probably amount to be the biggest intellectual freedom battle in their personal and professional lives. Why couldn't NYPL curators have shown a little professional solidarity with their beleaguered Smithsonian colleagues by publicly recognizing in "What Price Freedom?" the price being paid over at the NASM? NYPL couldn't have hoped for a better current example of threats to intellectual freedom in the U.S. The case of Enola Gay curators might not be on a par with Galileo up against the Catholic Church, but it is certainly similar to the case of artist William Gropper, featured in NYPL's exhibit, who had a run-in with the witch-hunt of Senator Joe McCarthy. Plus the Air and Space issue had

the important distinction of being a battle that gives defenders of intellectual freedom the opportunity to do the right thing, at the right time, in the right place!

Of course, if asked, NYPL would argue that they couldn't possibly take sides on a current public controversy, after all libraries "aren't supposed to take positions." Well, silence is "a position." Perhaps if the NASM was located in Poland NYPL would have highlighted the case. Or perhaps 100 years from now, when it's "safe" to do so, NYPL will honor Martin Harwit, Tom Crouch and Michael Neufeld, for the price they paid in attempting to preserve intellectual freedom at one of our nation's premier museums.

NYPL didn't oppose the censorship taking place at the National Air and Space Museum, however, because it would have been awkward and might have jeopardized NYPL's relations with one of the Air Force Association's biggest industrial affiliates -- IBM. IBM's CEO, Louis V. Gerstner Jr., just so happens to be a member of NYPL's Board of Trustees and helps the library procure funding from corporate sources. NYPL can't very well bite one of the hands that feeds it, even indirectly.

The other library body that shrank from supporting the Smithsonian curators was ALA's Intellectual Freedom Round Table and the Office of Intellectual Freedom. However, before I describe this particular affront to intellectual freedom I must take us back to my earlier suggestion that the heart of the battle over the Enola Gay was a fight for public opinion in the guns-or-butter budget battle.

One of the most important elements of the NASM exhibit, though the military people didn't make a big deal about it, was the insight the exhibit provided on the "spin" given by government officials immediately after the war on their decision to drop the bomb. With

primary sources from government records of the time, the exhibit detailed how, after the initial elation over the end of the war had passed and the awe of the power of the atom bomb had subsided, Americans learned of the horrible devastation caused by the bomb and began to ask whether or not the use of such a weapon was moral. In order to counter such questioning, and to garner public support for continued development of atomic weapons, government and military officials had to justify their actions. They did so by inflating American casualty estimates and said the atom bomb saved hundreds of thousands of lives because an invasion of Japan had been avoided. The exhibit informed viewers that U.S. officials knew in the early summer months of 1945 that the Japanese were prepared to surrender if the U.S. would agree to let their Emperor retain his throne. The exhibit also described disagreements in 1944 and 1945 between leading government officials, military commanders and scientists over the question of whether or not to use the bomb and who should have control over its development after the war. In other words, the NASM exhibit exposed several of the myths Americans have grown up with about the politics of the atom bomb, and the military and multinational corporations that reap the benefits of the power made available through such myths could not tolerate the idea that a bunch of historians, at what is widely considered the Air Force's own museum, would have the audacity to challenge their virtual monopoly on mythmaking in America.

ALA was meeting in Philadelphia just as the Smithsonian case was making national news. The Social Responsibilities Round Table suggested to the Intellectual Freedom Round Table that we co-sponsor for the annual conference in Chicago an exhibit about the controversy. IFRT agreed, and I, as SRRT's representative, volunteered to work with an IFRT member on the project. I became responsible for the text of the exhibit and the IFRT volunteer (then the director of a special collection with exhibit mounting equipment

and materials) took on the exhibit's physical presentation. I supplied the text and graphics, he brought the finished exhibit to Chicago.

Well, the exhibit displayed at OIF's booth omitted most of the material I'd prepared and, to my horror, slanted the entire content of the exhibit by stating -- as if it were accepted fact -- the very viewpoint that NASM curators had sought to expose as false. Namely, that the atom bomb was used solely to save American lives. And my IFRT colleague didn't even have the decency to inform me that he thought any changes were necessary to the text.

Why did OIF question whether censorship was taking place at the Smithsonian? Why did the IFRT member deliberately censor the text I'd provided? Might this unwillingness within the library profession to defend intellectual freedom against attacks from powerful corporations be widespread?

The point I wish to make in presenting these two instances where librarians declined to seize the opportunity to support Smithsonian curators against the military-industrial complex is that libraries must learn to defend intellectual freedom even if it might threaten relations with corporate or government bodies. Otherwise we turn our backs on those whose courage we (apparently) can admire only at a distance. And worse, in not publically defending intellectual freedom we silently provide a veneer of respectability to those who benefit from censorship and the ignorance it fosters.

At the Republican national convention three years ago, Pat Buchanan said, "There is a religious war going on in this country for the soul of America. It is a cultural war, as critical to the kind of nation we shall become as the Cold War itself." Well, the industries that made billions of dollars during the Cold War arms race, don't want

to lose, in the post-Cold War era, their cash cow, their golden goose that lays atomic bombs and other high priced, deadly and useless toys. So, they look for "Reds" in the Smithsonian, they hunt for "Commies" on campuses, and soon they'll be finding "terrorists" behind every bush, even those gracing the grounds of our libraries.

