
Ethics Inside and Out: The Case of *Guidoriccio*

JOHN SWAN

ABSTRACT

THIS IS AN EXAMINATION of problems of oversight and responsibility arising from a case in which librarians are implicated at several levels. Two art historians, principals in a major controversy in which they are challenging the traditional attribution of a great Sienese fresco, discovered what they (and others) deemed to be a pattern of censorship of their point of view via card catalog indexing in an important Florentine research library. This article surveys their attempts to find redress and to gain a hearing for their case, and it attempts an analysis of the major hurdles they faced in the academic and research world, principally the "ethics of collegiality" which presumes against complaining outsiders. The implications of both the alleged misdeed of librarians and the actual lack of response of librarians are explored.

Information becomes entangled with ethics through two obvious paths—by way of what people do with it, and by way of what they do not do with it. For librarians and others whose trade is information itself, this process begins when decisions are made as to how the information is to be dispensed in the first place. Thus, it is very early in the life of a piece of information that questions of action and its consequences gather around it—and for the purposes here we are ignoring many large related dilemmas, such as those involved in the choices that are made about just what information to generate—e.g., the morality of choosing to do the research necessary for the development of a plastic handgun, to name but one recent technological triumph.

That there are ethical connections between information and action is hardly startling news, but this does not establish any similarly obvious ethical dimension for those whose field of operation is the connection itself, the passage of information from its generators to its users. There is a character in a Flannery O'Connor (1971) story whose place in the moral scheme of things could be said to be parallel to that of the middle persons: "[she] had no bad qualities of her own but she was able to use other people's in such a constructive way that she never felt the lack" (p. 272). Neither the generators nor the users, neither the institutions that support us nor the patrons of our wares, fall under our ethical purview. As much as we are dependent upon and responsive to both, the ends to which they put our means do not play a part in the provision of those means. Or do they?

In the case examined here, that question arises in a rather specialized context, but its implications are broad and serious, especially within the world of research and scholarship. Librarians come into the picture first as alleged overt violators of what are presumably shared standards of professional ethics (codified and otherwise), then as professional colleagues within the academic establishment faced with the fallout from this transgression. In both phases of this event, which is still unfolding, we have faced multiple challenges; it will be argued here that, for reasons intimately related to the nature of professional collegiality and our professional identity itself, librarians have failed to meet these challenges.

This inquiry begins with a specific instance of unethical behavior—i.e., the apparent suppression of a controversial point of view through selective indexing of materials by library officials with important connections to the other side of the controversy. The word *apparent* is important here because this writer has not had the opportunity to examine the evidence first hand and is relying heavily on extensive correspondence with one of those whose published arguments were censored, as well as on the experience reported by others who encountered the selective pattern of indexing in the research institution.

It should be made clear that this author does find credible the charges leveled by my correspondent and his coauthor. Both have waged a long, tenacious, scrupulously documented, and, for the most part, thoroughly unrewarded campaign for redress. It is true that they have earned support and not a little sympathy from many along the way, and that is part of the point of this study. Just as this author must admit his own distance from the evidence for the accusation, despite the years of documentation arrayed before him, and his own impotence in terms of direct action, virtually everyone who has found

the evidence compelling has nevertheless found it easier to express sympathy than to find a solution. And further, this is not necessarily a failure of will or personal ethics among those who see the problem but do nothing directly about it. It is a problem that attaches itself with peculiar force to this kind of ethical breach, a problem compounded by questions of responsibility, authority, evidence, and the very nature of the unethical deed itself.

The importance of focusing on this instance of suppression lies not so much in the particular variety thereof. Outside of states controlled overtly by censoring elites and exclusive ideologies, there is little recorded evidence of censorship specifically by indexing because it is usually accomplished much more efficiently long before this stage of the processing of materials. But censorship by index may be a general problem with broad consequences, unreported because it is difficult to detect and often practiced by those who are unaware that they are, in fact, erecting barriers to information in the very process of organizing it (see Intner, 1984). What is more significant is the fact that this apparent censorship occurred within an academic research environment, and the act and the responses to it reveal a number of uncomfortable truths about the nature of the communal trust that is supposed to be the very foundation of scholarship.

That deed and its background are set forth from the point of view of its victims in a paper delivered in 1986 at the Second European Conference of the Art Libraries of IFLA—the International Federation of Library Associations being one of the organizations to which its authors took their case. The elaborate title of the paper (which was published in the proceedings of the conference) is effectively a summary of the situation as they see it: “‘Selective’ Card Cataloging (or In-House Screening of Periodical Indexing) of Art History Articles in Authors’ Files, and the Potential Effects of this ‘Selectivity’ on the Bibliographical Entries Relating to Specific Art Historical Problems: A Case Study” (Moran & Mallory, 1986).

