

ALA, IFLA, and South Africa

by Al Kagan

This article presents a brief overview of modern South African history going back to the arrival of the Dutch in 1652, subsequent European colonialism, and the years of white minority rule under the policy of apartheid. It briefly explains one aspect of the most potent worldwide responses to apartheid, the cultural and academic boycott. The institutional development of South African librarianship is then contextualized with ALA and IFLA responses. It pays particular attention to the Association of American Publishers report (*The Starvation of Young Black Minds*), Guidelines for Librarians Interacting with South Africa, IFLA's various activities and reports, and the role of South Africa's new nonracial democratic organization, the Library and Information Workers Organization (LIWO). Finally it analyzes ALA and IFLA actions and interventions during the transition to majority rule, and concludes with an evaluation of ALA and IFLA's strategic importance in the subsequent development of the South African library profession.

Colonialism and Apartheid

The modern history of South Africa is a product of European colonialism and the ideology of white supremacy. The Dutch first arrived at the Cape of Good Hope on the southern coast of Africa in 1652. They soon subjugated the indigenous peoples and established a colony. The British conquered the Dutch in 1795. The Dutch then trekked into the interior and fought against the indigenous peoples to create their own colonies. British colonists first arrived in 1806. The two European powers fought not only the indigenous peoples but also among themselves until the beginning of the twentieth century. By 1910, the British and Dutch colonies were unified under the British, and became the Union of South Africa. The descendants of the British colonists spoke English and the descendants of the Dutch colonists developed a hybrid language called Afrikaans. People of mixed race origin (called Coloured) and people of mainly South Asian descent (called Indian) generally had somewhat higher social and economic status and more rights than the indigenous African peoples from various ethnic groups. Race and

Al Kagan is Professor of Library Administration and African Studies Bibliographer Emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has been deeply involved in socially responsible library organizations throughout his career.

Keywords: anti-apartheid movement, boycotts, sanctions, African National Congress, South Africa, American Library Association, International Federation of Library Associations, Social Responsibilities Round Table

social class segregated people, but not quite as stringently as after 1948. The white supremacist South African ideology of apartheid was applied to government policy after the election of the Nationalist Party in 1948. In the Afrikaans language, the word “apartheid” translates as “apartness,” but its real meaning is closer to the way it is correctly pronounced: apart hate. A more functional definition of the policy of apartheid would be based around the concept of institutionalized racism. It was a policy that prevented the majority from holding any citizenship rights. It relegated only 13% of the land to more than 80% of the people. It allocated 60% of national income to 14% of the people. The distribution of wealth was so lopsided that it resulted in an African infant mortality rate of 94-124 deaths per 1000 live births and an average African life expectancy of 41-47 years. In contrast, the white infant mortality rate was 12 per 1000 and the average white life expectancy was 61-71 years.¹ Apartheid was a brutal system of white-minority rule and segregation, which controlled every aspect of the majority of the peoples’ lives, and was held in place by violence and political repression. It classified and separated people into four large “racial” groups: White, Coloured, Indian, and African, and even many subgroups.

Apartheid applied to librarians and libraries as with all other professions and institutions. Many readers will be aware of the peoples’ struggles and the incredible international campaign to overthrow apartheid. The opposition movement included organizations with various political philosophies, but the most successful was the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC). The Freedom Charter was proclaimed at the Congress of the People at Kilptown, Johannesburg, on June 26, 1955. Although the African National Congress came to life in 1912, the Freedom Charter became its most foundational document. It begins:

We, the People of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:
that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the people...²

Apartheid policies created completely separate and unequal education, official censorship and banning of books and ideas, and the banning and banishment of political leaders. It was against the law to even quote a banned person. The Freedom Charter addressed these policies. It said that:

The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall be Opened!

The government shall discover, develop and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life;
All the cultural treasures of mankind shall be open to all, by free exchange of books, ideas and contact with other lands;
The aim of education shall be to teach the youth to love their

people and their culture, to honour human brotherhood, liberty and peace;
Education shall be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children;
Higher education and technical training shall be opened to all by means of state allowances and scholarships awarded on the basis of merit;
Adult illiteracy shall be ended by a mass state education plan;
Teachers shall have all the rights of other citizens;
The colour bar in cultural life, in sport and in education shall be abolished.

The Sharpeville Massacre of March 21, 1960, and the Soweto Uprising of June 16, 1976, were widely reported and met international reprobation. (March 21st is now celebrated as Human Rights Day and June 16th as Youth Day.) A society-wide and international struggle was necessary to defeat apartheid. It included the armed liberation struggle of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC). A massive non-violent movement included strikes, boycotts, and civil disobedience organized by the ANC, PAC, Black Consciousness Movement, United Democratic Front (UDF), and Mass Democratic Movement. United Nations international economic, cultural, and sports sanctions were important in isolating the country, and finally causing the collapse of the banking system. Government policies only began to change with State President's F. W. de Klerk's speech of December 2, 1990, unbanning the ANC and other opposition organizations, and announcing the release of political prisoners including Nelson Mandela. Majority rule was finally achieved with the first inclusive elections in 1994.

The first ANC government along with its partners, the South African Communist Party and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), made an initial significant effort to try to transform social and economic conditions for the majority of the population through its Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). Although not as wide-ranging as some had hoped, many local initiatives were carried out under its auspices. Although some activists complained, by 1996 the government changed direction and implemented the neoliberal policy of Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR). Analysis of these policies is out of scope for this article, but note that many on the left criticized the government for much too readily giving up on its initial transformative agenda at a time when there was still much political space to forge on.

The Cultural and Academic Boycott

Although there were calls for a boycott of South Africa from as early as 1960 after the Sharpeville Massacre, a systematic international campaign that threatened white-minority rule did not materialize until 1987. Due to the burgeoning of a new popular liberation culture, South African

performers, those in exile and those still living inside the country, came together in Amsterdam in 1987. That major Conference on Alternative Culture endorsed the concept of a selective boycott determined through consultation of mass democratic organizations.³ Also in 1987, the United Democratic Front (UDF) proclaimed that, "One should seek to make the distinction between isolating the regime and isolating the people of South Africa."⁴ At that time, the UDF was the largest legal coalition of anti-apartheid groups in South Africa. At its peak the UDF represented over 800 religious, labor, community, and political groups. In a 1988 interview from exile in Sweden, ANC President Oliver Tambo endorsed the call for a selective boycott, which meant boycotting apartheid institutions and supporting all struggling to overturn the system.⁵

IFLA and Librarianship Under Apartheid, 1930-1989

The South African Library Association (SALA) was established in 1930, before the advent of institutionalized racism in 1948. Its initial membership was 89, but it grew to 1611 by 1977. SALA was initially open to all, but it was a mainly white organization. However, it did promote a little library work in African communities.⁶ There were only three "non-White" members in 1963, when it decided to limit its membership to whites, and set up separate library associations for "Coloureds," "Indians," and "Bantu" (a pejorative term meaning Africans).⁷ Of these separate organizations, only the African Library Association of South Africa (ALASA) survived until the 1990s.⁸

SALA was a member of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), the preeminent international organization for librarianship. However, IFLA received much financial support from Unesco, which was very active in the struggle against apartheid. IFLA had a problem after SALA officially became an apartheid association. Unesco suspended relations and significant grant funding to IFLA in 1971. This anti-apartheid pressure soon led to IFLA's request that SALA withdraw from membership. SALA withdrew in 1972, and the Unesco Executive Board lifted its suspension of IFLA. However, there were still three South African libraries that remained institutional members of IFLA, and they lost their voting rights in 1974. Strangely, IFLA restored voting rights to the South African institutional members in 1977, stating, "Their formal position had changed considerably." But remember that the Soweto Uprising took place in June 1976, and that the country was rocked by protests and demonstrations during these years. The apartheid repressive apparatus was in full swing. Restoration of voting rights was clearly unjustified, and showed the true political allegiance of IFLA's leadership.