The "culture wars" continue, they are part-and-parcel of the age old struggle to control the resources of a society, to determine who has and who hasn't, and it is a fight not only for the soul, but more importantly for the mind of America. Librarians must defend the freedom of the mind to explore, to experiment, to question, to celebrate, to grow. The curators at the National Air and Space Museum wanted to contribute in one small way to the growth of the minds of millions of Americans. They were not allowed to do so and, unfortunately, it was the silence of many of us that allowed that to happen. We cannot remain silent or we will surely lose all that we hold dear.

**HIROSHIMA & NAGASAKI,
THE ATOMIC BOMB, AND HISTORY:
A BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Books and Pamphlets

- Allen, Thomas B. and Norman Polmar. *Code-Name Downfall: the secret plan to invade Japan - and why Truman dropped the bomb*. Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Alperovitz, Gar. *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam*. 2nd ed. London: Pluto Press, 1994.
- . *The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb: and the architecture of an American myth*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
- Bernstein, Barton J., ed. *The Atomic Bomb: the critical issues*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.
- Bird, Kai. "Hiroshima" in *The Chairman: John J. McCloy, the making of the American establishment*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

- Bosworth, R. J. B. *Explaining Auschwitz and Hiroshima: history writing and the Second World War, 1945-1990*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Boyer, Paul. *By the Bomb's Early Light*. New York: Pantheon, 1985.
- Bradley, John, editor. *Atomic Ghosts: poets respond to the nuclear age*. Minneapolis, MN: Coffee House Press, 1995.
- Braw, Monica. *The Atomic Bomb Suppressed: American censorship in occupied Japan*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1991.
- Bundy, McGeorge. *Danger and Survival: choices about the bomb in the first fifty years*. New York: Random House, 1988.
- Burchett, Wilfred G. *Shadows of Hiroshima*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Buruma, Ian. *The Wages of Guilt: memories of war in Germany and Japan*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Caron, Robert. *Fire of a Thousand Suns: the Bob Caron story, tail gunner of the "Enola Gay"*. Westminster, CO: Web Publishing, 1995.
- Clark, Ian. *Nuclear Past, Nuclear Present*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985.
- Corell, John T. *The Smithsonian and the Enola Gay*. Arlington VA: Air Force Association, 1994.
- Dower, John. *War Without Mercy: race and power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon, 1986.
- Drea, Edward J. *MacArthur's Ultra: codebreaking and the war against Japan, 1942-1945*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1992.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. *The White House Years: mandate for change, 1953-1956*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1963.
- Engelhardt, Tom. *The End of Victory Culture: cold war America and the disillusioning of a generation*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- Feifer, George. *Tennozan: the battle of Okinawa and the atomic bomb*. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1992.
- Feis, Herbert. *The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Fermi, Rachel. *Picturing the Bomb: photographs from the secret world of the Manhattan Project*. New York: Abrams, 1995.
- Ferrell, Robert H. *Harry S. Truman: a life*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1994.
- Fogelman, Edwin, editor. *Hiroshima: the decision to use the A-bomb*. New York: Scribner, 1964.
- Fussell, Paul. *Thank God for the Atom Bomb and Other Essays*. New York: Ballentine, 1990.
- Gerson, Joseph. *With Hiroshima Eyes: atomic war, nuclear extortion and moral imagination*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1995.
- Giovannitti, Len and Fred Freed. *The Decision to Drop the Bomb*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1965.
- Harper, Stephen. *Miracle of Deliverance: the case for the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1985.