In the world of research and scholarship as well as any other, censorship is most likely to occur in a politicized environment. In this case, it is the politics of a major controversy in the world of Italian art, indeed, one which has repeatedly been called “the case of the century” (Watson, 1986). This is not the occasion for a recounting of this much recounted attribution debate, which is also treated elsewhere in this volume (for a convenient overview of the early literature thereof, see Wohl [1984] as well as Moran and Mallory [1986]; for a recent survey from particular points of view of salient portions of the evidence and arguments, see Mallory and Moran’s [1986] *Burlington* article, as well as Polzer [1987] and Maginnis [1988]).

However, knowledge of the essentials of the controversy are necessary for an appreciation of the intensity of conflict that led to the “selective” indexing and other instances of (at least apparent) suppression, such as the exclusion of Moran and Mallory from an important conference and their involvement in a letters to the editor fracas within the pages of a major art journal. This writer is, of course, in no position to take a stand in the original debate itself. Nor is that relevant to a brief account of the struggle of Moran and Mallory for what they consider to be a fair hearing within the scholarly establishment.

The RILA Editor, Alice Sedgwick Wohl (1984), is eloquent on the subject of the work of art that is at the center of all this:

The fresco known as *Guidoriccio da Fogliano at the Siege of Montemassi* in the great council hall of the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena has long been famous both as an artistic masterpiece and as a proud political symbol of the Republic. To the Sienese it means what Michelangelo's *David* means to the Florentines. To art historians it represents a cornerstone of the art of Simone Martini and the origin of the equestrian portrait. Solitary and powerful, baton in hand like a Roman conqueror, the condottiere rides his caparisoned horse along the fresco's frame, against a tawny and desolate landscape. In the background an undulating palisade encloses the scene of the siege....There is an eerie quality to the scene which makes it unforgettable. (p. 10)

Simone Martini, master of what some scholars call the “Sienese proto-Renaissance” and, like Giotto and Duccio, an Art 1 eminence and one of the founding fathers of Western painting, was taken to be the creator of the *Guidoriccio* by unquestioned consensus and multiple-century tradition until the appearance in 1977 of an article by Gordon Moran (1977) challenging that assumption. Basing his argument on a range of considerations, from the lack of mention of the *Guidoriccio* in contemporary documentation of payments to Martini or early descriptions of either Martini or the Palazzo Pubblico, to apparent incongruities and anachronisms in the costume and rank of the equestrian. Moran suggested that if there was originally a portrait of Guidoriccio by Simone Martini on that wall, it had been obliterated when the *capitano generale* was deposed in 1333 and forced to leave town in disgrace. When the redoubtable leader returned to rule again fifteen years later, Simone Martini was already dead. Moran originally argued that the Sienese likely commissioned a memorial portrait of Guidoriccio upon his death in 1352, added to the pre-existing Simone Martini fresco of the castle of Montemassi; later, taking into account a decade of new evidence, Mallory and Moran (1986) suggested that the whole *Guidoriccio* fresco was probably painted much later than the mid-trecento, perhaps even in the sixteenth century.

The act of questioning the authenticity of one of the most famous

and revered works of one of the most famous and revered artists of the early Renaissance produced a reaction that still seems to be growing, over a dozen years and many further developments later. The most striking of these developments came as a result of the official Siense response to the Moran heresy. In Siena, as can be imagined, the issue has been, and continues to be, far more than a matter of scholarly dispute. The mayor of Siena took the reasonable step of appointing a committee of experts to examine the *Guidoriccio* carefully and seek a resolution to the new controversy.

The resultant labor of studying, cleaning, and restoring the fresco led to the extremely important discovery and eventual uncovering in 1980-81 of a heretofore unknown fourteenth-century fresco directly below the *Guidoriccio*. This work, recognized immediately to be an outstanding example of trecento painting, depicts a castle and its palisade, its gates open perhaps to signify capitulation, with two figures standing at the left, both intentionally defaced with blue overpainting, apparently not long after they were painted in the first place.