As a result of political pressure, SALA could not continue, and dissolved itself at the end of 1979. It was immediately reformed as the South African Institute for Librarianship and Information Science (SAILIS). The organization's 1982 constitution opened membership to all, but excluded

most black librarians by insisting on proper librarianship qualifications. One might see this as a small step on the way to equality, but it was essentially a way for the white establishment to remain in control of the profession in the face of international pressure.

The IFLA Executive Board took up the matter again in 1983 and surveyed its fourteen South African institutional members. Twelve reported that they did not discriminate, and therefore the IFLA Executive Board took no action. By this time, the worldwide movement against apartheid had become very large and vocal. Librarians were no exception, and in 1985, the IFLA Council voted to exclude membership from all apartheid institutions at the Chicago conference.⁹

This author personally experienced the IFLA Executive Board's willful misinterpretation and refusal to honor the 1985 resolution. Other organizations took note. For example, the Archives/Libraries Committee of the [US] African Studies Association sent a letter of protest concerning the lack of implementation.¹⁰ In 1987, the IFLA Executive Board allowed all South African university and independent libraries to remain as members. The Board requested all South African government libraries to withdraw, and two protested this request. But after more surveys in 1988, the IFLA Executive Board again refused to carry out the 1985 resolution.¹¹ In 1989, the Board stated it would not comply because "...IFLA in the first instance is a professional, and not a political organization...."¹² But the IFLA establishment had included white South Africans for a long time, and IFLA was still mainly run by an elite European and North American group. International delegations regularly addressed the IFLA Executive Board demanding implementation of the resolution, but all to no avail.¹³ One is reminded of Ronald Reagan's bogus policy of "constructive engagement" towards South Africa.¹⁴ This brings the IFLA story up to State President de Klerk's historic speech on February 2, 1990, announcing the beginning of the end of apartheid.

ALA and Librarianship Under Apartheid, 1972-1989

In 1972, the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) called on ALA to break ties with IFLA until it expelled the South African Library Association for its apartheid policies. The ALA Council then passed a resolution stating that ALA would have no formal relationships with organizations that violate the human rights and social justice provisions of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. No specific organizations were mentioned.¹⁵ Although there were prolonged discussions with the International Federation for Documentation (FID) concerning their national South African member, no action was taken. And it appears that breaking with IFLA was never considered. Nothing happened until the ALA Midwinter 1978 meeting when the ALA Council passed a resolution condemning the abridgement of free expression in South Africa [over closing dissident newspapers], urging the US Congress to impose sanctions on the country, and asking the US delegation to IFLA to introduce a censure

resolution.¹⁶ However, there is no evidence that such a resolution was ever put forward.

An international movement against apartheid blossomed in the 1980s, and was reflected in ALA where relations with South Africa became a major issue. ALA Council voted in 1980 to suspend its affiliation with the International Federation for Documentation until its South African national member removed itself, or South Africa abolished apartheid, but no similar action was taken against IFLA.¹⁷ Many ALA members joined the ongoing demonstrations outside the South African Embassy in Washington, DC during the Midwinter 1985 meeting.¹⁸ The demonstrations took place at a time when the worldwide community was calling for divestment from corporations doing business in South Africa. Although the ALA Council did not act, the ALA Executive Board directed the ALA Endowment Trustees to develop plans for divestment of the ALA endowment at a “the most reasonable schedule appropriate.”¹⁹

The SRRT International Human Rights Task Force succeeded in passing a resolution on “Abridgement of Human Rights in South Africa” at the 1986 ALA Annual Conference’s Membership Meeting in New York City, which was affirmed by the ALA Council. It called for supporting the South African freedom struggle, opposing the reentry into IFLA of the South African Institute for Librarianship and Information Science (SAILIS) until it opened its membership to all, urging US bibliographic utilities against investing or expanding services in South Africa, revising the forthcoming 20th edition of the Dewey Decimal area tables prepared by SAILIS to reflect the history of all South Africans, urging libraries to collect alternative South African materials, and for inviting South African colleagues to advise ALA on how it might help promote the free flow of information, open library service, and a more just and humane society there.²⁰

In response to the policy, the Houston Public Library tried to find vendors that did not do business in South Africa. But the library gave up after sending 3000 unsuccessful letters, and asked the Houston City Council for an exemption, which was granted in October 1987. The ALA Office for Intellectual Freedom got an opinion from the ALA lawyer that local sanctions were unconstitutional, but no further ALA action was taken on the matter at that time.²¹

A turning point in the anti-apartheid movement came when the US Congress overrode President Reagan’s veto and imposed strict economic sanctions on South Africa in September and October 1986. But the Executive Board of the ALA Intellectual Freedom Round Table (IFRT) continued to be upset about sanctions, and tried unsuccessfully to get the 1987 ALA Membership to vote for a resolution opposing local government restrictions against dealing with South Africa.²² At the Annual Conference in 1988, the Council voted to support imprisoned librarian, Thiswilandi Rejoice (Joyce) Mabudafhasi. Council asked for her case to be brought to the UN Commission on Human Rights.²³

The Starvation of Young Black Minds Report

In a recent personal conversation with this author, Herb Biblo, ALA Treasurer from 1980-1984, said that ALA Executive Director Robert Wedgeworth wanted to travel to South Africa in the 1980-1984 period, but the ALA Executive Board refused his request, presumably because it would have broken international sanctions. By 1989, Wedgeworth had left his ALA position and he arranged a trip with Elizabeth Drew who represented the Association of American Publishers (AAP). This May 1989 “fact-finding mission” to South Africa was sponsored by the AAP and the Fund for Free Expression. Before the trip, Mr. Wedgeworth visited the African National Congress Observer Mission to the United Nations. At that time, the ANC notified Mr. Wedgeworth that the project could only be endorsed after consultations with the Mass Democratic Movement (MDM) and the ANC. But Mr. Wedgeworth did not follow-up. In a memo sent to E.J. Josey at the 1990 Midwinter ALA Meeting, Mr. Tebogo Mafole, the Chief Representative of the ANC United Nations Observer Mission, noted that the ANC did not endorse the project and “has not been apprised on the project itself.” In a letter on June 20, 1990 to the Progressive Librarians Guild (PLG), the Congress of South African Writers (COSAW) put forward a similar statement concerning the Wedgeworth/Drew trip.²⁴

