Freedom of Information and the Library

Milica Cvetkovic Stosic

The Matica Srpska Library, Serbia

Abstract: The present article examines progress in reorienting libraries towards more effective participation in the freedom of information process. In 1997 the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) set up its Freedom of Access to Information and Freedom of Expression (FAIFE) Committee to promote information rights in the context of libraries. In 2008, an IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption was adopted. Learning materials derived from this manifesto were first piloted in Vietnam and India. Further workshops were held in Iceland and Argentina and the success of the whole program has culminated in the Serbian experience.

Keywords: Freedom of information, libraries, IFLA, FAIFE, transparency, freedom of expression, Serbia

1. Introduction

"IFLA has on numerous occasions and in many forums made clear its belief in the positive role of libraries in society and its commitment to enhancing this role. It has consistently linked this to the principle of Freedom of Access to Information and Freedom of Expression, as set out in Article 19 of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948."

In what follows, I will describe what has been done by IFLA FAIFE² in order to show the direction for libraries to reorient themselves as transparency institutions. In particular I will describe the programme undertaken in my country- Serbia.

Received: 9..4.2015 / Accepted: 7.11.2015 © ISAST

ISSN 2241-1925



¹IFLA <u>Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption</u>. http://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-manifesto-on-transparency-good-governance-and-freedom-from-corruption

² The Freedom of Access to Information and Freedom of Expression Committee

Just let's firstly define transparency. Ann Florini³(2000) defined it as being opposite of secrecy. Secrecy means deliberately hiding your actions, while transparency means deliberately revealing them, she says. Though Florini emphasizes volition, transparency is not always voluntary, although the movement toward transparency is often voluntary.

Paul Sturges⁴(2012) has painted a more complex portrait of this phenomenon: 'It is best to regard transparency as the adoption of openness, whether imposed or voluntary, in both public and private sectors with the central aim of promoting good governance and a strong secondary aim of combating crime and corruption'.

2. The Transparency Manifesto

The idea that libraries could be rethought as transparency institutions, as well as the idea that FAIFE should work towards a new IFLA Manifesto on transparency began to take shape around 2005. Two national library associations that have a permanent FAIFE committee in their structure were involved in this phase of the 'rethinking' process- the Croatian Library Association and the South African association. An emerging central European democracy and a very newly democratic African state.

Primarly, the CLA agreed to attach a FAIFE one day workshop entitled 'Libraries, Civil Society Organisations and the Struggle Against Corruption' to its annual celebration of the International Day of Human Rights at the National Library of Croatia in Zagreb, in 2006. The Department of Information Science at the University of Zagreb's Faculty of Philosophy also agreed to be a partner. Speakers from Croatia, Bosnia, Russia, Germany, the USA, South Africa and Britain were brought together for the occasion in order to discuss the activities of anti-corruption activists and the frequency of corruption in the library profession itself.

The 'rethinking' process involving the FAIFE Committee of LIASA, the South African association, continued in 2007. This country's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, set up under an Act of Parliament of 1995 is an outstanding example of introducing transparency into a previously secretive system. The aim was to allow the revelation of the truth about what really happened in the enormous number of cases of human rights violations that had taken place under the apartheid system.

At the end of these workshops, a list of sub-topics that might eventually form part of a policy statement, were compiled by the FAIFE representatives.

-

³ Founding director of the Centre on Asia and Globalization at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore

⁴ Former FAIFE Chair

IFLA Manifesto was formally accepted in 2008, however the existence of a policy document was only a starting point. In order to increase the likelihood that it would be known and used, funds from SIDA⁵ and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation were committed to introducing learning materials that could be used by library associations and other interested parties. This process began at an experts' workshop held in Germany in 2008. Invited participants from countries including Russia, South Africa, Nigeria, Mexico, worked systematically through the Manifesto. The detailed report of proceedings was then turned into the materials.

