THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INFORMATION, DIVERSITY, & INCLUSION

Epistemicide Beyond Borders: Addressing Epistemic Injustice in Global Library and Information Settings through Critical International Librarianship

Jieun Yeon, Syracuse University School of Information Studies (iSchool), USA
Melissa Smith, Syracuse University School of Information Studies (iSchool), USA
Tyler Youngman, Syracuse University School of Information Studies (iSchool), USA
Beth Patin, Syracuse University School of Information Studies (iSchool), USA

Abstract

This conceptual research examines epistemic injustices in library and information science (LIS) due to the power imbalance between Western and non-Western LIS curricula, theory, and practice. It is equally critical to consider the presence of epistemic injustices in adjacent LIS domains (e.g., classification, preservation, digital scholarship); for if we work to prioritize access or digitize materials without considering historical oppression, we are at risk of perpetuating these same injustices. In this work, we utilize the concept of epistemic harm to understand the international dimension of epistemic injustice. This paper introduces the concept of critical international librarianship, which we define as recognizing, examining, critiquing, and subverting the power structures and hegemonies in library and information systems that exist among two or more nations in practice, pedagogy, and research. Critical international librarianship serves as an intervention for epistemic injustices. It provides a direction for the practitioners and researchers who pursue critical international librarianship to move toward a long-overdue epistemic justice in international LIS.

Keywords: critical international librarianship; epistemic injustice; epistemicide

Publication Type: research article - conceptual

Introduction

For some time now, we have witnessed a celebration of internationalization and globalization[1] in the library and information science (LIS) field. Barbara J. Ford, a past president of the American Library Association (ALA), one of the largest library organizations in the world, praised international cooperation in her presidential theme, "Libraries: Global Reach - Local Touch," which focused "on a unique, exciting, and invaluable aspect of what today's libraries offer: access to worldwide information resources and local accessibility" (Ford, 1998, p. 3). The ALA continues to promote international exchange through the "I am ALA International Spotlight" initiative, which is a list that highlights new international ALA members. The spotlight list was initiated in 2018 by another ALA president, Loida Garcia-Febo, in collaboration with the International Relations Round Table, a unit of the ALA. Notwithstanding ALA's outreach efforts, most national libraries are mandated to collaborate internationally (Landry, 2017). Additionally, the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) works as an overarching organization dedicated to a global effort to form

ISSN 2574-3430, https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

"a strong and united global library field powering literate, informed and participatory societies" (IFLA, n.d., para. 1).

Similarly, many books have been published to celebrate and encourage the international efforts of librarians. For example, Chakraborty and Das (2013) honored international librarianship as a way of

> broadening minds of LIS professionals and equipping them with the ability to perceive the world differently. With this, an enlightened LIS community hopes to create future citizens who can bond better with their fellow humans and bring wisdom, values, and understanding into the world. (p. xxv)

Singh (2020) similarly celebrated the publication of *Internationalization of Library and Information Science Education in the Asia-Pacific Region* by saying, "the book is a welcome resource in creating greater awareness on[2] LIS education in other countries, which can lead to better exchanges of ideas and resources and enhance cooperation and collaboration" (p. xvi). Indeed, academic and practical efforts to promote international collaboration and cooperation have played a positive role in preserving heritage across cultures and promoting equal access to information throughout different corners of the globe.

Nevertheless, a deeper investigation into the international LIS landscape presents a myriad of troubling revelations. Between 1996 and 2021, 68% of LIS publications worldwide were published in the top ten countries; at the top of the list, the United States publishes 31% of LIS publications as of 2021 (SCImago Research Group, 2022). Contrastingly, considering its century-long history, all but two IFLA presidents were from Europe or North America. Furthermore, "international librarianship"— a subarea of LIS research and practice focusing on international issues—is a term often used to describe the activities of American or British librarians outside of their home country (Bordonaro, 2017; Laugesen, 2019). While not necessarily rooted in intentional suppression, these distinctions indicate invisible barriers that inhibit diverse groups and knowers from engaging with the international LIS scene.

We approach this work critically while acknowledging that our positionality creates perspectives that allow us insights but also biases in undertaking this work. Collectively, we represent a research group at a large private R1 university in the United States and bring Western educational values and ideals embedded within us during our study and work in this context. However, we work to critically interrogate those values and ideals within the scope of this paper. The first author was educated in South Korea until she moved to the U.S. for a doctoral degree. Her first experience in a Western educational environment motivated her to coin and conceptualize the term critical international librarianship after realizing how many things learned from the Western model of LIS do not accommodate or reflect situations encountered in local information environments.

Additionally, the second author has worked extensively as a language editor in the academic publishing sphere, serving non-U.S. researchers seeking to publish their research in English. This has informed her perspective in this paper, especially regarding the burden that English and Western dominance and academic models can create. The third author, educated in the U.S., approaches this project with past work experiences in American libraries-archives situated in community, academic, and federal information settings. The fourth author, a former school

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

librarian, now an assistant professor of LIS, approaches this work as a marginalized person in the U.S. educational system.

In this research, we engage the concepts of epistemic injustice and epistemicide because both concepts identify biases in the formation and transmission of knowledge and provide appropriate frameworks for diagnosing the current situation of international LIS (Patin et al., 2020). This study applies epistemic injustice and epistemicide as a fundamental approach to examine what, how, and why biases in the international LIS field are perpetuated. The concept of epistemicide is employed to emphasize how simultaneous epistemic injustices in LIS not only occur in the present in a single geographical location but also have intergenerational repercussions that are simultaneously local and global. Our research addresses five types of epistemic injustices in LIS that occur across borders to introduce the concept of "critical international librarianship" as a conceptual means to provide language for collective action to address and stop epistemicide in LIS. Finally, this paper presents potential ways to intervene in the epistemic injustices across LIS research, education, and ethics. This research contributes to a genuinely international LIS field that connects people and knowledge to benefit all humanity, not just a select few.

Theoretical Background

Epistemic Injustice and Epistemicide

Epistemicide is the devaluing, silencing, killing, or annihilation of a knowledge system or a way of knowing (Patin et al., 2020). It consists of repeated and persistent epistemic injustice, which is the “wrong done to someone specifically in their capacity as a knower” (Fricker, 2007, p. 1). Epistemic injustices refer to the types of harm done that can potentially impede a person's capacity to know or to develop their own epistemological framework. The use of epistemicide and epistemic injustice as a theoretical lens is growing in the LIS field (Budd, 2022; Fisher, 2022; Jimenez et al., 2023; Oliphant, 2021; Patin et al., 2021a; Patin et al., 2021b).

Though there are more types of epistemic injustice, thus far, five have been discussed in the LIS literature. Testimonial injustice is defined as occurring when “prejudice” causes the receiver of the information “to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker’s word,” whereas hermeneutical injustice happens “when a gap in collective interpretative resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their [or someone else’s] social experiences” (Fricker, 2007, p. 4). Curricular injustice happens when educational resources are not available to help support epistemic growth, whereas participatory injustice is the exclusion of someone from participation in their own epistemological development (Patin et al., 2021a). Finally, commemorative injustices—which encompasses memorial, performative, and documentary injustice—can occur when harm is committed during acts of commemoration and memorialization (Youngman et al., 2022). Once a single injustice occurs, the other specific types of injustices may occur in singular or simultaneous forms. This experience is cumulative and, unless interrupted, leads to epistemicide.

Bonaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) describes epistemicide as a “traumatic experience” and argues that it creates repercussions for generations. While these injustices first harm the individuals who experience them, that first harm radiates beyond the individual to their immediate communities, which Fricker (2007) terms the second harm, and then to future generations, which is deemed by Patin et al. (2021a) as the third harm. Andrews (2018) writes about resistance in the LIS tradition and draws on historical trauma theory to discuss the process

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

of decolonization through Indigenous scholarship. As Andrews points out, this kind of harm sometimes creates intergenerational harm, as colonization attempts to exterminate entire cultures via assimilation into a new dominant one. Still, often it occurs without purposeful intention or malice. The violence of epistemic erasure inflicted upon one generation will impact the next. Thus, the egregiousness of the harm can be difficult to recognize when it comes in the form of beneficence (Patin et al., 2021a; Patin et al., 2021b).

International Librarianship & Comparative Librarianship

This section establishes a link between our argument of epistemic injustices and international librarianship, serving as our theoretical foundation. International and comparative librarianship have long been discussed to address cross-national library issues. Many academics have used comparative librarianship to define international librarianship (Harvey, 1973; Kawatra, 1987; Liu & Cheng, 2008). By tradition, we will first examine how international and comparative librarianship have been defined before introducing the concept of critical international librarianship in the following section.

