Stories of Censorship in the Old Pueblo: Banned Books Week at the University of Arizona By: Erica Defrain, and Cindy Elliott (U of A Assistant Librarians)

When the Mexican American Studies program at the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) was abruptly shut down in 2011, it drew national attention. After the program was declared to be in violation of state law ARS 15-112, which forbids Arizona schools from teaching courses promoting “resentment toward a race or class of people” or advocating “ethnic solidarity”. Seven books were physically removed from the classrooms and put into a district storage facility. Despite TUSD’s vehement claims that the books were not banned as they remained available for students to check out from many school libraries, the American Library Association approved a resolution opposing the restriction of access to these materials at the 2012 Midwinter Meeting.

Thus far, efforts to bring the removed books back into the classroom have failed. In July 2012, TUSD board member Mark Stegeman, who originally supported the book removal, brought a resolution to the board to bring the books back, but did not have enough support from the other board members, including Adelita Grijalva, a longtime supporter of the ethnic studies programming. (Continued on Pg. 2)

Welcome back to the IFRT Report. I hope you’ve missed us, because we’ve missed you during our publication hiatus. On behalf of IFRT, I warmly welcome our new committee members, newly elected board members, and all new members of IFRT. By joining IFRT, you connect with a community of like-minded librarians who are enthusiastic about protecting our intellectual freedom rights, privacy, and freedom to read. It is easy to get involved in IFRT: join a committee; submit nominees for our awards; or write an article for our publications. At ALA conferences, we invite all members to attend our executive board meetings. Or do something on your own. Intellectual freedom enthusiasts from every state recently submitted short videos honoring banned or challenged books for the Office for Intellectual Freedom’s 50-State Salute to Banned Books Week. (If you haven’t seen these yet, watch them at http://www.ala.org/advocacy/banned/bannedbooksweek/celebrating-banned-books-week/50statesalutevideos.) This is a fantastic idea, and it’s what member participation is all about. We all have our reasons to protect intellectual freedom. Earlier this year, I had a baby boy, and it’s exciting to know that IFRT members are working to protect his free speech and access to information. I’m happy to do my part to protect those freedoms. Thank you for your membership in IFRT. I think IFRT is one of the most important membership-based groups in ALA, and I hope you do, too. If you ever have any questions about getting involved, please email me at julia.warga@gmail.com. Be sure to keep up with IFRT’s news on Facebook (www.facebook.com/IFRTALA), Twitter (@IFRT_ALA), listserv (IFRT-Members), and our web site (http://www.ala.org/ifrt/).

P.S. If you are reading this column, and you are not a member of IFRT, join us! Learn more at http://www.ala.org/ifrt/ifrtorg/joinifrt/joinifrt.
Calling Stegeman’s move “the height of hypocrisy,” Grijalva remarked, “I don’t think the irony is lost on anyone who has been paying attention, if this was actually a true consideration of the fact that mistakes were made, then I would happily be voting,” (Huicochea, The Arizona Daily Star, July 25, 2012).

With the controversy ongoing, the University of Arizona in Tucson played host to a number of Mexican American Studies-themed events during Banned Books Week 2012. The University of Arizona Libraries held two lectures and created an exhibit of books containing the locally challenged materials. In the panel discussion, Misunderstood Titles: Stories of Censorship in the Old Pueblo, four UA faculty members shared their personal connections to the ongoing debate, discussed the legal and philosophical implications, and encouraged students in the audience to use their power to influence policymakers and keep the conversation going.

Associate Librarian Bob Diaz shared his stories as an activist, and the significance of ethnic studies. “Chicano Studies changed my life -- the course reflected the stories of folks who were just like me, and I saw myself in that classroom.” Associate Professor Patricia Montiel Overall highlighted her connection to the events through her Tucson roots, by discussing challenged title Los Tucsonenses, which mentions Montiel Overall’s family. Assistant Professor Kay Mathiesen analyzed the legal issues, and children’s rights according to the First Amendment, and Assistant Professor Roberto Rodriguez gave a firsthand narrative of the attempts to reinstate the program.

In the second event, Robert A. Williams, Jr., UA Professor of Law and American Indian Studies, presented his most recent publication, Savage Anxieties: The Invention of Western Civilization, which traces the origins of indigenous stereotypes back to ancient Greece. A prominent legal scholar who has defended Indian tribes and indigenous groups before the United States Supreme Court, a video can be seen on YouTube of Williams personally confronting the TUSD School Board after he discovered that his own work had been essentially banned with the removal of Richard Delgado’s Critical Race Theory. In the video Williams states, “I’ve been banned in Tucson. My work is included in one of the books that was incorporated into the Mexican-American Studies curriculum, and I can’t understand after a career of 30 years, in my own hometown, how my work is considered so dangerous, that you folks have decided to ban it. And so I’m here to ask you, why did you ban my work? Have you read my work? ...As professors, my colleagues, academics, teachers, if I was to vote on eliminating a course that included your work, I would give you the courtesy as fellow scholars, to at least read it. And I want to know: why have I been banned in Tucson?”

