

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Subject Access:
History and Current Practice

GLIS 791
Matt Johnson
Spring 2007

Introduction: A hidden history of queer subject access

Sexual minority populations have long been ascribed “hidden histories.” This lack of transparency takes on an added significance in library and information science, where the origins of current standards and practices are customarily veiled to information seekers and often obscure to professionals as well. This paper documents how, over the course of the past four decades, librarians have pursued a variety of strategies to make gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people and experiences visible and accessible in library catalogs. Some of those strategies have relied on modifying established cataloging instruments, notably the Library of Congress Subject Headings. Others have involved the adoption of newer technologies, such as information retrieval thesauri. The appraisal of these knowledge domains in the context of their production serves to fill a void in our knowledge about GLBT library history, as well as GLBT history more broadly. It also demonstrates the continued relevance of this type of knowledge production both for information professionals and for those we serve.

Literature review

Gay and lesbian activism in librarianship

Just as the new generation of gay and lesbian political activism in the United States was an outgrowth of civil rights and anti-war activism which dominated the 1960s and early 1970s, so too was gay and lesbian activism in American librarianship closely allied with broader activist movement within the profession. Librarians staged a picket of General Maxwell Taylor’s speech supporting US involvement in the Vietnam War at the

American Library Association (ALA) annual meeting in June 1967. The following year, ALA members presented a petition asking for the formation of a round table on the social responsibilities of libraries. Within six months, the petition was approved and the Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) was approved as a unit of ALA (Forsman 1971: 405).

From the outset, the SRRT lacked a centralized mission, instead becoming a platform for a wide spectrum of Leftist causes concerning libraries and their relationship to the larger society, as well as some causes which were not library-specific (Curley 1974). Numerous caucuses and task forces rapidly formed and allied themselves with SRRT, advocating such issues as recruiting ethnic minority librarians and disseminating literature relevant to blacks, Latinos, and American Indians, improving the status of women in the profession, ending poverty and serving populations who lived in poverty, often in urban centers, peace activism and environmental activism.

The Task Force on Gay Liberation (TFGL) was another such affiliate group. Convened by Israel Fishman at ALA's 1970 meeting in Detroit and promptly endorsed and allocated funding by SRRT, TFGL's formation came within a year of the riots at New York's Stonewall Inn, a year in which gay and lesbian organizing stepped up considerably and became more public and confrontational in its tenor. It has the distinction of being the first-ever professional organization for gay and lesbian people. TGFL wasted no time in advocating for gay librarians, as well as pointing up deficiencies in library services to gay and lesbian patrons. The 1971 annual meeting in Dallas was the site of the TFGL-sponsored "Hug-A-Homosexual" booth on the conference floor, an ambitious stunt which even attracted local media attention (Gittings 1998).

Though the Dallas newspapers may have been writing about this curious new phenomenon within librarianship, it appears to have been largely overlooked by the contemporary library press and by subsequent histories of social responsibilities activism. This is curious, given that *Library Journal* (under the editorial leadership of Eric Moon) devoted considerable attention to librarians' agitation on behalf of civil rights and intellectual freedom in this period (Moon & Nyren 1970). Subsequent historical accounts of the era, including assemblages of articles from *Library Journal* and *School Library Journal* (Schuman 1976, "Change: 1969-79" 1979, Bundy & Stielow 1987) do not accord a mention to TFGL and its activities. This parallels an exclusionary trend in much professional historical writing about 1960s activism overall, in which gay and lesbian activism is frequently marginalized or absent (Lekus 2006). A 1992 appearance of members of the Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Task Force (as it was then known) on the cover of *American Libraries* inspired a spate of angry letters to the editor (Gough 1998). This would seem to imply that some elements of social responsibilities activism might be more readily recuperated than others.

The SRRT and its attendant factions inspired considerable (and often justifiable) criticism from their contemporaries, both on the grounds of the groups' lack of a unitary focus (Curley 1974) as well as the danger which such activism posed to intellectual freedom and professional impartiality (Berninghausen 1972). Unfortunately, intelligent, reasoned criticisms often also betray the very sorts of bias which SRRT sought to eradicate, such as Berninghausen's oblique assertion that "[t]he *raison d'être* of the ALA is not ... [t]o promote homosexuality as a life-style" (3675). SRRT activism was no doubt a hallmark of a turbulent period in the history of the profession in the United

States, but the enthusiasm with which its adherents sought to engender professional and social change yielded positive long-term developments. Among the most significant of these was the drive to improve intellectual access to materials on socially marginalized people generally and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people in particular.

Subject access: efforts at reform

In a series of letters in the library press, the first of which appeared in *Library Journal* in February 1969, Sanford Berman, an American working at the University of Zambia Library, commenced a campaign of protest against “chauvinistic headings” employed by the Library of Congress as subject descriptors – a campaign which came to define his entire professional career. Berman’s suspicion that the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) contained an implicit and pervasive Euro-American bias was confirmed by his work with African materials, for which LCSH descriptors were often wholly inappropriate. Berman was commissioned by ALA to produce a book manuscript substantiating these claims. The result was *Prejudices and antipathies: A tract on the LC subject heads concerning people* (Berman 1971), published by editor Eric Moon at Scarecrow Press after ALA balked at publishing the book without significant cuts.

Berman’s energetic correspondence had already fueled similar speculations by others in the profession (Foskett 1971, Yeh 1971), but the appearance of *Prejudices and antipathies* effectively threw gasoline on the smoldering question of bias in library resource description. The scope of the little book was vast, encompassing dozens of heads denoting racial, ethnic, religious, and sexual minorities as well as women, youth, disabled people, and champions of progressive and Leftist political causes. Berman was

unsparing in his characterizations of how each head documented exhibited the eponymous “prejudices and antipathies” of mainstream American society; his copious and detailed documentation provided support for the alternative headings he proposed for each objectionable one. Paramount was the belief that in order to avoid misleading or pejorative language, subject descriptors concerning people should reflect the terminology employed by the population in question to describe themselves (e.g., “Blacks” instead of “Negroes”). The sheer outrageousness of some descriptors employed by LCSH at the time (e.g., “Yellow Peril”, “Mammies”, “Incorrigibles”), as highlighted by Berman, did much to promote wide discussion of his “tract” among librarians already primed for its appearance by several years of social responsibility activism.

In particular, unbiased subject access was an early concern of both TFGL and the SRRT Task Force on Women. TFGL’s first-ever sponsored program at the 1971 ALA annual meeting was a panel entitled “Sex and the Single Cataloger” (Gittings 1998). Panelists Steve Wolf and Joan Marshall advanced the idea that not only LCSH, but also Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) were riddled with anti-gay and anti-feminist bias and should be overhauled. Their remarks appeared in the 1972 collection *Revolting Librarians* (Marshall 1972, Wolf 1972); both contained high praise for Berman’s *Prejudices and antipathies*, notably his recommendation that the “see” reference to “Sexual perversion” be deleted from the headings “Homosexuality” and “Lesbianism”. This anticipated the eventual depathologization of homosexuality by the American Psychological Association in 1974.

Also in 1974, the Task Force on Women convened a Committee on Sexism in Subject Headings. The report which they prepared for ALA’s Resources and Technical

Services Division that year recommended limited changes to LCSH (e.g., the substitution of “Women” for the generic “Woman”, and the deletion of “as” forms relating to occupations – “Women as librarians” became “Women librarians”, etc.) which were quickly implemented. A feeling that more thoroughgoing changes were still needed inspired the Committee to apply for a Council on Library Resources grant to develop a thesaurus utilizing nonsexist language. The grant was awarded and the thesaurus completed by Joan Marshall with the coordination of the Committee; it was published as *On equal terms: A thesaurus for nonsexist indexing and cataloging* (Marshall 1977). Rather than attempting a formal innovation, Marshall’s thesaurus opts for pragmatism, mapping terms exactly to the LCSH format using an updated vocabulary. Meanwhile, *A women’s thesaurus* (Capek 1987) was beginning to be developed by the Business and Professional Women’s Foundation in conjunction with Marshall and many academic women’s studies research centers around the US. This was a unique project which resulted in a list of descriptors novel in both form and content. It was tested in many libraries and other information retrieval settings, but appears to have been adopted by few. No revision of either Marshall 1977 or Capek 1987 has been subsequently published. The development of both these thesauri, characterized by an initial flurry of enthusiastic activity, followed by the decline of the completed work into disuse, obsolescence, and obscurity, is also characteristic of the GLBT thesauri and classification schemes which are discussed below.

