

A PROGRESSIVE LIBRARIANSHIP FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

by William F. Birdsall

The philosophical foundation of twentieth century librarianship derives from the American concept of informed citizens having universal access to information. I believe the concept of the informed citizen can no longer sustain a relevant librarianship in the twenty-first century. As an alternative, I propose a human rights conceptual framework for a progressive librarianship in a world of inter-personal, global electronic communication and of the growing achievement of individual and collective human rights. I argue that we need to shift from the concept of the informed citizen in a mass media culture to that of the *communicative* citizen in a global communicative culture exercising her or his human right to communicate.

Progressive Librarianship

Progressive librarians are in the forefront in linking librarianship with human rights (Samek 2004a; Samek, 2006; Phenix and McCook 2005, Maret 2006). However, I believe progressive librarianship can make an even greater contribution to mainstream librarianship, but to do so it must overcome at least two obstacles.

One obstacle is that there is considerable ambiguity about just what constitutes progressive librarianship. According to Toni Samek, it is known in North America as socially responsible librarianship, activist librarianship, or radical librarianship (Samek 2004a, 2). As a consequence, "... progressive library discourse reflects the divergent voices on the margins of librarianship..." that includes, according to Samek, "... a range of viewpoints on a continuum that spans from an anarchist stance to varying degrees of a social responsibility perspective" (5).

Samek raises the legitimate question: "Will progressive librarianship be mainstreamed?" (Samek 2004a, 15) In my view, there is little possibility of progressive librarianship becoming mainstream while its nature remains so amorphous. Although Samek usefully delineates twenty-three defining characteristics and intentions of progressive librarianship, it strikes me that such an extensive list only confirms the lack of a central core of defining components (see also Rosenzweig, 2000).

With regard to human rights, it is noteworthy that a commitment to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and related UN covenants and IFLA statements, tops Samek's list of progressive librarianship's characteristics (Samek 2004a, 11). Samek asserts that progressive librarianship "is inextricably linked to the concept of intellectual freedom and the more 'universal' concept of human rights" (Samek 2004a, 4). She points out there are several UDHR articles relevant to librarianship (such as privacy, participation in the cultural life of the community, intellectual property), but does give particular emphasis to intellectual freedom as represented in Article 19 (Samek 2004b; Samek 2006). As well, Katharine J. Phenix and Kathleen de la Peña McCook claim librarians recognize that human rights and library values intersect, a position they support through an analysis of the values espoused by ALA that are compatible with those of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), in particular Article 19 relating to the intellectual freedom (24-25).

The commitment to human rights is highly commendable but I believe it is too narrowly focused on traditional human rights statements, in particular as regards intellectual freedom. I will attempt to show below that, in contrast, a basic universal human right to communicate, while rooted in Article 19 of the UDHR, is far more comprehensive, encompassing not only intellectual freedom but also intellectual property, privacy, access to information and modes of communication, and so forth. As well, I will contend that the relationship between the values of librarianship and human rights must be more than just a case of compatibility or intersecting of values; librarianship must be founded on a human right to communicate.

My assessment, then, of the current status of progressive librarianship is that its vitality is offset by a lack of clear definition as a movement and the resulting marginality to mainstream librarianship, and by a commitment to human rights that remains within the traditional articulations of the free flow of information. I believe a human rights framework residing in the basic right to communicate can provide a comprehensive foundation for a progressive librarianship that moves it to mainstream librarianship. Towards this end, progressive twenty-first century librarianship should incorporate within such a human rights framework at least six components. This paper briefly examines these six components whose foundation is a human right to communicate.

Components of a Progressive Librarianship

Component 1: A progressive librarianship responds to the emerging context of the expansion of global inter-personal electronic communication and of the increasing global achievement of individual and collective rights.

There emerged in the last half of the twentieth century two major, inter-related developments having profound implications for librarianship: (1)

the global expansion of inter-personal electronic communication and (2) the global expansion of individual and collective human rights.

