

Lambertson, Jesse Alonzo

May 2011 – Copy-Edited Mar 2012

(Terror-War Funding in Universities and Libraries)

A White Paper on how Military Funding's Relatively New Connection to the Research University and the Library-as-Liberal-Space don't Settle Together.

Introduction.

There exist no complete suggestions for handling the issue of how the War on Terror and the PATRIOT Act of 2001 has affected universities and libraries. The goal of this paper - to draw attention to "Tensions Caused by the War on Terrorism in Universities and Libraries." None of the sources herein stake a clear claim for what decisions university administrators and librarians should make in the face of military funding, its stipulations of silence and classification and the counter-drive to search for information – especially information that encourages a dissident view from that of power. It is up to each person to make decisions according to his/her own conscience as the elements involved in the actions taken by the Pentagon in regards to university funding, its controls, and libraries expose a number of assumptions.¹ Some of the same issues affect public libraries in regards to The PATRIOT Act. But academic libraries are a rare breed because they sit at just the space where military funding comes together at the university and are thus uniquely useful to investigate the directives and controls of those funds.

The decisions are tough and the required information contains deep nuance. For these questions reflect stances on: National security and the rhetoric that important technical information must be classified and monetarily controlled by the government² ; how one should build their professional lives and model their careers³ ; how high-technology is controlled closely by military funding⁴ ; how "cultures" are created (rather, how we arrive at knowledge of them) through funding initiatives by the military and other "non-profit" foundations that work hand in hand with the government since after World War 1⁵ ; how the military, working with the FBI, continues to halt research and reading at libraries with not only the PATRIOT Act (which came into being after 9/11 in October, 2001), but also with earlier federal actions against library patrons⁶ ; how library patrons and librarians may resist the effects of the PATRIOT Act's Section 215⁷ ; and how to question the validity of the PATRIOT Act's implications for libraries and universities along with other abstract concepts associated with the PATRIOT Act and the War on Terror.⁸ I say again, these are not easy questions to answer. This White Paper lays out a structure for thinking about these tensions and states that as libraries are traditionally a very liberal space, they can be used to find information to speak truth to power. And since much funding passes through universities, the academic library should be used to an even greater extent to find necessary information on these funds. The tensions are thus at the intersection between militarized funding models that classify information and determine departmental research directions while the academic library that has access

to just the resources that can be used to question those directions and the other controls because it may be the one space that represents people can think in ways outside of that militarized model – the library is an abstraction that represents possibility.

Military Funding: Science/Technology.

DARPA⁹ (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency), the Pentagon research arm, has been funding technology research for years and much of that money has gone to universities. John Edwards assesses the seed at the beginning-history of Department of Defense projects. He writes academic military research began in the days of the Manhattan Project and continues. Edwards quotes M. Mitchell Waldrop, an NSF spokesman, who says, “In a sense, we’re sort of a military application ourselves,” says Waldrop, referring to the NSF’s launch in 1950 as part of the government’s plan to boost scientific research at the start of the Cold War.”¹⁰ And Jeff Guntzel brushes his gloss on military academic research -“In 1958, the Department of Defense spent an already impressive \$91 million in support of 'academic research.' By 1964, the sum had reached \$258 million and by 1970, in the midst of the Vietnam War, \$266 million...”¹¹

It is not clear military research funds have lessened as there seems some disagreement whether the funds have decreased, flat-lined or increased since the War on Terror began. For instance, John Markoff writes that the Pentagon has underwritten many long-term “Blue Sky”¹² projects at universities, but David Patterson, a computer scientist from UC Berkeley, complains that the new classified funding model followed by the Pentagon will disable future technology-work. In response to queries on this topic, DARPA “revealed that within a relatively steady budget for computer science research that rose slightly from \$546 million in 2001 to \$583 million last year, the portion going to university researchers has fallen from \$214 million to \$123 million.” DARPA has felt the need since 9/11 to fund more classified terrorist-oriented projects and relies more heavily on corporate research.¹³ Markoff’s data shows one perception. But it also touches on the classification issue, a factor that plays a major role in how military funding affects actual research and access to said research. Markoff goes on to write, “Virtually every aspect of information technology upon which we rely today bears the stamp of federally sponsored university research,” said Ed Lazowska, a computer scientist at the University of Washington and co-chairman of the advisory panel. “The federal government is walking away from this role, killing the goose that laid the golden egg.” And, as of November, 2007, the Pentagon has put a cap on all of its funded projects which stipulates that no more than 35% of the total monies can be used for overhead. But as University research overhead sits around 34%, this new stricture will affect projects undertaken.¹⁴ Some scientists are aware that their work is changing as those “Blue Sky” projects turn into strictly military projects. Still, a change of funded projects does not mean that less money is available.

