

Biblioteke između cenzure i prava na informaciju (uticaj na praktično poslovanje u segmentu nabavke bibliotečke građe i kreiranja fondova)

Libraries between censorship and information rights (impact on library practice in the segment of library material acquisition and creation of funds)

Emira Kulenović

JU Biblioteka Sarajeva, Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina / Library of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
emira.kulenovic@bgs.ba

Informacije o članku / Article Info

Primljen / Received 15. 8. 2023.

Prihvaćen / Accepted 26. 9. 2023.

Dostupan online / Available online: 10. 12. 2023.

Ključne riječi / Keywords

nabavka bibliotečke građe, selekcija, cenzura,
pristup informacijama

library acquisition, selection, censorship,
information access

Sažetak / Abstract

Biblioteke kao najdemokračićnija mjesta na svijetu imaju jasno definiranu ulogu i zadaću u društvu. One su dužne obezbijediti svim korisničkim grupama podjednak pristup informacijama, ali i uticati na kreiranje ukusa korisnika, te vršiti pedagošku ulogu. U tom procjepu između imperativa poštivanja zakona i normi demokračićskog društva – obezbjeđivanja prava na informaciju s jedne, te diktata tržišta s druge strane, biblioteke se nerijetko nađu u nezavidnoj poziciji kada je u pitanju segment nabavke bibliotečke građe i kreiranje fondova. Iako je načelno ovaj segment poslovanja reguliran zakonskim i internim aktima biblioteka, te kroz različite stručne preporuke, ostaje neriješena dilema vezana za tretiranje publikacija i/ili autora koji se mogu svrstati po određenom osnovu u problematične sa etičkog ili estetičkog aspekta. Cilj ovog rada je pridonijeti sagledavanju specifičnih manifestacija cenzure koja se može pojaviti u određenim segmentima bibliotečkog poslovanja poput kreiranja fondova, nabavke bibliotečke građe ili udovoljavanja zahtjevima korisnika. To se nastoji postići usporedbom onoga što su stvarne dileme u praksi i onoga što propisuje legislativa ili što preporučuju strukovne organizacije. Fokusirajući se na propitivanje granica u rješavanju pomenutih problema, kroz pokušaj otvaranja konkretnih pitanja, nastoji se ukazati na manjkavosti postojećih rješenja i određenu diskrepanciju između ponuđenog zakonsko-teorijskog okvira i njegove provodljivosti u svakodnevnoj praksi.

Libraries as supposed to be the most democratic places in the world have a clearly defined role and purpose in society. They are obliged to provide equal access to information for all, but also to get an impact on reader preferences and at the same time to perform an educational role. In that gap between the imperative to obey the law and follow democratic principles – providing the right to information on the one hand, and the dictates of the market on the other, libraries found themselves in an unenviable position when it comes to the segment of acquiring library materials and creating funds. Although, in principle, this business segment is regulated through various professional recommendations and by legal and internal acts of libraries, there still remains an unresolved dilemma related to the treatment of publications and/or authors that can be classified on a certain basis as problematic from ethical or aesthetic aspects. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the theoretical understanding of specific manifestations of censorship that can occur in certain segments of library practice such as creating funds, purchasing library materials, or meeting user requirements. This is being achieved by comparing what are real dilemmas in practice and what the legislation prescribes or what is recommended by professional organizations. By focusing on questioning the boundaries in solving the aforementioned problems, through an attempt to open specific issues, it seeks to point out the shortcomings of existing solutions and a certain discrepancy between the offered legal-theoretical framework and its implementation in everyday practice.

1. Uvod – društveni kontekst

Demokratsko društvo kojem težimo je društvo zasnovano na principima zalaganja za širok spektar ljudskih prava i sloboda, uključujući i pravo na obrazovanje, pravo na slobodan pristup informacijama i slobodu govora. Različita društvena kretanja kroz historiju su, svako na jedinstven način, kreirala društveni kontekst u ovom pitanju.

Međutim, ono sa čim se po prvi put sada susrećemo svojevrsni su apsurdni proistekli iz situacije gdje živimo u vrijeme kada propagiranje pomenutih vrijednosti nikad nije bilo veće, a da se one istovremeno uskraćuju kroz određene mehanizme sistema koji insistira na njihovom zagovaranju. Živimo u vremenu hiperprodukcije informacija svih vrsta i glasovi svih onih koji do sada nisu bili vidljivi imaju mogućnost da se čuju, ali u svem tom mnoštvu dolazi do zaglušenja, pa svijet sve više počinje ličiti na distopijsku viziju Raja Bradberija (Bradbury, 2003) gdje je nemoguće razaznati koji glasovi/informacije su autentični, vrijedni pažnje ili, pak, nepoćudni/neprihvatljivi. Iako se može na prvi pogled učiniti bespredmetnim raspravljati o nekom djelu ili autoru kao kontroverznom u 21. vijeku (šta danas još može biti kontroverzno!?), određeni standard u valorizaciji onoga što je društveno (ne)prihvatljivo trebao bi da postoji. To je osobito važno za institucije kakve su biblioteke – mjesta koja imaju jasnu ulogu u društvu i koja bi istovremeno trebala biti najdemokratičnija na svijetu. Gdje nastaje problem? Problem nastaje kada dođe do tačke sudara onog što se naziva neotuđivo pravo na informaciju – pristup informaciji i pitanja (opravdanosti) ograničenja tih sloboda (**pritom imajući u vidu da nečija sloboda i pravo seže do granica slobode onog drugog!**).

U svijetu gdje gotovo da ne postoje tabu-teme i gdje sve ima svoju tržišnu vrijednost, ko je taj ko može objektivno postaviti granice i dati sebi za pravo da bude arbitar?

Prevedeno na rječnik struke, koja je uloga biblioteke i bibliotekara u svemu tome, na koje aspekte poslovanja se ovakve dileme odražavaju, koja je svrha toga i u kojim slučajevima je bavljenje dilemom “etičko ili estetičko” u bibliotekama opravdano, ako je uopće? Na koncu, koje su posljedice takve prakse – i da li se to može nazvati (opravdanom ili neopravdanom) cenzurom?

U bibliotekama je to, imajući u vidu njenu društvenu ulogu, posebno delikatno pitanje, ali ne može se reći kako ne postoji neka vrsta cenzure, makar se radilo “samo” o selektivnosti prilikom odabira – postavljanja kriterija prema kojima se oni koji

1. Introduction

The democratic society we strive for is a society based on the principles of advocacy for a wide range of human rights and freedoms, including the right to education, the right to free access to information, and freedom of speech. Different social movements throughout history have, each in a unique way, created a social context on this issue.