The civic leaders of Renaissance Siena had a tradition of celebrating the city's conquests of important rival fortifications by commissioning their portrayal on the walls of the Palazzo Pubblico. Therefore, the identification of the subject matter of the newly uncovered fresco has become a controversy intimately connected to that involving the *Guidoriccio*, itself traditionally identified as the memorialization of the siege and conquest of Montemassi in 1328. Indeed, in his detailed defense of the traditional attribution, Polzer (1987, p. 67) places great emphasis on the signal importance of Guidoriccio's triumph at Montemassi over the most famous and feared of Tuscany's military foes, Castruccio Castracani, as the reason for the fresco's prime location and its survival without the defacement posited by Moran and Mallory. The proper naming of the event portrayed on the other fresco, and the various possible alignments thereof with recorded commissions of Simone Martini (and others), have added a whole new dimension of the similar struggle concerning its famous wall companion.

Throughout the controversy, the Kunsthistorisches Institut in nearby Florence has played a number of vital roles. As one of the great centers of scholarship and research in the art of the Italian Renaissance, it has inevitably served as a major resource for all concerned, but the institute's members have also been more particularly involved. Max Seidel, president of its support organization and member of its governing Kuratorium, was also a member of the special *Guidoriccio* commission appointed by Siena's (then) Mayor Mauro Barni. Seidel was co-author of the official report

of the commission, and he has consistently argued for the traditional attribution of the fresco. Members of that supporting organization (Verein zur Forderung des Kunsthistorischen Instituts) also gave the funds necessary to uncover and restore the newly discovered fresco, which Seidel and co-commissioner Luciano Bellosi consider to be a portrayal of the submission of the town of Giuncarico in 1314 and painted by Duccio, another founding father. Moran and Mallory argue that it is, rather, the work of Simone Martini himself, a depiction of the surrender of Arcidosso to Guidoriccio done in 1331. (The commission had also originally identified the site as Arcidosso, but they changed their collective mind—according to Moran [G. Moran to G. Ewald, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, personal communication, June 18, 1986], this was because they belatedly recognized that this position played havoc with the traditional view of the man on horseback as being Guidoriccio.) Each of these views has the expected implications for the identity of the fresco, of course.

Seidel and two other institute officials, Irene Hueck and Hans Belting, were also members of the organizing committee of a special conference devoted to the subject of Simone Martini. This *convegno*, which took place in Siena in March 1985, has a place in this complicated tale, because, according to Moran (personal communication, 1986) and backed by considerable documentation, this committee excluded Moran and Mallory from the speakers' program twice, at first upon their written request for the opportunity to present new evidence disputing the established view of the *Guidoriccio*, then (and more tellingly), after the local government of Siena negotiated to have them placed on the program at the last minute, in response to the local and even national outcry against their exclusion. (In fairness, it should be mentioned here that according to the institute, and specifically according to B. Döll [to G. Moran, personal communication, September 24, 1986, at the behest of Döll and copied to twenty others including this author], head of the Division for Humanities of the Bundesminister für Forschung und Technologie in Bonn, Seidel had no part in preparing the Simone Martini Congress, nor in excluding Moran and Mallory from it—"solely the Italian organizers were responsible for preparing and holding this congress." The West German government funds a number of research centers in foreign countries, among which is the Kunsthistorisches Institut, and thus it became Döll's place to defend the institution and its officials against the accusations of censorship.)

In terms of both scholarly and political issues then, the Kunsthistorisches Institut, or at least key figures associated with it, has a place in this controversy that goes beyond its central function as a vital institutional resource. As an independent scholar and a

resident of Florence, Gordon Moran has long made regular use of this great library for reasons quite unassociated with the controversy. His and Mallory's accusation of censorship by indexing and the article summarizing the case are based on their experience as patrons of the library, not on their role in that debate—although for them as well as for the members of the institute, this background presses rather closely at times.

As Moran explains, the Kunsthistorisches Institut began indexing in the card catalog beyond the level of the monograph in the early seventies, producing card sets for articles from periodicals, conference proceedings, *Festschriften*, and other sources. He quotes Head Librarian Peter Tigler to the effect that this procedure covers "several hundred periodicals" and that "this coverage is far more extensive than that of the standard bibliographic tools such as *RILA*, *Art Index*, and the *Repertoire d'art et d'archeologie*" (Moran & Mallory, 1986, p. 123). Around 1980, this comprehensive indexing had to be curtailed because of a shortage of help. It was replaced by the practice of "selective" indexing of periodicals according to their "importance"—that is, whether they were "especially rich" in articles on Italian art or were otherwise regarded as significant according to the "special knowledge or interests" of those responsible for the indexing was begun (Moran & Mallory, 1986, p. 124).