In their trip report, Wedgeworth and Drew concluded that the international boycott was having negative effects, that our professional organizations should take strong positions against the boycott, and that publishers should be allowed *carte blanche* to trade with South Africa. The conclusions were based on discussions in South Africa with “more than 75 representatives of various organizations and institutions.” However, only a partial list was provided. Some of the organizations had a clear interest in breaking the boycott (for example, the two Government libraries and the three commercial bookstores). We should also be skeptical of a trade organization report with proposed recommendations that would financially benefit its members. Furthermore, there was no indication that the authors communicated with the large umbrella organizations that constitute the progressive movement, such as the United Democratic Front (UDF), or its constituent bodies such as church organizations and community groups. (It is interesting that the AAP did not speak for all mainstream US publishers. Chadwyck-Healey specifically opposed the report.²⁵)

The ALA Executive Board transmitted the report to the ALA International Relations Committee (IRC). The AAP report had specifically called for ALA and other organizations’ endorsement. However, the current chair of the IRC was one of the founders of the ALA Black Caucus (BCALA) and SRRT, E. J. Josey, and he was a strong proponent of sanctions. Josey called an open committee hearing to debate the report. Many BCALA and SRRT members testified, and all called for rejecting the report except for Mr. Wedgeworth, who spoke last and then walked off in a huff. As a result, ALA reaffirmed its policy by rejecting the AAP report.²⁶

We should try to understand the political context to determine the significance of the AAP report. When South African President F. W. de Klerk unbanned the anti-apartheid organizations and released prominent political prisoners, he called for the end of international sanctions. At the same time, the newly released prisoners and the unbanned organizations called for increased sanctions to force the South African Government into serious negotiations to end apartheid. In this context, we see why the ANC rejected the report; it precisely followed de Klerk's position and was in direct opposition to the freedom struggle.²⁷

It is heartening that the hearings sponsored by the ALA International Relations Committee resulted in an ALA Council resolution reaffirming current ALA policy and not endorsing the AAP report (Revised CD #97). However, the ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee did endorse the report at its June 1990 meeting.²⁸

Guidelines for Librarians Interacting with South Africa

The need to produce "Guidelines for Librarians Interacting with South Africa" resulted from the explosion of mass alternative culture within South Africa, a reflection of the changing political climate. The rise of grassroots organizations and local labor unions led to the formation of the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU).

The Archives/Libraries Committee (ALC) of the [US] African Studies Association (ASA) organized a panel discussion on "South Africa and the Free Flow of Information: Dilemmas Facing the Librarian and Scholar" at the ASA Annual Conference in Chicago in October 1988. This author chaired the program. Panelists were Corinne Nyquist (SUNY New Paltz), Thomas Nyquist (SUNY Central Administration, Albany), Ismail Abdullahi (University of Pittsburgh), and Lorraine Haricombe (University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign).²⁹ The program was so successful and provoked so much discussion that the organizers followed up by drafting guidelines in accordance with the African National Congress' call for cultural and economic sanctions for presentation at the ALC's next meeting in Gainesville, Florida, in April 1989.³⁰ After long hours of debate, the ALC approved a document for its own use and forwarded it to the Executive Committee of the African Studies Association. (See Guidelines text in the appendix to this article.)

The original drafters of the Guidelines, Al Kagan and Corinne Nyquist, were ALC members, and they brought the Guidelines to SRRT and many other ALA bodies at the Dallas Annual Conference in June 1989. And they presented the document at an ALA panel discussion sponsored by the SRRT International Human Rights Task Force.³¹ Very lively debate ensued and the ad hoc group voted to make several significant amendments to be presented for further discussion. On that same evening, SRRT met

and further amended the document.³² The newly formed Progressive Librarians Guild (PLG) adopted the Guidelines at its December 1989 meeting in New York City.

SRRT members made numerous presentations at the 1990 ALA Midwinter meeting in Chicago advocating adoption of the guidelines. Supplementing the work of Nyquist and Kagan, the most important SRRT activists not on the ALA Council were Ismail Abdullahi, Sandy Berman, Elaine Harger, Zoia Horn, Peter McDonald, Joseph Reilly, and Mark Rosenzweig. Advocates on the ALA Council were Herb and Mary Biblo, Betty Blackman, Cesar Caballero, Marva DeLoach, Mitch Freedman, E. J. Josey, Michael Malinconico, Linda Pierce, and John Sheridan.

The Guidelines won endorsement (in various iterations) of the ALA Black Caucus, the International Relations Committee, the International Relations Round Table, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), the Committee on the Status of Women in Librarianship (COSWL), the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT), Reference and Adult Services Division (RASD), and the Young Adult Services Division (YASD).³³

The Guidelines were adopted at the ALA Membership Meeting also in Chicago on June 26, 1990. However, by a vote of 62 to 76, the ALA Council voted against endorsement and sent the document back to three committees for further discussion, the International Relations Committee (IRC), the Intellectual Freedom Committee (IFC), and the Committee on Professional Ethics. Surprisingly, these three committees did not meet with each other. After separate considerations, the committees issued a joint memo to the ALA Council declining to recommend any further action. The committees instead suggested that the Social Responsibilities Round Table might want to rewrite the document. But SRRT refused to rewrite, and the Council on January 16, 1991, referred the Guidelines back to the three committees for further consideration and possible action at the June 1991 Annual Conference. No further action was taken. The Committee on Professional Ethics particularly objected to putting ALA on record to serving any particular social cause, as in point 3.4:³⁴

Librarians are encouraged to be of service to the South African mass democratic movement in the context of their professional work.

The powerful IFC was strongly opposed based on an absolutist conception of the freedom of expression. Its key sticking point was the statement in point 2.6:³⁵

As professionals, we must strive to balance our methods to promote the free flow of information with work activities that are morally and politically responsible.

In a later high profile debate and later book, intellectual freedom advocate John Swan used the absolutist argument to oppose ALA's full support of the international cultural boycott of apartheid South Africa. He noted that it would restrict the free flow of information by preventing US publishers from selling their books there. What he did not say is that the only people who could afford to purchase the books were the affluent white minority, and that there were few if any libraries open to the majority of the population.³⁶ Noel Peattie considered the ALA South Africa debate one of his "three hard cases."³⁷

The Guidelines had six sections.

Section 1, "Guiding Principles," explains that libraries do not exist in isolation from the world arena; that libraries must serve their communities; and that our commitment to social responsibility means that we must oppose apartheid in all its forms.

Section 2, "The Issue," deals with the need to "balance our methods to promote the free flow of information with work activities that are morally and politically responsible."

Section 3, "General Recommendations," encourages librarians to get involved in the political process to isolate the apartheid regime and be of service to the South African mass democratic movement.

Section 4, "Recommendations for Collection Development, Reference Service and Outreach," notes the large worldwide propaganda program that distributes pro-apartheid material, and encourages the aggressive collection and dissemination of counter materials, development of teaching aids, and the need to teach library users how to evaluate materials.

Section 5, "Recommendations Regarding Professional Travel to South Africa," provides various criteria as to whether such trips would benefit or hinder scholarship and progressive developments. It especially addresses how professional travel might unknowingly further apartheid interests.

Section 6, "Recommendations for Action," promotes assistance to South African library workers who suffer the consequences of their actions in opposing apartheid. It encourages assistance to South African library school students who wish to study in a non-racial environment. And it opposes all activities that promote South Africa as a regional center for library development.