It is noteworthy that other social minority groups affiliated with SRRT, such as the Black Caucus, do not appear to have shared the same level of preoccupation with non-prejudicial subject access. Technical services are not even addressed directly in the

landmark *Handbook of black librarianship* (Josey & Shockley 1977) and LCSH descriptors relating to people of African descent merit scant mention in the professional literature (Clack 1978). A report on developing research collections in the then-nascent field of black studies reservedly recommended the development of “a compatibility index giving standard Library of Congress headings as derived from the user headings chosen specifically for a black bibliography until such a time as the Library of Congress changes its approach to black materials” (Doherty 1970: 384). The development of “bibliographic tools germane to Chicano resources” at UCLA’s Chicano Studies Research Library merits only a cursory reference in Bundy & Stielow 1987 (148), even though this library eventually produced its own Chicano thesaurus, which is still in use. Yeh 1971’s criticism of the LCC separation of American Indians from the United States history classification schedule – a criticism reiterated by Marshall 1972 and Milstead Harris & Clack 1979 – was summarily dismissed by the Library of Congress (Frosio 1971). The cleavage still exists, as does comparable *de facto* segregation of material on African Americans, women, and GLBT people; no further efforts to modify the LCC E-F or HQ schedules with respect to these groups appear to have been made.

While many in the profession were eager to point up the biases and inadequacies betrayed by LCSH, fewer were inclined to systematically investigate how LCSH descriptors were applied (or misapplied) to library materials. A study undertaken at UCLA and Florida State University (Milstead Harris & Clack 1979) validates many claims made in Berman 1971 concerning how LC heads, rapidly becoming an international standard, inadequately describe materials in many collections. However, the study also emphasizes how recommendations made by Berman, Marshall and others

positively influenced LC to make changes to descriptors within a comparatively short time span. These changes include those outlined by Marshall 1977 as well as the deletion of the relationship between “Homosexuality” and “Sexual perversion”.

Berman, meanwhile, left his position at the University of Zambia in 1973 to become chief cataloger at the Hennepin County Library (serving suburban Minneapolis). He remained there for nearly three decades, publishing extensively on cataloging reform and pressing LC to implement changes in its subject descriptors. Unusual for a public library system, Hennepin rejected the use of LCSH and developed its own subject authority file under Berman’s leadership. The development of the authority file was documented in the *Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin*, a publication which circulated widely among technical services professionals. Many other libraries began to adopt Hennepin subject heads to address inadequacies in LCSH, and over time LC incorporated numerous heads established by Hennepin. In 1999, however, with imminent plans to join OCLC, the Hennepin County Library administration insisted that the subject authority file be replaced with LCSH terms in order to ensure compatibility with the shared database. Berman protested this action and was subsequently dismissed. The Hennepin authority file, the product of nearly thirty years of innovation designed to facilitate subject access, is now housed with Berman’s papers in the University of Illinois archives (Eichenlaub 2003).

Information retrieval thesauri: a new approach to subject access

Activist interventions into intellectual access to material pertaining to socially marginalized groups spurred much new discussion on the history and future of LCSH as a

bibliographic tool (Chan 1978, Miksa 1983, Studwell 1990). Writers noted the perennial and fundamental inexactitude of the construction and deployment of subject heads, generally conceding that subject cataloging “is at least as much an art as it is a science” (Studwell, 8). The retention and revision of LCSH as a standard was generally recommended; its usage was already so widespread and entrenched as to render its substitution generally impracticable.

However, activist railings against LCSH were contemporaneous with an innovation in subject access which was growing in currency and significance: the thesaurus. Thesauri for information retrieval trace their conceptual origins to the writings of Vannevar Bush, in particular his description of the theoretical “memex”, a mechanical document retrieval machine. The “essential feature” of the memex was “associative indexing ... a provision whereby any item may be caused at will to select immediately and automatically another” (Bush 1945). In recent years, Bush’s account of associative indexing has been viewed as prefiguring hypertext and the lattice of documents comprising the World Wide Web. It can also be seen as an exhortation to correlative indexing.

Bush’s call was first heeded by his engineering colleagues, which were grappling with the problem of organizing an ever-increasing number of scientific publications and making them accessible to researchers. Solving this problem was viewed as critical to the continued, unhindered advance of the sciences. Different theorists had different takes on the issue. Some, like Calvin Mooers, were focused on developing a practical information retrieval mechanism along the lines proposed by Bush. Mooers’s Zator-A machine relied on keyword-in-context searching by way of optical scans of microfilmed

documents, an approach which relied less on structured indexing (Mooers 1951). H. P. Luhn, meanwhile, conceived of a “dictionary of notions” modeled on Roget’s *Thesaurus* which would facilitate not only mechanized retrieval but primarily mechanized indexing, allowing a computer to correctly associate synonymous terms as well as disambiguate terms with multiple usages (Luhn 1957).

Perhaps due to the technical and computational limitations of the time, mechanized indexing and retrieval of research documentation never enjoyed widespread application, but the concept of the information retrieval thesaurus – a standardized associative indexing vocabulary – was quickly seized upon as “a secondary, supplementary indexing aid” (Roberts 1984: 282) for manual indexers in industrial research settings in the United States and the United Kingdom. The first fully operational information retrieval thesaurus was that of the E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Company’s, published in 1959. Only a few years after the introduction of the term, “thesaurus” had become a buzzword in documentation studies, and attempts were being made to codify as well as historicize its usage (Vickery 1960). By 1967, with the publication of the *Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms*, standards for thesaurus construction, including the prescribed equivalent (USE/UF), hierarchical (BT/NT), and associative (RT) relationships, had been largely agreed upon by practitioners (Krooks & Lancaster 1993). In 1974 the American National Standards Institute produced the first edition of its *Guidelines for thesaurus structure, construction, and use* (ANSI Z39.19), using the *Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms* as a model (Roe & Thomas 2004).

The mid-1960s to the mid-1980s might well be called the golden age of information retrieval thesauri. Thousands such domain-specific controlled vocabularies

were independently developed in academic, industrial, military, governmental and nonprofit sectors. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the standard enjoyed little currency in libraries. The theory of subject cataloging dated back to Charles Ammi Cutter's 1876 *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*, and was further entrenched in the mid-twentieth century by the publication and dissemination of Library of Congress catalog cards (including Library of Congress Subject Headings) to libraries across the United States and, increasingly, outside of it as well. Moreover, new technologies introduced around 1970, including Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) and networked bibliographic databases such as OCLC, adopted LCSH as a standard, further militating against the introduction of thesauri in all but the most specialized library collections. In 1985, LCSH imported the vocabulary of the ANSI standard to describe relationships among terms on the list, though syndetic "see" and "see also" references had appeared as early as the fourth (1943) and fifth (1948) editions (Stone 2000). Yet LCSH cannot be said to conform entirely to the standard because of its continued use of faceted subdivisions.

Thesauri had admittedly proven most useful in highly particularized knowledge domains, where vocabulary sets were already more limited and more standardized given the formality of scientific discourse and the limited number of people deploying the concepts described by thesaurus terms. The development of "open-world" meta-thesauri – the universal knowledge domain ideally encompassed by the library catalog and tools such as Dewey Decimal Classification – through the union of various established vocabularies remained prohibitive (Lancaster 1986).

Controlled vocabularies in the online environment

The growth of networked electronic information retrieval systems in the 1980s lent a renewed gravity to the development of the meta-thesaurus. Bates (1989) noted that the new utility of keyword searching in online library catalogs could be regarded as a kind of meta-indexing. Based on numerous studies showing little overlap in vocabulary between research subjects describing the same phenomena, she recommended the construction of a “superthesaurus” mapped onto bibliographic record elements (including subject headings) to allow for more dynamic searches (see also Jantz 1999).

Particularly with the rise of the World Wide Web, researchers have noted a shift in emphasis in the construction and use of thesauri from the indexer to the end-user (Strong & Drott 1986; Shiri & Revie 2000). Web directories (such as Yahoo! and dmoz Open Directory Project) and commercial portals such as eBay relied on simply-structured knowledge hierarchies to permit users to “drill down” through taxonomic hierarchies, an approach to organizing information on the web made increasingly marginal with the ascendancy of search engines such as Google.