International activities in the modern library field have existed since the 19th century and have gradually developed into the distinct field of international and comparative librarianship (Lor, 2019). As international cooperation and cultural exchange were promoted after World War II, the field of international and comparative librarianship began to attract the attention of library professionals and grew substantially in the 1960s and 1970s (Harvey, 1973; Lor, 2018). Chase Dane (1954) was the first to examine comparative librarianship. He defined comparative librarianship as “a study of library science in many countries to discover what factors are common to those countries and which are unique to one” (Dane, 1954, p. 89). In addition, he argued that the objective of comparative librarianship is to evaluate "the philosophy of library from many points of view" (Dane, 1954, p. 89) and to promote internationally applicable best practices. Since then, academics have proposed various definitions for comparative librarianship, focusing primarily on the similarities and differences between libraries located in various contexts and, typically, in different countries (Harvey, 1973; Wang, 1985).

Furthermore, a theoretical and philosophical contribution has been proposed as the goal of comparative librarianship. For example, based on Danton’s discussion (1973), Lor (2014), a prominent scholar in international and comparative librarianship, characterized comparative librarianship as “the area of scholarly study that analyses and explicitly compares library phenomena in two or more countries [...] to distinguish and understand underlying similarities and differences and arrive at valid insights and generalisations” (p. 28). Kawatra (1987) further argued that comparative librarianship aims to discover the cause and effect of library development by comparing libraries in different contexts.

In contrast, international librarianship needs a narrower and more coordinated scope (Bliss, 1993; Bordonaro, 2017). Even though international cooperation among librarians advanced significantly by the middle of the 20th century through international organizations such as IFLA and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), no comprehensive discussion of international librarianship appeared until Wormann (1968) examined the history of international cooperation in the library field (Keresztesi, 1981). Without defining international librarianship, Wormann focused on the collaboration between European and American libraries since the 17th century, reflecting the practical orientation of international librarianship at the time. Later, researchers investigated the purpose and scope of international librarianship. For

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

example, Parker (1974) identifies the scope of international librarianship as “activities carried out among or between governmental or non-governmental institutions, organizations, groups or individuals of two or more nations, to promote, establish, develop, maintain and evaluate library, documentation and allied services, and librarianship and the library profession generally, in any part of the world” (p. 221). Harvey (1973), similarly, defines it as “a generic term to cover all aspects of the international affairs of libraries, all kinds of library studies involving more than one country, anything not local or national" (p. 297). In contrast, Keresztesi (1981) limits international librarianship to the activities of “the multilateral, supranational organizations and institutions that were brought into existence through some joint effort with a view to promoting and developing library and information services, as well as the profession as a whole, all over the world” (p. 439). These well-accepted definitions show that international librarianship encompasses a broad range of issues that involve at least two countries.

Overall, international and comparative librarianship are closely related subareas of librarianship that have often been used interchangeably. However, to clarify the concept of international librarianship, it is essential to examine these two concepts' similarities and differences (Lor, 2018). First, as a point of differentiation, we assume that international librarianship encompasses all library-related issues involving multiple countries. In contrast, comparative librarianship is a more specific concept applicable to cross-national library comparison. Thus, we conceptualize comparative librarianship as a subset of international librarianship. The term ‘international librarianship’ denotes a broader, more inclusive field encompassing both theoretical and academic issues, which have historically been the primary areas of comparative librarianship (Kawatra, 1987), as well as more practical concerns such as global standardization and international cooperation. Second, as a similarity, we assume that international and comparative librarianship share an interest in the cross-national aspects of librarianship. As Harvey (1973) addressed, “theoretically, the term ‘comparative’, when applied to library science, can refer to comparisons of any kind of library science, such as a study of Danish public and school libraries” (p. 296). However, it is undesirable to extend the meaning of "comparative" too far “since comparisons are inherent in empirical research,” so that “the greater part of research in library science could be labeled as ‘comparative librarianship’” (Lor, n.d., para. 12). Therefore, for our purposes, we limit comparative librarianship to research comparing libraries from two or more countries.

In addition, it is essential to exercise caution in classifying "foreign librarianship," which Lor (2019) defines "librarianship in other countries - countries other than that of the author" as a subset of international librarianship (p. 85). The description of "exotic" libraries or "marginalized users" in developing countries by Western librarians does not necessarily involve multiple countries in the discussion. To fall under the umbrella of international librarianship, the discussion should include international concerns, such as a practical comparison of libraries between nations or a discussion of the transnational influences on libraries. Regarding the expansive nature of international librarianship, this research aims to establish a connection between international librarianship and epistemicide to address the international dimension of epistemic injustices in LIS.

Epistemic Injustices in the International LIS Scene

In the context of LIS, predominately white-European cultural regimes have established dominant approaches, standards, and values related to knowledge organization, information representation, and intellectual freedom. In an age of academic imperialism, the overarching

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

declarations from powerhouse information institutions have pressured library and information professionals to adapt to standardized knowledge about the processes and practices—informed mainly by Eurocentric cultural traditions, education, and practices—within our modern information environments. These overarching conditions in global library and information settings present new risks for committing and perpetuating epistemic injustice.

Testimonial Injustice

Testimonial injustice entails an individual's words, story, or testimony being dismissed, and previous scholars have specifically associated this with a "lack of belief" in that person's credibility (Patin et al., 2020, p. 1308). Though this phenomenon is considered to occur at the individual level, in information studies, the broader historical and international contexts explain why a person's—even an information professional's—testimony may be discounted.

Eurocentric traditions often assume the universality of knowledge (de Sousa Santos, 2014). The belief in universal knowledge presupposes that there is "more correct" and "less correct" knowledge. These ideas pervaded the colonial endeavors by which many library systems were introduced to non-Western contexts. As Amadi (1981) described, "libraries and formal education featured among the various cultural artifacts imported from the mother country, with love, into 'the heart of darkness,' to enlighten, civilize, and Westernize Africans" (p. 56). Thus, based on this false belief in universality, Europeans forcefully oppressed and disregarded the knowledge systems of colonized people because their knowledge appeared "less accurate" when the universality of knowledge became the handmaiden of colonial aims.

One prominent manifestation of this belief is the suppression of indigenous oral traditions and their aggressive replacement by a (non-local) reading culture. Fitzpatrick (2008) describes how orality challenged colonial power in the Dutch East Indies. Performances of traditional literary texts allowed the community to gather, reinforce its values, and offer critical commentary on contemporary events. In contrast, Fitzpatrick (2008) points out that print texts and library collections could be more easily controlled in terms of content, and solitary reading practices were less dangerous than community gatherings. Similarly, the oral tradition of Sub-Saharan nations was labeled "illiteracy," which needed to be eradicated to "civilize" the continent (Amadi, 1981, p. 52, 56). Amadi (1981) summarizes, "Libraries and the concept of literacy usually associated with them were to deaden the dynamism and effectiveness of the oral tradition" (p. 61). This suppression of orality among those colonized painted the oral testimony and aurally derived knowledge of non-Western peoples with a shade of illegitimacy and even threat. Moreover, even the vibrant local print culture sustained by Indonesians, which included "stories from the Malay and Javanese oral performance traditions" and tended to have "a nationalist bent", was subject to "outright censorship" by colonial authorities, which reinforced the subsequent false representation of Indonesian literary output as negligible (Fitzpatrick, 2008, p. 278). Such efforts at suppressing local peoples attempting to make their voices heard constitute an early example of how the import of libraries and Western reading materials perpetuated testimonial injustice.

An identifiable descendent of European colonialism is academic imperialism, which can perpetuate not just testimonial injustice but also hermeneutic, participatory, and curricular injustice in the information field, which will be discussed further below. Academic imperialism is evident in "the West's monopolistic control of and influence over the nature and flows of […] knowledge" and is maintained by "academic dependency" (Alatas, 2003, pp. 602–603). For

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

instance, if scholars depend on aid from the Global North to carry out their research, they can pursue only those lines of inquiry prioritized by other nations and are kept in a state of academic dependence. Dependence on ideas, methodologies, and theories is another issue that Alatas (2003) identifies. Consider how such dependence is manifest or could develop in the situation observed by Flagg (2000):

> There's a tendency to view [the United States's] involvement with libraries elsewhere as largely a one-way street, with American librarians bringing their know-how to colleagues in less-developed nations. Foreign librarians always participate prominently in ALA meetings—437 registrants from 70 countries attended this year's Annual Conference—but such activity remains mostly one-sided. (p. 37)

Testimonial injustice emerges quickly when perceived expertise and resources favor one party. Revealing how this dynamic is reproduced on a larger scale, Scale (2021) explains, "Most studies of international librarianship emanate from American sources and examine research initiatives within the Global North or which originates from the Global North to reach out to the Global South" (p. 88). Thus, librarians and libraries in the Global South are likely to be over-represented as recipients rather than possessors of knowledge in information studies scholarship and those from the Global North as teachers or experts; this power dynamic perpetuates testimonial injustice.

