Supporting Intellectual Freedom: Symbolic Capital and Practical Philosophy in Librarianship

Emily J. M. Knox

ABSTRACT

Support for intellectual freedom has been a part of librarianship since the 1930s. There are three primary phenomena that form the foundation of this support: *codification*, *institutionalization*, and *investigation*. Codification occurred primarily through the ratification of the Codes of Ethics and the Library Bill of Rights by the American Library Association (ALA). Institutionalization refers to the establishment of committees dedicated to upholding intellectual freedom by the ALA. Finally, investigation includes both scholarly and nonscholarly research into intellectual freedom and censorship within library and information science. Using Pierre Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital, this article argues that these three areas are the foundation of a practical philosophy for librarianship that encourages librarians to eschew censorship in their institutions.

Although it has been codified in librarianship since the 1930s, support for intellectual freedom has long been a point of contention within the wider profession. Three areas form the basis for this support: *codification*, *institutionalization*, and *investigation*. The codification and institutionalization of this support are the fruits of a slow process that culminated in a Code of Ethics and a Freedom to Read Statement, as well as the American Library Association's Office for Intellectual Freedom. Scholarly research in the area—particularly concerning censorship—often focuses on one of the following subjects: how librarians and librarianship in general have and should respond to threats to intellectual freedom, policy prescription, and legal and philosophical analysis. Taken as a whole, these foundations lead to what might be called a "practical philosophy" for librarianship. That is, they have the effect of increasing the symbolic capital of librarians and other information professionals by systematizing and reinforcing support for intellectual freedom within the profession. Using the work of Pierre Bourdieu as a theoretical framework, this article argues that, because they are produced and maintained by specialists for specialists, these foundations give librarians sophisticated and theoretically-grounded justifications for supporting intellectual freedom within their institutions.

The article begins with a brief introduction to the work of Bourdieu, with special emphasis on his conceptualization of symbolic capital and power. It then presents a definition of intellectual freedom as it is understood within the field of librarianship. Next, the article offers an overview of the codification and institutionalization of support for intellectual freedom within the field. Finally, the article presents an overview of research on intellectual freedom in library and information science (LIS).

Bourdieu: Theory of Practice and the Symbolic

In order to better situate the concepts of symbolic capital and power as they are used here, it is necessary to provide some introduction to Bourdieu's philosophy. The symbolic plays a major role in Bourdieu's project—the development of a theory of practice. Bourdieu's theory posited that the social world is neither wholly constructed nor wholly structured. Instead, he described his theory as a "constructivist structuralism" and viewed the world in "dialectical relationship" (Bourdieu 1989, 15). For example, even though social classes do not "really exist" (i.e., they are constructed through social interaction and political work), people act as if they do.

One primary aspect of the "constructed structures" of the social world are symbolic systems that mold objective reality. These systems operate in two different ways. First, they operate as *structuring structures* that provide the means for people to know and construct objects in the world. That is, symbolic systems shape cognition. Second, symbolic systems are also *structured structures* that provide signification to the objects in the world, that is, the "meaning" aspect of symbolic systems. It should be noted that these systems are always socially determined and never universal (Bourdieu 1991). Bourdieu calls his theory a theory of "practice" because it attempts to explain the poetic actions between and among the structured structures and structuring structures. That is, it is not wholly deterministic theory, and this poetic space of action provides for the emergence of and clash between differing worldviews. In some respects, the cumulative effects of the foundations for supporting intellectual freedom in LIS are a symbolic system within which information professionals operate.

Symbolic Capital and Power

Throughout his work, Bourdieu describes four different types of capital that people possess: *economic, cultural, social,* and *symbolic capital.* Cultural capital exists in three different states. One is an embodied state exemplified by manners and dispositions of the body. Another is an objectified state that is represented by art, books, and other objects. The third state of cultural capital, its institutionalized form, is most easily exemplified by academic qualifications. While many types of cultural capital can be converted into economic capital, institutionalized cultural capital is often converted into the networks that exemplify social capital (Bourdieu 1986). This latter type of capital consists primarily of one's social networks. Economic capital is, of course, one's monetary worth.