IFLA Working Group on South Africa

The IFLA Section on Library Services to Multicultural Populations submitted a motion at the 1989 Paris IFLA Conference to "reconsider

the propriety of continued membership” of South African individuals and institutions. However the Section was strong-armed by the IFLA Executive to withdraw the motion. The Section Chair, Michael Foster wrote that he was subjected to “extreme psychological pressure” by IFLA President Hans Peter Geh.³⁸

In a compromise, a Working Group on South Africa was established. Patricia Berger, ALA’s 1989-1990 President, chaired the working group. Their report was sent to all IFLA institutional members in April 1990, and generally released in July 1990 with comments due back to the IFLA Executive Board by November 1, 1990, *after* the 1990 IFLA Conference, and for action at the 1991 IFLA Conference.³⁹ The Working Group recommended seven IFLA actions: 1. a statement against apartheid laws and the continuing “State of Emergency,” 2. endorsement of a statement on human rights and the ethics of librarianship, 3. two policy statements supporting freedom of expression and the obligation of all IFLA members to provide equal services to all, 4. a new working group to develop and distribute the policy statements, 5. revocation of the membership of existing South African IFLA members, assuming adoption of the policy statements and lack of change in South Africa, 6. personal membership for South African librarians who have shown their commitment against apartheid, and 7. an IFLA scholarship program for South African black library school students. After reviewing responses including endorsement by the Archives-Libraries Committee of the African Studies Association, the IFLA Executive endorsed points 1-3 with qualifications, considered it unnecessary to form a new working group because the situation on the ground was changing, and therefore suspension of IFLA membership was “not warranted.” Instead the Executive Board recommended that South African institutional members initiate another study on access to library services, and urge their associations and universities to develop programs to “recruit, train, and employ qualified black librarians.”⁴⁰

Two weeks after that report was issued, Patricia Berger wrote to the Working Group members noting her “disappointment,” and that “...they just do not want to take a stand on South Africa” (underlining in the original).⁴¹ Then Michael Foster, another member of the Working Group and editor of the journal of the IFLA Section on Library Services to Multicultural Populations, editorialized his chagrin with the IFLA Executive Board’s response. This led to a heated exchange of letters between Foster and IFLA’s Coordinator of Professional Activities, Winston D. Roberts, who excoriated Foster for his editorial and warned that “The question of overall editorial policy of IFLA journals is likely to come up for consideration...” Foster made a detailed reply noting the “high degree of aggression” shown to him regarding withdrawal of the Paris resolution (noted above).⁴²

Readers may marvel over this extraordinary denial of democratic practice and basic free expression rights by the leadership of an organization that is supposedly committed to upholding freedom of expression. However, it is not an isolated incident.⁴³

The Launch of LIWO and the 1990 Stockholm IFLA Conference

Meanwhile, 1990 finally brought significant political changes to South Africa. Nelson Mandela was released in February, and in June the Parliament repealed the infamous Separate Amenities Act of 1953. The ANC renounced armed struggle in August. On December 2nd, State President F. W. de Klerk gave a speech announcing the unbanning of the ANC and other political organizations. After discussions in Durban and Pietermaritzburg in 1989, a new alternative South African library organization was launched in Durban on July 14, 1990, the Library and Information Workers Organization (LIWO). SRRT and PLG immediately sent congratulation messages.⁴⁴ More branches then organized around the country.

SRRT members took part in a demonstration outside the convention center at the IFLA Stockholm Conference in August 1990. More than 800 leaflets were distributed calling for implementation of the Working Group Report. The demonstration was organized by the Swedish alternative library organization, Bibliotek i Samhälle (BiS, Libraries in Society), the Isolate South Africa Committee (ISAK) of Sweden, and LIWO. It was cosponsored by the ANC, the Resource Centre Forum (Durban), the National Education Union of South Africa (NEUSA), SRRT, and PLG. The demonstration greatly disturbed the IFLA leadership.⁴⁵

The 1991 IFLA Conference and Responses to the Working Group Report

Nothing much more happened at the 1991 IFLA Conference in Moscow due to the disruption caused by the attempted coup during the conference. However, LIWO did distribute a resolution and statement there asking for implementation of the Working Group Report, and it was published in the conference newsletter.⁴⁶ The LIWO statement noted that apartheid was “far from dead,” cited the problems with opening up libraries to all, and noted that the few township libraries that did exist were in poor shape. The resolution asked for IFLA’s support for library transformation, for continued withholding of membership from libraries and institutions that continue to uphold white privilege through various tactics, and for postponing a decision on South African participation in IFLA for one year, along with consultation of progressive librarians and organizations.

If Council II had been held, it would have considered two opposing resolutions. The first submitted by the Library Association (UK) called for another survey of South African libraries and a moratorium on new South African institutional members. The second proposed by the IFLA Regional Section on Africa called for endorsing the Working Group report. These resolutions were read but not debated at an abridged closing session. Instead, the Executive Board requested comments on all four resolutions submitted (only two concerned South Africa), and noted that it would implement them if there was “consensus.”⁴⁷ Forty replies were received

before the Board met again in April 1992. Although there was a “mixed response,” the Board reneged on its promise by rejecting a moratorium on admitting new South African members and rejecting the actions advocated in the report of the Working Group on South Africa, which had been endorsed by the IFLA Regional Section on Africa.⁴⁸ This was another example of lack of democracy and the authoritarian nature of the IFLA Executive Board. It would have been much better to put off any decisions until the next IFLA Conference where IFLA institutional members could vote in the normal way.

IFLA Fact-Finding Mission to South Africa

Although the IFLA Executive Board had used every stalling tactic and underhanded method it could devise, the issue of South Africa would not go away. Their next ploy was to establish a fact-finding mission. Since the goals and mission were unclear, the ALA Executive Board declined to appoint a representative to go on the mission.⁴⁹ However, an IFLA group did visit the country in June 1993, with members from Botswana, Finland, Netherlands, Nigeria, and Northern Ireland. The report was presented orally at the IFLA Council Meeting on August 22, 1993 at the Barcelona IFLA Conference. One can only speculate why no print copies were available. The Council “accepted” the report and sent it out on September 10 to all IFLA members for further comments by November 15th.⁵⁰

There were six recommendations: 1. IFLA should assist in promoting free access to information for all South African citizens, 2. IFLA should assist and cooperate with all the new South African library initiatives and organizations on the ground, 3. IFLA should recognize all the existing South African library organizations and encourage communication between them, with a view for smoothing South Africa’s reentry into international librarianship after years of isolation, 4. IFLA should assist in “manpower development” of neglected population groups, 5. IFLA should recommend: a strategic national plan for library and information service provision, a legal framework, recruitment from disadvantaged groups based on potential rather than formal qualifications with appropriate staff development programs, more continuing education programs, and restructuring of the South African Institute for Library and Information Science, SAILIS (the largest and mostly white library professional organization) with a view to forging unity among existing library organizations, and 6. In view of the major constitutional changes in progress, a comprehensive review of the situation by another fact-finding mission in three years’ time. It is unclear if any comments were received.

The End of Sanctions and ALA’s Adoption of an Investment Code

Beginning in 1990, there were serious negotiations between the government and ANC, and real change on the ground finally started to appear. In a speech to Parliament on January 29, 1993, President de Klerk renounced apartheid and said that the old order would be gone in a matter of months.⁵¹

Mandela and de Klerk received the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize. And by October 1993, the African National Congress called for ending sanctions.