- Harris, Jonathan. *Hiroshima: a study in science, politics and the ethics of war*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Hein, Laura, guest editor. Remembering the Bomb: The Fiftieth Anniversary in the United States and Japan. A special issue of *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Hershberg, James G. *James B. Conant: Harvard to Hiroshima and the making of the nuclear age*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
- Herken, Gregg. *The Winning Weapon: the atomic bomb in the Cold War, 1945-50*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Hersey, John. *Hiroshima*. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Holloway, David. *Stalin and the Bomb: the Soviet Union and atomic energy, 1939-1956*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1944.
- Jones, Vincent C. *Manhattan, the Army and the Atomic Bomb*. Washington DC: Center of Military History, 1985.
- Lanouette, William, with Bela Szilard. *Genius in the Shadows: a biography of Leo Szilard, the man behind the bomb*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992.
- Leahy, William. *I Was There: the personal story of the Chief of Staff to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, based on his notes and diaries made at the time*. New York: Whittlesey House, 1950.
- Leffler, Melvyn P. *A Preponderance of Power: national security, the Truman Administration and the Cold War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Lifton, Robert Jay and Greg Mitchell. *Hiroshima in America: fifty years of denial*. New York: G.P. Putnam's, 1995.
- Linenthal, Edward Tabor. *"Pearl Harbor" in this Sacred Ground: Americans and their battlefields*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- McCullough, David. *Truman*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
- Maddox, Robert James. *Weapons for Victory: the Hiroshima decision fifty years later*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995.
- Malcolmson, Robert W. *Nuclear Fallacies: how we have been misguided since Hiroshima*. Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.
- Mandelbaum, Michael. *The Nuclear Revolution: international politics before and after Hiroshima*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Messer, Robert L. *The End of an Alliance: James F. Byrnes, Roosevelt, Truman and the origins of the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Muresianu, John. *War of Ideas: American intellectuals and the world crisis, 1938-1945*. New York: Garland, 1988.
- Nakano, Jiro, editor and translator. *Outcry from the Inferno: atomic bomb tanka anthology*. Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1995.
- Nakazawa, Keiji. *Barefoot Gen: a cartoon history of Hiroshima*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1987.
- _____. *Barefoot Gen: the day after*. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Newman, Robert P. *Truman and the Hiroshima Cult*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1995.
- Nitze, Paul H. *From Hiroshima to Glasnost: at the center of decision - a memoir*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989.
- Nornes, Abe Mark and Fukushima Yukio. *The Japan/American film wars: World War II propaganda and its cultural contexts*. Langhorne, PA: Harwood Academic, 1994.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: the "objectivity question" and the American historical profession*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Oe, Kenzaburo. *Hiroshima Notes*. Marion Boyars, 1995.
- Piehler, G. Kurt. *Remembering War the American Way*. Washington DC: Smithsonian, forthcoming 1995.
- Quigley, Martin Schofield. *Peace without Hiroshima: secret action at the Vatican in the spring of 1945*. Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1991.
- Rhodes, Richard. *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1986.
- Robertson, David. *Sly and Able: a political biography of James F. Byrnes*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994.
- Sayen, Jamie. *Einstein in America: the scientist's conscience in the age of Hitler and Hiroshima*. New York: Crown, 1985.
- Shaheen, Jack G., editor. *Nuclear War Films*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.
- Sherry, Michael. *The Rise of American Air Power: the creation of Armageddon*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Sherwin, Martin. *A World Destroyed: Hiroshima and the origins of the arms race*. New York: Vintage Books, 1987.
- Sigal, Leon. *Fighting to a Finish*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Skates, John Ray. *The Invasion of Japan: alternative to the bomb*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Spector, Ronald H. *Eagle Against the Sun: the American war with Japan*. New York: Vintage, 1985.
- Stoff, Michael, Jonathan Fanton, and R. Hal Williams. *The Manhattan Project: a documentary introduction to the atomic age*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1991.
- Stone, Albert E. *Literary aftershocks: American writers, readers and the bomb*. New York: Twayne Pub., 1994.
- Takaki, Ronald. *Hiroshima: why America dropped the atomic bomb*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1995.
- Treat, John Whittier. *Writing Ground Zero: Japanese literature and the atomic bomb*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Udall, Stewart L. *The Myths of August: a personal exploration of our tragic Cold War affair with the atom*. New York: Pantheon, 1994.

- Vance-Watkins, Lequita and Mariko Aratani. *White Flash, Black Rain: women of Japan relive the bomb*. Milkweed Editions, 1995.
- Weale, Adrian, editor. *Eye-Witness Hiroshima*. Carroll & Graf, 1995.
- Weart, Spencer. *Nuclear Fear: a history of images*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Winkler, Allan. *Life Under a Cloud: American anxiety about the atom*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- Wittner, Lawrence S. *Cold War America: from Hiroshima to Watergate*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
- Yamahata, Yosuke. *Nagasaki Journey: the photographs of Yosuke Yamahata, August 10, 1945*. Pomegranate Artbooks, 1995.
- Yamazaki, James N. and Louis B. Fleming. *Children of the Atomic Bomb: an American physician's memoir of Nagasaki, Hiroshima and the Marshall Islands*. Duke University Press, 1995.
- York, Herbert F. *Making Weapons, Talking Peace: a physicist's odyssey from Hiroshima to Geneva*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Zinn, Howard. *Hiroshima: Breaking the Silence*. Westfield, NJ: Open Magazine Pamphlet Series, 1995.

ARTICLES

- "50 Years After Hiroshima," reflections by Jean Bethke Elshtain, John Rawls, Ronald Takaki and Michael Walzer. *Dissent* 42, no. 3, Summer 1995.
- Alpervitz, Gar. "Why the United States Dropped the Bomb." *Technology Review*, August/Sept. 1990.
- and Robert Messer. "Marshall, Truman, and the Decision to Drop the Bomb." *International Security* 16, Winter 1991/92.
- "The Hiroshima Decision: A Moral Reassessment." *Christianity and Crisis*, February 3, 1992.
- "Was Hiroshima Needed to End the War?" *Christian Science Monitor*, August 6, 1992.
- and Kai Bird. "The Centrality of the Bomb." *Foreign Policy* 94, Spring, 1994.
- Bernstein, Barton J. "Truman at Potsdam: his secret diary." *Foreign Service Journal* 36, July/August 1980.
- "A Postwar Myth: 500,000 U.S. lives saved." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 42, June/July 1986.
- "Seizing the Contested Terrain of Early Nuclear History: Stimson, Conant, and their allies explain the decision to use the atomic bomb." *Diplomatic History* 17, Winter 1993.
- "The Atomic Bombings Reconsidered." *Foreign Affairs* 74, January/February 1995.
- Bird, Kai. "Silencing History." *The Nation*, February 20, 1995.