These factors can affect attitudes toward librarians' professionalism and credentials, which can be especially damaging when employment is concerned. One librarian at a university in the United Arab Emirates noted that the institution considered only applicants with degrees from ALA-, Canadian Library Association-, Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP)-, or Australian Library Association-accredited programs. "The effect was to prevent us from hiring great librarians from our neighbors in the region, while we sometimes brought on less experienced or less talented librarians from the West simply because they were from the West" (Evans, 2016, para. 3).

In other words, even candidates with evident job readiness were not credited for their experience because they had the 'wrong' credentialing.

Clearly, "international" has not always meant cooperation on equal footing, and the harmony envisioned by internationalization can easily shade into the imperial. Critical international librarianship can help reveal sources of inequity that perpetuate testimonial injustice. As Liu and Cheng (2008) assert, "When we realize […] that other countries have systems and ideas that can help us, then, and only then, can we come together as a world community of knowledge" (p. xvii).

Hermeneutic Injustice

As was mentioned in the preceding section, libraries were one of the instruments utilized to colonize knowledge systems. According to the Western view of the "universality"[3] of knowledge, true knowledge should be the goal of all knowers (Meyer, 2001; Shohat & Stam, 2014). Relatedly, Scale (2021) describes the result of being exposed to this perspective in a Caribbean context where "North American and British texts by North American and British authors" (p. x) predominated in LIS education. In keeping with the Eurocentric notion of universal knowledge, Scale recalls that he once "saw librarianship as a truly universal and global profession which had

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

adopted widely accepted best practices and evidence-based solutions to information and communication problems" (2021, p. 8). However, the Western knowledge system itself is contextual knowledge situated in Western experiences and is not universal (Lebakeng et al., 2006). Scale (2021) concurs: "I now see librarianship as an institution struggling between facilitating intercultural understanding among global library users and supporting the hegemonic communications of dominant cultures at the expense of others" (p. 8).

The academic imperialism experienced by Scale and described in the prior section effectively began

> with the setting up and direct control of schools, universities and publishing houses by the colonial powers in the colonies. [Truly], the 'political and economic structure of imperialism generated a parallel structure in the way of thinking of the subjugated people.' (Alatas, 2003, p. 24)

Such imperialistic endeavors did not cease with colonialism. Laugesen (2014) discovered that UNESCO's library development work was to implement the Western, specifically Anglo-American[4], library model in "underdeveloped" countries in an effort to aid their "civilization" (p. 6, 13). In short, "well-intentioned" Westerners equipped with "universal" knowledge have suppressed traditional knowledge systems.

As a result of devaluing the knowledge systems of non-Western cultures *with love*, the patronized lost their autonomy as knowers, which is an example of hermeneutical injustice (Bernal & Axtell, 2020). After experiencing paternalistic intervention during the colonial and post-colonial periods, librarians and scholars in non-Western countries perceive themselves as pupils who need to learn from the Western world. Some non-Westerners have internalized this Western centricity to such an extent that it is difficult for them to critique why and how Western knowledge has become the global norm (Patin et al., 2021a). For example, the following quotes from academic LIS journals display how non-Western scholars revere Western standards:

> Kenya has been included, despite being a developing country that is faced with the challenge of poor funding. Few academic, public and special libraries have built modern libraries for their institutions of a high standard to the level of some libraries in Europe and North America. (Mwanzu & Wendo, 2017, p. 7)

> As this evolves, we should examine emerging Web 2.0 theories and applications to envisage the future of academic libraries. Best practices, risks and policies involved, challenges and lessons learned for using Web 2.0 applications from developed countries will help Asian libraries to move forward. (Balaji et al., 2019, p. 542)

In these quotations, the authors express their belief that Western knowledge is authoritative without questioning why Western knowledge and institutions are held to a "high standard" while their countries suffer from "poor funding" and a lack of experience or in what way Western knowledge is better than their own knowledge.

We do not imply that non-Western librarians and scholars are negligent in developing library services that specifically serve local needs or critiquing LIS's Western-centric bias (Civallero, 2017; Scale, 2021). Instead, we claim that the LIS field lacks the language and tools to criticize the Western centricity of this intellectual space collectively.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

International librarianship is in a preferred position to help address this hermeneutical injustice, as it focuses specifically on international knowledge flow and cooperation between libraries around the globe. However, international librarianship often contributes to hermeneutical injustice by actively incorporating the concept of universal knowledge and linear progression. For example, in the introduction of *International and Comparative Studies in Information and Library Science,* Liu and Cheng (2008) lamented the lack of international comparison librarianship studies, which seemed problematic to them because "underdeveloped countries have their libraries looking towards developed countries all the time for guidance and protocol" (p. xxix). Constantinou et al. (2017) used the term "international librarianship" to encompass American librarians' work in other countries: "Echoing concerns about global leadership within the profession (Asselin, 2011), we wanted to learn about the impact of international librarianship on information access and overall education in emerging and developing countries" (p. xv). These remarks imply that librarians from "developed" countries are LIS leaders who can provide "developing" countries with knowledge, protocol, and best practices. Moreover, as Bordonaro (2017) and Scale (2021) point out, international librarianship is overflowing with volunteer and travel experiences for North American librarians.

Similarly, Lor (2019) critiques how international librarianship is used to denote "foreign" libraries without addressing library issues involving more than two countries. When international librarianship disproportionately amplifies the experiences of certain groups, we lose the potential to address power dynamics between countries, resulting in a lack of critical praxis in LIS that inhibits professionals from identifying, naming, and addressing these injustices. To intervene in this hermeneutical injustice, we propose using critical international librarianship to provide a language and intellectual space to discuss the dominance of Western ideas in LIS and local library services without venerating knowledge from the so-called developed world.

Curricular Injustice

Curricular injustice is "specific to the academy" and occurs when learners are denied "an education that allows for diverse epistemologies, disciplines, theories, concepts, and experiences" (Patin et al., 2021a, p. 5). Because of the centrality of curriculum to shaping the hermeneutic framework of new professionals, it is a crucial site for disrupting international information injustices. However, the colonial histories and academic imperialism discussed above must be acknowledged and directly addressed in LIS education.

First, considering the lopsided nature of the information flow discussed earlier, it is critical to consider whether and how students from more dominant cultures in library development are exposed to ideas of international cooperation among libraries and library and information systems worldwide. An informal review of the top LIS programs in the U.S., as ranked by *U.S. News* in 2021 (U.S. News & World Report, 2021), reveals that several appear to offer a class on international librarianship in some form. Web searches and course catalog searches turned up, for example, an "International Librarianship" course at the University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign, "Information and Migration" and "Indigenous Systems of Knowledge" at the University of Washington, "International and Cross-Cultural Perspectives for Information Management" at UNC-Chapel Hill, and a seminar in "International and Comparative Librarianship and Information Science" at the University of Maryland-College Park. An additional web search brings up an "International and Comparative Librarianship" course once taught at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. If these are a bellwether, then some new professionals (though perhaps

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

the minority) may experience exposure to ideas about international librarianship in their programs.

The caveat is that classes on international librarianship or adjacent topics may be "special topics" courses rather than core courses in the curriculum that are taught regularly; they may not have full-time faculty who are dedicated to teaching them, and they may not be integrated into an overall program designed to foster an international or multicultural perspective. Moreover, without a critical mass of LIS researchers developing the field of international librarianship, including through mentorship of future faculty members, the ability of such courses to be offered more widely, not to mention the possibility of a paradigm shift in American LIS education, will prove challenging. However, such a transformation is necessary to address the academic imperialism that can implicitly underlie North American LIS education.

Curricula across the Global North and Global South may also favor Anglo-American librarianship models to the detriment of indigenized LIS models and international cooperative understanding. Consider Peter Lor's (2019) surprise at the operation of French libraries after his Anglo-focused education in South Africa in the 1960s, as well as Scales' (2021) awakening to the Anglo-centricity of the LIS curriculum in the Caribbean described above. Despite Lor's (2019) lifetime of work in international librarianship, barriers to international understanding, including language and travel difficulties, prevent sharing LIS experiences. For instance, if scholars participate in academic conversations that are highly localized because of language barriers, information systems become siloed and critical insights are lost. One study conducted on biodiversity conservation research, a field in which broader understanding is reliant on local knowledge, revealed that:

> (1) most of the 35.6% of scientific documents written in a non-English language cannot be understood fully without the relevant non-English language skills, and
>
> (2) up to half of the non-English scientific documents are, in theory, unsearchable using English keywords. (Amano et al., 2016, p. 2)

The authors point out that missing so much "non-English knowledge can cause biases in our understanding of study systems" (Amano et al., 2016, p. 1). The same is true for our local and global information systems. The most readily available information is what will make its way by the path of least resistance into LIS education. Addressing inequities in information flows through the concept of critical international librarianship is thus central to addressing curricular injustice in LIS education.

