Section I

Races, Nationalities, Faiths, and Ethnic Groups

1. Item: JEWISH QUESTION (p. 685; Sears, p. 344)¹

For the image of the Jew to arouse any feelings, pro or con, he had to be generalized, abstracted, depersonalized. It is always possible for the personal, individual case to contradict a general assertion by providing living, concrete proof to the contrary. For the Jews to become the foils of a mass movement, they had to be converted into objectified symbols so as to become other than human beings. Moreover, mass agitation demanded simplicity and consistency, and consequently did not readily countenance subtle distinctions which might have excluded some Jews from condemnation. Hitler followed the path of his Volkish predecessors when he presented the Jewish evil not in its flesh-and-blood aspects, but as an abstracted stereotype.

The growing abstraction of the Jew reflected the growing process of his depersonalization. Once the Jew had been denied a soul and genuine emotions, once his religion had been categorized as a fossil without ethical content, he was well on the way to being dehumanized. And who could feel any sorrow for or commiserate with an entity that had lost all human dimensions? Once a population had accepted this depiction of the Jew, it was possible to regard him as a cipher, as a figure that aroused no human compassion—only the large numbers of the martyred dead would stagger the imagination.²

This and its analogues (e.g., “Race question” as a subdivision) qualify as the most odious examples in the whole list of outright
racism, WASPish myopia, and marvelous insensitivity to the suffering and legitimate aspirations of minority peoples. What was (and in many places still is) the “Jewish Question”? Who posed the “question”? And what kind of “answer” did they furnish? In Europe, the “questioners” were (are) the Slavic or “Teutonic” majorities, not the Jews themselves. They “questioned,” in essence, what to do with the Jewish communities who had lived among them for centuries, but who had seldom enjoyed full political or social rights. They “answered” with relatively more or less heinous versions of the Endlösung (Final Solution): exterminate; expel; or reduce the “non-Aryans,” the “rootless cosmopolitans,” to a subhuman condition. On the face of it, “Jewish Question” may seem a bland, neutral term. Yet it is just the opposite, masquerading ruthlessness and inhumanity—the age-old and altogether vicious practice of scapegoating—in a deceptive, leisurely abstraction. The phraseology is that of the oppressor, the ultimate murderer, not the victim. Strong language? The stench at Auschwitz was stronger. The “question” facing the soon-to-be-incinerated millions was not one to be calmly debated. It was fundamental: life or death.

Remedy: Reconstructions are possible for many other inappropriate terms. Not, however, for this. It richly merits deletion.

Notes (Item 1)

1. This and all succeeding references are to the Library of Congress Subject Headings, 7th ed. (Washington, D.C.: Card Division, Library of Congress, 1966). The ensuing study is founded solely on the 7th edition itself, not on the quarterly supplements, titled Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress (Washington, D.C.: Card Division, Library of Congress). The presumption here, based on actual experience in libraries of varying size and kind, is that the public, as well as noncataloging staff, ordinarily know the list in book-form only and that changes often go unmarked in the basic volume. Moreover, there may be some comparative and historic worth to a treatise on the “state of the art” as of 1966, even if—with luck—it radically changes, or to some extent has changed, afterwards. Relevant modifications, however, that have been made in the annual cumulative supplements (hereafter: ACS), five of which have appeared since the list itself, will be footnoted. Many such changes are wholly commendable
and should be called to the attention of librarians and others unaware that such alterations have occurred. Others are less praiseworthy and, as will be shown, still require change.

The methodology has been to survey the 7th ed. page-by-page, prepare an itemized analysis based on the book-form edition alone, and then to examine the annual supplements, revising the book-grounded survey as necessary in notes.

Broadly considered, the Sears List of Subject Headings, first published in 1923, represents an adaptation or simplification of the LC scheme. Indeed, Barbara M. Westby, editor of the 9th ed. (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1965), states in a Preface that “as in earlier editions of Sears, the Library of Congress forms of subject headings were used, with some modifications to meet the needs of smaller collections or to follow popular terminology.” She adds that “several correspondents have expressed the opinion that Sears should follow the Library of Congress form of headings without exception,” and—while believing that “further study and discussion is needed” on that proposal—nonetheless observes that “the increase in centralized and cooperative cataloging services may make standardization more desirable” (p. 5).

That Sears commits many of the same errors as LC and incorporates a similar stance toward various elements of humanity should startle no one. Since, however, Sears—using librarians may mistakenly feel that none of the LC problems to be discussed directly affect them, page-citations will be made to identical constructions in both the LC 7th ed. and Sears 9th ed., hereafter referred to simply as “Sears.”


4. Documentation on the Jewish plight abounds. Cf., e.g., Gerald Reitlinger, Final Solution (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1961) and the entries under “Jewry,” as well as individual countries, in the Institute of Contemporary History and Wiener Library Quarterly Select List of Accessions (London: 4 Devonshire Street, W. 1.), plus continuing and retrospective material in both the quarterly Wiener Library Bulletin and bimonthly Patterns of Prejudice (London: Institute of Jewish Affairs, Ltd., 13–16 Jacob’s Well Mews, George Street, W. 1.), the latter including a regular feature, “Books to note,” which briefly describes new works under heads like “Holocaust,” “War Crimes,” “Antisemitism,” and “Germany.”

5. The anxious, meticulous cataloger who finds that this leaves some
titles without any subject entry may turn to several existing forms that will do equally well: e.g., GENOCIDE (p. 536), HOLOCAUST, JEWISH (1939–1945), JEWS—PERSECUTIONS (p. 687), JEWS IN GERMANY [ARGENTINA, POLAND, RUSSIA, etc.] (p. 688). The admirable "Holocaust"—form was introduced on p. 203–04 of the 1968 ACS. Inexplicably, however, LC did not take this ready-made opportunity to simultaneously cancel JEWISH QUESTION.

2. Item: —RACE QUESTION as a subdivision (p. 1063)

This variant of JEWISH QUESTION invites much the same accusations. To American, Rhodesian, and South African Blacks, or to Asians in East Africa, as examples, their status in the larger, White-(or Black-) governed society is no ethereal concern, no matter for rhetorical gamesmanship. It involves survival in its every aspect: physical, cultural, social, economic, and political. The "question" is one of maintaining group (or, better, human) integrity and dignity, of ending oppression and the soul-wracking uncertainty that pervades their daily lives; more positively stated: of winning those elemental rights that numberless international conventions and proclamations have promised to everyone on earth, of becoming free, whole persons who command their own destinies and contribute fully to the body politic of which they form a part. "Race question" is the overlords' terminology, nicely suggesting that the oppressed—not themselves—represent the "problem." It is a consummate piece of double-think.¹

Remedy: (a) Assign RACE QUESTION as a subhead to the dustbin, where it belonged from the start, and excise it as a See referent to RACE PROBLEMS (p. 1063).

(b) Replace RACE DISCRIMINATION (p. 1063) with the totally new head, RACISM, a broader term encompassing attitudes, as well as deeds, creating extensions and variations as necessary (e.g., RACISM—AFRICA, SOUTH; RACISM—U.S.; RACISM IN EDUCATION; etc.).² Additionally, make cross-references from and to GENOCIDE and PREJUDICES AND ANTIPATHIES.

(c) Where required to express the relationship between various racial groups, particularly those identified by themselves and or others
as "different" on the basis of physical characteristics to which are linked certain nonphysical attributes, employ the subhead—RACE RELATIONS; or, in the case of relationships between ethnically differentiated peoples—i.e., groups distinguished by cultural characteristics like language and religion—use the subdivision—INTERETHNIC RELATIONS.³

Notes (Item 2)

1. A specific application of the subhead appears on p. 759: LOS ANGELES—RACE QUESTION. Its utter inapplicability becomes clear when juxtaposed with these honest, if somewhat apocalyptic, remarks by a young Black resident of the Watts ghetto:

Sometimes living in Watts brings me to the point where I'm just a drop in the ocean, an ocean that is dirty.... And sometimes I feel like I even don't want to live in Watts, because Watts is in the United States, the United States is in the Western Hemisphere, and the Western Hemisphere is part of the Western philosophy, and the Western philosophy is doomed to die. Watts is a container of filth and ignorance, because it was created by the white man. There're containers all over the country, of black people, and they hold and suppress the people that are in them. The filth and ignorance that's in the community is fermenting, to where it's exploding out of the container, and this chemical of filth in the black community is going to emerge and going to destroy itself along with the country, just to prove that black people's minds haven't been robbed, they can't live in this country where they are second, they can't live in a society where they're unhappy....


2. There are ample precedents: Two well-reputed Wilson publications, the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature (RG) and Social Sciences and Humanities Index (SSHI), employ "Racism" as a primary head. So does the newly born Alternative Press Index (API), issued by the Radical Research Center (Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota 55057; v. 1, nos. 1/2, covering July–Dec. 1969, appeared in early 1970).
For a useful distinction, incidentally, between "Racism" and "Ethnocentrism," cf. van den Berghe, *op. cit.*, p. 12. Taking advantage of his insights, "Race" should be eliminated as an "××" under ETHNOCENTRISM (p. 445).

3. As precedents: The Institute of Contemporary History and Wiener Library in their *Quarterly Select List of Accessions, op. cit.*, employ "Race relations" as a major category; so do the annual *Index to Periodical Articles by and About Negroes* (Boston: G. K. Hall) and *British Humanities Index* (BHI; London: Library Association), while Sears uses it as a subdivision under countries, cities, etc., having eliminated "Race question" altogether. Moreover, numerous periodicals incorporate the expression into their titles; e.g.: *Race Relations* (London: Race Relations Board), *Race Relations Abstracts* (London), *Race Relations Law Survey* (Nashville, Tenn.), *Race Relations Bulletin* (London: Institute of Race Relations), and *Race Relations News* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations).

As a social scientist, van den Berghe opts for a working definition by which "race" signifies "a human group that defines itself and/or is defined by other groups as different from other groups by virtue of innate and immutable physical characteristics." These physical characteristics," he adds, "are in turn believed to be intrinsically related to moral, intellectual, and other non-physical attributes or abilities." It is within this framework that he subsequently discusses "race relations," particularly in Mexico, the United States, Brazil, and South Africa. *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

The very first sentence of van den Berghe's chapter on Mexico implicitly makes a strong case for the suggested subhead — INTERETHNIC RELATIONS. "Of all the multiracial societies created by the expansion of Europe since the late fifteenth century," he writes, "those of Spanish America stand out as exhibiting only traces of the racist virus. Indeed, most of these countries constitute such limiting cases that one may more properly speak of ethnic relations." *Ibid.*., p. 42. Emphasis added. The phrase also served as the full title of Julio de la Fuente's 1955 study, *Relaciones interétnicas* (Mexico, D. F.: Instituto Nacional Indígena).