These talks highlight the importance of maintaining an open dialogue and provide an opportunity for public discourse on intellectual freedom. As stated by Professor Rodriguez, the books at the heart of the Arizona controversy enhance education and allow students to self-identify and develop confidence in themselves by studying their own unique American stories that are not detailed in traditional curriculum.

**OIF’s Top Ten List of Frequently Challenged Books in 2011**

1. *ttyl; ttfr; l8r, g8r* (series), by Lauren Myracle
2. *The Color of Earth* (series), by Kim Dong Hwa
3. *The Hunger Games* trilogy, by Suzanne Collins
6. *Alice* (series), by Phyllis Reynolds Naylor
7. *Brave New World*, by Aldous Huxley
8. *What My Mother Doesn’t Know*, by Sonya Sones
9. *Gossip Girl* (series), by Cecily Von Ziegesar
10. *To Kill a Mockingbird*, by Harper Lee

**Books Banned by Tucson School District**

*Rethinking Columbus: The Next 500 Years*, by Bill Bigelow and Bob Peterson

*The Tempest* by William Shakespeare

*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by Paulo Freire

*Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* by Rodolfo Acuna

*Chicanos: The History of Mexican Civil Rights Movement* by F. Aruro Rosales

Why would a perfectly good word like "scrotum" cause such a ruckus within the library community? It's not a swear word, in fact the correct term for that part of human anatomy. In 2007, the New York Times, among other media outlets, reported on numerous challenges to Susan Patron's Newbery Award winning novel *The Higher Power of Lucky* because some school librarians, yes, librarians, and parents argued that she had included the word "scrotum" on the first page of the story for its shock value. The book was subject to a great deal of censorship pressure for the inclusion of only one word, and in only three passages in the entire book. Many intellectual freedom advocates are disturbed by such incidents, that the mere inclusion of a word makes a book worth eliminating or reducing access to its intended readers. The issue comes down to whether or not a book is seen as harmful and in what way. This concern about the harmful effects of even one instance in a book goes back as far as the British Hicklin court case in the 1860s, used by US courts as a rule for many years to ban an entire work when even one passage was objectionable. As the Family Friendly Libraries organization states on its Web site, "minor patrons – kids under 18 – have sensibilities and vulnerabilities different from that of adults and deserving of protection." Family Friendly Libraries, an advocacy group now part of the Citizens for Community Values, founded by long-time anti-pornography crusader, Jerry Kirk, supports parents' right to challenge what they see as objectionable materials in libraries. Their stated mission is to increase awareness in the community of the need to protect children from harmful or age inappropriate materials in publicly funded libraries. When a word is considered objectionable, children need to be protected from being exposed to such words, presumably, because they could be psychologically harmed or not capable of understanding the impact of its use as an adult would, and affect their behavior in ways parents would find against their own values.

However, the counter argument is the view that "harm" is not a matter of the simple inclusion of a word, phrase or concept. Context mitigates any harmful effects and places singular use of a word into perspective. The work taken as a whole provides a greater good and understanding of complex issues and problems. For example, Pat Scales, a former chairwoman of the Newbery Award committee, said that declining to stock the *Higher Power of Lucky* in libraries was nothing short of censorship.

"The people who are reacting to that word are not reading the book as a whole," she said. "That's what censors do — they pick out words and don't look at the total merit of the book." Many intellectual freedom advocates also see a chilling effect on the artistry of literature that has the potential of restricting how authors portray characters and the story. Robin Brancato, author of children's and young adult books that include *Winning, Sweet Bells Jangled Out of Tune*, has said, "I suppose I don't like 'bad language' any more than you do. The main trouble with it from my point of view is that it is boring, unimaginative, and lazy. In conversation, it often fills in where original and interesting language ought to be. However, my business as a writer is not so much to pass judgment on how people speak, but to try to record their speech accurately for the sake of telling a story whose underlying values, I hope, are moral and positive." The important point that she conveys here is that the story as a whole has a foundation in "moral and positive" values. She goes on to say, "When I employ 'bad language', as you call it, and references to sex, it is not because I think these are needed to sell books or to hold the reader's interest, but because sex and body functions and the names for them, polite or impolite, are parts of life, and I am interested in portraying life as it really is." (Reichman, 1988, p. 31). Blogger Sara, of Books Your Kids Will Love http://booksyourkidswilllove.blogspot.ca/2011/07/why-curse-words-are-non-issue.html, has said, actual cause-and-effect relationship is between reading and behavior. As Bergen Evans has stated, 'In the realm of sexual customs-the field in which censors are most industrious-the effect of the book is very slight.'" (p. 71).