Symbolic capital is the most important for understanding the implications of research on intellectual freedom and censorship in LIS as it is the relationships between and among individuals and groups that is based on economic or cultural capital altered into other resources such as credibility or obligation. Symbolic capital is "a transformed and thereby disguised form of physical 'economic' capital that produces its proper effect inasmuch and only inasmuch, as it conceals the fact that it originates in 'material' forms of capital which are also, in the last analysis, the source of its effects" (Bourdieu 1977, 183). It relates most strongly to concepts of prestige and authority in society. For example, the title "director" conveys a certain amount of authority within a particular workplace.

For Bourdieu, symbolic power is extremely important because it is misrecognized by people as something entirely different—common sense, for example. Bourdieu (1991) notes that there are many sources of symbolic power. One type of symbolic power is produced and imposed by institutional experts. This is one way to understand how a library operates; that is, it is an institution sustained by a group of specialists who have a large amount of symbolic power when it comes to the policies of the institution. Librarians generally have significant control over the materials in their collections: they develop collection development policies, control the dispersal acquisitions budgets, and select materials. These institutionalized procedures help to consolidate librarians' symbolic power over their collections.

Bourdieu and Previous LIS Research

In her chapter on Bourdieu in *Critical Theory for Library and Information Science*, Lisa Hussey (2010) argues that Bourdieu's theory provides a viable framework for understanding how librarians and other information professionals in the social world and more researchers should consider using his theory to critically analyze the relationships among symbolic capital, power, and knowledge. Bourdieu's theories have been applied sporadically in LIS research. Some researchers focus on process and meaning within a particular context. For example, France Bouthillier (2000) used Bourdieu in her study of public library service to describe how information professionals create "symbolic resources" such as collections that are consumed by library patrons. John Budd and Lyn Silipigni Connaway employed Bourdieu's theory in a discourse analysis of library and information science education guidelines. They noted that discourse is connected to power, and they argued that it is "designed to mobilise, either by affirmation or by silence, a group to accept the claims that are made" (Budd and Connaway 1998, 151). The current article, in some respects, is also a study of the mobilization effects of discourse within librarianship. In a 2003 article, Budd also discussed Bourdieu in relation to librarianship and praxis, noting that libraries have symbolic power and "do not simply respond passively to communities' stated desires. . . . They help to construct the desires and expectations of the communities" (Budd 2003, 22). This article takes up Hussey's challenge by focusing on the discourse of intellectual freedom—especially regarding censorship—as it

is understood in LIS and on how this discourse increases the symbolic capital and power of information professionals. The following section focuses on the definition of intellectual freedom and the codification of support for upholding the principle of access to information within librarianship.

The Codification of Intellectual Freedom in LIS

Although it is rarely foregrounded, the meaning of the terms "intellectual freedom" and "censorship" are often rooted in implicit beliefs about the effects of knowledge and reading. What knowledge one thinks should be accessible is intimately tied to one's assumptions of how that knowledge will affect the seeker. People's epistemological positions (i.e., the justifications and verifications that they give for having a particular belief) regarding the concept of intellectual freedom are often based in symbolic systems in which they operate and in how they believe new knowledge affects people's lives and society as a whole. One might believe that there is some knowledge that would have a detrimental effect on individuals and society and therefore ought to be considered "forbidden" or "illegitimate." One's epistemological position operates as both structuring and structured structures in one's life and form part of an individual's habitus. Therefore definitions of intellectual freedom are socially constructed ideas based in a particular worldview. One of the notable aspects of professional librarianship as it is practiced today is its adherence to a classically libertarian definition of intellectual freedom. This definition is found in a series of documents created and ratified by librarianship's primary professional association, the American Library Association (ALA).

In contemporary librarianship, the principle upholding intellectual freedom and opposing censorship is codified within the profession. Five out of six articles of the Library Bill of Rights, a guideline for library policy developed by the ALA, relate to intellectual freedom and censorship. For example, Article II states: "Libraries should provide materials and information presenting all points of view on current and historical issues. Materials should not be proscribed or removed because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval" (American Library Association 1996). Article II of the most recent ALA Code of Ethics states: "We uphold the principles of intellectual freedom and resist all efforts to censor library resources" (American Library Association 2008a). The ALA is also the creator of the "Freedom to Read Statement," which argues that this freedom is crucial to democratic governance. It includes seven propositions that cover various controversial aspects of reading. For example, Proposition 4 states: "There is no place in our society for efforts to *coerce the taste of others* [emphasis added], to confine adults to the reading matter deemed suitable for adolescents, or to inhibit the efforts of writers to achieve artistic expression" (American Library Association 2004). This means that, according to the ALA, information professionals should always support intellectual freedom for all individuals even when it comes to seemingly benign issues of taste in genre or perceived age appropriateness.