The communications revolution of the closing decades of the last century was due to the convergence of satellite communication, the Internet, the World Wide Web, and the personal computer. According to Internet World Stats, as of June 30, 2006, world Internet usage totaled 1,043,104,886, a growth rate of 189% since 2000 (<http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>). The availability of personal, interactive global electronic communication is increasingly enhanced with the development of various modes of communicating, obvious examples being email, listservs, blogs, podcasts, and such websites as YouTube.com and Myspace.com. The important factor in these developments is that they make it possible for millions of people personally to communicate directly electronically and globally with other individuals and groups.

This ability is, of course, by no means universal as the extensive research on the phenomenon typically described as the “digital divide” demonstrates. While Internet usage may exceed one billion, it only represents, according to Internet World Stats, about 16% of the world population. Limited digital access among countries is clearly evident (Birdsall and Birdsall 2005). Nonetheless, the number gaining access steadily increases and promoting greater access is an ongoing national and international public policy objective as demonstrated by the recent United Nations World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).

Coinciding with the expansion of global personal instantaneous communication there is a growing achievement in attaining individual and collective human rights. Since World War II and the resulting adoption of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, there has been a revolution in the expansion of human rights throughout the world. In 1993, 171 countries affirmed their commitment to the UDHR at a World Conference on Human Rights. The concept of universal human rights, unknown before World War II, is now central to human “rights talk” at the national and international level (Glendon 199, Lauren 1998).

Of course, the identification of legitimate human rights and the struggle to achieve them continues in all countries. However, there is measurable evidence that more people enjoy a greater range of human rights than they did at the beginning of the previous century. As the United Nations 2000 *Human Development Report* states:

One of the 20th century’s hallmark achievements was its progress in human rights. In 1900 more than half the world’s people lived under colonial rule, and no country gave all its citizens the right to vote. Today some three-quarters of the world lives under democratic regimes. There has also been great progress in eliminating discrimination by race, religion and gender—and in advancing the right to schooling and basic health care (United Nations 2000, 1).

Despite setbacks the momentum favors continued progress in the implementation of human rights in the twenty-first century.

While there has been a continual interaction between the development of communication freedoms and technology, it was not until the late 1960s that universal human rights and communication were linked in a specific right (McIver and Birdsall 2004). With the development in the late 1950s and 1960s of communication satellites Jean d'Arcy, French television pioneer, Eurovision founder, and United Nations public servant, recognized that the convergence of direct satellite broadcasting and computing was going to open up multiple channels of communication to individuals and groups.

In contrast to the traditional modes of corporate mass media communication, global two-way or interactive communication could be available to everyone. As a result, the traditional statements of freedom of expression and information arising out of earlier mass media print and electronic communication technologies and environments, as exemplified by Article 19 of the UDHR, were no longer adequate. For d'Arcy the time had arrived to move beyond Article 19; he enunciated in 1969 the need for a new human right, a right to communicate (d'Arcy 1969).

D'Arcy never articulated a precise definition of a right to communicate but since 1969 there has been much discussion and research exploring the meaning and implications of such a right. Desmond Fisher, an early participant in efforts to promote a right to communicate, concisely delineates how this right differs from traditional communication freedoms and entitlements, such as those stipulated in library statements and policies. He observes jurists make a distinction between two types of individual liberties. Among the first are such fundamental rights as freedom of religious belief and the right of citizen to choose their own government. However, they do not recognize freedom of speech, of assembly, and association as belonging to the category of fundamental rights "because they are not absolute and may be limited" Fisher 1977, 95-96).

It was d'Arcy, according to Fisher, who recognized these second category freedoms were no longer adequate to meet the needs of citizens in the emerging global communicative culture; thus, the need for a fundamental right to communicate. Fisher explains the character of such a basic right:

It [a right to communicate] springs from the very nature of the human person as a communicating being and from the human need for communication, at the level of the individual and of society. It is universal. It emphasizes the process of communicating rather than the content of the message. It implies participation. It suggests an interactive transfer of information. And underlying the concept is an ethical or humanitarian suggestion of a responsibility to ensure a fairer global distribution of the resources necessary to make communication possible (Fisher 1982, 8).

Essentially a right to communicate includes “the right to inform and be informed, the right to active participation in the communication process, the right of equitable access to information resources and information, and the right of cultural and individual privacy from communication” (Richstad and Anderson 1981, 26-27). It is interactive in that applies to two-way horizontal communication between groups and individuals in contrast to the traditional mass-media one way, top-down modes of communication. A right to communicate is participatory in that everyone should have access to the resources necessary to exercise the right as well as the right to participate in the development and use of global communication processes.