In October 1993, at the request of the ALA International Relations Committee, the ALA Endowment Trustees asked the ALA Executive Board to rescind sanctions; and the Executive Board voted to seek Council approval at the 1994 Midwinter Meeting. The ALA Council approved SRRT's June 1994 resolution. It resolved to lift sanctions immediately after the results of the 1994 South African elections had been ratified, and that ALA would abide by the South African Council of Churches' Code of Conduct for Businesses Operating in South Africa.⁵² The Code promoted ten standards: equal opportunity, training and education, workers rights, working and living conditions, job creation and security, community relations, consumer protection, environmental protection, empowerment of black businesses, and implementation.

The first majority rule elections were held April 27-28, 1994. The ANC won the majority of votes, and Nelson Mandela became President. Very little happened in ALA concerning South Africa after majority rule in 1994.

IFLA and the "Unification" of the South African Library Profession

The IFLA leadership continued to press for the "unification" of the profession. But in practice this meant merging the three existing library organizations: SAILIS, LIWO, and ALASA (African Library Association of South Africa). Colin Darch (University of Cape Town) provided the intellectual arguments against SAILIS, ALASA, and LIWO merging into one organization.⁵³ He said that he was not opposed to either unity or unification, but that unity must come before unification. Darch defined 'unity' as "...the holding of broadly similar or compatible social and political viewpoints by most or all of a defined population (in this case, the community of LIS practitioners)." He defined 'unification' as "...the administrative union of two or more separate organizations...." He noted that "...SAILIS and LIWO are actually in fundamental disagreement over what LIS practitioners really do, and especially how they do it; and over what membership associations are supposed to be like. We do think differently." He asked, "Unity to what purpose?," "Unification on what conditions?," and "Unification through what process?" He exploded the myth that a single organization with a single voice was standard practice in the rest of the world by explaining the LIS situations in several countries, most especially the multiple organizations in the United States. He said that the various organizations could perhaps speak with a single voice around specific issues, and provided examples.

In 1994, IFLA President Bob Wedgeworth held discussions with the three library associations and gave the keynote address at the SAILIS meeting.⁵⁴ In a confidential e-mail message of November 18, 1994 to this author, one of the LIWO leaders wrote that he had written a letter to Leo Voogt, IFLA

Secretary General, informing him of LIWO's non-involvement in the forthcoming LISDESA Conference, and warning IFLA that LIWO would oppose any neo-colonial library intervention. He stated that the coming conference is a thinly veiled attempt to force unity on the South African LIS associations. He also expressed his suspicion about the reasons behind IFLA President Robert Wedgeworth visiting South Africa just before the conference.

And there is another piece in this IFLA story. Jane Digby, Marketing Executive at the International Conference Centre (ICC) in Durban sent letters to many of the LIS leaders in South Africa asking if they as individuals would like to bid on holding the 1999 IFLA Conference in Durban, South Africa. Several LIWO leaders were upset.⁵⁵ They were concerned that such an undertaking could only come from the LIS associations. They were concerned that IFLA might be directly intervening again in the development of LIS in South Africa. On behalf of LIWO, Christopher Merrett wrote to Leo Voogt, IFLA Secretary General, asking if the three South African library associations had been consulted. Mr. Voogt did not reply directly but sent a letter to Ms. Digby saying that the venues for IFLA conferences had already been allocated up to the year 2003.⁵⁶ One must wonder how Ms. Digby got a contact list of key LIS leaders, and whether IFLA officials were involved.

The first Unification of Library and Information Stakeholders (ULIS) Conference was held on July 8-10, 1996, in Johannesburg with more than 250 participants. Thabo Mbeki, South Africa's Executive Deputy President, urged unification.⁵⁷ Kay Raseroka, Chair of the IFLA Regional Section on Africa, and Christina Stenberg represented IFLA.⁵⁸ LIWO did not officially participate. Although nothing concrete was decided at ULIS, SAILIS voted to dissolve within one year from the date of its September 1996 meeting.⁵⁹ ALASA reluctantly went along with unification, but LIWO refused this initiative because it rightly thought it would be swallowed up and lose its unique voice.

The ULIS-2 Constituent Conference was held October 17, 1996, in Pretoria with 450 participants. Ross Shimmon, Chief Executive of the Library Association (UK), along with IFLA President Robert Wedgeworth and IFLA Secretary General Leo Voogt, attended. Brigitte Mabandla, South Africa's Deputy Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology gave the opening address. Sibusiso Bengu, South African Minister of Education, gave a congratulatory message on behalf of President Nelson Mandela. IFLA President Christine Deschamps gave the keynote address. The conference chair was Kay Raseroka, Chair of the IFLA Regional Section on Africa. After much debate, the participants unanimously adopted a constitution for the new "unified" association, LIASA, the Library and Information Association of South Africa. LIASA had been admitted to IFLA membership in August 1997, and SAILIS and ALASA disbanded in April 1998.⁶⁰ LIWO gradually faded away and formally disbanded in 2000.

LIASA has since hosted two IFLA Conferences: 2007 in Durban and 2015 in Cape Town.

For more history and analysis of South African library organizational matters, please see chapter one, “South Africa: Library and Information Workers Organisation (LIWO)” in this author’s book, *Progressive Library Organizations: A Worldwide History* (McFarland, 2015). For more insight on all these matters, please also see Elaine Harger’s excellent history in chapter 2 of her recent book, “Singing (and Silencing) Solidarity: Interrupting Legacies of Racism and the Anti-Apartheid ‘Book Boycott,’” in *Which Side Are You On?: Seven Social Responsibility Debates in American Librarianship, 1990-2015* (McFarland, 2016).

Conclusion

ALA generally played an important solidarity role in the struggle against apartheid from the 1970s to the 1990s. The early efforts of E. J. Josey and the Black Caucus of ALA (BCALA) combined with the steadfast efforts of SRRT educated thousands of librarians about the only country upholding a system of legalized and institutionalized racism after World War Two. BCALA and SRRT worked in conjunction with the ANC to push the association to uphold international sanctions. And many ALA bodies adopted guidelines for interacting with South Africa. It was unfortunate that the absolutist orientation of the ALA intellectual freedom bodies prevented the ALA Council from also adopting the guidelines. Nevertheless, the African National Congress and the South African liberation movement in general gained support from ALA’s actions.

IFLA’s role can be analyzed by looking at two periods: before and after majority rule in 1994. IFLA’s role in the first period was mostly negative. Although the IFLA Council passed a clear resolution in 1985 to exclude apartheid institutions, the IFLA Executive found every possible way to delay action by commissioning surveys, reports, and a fact-finding mission. Although many IFLA activists from various countries continued to press for change with delegations to the IFLA Executive at every conference, the IFLA leadership succeeded in putting off action right up until majority rule in 1994.