3. **Item: YELLOW PERIL (p. 1427)**

Such phraseology is of a piece with gutter epithets like "slop," "gook," and "chink." It is not only an affront to the people so labelled, but also demeans the user. How it has remained with us this long perhaps only the Sphinx can explain. Or a pathologist.¹

**Remedy:** Cancel the head and ensure that it does not re-
appear even as an unused see referent to other forms. Abundant heads are already available to handle material hitherto assigned yellow peril; e.g.: east and west (p. 396) and pan-pacific relations (p. 940). The innovative form racism, recommended above, might also be appropriate.

Note (Item 3)

1. For anyone unfamiliar with the term or skeptical about its debasing quality, webster's third new international dictionary of the english language unabridged (hereafter: webster's third) supplies two definitions, one as repulsive as the other: “1: a danger to western civilization held to arise from expansion of the power and influence of oriental peoples (as the chinese and japanese) 2: a threat to western living standards developed through the incursion into western countries of oriental laborers willing to work for very low wages and under inferior working conditions” (springfield, mass.: g. & c. merriam co., 1961), p. 2650.

4. Items: JAPANESE IN THE U.S. (p. 679; Sears, p. 342); MEXICANS IN THE U.S. (p. 817; Sears, p. 393); CHINESE IN THE U.S. (p. 224; Sears, p. 146); etc.

The nub here is that these people are described or classed exclusively according to racial, national, or ethnic origin, with no regard nor recognition that many, while still “Mexican” or “Japanese” in heritage, if not appearance, are nonetheless American in nationality, citizenship, and actual residence. The head, in effect, makes them permanent aliens.

Remedy: (a) Determine from the “Americanized” peoples themselves what they wish to be called and add these terms to the scheme (e.g., as appropriate, JAPANESE-AMERICANS, MEXICAN-AMERICANS, etc.).1 The very titles of scholarly studies produced over the past decade imply a marked preference for the hyphenated form.2
So do the organizational and other names created by these various groups. And so does at least one major periodical index, plus one newcomer to the field. Most spectacularly, the LC scheme itself—albeit inconsistently—furnishes several precedents.

(b) The now existing heads could continue to play a role, but much narrower, applying solely to “aliens” (like Mexican seasonal laborers) whose permanent abode is clearly outside the country. Once the “hyphenation” or some similar principle becomes operative for peoples of foreign extraction in the United States, it may also be applied elsewhere, to other countries whose populations developed at least in part through immigration. This might result, e.g., in forms like UKRAINIAN-CANADIANS, ITALO-ARGENTINIANS, ANGLO-AUSTRALIANS, etc. Indeed, when rigorously employed solely within the United States context itself, no “people” apart from Amerindians justly qualifies for the un-hyphenated AMERICANS. It is thus appropriate that constructions like ANGLO-AMERICANS and DUTCH-AMERICANS should coexist with MEXICAN-AMERICANS and JAPANESE-AMERICANS, however much that may discomfit the Daughters of the American Revolution.

(c) Another serious problem inheres in the scheme’s treatment of the Japanese-American experience during World War II. The only pertinent subhead is —DEPORTATION, which less-than-adequately describes the forced internment of over 110,000 Japanese-Americans in concentration camps at Tule Lake and elsewhere entirely on the basis of their “ancestral origins.” To do justice, subject-wise, to this wholly shameful episode requires, minimally, a new subhead like —MMASS INTERMENT, 1942–1945, with “ xxxx’s ” for “Civil rights” and “Racism—U.S.” Further, the individual “detention” or “relocation” centers deserve specific entries; e.g., TULE LAKE (CONCENTRATION CAMP). And at least one of these should be cited as an “also” example under CONCENTRATION CAMPS (p. 286). In this particular instance, the profession can modestly contribute to our own national maturity by destroying the illusion that only other nations or systems (e.g., the Nazis) have committed grievous crimes like the establishment of KZs.

“What thyself” runs the ancient injunction. It’s not yet too late to start.
Notes (Item 4)

1. As an even further refinement, cross-references to Japanese-Americans, if selected as a bona fide head, might be introduced from "Issei," "Nisei," and "Sansei" (first, second, and third generation immigrants, respectively), and from "Chicanos" and "La Raza" to Mexican-Americans. For completeness, additional see or "sa" references will be necessary from "Latin-Americans," "Spanish-Americans," "Hispano-Americans," and "Latinos" to all the particular forms representing Spanish-surnamed peoples of Latin-American origin (i.e., Puerto Rican, Mexican, Cuban, etc.).


4. RG employs both Mexican Americans and Japanese Americans; cf., for example, v. 69, no 22 (Feb. 10, 1970), p. 159, 193; while API uses Mexican Americans, together with Chicano Movement, op. cit., p. 39, as well as Japanese Americans, p. 35.

5. Cf., for example, Czech-American Literature and Czech-American Newspapers (p. 346), Danish-American Literature (p. 349), Norwegian-American Fiction (p. 899), French-Canadians (p. 516), German-American Wit and Humor (p. 542), Irish-American Wit and Humor (p. 672), Swedish-American Poetry (p. 1261), and Greek-American Wit and Humor (1966 ACS, p. 67).

6. For a recent, photo-illustrated retelling of "this story of racist hysteria and abuse of government power," cf. Allan R. Bosworth, America's Concentration Camps (New York: W. W. Norton, 1967). The quoted phrase is from the introduction by Roger Baldwin, wartime director of the American Civil Liberties Union, who neatly annuls the "military necessity" argument by noting that "no evacuation was even suggested for the Germans and Italians, aliens or citizens, on the Atlantic Coast where submarines and defense installations were far more numerous, and the dangers of espionage and sabotage apparently greater" (p. 6–7). Bosworth served at the time as a captain in naval intelligence, stationed on the Pacific Coast. Scholars, students, and concerned citizens will particularly appreciate the year-by-year chronology (p. 254–57) and complete bibliography of both primary and secondary sources (p. 258–61).

5. Items: JEWISH CRIMINALS (p. 685); NEGRO CRIMINALS (p. 885)

A frankly off-handed squib appeared in the April 1969 ALA Bulletin:

Though it may be more a reflection on publishing and writing than librarianship, the 1966 LC subject-heading list contains entries for JEWISH and NEGRO CRIMINALS, but none for the Italian, Irish, Dutch, English, or German varieties.

Curious, hmmm?\(^1\)

It elicited from LC's assistant director for cataloging the retort that:

As a matter of fact, LC exposes the allegedly protected varieties, along with many others, under the heading CRIME AND CRIMINALS with direct geographical subdivisions, e.g. —ITALY, —IRELAND, —HOLLAND, etc. The form beginning with an adjective is used for books that deal with the criminal elements of groups that cannot be expressed in geographical terms.\(^2\)

The “justification” is at once revealing and tragic. Indeed, it transformed what had been little more than a tongue-in-cheek jibe into a matter of ugly proportions, for it manifested an attitude, a type of moral blindness, that now commonly bears the rubric, “institutionalized racism.” The LC defender is no Mississippi redneck. Far
from it. He's a responsible, high-ranking, experienced official. And yet he apparently couldn't see that his prize subdivisions only pertain to "criminals" in Ireland, Italy, etc. These wrongdoers may be Irish or Italian. They could equally be Black, Jewish, or Asian. That two ethnic/racial/national groups alone have been accorded "special" treatment seems to have escaped him.\(^3\) Were there any equity or logic to the scheme, heads like ITALIAN-AMERICAN CRIMINALS (has there been nothing published on the U.S. Mafia?) or IRISH CRIMINALS IN GREAT BRITAIN would also be included. In fact, MAFIA appears as a discrete head (p. 767) with an "xxx" for "Crime and criminals," but with no subhead specified for "—Italy" nor any other indication of the Mafioso's nationality, ethnicity, etc. Curious, hmmm?

**Remedy:** Perhaps the wisest path would be to abandon adjectival forms altogether in this case. Given, though, that *some* are specified, why not the rest? Appearing as they do in splendid isolation, the two *used* heads impute a distinct if not unique criminal propensity to Jews and Blacks.\(^4\) If it were simply that LC hasn't any books on the others, okay. But that's not the way the LC spokesman explains it. Which, again, is revealing. And tragic.

**Notes (Item 5)**

4. A "propensity," be it noted, once vigorously maintained by Nazi propagandists like Otto Dietrich, who operated the Deutscher Wochendienst, an official agency charged with supplying anti-Semitic material to both foreign and domestic journals. Among the emphases urged on journalists by Dietrich was that "Every single Jew, wherever he is and whatever he is doing, shares the guilt. There is no such thing as a 'good Jew,' but only degrees of skill and camouflage. The Jew is a Notorious Criminal." Quoted by Bramsted, *op. cit.*, p. 401. Emphasis added.
Joan Marshall correctly points out—in a personal communication, \textit{op. cit.}—that Catholics, too, appear as “a special class of criminals” (p. 197). To conserve searching-time, it may be recorded here that no complementary forms exist for PROTESTANT CRIMINALS, BAPTIST CRIMINALS, EPISCOPALIAN CRIMINALS, etc. Moreover, the list expresses not even one iota of doubt about Catholics’ criminal proclivities, for it refers directly from the unused “Catholics as criminals” to the uncompromising CATHOLIC CRIMINALS. Until members of other religious groups are accorded “equal treatment,” the “Catholic” rubric should be abolished.

6. \textbf{Items: MOHAMMEDANISM (p. 839); MOHAMMEDANS (p. 840), and some 16 adjectival forms beginning MOHAMMEDAN ... (e.g., MOHAMMEDAN ANTIQUITIES, p. 839), as well as several phrase forms like MOHAMMEDANISM AND PHILOSOPHY (p. 840) and COMMUNISM AND MOHAMMEDANISM (p. 281)}

In legal jargon, this is a virtually open-and-shut case. Even as the first edition of the LC came off the press, James Hastings wrote in his \textit{Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics} that “Islam is the name peculiar to the religion founded by Muhammad, and embraces all the different sects which are now found among his followers. Thus, a Shi'ite and a Sunnite are both Muslims.”\textsuperscript{1} The proper terminology, then, for the religion and its professors is “Islam” and “Muslims,” respectively. Lest any doubts remain:

- the \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia} declared that Islam is the name “invariably preferred by its adherents to ‘Mohammedanism’ ... and its believers call themselves Moslems (more accurately, Muslims, Arabic \textit{muslimun})....”\textsuperscript{2}
- “muhammadan ... or mohammedan,” according to Webster, is a term “used predominantly by those outside the faith of Islam and \textit{usually taken to be offensive by the Islamic believer}.”\textsuperscript{3}
Remedy: Replace the long favored LC forms with ISLAM and MUSLIMS (or the adjectival "Islamic" and "Muslim"), making appropriate cross-references from the discarded terms.4

Notes (Item 6)


4. For a precedent, cf. the March 1970 SSHI (v. 57, no. 4), which uses ISLAM, MUSLIMS, and the adjectival ISLAMIC, p. 82, 111. The BHI, however, persists in adhering to the discredited “Mohammedan/Mohammedanism” forms. So, ludicrously, does the Guide to Indian Periodical Literature (Gurugon, Haryana: Prabhu Book Service), where the searcher will regularly discover titles like “Islam and Pakistan,” “Islam in India’s Transition to Modernity,” and “Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan” under the heading MOHAMMEDANISM! Cf. v. 6, no. 2 (April-June 1969), p. 101. Emphasis added.

