

Mediating in a Neutral Environment: Gender-Inclusive or Neutral Language in Archival Description

by SHARON P. LARADE and JOHANNE M. PELLETIER*

... Distinguished faculty, parents, friends, graduating seniors, secret service agents, class agents, people of class, people of colour, colourful people, people of height, the vertically constrained, people of hair, the differently coiffed, the optically challenged, the temporarily sighted, the insightful, the out of sight, the out-of-towners, the eurocentrics, the afrocentrics, the afrocentrics with eurailpasses, the eccentrically inclined, the sexually disinclined, people of sex, sexy people, sexist pigs, animal companions, friends of the earth, friends of the boss, the temporarily employed, the differently employed, the differently optioned, people with options, people with stock options, the divestiturists, the deconstructionists, the home constructionists, the homeboys, the homeless, the temporarily housed at home, and, god save us, the permanently housed at home.¹

This excerpt from cartoonist Garry Trudeau illustrates a panic associated with the necessity to ascribe specific names to individual and collective human experience. Identifying social experiences and self-naming has been a source of empowerment for aboriginal people, women, victims of abuse, ethno-cultural majorities and minorities. In addition to introducing specific identifying terms (e.g., “people of colour” and “First Nations people”), significant changes have been made to remove linguistic negatives from broader groups (e.g., substituting the term “differently abled” for “disabled”). These changes and Trudeau’s extension of them are attempts at more accurate representational language.

In the last ten years, a new terminology — embodying a confirmation of the rights of racial, linguistic and other identifications — has become part of popular discourse. Yet there is unease over continued attempts to develop more representative language. The implicit threat is one of social subterfuge, rendering invisible all those without a significant social identifier. These conflicts are reported in the media as debates over “politically correct language.”

“Political correctness,” and a humorous testimony to the power of language, serve as an adequate point of departure for an exploration of language and descriptive standards. Our quest is not to resolve linguistic conflicts or debate political correctness but to find those issues which affect archivists and archival institutions. Our principal interest

is to illustrate why and how the questions about language and its representation grew out of North American "second wave" feminist writing. Our treatment will examine the process by which sexist language in particular was analysed by contemporary feminist research, which allows us some economy as a locus for research in this area; information professionals and librarians were among the first to experiment with gender equality in language. By "experimentation" is meant the stages of identifying and analysing the inequities of language and proposing alternative constructs, such as neutrality, to the work of archival description. The parameters of the literature survey will be writing by English-language North American-based feminist and social historical scholars since 1960. While the interdisciplinary nature of feminist studies extends the scope of this work on language to an international forum, French feminists (including Québécoises) have produced a distinctive body of literature in both theory and fiction that is beyond the range of this paper.

Turning to the archival profession, we ask whether the evolution of language should be considered as archivists formulate the dimensions of descriptive standards. If everyone else has been talking about a language revolution, why are archivists not doing so? Are individual archivists responsible for reflecting emerging linguistic trends (i.e., which terms to use and not to use)? Do we regard them as inconsequential linguistic fashions, irrelevant for long-term applicability to reference and public service? Do pretensions to "moral responsibility" for doing right by the records and by future users not compel archivists to adopt new forms of language? What role do archival institutions play in sharing the responsibility of reflecting the emergence of self-determination through language? The result of this exploration of language and archival issues will not bring us to a blueprint for future "safe" language. Its purpose instead is to establish parameters for a discussion of what archivists' collective responsibility to language is, and the implications of linguistic changes for the development and implementation of descriptive standards.

Critical writing about language and its inadequate representational value for racial, sexual and social groups centres on a tangible yearning for change. Such yearning is derived from a discomfort with language perceived to be borrowed, one that is not the writer's own but that which is necessary for success. American poet Adrienne Rich described language principally as a place of struggle for women, but one with which a close relationship was necessary: "This is the oppressor's language, yet I need it to talk to you."² The inefficiency of language in describing experiences specifically of women in the 1960s was underlined in early second-wave feminist works, which struggled to find that special term to describe their common condition or problem. The best-known example of such linguistic alienation is the term "feminine mystique," coined by Betty Friedan to characterize the conflicts facing postwar middle-class American women. The power of language to represent the simplest concepts or substantiate one's most profound beliefs resounds equally among theorists of race and class.

