

Section IV

Man/Woman/Sex

1. *Item*: WOMEN AS ACCOUNTANTS [ARCHITECTS, ARTISTS, ASTRONAUTS, SOLDIERS, etc.] (p. 1412-13; Sears, p. 631)

It is quite true there are no limits to masculine egotism in ordinary life.

—Lev Trotskii¹

The same objection applies to these forms as to NEGROES AS BUSINESSMEN, etc. The “as” strongly suggests that women are not ordinarily competent or otherwise equipped to work at accountancy, bear arms, or fly to the moon. Implicit is the wholly indefensible stereotype that relegates women to “hearth and home.”² Skeptics not convinced that the “as” is a reflex of male chauvinism are invited to cite comparable terms assigned to the other sex; e.g., MEN AS ACCOUNTANTS. But they needn’t bother, of course. They aren’t there.³

Remedy: As with the “Negroes” forms, remove the “as”; e.g., WOMEN ACCOUNTANTS [ARCHITECTS, ARTISTS, ASTRONAUTS, SOLDIERS, ETC.]⁴

Notes (Item 1)

1. From *Problems of Life* (London: Methuen & Co., 1924), quoted by Sheila Rowbothams, “Alexandra Kollontai: Woman’s Liberation and Revolutionary Love,” *Spokesman*, no. 4 (June 1970), p. 30.

2. Fay Ainscow states that "Society has developed certain sex stereotypes that need realistic reexamination. One cliché assumption is that the well-adjusted male should try to get ahead or be aggressive. If a female seems aggressive, then it's often assumed that she's frustrated, is compensating for some lack or she'll be labeled 'pushy.'" Cf. "Targets of Prejudice," *Freethinker*, v. 90, no. 13 (March 28, 1970), p. 103.

3. Anita R. Schiller, research assistant professor at the University of Illinois, forcefully underscores this critique:

An interesting sidelight, which illustrates how out-of-touch with the times we are, is provided by the subject headings librarians have devised to categorize the attainments of women in the various professions: The Library of Congress . . . for example, uses the term "Women *as* authors," not "Women authors"; "Women *as* physicians," not "Women physicians"; "Women *as* librarians," not "Women librarians," etc. . . . While it is delightful to note the cross reference "Women, see also Charm," and disturbing to find the heading "Women *as* colonists," it is clear that this terminology, which arose in a bygone age, is not in keeping with present conditions.

Op. cit., p. 346. Emphasis in original. The author later includes among a number of proposals for achieving female equality within the library profession a suggestion that "subject headings which reflect customary prejudice toward women should be reconsidered and revised," observing in particular that "*Library literature* used the term 'Women *as* librarians' until 1952, when the wording was changed to read 'Women librarians.'" *Ibid.*, p. 349. Joan Marshall adds that the general "*as*" form "does not merely imply, it *states* that all segments of society other than white Christian males who achieve (anything) are merely role-playing. Women *are* doctors; they do not simply act *as* doctors." And she asks: "Why is WOMEN AS LIBRARIANS included? Logically, given our profession and the construction of the list, MEN AS LIBRARIANS should be a subject heading. In this field, at least, women are the majority."

As another, later eruption of what may be called the masculinocentric reflex note that the 1967 ACS on p. 166 innovated MEN NURSES as a primary head without making even a cross-reference from "Men *as* nurses," though they are statistically less common than women in that profession.

4. Where this produces a conflict with or duplication of certain inverted heads (e.g., AUTHORS, WOMEN), which heretofore have encompassed mainly biographical material, prefer the already-established form, broadening its scope to now include "attainments of women *as* authors," etc. The *BHI* furnishes numerous precedents; e.g., WOMEN ATHLETES, WOMEN

CLERGY, WOMEN DIRECTORS, WOMEN PEERS, WOMEN PILOTS. Cf., e.g., the 1968 cumulation, p. 514–15.

The 1967 ACS on p. 291 exacerbates the mischief by installing two new heads: WOMEN AS CONSUMERS and WOMEN AS PHOTOGRAPHERS, while the 1968 ACS on p. 492 still further worsens the situation with WOMEN AS AUTOMOBILE DRIVERS, WOMEN AS PUBLISHERS, and WOMEN AS SPIES.

2. *Item*: ABORTION

×× **Birth control**

Conception—Prevention

Criminal law

Fetus, Death of

Infanticide

Obstetrics

Offenses against the person

Sex and law (p. 3)

It is not the prime head itself, but rather the “××’s” that need repair, particularly “Infanticide” and “Offenses against the person.” These two “related” heads, when cited under ABORTION, imply a judgment concerning a matter that has long been—and remains—in contention. In effect, they equate “Abortion,” advocated by an impressive array of medical, civil libertarian, and women’s groups, with “crime.”¹

Remedy: Excise both terms from the “××” roster and apply them as primary heads with great caution.

Note (Item 2)

1. For a highly objective, heavily documented overview, maintaining that “abortion guilt is, in large measure, culturally determined,” cf. Edwin M. Schur, “Abortion,” in American Academy of Political and Social Science, *Annals*, v. 376 (March 1968), p. 136–47. On the controversy itself, the RG for March 1968–Feb. 1969 (v. 28) on p. 2–3 offers no fewer than 18 citations. Cf. also: Donald Gould, “Abortion in Perspective,” *New Statesman*, v. 78 (July 11, 1969), p. 42–3; Sheila Golden, “Abortion Now!,”

Madison Kaleidoscope, v. 2, no. 3 (Feb. 4, 1970), p. 1+; Jefferson Poland, "Death Issue," *Modern Utopian*, v. 3, no. 2 (Nov.-Dec. 1968), p. 34; Carol Driscoll, "The Abortion Problem," *Women; A Journal of Liberation*, v. 1, no. 2 (winter 1970), p. 7-9; Evelyn Frankford, "Social Workers & Abortion," *ibid.*, p. 18-9; "Union Hits Cal. Abortion Laws, Backs Rights of Women, MDs," *Civil Liberties*, no. 262 (June 1969), p. 4; John L. Broom, "Can Abortion Be Rationally Justified?," *Freethinker*, v. 90, no. 7 (Feb. 14, 1970), p. 53; Daniel Callahan, *Abortion: Law, Choice and Morality* (New York: Macmillan, 1970); American Friends Service Committee, *Who Shall Live? Man's Control Over Birth and Death* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1970); and "Is Abortion a Right?," three probes by Charles H. Bayer, K. Danner Clouser, John Moore and John Pamperin, *Christian Century*, v. 87, no. 20 (May 20, 1970), p. 624-31. Further: Lawrence Lader, *Abortion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), which includes a lengthy "Bibliography and Sources," plus citations for relevant legal cases; and Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Committee on Psychiatry and Law, *The Right to Abortion; A Psychiatric View* (New York: Scribner's, 1970).