A right to communicate shares with traditional freedoms and liberties a concern about the free flow of content but it gives primacy to the *process* of communication and the right of the individual to participate in the process. It provides a comprehensive conceptual framework within which to address policy issues of access, intellectual freedom, property rights, cultural and linguistic rights, and privacy for individuals and communities in a world of global communication. It provides a human rights basis upon which to attack such immediate challenges as the digital divide and the cross-currents of globalization (Cunningham 2005; Dakroury 2004). In short, it moves beyond the traditional articles of the UDHR and other rights statements in recognition of the realities of global interactive communication in the twenty-first century.

Globalization raises technological, political, and cultural challenges to all human rights. Regarding a right to communicate specifically, Aliaa Dakroury raises the question whether globalization will lead to Utopia or prison (Dakroury 2004). Indeed, the threats and opportunities of globalization continues to be an issue of intense debate within the human rights community (Ishay 2004, 246-311). What is without question is that human rights in the context of global communication will be a paramount issue during the twenty-first century, therefore, in my view, it must be as well the central context of formulating a twenty-first century librarianship.

Component 2: A progressive librarianship shifts the focus from the concept of the informed citizen to that of the communicative citizen.

The concept of the informed citizen gained broad political support in eighteenth-century America when revolutionary leaders realized expanding voting rights to select segments of the common people (excluding, for example, women and slaves) was a means of attracting supporters to their revolutionary political objectives. This new perspective began a shift from the idea of the gentleman citizen to the informed citizen. After the American Revolution political leaders saw a continuing need for developing an informed citizenry to insure the preservation of liberty from irresponsible demagogues and for the preservation of social order (Brown 1996).

The concern over maintaining both a stable society and democracy led to the creation in the nineteenth century of tax supported public schools and libraries whose objective was the development of informed citizens. The concept of the informed citizen was sufficiently malleable to allow libraries to respond over time to social, economic and political changes. The result was such library initiatives as the Americanization of immigrants, promoting vocational self-education, advancing individual cultural development, and serving as the gateway to the information highway (Molz and Dain 1999, 11-44). Regardless of the specific objective or program, the image of the informed citizen is the foundation for all of them.

So from the earliest days of the modern library movement to the present, librarians affirm that universal access to information through libraries is critical to having informed citizens in a democratic society; indeed, libraries are promoted as “the cornerstones of liberty” (Kranich 2001). When this goal is challenged library activists rise to its defense. For example, in response to the shift to a neo-conservative public policy environment in the 1970s and 80s, the Progressive Librarian Guild (PLG) was created in 1990 by “librarians concerned with our profession’s rapid drift into dubious alliances with business and the information industry, and into complacent acceptance of service to an unquestioned political, economic and cultural status quo.” In response, the PLG affirms:

...that the development of public libraries was initially spurred by popular sentiment which for one reason or another held that real democracy requires an enlightened citizenry, and that society should provide all people with the means for free intellectual development (<http://libr.org/plg/statement.html>, my emphasis).

However, as voting rights became incrementally more inclusive during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, defining just what it meant to be an informed citizen became more difficult. Society may continue to give a rhetorical commitment to the idea of the informed citizen but in reality there is little evidence that such a vision is the basis of substantive public policy. The print and electronic mass media, a major source of information for most citizens, are increasingly dominated by a few national and global corporations. Governments at all levels limit access to government information. The United States government increasingly encroaches on the privacy of citizens while striving to control the international governance of the Internet (Cukier 2005).

More to the point, librarians have little hard evidence demonstrating to what extent, if any, libraries directly contribute to the development of informed citizens. The lack of such evidence makes the concept of the informed citizen a shaky foundation for a twenty-first century librarianship. In contrast, the Pew Internet and American Life Project continues to document the increasing use by Americans of the Internet as a means of keeping informed. People who used the Internet, listened to National Public Radio,

and were readers of news magazines were most informed about the 2004 presidential election (Pew Research Center 2003, 6).