The essence of the Moran/Mallory charge is that, starting in 1980, this "selective" indexing took on a particular ideological pattern that affected the treatment of articles dealing with the *Guidoriccio* affair. The year 1980 was also the time that these articles began appearing in larger numbers, reflecting the discovery of the other fresco. Before glancing at the evidence behind the charge, it is appropriate to quote at length from Döll's (1986) defense of the institute, as addressed to Moran, because it does provide useful coverage of the technical processing problems facing its catalogs—and of the nature of the official response:

With your indication of the delays in the cataloguing of journals, you, quite rightly, pointed to a major emergency impairing the use of these journals, which does exist unfortunately. The Kunsthistorisches Institut has a library of currently approx. 158,000 volumes, among them 1,082 journals which must be indexed. The number of visitors is very high for a research institution of the size of the Kunsthistorisches Institut. Only three scientists and one academically trained librarian are available for acquisition, cataloguing, maintaining and safekeeping the books and for attending to visitors. If this situation is compared with the proven standards existing for art libraries, namely that one librarian should be responsible for a maximum of 20,000 books, the acute shortage of personnel...becomes clear. This shortage is particularly painfully felt in the work-intensive indexing of the journal catalogues; it is the reason for the major backlog from 1980 onwards....Because of the ban—issued by the Federal Government for the purpose of consolidating the budget—on the recruitment of new staff, it has been impossible so far to remedy

this unsatisfactory situation. Yet it is the supreme aim to handle all journals as speedily as possible. While this optimum cannot be reached, one must make do with makeshift measures, which are in the first place determined by internal technical aspects.

This shortage of staff is therefore the only reason why your essays...have not yet been indexed. Your claim that your publications had been deliberately neglected in the indexing of journals is an insinuation which is explicitly rejected once again here. Indeed, no member of the Institute is concerned in their own research work with the Riccio controversy. If this were the case, they would strictly separate their tasks at the Institute from their own scientific work.... (pp. 2-3)

Although they reject much in the official defense here and elsewhere and present considerable evidence of evasion and misrepresentation, Moran and Mallory do not dispute some salient features of the above passage. The financial and staff workload difficulties faced by the institute have, in fact, been very large. They constitute the essence of the defense offered by the institute—that is, by its Director, G. Ewald, and the Head Librarian, Tigler—as well as Döll; the response to the charge of censorious selectivity has been nothing but categorical denial. An addition to the workload defense, also undisputed, is ironically revealing from the point of view of librarians who worry about points of access. In response to Moran's accusations, that his and Mallory's publications were being suppressed, the library instituted the practice of collecting Moran's essays "in dailies and other ephemeral organs" and putting them in a folder under the title of "Miscellanea Moran," claiming "this folder can be used at any time by any visitor to the library" (Döll, 1986, p. 3). Since this folder was apparently unconnected by any cross reference to Simone Martini or the *Guidoriccio* issue, at least between 1984 and early 1986, visitors may have had the right to use it, but they did not have the knowledge necessary to make use of that right.

Indeed, the effectiveness of concealment by subject heading (whether or not it was intentional) was demonstrated in the fate of the February 1984 issue of *News from RILA*, the issue containing Alice Wohl's summary of the controversy (quoted earlier), as well as her useful bibliography on the subject. When the issue arrived in the library, it was put into the "Miscellanea Moran" folder instead of being shelved with other issues of the title. This meant that not only were interested patrons unable to find it, but even an institute librarian failed to retrieve it when asked by visiting scholar Samuel Edgerton (Moran & Mallory, 1986, p. 127). After two years, the issue was finally reunited with other copies of the title, although the Wohl article therein remained unindexed long after that, and the problematic nature of "Miscellanea Moran" continued. It was further dramatized by the fact that, until early 1986, none of the twelve articles

abstracted in the Wohl piece that disagreed with the traditional attribution of the *Guidoriccio* could be found in the Kunsthistorisches Institut's authors' catalog card indexing, although many contemporaneous articles that upheld the Simone Martini identification did receive prompt indexing. To quote (as do Moran and Mallory) Sheila Intner: "Because the function of an index is to bring out ideas and materials from a mass of stuff, searchers rely on it and assume that an item not found in the index, for whatever reason, is missing..." (Intner, 1984, p. 106. Her specific reference is to printed indexes, but it applies to a card index as well).

Without repeating the sometimes grueling detail of the Moran/Mallory inventory of what articles expressing which points of view were indexed when, suffice it to say that they provide a thorough documentation of the charge that articles of the traditional persuasion received the thorough indexing that it was the institute's policy to provide selected titles, while articles challenging that view—even when they were from journals that heretofore had been indexed—did not. A number of the latter are, of course, by Moran and Mallory themselves but several are not.