For instance, the Department of Homeland Security, which came into existence in 2003, has asked that colleges and universities start providing classes that relate to security and counter-terrorism.¹⁵ And it has been looking for a university at which to house a facility that would centralize anti-terror think-tanks and research.¹⁶ This is not strictly a funding issue directly, but it does speak to the potential for a kind of “spirit of the future” to which monies could be tied to militarization of campuses.¹⁷ It is

also a worthy matrix in which to think through other examples. For instance, Charles Dervarics writes (2002) that anti-terrorism funding models from the Pentagon will feature training grounds for terrorist attack first responders, features funded projects for research universities and that the contracts that encapsulate these projects will be handled in the way as every other Defense contract.¹⁸ For instances of current DARPA projects: MIT is (as of 2006) developing technology that allows for airplane wings to change shape. One of the scientists involved (Yet-Ming Chiang) think it may be adaptable to morphable submarines; At University of California-Davis, S.J. Ben Yoo plans to take a huge chunk of DARPA funds (I assume some part of \$9.5 million set aside for just this) to develop optical data technology that increases speeds for information transmission; And at UCLA, Bahram Jalali has received DARPA funding to further develop technology that makes use of energy that is normally lost in heat/friction.¹⁹ And Judith Reppy writes about how the National Institute of Health funding cycle began to wind down but that the Pentagon started funding new Bio-Weapons projects at that same moment – with a few universities such as Texas A&M, Michigan State and University of Minnesota listed as recipients of these funds.

So it is not clear that monies from the Department of Defense are decreasing as many other projects have taken off during this last decade. What is clear, however, is the new direction and “focus” of those projects.²⁰ They are clearly becoming more tightly determined, not the same as those “Blue Sky” projects mentioned above. A major tension with the increase of military, specifically weapons projects, funding is that there are more classification stipulations. The question of whether the public has access to university research after it has been underwritten by private interests is a question with which one must struggle.²¹ But this question becomes even more crucial as the “private” underwriter is the government itself and the institution is not only a university, but specifically a public university.²² The Pentagon, besides restricting what “foreign” researchers can do on military funded projects and what they can “see,”²³ has also asked that results gathered from its funded projects be classified and that previous results that were formerly un-classified but get classified later must have all pointers to them removed. Part of the justification for this is not only that “the enemy” will gather information, but in fact that proponents suggest universities may be training grounds for terrorists.²⁴ This “national security” arrangement impressed upon universities and researchers, the top in their fields most of the time because the government is trying to work with only the best, creates a tension as these researchers will be barred from doing their job as engaged researchers – even within only the domain of their fields. Not only does this funding model present a tension for professionals in academic research, but as the rhetoric has dropped open “Blue Sky” projects for classified projects, it becomes less obvious to many that the projects have anything to do with the American people or students who go to university in order to learn to sift through data in whatever fields they may be interested.

Military Funding: Social Science.

The Pentagon funds not only technology. The Military also commissions studies in the social sciences by way of The Minerva Initiative. The Minerva Initiative states in its Mission: ““The Minerva Initiative is a Department of Defense-sponsored, university-based social science research umbrella launched...in 2008 focused on areas of strategic importance to U.S. national security policy. The goal of the Minerva Initiative

is to improve DoD's basic understanding of the social, cultural, behavioral, and political forces that shape regions of the world of strategic importance to the U.S."²⁵ The reason this counts as a tension is that it implies militarism of culture globally. Not that all cultures will become militaristic, but rather that the worldview of the military and its weighty dollars will focus the types of things studied and considered valuable about global "culture." The intent, according to Minerva's mission statement, is to deepen the use of the top research universities across all "necessary" fields. These needs are listed, in part, as extending to the disciplines of: history, Arabic studies and Mandarin studies. Thomas Mahnken, deputy assistant secretary of defense for policy planning, said, "Minerva's focus is on basic research and developing the skills in academia and the insight in academia that we need to understand other cultures for a variety of purposes."²⁶