Continued on page 4
To forbid a child from reading a book for language reasons only is to not respect their ability to handle a few simple words and understand that seeing them in print doesn’t make them suddenly acceptable to say at school or at home.” Eli Oboler (1980), one of the most acclaimed intellectual freedom advocates, noted, “Let’s face it. At this point, we really don’t know for sure what the For example, in Georgia during the heyday of the popularity of the Harry Potter books, Gwinnet County parent Laura Mallory pressed her case through her school district board of education, not stopping when her complaint was rejected by the courts and then on to Georgia State Board of Education, because she saw it as an “evil” attempt to indoctrinate children in the Wicca religion. She evidence a blog by a teen who claimed that the books had turned her into a witch. Busha also describes the paternal nature of censorship as “those which originate from the desire of parents to have their children confronted only with those influences which might allow them to develop along the lines deemed acceptable or attractive” (p. 28). Charles Busha (1972), author of Freedom versus Suppression and Censorship, finds that causes of censorship can be classified into four categories: psychological, political, paternal, and social. The more salient of these for this discussion are psychological and paternal. Busha argues that “psychological causes stem from a compulsive need of some people to restrain others from uttering disturbing or distasteful thoughts or images” (p. 28). The censor is compelled out of their fear to suppress expression. (Continued, page 4).

Censorship has also been seen in the context of the dichotomy of left-right viewpoints, liberal versus conservative. While there are several instances of censorship perpetrated by liberals, studies of censorship from 1965 to 1990 indicate far more book challenges have come from the right. Harer and Harris (1994) analyzed censorship incidents reported to ALA, and found that of all of the organizations that challenged materials in libraries that could be identified by ideology, conservative groups outnumbered liberal groups 4 to 1. The defense of traditional values by conservatives has played itself out in our recent political environment, i.e. opposition to abortion, same-sex marriage, among others. This supports the basic nature of conservatism, to preserve the status quo. But, can it be said that censorship of books for children is just a matter of choice of values? As Busha has argued, there is a deeper psychological foundation as to why people want to censor such materials, that fear compels them to want to protect children from even one word. Consider one last instance of how fear drives this psychological response. During the 2004 election cycle, a poll of the families of the 9/11 victims was taken on their choice for president. It found that the families that had come to peace with their grief were overwhelmingly for the Democrat John Kerry and those families still grieving deeply were overwhelmingly for the Republican George W. Bush. Anger with and fear of terrorism contributed to identifying with conservatism. It is doubtful we will see a coming together of these two opposing forces on the value of protecting intellectual freedom because the reasons why parents and others challenge books are too deeply seated. Diligence in protecting the book from censorship will always be needed.

**Books Your Kids Will Love (Blog).** Retrieved from http://booksyourkidswilllove.blogspot.com/


Sought review by the Michigan Supreme Court. Kilpatrick then pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice. The Court of Appeals then agreed to pay restitution when he pleaded the order, but the trial court summarily rejected Kilpatrick's appeals for further consideration.

Son of Sam laws previously struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts. Kilpatrick challenged his case with the Supreme Court, but the court summarily rejected the appeal.

This state lawsuit seeks to enforce the Michigan “Son of Sam” law. The law closely resembles similar laws previously struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts. Kilpatrick challenged the law, but the trial court summarily rejected Kilpatrick’s First Amendment arguments on the ground that Kilpatrick agreed to pay restitution when he pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice. The Court of Appeals then refused to review the trial court’s ruling. Kilpatrick then sought review by the Michigan Supreme Court.

United States v. Alvarez: This lawsuit challenges the constitutionality of the Stolen Valor Act, a law that makes it a federal crime to lie about having received military honors. Alvarez, the defendant, was charged with violating the Act after he falsely told the audience at a meeting that he had been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. After the district court rejected Alvarez’ attempt to have the charges dismissed on the grounds that the Act violated his First Amendment right to free speech, Alvarez pleaded guilty but reserved the right to challenge the constitutionality of the Act on appeal. After the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed Alvarez’ conviction, the U.S. government successfully sought review by the Supreme Court. FTRF joined several other members of the Media Coalition in an amicus brief urging the Court to overturn the Stolen Valor Act on First Amendment grounds. The Supreme Court heard oral arguments on February 22, 2012; the parties await a decision. NOTE: In argument, the Government tried to narrow application to “knowingly false statements”. Plaintiffs argued that false speech is protected and can be prosecuted only if specific harm can be shown, as in historical exceptions. It was decided on June 28 that the Stolen Valor Act violates the First Amendment’s guarantee of the right to free speech.