The number of people turning to the Internet for information relating to their civic life, health, work, hobbies, interests, and decision making continues to increase (Lake Snell Perry & Associates 2004, Madden 2006; Horrigan and Rainie 2006). By early 2006 about 50 million Americans use the Internet on a typical day for news (Horrigan 2006).

Meanwhile, blogs, a prime example of global individual, interactive communication, are emerging as major sources of information and dialogue on civic affairs with politics and government being, after “my life experiences,” the second major topic of blogs (Lenhart and Fox 2006). It is evident the informed citizen looks to the mass media and, increasingly, the Internet, to stay informed. It is within this emerging communicative culture that a conceptual framework based on the idea of the twenty-first century communicative citizen possessing a right to communicate provides a foundation more aligned with global developments and democratic communication than that of the eighteenth-century concept of the informed citizen.

Component 3: A progressive librarianship responds to the political economy of librarianship by advocating a shift from a mass-media mentality favoring top-down, one way vertical communication to that of a communication environment favoring global, personal, two-way, horizontal communication between individuals and groups.

Libraries operate in a political economy. As public institutions they are an instrument of public policy which arises out of political processes. Therefore, it is crucial for librarians to understand the link between power, politics, and economy in the sphere of public policy (Birdsall 2000).

The traditional one way flow of information through the mass media, and the statements of freedom of information that flow from it, represents a political economy subject to domination by political, economic, and cultural elites. Indeed, the traditional emphasis on the free flow of information gave rise to what Jean d’Arcy described as the “mass media mentality.” According to d’Arcy, in the mass society of the twentieth century people became conditioned to accept as normal the unilateral, vertical, top-down flow of information characteristic of the mass media that evolved out of the print and broadcasting technological and power structures. For d’Arcy this type of communication is inadequate in an era of global communications where the individual can directly participate in horizontal, interactive communication with other individuals or groups. He stressed the traditional one-way transmission of information is not communication; communication is about the *interactive* exchange of information (d’Arcy 1983).

Since d'Arcy's analysis the concentration of the corporate mass media and modes of global communication has increased even more so while governments and the private sector accelerate their efforts to control and monitor access and use of the Internet for their own political and economic ends. These challenges arise out of a public policy environment dominated by a neo-conservative ideology of information technology that conceives the idea of universal access not as a necessary condition for the cultural, social, and educational benefits of all citizens but as a means of creating a critical mass of potential consumers in the ecommerce marketplace (Birdsall 1996). The "war on terror" reinforces these tendencies.

This is a political economy that has corrupted the concept of universal access developed in an earlier era of mass media communication public interest regulation. While communication rights related to access to information, government information access policy, intellectual property, intellectual freedom, and so on are central to the core of librarianship's professional values, the revolution in global communication combined with a political economy driven by a mass media mentality of information technology is generating intense challenges to all of these traditional values.

Librarians are, of course, concerned with information freedoms and liberties as reflected in the many policy statements of their professional associations. However, such statements were conceived in the context of a political economy dominated by a mass-media mentality and one-way flow of information rather than within a context of participatory, horizontal interactive communication. As a result, these statements reflect mass-media mentality values concerned about the flow of and access to information, not about two-way, interactive communication. This orientation is seen in the emphasis librarians — including progressive librarians — give to access to information and to serving, as do mass media outlets, as gateways to the one way flow of information (Rosenzweig 2000).

This emphasis on information flow, intellectual freedom, access, free flow of information and the gateway role is explicit in the American Library Association Code of Ethics which states:

In a political system grounded in an informed citizenry, we are members of a profession explicitly committed to intellectual freedom and the freedom of access to information. We have a special obligation to ensure the free flow of information and ideas to present and future generations (ALA, 1995).

Likewise, IFLA's Glasgow Declaration on Libraries, Information Services and Intellectual Freedom which states: "IFLA proclaims the fundamental right of human beings both to access and to express information without restriction." Furthermore, it affirms libraries "...serve as gateways to knowledge, thought and culture, offering essential support for independent decision-making, cultural development, research and lifelong learning by both individuals and groups" (International Federation of Library

Associations and Institutions 2004). The conceptualization of libraries must shift from a focus on the one-way flow of information to that of horizontal interactive communication from a mass media communicative culture to a personal or individual, global communicative culture.