Language classifies and orders the world: it is a means of manipulating reality³ which has the potential to mislead, misguide or deceive. Language reflects the inequalities and prejudices of human culture; it also reflects attitudes that demean or discriminate against sexual, ethnic or cultural identities. Kate Swift and Casey Miller, feminist linguistic theorists, suggest that resistance to change in what we know to be common parlance has its roots in a desire to maintain what is conceived to be a pure linguistic form.⁴ Whether one has learned a language at school or adopted another language, one's familiarity with the vocabulary of language constitutes a dependable foundation of a communications

system; to challenge this is an unsettling prospect. The mediating factor in adopting linguistic change is maintaining perspective; it helps to remember that these changes are but steps in a lengthy evolution, not just a passing phase.

Let us consider, for example, changes in the term "youth," which in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was used appropriately only in reference to young men. Modern English also created the associations between the terms "gender" and "sex," though inaccuracies in the use of both these terms abound. Gender is the cultural notion of what it means to be a woman or a man; "masculine" and "feminine" describe these states of being. "Sex" is the biological status of the person, i.e., the objective fact of a person's sex. "Gender" is often used inappropriately to define both the cultural norms of masculinity and femininity and the objectiveness of sexual determination (i.e., "gender" should not be used in referring to a male or a female; there is no singular male or female gender).

Despite an evolution in language over the past twenty years, universal discomfort arises from the mere threat to alter what is held to be sacred about common parlance. Swift and Miller (1991) remind us that gender-specific terms were once used historically to describe certain professions; if such changes are part of our collective history, why then the current resistance to such change? It is easy to see that language constitutes a powerful catalyst, acting as a conduit of social meaning. To be inferior when it comes to language is to be discounted in Western culture. In addition to its representational value, language embodies the authority of the culture. Early examples of feminist and social research examined the bias in language research, looking at how women's responses were systematically undervalued or obscured. Feminist theorists such as Dale Spender summarized this work in a series of studies on women and language, history and society; these monographs "discover" works by women and the modes of language which have obscured them. Spender identifies the one semantic rule in operation in the language as that of the "male-as-norm"⁵ and a "blatant legitimization of middle-class code."⁶ Maintaining the authority of the English language without criticism was, in Spender's view, analogous to enforcing the use of a foreign language.⁷ Awareness of this implicit semantic rule is commonplace now as terms such as "stewardess," "actress" and "sales-girl" are replaced with terms importing gender neutrality, e.g., "flight attendant," "actor" and "salesperson." Such studies sensitized North American feminist audiences to different social groups and to the ways in which language as a communicator of culture dominates and constructs our lives.

One of the earliest articles to draw attention to sexist dimensions of the English language was Swift and Miller's "One Small Step for Genkind."⁸ This short article began with a common riddle to illustrate how obvious solutions appear once they become known: A man and his young son were in an automobile accident. The father was killed, while the son, who was critically injured, was rushed to hospital. As attendants wheeled the unconscious boy into the emergency room, the doctor on duty looked down at him and said, "My God, it's my son!" What was the relationship of the doctor to the injured boy?⁹ This article drew attention to how, with the exception of words connoting traditionally female occupations ("nurse," "secretary," "prostitute") and words referring by definition to women ("mother," "actress," "aunt"), the English language defined everyone as male.

Writing in the 1960s and early 1970s reflected strong connections to a growing second-wave feminist movement in the United States and Canada which demonstrated a proactive

approach to the relationship between language and political change. Wilma Scott Heide of the National Organization of Women observed that “in any social movement, when changes are effected, the language sooner or later reflects the changes. Our approach is different. Instead of passively noting the change, we are changing language patterns to actively effect the changes.”¹⁰

Language was also recognized as a source of revelation; several feminist works in this area refer, as an example of language’s prophetic power, to Helen Keller’s first signing of “w-a-t-e-r,” associating the coolness of water with signs in her palm. Identifying with language was thought to bring not only political but also related personal affirmation.