- Boller, Paul F., Jr. "Hiroshima and the American Left." *International Social Science Review* 57, Winter 1982.
- Boyer, Paul. "The Cloud Over Culture." *New Republic*, August 12, 1985.
- Capaccio, Tony. "Truman Author Errs on Japan Invasion Casualty Memo." *Defense Week* 15, October 11, 1994.
- Cox, Alvid D. "The Enola Gay and Japan's Struggle to Surrender." *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, Summer 1995.
- Correll, John T. "War Stories at Air and Space." *Air Force Magazine*, April 1994.
- "Washington Watch: The Activists and the Enola Gay." *Air Force Magazine*, September 1995.
- Cousins, Norman. "The Literacy of Survival." *The Saturday Review of Literature* 14, September 14, 1946.
- Daizaburo, Yui. "Between Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima/Nagasaki: A Psychological Vicious Circle" (translated by Laura Hein). *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Dichtl, John R. "A Chronology of the Smithsonian's 'Last Act.'" *Organization of American Historians Newsletter*, November 1994.
- with Arnita Jones and Page Miller. "Enola Gay Controversy Continues." *Organization of American Historians Newsletter*, February 1995.
- Fenrich, Lane. "The Enola Gay and the Politics of Representation." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Gallup, George, Jr. and Frank Newport. "Only Half of Americans Now Approve of the Atom Bombing of Japan." *Gallup Poll Monthly* no.299, August 1990.
- Gilbert, James. "Memorializing the Bomb." *Radical History Review* 34, January 1986.
- Goldberg, Stanley. "Groves Takes the Reins." *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, December 1992.
- Hales, Peter. "The Atomic Sublime." *American Studies* 32, Spring 1991.
- Hammond, Ellen H. "Politics of the War and Public History: Japan's Own Museum Controversy." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Harrington, Herman G. "History Upheld." *The American Legion*, August 1995.
- Hein, Laura. "The Bomb as Public History and Transnational Memory." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Hikins, James. "The Rhetoric of 'Unconditional Surrender' and the Decision to Drop the Atomic Bomb." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69, November 1983.
- Historians' Committee for Open Debate on Hiroshima. "Call for a National Teach-in on Hiroshima." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Japanese Committee to Appeal for World Peace, '95. "Proposal for an International Appeal for Global Peace on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the End of World War II." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Kern, Alfred. "Hang the Enola Gay." *War, Literature, and the Arts*, Spring 1995.

- Lanouette, William. "Why We Dropped the Bomb." *Civilization*, Jan/Feb. 1985.
- Linenthal, Edward Tabor. "Shaping a Heroic Presence: Iwo Jima in American Memory." *Reviews in American History* 21, 1993.
- "Can Museums Achieve a Balance Between Memory and History?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. February 10, 1995.
- "Between History and Memory: The Enola Gay Controversy at the National Air and Space Museum." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- MacDonald, Dwight. "The Bomb." *Politics* 2, September 1945.
- Matthews, Richard. "Dispute: Tempest in a Time Warp." *Japan Update*, April 1995.
- Messer, Robert L. "New Evidence on Truman's Decision." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 41, August 1985.
- Reingold, Nathan. "Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Meets the Atom Bomb." *Sociology of the Sciences* 9, 1985.
- Rinjiro, Sodei. "Hiroshima/Nagasaki as History and Politics." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Sherry, Michael S. "Patriotic Orthodoxy and U.S. Decline." *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 27, no.2, April-June 1995.
- Sigal, Leon V. "Bureaucratic Politics and Tactical Use of Committees: the interim committee and the decision to drop the atomic bomb." *Polity* 10, Spring 1978.
- Van De Velde, James. "Opinion: The Enola Gay Saved Lives." *Political Science Quarterly*, Fall 1995.
- Walker, J. Samuel. "The Decision to Use the Bomb: a historiographical update." *Diplomatic History* 14, no.1, 1990.
- Wallace, Mike. "The Battle of the Enola Gay." *Radical Historians Newsletter*, May 1995.
- "The Battle of the Enola Gay." *Museum News*, July 1995.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E. "The Smithsonian and the Enola Gay." *The National Interest*, Summer, 1995.
- Yavenditti, Michael J. "The American People and the Use of Atomic Bombs on Japan." *Historian* 36, 1974.
- "John Hersey and the American Conscience: the reception of *Hiroshima*." *Pacific Historical Review* 43, February 1974.
- "Atomic Scientists and Hollywood: the beginning or the end?" *Film & History* 8, no.4, 1978.
- Winnacker, Rudolph A. "The Debate About Hiroshima." *Military Affairs* 11, Spring 1947.
- Zacharias, Ellis M. "We Did Not Need to Drop the A-Bomb." *Look*, May 23, 1950.