The indoctrination (used here nonpejoratively) of support for intellectual freedom is also a major part of library school education throughout the United States. Introductory library science texts and books on library ethics, such as Robert Hauptman's *Ethics and Librarianship* (2002), note that: "Students in librarianship are acculturated to defend intellectual freedom and abjure censorship. The general consensus seems to be that they accept this responsibility and that they continue to do so in the field" (Hauptman 2002, 22). This consensus has become the generally accepted code of ethics for the library profession. It should be noted that although the standards for ALA-accredited master's programs do not explicitly mention intellectual freedom, Standard I.2.4 states that students should learn the "philosophy, principles, and ethics of the field" (American Library Association 2008b). This is also an example of the institutionalization of support for intellectual freedom, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Codification and institutionalization mean that support for intellectual freedom is normalized in librarianship and has become part of the profession's symbolic power. However, it should be noted that librarians did not always hold this view and that their support for intellectual freedom developed in tandem with an agnostic view toward the effects of reading and with institutionalized responses toward challenges to materials in library collections. The following section presents a brief historical overview of the development of systemic and institutionalized support for intellectual freedom within librarianship. This history demonstrates how librarians consolidated their symbolic capital within their institutions, particularly through the symbolic power of their professional association, the ALA. This institutionalized support for intellectual freedom is one of the foundations of the symbolic capital that librarians and other staff and administrators employ when they encounter challengers to their authority within their institutions.

Intellectual Freedom and Institutionalization

In 1876, when the ALA was first established, librarians were generally members of the elite and were often opposed to collecting or reading popular fiction. In her monograph on the history of librarianship and intellectual freedom from 1876 to 1939, Evelyn Geller (1984) notes: "It is significant that librarians who did challenge authority asserted their autonomy in the name of censorship. They used that value to demonstrate their professionalism on intellectual and ethical grounds—their superior judgment, or expertise, on harmful literature, and their greater commitment to the public good" (Geller 1984, 39). Librarians used their new professional status to encourage their patrons to read "good books." In other words, although librarians often relied on outside sources such as ALA catalogs and Booklist reviews to inform their selection practices, they themselves censored books they considered to be inappropriate by simply refusing to purchase them for their collections (Wiegand 2011). This practice of censorship was often informed by a belief that reading books had direct effects on the reader

and that these effects had a one-to-one correlation. Reading "good books" led to "good be-havior" while reading "bad books" had the opposite effect.

Although such attitudes toward reading "good books" continued within the library pro-fession during the Progressive Era, librarians shifted their tactics in regard to their patrons. They were highly influenced by the social justice theories and movements of the Progressive Era, and the library became a place for "socializing the reader," where the staff members were concerned with washing, sexual morality, and homelessness (Garrison 2003, 41). Books of all kinds were added to library collections in order to "lure" people into the library, often in the hope that they would eventually turn toward classic literature and nonfiction. Although they maintained the elitist notion that patrons should be steered toward reading "good books," it was during this period that librarians began to more fully support the concept of intellec-tual freedom for all. As Dee Garrison (2003) notes, the censorship of the previous era slowly gave way to a more democratic position regarding reading—that people could choose their reading materials for themselves. This change reflects the growing acceptance of what might be called an agnostic view toward reading effects, which holds that it is impossible to know what effect reading a particular text will have on the reader.