However, what we are now encountering for the first time is a kind of absurdities stemming from the situation where we live in a time when the propaganda of the mentioned values has never been greater, while at the same time, they are being denied through certain mechanisms of the system that insists on advocating them. We live in a time of hyperproduction of information of all kinds, and the voices of all those who have not been visible until now have the opportunity to be heard, but in all this multitude there is deafening, so the world is starting to resemble Ray Bradbury’s dystopian vision more and more (Bradbury, 2003) where it is impossible to distinguish which voices/information are authentic, worthy of attention or, on the other hand, undesirable/unacceptable. Although at first glance it may seem pointless to discuss a work or an author as controversial in the 21st century (what else can be controversial today!?), a certain standard in the valorisation of what is socially (un)acceptable should exist. This is particularly important for institutions such as libraries – places that have a clear role in society and which at the same time should be the most democratic in the world. Where does the problem arise? The problem arises when there is a collision point between what is called the inalienable right to information – access to information and questions (justification) of restrictions on these freedoms (**while bearing in mind that one’s freedom and right extends to the limits of the other’s freedom!**).

In a world where there are almost no taboo topics and where everything has its market value, who is the one who can objectively set boundaries and claim the right to be the arbiter?

Translated into the vocabulary of the profession, what is the role of the library and librarians in all of this, which aspects of business do such dilemmas reflect, what is the purpose of it, and in which cases is dealing with the “ethical or aesthetic” dilemma in libraries justified, if at all? Finally, what are the consequences of such a practice – and can it be called (justified or unjustified) censorship?

In libraries, bearing in mind its social role, this is a particularly delicate issue, but it cannot be said

učestvuju u kreiranju fondova odlučuju za to šta nabaviti, a šta ne i koji su argumenti za to.

Dakle, težište ovog rada je na promišljanju o dilemama koje se mogu javiti u praksi u određenim segmentima bibliotečkog poslovanja (poput nabavke i kreiranja fondova), gdje za pojedine slučajeve ne postoje jasno propisane smjernice, a mogu rezultirati svojevrsnim vidom “tihe” cenzure.

2. Pozicioniranje biblioteka(ra) između prava i obaveze

Cenzura kao oblik represivnog djelovanja postojala je oduvijek, a poimanje *poželjnog i nepoželjnog* u različitim historijskim periodima i u različitim sredinama bilo je vrlo promjenjiva kategorija, pa je tako poznato da se na listi zabranjenih moglo naći svašta – od Don Kihota do Crvenkapice, od Đordana Bruna do Ane Frank. Načini provedbe cenzure su, pritom, bili različiti.

Mehanizmi i vrste cenzure koje su se primjenjivale za sprječavanje širenja nepoćudne literature imali su različite oblike – od izdavanja popisa zabranjenih knjiga, autocenzure, “preventivne cenzure”, zabrane prodaje nepoželjnih publikacija, do onih sofisticiranih, institucionalnih vidova cenzure poput kontrole štampanja, nabavke ili politike “tihog čišćenja” knjiga u fondovima biblioteka.

Danas se jednim od najčešćih oblika cenzure smatra ograničavanje pristupa i određivanje željenog i neželjenog sadržaja kroz kontrolu pristupa informacijama, stavljanjem adekvatnih oznaka na publikacije i sl. – pod uslovom da uopće govorimo o cenzuri s namjerom. Treba naglasiti da je u praksi nedostupnost određenih naslova najčešće uzrokovana zapravo ograničenim finansijskim sredstvima kojima biblioteke raspolažu za nabavku bibliotečke građe i to nema veze sa ideološkim ili vrijednosnim karakteristikama djela, te su u tim slučajevima bibliotekari prisiljeni svoditi liste deziderata na neki “razuman” broj naslova ili primjeraka i pružati prednost prilikom nabavke određenoj vrsti građe nauštrb neke druge. Veliku ulogu u segmentu nabavke svakako ima i upravljačka politika biblioteke, profil biblioteke, te kakve zbirke biblioteka ima nakanu sakupljati.

Neki vodeći regionalni autori cenzuru vide isključivo kao “...sustav mjera koje poduzimaju vlasti ili oni koji tu vlast predstavljaju, za sprječavanje javnog iznošenja ideja i mišljenja koje vlasti drže oprečnim svojim interesima, odnosno onim moralnim i društvenim normama koje vrijede u određenoj sredini i vremenu” (Stipčević, 1994) ili kao “...nastojanje da se uspostavi kontrola nad javnom cirkulacijom

that there is no kind of censorship, even if it was “only” about selectivity when choosing – setting criteria according to which those who participate in the creation of funds decide what to get and what not to get and what are the arguments for that.

So, the focus of this paper is thinking about dilemmas that can arise in practice in certain segments of library business (such as procurement and creation of funds) where there are no clearly prescribed guidelines for certain cases, but they can result in a kind of “silent” censorship.

2. Positioning of libraries (librarians) between rights and obligations

Censorship as a form of repressive action has always existed, and the concept of what is *desirable* and what is *undesirable* in different historical periods and in different environments was a very variable category, so it is known that on the list of forbidden things, one could find everything – from Don Quixote to Little Red Riding Hood, from Giordano Bruno to Anne Frank. The methods of implementing censorship were different.

The mechanisms and types of censorship that were applied to prevent the spread of undesirable literature took different forms – from issuing a list of prohibited books, self-censorship, “preventive censorship”, banning the sale of undesirable publications, to sophisticated, institutional forms of censorship such as control of printing, procurement or politics “quiet cleaning” of books in library collections.

Today, one of the most common forms of censorship is considered to be limiting access and determining wanted and unwanted content through controlling access to information, placing adequate labels on publications, etc. – on condition that we are talking about intentional censorship at all. It should be emphasized that in practice, the unavailability of certain titles is most often caused by limited financial resources available to libraries for the acquisition of library materials, and this has nothing to do with the ideological or value characteristics of the works, and in these cases, librarians are forced to reduce their wish lists to a “reasonable” number of titles or copies and give advantage when acquiring a certain type of material at the expense of another. The management policy of the library, the profile of the library, and the kind of collections the library intends to collect certainly play a big role in the procurement segment.

neprihvatljivog sadržaja koji je takvim određen na temelju prethodne kvalitativno-političke procjene koju, prema vlastitim kriterijima, provode institucionalni i neinstitucionalni društveni akteri s ciljem oblikovanja sužene javnosti” (Panić, 2017: 30).