Somewhat strangely—indeed, contradictorily—another precedent appears in LC itself: PAN-ISLAMISM (p. 941).

Though accomplished too late for inclusion in the 7th ed., it is unreservedly to LC’s credit that it undertook, by means of the July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS, perhaps the greatest and longest overdue heading-rectification in many years. Not only has ISLAM replaced MOHAMMEDANISM as the head for material “on the religion of which Muhammad is the prophet,” but MUSLIMS is now to be applied to “works on the community of believers in this religion” and the adjectival forms “Islamic” and “Muslim” have been introduced wherever necessary. This conversion, evidenced throughout the cited supplement, but particularly concentrated on p. 107–12, appears to be total, all possible ramifications having been accounted for. The massive revision, which convincingly underscores the technical competence of LC’s staff and reveals that large organization’s capacity to be flexible, merits hearty congratulations and augurs well for future improvements. It proves in short, that needed changes, however vast, can be made, though it is earnestly to be hoped that the “goliath” will henceforth respond somewhat more rapidly to such imperatives than in the past. Fifty years, after all, is rather long to wait.
7. *Item:* MIXED BLOODS as a subdivision under INDIANS (p. 627); INDIANS OF MEXICO (p. 629); INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA (p. 633); and INDIANS OF SOUTH AMERICA (p. 636)

A colorful, frontier-style term that no doubt appeals to whole generations nourished on Cowboy-and-Indian thrillers, it nevertheless represents shoddy science and the White Man’s hauteur: (a) “Blood” is by no means the crucial element in genetic crossing; it is merely one element among many for determining or defining ‘racial’ groups and not in itself a causal factor; (b) It is highly dubious that Indians anywhere in the Americas credit “Mixed bloods” as a proper, acceptable term for persons of White-Indian or Black-Indian parentage. In Mexico, for example, the common designation for the majority of the population descended from Europeans and Indians alike (with some African admixture) is “Mestizos,” not “Sangres mixtas.”

*Remedy:* Canvass the principal Amerindian organizations, establishing a substitute head through consensus.²

**Notes (Item 7)**


Edward T. Price in 1953 estimated the total number of “mixed-bloods” in America, mainly scattered in endogamous groups along the Eastern Seaboard, as between 50,000 and 100,000. He further indicated that their “unusual group names,” ranging from Bushwhackers and Jackson Whites to Melungeons and Croatans, “were applied to them by the country people.” Cf. “A geographic analysis of white-Negro-Indian racial mixtures in Eastern United States,” in Association of American Geographers, *Annals*, v. 43, no. 2 (June 1953), p. 138. Emphasis added.

2. For a comprehensive list of such groups, national and—more specifically—California, cf. “Organizations” in the Jan.-Feb. 1970 *Synergy* (No. 25), p. 14–7. It might also be useful to consult the editors of leading
Amerindian magazines and newspapers. A roster of these publications, compiled by Carol Brown and Celeste West, appears in the same "First Americans" issue, p. 4–10.

An analogous head, requiring the same sort of alteration, is GUINEAS (MIXED BLOODS, U.S.), p. 569. According to Webster, the singular form means "one of a group of people of mixed white, Indian and Negro ancestry who live chiefly in West Virginia and Maryland," p. 1010. The lexicographer adds, importantly, that the term is "often used disparagingly." In this case it seems wise to consult not only Amerindian but also Afro-American authorities like John Henrik Clarke, editor of Freedomways and president of the African Heritage Studies Association (AHSA).

An objection is also in order here to MULATTOS, presently accorded primary-head status (p. 858), as a designation for persons of mixed African and other descent. Its palpably offensive character is revealed by its very etymology, its derivation: "from mule, implying a cross between different biological species." Cf. van den Bergh, op. cit., p. 52. Emphasis added. This, then, is still another form in which a substitute should be devised by Afro-American and perhaps Amerindian experts.

The situation has further deteriorated with the gratuitous appearance of an "x" for "Half-breed Indians" under INDIANS—MIXED BLOODS in the 1969 ACS, p. 108.

8. Item: MORAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS as a subdivision (uniquely) under NEGROES (p. 896; Sears, p. 426)

The enormous problem surrounding "Negroes" itself will be dealt with later. The difficulty with this subhead centers on the word "Moral." It smacks of paternalism, condescension, and the ubiquitous "White Man's Burden," all the more so since it is not applied to any other ethnic/racial group. A concern with Black "morals" can only be attributed to a missionary, warder, or trustee. The very approach reeks of inequality. For comparative purposes, note that merely "Social conditions" is shown as a subhead under CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA (p. 299), although it might be reasonably argued that the very system of chattel slavery which the Confederacy so warmly adulated and staunchly defended represented a moral problem or condition of impressive dimensions. Why, then,
was the same solicitude displayed for "moral" conditions among Black men not also expended on the Confederates?

**Remedy:** Excise "Moral" from the subhead, thus reducing it to the fully adequate — SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

9. **Items:** PAGANISM (p. 935; Sears, p. 443);
   PAGANISM IN LITERATURE (p. 935);
   CIVILIZATION, PAGAN (p. 254)

"Heathenism," mercifully, goes unused. But "Paganism" is bad enough, fully illustrating the Christian chauvinism epidemic to the scheme. A. Babs Fafunwa, dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Ife in Nigeria, cogently addresses this theme with respect to Africa, but his comments are generally applicable:

Religious intolerance is another important contributory factor to racial prejudice in Africa. The early Christian missionaries genuinely but naively believed that their mission was to convert the "African pagans and muslims" to Christianity and thus bring light to the "benighted" Africans. The early Christian attitude presumed that the Africans' own religions were inferior and should be ruthlessly eliminated. The missionaries, in collaboration with local colonial administrators, joined forces together in imposing their own religion and culture on the African populace . . .¹

Coming directly to "pagan," Fafunwa observes:

The word "Pagan" is defined as "one of a nation or community which does not worship the true God." How any human being can arrogate to himself the power to determine who and who does not worship the true God is still one of the mysteries of life and living.²

How the wretched heading survived on the pages of the LC subject list through at least 1966 is no less a mystery.³

**Remedy:** Cancel all three heads. The legitimate forms CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS, RELIGIONS, RELIGION IN LITERATURE, and the many existing permutations of "Civilization" should suffice.
Notes (Item 9)


3. Substitute "pagan" for "heathen" in this account of an actual childhood experience in Painesville, Ohio, and the human, flesh-and-blood implications of the term, as well as the haughty, pogrom-generating attitude it embodies, become clear:

... This little girl. A nice one, she was. She wanted to help me.
You see, I was a Jew, and that meant that I was one of those who ground up babies to make matzohs for the High Holy Days. She believed that, and she wanted to save me. She followed me for several days, and then one day she caught up with me and tried to help.
"You've got to repent," she said, seriously.
I stared at her. I didn't know what she meant, but I was frightened.
"You're a heathen," she said. "You're damned to hell by God because you aren't baptized."
I wanted to run.
"Please, please"—she was almost crying—"you've got to believe in the Christ child, because you're going to Hell, and you'll be burning, and you'll ask for water on your tongue, and I can't give you any, because you're a heathen... ."
I turned and ran, terrified that she was right.


Irmgard Johnson accentuates the anti-intellectual, education-thwarting effect of the "pagan" posture. An individual, she writes, "seeks approval and fears disapproval; he gains approval and avoids disapproval by making the expected responses. His indoctrination is the core of his self-identity, and he fears the disorientation and insecurity that are the result of threat to or loss of any part of it. His family and church have equipped him with feelings of guilt should he for a moment entertain ideas or facts contrary to the 'right' ones. Such ideas belong to 'pagans,' 'foreigners,' 'others,' the
'unenlightened,' to use the politest terminology, and therefore should not be allowed to contaminate him.” Cf. “Religion as a deterrent to learning,” Journal of General Education, v. 20, no. 4 (Jan. 1969), p. 282–83. The whole essay, founded on concrete classroom experience, is worth serious attention, for the author alleges that powerful, “irrational forces,” to whom “fixed beliefs” are sacred, willfully suppress, rationalize, or disparage data that challenge their convictions.

10. **Items:** NEGROES (p. 886; Sears, p. 425); the numerous adjectival forms beginning NEGRO ... (e.g., NEGRO ART, NEGRO LIBRARIANS, p. 885–86; Sears, p. 424–25); all extended phrases commencing with NEGROES (e.g., NEGROES IN LITERATURE, NEGROES IN AFRICA, p. 886–87; Sears, p. 426); and relevant inverted constructions (e.g., LUTHERANS, NEGRO, p. 763)

How do we handle catalogue relevance for blacks? How do we assign subject headings to black material? Do we follow the Library of Congress and put it all under Negroes? This violates the thinking of blacks in this area and might be construed as just another example of white racism at work.¹

Being a complex matter, it demands systematic unravelling:

(a) Mr. Fafunwa, a Nigerian, states unequivocally that Africans prefer “to be called ‘African,’ not ‘Negro’ or ‘coloured.’”²

(b) Among Black Americans, “Negro” has increasingly become an object of derision, stigmatized as “Whitey’s” language, an instrument of de-identification.³

(c) Its employment by LC is wholly “special” and inconsistent vis-à-vis the two other major “racial” categories, Caucasian and Oriental. No comparable forms, like CAUCASIAN LIBRARIANS OR ORIENTALS AS FARMERS, appear anywhere in the list. And the “Oriental” entry, by means of an *sa* note, seems to prefer forms for “individual peoples” (e.g., “Chinese, East Indians, Mongols”).⁴

(d) In the sphere of sheer practicality, monumental confusion
arises over the delimitation imposed by the scope note under NEGROES: that the unqualified term applies solely to "Negroes" in the United States. African (and other) readers, not to mention overseas librarians themselves, thus find it difficult to "discriminate" between "Negroes" who dwell in America and Black Americans ("Negroes" again) who may reside, for example, in Liberia. Does NEGROES IN LIBERIA refer to Black Americans there or to black Liberians? Or perhaps, to Black Americo-Liberians? The scheme fails to resolve this dilemma. If nothing else, such a master guide should promote clarity. Instead, it encourages intellectual anarchy and much frustration. 5