Participatory Injustice

Many of the described injustices imply participatory injustices in the international librarianship scene. For example, when librarians are seen as having the wrong credentials to succeed in a library position they are otherwise qualified for according to their testimony and demonstrated experience, they are prevented from participating in further professionalization in the setting of their choosing, thus limiting their epistemic development as library professionals. Moreover, the loss to institutions of the diversity of global librarianship experiences that these workers would bring with them is one of the factors that keeps library and information systems siloed, perpetuating the epistemic injustices in the international librarianship context.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Currently, library workers seeking employment in the United States must have received their degree "from an institution that is included on the […] lists of accredited institutions/programs" from the following countries: Australia, Germany (two institutions), Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, South Africa (one institution), and the United Kingdom (ALA, 2022, para. 7). Notably, this list favors Anglophone countries and Western (and perhaps even Anglo-American) library traditions. Those without a degree from one of the listed institutions must go through an extra step of having their credentials evaluated by an independent agency, which is undoubtedly a barrier to job-seekers due to the time and effort (and possibly money) that must be expended, without a guarantee that a prospective employer will accept the external evaluation. Thus, library professionals with Anglo-dominant LIS education seem to have a built-in advantage in the international job market. Those with other credentials may often work as paraprofessionals below their qualifications if they desire or are forced to seek work outside their region.

Participatory injustice is also experienced by LIS researchers from non-Anglo-American contexts, who encounter multiple barriers to their participation in knowledge creation and dissemination in their field. For example, Patra and Mahesh (2018) note that their bibliometric analysis showed a relatively small output of LIS research from African countries. However, they also note that "only one LIS research journal from the continent is indexed in Scopus" and mention that developing countries, including India, have established their citation databases due to the "low coverage of journals from developing countries by international citation databases" (Patra & Mahesh, 2018, p. 113). Failure to make the publications of certain regions discoverable suppresses the spread of information and sharing of experiences from places like India and Africa. It makes the practical library work and scholarship of such regions less visible. The invisibility of these library workers and researchers is further enforced by databases' and academia's domination of the English language: Western publishers dominate, and English dominates as the language of academic exchange. Onyancha (2007) notes, "The ISI prefers indexing records that are published in English, and whenever a paper is prepared in any other language, the institute requires that an English version be provided. This limits its coverage of records published in other languages, including those written in Arabic or other African languages" (p. 106). In other words, scholars must bear additional costs for translation or language editing services or be faced with significantly global curtailed exposure of their ideas and work. Information studies is subject to considerable harm from the knowledge lost to this participatory injustice. Moreover, this suppression of knowledge production makes it more difficult for some librarians and scholars than others to establish themselves as epistemological equals in the profession, further limiting their participation in the library workforce, as noted above, and even in forums for academic exchange.

The issues of academic imperialism described above also entail an element of participatory injustice in terms of LIS researchers' ability in all regions but especially the Global South to break out of information silos and fully engage in collaboration, exchange of information, and idea sharing. Through the lens of critical international librarianship, practitioners and professionals can work to ameliorate these injustices by discussing how they source information and their policies for hiring. There is a need to work towards an international accreditation schema informed by global experiences and local knowledge related to librarianship and information practices. Critical international librarianship is a step toward this vision.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Commemorative Injustices

As a recent addition to the epistemicide framework, commemorative injustices describe the "collection of epistemic injustices that occur within commemorative information contexts, which encompass our participation in acts of commemoration, processes of memorialization, and interactions with tangible and intangible cultural heritage" (Youngman et al., 2022, p. 362). These commemorative injustices—including memorial, performative, and documentary injustice—are described differently depending on both the physical medium and social settings where such interactions with cultural information take place. Regardless of intentionality, commemorative injustices seriously threaten a knower's capacity to understand and situate information about the past. Likewise, it inhibits a knower's potential for future epistemological development. Through weaponizing the recording processes and recorded products of cultural information, knowers lose agency when determining the terms on which they acquire new knowledge and derive new understandings of the past.

To understand commemorative injustice from an international institutional perspective, we can examine the case of The Harvard-Yenching Institute Library, in which Qing (2020) explores the implications of knowledge extraction. Specifically, Qing details how Harvard scholars believed that "native Chinese scholars were unfit and ill-suited for the duty of protecting their own cultural heritage" because "they were thought to be unaware of 'modern' academic standards and incapable of the same intellectual precision as their Western counterparts" (2020, p. 57). Qing (2020) continues: "Chinese scholars were perceived to be 'unscientific,' because they suffered from a lack of Western training and therefore did not—and purportedly could not—know China as well as Westerners did" (p.57). This testimonial injustice accuses the "native" scholars of being incapable of protecting cultural materials because they are not trained under the standards of Western scholarship. Simultaneously, this commemorative injustice enabled the savior mindset espoused by this library and information institution to effectively deprive Chinese scholars of the agency to study, share, and commemorate their cultural heritage under the colonial guise of "saving" that knowledge. This paternalistic form of epistemicide echoes the sentiments of Schlesselman-Tarango (2016) that Western library ideology is paternalistic in assuming that "users," "foreigners," "people of color," and "the Other" do not know what is best for them and always need support from the bountiful librarian (pp. 676, 678, 679).

To understand commemorative injustice from a more collaborative international perspective, we can examine the reflection from Britz and Lor (2004) on the ethics of digitizing African documentary heritage and the implications of digital preservation and accessibility in enabling knowledge extraction. Britz and Lor (2004) assert a need for "information-based human rights" in their discussion of implementing a four-part typology of social justice as a social contract for our interactions with cultural materials made available from such digitization (p. 220). In consideration of their discussion of ethical concerns regarding compensation, prioritization, ownership, and means of access, the notion of "information-based human rights" (Britz & Lor, 2004, p. 218) adjacently posits a commitment to commemorative justice for all parties that interact with the physical and digital materials, thus promoting a commitment to acknowledging the legal, historical, and social origins of cultural information.

Beyond the examples above, the manifestation of commemorative injustices can also reflect long-standing colonial attitudes regarding who is deemed worthy of producing, preserving, and disseminating knowledge (Fanon, 2015). In considering how we value information, it is essential to consider how our shared cultural conditions and traditions can reflect practices of saviorism,

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

gatekeeping, and paternalism derived from colonial domination, potentially leading to the destruction and misrepresentation of heritage and memory. As Fanon (2015) reminds us,

> Colonialism is not satisfied merely with hiding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the oppressed people's past, distorts, disfigures and destroys it. (p. 37)

Therefore, library and information professionals are responsible for refusing and mitigating the proliferation of such behaviors in their practice to hold space for non-dominant knowledge and ways of knowing. By breaking out of the sphere of academic imperialism and looking to international settings for how information is valued, conceptualized, and organized, we can better understand how epistemic injustices are inflicted and create a more representative library and information landscape. In disrupting colonial research attitudes, recentering suppressed knowledge, and enabling more representative manifestations of commemoration, we can collaboratively build our capacity for implementing justice-driven library and information services.

Expanding Epistemic Harm into International LIS

In the prior section, we examined how epistemic injustices have harmed the LIS field internationally. Deeply rooted in Western centricity, international knowledge exchange in LIS remains unrealized, and a significant amount of knowledge is being lost due to prejudice. To overcome this situation, diagnosing how epistemic injustices operate accurately is necessary. In this section, we expand the discussion of epistemic harm in the international LIS field, which was indicated in Patin and Yeon's (2019) initial conceptualization of epistemicide in information professions. We examine how these injustices are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. In addition, we supplement the concept of epistemicide by elaborating that the third harm is intergenerational and international.

Understanding Concurrent Epistemic Injustices

Identifying the different types of epistemic injustice is essential, but it is also necessary to simultaneously address all types of epistemic injustice, as they are not independent. In most cases, epistemic injustices coexist and reinforce one another (Youngman et al., 2022). Here, we posit that international dimensions of epistemic injustices in LIS further exemplify how such injustices work concurrently.

For example, when the concept of a Western library system was exported to non-Western regions, the inhabitants already had their knowledge systems and ways to transmit and manage knowledge, even if it was not always referred to as a library (Amadi, 1981; Fitzpatrick, 2008; Green, 1988; Roy, 2022). In Sub-Saharan Africa, knowledge was transmitted orally from generation to generation. Many countries in northern Africa and Asia systematized their knowledge based on their writing and language systems. However, over the last two centuries, the Western library system was introduced, and as mentioned above, the "good-minded" Westerners paternalistically suppressed the knowledge systems of the non-Western world. In this process, non-Westerners experienced testimonial injustice, not being trusted as knowers. Accordingly, modern library education has been achieved through a Westernized curriculum, and non-Western knowledge systems are frequently excluded from the curriculum or become electives rather than the core of the curriculum (Chang, 2000; Méndez, 2020).