Tim Berners-Lee, the Web’s original architect, had always envisioned its documents as being semantically indexed to facilitate their retrieval (Berners-Lee 1999); in 2001, he and others issued the challenge to build a Semantic Web (Berners-Lee, Handler & Lassila). The semantic indexing of the Web is meant to be driven primarily by markup languages incorporating metadata tags, such as the Resource Description Framework (RDF) and Extensible Markup Language (XML), although even the standard Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) has this capacity. Most recently, the Semantic Web community has seen the development of the Web Ontology Language (OWL), established as a standard by the World Wide Web Consortium in 2004 (World Wide Web

Consortium 2004). Originally utilized by researchers in artificial intelligence to facilitate knowledge sharing and reuse (Fensel et al 2001), ontologies (like information retrieval thesauri) are intended to provide standard vocabularies and referential frameworks for metadata resources encoded in document sets. Their primary advantage over thesauri is that they greatly expand the potential descriptive power of relationships between terms. As with Bates's "superthesaurus", there is an aspiration to build a universal standard relational vocabulary for the description of web resources, possibly built on WordNet, an English-language vocabulary incorporating syndetic relations which was developed by linguistics researchers at Princeton University (Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory n.d.). To date, however, ontologies have not enjoyed widespread adoption or support from applications such as web browsers; they remain highly domain-specific and are not much seen outside computational linguistics and artificial intelligence laboratories. Few publications in library and information science have referenced ontologies (Ding 2001; Qin & Paling 2001; Denda 2005; see also Schmitz-Esser 1999), and even these only consider their application in theoretical information retrieval settings.

Gay and lesbian thesauri: an overview

While LC commenced a measured response to criticism of its subject descriptors in the mid-1970s, gay and lesbian collections adopted the strategy pursued by Marshall's *On equal terms* and Capek's *A women's thesaurus*, embracing the information retrieval thesaurus as a model developing their own lists of contextually relevant subject descriptors. As was true of the many women's studies centers whose subject lists Capek drew on to build *A women's thesaurus*, most gay and lesbian collections created lists

independently of one another to describe their own particular holdings. Between the mid-1970s and the mid-1990s, as many as thirty distinct, identifiable gay and lesbian thesauri, lists of headings, and classification schemes were developed. Concurrent with the production of gay and lesbian thesauri in this period was the production of indexes to gay and lesbian periodicals, as well as initiatives to ensure that gay and lesbian periodicals would appear in more general periodical indexes and directories (Potter 1986, Garber 1993, Ridinger 1997, Gough 1998).

Unfortunately, no comparable effort was made to coordinate all these instruments until the mid-1980s, when TFGL convened a thesaurus committee to synthesize a number of extant lists and produce something approaching a uniform standard, the *International thesaurus of gay and lesbian index terms* (Gregg & Ridinger 1988). Yet even the Gregg and Ridinger thesaurus has enjoyed little circulation or application among gay and lesbian collections, which have either continued to utilize their own lists or (more commonly) have adopted modified LCSH heads for greater ease of description, retrieval, and record sharing (Michel 2006). As LC has incorporated a greater variety of headings, this approach has become more practicable (DeSantis 2000).

The majority of the schemes documented here are identifiable only from bibliographies (“Classification schemes” n.d., “GLBTRT Clearinghouse inventory” n.d.). Unlike periodical indexes, thesauri were not intended as reference tools for the general user, and consequently were not generally published and disseminated. Hence in the case of many I am unable to verify whether or not a given “thesaurus” indeed had a thesaurus-like structure, or even whether or not it is still (or was ever) used to describe a collection or collections. Those which I have been able to view and analyze have been obtained

through correspondence with their original authors. Some schemes are closely tied to particular collections; others appear to have been developed by gay and lesbian librarians independent of any particular collection to be described. Most have never been revised since their generation and much of terminology they incorporate is quaint or obsolete.

Given all this, unearthing and revisiting these thesauri may seem an exercise in futility. Yet I believe this work is merited for several reasons. As information on the internet multiplies exponentially, librarians, information architects, web taxonomists and other professionals seek to develop controlled vocabularies to better describe electronic resources and improve both precision and recall in information retrieval. Information retrieval thesauri are strongly recommended as a model for this purpose (Roe & Thomas 2004). A comparative examination of subject-specific thesauri which predate the web environment is instructional as to issues of design and vocabulary usage.

Second: though many of the liabilities of more general subject description schemes such as LCSH have been corrected, these instruments are still not designed to adequately accommodate socially marginalized knowledge bases (Olson 1994), particularly material on human sexuality. An earlier generation of gay and lesbian thesauri may yield insights as to how information on sexuality may be better described and organized.

Last, the reappraisal of these thesauri serves to fill a void in our knowledge about gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender library history, as well as GLBT history more broadly. The forgetting of this history of information organization is a testament to Gayle Rubin's observation that "the more I explore these queer knowledges, the more I find out how much we have already forgotten, rediscovered, and promptly forgotten

again. I myself have attempted to reinvent the wheel on several occasions” (Rubin 2004:6). It is hoped that a recollection of this history of knowledge production will both spur and guide contemporary efforts in the same direction.

Analysis: overview of vocabularies

In my analysis, I attempted to address the following research questions:

- 1) How have practices for the cataloging and classification of GLBT materials changed over time?**
- 2) How have changes in practice influenced and been influenced changes in other library standards (i.e., LCSH)?**
- 3) How have changes in practice reflected changing terminology in everyday speech and in formal writing?**
- 4) What are the implications of changing cataloging and classification practices for current GLBT collections?**

To answer these questions, I chose three GLBT thesauri which possessed standard syndetic structures (Michel 1990; Van Staaldunin 1997; *LGBT Life* 2004) and compared their treatment of one particular topic to that of LCSH.¹ The topic I chose is “transgender”, which for purposes of synchronic and diachronic comparison has the benefit of being a highly polyvalent and complex concept, drawing other equally complex concepts into its definitional orbit, a number of which are examined here in turn. “Transgender” is also a relative neologism whose history and changing significance is clearly demonstrated by these controlled vocabularies as well as research literature in GLBT studies. To amplify my discussion, I have relied on five scholarly GLBT

¹ References to Library of Congress Subject Headings are taken from their respective authority records in the Library of Congress Authorities database, accessed online at <http://authorities.loc.gov>. Authority records cited are current as of 15 February 2007. See Appendix 1 for more information about the three GLBT thesauri.

encyclopedias as lexicons: an early standard reference source compiled about two decades ago (Dynes 1990) as well as four sources which have appeared within the past ten years (Haggerty 2000, Zimmerman 2000, Stein 2004, *glbtq.com* 2005).

Transgender

The word “transgender” was first coined by Virginia Prince in the late 1980s to refer to gender variant persons who did not wish to undergo a physiological transition. This chronology explains the absence of the term from the Michel thesaurus as well as from Dynes’ *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*. It has since proven an expedient if not particularly precise designation for many kinds of people, among them:

anyone who trans-gresses, or crosses, gender boundaries, but specifically for transvestites, transsexuals, transgenderists, drag queens and drag kings, gender-benders, gender-blenders, she-males and he-shes, androgynes, and intersexed people (Cromwell 2000, 774).

The application of transgender as an umbrella term encompassing these myriad, often equally ill-defined categories is largely indebted to the theoretical writings of Leslie Feinberg, who argued that rigidly dyadic gender roles and the repression of gender role transgression were conditions of modern capitalist societies. Just as many feminists proposed that the overthrow of capitalism was a necessary condition for women’s emancipation from patriarchy, Feinberg claimed that the liberation of all those who failed to adhere to social conventions around gender presentation would also require a revolution of the socioeconomic system (Feinberg 1992; summarized in Stryker 2004).

While many embraced Feinberg’s politicization of gender transgression, others (including many persons identified by the categories in the above list) have maintained a cautious distance from it. For transsexuals, who not uncommonly treat their status as privileged medical information and seek to sever any connection to the gender roles and

gendered bodies they were born into, identification as “transgender” is particularly problematic. In crossing permanently and irrevocably from one gender status to another, transsexual people are reifying the notion of the gender binary which Feinberg is working to tear down (Cromwell 2000, Thompson 2004).

Library of Congress Subject Authorities do not accord a main entry for “Transgender” or variations on that term, perhaps given the relative novelty of the concept as well as the continued contestation of its meaning. However, “Transgender orientation” and “Transgenderism” are incorporated into the Subject Authorities database as “see” references to “Transsexualism”, with “Transgender people”, “Transgendered people”, and “Transgenders” being included as “see” references to “Transsexuals”, likely perceived as a more authoritative heading given its heritage in scientific literature. This is problematic; the scholarly literature suggests that while transsexualism may or may not be accorded a position under the umbrella of transgenderism, it is nonetheless important to maintain a distinction between the two, as they are not congruent. There is currently a move among some catalogers in the United States to compel the Library of Congress to introduce the distinction (Berman 2006).

It is particularly odd that the authority record for “Transsexualism” cites the University of Washington President’s Task Force on Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, and Transgender Issues publication *Affirming diversity* as literary warrant for this conceptual elision. *Affirming diversity* notes that sexual orientation is defined in the University’s handbook as “heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender orientation, real or perceived” (*Affirming diversity* 2001, 3). While transsexuals may well be encompassed

by the University of Washington's definition, nowhere do the words "transsexual" or "transsexualism" appear.