However, changes to the varied uses of terms will not necessarily effect substantive social change. For example, using the term “secretary” to address members of both sexes in this occupation will not change the reality that it is a female-intensive occupation. Even the term “intensive” is itself new, replacing “dominated,” which in this context would incorrectly ascribe power to those in this occupation; used in this sense, “intensive” refers to “prevalence.”

Sexist language promotes and maintains attitudes which stereotype people according to their sex; it also assumes the male as the norm. Sexist language assumes for the entire sex what might be appropriate for only some persons of that sex; sexist language assumes male superiority and uses noncongruent terms (“man and wife,” instead of “husband and wife” or “man and woman”).¹¹

Gender-free terms do not indicate sex and can be used for either women or men, boys or girls. Teacher, archivist, bureaucrat, employee, hiker, biker, manager, child, clerk, patient, student, parent, etc. Gender-specific terms such as alderwoman, businessman or altar girl are neither good nor bad when they are used “gender fairly” — that is, not used to discriminate against either sex. The potential problems with these terms is that they identify sex, or otherwise emphasize it, where it might not be necessary to do so.

Generic terms are all-purpose, gender-free words such as everybody, workers, immigrants, people, voters, church members, we, us, you, they, etc. A false generic term is one which is commonly thought to include everyone but actually does not, such as man, mankind, chairman, forefathers, etc. We must beware of using terms which derive from cultural bias or stereotypes in order to describe people — e.g., “nagging” and “gossiping” in reference to females, or “boasting” and “uncommunicative” in reference to males. The only acceptable gender- or culturally relative terms are those which are dependent on cultural conditions, such as nanny, wet-nurse, or home-maker; these reflect some aspect of a reality, as the majority of such workers at least currently are female. A striking example of poor usage which is far too familiar would be, “Seventy people were killed in the derailment yesterday, including three women.”

Rosalie Maggio’s *Non-Sexist Word-Finder* refers to generic nouns — that is, words referring to professions and identities which are assumed to be male (politicians, doctors, lawyers, clergy, farmers, colonists, pioneers, settlers). Maggio claims that we should exercise caution when using these terms, because “in a historical context, it is particularly damaging for young people to read about settlers and explorers and pioneers as though they were all white men.” Common examples of omitting women from these groups are references to “those clergy permitted to have wives,” or “immigrants, their wives, and children.”¹²

Regarding women as separate people in describing them and their relationships has also constituted a problem. Often women are referred to only in relationship to a significant male family member, or as part of a larger family unit: e.g., "Frieda, his wife of seventeen years," instead of "Frieda and Harold, married for seventeen years." Maggio has a striking example of a woman who, despite no connection to either a male or a female in her life, was dubbed the "fiancée of danger" for her lifelong commitment to adventure, illustrating the connection to social institutions regulated by men. Even unintentional distortions require attention when the use of a modifier obscures the question of whether the person referred to is being judged on the same footing as everyone else, or only within a limited category: ¹³ not "a leading Black historian," but rather "a leading authority on Black history."

Julia Penelope describes language as being intrinsically linked to misogyny, élitism, and racism. In her *Patriarchal Universe of Discourse*, Penelope proposes that women should live in two universes of discourse: the patriarchal one, which they have inherited, and the women-controlled one, which they can choose to create. Quoting from Penelope's *Speaking Freely*,

The culture "of today" recorded by English dictionaries is patriarchal. The coherence of a culture's vocabulary lies in how words are categorized as classes, and the distinctions among the words in a class that create sub-classes. Together, the categories, classes and sub-classes that structure the vocabulary tell us what is valued, devalued or utterly ignored by dominant members of a culture. The dictionary, as a repository of these categories and classifications, reflects a culture's world view and standardizes it for its preservation and perpetuation.¹⁴

Librarians since the 1970s have been vocal on the use of racist and sexist language in subject headings and card catalogue descriptions, as well as in the terminology of cataloguing instructions: "Women, children, the mentally and physically handicapped, and racial, sexual, and other minorities ... fall outside the assumed norm and therefore qualify for separate and unequal categorization," Elizabeth Dickinson wrote in 1974¹⁵ regarding the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* used in American libraries. Dickinson had been coordinating nationwide efforts to reform cataloguing practice. Joan Marshall prepared a position paper in which she argued that language, if left to evolve on its own, would do so conservatively and at a rate too slow for women in America.¹⁶ In these works, there is an awareness that social change is connected to alteration in the language.