The use of the vague phrase, "for a variety of purposes," hides a lot.²⁷ The questions being asked by one field taken under the military's wings for a long time, Anthropology, indicate some of the worry that is implied by those "variety of purposes." For instances: Aiyer Ananthakrishnan et al state clearly in their article that they have real worries about how decisions are made and what questions are asked by the deep pockets of whoever funds projects;²⁸ Arkansas Sen. William J. Fulbright (1905-95) said, "In lending itself too much to the purposes of government, a university fails its higher purposes;"²⁹ and John Hogan discusses Auguste Comte, John Stuart Mill's (the archetypal liberal) being influenced by him and that Auguste Comte even influenced Karl Marx. Hogan reads Comte to say that the social sciences [sociologie] should be the first science because it is the moral framework upon which all other research is performed.³⁰ What "moral framework" is...is another question, but these are the tension-types Anthropologists have pondered since the War on Terror began and if we can interpret Fulbright's comment about universities failing in their higher purpose, then let's suggest that one of those goals could be the hard task of investigating any topic in order to shed truth on the matter, no matter who may be guilty and no matter the changes that may have to occur as a result of truth being investigated and revealed.

To explore that notion of truth revealed a little further, here are a few case items to ponder. Catherine Lutz observes The Minerva Initiative's goal is to use the university as a culture think-tank and that much funding in this initiative is hidden from Congress. But she also historicizes the Department of Defense's use of the social sciences amidst the rise of the "national security" state. She writes that anthropologists were used to write on the Japanese (World War 2) and later the Soviets (Cold War). She notes that the end of the Cold War marked a time in which a few anthropologists began studying the US Military itself and says that the HTS (Human Terrain System), a cultural studies element of the military, has helped some commanders better decide who really was an "enemy." She also states that the university has invested highly in the national security state and that it [the university] has internalized the ideology the state. What would Fulbright say about this? She details percentages of funds coming from the military: 41% of all university engineering dollars from federal sources comes from the Military as well as 45% of all graduate student funding in computer science and that the point of the large dollars is to hold researchers on retainer. She cites the example at Brown University (where she works) where military funds have driven research on Iraqi terrorists and the Chinese Military. But she concludes with the statement that anthropologists should be

studying the culture of the military with greater scrutiny.³¹ It seems perfectly reasonable that academic social scientists should be able to turn their gazes on the military itself. But with these new directives and funding models, it will be harder and harder to do that. In fact, it becomes harder to question what a social scientist is if the supposed not-for-profit institutions that employ them accept monies that discourage social scientists from doing their jobs.

Lutz is not the only person that sees the troubles brewing within the Social Sciences in this era of projects funded with militaristic ends. David Price, in his Plenary Address at the Global Counterinsurgency Conference in Chicago 24 April 2008, declares unequivocally that studies undertaken by anthropologists can be used by the military against insurgents but emphasizes Franz Boas' [considered the Father of Anthropology] dictum that Anthropology is useful to speak truth to power.³² This is a real tension - conflicting interests are at work in Anthropology. Catherine Lutz agrees that it will be ever more challenging to speak truth to power. In fact, she recounts the 2008 series of The Minerva Initiative projects and the fight to transfer the application approval process from the direct control of the Pentagon to the National Science Foundation to promote oversight. She brings this up because even as we have brought up the tensions of funded "culture" research, she sees the problems with whole peoples brought under broad militaristic perception - that the cultures studied are considered enemies, others or competition. She suggests that Anthropologists normally frame the questions researched themselves and often revolve around such abstractions as: "global warming, inequality, disease, job loss, hunger, refugees, racism and sexism."³³ Lutz claims there are three disturbing factors that create tension for universities in general and social scientists in particular in regards to the drive to grab high funding. She writes, "...the free marketization of the university over the last several decades, the emergence of an incentive system that puts grants at the center of the university's reason for being, and a process of cultural militarization that has fundamentally normalized war-making. University administrators have certainly already welcomed the influx of funds - however small the amounts this year, they can hope for much more, perhaps even the kind of support that they have counted on for many decades in the sciences, to help underwrite their electricity bills and professors' salaries, and to produce publications that plump their National Research Council ratings."³⁴ She argues that these factors draw out the tensions clearly for the social sciences.