In this regard the IHLIA and *LGBT Life* thesauri do a better job of relating transsexualism to transgenderism, retaining the distinction rather than allowing the former to stand in for the latter. Both, however, also privilege transgenderism by relegating transsexualism to a subordinate position (using a narrower term reference) within this rubric. *LGBT Life* further compounds this by rendering "Transsexuals" subordinate to "Transgender people". It should be noted that, of the four contemporary encyclopedias consulted, three (Haggerty 2000, Zimmerman 2000, *gltq.com*) treat transsexualism under the heading "Transgender"; the fourth (Stein 2004) treats both under the heading "Transsexuals, Transvestites, Transgender People, and Cross-Dressers". (Lacking "transgender" as a conceptual referent, Dynes 1990 treats related concepts under the headings "Transsexualism" and "Transvestism (Cross-Dressing)".) For many transsexual people, related term references might be more apt characterizations of the conceptual relationship.

The reference to "transgender" in the University of Washington's definition of "sexual orientation" evokes yet another conceptual vagary embodied by "transgender": its usage as a descriptor alongside terms pertaining to sexual object-choice rather than gender identity and presentation. Susan Stryker notes:

One consequence of the deployment of this term is that it tends to construct sexual identity categories (like homosexual, heterosexual, and bisexual) as gender-normative, and to segregate gender non-conformity solely within the newly created minority classification of "transgender." This conceptual move allows "transgender" to be treated like a discrete identity category--setting in motion all the struggles over inclusion and exclusion--rather than perceived, like race or class, as a phenomenon that cuts across existing sexual identity categories (Stryker 2004).

This usage of “transgender” is most easily seen as a relic of requests for inclusiveness within gay political movements and organizations. Many groups which were founded as “gay” in the early 1970s have since come to include “lesbian”, “bisexual”, and “transgender” – generally appearing in that chronological order – in their names and mission statements. In this instance, “transgender” is once again convenient shorthand, but its descriptive power is woefully imprecise. Transgender people have sexual orientations – gay, lesbian, bi, or straight – which are distinct from (if usually complementary to) their gender identity. To align gender identity with sexual identities that are typically dependent on it (i.e., being a lesbian presupposes being a woman) is to compare apples and oranges.²

Transsexual

Compared to “transgender”, “transsexual” is a more established concept with a significantly more stable referent. A term emerging from medicine and psychiatry in the early twentieth century, transsexuals may be defined as those who “hope to change the bodily characteristics of sex” (Meyerowitz 2000, quoted in Thompson 2004). The earliest such medical interventions in this regard were performed in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, but both the concept and the procedures associated with it only became widely known in the United States in 1952, when the *New York Daily News* published an account of World War II veteran Christine Jorgensen’s transformation into a woman through hormonal treatment and sex reassignment surgery.

² See Valentine 2002 for a critique of this separation of gender and sexuality.

The seminal quality of Jorgensen's transformation – from man to woman – is evinced by the structure of LC Subject Authorities in this area:

According to Meyerowitz, medical doctors in the past generally believed that MTFs [male-to-female transsexuals] greatly outnumbered FTMs [female-to-male transsexuals], but some doctors today think their numbers are roughly equal ... however, FTMs were often ignored or their experiences were conflated with those of MTFs (Thompson 2004: 205).

The term “transsexual” was taken by many to denote MTFs exclusively, and the LC Subject Authorities followed suit. While LC commendably established the heading “Female-to-Male Transsexuals”, following on a spate of publications establishing literary warrant for this term in the late 1990s, it did not introduce a parallel heading for MTFs until 2006, when the heading “Male-to-Female Transsexuals” was established through the intervention of contributing SACO librarians.³

In its use of “transpersons” as a descriptor, the Michel thesaurus makes no apparent distinction among the gender identities of transsexual people or the direction of their transition. Both IHLIA and *LGBT Life* do make this distinction, albeit by different means. IHLIA incorporates the terms “transsexual men” (broader term referent: “men”) and “transsexual women” (broader term referent: “women”), both with a related term referent of “transgenderism” (but not “transsexualism”, interestingly, a term which also appears in the thesaurus). The liability of the IHLIA descriptors is that one cannot be certain whether or not they refer to people who have successfully completed a transition. If that is the case, it is salutary that IHLIA recognizes the identity these people have chosen for themselves. *LGBT Life* includes the terms “Female-to-male transsexuals” and “Male-to-female transsexuals”. This eliminates the ambiguity of the IHLIA descriptors,

³ This was pursuant to discussion on the GAY-LIBN-L listserv, March 2006, discussed by K. R. Roberto at the GLBT ALMS 2006 Archives, Libraries, Museums and Special Collections Conference, University of Minnesota, 19 May 2006.

but both terms are arguably misplaced under the broader term “Transgender people”, for reasons discussed in the previous section.

“Gender dysphoria”, a term present in earlier GLBT sources (Dynes 1990) and used to describe a pathological psychological condition precipitating transsexualism, has largely disappeared from subsequent discussions of the topic. This is partly because the term has now been discredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) in favor of “Gender identity disorders.” This term is incorporated into the LC subject authorities with “Gender dysphoria” as a “see from” reference and “Transsexualism” as a “see also” reference. For the many transsexual people who do not view their condition as pathological, this cross-reference is analogous to the one for “Sexual perversion” which appeared under “Homosexuality” until 1972. Since professional opinion tends to trump popular understanding when it comes to establishing headings and references, it is unlikely that the cross will be removed until the APA no longer classifies transsexualism as stemming from a disorder. It is notable, however, that the deletion of the cross to “Sexual perversion” from “Homosexuality” was deleted two years prior to homosexuality’s removal from the APA’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual in 1974 (Greenblatt 1990).

Gender and sex

“Transgender”, “transsexual”, and their attendant terminology evoke the question of how “gender” and “sex” may be differentiated, and their treatment may be seen to a limited extent as a relic of earlier definitions of these more fundamental terms. “Sex” is a term with a long history, having roots in reproductive biology. “Gender”, meanwhile, is

a repurposed term from linguistics; its novel usage roughly corresponds with the entry of “transsexual” into the lexicon and the two are not unrelated:

The term “sex” traditionally was used in ways that assumed there is a correspondence between individuals’ biological sex, their perception of themselves as female and feminine or male and masculine, and their social circumstances (Freeman 2004: 441).

In current social science usage, gender denotes consciousness of sexual dimorphism that may or may not be congruent with actual genital sex in human beings. The expression *gender role* was introduced by John Money in 1955, as a relatively new use of a term that has a long history in English in other senses. In a relatively short time, however, it found acceptance in both scientific and political usage as a needed complement to the older term *sex* ... Gender is more subtle and more inclusive than sex, as it embraces far more than the genitals and their functioning (Johansson 1990: 461-62).

This definition of “gender” – a social role which, while distinct from genital sex, could nonetheless be adduced from it – was largely uncontested until the 1990s, when feminism, queer theory, and related knowledge domains brought evidence to bear against it. Scholars advanced an alternative model in which human bodies were not inherently gendered, but instead became gendered through the mediation of language and discourse. Not surprisingly, much of this evidence was derived from studies of transgender, transsexual, and intersexed people (Freeman 2004). All five GLBT encyclopedias incorporate headings for “gender”, while none include entries for “sex”, betraying their focus on the social sciences and humanities.

In LC’s authority file, “Gender” appears as a main heading apparently relating exclusively to linguistics. This usage is only deducible from the sources cited for literary warrant; the term has no scope note and no references to other headings – not even “Gender (Sex)” and “Sex (Gender)”, both of which appear as “see from” references under the heading “Sex”. “Sex” in LC, then, would seem to preserve the notion of genital sex as being coextensive with social role; the file also contains headings for “Sex (Biology)” and “Sex (Psychology)”. Yet while “Sex (Biology)” is a “see also from” reference for

“Reproduction”, “Sex (Psychology)” is a “see also from” reference for, of all things, “Gender identity”. The authority record for “Gender identity” incorporates a “see from” reference for “Sexual identity”. In this instance it seems that LC has made the distinction “gender” and “sex”, the former serving as a social analog for the latter. The use of “Gender identity” is likewise preserved in the heading “Gender identity disorder”. Interestingly, these two headings do not reference one another, though “Gender identity” does reference “Transsexuals – Identity” in contradistinction to the reference of “Gender identity disorder” to “Transsexualism”. Clearly, “gender” and “sex” are a tangled thicket of conflicting definitions and references in LC, demonstrative to some extent of the accretion of variant meanings accorded each of these terms over the history of the authority file.