The remedy must discard the manifestly offensive and racially mired current term, replacing it with forms chosen on an essentially ethnic or national basis:

(a) For material on Black Americans, substitute AFRO-AMERICANS for NEGROES and institute AFRO-AMERICAN as the adjectival form (e.g., AFRO-AMERICAN ART; AFRO-AMERICAN AUTHORS; LUTHERANS, AFRO-AMERICAN, etc.). Similarly: replace NEGROES IN LITERATURE with AFRO-AMERICANS IN LITERATURE, etc. 6

(b) As a corollary, abolish altogether phrases beginning NEGROES IN . . . If a work treats with Black people in Canada or Brazil, as examples, it would be assigned AFRO-CANADIANS or AFRO-BRAZILIANS. Together with the recommendations advanced earlier regarding, e.g., JAPANESE-AMERICANS and MEXICAN-AMERICANS, this should achieve both fairness and consistency. 7

(c) Completely delete such monstrosities as NEGROES IN AFRICA and NEGROES IN LIBERIA. Material on Black Africans, Liberians, Nigerians, etc., since they constitute the majorities on that continent and in nearly all of its lands, can be adequately handled by a number of already-available heads (e.g., LIBERIA—SOCIAL CONDITIONS; AFRICA—POPULATION) or the proposed subdivisions—PEOPLES. 8

(d) If necessary to specify Black Americans, Africans (in general), or Liberians, et al., who are temporarily outside their home continent or country, use forms like AFRO-AMERICANS IN SWEDEN, LIBERIANS IN THE U.S., OR AFRICAN STUDENTS IN RUSSIA. 9

(e) The much greater sophistication among library users today, plus overwhelming hostility to the antiquated word "colored" among people of African descent, compellingly dictate that the nine
"Colored" See references on p. 274 be deleted. Why pamper the troglodytes?10

(f) FOLKLORE, NEGRO (p. 496) should be split into two new heads: FOLKLORE, AFRICAN and FOLKLORE, AFRO-AMERICAN.

(g) Consistent application of the "Afro-" principle will alter forms like NEGRO POETRY (AMERICAN), NEGRO POETRY (FRENCH), NEGRO POETRY (PORTUGUESE), and NEGRO POETRY (SPANISH-AMERICAN)11 to AFRO-AMERICAN POETRY, AFRO-FRENCH POETRY, AFRO-PORTUGUESE POETRY, and AFRO-Spanish POETRY, with glosses added as necessary to indicate location; e.g., AFRO-Spanish POETRY (LATIN AMERICA), AFRO-Spanish POETRY (EQUATORIAL GUINEA).12

(h) The heading and note for FREEMASONs, NEGRO (p. 515) may be revamped as:

FREEMASONS, AFRO-AMERICAN

Only general works are entered here. Works relating to individual Afro-American lodges, as well as the literature of Afro-American freemasonry in any given locality, are entered under Freemasons. [local subdivision], e.g., Freemasons. U.S. Scottish Rite. National Supreme Council (Afro-American).

xx Afro-Americans

Notes


3. As indirect evidence: the venerable, widely-read Negro Digest this year changed its title to Black World. For a powerful, convincing assault on "Negro" by a Black American, cf. Adelaide Cromwell Hill, "What Is Africa to Us?" in Floyd B. Barbour, ed., The Black Power Revolt (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1968), p. 127–35. Also: The Name "Negro"—Its Origin and Evil Use, by Harlem bookstore-owner Richard B. Moore (New York: Afroamerican Publishers, 1960). Lerone Bennett, Jr., in a cogent exploration of the "name" controversy, notes that "a large and vocal group ... charges that the word 'Negro' is an inaccurate epithet which perpetuates the master-slave mentality in the minds of both black and white Americans." From his discussion the irrefutable fact emerges that "Negro" as a term derived from the slavers who forcibly transported Africans to the New World. Adds Bennett, it "fused not only humanity, nationality and place of origin, but also certain
white judgments about the inherent and irredeemable inferiority of the persons so designated." Cf. "What's in a Name," Ebony, v. 23, no. 1 (Nov. 1967), p. 46+. Echoing this view, the editor of the 10-year-old Liberator in the April 1970 number stated: "We prefer to designate ourselves, as a whole people, as 'Black,' or 'Afro-American,' rather than by the objectionable slave term 'negro.'" V. 10, no. 4, p. 22. Van den Berghe further substantiates the odious nature of "Negro" in his contention that Spaniards, who figured among the earliest slavers and slave-owners, regarded Africans as a "vile, immoral race possessing unclean blood and low intelligence." Op. cit., p. 52. The word itself is Iberian in origin.

4. P. 928.

5. The BHI, for example, finds it necessary to specify NEGROES IN UNITED STATES. Cf., e.g., no. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1969), p. 78.

6. The "Afro" form is hardly a startling innovation. A national Afro-American Council existed in the 19th century; a well-known Baltimore weekly has borne the term on its masthead since 1982; "Black Power" advocates Robert F. Williams, Ron Karenga, LeRoi Jones, and Lawrence P. Neal have freely used it; likewise Black Panther Minister of Information Eldridge Cleaver. Representatives of the Student Afro-American Society attended the 1967 National Conference on Black Power; at the 1967 Racism in Education conference of the American Federation of Teachers (according to Bennett, op. cit., p. 47), "the delegates unanimously endorsed a resolution which called on all educators, persons, and organizations to abandon the slavery imposed name 'Negro' for the terms 'African-American' or 'Afro-American.'" A Brooklyn-based organization called Brothers and Sisters for Afro-American Unity publishes the quarterly Habari Barua, "a new experience in black magazines." The Amsterdam News, an important Black paper in New York, regularly identifies Americans of African descent as "Afro-Americans," and within the last year or two it has become common currency among Blacks and Whites alike, entirely free of opprobrium or "bad vibes." In fact, RG has lately incorporated AFRO AMERICAN STUDIES as a primary head, but curiously continues to refer from "Afro-American culture" and "Afro-American students" to "Negro" forms. Cf., e.g., v. 70, no. 4 (April 10, 1970), p. 2. For another precedent in professional literature, cf. the "Afro-American" listings in Katz, op. cit., p. 7–11.

For an LC precedent, cf. p. 4 of the 1969 ACS, which instituted AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES as a primary head. The same supplement, however, perhaps as a belated and surely heavy-handed concession to the new mood among American Blacks, instead of pursuing the logic of AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES to its obvious consequences elsewhere in the scheme, simply and feebly manufactured a series of See references to NEGROES from "African-Americans," "Afro-Americans," "Black people (U.S.)," and "Black Americans" (p. 4 and 25). Such "tokenism" will not do.
7. Keith Baird's opinion, quoted by Bennett, is apropos: "The unwillingness of the dominant group to recognize the humanity of the African is evidenced by the fact that when it is necessary or desired to identify Americans in terms of the land of their origin, terms such as Italian-American, Polish-American, Spanish-American, Jewish-American . . . . etc., are employed. In the American mind there is no connection of the black American with 'land, history and culture'—factors which proclaim the humanity of an individual." Op. cit., p. 52. Baird is coordinator of the Afro-American History and Cultural Center of the New York City Board of Education.

8. See below under NATIVE RACES, Section II, item 1.

9. "Nationalist" militants, in particular, may argue strenuously for "Blacks" in preference to "Afro-Americans." Indeed, the API opted for such terminology, and so has at least one perhaps hyper-responsive public library. But "Blacks," however emotionally satisfying to some, perpetuates the old "racial" hang-up and could well wreak havoc subject-wise. BLACKS IN SOUTH AFRICA really affords little improvement over NEGROES IN SOUTH AFRICA, both wrongfully implying that black South Africans somehow constitute a minority in their own land. And BLACK WIT AND HUMOR, as another instance, could mean something radically and undesirably different from AFRO-AMERICAN WIT AND HUMOR.

The L.C., acknowledging the imprecision and consequent misunderstanding that would result from a phrase like NEGRO STUDENTS IN THE U.S. applied to students who were in fact from an African country, permits: AFRICAN STUDENTS IN THE U.S. [etc.], p. 23.

10. As another instance of retrogression (or simply continuity), the 1967 ACS on p. 59 added "Colored people (U.S.)" to the previous "Colored people (American)" as a See reference to NEGROES.

11. P. 885.

12. In fact, the 1966 ACS altered these basic forms to AMERICAN POETRY—NEGRO AUTHORS, PORTUGUESE POETRY—NEGRO AUTHORS, etc. (p. 106), which still does not meet the objection to "Negro" and—if retained—would only complicate application of the "Afro" forms, producing quasi-redundancies like AMERICAN POETRY—AFRO-AMERICAN AUTHORS. The proposed heads can easily be related to the larger language or culture-complex through cross-references; e.g., from "American poetry—Afro-American authors" to AFRO-AMERICAN POETRY.

The 1967 ACS, on p. 179, spewed up an extraordinarily regressive form, albeit as only a cross-reference:

Negro literature (African)

See African literature
It was unnecessary labor, whose offspring ought to be cancelled, since it may be safely assumed that most African literature is in any event authored by Black writers.

11. Items: CHURCH (p. 238; Sears, p. 150); CHURCH HISTORY (p. 241; Sears, p. 152)

When I mention religion, I mean the Christian religion....
—Parson Thwackum

There can be no great quarrel with the fact that Christian entries preponderate in a scheme based on the actual holdings of a Western (i.e., religion-wise: Christian-oriented) library. The problem thus does not revolve about the number or extent of these entries, but rather with the manner of presentation. If the scheme is to be truly disinterested in tone and universal in applicability, there must be a parity in approach toward all the various faiths that compose the earth's religious landscape. A Jew, Jain, Shinto believer, or Muslim will not find that these heads embrace his Church or its history. The scope is restricted to Christianity, as a See reference under CHRISTIANITY—HISTORY (p. 235) and the multiple subdivisions like —BIBLICAL TEACHING under CHURCH clearly indicate.

Remedy: (a) Remove CHURCH HISTORY as a primary head, transferring the two columns of subdivisions to CHRISTIANITY—HISTORY.2

(b) The unqualified CHURCH, together with all other heads beginning CHURCH... (p. 238–42), if designed for sole application to the Christian Church, should be prefaced by “Christian” (e.g., CHRISTIAN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE, CHRISTIAN CHURCH MUSIC, CHRISTIAN CHURCH GROUP WORK, CHRISTIAN CHURCH WORK WITH PROSTITUTES, CHRISTIAN CHURCH WORK WITH WOMEN).3

Notes (Item 11)

1. “Mr. Thwackum, the divine,” makes this statement to “Mr. Square” in Henry Fielding’s The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling (New
   2. This will then conform to already established practice elsewhere in
   the scheme; e.g., JUDAISM—HISTORY (p. 691–92).
   3. The last two unprefaced forms appear, together with several others,
   in the 1966 ACS, p. 31.