The War on Terror: The USA PATRIOT Act of 2001/Libraries.

In regards to the War on Terror in libraries, first, let us state the provisions (section 215) of The USA PATRIOT Act most discussed in the literature most affecting libraries have been renewed until June 2013. These provisions are directed at academic AND public libraries. Second, let's recognize, again, that the library is not just a physical space, it is also representative of possibility. Ok, the Act's proponents claimed the 9/11 hijackers used libraries to check on their flight reservations.³⁵ But some of the Act's provisions had a sunset clause and were set to expire in early 2011.³⁶ And this is 7 years after the close vote (219 to 201) in the U.S. Senate (in 2004) that would have strictly limited the kinds of information requests forced upon libraries via The USA PATRIOT Act.³⁷ That close vote reveals that many in the chambers wanted limitations on those information requests, but it was vetoed by President Bush. What are these provisions of the Act, how do they differ from past

governmental actions against libraries/patrons and what are the tensions in them? Stacey Bowers writes that The Video and Library Privacy Protection Act was signed into existence in 1988 and that “The follow-up bill provided protection for library records, including circulation records, reference interview records, database search records, interlibrary loan records, and other personally identifiable records regarding a patron’s use of library services and materials. As a result of its broad position, the bill provided greater protection than many of the existing State statutes afforded library records and offered protection in those States that did not currently have a statute that protected library records.” The FBI fought this when it implemented its Library Awareness Program (late 1980s) and created National Security Letters [documents that can easily request information on library users, reading habits etc] and developed the program, *Total Information Awareness*.³⁸ This program was overarching in its implications of *total* awareness of all information deemed relevant to security. Bowers also states, “As a result of the USA PATRIOT Act’s revisions to FISA and the Attorney General’s insistence that Sections 215 and 218 be made permanent, library records will continue to be subject to invasion by the FBI. In addition, the USA PATRIOT Act overrides the State statutes that protect library records. So no longer can libraries rely on those statutes to protect the privacy and confidentiality of their patron’s records.”³⁹ This means that it is harder to walk in and use the library to investigate certain topics. This will affect academic libraries in the same way as there seems no separation between public and academic libraries under the relevant sections of The Act found in the literature.

Michael Gorman, former American Library Association President, writes in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (November, 2005) against the Act and Section 215’s effect on libraries and the news that even a library patron was second-guessed because he had checked out a book on Osama Bin Laden. He says, ““By imposing a gag order and depriving recipients of any opportunity to challenge the government’s action, Section 215 does away with traditional due-process protections guaranteed under our Bill of Rights. Moreover, it allows the FBI to obtain records without any showing of probable cause or individualized suspicion. ... Librarians’ opposition to the Patriot Act is not an attempt to strip law-enforcement agencies of their power to investigate crimes or terrorism; it is an effort to assure that the government does not have the power to monitor reading habits in secret.”⁴⁰ Let it be clear, and Gorman points to the notion here, that there is disagreement by librarians on how to react to governmental requests for information and surveillance in libraries. For instance, some California libraries have posted signs all around the libraries that said records and reading/viewing/internet activities are potentially being monitored by the government and concluded with the words, “Questions about the policy should be directed to Attorney General John Ashcroft, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530.”⁴¹ In fact, a 2003 study run from University of Illinois’s Library Research Center (in which Leigh Estrabrook was involved) confirms librarians are divided over how to respond to federal requests for records etc at libraries. According to the study, only 49% cooperated with law enforcement when asked to provide information and only 10% of the respondees say they have made access to internet records by law enforcement easier for them. Supposedly 545 libraries have had information requests, but as Section 215 of the Patriot Act imposes a gag order on a librarian’s freedom to reveal an information request has been made, those numbers may be off.⁴²