The Michel thesaurus includes “Gender” as a top term, with a related term reference to the older designation “Sex roles”, but not to “transsexual” or “transgender”, the latter of which does not appear as a term. IHLIA and *LGBT Life* both incorporate “Gender” with similar sets of relationships, the main exception being that *LGBT Life*, as elsewhere, tends to follow the syntax of the LCSH vocabulary (e.g., “Androgyny (Psychology)”, “Gender identity in art”). *LGBT Life* also goes to some pains to differentiate gender from sex, adding a “see from” reference for “Gender (Sex)” and the following scope note: “Gender is culturally defined, in opposition to sex, which is biologically defined.”

Intersex

Intersexual people have sex chromosomes, external genitalia, or an internal reproductive system that are not considered “standard” for either the male or female sex according to the dominant point of view of modern Western culture (Ben 2004, 87).

“Intersexuality” is a neologism which emerged in the 1990s (roughly contemporaneous with “transgender”), largely on the strength of a social movement among intersexual people which sought to change the prevailing medical opinion that their bodies required surgical intervention in infancy in order to be “corrected” so that their biological sex and social gender role would be in concert. Picking up on gender theorists’ critiques of naturalizing gender in the body, intersex activists have emphasized the psychic harm which such intervention can create, equating it with the practice of female genital mutilation. They have also sought to demonstrate that sexual variance is ubiquitous; indeed, variance occurring at the chromosomal level may have no apparent somatic manifestation and remain unknown to the person who possesses the variation.

Intersexed people were formerly described as “hermaphrodites”, a term which continues to appear in movement publications (e.g., *Hermaphrodites with Attitude*), but which has generally fallen out of favor as a descriptor in scholarly social science literature in recent years. *LGBT Life* introduces “Intersexuality” as a narrower term reference under “Genetics” and “Sex (Biology)”. LCSH, however, has introduced “Intersexuality” only as a “see” reference to “Hermaphroditism”, which in turn has a “see also” reference to “Sexual disorders”. One would expect that this emergent terminology would not appear in older vocabularies; “hermaphroditism” appears in place of “intersexuality” in the IHLIA thesaurus, though it is not classed as a “disorder”. Curiously, the older Michel thesaurus prefers “Intersexuality” to “Hermaphroditism”,

though it appears to be describing a different phenomenon. In nineteenth- and early twentieth-century studies, male homosexuality was sometimes described as “psychic hermaphroditism”, and explained by the existence of a third, intermediate sex which possessed “a female soul in a male body”. Michel’s scope note for “intersexuality” notes that this term refers to the “concept of homosexuality as third sex”, indicating that this term is a reference to an older tradition of literature on homosexuality rather than to the contemporary movement which emerged a decade or so after the version of Michel’s thesaurus appeared.

Transtestism and cross-dressing

The clinical definition of a “transvestite” is “a male who dresses as a woman and obtains erotic arousal while cross-dressed” (Cromwell 2000, 774). This definition is limiting in multiple respects. Cross-dressing is not a phenomenon exclusive to men. It is not only situational; for example, historically some women have routinely worn men’s clothing and lived as social men, a phenomenon known as “passing”. This behavior should not be confused with transsexualism, as cross-dressers do not customarily desire a change of biological sex. (It is worth noting that Virginia Prince, who is credited with coining the term “transgender”, passed as a woman.) Additionally, this behavior (along with more transitory modes of cross-dressing such as drag) is not oriented around sexual arousal or gratification.

Because the terms “transvestism” and “transvestite” have become so closely identified with the language of psychopathology, most people who engage in this practice for whatever reason have come to prefer the terms “cross-dressing” and ‘cross-dresser”.

However, “transvestism” has clearly persisted alongside “cross-dressing” as a descriptor in Thompson 2004 and in LCSH, which gives preference to “transvestism”, as does the IHLIA thesaurus. “Cross-dressing”, as well as variant phenomena (e.g., “drag”, “passing”), are identified with transgenderism by means of cross-references in several vocabularies. This is not true for LCSH, which does not include “transgenderism” as a preferred term and does not include terms such as “drag queens” or “passing women” at all, a point of some contention.

Drag

It is hard to think of a figure more paradigmatic of popular views of gay life than the gay man who performs in women’s attire, the drag queen: “Drag queens have long been a part of gay life and gay communities” (Taylor and Rupp 2004, 316). More recently, lesbians have begun to stage analogous performances in men’s clothing as drag kings (Halberstam 2000). Drag is an indispensable element of vocabularies which describe GLBT people; it appears in all of the GLBT-specific sources cited here, though Dynes (1990) and the IHLIA thesaurus subsume “drag” under “transvestism”. In contemporary vocabularies, references to “drag” typically include cross-references to “cross-dressing”, “transgender”, or both.

Given its relative ubiquity and staggering literary warrant, it is somewhat startling that “drag”, “drag queens”, and “drag kings” do not appear as authorized descriptors in LCSH. “Drag queens” and “drag kings” are included as “see” references to “female impersonators” and “male impersonators”, respectively. Not only is this terminology somewhat outmoded (e.g., “female impersonators” is included in the IHLIA thesaurus

only as a “see” reference to “drag queens”), it is also imprecise, as a finer distinction between “impersonation” and “drag” can be made:

One basic distinction is between “female impersonators,” who generally do celebrity impersonation and keep the illusion of being women, and drag queens who regularly break the illusion by, for example, speaking in their male voices, referring to themselves as men, or discussing their untucked penises (Taylor and Rupp 2004, 316).

Decades of petitioning the Library of Congress have thus far failed to induce this change (Berman 1999), which would be especially beneficial in the interest of preserving consistency with other authorized LC headings such as “drag balls” and “drag shows”.

Butch-femme

Related but not analogous to either passing women or drag kings, “butch-femme relationships are a style of lesbian loving and self-presentation” which transform “heterosexual elements, such as gender attitude and dress, into a unique lesbian language of sexuality and emotional bonding” (Nestle 2000, 138). Lesbian butches adopt explicitly masculine attire and demeanor in their quotidian lives, while retaining self-identification and social identity as both female and lesbian. Their counterparts, femmes, adhere to more conventionally feminine self-presentation and are thus not publicly identifiable as “lesbian” in the way that butches are.

Because of their presumed mimicry of heterosexual gender roles and relations understood as oppressive, butch-femme relationship styles largely fell out of favor in the wake of the lesbian-feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s, which held up as its ideal the “woman-identified woman”. However, many contemporary lesbians have preserved identifications as butch or femme, and there is a considerable scholarly literature

detailing the history and aesthetics or relationships between butches and femmes.⁴

“Butch-femme” and variant headings (e.g., “Butch-femme roles”, “Butch-femme relationships”) appear in all of the GLBT-specific sources cited here. The term is not typically cross-referenced to terms such as “cross-dressing” or “transgenderism”, but more frequently to terms such as “relations”, “sex roles”, and “androgyny”. A concerted effort to prompt LCSH to include “butch-femme” as a descriptor has to date not been successful; it is not even included as a “see from” reference (Berman 1998).

Androgyny

“Androgyny”

can refer to either a person who appears to combine masculine and feminine or male and female traits or a person whose gender or sex is difficult to determine. It has also been a euphemism for and a concept linked with homosexuality, bisexuality, transsexuality, and intersexed conditions (Califia 2004, 58).

The concept plays an important role in both clinical and popular characterizations of the relationship between self-presentation, gender identity, and sexual orientation, even if these characterizations are frequently erroneous. Androgyny may be manifest on the body as primary or secondary sexual characteristics; it may also be adduced to cross-dressing. These two modes of androgynous self-presentation may but do not necessarily co-occur. Dynes (1990b) and Farwell (2000) emphasize that androgynous persons should not be assumed to be “hermaphrodites”. Nor, for that matter, should they be assumed to be homosexual or bisexual (many cross-dressers, for example, are heterosexual men). Nor is androgyny necessarily a hallmark of transsexualism:

⁴ Especially notable are Nestle (ed.) 1989 and Kennedy & Davis 1993.

... many transmen and transwomen are more interested in conforming to conventional sex roles and see androgyny as an undesirable state of limbo they are forced to endure before they can live fully in their gender of preference (Califia 2004, 60).

The lack of direct correlation between gender role and sexual orientation

notwithstanding, androgyny is often deliberately and strategically deployed by gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people as a way of flouting social convention.

Androgynous self-presentation is frequently used to reference alternative social models (tranhistorical or cross-cultural) in which the demarcation between gender roles was less rigid, and gender crossing as well as same-sex sexuality apparently more tolerated or even celebrated.

Like “butch-femme”, “androgyny” lacks strongly denoted relationships to “transgenderism” and related terms, and cross-referencing across vocabularies is inconsistent. The term “Androgyny (Psychology)” appears in LCSH with “Sex differences (Psychology)” and “Sex role” as “see also” references, but appropriately does not reference “Transsexualism”, “Hermaphroditism”, “Homosexuality”, or “Bisexuality”.