3. *Item: WOMAN—RIGHTS OF WOMEN* (p. 1412; Sears, p. 631)

Woman is made the slave of a slave and is reckoned fit only for companionship in lust.

—Eugene V. Debs¹

Eve's biological role was to bear children . . . her romantic role was to love her husband . . . her vocational role was to be second in command . . . Wife, mother, homemaker, this is the appointed destiny of real womanhood.

—Billy Graham²

It might not easily have been foreseen in 1966, but there has since arisen a vocal and powerful movement among women that transcends in its spirit and approach the conventional "feminist" demands or agitation for "rights." This new surge accents radical change within the whole society, with particular emphasis on restructuring the institutions of "family" and "marriage."³ "Women," in short, "are asking for nothing less than the total transformation of

the world."⁴ The old head may well enough cover the earlier, "feminist" period, but it does not adequately handle the new era.

Remedy: Add a subhead, —LIBERATION, or introduce another entry, WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT, with both an "xx" and *sa* for WOMEN—RIGHTS OF WOMEN, as well as RADICALISM AND RADICALS.⁵

Notes (Item 3)

1. Quoted by Eric Bentley, "The Red, White, and Black; A Patriotic Demonstration," *Liberation*, v. 15, no. 3 (1970), p. 39.

2. Quoted from a *Ladies' Home Journal* article in *The Ethiopian Herald*, v. 8, no. 270 (Nov. 24, 1970), p. 3.

3. It has already spawned a host of magazines, articles, and studies; as examples, cf. Maxine Williams, "Black Women and the Struggle for Liberation," *Militant*, v. 34, no. 26 (July 3, 1970), p. 12-3; the *Milwaukee Kaleidoscope's* "Woman Liberation Special," v. 2, no. 23 (7 Nov. 1969); Marlene Dixon, "Why Women's Liberation?," *Ramparts*, v. 8, no. 6 (Dec. 1969), p. 57-63; Susan Brownmiller, "Sisterhood Is Powerful," *New York Times Magazine*, March 15, 1970, p. 26+; Ellen Gay Detlefsen and Patricia Schuman, "The Women's Liberation Movement—I," *WLB*, v. 44, no. 9 (May 1970), p. 962+; Sheila Rowbotham, *op. cit.*, Bonnie Eisenberg, "Women's Liberation and Self-Defense," *IS* (i.e., *International Socialist*), no. 16 (Feb. 1970), p. 20; "Berkeley Campus Women's Liberation Program," *ibid.*, Carol Rosenbaum, "Sex Segregation: On the Job and in the Schools," *ibid.*, p. 9; Alice S. Rossi, "Sex Equality: The Beginnings of Ideology," *Humanist* (Buffalo, N.Y.), v. 29, no. 5 (Sept.-Oct. 1969), p. 3-6+; the "literature kit" on "Women's Liberation" prepared in early 1970 by *Our Generation*, *op. cit.*; and "Women's Liberation," a radical précis of the new movement by a pseudonymous "Eve," *Sechaba*, v. 4, no. 6 (June 1970), p. 15-7. Also: the 30 inexpensive items from various offbeat publishers cited under "Women's Liberation and Sexual Oppression" in *Critical Politics*, *op. cit.*, p. 6; the listings under "Women's Liberation" in Muller, 2nd ed., *op. cit.*; and issues of the 5-times-yearly *Women: A Journal of Liberation* (3011 Guilford Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21218), of which the first three numbers (v. 1, nos. 1-3) were titled, respectively, "Inherent Nature or Cultural Conditioning?," "What Is Liberation?," and "Women in History: A Recreation of Our Past." Further: Evelyn Reed, *Problems of Women's Liberation*, 5th ed. (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970); Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood Is Powerful; An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*

(New York: Vintage Books, 1970); Branka Magas, "Women's Liberation," *New Left Review*, no. 61 (May/June 1970), p. 31–4, which holds that "what separates the feminist from the revolutionary at present is the lack of a theory of the specificity of women's oppression, and its relationship to other forms of exploitation"; Jenny Sims and Valerie Hart, "Birmingham Women's Liberation Group," *Peace News*, no. 1775 (July 3, 1970), p. 3; Jan Williams, "Emerging from Passive Female Shells," *ibid.*, p. 6; the roster of 26 active "Women's Lib. Groups in Britain," *ibid.*; Carol Brown and Celeste West, "News from the Front," *Synergy*, no. 27 (May-June 1970), p. 35, a supplement to their initial, annotated bibliography in the Dec. 1969 issue; and Sonya Okoth, "Liberation Must Also Include the Women of Africa," *Africa and the World*, v. 6, no. 60 (June 1970), p. 17–9.

4. "Editorial," *ibid.*, v. 1, no. 2 (winter 1970), inside front cover.