Parents, Families, And Friends Of Lesbians And Gays, Inc. v. Camdenton R-III School District, et al.: This federal lawsuit challenged the Internet filtering practices of a school district in Camdenton, Missouri. The school district’s custom-built Internet filtering software blocks access to all LGBT-supportive information, including many websites that are not routinely explicit in any way. The filter did, however, allow students to view anti-LGBT sites. The lawsuit argues that the district must either unblock the discriminatory “sexuality” filter or obtain other filtering software that is capable of filtering content in a viewpoint-neutral manner. On February 15, 2012, the district court entered a preliminary injunction ordering the school district to stop using the discriminatory filter. The parties then agreed to resolve the lawsuit without further litigation. On April 6, 2012, the court approved a consent decree. Under the settlement, the school district agreed to stop blocking pro-LGBT sites, submit to monitoring for 18 months to confirm compliance with the decree, and pay $125,000 in legal fees and costs to the plaintiffs and their attorneys.

NOTE: Barbara Stripling testified that the Blacklist filter lacked clear criteria, it lacked credibility because it is...
which the Court granted on June 27, 2011. The court ruled 5-4 that the FCC violated the due process rights of Fox, and the Court did not address the 1st Amendment issues. The Broadcasters are now considered to be “on notice” regarding the FCC’s sanctioning fleeting expletives.

NOTE: The decision stated that the FCC violated the due process rights of Fox, and the Court did not address the 1st Amendment issues. The Broadcasters are now considered to be “on notice” regarding the FCC’s sanctioning fleeting expletives.

Developing Issues Committee Report:
1. Biblio Commons is using ILS-generated person information and selling it to other entities. Often the “public” setting is the default and requires the patron to change his/her settings to “private.” Patrons are labeling titles as “occult” or “criminal.” The plaintiff further alleges that the library director informed the plaintiff that the director was required to report to the police any person who accessed such sites. On April 11, the court ruled that Ms. Hunter could not sue the City of Salem because she could not demonstrate that the City was responsible for the decisions made by the library board and the library director. The city has been dismissed as a defendant, and the case continues against the library board and library director. A trial is scheduled for June 24, 2013.

FTRF is not currently involved in this lawsuit.

NOTE: this is viewpoint discrimination. The city was dismissed from the case because it has no role in the administration of the library.

Other Business:

Fox Television Stations, et al. v. FCC: After the FCC imposed fines on the Fox Television Stations for the use of fleeting expletives on two broadcasts, Fox appealed the FCC’s decision to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and, with the support of other broadcast networks and numerous amici, challenged the FCC’s indecency regime. In June 2007, the Second Circuit vacated the FCC’s order and ruled that the FCC’s new policy sanctioning fleeting expletives was arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedure Act. The U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari and ruled 5-4 that the FCC’s policy was not arbitrary and capricious and returned the case to the Second Circuit for a decision on the constitutional issues not yet addressed by that court. On July 13, 2010, the Second Circuit struck down the FCC regulations on First Amendment grounds for being “unconstitutionally vague, creating a chilling effect.” The FCC petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, which the Court granted on June 27, 2011. The court heard oral argument on January 10, 2012; the parties await a decision.

FTRF previously joined with individuals, other free speech organizations, and broadcast corporations to file a petition urging the FCC to reverse its decision to adopt new rules that impose harsh punishment on broadcast communications; this lawsuit addresses those rules. FTRF is not a party to the lawsuit.

NOTE: FTRF is not a party to the lawsuit.

Federal Legislation: Currently cybersecurity bills are being written that are overly broad, and warrant requirements are needed for information gathered by unmanned drones; on a positive note, protection for employees’ passwords to social networking sites is gaining support.

State Legislation: Watch for continued attempts to restrict sex offenders access public libraries and attempts to require public libraries to retain web searching records.

Membership Initiative and New Website Update: J. Chrastka is developing a new FTRF website with a content management system. It is expected to be released in Fall 2012.
Getting Involved in Intellectual Freedom: An Overview (Revised October 2012)
by Julia Glynn Warga

Originally published in NMRT Footnotes, May 2010

Many new librarians are passionate about intellectual freedom (IF), but the many committee choices and acronyms can make getting involved within ALA feel daunting. To help new members jump right into IF, I’ve assembled a brief (but not exhaustive) overview.

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM ROUND TABLE (IFRT) Founded in 1976 by John Phillip Imroth, the Intellectual Freedom Round Table is the first stop for ALA members who want to become active in promoting awareness and take action on a wide range of issues pertaining to censorship and freedom of expression. According to the IFRT website, the round table was founded in order to provide “a greater opportunity for involvement among the members of the ALA in defense of intellectual freedom; [as well as encouraging] a greater feeling of responsibility in the implementation of ALA policies on intellectual freedom.” Committee responsibilities include planning the ALA Annual Conference program, presenting awards, promoting membership, and publishing the quarterly newsletter.

The IFRT board meets biannually at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and at the ALA Annual Conference. The executive board consists of the chair, chair-elect, immediate past-chair, four directors-at-large, secretary, treasurer, and committee chairs. Liaisons to ALA committees, divisions, and round tables also attend the meetings. Agendas typically include announcements and discussions of pertinent news and updates, as well as round table governance. The executive board meetings are open to all members. (Check the conference program guide for exact times and locations).