The Council of the American Library Association acknowledged in 1975 that its publications did "use nouns and pronouns with strictly male connotations." There was also acknowledgement that this exclusive use "perpetuates the traditional language of society which discriminates against women."¹⁷ The Council resolved in the same year to avoid terminology perpetuating sex stereotypes, and to revise existing publications in order to avoid such terminology.

Emergency Librarian, a Canadian periodical devoted to resources in children's literature, began as an underground publication of the Canadian Library Association in 1973. Self-described as an "explosive challenge" to the status quo in the library profession, this publication included articles examining, for example, the inadequacies of *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, a reference source based on the premise that the "norm in Anglo-American Society is white, Christian, male, and heterosexual."¹⁸ Key/outdated

examples of cross-references cited by Dickinson included: for “man,” ... human being ... male human being ... manly; for “woman,” ... female human being ... female attendant ... mistress ... wife ... charm.”

Broader public institutional change occurred in places such as the United States Department of Labor in the mid-1970s, when a revised list of occupational classifications dropping sex-stereotyped job titles was introduced. In general, progress in this area involved changing the suffix “man” to neutral terms such as “operator” or “worker.” In Canada, the federal government adopted regulations against using stereotypes in language in 1982; the Canadian Museum of Man changed the name of the renovated facility to the Museum of Civilization in 1986.¹⁹

Feminist revision of language became important as an indication of political awareness and as part of the process of consciousness-raising. Changing the spelling of “woman” to “wom-y-n” and “history” to “h-e-rstory” illustrated an urgent concern with community and cultural creation. *A Feminist Dictionary*, *The Encyclopedia of Feminism* and *The Canadian Feminist Thesaurus/Féministe du Canada* all reconfigure and subvert the traditional or conventional authority invested in language reference works. Not only do these works include words “created” by feminists and the women’s movement, but they also include theories and historical concepts such as female sexual slavery. Their underlying framework questions the unilateral authority expressed in conventional reference works; the creators of the former works forgo endorsement of any single definition, offering instead options invested with the political consciousness of their social movement. For example, *The Canadian Feminist Thesaurus* includes under “prostitution” the broad terms “female intensive occupations,” “images of women” and “service occupations.”²⁰

Did these revisionist linguistic works suggest a patriarchal conspiracy of language? While some authors rather playfully suggest the possibility of imaginary organizations such as Males Against Linguistic Equality (MALE),²¹ there is no suggestion of a specific plot to produce and perpetuate inequality in language. These inadequacies in our system of communication are points on a continuum, points where the inequalities in social structures become the most obvious. There have been suggestions, however, in recent publications and in the popular media of continued uncertainty over changes to the language. Perhaps there are limits to the extent of practical language modification: a recent issue of *Wildflower* suggested putting a stop to the use of language to reflect “narrow anthropocentric attitudes and values that are central to the ongoing degradation of nature.” Specifically, the suggestion is that terms such as “our political wilderness” and “concrete jungle” misrepresent nature as an undesirable place. Similarly, to describe someone as “greedy as a pig” or “a snake in the grass” is an animal insult, or “speciesism”; “natural resources” betray a sign of “resourceism,” while economic metaphors such as “biological richness” transform nature into a reflection of the corporate industrial system.²² While some critics have tempered their views in order to be wholly supportive of removing inequitable and therefore damaging terms, they have also suggested that such continued revision of English-language vernacular will serve to “sever it from its physical reality” and “flatten it.”²³ Other critics have blamed the influence of radical feminism and “linguistically sensitive feminists” for these attacks on language; feminist work in this area has been accused of having as its goal the “divine sex-change” — particularly in the area of making religious language more equitable.²⁴ There is a sense of having gone too far with a good idea: *Harper’s Magazine*, ever attentive to

such experiments with language, recently noted that signs indicating "coloured paper" affixed to recycling boxes were being replaced by the more neutral "dyed paper."²⁵