This shift does not necessitate abandoning a concern about content; recall that a right to communicate encompasses both a right to inform and to be *informed*. Rather, it means adopting a conceptual framework embracing all elements of the generation, transmission, and use of information and knowledge. Consequently, it is necessary to develop a new concept of the library and librarianship in a human rights context that contributes to the transformation of a political economy currently dominated by a mass media mentality. Alternatively, librarians must work to establish the principle that it is the responsibility of the state to insure resources are available to allow citizens to exercise their right to communicate. Thus, a right to communicate must be embodied in legal, political, and institutions structures. The most central of those institutions must be the tax-supported library.

Within such a human rights framework the library becomes the institutional embodiment of a right to communicate. The library, whose legal foundation is a right to communicate, becomes the preeminent social institution whose social role is to insure the communicative citizen can exercise a right to communicate.

Component 4: A progressive librarianship favors a new balance between the needs of the individual and of the community through a combination of individual and collective rights.

The meaning of community has always been problematic in America (Fowler 1991; Shain 1994). As political scientist Derek L. Phillips observes: "We are always dreaming, it seems, of community" (Phillips 1993, 3). The library's real contribution to community, framed in a nostalgic picture of the small town public library, is increasingly difficult to assess in an era of the rapidly expanding urbanization. Indeed, the modern American library movement has always been an urban phenomenon while successfully incorporating into its ideology American dreams of the rural, small town community. What is required is a more explicit link between community and human rights. As Gregory J. Walters observes:

Human rights require community for their implementation, while community requires human rights as the basis of its morally justified economic, political, and social operations and enactments; hence the need for a community of rights in the information (Walters 2002, 239).

The library has always been cast as one of those public institutions constituting a community. Librarians stress in their professional ideology their service to both the individual and the community (Birdsall 1985).

For progressive librarians the library is a “community building institution” (Rosenzweig 2000). However, in the end the primary focus of library services is service to the individual toward the goal of insuring she or he is an informed citizen. Indeed, the development of the rational, informed individual is seen the library’s primary contribution to the community. This objective is in accord with the American allegiance to first generation civil and political rights.

First generation civil and political rights, such as freedom of speech, religion, and assembly, are typically orientated to the rights of individuals in opposition to real or potential restraints imposed by the state or other collectives such as the church. Belief in these rights is especially strongly held among those countries whose human rights history arises out of the Anglo-American human rights tradition (the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia) and they are endorsed by these nations in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Second generation economic, social, and cultural rights (such as education, health, social security) recognize the rights of individuals with a social or collective context. These rights are more firmly entrenched in those countries whose rights tradition derives from the Continental or French human rights tradition which places individual rights within a social context. While first generation rights are to protect the individual from the state, second rights place an obligation upon the state to provide the means allowing citizens to exercise such rights. The United States has not formally endorsed these rights as express in the United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Emerging third generation rights relate to global issues including the environment; economic, social and cultural development; peace; common heritage; humanitarian assistance; a right to communicate. Debate continues on the precise definition and implementation of these third generation rights but because of their global implications there is general agreement they are not only the rights of individuals but also of communities. Collective or community rights are relevant to a right to communicate in regard to such issues as intellectual property rights of Indigenous peoples, the protection of cultural identities, or the preservation of minority languages.

A third generation right to communicate provides a new conceptual framework for defining the relationship of the library to the individual and community. As lawyer and library trustee Merrilee Rasmussen asserts: “The right to communicate embodies the individual’s right to belong to a community in an era when the nature of community is changing.” Global electronic communication opens the possibility to form new modes of community, indeed, according to Rasmussen: “The right to communicate grounds the very idea of community” (Rasmussen 2002, 142). Based on a right to community held by both individuals and communities, a progressive librarianship can continue to serve the needs of the both by providing communicative opportunities for all citizens in a global context.

Component 5: A progressive librarianship encompasses any particular form the library may take and works for its continual transformation.

