Section III

Politics, Peace, Labor, Law Enforcement, etc.

1. Items: ANARCHISM AND ANARCHISTS (p. 49); COMMUNISM (p. 281); COMMUNISTS (p. 282); CONSERVATISM (p. 303); DISSENTERS (p. 377); LIBERALISM (p. 737); REVOLUTIONISTS (p. 1105); SOCIALISM (p. 1194); SOCIALISTS (p. 1195)

At first glance, these heads appear satisfactorily to cover the full political spectrum, past and present, Left to Right. But which rubric would the cataloger assign to material on the New Left, to composite studies on groups like the German and American SDS, Peace and Freedom Party, Ausserrparliamentarische Opposition (APO), and International Socialists; to leaders and theoreticians like Herbert Marcuse, Staughton Lynd, Paul Buhle, Jerry Rubin, Rudi Dutschke, Tariq Ali, Bobby Seale, and Dave Dellinger? "Dissenters" misses the mark, for it seems to sidestep the activist, militant, Movement quality that characterizes these persons and organizations. Additionally, it implies a "reformism" which they hardly endorse or personify.1 Likewise, "Revolutionists" may apply, in part, to some, but fails to capture the ideological dimension and many-faceted activities that typify the subjects. Similarly, "Communism" and "Socialism" are only approximate labels, failing to convey the distinctive "new" Left-oriented moods, lifestyles, strategies, and tactics.2
**Remedy:** Initiate a new head, **RADICALISM** and **RADICALS**, with both "××"s and sa's for **ANARCHISM** and **ANARCHISTS**, **DISSENTERS**, **REVOLUTIONISTS**, and **SOCIALISM**, as well as See references from "Extraparliamentary Opposition" and "New Left."

**Notes (Item 1)**

1. The same argument disqualifies **SOCIAL REFORMERS**, a new head appearing on p. 208 of the July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS.

2. An absolutely vital, current guide to "radical" organizations and publishing is the monthly Red Notes, issued by Agitprop Information (160 North Gower Street, London, N.W. 1). "Movement" reportage accents British and continental European events, but coverage of new magazines, books and pamphlets is international.


3. The 1968 ACS on p. 366 finally introduced **RADICALISM** as a primary head, but skimmed on cross-references, indicating only an "××" for "Political Science." The innovation still bears improvement.

Sears on p. 495 makes a See reference from "Radicals and radicalism" to "Anarchism and Anarchists; Reformers; Revolutions," which represents a broader approach than LC's, but results in an unsatisfactory hodge-podge, still failing to account for New Left-style radicals.
2. **Items**: ANARCHISM AND ANARCHISTS

   *sa* Terrorism (p. 49)

TERRORISM

   *sa* Anarchism and Anarchists (p. 1288)

Popular mythology merrily associates “terrorism” with “anarchy.” But what intelligent person would concur that a document like the LC list should be based on popular mythology? Admittedly, some anarchists have espoused or practiced “terrorism.” Others, like the towering Prince Kropotkin, Judith Malina and Julian Beck of the “Living Theater,” the prolific and pacific Paul Goodman, Errico Malatesta, and most contemporary “communards” have not. In any event, “terrorism” is hardly a theory or tactic peculiar to anarchists. Ultra-conservative groups like the Minutemen and KKK have embraced it; so, it might be argued, have the “Liberals” who developed “saturation bombing” during World War II, dropped the atomic bomb on Japan, authorized “search and destroy” missions, together with massive defoliation, in Vietnam, etc. Yet under neither CONSERVATISM nor LIBERALISM does an *sa* to “Terrorism” appear.

**Remedy**: Drop both references and exercise some constraint when applying TERRORISM as a primary head to Kropotkinites and others who may be anarchists, but not ipso facto of the violent variety.

---

**Notes (Item 2)**

1. Sears, in which “Terrorism” doesn’t figure as a prime head, settles for “Assassination” as an “*x*” referent.


management" may be attributed to the Anarchist Movement as its "most original creation." Quoted in the MRP spring 1970 checklist, p. 6. Noam Chomsky confirms this judgment in a lucid, thoughtful exposition of "libertarian socialism" or "council communism" as both doctrine and practice, noting, for instance, that "the workers' control movement has become a significant force in England in the past few years" and that "on the continent, there are similar developments." Cf. "Notes on Anarchism," New York Review of Books, v. 14, no. 10 (May 21, 1970), p. 31–5. From the Chomsky-Guerin discussions emerges what may be a useful illumination in this area: the addition of "Libertarian socialism" and "Council Communism" as "x" refers under ANARCHISM AND ANARCHISTS, as well as SOCIALISM.

Says Ashley Montagu in a foreword to the Porter Sargent edition of Kropotkin's major opus, Mutual Aid:

For Kropotkin anarchism was a part of philosophy to be treated by the same methods as the natural sciences. He saw anarchism as the means by which justice (that is equality and reciprocity) in all human relations could be established throughout the world of humanity. This could best be achieved by the complete elimination of the state and all governmental processes, and their replacement by a free and spontaneous co-operation among individuals, groups, regions, and nations. Kropotkin abhorred violence of any kind....


