

UCLA

InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies

Title

LGBT and Information Studies: The Library and Archive OUTreach Symposium at UCLA; and In the Footsteps of Barbara Gittings: An Appreciation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9jm2b1sh>

Journal

InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 3(1)

ISSN

1548-3320

Author

Keilty, Patrick

Publication Date

2007-03-08

DOI

10.5070/D431000592

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9jm2b1sh#supplemental>

Peer reviewed

LGBT and Information Studies: The Library and Archive OUTreach Symposium at UCLA



Figure 1. From L-R: Dan Tsang, Yolanda Retter, Susan Parker, Jim Carmichael, Jim Van Buskirk, and Barbara Gittings at the Library and Archive OUTreach Symposium at UCLA, November 17, 2006. Copyright 2006 by Patrick Keilty.

For Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) individuals, access to information can often be a matter of survival. Consider, for example, LGBT teenagers. A simple search in Google for “LGBT Teenagers,” or similar subject, produces page after page of websites that either make mental health a primary resource or their sole resource. The Journal of the Medical Library Association published the results of an Internet survey in January 2004. It found that more than 75% of medical librarians and students believed that LGBT adolescents had special information needs, with similar response rates by non-librarian health professionals and students (Fiker and Keith, January 2004). The study identified major areas of information need. Among these were, not surprisingly, information on adolescent depression and suicide, mental health issues in general, transgender health issues, sexual health and practices, and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection. For teens, the hard statistics come easily: queer teenagers are 2.5 times more likely to attempt suicide, and to accomplish it, than their heterosexual peers; up to 30 percent of teen suicides are likely to be gay or lesbian; a third of lesbian and gay teenagers say they have attempted suicide; and minority queer adolescents are even more at risk (Sedgwick, 1993, p. 154).

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) is a particularly important information issue in the LGBT community. Currently, there is no cure for AIDS. Researchers have focused their efforts on curbing the effects of the disease, but no vaccine has been developed. “Prevention is presently the only option in curbing the transmission of AIDS, and educating the public is *the* major component of such efforts,” says Ellen Greenblatt, a prominent LGBT information scholar (1990, p. 173). Greenblatt continues, “Providing accurate, timely, balanced and unbiased information is at the core of AIDS education efforts.” Because information is essentially the only prevention for AIDS, failing to provide that information would practically be the same as withholding the vaccine for the disease. Hence, information institutions play a vital role in AIDS education. Librarians, archivists, and other information professionals stand on the

front lines in local censorship battles and regularly advocate, in and out of court, for intellectual freedom. They select, describe, and determine the visibility of their collections. At the reference desk they regularly evaluate the needs of information-seekers and make decisions about what materials to recommend. Archivists can inscribe or obscure LGBT history.

Additionally, accessing information about one's very person often leads to compromising situations for LGBT individuals. Every single day, they contend with heterosexist presumption, interlocutors about whom the information professional knows or doesn't know or wants to know, 'therapy,' distorting stereotypes, insulting scrutiny, simple insult, and forcible interpretations of one's bodily product, the anxiety of which might intimidate the patron deliberately to re-enter the closet, even if one were out to begin with, in order to conceal one's embarrassment and general apprehension toward research perceived as threatening or that poses actual threat to one for undertaking it.

Similar issues can be seen in the catalog, which is the heart of a library. A catalog does more than simply organize knowledge. It is the carrier of civilization, not least because it allows for scholarship about civilization. Without the catalog, history is silenced, literature muted, science crippled, thoughts and ideas arrested. The catalog is an agency of change. However, for many marginalized people, including gays and lesbians, it often contains terms that exclude them, that ignore their very existence, and insult their very being. Catalog users should ideally be able to locate desired subjects on their first try without being offended, prejudiced, confused, misled, or repelled by the very terminology used to denote specific topics (Berman, 1981, p. 110). However, in reality, classification presents hurdles for those seeking LGBT information. Greenblatt explains that the Library of Congress has been slow to implement mainstream usage of terminology relating to homosexuality in their classification scheme, which is used in libraries throughout the country. "Until 1946, the concept of homosexuality was subsumed under the heading *Sexual Perversion*" (Greenblatt, 1990, p. 79) and until 1972 a "see also from" reference to "Sexual Perversion" appeared as a cross-reference to "homosexuality." Even popular usage of the term "gay" to describe homosexual men was not sanctioned by the Library of Congress until 1987, despite the fact that many books had long used the term in their titles. Additionally, the word "lesbian" did not appear in the Library of Congress Subject Heading (LCSH) until 1976. LCSH did not recognize the process of "coming out" until 2004. Thus, trying to retrieve information about homosexuality has often proved difficult.