Beginning in the 1970s, librarians entered a period of intense angst over their professional future and that of the library. Challenged by the prognostications of Frederick W. Lancaster librarians have ever since dwelt upon the question of what form the library will take in the electronic era (Lancaster 1978; Harris, Hannah, and Harris 1998, 30-38). Would it be a electronic, virtual, digital, or hybrid library—or even not exist at all? However, it matters not whether the issue of the form of the library remains unresolved as it should not be determining factor in the role the library plays in meeting society's needs. In this respect, borrowing from Umberto Eco, the library is conceived as an open work, a concept endowed with sufficient generality and universality to be interpreted appropriate to its context and the communicative needs at any particular time and place (Eco 1989; Birdsall 2006).

Librarians' strict adherence to universally applying accepted professional techniques and standards has marginalized different ways of knowing certain types and formats of information. These dominant professional methodologies, constructed in a print environment, are increasingly irrelevant in the digital environment. Likewise, the traditional top-down professional/client relationship in an era of growing citizen empowerment is no longer viable. The centralized, hierarchical construction of programs, standards, and techniques typical of the traditional professional model must give way to participative collaboration between professional and client in constructing the open library at the community level.

Indeed, there will be the recognition of many communities and of many ways of knowing that require the development of unique approaches to reflect multiple knowledge systems. The focus should be on creating through professional/client collaboration an open library embodying a wide range of communicative opportunities. New developments, such as Web 2.0, embody values of client participation that enhance the possibilities of such collaborations for developing multiple strategies to meet individual and community communicative needs (Miller 2005). One can envision libraries serving particular communities being in a "perpetual beta" state of evolution (on perpetual beta see O'Reilly 2005).

Whether the library as place or the digital library, a right to communicate provides a framework within which to develop progressive library organizations and operations centered on dynamic communication processes and services rather than solely on the traditional passive focus on content and collections. As well, libraries would be evaluated on the range and quality of services they provide rather than the increasingly irrelevant counts of their collection size or circulation of items. The primary resource of the library becomes the staff working in collaboration with users rather than passive services orbiting around the library's collections. This transformation of the library creates the possibility of attracting a more

inclusive clientele for the library as well as creating political alliances with other activists and others promoting communication rights including academics, computing professionals, women's groups, the disabled, journalists, and ethnic and linguistic minorities.

Component 6: A progressive librarianship embraces the development of a genuinely international librarianship that yet remains responsive to local needs.

The values of twentieth century librarianship based on the concept of the informed citizen were formulated in the United States. This commitment to an informed citizenry has been adopted by librarians around the world. For example, the IFLA/UNESCO Public Library Manifesto, adopted in 1994, states:

Freedom, prosperity and the development of society and individuals are fundamental human values. They will only be attained through the ability of well-informed citizens to exercise their democratic rights and to play an active role in society (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions/ UNESCO 1994)

But as the concept of the informed citizen is no longer sufficient to sustain a vital librarianship in an merging global communicative culture we can expect the development of a twenty-first century progressive librarianship will be an international and multi-national project.

A progressive librarianship will be international to the extent it is grounded in a *universal* human right to communicate. Yet, if librarianship is to develop within the universalization of global communication and of human rights, the development of which are at various stages among nations, we can also anticipate a progressive librarianship that will take various forms among nations of various cultures. Indeed, librarians, in their efforts to construct a librarianship sensitive to both the local and international context, will need to be especially attuned to cultural differences. As Randy Kluver observes: "In a globalized world, the political abstractions known as nations are becoming increasingly irrelevant, while the symbolic systems known as cultures are continually in flux" (Kluver 2000).

This sensitivity to cultural differences will require librarians to devote more attention to understanding cross- or intercultural communication. This must involve an understanding of intercultural communication in itself and as a field of research examining how people communicate among different cultures and their unique knowledge systems.

Conclusion

I have delineated a set of six components of a progressive librarianship for a twenty-first century communicative culture. The basis of that

librarianship is a basic human right to communicate possessed by the communicative citizen. A right to communicate establishes a fundamental legal foundation for the library as the institutional embodiment of a right to communicate in an era of global electronic communication and expanding human rights. It transforms traditional library values in accord with the emerging global communication and human rights environment. It envisions the library as being an important component of global electronic communication networks while offering an alternative political economy encompassing an active role for the communicative citizen. It shifts the focus of the library from information to communication, from content to process, from the informed citizen to the communicative citizen. It allows for a participatory process based on a close collaboration of professional and client. It provides a conceptual framework for the library regardless of its form. Finally, it opens up the possibility of a genuinely international librarianship that is also responsive to diverse cultural needs.