During the Great Depression, institutional and professional support for intellectual free-dom grew. Although there is some debate regarding which public library system initially de-veloped an intellectual freedom statement (Latham 2009), by 1939 the ALA had adopted its own policy statement based on one originally developed by the Des Moines Public Library in 1938. The 1939 Library Bill of Rights is suffused with ideas appealing to the importance of free access to information in order to maintain democracy. As "an institution to educate for democratic living," libraries should endeavor to collect "all sides" of controversial topics on the basis of their value and interest to the library's patrons (Geller 1984, 175). These ideas concerning democracy and collection development continue to form the foundational build-ing blocks for the ALA's current documents on intellectual freedom. The concept of collect-ing "all sides" in particular demonstrates the integration of the agnostic view of reading effects with librarianship's support of intellectual freedom. There is no longer a prevailing concern within the profession that reading "bad books" will necessarily lead to "bad behavior."

Following the adoption of the 1939 Library Bill of Rights, the ALA also established the awkwardly named Committee on Intellectual Freedom to Safeguard the Rights of Library Users to Freedom of Inquiry (eventually shortened to the Committee on Intellectual Free-dom). However, the organization initially did not provide sufficient structural or monetary support for the new policy. There were also librarians who were not ready to support intel-lectual freedom as part of their professional ethics in the late 1930s and early 1940s (Robbins 1996). Over time, however, more librarians began to support intellectual freedom even as the rise of anti-Communism in the United States tested their support. This shift in attitude reached an apex in 1948, when the ALA adopted a new version of the Library Bill of Rights

just as librarians across the country grappled with the collection of propaganda materials and loyalty oaths. Librarians often adopted policies that supported intellectual freedom but also capitulated to community norms and standards. As demonstrated in the so-called Fiske Report (see Lowenthal 1959) titled "Book Selection and Censorship," when confronted with "enemies" both imminent and distant, many librarians chose to self-censor rather than support the ideals of neutrality and intellectual freedom. As described below in the section on research on libraries and librarians in this article, concern that librarians will not uphold their stated principles of support for intellectual freedom is the driving force behind many studies within LIS.

Support for intellectual freedom became more institutionalized and solidified in the 1960s when Judith Krug established and became director of the ALA's Office for Intellectual Freedom. Although, as Toni Samek (2001) demonstrated in her book on social responsibility in the profession, this was a highly contested time for librarianship, the new office "put teeth" behind librarians' philosophical stances toward censorship and intellectual freedom. Three mandates guide the Office for Intellectual Freedom's mission: to collect and communicate data regarding the state of intellectual freedom in the United States, to provide legal analysis of First Amendment law, and to educate librarians and other interested parties regarding intellectual freedom. Of particular importance for this study is the *Intellectual Freedom Manual*, which has been updated eight times since its initial publication in 1974. The *Manual* provides an overview of intellectual freedom in libraries, interpretations of the Library Bill of Rights and Freedom to Read policies, and essays on ethics and legal frameworks relating to intellectual freedom. The book operates as an institutional boundary object that encourages librarians to create policies that codify support for intellectual freedom within the profession. Boundary objects are objects that permit the communication of information across varying contexts (Bowker and Star 1999, 297). The policies in the *Manual*, which are developed in one institution and employed in another, solidify the symbolic power of librarians within their institutions. Accordingly, in order to challenge the inclusion of a particular item in library collections, patrons are required to proceed through a series of bureaucratic hoops that collectively mitigate their views regarding the material vis-à-vis the symbolic power of the librarians and other administrators. Many of these policies are based on prescriptions given in the *Manual*, which was recently updated in 2010. The next section of this article investigates another foundation for librarianship's symbolic power in challenge cases: research in the area of intellectual freedom and censorship within the field of library and information science.

Investigating Intellectual Freedom
Information Ethics

In her 2006 article on the state of intellectual freedom research in the early twenty-first century, Eliza Dresang notes that "publications about intellectual freedom or censorship in

relation to libraries are frequently philosophical (including ethics and values); legal (laws and court cases); descriptive of policy, as opposed to analytical or theoretical or are isolated accounts of individual or institutional incidents" (Dresang 2006, 171). The *Manual of Intellectual Freedom* provides an excellent starting point for discussing research on intellectual freedom and censorship in library and information science. Philosophical scholarship (including ethical studies) on intellectual freedom generally posits that a particular philosophical stance provides the best foundation for supporting intellectual freedom in librarianship. For example, Martin Frické, Kay Mathiesen, and Don Fallis (2000) argue that librarians' support for intellectual freedom should rest on social contract theory. For the authors, access to information should be based on societal, not individual, good and therefore some ideas should be censored. They state that "there is some information that should be kept out of libraries . . . because merely disseminating it, or facilitating access to it, would violate rights or have bad consequences" (476). According to the authors, support for intellectual freedom does not include providing access to dangerous or hurtful information.