How far in fact should revisions of language be incorporated into archivists' thinking? The Canadian Women's Educational Press split in 1988 over disagreements relating to alleged racist publication policies. The remaining members of the Press, calling themselves the Popular Front-of-the-Bus Caucus, drafted anti-racism guidelines for comment among groups and activists in the Toronto feminist and publishing communities. In the guidelines, racism is defined as "the general system of economic, political and social relations that creates, with minor exceptions, a ruling class that is defined by colour."²⁶ The use of the term "anti-racist" instead of "non-racist" is based on the contention that all members of a racist society are influenced by its racist structures and therefore will only bring about change by acting against racism. For the purposes of language in description, the Caucus recommends that the use of black and white imagery be monitored, since white has traditionally been paired or associated with good things. Other terms not to use include blackmail, black lie, white lie, black outlook, blacken, black, or master and slave. Stereotypes such as docile and passive should not be used of Asian women; nor should Mexican-Americans be characterized as fiesta-loving. Naked savages, primitive braves, squaws, switchblade-toting gang members are — needless to say — grossly inappropriate. Some of the terms designated as reinforcing stereotypical assumptions include merciless, docile, threatening, fierce, primitive, renegade, wild, tribal, barbarian, and shrill. The Press's guidelines include Value Laden Terms, or terms which "reinforce ethnocentric viewpoints by making dominant white values a standard."²⁷ Examples are "non-white," which uses white as the standard, or "minority," usually used in reference to non-whites, when globally Caucasians constitute the minority. Culturally deprived, economically disadvantaged, and underdeveloped are similar problematic terms, since they are used to describe so-called Third World societies while blaming the victims for their own misfortune.

Such guidelines may seem impossible to apply. Nevertheless, they do illustrate how revelatory the meanings in archival descriptive language can be. To divert the catalogues of indexing terms which appear in these guidelines or in feminist proposals may not be the easiest or most prudent course of action. Words may be invested with historical connotations. At which point do archivists and other information managers stop incorporating the steady evolution of language into their professional work?

Using language accurately should be important to archivists. Language constitutes a conduit of information delivered through reference and public service. As the point of "contact" with the user, language holds the potential both to make successful the principle of access to information, and to confound and misdirect the user by its inaccuracy. The language used to express archival description and theoretical terminology conveys values invested in institutional and professional structures. As cultural and social institutions having an interest in perpetuating a stable and secure image, archives favour language unencumbered by the complexities of linguistic revision, as outlined previously. The criteria for the development of descriptive standards suggest a similar foundation of overall reliability and predictability of interpretation, as described by Richard Szary.²⁸

It would be preemptory to examine how archivists incorporate the revisions outlined above, or whether institutions must endorse representational language without first

considering whether archivists as a profession are prepared to address these questions about language. Archival literature suggests an ongoing duality of professional identity. Professional responsibility, though favoured, is tempered by a compulsion to identify closely with the standards of a neutral physical environment. Incorporating linguistic change would require some abandonment of neutrality; here archivists risk challenging Schellenberg's model of the archivist:

The archivist's job at all times is to preserve the evidence, impartially, without taint of political or ideological bias, so that on the basis of evidence those judgements may be pronounced upon men and events by posterity which historians through human failings are momentarily incapable of pronouncing. Archivists are thus the guardians of the truth, or, at least, of the evidence on the basis of which truth can be established.²⁹

The necessity to remain neutral may be too ideal for modern archivists, who are products of diverse societies. Bias which affects critical appraisal skills may potentially distort archival description; as Hans Booms has written, "Archivists are human beings: as an *animal sociale*, the archivist will unavoidably appraise records according to those subjective opinions and ideas which have been acquired as part of the mindset of one's own time."³⁰ Archivists currently questioning their cultural or social responsibilities endeavour to reflect this "mindset," and in so doing disrupt the guise of objectivity. This pragmatic evolution of archival thought does, however, suggest a range of additional responsibilities, problems and questions. To engage the *animal sociale* in all its forms is to make archivists responsible for the expressions of social identity and their locations in archival institutions. Language is a logical prime locus in which to begin the reintegration of cultural and social mind-sets into archives.