5. The RG early in 1970 recognized this necessity, instituting WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT as an independent head. Cf., e.g., v. 69, no. 22 (Feb. 10, 1970), p. 340. API uses the shorter form, WOMEN'S LIBERATION, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

4. *Item: DELINQUENT WOMEN* (p. 358)

Since unused terms like "Female offenders," "Woman—Crime," "Women as criminals," and "Woman offenders" all refer to DELINQUENT WOMEN, the implication, an apparent reflex of male gallantry with an admixture of condescension, is that members of the "fairer sex" can't possibly commit bona fide delicts or pursue a genuinely criminal life in the fashion that *men* can. "Delinquent," as any dictionary reveals, occupies a much lower rung on the sociopathological ladder than "criminal." LC practice assigns female felons to the same category as wayward children and youths.¹ If candor is to take precedence over Camelot-like chivalry, our subject lists must discard such forms of "favorable" discrimination and acknowledge—as in this case—that *some* women are just as capable of serious misbehavior as *some* men.²

Remedy: (a) Excise DELINQUENT WOMEN.

(b) Introduce two new heads: MALE CRIMINALS and FEMALE CRIMINALS.³

(c) Abandon "Women as criminals" and "Woman—Crime" as

See referents, replacing them with "Women criminals" and "Women—Crime."

Notes (Item 4)

1. Cf. DELINQUENT GIRLS and DELINQUENTS, p. 358.
2. Joan Marshall comments further that the construction "implies that women are not full and equal members of society and cannot therefore commit a crime against society; women, instead, have certain duties in society which they may be *delinquent* in performing. This implication is patently untrue." Personal communication, *op. cit.*
3. CATHOLIC CRIMINALS, JEWISH CRIMINALS, and NEGRO CRIMINALS—all discussed earlier—constitute precedents for such an adjectival form, as does the 1968 BHI's WOMEN CRIMINALS, p. 514.

5. Items: HOMOSEXUALITY

xx Sexual perversion (p. 598)

LESBIANISM

xx Sexual perversion (p. 734)

With the advent of the Wolfenden Report, the liberalization in many lands of laws regarding homosexual relations, and recent birth of an outspoken, self-confident "Gay Liberation Movement," the stigma traditionally attached to homosexuality has markedly lessened, and—among the more enlightened—vanished.¹ Increasingly, homosexuality has come to be regarded as only one among many varieties of sexual or social liaison, not intrinsically better or worse than the others. "Perversion," however, unmistakably brands it "worse," a form of "corruption" or "maladjustment." The referent thus smears and blemishes a large and already much-harrassed body of men and women, whose habits may be different, but not therefore more dangerous, disagreeable, or censurable, than those of the heterosexual majority.

Remedy: Delete "Sexual perversion" as an "xx" under both heads, and similarly eliminate "Homosexuality" and "Lesbianism" as *sa*'s under the prime head SEXUAL PERVERSION (p. 1167).

Note (Item 5)

1. Carl Wittman's "Gay Manifesto," in *Liberation*, v. 14, no. 10 (Feb. 1970), pointedly declares that "Homosexuality is *not* a lot of things. It is not a makeshift in the absence of the opposite sex; it is not hatred or rejection of the opposite sex; it is not genetic; it is not the result of broken homes except inasmuch as we could see the sham of American marriage. *Homosexuality is the capacity to love someone of the same sex*" (p. 18-24). Emphasis in original. Cf. also: the "Gay Liberation Supplement" to the 13-26 Feb. 1970 *Milwaukee Kaleidoscope* (v. 2, no. 26); Great Britain. Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution. *Report* (London: H.M.S.O., 1957; Command paper 247); issues of *Red Butterfly*, a "radical gay newsletter," which began publication in March 1970 (Box 3445, Grand Central Station, New York, N.Y. 10017); the "Homosexual" section in Muller, 2nd ed., *op. cit.*; and Bill Katz's annotations for *The Ladder*; *A Lesbian Review* and *Tangents*, *op. cit.*, p. 105. Don Slater, *Tangents* editor, estimates the homosexual population in the U.S. at 17,000,000. The magazine's editorial viewpoint, says Katz, is "clear: the homosexual is a human being who should not be treated as a criminal or far-out sexual deviate." *Ibid.* Gore Vidal further underpins this view in the course of exploding the myriad myths surrounding bi-, homo-, and heterosexual activity. *Op. cit.*, p. 8-14.

Editor David Reynolds, in the April 18, 1970, *Freethinker* (v. 90, no. 16), maintains that "Psychologists are fast agreeing that sexual deviation is not the manifestation of a diseased mind. By what authority," he asks, "does the [Church of England Evangelical] Council class homosexuals as perverts and presumably heterosexuals as sexually perfect? Are they not both equally perfect within their own definitions of the term?" (p. 122).

Great Britain, through the Sexual Offences Act of 1967, legalized "homosexual relations in private between consenting adult men." Cf. Denis Cabell, "Thou shalt not. . .," *Freethinker*, v. 90, no. 20 (May 16, 1970), p. 156.

6. *Items*: MONASTIC AND RELIGIOUS LIFE; MONASTIC AND RELIGIOUS LIFE OF WOMEN (p. 842)

One need not be a Catholic to appreciate that there are—and have been for centuries—monastic orders for men *and* women, "brothers" *and* "sisters." Yet by specifying a head for "Women," it appears that *male* orders are the norm, the usual, the unexceptional,

while female varieties are *abnormal*, *unusual*, etc., which is hardly the case in fact.¹ "Sisters" ought rightly to take umbrage at the suggestion that "brothers" are somehow more *natural* and *proper*.

Remedy: Either delete MONASTIC AND RELIGIOUS LIFE OF WOMEN or complement it with MONASTIC AND RELIGIOUS LIFE OF MEN, allowing the unqualified MONASTIC AND RELIGIOUS LIFE to apply strictly to works dealing on a general plane with life in monasteries and convents.

Note (Item 6)

1. Indeed, some authorities hold that such women's groups probably *antedated* similar organizations among men. Says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:

In all ages, women, hardly less than men, have played their part in monasticism. In the earliest Christian times the veiled virgins formed a grade or order apart, more formally separated from the community than were the male ascetics. There is reason for believing that there were organized convents for women before there were any for men, for when St. Anthony left the world in 270 to embrace the ascetic life, the *Vita* says he placed his sister in a nunnery. . . . We learn from Palladius that by the end of the 4th century nunneries were numerous all over Egypt, and they existed also in Palestine, in Italy and in Africa—in fact throughout the Christian world. In the West the Benedictine nuns played a great part in the Christian settlement of northwestern Europe. As the various monastic and mendicant orders arose, a female branch was in most cases formed alongside the order.