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

When Western hegemony is institutionalized through education, it becomes difficult for students to acquire a language for recognizing experienced injustices. From the moment one enters the profession through LIS education, the entire educational process becomes a process of building the "hermeneutical gap" (Fricker, 2006, p. 103). Students who have studied this curriculum would not doubt that the Western library model is universal knowledge and the standard that information professionals must follow. However, is it *really* possible to apply a Western curriculum to a place where the context differs from a Western one? It is not a coincidence that the literature produced by so-called 'developing' countries critiques their insufficient LIS education compared to the West (Kaur, 2015). This self-criticism implies that LIS has an international epistemic hierarchy and that librarians in "developing" countries endlessly reflect on their inferiority by comparing themselves to U.S. or European librarians without recognizing contextual differences or the hegemony they live in. Different types of epistemic injustice are pervasive and mutually reinforcing to maintain hegemony. The tight interplay among epistemic injustices is one of the reasons why epistemicide is particularly devastating when it occurs across time and space. The following section discusses the implications of the international dimension of epistemic harm caused by epistemicide.

Intergenerational and International Epistemic Harm

Patin et al. (2021a) argue that epistemic harm is exponential because it harms "not only the individual (primary) at this moment in time, and the current collective community (secondary), but…the future" (p. 7). They named this temporal dimension of epistemic harm the third harm. In their conceptualization, time works as a multiplier of epistemic harm, and it eventually magnifies the negative impact of epistemicide. Similarly, space also works as a multiplier of epistemic harm that magnifies the impact of harm. As the impact of epistemicide extends over generations, the epistemic harm that crosses national borders expands epistemicide to all humanity.

Based on the five types of epistemic injustice identified in the international LIS scene, we have found two distinctive aspects of the international dimension of epistemicide. First, epistemic injustices are often institutionalized when transplanted to another country, where they thrive independently. For example, the story of a librarian in the United Arab Emirates highlights how Western hegemony is institutionalized in a post-colonial nation, as described in the prior section (Evans, 2016). Notably, this university's hiring policy prioritized Western librarian credentials despite the end of British colonial rule in 1971. In the case of South Korea, the United States Agency for International Development and the United States Military Government in Korea aided the implementation of LIS research and education for twenty years following the end of World War II as a form of cultural propaganda (Chang, 2000). Although South Korea is no longer a recipient of foreign aid, dependence on the United States is institutionalized in South Korean library education and research, resulting in the LIS academic community looking up to American libraries to solve social issues in South Korea (Choi & Ha, 2019; Oh & Kim, 2019). Both examples illustrate the international influences in LIS that have passed down epistemic domination through generations. In other words, the international transfer of epistemic injustice often plants a seed in a different soil to grow a tree of epistemic injustice that will survive for decades.

Second, the intersection of the international and intergenerational dimensions of epistemicide in LIS exacerbates the dilemma between autonomy and paternalism. Autonomy and paternalism are frequently discussed in public health, public policy, international relations, and social work ethics, but they are unfamiliar within LIS. "The concept of paternalism is intricately tied to the

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

concept of autonomy" because paternalism is the restriction of personal autonomy for an individual's benefit (Sullivan & Niker, 2018, p. 649). Although paternalism is condemned as unethical in many fields, paternalism still presents moral dilemmas, such as when a medical practitioner prescribes a life-saving medication, and the patient refuses to take it. Similarly, librarians sometimes encounter valuable knowledge in different countries that requires preservation for future generations. What should librarians prioritize if librarians and institutions in a particular country do not have enough resources to preserve knowledge or are not motivated to protect knowledge? Autonomy of the country or paternalistic intervention? Since the international library scene is biased regarding knowledge and economic power, the resources for preserving and disseminating specific knowledge in less developed countries are often only available to developed countries. In this case, it is hard to say that external intervention from resource-rich countries is always wrong and harms the autonomy of librarians and citizens of a particular country. Without international collaboration, valuable knowledge will be lost, and the global distribution and representation of knowledge will become more unequal.

To avoid the pitfalls of paternalism, librarians must walk the fine line between autonomy and paternalism for the preservation and dissemination of knowledge. Existing discussions and suggestions regarding the autonomy-paternalism dilemma provide hints for resolving our conundrum. For instance, Zomorodi and Foley (2009) argue that in communication between nurses and patients, clarifying information and educating are essential elements that differentiate advocacy from paternalism. Sullivan and Niker (2018) similarly proposed the term "maternalism" to argue that it is crucial to respect one's autonomy by "relationally acquired understanding" in interpersonal interventions (p. 666). To form this understanding, epistemic injustices serve as a warning to librarians practicing international librarianship to respect the epistemic autonomy of others.

Critical International Librarianship as Intervention

International librarianship has been a subarea of LIS that addresses issues relevant to libraries in multiple nations. As a cooperative approach, it has contributed to helping librarians and researchers to have a space to understand libraries in different countries and encourage international collaboration. However, unless the power dynamics and hegemony impeding epistemic justice in global LIS are addressed, international librarianship can easily become a sanitizing term that conceals the Western-dominated intellectual foundation of LIS. In this section, we propose "critical international librarianship" as a new area that combines the tradition of critical librarianship and international librarianship as an intervention against epistemicide in the international LIS field.

Critical librarianship often refers to social justice-oriented activism within the LIS profession (Ferretti, 2020). At its core, critical librarianship tasks the field of librarianship with approaching our practice with a framework that is "epistemological, self-reflective, and activist in nature" (Garcia, 2015, para. 1). Critical librarianship "acknowledges and then interrogates the structures that produce us as librarians, our spaces as libraries, our patrons as students, faculty, and the public, whose interface with the sum of human knowledge" (Drabinski, 2019, p. 49). Acknowledgment and interrogation of our structures, processes, procedures, and policies are necessary to further a critical perspective in our field.

Following the core ideas of critical librarianship, critical international librarianship focuses on recognizing, examining, critiquing, and subverting the power structures and hegemonies in

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

library and information systems that exist among two or more nations in practice, pedagogy, and research.

Addressing epistemic injustice is one crucial intervention of critical international librarianship since libraries are one of the institutions of knowledge that select, preserve, and disseminate information for the benefit of humanity. Critical international librarianship assists oppressed knowers in regaining their self-confidence by providing a conversation forum where they, particularly those from less privileged nations, can discuss and name their experiences with libraries that never made sense to them. As many countries implemented modern libraries due to colonial or imperial activity, it is essential that the LIS field collectively acknowledge this traumatic past in multiple nations to advance justice. This awareness will serve as the first step toward reconciliation, and the second step is for libraries to "acquire the hope necessary to anticipate a shared future" (Rigby, 2005, p. 869). Therefore, any international collaboration should be based on a thorough examination of the past and the belief that libraries can collectively achieve justice through their efforts.

Situating Critical International Librarianship

As previously stated, epistemic injustices are interconnected and mutually reinforcing, necessitating simultaneous global interventions for all types of injustice. Thus, critical international librarianship encourages activities in different areas of librarianship, such as research, education, and practice, to address epistemic injustices. We propose multiple instances of critical international librarianship in research, education, and practice, as well as the ethical tensions that emerge from such an intervention, to break the vicious cycle of epistemicide. This section suggests a few examples of interventions for research in the international LIS field.

Recognizing Imperialism and Colonialism in Library Development

Critical international librarianship should build upon cross-national studies focusing on colonial and imperial influences on library development. Library development has been suggested as an appropriate topic for comparative librarianship because cross-national comparison may identify core factors that contribute to the development of libraries (Kawatra, 1987). However, recognizing colonial and imperial influences on library development is necessary to produce knowledge relevant not only to Westerners but to the entire world. As mentioned above, colonizers forced many non-Western countries to import western library systems. The starting point of modern library systems in these countries is far different from that of library systems that grew out of necessity to serve citizens (Shera, 1971). Thus, cross-national analysis among non-Western countries would reveal how colonialism and imperialism have affected library development. Ignatow et al.'s. (2012) comparative study of Malawi, Namibia, and Nepal is a rare example that incorporates colonialism into discussing the relationship between library development and democratization. Ignatow et al. (2012) successfully criticized the ideology that believes in "the relations of public libraries to democracy [which is] derived from the broad Enlightenment tradition" (p. 78), which does not explain non-Western librarians' and library users' experiences. As this research demonstrates, more comparative studies are required to comprehend the long-lasting effects of colonialism and imperialism and assess the current state of non-Western libraries.