If you want to join a committee, but are unable to attend conferences, do not worry. Most committees meet virtually. If you are interested in being appointed to a committee, fill out the online form. Committee assignments are made in the spring time by the Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

If you are reading this article, you should already be a member of IFRT; but if not, joining IFRT is the easiest and quickest way to get involved with the profession’s IF activities. Anyone who is a member of ALA may join IFRT. Annual dues for individual members are $15. Student memberships are $5. Membership benefits include a subscription to IFRT Report, the round table’s electronic newsletter.

ALA INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM COMMITTEE (IFC) The Intellectual Freedom Committee was founded 60 years ago. According to the website, their charge is “to recommend such steps as may be necessary to safeguard the rights of library users in accordance with the Library Bill of Rights, as adopted by Council.” The committee’s charge has not changed much since then. The current charge includes “The IFC works very closely with the Office for Intellectual Freedom and other ALA offices and divisions if expert advice is needed. The IFC is a Council committee that meets twice a year. The meetings are held at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference. The IFC submits biannual reports to Council on IF-related news and actions from the profession. Committee members are responsible for reviewing policy statements as each relates to the Library Bill of Rights. Any ALA member may attend the meetings.

In the spring, the ALA president-elect appoints members of IFC to two-year terms. To be considered for an appointment, you must submit an application expressing your interest. Each ALA division sends an official representative, usually the chair of their IF-related committee or group, to the IFC meetings. The IFC typically has 1 or 2 interns who are also appointed by the president-elect. Committee members must be able to attend the meetings and meet electronically between conferences.

DIVISION IF COMMITTEES Many ALA divisions have a committee or special interest group responsible for intellectual freedom and censorship issues. These organizations sponsor conference programs, present awards, and provide resources for librarians on censorship and information access. To learn more about division IF-related committees, including how to get involved, see the following list:

American Association of School Librarians (AASL) Intellectual Freedom Committee http://www.ala.org/aasl/aboutaasl/aaslgovernance/aaslccommittees/intellectualfreedom


Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC) Intellectual Freedom Committee http://www.ala.org/alsc/aboutalsc/coms/pg1childadv/als-if


Library and Information Technology Association (LITA) Technology and Access Committee http://www.ala.org/lita/involve/committees/tech-access/lit-ta

Public Library Association (PLA) Intellectual Freedom Committee http://www.ala.org/pla/about/committees/pla-if/Public Library Association (PLA) Gordon M. Conable Award Jury http://www.ala.org/pla/awards/gordonmconableaward

Access to Information Committee http://www.ala.org/rla/contact/rosters/rla/rusa-infoaccess

Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA) Intellectual Freedom Interest Group http://www.ala.org/yalsa/workingwithyalsa/discussion

ALCTS, ASCLA, & LLAMA do not have Intellectual Freedom standing committees
LEROY C. MERRITT HUMANITARIAN FUND

Founded in 1970 in honor of Dr. LeRoy C. Merritt, awarded to those who promoted intellectual freedom and have been active in the fight against censorship. The Merritt Fund provides financial assistance to librarians who were denied employment because they defended the First Amendment or were discriminated against. The Merritt Fund is managed by three elected trustees and is a separate organization from ALA.

Anyone who donates to the Fund is invited to participate in the annual election of trustees. All are invited to attend the fundraisers hosted each year at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference. Another way to become involved with the Merritt Fund is to be appointed to the IFRT Merritt Fund Promotion Committee.

OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN MORE

At the ALA Annual Conference, the Office for Intellectual Freedom hosts the session “Intellectual Freedom 101” where you can meet a representative from the Intellectual Freedom Committee, Intellectual Freedom Round Table, Freedom to Read Foundation, and the Merritt Fund, who will give a brief overview of each organization.

FREEDOM TO READ FOUNDATION (FTRF)

Founded in 1969, the Freedom to Read Foundation is a legal defense organization associated with ALA that supports librarians and libraries fight censorship and defend freedom of speech. Members of FTRF include librarians, publishers, lawyers, and authors.

Anyone can attend FTRF meetings, which are held during the ALA Midwinter Meeting and the ALA Annual Conference. FTRF elects a board of directors. Ex-officio board members include the ALA executive director, ALA president, ALA president-elect, and the Intellectual Freedom Committee chair. Each ALA division and round table is encouraged to send a representative. The meeting agendas typically include an FTRF’s general counsel status update on court decisions, an Office of Intellectual Freedom update on state and federal legislation, and a general business meeting.

Anyone may join FTRF. Membership in FTRF is separate from ALA membership. The annual membership dues are $35 for regular members and $10 for students. Benefits of membership include the newsletter, voting for trustees, and a reception for members hosted during the ALA Annual Conference.