This watchful eye on libraries is more than just about surveilling which books are read and what people do with the internet; it is also about control of the internet itself. Academic libraries are charged with providing access to the internet. We often think of it as a freeing and internationalist resource. But as Stuart Hamilton has written (researching for IFLA),⁴³ the internet is being tightened as a result of the War on Terror internationally. So not only are access, activity and records surveilled in libraries under The USA PATRIOT Act, but the very resource itself is being controlled. *The War on Terror on the Web* is the name Hamilton gives it. He writes that some sites have come at odds with the US Military. For examples, YellowTimes.com (not accessible) was completely shut down because it revealed via normal journalistic modes pictures the government did not want shown from Iraq; and Al-Jazeera in English was under constant pressure not to do its job of information gathering/dissemination.⁴⁴ But this is not just a process that involves controlling information NOW for the War on Terror. The government even asked Time Magazine (on-line) to take down a 1998 article in which George H.W Bush claims that it is not wise to try to dismantle Saddam Hussein's kingdom and power. And even though the "internet" is not a resource hosted at universities per se, it is promoted and used as such and with rhetoric that it can be trusted. But digital information has proven itself to be easily manipulated here. And as private software companies see military funding for Web "security" projects (which would also be Classified), the future for academic libraries and the "free use" of the internet is questionable as multiple facets of its use COULD have a military hand on it. And to quickly internationalize this just a bit more, many countries have built their own data retention systems on the ideas behind The USA PATRIOT Act/Total Information Awareness model.⁴⁵ Tensions arise in light of this information and one asks what he/she should do.

We could look at more examples of how the government has manipulated information on the Internet, but let's switch to the reason this issue is such a tension.⁴⁶ The university setting is thought of as a place where individual research is pursued and written.⁴⁷ This is partly true as so much of what is considered research "worthy" has been determined by large foundational funds that began after World War 1.⁴⁸ But what we have here is the possibility of library patrons using the Freedom of Information Act to gain information that, at a certain level, has been increasingly manipulated and classified by the militarization of the university. Also, the act of looking for said information will bring suspicion on the searcher. Don't misunderstand. There ARE theoretically times in which information should be classified for security. But given that the government has proven itself to be controlling of even un-classified information, it is not obvious that one should be restricted from using the Library and the Freedom of Information Act to search for this information. A good academic library is just the place to do such searches. But even though The Freedom of Information Act and its E-version, the Electronic Freedom of Information Act (which was signed into law in 1998 by President Clinton) has been around for some time (since 1966), The USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 that came into being under the auspices of the War on Terror trends nearly opposite directions for the potential of information gathering at libraries.⁴⁹ And it leaves open the possibility that classified documents, maybe even items accessible from Government Repositories, will be classified for even longer.

The American Library Association has released a statement that essentially asks that librarians treat their patrons with the same personal confidential respect

that one associates with professional lawyers and doctors in regards to what kind of information is needed or searched.⁵⁰ The reason for this is because it as part of the “sacred” rhetoric that information and the thought that can arise from proper use is an essential aspect to this tension – essential in that information is a form of power.⁵¹ But The Act tries to sidestep these searches for power.⁵² And amidst these tensions are libraries. Scott McLemee writes, “Their [Librarian’s] work constitutes the real intersection of knowledge and power -- not as concepts to be analyzed, but at the level of almost nonstop practical negotiation. It is the cultural profession most involved, from day to day, with questions concerning public budgets, information technology, the cost of new publications and intellectual freedom.”⁵³ McLemee’s thoughts seem apt. And given that “sacred” rhetoric mentioned in the first part of this paragraph, the America Library Association’s statement to the effect that people who use libraries should be given freedom to investigate what they want and that professional individuals within the library field are divided over how to respond to the Total Information Awareness model imposed by The USA PATRIOT Act, there is already a space needed to ask questions and investigate those impositions on libraries and universities. These declarations about the library by librarians suggest that libraries [academic in particular] can be useful to find ways to speak truth to power. But these same impositions by the military upon libraries create these tensions this paper organizes.

Tensions Clarified, Conclusion: War on Terror, Academia and Libraries.