Tony Doyle (2001), on the other hand, argues that librarians should oppose censorship on the basis of the utilitarian philosophy of John Stuart Mill, since "we cannot know beforehand precisely which set of ideas or images if published would do more harm than good" (69). These philosophical articles often do not offer practical applications of the theories that are discussed, but they do add to the symbolic power of librarianship for supporting intellectual freedom. Librarians and other information professionals are empowered to ground their actions against challengers on well-known philosophical foundations. The analytic nature of these arguments is in direct contrast to the more "emotional" justifications made by the challengers. Information professionals are also able to draw on social structures and frameworks that have roots in more "elite" institutional foundations, such as the law and philosophy, instead of simply employing "common sense" arguments.

Legal Framework: Policy and Procedure

Legal scholarship in intellectual freedom tends to be written by attorneys who evaluate intellectual policies, including the Freedom to Read Statement and the Library Bill of Rights, in terms of legal precedent and philosophy. One example of this scholarship is Gordon Baldwin's (1996) conservative critique of the Library Bill of Rights. Baldwin evaluates each section of the Library Bill of Rights in light of relevant case law. He argues that freedom of access is not possible and that the library must make moral and economic judgments when developing collections. For Baldwin, the Library Bill of Rights offers uncertain commitment to intellectual freedom and embodies the interests of librarians, not patrons.

Yale M. Braunstein's (1990) article discusses conflicts between copyright law (i.e., the ownership of information) and intellectual freedom. Braunstein notes that the tension between the two comes from, first, a perceived need for state control of both information and

intellectual property and, second, the economics of distribution and calls for different copy-right laws for different mediums. Of particular interest is his discussion of the word "free": "We use the same word to mean 'unhindered' and 'without charge' while many other languages use two different words for these separate concepts." This problem of dual definition of the term "freedom" appears in Braunstein's discussion of government user fees restricting access to federal data sources (130). The tension between intellectual property and intellectual freedom comes from two sources. First, it comes from the need for state control and, second, it comes from the economics of distribution.

Barbara M. Jones (1999), on the other hand, focuses on the institution of the library and states that the library should be understood as a limited public forum (i.e., one designated as such by the government) and not a traditional forum for debate. As with the philosophical scholarship, legal arguments for or against various intellectual freedom policies in that realm are often quite esoteric. Setting aside the Baldwin article described above, they generally allow librarians to argue that their policies are rooted in structural legal frameworks that are accepted as the law of the land in the United States. In other words, like the philosophical arguments given above, this research can offer rationalized, analytical foundation for implementing certain procedures in the library while evading the arguments of challengers.

There is also a great deal of information published on how these policies based in philosophical and legal foundations should be implemented in libraries. For example, along with the *Intellectual Freedom Manual*, the ALA also publishes a series titled *Intellectual Freedom Front Lines* (Jones, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association 2009; Scales, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association 2009; Pinnell-Stephens, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association 2012), which discuss how to defend intellectual freedom in academic, school, and public libraries. The books offer general introductions to the concept of intellectual freedom in the various settings, case studies, and suggested procedures for implementing policies. It should be noted that all of the books, since they are published by a professional organization, strongly reinforce the institutionalization of support for intellectual freedom by information professionals.

Contemporary and Historical Case Studies

Perhaps the most common type of research on intellectual freedom and censorship is written by practitioners and consists primarily of case studies and reflective essays. A recently published book published by the ALA, *True Stories of Censorship Battles in America's Libraries*, focuses on librarians' accounts of challenge cases (Nye and Barco 2012). Many of these case studies appear periodically in trade literature, including *American Libraries, Library Journal*, and the *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* (the bimonthly publication of the ALA's Office of Intellectual Freedom). For example, Linda Cornette's (1998) article "A Censor: How Do You Know One When You See One?" gives a psychological profile of challengers. Other articles that fall into

this category include interviews with and essays by authors whose books have been targets of challengers. For example, Susan Patron (2009) describes her experiences when her book *The Higher Power of Lucky* was challenged. These case study articles, which do not emphasize theory and analysis, usually encourage librarians to maintain a hard line against removing or relocating books in library collections.