If you are interested in becoming active in FTRF, check with your ALA division or round table to see if they need a liaison representative.

GLBRT Round Table Discussion Forum:

GLBRT Round Table Executive. Board will host a discussion forum on recent book challenges at the ALA Midwinter meeting in Seattle. This forum is Saturday Jan 26, from 10:30 to 11:30 am.

This forum is meant to be an open discussion about recent book challenges or bans, and representatives from ALA’s OIF, IFC, and IFRT will be in attendance.

True Stories of Censorship Battles in America’s Libraries
Edited by Valerie Nye and Kathy Barco (2012)


ALA Midwinter Conference in Seattle

NEWS
For Immediate Release
October 2, 2012

Contact: Alicia Babcock

Registration and housing now open for 2013 ALA Midwinter

CHICAGO — ALA Midwinter Meeting registration and housing are now open. Important conversations about the transformation and future of libraries will be taking place Jan. 25-29 in Seattle. Details will follow in the coming weeks; in the meantime, in addition to being in the popular city of Seattle, Midwinter highlights include:

- 200+ discussion groups on hot topics;
- Topic-specific Pre-Midwinter Institutes from ALA divisions and offices;
- 350+ exhibitors with the latest books, technologies and services;
- Updates on key issues from ALA Washington Office, Pew Research Center and other leading institutions;
- Provocative Auditorium Speakers, ERT/Booklist Author Forum, ALA Masters Series, ALA President’s Programs, Arthur Curley Memorial Lecture;
- Facilitated afternoon conversations, Unconference, Library Camp, Networking Uncommons;
- ALA Youth Media Awards, RUSA Book and Media Awards;
- hundreds of authors, including at United For Libraries Gala Author Tea and Spotlight on Adult Literature;
- ALA JobLIST Placement Center connecting job seekers and employers and offering free career counseling.

For attendees who need support in making their case for attending and why they’ll be more valuable to their institutions afterwards, ALA has put together resources that include step-by-step guidelines for what information to present, what previous attendees have said about what they took home from ALA conferences and events, a sample budget worksheet and more. Those resources are available on the Midwinter website.

ALA Midwinter Meeting. The conversation starts here …

Intellectual Freedom Roundtable (IFRT) Meetings at Mid-Winter

IFRT Executive Committee meetings:
Meeting I: Saturday, Jan. 26, 1:00-2:30 pm: WSCC-Room 206
Meeting II: Monday, Jan. 28, 8:30-10:00 am: WSCC-Room 206

Intellectual Freedom Discussion Group: Sunday, Jan. 27, 1:00-2:30 pm: WSCC 616
3. Angela Maycock reported on the revision of the Challenge Reporting Database

- The Challenge Database has been in MS Access since start in 1990.
- In current form it has data input, updating and consistency issues.
- OIF is working with U. of I. at CU to clean up of data, create a new DB
  - It will be automated, relational protect privacy and allow visualization of data and be available by the end of this summer.
  - We'll need advanced notice on any change of categories

- They will check for consistency of entries (authors & titles).
- Please note that only public challenges are in BBW book resource guides.
- A team of MIT researchers are using the DB to visualize data & identify trends.
- This is the first step in making data available for researchers.
- Privacy & confidentiality will be protected.
- Capabilities for research & analysis will be enhanced.
  - more than anecdotal
  - more authoritative
  - more visibility may lead to more reporting
- Barb J. indicated that new categories will be included, e.g., website & ebooks.
- Angela M. will reach out to state chapters to expand awareness of the variety of library challenges - not just books and not just public challenges (e.g., reconsideration requests)


- Suggestions included:
  - Adding filtering and blocking of websites
  - Keeping the name and expanding what we cover
  - Noting that this is an incomplete list - plays, movies, exhibits, games
  - Nanette P. reported the theme of “30 years of liberating literature” for BBW 2012.
  - Possible name for the nationwide BBW Readout is “50 Shades of Banning”

5. Discussion of SSRT Homeless Patrons Resolution with update from Jim Kuhn & Bob Doyle.

- Bob D. reported that the Illinois Library Association worked with the legislation on library service to the homeless including residency in shelters. It’s complicated.
- Deborah C.S. noted that the ACLU is beginning to take notice of denials of service for the homeless.
- SRRT is pushing ahead with a variation of its original resolve.
  - The IFC was opposed to a revision of LBOR and suggested changing the "resolved."
  - The IFC noted that the term "background" includes homelessness (see the IF Manual's glossary).
  - There was a general, lengthy discussion. The main points included:
    - The issue for the homeless is greater than library cards; it includes library services.
    - A relevant resolution already exists and this resolution as written is not needed.
    - We need more practical education since the issue is multidimensional.
    - The current resolution is not helpful.