These learning materials derived from the IFLA Manifesto on Transparency were first piloted in India in 2009 (by Kai Ekholm⁶ and Barbara Jones⁷), and then in Vietnam, also in 2009 by Paul Sturges. In order to further reinforce the dissemination of the Manifesto, two more workshops were carried out during 2011. These workshops took place in Iceland and in Buenos Aires. And has the Manifesto been acted upon since then? To suggest the shape of an answer I am going, as the co-author of the project 'Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption', to describe my country's experience and offer it as an example of good professional involvement.

3. The Serbian experience

Today, wherever there is need for change or improvement, the Manifesto on Transparency offers the profession a clear statement to guide it. It calls on the library profession to make itself as corruption-free as possible. The fact is that insufficiently respected profession is more vulnerable to corruption, and that is the reason why the Manifesto recommends campaigning on librarians' status and pay. Where a country has freedom of information laws librarians are recommended to make the library a support centre for potential inquirers and where a country does not have information access or freedom of information laws, or such laws are not effective, then to campaign for their introduction. The cooperation with anti-corruption NGOs is also recommended. Training programmes for both librarians and their users are suggested. Transparency is an indispensable requirement for good governance which needs capable professionals to ensure its presence and continuance. An extensive collection of official information materials is also suggested. Most of this will not be easy policy to adopt in countries where corrupt governments repress criticism in a heavy-handed way.

In 2010 the Serbian Library Association identified Serbia as a country perfectly positioned for interventions in favour of transparency, good governance and freedom from corruption. Being conscious of the serious consequences of

⁶ Chair of FAIFE

⁵ The Swedish International Development and Cooperation Agency

⁷ FAIFE advisor and former Secretary

corruption impacting all spheres of social life, not excluding the library sector, the SLA has applied for the IFLA/ALP program with the project entitled (after the same title as the Manifesto): 'Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption' and obtained funding.

The 2011 Corruption Perception Index (Transparency International, 2011)⁸ ranked Serbia at 86 out of the 182 countries surveyed, with the low score of only 3.3 out of 10.