[Editors Note: The above article was presented as a paper at the Progressive Librarians Guild program in Chicago on June 24, 1995.]

IFLA AND HUMAN RIGHTS

by Al Kagan

The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) is the most important international professional organization for librarians. As the name implies, members are not individuals but library associations (such as ALA) and institutions (such as individual libraries). Although there is an annual conference, the governing body, the IFLA Council, meets only every two years at the annual conference. 1995 was a Council year.

In its early years, IFLA was mainly an elite European club, but more recently it has expanded to the point where most countries of the world are represented. Of course, it still takes money to travel to meetings so participants still form a privileged group. Furthermore, the IFLA Executive Board continues to be predominantly (but not exclusively) from Europe and North America. In addressing the needs of new members, the most recent "core program" established was Advancement of Librarianship in the Third World (ALP). In addition, meetings are more often held outside of Europe and North America. For example, since 1990, the meetings have been held in Stockholm, Moscow, New Delhi, Barcelona, Havana, Istanbul, and next year's meeting will be in Beijing.

As the organization has become more diverse and has met in more countries, new issues have confronted the established power structure. For example, the IFLA Executive could not prevent the IFLA Council from passing a 1985 resolution excluding South African apartheid institutions from membership. But the IFLA Executive was able to negate the central point of the resolution by failing to

implement it. Even though an international delegation protested this inaction at every subsequent meeting until the majority-rule election, the IFLA Executive Board always found another way to delay implementation by doing another survey or establishing another study group. Nevertheless, an important human rights provision was official IFLA policy, and this did have an effect on the library situation in South Africa. It was precisely these kinds of actions worldwide that, taken together, speeded the end of the apartheid government.

Most readers of this journal may wonder how the IFLA Executive could oppose and then not implement an anti-apartheid policy that became quite mainstream during the end of the 1980s. After all, freedom of expression is supposed to be one of our most sacred beliefs as librarians. Furthermore, IFLA official policy includes a statement of support for Article 19 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. There seems to be a contradiction between policy and practice.

Moving to a more controversial issue, how should we react when IFLA meets in a country known for its official human rights violations such as Turkey? The Turkish Government is fighting a brutal war against its Kurdish population. Although Turkey depends on tourism for much of its income, the Kurdish area is off limits for travel. Kurdish villages have been emptied, people disappear, torture is routine, newspapers are closed down and regularly censored, and Turkey has more writers in jail than any other country. Large numbers of Kurds have been displaced and they are now spread throughout the country. Repression is not limited to the traditional Kurdish area. For example, a senior library school faculty member from Istanbul told me that it was impossible for her to speak out for fear of torture.

Istanbul is a wonderful place for tourists and relatively inexpensive. It is truly exciting to experience the magnificent architecture and art, the beautiful Bosphorus, the fascinating Grand Bazaar, the vibrant street life, delicious food in grand or small friendly restaurants, the castles, the mosques, and the Topkapi Palace. It would be very easy to lose oneself in tourist pleasures, attend to the usual conference concerns, and go home happy. The majority of conference attendees probably did that. On the other hand, a large minority were ready to raise the issue of human rights. The IFLA Executive knew that the issues would be raised and announced the formation of a committee to address the question of freedom of expression and report back in two years. In addition, the Director of the Article 19 organization was invited to give a talk.

Not satisfied with the two year wait, the Scandinavians debated the human rights issue for months before the conference. In the end, the Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish Library Associations in coordination with other small associations developed a compromise resolution that reaffirmed IFLA's commitment to human rights and called for the repeal of Article 8 of the Turkish Anti-Terrorism Law and the release of prisoners held under its provisions. This resolution was seconded by the Library Association (UK) and supported by the Article 19 organization in London. All this was accomplished before the meeting, so the resolution was submitted to the IFLA Executive for publication in the conference newspaper, the *IFLA Express*, for consideration of the IFLA Council.

Not knowing about the Scandinavian activities, three US librarians (including this writer) developed a strong resolution regarding human rights in Turkey and submitted it in the same way. We also began to distribute the resolution to our colleagues in Istanbul, and especially at the talk given by the director of the Article 19 organization. She gave an excellent talk on the need to act with

examples in many countries, but she did not speak about Turkey. However, this writer was able to ask about the Turkish situation and she gave an excellent factual reply. As a result of these activities, I was summoned to the IFLA Executive and asked to withdraw our resolution within two hours. After finding out about the Scandinavian resolution and its very solid support, our group decided to support that resolution and we withdrew our own the next day. In the meantime, the IFLA Executive decided against publishing all the resolutions, and also prevailed upon the Scandinavians to delete all mention of Turkey from their carefully developed compromise language. In return, we tried to amend what was left by restoring the Scandinavian's own language on Turkey on the floor of the IFLA Council. A large minority supported our amendment, but it was defeated.

The question remains. Where does our responsibility lie while we are enjoying the hospitality of the host country and our local colleagues? And what if most of our local colleagues support their Government's repressive policies for one reason or another? If courageous local colleagues must remain silent to protect their health and lives, and if we can speak with only relatively minor consequences, how can we justify remaining silent?