Remarks Roderick Kedward of Malatesta, "[He] was the nearest of the major anarchists to the ideal of the labouring, sociable individualist, and his ideas had the basic force of Kropotkin's... By definition," he wrote in 1913, 'an anarchist is he who does not wish to be oppressed nor wishes to be himself an oppressor, who wants the greatest well-being, freedom, and development for all human beings.' From this, from his repeated denunciation of 'supermen rebels,' and his restriction of violence to self defence, it is clear that he believed anarchism to be a constructive proposition for all societies." Cf. "The Anarchists," History of the 20th Century, no. 10 (1969), p. 257. Initial emphasis in original; last emphasis added.

As current, reliable sources for anarchist thought and activity, cf. the weekly Freedom and monthly Anarchy, both issued by Freedom Press (84b Whitechapel High Street, London, E. 1).

4. "Terrorist," of course, has long proven a convenient epithet for threatened rulers or classes to hurl at those who would upset the status quo and challenge their authority. "In all history," declares a front-page Sechaba editorial, "whenever men have fought for freedom they have been called names: In Algeria they were called terrorists; in Vietnam they were called bandits; in Kenya they were called criminal gangs; and in Southern Africa itself those who refuse to say 'Ja baas' are also called names: terrorists—saboteurs—agitators.... They try to destroy us by swear-words because they fear what we really are—Freedom Fighters!" V. 4, no. 1 (Jan. 1970).


Van den Berghe, discussing the "development of new terrorist tactics to supplement the other mechanisms of racial subordination" in the post-Reconstruction South, writes that "secret organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan resorted to intimidation, brutality, and murder as their major means for keeping Negroes and 'nigger-lovers' in their place, but so did spontaneous groups of unorganized private citizens as well as the police, which, in the South, has traditionally played the role of uniformed vigilantes in the service of the dominant whites. The most notorious and extreme form of terrorism was lynching, but other tactics were also used such as beatings, cross-burnings, masked night rides through Negro districts, verbal threats, hate rallies, public humiliations, and random discharging of shotguns in windows." Race and Racism, op. cit., p. 90. This grisly recitation argues convincingly for a bona fide "Terrorism" as under both KU KLUX KLAN (p. 707) and RECONSTRUCTION (p. 1084). It additionally prompts the already-suggested form, AFRO-AMERICANS—PERSECUTIONS, as a cross-reference from and to both RECONSTRUCTION and KU KLUX KLAN.

3. Item: PEACE—SOCIETIES (p. 954)

This subdivision may suitably handle material on the nearly 2,000 individual peace groups like MOBE, the War Resisters League, Kampagne für Abrustung, and CND, but miserably under-represents the worldwide Peace Movement, an aggregate of organizations and persons—in fact, a spirit and style made manifest in yearly "Easter Marches," the "V" sign (freely exchanged and readily understood everywhere), and the starkly simple "peace symbol," much seen on posters, stickers, flags, walls, jewelry, clothing, etc., as well as in
internationally circulated publications like *Peace News*, the *Journal of Peace Research*, *Peace Press*, and *WIN*.¹

**Remedy:** Establish a new form, PEACE MOVEMENT.²

**Notes (Item 3)**


2. Even so, while eschewing a “numbers-game,” the literally scores of primary heads and subheads relating to Armies and Armed Forces, together with specific weapons, in toto far out-bulk the relatively meagre subject attention to Peace and Disarmament. Note, as a single, depressing example, that the prime head *ART AND WAR* (p. 77) has thus far not been balanced with an *ART AND PEACE*, although it seems likely that some work has dealt with this topic, employing Picasso’s “Guernica” and many dove-motifs (one of which adorns a bright, giant tapestry at the Brecht-Theater in East Berlin), Goya’s “Disasters of War,” and similar material as illustrations. Indeed, a study or collection of such graphics and plastics—particularly the horrendous statements on human brutality and military madness like Käthe Kollwitz’s “Seven Woodcuts on War” or Georg Grosz’s “Ecce Homo”—better warrant *ART AND PEACE* as a head than *ART AND WAR*, the former more faithfully reflecting the artists’ intent and inspiration. Says H. W. Janson of “Guernica”: “With
a series of powerful images, it evokes the agony of total war. The destruction of Guernica was the first demonstration of the technique of saturation bombing which was later employed on a huge scale during the Second World War; the mural was thus a prophetic vision of doom—the doom that threatens us even more in this age of nuclear warfare.” History of Art (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall; New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1966), p. 524. A new head PEACE IN ART does appear in the 1966 ACS, p. 115, but is not semantically equivalent to ART AND PEACE.

The initial API number includes five closely printed entry-columns under PEACE MOVEMENT, op. cit., p. 44–6.

Libraries with extensive holdings in this area, especially if they include much retrospective material, may wish to sophisticate the head by creating two chronologically distinct forms:

PEACE MOVEMENT, 1843–1945
PEACE MOVEMENT, 1946–


4. Items: EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP (p. 425); EMPLOYEES REPRESENTATION IN MANAGEMENT (p. 426; Sears, p. 230)

The first head covers material on profit-sharing and stock-ownership plans, while the second deals with Mitbestimmungsrecht (the original German term), i.e., schemes for worker-participation in industrial management. Both are valid forms, though the rejected variant, CO-DETERMINATION (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS), might be preferred to the used head in that it posits a degree of labor-management equity in control, EMPLOYEES REPRESENTATION IN MANAGEMENT suggesting a largely paternalistic concession by management to labor, perhaps a variety of cooption.
At any rate, events within the labor movement, notably in England, Algeria, and Yugoslavia, have rendered both heads inapplicable to the theory and system now widely called “Workers’ Control,” which extends well beyond profit-sharing and “co-determination” to total ownership and administration by workers.¹ No existing LC term satisfactorily comprehends this relatively new phenomenon.