12. **Items: HERESIES AND HERETICS; HERESY**
   **(p. 587)**

   Another example of Christian bias, for the heads are obviously
   restricted to heretics and heresy vis-à-vis Christian dogma or
   orthodoxy.

   **Remedy:** As suggested previously, indicate to which faith the
   heresy and heretics relate; e.g., HERESIES AND HERETICS, CHRISTIAN.¹

   **Note (Item 12)**

   1. The scheme itself affords precedents: HERESIES AND HERETICS,
   JEWISH and HERESIES AND HERETICS, MOHAMMEDAN (p. 587).

13. **Item: NEGROES AS BUSINESSMEN**
   **[CONSUMERS, FARMERS, etc.], p. 886²**

   The “as” necessarily implies that the occupation or activity that
   follows is somehow odd, uncommon, or unfitting for “Negroes” to
   engage in. The “proof of the pudding” is that no NEGROES AS SLAVES
   or NEGROES AS DOMESTIC SERVANTS is thought necessary.

   **Remedy:** Directly precede the occupation or activity with the
   adjectival form; e.g., AFRO-AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN [CONSUMERS,
   FARMERS, etc.].²

   **Notes (Item 13)**

   1. Also, the spanking new form NEGROES AS COWBOYS (1966 ACS,
   p. 106).
2. The same criticism and rectification apply to Jews as farmers [seamen, soldiers, etc.]. p. 688. For a precedent, cf. Jewish Criminals (p. 685). Apparently the qualms that obviously troubled the list composers regarding a Jew's fitness for farming or soldiering did not afflict them with respect to his capacity for law-breaking.

Not unexpectedly, Amerindians fare little better than Blacks or Jews. Cf. Indians of North America as Seamen and Indians of North America as Soldiers (p. 635). Ranganathan has nicely tabbed this construction a "Bias Phrase" in which a subject is treated "from the point of view of a class of users [or doers] whose primary interest lies in another subject." Cf. E. J. Coates, Subject Catalogues; Headings and Structure (London: Library Association, 1969), p. 105. To which nations or peoples, then, can a "primary interest" in soldiering be ascribed? Probably none. Yet no heads appear for Americans as soldiers, Christians as soldiers, or Caucasians as soldiers.

Deaf as Authors (p. 352) belongs in the same category. There are no intelligent grounds for assuming that deafness per se is likely to blunt anyone's literary or creative potential. The form should be altered to deaf authors. The 1967 ACS on p. 71 compounded this foolishness by installing deaf as athletes as a new rubric. Perhaps the innovator would be good enough to explain why a deaf person cannot be expected to run, jump, or swim as well as anyone else.

14. Item: ANGELS (p. 51)

Now what could be amiss with so patently inoffensive a term? Simply that these angels are automatically assumed and understood to be Christian, while other varieties require an explanatory gloss; e.g., angels (Judaism) and angels (Mohammedanism).

Remedy: To establish equality among the seraphim of all faiths, add the gloss: (Christianity). The unglossed form may be retained to cover material, if any, on Comparative Angelics.

15. Item: GOD (p. 552)

Subsequent primary heads on the same page—e.g., God (Brahmanism), God (Chinese Religion), God (Judaism)—prove conclusively that the Christian deity (just, as previously shown, Christian
angels, the Christian Church, etc.) has been allotted an unqualified prominence. For identical reasons, the form should be amended so that the Christian Divinity simply assumes its rightful, yet not overpowering, place alongside Zeus, Shiva, Parvati, Isis, and Allah in the vast panoply of gods.

**Remedy:** Add the gloss (CHRISTIANITY), and transfer the resultant head to its proper slot in the alphabetical sequence, between GOD (CHINESE RELIGION) and GOD (EGYPTIAN RELIGION).¹

**Note (Item 15)**

1. Several more glossed forms have since been added; e.g., GOD (AFRICAN RELIGION), GOD (Sikhism). Cf. 1967 ACS, p. 114.

16. **Item: GENOCIDE (p. 536)**

(a) An inconspicuous entry, its one sa—“Trials (Genocide)”—and four “××’s” occupy barely a column inch. “Race problems,” figuring third among the ×× referents, seems starkly incongruous, if not macabre. Signifying mass murder, the deliberate annihilation or degradation of a people, “Genocide” itself represents a problem of mammoth dimensions. Only by means of lingual alchemy, perverting the very substance of speech, can it be counted an aspect of “Race problems,” or vice versa. A “problem” presupposes a “solution.” Genocide, once effected, nullifies and liquidates any such antecedent “problems,” whether racial or ethnic. Considered within the framework of a Judaeo-Christian or broadly humanistic ethic, it solves nothing. Moreover, “Race problems” intimates a certain minimal distribution of strength among the contestants, no party being wholly at a disadvantage, which bears no relationship whatever to a genocidal situation in which one side enjoys such a monopoly of power that it can eliminate the other. There is decidedly a “problem” here; not of “race,” but of fathoming the enormity of that inconspicuous eight-letter entry.

(b) Under MASSACRES (p. 789) appears the useful direction to
"sa names of massacres, e.g. St. Bartholomew's Day, Massacre of," etc. Referring to specific instances thus amplifies and illustrates the general head. Yet no such specific referents amplify or illustrate GENOCIDE, by any standard a far weightier—and from a strictly moral viewpoint, immensely more reprehensible—matter. The omission, in effect, results in a pronounced imbalance of horror, of depravity.

Remedy: (a) Excise "Race problems" from the "××'s."
(b) Expand the sa statement to read: sa Trials (Genocide) and entries for specific victims of Genocide; e.g., Armenian Massacres, 1915–1923; Indians, Treatment Of; Indians of North America—Government Relations; Jews in Europe—History—1933—

Notes (Item 16)


2. Introduced on p. 25 of the 1968 ACS, with an "×" for "Armenian genocide, 1915–1923." An "××," however, for "Armenian question" (p. 72, 7th ed.) powerfully suggests that this phrase, like "Jewish question," should be cancelled, relying upon the new form, together with ARMEINDANS IN TURKEY (p. 72), as adequate substitutes.

3. Reporting on the "Alcatraz occupation" undertaken by Amerindiands in November 1969, Peter Collier wrote: "The California Indians now on the Rock know that their people were decimated from a population of 100,000 in 1850 when the goldrush settlers arrived, to about 15,000 thirty years later, and that whole tribes, languages and cultures were erased from the face of the earth. There are South Dakota Indians there whose grandparents were alive in 1890 when several hundred Sioux, mostly women and children leaving the reservation to find food, were caught at Wounded Knee, killed, and buried in a common grave—the old daguerreotypes still showing heavily-mustached soldiers standing stiffly over the frozen bodies like hunters with their trophies." If any single word properly describes the Ameridian agony as recounted by Collier and many others, it is Genocide. Cf. "The Red Man's Burden," Ramparts, v. 8, no. 8 (Feb. 1970), p. 26–38. According to the "President's Message to the Congress on Goals and Programs for the American Indians," presented on March 6, 1968, "There are about 600,000 Indians in America today."
there were some 850,000 in what is now the U.S., a figure that by 1910 had declined to 220,000. Cf. *Cherokee Examiners*, no. 2 (1969), p. 2, and *Collier's Encyclopedia* (New York: Crowell & Macmillan, 1967), v. 12, p. 643.

Ernest Kaiser maintains that “more than 75 million Indians have been exterminated throughout the Americas. Some tribes,” he continues, “have been destroyed completely by the cruel and inhuman treatment of white imperialist Americans. America’s colonial Indian policy of destruction of all Indian organizations, denial of all self-rule, constant violations of treaties which were only to trick the Indians, suppression of all Indian cultures including their religions and the theft of almost all Indian lands was really a policy of liquidation of Indian properties and Indian life, that is, genocide.” About 1,200,000 Amerindians, he claims, “were massacred in the U.S. alone.” *Op. cit.*, p. 298–99. Likewise, van den Berghe, limiting his scope solely to Mexico, declares that the “Indian population declined from an estimated 4.5 million in 1519 to 3.3 million in 1570 to 1.3 million in 1646.” As reasons for this staggering decimation he lists: “smallpox and typhus epidemics, wars, forced labor, and mistreatment on mines and plantations, heavy tribute demands, spoliation of land, and the general social and economic disruption which came in the wake of the Conquest.” *Op. cit.*, p. 43. Cf. also: Ian T. Peters, “The Non-vanishing American,” *International Relations*, v. 3, no. 9 (May 1970), p. 717–25. Peters estimates the pre-Columbian Amerindian population in the U.S. at 1,000,000, which had dropped “at the turn of the century” to an “all-time low of approximately 300,000.” p. 717.

It should be noted that the new form, **HOLOCAUST, JEWISH** (1939–1945), installed by the 1968 ACS (p. 203–04), *does* specify an “××” for “Genocide.”

17. **Item:** BANDEIRAS

   ×× **Brazil—History—To 1821**

   **Brazil—History—1549–1762** (p. 109)

   This head deserves embellishment, rather than correction. The metal-working, gold-discovering *bandeirantes*, says Gilberto Freyre, were “an active, creative, and one might almost add, a noble element in the colonization of Brazil.” A “frontier folk,” remarks Basil Davidson, “of unusual daring and accomplishment,” they were also, for the most part, runaway slaves, Africans who fled the tyranny of coastal plantations. And they may well qualify, in addition, as the first
Republicans in the Western Hemisphere. Were library catalogues to show their origin, it would render a distinct bibliographic service to programs of Black and African Studies.

Remedy: Establish AFRO-BRAZILIANS as a primary head (recommended earlier), with both an sa and “××” for “Bandeiras.”

Notes (Item 17)

2. Ibid., p. 19, 21.

18. Item: BAPTISM (p. 112)

This, too, exudes the by-now-familiar priority assigned to Christianity throughout the scheme. More than one faith, as the list itself admits in a later head, BAPTISM (HINDUISM), practices this ritual or sacrament. But Christianity again enjoys an absolute precedence.

Remedy: Add the gloss (CHRISTIANITY).

19. Items: BANKS AND BANKING—JEWS (p. 111); CAPITALISTS AND FINANCIERS—JEWS (p. 185)

All Jews love money. All Jews are sensualists with a penchant for gentile virgins. All Jews are involved in a conspiracy to take over the financial and cultural life of whatever country they happen to be living in.