"Monasticism" (London/Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Ltd., 1964), v. 15, p. 690.

7. *Items*: FALL OF MAN (p. 466)

Why assail this obviously theological head under "Man/Woman/Sex"? Women themselves, more sensitive than men to the wide

-ranging implications of the "forbidden fruit" tale, furnish a convincing rationale:

Something more than technology or reproduction must explain the kind of myths and attitudes which have devalued women. For example, many religions perpetuate abusive concepts: the myth that Eve caused the fall of man, or that the Orthodox Jew in a morning prayer thanks God that he was not born a woman.¹

Of course, the library profession through its cataloging practice cannot by itself undo the pernicious "Fall of Man" concept. Further, it would be dishonest to cast the form, together with the works it describes, down an Orwellian "memory hole." Still, the abusive overtones can be somewhat reduced.

Remedy: Add a gloss: (JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN MYTHOLOGY) or (BIBLICAL MYTHOLOGY).

Note (Item 7)

1. "Editorial," *Women; A Journal of Liberation*, *op. cit.*

8. **Item:** CHILDBIRTH—PSYCHOLOGY (p. 218)

The scope note under CHILDBIRTH elucidates when this subhead is to be used:

*Works on the system of psychological preparation for childbirth, referred to as "natural childbirth," are entered under the heading Childbirth—Psychology.*¹

It's hard to believe that a woman created (or approved) this form, for most presumably know that "natural childbirth" is a system involving not only "psychological," but also *physical* "preparation," largely by means of special exercises. Even more seriously, perhaps, the LC

form severely constricts the significance of "natural childbirth" for many women. The benefits derived may also be of a social and even economic and political order. "Psychology" most inadequately embraces these several dimensions, let along the obvious *physiological* aspect of probably-lessened pain.²

Remedy: Add to CHILDBIRTH the subhead —TRAINING or, preferably, elevate the unused form CHILDBIRTH, NATURAL to primary status, abandoning CHILDBIRTH—PSYCHOLOGY as the rubric for material on this multidimensional topic.³

Notes (Item 8)

1. P. 218.

2. Comments Vicki Pollard: "Natural childbirth training does help women do what doctors won't do. It teaches women to control their own bodies and how to help themselves in childbirth rather than depending on some man. Having a baby means using muscles that are otherwise rarely used. A woman doesn't know how to use these muscles unless she practices regularly before her labor. It's as ridiculous to expect a woman in modern, urban society to have a baby with no training as it would be to expect a person to run five miles without ever building up to it. But doctors will not tell you this because they see women as objects whose purpose is to produce babies, and they never question the fact that women should suffer in childbirth. Trained childbirth doesn't mean that all women will have a painless experience. Many women have been so badly frightened about childbirth and about their own bodies that they will always have a difficult time. But all women will have a much easier birth than they would have had without the training. They will be able to make any necessary decisions for themselves throughout the birth, and feel that they are in control." Cf. "Producing Society's Babies," *Women; A Journal of Liberation*, v. 1, no. 1 (fall 1969), p. 20.

3. The scope note will require alteration, as well, most appropriately by removing the second sentence. The cross-references under —PSYCHOLOGY should then be expanded by adding both an *sa* and "xx" for "Childbirth, Natural." The new form itself will need an "xx" for "Natural childbirth."

Index Medicus, issued by the National Library of Medicine, employs NATURAL CHILDBIRTH as a primary head. Cf., e.g., v. 11, no. 4 (April 1970), p. 406.

9. *Item*: FREE LOVE*sa* Concubinage

×× Concubinage (p. 514)

Comstock, Bowdler, and other sin-obsessed guardians of public morals, convinced that sexual relations—at best—are “dirty” and chastity *ipso facto* virtuous,¹ would rejoice at the Free Love = Concubinage formula, while humbug-shattering libertarians like H. L. Mencken or Bertrand Russell would no doubt think it downright silly. What, essentially, does “free love”—or the more up-to-date term, “sexual freedom”—actually *mean*? Simply, according to Webster, “sexual intercourse or cohabitation without a legal wedding.”² Even more importantly: sexual intercourse or cohabitation among *consenting* partners. *Without* consent, the “intercourse” is “rape,” for which LC furnishes an independent head.³ If *bought*, it becomes “Prostitution,” also assigned a distinct rubric.⁴ “Free love” or “sexual freedom” may surely involve extended cohabitation among unwedded partners, but the doctrine and its practitioners emphatically reject “guilt,” “subserviency,” “bondage,” and “primitivism”—all usually associated with “concubinage”⁵—as elements or outgrowths of such a relationship. The “concubinage” referents, leftovers from an epoch demolished—literarily, in any event—by *Ulysses*, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, and *Tropic of Cancer*, both denigrate sexual activity and distort the historical, as well as post-Kinsey, significance of “free love.”⁶

Remedy: (a) Abolish “Concubinage” as an “××” and “*sa*.”

(b) Establish “Sexual freedom” as an “×” under FREE LOVE, or—to fully modernize the treatment—replace FREE LOVE with SEXUAL FREEDOM, supplying an “×” for the former term.⁷

Notes (Item 9)

1. For a short, pungent discussion of the hackneyed notion that sexual pleasure satisfies one of the “lower instincts,” and the resulting adulation of chastity or celibacy, cf. William Welsh, “Virginity Cult,” *Freethinker*, v. 90, no. 19 (May 9, 1970), p. 148–49.

2. P. 906.

3. P. 1078.

4. P. 1038.

5. Cf. Webster, p. 472; *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), v. 1, p. 363.

In a finite historical context, van den Berghe speaks of the "concubinage" practiced by Spanish men with "women of lower status" in colonial Mexico. The European laity, he notes, "condoned" such an interracial arrangement, this attitude being "congruent with the traditional *dual standard* of Spanish sexual morality." *Race and Racism*, *op. cit.*, p. 46. Emphasis added. Later he tells of how the Portuguese planters in colonial Brazil engaged in "promiscuous concubinage with female slaves," a form of exploitation typical of "paternalistic" social structures. *Ibid.*, p. 65-6, 27-9.