Michael Olivas writes (on The USA PATRIOT Act of 2001), “I have since come to believe that if a title actually has the word ‘patriot’ as its acronym, it has to be the devil itself in its details.”⁵⁴ (Ref: The Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001) We are not analyzing dynamics of language, but the acronym does allow some of the tensions to bubble to the surface because the language in the acronym string is fabricated with specific purposes in mind – purposes which are about language and its effects, not necessarily the elements in the Act itself. It is not up to this paper to frame reforms or policy suggestions because it will be up to each person to think through the tensions in this scenario in which the military has increasingly moved toward classified research models, weapons oriented projects with universities, militarizes academic cultural studies with its closely guarded funding goals, continues surveillance in libraries and develops systems to restrict information at libraries. The result is more and more militarization in which one funded world-view dominates (potentially) the university setting and its libraries.

Tensions.

1. The Department of Defense restricts who can work on research and is increasingly funding War on Terror related classified projects. The result is that the public can know less and less about what the Military is doing and top researchers are discouraged (or barred completely) from being able to share results with other top researchers in their fields.

2. The Department of Defense, under the auspices of the War on Terror, has formalized culture studies so that the military can know their competition/enemy/other better. The result is that culture has become militarized increasingly and many social scientists are at risk of being unable to frame questions

that allow them to speak truth to power because more and more of their projects are getting funded by the same Department of Defense that funds and uses weapons.

3. The USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 was birthed from the War on Terror and has given itself vast powers not previously held by governmental organizations to request information (deemed suspicious) as to who is using what resources at libraries. But the “Library” is the one place that unifies information on technology, government repositories, print research (social science) and technology research results.

4. Even though The Act says that it cannot request records that conflict with 4th Amendment Rights of unreasonable search and seizure and Freedom of 1st Amendment rights to express a dissenting voice, there is no way to separate motivations behind one research project from another undertaken by a patron at a university library. And as the government has shown itself to now be militarizing university technology research, culture questions, altering information in actual sources and lying to the press, the major tension is that academic libraries may be the only place where one can find the correct information to speak truth to power. Speaking truth to power is not just a social science prerogative. And when the culture (military) already assumes the war and justifies the assorted Acts that come along with it, that represents the best time to think through these tensions. And in order to be Information Literate, one must be able to realize tensions involved in the control of “information.”⁵⁵

¹ Hounshell, David A. "AFTER SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: AN ESSAY ON OPPORTUNITIES AND OPPORTUNISM, INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATION, AND TECHNOLOGIES AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE." *History & Technology* 19, no. 1 (March 2003): 39. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011).

² Keith, Jamie Lewis. "The War on Terrorism Affects the Academy: Principal Post-September 11, 2001 Federal Anti-terrorism Statutes, Regulations and Policies that Apply to Colleges and Universities." *The Journal of College and University Law*. 30, no. 2 (2004): 292. / Marcus, Jon. "Centre to probe terror." *Times Higher Education Supplement* no. 1650 (July 23, 2004): 13. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011).

³ MARKOFF, JOHN. "Pentagon Research Director Visits Universities in Bid to Re-energize Partnerships." *New York Times*, October 07, 2009., 20, *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 17, 2011). / Markoff, John. "Pentagon Redirects its Research Dollars," 02 April 2005. *NYTimes.com* (Accessed 16 Feb 2011).

⁴ "DARPA Funding "Cool" Electronics Research." *Printed Circuit Design & Manufacture* 25, no. 9 (September 2008): 8. *Business Source Complete*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 17, 2011). / Dervarics, Charles. "Homeland Security Bill May Have Funds for Higher Education." *Black Issues in Higher Education* 20, no. 22 (December 19, 2002): 7. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011). / Edwards, John. "Military R&D 101."

Electronic Design 54, no. 19 (September 2006): 36-46. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011). / Markoff, John. "Pentagon Redirects its Research Dollars."

⁵ AGENCY GROUP, 09. "PENTAGON FUNDS NATIONAL SECURITY RESEARCH." FDCH Regulatory Intelligence Database (n.d.): Business Source Complete, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011). / Minerva Initiative, The. <<http://minerva.dtic.mil/>> (accessed 29 March 2011). / Nugent, David. "Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion." *Identities* 17, no. 1 (January 2010): 2-44. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 11, 2011).