- Since in the electronic environment it is increasingly difficult to check facts and to separate facts from opinions, the OIF has received a $750 K grant a 2 year effort discuss news literacy with high school students.
- They will be looking for models, state by state.
The issue is broader than library cards and includes
- access to building
- lack of welcome, i.e. discriminatory behavior,
- Access to Internet
- financial pressure on individuals
- financial pressure on libraries
- under and unserved areas

Suggestions
- refer to IFC
- refer to divisional IFCs
- IFC should develop toolkit
- be more positive on services that can be provided
- OLOS has already developed kit for the homeless
- refer to ALA APA Council (paraprofessionals)
- wording should not seem to dictate specific policy

Jim will take ideas to SRRT for their consideration.

Wikileaks (from SRRT)
- We should separate Julian Assange from Wikileaks
  as issues.
- We can agree to the right to publish leaked govern-
  ment documents in general with Wikileaks as an exam-
  ple.
- Bradley Manning Resolution (from SRRT)
  - The “resolved” clause doesn't follow from whereas
    clauses.
  - The correct terminology is “improper command influ-
    ence.”
  - It’s not ALA’s place to determine innocence.
  - It should focus on treatment of whistleblower in gen-
    eral and not specifically to Manning’s situation.
  - The resolution needs to be linked more clearly to
    ALA’s interests.
    - Focus on core values and our unique expertise
      - Resolutions should directly address access to infor-
        mation and information seeking behavior.
    - Otherwise, our credibility is undermined.

8. Deborah C.S. reported on Bibliocommons and other
vendors that are developing similar products.

- Bibliocommons is social networking overlay on a LIS.
  Concerns:
  - Is the default opt “out in” or “opt out”?
  - Is the default a library or a company choice?

- Labeling
  - Puts public comments into catalog record (appears to
    alter record)
  - Can result confusion about professional judgement
    vs public opinion
  - Is Personally Identifiable Information (PII) being shared
    or sold?
    - Sharing of PII can lower or /remove expectation of
      privacy thereby undermining legal protection
  - All new technologies and social media should be exam-
    ined for implications
  - Anne will do some data gathering on Bibliocommons.

9. Filtering

- The Bradbury decision is being misinterpreted and mis-
  represented.
- Filtering is once again a high priority and OIF will be
  addressing it.

Suggestions included:
- Hiring a media consultant for messaging.
- Holding another Lawyers for Libraries event.
- Holding another train the trainers /law for librarians
  event.
- State by state is crucial as local experts are harder to
  debunk.
- Include filtering in school libraries.
- Create web age with all state filtering laws

Bruce Ennis wrote a legal memo on the 1st amend-
ment and the Internet.
- There is power of legal memo from a respected
  law firm
- Doc could be used with attorneys and library
  board attorneys
- Perhaps Teresa Chmara could be asked to update
  it.
- Revisions to CIPA digital citizenship requirements now
  require education on cyberbullying.
- We should package legal principles for different audi-
  ences

10. Current and future status of the ACRL IFC discussion

- Jim Teliha. reported that his experience of the ACRL
  Leadership Council.
  - Previously the point had been made that there were
    not enough volunteers to fill committees and now that
    there are too many volunteers.
  - The Value Group survey was delayed at the re-
    quest of the Board.
  - It is clear that communication needs improvement,
    e.g., a structure.
  - The ACRL Board (& others) don’t understand the need
    for divisional committees
  - Further suggestions.
  - Doug Archer will continue to work from within the
    ACRL IFC.
  - Reach out to AAUP.
  - Get Jim Neal’s input & support.
  - Contact ARL.
  - Seek ACRL membership support.
  - Set up new ALA IFC subcommittees for each divi-
    sion.
    - With official representation (liaison/committee
      chair) from division.
    - Caution - might undermine ownership by Divi-
      sions.
  - Values such as IF are being lost or overlooked in the
    corporatization of U.S. higher education (e.g., U. of
    Virginia).
  - Barb J. will arrange a conference call to discuss this
    further.

11. Deborah C.S. gave a legislative update – details avail-
able on request

12. OIF reports and updates

- Barb J.
  - noted the continuing fiscal stress
  - Brian has resigned to take a position with another
    membership organization
  - Shumeca Picket has been hired as a temp but OIF
    hopes to make her permanent

Deborah C.S.

- Newsletter on IF
  - Has transitioned to an e-publication.
  - The OIF is now working on redesign
  - The OIF is seeking volunteers for editorial board
  - More publicity is needed and a new brochure is
    being written
  - Privacy (details reported previously
  - Consumer Alert award will be given to Choose Priva-
    cy Week on Oct. 3

Angela M.