Country	Population 2		Provider	Consister 5 of World Resister		Country	Population 2		Percentage of World Population	Population	Country	Population		Population	Consistive % of World Population	
lorth Korea	24,052,231	1.0	0.34%	0.34%		Togo	5,753,324	24	0.08%	13.37%	São Tomé & Principe	169,000	3.0	0.00%	34.49%	
Somalia	9,557,000	1.0	0.14%	0.48%		Uganda	32,939,800	24	0.47%	13.84%	Suriname	529,000	3.0	0.01%	34.49%	
Afghanistan	32,358,000	1.5	0.46%	0.94%		Cameroon	19,406,100	2.5	0.28%	14.12%	Tanzaria	43,188,000	3.0	0.62%	35.11%	2,451,510,6
Myanmar	48,337,000	1.5	0.69%	1.63%		Eritrea	5,415,000	2.5	0.08%	14.19%	1.00					
Sudan	30,894,000	1.6	0.44%	2.07%		Guyana	784,894	2.5	0.01%	14.21%	2.45 billion people live	e in countries which achieved a 2011 CPI rating of 3.0 or less				
Turkmenistan	5,105,000	1.6	0.07%	2.14%		Lebanon	4,259,000	2.5	0.06%	14.27%						
Uzbekistan	28,000,000	1.6	0.40%	2.54%		Maldives	317,280	25	0.00%	14.27%	Albania	3,194,972	3.1	0.05%	35.16%	
Haiti	10,085,214	1.8	0.14%	2.68%		Nicaragua	5,815,524	2.5	0.08%	14.35%	India	1,210,193,422	3.1	17.34%	52.50%	
raq	32,105,000	1.8	0.46%	3.14%		Niger	15,730,754	2.5	0.23%	14.58%	Kiribati	101,000	3.1	0.000%	52.50%	
Burundi	8.575,000	1.9	0.12%	3.26%		Pakistan	177,998,000	2.5	2.55%	17.13%	Swaziland	1,203,000	3.1	0.020%	52.52%	
Equatorial Guinea	720,000	1.9	0.01%	3.27%		Sierra Leone	5,997,000	2.5	0.09%	17.22%	Tonga	105,000	3.1	0.000%	52.52%	
Venezuela	29,467,000	1.9	0.42%	3.69%		Armenia	3.266.300	26	0.05%	17.27%	Bosnia & Herzegovina	3.843.126	3.2	0.060%	52.57%	
Angola	19,618,000	2.0	0.28%	3.97%		Dominican Republic	9,378,818	26	0.13%	17.40%	Liberia	3,476,608	3.2	0.050%	52.62%	
Chad	11,274,106	20	0.16%	4.13%		Honduras	8.215.313	26	0.12%	17.52%	Trinidad & Tobago	1,317,714	3.2	0.020%	52.64%	
Dem.Rep Congo	67,758,000	2.0	0.97%	5.10%		Philippines	94,013,200	26	1.35%	18.87%	Zambia	13,046,508	3.2	0.190%	52.83%	
Libva	6.423.000	2.0	0.09%	5.20%	364,328,551	Syria	21,340,000	26	0.31%	19.18%	Bulgaria	7,364,570	3.3	0.110%	52.94%	
	5, 40,000			0.0079		Bangladesh	142.319.000	27	2.04%	21.22%	Jamaica	2,705,800	3.3	0.040%	52.98%	
364 million people live in	n countries which	h achieve	d a 2011 CPI	ration of 2 ft	nrioce	Ecuador	14.483.499	27	0.21%	21.43%	Panama	3,405,813	3.3	0.050%	53.03%	
not minion people live in	. countries mine	ii deiiie te		raining or a.e.		Ethiopia	82,101,998	27	1.18%	22.61%	Serbia	7.120.666	3.3	0.100%	53.13%	
Cambodia	13.395.682	21	0.19%	5.39%		Guatemala	14,713,763	27	0.21%	22.82%	Sri Lanka	20.653.000	3.3	0.300%	53.43%	
Guinea	10.217.591	21	0.15%	5.54%		Iran	75,886,000	27	1.09%	23.91%	Colombia	46,278,000	3.4	0.660%	54.09%	
(yrgyzstan	5,477,600	21	0.08%	5.61%		Kazakhstan	16,615,000	27	0.24%	24.15%	El Salvador	6.227.000	3.4	0.090%	54.18%	
femen	23.833.000	21	0.34%	5.95%		Monoolia	2,736,800	27	0.04%	24.19%	Greece	10,787,690	3.4	0.150%	54.33%	
Central African Republic	4,487,000	22	0.06%	6.02%		Mozambique	23.049.621	27	0.33%	24.52%	Morocco	32,396,000	3.4	0.460%	54.79%	
Congo Republic	4,140,000	22	0.06%	6.08%		Solomon Islands	542.287	27	0.01%	24.52%	Peru	29,797,694	3.4	0.430%	55.22%	
Côte d'Ivoire	21,395,000	22	0.31%	6.39%		Bolivia	10,426,154	28	0.15%	24.52%	Thailand	69,519,000	3.4	1.000%	56.22%	
Guinea-Bissau	1,520,830	22	0.02%	6.41%		Mai	14,517,176	2.8	0.13%	24.88%	Gambia	1,776,000	3.5	0.030%	56.25%	
	38,610,097	22	0.55%	6.96%			36,300,000	29	0.52%	25.40%	Lesotho	2,194,000	3.5	0.030%	56.28%	
Kenya		22	0.09%	7.05%		Algeria	81,196,000	29	1.16%	26.56%		234,023	3.5	0.000%	56.28%	
.208	6,348,800		0.38%	7.43%		Egypt		29	0.02%	26.59%	Vanuatu China		3.6	19.20%	75.48%	
Vepal	26,620,809	22				Kasavo	1,733,872					1,339,724,852				
Papua New Guinea	7,014,000	2.2	0.10%	7.53%		Moldova	3,560,400	2.9	0.05%	26.64%	Romania	21,436,000	3.6	0.310%	75.79%	
araguay	6,337,127	22	0.09%	7.62%		Senegal	12,855,153	2.9	0.18%	26.82%	Brazil	190,755,799	3.8	2.730%	78.52%	
Embabwe	12,754,000	22	0.18%	7.80%		Vietnam	85,846,997	2.9	1.23%	28.05%	Tunisia	10,673,800	3.8	0.150%	78.67%	
lajikistan	7,616,000	23	0.11%	7.91%		Argentina	40,117,096	3.0	0.57%	28.62%	FYR Macedonia	2,057,284	3.9	0.030%	78.70%	
Ukraine	45,668,028	23	0.65%	8.56%		Benin	9,100,000	3.0	0.13%	28.75%	Ghana	24,233,431	3.9	0.350%	79.05%	
Azerbaijan	9,111,100	2.4	0.13%	8.69%		Burkina Faso	15,730,977	3.0	0.23%	28.98%	Italy	60,705,991	3.9	0.870%	79.92%	
Belarus	9,468,000	2.4	0.14%	8.83%		Djibouti	818,159	3.0	0.01%	28.99%	Samoa	184,032	3.9	0.000%	79.92%	
Comoros	754,000	24	0.01%	8.84%		Gabon	1,534,000	3.0	0.02%	29.01%	Croatia	4,290,612	4.0	0.060%	79.98%	
Vauritania	3,340,627	24	0.05%	8.89%		Indonesia	237,641,326	3.0	3.40%	32.41%	Montenegro	620,029	4.0	0.010%	79.99%	
Nigeria	162,471,000	2.4	2.33%	11.22%		Madagascar	18,866,000	3.0	0.27%	32.68%	Slovakia	5,437,126	4.0	0.080%	80.07%	5,588,570,2
Russia	142,914,136	24	2.05%	13.27%		Malawi	13,077,160	3.0	0.19%	32.87%						
Timor-Leste	1.066.409	24	0.02%	13.28%		Mexico	112.336.538	3.0	1.61%	34.48%	5.6 billion people live i		achieur	4 - 2044 CDI	miles of 40	or lose