Manifestaciju cenzure u biblioteci tematizirala je Aleksandra Horvat i definirala je kao “ograničavanje prava na čitanje i smanjivanje odgovornosti knjižničara” (Horvat, 1994: 1). Autorica se u tekstu poziva na Povelju o bibliotekskim pravima (ALA, 1983: 14), u kojoj se jasno navodi kakav bi trebao biti odnos biblioteke spram bilo koje vrste cenzure, te šta u praksi zapravo znači pozivanje na praktičnu primjenu osnovnog ljudskog prava na obrazovanje i informisanje. U pomenutoj *Povelji* se izravno navodi kako bi se biblioteke trebale opirati cenzuri u ispunjavanju svoje odgovornosti pružanja informacija i prosvjetljenja, te saradivati sa onima koji se opiru ograničavanju slobode izražavanja i slobodnog pristupa idejama. Istovremeno, autorica na neki način amnestira bibliotekare/knjižničare od odgovornosti kroz stav da odgovornost spram nečeg spornog u djelu leži isključivo na autoru. Pa ipak, ovdje treba biti jako pažljiv. Naime, kada se govori o slobodi informiranja i dostupnosti informacija/znanja, govori se o potrebi dokidanja diskriminacije po bilo kojem pitanju u nekoj zajednici ili spram neke korisničke grupe. U Manifestu se navodi: “Zbirke i službe ne smiju biti izložene bilo kakvom obliku ideološke, političke ili vjerske cenzure niti trgovačkim pritiscima” (UNESCO, 1994). **Obezbijediti pristup svima podrazumijeva osigurati pristup za sve grupe korisnika, ali se ne odnosi (ili barem ne bi trebalo!) na svaku vrstu literature ili autora.** Ovdje se, dakle, ne govori o cenzuri kao mjeri represije spram neke društvene grupe, već radije kao instrumentu za suzbijanje potencijalno štetnih i društveno neprihvatljivih sadržaja.

Zapravo se čini kako su se, kada je u pitanju cenzura, biblioteke i bibliotekari našli u procjepu između onog što propisuju zakonodavni akti (zakoni o bibliotekskoj djelatnosti, pravilnici o radu, o sistematizaciji, o uslovima za osnivanje i rad biblioteka i sl.) ili što preporučuju stručne organizacije i određenih zahtjeva koje pred njih stavljaju korisnici ili diktiraju trendovi. Rad javnih biblioteka jasno je regulisan pravnim propisima titulara (finansijera) i internim aktima biblioteke koji su obavezujući. “Svaki sistem narodnih biblioteka zahtijeva pisane smjernice za izgradnju zbirke koje usvaja upravljачko tijelo biblioteke. Svrha smjernica treba biti osiguranje dosljednog pristupa održavanju i razvijanju bibliotekskih zbirki i pristupa građi.” (IFLA, 2009)

Some leading regional authors see censorship exclusively as “(...) a system of measures taken by the authorities or those who represent that authority, to prevent the public presentation of ideas and opinions that the authorities consider contrary to their interests, i.e. those moral and social norms that apply in a certain environment and time” (Stipčević, 1994) or as “(...) an effort to establish control over the public circulation of unacceptable content that is determined as such on the basis of a previous qualitative-political assessment, which, according to their own criteria, is carried out by institutional and non-institutional social actors with the aim of shaping a narrow public” (Panić, 2017: 30).

The manifestation of censorship in the library was thematized by Aleksandra Horvat and defined as “limiting the right to read and reducing the responsibility of librarians” (Horvat, 1994: 1). In the text, the author refers to the Library Bill of Rights (ALA, 2019) which clearly states what should be the library’s attitude towards any type of censorship, and what it actually means in practice to call for the practical application of the basic human right to education and information. The aforementioned Bill directly states that libraries should resist censorship in fulfilling their responsibility to provide information and education and cooperate with those who resist restrictions on freedom of expression and free access to ideas. At the same time, the author in some way amnesties librarians from responsibility through the attitude that responsibility for something disputed in the work lies solely with the author. And yet, you have to be very careful here. Namely, when we talk about freedom of information and the availability of information/knowledge, we are talking about the need to end discrimination on any issue in a community or against a user group. It is stated in the Manifesto: “Collections and services must not be exposed to any form of ideological, political or religious censorship or commercial pressure” (UNESCO, 1994). **Providing access to all means providing access for all groups of users, but it does not (or at least should not!) apply to every type of literature or author.** Here, therefore, we are not talking about censorship as a measure of repression against some social group, but rather as an instrument for suppressing potentially harmful and socially unacceptable content.

In fact, it seems that when it comes to censorship, libraries, and librarians have found themselves in a gap between what legislative acts stipulate (Laws on library function, work regulations, systematiza-

Zakonodavstvo koje se odnosi na biblioteke različito je u zavisnosti od zemlje, ali i tipa biblioteke. Međutim, stručne organizacije poput bibliotekarskih društava, ALA-e, IFLA-e, EBLIDA-e, ili čak UNESCO-a, propagiraju kroz svoje preporuke i manifeste smjernice koje bi trebale biti od pomoći stručnim radnicima u rješavanju mnogih nedoumica u vezi sa praktičnim poslovanjem, ali one za razliku od pomenutih akata nisu obavezujuće. Pred biblioteka je tako stavljen zadatak da ispune obaveze prema zakonodavcu i usklade svoju politiku sa vladajućom jer “oni određuju mjesto javnih biblioteka u širem okviru”¹ (IFLA, 2012), premda se nerijetko čini kako se one samo deklarativno zalažu za demokratske principe. Kada su u pitanju stručne organizacije, na stranici IFLA/FAIFA-e može se naći oko dvadesetak etičkih kodeksa za bibliotekare iz različitih zemalja (IFLA, 2011) koje propagiraju rad biblioteka nezavisan od bilo kakvih političkih ili drugih uticaja. Sve pomenute organizacije kroz svoje povelje, kodekse i preporuke pokušavaju propagirati visok stepen demokratičnosti, sloboda govora i mišljenja, protiveći se bilo kakvom obliku cenzure (Gebolys & Tomaszczyk, 2011). Od stručnih radnika se pritom očekuje visoki profesionalizam u radu i poštovanje etičkih standarda.

- Bibliotekari i drugi informatički radnici striktno su posvećeni neutralnosti i nepristrasnom stavu u pogledu prikupljanja, pristupa i usluga. Neutralnost rezultira najizbalansiranim prikupljanjem i najuravnoteženijim pristupom informacijama.² (IFLA, 2012: 4)
- Bibliotekari ne smiju dopustiti da njihovi osobni stavovi i mišljenja određuju kojim će se članovima zajednice pružiti usluga ili koja će se građa odabrati i ponuditi. (IFLA, 2011: 82)
- Etički kodeks zabranjuje bilo kakve rasne, društvene i nacionalne predrasude.³ (IFLA, 2012: 13)

Ali, kako to zapravo funkcioniše u praksi kada dođe do kolizije između onoga što jeste i onoga kako bi trebalo biti – npr. u segmentu nabavke ili kreiranja fondova?