6. The fact that Swiss Television in mid-1970 included a discussion of "Free Love" in a program dealing with "the emancipation of women" suggests a definite connection between sexual freedom and women's liberation. The show, however, was cancelled "at the last moment" when a former federal judge complained. Which also suggests the continuing strength of Comstockery. Cf. *IPI Report*, v. 18/19, no. 12/1 (April-May 1970), p. 12.

7. For an annotated list of "sexual freedom" magazines, cf. the section so-named in Muller, 2nd ed., *op. cit.*

10. *Item*: DIVORCE

×× Woman—Social and moral questions (p. 378; Sears, p. 206)

A double standard erupts once more in this head. Why divorce should qualify as a "social" or "moral" question for *women* and *not* for men is a conundrum answerable only in terms of masculine supremacy. And there are other problems, as well: (1) As Joan Marshall argues below, the subhead —SOCIAL AND MORAL QUESTIONS is misplaced under the "generic" WOMAN; and (2) As shown earlier with respect to "Negroes," the "moral" situation of women—particularly since it is not paralleled with any form covering the moral situation of *men*—represents an affront to womankind that reeks of paternalism.

Remedy: (a) Cancel —SOCIAL AND MORAL QUESTIONS as a subhead under WOMAN, creating in its stead the subdivision —SOCIAL CONDITIONS under WOMEN.

(b) Install under MEN the subhead —SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

(c) Under DIVORCE, either delete the new form "Women—Social conditions" as an "××," or complement it with "Men—Social conditions."

11. *Item: LITERATURE, IMMORAL* (p. 751; Sears, p. 368)

Any adult should resent any other adult telling him what he may or may not read. When such a thing happens in the complete absence of any rational justification, it is time to say "Enough!!!"¹

It becomes abundantly clear from the *sa* referents, as well as the various works actually assigned this head, that LC has accepted whole-hog the Mrs. Grundy/"Nosey Parker" dictum that pleasurable sex or undisguised eroticism (as distinct from "soft" sex in TV commercials and magazine advertisements) is automatically tantamount to immorality.² By what authority, pray tell, does LC, or anyone else, determine that an erotic novel or volume of poetry is—purely *because* of its sex content—immoral?³ The pornography/vice, obscenity/crime nexus is itself in no wise established. The very terms are presently subject to much legal and scientific dispute.⁴ Moreover, given increasingly frank, "permissive," or—as some have suggested—"civilized" publishing and librarians consequently beleaguered by the censorious to keep ill-defined "smut" off their shelves, such a flagrantly puritanical, antediluvian head only donates ammunition to the "purity"-mongers and represents a clearcut form of professional suicide.⁵ While "sex" *per se* undoubtedly offends some people, it remains the *sine qua non* for continued life and a source of real satisfaction—as liquor drinking, cigarette smoking, and watching football games may also be—for untold millions. This simple truism may upset the taboo-shackled Mrs. Grundy. But LC is under no obligation to pander to her, nor to besmirch a time-honored human pastime and procreative necessity.⁶ In truth, it is time to say, "Enough!!!"

Remedy: Cancel the head. Adequate alternatives already exist

in EROTIC LITERATURE (p. 441), EROTIC POETRY (1967 ACS, p. 90), SEX IN THE BIBLE (July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS, p. 203), LOVE IN LITERATURE (p. 760), SEX IN LITERATURE (p. 1166), OBSCENITY (LAW) (p. 908), LITERATURE AND MORALS (p. 751), SEXUAL PERVERSION IN LITERATURE (p. 1167), VULGARITY IN LITERATURE (p. 1382), and SEDUCTION IN LITERATURE (p. 1155).

Notes (Item 11)

1. G. L. Simons, "The Next Step," *Freethinker*, v. 90, no. 3 (Jan. 17, 1970), p. 19.

2. Among the four *sa*'s appear "Erotic Literature" and "Sex in Literature." The newly-created form, EROTICA (1969 ACS, p. 74), also features telltale *sa*'s to "Literature, Immoral" and "Obscenity (Law)."

Books catalogued under this head include Ralph Ginsburg, *An Unhurried View of Erotica*; with an introduction by Theodore Reik and preface by George Jean Nathan (New York: Heinemann, 1958); Eberhard Kronhausen, *Pornography and the Law; The Psychology of Erotic Realism and Pornography* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1959); and Henry Miller, *L'Obscénité et la Loi de Réflexion* (Paris: P. Seghers, 1949). Sources: *Library of Congress Catalog. Books: Subjects, 1955–1959* (Paterson, N.J.: Pageant Books, 1960), v. 12, p. 618–19; and *Library of Congress Catalog. Books: Subjects 1950–1954* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1964), v. 12, p. 28.

3. Evidence from other times and places starkly illumines our peculiar monomania concerning "obscenity" and "immorality," disclosing its erotophobic, sex-denying essence and suggesting new, supracultural definitions. K. M. Munshi observes that in Sanskrit literature "we come across descriptions of love scenes which do not conform to the values of modern prudery. The *Gita-Govinda*, for instance, describes the amours of Radha and Krishna very frankly. The work became a classic in India, but was never censured on that account. Even our greatest poet, Kalidasa, than whom there has been no greater exponent of self-restraint, could invest sexual relations with classic brevity: 'Who, that has once tasted the joys will be able to abandon her who has bared her hips?' Here in a single verse Kalidasa voices the longings of that Yaksha *which is natural to man in all ages and in all countries*." "Would any critic," he asks, "dare say that it is inartistic or unpoetic, because prudery is ashamed to read it?" Cf. "The Saga of Indian Sculpture," in A. Goswami, ed., *Indian Temple Sculpture* (Calcutta: Rupa & Co., 1959), p. 356. Emphasis added.