DOCUMENTS

RESOLUTION ON THE IMPORTANCE OF FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND FREE ACCESS TO INFORMATION

passed by IFLA, August 1995

The 1995 IFLA General Conference in Istanbul affirms its commitment to Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as stated by the 55th IFLA General Conference 1989.

The IFLA General Conference is deeply concerned about increasing infringements on free expression and the free flow of information in many parts of the world, and the mounting cases of abuse and even killing that are being recorded. Attacks are often directed against writers, journalists, publishers and editors, and those responsible may be governments, groups or parties representing extreme political or religious views.

The IFLA General Conference firmly condemns all violent and other restrictions on freedom of expression, access to information and free debate. These are fundamental rights that enable people and societies to protect and enhance democracy and culture. The IFLA General Conference will call upon all governments to ensure the right to freedom of expression and the free flow of information for their citizens and to protect them from violence, intimidation and threat of punishment.

The following text contains a paragraph excised from the original Scandanavian resolution concerning freedom of expression in Turkey. This paragraph was stripped from the end of the Scandanavian resolution because of pressure from the IFLA Executive. [Editors]

Original resolution's final paragraph: The IFLA General Conference is aware that the Turkish authorities are debating an amendment to Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law. The IFLA General Conference wishes to emphasize the urgency of this amendment, and the need to release all those who remain charged and imprisoned under Article 8.

* * *

Supporters of the entire original resolution moved to have the above paragraph reinstated, but failed in a final vote by about 2-1. Below is a statement made by Michael Malinconico arguing for the importance of the paragraph above. [Editors]

Michael Malinconico: As librarians we are unequivocally committed to ensuring free and unhindered access to information information representing a wide diversity of viewpoints, ideologies and cultural expression. IFLA has articulated in its long-term policy statement that it supports and works to ensure that the cultural heritage of all societies is preserved and maintained. Furthermore, IFLA has reaffirmed its commitment to intellectual freedom by

forming a committee to study how it can further the causes of access to information and freedom of expression.

Consequently, as librarians and as members of this federation, we oppose and reject policies and practices that abrogate these rights. We oppose and abhor anything that contributes to censorship or suppression of cultural expression.

As librarians, as members of IFLA and as men and women of conscience, we speak out against violations of human rights that restrict access to information or curtail freedom of expression. We speak out in opposition to such policies when the transgressions are committed by our own countries. And, in spite of our reluctance, we are compelled do so even when they are practiced by a gracious and generous host. It should not be said that urging the government of a great nation to adhere, without reservation, to the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights is an act of discourtesy to its people. Rather it is an affirmation of a belief in the best instincts of those people.

**RESOLUTION ON NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY'S
SCIENCE, INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS LIBRARY**

passed by the New York City Central Labor Council, Sept. 1995

WHEREAS the labor of human beings is central and indispensable to all social relations, be they relations in the political, economic, scientific, cultural or any other realm; and

WHEREAS the social institutions of a democratic society strive to serve equally every sector of society including the laboring classes; and

WHEREAS the public library was conceived in the United States of America to serve as an institution that could strengthen our democracy by facilitating the education of all members of our society including workers; and

WHEREAS the New York City Central Labor Council is concerned that the New York Public Library, a library of international renown, in planning for its new research facility -- the Science, Industry and Business Library -- is grossly neglecting the informational and educational needs of workers and labor organizations as library users; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the New York City Central Labor Council calls upon the NYPL to add the word "Labor" to the new library's name -- making it the Science, Industry, Business AND LABOR Library. In addition we ask that NYPL make provisions and allocate resources so that the new library can enhance its collections and library services by integrating labor as both subject and constituency.

LIWO AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN UNIFICATION DEBATE

adopted by Library and Information Workers, Nov. 1995

The Library and Information Workers Organisation of South Africa (LIWO) is an independent activist body involved in social transformation. It aims to provide the space for critical and constructive debate and projects, and to bring together LIS practitioners of all kinds in an organisation working towards an equitable, non-discriminatory information system accessible to all the people of South Africa. It is a forum for the voiceless, the marginalised and the non-conformist in the LIS sector within a culture of human rights. In line with this progressive stance, LIWO's base is the individual commitment of its members.

At its conference in July 1995, LIWO examined its role in a post-apartheid South Africa and identified a need for its continued existence as an independent voice, thus precluding absorption into any proposed single LIS organisation. This was reiterated at a national meeting in November which followed branch-level consultations. This stand has drawn much criticism from sections of the LIS community in particular from ULIS, an initiative to draw all library associations into one association.

Although it has a democratically elected government, South Africa is still in a difficult period of transition: the restructuring of all aspects and sectors of society, including the LIS sector, has barely begun. Vigilance is necessary to ensure that real change occurs and that the new order is not simply an extension of the old. A democracy demands diversity and South African society is still far from the desired goal of accepting differences of opinion and persuasion.

In South Africa, the three main library associations represent very different ideologies and approaches to the work of librarians. People have chosen to identify with particular styles and viewpoints, a pro-choice approach. This diversity has proved a strength in recent years as seen in the umbrella body, TRANSLIS, which brings all interested parties together. Just as LIS workers co-operate on an individual and institutional basis, so they have at an organisational level and will no doubt continue to do so on matters of mutual concern.