¹ Primjeri propisa u vezi sa javnim bibliotekama mogu se naći na: <http://www.ifla.org/V/cdoc/acts.htm>

² “Librarians and other information workers are strictly committed to neutrality and an unbiased stance regarding collection, access and service. Neutrality results in the most balanced collection and the most balanced access to information achievable.”

³ “The code of ethics prohibits any racial, social and national prejudices.”

tion, conditions for the establishment and operation of libraries, etc.) or what professional organizations recommend and certain requirements put before them by users or dictated by trends. The work of public libraries is clearly regulated by the legal regulations of the founder (financiers) and the library’s internal acts, which are binding. “Each public library system requires a written collection management policy, endorsed by the governing body of the library service. The aim of the policy should be to ensure a consistent approach to the maintenance and development of the library collections and access to resources” (IFLA, 2009).

Legislation related to libraries is different depending on the country and also on the type of library. However, professional organizations such as library societies, ALA, IFLA, EBLIDA, or even UNESCO, propagate through their recommendations and manifesto guidelines that should be helpful to professionals in solving many doubts related to practical business, but unlike the aforementioned acts, they are not binding. Thus, libraries are given the task of fulfilling their obligations to the legislator and harmonizing their policy with the governing one because “they determine the place of public libraries in a wider framework”¹ (IFLA, 2012), although it often seems that they are only declaratively advocating for democratic principles. When it comes to professional organizations, on the IFLA/FAIFA website it can be found about twenty codes of ethics for librarians from different countries (IFLA, 2011) that promote the work of libraries independent of any political or other influences. All the mentioned organizations, through their bills, codes, and recommendations, try to propagate a high level of democracy, and freedom of speech and opinion, opposing any form of censorship (Gebolys & Tomaszczyk, 2011). Professional workers are expected to be highly professional in their work and respect ethical standards.

- Librarians and other information workers are strictly committed to neutrality and an unbiased stance regarding collection, access and service. Neutrality results in the most balanced collection and the most balanced access to information achievable. (IFLA, 2012: 4)
- Librarians must not allow their personal views and opinions to determine which members of the community will be served or which materials will be selected and offered. (IFLA, 2011: 82)

¹ Examples of regulations related to public libraries can be found at: <http://www.ifla.org/V/cdoc/acts.htm>

3. Između teorije i prakse: rasprava

Tri su ključna kriterija na koja bi u ovom kontekstu posebno trebalo obratiti pažnju kada je u pitanju kreiranje bibliotečkih fondova: selekcija, evaluacija i odgovornost (Perunović, 1997: 14).⁴

“Nabavna politika najbolji je pokazatelj položaja knjižnice u društvu, u njoj se odražavaju sve političke i društvene promjene.” (Stipčević, 1992: 30-31).

Jedno od najkompleksnijih pitanja kada se govori o planiranju nabavke bibliotečke građe i kreiranju fondova jeste ono koje se javlja u slučajevima gdje se suprotstavljaju etički i estetički aspekt nekog djela i kada to postaje problematično prilikom odlučivanja da li jednu takvu “spornu” jedinicu uvrstiti u fond ili ne. **Da li tada načelo estetičnosti i umjetničke vrijednosti koju neko djelo ima, nezavisno od svoje sadržine i ideje koju propagira, treba imati prioritet u odnosu na načelo etičnosti?** Kako u tom slučaju ispoštovati pravo korisnika na informaciju, a ne biti pristrasan ili optužen za subjektivnost, političku ili kakvu drugu nekorektnost i/ili cenzuru? Jer, kako se navodi: od bibliotekara i drugih informacijskih stručnjaka se očekuje da budu striktno posvećeni neutralnosti i nepristrasnom stavu u pogledu prikupljanja, pristupa i usluga, a štiteći svoju poziciju i kredibilitet prisiljeni su da “inzistiraju na tome da se odluke o nabavljanju ili nenabavljanju neke knjige obrazlažu stručnim, a ne političkim, vjerskim, ideološkim i sličnim razlozima. Time što izabire knjige ovisno o stručnim razlozima, knjižničar obavlja selekciju, a što se u određenim slučajevima može posmatrati i kao vid cenzure.” (Stipčević, 1992: 30-31)

Kreiranje fondova ma koje biblioteke izuzetno je složen segment poslovanja i mnogo je parametara potrebno uzeti u obzir prilikom nabavke i selekcije bibliotečke građe. Kada su pitanju javne biblioteke, u razmatranje se uzima recentna i aktuelna produkcija, interes korisnika, potreba za nabavkom deficitarnih naslova koji su ili jako traženi i potrebni, ili izuzetno vrijedni i rijetki, ili su pak u pitanju naslovi za popunjavanje specijalnih zbirki – a sve to nastojeći da se udovolji željama korisnika različitih profila i potreba. U slučaju kontroverznih autora/djela, interes publike i potražnja za njima je uvijek velika, bez obzira na e(ste)tičku dimenziju. Takvi autori i njihova djela će se uvijek naći na listama deziderata. Nije tako teško donijeti odluku

- The code of ethics prohibits any racial, social and national prejudices. (IFLA, 2012: 13)

But how does it actually work in practice when there is a collision between what is and what should be – for example, in the segment of procurement or creation of funds?

3. Between theory and practice: discussion

In this context, there are three key criteria that should be paid particular attention to when it comes to the creation of library collections: selection, evaluation, and responsibility (Perunović, 1997: 14).²

“The acquisition policy is the best indicator of the library’s position in society, it reflects all political and social changes” (Stipčević, 1992: 30-31).

One of the most complex issues when talking about planning the acquisition of library materials and creating funds is one that arises in cases where the ethical and aesthetic aspects of a work are in conflict and when it becomes problematic when deciding whether to include such a “controversial” unit in the fund or not. **Should the principle of aesthetics and artistic value that a work has, regardless of its content and the idea it propagates, have priority over the principle of ethics?** In that case, how to respect the user’s right to information, and not be biased or accused of subjectivity, political or any other incorrectness, and/or censorship?

Because, as it states: librarians and other information professionals are expected to be strictly neutral and impartial with regard to collection, access, and services, and to protect their position and credibility they are forced to “insist that decisions for acquisition or non-acquisition of some book are justified by professional rather than political, religious, ideological and similar reasons. By choosing books depending on professional reasons, the librarian carries out the selection, which in certain cases can be seen as a form of censorship” (Stipčević, 1992: 30-31).