The authors offer as evidence the difficulties experienced by other patrons of the institute, and Moran later pointed to the evidence of an article written in December 1987 by Nicole Squires, a California State University student, who went to the Kunsthistorisches Institut to study Simone Martini via its "fabulous collection of periodicals." As she tells it, the card catalog yielded some sixty articles on her subject but very few after 1983. After considerable struggle learning and relearning the library's systems (her first assumption, naturally, was that she was not using them properly), seeking staff help, and finally being told that the recent material she sought was not indexed because of the earlier-mentioned workload problem, she came to the following conclusions:

Based on the catalogueing (sic)-indexing situation, people from the Kunst went against principles of some teaching in library science and left out, in an inconsistent manner, several crucial articles on Simone Martini having to do with Moran's side of the Guido Riccio controversy, giving the excuse that they were understaffed. If this was really true, then why were all existing articles written by the opposing side (their side) immediately filed in both author and subject indexes! As a result students like myself encounter some difficulties in using materials at the Kunst. Is such difficulty the case only in this particular situation, and thus limited to art history, or do such cases occur elsewhere in academia? (Squires, 1987, p. 11)

Whatever the truth in this particular case, her final question is extremely important and one that makes this incident, a small facet of a large controversy, relevant to all librarians.

Once they had uncovered what they perceived to be a pattern

of censorship by indexing, Moran and Mallory were not reticent about seeking redress, both in person at the institute and by way of correspondence with a great many near and distant connections with the institute and the art world, the library community, intellectual freedom groups, any organization or person who came to their attention who might be able to bring pressure to bear, or at least shed light upon, their case. Gordon Moran is an indefatigable builder of epistolary networks who puts forth his case in long and detailed letters, often copied to many other parties. Sometimes he is rewarded with silence or even hostility (there is considerable potential for both contentiousness and defensiveness in this case, of course), or the kind of weary politeness expressed by Döll toward the end of the letter quoted earlier:

If a visitor feels he has been treated unfairly, his criticism is heard, not only at the Institute but also in the Ministry. This obligingness ends, however, where the effort is disproportionate to the importance of the matter. Please consider this statement to be a conclusive answer to your numerous questions.... (p. 4)

However, just as his *Guidoriccio* position continues to gain ever wider notice, Moran has also attracted the sympathetic response of many who concern themselves with ethical issues in the worlds of scholarship and librarianship. The fact that he pours such energy with such effectiveness into letter writing (not word processed, which these days is further evidence of an unusually high level of energy) is not merely an observation of a personality quirk. It is thoroughly germane to this discussion, not only because without the major epistolary habit there would be no network and likely no broader case, but also because it bespeaks an “outsider’s” style.

As an observer and (very minor) participant in this matter for a number of years, this writer has come to believe that one of the obstacles confronting Moran is the fact that he is an outsider who has become something of a major player in an insider’s game. This is not to deny that “gentlemen scholars” and inspired amateurs have contributed mightily to scholarship, certainly in the field of art history, or that the professionals have been capable of acknowledging this in the past and no doubt will continue to do so in the future.

That Gordon Moran is a former stockbroker who has settled in Florence to pursue the life of the art historian is, then, only partly to the point—and his partner in the struggle, Michael Mallory, is, after all, a professional in the field, a bona fide member of the Brooklyn College faculty. More relevant is the fact that being an outsider to the academic establishment, Moran acts like an outsider; that is, he writes long letters expressing and documenting his charge of injustice to a wide range of correspondents without regard to the protocols attendant upon academic hierarchies and turf. He is courteous, even

deferential, but he is also relentless and exhaustive in the support of his argument, and in effect he calls upon the wider world to bear witness to his cause. All of this is, it seems, a considerable strain upon the *politesse* which is everywhere at the center of the academic style, both personal and institutional, even when academics are at each other's throats.

This flagrantly subjective point is insisted upon here because this author believes that there is such a thing as an "ethics of collegiality" that is at work in this case. It is not unique to academia, of course; just as the Greeks tended to regard fellow Greeks as somehow more civilized, more fully human, than the barbarians (which meant, in a simple and pejorative sense, non-Greek), people have always parsed the race into insiders and outsiders. But the world of research, scholarship, and higher education depends, at least in theory, upon uniquely high standards of mutual trust and openness, combined with an intricate, discipline-based meritocracy of knowledge, brains, and curriculum vitae. It is in many respects an open-ended democratic world in accordance with the dynamics of meritocracy, but once one is a member of the *collegium*, it becomes very natural to divide the world into those within and those without.