LIWO has carefully considered the debate about the unification of library associations. The current ULIS initiative raises many questions. First, the reasons why unification is allegedly necessary have never been clearly articulated. Second, unity does not ensure effectiveness and organisational unification is not a prerequisite for speaking 'with one voice'. LIWO members remember only too well the motto of the apartheid regime *Ex unitate vires* and the appalling damage this did to individual lives, institutions and professions. Third, the outcome of the ULIS process was predetermined at its inception: one unified association. This struck LIWO as 'back to front', a matter of decision before consultation, with discussion around a foregone conclusion totally out of keeping with democracy. Fourth, the composition of the ULIS committee with its ostensibly 'non-aligned' members, was problematic.

Recent ULIS correspondence with LIWO indicates that the latter's standpoint is viewed as a problem for which a solution must be found. This interpretation of LIWO's position shows not only a lack of understanding of the background to the organisation but an unwillingness to accept differences and accommodate anything but conformity.

LIWO's criticism of a deeply flawed process does not preclude discussion about co-operation. It has always promoted co-operation between LIS organisations and has strongly supported TRANSLIS, a forum that has been noticeably ignored by the unification initiative. LIWO will not participate in a process that is prescriptive, undemocratic, insensitive to differences of opinion and unwilling to consider other options. LIWO seeks to safeguard a creative dissidence and to continue to provide a home for the marginalised in the LIS sector.

Rather than address the serious flaws in and limitations of the ULIS process, certain interests are accusing LIWO of damaging the LIS sector. As an organisation, LIWO is undergoing a period of transition as it develops national structures and reassesses its focus and guiding principles. Its current restructuring needs should be respected rather than slammed as damaging to ULIS. LIWO applauds moves towards re-unification of the long-divided South African Institute of Library and Information Science (SAILIS, the conservative and bureaucratic body which co-existed with apartheid) and the African Library Association of South Africa (ALASA, equally conservative but conscious of an African identity) and will follow the progress of ULIS with intense interest. It will also continue to explore ways of furthering co-operation on issues of mutual concern amongst LIS associations.

SEARCHES WITH NO DIRECT HITS

WORDS

an OPAC-generated list

abendzauber
aryuvedic
attrition
banan
beeto
camembert
camemberti
carbureutor
chhapra
clorofi
degringy
diamictite
ecla
cheret
ethernet
fdsfds
femmalia
frigid
fufu
gosstalk
gringy
handglider
hindermith
ibertn
khaciaturian
kissen

kombucha
lokme
mnmn
mordred
mucorales
neem
newburg
nfdfsa
missmann
nsadkfjasdf
pavorati
paxil
penecillium
persifa
poonah
refrigerant
rhizopus
sackbutt
samru
sathananthan
shenadoah
silhouet
smithonian
stepanovitch
sumroo
tempeh
tryfuss
ultralights
vacchai
vegetatio
woyzek

*captured & slightly edited,
by Jessica Grim*

BOOK REVIEW

***Into the Future: The Foundations of Library and Information Services in the Post-Industrial Era*, by Michael H. Harris and Stan A. Hannah (Norwood NJ: Ablex, 1993)**

by Henry T. Blanke

Perhaps no other single work of social theory has had as profound an influence on the library profession as Daniel Bell's *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973). From library school curricula to the pages of *Library Journal*, Bell's thesis that we are in the midst of a transition from a goods-producing society to an information society has gained wide currency. Influential enough in other spheres, the idea that innovations in computerization and information technology are forging a new social formation has virtually become an article of faith in librarianship. Bell's pronouncements to the effect that "if capital and labor are the major structural features of industrial society, information and knowledge are those of post-industrial society" resonate with the status-starved sensibilities of librarians who envision an enhanced social role for their profession. In their rush to embrace the "information society" paradigm, however, librarians have failed to scrutinize the assumptions and implications of Bell's forecast, nor have they assimilated, in any sophisticated way, the substantial body of critical literature dealing with the subject. Certainly, if Bell and other prophets of post-industrialism have been criticized for technological determinism, technocratic elitism, and for their view of information as a commodity, it behooves librarians to come to terms with these issues.

Toward the goal of redressing this paucity of informed analysis in the library literature regarding the information society paradigm, Michael H. Harris and Stan A. Hannah have written a citation-laden survey of post-industrial theory and its implications for librarianship. Emphasizing the linkages between library issues and broader political and economic trends (an approach sorely absent from most library research), the authors argue that the increasing economic importance of information in combination with rapid developments in information technology have generated forces which challenge traditional conceptions and practices of library service. Beginning with the influential F. Wilfrid Lancaster, a growing contingent of library theorists have advocated the necessity of moving away from the historical library as a socially underwritten repository of public information and toward a more entrepreneurial, highly technologized model. In the more extreme version of this vision, the electronic "paperless society" (Lancaster's phrase) of the near future will render traditional libraries obsolete, while the emergence of a vast market of individuals and institutions willing to pay for access to computerized information sources promises unprecedented opportunities for those librarians willing to redefine themselves as private "information consultants." Against this perspective on the future of the profession are those who defend libraries as vital democratic institutions charged with providing free and equal access to information as a public good.