The creation of funds for any library is an extremely complex business segment and many parameters need to be taken into account when acquiring and selecting library materials. When it comes to public libraries, consideration is given to recent and current production, user interest, the need to acquire deficit titles that are either highly sought after and needed, or extremely valuable and rare, or titles to fill special collections – and all of that trying

⁴ Perunović, N. navodi 21 princip, ali u kontekstu problema kojim se ovaj rad bavi, posebno su značajna navedena tri.

² Perunović, N. states 21 principles, but in the context of the problem that this paper deals with, three are particularly significant.

o tome da li nabaviti ili ne takav naslov ukoliko se prilikom nabavke kao jedan od prioriteta postavi kriterij estetike. Biblioteka ne bi trebala nužno biti u obavezi da udovolji željama korisnika po svaku cijenu, misleći pritom na onu vrstu “šund” literature koja jeste legitimna, ali svojim sadržajem i upitnim kvalitetom ne korespondira sa primarnom zadaćom biblioteke, a to je da odgaja i oblikuje ukus korisnika. Mnogo ozbiljniji problem nastaje kada je u pitanju postavljanje kriterija koji zalaze u sferu etike.

Dileme koje tjeraju na razmišljanje su vezane za autore i/ili djela koji su iz bilo kojeg razloga subverzivni, provokativni, neki na granici dobrog ukusa (tzv. šund literatura), da je nemoguće ne zapitati se kako ih, iz perspektive bibliotekara, tretirati. S obzirom na preporuke, koje ne moraju biti obavezujuće i nerijetko su samo deklarativne,⁵ čini se da su dileme koje ostaju na teret bibliotekarima nepremostive.

S jedne strane, javne biblioteke su dužne obezbijediti korisnicima knjige koje potražuju s obzirom na to da su oni ti koji kroz budžet finansiraju rad biblioteke; također, podrazumijeva se da bi svaka ozbiljna javna biblioteka na svojim policama morala imati velikane svjetske književnosti, barem one koji se smatraju klasicima, nagrađivane autore, građu koja pruža različite perspektive na određene događaje i pitanja, a pritom imati u vidu i da “...građa se ne smije isključivati zbog porijekla, prošlosti ili stavova onih koji su doprinijeli njezinom stvaranju” (ALA, 2019).

Sa druge strane, a referirajući se na ovo posljednje – da li treba postaviti granicu i gdje prilikom odluke da li finansirati i propagirati kroz svoje fondove autore ili djela koja baštine ideje koje su u suprotnosti sa idealima demokratskog i slobodnog društva i da li je opravdano pokleknuti spram diktata tržišta ne obazirući se pretjerano na načela struke?

“Onaj knjižničar koji dobro zna da ono što radi bi se moglo okarakterisati (op. a.) kao cenzura, naći će za svoje postupke valjanih opravdanja u postojećim propisima, u prilikama koje ga okružuju, u javnim ili prikrivenim pritiscima kojima je izvrnut.” (Stipčević, 1992: 18)

Zakon o bibliotečkoj djelatnosti, pravilnici o poslovanju biblioteka, uputstva za formiranje zbirki i sl. dobrim dijelom nastoje postaviti principe poslovanja, ali njima nisu u mogućnosti razriješiti dileme

to satisfy the wishes of users of different profiles and needs. In the case of controversial authors/works, the audience’s interest and demand for the same is always high, regardless of the ethical or aesthetic dimension. Such authors and their works will always be on desideratum lists. It is not so difficult to make a decision on whether or not to acquire such a title if the criterion of aesthetics is set as one of the priorities during procurement. The library should not necessarily be obliged to satisfy the wishes of the users at all costs, thinking of the kind of “pot-boiler” literature that is legitimate, but with its content and questionable quality does not correspond to the library’s primary task, which is to educate and formulate users’ taste. A much more serious problem arises when it comes to setting criteria that fall into the sphere of ethics.

Thought-provoking dilemmas are related to authors and/or works that are, for any reason, subversive, provocative, some on the border of good taste (so-called pot-boiler literature), that it is impossible, from the librarian’s perspective, not to wonder how to treat them. With regard to recommendations that do not have to be binding and are often only declarative,³ it seems that the dilemmas facing librarians are impassable.

On the one hand, public libraries are obliged to provide users with the books they request, given that they are the ones who finance the work of the library through the budget; also, it goes without saying that every serious public library would have to have on its shelves the great ones of world literature, at least those who are considered classics, award-winning authors, materials that provide different perspectives on certain events and issues, while keeping in mind that “(...) material should not be excluded because of the origin, past or stands of those who contributed to its creation” (ALA, 1983: 14).

On the other hand, and referring to the latter – should we set a limit when deciding whether to finance and propagate through our fund’s authors or works that inherit ideas that contradict the ideals of a democratic and free society and whether it is justified to give in against the dictates of the market without paying too much attention to the principles of the profession?

“The librarian who knows well that what she/he does could be characterized (author’s note) as censorship, will find valid justifications for hers/his actions in

⁵ Npr. u Etičkom kodeksu bibliotekara BiH (BAM, 2007) navodi se: “Mi **podržavamo** principe, intelektualne slobode i protivimo se svim oblicima cenzure...”

³ E.g. in the Code of Ethics of BH Librarians is stated: “We **support** principles, intellectual freedom and oppose all forms of censorship...”

u svakom pojedinom slučaju (Zakon o bibliotečkoj djelatnosti KS, čl. 12)⁶ i obično su formulirani na način da građa treba biti raznovrsna, dostupna širokom krugu korisnika, slijediti standarde i biti relevantna za postizanje ciljeva biblioteke.

Uzmimo za primjer Hitlerovu knjigu *Mein Kampf*, *Protokol sionskih mudraca* ili Célineovu *Bagatelu za jedan masakr*. Osim u slučajevima eksplicitnog propagiranja nečeg štetnog ili (posebno na ovim prostorima aktualnog i problematičnog) tendencioznog historijskog revizionima, **pitanje diskreditacije je nerijetko pitanje tumačenja** (jer kako drugačije objasniti da je neka knjiga ili autor u određenom periodu zabranjena, dok u nekom drugom biva uvrštena u obaveznu lekturu).