Thus, for example, when Serge Lang, the Yale mathematician, attacked the candidacy of Samuel Huntington for membership in the National Academy of Sciences on the grounds that the influential Harvard professor had presented a political view (that South Africa was measurably a "satisfied society" before the "early 1960s") as if it were objective science, he was perceived as an insider betraying the insider's code. The fact that his campaign to block the membership of Huntington has (so far) been successful indicates that that code is not monolithic, but the fact that he has to resort to a paid advertisement to get his argument and defense of his action into print is but one indication of the price paid by one who behaves like an outsider. In that advertisement, he quotes from a letter to him by Yale's provost:

We need to muster all the strength we have to combat the ignorance and superstition that prevails without our walls. Our mission as an institution for the precious nourishment of ideas and scholars is badly bruised when we turn on our own, when we withhold that extra ounce of trust and forgiveness. (Lang, 1988, p. 4)

As this example should make clear, the "ethics of collegiality" is a genuine ethics, not just a Mafia, code for scholars who seek to hide the misdeeds of their own. The provost, like Döll on behalf of the Kunsthistorisches Institut, is not seeking a coverup but urging cooperation. That the result is the same as a coverup is only the view of those who have taken the position of outsider. There is a common presumption shared in one case by the provost and, among

others, the Harvard colleagues who rushed to Huntington's defense, and in the indexing case, by officials of the institute and its governing ministry. That is, that their colleagues, as honest and proven insiders, are being attacked unfairly. The related assumption is, naturally, that their assailants are misguided at best, traitors to a higher cause at worst.

The well-known case of the examination of the effects of a proven case of laboratory fraud on the scientific literature by Walter Stewart and Ned Feder (1987) is very revealing in this regard. Their analysis of the 109 papers of Harvard researcher John Darsee (and his forty-seven variously attentive co-authors), exposing an extensive pattern of errors stemming from Darsee's original falsifications, was an insiders' attack concluding that "certain lapses from generally accepted standards of research may be more frequent than is commonly believed" (Stewart & Feder, 1987). This article encountered massive resistance even before finally being accepted for publication (in a form surrounded by hedging commentary and a negative response), and even more hostility thereafter. Many scientists felt that Stewart and Feder were letting down the side, overreacting to an unfortunate but still uncommon incident; there was derogatory comment about their personal careers, and they also encountered difficulties at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), their place of employment (Greenberg, 1988).

It should also be noted that the scientific and scholarly community has responded to recent instances of fraud and allegations of misconduct with considerable worry and self-examination, including the establishment by the NIH of a special office to ferret out misconduct (Mervis, 1989). Additionally, the research community's fear of government interference in the laboratory is genuine and well-founded (Jaschik, 1989), and all agree that trust and collegiality remain essential to the research process. But the fact of fraud and dishonest behavior within this collegial, but very pressured, system has been established, and the fate of those who point this out is still often painful (see also the special section on "whistle-blowing" in *The Scientist* ["Special Section," 1987]).

The ethics of collegiality is not a universal ironclad code that renders all who abide by it capable of concealing what are genuine ethical transgressions, but it is, at the very least, a strong reference point quite independent of issues of guilt or innocence. Denial was sufficient defense for the institute librarians (that and at least some redress, after more than two years, in the form of some cataloging for some of the affected articles). Therefore, absent any independent investigation, the issues of evidence as well as turf came to the fore very early as part of the problem of seeking redress. Moran

approached, among other groups, the American Library Association (specifically the Office for Intellectual Freedom, through them the Intellectual Freedom Committee, and the Intellectual Freedom Round Table [IFRT]), the International Federation of Library Associations (where they were given a place on the program of the Second European Conference of Art Libraries, if no other official support), and the College Art Association.

Although Moran's correspondence caused not a little discussion in all of these groups, none of them decided that it was appropriate to take specific action, either because they thought it was not their business (especially the American groups), or because of a lack of clarity (from a distance, anyway) about what the evidence proved and just what they were to do about it. As is apparent in the Moran/Mallory charges, the "selective card cataloging" pattern is inextricably bound up with the larger *Guidoriccio* controversy, and (again, from a distance) this presents the possibility of motives not only for the censorship but also for the accusation of the misdeed. In the minds of people who may have a responsibility for ethics oversight but still do not know exactly what they are supposed to do anyway, this presents further hurdles. In the wake of the Stewart/Feder (1987) *Nature* article controversy, a number of scientists, including David Baltimore (not himself accused of actual fraud but involved in a controversy surrounding published work emanating from his lab), argue that significant discrepancies that may to outsiders look like fraud were the result of differences of opinion rather than misrepresentation. This is always a possibility in cases of heated controversy—especially (again) from a distance. For Moran and Mallory, Stewart and Feder, the evidence may appear unmistakable, but there is a question as to how well some kinds of evidence travel.