Illustrative of archival readiness to incorporate a more self-consciously responsible role are appraisal strategies for and guides to women's records. Among many such examples is Melissa Rombout's work through the Documentary Art and Photography Division of the National Archives, aimed at locating public records representing a "broader societal framework."³¹ Kinnear and Fast's *Annotated Bibliography to Women's Records in Manitoba*, moreover, subverts hierarchical precedence by making a convincing argument for non-traditional classification in description. Their bibliography arranges references in three general categories uniquely suited to the experiences of women:

- 1) identity (auto/biographical, local history, early settlement, aboriginal life, immigration)
- 2) work and activities (reproductive, household, volunteer work)
- 3) mentality (religion, culture, reform)

The rationale runs thus:

Categorization is a difficulty.... [The effect of] ... nineteenth-century division of society by gender into public and private ... was to banish women altogether from old-fashioned history, which was conceived as the record and explanation of what went on in public-male-life.... Twentieth-century social history ... has provided the vehicle for retrieval of material whose relevance to political, diplomatic, constitutional, economic and social events had not hitherto been apparent. The old classifications and the old questions no longer suffice if we wish to discover social structures and the experience of other groups in society besides the male élites. New categories

must be offered, and new questions asked, realistically related to the experience of newly examined groups.³²

These two innovative examples provide evidence of a partial reorientation of the archivist towards the record — a conscious effort to adapt archival principles to new vistas of records creation.

But what about language? Works cited earlier are too unconventional for archivists to use because they do not accommodate standards and rules about consistency, nor does their fluidity make them easily applicable to an emerging body of descriptive standards. If language articulates a culture's vision in a succinct format, then can language be equally true to the meaning of those activities which are being described? Do the criteria for implementing descriptive standards create invisible barriers to the process of incorporating new terminologies?

As with all issues relating to descriptive standards, who will undertake these global initiatives? Any decision to alter past practice reflects an institution's recognition of social changes; should archivists be merely reactive and regard such changes as "fads" and "fashions"? Would the response require creation of new vocabularies and subject headings, or the use of neutral language in descriptions?

There will be those who regard any efforts to incorporate new language as interference rather than as responsible mediation — as pushing archival objectiveness and impartiality out the window. If archivists are defined by the quality of descriptive activity, however, then we shall be tempted to support some degree of change. The examination of language and accommodation of terminology and forms in archival practice could be considered a natural outcome of the implementation of descriptive standards — only in the perfect world of implementation. If institutions adopt descriptive standards, and monitor the results, then eventually descriptive practice and terminology will reflect linguistic changes by virtue of the acquisition of records which already incorporate new terminologies. The security in this prospectus is the adherence to using the document itself as the chief source of information, according to the Bureau of Canadian Archivists' *Rules for Archival Description*. Leaving the recognition of language issues to arise naturally from the records themselves may not be a proactive stance, but can nevertheless be said to achieve an economy of effort.

Allowing strategic work on the subject of language revision to run its natural course unfortunately places yet another burden of cultural and social responsibility on the individual archivist. Mounting and as yet undefined professional responsibilities include maintaining a bold cultural awareness on behalf of the archival institution and, as Brien Brothman has described it, "continually replenishing its intellectual resources and reaffirming its cultural station."³³ Realistically, this role cannot conceivably sustain the development of a normative language (meeting all the contingencies outlined earlier) and apply as well to descriptive standards.

Have we led ourselves in this exploration of language to an empty trough? Despite the absence of a new vocabulary, we have demonstrated not fads and fashions, but the linguistic expression empowerment by emerging social identities. The argument is that these identities constitute in part potential users, potential creators, and symbols of "cultural stations" beyond our accessibility. Exploring language issues such as these may be as relevant a barometer of archivists' future relevance, as is interest in new

historiography questioning the central role of the document for historical research. If archivists are not recognized by any of these emerging identities, whatever attempts we make in changing descriptive language may be premature, if not futile. The median solution is perhaps, in the process of developing and implementing descriptive standards, to begin to nurture an environment sensitive to the politics of language.