4. Cf., for example, Charles Rembar, *The End of Obscenity* (New York: Random House, 1968); the contributions by Ervin J. Gaines, Robert B.

Downs, Edward de Grazia, Henry Miller Madden, and Evelyn Geller to Eric Moon's 1969 anthology, *Book Selection and Censorship in the Sixties* (New York: Bowker); "Four-letter Words: A Symposium," *Humanist* (Buffalo, N.Y.), v. 29, no. 5 (Sept.-Oct. 1969), p. 7-8+; G. L. Simons, *op. cit.*, who declares that "no correlation has been found between an inclination to pornography and a tendency to sexual delinquency"; and "Inquest on Pornography," the report by the Danish Forensic Medical Council to the Danish Penal Code Council, which, having concluded that "no scientific experiments exist which can lay a basis for the assumption that pornography or 'obscene' pictures and films contribute to the committing of sexual offences by normal adults or young people," proved instrumental in changing the pornography statutes in Denmark, *Humanist* (London), v. 85, no. 2 (Feb. 1970), p. 44-5.

5. The "lewd," "dirty" works assaulted by prudes or, more generously, "decency-fighters" during recent years range from the D. H. Lawrence classic, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Henry Miller's highly-influential *Tropic of Cancer*, LeRoi Jones' short, provocative drama *The Slave*, William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, and Hubert Selby's grimly candid *Last Exit to Brooklyn* to J. D. Salinger's "vulgar" *Catcher in the Rye*, Herman Hesse's *Demian* (assertedly part of a "worldwide plot by Satan"), James Baldwin's *Another Country* (assailed as "obscene" in New Orleans and elsewhere), William Burroughs' *Naked Lunch* (an opus of acknowledged "literary and social importance"), Lorraine Hansberry's play *Raisin in the Sun*, Claude Brown's much-recommended memoir of ghetto life, *Manchild in the Promised Land*, and the "trashy" *Dictionary of American Slang*. Sources: Rembar, *op. cit.*; *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*, v. 18, no. 1 (Jan. 1969), p. 15, 18; *Censorship Today*, v. 1, no. 3 (n.d.), p. 47-8; *ibid.*, v. 2, no. 2 (April/May 1969), p. 30-1; Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 246-48, 290-91, 329; and John Holt, "To the Rescue," *New York Review of Books*, v. 13, no. 6 (Oct. 9, 1969), p. 27-8.

6. Reviewing Rembar's opus in the Jan. 1969 *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*, one librarian commented thusly upon our "national obsession with sex-cum-sin": "Frankly, it appears baffling—in an age of napalm, mass murder, concentration camps, and possible nuclear holocaust—that so much anxiety and energy are expended on what, in this perspective, seems relatively trivial. Further, the whole argument regarding the alleged pernicious effects of pornography on the moral fabric of society becomes increasingly ludicrous as more and more evidence arrives from little, Lutheran Denmark, which last summer abolished obscenity laws altogether and thus reduced the consumption of pornography." Cf. Sanford Berman, "No End Yet," v. 18, no. 1, p. 19. Emphasis in original.

Analyzing the "change in the climate of opinion" that fomented the Roth decision, Ervin J. Gaines notes that "Christian opposition to birth control, and indeed to any tampering with traditional sexual codes (masturbation,

abortion, homosexuality, adultery, fornication, etc.) in the name of higher law, began to seem irrelevant in the face of threat to human survival; at the same time there set in a strong tide of opinion favorable toward civil rights, privacy, and the sanctity of individual decisions with respect to self as distinct from society. . . . The 'pill' and the widespread publicity to it in the mass media increased the confidence of men and women to make their own decisions about their lives, whatever church or state might decree. . . ." Cf. "Intellectual Freedom from *Roth* to the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography," in Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

Anyone who chooses to defend the LC form should be prepared to rebut G. L. Simons' contention that "in general unless pleasure harms other people it is wrong to assess it in moral terms. There is no such thing as immoral pleasure *per se*. If a number of people go to see a nude painting for artistic reasons and enjoy it, then great! If people go for sexual titillation and get it, then great! Why should sexual titillation be frowned upon as a literary or artistic experience? . . . Of course, there are distinctions in the quality of literature—but are there *moral* distinctions? Human beings are capable . . . of a wide range of pleasurable emotions. Why should it be right to try to evoke some of these by the written word and wrong to evoke others?" Cf. "In Praise of Pleasure," *Freethinker*, v. 89, no. 48 (Nov. 29, 1969), p. 381. Emphasis in original. The last word belongs to Supreme Court Justice William Douglas, who sagely observed that "A person without sex thoughts is abnormal. Sex thoughts may induce sex practices that make for better marital relations." Quoted by Irving Wallace, "A Problem Author Looks at Problem Librarians," in Moon, *op. cit.*, p. 262. From this viewpoint, LC—by linking sex with immorality—thereby endorses *abnormality* as a societal norm.

12. *Item*: NUDE IN ART

×× Art, Immoral (p. 903)

Among authorities on visual art, a debate has long flourished between the sex-arousal = dirt school and those who maintain that erotic feelings engendered by viewing a nude painting or sculpture ought not to produce guilt nor qualms in the beholder. An English philosopher, S. Alexander, most forthrightly propounded the anti-sex opinion. "If the nude is so treated," he said, "that it raises in the spectator ideas or desires appropriate to the material subject, it is false art, and bad morals."¹ It is this posture that LC implicitly endorses in ART, IMMORAL as both a primary head (p. 76) and "××" under NUDE IN ART. It is not, however, a position widely shared by

critics or even by lay devotees, who may admire a Greek sculpture or Goya canvas as much for its elemental sex content as for its artistic execution. Kenneth Clark, a leading authority, has asked:

Is there, after all, any reason why certain quasi-geometrical shapes should be satisfying except that they are simplified statements of the forms that please us in a woman's body? . . . This unexpected union of sex and geometry is a proof of how deeply the concept of the nude is linked with our most elementary notions of order and design.²