Harris and Hannah are clearly sympathetic with the latter view as they describe how the logic of commodification and innovations in information technology impact on government information policy, the library profession's self-image and hopes for enhanced status, and the internal organization of the library workplace. Yet in each case, the authors strive unsuccessfully to reconcile the positions of those in the field who are critical of commercialization and technological determinism with those who eagerly welcome the promise of

a privatized information environment. Because they believe that "it is no longer constructive to continue the debate in terms of 'simple acceptance or rejection' of the commodification of information," Harris and Hannah call for "a much higher degree of conscious agreement and commitment to a shared professional ethos" (p.56). However, they never adequately establish on what basis such a consensus can be forged. It may well be that a professional ethos grounded in what John Buschman has called the "values of print literacy, social memory and equal access to resources" cannot be reconciled with commodification and technical rationality.

In the book's most effective chapter, Harris and Hannah analyze federal information policy in terms of the function of the state in capitalist societies. Using a structuralist approach, they argue that capitalist states oscillate between their function to facilitate capital accumulation and the necessity of legitimizing the system by meeting enough of the basic needs of enough of the population to insure social stability. The intense commitment of the Reagan administration to the accumulation function combined with the belief that information was becoming a fundamental source of economic growth translated into policies which have facilitated the privatization of public information. The Reagan-Bush years resulted in the transfer of vast amounts of tax-funded government data to the commercial information industry. Harris and Hannah demonstrate how neatly information society rhetoric meshed with the ideological orientation of the Reagan-Bush era to convert the view of information as a commodity into national policy. They encourage librarians who oppose these developments to acquire a more sophisticated understanding of political economy and to avoid moral appeals, ritual slogans and justifications for the state's legitimation function.

I would agree, but the authors then continue with a ritualistic plea of their own that we "must somehow find a way" to overcome

divisions within the profession between the camp of librarians opposed to privatization and the growing pro-information industry element. The chapter concludes, oddly, by urging us to reflect on a passage by political scientist Adam Przeworski to the effect that there can be no certainty as to whether democratic socialism would be a more egalitarian and just system than capitalism. It is not clear what Harris and Hannah are getting at here. Should progressive librarians abandon socialist ideals in favor of a more pragmatic approach or for the sake of professional unity? One would have thought that the savvier understanding of political economy they advocate would require more of a socialist commitment, not less.

Again, it is obvious that the authors' sympathies lie with the left-liberal wing of the profession, but they try so hard to be fair and evenhanded and clutter their text with so many brief quotes and citations that it becomes difficult to ferret out their argument, other than the advocacy of some vague third way between the "idea of information as a commodity" and the "fruitless commitment to blind resistance" to commodification (p.139). One misses here the critical bite normally associated with Harris' work, especially in the sections on the impact of information technology on the organization and operation of libraries. Here the authors end up simply recommending more sophisticated and creative applications of such technology without sufficiently analyzing issues such as the increasing reliance of libraries on commercial database vendors and the imposition of user fees to cover the costs of new technologies.

Into the Future closes weakly with the advice that librarians who view information as a social good must "agree to disagree" with the information-as-a-commodity school and then attempt to "argue well" about contested concepts such as the "right-to-know." Since the authors conclude that the arguments of both camps are of "more or less equal merit," presumably they would advocate

compromise and accommodation (pp. 143, 144). However, to compromise on such fundamentals as the principle of free and equal access to information as a public right will send the profession further down the slippery slope of entrepreneurial librarianship toward the final dissolution of whatever potential the library may have had as a public sphere of democratic inquiry and social dialogue. Given the stakes, one would have hoped for more of a critical intervention from Harris and Hannah and less of a bland survey.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Henry T. Blanke is a reference librarian at Marymount Manhattan College in New York City and co-editor of *Progressive Librarian*.

John Budd is a faculty member of the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Missouri-Columbia. His most recent book is *The Library & Its Users: The Communication Process* published in 1992 by Ablex.

Jessica Grim is a reference librarian at Oberlin College, and has published several books of poetry, including *Locale* (Potes & Poets Press, 1995) and *The Inveterate Life* (O Books, 1991). "Searches..." was read publicly at the Ear Inn in New York City on November 11, 1995.

Stan A. Hannah and *Michael H. Harris* are both on the faculty of the College of Library and Information Science at the University of Kentucky in Lexington. Their book *Into the Future: The Foundations of Library and Information Services in the Post-Industrial Era* was published by Ablex in 1993.

Elaine Harger is the librarian at the Empire State College School of Labor Studies and managing editor of *Progressive Librarian*.

Roma Harris is a professor at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science and Registrar and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Western Ontario. She is the author of *Librarianship: The Erosion of a Women's Profession* (Ablex, 1993) and *Barriers to Information: How Formal Help Systems Fail Battered Women* (Greenwood, 1994).

Al Kagan is the bibliographer for Africana studies at the University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign.

Michael Malinconico is EBSCO Professor of Information Studies at the University of Alabama.