Conclusion

Alternative vocabularies used to describe GLBT people have arguably been victims of their own success. Criticisms of Library of Congress cataloging practices eventually prompted LC to permit other institutions to contribute bibliographic and authority records to LC’s database. This has addressed many, though by no means all, of catalogers’ concerns. As the terms utilized by these vocabularies have become increasingly institutionalized, incorporated into shared cataloging standards such as LCSH, GLBT collections have departed from the more innovative practice of developing

and implementing their own descriptors. This has had the fortunate effect of allowing resources in GLBT collections to be shared via bibliographic utilities such as OCLC which insist that their contributors adhere to standards such as LCSH. However, it has likely also entailed diminished, imprecise, or inappropriate subject description in many specialized collections (Michel 2006).

Much like the independent generation of bibliographic records, maintenance of local authority files is a costly, time-consuming affair which is out of the reach of most libraries in an era of shrinking budgets. The maintenance of a global authority file by a centralized body over a period of decades is neither lightly nor easily undertaken. Terminological changes in both academic and popular discourse, particularly those pertaining to social identities still in a process of formation (e.g., “transgender” or “intersex”) pose formidable problems for ongoing vocabulary control. It can very difficult to keep pace with these changes or determine which of multiple competing terms is the more authoritative, even when literary warrant is brought to bear. Changes to headings with a long lineage in the authority file engender a concatenation of corresponding changes in thousands or perhaps tens of thousands of bibliographic records (Litwin 2006).

It is clear, however, that alternative sets of subject descriptors may be useful in specialized settings, particularly in non-library collections, many of which customarily use subject descriptors not derived from LC authorities. The use of local descriptors need not be at odds with the free interchange of bibliographic records among institutions; utilities such as OCLC should be encouraged to foster support for this. Additionally, new web technologies, such as social tagging, may allow informal, user-generated

vocabularies to be mapped to more established and authoritative ones. Semantic tagging is widely supported by interactive websites which permit the creation and management of digital media collections; appending this technology to bibliographic records in library catalogs might greatly enhance keyword searching.

It is clear that even as LCSH has gradually extended its reach, the universe of describable resources continues to outstrip it by leaps and bounds. Efforts to develop novel sets of descriptors remain a current concern both within and outside of library settings, driven as much if not more by pragmatism than by political ideology and social change. In order to assure libraries of a place on the web, the continued elaboration and refinement of thesauri, taxonomies, and tags must remain on our agenda.

Appendix 1: GLBT thesauri

Michel thesaurus (1983; revised 1985, 1990)

This thesaurus was developed by Dee Michel while he was a library school student at the University of Illinois. It contains 1215 terms (911 preferred, 304 non-preferred). Unlike the other three thesauri, it was not developed to describe a particular collection of materials; Michel used various print resources which he had to hand (periodicals, as well as the document collection *Gay American History*) to develop the vocabulary. The thesaurus was later included in a kit containing a cataloging manual and a decimal classification system for GLBT materials, both also developed by Michel. This kit became the tool used for cataloging and classification at the library of the ONE Institute in Los Angeles. Now that the library is overseen by the University of Southern California, it is unclear if Michel's schemes are still in use.

Given that it was developed nearly twenty-five years ago, it is unsurprising that the Michel thesaurus is consistently the most dated of the three thesauri. Coverage of women, bisexual and transgendered people, non-US topics and ethnic minorities within the US is also limited. However, it has the distinction of being the first widely known (if not widely applied) thesaurus; its influence is apparent in that many of its terms as well as relationships have been incorporated into subsequent GLBT thesauri.

IHLIA Thesaurus (1993; revised 1997)

The thesaurus of the Internationale Homo- en Lesbisch Informatiecentrum en Archief (International Gay and Lesbian Information Center and Archive, or IHLIA) was developed by combining the subject lists of two important GLBT collections in the

Netherlands (Amsterdam's Homodok and Leeuwarden's Anna Blaman Huis) and adding a syndetic structure. It incorporates approximately 2500 terms (preferred and non-preferred) and is available in English as well as Dutch. Since the original subject lists were developed to describe the holdings of these institutions, the terminology is largely specific to the Netherlands and the European Union, although there is global coverage extending to North America and former Dutch colonies. It also incorporates numerous terms which are format and genre descriptors, as well as separate lists of geographical and chronological subdivisions. This last is unusual for a thesaurus, but parallels the structure of LCSH. The IHLIA thesaurus continues to be used to describe these collections.

LGBT Life (2004)

LGBT Life is a full-text database product of EBSCO Information Services, available to libraries by subscription. The *LGBT Life* thesaurus was thus developed to index the contents of mostly English-language GLBT periodicals (though it does cover some non-US titles), both scholarly and non-scholarly. With a total of 6469 terms, it far outstrips any other available GLBT thesaurus in terms of scope. In addition to relying on content from the sources being indexed, the *LGBT Life* thesaurus also incorporates LCSH headings wholesale as terms, many of which are precoordinated with subheads.

Appendix 2: Transgender term trees

Michel

transpersons

RT: hormones

transsexualism

BT: sexual minority issues

IHLIA

transgender movement

BT: social movements

RT: transgenderism

transgenderism

UF: cross-gender behaviour

NT: transsexualism

NT: transvestism

RT: acaults

RT: berdaches

RT: drag kings

RT: drag queens

RT: gender

RT: gender identity

RT: genderfuck

RT: hijras

RT: transgender movement

RT: transsexual men

RT: transsexual women

RT: waria

transsexual men

BT: men

RT: transgenderism

transsexual women

BT: women

RT: transgenderism

transsexualism

UF: transsexuality

BT: transgenderism

transvestism

UF: cross dressing

UF: drag

BT: transgenderism

RT: eonism

LGBT Life

Transgender people

UF: Gender outlaws

UF: Transgender
UF: Transgender persons
UF: Transgendered people
UF: Transgendered persons
UF: Transgenderers
UF: Transgress people
UF: Transgress persons
UF: Transpeople
BT: GLBT people
BT: Persons
NT: African American transgender people
NT: Asian American transgender people
NT: Balkan sworn virgins
NT: BERDACHES
NT: Catholic transgender people
NT: Catholic transsexuals
NT: Christian transgender people
NT: Christian transsexuals
NT: Closeted transgender people
NT: Crossdressers
NT: Cuban American transgender people
NT: Drag kings
NT: Drag queens
NT: East Indian American transgender people
NT: European American transgender people
NT: Female-to-male transsexuals
NT: Hispanic American transgender people
NT: Indian transgender people
NT: Jewish transgender people
NT: Male-to-female transsexuals
NT: Mass media and transgender people
NT: Mexican American transgender people
NT: Mormon transgender people
NT: Mormon transsexuals
NT: Muslim transgender people
NT: Pacific Islander American transgender people
NT: Post-operative transsexuals
NT: Pre-operative transsexuals
NT: Protestant transgender people
NT: Protestant transsexuals
NT: Puerto Rican transgender people
NT: Rural transgender people
NT: South Asian American transgender people
NT: Stone butches (Gender expression)
NT: Transgender people -- United States
NT: Transgender people in literature
NT: Transgender teenagers
NT: Transgender young adults
NT: Transgender youth
NT: Transgenderists
NT: Transsexual teenagers
NT: Transsexual young adults
NT: Transsexual youth
NT: Transsexuals
NT: Transsexuals -- United States
NT: Transsexuals in literature
NT: Working class transgender people
RT: Bisexuals
RT: Church work with transgender people
RT: Female impersonators

RT: Gays
RT: Gender
RT: Gender-variant people
RT: Intersex people
RT: Male impersonators
RT: Parents of transgender people
RT: Sex instruction for transgender people
RT: Transgender people -- History
RT: Transgender people -- Identity
RT: Transgenderism

Transgenderism

UF: Gender transgression
UF: Transgender orientation
BT: Sexuality
NT: Crossdressing
NT: Cross-living
NT: Gender transition
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Buddhism
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Catholic Church
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Christianity
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Hinduism
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Islam
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Judaism
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Mormon Church
NT: Transgenderism -- Religious aspects -- Protestant churches
NT: Transgenderism and motion pictures
NT: Transgenderism in art
NT: Transgenderism in literature
NT: Transgenderism in motion pictures
NT: Transsexualism
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Buddhism
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Catholic Church
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Christianity
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Hinduism
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Islam
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Judaism
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Mormon Church
NT: Transsexualism -- Religious aspects -- Protestant churches
RT: Bisexuality
RT: Homosexuality
RT: Intersexuality
RT: Lesbianism
RT: Transgender people
RT: Transgenderism -- History
RT: Transgenderism -- Mythology

Transsexualism

UF: Transsexuality
BT: Sexuality
BT: Transgenderism
NT: Gender transition
RT: Transsexualism -- History
RT: Transsexualism in animals
RT: Transsexuals