Many argue that IFLA played a positive role in helping to normalize the South African library profession, particularly after majority rule. The IFLA Executive had strong influence on the so-called “unification” process and the establishment of LIASA. IFLA’s influence on the internal dynamics of the library situation on the ground favored the established library leaders in SAILIS who were willing to share power along with the young African librarians who were willing to work alongside their previous bosses. This coalition effectively marginalized the upstart progressives in LIWO. Those who see IFLA’s role during this period as positive use the most minimal criteria. These changes took place following majority rule during the years of Mandela’s presidency. There was great widespread hope at that time that

South Africa would seriously address the problems of social and economic inequality. Although progress ensued, this period soon faded, and the ANC government descended into neoliberalism. Seen from the perspective of the LIWO activists who were part of the Mass Democratic Movement, the normalization of the South African library profession under neoliberalism was a defeat. There is no caucus or other body within LIASA that represents the agenda of the LIWO activists. Although LIASA represents all population groups and has black leadership, the strong progressive agenda for structural change has largely fallen by the wayside in favor of a technocratic orientation.

Except in extraordinary situations, library and other professional associations follow and therefore represent current trends in society. In a normalized South Africa, LIASA plays the usual role. It will be interesting to see how LIASA reacts if and when South Africa's growing social movements become more powerful and have a transformative national impact.

We should acknowledge what the activists were able to accomplish in ALA. And we should learn just how hard it is to change the bureaucratic and establishment oriented nature of IFLA.

APPENDIX

GUIDELINES FOR LIBRARIANS INTERACTING WITH SOUTH AFRICA

In light of the continuing crisis in South Africa, numerous organizations, both within that country and worldwide, have called for a total boycott to isolate the South African regime. However, with the enormous growth of the South African democratic movement and its alternative structures, the international boycott has been modified in order to support that movement while still isolating the apartheid regime. Because librarians have a special role in providing information, guidelines are especially necessary to define our role under current circumstances.

A version of these guidelines was first adopted by the Archives-Libraries Committee of the [U. S.] African Studies Association (ALA) in April 1989. That version was significantly amended and adopted by the Social Responsibilities Round Table of the American Library Association in June 1989. The following other ALA bodies adopted these guidelines in January 1990: Association of College and Research Libraries, Black Caucus, International Relations Committee, International Relations Round Table.

1.0 Guiding Principles

- 1.1 We support and uphold the values of a free, democratic and non-racial society and therefore totally oppose the South African system of government based upon race known as apartheid.
- 1.2 We oppose all institutions which contribute to the continuation of apartheid.
- 1.3 We are committed to excellence in the performance of our professional

- responsibilities.
- 1.4 We are committed to social responsibility as one of our highest priorities.
 - 1.5 Libraries should provide and promote services that are appropriate to the needs of the communities that they serve.
 - 1.6 Research is enriched in excellence and social value through an exchange of ideas that occurs locally and internationally.
 - 1.7 Meaningful research is impossible without full and uncensored access to information.
 - 1.8 Libraries do not exist in isolation from the dominant trends and conflicts in the world arena.

2.0 The Issue

- 2.1 We take serious note of the international campaign to isolate the South African Government and its apartheid structures.
- 2.2 We note that the international cultural boycott has recently been modified to exclude from the boycott people and organizations that are contributing to the struggle to abolish apartheid such as the African National Congress of South Africa, Congress of South African Trade Unions and the United Democratic Front.
- 2.3 We note that the lack of the free flow of information to and from the mass democratic organizations and anti-apartheid institutions in South Africa has inhibited the evolution of South African democracy.
- 2.4 We note that the Government of South Africa does everything in its power to deny the free flow of information deemed useful to the mass democratic movement, both domestically and in the international arena.
- 2.5 We note that the Government of South Africa engages in a substantial and sophisticated worldwide propaganda campaign to assert its legitimacy, using every conceivable medium including the free distribution of publications.
- 2.6 As professionals, we must strive to balance our methods to promote the free flow of information with work activities that are morally and politically responsible.

3.0 General Recommendations

- 3.1 Librarians should encourage discussion and debate on the South African situation.
- 3.2 Librarians are encouraged to express their outrage concerning the continued existence of the apartheid South African Government.
- 3.3 Librarians are encouraged to work within the political process to isolate the South African Government and all apartheid institutions.
- 3.4 Librarians are encouraged to be of service to the South African mass democratic movement in the context of their professional work.
- 3.5 Librarians should attempt to educate members of their institutions to be aware of the subtleties of the South African Government's propaganda campaign.
- 3.6 Librarians should become aware of the democratic and support organizations concerned with South Africa operating in the United States and elsewhere.

4.0 Recommendations for Collection Development, Reference Service and Outreach

- 4.1 We recognize the need to build balanced collections relating to South Africa. Because the South African Government maintains a large worldwide

- program to distribute free pro-apartheid materials to libraries and other institutions, librarians are especially encouraged to aggressively acquire and publicize counter materials, especially those published by the mass democratic and liberation movements.
- 4.2 In their reference interactions and teaching responsibilities, librarians should strive to encourage library users to develop the critical skills necessary to evaluate, interpret and understand the underlying intentions of various sources of information about South Africa.
 - 4.3 Through direct contact, guides, and bibliographies, librarians should publicize and provide access to a variety of sources of information, including possibly conflicting presentations of statistics and other facts, as well as expressions of differing points of view, and assist in interpreting these presentations.
 - 4.4 Librarians should take the opportunity whenever possible to provide bibliographies and reading lists to support school and community activities such as films, programs and other public events, as well as to supplement media coverage of South Africa.
- 5.0 Recommendations Regarding Professional Travel to South Africa
- 5.1 Librarians should only travel to South Africa at the invitation of anti-apartheid groups and institutions.
 - 5.2 Talks and seminars at, or contractual relationships with apartheid institutions should not be undertaken.
- 6.0 Recommendations for Action
- 6.1 Librarians and library associations are encouraged to promote legal and other humanitarian assistance to South African librarians and library workers who suffer the consequences of their actions in opposing apartheid.
 - 6.2 Librarians, library associations and library educational institutions are encouraged to provide all types of educational and financial assistance to black (African, Asian and “coloured”) South African students who wish to study library and information science in a non-racial environment. Assistance should not be based on whether or not students have the possibility of working in their own country under current conditions. Such students should be recruited from or with the approval of non-racial mass democratic organizations.
 - 6.3 All activities that promote South Africa as a regional center for library development should be opposed while apartheid continues. Examples of such activities are: special training programs or lecture series at apartheid institutions, and consultation of the South African Institute for Library and Information Science in matters that involve other African countries (such as the revision of the Dewey classification schedules).

Notes

1. *Southern Africa Fact Sheet* (Southern Africa Perspectives, 1/88), New York: The Africa Fund, 1988.
2. African National Congress, *The Freedom Charter*, <http://www.anc.org.za/showphp?id=72>
3. See “Making the New South African Culture: the Amsterdam Conference,” *Southern Africa Report* 3, 4 (February 1988): 18-21;
4. “The Cultural Boycott,” *ANC News Briefing* (June 6, 1987): 8-9.
5. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 16, 1988): 40. The ANC formally adopted the selective boycott in a “Position Paper on the Cultural and Academic Boycott” in May

1989.