⁶ "A Patriot Act Surprise," 13 Feb 2011. *NYTimes.com*. (accessed 27 Feb 2011). / Bowers, Stacey L. "Privacy and Library Records." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 4 (July 2006): 377-383. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011). / Foerstel, Herbert N. *Refuge of a Scoundrel: the Patriot Act in Libraries*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2004. / Gorman, Michael. "Politics and Professional Obligations in the Library," 11 November 2005. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 17 Feb 2011).

⁷ G.M.E. "Librarians Divided over Patriot Act Compliance." *American Libraries* 34, no. 3 (March 2003): 18. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011). / Ishizuka, Kathy. "Warning: Uncle Sam Watching?." *School Library Journal* 49, no. 4 (April 2003): 23. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011).

⁸ Althaus, Scott and Kalev Leetaru. "Airbrushing History, American Style." 25 November 2008. <http://www.clinecenter.uiuc.edu/research/airbrushing_history/> (accessed 16 Feb 2011). / Matz, Chris. "Libraries and the USA PATRIOT Act: Values in Conflict." *Journal of Library Administration* 47, no. 3/4 (May 2008): 69-87. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011).

⁹ DARPA Site. <<http://www.darpa.mil/index.html>> (accessed 01 April 2011).

¹⁰ Edwards, 37.

¹¹ Guntzel, Jeff Severns. "Catholic colleges, universities soak up Pentagon dollars." *National Catholic Reporter* 43, no. 19 (March 9, 2007): 10-11. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011).

¹² Markoff, "Pentagon Redirects its Research Dollars." / Tomasky, Michael. Read the actual words, people. *Guardian Unlimited*. *Guardian.co.uk* 06 October 2009. LexisNexis Academic. (accessed 11 March 2011).

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ "Cap on overheads may put universities off defence." *Nature* 450, no. 7168 (November 15, 2007): 332. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed February 18, 2011).

¹⁵ <http://www.dhs.gov/index.shtm> (accessed 03 April 2011). / *Chronicle of Higher Education*. "Demands of Homeland Security Will Pressure Colleges, Campus Computing Experts Warn." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 16 Feb 2011). / Olsen, Florence. "Demands of Homeland Security Will Pressure Colleges, Campus Computing Experts Warn," 17 Jan 2003. *Chronicle of Higher Education* <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 20 Mar 2011).

¹⁶ Marcus, "Centre to probe terror."

¹⁷ I am saying this in the abstract because the data we have thus far, including that suggestion that colleges add more counter-terrorism classes does open the door for a future way the military could interact with campuses and I think that possibility, given trends, should be acknowledged.

¹⁸ Dervarics, "Homeland Security Bill May Have Funds for Higher Education."

¹⁹ Edwards, "Military R&D 101," 41, 46.

²⁰ There is also this issue as to the breakdown of the relationships between universities and the Pentagon that many critics say is the fault of the Bush Administration. But there is unanimous agreement that this severing did happen during that time. so the new trend has been to redirect those relationships between the Department of Defense and research universities and reconnect what has been described as disconnected. For reading on this sub-element in the trends of military funding for universities during the decade of the War on Terror, please read:

²¹ Aire, Camila A and G. Edward Evans. *Academic Librarianship*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2010. 137. / Ananthakrishnan Aiyer, et al. "Commentaries on "Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion"." *Identities* 17, no. 1 (January 2010): 45-71. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed February 18, 2011).

²² Chronicle of Higher Education, "Demands of Homeland Security Will Pressure Colleges, Campus Computing Experts Warn."

²³ Hamilton, Stuart. "The War on Terrorism - Towards a 'less free, less choice' Internet for Library Users?." IFLA Conference Proceedings (November 2003): 1-9. Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts, EBSCOhost (accessed February 21, 2011). 3.

²⁴ Keith, Jamie Lewis.

²⁵ Minerva Initiative, The.

²⁶ AGENCY GROUP, 09, "PENTAGON FUNDS NATIONAL SECURITY RESEARCH."

²⁷ I consider this phrase, "a variety of purposes," to be a door opener for a total research project for the future because given what I have uncovered here, I am still very interested in the full range of those purposes.

²⁸ Ananthakrishnan Aiyer, et al.

²⁹ Guntzel, Jeff Severns.

³⁰ Hogan, John. "A Prescription for the Malaise of Social 'Science.'" Chronicle of Higher Education. <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 16 Feb 2011).