**Remedy:** Institute a new head, workers’ control, with cross-references from and to the two “Employee” forms.²

---


2. It will be readily apparent that employee control or employee management as possible alternatives violate the very essence of “Workers’ control.” The essential point is that “employees” would no longer exist under such a system, for every worker would be part-owner, part-manager. As early as the late 1920s and early 30s in Spain “workers’ participation in management” was understood by the workers’ movement, whose “ideology was based on anarchist trade union doctrines,” to mean “control and autonomy,” not co-determination. Cf. “Workers’ Participation in the Management of Undertakings in Spain,” IILS country-study no. 8, op. cit., p. 284.

The API affords a precedent for this new form, op. cit., p. 68.

In view of the connection established by Guerin, Chomsky, and others between anarchism and workers’ control, sa references seem advisable from and to anarchism and anarchists, while “x” referents would be appropriate for “Council Communism,” “Liberatarian Socialism,” and “Industtrial Democracy.”
5. Item: BOYCOTT
   ×× Competition, Unfair (p. 155)

   What is necessarily "unfair," as the "××" implies, about a labor-generated boycott—like that of the California farm workers—conceived as a form of pressure upon recalcitrant employers to negotiate worker demands? Is it not equally "unfair" that such bosses refuse either to recognize a bona fide union or to grant their employees a living wage plus certain minimal amenities taken for granted by most of the population? The "boycott" is merely one among relatively few weapons in the labor arsenal. When compared with the many employer options, like dismissal, blacklisting, and scab-hiring, it hardly merits the appellation "unfair."

   **Remedy:** Remove "Competition, Unfair" as an "××."

---

**Note (Item 5)**


6. Item: COLLECTIVE SETTLEMENTS (p. 270)

"Classic" communal ventures like the Oneida Community and Brook Farm are well enough covered by this form. But it doesn't suffice as a rubric for the experiments in cooperative living that have recently blossomed in both metropolis and wilderness, from ultra-urban Berkeley and Berlin to teepee-dotted northern New Mexico. These newer incarnations differ in important respects from the older varieties, often serving—for instance—as loci for political action, and frequently interacting with one another in a fashion that their progenitors never did. Such postwar politico-ecological undertakings are described by most practitioners as "intentional communities."

Remedy: Create two new forms, INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES, RURAL, 1946— , and INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES, URBAN, 1946— , WITH "××"s" FOR COLLECTIVE SETTLEMENTS, COOPERATION, etc.1

Note (Item 6)

1. Since many such communitarians also regard themselves as "libertarians" or "anarchists," it would be well to add cross-references from and to ANARCHISM AND ANARCHISTS.

The API prefers COMMUNES, RURAL and COMMUNES, URBAN, op. cit., p. 15. These seem altogether acceptable forms. If selected instead of INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES, there should be a See reference from "Intentional communities." Likewise, See references from "Communes, Rural" and "Communes, Urban" are advisable if INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES becomes the prime head.

ONEIDA COMMUNITY, incidentally (p. 919), deserves an "××" for Collective settlements," as does BROOK FARM (p. 162).

7. Item: MOLLY MAGUIRES

×× Crime and criminals (p. 842)

The provocation under which the miners lived day by day in the 1870's was immense; one need only mention the starvation
wages, the company-owned homes, the blacklisting and the terror and violence used against the Mollies and miners in general. During the sharp economic crisis of 1873 the burden was shifted to the workers in the form of unemployment, wage cuts and longer working hours. In the 1870’s the largest number of strikes—304—were in Pennsylvania. In the absence of a powerful labor movement to fight for their rights, the miners fought injustice with violence and terrorism until the mining union was reorganized. After this such tactics were almost entirely abandoned. If the movement is viewed against the background of class and ethnic struggles, then the coal miners of eastern Pennsylvania had added a tactic which, if not particularly pretty, is not surprising.

—Ann J. Lane

The Mollies, says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, were “certain men in the anthracite coal–producing counties of Schuylkill, Luzerne, Carbon and adjacent counties in Pennsylvania, who violated property rights of coal-mine operators and even committed murder during the years 1862 to 1876...” Reluctantly, the *EB* expert admits that “there is some justification for considering the Molly Maguire episode as an aspect of labour struggles in the coal mines...”2