6. M. Syphus, "Towards a LIS Association for All: a Critical Assessment of the Position of SAILIS with Regard to a Unified Profession," *South African Journal of Library and Information Science* 63, 1 (1995): 4.
7. "South African Library Association," in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, v. 28, edited by Allen Kent, Harold Lancour, and Jay E. Daily (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1980), 223-225. However, there was already a Cape Library Association for Coloureds launched in 1960, and the Non-European Library Service, Transvaal, which began in 1962. The Non-European Library Service, Transvaal, changed its name to Central Bantu Library Association in 1964 and was relaunched at a SALA meeting that year. It then changed its name again in 1966 and became the Bantu Library Association. Finally it took the name African Library Association of South Africa (ALASA) in 1972. The South African Indian Library Association was established in 1967.
8. Ellen R. Tise, "Strategies by LIASA to Develop Library Services and the Profession in South Africa," (Paper Presented at the World Library and Information Congress: 69th IFLA General Conference and Council, Berlin, 1-9 August 2003), 2.
9. "Resolution on Membership of South African Institutions in IFLA," *IFLA Annual Report* 1985, 85. Reprinted in Robert P. Doyle, Fact Sheet, (ALA document 1989-90 EBD#48.1), Exhibit 10, page 46.
10. Letter from Phyllis Bischof, Chair of ASA Archives/Libraries Committee to Paul Nauta [IFLA Secretary General], November 17, 1989.
11. The IFLA Executive Board sent the same survey it used in 1983 to poll its South African members. E.J. Josey told the Board that it was inadequate and submitted revisions. Letter from E.J. Josey to Paul Nauta with revised questionnaire attached, November 5, 1987. See also letter from Margreet Wijnstroom, Secretary General of IFLA to The South African Library in Cape Town, The South African Library of Parliament, The State Library in Pretoria, and The Library of the Department of National Education in Pretoria, August 28, 1987. E.J. Josey evaluated the survey responses in 1988 and again called for implementation of the 1985 resolution. The only result was another letter from the IFLA Executive Board asking for more information from 10 libraries.
12. Letter on "Policy on Apartheid" from Paul Nauta to IFLA Institutional Members in South Africa, May 3, 1989.
13. This author was a member of several of these delegations.
14. "Constructive engagement" was official US policy under President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s. It was an alternative to United Nations mandated economic sanctions and the strong corporate divestment campaigns in the United States and Western Europe.
15. "IFLA Asks South Africans to Meet UNESCO Standards," *Library Journal* (May 15, 1972): 1757; Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 11.
16. *ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter*, no. 48 (March 1978): 2; Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, Exhibit 2, 10.
17. Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 1.
18. *SRRT Newsletter*, no. 75 (March 1985): 2.
19. Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa* 2.
20. Membership Document #1.1 (1985-86 CD#58), moved by Corinne Nyquist and seconded by Elizabeth Morrissett. See *SRRT Newsletter*, no. 81 (September 1986): 5-6; Doyle, Fact Sheet: South Africa, 2.
21. "Houston Public Library Wins Exception to Anti-Apartheid Ruling," *Library Hotline* 16, no. 37 (November 16, 1987): 1; Letter from E.J. Josey to Randall Robinson, Trans Africa Forum, October 30, 1987.
22. "Social Issues and ALA Organization," *Library Journal* (August 1987): 25; "Resolution: Access South Africa," in Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, Exhibit 4, 15-16 (1987 MBRN#8).
23. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 3. The Council reaffirmed its support at the Midwinter 1990 meeting, Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa* (Chicago: American Library Association, [updated 1994, no document number, unpublished], Exhibit 11, 81-82, "Resolution Concerning the Abridgement of Human Rights of Thiswilandi Rejoice (Joyce) Mabudafhasi, Under Heavy Restriction at Her Home Near Pietersberg, Republic of South Africa" (1989-90 CD#42).
24. See *Progressive Librarian*, Preview Edition (Summer 1990): 29-30. This edition is titled "Libraries and Sanctions: A Special Issue on South Africa." It includes Kagan and Nyquist's article, "The Starvation of Young Black Minds: A Critique" (pages 18-

- 20), and the memo from Tebogo Mafole to E.J. Josey (page 29-30). Other articles are: Mark Rosenzweig and Elaine Harger, "The South Africa 'Book Boycott,': Censorship or Solidarity?"; Joseph Reilly, "International Librarianship & the Struggle for Democracy in South Africa"; Joseph Reilly, "Interviews with South African Library Users"; Dennis Mumble, "The Times Miscovers the ANC."; and Christopher Merrett, "Censorship on the Retreat." There are also brief statements by the ANC, COSATU, and the UDF.
25. Letter from Cheryl D. Thompson, Sales Manager, Northeast Region, Chadwyck-Healey Inc. to Al Kagan, August 27, 1990.
 26. The AAP press release, cover letter, and full report can be found in Robert P. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 30-45. Doyle updated his Fact Sheet in 1994, but this version has no ALA document number. The AAP materials are also there on pages 65-80. The IRC brought acclaimed South African poet and former political prisoner Dennis Brutus to the 1990 Annual Meeting. For more discussion and analysis, see "Libraries and Sanctions: A Special Issue on South Africa," *Progressive Librarian*, preview issue (Summer 1990). Those presenting at the IRC hearing were: Sanford Berman, Alfred Kagan, Herbert Biblo, Mary Biblo, Elliot Shore, Betty J. Blackman, Zoia Horn, Joseph Reilly, Maurice J. Freedman, Mark C. Rosenzweig, Miles Jackson, Ismail Abdullahi, George Grant, Corinne Nyquist, Marva DeLoach, Clara Stanton Jones, Margaret Collins, and Robert Wedgeworth. Sanford Berman presented a statement by 12 South African progressive librarians at the hearing. Also see Noel Peattie's discussion in *Sipapu*, 20, no. 1 (1990): 4-5; and 20, no. 2 (1990): 7. The "Resolution on the Starvation of Young Black Minds: The Effects of Book Boycotts in South Africa," which reaffirmed ALA policy (Revised CD#97, 1990) is reprinted in Mary Biblo and Herb Biblo, "E. J. Josey: The Internationalist," in *The 21st-Century Black Librarian in America: Issues and Challenges*, eds. Andrew P. Jackson (Sekou Molefi Baako), Julius C. Jefferson Jr., and Akilah S. Nosakhare (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2012), 243-245.
 27. For further discussion of the issues, see Janice Woo's article, "Fact-Finding Mission to South Africa Calls for End to Book Boycott" in *American Libraries* 21, 1, (January 1990): 9-11, and this author's response in *American Libraries* 21, 4 (April 1990): 290. For a longer version of the response, see *Progressive Librarian*, preview edition (Summer 1990): 18-20. And see Nelson Mandela's statement on maintaining the boycott, *New York Times*, February 12, 1990, A15.
 28. It is interesting that noted author and critic Nat Hentoff weighed in to support Judith Krug, director of the ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom. In a newspaper article, he slammed ALA for "Banning Our Own Books," *Washington Post*, December 5, 1989, A25. Hentoff also had an obsession in castigating ALA for its policy on Cuba. See this author's article on "ALA, IFLA, and Cuba" in *Progressive Librarian*, no. #45.
 29. Memo from Corinne Nyquist to Karen Tranberg Hansen, ASA 1988 Program Chair, September 23, 1988.
 30. The evolving Guidelines were published in various places including: *Africana Libraries Newsletter* no. 59 (July 1989): 4-5; *ASA News* 22, 3 (July/Sept. 1989): 19-21; *SRRT Newsletter* no. 93 (September 1989): 7-9; *SAILIS Newsletter* 9, no. 10 (October 1989): 8-9; *C&RL News* (April 1990): 311-313.
 31. The panel was titled, "The South Africa Boycott: Developing Guidelines." Speakers were Al Kagan, Chair (University of Connecticut), David Easterbrook (University of Illinois at Chicago), Regina U. Minudri (Berkeley Public Library), and Lorraine Haricombe (Peninsula Technicon, South Africa).
 32. *SRRT Newsletter*, no. 93 (Sept. 1989): 7-10; Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, Exhibit 6, 20-22.
 33. Memo from Denise Botto, Chair of SRRT to Corinne Nyquist, Chair of SRRT International Human Rights Task Force, June 20, 1990, with notes by this author.
 34. Transcript of Council III meeting, June 28, 1990 (unpublished).
 35. This statement is based on this author's personal knowledge.
 36. John Swan and Noel Peattie, *The Freedom to Lie: A Debate about Democracy* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1989), 150.
 37. *Ibid.*, 135-139. And note Swan's letter opposing some aspects of the South African Guidelines, *SRRT Newsletter*, no. 95 (March 1990): 3.
 38. Letter from Michael Foster to Winston D. Roberts, IFLA Coordinator of Professional Activities, May 1, 1991. Foster was also the editor of the Section's *Journal of Multicultural Librarianship*.
 39. Memos from Paul Nauta, Secretary General of IFLA, April 24, 1990 (reprinted as ALA