Within the realm of scholarly academic research in LIS, historians and other scholars have published works of individual intellectual freedom cases. For example, Louise S. Robbins's (2001) history of a case of book censorship in Oklahoma during the 1950s focuses on Ruth Brown, a librarian in Bartlesville. Brown was accused of putting Communist propaganda in the local library, but the pamphlets had actually been planted. The people of Bartlesville were actually upset that Brown worked for racial equality in the town and used the material to turn her into a scapegoat. Robbins notes that the ALA focused on the censorship and not the racial equality aspect of the case. In another historical study, Shirley A. Wiegand and Wayne A. Wiegand's *Books on Trial* (2007) investigates another case of a "Communist books scare" in 1940s Oklahoma. Donald Davis's (1999) article "The Not-So-Friendly Censors" discusses contemporary conservative watchdog groups, such as Family Friendly Libraries, that attempt to influence public library collection development policies and library boards by publicizing what the group perceives to be objectionable books in collections and other pressure tactics. These case studies add to librarians' symbolic power by emphasizing historical actions against censorship that information professionals have accomplished. Although more limited in scope compared to the sweeping ethical and legal frameworks discussed above, these historical case studies place contemporary librarians within a long tradition of other professionals who stand for intellectual freedom even in difficult circumstances. They encourage librarians to not "give in" to challengers' demands to remove or relocate collection materials.

Research on Libraries and Librarians

Intellectual freedom research also includes scholarly empirical studies that tend to focus on the librarians' attitudes toward censorship and whether or not librarians have ideologically diverse collections. This type of scholarship adds to the consolidation of information professionals' symbolic power through negative means. By focusing on how librarians fail to support intellectual freedom in the workplace, individual librarians will be more aware of the practical applications of such support and be more empowered to take steps against censorship in their own professional lives. Marjorie Lowenthal's (née Fiske) 1959 report on self-censorship by librarians is a classic example of this type of research. Lowenthal, a sociologist, interviewed librarians in California and found that they tended to select books that would not lead to controversy. In 1972, Charles H. Busha (1972) surveyed librarians in the Midwest and found a correlation between authoritarianism and censorship behavior in librarians. Like Lowenthal,

he also found that librarians were wary of controversy. Howard D. White (1981) used data from the "Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography" in order to demonstrate that most people do not agree with librarianship's official position on censorship.

Alex Spence (2000) conducted a collection survey of public libraries in order to see whether or not they collected controversial children's books and discovered that there are marked differences across the libraries but that, generally, if a title was reviewed in library literature, it was more likely to be held in a number of libraries. In 2008, *School Library Journal* surveyed 655 school librarians and found that 70 percent avoid buying titles that are likely to be the target of challengers (Whelan 2009). Although not an empirical study, Rebecca Hill's (2010) essay in *School Library Monthly* also explored the issue of self-censorship in school libraries, stating that librarians should not use labels or restricted shelves to preemptively head off challenges to materials in their collections.

Research investigating librarians' support for intellectual freedom operates as a cautionary tale to the profession. Although the profession purports to support intellectual freedom, there are some who do not live up to their stated ethical codes of conduct. These articles demonstrate that librarians have a somewhat fragile hold on symbolic power within their institutions. It is possible that this lack of consistency across the profession results in challenge cases that lead to the removal or relocation of materials.