Through its single “××,” LC chooses to emphasize the Mollies’ alleged criminality, entirely ignoring the labor-struggle dimension of the “episode.” That terror erupted in the Pennsylvania coalfields during the 1870s nobody denies. But that the “Mollies” deserve responsibility for that terror remains an unresolved question. Indeed, studies by Anthony Bimba and others conclude that far from being hooligans and murderers, the Mollies were “pioneers and martyrs in a determined struggle of the miners to improve their miserable working conditions.”2 Bimba, in particular, holds that the railroad company owning the mines itself organized the “terror” and managed “the frame-up trial that sent the Mollies to the gallows.”4 A court well attuned to the wishes of the “robber baron” Establishment and patently unsympathetic to working-class organization convicted the Mollies on capital charges. But history has yet to prove them guilty. If, however, their “guilt” inheres in having “violated” the coal operators’ “property rights,” then the owners themselves must be
adjudged no less “guilty” for having violated the miners’ human rights. But no “××” for “Crime and criminals,” naturally, appears under COAL MINES AND MINING, the standard head for the industry (p. 262). Until the matter of the Mollies’ asserted “gangsterism” is finally settled, it is incumbent on subject-schemes to tread warily—in terms of our own legal precepts, to presume them innocent.³

Remedy: (a) Delete the “××” for “Crime and criminals.”

(b) Introduce two nondebatable “××’s”: COAL-MINERS—PENNSYLVANIA and LABOR AND LABORING CLASSES—PENNSYLVANIA.

Notes (Item 7)

4. Ibid.
5. Indeed, Lane—at the outset of her judicious review of “Molly” studies—straightforwardly announces that “little . . . can be said of the Molly Maguires upon which all knowledgeable persons can agree and for which there is some convincing evidence.” Op. cit., p. 310.

8. Item: COMMUNIST STRATEGY (p. 282)

Since the head posits a single, monolithic Communist movement which in reality has not for some time—if ever—existed, it is foolish and careless. Beyond that, however, it reflects a distinctly Western, “Free World,” Cold War bias in that no correlative form has been devised for what Soviet or Cuban ideologues and analysts might well term “Capitalist strategy.” Both terms, admittedly, represent over simplifications. Still, if the one can claim any merit, so can the other. The very isolation of COMMUNIST STRATEGY attributes to Communist “bloc” activities a singular, sinister quality. “Sinister” and nefarious they well may be, but not—in view, e.g., of widely-known CIA machinations in both the West and Third World—singular.
Remedy: Either institute CAPITALIST STRATEGY as a complementary form or dispense completely with COMMUNIST STRATEGY, employing in its place such fully-adequate and far less-slanted rubrics as COMMUNISM, WORLD POLITICS—1945—, RUSSIA—FOREIGN RELATIONS, etc.

Note (Item 8)


9. Items: CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS (p. 303); MILITARY SERVICE, COMPULSORY (p. 825)

Events have overtaken these heads, for resistance to the draft, largely a reflex of the continuing Vietnam War and accompanying radicalization of youth, has increasingly been based on nonreligious and frankly political considerations. CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS, mainly and traditionally limited to religion-inspired pacifists who make formal application for military exemption, fails to describe
satisfactorily the now much-enlarged area of draft resistance, typified by conscription-eligible young men who may refuse even to register with government authorities, exile themselves to Canada and elsewhere, etc., frequently on ethical or ideological grounds.¹

**Remedy:** (a) Add the subhead —**RESISTANCE TO MILITARY SERVICE, COMPULSORY**, with an “××” and *sa* for “Conscientious objectors.”

(b) Under this new form introduce “Draft resistance” as an “×.”

---

**Note (Item 9)**


---

10. **Item: COMPANY UNIONS**

   ×× **Independent unions** (p. 283)

   . . . a labor union consisting of the employees of a single firm, having no affiliation with a larger outside union, and often felt to be dominated by the employer.¹

   “Independent” of larger, “international” unions, yes. But not usually *independent* of management, as any student of labor history appreciates. The “××,” however, does not make this absolutely essential distinction, mistakenly implying that “company unions” are in fact, truly and fully “independent.”

   **Remedy:** Remove “Independent unions” as an “××.”
Note (Item 10)

1. Webster’s Third, p. 461. Emphasis added.


This subhead immediately follows —REVOLUTION, 1935. Regardless of personal views toward the transformation undergone by Cuba since 1958–59, the events of those two years, culminating in the overthrow of Batista’s regime and marking the outset of a thoroughgoing reconstruction of society, no less qualify as a “Revolution” than the upsurge 25 years earlier.¹


Note (Item 11)


12. Items: EMPLOYEE MORALE (p. 425); PSYCHOLOGY, INDUSTRIAL (p. 1044); WORK (p. 1417)

The “××” referents for these forms include “Incentives in industry” and “Job satisfaction.” Remarkably, however, there is no reference to a primary head on alienation as an ingredient or aspect of worker psychology, though Marx introduced the concept more than a century ago and numerous commentators have elaborated it since. The present referents, in true Babbitt fashion, tend to “accentuate the positive,” whereas objective studies tend to substantiate the grimmer, estrangement-producing side of the workplace.¹
Remedy: Establish alienation (social psychology) as a primary head, with cross-references from and to employee morale; psychology, industrial; and work.²

Notes (Item 12)


It is a pleasure to report that the July 1964–Dec. 1965 ACS on p. 9 did install alienation (social psychology) as a prime head. However, its two “××’s” are solely for “Social isolation” and “Social psychology,” while a later “×” (1967 ACS, p. 9) refers merely from “Estrangement (Social Psychology).” In short, it still fails to relate the concept to “Employee morale,” etc. Further, its utility may be enhanced by the addition of an “×” for “Entfremdung” and an “××” for “Anomy” (p. 56).