Examining the Experiences of non-Western Librarians and Scholars

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

We propose empirical studies of international epistemic injustices experienced by librarians and scholars to amplify their voices. Such research may provide a space where librarians and scholars share cases of epistemic injustice in their research, learning, and practicing librarianship and have their feelings and thoughts validated. Critical studies of librarianship present the lived experiences of librarians of color, primarily in an American context (Chou & Pho, 2018; Hill, 2019). Using epistemic injustice and epistemicide as a framework, similar efforts to collectively record librarians' experiences in the context of international collaborations or knowledge flow can shed light on the international dimensions of epistemicide, which will serve as the foundation for resolving epistemic biases in LIS. These collective research efforts may lead to collaboration among non-Western librarians and scholars, allowing them to see the inherent problems within their libraries and then dream of a new model of librarianship that reflects the actual needs and epistemologies of their users.

Critiquing Lingua Franca and Identifying Alternative Approaches

English as a Lingua Franca is one of the most unique and challenging issues in international knowledge dissemination (Jenkins, 2013). Bennett (2013) argues that the dominance of English in academic discourse erodes traditional knowledge when translated into English, thereby contributing to epistemicide. Although the international LIS academic community faces the same challenges, there is only a small amount of relevant research on this issue compared to other issues, such as subscription fees and open access (MoChridhe, 2019). For instance, Tariq et al. (2016) presented a remarkable examination of the language barrier encountered by Pakistani LIS scholars and students. They found that most of their participants perceived English as a significant barrier to research productivity (Tariq et al., 2016). Declève's (2010) study suggests that the English barrier is not an issue exclusively in non-Western countries. Declève found that Belgian librarians are unaware of Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP) and questioned if this was related to its availability only in English. This was validated by Bennett (2013), who found that "English academic discourse, and the knowledge paradigm that it encodes, are deeply bound up with the power structures of the modern world (industry, technology, capitalism)" (p. 188). However, some examples may inform scholars who intend to pursue critical international librarianship. For example, Meneghini and Packer (2007) proposed a bilingual journal policy encouraging authors to publish the same manuscript in their language and English. Bennett (2013) and Luo and Hyland (2019) argued for the acknowledgment of translators' role in publishing EAL (English as an additional language) researchers' intellectual work in English journals. Nonetheless, recognizing the taken-for-granted position of English as a universal language in LIS academia is the most crucial step toward epistemic justice. More studies and efforts addressing English dominance may also help diversify the editorial boards of journals and publications (Harzing & Metz, 2012).

Subverting Injustice by Moving Towards Critical Pedagogy

To move towards a critical international pedagogy in the LIS field, LIS programs must conduct a diversity audit (Cooke & Sweeney, 2017) to help identify which international topics, perspectives, and authors are covered across the program. Diversity audits are limited in what one can learn about the curriculum, but they are an important place to start. Furthermore, audits encouraging collaborative engagement from multiple countries will enable global library and information institutions to critically self-reflect on barriers in culture, language, practice, and policy and derive justice-driven goals for overcoming such obstacles in education. While it was established that there were multiple courses across LIS programs covering international

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

librarianship, often, these courses were relegated to electives. It is imperative that international perspectives, practices, and cases are shared with our students in their core courses as a means to further embed multiple perspectives in our educational content. Finally, we encourage LIS educators to move towards dialogue in their courses, allowing students to speak as experts of their own experiences.

Ethical Tensions: An Invitation to Critical International Librarianship

An internationally informed perspective of critical librarianship requires us first to acknowledge the influence of LIS's policies, practices, and procedures across global contexts. It is essential to consider how LIS governing organizations contribute to divergent perspectives of the roles, responsibilities, and challenges LIS professionals face. Rather than espousing interventions that often advocate for universalist solutions to practice, pedagogy, and research that hegemonize interpretations of library and information work, our distinctions here emphasize an intentional commitment to dissecting these differences to understand the gaps in our professional knowledge better. Such explorations lend themselves to new opportunities for collaboration and identifying emergent areas of inquiry, including a shared commitment to combating manifestations of epistemic injustice.

When examining governance, library and information organizations' core values and standards provide an initial indication of LIS professionals' aspirations and shared expectations. Here we examine the core values and ethics policies from three globally dominant organizations: the ALA (2021) Code of Ethics, the CILIP (2018) Ethical Principles Framework, and the IFLA (2012) Code of Ethics.

ALA (2021) prioritizes library services, intellectual freedom, confidentiality, intellectual property, public benefit, professional development, and human dignity, signaling a commitment to information-centric approaches to professional work. Conversely, CILIP (2018) prioritizes human rights, public benefit, preservation, intellectual preservation, impartiality, confidentiality, and information literacy, signaling a human-centric approach to professional work. IFLA (2012) prioritizes access to information, societal responsibility, privacy and transparency, open access, intellectual property, neutrality, and collegiality, signaling a balance of responsibilities between people and information. While these policies initially appear to have standardized purposes, they are disjointly aligned through their use of ordering that reflects differing interpretations of the importance of professional responsibilities, addressing social change, and recognizing historical precedents that have influenced the values held by our profession.

Given the dominating presence of these organizations in the global library and information community, there exists a risk of perpetuating harm through the need for a unified approach to ethics and values. However, we are reluctant to advocate for centralized and universalist approaches to professional ethics, standards, and values, as we recognize that divergent information needs across global communities cannot be dismissed. Rather, for our profession to progress toward promoting shared ideals, we must acknowledge that tension will always exist within our desire to advocate for universalist solutions and alignments. However, we must recognize that acting upon such desires would remove autonomy from library and information institutions and organizations to make decisions reflective of the needs of their respective communities. This would ultimately discredit the aims to recognize the variety of philosophical, organizational, and epistemological approaches to information. Critical international

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

librarianship does not suggest a forced alignment of governance, values, educational standards, and access requirements. Instead, it must be an engine for extending an invitation for library and information institutions and organizations to come together to promote shared accountability, derive mutual agreements, and demonstrate action that helps us live up to the values we espouse.

Conclusion

Our discussions on the manifestation of epistemic injustice in international library and information settings have yielded new insights into the global consequences and intergenerational harm of epistemicide. In presenting critical international librarianship as an approach to addressing the influence of epistemic injustice in international LIS, we encourage LIS professionals to consider how a critical praxis for research, pedagogy, and ethics on a global scale can collectively contribute to the amplification of marginalized knowledge.

While our discussions explore specific interpretations of critical international librarianship, it is equally important to note what critical international librarianship is not. While this study focuses on inequities between Western and non-Western nations, the application of critical international librarianship is by no means restricted to this dichotomy. Epistemic injustice can be inflicted between nations with any power differential. One paternalistic and political example occurred when the National Library of Korea invested in nurturing "pro-Korean" librarians by inviting librarians from Nepal, Mongolia, Vietnam, and so on (National Library of Korea, n.d.). Thus, critical international librarianship has excellent potential for explicating and criticizing epistemicide in various contexts that have not been foregrounded.

Future scholarship should explore how collaboration allows for closer examination of the tensions between universality and autonomy, shared development of and access to resources, and moving away from proposing reactive interventions toward promoting proactive dialogue on the implications of critical approaches to international librarianship. Such explorations require a collective and equitable effort from librarians in different contexts, which will also demand creative solutions to tear down the linguistic, financial, and cultural barriers that inhibit international collaboration. In particular, as the gap between time and space has narrowed and people living in different societies or cultures are connected more directly, it will be a task given to critical international librarianship to find out how globalization affects epistemic injustice and find countermeasures. For example, examining how LIS can "realize the opportunities and mitigate the damages of a common language" through an epistemic injustice framework could be a way to unravel the complex effects of globalization (Salomone, 2022, p. 378). We must recognize that libraries and information institutions do not exist in a vacuum and that combating epistemic injustice in the LIS field requires constant resistance to hegemonic structures and power dynamics. However, by emphasizing that libraries and information institutions around the globe can intervene in epistemicide by accumulating and disseminating more just representations of knowledge systems, we begin to take a more meaningful step toward justice through critical international librarianship.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Endnotes

[1]One common way to understand internationalization and globalization is to view globalization as a phenomenon and internationalization as a response to this phenomenon (Click et al., 2017). Globalization is "spatial-temporal processes, operating on a global scale, that rapidly cut across national boundaries, drawing more and more of the world into webs of interconnection, integrating and stretching cultures and communities across space and time, and compressing our spatial and temporal horizons" (Inda & Rosaldo, 2008, p. 9). Internalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of" national, sectoral, or institutional-level actions to cope with globalization (Knight, 2003, p. 2).
[2]We opted not to put [sic] despite the incorrect usage of "on" in the sentence. We believe that in international academic communication, minor grammatical errors should be accepted so long as the authors' ideas are conveyed. This practice could be an intervention that reduces the language barrier faced by EAL (English as an additional language) researchers.
[3]There can be various manifestations of "universality." For example, Meyer (2001) described an Indigenous way of viewing universality by illustrating a "'sequence of immortality' [that] summarizes this sense of spiritual continuity" (p. 144). This quote implies that there is a generational continuity of knowledge besides immediate knowledge from an individual's bodily experience. However, in this article, we specifically critique the Western manifestation of universality that idealizes objective knowledge.
[4]The terms "Anglo-American" and "Anglo-centric" are used in this paper to refer to the British and "a North American whose native language is English and whose culture or ethnic background is of European origin" (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

References

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, *51*(6), 599–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003

Amadi, A. O. (1981). *African libraries: Western tradition and colonial brainwashing*. Scarecrow Press.