A Practical Philosophy for Librarianship

The three areas of support described above—codification, institutionalization, and investigation—generate a practical philosophy for librarianship, which, in turn, increases the symbolic power of librarians in disputes regarding intellectual freedom. The codification of support for intellectual freedom means that this support is part of the general professional ethos of librarianship and other information professionals. Codification works in tandem with institutionalization, wherein the ALA, through the establishment of funded committees, provides funding and institutional support for working against censorship. Finally, investigation provides a symbolic and empirical discourse on the legal and philosophical aspects of intellectual freedom; historical and contemporary case studies, as well as research on libraries and librarianship, also add to the symbolic capital of librarianship. This is accomplished primarily by encouraging information professionals not to capitulate to any censorship requests but also by making them aware of the areas in which they fall short of this goal. The policies that libraries are encouraged to put in place regarding intellectual freedom are also part of this practical philosophy. For example, although people who challenge materials in a collection are given space to voice their opinions via requests for recommendations and meetings with staff at every point throughout the process, the overwhelming ethos of the profession (e.g., codification, institutionalization, and investigation) encourages librarians not to accede to these requests. Following Bourdieu, this capital becomes a source of symbolic power.

The codes, organizations, and research constitute a symbolic system that is produced by specialists. The practical philosophy undergirding support for intellectual freedom leads to the consolidation of librarians' social capital and power within their institutions.

This framework is most clearly enunciated in the *Intellectual Freedom Manual*, which states the following: "Listen calmly and courteously to the complaint. Remember the person has a right to express a concern. Use of good communication skills helps many people understand the need for diversity in library collections and the use of library resources. In the event the person is not satisfied, advise the complainant of the library policy and procedures of handling library resource statements of concern. If a person does fill out a form about their concern, make sure a prompt written reply related to the concern is sent" (American Library Association 2010, 243). Nowhere in the manual is it recommended that librarians consider removing or relocating the book from collections. The request for reconsideration policies and procedures are intended to give community members a voice but not a vote over collections.

This accumulation of symbolic capital based on a strong practical philosophy encourages librarians to be less responsive to those who disagree with them regarding materials in their collections. However, it should be noted that, as the empirical research studies discussed above demonstrate, this consolidation of symbolic power is not comprehensive. Librarians are, in fact, part of a weak institution, and this weakness might account for the preemptive actions that they employ to lessen the threat of challenges. Libraries are also overseen by nonprofessional boards, whose members do not necessarily adhere to information professionals' codes of ethics regarding intellectual freedom. The contested nature of librarians' symbolic power is also demonstrated in challenges from community members to materials in a particular collection. This lack of cohesiveness between ethics and practice means that all library workers—both professional and nonprofessional—must be educated in and trained to apply professional ethics in real-life situations. If all workers in libraries are aware of the professional code of ethics, the history of institutional support, and the insights provided by research into intellectual freedom, there might be fewer instances of self-censorship among librarians and capitulation to louder voices within a library's patron base. In spite of this, the profession as a whole, especially through codification, institutionalization, and investigation, is dedicated to upholding support for intellectual freedom as a core value whether or not it is actually part of librarians' actual practice.

References

American Library Association. 1996. "Library Bill of Rights." http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/int freedom/librarybill/index.cfm.

American Library Association. 2004. "Freedom to Read Statement." http://www.ala.org/advocacy/int freedom/statementspols/freedomreadstatement.

American Library Association. 2008a. "Code of Ethics." http://www.ifmanual.org/codeethics.

American Library Association. 2008b. "Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Science." http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/sites/ala.org.accreditedprograms/files /content/standards/standards_2008.pdf.

American Library Association. 2010. *Intellectual Freedom Manual.* 8th ed. Chicago: American Library Association.

Baldwin, Gordon. 1996. "The Library Bill of Rights: A Critique." *Library Trends* 45 (1): 7–27.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7 (1): 14–25.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language* and *Symbolic Power.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bouthillier, France. 2000. "The Meaning of Service: Ambiguities and Dilemmas for Public Library Service Providers." *Library and Information Science Research* 22 (3): 243–72.

Bowker, Geoffrey, and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Braunstein, Yale M. 1990. "Resolving Conflicts between Information Ownership and Intellectual Freedom." *Library Trends* 39 (1–2): 126–31.

Budd, John. 2003. "The Library, Praxis, and Symbolic Power." *Library Quarterly* 73 (1): 19–32.

Budd, John M., and Lynn Silipigni Connaway. 1998. "Discursive Content and Discursive Power in US Library and Information Science Education." *Libri* 48 (3): 140–52.

Busha, Charles H. 1972. "Intellectual Freedom and Censorship: The Climate of Opinion in Midwestern Public Libraries." *Library Quarterly* 42 (3): 283–301.