13. Items: LIBRARIES AND FOREIGN POPULATION; LIBRARIES AND LABOR; LIBRARIES AND SCHOOLS; etc. (p. 740)

No one can fair-mindedly expect that LC compilers would be blessed with the gift of prophecy to a greater degree than anyone else. Hence, noting the list’s failure to indicate the lately-expanded social concerns of the profession can hardly be interpreted as a criticism. This is a useful opportunity, however, to suggest that the next edition reflect what may properly be termed a near-revolution in library services and professional philosophy, already incarnated, print-wise, in many studies and such periodicals as Response, “the newsletter of the N.Y.C. Librarians Roundtable on Social Responsibilities,” and the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Newsletter,¹ as well as The Liberated Librarian, Sipapu, and the Bay Area Reference Center’s vibrant, “with it” Synergy.

Remedy: Establish, as the literature warrants, such new forms as

LIBRARIES AND THE COMMUNITY
LIBRARIES AND SOCIETY
LIBRARIES AND SOCIAL CHANGE
  × Social change and libraries
LIBRARIES AND THE POOR
  × Libraries and ghettos
  Libraries and slums
  Libraries and the disadvantaged
  Libraries and the inner city
LIBRARIES AND PEACE
  × Peace and libraries
Note (Item 13)

1. Both available from the SRRT Clearinghouse, c/o George Hathaway, Secretary, Brooklyn College Library, Bedford Avenue and Avenue H, Brooklyn, NY 11210.

14. Items: LONDON—BOMBARDMENT, 1940 (p. 757); ROTTERDAM—BOMBARDMENT, 1940 (p. 1118)

It is irresistibly tempting to ascribe the inclusion of these forms to the close political and cultural affinities felt toward wartime allies and, similarly, to explain the exclusion of certain other heads in terms of political and cultural antagonism toward erstwhile enemies. Whatever the real reasons, the agonies undergone by our “friends” are duly noted in the list, while the no-less-horrrendous suffering inflicted by us upon our adversaries passes unremarked. From February 13th through 15th, 1945, the RAF in tandem with the USAF completely destroyed the refugee-swollen city of Dresden with phosphorus and high-explosive bombs, producing an estimated 300,000 deaths and casualties. No other German city during World War II experienced a bombardment of such magnitude in death and destruction.¹ No inkling of this event appears on p. 386, merely two entries for safely-distant episodes: DRESDEN, BATTLE OF, 1813, and DRESDEN, PEACE OF, 1745. On August 6, 1945, the USAF dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The result: 260,000 dead; 163,263 missing or wounded; 60 percent of the city devastated.² And three days later another atomic device fell on Nagasaki, almost totally wrecking the city, wounding 40,000 and killing 36,000.³ There are no entries for even the names of these two cities. Nor is there any indication—21 years later—under either ATOMIC BOMB or ATOMIC WARFARE that the weapon had in fact ever been used. It would seem from this LA treatment—or lack of it—that nuclear weapons had never hurt anybody, that the dead, mangled, and deformed of Hiroshima and Nagasaki inhabit only some hyperactive imaginations. It
is a stupendous achievement in make-believe. But for fairy tales most persons prefer Grimm or Andersen, not the LC subject-list. The charred corpses in Dresden's streets were real enough. So is the Hiroshima-demonstrated threat of nuclear annihilation. This is the Atomic Age. Let us face it. And let us further face the perhaps unsavory fact that evil doing on a terrible scale has not always been the exclusive province of our foes. As the Dean of St. Albans explained when banning the use of St. Albans Abbey for a thanksgiving service on August 15, 1945: "I cannot give thanks to God for an event brought about by a wrong use of force, by an indiscriminate massacre."

**Remedy:** (a) Institute three new forms:

- DRESDEN—BOMBARDMENT, 1945
- HIROSHIMA—ATOMIC BOMBARDMENT, 1945
- NAGASAKI—ATOMIC BOMBARDMENT, 1945

(b) Under each of the above, as well as under the London and Rotterdam entries, place an "××": "World War, 1939–1945—Atrocities."

(c) Under both ATOMIC BOMB and ATOMIC WARFARE make an sa reference to Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

(d) To correct any misappositions that "Massacres" only happen on the ground, effected with bows-and-arrows, rifles, knives, or cannon, establish another new form, MASSACRES, AERIAL, with a note: sa the subdivisions BOMBARDMENT and ATOMIC BOMBARDMENT under names of places, e.g. HIROSHIMA—ATOMIC BOMBARDMENT, 1945, and ROTTERDAM—BOMBARDMENT, 1940.

**Notes (Item 14)**


“74,000 dead and 75,000 wounded,” adding that “Japanese figures confirm this estimate.” Op. cit.

4. Only slightly lessened by the institution of — PERSONAL NARRATIVES as a subhead under ATOMIC BOMB—PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECT (1969 ACS, p. 16).


15. Item: FASCISM
   — ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
   — BRAZIL
   — GERMANY
   — ITALY (p. 470)

Fair enough. But not complete enough, for fascist movements have thrived—and continue to flourish—elsewhere, not merely in the Axis countries and cacique-prone Latin America. The virus has also infected Great Britain, Finland, America, Spain, France, Portugal, and South Africa.¹

Remedy: Add subheads for the above-named states, together with any others indicated by the literature.

