

better to explicate and expose codes and texts than librarians, the vocational descendants of the priestly cataloger of Nippur, who acquired, classified, and sanctified the very first collection? This is a crucial point in developing a philosophical basis for an IL theory that emanates from a concern for equity while honoring the ancient role of the librarian as "keeper." No longer wishing to wear the mantle of arbiter but hesitant to throw away such a long venerated cloth, the librarian committed to equity shares the mantle by turning it inside out, explicitly encouraging students to inspect the seams, to examine critically the ways in which information is constructed.

*Explicit and Critical Information Literacy for Creating Information*

This shift in the role of librarian toward facilitating an explicit and critical examination of information is of particular importance in community colleges. Often the first generation in their families to attend higher education and frequently coming from poorly funded K-12 schools in which they have been underprepared for higher education, community college students especially would profit from librarians who see in themselves some of the metaphors suggested by Allan Luke and Cushla Kapitzke: "critical commentators, mediators, . . . mentors, . . . nomadic intellectuals and cultural tourists" [27, p. 472]. Mentored to think about information critically, such students would be more likely to interact with information in strategic ways than if they received instruction from librarians who viewed themselves as bibliographic custodians.

Librarians who view their job as monitors of information and who prize the conventional LIS framework of efficiency and effectiveness are probably the least likely mentors for promoting the idea that knowledge is constructed, an idea that is both crucial to Nancy's thoroughly constructivist concept of *mondialisation* and essential to the intellectual development of all college students. Because students often arrive at a community college underprepared, they are both especially disinclined to see themselves as capable of constructing knowledge and especially prone to see knowledge as "existing as a thing-in-itself, independent of mediation and interpretation" [27, p. 484]. Community college librarians need to offer underprepared students' IL imbued with expectations that research is about what Radford calls "the individual's attempt to locate his knowledge claims within an existing order of knowledge claims" [28, p. 485].

Such an approach to IL—an approach that authorizes students to create meaning, to construct an argument, to stake claims, and to question others' claims—is often full of inefficiency, doubts, intellectual circling, and confusion. It is surely more efficient for both librarian and student to see knowledge as something that can be tracked down and captured, as Luke and Kapitzke have described [27, p. 484], but it is a kind of efficiency that community college librarians especially need to reject. ~~Literacy theorists~~ Glynnda Hull and Mike Rose long ago pointed out the debilitating effects