- document 1989-90 CD#64), and July 1990. The first memo and the report were included in the revised Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 1994, Exhibit 15, 91-94. (Note that page 94 is missing in this author's document.)
40. *Report of the Executive Board on the Motion Concerning South African Membership in IFLA*, April 11, 1991.
 41. Memo from Patricia W. Berger, Chair, to Members of the IFLA Working Group on South Africa, April 25, 1991; Letter from Phyllis B. Bischof, Chair, Archives-Libraries Committee to Paul Nauta, November 7, 1990.
 42. Winston D. Roberts, Coordinator of Professional Activities to Michael Foster, April 23, 1991; Michael Foster to Winston D. Roberts, May 1, 1991.
 43. For more on the authoritarian nature of IFLA leadership, see Alfred Kagan, "An Alternative View on IFLA, Human Rights, and the Social Responsibility of International Librarianship," *IFLA Journal* 34, 3 (2008): 230-237.
 44. Letter from SRRT to Library and Information Workers Organization of South Africa, July 5, 1990. Minnesota Librarians for Peace and Justice also congratulated LIWO in a letter of June 20, 1990.
 45. See "Apartheid Out of IFLA" leaflet for the demonstration in the BiS chapter in Alfred Kagan, *Progressive Library Organizations: A Worldwide History* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2015), 73; Al Kagan, "Iffy IFLA Issues," [letter to the editor], *American Libraries* (December 1990): 1035.
 46. "Statement and Resolution to the IFLA Conference, Moscow, August 1991, Adopted by the Library and Information Workers Organization (South Africa) at its First AGM, Pietermaritzburg, 17 July 1991," *IFLA Express*, no. 6 (1991), 3-4.
 47. Memo from Paul Nauta, Secretary General of IFLA to IFLA Delegates, January 15, 1992.
 48. Memo from Paul Nauta, Secretary General of IFLA, June 2, 1992. Paul Nauta sent this author a summary of the 40 responses from 18 countries, along with 15 of the letters from 8 countries. Many of the letters failed to respond at all to the two South Africa resolutions, and several seemed to endorse both positions.
 49. Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 1994, 10.
 50. Memo from Leo Voogt, Secretary General of IFLA, September 10, 1993. The memo and report were reproduced in Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 1994, 95-123. The Code was also published in *Washington Notes on Africa* (Fall 1993): 7.
 51. "De Klerk Convenes Lawmakers to Put End to White Rule," *New York Times*, January 30, 1993, 1; "The End of Apartheid and the Birth of Democracy," *South Africa: Overcoming Apartheid and Building Democracy* (East Lansing: African Studies Digital Library, Michigan State University), Unit 6, <http://overcomingapartheid.msu.edu/unit.php?id=65-24E-6&page=2>.
 52. "Resolution on Code of Conduct for Businesses Operating in South Africa" (Council Document #35 of 1994); Doyle, *Fact Sheet: South Africa*, 1994, 6-7, 85-87 (Exhibit 13); *SRRT Newsletter*, no 111 (March 1994): 3. Al Kagan drafted the 1994 resolution that lifted sanctions and endorsed the South African Council of Churches investment code. (SRRT has tried to establish policy on socially responsible investment through the ALA Council using the South Africa code as a model. Although the Council did not act, slow progress has been made. A full discussion of that debate is out of scope for this article.)
 53. Colin Darch, "Unity Before Unification?: South Africa's LIS Organisations and the Prospects for a Single Structure," *Proceedings of the Second National LIWO Conference Held in Pietermaritzburg 20-21 July 1995* (Pietermaritzburg: LIWO Pietermaritzburg, 1995), 4-10., http://www.colindarch.info/docs/19950700_LIS_organisations_in_SA.pdf
 54. Ellen R. Tise, "Strategies by LIASA to Develop Library Services and the Profession in South Africa," (Paper Presented at the World Library and Information Congress: 69th IFLA General Conference and Council, Berlin, 1-9 August 2003), 2.
 55. Letter from Jane Digby, Marketing Executive, ICC Durban to M. Moodley, January 11, 1996 (photocopy), and email messages between Colin Darch, Manikam Moodley, and Christopher Merrett, February 21-26, 1996 (photocopies).
 56. Letter from Christopher Merrett, [LIWO] Communications and Media to Leo Voogt, IFLA Secretary General, February 28, 1996 (photocopy). Letter from Leo Voogt to Jane Digby, March 13, 1996.
 57. "Address Delivered by the Executive Deputy President, the Hon. Mr T. Mbeki, 8-10 July 1996, Linder Auditorium, Johannesburg College of Education" (photocopy). Maria Farelo, LIWO National Coordinator had written to Mbeki on June 11, 1996, informing

him that LIWO would not attend the conference and attaching a copy of their position paper. An acknowledgement of receipt was received from Sophia Toona, Acting Administrative Secretary for Ms. B. Mabandla, Deputy Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology.

58. "Progress in Unifying South African Librarians and Information Workers" (photocopy). This appears to be a ULIS document.
59. Claire Walker, the last SAILIS President, wrote to Mary R. Somerville, the current ALA President on October 10, 1996. The letter informed ALA of the SAILIS decision to disband in favor of a unified library profession.
60. Ellen R. Tise, "Strategies by LIASA to Develop Library Services and the Profession in South Africa," (Paper Presented at the World Library and Information Congress: 69th IFLA General Conference and Council, Berlin, 1-9 August 2003), 3; Peter Johan Lor, "LIASA: the Birth and Development of South Africa's New Library Association," (Paper Presented at 64th IFLA General Conference and Council, Amsterdam, 16-21 August 1998), 3. The names of attendees and speakers were found on an August 12, 1997 message sent to the ULIS-2 listserv.