Note (Item 15)

1. The outstanding U.S. examples in recent years are the American Nazi and National Renaissance parties, whose chief publications are annotated in Robert H. Muller, ed., From Radical Left to Extreme Right (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Campus Publishers, 1967), especially p. 96–8. F. L. Carsten, in his Rise of Fascism (London: Batsford, 1967), traces “the history of the principal Fascist movements as they developed in the course of the 1920s and 1930s.” A final chapter (p. 230–37) delineates their common traits. E. J.

16. **Item: MANAGEMENT RIGHTS**

Here are entered works dealing with the rights and powers essential to the operation of a business, such as hiring, production methods, and the like, which management may claim to be outside the scope of collective bargaining and over which management commonly maintains authority and responsibility [p. 775].

An initial reaction to this form, in light of the growing segment of labor that aims at total control of industrial and business enterprises, is that there are no longer such unquestioned “management rights.” In fact, many of the scope-note prerogatives have long been contested—and eroded—even by relatively “moderate” unions. “Union shop” and “closed shop” arrangements surely inhibit management’s hiring “rights,” while disputes, as an example, over speed-ups on an assembly-line certainly encroach on the manager’s alleged rights concerning “production methods.” A secondary response, however, centers on the ethical geometry of the head. In a word, it is disturbingly asymmetrical. The cataloger who turns to p. 711 and p. 712 expecting to find a correlative entry, LABOR RIGHTS, sandwiched between LABOR REST HOMES and LABOR SERVICE, will be disappointed. No such head exists. Which leads to the interesting, inescapable conclusion, worthy of Ford, Carnegie, or Rockefeller, that Management enjoys certain God-given, indestructible rights, while Labor, by contrast, is entitled to none.

**Remedy:** Either delete MANAGEMENT RIGHTS as a superfluous, moribund form or install LABOR RIGHTS as a symmetry-making rubric with an equivalent scopenote; e.g.,
Here are entered works dealing with the rights and powers essential to the well-being of workers, such as hiring, production methods, union organization, shop conditions, and the like, which labor may claim to be within the scope of collective bargaining but over some of which management, until recent times, has commonly maintained full authority and responsibility.

Note (Item 16)

1. A Working Party established by the Department of Christian Education and Training of the National Christian Council of Kenya found, in the course of examining "some attempts [in Yugoslavia, West Germany, and elsewhere] to associate industrial workers with the management of their enterprise," that "sometimes the distinction is made between the external responsibilities of management: sales, purchasing, etc., about which most employees have little contribution to make, and their internal responsibilities: production, methods, personnel, etc., with which the man on the shop floor is very much concerned." Cf. Who Controls Industry in Kenya? (Nairobi: East African Publishing House, 1968), p. 242–43. First two emphases in original, last added.


G. Warren Miller further cavils against "exploitative" union behavior, manifest in "work rules of various kinds, employment guarantees, output royalties for union benefit, penalty rates of various types (e.g., overtime pay) and so on." In Miller's view, "as far as industrial unions are concerned, all exploitation tends toward the ultimate 'optimum': syndicalism." p. 299–300.
17. **Item:** ANTI-COMMUNIST MOVEMENTS  
(p. 584; Sears, p. 69)

The head suggests a polarity that the list itself fails to express.  
For if there are “anti-Communist movements,” then certainly there  
are also “anti-Capitalist movements.”

**Remedy:** Establish a *See* form:

- Anti-Capitalist movements
  - *See* Anarchism and anarchists
  - Communism
  - Radicalism and radicals
  - Socialism

18. **Item:** POOR (p. 1009)

The 20 *sa* and 13 “××” referents, ranging from “Almshouses”  
and “Begging” to “Benevolence” and “Tramps,” effectively de-  
humanize the poverty-stricken. The twin emphases are upon *external*  
amelioration of their condition (e.g., “Benevolence” and  
“Charities”) and the pitifully low state to which they have fallen (e.g.,  
“Tramps” and “Unemployed”). No hint appears of the actions and  
campaigns mounted by the poor themselves to improve their lot,¹  
nor of the socioeconomic systems to which large scale poverty—or,  
more accurately, a marked disparity in income distribution—seems  
invariably wedded.²

**Remedy:** (a) Create three new forms, RENT STRIKES, TENANTS’  
UNIONS, and WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT (U.S.), providing each with  
an “××” for POOR.³ Each of the first two heads should also become  
both an *sa* and “××” under the other, as well as under LANDLORD AND  
TENANT (p. 716), while WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT (U.S.) will require  
an “××” for PUBLIC WELFARE—U.S. (p. 1050).

(b) Add “Capitalism,” “Feudalism,” and “Laissez-faire” to  
the “××” rosters for both POOR and POVERTY (p. 1018).

(c) Add “Migrant labor” as an *sa* entry under POOR.
Notes (Item 18)


19. **Item: NAPALM**


---

Napalm is a purely American invention. It was compounded by Professor Louis Fieser at Harvard University in World War II and has since experienced considerable refinement. The early formulations were metallic soaps gelled with gasoline... In recent years the Air Force has adopted a new type of napalm, designated "Napalm B," which consists of 50% polystyrene mixed with 25% each of gasoline and benzene. This blend, which was developed by the Dow Chemical Company,
is said to impart superior qualities of "adhesion" to the product.