According to the index, New Zealand was the least corrupt country (with a score of 9.5). The most corrupt were identified as North Korea and Somalia, each with a score of 1.00. However, at the same time another list, the Right to Information index (Access Info Europe, both in 2011 and today)⁹ brings a whole different light on Serbia's situation. This index deals with the legal framework for information rights in 89 countries throughout the world, using 61 different indicators drawn from international standards and data on law and regulation in the various countries. The very first country in the list, with a score of 135 out of a possible 150 was/is Serbia. To conclude- we are talking about a gravely corrupt country with a high quality right to know framework.

⁸ Transparency International. http://www.gizmag.com/transparency-international-corruption-perceptions-index/20730/

Access Info Europe. http://www.rti-rating.org/

Country Rating Results

TOP 10		BOTTOM 10					
Serbia	135	Austria	39				
India	130	Greece	46				
Slovenia	130	Tajikistan	51				
Liberia	126	Germany	52				
El Salvador	124	Jordan	56				
Mexico	119	Russia	58				
Antigua	117	Italy	58				
Ukraine	115	Taiwan	60				
Croatia	114	Belgium	60				
Ethiopa	114	Uzbekistan	61				

To say that Serbia is perfectly positioned does not, however, mean that such an intervention was easy. Effectively acquiring transparency related publications and databases, providing information services that deal with laws, liaising effectively with civil society organisations, all of this requires a certain amount of courage. The challenge was taken up by the SLA, despite a genuine sense of danger. We started the project at a Librarians' Day in the city of Nis, with even 70 participants. Seven libraries (Krusevac, Belgrade, Novi Sad, Pirot, Kladovo, Bor and Pozarevac) were selected to participate.