Were other kinds of bankers, capitalists, and financiers accorded subheads, this might not be worth mentioning. But “Jews” appears as the sole subdivision, no doubt a source of warmth and comfort.
to anti-Semites and neo-Nazis, yet outrageous to anyone else. Such a form tempts the finder to believe that Joseph Goebbels composed it. Surely, it would have delighted him.²

**Remedy:** Either add subheads for the entire gamut of bankers, as well as "capitalists and financiers"—e.g., Lebanese, Christian, Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic, etc.—or dispense with the singled-out "Jews" altogether.³

**Notes**

3. A related subhead, demanding the same reform, is COMMUNISM—Jews (p. 281). It should be common knowledge that members of many groups have been associated with Communism, but LC specifies only "Jews," again—even though unwittingly—parroting the Goebbels propaganda line, which sought to firmly identify Jews with Bolshevism. Who, asked Dr. Goebbels, "were the men 'behind the scenes of this virulent world movement . . . the inventors of all this madness?' The answer was, of course, the Jews. It was they who had discovered Marxism and who were now at the head of Marxist movements everywhere. He insisted that 'only in the brain of a nomad could this satanism have been hatched.' By amassing names and alleged atrocities of countless Jews, Goebbels hoped to unmask Communism and impress on the world that it was the Fuehrer who had rendered it a signal service by setting up 'a barrier to halt world Bolshevism against which the waves of this vile Asiatic-Jewish flood break in vain.'" Cf. Bramsted, *op. cit.*, p. 380.
20. **Item: CATHOLICS AS SCIENTISTS** (p. 198)

The presumption, as with all such “as” forms, is that Catholics aren’t likely to become scientists due to some quasihereditary or doctrinal defect. The solitary fact that Gregor Mendel was a monk amply discloses the spuriousness of that contention.¹

**Remedy:** Assign to all relevant material the related head **SCIENTISTS, CATHOLIC** (p. 1147).

---

**Note (Item 20)**

1. The “as” form applied to Blacks, Jews, and Indians has earlier been commented upon. Consider, however, the magnificent assiminity embodied in **JEWS AS SCIENTISTS** (p. 688). It fundamentally implies that men like Einstein, Salk, Oppenheimer, Freud, and Rabi are **deviants**. Similarly, “Jews as educators,” though unused as a prime head (1966 ACS, p. 82), should not even be printed as a cross-reference.

21. **Item: CHILDREN’S SERmons** (p. 222)

Since **CHILDREN’S SERMONS, JEWISH** immediately succeeds this unqualified head, and given the likelihood that more **Christian** sermons for children have been published than those originating from any other faith, it is practically certain that the noninverted head handles solely the Christian species. Which again ruptures what should be the universality of the scheme.

**Remedy:** (a) Employ the unqualified head for multireligious collections or studies.

(b) Institute an inverted form, **CHILDREN’S SERMONS, CHRISTIAN**, for material dealing wholly with that faith.¹

---

**Note (Item 21)**

1. Similar “remedies” may be applied to the prime head, **SERMONS**
22. Item: INTELLIGENCE LEVELS
   — Chinese
   — Javanese
   — Jews
   — Negroes
   — Shilluks (p. 660)

The particularized subheads imply that these five peoples must either be hyper- or sub-intelligent, no other comparable groups having (apparently) been the subjects of special intelligence research. Moreover, they suggest that race or ethnicity are exclusive causal factors in intelligence.

None of these imputations successfully withstands scientific examination. Many races and peoples, not merely the five shown, have been subjected to intelligence tests. And it is well established that a grand variety of factors, environmental and otherwise (not excluding the testers' presuppositions and biases), may influence "intelligence levels."  

Remedy: Closer, more exact cataloging, undertaken in a universalist spirit, would no doubt result in a much expanded and non-discriminatory roster of subheads: e.g., — CAUCASIAN, — AMERICAN, — AFRO-AMERICAN, — MEXICAN-AMERICAN, — BRITISH, — ANGLO-INDIAN, etc. To argue that direct subdivision to place (e.g., — UNITED STATES) would suitably encompass material on "American" intelligence begs the question. In fact, "Americans" are widely-distributed across the globe, just as Jews and Chinese are. If there is something peculiar about American intelligence, it is not necessarily a reflex of being born or living in the United States, but rather a result of factors like American culture, the nature of the American gene-pool, etc.
Note (Item 22)


23. Item: COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH
   (p. 276)

   So ambiguous is this heading that LC supplies a scope note to explain that "if used for any church other than the Catholic, the name of the denomination is added as a subdivision." It remains quite unclear, however, why the Catholic Church should enjoy unqualified precedence in this case.

   Remedy: Whenever used, indicate the Church in question by means of a gloss or subdivision; e.g., COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH (ROMAN CATHOLIC).

24. Item: CONFIRMATION (p. 300)

   Such a rite de passage is not confined to Christian peoples and denominations. Indeed, CONFIRMATION (JEWISH RITE) appears on the same page. To ease Christocentricity from the scheme, the unemended head should solely be assigned to comparative and multi-faith works.

   Remedy: For treatises dealing with Christian confirmation, add the gloss (CHRISTIAN RITE).
25. **Item: DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE (p. 365)**

Juxtaposed with DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, HINDU; DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, JEWISH; and DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, MOHAMMEDAN, the Christian favoritism emerges clearly, if somewhat monotonously.

**Remedy:** For works on or of Christian devotional literature, construct an inverted head DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, CHRISTIAN.¹

**Note (Item 25)**

1. Supplements (e.g., July 1964–Dec. 1965, p. 58) have since altered this construction. The pattern is now to refer from DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, HINDU to HINDU DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE. Significantly, the unmodified DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE remains, with an “x” for “Christian devotional literature.” The result, then, of this “reform” is to make the pro-Christian bias a bit less obvious. The remedy, if all faiths are to be treated equally, would thus be to raise the unused head, CHRISTIAN DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, to primary status, referring from DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE, CHRISTIAN.

26. **Item: ESCHATOLOGY (p. 442)**

The theological doctrine of last or final things appears in many faiths, but LC grants pre-eminence to the Christian genus, designating other creedal versions by inverted heads like ESCHATOLOGY, EGYPTIAN and ESCHATOLOGY, JEWISH.

**Remedy:** Apply the uninveted head only to comparative works, formulating ESCHATOLOGY, CHRISTIAN as a new rubric to encompass Christian material on the subject.

27. **Item: LYNCHING**

\textit{sa} Vigilance committees

\textit{x\times} Criminal Justice, Administration of (p. 764)¹

Note, first, that there is no “x×” from HOMICIDE (p. 596), although that head is provided with references variously from and to
ASSASSINATION, DEATH BY WRONGFUL ACT, MURDER, POISONING, SUICIDE, OFFENSES AGAINST THE PERSON, and VIOLENT DEATHS. Second, there is no “××” from MURDER, despite the fact that this form, like HOMICIDE, is accorded many of the above named referents, plus STRANGLING. Third, no connection is made between LYNCHING and TERRORISM, nor between the act itself and its historically well known victims: Black people. And fourth, the appearance of “Criminal Justice, Administration of” as the sole “××” lends the term, as well as the practice it denotes, a certain dignity, if not legitimacy. Coming to fundamentals, is lynching somehow less “homicidal” or “murderous” than “strangling” or “poisoning”? Is it not an “offense against the person” usually resulting in a “violent death”? Are these qualities of lynching particularly diminished because the lynchings, over the past century, have been largely Black and the lynchers White? Outlining the historic role of lynching in America, van den Berghe states that the practice existed before the Civil War, but it was overwhelmingly an act of whites against whites in attempting to control frontier lawlessness, where legal machinery was either absent or ineffective. After the Civil War, lynching assumed a different character. It became a racial phenomenon: most victims were Negroes and most criminals were whites; it was no longer a device to control banditry in an anarchistic frontier, but rather a terrorist technique to maintain white supremacy in settled communities with an established legal order.²

Perhaps an LC savant can elucidate on how racist murder committed by White criminal gangs qualifies as the “Administration of criminal justice,” all the more so when the “punished” victims “may, in fact, be known to be innocent of any crime” and in any event never enjoyed due process.³

Remedy: (a) Eliminate “Criminal Justice, Administration of” as an “××,”

(b) Install as “××’s” under LYNCHING:
Homicide
Murder
Offenses against the person
Terrorism
Violent deaths
(c) Create a new subhead under AFRO-AMERICANS (formerly NEGROES): —PERSECUTIONS, making cross-references from and to “Lynching.”

Notes (Item 27)

1. The Sears variant (p. 372) is:
LYNCHING
See also Vigilance committees
×× Crime and criminals
3. Cf. ibid. for the quoted phrase.

28. Items: SLAVERY IN THE U.S.
—Insurrections, etc. sa particular insurrections, e.g. Southampton Insurrection, 1831 (p. 1187)
SOUTHAMPTON INSURRECTION, 1831
× Nat Turner’s Insurrection
Turner’s Negro Insurrection, 1831 (p. 1207)

That is why the racists and the narrow-minded chauvinists do not want black people, Chicano people, Puerto Rican, Asian, and poor white people to study and know their own true history—because their history will tell the truth about America today.

—Bobby Seale

These “items” only underscore further what by now should be well demonstrated: that the LC scheme, whether intentionally or not, tends to minimize and sadly neglect Afro-American history, as well as dehumanizing the Black man himself. Point-by-point:

(a) Any dictionary endows the word “Revolt” with a greater intensity and broader signification than “Insurrection.” The many slave
uprisings in America, especially during the 19th century, most assuredly qualify as "revolutionary" rather than merely "insurrectionary" in scope, tactics, and objectives. Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey, and Nat Turner, leaders of the three most notable rebellions, unquestionably warrant the appellation "revolutionists."²

(b) Of these three major revolts, which took place, respectively, in or around Richmond, Charleston, and Southampton, only the Southampton event has been accorded a distinct head. The Charleston rising appears as a subhead under the city, —SLAVE INSURRECTION, 1822, while the Richmond enterprise goes unnoted.

(c) Raids, rebellions, expeditions, and like undertakings engineered by White men ordinarily merit entries under the leader's name.³ Black men, apparently, do not qualify for such a distinction. Their deeds, if recorded at all, remain nameless. In effect, they are reduced to ciphers, to shadows, concretely exemplifying Julius Lester's contention that "we live in a world where race has meaning, conferring superiority to white and inferiority to black..."⁴

Remedy: (a) Under SLAVERY IN THE U.S., substitute —REVOLTS for the present subhead, —INSURRECTIONS.