Napalm was used extensively in the Pacific theatre in World War II, and a total of 32,215 tons was dropped in the three years of the Korean war. Figures released by the Defense Department in early 1968 revealed the napalm escalation in Vietnam: 2181 tons dropped in 1963; 1777 tons in 1964; 17,659 tons in 1965, and 54,670 tons in 1966. For the first six months of 1967, napalm spending came to $2,949,929 per month. By March of 1968 it was estimated that the Air Force alone had dropped in excess of 100,000 tons in Vietnam; the Navy also uses napalm bombs and the Army employs substantial quantities in flame-throwers.  

Napalm sticks to kids, napalm sticks to kids,
When'll those damn gooks ever learn?
We shoot the sick, the young, the lame,
We do our best to kill and maim,
Because the 'kills' all count the same,
Napalm sticks to kids. 

Since the 1969 ACS made no further emendation to the new head, it appears that the role of this chemical mixture remains both harmless and even helpful. Were its uses confined to purely peaceful soap production, it would warrant no comment here. But the Air Force has not dropped 100,000 tons of soap on Vietnam, though one might fervently wish that it had. Napalm, as everyone who has merely scanned the daily newspaper or fitfully watched TV news reports over the past few years well knows, is a flesh-scouring chemical weapon, whose employment in Vietnam has often been wholly indiscernible. Not only does it inflict severe burns, but may also kill by asphyxiation—i.e., carbon monoxide poisoning—persons who have "sheltered" themselves out of the open air. It cannot be claimed that LC just doesn't know about napalm's extra-soap aspects. It has already cataloged a 1967 title that dealt specifically with this substance as a chemical warfare agent. Why, then, the obfuscation, the same "let's pretend" posture earlier noted with respect to the atomic bomb?  

Remedy: Add to the "××" for "Metallic soaps" further references for "Chemical warfare," "Offenses against the person,"

Notes (Item 19)


2. First verse of a little ditty composed by 1st Cavalry Division (Air-mobile) "skytroopers" at Phuoc Vinh, Vietnam, as reported by John E. Woodruff from Saigon in the June 15, 1970, Baltimore Sun and quoted by I. F. Stone in his *Bi-Weekly* for June 29, 1970 (v. 18, no. 13), p. 2. Woodruff notes that "agreement was by no means complete on whether the [song-writers] were protesting the war or mocking a 'bad image' that many helicopter pilots and gunners feel they have acquired unfairly in the course of the war." Still, the ballad seems to verify, however crudely, Neilands' point regarding the product's "adhesive" quality, as well as evincing the essentially racist ("gook") attitude toward Asians mentioned earlier with respect to *yellow peril*.


4. Cf. Gilbert Dreyfus, "Napalm: "What It Is; What It Does," *London Bulletin*, no. 4 (winter 1967–68), p. 152–55. Dr. Dreyfus, professor of biochemistry at the University of Paris Medical School, made a detailed report on the various forms and effects of napalm to the second session of the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal. He concluded that "whether it is used strategically on the battlefield or in the bombardment of urban areas or village collectives, [napalm] is a means of extensive, nondiscriminatory destruction. It affects primarily human beings, livestock, crops and light flammable structures such as habitations. Its employment in heavily populated areas will produce immense loss of life from burning and asphyxiation. In survivors, corporal injuries of the greatest gravity with functional sequels which prevent the resumption of normal life are the rule" (p. 158).

20. **Item:** PUBLIC RELATIONS—POLICE
   × Police-community relations (1968 ACS, p. 361)

Some of the published literature may, indeed, require this head. But some also requires a heading akin to that reduced to an "×" referent. For "Public relations"—PR—is ad-world jargon. In this context, it signifies "image-building" undertaken by the police, not their de facto relationship with the communities they ostensibly "serve and protect." Just as TEACHERS AND COMMUNITY is not equivalent to PUBLIC RELATIONS—TEACHERS, neither is POLICE AND COMMUNITY or POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS the same as PUBLIC RELATIONS—POLICE. An additional form is needed, particularly since police activities have become the subject of much controversy and concern within the past few years.

**Remedy:** Introduce POLICE AND COMMUNITY as a new head, with an "×" for "Police-community relations," deleting this latter referent under PUBLIC RELATIONS—POLICE. The literature may also demand further heads like POLICE AND AFRO-AMERICANS, POLICE AND YOUTH, and POLICE MALPRACTICE.

---

**Notes (Item 20)**

1. TEACHERS AND COMMUNITY appears on p. 446 of the 1968 ACS.
p. 5; "Police Beat, Jail Student," no. 253 (Feb. 1968), p. 2; and "Epileptic Asks Damages for Police Beating During Seizure," no. 254 (March-April 1968), p. 3. Further: the abundant material cited under POLICE, POLICE BRUTALITY, and POLICE RIOT in the initial API number, op. cit., p. 47–8. Further: the detailed account of "Police violence" on the UCLA campus prepared by the Chancellor's Commission on the Events of May 5, 1970, reprinted in the UCLA Daily Bruin, Jan. 19, 1971, p. 9–12, which alleges police attacks upon "many innocent persons," arrests "for no sensible reason," and invasion of two university buildings "for no useful purpose whatever." The report concludes that "the pattern of attack and arrest was discriminatory: the longhairs, the Blacks, the Mexican-Americans, the Asian-Americans and American Indians were prime targets; there was one illustration of anti-Semitism."