Amano, T., González-Varo, J. P., & Sutherland, W. J. (2016). Languages are still a major barrier to global science. *PLoS Biology*, *14*(12), Article e2000933. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2000933

American Library Association. (2021, June 29). *Code of ethics*. https://www.ala.org/tools/ethics

American Library Association. (2022, April). *Foreign credentials evaluation assistance*. https://www.ala.org/educationcareers/employment/foreigncredentialing/forjobseekers

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Andrews, N. (2018). Reflections on resistance, decolonization, and the historical trauma of libraries and academia. In K. P. Nicholson & M. Seale (Eds.), *The politics of theory and the practice of critical librarianship* (pp. 181–192). Library Juice Press.

Balaji, B. P., Vinay, M. S., Shalini, B. G., & J. S., M. R. (2019). Web 2.0 use in academic libraries of top ranked Asian universities. *The Electronic Library*, *37*(3), 528–549. https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-12-2018-0248

Bennett, K. (2013). English as a lingua franca in academia: Combating epistemicide through translator training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *7*(2), 169–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798850

Bernal, A., & Axtell, G. (Eds.). (2020). *Epistemic paternalism: Conceptions, justifications and implications*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bliss, N. J. (1993). International librarianship: A bibliometric analysis of the field. *International Information & Library Review*, *25*(2), 93–107. https://doi.org/10.1006/iilr.1993.1008

Bordonaro, K. (2017). *International librarianship at home and abroad*. Chandos Publishing.

Britz, J., & Lor, P. (2004). A moral reflection on the digitization of Africa's documentary heritage. *IFLA Journal*, *30*(3), 216–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/034003520403000304

Budd, J. M. (2022). *The library as forum in the social media age*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Chakraborty, S., & Das, A. K. (Eds.). (2013). *Collaboration in international and comparative librarianship*. IGI Global.

Chang, D. H. (2000). *Knowledge, culture, and identity: American influence on the development of library and information science in South Korea since 1945* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. https://search.proquest.com/docview/304631273?accountid=14214

Chartered Institute for Library and Information Professionals. (2018, October). CILIP's *ethical principles framework*. https://www.cilip.org.uk/page/ethics

Choi, S., & Ha, Y. J. (2019). An analysis of library and information science curriculum in U.S. *Journal of the Korean Society for Information Management*, *36*(1), 53–71. https://doi.org/10.3743/KOSIM.2019.36.1.053

Chou, R. L., & Pho, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Pushing the margins: Women of color and intersectionality in LIS*. Library Juice Press.

Civallero, E. (2017, June 24). *Library services for indigenous societies in Latin America*. [Paper presentation]. ALA Annual Conference & Exhibition (IRRT International Paper Session—Libraries Transform: Programs and Services for Sustainable Environments, Social Justice, and Quality Education for All). Chicago, IL, United States. https://www.ala.org/rt/sites/ala.org.rt/files/content/irrtcommittees/irrtintlpapers/Civallero-papersALA2017.pdf

Click, A. B., Wiley, C. W., & Houlihan, M. (2017). The internationalization of the academic library: A systematic review of 25 years of literature on international students. *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(3), 328-358.

Constantinou, C., Miller, M. J., & Schlesinger, K. (Eds.). (2017). *International librarianship: Developing professional, intercultural, and educational leadership*. State University of New York Press.

Cooke, N. A., & Sweeney, M. E. (Eds.). (2017). *Teaching for justice: Implementing social justice in the LIS classroom*. Library Juice Press.

Dane, C. (1954). The benefits of comparative librarianship. *The Australian Library Journal*, *3*(3), 89–91.

Danton, J. P. (1973). *The dimensions of comparative librarianship*. American Library Association.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.

Declève, G. (2010). EBLIP: Bridging the language barrier. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, *27*(4), 332–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2010.00914.x

Drabinski, E. (2019). What is critical about critical librarianship? *Art Libraries Journal*, *44(*2), 49–57. https://doi.org/10.1017/alj.2019.3

Evans, K. D. (2016, April 7). *Librarians need global credentials*. Library Journal. https://www.libraryjournal.com/story/librarians-need-global-credentials-backtalk

Fanon, F. (2015). On national culture. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp.36–52). Routledge. (Original work published 1994)(Reprinted from The wretched of the earth (C. Farrington, Trans.) pp. 166–175, 178–83, 187–99, by F. Fanon, 1967, Penguin)

Ferretti, J. A. (2020). Building a critical culture: How critical librarianship falls short in the workplace. *Communications in Information Literacy*, *14* (1), 134–152. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2020.14.1.10

Fisher, K. E. (2022). People first, data second: A humanitarian research framework for fieldwork with refugees by war zones. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 31, 237–297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-022-09425-8

Fitzpatrick, E. B. (2008). The public library as instrument of colonialism: The case of the Netherlands East Indies. *Libraries & the Cultural Record*, *43*(3), 270–285. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25549496

Flagg, G. (2000). Editorial: Global librarianship, global apathy. *American Libraries*, *31*(9), 37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25645634

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Ford, B. J. (1998). Inaugural remarks. In K. P. McCook, B. J. Ford, & K. Lippincott (Eds.), *Libraries: Global reach—local touch* (pp. 3–5). American Library Association.

Fricker, M. (2006). Powerlessness and social interpretation. *Episteme*, *3*(1–2), 96–108. https://doi.org/10.3366/epi.2006.3.1-2.96

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Garcia, K. (2015, June 19). *Keeping up with...critical librarianship*. American Library Association. https://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/keeping_up_with/critlib

Green, A. H. (1988). The history of libraries in the Arab world: A diffusionist model. *Libraries & Culture*, *23*(4), 454–473. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25542092

Harvey, J. F. (1973). Toward a definition of international and comparative library science. *International Library Review*, *5*(3), 289–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7837(73)80033-0

Harzing, A.-W., & Metz, I. (2012). Explaining geographic diversity of editorial boards: The role of conference participation and English-language skills. *European Journal of International Management*, *6*(6), 697–715. https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2012.050423

Hill, R. F. (2019). The danger of an untold story: Excerpts from my life as a Black academic. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *60*(3), 208–214. https://doi.org/10.3138/jelis.2019-0008

Ignatow, G., Webb, S. M., Poulin, M., Parajuli, R., Fleming, P., Batra, S., & Neupane, D. (2012). Public libraries and democratization in three developing countries: Exploring the role of social capital. *Libri*, *62*(1), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2012-0005

Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (2008). *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Wiley-Blackwell.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. (n.d.). *Our vision and mission*. https://www.ifla.org/vision-mission/

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. (2012, August). *Code of ethics*. https://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-code-of-ethics-for-librarians-and-other-information-workers-full-version/

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203798157

Jimenez, A., Vannini, S., & Cox, A. (2023). A holistic decolonial lens for library and information studies. *Journal of Documentation*, *79*(1), 224–244. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-10-2021-0205

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Kaur, T. (2015). Challenges and concerns for library and information science (LIS) education in India and South Asia. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *56*(1, Suppl.), 6–16. https://doi.org/10.3138/jelis.56.s1.6

Kawatra, P. S. (Ed.). (1987). *Comparative and international librarianship*. Sterling Publishers.

Keresztesi, M. (1981). Prolegomena to the history of international librarianship. *The Journal of Library History*, *16*(2), 435–448. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25541207

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3.

Landry, P. (2017, August 24). *National libraries' functions: Results from the 2016 survey of national libraries' functions* [Paper presentation]. IFLA WLIC 2017, Wrocław, Poland. https://library.ifla.org/id/eprint/1722/1/223-landry-en.pdf

Laugesen, A. (2014). UNESCO and the globalization of the public library idea, 1948 to 1965. *Library & Information History*, *30*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1179/1758348913Z.00000000052

Laugesen, A. (2019). *Globalizing the library: Librarians and development work, 1945–1970*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351250924

Lebakeng, J. T., Phalane, M. M., & Dalindjebo, N. (2006). Epistemicide, institutional cultures and the imperative for the Africanisation of universities in South Africa. *Alternation*, *13*(1), 70–87. https://journals.co.za/doi/epdf/10.10520/AJA10231757_547

Liu, Y. Q., & Cheng, X. (Eds.). (2008). *International and comparative studies in information and library science: A focus on the United States and Asian countries*. Scarecrow Press.