(b) Establish primary heads for individual revolts under the names of the leaders, with cross-references from place; specifically:

GABRIEL PROSSER'S SLAVE REVOLT, RICHMOND, VA., 1800
   × Prosser's Slave Revolt, Richmond, Va., 1800
   Richmond, Va.—Prosser's Slave Revolt, 1800
   ×× Slavery in the U.S.—Revolts

DENMARK VESSEY'S SLAVE REVOLT, CHARLESTON, S.C., 1822
   × Vesey's Slave Revolt, Charleston, S.C., 1822
   Charleston, S.C.—Denmark
   Vesey's Slave Revolt, 1822
   ×× Slavery in the U.S.—Revolts

NAT TURNER'S SLAVE REVOLT, SOUTHAMPTON, VA., 1831
   × Turner's Slave Revolt, Southampton, Va., 1831
   Southampton, Va.—Nat Turner's Slave Revolt, 1831
   ×× Slavery in the U.S.—Revolts
(c) The above changes will require elimination of the current note under SLAVERY IN THE U.S.—INSURRECTIONS, ETC., and the relegation of SOUTHAMPTON INSURRECTION, 1831, to an unused form.

Notes (Item 28)


29. Item: GIPSIES

   **Rogues and vagabonds** (p. 547; Sears, p. 298)

   A highly picturesque cross-reference. And also pejorative, conferring upon these people *en masse* the status of thieves, vandals, and ne'er-do-wells.¹ Undoubtedly, Gypsies—since the first of them left India in the 10th century—have pursued a wayfaring life. But what-
ever their faults, they cannot truthfully be characterized across-the-board as scoundrels or robbers, no more so than any other given people. In fact, contemporary Romanies, obeying their own cultural traditions, "earn a living how they can — dealing in scrap metal, selling flowers or lace and, sometimes, by telling fortunes." Their original forebears — "acrobats, singers, dancers, fortune-tellers, wood-workers and horse dealers" — plied occupations "forbidden to their high-caste countrymen." One Gypsy woman not long ago related to a British interviewer that "people really did still fear them — believed that they could cast spells, stop cows giving milk or hens laying, and sold babies." It seems that LC, too, still believes this. Indeed, the stereotype, as the interviewer mused, may spring "from a certain envy for the gypsies," an envy of that "freedom described by one as 'the feeling of the dew underfoot in an orchard on a summer's morning.'" And the envious, he adds, "would deny to others what they themselves can't have."

This introduces a less "romantic" and positively sobering aspect of the Gypsies' treatment by their "hosts" through history: they have been systematically brutalized and repressed. "In 1596," as a single instance, "106 were condemned to death simply for being gypsies." Since 1530, according to one authority, "the English have persecuted their gypsies with vigor." Today the persecutions continue in the form of evictions, together with other kinds of both private and official hostility. All this might be casually dismissed as but another manifestation of stupid prejudice and know-nothingsm, albeit demanding correction, except for the central, overwhelming fact of 20th century Gypsy experience, conveniently ignored in the LC scheme: that the Nazis exterminated somewhere between 200,000 and 600,000 Romanies before the Third Reich concluded, first subjecting numberless thousands to diabolical "medical experiments."

Well, who cares what fate befalls a pack of vile "rogues and vagabonds," of "habitual criminals and parasites?" If Gypsies be less than human, they make no claim on human compassion nor concern. Which side are we on?

Remedy: (a) Delete "Rogues and vagabonds" as an "××."  
(b) Add the subhead, —PERSECUTIONS, with an "××" for "Genocide."
Notes (Item 29)

1. These remarks by William Perkins, a 17th century Puritan preacher, speaking of the English poor, fully illustrate the pejorative quality of the phrase:

   *Rogues, beggars, vagabonds* ... commonly are of no civil society or corporation nor of any particular Church: and are as rotten legs and arms that drop from the body . . . . To wander up and down from year to year to this end, to seek and procure bodily maintenance is no calling, but the life of a beast.


10. The Gauleiter of Austrian Styria, in demanding a “National Socialist Solution for the Gypsy Question” even before the war began, described them as of “notoriously foul heredity . . . habitual criminals and parasites within the body of our people, causing immense damage and imperiling the purity of the borderland peasant’s blood and way of life.” Quoted by Poliakov, *ibid.*, p. 265. Emphasis added. Other Nazi spokesmen,
labeling them “asocial,” thought this a sufficient death-warrant. Is it on such high authority that LC devised its miserable cross-reference?

11. The only alterations undergone by GIPSIES in five years were the addition of three subheads, — JUVENILE LITERATURE (1967, ACS, p. 113), — LITERARY COLLECTIONS, and — RELIGIOUS LIFE (1969 ACS, p. 93), as well as the installation of a new primary head, HYGIENE, GYPSY (1969 ACS, p. 106).

30. **Item: INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA, CIVILIZATION OF**

*Here is entered literature dealing with efforts to civilize the Indians* . . . (p. 635)

A few hundred years ago there were no white people in this country. The only inhabitants of the United States were the Indians. These Indians usually lived in small bands and wandered about from place to place. They lived mostly by hunting and fishing. They were often quarrelsome. Some of the different tribes or bands had settled homes and were partly civilized, but most of them were wandering savages who did nothing to develop this great country.¹

. . . It should be the role of the library to aid in overcoming another insidious application of white supremacy—cultural imperialism. Now there is literature available which decimates the “Tonto myth”; the “our-feathered-friends-a-picturesque-species-of-wildlife” stereotype; and that separates the whitewash from the war paint.²

If there were a competition among LC heads for sheer wrong-headedness, stupidity, distortion, and Anglo-Saxon myopia, this form would be among the top contenders. It fully embodies the “Tonto myth,” accepts the preposterous “wandering savages” thesis, and culturally emasculates a varied, remarkable people whose attainments in many fields are legion and universally valuable.³ Yes, the 19th century witnessed “the first large-scale efforts to ‘civilize’ the Indians by forcing on them what was believed to be the highest cultural form possible, the White man’s way of life.”⁴ But only Tontomythologists could argue that the Indians needed “civilizing.” Serious, informed students of Amerindian life, like the late anthropologist
Paul Radin, have shown in considerable detail that before the White Man's advent Indians had developed mighty, complex "civilizations" and registered signal accomplishments in the arts, astronomy, engineering, agriculture, conservation, pharmacy, social organization, and numerous other spheres. The "civilizing" efforts encompassed in the LC head, apart from enhancing the very eradication of Indians biologically, resulted in "mental and physical degradation" for those who somehow survived. A young Amerindian testified eloquently before the Commission on Indian Affairs that "The relatives you left behind are still trying to kill each other and enslave each other because they have not learned . . . that freedom is built on my respect for my brother's vision and his respect for mine." Can we not, even at this late date, begin to respect our brother's vision? As well as his dignity?

Remedy: a) Delete INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA, CIVILIZATION OF.

b) Introduce two new subheads to cover material previously assigned the excised form:

—DECULTURATION
—RELATIONS WITH MISSIONARIES, SETTLERS, ETC.

Under both should appear "××'s" for "Indians, Treatment of" and "Indians of North America—Government relations."

c) While not formally cited above as an "item," it is appropriate here to observe that under INDIANS, INDIANS OF CENTRAL AMERICA, INDIANS OF MEXICO, and INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA appears the subhead —CULTURE, usually with an "×" for "Civilization." In other words, the scheme generously acknowledges that the Mayas, Inca, Toltecs, and others—like all " primitives"—possessed a " culture," but refuses to grant that some, at least, had created " civilizations." The remedy for this absurdity is to replace —CULTURE with a new form, —CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE, which should satisfactorily embrace buffalo hunters and pyramid builders alike.

Notes (Item 30)


5. Cf. especially Radin's The Story of the American Indian (New York: Liveright; first published in 1927, reprinted in an "enlarged Black & Gold edition," 1944). In a preface to the revised edition, Radin briefly restates his central thesis that "aboriginal American history can only be understood in terms of the spread of the great civilizations that developed in Mexico, Central America and along the Pacific coast of South America from Ecuador to Peru." Addressing himself to the "tantalizing question of what type of culture the Indians of the United States possessed before the spread of the higher elements from Mexico," he states that "although these cultures were on a non-agricultural basis, some of them were clearly more complex than has generally been assumed. It is quite within the realm of probability that, at a very early date, a fairly unified civilization, possessing pottery and a significant ritualistic and political development, stretched across North America from the northwest coast of Canada, across the northwestern plains to the Great Lakes, then along the entire area east of the Mississippi, across the Caribbean, to northeastern South America" (p. vii–viii).

On the same theme, Peggy O'Donnell declares that "the vast range of Indian peoples that inhabited this hemisphere in the 15th century covered the whole spectrum of 'civilized' experience, from the simplest form of social life to classic civilizations that in some instances operated more effectively than their European counterparts." She then limns some of the salient features of Indian culture and attainments, not the least of which being a sound ecological relationship to the environment and nonmaterialistic concept of life. On the specific question of "quarrelsome Redskins," she notes that "peace was the way of life among many of the people of the New World. A life that is spent in cooperative sharing, and in communion with the natural world, has little room for the systematic destruction of others. . . . They were more concerned in making life liveable than in making war." Cf. "The American Heritage: Gifts of the Indian," Synergy, op. cit., p. 20–23.


7. Quoted by O'Donnell, op. cit., p. 22.

8. For an example of "deculturation" employed by a sociologist to describe the experience of post–Conquest "indigenous societies" in Mexico, cf. van den Berghe, op. cit., p. 43.
31. **Items**: CONVERTS; CONVERTS FROM BUDDHISM [CONFUCIANISM, JUDAISM, etc.] (p. 310); PROSELYTES AND PROSELYTIZING, JEWISH (p. 1038)

The note under CONVERTS unsurprisingly declares that "*Here are entered works on converts to Christianity.... Works on converts to Judaism are entered under Proselytes and proselytizing, Jewish.... Works on converts to other religions are entered under Buddhist [Mohammedan, etc.] converts....*" At least this is a candid admission. The arrangement may be criticized on two bases: (1) It further entrenched a pro-Christian bias; and (2) It results, from a purely logical, information-seeking viewpoint, in absolute chaos, cumbersomely strewing material on "Converts" throughout the list, although catalogue users wanting data on the general subject and its several manifestations ought certainly to find it in one convenient spot.

**Remedy**: (a) Excise PROSELYTES AND PROSELYTIZING, JEWISH.
(b) Reconstruct all existing heads so that they indicate, as necessary, to and from what faiths the conversions have been made; e.g.,

- CONVERTS TO BUDDHISM
- CONVERTS TO CHRISTIANITY
- CONVERTS TO CHRISTIANITY from HINDUISM
- CONVERTS TO JUDAISM
- CONVERTS TO JUDAISM from CHRISTIANITY
- CONVERTS TO ISLAM from BUDDHISM
(c) Replace inverted heads like CONVERTS, ANGLICAN and CONVERTS, MORMON with appropriate new forms; e.g.,
- CONVERTS to ANGLICANISM
- CONVERTS to MORMONISM
(d) Under the discarded head, PROSELYTES AND PROSELYTIZING, make a *See* reference to CONVERTS .... and MISSIONS. In like vein, cross-references will be required, e.g., from BUDDHIST CONVERTS to CONVERTS TO BUDDHISM, etc.
(e) On a related tangent, the missionizing religion should preface the various MISSIONS to .... forms (1966 ACS, p. 98–9), resulting
in CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO CONFUCIANS, CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO LEPERS, CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO JEWS, CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO PYGMIES, etc.¹

Note (Item 31)

1. The new, still deficient construction, MISSIONS TO..., replaces the earlier MISSIONS—LEPERS, MISSIONS—JEWS, etc. (7th ed., p. 835). Sears (p. 402) continues the older form.