Bibliography

- American national standard guidelines for thesaurus structure, construction, and use.* (1974). New York: American National Standards Institute.
- Antoniou, G., and Van Harmelen, F. (2004). *A Semantic Web primer*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Austin, D. (1984) *PRECIS: A manual of concept analysis and subject indexing*. 2nd ed. London, British Library.
- Bates, M. (1989). Rethinking subject cataloging in an online environment. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 33(4), 400-412.
- Ben, P. (2004). "Intersexuals and intersexed people." In Stein, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. v. 2. New York, Scribner's: 87-90.
- Berman, S. (1969). Chauvinistic headings. *Library Journal*, 94, 695.
- . (1971). *Prejudices and antipathies: A tract on the LC subject heads concerning people*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- . (1979). Gay access. *Gay Insurgent* 4/5, 14-15. Reprinted in Berman, S. (1981). *The joy of cataloging: Essays, letters, reviews, and other explosions* (pp. 110-112). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- . (1998). Jackdaws strut in peacock's feathers: the sham of "standard" cataloging. *Librarians at Liberty* 5(2)/6(1-2), 1, 4-21.
- . (1999). Good luck, folks! Finding material on "those people" (and their concerns) in library catalogs. Paper presented at the Special Libraries Association Annual Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 9.
- . (2006). Personal correspondence, 27 November.
- Berners-Lee, T., Hendler, J., & Lassila, O. (2001). The Semantic Web. *Scientific American*, 17 May.
- Berners-Lee, T., with Fischetti, M. (1999). *Weaving the Web: The Original Design and Ultimate Destiny of the World Wide Web by Its Inventor*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Bernier, C. L., and Heumann, K. F. (1957) Correlative indexes. III. Semantic relations among semantemes – the technical thesaurus. *American Documentation* 8, 211-20.
- Berninghausen, D. (1972, November 15). Antithesis in librarianship: Social responsibility vs. the Library Bill of Rights. *Library Journal*, 3675-3681.
- Brooks, J., & Hofer, H. C. (Eds.). (1976). *Sexual nomenclature: A thesaurus*. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- Bundy, M. L., & Stielow, F. J. (Eds.). (1987). *Activism in American librarianship, 1962-1973*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bush, V. (1945) As we may think. *Atlantic Monthly* 176:1, 101-8.
- Califia, P. (2004). "Androgyny." In Stein, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. v. 1. New York, Scribner's: 58-61.

- Capek, M. E. S. (Ed.). (1987). *A women's thesaurus: An index of language used to describe and locate information about women*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chan, L. M. (1986). *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Principles and application* (2nd ed.). Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Chan, L. M., Richmond, P. A., & Svenonius, E. (Eds.). (1985). *Theory of subject analysis: A sourcebook*. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Change: 1969-79 (1979, June). *American Libraries*, 10.
- Clack, D. H. (1978). The adequacy of Library of Congress Subject Headings for black literature resources. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 22, 137-144.
- Classification schemes for lesbian/gay materials. Internet. Online at <http://isd.usc.edu/~trimmer/glbtrt/bibresources.htm>. Accessed 10 April 2007.
- Colfax, L. (Ed.). (1974). *Homosexual subject heading schemes*. Bossier City, LA: Homosexual Information Center.
- Cornog, M. (1991). Providing access to materials on sexuality. In M. Cornog (Ed.), *Libraries, erotica, pornography* (pp. 166-87). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Cromwell, J. (2000). "Transgender." In Zimmerman, B. (ed.), *Lesbian histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland: 774-76.
- Curley, A. (1974). Social responsibility and libraries. *Advances in Librarianship*, 4, 77-101.
- Denda, K. (2005). Beyond subject headings: A structured information retrieval tool for interdisciplinary fields. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 49(4), 266-75.
- DeSantis, J. (Ed.). [2000]. Library of Congress queer subject headings. Internet. Online at <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~jcd/qsubj.html>.
- Ding, Y. (2001). A review of ontologies with the Semantic Web in view. *Journal of Information Science* 27(6), 377-384.
- Doherty, A. S. (1970). Black studies: A report for librarians. *College & Research Libraries* 31(6), 379-388.
- Dynes, W. (ed.). (1990). *Encyclopedia of homosexuality*. New York, Garland.
- Eichenlaub, N. (2003). Silencing Sandy: The censoring of libraries' foremost activist. In Roberto, K., & West, J. (Eds.), *Revolting Librarians redux: Radical librarians speak out* (pp. 120-128). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Eldrod, J. M. (1977). Sexuality: Suggested subject headings. *Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin*, 30, 28-30.
- Ethnic NewsWatch Subjects (Thesaurus). Internet. Online at <http://training.proquest.com/trc/splash/enw/en/thes.htm>. Accessed 10 April 2007.

- Farwell, M. R. (2000). "Androgyny." In Zimmerman, B. (ed.), *Lesbian histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland: 35-36.
- Feinberg, L. (1992). *Transgender liberation: a movement whose time has come*. New York, World View Forum.
- Fensel, D., Van Harmelen, F., Horrocks, I., McGuinness, D. L., & Patel-Schneider, P. F. (2001). OIL: An ontology infrastructure for the Semantic Web. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 16(2), 38-45.
- Forsman, C. (1971). Up against the stacks: The liberated librarian's guide to activism. In Katz, B., & Schwartz, J. J. (Eds.), *Library lit: The best of 1970*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Foskett, A. C. (1971). Misogynists all: A study in critical classification. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 15(2), 117-121.
- Freeman, B. (2004). "Gender and sex." In Stein, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. v. 1. New York, Scribner's: 441-45.
- Frosio, E. T. (1971). Comments on the Thomas Yen-Ran Yeh proposals. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 15(2), 128-132.
- Garber, L. (Ed.). (1993). *Lesbian sources: A bibliography of periodical articles, 1970-1990*. New York: Garland.
- Gerhard, K. H., Su, M. C., & Rubens, C. (1998). An empirical examination of subject headings for women's studies core materials. *College & Research Libraries*, 59(2), 131-138.
- Gilchrist, A. (1971). *The thesaurus in retrieval*. London, Aslib.
- Gittings, B. (1998). Gays in Library Land: The Gay and Lesbian Task Force of the American Library Association: The first fifteen years. In J. V. Carmichael (Ed.), *Daring to find our names: The search for lesbian library history* (pp. 81-93). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- gltq: an online encyclopedia of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and queer culture*.
<http://www.gltq.com>. Accessed 15 February 2007.
- GLBTRT Clearinghouse inventory. Internet. Online at <http://www.niulib.niu.edu/lgbt/inventory.html>. Accessed 10 April 2007.
- Gough, C. (1998). The Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Task Force of the American Library Association: A chronology of activities, 1970-1995. In J. V. Carmichael (Ed.), *Daring to find our names: The search for lesbian library history* (pp. 121-132). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Greenblatt, E. (1990). Homosexuality: The evolution of a concept in the Library of Congress Subject Headings. In Gough, C., & Greenblatt, E. (Eds.), *Gay and lesbian library service*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Gregg, J., & Ridinger, R. B. M. (Eds.). (1988). *International thesaurus of gay and lesbian index terms*. [Chicago]: Thesaurus Committee, Gay and Lesbian Task Force, American Library Association.
- Haggerty, G. E. (ed.). (2000). *Gay histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland.
- Halberstam, J. (2000). "Drag kings." In Zimmerman, B. (ed.), *Lesbian histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland: 247-49.

- Heald, J. H. (1960) Project MARS. *Special Libraries* 51, 115-21.
- Hennepin County Library Authority File Entries* [computer file]. Minnetonka, MN: Hennepin County Library.
- Jantz, R. C. (1999). An approach to managing vocabulary for databases on the Web. *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*, 28(3), 55-66.
- . (2003). Information retrieval in domain specific databases: An analysis to improve the user interface of the alcohol studies database. *College and Research Libraries*, 64(3), 229-239.
- Johansson, W. (1990). "Gender." In Dynes, W. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of homosexuality*. New York, Garland: 461-64.
- Josey, E. J., & Shockley, A. (Eds.). (1977). *Handbook of black librarianship*. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Joyce, T., and Needham, R. M. (1958) The thesaurus approach to information retrieval. *American Documentation* 9, 192-7.
- Kennedy, E. L., & Davis, M. D. (1993). *Boots of leather, slippers of gold: the history of a lesbian community*. New York, Routledge.
- Kepner, J. (1998). An accidental institution: How and why a gay and lesbian archives? In J. V. Carmichael (Ed.), *Daring to find our names: The search for lesbian and gay library history* (pp. 175-182). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Krooks, D. A., and Lancaster, F. W. (1993). The evolution of guidelines for thesaurus construction. *Libri* 43(4), 326-342.
- Lancaster, F. W. (1972). *Vocabulary control for information retrieval*. Washington, Information Resources Press.
- . (1986). *Vocabulary control for information retrieval*. 2nd ed. Arlington, VA, Information Resources Press.
- Lekus, I. K. (2006, March). The Long Sixties. *OAH Magazine of History*, 29-35.
- LGBT Life*. (2004). Electronic resource. Ipswich, MA: EBSCO Publishing.
- List of subject headings for use in cataloging the sexual literature of libraries* (rev. ed., 1974). Bossier City, LA: Homosexual Information Center.
- Litwin, Rory. 2006. "Interview with Barbara Tillet." *Library Juice*, 6 August 2006, <http://libraryjuicepress.com/blog/?p=115>. Accessed 30 January 2007.
- López-Huertas, M. J. (1997). Thesaurus structure design: A conceptual approach for improved interaction. *Journal of Documentation*, 53(2), 139-177.
- Luhn, H. P. (1957) A statistical approach to mechanized encoding and searching of literary information. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 1, 309-17.