Mario Praz poses the further question: "Who can guarantee that even the least realistic representations of the nude are not capable of arousing the spectator?"³ And then cites Clark's rebuttal to the Alexander thesis:

In the mixture of memories and sensations aroused by the nudes of Rubens or Renoir are many which are 'appropriate to the material subject.' And since these words of a famous philosopher are often quoted, it is necessary to labour the obvious and say that no nude, however abstract, should fail to arouse in the spectator some vestige of erotic feeling, even although it be only the faintest shadow—and if it does not do so, it is bad art and false morals.⁴

The association of impropriety if not sin with entirely normal sex-reactions to nude art, a remnant of obsolete dowdiness, needs to be expurgated from the LC scheme.⁵

Remedy: Eliminate ART, IMMORAL as a primary head, with its consequent deletion under NUDE IN ART, SEX IN ART, and VICE. Two already existing forms, ART AND MORALS and OBSCENITY (LAW), should suffice as rubrics for material otherwise assigned this wonderfully prissy and outdated construction that for some time has wholly failed to reflect "contemporary community standards."

Notes (Item 12)

1. Quoted by Mario Praz, "Sex and Erotica," *Encyclopedia of World Art* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958), v. 12, p. 890.

2. Quoted by Praz, *ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*

4. Quoted in *ibid.*

5. The Indian example may again prove instructive. Munshi says of certain Mauryan sculptures, dating from about the 1st century B.C., that "voluptuousness and passion are as important as grace and spiritual calm." Much art, he claims, of the Andhra School in particular, was "dominated by the joy of life. Frankly sensuous, almost bursting with dynamism, the human figure represents its most brilliant phase." *Op. cit.*, p. 12-3. Speaking of a later period, he notes that the *Mithunas*, "the amorous lovers of Konarak, carved as they are in innumerable poses, and with unabashed realism have evoked considerable criticism." Regarding these criticisms of "amorous carvings," however, he enters "a caveat against people of one generation, brought up with its own standard of taste, sitting in judgment on the taste of another generation, a different age or a different social or aesthetic tradition. *There is no universal criterion*," he emphasizes, "*of taste or delicacy for all things at all times*. Such critics are apt to forget that ascetics strictly pledged to life-long celibacy and ardent reformers preaching high moral principles have never, in the past, protested against what is now termed as 'obscene representation.'" He then states a few core questions, which today's censors, those so quick to brand sensuous art "immoral," should be compelled to answer:

Is it not possible that these sculptures possess a significance which has been lost to us? Would it not be better to assume that the masters, who carved the sculptural wonders, did not realise that their masterpieces would be looked at *by those to whom the beauty of the human body would not be admirable; to whom universal creativeness could not be presented without evoking lewdness?*

Ibid., p. 34-5. Emphasis added. On the religious and philosophical tradition from which these specific sculptures emanated, a tradition accenting "the life-force pouring into the Universe . . . , manifesting itself no less in the gross matter of daily experience than in the divine beings of religious vision," cf. the extended remarks on p. 35.

13. *Item*: FRATERNITY SONGS × Sorority songs (p. 513)

The male dominance inherent in this form needs no explanation.

Remedy: Either establish another prime head, SORORITY SONGS, or convert FRATERNITY SONGS into an omnibus form: FRATERNITY AND SORORITY SONGS.¹

Note (Item 13)

1. Time has wrought little improvement in this sphere. Cf. the new head, FRATERNITY LIBRARIES (1966 ACS, p. 61), which—like FRATERNITY SONGS—either requires a complementary form, SORORITY LIBRARIES, or may be expanded to FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LIBRARIES.

14. *Item:* WIFE BEATING

×× Criminal law (p. 1403)

Judging from the single “××,” the (presumably) male author of this head didn’t think the act worth much attention. The “beaten” wife, however, and her sisters may justly think otherwise.

Remedy: Add “××’s” for “Husband and wife” (p. 609), “Offenses against the person” (p. 912), “Wives” (p. 1410), and “Women—Social conditions.”

15. *Items:* MAN

sa Anthropology
 Anthropometry
 Color of man
 Craniology
 Creation
 Ethnology
 Heredity
 Men
 Men in literature
 Persons
 Philosophical
 anthropology

WOMAN

sa Charm
 Family
 Girls
 Mothers
 Postage stamps—
 Topics—Women
 Single women
 Teachers’ wives
 Young women
also Artists [Authors,
 Musicians, etc.]
 Women; Women

xx Anthropology Creation Men Primates (p. 773)	as artists [au- thors, poets, etc.]; Women in art; Women in charitable work; and similar headings
	x Female Feminism
	xx Anthropology Family Girls Sociology Young women (p. 1411) ¹

The term "Man" is used generically. *See also* references are made from it to MEN and MEN IN LITERATURE, but not to WOMAN or WOMEN; however, this is a minor and easily corrected fault. The term "Men" refers to the male half of the generic "Man."² WOMAN, by logical analogy, should also be a generic term. A comparison of the references under the two heads, however, clearly indicates that LC's use of the term WOMAN is extremely ambiguous. The "x" for "Female" (although there is no such "x" for "Male" under MAN), and the "xx's" for "Anthropology" and "Sociology" are the only referenced terms that do not refer to attributes or aspects of particular women or groups of women, rather than to the *universal* woman.

Remedy: (a) Add "Woman" and "Women" as *sa's* under MAN, together with an "x" for "Male."

(b) Excise all the present referents under WOMAN, except for "Female," "Anthropology," and "Sociology." The deleted items may be transferred to WOMEN.

Notes (Item 15)

1. The discussions and "remedies" for items 15 through 20 were largely prepared by Joan K. Marshall, cataloger at Brooklyn College Library.

2. Although it may be wondered if MEN—MORTALITY (p. 805) should not be MAN—MORTALITY, since a comparable subdivision is not found under WOMAN or WOMEN.

16. *Item:* WOMAN—ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY (p. 1411)

Since female “anatomy and physiology” certainly differ from the male varieties, this is a valid subdivision of the generic WOMAN. However, as the heading now stands, the reader interested in *female* anatomy and physiology must use *two* subject heads to get at the basic material in the collection, in that many works on *human* anatomy (unless females aren’t “human”) will deal with the anatomy of both sexes. This heading, as so many others in the list, illustrates the bias toward accepting the male as the norm: human = male.