³¹ Lutz, Catherine. "Anthropology in an Era of Permanent War." *Anthropologica* 51, no. 2 (September 2009): 367-379. America: History & Life, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2011). 367-375.

³² Price, David. "Soft Power, Hard Power and the Anthropological "Leveraging" of Cultural "Assets: Distilling the Theory, Politics and Ethics of Anthropological Counterinsurgency," audio edition of Paper presented at the Global Counterinsurgency Conference, Chicago 24 April 2008. <<http://cis.uchicago.edu/events/08-09/reconsidering-american-power/2008audio.shtml>> (accessed 20 Mar 2011).

³³ Lutz, Catherine. "Selling our independence? The perils of Pentagon funding for anthropology." *Anthropology Today*, October 2008., 1-3, Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed February 18, 2011). 2.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Hudson, Audrey. "9/11 Hijackers used Public Libraries," 29 April 2005. *The Washington Times*. LexisNexis Academic. (accessed 11 March 2011).

³⁶ "A Patriot Act Surprise," 13 Feb 2011. *NYTimes.com*. (accessed 27 Feb 2011).

³⁷ Carlson, Scott. "Congress Narrowly Rejects Provision to Limit Patriot Act's Impact on Libraries." 23 July, 2004. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 16 Feb 2011).

³⁸ Foerstel, Herbert N. 1-44.

³⁹ Bowers, 381.

⁴⁰ Gorman, Michael.

⁴¹ Ishizuka, Kathy. "Warning: Uncle Sam Watching?." *School Library Journal* 49, no. 4 (April 2003): 23. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011). / Also, when asked how many information requests have been delivered to libraries since the War on Terror began and Act was put into effect, John Ashcroft said, "Zero." He lied.

⁴² G.M.E. "Librarians Divided over Patriot Act Compliance."

⁴³ The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. <<http://www.ifla.org/>> (accessed 05 April 2011).

⁴⁴ Hamilton, Stuart. "The War on Terrorism: Consequences for Freedom of Expression and the Integrity of Library Users." *IFLA Journal*. Vol. 30 (2004) No. 3: 199-207. <<http://archive.ifla.org/V/iflaj/ij-3-2004.pdf>> (accessed 20 Feb 2011). 200-201.

⁴⁵ Hamilton, Stuart. "The War on Terrorism - Towards a 'less free, less choice' Internet for Library Users?." *IFLA Conference Proceedings* (November 2003): 1-9. *Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 21, 2011).

⁴⁶ Althaus, Scott and Kalev Leetaru. "Airbrushing History, American Style." 25 November 2008. <http://www.clinecenter.uiuc.edu/research/airbrushing_history/> (accessed 16 Feb 2011). I recommend reading this article for a strong example of how the government can manipulate information when it has control over the domains in which it is produced and held. / Also, take a look at: Johnson, Linda B. "CONTENT AND ACCESS REMAIN KEY." *Library Journal* 132, no. 9 (May 15, 2007): 52-58. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011).

⁴⁷ Kistiakowsky, Vera. "Military funding of university research." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 502 (1989): 141-154. Academic OneFile. (accessed 16 Feb. 2011).

⁴⁸ Nugent, David. "Knowledge and Empire: The Social Sciences and United States Imperial Expansion." 7-12

⁴⁹ Martorella, Georgina. "Libraries in the Aftermath of 9/11." *Reference Librarian* 45, no. 94 (March 2006): 109-137. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed March 9, 2011).

⁵⁰ Matz, Chris. "Libraries and the USA PATRIOT Act: Values in Conflict."

⁵¹ McLemee, Scott. "Silence in the Stacks," 09 June 2005. *Inside Higher Ed*. <www.insidehighered.com> (accessed 18 March 2011).

⁵² Young, Jeffery, R. "FBI Seeks Library Data Under Patriot Act, Court Records Show." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <www.chronicle.com> (accessed 16 Feb 2011).

⁵³ McLemee, Scott. "Silence in the Stacks."

⁵⁴ Olivas, Michael A. "The War on Terrorism Touches the Ivory Tower – Colleges and Universities after September 11: An Introduction." *The Journal of College and University Law*. 30, no. 2 (2004): 234.

⁵⁵ Alire, Camila A and G. Edward Evans. 203.