Cooperation on the project was obtained from:

- 1. Anticorruption Agency of Republic of Serbia
- 2. The Commissioner for Information of Public Importance and Personal Data Protection of the Republic of Serbia
- 3. Transparency International Serbia Chapter
- 4. Individual supporter: Ms Vesna Pesic, Member of Serbian Parliament and well known fighter for human rights in Serbia
- 5. Ombudsman Protector of Citizens of Vojvodina
- 6. Ombudsman Protector of Citizens of City of Novi Sad
- 7. US Embassy in Belgrade
- 8. American Corners in Serbia
- 9. Goethe-Institute Library Belgrade

Anti Corruption Agency sent a Board member to six of the events and the Commissioner for Information organised important lectures on the anti-

corruption theme in Belgrade. Without this valuable support, the Project activities would definitely have had much less credibility.

At the beginning of the project realization, FAIFE advisor and Director of the American Library Association's Office for Intellectual Freedom, Barbara Jones, was invited to visit Serbia. In February 2011, she conducted a workshop on the Transparency Manifesto at the Goethe Institute in Belgrade and gave talks at other locations. The project that followed consisted of a series of activities whose objective was to raise awareness about the problem of corruption by promoting and providing free access information and freedom of expression in the library community in Serbia. Activities included citizens' panels and workshops to train librarians in the use of information that will help citizens in understanding the law and claiming their rights. The Transparency Project activities were conducted in seven public libraries and eight American corners throughout Serbia.

What has been done through the project activities is to ingrain the idea of the libraries as transparency institutions somewhere in the collective mentality of the Serbian library profession. What has been worked on since is trying and making an effort to strengthen that idea trough activities including special training programs, arranging talks about fight against corruption, acquiring transparency related publications, cooperating in the creation of anti-corruption portals which link content from official and other relevant sources and so on. And now, almost three years after the completion of the project, it is possible to claim the following:

- The project organisers emerged from this campaign firmly convinced that libraries, especially the public ones, can be centres to support the right of free access to information.
- Both librarians and citizens involved in the activities are grateful to learn more about how to get information about their right of free access to information of public importance.
- Librarians become more aware of their potential role as citizens' advisors on free access to information.
- Librarians also say that they had been shown how they might support this and similar campaigns- particularly by arranging talks about fight against corruption.
- The most important is message that campaigns and discussions on this subject are imperative examples to follow and that they should be continued in the future.

4. Conclusion

Circumstances for libraries are difficult in most parts of the world. There is, among others, a confusion over roles, especially when it comes to library as a transparency institution. In most environments, as it is the case with Serbia, it

will represent an ideal to be pursued over the long term. Times are not easy for libraries, however, the IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption with its accompanying learning materials provides an important lead, and the example of Serbia shows how that lead can be taken further forward.

References

 $IFLA\ Manifesto\ on\ Transparency,\ Good\ Governance\ and\ Freedom\ from\ Corruption. \\ \underline{http://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-manifesto-on-transparency-good\ governance-}\ and-freedom-from-corruption$

Florini, A. (2000) The end of secrecy. *Power and conflict in the ago of transparency*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 13–28.

Access Info Europe. 'Rating of legal framework for Right to Information in 89 countries' http://www.rti-rating.org/

Sturges, P. (2000) The Council of Europe, freedom of expression and public access to networked information. *IFLA Journal* 26(4) pp. 280-283.

Sturges, P. (2001) The library and freedom of information: agent or icon? *Alexandria* 13(1) pp. 3-16.

Sturges, P. (2009) Stimulating IFLA's ethical conscience: FAIFE 2003-2009. *IFLA Journal* 35(2) pp. 117-122.

Sturges, P. and Crnogorac, V. (2012) The Library and Transparency. *Alexandria* 23(1) pp. 44-54

Transparency International. 'World Corruption Perception Index' http://www.gizmag.com/transparency-international-corruption-perceptions-index/20730/