32. Items: HEAVENLY RECOGNITION (p. 583); IMMACULATE CONCEPTION (p. 621); IMPOSITION OF HANDS (p. 622); JUDGMENT DAY (p. 692); LORD'S SUPPER (p. 758; Sears, p. 371); MYSTICAL UNION (p. 871); POWER OF THE KEYS (p. 1018); VIRGIN BIRTH (p. 1376)

All these forms appear unglossed. To the well catechized Christian or student of religions it is immediately clear that they express theological concepts or doctrines. This may not be true, however, for the "outsider," especially persons reared in a milieu outside Christendom. At the risk of facetiousness, someone not overly familiar with Christianity nor schooled in Biblical teachings could easily mistake HEAVENLY RECOGNITION as referring to an aspect of astronomy, or POWER OF THE KEYS as relating to hardware, if not locksmithing. In short, these heads are not only prejudiced toward Christianity, but also ambiguous.

Remedy: Add glosses for clarification; e.g., HEAVENLY RECOGNITION (CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY) IMPOSITION OF HANDS (CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT) JUDGMENT DAY (CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY)¹ LORD'S SUPPER (CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT) MYSTICAL UNION (CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE) POWER OF THE KEYS (CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE) VIRGIN BIRTH (CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE)
Note (Item 32)

1. As precedents, cf. the glossed form, judgment day (islam), 1966 ACS, p. 82, and rebirth in western paradise (buddhism), 1969 ACS, p. 185.

33. Items: hymns (p. 613–14); preaching (p. 1020); religious education (p. 1094–95); resurrection (p. 1103); revelation (p. 1104); saints (p. 1128); salvation (p. 1132; 1966 ACS, p. 136)

To avoid tiresome repetition, the more detailed comments already made regarding kindred forms like angels, children's sermons, devotional literature, eschatology, god, and heresy may also, with some modifications, be applied to these heads. In each case, the activity, doctrine, or category is not limited to Christianity, yet Christianity enjoys an unqualified priority.

Remedy: As appropriate, add glosses or adjectival inversions; e.g., hymns, christian'; resurrection (christian doctrine). Multifaith or comparative studies may be assigned the gloss (comparative religion).

Note (Item 33)

1. The hymns construction, like that for devotional literature, has been changed so that all non-Christian entries are now prefaced by the name of the faith; e.g., Buddhist hymns (July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS, p. 98). True universality, however, necessitates similar handling for all religions. The remedy, therefore, is to precede the unqualified rubric hymns with "Christian," referring from "Hymns, Christian."

34. Item: Mammies
   × Colored mammies
      Mammies, Colored
Mammies, Negro
Negro mammies (1967 ACS, p. 159)

Annica [a Black house slave in Mississippi] got a letter from her mammy which detected her in a lie. O! that negroes were more truthful.

—Entry, dated January 25, 1855, in Eliza L. Magruder’s personal diary

mammy . . . 2a: a Negro woman serving as a nurse to white children esp. formerly in the Southern states. ’’ . . b: A Negro woman—often taken to be offensive

An Afro-American woman, when asked what she thought of the word, responded unhesitatingly, “I wouldn’t want to be called one.” It might be sound policy for LC catalogers to first query Black LC staffers before elevating antebellum plantation slang to primary head status.

Remedy: Substitute CHILD-NURSES, AFRO-AMERICAN, with an “××” for NURSES AND NURSING as well as CHILDREN—CARE AND HYGIENE, canceling all the “Mammy” referents.

Notes (Item 34)


2. Webster, p. 1369. Emphasis added.

35. Items: PROVIDENCE AND GOVERNMENT OF GOD (p. 1040); PROVIDENCE AND GOVERNMENT OF GOD (JUDAISM)
(1966 ACS, p. 125)
The introduction of the glossed form for Judaism makes necessary the revision of the unglossed Christian centered rubric.

**Remedy:** Add the gloss (CHRISTIANITY).

### 36. Item: ALCOHOL AND JEWS; ALCOHOL AND NEGROES; ALCOHOL AND WOMEN (1967 ACS, p. 8)

Does no one else drink? Only Jews, Blacks, and women? That’s surely the implication, imputing to these three groups a peculiar affection for liquor.

**Remedy:** (a) Scan the LC collection for similar material on the Irish, Scotch, French, Germans, etc., creating suitable prime heads like ALCOHOL AND THE IRISH.

(b) If the survey fails to disclose such material, commission the LC poet-in-residence to fill the void. It should be an engrossing addition to the bibulous literature.


Apparently the LC cataloger was not much attuned to the ramifications of the Frankfurt trial. Otherwise, a number of cross-references would automatically have been indicated.

**Remedy:** Add an “××” and sa for AUSCHWITZ (CONCENTRATION CAMP), together with “××’s” for GENOCIDE; HOLOCAUST, JEWISH (1939–1945); JEWS—PERSECUTIONS; and NATIONAL SOCIALISM.


The “great conversion” to “Islam” and “Muslim,” footnoted under Item 6, at least reduces the objection to one plane, rather than two (as would have been the case with “Mohammedans as scien-
tists”). B. Ben Yahia, while acknowledging that “Muslim science has been the subject of many severe and even extreme criticisms,” nonetheless maintains that during the 19th century “some Arab-writers . . . produced works of great originality.” Moreover, in a brief retrospective passage, he notes that “the period between the 8th and 13th centuries may fairly be called the Arabs’ age in the history of science” when “princes, ministers and rich patrons rivalled with one another in commissioning the translation of ancient, and the writing of new, scientific masterpieces. . . .” In view of the impressive contributions in medicine, botany, geography, and the exact sciences attributed by Yahia to Muslim scientists and bulwarked by the many monographs cited in his “Bibliography,” the “as” in LC’s heading seems a wholly unwarranted slight.

Remedy: Cancel the head, recataloging all relevant material under SCIENTISTS, MUSLIM (1968 ACS, p. 395).

Notes (Item 38)

2. Ibid., p. 572.

39. Item: BABIY YAR MASSACRE, 1941
   ×× Russia—History—German occupation,
   1941–1944
   World War, 1939–1945—Atrocities
   World War, 1939–1945—Jews (1968 ACS, p. 38)

The “××’s” uncannily make it appear not that an explicit genocidal policy accounted for such atrocities, but rather that they were simply a reflex or result of the war itself. Unquestionably, the wartime German occupation of the Ukraine made the Babi Yar massacre possible, but does not alone explain why it happened. Moreover, the referents totally ignore Ukrainian complicity in the event.¹

Remedy: Add “××’s” for ANTISEMITISM—UKRAINE; GENOCIDE; HOLOCAUST, JEWISH (1939–1945); and JEWS—PERSECUTIONS.
Notes (Item 39)

1. Poliakov documents the Nazi policy of inciting “pogroms and ‘spontaneous' massacres” against the Jews in newly-occupied regions, like Lithuania and the Ukraine, that were “anti-Semitic by tradition.” Op. cit., p. 118–39. For a verbatim account of the “liquidation of the cemetery at Kiev” by the Nazi officer in charge, cf. p. 139. For explicit references to the complicity of the Ukrainian militia in these exterminations, cf. p. 125, 128, 130, and 136.

Alec Nove, in effect buttressing Poliakov’s claims, writes that “unfortunately, the war also greatly stimulated antisemitism, especially in the Ukraine. This was apparently due partly to German propaganda, and partly to the general consequences of hardships on popular temper in traditionally antisemitic areas.” Millions of Jews, he declares, “ended their lives in mass graves on the outskirts of Kiev, Minsk, Vilna, and hundreds of smaller places.” Cf. “Jews in the Soviet Union,” Jewish Journal of Sociology, v. 3, no. 1 (June 1961), p. 109. Emphasis added.

In describing how, as of 1961, Soviet sources rarely mentioned the wartime atrocities visited upon Russian Jewry, Nove says: “To take another example, in such places as Babi Yar, the ravine outside Kiev which was the scene of one of the biggest massacres, there is no monument or any mark of commemoration of the victims.” Ibid., p. 115. It may be further noted, on the basis of personal knowledge, that even when a monument did later appear at the massacre site, in about 1967, local Intourist guides would only conduct visitors to the grisly spot by request—and with visible reluctance. David W. Weiss, a Jewish-American cancer expert who attended a scientific conference in the Soviet Union late in 1965, reported a similar experience. Shortly after arriving in Kiev, he asked to be escorted to Babi Yar, only to be told that “there was no such place as Babi Yar.” Later, following a discussion with her Intourist superior, the guide affirmed that the site existed, but that it was hardly worth seeing. Weiss opined that “surely ... there must be some sort of memorial to mark such a place of martyrdom; there were, after all, a variety of memorials to the Ukrainian war dead throughout Kiev!” A lengthy altercation resulted in the “compromise” that he might visit the spot if he were willing to privately hire an auto. For a full recitation of this incident, together with much evidence of continuing anti-Semitism in the Ukraine and elsewhere, cf. “The Plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union,” Dissent, v. 13, no. 4 (July-Aug. 1966), p. 447–64. Emphasis in original.

Jacob Robinson accents the indivisibility of “Hitler’s extermination order” and individual events like the Babi Yar massacre. “Despite the wide distribution of the Jewish communities involved and their relative isolation during the war years,” he maintains, “the history of these communities during the Hitler era cannot be written outside the context of the total European
Jewish scene.” Cf. “Research on the Jewish catastrophe,” *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, v. 8, no. 2 (Dec. 1966), p. 193. His entire essay, incidentally, well indicates the continuing need to document and synthesize the experience of the “Catastrophe” or “Holocaust,” as well as the immense difficulties involved in that task.

40. *Item:* SLAUGHTERING AND SLAUGHTER-HOUSES—JEWS (p. 1187)

No other people is so specified in a subdivision. To accuse LC of viciousness in this construction may be too severe, but surely it may be judged *inept*. Of course, the head refers to orthodox Jewish dietary laws, which make imperative the special, rabbinically-supervised preparation of meats. But the formulation, in view of the still vivid “slaughter” that characterized the Holocaust, requires modification.

*Remedy:* Create a substitute form, SLAUGHTERING AND SLAUGHTER-HOUSES, KOSHER, with an “x” for “Kosher slaughtering and slaughter-houses.” Or, better yet, employ MEAT INDUSTRY AND TRADE, KOSHER as an alternative.