Notes

- * Paper presented at the 1992 Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Archivists, Montréal, 13 September 1992; revised and edited for publication.
- 1 Garry Trudeau, "Salutation," *Harper's Magazine* (October 1991), p. 40; from a speech at Yale University's Class Day, May 1991.
- 2 Adrienne Rich, cited in Belle Hooks, *Learning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* (Toronto, 1990), p. 146.
- 3 Dale Spender, *Man Made Language* (London, 1980), p. 2.
- 4 Casey Miller and Kate Swift, *The Handbook of Non-Sexist Writing for Writers, Editors and Speakers*, revised British edition (London, 1981), p. 5.
- 5 Spender, *Man Made Language*, p. 3.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- 8 Casey Miller and Kate Swift, "One Small Step for Genkind," Appendix to *Words and Women: New Language in New Times* (New York, 1991), pp. 177-92; first published 16 April 1972, *New York Times Magazine*.
- 9 Miller and Swift, *Words and Women*, Appendix, p. 177.
- 10 *Ibid.*, Preface, p. xix.
- 11 Concerning feminine and masculine: R.H. Robins, *A Short History of Linguistics* (London, 1979), cited in Julia Penelope, *Speaking Freely: Unlearning the Lies of the Father's Tongues* (New York, 1990), pp. 56-57.
- 12 Rosalie Maggio, *The Non-Sexist Word-Finder: A Dictionary of Gender Free Usage* (Boston, 1989), p. 171.
- 13 Miller and Swift, *Handbook of Non-Sexist Writing*, p. 55.
- 14 Penelope, *Speaking Freely: Unlearning the Lies of the Father's Tongues*, p. 218.
- 15 Elizabeth Dickinson, "The Word Game," *Canadian Library Journal* (August 1974), p. 339.
- 16 Joan K. Marshall, *On Equal Terms: A Thesaurus for Non-Sexist Indexing and Cataloguing*, repr., *Hennepin County Library Cataloguing Bulletin* 11, 12, 13 (15 March 1975), pp. 10-11.
- 17 The American Library Association resolution was reported in *Media Report to Women* (1 May 1975), p. 10.
- 18 Elizabeth Dickinson, "A Word Game," *Emergency Librarian* 1, no. 3 (1973), p. 2.
- 19 Margrit Eichler and Jeanne Lapointe, "The Treatment of the Sexes in Research/Le traitement objectif des sexes dans la recherche" (Ottawa, 1985), pp. 15-17 [in English], pp. 7-19 [in French].
- 20 The Canadian Women's Indexing Group/Le Groupe d'analyse de documents féministes canadiens, *Canadian Feminist Thesaurus/Féministe du Canada* (Toronto, 1990), p. 200.

- 21 Miller and Swift, *Words and Women*, pp. 91-93; pp. 102-5.
- 22 "Notebook," *The Bulletin* (24 February 1992), p. 3.
- 23 Nicholas Bradbury, *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 28 January 1992, p. C 1.
- 24 James S. Cunningham, "Sexism is not the Work of God," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 11 March 1992, p. A 14.
- 25 *Harper's Magazine* (November 1991), p. 36.
- 26 The Popular Front-of-the-Bus Caucus, "Anti-Racism Guidelines," 14 June 1988 [draft], p. 1.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- 28 Richard V. Szary, "Archival Descriptive Standards: Scope and Criteria," *American Archivist* 52, no. 4 (Fall 1989), p. 524.
- 29 T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago, 1975), p. 236.
- 30 Hans Booms, "Überlieferungsbildung: Keeping Archives as a Social and Political Activity," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991-92), pp. 27-28.
- 31 Melissa K. Rombout, "Representation in a Pluralistic Society: A Strategic Approach to Contemporary Collection in the World of Photographs" (paper presented at the 1991 Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Archivists, Banff, Alberta, 24 May 1991).
- 32 Mary Kinnear and Vera Fast, *Planting the Garden: An Annotated Archival Bibliography of the History of Women in Manitoba* (Winnipeg, 1987), p. xv.
- 33 Brien Brothman, "Orders of Value: Probing the Theoretical Terms of Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), p. 90.