21. Item: SOCIAL PROBLEMS

   sa Crime and criminals
   Discrimination
   Race discrimination
   Race problems
   Suicide [etc.] (p. 1192–93; Sears, p. 548)

Some 44 sa referents appear under this head. In the light of previous discussions and recommendations, more are needed to suitably contemporize the coverage.

   Remedy: Add to the sa roster, after canceling "Race discrimination" and "Race problems":

   POLICE AND COMMUNITY
   POVERTY
   RACE RELATIONS
   RACISM

22. Item: PREVENTIVE DETENTION

Here are entered works on long-term detention as a correctional measure against habitual criminals. Works on the detention of suspects before trial are entered under the heading Arrest.
Detention, Preventive

Arrest

Criminal Justice, Administration of
Detention of persons
Imprisonment
Prisons
Punishment
Recidivists (p. 1025)

Whether "habitual criminals" can, in fact, be readily and unerringly identified, and how efficacious "preventive detention" is likely to prove in combating recidivism are matters for jurists, lawyers, and penologists to determine. The theory and practice undoubtedly exist. And, as of mid-1970, some four bills on the subject were pending before the U.S. Congress. The LC treatment adequately conveys the penological/administrative dimension of the topic, but entirely fails to show its legal and civil libertarian aspects. Who could possibly imagine from the scope note and seven "××" referents that "preventive detention" is equally the subject of profound ethical and juridical dispute, that the very idea has been denounced as "alien to the American concept of law-enforcement and our tradition"? In short, there's more to the matter than meets LC's eye.

Remedy: (a) Introduce additional "××’s" for CIVIL RIGHTS, CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, and DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

(b) Since material on pretrial detention is ignominiously buried by LC under ARREST, although such imprisonment is often imposed for punitive or "preventive" reasons, a new primary form is indicated:

PRETRIAL DETENTION
  × Detention, Pretrial
  ×× Arrest
     Civil rights
     Constitutional law
     Detention of persons
     Due process of law
Imprisonment
Preventive detention
Prisons
Punishment

Notes (Item 22)

1. This is Arthur J. Goldberg's opinion, quoted in "Union Forms Group to Block Preventive Jail," *Civil Liberties*, no. 269 (May 1970), p. 5. The national ACLU, together with its National Capital Area affiliate, in a letter sent to all Congressmen, called one of the four pending bills "indistinguishable from a 60-day jail sentence imposed without a crime having been committed." *Ibid.*


23. *Item: WIRETAPPING*

*sa Eavesdropping

*xx Criminal investigation

Eavesdropping

Evidence (Law)

Evidence, Criminal

Telephone—Laws and regulations (p. 1409)*
Wire tapping is admitted to be a form of "eavesdropping." Eavesdropping on p. 397 is associated by an "××" with "Privacy, Right of." Why, then, is no connection made between wiretapping and the right of privacy? Because most anyone can eavesdrop, while wiretapping, which requires more sophisticated technology, is largely the preserve of governmental agencies? Or simply because no LC catalogers, fortuitously, have been wiretapped (just as none, thankfully, has been napalmed)? Beyond that, the larger issue of wiretapping as a publicly-employed instrument to protect "national security" or secure criminal indictments goes unnoted, much as with "preventive detention." In brief, "wiretapping" is not merely one among many investigative techniques, nor solely a mode for securing evidence to be placed before judge-and-jury; it is also a means of coercion or repression, a Constitutionally questionable way for official bodies like the Department of Justice to gather information on "dissident" or "controversial" persons and groups. Indeed, there has been vigorous debate on both wiretapping as a means and the ends for which it is used.²

Remedy: Install "××'s" for CIVIL RIGHTS; CONSTITUTIONAL LAW; DUE PROCESS OF LAW; POLITICAL CRIMES AND OFFENSES; and PRIVACY, RIGHT OF.

Notes (Item 23)

1. It would be lamentable, however, if sensitivity to political and social questions were wholly contingent upon firsthand experience. It should not, for instance, be necessary to witness or undergo tear-gassing during a demonstration in order to appreciate both the physiological and political effects of such "control" methods. Still, it must be confessed that personal exposure of that nature—as the author learned from a gas-dispersed protest at the British High Commission in Lusaka in late July 1970—tends to heighten and crystallize one's perceptions. Which is not to suggest that a tear-gas canister should be exploded at LC for instructional purposes, but rather that catalogers might at least benefit from other people's experience in this sphere.

2. Cf., for example, "Dissenters Sue to Stop U.S. Wiretapping, Eavesdropping," Civil Liberties, no. 263 (Aug. 1969), p. 1+. The plaintiffs in this case, who asked a federal district court "to declare Justice Department and
Federal Bureau of Investigation wiretapping policies and practices unconstitutional" and "to prohibit all electronic surveillance of members of controversial organizations," included "nine anti-war, civil rights and black power" groups, among them the Congress for Racial Equality, American Servicemen's Union, and Catholic Peace Fellowship.
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 Trotsky

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)