The IFRT Executive Committee did approve a very general resolution on "Libraries and the Integrity of Research and Scholarship," inspired in part by the Moran/Mallory experience ("be it resolved that the membership of the American Library Association work within and beyond our profession to further cooperation and vigilance in the affirmation of the highest standards of ethics in research and in the sharing of knowledge" [Approved January 8, 1989]). This, however, was a very broad statement that did not find approval beyond the ALA round table. The cases and the issues that engendered it have resulted in some discussion about the place of librarians in all of this, however. While that is itself small comfort to Moran and Mallory or others who seek redress or at least support from organizations which are supposed to concern themselves with ethics oversight, it may be a sign that librarians are beginning to see that their role cannot be limited to that of passive shepherds

of documents and data, even if this means addressing some very difficult questions surrounding their mediator's role.

Librarians have long involved themselves in the exploration of both the theory and practice of ethics, including the ethical aspects of intellectual freedom. The traditional professional commitment to the care and delivery of the information package, rather than to the nature of its contents, usually serves as an important limitation upon the range of that exploration. Professionals have been nervous, rightly, about any claim that they ought to have a share of responsibility for the actual quality of the information delivered beyond their training in and reliance upon review sources and collection development and organization tools. "Vigilance," the word used in the IFRT resolution on ethics quoted earlier, was chosen in an attempt to assert the responsibility of librarians to maximize access to the best information. However, it conjured up, for some, the old vision of the librarian as gatekeeper of the House of Knowledge, censor of that which does not meet a particular standard. This is a genuine danger that requires its own kind of perpetual vigilance, but it does not let librarians off the hook.

Moran and Mallory encountered a situation of a kind that is probably as old as libraries and academic politics, but when they sought an audience for their case, there was no mechanism in place within academia, librarianship, or otherwise adequate to their need—adequate, that is, even to give them a forum with the proper authority and opportunity to judge the evidence, no matter what the outcome. The reasons for this go beyond the specific problem of a lack of effective ethics oversight, of course; the controversy, of which the indexing issue is a part, is large and messy and getting messier. It has even reached into the latest guidebook for Italy-bound tourists, where the *Guidoriccio* is referred to as "attributed" to Simone Martini: "In recent years a nasty squabble has broken out among art historians," it says, with a quick summary of the Moran/Mallory position (Hoefer & Barrett, 1989, p. 262). The nastiness now includes accusations of destruction of evidence in the process of restoration, accusations concerning the suppression of a letter to the editor (of *Burlington Magazine*) that was a response to another bitter attack, and many other signs of a scholarly war with more than its share of excesses. Meanwhile, whether or not there was an original intention to suppress their point of view, the co-authors have gained an ever wider following and not a few adherents—in part, surely, because of the earlier-mentioned "outsider's" persistence.

Whatever their ultimate success, however, librarians are still confronted with the issues of ethics and ethics oversight that Moran and Mallory raised. It may well be that this incident took a shape

from the beginning that prevented an effective response by the library community; still, it behooves us to examine our place, or lack of place, in the process of articulating and enforcing ethical standards in academic and research institutions. On the level of individual responsibility and practice, there are also important lessons to be learned from the frustrations of Moran and Mallory.

In a thoughtful article on the impact of information technology on professional ethics, Lawson Crowe and Susan Anthes (1988) addressed what they regard as an increase in this professional responsibility:

The academic librarian as information mediator must acquire deeper and broader subject expertise...and prepare for new information storage and retrieval capabilities. In respect to both technique and substantive content, the mediator must be more directive in relationship to the user. The modern academic librarian must be *client-oriented* rather than *medium-oriented*....In offering bibliographic services, and by discriminating among materials acquired, the academic librarian may stand in the midst of contending interests. It is at this confluence of values that ethical conflicts arise. (p. 126)

The authors are not addressing the kind of conflict examined here, and it could be argued that the responsibilities they describe as new should have always been part of the librarian's code of service, with the new technology only providing extra pressure down the paths of greater content mastery and stronger patron orientation. Their essential argument is very relevant here, however.

Academic librarians, even impressively pedigreed inhabitants of major research institutions, usually find themselves at the fringes of the circle of faculty collegiality. In this uncertain position (uncertain in most cases even if librarians do have "faculty status"), they are particularly vulnerable to the push and pull of the insider-outsider condition. Effectiveness and status increase with greater faculty recognition and cooperation, but it remains important to remember that the patrons are outsiders as well as insiders, and professional priorities must take both into account. (A common, if not directly relevant, example is the widespread practice of granting faculty much longer checkout periods than students and then charging overdue fines to students but not faculty; there are many who do not even regard this as an ethical issue, not to mention an unfair practice.)