Sraz između etičkog i estetičkog upravo na primjeru pomenutog Célinea odlično je svojevremeno poentirala Mirjana Miočinović. Célinea drži za jednog od najvećih francuskih pisaca 20. vijeka, ali i tvorcem antisemitskog spisa *Bagatela za jedan masakr*, te za njega kaže: “Taj veliki pisac, s knjigama u milionskim tiražima (sa izuzetkom pomenute Bagatele), nema niti će, verujem, ikada imati ulicu ili spomenik, ne samo u Parizu, no ni u jednom gradiću u kojem je, menjajući mesta, živeo. Verujem, mada za to nemam lično pouzdane dokaze, da ni Knut Hamsun nema u Oslu, niti bilo gde drugde, svoju ulicu ili spomenik. Jednom notornom kvislingu u civilizovanim zemljama ne upućuje se ta vrsta počasti, kao ni onom koji je napisao spis koji je stvorio (a verovatno i dalje stvara) hiljade ostrašćenih antisemita.” (Miočinović, 2015)

Ne treba ići dalje od površnog pregleda online kataloga pa zaključiti kako većina javnih biblioteka posjeduje pomenuti *Mein Kampf*, i to u otvorenom pristupu.⁷ Ono što je jako važno primijetiti jest da većina izdanja ima i popratni, nemali predgovor ili pogovor. Druga dva navedena naslova je, s druge strane, mnogo teže naći. Pa ipak, bez obzira na problematičnu reputaciju autora, nemoguće je danas zamisliti ozbiljnu biblioteku bez remek-djela svjetske književnosti poput *Putovanja nakraj noći*, *Gladi*, *Limenog doboša* i sl.

Pribjegavati kompromisu se čini kao najrealnije rješenje. Dakle, u slučaju ideološki/moralno/etički problematičnih autora/djela omogućiti nabavku minimalnog broja primjeraka uz imperativ estetskog kriterija, ali ograničiti pristup ili nabavljati izdanja sa kvalitetnim kritičkim osvrtima na to određeno

the existing regulations, in the circumstances that surround her/him, in the public or covert pressures to which she/he is subjected” (Stipčević, 1992: 18).

The Law on Library Function, the Regulations on Library Work, the Guidelines for Building the Collections, etc., for the most part, try to set the principles of work, but they are not able to resolve dilemmas in each individual case (The Law on Library Activity of Sarajevo Canton, Article 12)⁴ and are usually formulated in such a way that the material should be diverse, accessible to a wide range of users, follow standards and be relevant to the achievement of the library’s goals.

Take for example Hitler’s book *Mein Kampf*, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, or Céline’s *Trifles for a Massacre* (*Bagatelles pour un massacre*). Except in cases of explicit propagation of something harmful or (especially in these areas current and problematic) tendentious historical revisions, **the question of discrediting is often a question of interpretation** (because how else to explain that a certain book or author is banned in a certain period, while in another it is included in mandatory reading).

Mirjana Miočinović perfectly pointed out the collision between the ethical and the aesthetic in the example of the aforementioned Céline. She considers Céline as one of the greatest French writers of the 20th century, but also as a writer of the anti-Semitic writings *Trifles for a Massacre*, and says about it: “This great writer, with books in millions of copies (with the exception of the aforementioned *Bagatelles*), does not have and, I believe, will never have a street or a monument, not only in Paris but not in any small town that he lived in while changing places. I believe, although I personally do not have reliable evidence for this, that Knut Hamsun does not have his own street or monument in Oslo, or anywhere else. A notorious quisling in civilized countries is not given that kind of honour, nor is one who wrote a book that created (and probably still creates) thousands of enraged anti-Semites” (Miočinović, 2015).

One should not go further than a superficial review of the online catalogue and conclude that most public libraries have the aforementioned *Mein Kampf* in open access.⁵ What is very important to note is that most editions also have an accompanying, not-so-small foreword or afterword. The other two mentioned titles, on the other hand, are much harder

⁶ Istovjetan tekst Zakona je naveden i u članu 11. Zakona o bibliotečkoj djelatnosti RBiH, “Sl. list” br. 37/95.

⁷ Vidi: <https://bh.cobiss.net/>

⁴ The same text of the Law is also stated in Article 11. of the Law on Library Function of RB&H, “Official Journal” No. 37/95.

⁵ See: <https://bh.cobiss.net/>

djelo. U tom slučaju, oni koji imaju stvarnu potrebu u vidu naučnog istraživanja ili proučavanja tog djela u bilo kojem smislu, te ozbiljnim čitateljima koji žele kritički promišljati o njemu, djelo treba učiniti dostupnim. Svako ozbiljno djelo treba naći svoje mjesto na bibliotečkoj polici, ali u određenim specifičnim slučajevima ograničenje pristupa tom djelu može spriječiti štetu koja bi inače potencijalno mogla biti izazvana njegovom širom upotrebom ili neadekvatnim interpretacijama.

Kada pak govorimo o literaturi gdje lična reputacija autora nije upitna, ali jeste kvalitet djela, postoji rizik da primjena “dobronamjerne cenzure” tada bude tumačena kao skliznuće u drugu krajnost i neku vrstu isforsiranog puritanizma ili “filistarskog licemjerja” (Pančić, 2001). Ovdje bismo se mogli složiti sa stavom da je, u slučaju popularne literature, odgovornost na korisniku – osim, naravno, kada su u pitanju mlađi čitatelji.

Insistiranje na političkoj korektnosti kao drugoj krajnosti koja se, s pravom, često problematizira, također može predstavljati zamku prilikom određivanja kriterija za odabir bibliotečke građe i rezultirati onim što je Teofil Pančić u jednom svom tekstu nazvao “Tiranijom Dobrih Namjera” (Pančić, 2001).⁸ Na tom tragu, Stipčević pronicljivo primjećuje kako će “u budućnosti svaka pojedina grupacija u društvu (feministkinje, LGBTQ, rasne manjine, nacionalne manjine, pristalice marginalnih političkih stranaka, pripadnici različitih religija i sekti, hendikepirani, bolesnici zaraženi AIDS-om i dr.) moći povlačiti pitanje svog prezentiranja u knjigama i ostaloj građi te da će to predstavljati probleme s kojima će se knjižnice morati suočiti, posebice kad se uzme u obzir da su neka od tih spornih djela nacionalni klasici ili djela neupitne umjetničke kvalitete” (Stipčević, 1992: 117).