Works Cited

- American Library Association. *Code of Ethics of the American Library Association*. June 28 1995. <http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/statementspols/codeofethics/codeethics.htm>
- Birdsall, Stephanie A., William F. Birdsall. 2005. Geography matters: mapping human development and digital access. *First Monday*. 10(October): http://firstmonday.org/issues/issues10_10/birdsall/index.html.
- Birdsall, William F. 1985. Community, individualism, and the American public library. *Library Journal*. 110(November 1): 21-24.
- Birdsall, William F. 2000. A political economy of librarianship? *HERMÈS : revue critique*. No. 6. <http://pages.globetrotter.net/charro/HERMES6/birdsall.htm>. Reprinted in *Progressive Librarian*. Issue 18(Summer, 2001): 1-8, and as Uma economia politica da bibliotecomia? *Perspectivas em Ciência da Informação* 10(Jan. 2005): 86-93. <http://www.eci.ufmg.br/pcionline/viewarticle.php?id=108&layout=abstract>
- Birdsall, William F. 2005. Libraries and the communicative citizen in the twenty-first century. *Libri: International Journal of Libraries and Information Services*. 55(September): 75-83.
- Birdsall, William F. 2006. A right to communicate as an open work. *Media Development*. 53(1): 41-46. http://www.wacc.org.uk/wacc/publications/media_development/2006_1/a_right-to-communicate_as-an-open-work.
- Brown, Richard D. 1996. *The Strength of the People: the Idea of an Informed Citizenry in America, 1650-1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Cukier, Kenneth N. 2005. Who will control the Internet. *Foreign Affairs*. (November/December): <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20051101facomment84602/kenneth-neil-cukier/who-will-control-the-internet.html>.
- Cunningham, Carolyn. 2005. The right to communicate: democracy and the digital divide. Paper presented to the Telecommunications Policy and Research Conference, September 24, 2005. <http://web.si.umich.edu/tpcr/papers/2005/434/The%20right%20to%20comm%2023-05.htm>
- Dakroury, Allia I. 2004. Glovalization and the right to communicate: utopia or prison? *Journal of Intergroup Relations*. 31(Fall): 40-60.
- d'Arcy, Jean. 1969. Direct broadcast satellites and the right to communicate. *EBU Rview*. 118(1969) 14-18; reprinted in L.S. Harms, J. Richstad, K. A. Kie. Editors. *The Right to Communicate: Collected Papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1977.
- d'Arcy, Jean. 1983. An ascending progression. In Desmond Fisher and L. S. Harms. Editors. *The Right to Communicate: a New Human Right*. Dublin: Boole Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1989. *The Open Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fisher, Desmond. 1977. The right to communicate: a philosophical framework for the debate. In Jim Richstad, L. S. Harms. Editors. *Evolving Perspectives on the Right to*