- . (1959) "Auto-encoding of documents for information retrieval systems, in *Modern trends in documentation*. [New York], Pergamon Press.
- Lukenbill, B. (2002). Modern gay and lesbian libraries and archives in North America: A study in community identity and affirmation. *Library Management*, 23(1/2), 93-100.
- Marshall, J. (1972). LC labeling: An indictment. In C. West, E. Katz, et al (Eds.), *Revolting librarians* (pp. 45-49). San Francisco: Booklegger Press.
- . (1977). *On equal terms: A thesaurus for nonsexist indexing and cataloging*.
- Masterman, M., et al (1958) "The analogy between mechanical translation and library retrieval", in National Academy of Sciences, *International conference on scientific information, Proceedings, 1958*, p. 917-35.
- Meyerowitz, J. (2002). *How sex changed: a history of transsexuality in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Michel, D. (1990). *Cataloging Manual* (rev. ed.).
- . (2006). *Standard cataloging systems and innovation in GLBT community libraries*. Paper presented at the GLBT ALMS 2006 Archives, Libraries, Museums and Special Collections Conference, University of Minnesota, 19 May.
- Michel, D. (Ed.). (1990). *Gay studies thesaurus*. Rev. ed.
- Michel, D., & Moore, D. (1990). *Michel/Moore Classification Scheme for Books in Lesbian/Gay Collections* (rev. ed.).
- Miksa, F. (1983). *The subject in the dictionary catalog from Cutter to the present*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Milstead Harris, J. L., & Clack, D. H. (1979). Treatment of people and peoples in subject analysis. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 23(4), 374-390.
- Milstead J. L. (1984). *Subject access systems: alternatives in design*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Mooers, C. N. (1951) The Zator-A proposal – a machine method for complete documentation. *Zator Technical Bulletin* 65, 1-15.
- Moon, E., & Nyren, K. (Eds.). (1970). *Library issues: The Sixties*. New York: Bowker.
- Moore, D., with Williams, W., & Kepner, J. (Eds.). (1985). *International Gay & Lesbian Archives Classification System* (rev. ed.).
- Nestle, J. (1992). *The persistent desire: a femme-butch reader*. Boston, Alyson.
- . (2000). "Butch-femme." In Zimmerman, B. (ed.), *Lesbian histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland: 138-40.
- Olson, H. A. (1998). Mapping beyond Dewey's boundaries: Constructing classificatory space for marginalized knowledge domains. *Library Trends*, 47(2), 233-254.

- . (2001). The power to name: Representation in library catalogs. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 26, 639-668.
- Parkinson, P. (Ed.). (1984a). *Thesaurus of subject headings*. Wellington: Lesbian and Gay Rights Resource Centre.
- . (Ed.). (1984b). *GDC: Gay Decimal Classification*. Wellington: Lesbian and Gay Rights Resource Centre.
- Parkinson, P., & Parkin, C. (1998). Safe harbour: The origin and growth of the Lesbian and Gay Archives of New Zealand. In J. V. Carmichael (Ed.), *Daring to find our names: The search for lesbian and gay library history* (pp. 176-201). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Potter, C. (Ed.). (1986). *The lesbian periodicals index*. Tallahassee, FL: Naiad Press.
- President's Task Force on Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian and Transgender Issues. (2001). *Affirming diversity: moving from tolerance to acceptance and beyond*. [Seattle], University of Washington. Online at <http://www.washington.edu/reports/gblt/gblt.pdf>. Accessed 15 February 2007.
- Qin, J., & Paling, S. (2001). Converting a controlled vocabulary into an ontology: The case of GEM. *Information Research*, 6(2)
- Ridinger, R. B. M. (1997). Playing in the attic: Indexing and preserving the gay press. In Kester, N. G. (Ed.), *Liberating minds: The stories and professional lives of gay, lesbian, and bisexual librarians and their advocates*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Ridinger, R. B. M. (Ed.). (1985). Index to *The Advocate*, 1967-1982.
- Roberts, N. (1984). The pre-history of the information retrieval thesaurus. *Journal of Documentation* 40(4), 271-285.
- Roe, S. K., & Thomas, A. R. (Eds.). (2004). *The thesaurus: Review, renaissance, and revision*. New York: Haworth.
- Rogers, M. N. (1993). Are we on equal terms yet? subject headings concerning women in LCSH, 1975-1991. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 37(2), 181-196.
- Rubin, G. (2004). Geologies of queer studies: It's *déjà vu* all over again. *CLAGS News*, 14(2), 6-10.
- Schmitz-Esser, W. (1999) Thesaurus and beyond: An advanced formula for linguistic engineering and information retrieval. *Knowledge Organization* 26:1, 10-22.
- Schuman, P. G. (Ed.). (1976). *Social responsibilities and libraries: a Library Journal / School library journal selection*. New York: Bowker.
- Shiri, A. A., & Revie, C. (2000). Thesauri on the Web: Current developments and trends. *Online Information Review*, 24(4), 273-9.
- SIECUS thesaurus*. New York: Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States.
- Sipe, L. (Ed.). (1980). *National Gay Archives Library Classification System*. Library Committee, National Gay Archives.

- Stein, M. (ed.). (2004). *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. New York, Scribner's.
- Stone, A. T. (2000). The *LCSH* Century: A brief history of the *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, and introduction to the centennial essays. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 29(1/2), 1-15.
- Strong, G. W., & Drott, M. C. (1986). A thesaurus for end- user indexing and retrieval. *Information Processing & Management*, 22(6), 487-492.
- Stryker, S. (2004). "Transgender." In *gbtq: an online encyclopedia of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and queer culture*. <http://www.gbtq.com>. Accessed 15 February 2007.
- Studwell, W. E. (1990). *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Philosophy, practice, and prospects*. New York: Haworth.
- Taube, M. (1955) Storage and retrieval of information by means of the association of ideas. *American Documentation* 6, 1-18.
- Taylor, V., and Rupp, L. (2004). "Drag queens and kings." In Stein, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. v. 1. New York, Scribner's: 316-320.
- Thompson, K. (2004). "Transsexuals, transvestites, transgender people, and cross-dressers." In Stein, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history in America*. v. 3. New York, Scribner's: 203-08.
- Timmons, S. (1990). *The trouble with Harry Hay, founder of the modern gay movement*. Boston: Alyson.
- Valentine, D. (2002). "We're 'not about gender': the uses of 'transgender'." In Lewin, E., & Leap, W. L., *Out in theory: the emergence of lesbian and gay anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 222-45.
- Van Staalduinen, K., Jansma, A., Brandhorst, H., & Bruin, A. (Eds.). (1997). *A queer thesaurus: An international thesaurus of gay and lesbian index terms*. [Amsterdam: Homodok; Leeuwarden: Anna Blaman Huis].
- Vickery, B. C. (1960). Thesaurus – a new word in documentation. *Journal of Documentation* 16(4), 181-189.
- Weinberg, B. H. (1995). Library classification and information retrieval thesauri: Comparison and contrast. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 19(3/4), 23-44.
- White, D. A. (1977). Homosexuality and Gay Liberation: An Expansion of the Library of Congress Classification Schedule. *Hennepin County Library Cataloging Bulletin*, 28, 35-38.
- Wolf, S. (1972). Sex and the single cataloger: New thoughts on some unthinkable subjects. In C. West, E. Katz, et al (Eds.), *Revolting librarians* (pp. 39-44). San Francisco: Booklegger Press.
- Yeh, T. Y. (1971). The treatment of the American Indian in the Library of Congress E-F Schedule. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 15(2), 122-128.
- Zimmerman, B. (ed.). (2000). *Lesbian histories and cultures: an encyclopedia*. New York, Garland.