⁸ U svom osvrtu na knjigu Dubravke Ugrešić *Zabranjeno čitanje*, Pančić dalje piše: “...‘Aktivistički’ duh, kojem je najvažnije da nešto bude politički korektno, low-fat, minority-friendly i sl., pa makar bilo slaba literatura ili ne bilo literatura uopšte, može da produkuje onu vrstu ‘gleichhaltunga’ u kojem se – posve nepatetično shvaćeni – smisao umetničkog gubi u Tiraniji Dobrih Namjera...U permisivnoj kulturi u kojoj se ama baš svako poziva na ‘pravo na svoj glas’, više se nijedan glas uistinu ne čuje i više nijedan glas nije zaista važan...” Autor potom zaključuje kako izlaz iz ove zamke svakako nije u petparačkom “Povratku Tradicionalnim Vrednostima...”, te smatra kako “...svespasavajućeg izlaza zapravo i nema: nepopulistička umetnost uvek će biti suprotstavljena uvek novim manifestovanjima filistarskog duha, koji i te kako može imati i demokratsko ruho, pošto je ono autoritarno već tako beznadno iskompromitovano...” Dalje, naslanjajući se na tezu da je danas sve postalo žrtvom tržišta, nazivajući to “čudesnim svetom književnog merkantilizma Zapada”, on konstatuje kako “...prodaja postaje keyword, jedino o čemu se zaista vodi računa; dobro, možda to i nije baš od juče ovako, ali sada već polako izumiru i one slادنjave strategije prikrivanja koje su imale pokazati kako je estetska vrednost – bila ona ‘utrživa’ ili ne – i dalje ono jedino o čemu se vodi računa.”

to find. And yet, regardless of the problematic reputation of the author, it is impossible to imagine a serious library today without masterpieces of world literature such as *Journey to the End of the Night* (*Voyage au bout de la nuit*), *Hunger* (*Sult*), *The Tin Drum* (*Die Blechtrommel*), etc.

Resorting to a compromise seems like the most realistic solution. Therefore, in the case of ideologically/morally/ethically problematic authors/works, enable the acquisition of a minimum number of copies with the imperative of aesthetic criteria, but limit access or acquire editions with high-quality critical reviews of that specific work. In that case, for those who have a real need in the form of scientific research or study of that work in any sense, and serious readers who want to think critically about it, the work should be made available. Each serious work should find its place on the library shelf, but in certain specific cases, limiting access to it can prevent harm that could otherwise potentially be caused by its widespread use or inadequate interpretations.

When we talk about literature, where the personal reputation of the author is not questionable, but the quality of the work is, there is a risk that the application of “benevolent censorship” can then be interpreted as slippage to the other extreme and some kind of forced Puritanism or “philistine hypocrisy” (Pančić, 2001). Here, one might agree with the view that, in the case of popular literature, the responsibility lies with the user – except, of course, when it comes to younger readers.

Insisting on political correctness as the other extreme, which, rightly, is often problematic, can also be a trap when determining the criteria for the selection of library material and can result in what Teofil Pančić in one of his texts called the “Tyranny of Good Intentions” (Pančić, 2001).⁶ On this track,

⁶ In his review of Dubravka Ugrešić’s book *Forbidden Reading*, Pančić further writes: “...‘Activist’ spirit, for whom the most important thing is for something to be politically correct, low-fat, minority-friendly, etc., even if it is weak literature or no literature at all, can produce the kind of ‘gleichhaltung’ in which – completely unapathetically understood – the meaning of art is lost in the Tyranny of Good Intentions... In a permissive culture where everyone calls for the ‘right to their voice’, no voice is really heard anymore, and no voice is really important anymore.” The author then concludes: “the way out of this trap is certainly not in the two-bit Return to Traditional Values...” and thinks that “...there is actually no all-saviour way out: non-populist art will always be opposed to always new manifestations of the philistine spirit, who can also have a democratic attire, since the authoritarian one is already so hopelessly compromised (...)” Further, relying on the thesis that today everything has become a victim of the market, calling it “the wonderful world of literary mercantilism of the West”, he states how “...sale becomes a keyword, the only thing that is really taken care of; well, maybe it’s not like this since yesterday, but now those mushy concealment strategies that were supposed to show the aesthetic value are slowly dying out – whether it is ‘marketable’ or not – still is the only thing that is taken care of.”

Na kraju, pitanje koje se ovdje nameće je kolike mogu/trebaju biti ingerencije i kompetencije bibliotekara kada je u pitanju društvena odgovornost, a s obzirom na odgojnu/prosvjetiteljsku ulogu koju biblioteke po svojoj definiciji imaju – rame uz rame sa osiguravanjem prava na informaciju i čitanje?

4. Zaključak

U čitavoj ovoj zavrslami postoji i nešto pozitivno. Sve pomenuto evidentno pobija tezu o upitnosti potrebe opstanka biblioteka u budućnosti. Po svemu sudeći, čini se kako će ona biti još i veća, zbog potrebe da se, uz pomoć instrumenata i alata koji su bibliotekarima na raspolaganju, pokuša uvesti “red” i na neki način bude lakmus papir za procjenu kvaliteta (izvora) znanja i informacija koje nam se plasiraju. Kreiranje fondova bazirano na visokim kriterijima selekcije tako bi trebalo postati možda i najozbiljniji segment poslovanja.

Važno je, na kraju, naglasiti da se ono o čemu se promišlja u ovom radu nikako ne odnosi na već zakonski regulirana rješenja ili aktivnosti koje potpadaju pod krivičnu odgovornost, a tiču se definiranja slobode govora i izražavanja (sankcionisanje govora mržnje). Ovdje je riječ o dilemama za koje nema jasno propisane regulative ili protokola i gdje se profesionalac (bibliotekar) treba osloniti isključivo na vlastitu prosudbu.

Kako smo više puta konstatovali, postoje načelne preporuke, smjernice i načini da biblioteke sačuvaju svoj integritet praveći otklon od (auto)cenzure ukoliko takve tendencije postoje, a da istovremeno ispoštuju i kriterij etike i estetike. Ono najpotrebnije je definiranje što preciznije politike biblioteke spram ovakvih, delikatnih pitanja kroz donošenje internih akata i općih preporuka krovnih stručnih organizacija, kroz kreiranje smjernica za nabavnu politiku i korištenje bibliotekarskih fondova (određivanje i definiranje neke vrste ograničenog ili kontroliranog pristupa problematiziranim jedinicama fonda). Drugi bitan korak bi bio otvoreno javno zagovaranje i propagiranje poštovanja ljudskih prava i intelektualnih sloboda, te insistiranje na suzbijanju loših pojava u društvu kroz društveno angažirano poslovanje (postavljanje jasnih kriterija o tome šta jeste dobro i korisno, propagiranje humanističkih vrijednosti, potenciranje odgojne uloge biblioteka, odgovornost autora, upoznavanje korisnika sa stvarnom ulogom i zadaćama biblioteka i sl.). Samo tako je moguće izmiriti kontradikcije proistekle iz kolizije onoga što propisuje zakon o dužnosti biblioteka da obezbijede pristup informacijama i naprave totalni, neselekti-

Stipčević astutely observes that “in the future, every single group in society (feminists, LGBTQ, racial minorities, national minorities, supporters of marginal political parties, members of different religions and sects, the handicapped, patients infected with AIDS, etc.) be able to raise the issue of its presentation in books and other materials and that this will represent problems that libraries will have to face, especially when it is taken into account that some of these controversial works are national classics or works of unquestionable artistic quality” (Stipčević, 1992: 117).