If (and only if) the Moran/Mallory charges are true, the indexers involved arranged their indexing priorities in favor of the insiders in the *Guidoriccio* controversy. Librarians do receive complaints from faculty members for acquiring books inimical to views of the complainers—a rare occurrence, to be sure (in one of the few personal cases, the faculty member was abjectly apologetic some time after he realized the implications of what he was doing). Librarians are

also sometimes under quite understandable pressure to spend more resources and energy in some areas than in others. This is a fact of life in every institution that must support a particular curriculum rather than the broad world of inquiry, but it becomes an ethical trap if it means supporting one side of a controversy within a given field more than another.

With the resources of modern information technology at hand, a librarian can compensate for virtually any under-representation of significant points of view in the local collection. But this presupposes an awareness that there are other points of view in the first place. As the experience of Nicole Squires (1987), described earlier, indicates, it is not enough to assume that the patron will have that awareness.

The difficult truth is that librarians must be both neutral champions of access to all points of view *and* advocates for the important views that are suppressed or unrepresented. This means that they must worry about the inside as well as the outside of the information package. In most cases the preparation given to become effective information providers is narrow and inadequate for these challenges. What people do or do not do with the information made available may be beyond the ethical purview (in the vast majority of cases, anyway), but there is a responsibility for the quality and comprehensiveness of the information upon which they do or do not act. If the immense fracas that began on an old wall in Siena has no other relevance for librarians, it at least carries the vital lesson that this responsibility does indeed have serious ethical implications. More is expected of librarians than they are in the habit of giving.

REFERENCES

- Crowe, L., & Anthes, S. H. (1988). The academic librarian and information technology: Ethical issues. *College & Research Libraries*, 49(2), 123-130.
- Greenberg, D. S. (1988). Lab-scam: How science goes bad. *The Washington Post*, Sunday, April 24, D3-D6.
- Hoefer, H., & Barrett, K. (Eds.). (1989). *Insight guides: Italy*. Hongkong: APA Publications.
- Intner, S. S. (1984). Censorship in indexing. *The Indexer*, 14(2), 105-108.
- Jaschik, S. (1989). Congress's interest in ferreting out fraud is misinformed, harmful, say researchers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 7, A1, A25.
- Lang, S. (1988). Academic, journalistic, and political problems (advertisement). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 3, B4.
- Maginnis, H. B. J. (1988). The "Guidoriccio" controversy: Notes and observations. *RACAR, Revue d'art Canadienne. Canadian Art Review*, 15(2), 137-144.
- Mallory, M., & Moran, G. (1986). New evidence concerning *Guidoriccio*. *Burlington Magazine*, 128, 250-259.
- Mervis, J. (1989). NIH establishes office to probe science misconduct. *The Scientist*, 3(10), 1, 6-7.
- Moran, G. (1977). An investigation regarding the equestrian portrait of Guidoriccio da Fogliano in the Siena Palazzo Pubblico. *Paragone*, 28(333), 81-88.
- Moran, G., & Mallory, M. (1986). "Selective" card cataloging (or in-house screening

- of periodical indexing) of art history articles in authors' files, and the potential effects of this "selectivity" on the bibliographical entries relating to specific art historical problems: A case study. In K. Wynia (Ed.), *Art periodicals: Papers of the 2nd European Conference of the Art Libraries of IFLA* (13-17 October, 1986) (pp. 123-132). Amsterdam: Overleg Kunsthistorische Bibliotheken in Nederland.
- O'Connor, F. (1971). Good country people. In *The complete stories of Flannery O'Connor*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Polzer, J. (1987). Simone Martini's *Guidoriccio* fresco: The polemic concerning its origin reviewed, and the fresco considered as serving the military triumph of a Tuscan commune. *RACAR, Revue d'Art Canadienne. Canadian Art Review*, 14(1-2), 16-69.
- Special section: Whistle-blowing. (1987). *The Scientist*, 1(27), 9-12.
- Squires, N. (1987). Unpublished paper.
- Stewart, W., & Feder, N. (1987). The integrity of the scientific literature. *Nature*, 325(January), 207-214.
- Watson, P. (1986). The well-shaken Martini. *The Observer*, (London), February 15, 4.
- Wohl, A. S. (1984). In Siena, an old masterpiece challenged, a new one discovered. *News from RILA*, 2(February), 1, 11-13.