- All 8 2011 webinars are available as for sale but
  none have sold
  - future webinars will be free and open access
  - online Privacy Week videos are now free online
  - a webinar on self-serve holds is scheduled for May 2
  - state level webinars in development
• Carolyn Caywood  
  ◦ Center for Civic Engagement & ALA program office are planning 3 webinars  
  ◦ Division conferences  
  ◦ OIF & IFC don’t have guaranteed program slots but have done & will do several  

13. Freedom to Read Foundation  
Rosanne Cordell, as IFRT Liaison, reported on FTR separately.  

14. IFC/COL joint meeting co-chaired by Pat Scales (IFC) and Vivian Wynn (COL)  
• Carrie Russell reported on the Digital Content working group - Carrie Russell  
  ◦ 6 committees have been established  
  ◦ The focus so far has been on business models  
    • Meetings have been held with 6 big publishers.  
    • Good progress in setting up models has been made  
    • Top corporate leadership is clueless. They fear of loss of sales.  
  ◦ Need to differentiate among different types of libraries  
    • Meetings with school publishers will be next.  
    • They are more flexible than trade publishers.  
  ◦ IFC/OIF report (included in other sections of this report)  
  ◦ COL/OGR report  
    ◦ UNESCO - Barbara Ford  
      • U.S defunded UNESCO in 2011 when Palestine was admitted  
      • Legislation may arise request for waiver legislation for funding  
      • Will be on agenda for Midwinter for COL/IFC joint meeting  
    ◦ Cybersecurity - Lynn B. (WO)  
      • Many option & many coalitions  
    ◦ ALA now has a Mobile commons texting app for legislative alerts  
  ◦ Resolutions  
    ◦ Homeless persons  
      • IFC has already begun the review of IF docs & will address issue  
      • IFC consciousness has been raised - concern is duly noted  
    ◦ School library support  
      • COL wanted more of an external focus in resolution as we already have a resolution with internal focus.  
      • COL was ignored [resolution passed].  
    ◦ No action was asked for or taken on the voter suppression, Bradley Manning or Wikileaks resolutions.  
    ◦ The impact of the new schedule on Council Committee Reports was discussed.  
      • The effect on doing ALA/Council business may be significant.  
      • It will force greater cooperation on programming - timing & funding  
      • IFC & COL will need to use e-tools.  
      • IFC & COL need to stress transparency and openness.  
      • In some cases, face to face meetings are essential.  

15. IFC/IFRT/Divisional Update – Carrie Gardner  
• Several members expressed concerns about dropping of joint IFC / IFRT meeting without directly contacting IFRT chair.  
  ◦ The IFRT Chair chairs the joint meeting at Annual conference.  
  ◦ The decision was made during a spring IFC conference call to move the meeting to IFC III.  
  ◦ Apologies were offered by the IFRT Liaison for the confusion and for not clearly communicating the switch and its rationale.  

◊ Attendance seemed to be low and declining and what reports were given seemed to be repetitive.  
◊ The following questions were raised:  
  • Do we have data on poor attendance?  
  • What percentage of people attended and need to attend to make joint meeting significant?  
  • Who gets to cancel a meeting?  
  • Was this a permanent or a onetime cancellation?  
  • It was noted that from Chicago on it will be more difficult to schedule meetings.  
  • What is the appropriate method of making such decision?  
  • Was this a cancellation or shift in time and location?  
  • Perhaps a virtual, all IF community informational meetings are needed using chat, voice and other virtual meeting technologies with different agendas appropriate to the medium used.  
  • Carrie Gardner called for Divisional IFC reports.  
  ◦ Further discussion of ACRL IFC & other divisional IFCs  
  • Jim K. will work with SRRT and others to draft an economic barriers resolution that specifically addresses homelessness, poverty, etc.  

16. Privacy Q & A Introduction  
• This document was approved leaving grammatical corrections and a clarification in the last sentence to the Office for adjustment.  

Respectfully submitted,  
Doug Archer  
IFRT Liaison to ALA IFC  

Connect with us!  
IFRT has recently re-energized our communications strategies. The Publications and Communications committee is committed to a robust information flow across a number of avenues. In addition to this newsletter (which will be archived on the IFRT site http://www.ala.org/ifrt/ifrtreport/ifrtreport and on ALA Connect http://connect.ala.org/file-manager/group/168/The-IFRT-Report), we have been actively posting content to a variety of platforms. You can find, follow, and chat with us in a lot of places  

The IFRT Blog http://ifrt.blogspot.com  
The IFRT Twitter account http://www.twitter.com/IFRT_ALA  
IFRT on Facebook http://www.facebook.com/IFRT_ALA  
Members-only IFRT email discussion list http://lists.ala.org/wws/info/ifrt-members  

And soon we hope to have an up-to-date website.  

We want to know what you want to hear about! What intellectual freedom stories engage your thoughts? What issues are you struggling with (or solving!) at your library?  

You can always message us on any of the above platforms, but if you want to do more to help shape the conversation, contact IFRT Chair Julia Glynn [julia.warga@gmail.com] or IFRT Publications and Communications Chair Rudy Leon [rudy.leon@gmail.com] to volunteer.