In the end, the question that arises here is how much authority and competence librarians can/should have when it comes to social responsibility, and considering the educational/enlightening role that libraries have by definition – side by side with ensuring the right to information and reading?

4. Conclusion

There is something positive in this whole conundrum. All of the above obviously refutes the thesis about the questionable need for the survival of libraries in the future. By all accounts, it seems that it will be even greater due to the need to, with the help of instruments and tools available to librarians, try to introduce “order” and in some way be a litmus paper for assessing the quality (source) of knowledge and information which are marketed to us. The creation of funds based on high selection criteria should thus become perhaps the most serious work segment.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that what is discussed in this paper does not in any way refer to already legally regulated solutions or activities that fall under criminal liability and concerns the definition of freedom of speech and expression (sanctioning of hate speech). Here we are talking about dilemmas for which there are no clearly prescribed regulations or protocols and where the professional (librarian) must rely solely on its own judgment.

As we have stated several times, there are principle recommendations, guidelines, and ways for libraries to preserve their integrity by avoiding (self) censorship if such tendencies exist, while at the same time respecting the criteria of ethics and aesthetics.

The most necessary thing is to define as precisely as possible the policy of the library in relation to such delicate issues through the adoption of internal acts and general recommendations of umbrella

van otklon od bilo koje vrste cenzure i moralnog imperativa proisteklog iz bibliotečke prakse koja u svojoj suštini ima za cilj odgoj i obrazovanje korisnika i afirmaciju društva u cjelini.

professional organizations through the creation of guidelines for procurement policy and the use of library funds (determining and defining some kind of limited or controlled access to problematic fund units). Another important step would be open public advocacy and propaganda of respect the human rights and intellectual freedoms, and insisting on suppressing bad phenomena in society through socially engaged business (setting clear criteria about what is good and useful, propaganda of humanistic values, enhancing the educational role of libraries, author's responsibility, introducing users to the real role and tasks of libraries, etc.). Only in this way is it possible to reconcile the contradictions arising from the collision of what the law prescribes regarding the duty of libraries to provide access to information and make a total, non-selective deflection from any type of censorship and moral imperative arising from library practice, which in its essence aims to up bring and educate users and affirmation of society as a whole.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

- ALA. (2019). *Library Bill of Rights*. <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill>.
- BAM. (2007). *Etički kodeks bibliotekara Bosne i Hercegovine*. <http://www.bam.ba/eticki-kodeks-2/>.
- Basara, S. (2015, Juni 15). Etičko čišćenje. *Danas*. <https://www.danas.rs/kolumna/svetislav-basara/eticko-ciscenje/>.
- Bradbury, R. (2003). *Farenhajt 451*. Beograd: Laguna.
- Crnogorac, V. (2018). *Javne biblioteke i demokratija*. Beograd: Clio.
- Gebolys, Z., & Tomaszczyk, J. (2011). *Library Codes of Ethics Worldwide: Anthology* [Elektronski izvor]. Berlin: Simon Verlag fur Bibliothekswissen. https://books.google.ba/books?id=IqoN_CJz-kQ0C&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false.
- Hebrang-Grgić, I. (2008). Cenzura – neizostavan čimbenik razvoja ljudske misli i društva. U: Tuđman, M. (ur.). *Aleksandru Stipčeviću s poštovanjem* (str. 135-165). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet. <http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/id/eprint/9737/1/CenzuraIHG.pdf>.
- Horvat, A. (1994). Pravo na čitanje. U: Šeta, V. (ur.). *Razvijanje čitateljskih interesa i navika putem školske knjižnice: zbornik radova. Proljećna škola školskih knjižničara Republike Hrvatske, Crikvenica 1993*. Rijeka: Ministarstvo prosvjete, kulture i športa Hrvatske. <https://library.foi.hr/dbook/index.php?B=&C=1929&stranica=00011>.
- IFLA/UNESCO. (1994). *IFLA-in i UNESCO-ov manifest za narodne knjižnice*. http://dzs.ffzg.unizg.hr/text/UNESCOv_manifest_za_narodne_knjiznice.htm.
- IFLA/UNESCO. (2009). *Smjernice za razvoj javnih biblioteka*. Tešanj: Opća biblioteka.
- IFLA/FAIFE. (2012). *Professional codes of ethics for librarians*. <https://www.ifla.org/g/faife/professional-codes-of-ethics-for-librarians/>.
- Koontz, C., & Gubbin, B. (ur.). (2011). *IFLA-ine smjernice za narodne knjižnice*. Zagreb: HKD.
- Miočinović, M. (2015, Juni 20). O piscima i počastima. *Peščanik.net*. <https://pescanik.net/o-piscima-i-pocastima/?fbclid=IwAR1SFrbnJbWZDndS2COCXAS4BhK7M6BWCT3EMBWo3hPZ-K0HBntE7oyzL7ok>.
- Panić, M. (2017). Cenzura odozdo: prilog teorijskoj raspravi o cenzuri. *Vjesnik bibliotekara Hrvatske* 60(4), 25-44. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/288848>.
- Pančić, T. (2001, Septembar 13). "Zabranjeno čitanje" [Prikaz knjige *Zabranjeno čitanje*, od D. Ugrešić]. *Vreme*, 558. <https://www.vreme.com/kultura/zabranjeno-citanje/>.
- Perunović, N. (1997). *Principi nabavne politike u bibliotekama*. Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević.
- Stipčević, A. (1992). *Cenzura u knjižnicama*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, Zavod za informacijske studije Odsjeka za informacijske znanosti.
- Stipčević, A. (1994). *O savršenom cenzoru ili ti Priručnik protiv štetnih knjiga i njihovih autora*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Zakon o bibliotečkoj djelatnosti RBiH. (1995). *Službeni list Republike Bosne i Hercegovine*, br. 37/95. <https://fmks.gov.ba/kultura/legislativa/fbih/36.pdf>.
- Zakon o bibliotečkoj djelatnosti KS. (1999). *Službene novine Kantona Sarajevo*, br. 4/99. https://www.bgs.ba/storage/2022/03/zakon_o_biblioteckoj_djelatnosti.pdf.