Remedy: (a) Eliminate —ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY as a sub-head under WOMAN.

(b) Establish under ANATOMY, HUMAN (p. 50) two new subdivisions: —MALE and —FEMALE, with “x’s” for “Man—Anatomy” and “Woman—Anatomy.”

(c) Presuming that PHYSIOLOGY (p. 981) is intended to cover both humans *and* animals (since no PHYSIOLOGY, HUMAN appears in the list), institute two new subdivisions under this head: —MALE and —FEMALE, with “x’s” for “Man—Physiology” and “Woman—Physiology.”

(d) Institute under BODY, HUMAN (p. 143) two new subdivisions:

—MALE

sa Anatomy, Human—
Male

Physiology—Male

x Human body—Male

xx Anatomy, Human—
Male

Physiology—Male

—FEMALE

sa Anatomy, Human—
Female

Physiology—Female

x Human body—Female

xx Anatomy, Human—
Female

Physiology—Female

17. *Item:* WOMAN—BIOGRAPHY

× Heroines (p. 1411)

The “biography” of *generic* woman! And although it may be petty to quibble with an “×” referent from a subject head that is itself illogical, the “×” *does* show where the listmakers are at. For there is no “×” for HEROES (p. 587) to such a form as MAN—BIOGRAPHY, nor to WOMAN—BIOGRAPHY. This lopsided treatment can only reinforce the attitude of readers who have already accepted the implication as fact: that women who achieve are somehow extraordinary and peculiar, and whatever the denotation of the word, its connotation is of *fictitious* women.

Remedy: (a) Transfer the subhead —BIOGRAPHY to the primary head WOMEN.

(b) Either expand the HEROES form to HEROES AND HEROINES, with cross-references from and to WOMEN—BIOGRAPHY and MEN—BIOGRAPHY, or create a new head:

HEROINES

sa Women—Biography

×× Women—Biography

18. *Item:* WOMAN—CHARITIES

sa Day nurseries

Fresh-air charity

Maternal and infant welfare

Milk depots

Women in charitable work (p. 1411)

“Charities,” again, of *generic* woman. And even if it were WOMEN—CHARITIES, what does that mean (even to a cataloger)? The material to be found under the head is apparent only from the *sa*’s, which let the user in on the secret that the heading means charities whose object is to *aid* women. It would be *clearer* to say CHARITIES FOR WOMEN. It would be *better* not to say “Charities” at all in relation to

any particular group of persons, for the word's connotation is, and has been for a very long time, derogatory to the recipient of the "charity."

Remedy: (a) Discard the subdivision — CHARITIES under all the primary heads where it now appears.

(b) Institute a new series of primary forms, beginning WELFARE WORK WITH . . . ; e.g., WELFARE WORK WITH MEN, WELFARE WORK WITH WOMEN, etc.¹

Note (Item 18)

1. For an LC precedent, cf. WELFARE WORK IN INDUSTRY, p. 1400.

19. *Items:*

MAN (JEWISH THE-
OLOGY)

MAN (MOHAMMED-
ANISM)

MAN (THEOLOGY)

MAN (ZOROASTRIAN-
ISM)

(p. 744)

WOMEN IN BUDDHISM
WOMEN IN CHRISTIAN-
ITY

WOMEN IN HINDUISM

WOMEN IN MOHAM-

MEDANISM

WOMEN IN THE BIBLE

WOMEN IN THE KORAN

WOMEN IN THE TALMUD

(p. 1413-14)

WOMEN IN ART and WOMEN IN LITERATURE cover the representation of women in those fields. What, then, does WOMEN IN BUDDHISM mean? Does it mean the representation of women in Buddhist religious works, the theological position of women in Buddhism, or the day-to-day routine of women practicing the religion? And what does WOMEN IN THE BIBLE, etc., mean? Can the depiction of women in works such as these be separated from the theological position of women given in these books? If so, there should also be headings like MEN IN THE BIBLE, etc. Do the heads such as MAN (JEWISH THEOLOGY)

and MAN (MOHAMMEDANISM), as the use of the generic term implies, cover the theological position of both men *and* women in these religions? It is sincerely to be doubted that any cataloger would interpret the choice of subject headings offered by the list that way; and further to be doubted that a user would so interpret the choice of heads without some reference guidance.

Remedy: Recast the WOMEN IN . . . entries to make them analogous to the MAN forms; e.g., WOMAN (JEWISH THEOLOGY), WOMAN (ISLAM), etc. If retained, the heads referring to the depiction of women in holy books should be complemented by MEN constructions; e.g., MEN IN THE BIBLE, MEN IN THE KORAN, etc.

20. *Items:* WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE [MISSIONARY WORK, THE CIVIL SERVICE, etc.] (p. 1413-14)

The objections made to WOMEN AS . . . apply with equal force to these "in" heads. For some incomprehensible reason, one sensible substitute form *has* been established: U.S. MARINE CORPS—WOMEN MARINES, equipped with "x's" for "Women in the U.S. Marine Corps" and "Women Marines" (p. 1350).

Remedy: There are several possible alternatives; e.g., to create inverted adjectival forms like AGRICULTURISTS, WOMEN; CIVIL SERVANTS, WOMEN; and MISSIONARIES, WOMEN, with "x's" for "Women agriculturists," "Women civil servants," and "Women missionaries"; or, in some cases (not, however, with "Missions"), to introduce — WOMEN as a direct subhead, resulting in such constructions as AGRICULTURE—WOMEN and CIVIL SERVICE—WOMEN.¹

Note (Item 20)

1. Some flexibility and common sense will be required in order not to produce monstrosities like WOMEN BUSINESSMEN or BUSINESSMEN, WOMEN. In this particular instance, BUSINESSWOMEN should serve, all the more so since BUSINESSMEN already exists as a prime head (p. 172).