Cornette, Linda. 1998. "A Censor: Do You Know One When You See One?" *Ohio Media Spectrum* 49 (4): 13–14.

Davis, Donald. 1999. "The Not-So-Friendly Censors: Children's Collection Development and the Family-Friendly Libraries Movement." *Florida Libraries* 42 (4): 62–64.

Doyle, Tony. 2001. "A Utilitarian Case for Intellectual Freedom in Libraries." *Library Quarterly* 71 (1): 44–71.

Dresang, Eliza T. 2006. "Intellectual Freedom and Libraries: Complexity and Change in the Twenty-First-Century Digital Environment." *Library Quarterly* 76 (2): 169–92.

Frické, Martin, Kay Mathiesen, and Don Fallis. 2000. "The Ethical Presuppositions behind the Library Bill of Rights." *Library Quarterly* 70 (4): 468–91.

Garrison, Lora Dee. 2003. *Apostles of Culture: Public Libraries and American Society, 1876–1920.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Geller, Evelyn. 1984. *Forbidden Books in American Public Libraries, 1876–1939: A Study in Cultural Change.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Hauptman, Robert. 2002. *Ethics and Librarianship.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Hill, Rebecca. 2010. "The Problem of Self-Censorship." *School Library Monthly* 27 (2): 9–12.

Hussey, Lisa. 2010. "Social Capital, Symbolic Violence, and the Fields of Cultural Production: Pierre Bourdieu and Library and Information Science." In *Critical Theory for Library and Information Science: Exploring the Social from Across the Disciplines*, edited by Gloria Leckie, Lisa Given, and John Bushman. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Jones, Barbara M. 1999. *Libraries, Access, and Intellectual Freedom.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Jones, Barbara M., Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association. 2009. *Protecting Intellectual Freedom in Your Academic Library: Scenarios from the Front Lines.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Latham, J. M. 2009. "Wheat and Chaff: Carl Roden, Abe Korman, and the Definitions of Intellectual Freedom in the Chicago Public Library." *Libraries and the Cultural Record* 44 (3): 279–98.

Lowenthal, Marjorie F. 1959. *Book Selection and Censorship: A Study of School and Public Libraries in California.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nye, Valerie, and Kathy Barco. 2012. *True Stories of Censorship Battles in America's Libraries.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Patron, Susan. 2009. "Shock Treatment." *Horn Book Magazine* 85 (5): 481–87.

Pinnell-Stephens, June, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association. 2012. *Protecting Intellectual Freedom in Your Public Library: Scenarios from the Front Lines.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Robbins, Louise S. 1996. *Censorship and the American Library: The American Library Association's Response to Threats to Intellectual Freedom, 1939–1969.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Robbins, Louise S. 2001. *The Dismissal of Miss Ruth Brown: Civil Rights, Censorship, and the American Library.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Samek, Toni. 2001. *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967–1974.* Forward by Sanford Berman. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Scales, Pat, Office for Intellectual Freedom, and American Library Association. 2009. *Protecting Intellectual Freedom in Your School Library: Scenarios from the Front Lines.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Spence, Alex. 2000. "Controversial Books in the Public Library: A Comparative Survey of Holdings of Gay-Related Children's Picture Books." *Library Quarterly* 70 (3): 335–79.

Whelan, Debra Lau. 2009. "A Dirty Little Secret." *School Library Journal* 55 (2): 27–30.

White, Howard D. 1981. "Library Censorship and the Permissive Minority." *Library Quarterly* 51 (2): 192–207.

Wiegand, Shirley A., and Wayne A. Wiegand. 2007. *Books on Trial: Red Scare in the Heartland.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wiegand, Wayne A. 2011. *Main Street Public Library: Community Places and Reading Spaces in the Rural Heartland, 1876–1956.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Emily J. M. Knox: assistant professor, the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research interests include intellectual freedom and censorship, the intersection of print culture and reading practices, and information ethics and policy. Knox's most recent research investigates the worldviews of challengers to library materials. She received her PhD in library and information science from Rutgers University. Prior to returning to school, Knox was associate director and reference librarian at the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in New York City. E-mail: knox@illinois.edu.