- Communicate*. Honolulu, HI: East-West Communication Institute, 89-103.
- Fisher, Desmond. 1982. *The Right to Communicate: a Status Report*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fowler, Robert B. 1991. *The Dance With Community: the Contemporary Debate in American Political Thought*. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2006. After neoconservatism. *New York Times*. February 19, 2006. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html>.
- Glendon, Mary Ann. 1991. *Rights Talk: the Impoverishment of Political Discourse*. New York: Free Press.
- Harris, Michael H., Stan A. Hannah, Pamela C. Harris. 1998. *Into the Future: the Foundation of the Library and Information Services in the Post-Industrial Era*, Second Edition. Greenwich, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Horrigan, John B. 2006. For Many Home Broadband Users, the Internet is a Primary News Source. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Online News. 22 March, 2006. http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/PIP_Online_News_0306.pdf
- Horrigan, John B., Lee Rainie. 2006. The Internet's Growing Role in Life's Major Moments. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Findings. April 19, 2006. http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Major%20Moments_2006.pdf.
- International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions/UNESCO. 1994. *IFLA/UNESCO Public Library Manifesto*. <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s8/unesco/eng.htm>.
- International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. 2004. *The Glasgow Declaration on Libraries, Information Services and Intellectual Freedom*. September 18, 2004. <http://www.ifla.org/faife/policy/iflastat/gldeclar-e.html>.
- Ishay, Micheline R. 2004. *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kluver, Randy. 2000. Globalization, informatization, and intercultural communication. *American Communication Journal*. 3(May 2000): <http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol3/Iss3/spec1/kluver.htm>.
- Kranich, Nancy. 2001. Editor. *Libraries and Democracy: the Cornerstones of Liberty*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Lake Snell Pery & Associates. 2004. Youth Attitudes Toward Information Sources. Memorandum. January 15, 2004. http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/center_democracy_survey2_011504.pdf
- Lancaster, Frederick W. 1978. Whither libraries? Or Wither Libraries? *College and Research Libraries*. 39(September): 345-357.
- Lauren, Paul G. 1998. *The Evolution of International Human Rights: Visions Seen*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lenhart, Amanda, Susannah Fox. 2006. Bloggers: a Portrait of the internet's new storytellers. Pew Internet & American Life Project. July 19, 2006. http://www.pewinternet.org/PPF/r/186/report_display.asp.
- Madden, Mary. 2006. Internet Penetration and Impact. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Data Memo, April, 2006. http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Internet_Impact.pdf.
- Maret, Susan L. 2006. Formats are a Tool for the Quest for Truth: HURIDOCs Human Rights Materials for Library and Human Rights Workers. *Progressive Librarian*. 26(Winter 2005/2006): http://libr.org/pl/26_Maret.html.
- McIver, William J., Jr., William F. Birdsall. 2004. Technological evolution and the right to communicate. *EJC/REC: the Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique e Communication*. 14(3 and 4): <http://www.cios.org/www/ejc/v143toc.htm>.
- Miller, Paul. 2005. Web 2.0: Building the new library. *Ariadne*. Issue 45(October):<http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue45/miller/>.
- Molz, Redmond K, Phyllis Dain. 1999. *Civic Space/Cyberspace: the American Public Library in the Information Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- O'Reilly, Tim. 2005. What is web 2.0: design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. <http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-web-20.html>.
- Pew Research Center. 2003. Cable and Internet Loom Large in Fragmented Political News Universe. News Release. January 11, 2003. http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/pew_research_internet_voters_011404.pdf
- Phenix, Katharine J., Kathleen de la Pena McCook. 2005. Human Rights and Librarians. *Reference and User Services Quarterly*. 45(Fall): 23-26.
- Phillips, Derek L. 1993. *Looking Backward: a Critical Appraisal of Communitarian*

- Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rasmussen, Merrilee. 2004. Information rights and the law: the right to communicate in the Canadian charter. In Karen G. Adams and William F. Birdsall. Editors. *Access to Information in a Digital World*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Library Association: 135-147.
- Richstad, Jim, M. H. Anderson. 1981. Policy context for news and a 'new order.' In Jim Richstad, M. H. Anderson. Editors. *Crisis in International News: Policies and Prospects*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rosenzweig, Mark C. 2000. Transcript of "What Progressive Librarians Believe: An International Perspective": a presentation to the Vienna International Library Conference of AKRIBE at the Dr. Karl-Renner-Institut. <http://libr.org/plg/Vienna2000.html>.
- Samek, Toni. 2004a. Internet AND Intention: An Infrastructure for Progressive Librarianship. *International Journal of Information Ethics*. 2(11):1-18.
- Samek, Toni. 2004b. Letter from the Guest Editor. *School Libraries in Canada*. 24(4): <http://www.schoollibraries.ca/articles/149.aspx>.
- Samek, Toni. 2006. *Librarianship and Human Rights: a 21st Century Guide*. Oxford, UK: Chandos Publishing.
- Shain, Barry A. 1994. *The Myth of American Individualism: the Protestant Origins of American Political Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- United Nations. Human Development Programme. 2000. *Human Development Report 2000*. New York: Oxford University Press. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2000/en/pdf/hdr_2000_ch0.pdf.
- Walters, Gregory J. 2002. *Human Rights in an Information Age: a Philosophical Analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