Lor, P. J. (n.d.). *International and comparative librarianship: What is international librarianship? What is comparative librarianship? How are they related?* Peter Johan Lor. https://peterlor.com/international-comparative-librarianship/

Lor, P. J. (2014). Revitalizing comparative library and information science: Theory and metatheory. *Journal of Documentation*, *70*(1), 25–51. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-10-2012-0129

Lor, P. J. (2018). International and comparative librarianship. In J. D. McDonald & M. Levine-Clark (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of library and information science* (4th ed., pp. 2404–2412). CRC Press.

Lor, P. J. (2019). *International and comparative librarianship: Concepts and methods for global studies*. De Gruyter Saur. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110267990

Luo, N., & Hyland, K. (2019). "I won't publish in Chinese now": Publishing, translation and the non-English speaking academic. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *39*, 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.03.003

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Méndez, A. S. (2020). A decolonial curricular approach to LIS education. *ALISE 2020 Conference Proceedings*, 211–219. http://hdl.handle.net/2142/108814

Meneghini, R., & Packer, A. L. (2007). Is there science beyond English? Initiatives to increase the quality and visibility of non-English publications might help to break down language barriers in scientific communication. *EMBO reports*, *8*(2), 112–116. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.7400906

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Anglo-American. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved August 31, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Anglo-American

Meyer, M. A. (2001). Our own liberation: Reflections on Hawaiian epistemology. *The Contemporary Pacific*, *13*(1), 124–148. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23718511

MoChridhe, R. (2019). Linguistic equity as open access: Internationalizing the language of scholarly communication. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *45*(4), 423–427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.02.006

Mwanzu, A., & Wendo, D. R. (2017). Re-branding libraries to embrace open space and aesthetic reflections: A case of USIU-Africa as a benchmark of Kenyan libraries. *Library Hi Tech News*, *34*(1), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-10-2016-0045

National Library of Korea. (n.d.) *Library cooperation*. https://nl.go.kr/NL/contents/N50206020000.do

Oh, Y., & Kim, H. J. (2019). A study on the spatial design of makerspace in public libraries based on the L-commons model. *Journal of Korean Library and Information Science Society*, *50*(3), 293–315. https://doi.org/10.16981/kliss.50.3.201909.293

Oliphant, T. (2021). Emerging (information) realities and epistemic injustice. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *72*(8), 951–962. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24461

Onyancha, O. B. (2007). LIS research in Africa: How much is it worth? A citation analysis of the literature, 1986–2006. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, *73*(2), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.7553/73-2-1343

Parker, J. S. (1974). International Librarianship: A reconnaissance. *Journal of Librarianship*, *6*(4), 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/096100067400600401

Patin, B., Sebastian, M., Yeon, J., & Bertolini, D. (2020). Toward epistemic justice: An approach for conceptualizing epistemicide in the information professions. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *57*(1), Article e242. https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.242

Patin, B., Sebastian, M., Yeon, J., Bertolini, D., & Grimm, A. (2021a). Interrupting epistemicide: A practical framework for naming, identifying, and ending epistemic injustice in the information professions. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *72*(10), 1306–1318. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24479

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Patin, B., Sebastian, M., Yeon, J., Bertolini, D., & Grimm, A. (2021b). The mis-education of the librarian: Addressing curricular injustice in the LIS classroom through social justice pedagogy. In B. Mehra (Ed.), *Social justice design and implementation in library and information science* (pp. 175–189). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003129219-16/mis-education-librarian-beth-patin-melinda-sebastian-jieun-yeon-danielle-bertolini-alexandra-grimm

Patin, B., & Yeon, J. (2019). Ending Epistemicide: Amplifying Knowledge Systems in Libraries. Library Research Seminar (LRS) VII, Columbia, South Carolina, October 2019.

Patra, S. K., & Mahesh, G. (2018). The slow progress of library and information science research in Africa. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, *7*(2), 107–113. https://doi.org/10.5530/jscires.7.2.16

Qing, L. (2020). Whose books? The Harvard-Yenching Institute's library and the question of academic imperialism. *History of Education Review*, *50*(1), 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1108/HER-11-2019-0044

Rigby, A. (2005). Reconciliation. In D. L. Shelton (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of genocide and crimes against humanity* (Vol. 2, pp. 869–870). Macmillan Reference USA.

Roy, H. (Ed.). (2022). *Social thought in Indic civilization*. SAGE Publications India.

Salomone, R. C. (2022). *The rise of English: Global politics and the power of language*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190625610.001.0001

Scale, M.-S. (2021). *Colonization and imperialism in libraries: Perspective from a Caribbean immigrant*. FriesenPress.

Schlesselman-Tarango, G. (2016). The legacy of Lady Bountiful: White women in the library. *Library Trends*, *64*(4), 667–686. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0015

SCImago Research Group. (2022, April). *Scimago journal & country rank*. Retrieved August 7, 2022, from https://www.scimagojr.com/countryrank.php?category=3309&area=3300

Shera, J. H. (1971). The expansion of the social library. In M. H. Harris (Ed.), *Reader in American library history* (pp. 45-53). Microcard Editions.

Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (2014). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media* (2nd ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1994)

Singh, D. (2020). Foreword. In R. Alenzuela, H. Kim, & D. M. Baylen (Eds.), I*nternationalization of library and information science education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. xv-xvi). IGI Global.

Sullivan, L. S., & Niker, F. (2018). Relational autonomy, paternalism, and maternalism. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practices*, *21*, 649–667. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-018-9900-z

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Tariq, M., Ahmad, T, & ur Rehman, S. (2016). Is the English language a barrier to research productivity among information professionals? A descriptive study. *Pakistan Journal of Information Management & Libraries*, *17*, 162–173.

U.S. News & World Report. (2021). *Best library and information studies programs*. Retrieved August 2022, from https://www.usnews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-library-information-science-programs/library-information-science-rankings

Wang, C. (1985). A brief introduction to comparative librarianship. *International Library Review*, *17*(2), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7837(85)90002-0

Wormann, C. D. (1968). Aspects of international library co-operation: Historical and contemporary. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, *38*(4), 338–351. https://doi.org/10.1086/619694

Youngman, T., Modrow, S., Smith, M., & Patin, B. (2022). Epistemicide on the record: Theorizing commemorative injustice and reimagining interdisciplinary discourses in cultural information studies. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *59*(1), 358–367. https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.759

Zomorodi, M., & Foley, B. J. (2009). The nature of advocacy vs. paternalism in nursing: Clarifying the "thin line". *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *65*(8), 1746–1752. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05023.x

Jieun Yeon (jiyeon@syr.edu) is a Ph.D. candidate at Syracuse University's School of Information Studies. As a member of the Library and Information Investigative Team (LIIT), her research focuses on social justice in libraries and critical librarianship. She has worked with Dr. Beth Patin to conceptualize epistemicide and epistemic injustice. Currently, she is studying library governance to implement social justice values to public library boards. She holds M.A. in Library and Information Science at Yonsei University and B.A. in Library and Information Science and Public Administration at Yonsei University, South Korea.

Melissa Smith (msmit128@syr.edu) is a second-year master's student at Syracuse University's School of Information Studies, where she is focusing on archives and cultural heritage. As a recipient of the iSchool's Wilhelm Library Leadership Award, she has worked with Dr. Beth Patin on a book chapter and several papers related to epistemicide and epistemic justice in information studies. She is also coauthor with Dr. Sebastian Modrow on a new translation of the Papal Bull Inter Caetera for the Doctrine of Discovery project and a paper on 19th-century library historiography and public library activism, presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Association of Information Science. She earned a Ph.D. in English Literature from the University of Texas at Austin.

Tyler Youngman (tdyoungm@syr.edu) is a 2nd Year Ph.D. Student in Information Science & Technology at the Syracuse University School of Information Studies. Tyler's research examines knowledge destruction in relation to libraries, archives, and museums and how digital technologies can amplify suppressed knowledge. Prior to doctoral studies, Tyler worked in libraries and archives and earned their MSLIS and BS/BA from Syracuse University.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251

Beth Patin (bjpatin@syr.edu) is an Assistant Professor at Syracuse University's School of Information. Her research agenda focuses on equity informatics, community resilience, and cultural responsiveness. The co-founder of the Library Information Investigative Team research group and Director of the Rocket City Civil Rights Initiative, Beth was also recently appointed to the New York State Regents Advisory Council on Libraries. Her work focuses on epistemicide (the silencing, killing, or devaluing of knowledge systems), how libraries help support resilient communities, and digital humanities and the Civil Rights Movement. Her work on epistemicide was named the Best Information Ethics and Policy paper of 2021 by the Association for Information Science and Technology, and her latest paper, The Sankofa Intervention: Combatting the Epistemicide of Parasitic Omission Through Civil Rights Literacy in Community Information Contexts, won the award for the best paper at the Association of Library and Information Science Educators conference in 2022.

ISSN 2574-3430, jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijidi/index
DOI: 10.33137/ijidi.v7i1/2.39251