To this day, LCSH does not adequately classify LGBT materials. Between nine and ten million people, in addition to over six million Jews, were systematically exterminated by the Nazis during WWII. One million were gay men. However, "LCSH contains only one Holocaust heading: Holocaust, Jewish

(1939-1945) and does not acknowledge any other group during this time” (Greenblatt, 1990, p. 89). The pink triangle, which was used the same as the Star of David for Jews to demarcate homosexual men, has become a symbol of gay pride in popular culture. Even the GLBT Roundtable of the American Library Association has adopted this symbol from the Holocaust for their organization’s logo. It is amazing then, that a book such as *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War Against Homosexuals* by Richard Plant is described by the following LC subject headings: “Homosexuality, Male – Germany – History – 20th century; Concentration camps – Germany – History – 20th Century; Germany – Politics and government – 1933-1945; and Homosexuality – Law and legislation – Germany.” This subject heading simply lets fall to the wayside any idea of the genocide against gay men in Germany from Hitler’s rise to power throughout World War II. There are countless examples of how LGBT information is consistently misrecognized and miscategorized, which constitutes a passive discrimination in a profession whose claim to safeguarding access to information is beset by avoidance, non-responsiveness, and a clear paradigm of bias (Greenblatt, 1990, p. 77).

Unfortunately, as vital as LGBT awareness and sensitivity are for information professionals, LGBT concerns continue to be overlooked in information studies. There is a dearth of LGBT scholarship in our field, and only recently have some information studies programs addressed LGBT issues in their curriculum. However, students in the Department of Information Studies at UCLA organized a symposium on November 17, 2006 to raise consciousness about LGBT information issues; put a face on current LGBT activists, practitioners and scholars; and address how LGBT issues make their way into information studies education. The symposium acknowledged how far we have come and recognized how far we still have to go in the information field (and society in general) to develop respectable conceptual tools for negotiating the self-evident fact that people are different.

The symposium’s panelists, who have all made a variety of contributions to LGBT issues in the information field (see the biographies below) were asked to extend the symposium discussion to include LGBT educational issues in information studies. Their responses were just as lively and diverse as the dialogue generated during the symposium. Most notable themes that appeared included the need for diverse cultural education in information studies, caution about letting academic theorizing about change overtake the real world of practice, the need for activism alongside scholarship, the use of praxis for combating discrimination, the illogical coherence of the acronym “LGBT” as a “name” for an identity, and the importance of new digital technology for increasing access to LGBT materials.

The Need for LGBT Studies in Information Studies

Jim Carmichael, a professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, remarks on the lack of cultural studies in information studies, and the desperate need for teaching diversity in the classroom: “In 1996 Marilyn Shontz and I published the results of a survey of attitudes towards social responsibilities, which is how the debate was then professionally framed, among recent MLIS [Masters of Library and Information Science or Studies] graduates.¹ We found that social responsibilities to specific groups based on sex, race, ethnic identity, and sexual orientation, were very poorly covered in MLIS curriculums.” Carmichael continues, “At that time, I could name on less than two hands all of the LGBT library educators in my acquaintance. That situation has changed, not because of LIS research or ALA programs, but because of the changing (younger, more permissive, more tuned in to mass communication, and of course, more “out”) demographic profile of our society (including faculty).”²

Yolanda Retter, Librarian/Archivist of the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Library and Archive, agrees with Carmichael’s assessment of information studies education. “Neither ethnic, gender or sexual orientation are properly included in IS syllabi or classroom discussions. Multicultural sexual orientation is the topic faculty are least prepared to teach,” she claims.³ “Inclusion at this time often means throwing in a few readings that may or not be covered in class, and maybe inviting someone who is LGBTIQQ [Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Intersex Queer and Questioning] to talk to the class. Multicultural/multigender analysis and presentation of LGBTIQQ issues is missing.”

Additionally, Anne Gilliland, Professor and Chair of the Department of Information Studies at UCLA, suggests three main reasons to pursue LGBT issues in information studies education that not only speak directly to LGBT needs but that serve as a model of all kinds of differences information professionals encounter: “One would be to raise consciousness generally of LGBT needs and concerns, which are frequently poorly understood at best and invisible at worst. A second might be to understand what these concerns and needs may have in common with or how they may be distinctive from other marginalized and as well as more enfranchised populations. This reason is especially important when we consider that individuals have multiple identities, including those who are doubly-marginalized such as LGBT persons of color. The third could be to present or to generate ways to think about and address these needs and concerns (especially since there is considerable work that still needs to be done in this area).”⁴

Experiential Opportunities: LGBT Information Praxis

Each of the panelists was asked to identify what LGBT issues in information studies education would look like, and all discussants emphasized the need for experiential educational opportunities. “Practical application is more important to me than theory,” claims Susan Parker, Deputy University Librarian & CFO of UCLA Library.⁵ “It is important to me to make sure that LGBT students will be able to be as open in their identities at school and in their future jobs as possible.” Carmichael believes being ‘out’ in the classroom is part of an experiential opportunity, what he terms “performing” a “ritual of witness,” and he sees this ritual as an important part of growth for him as well as his students.

Gilliland, too, understands the importance experiential opportunities play in LGBT issues. She suggests changes in curriculum that would emphasize “internships and service learning... so that all students regardless of sexual orientation or interests are exposed and sensitized ...[to] the needs and concerns of a range of diverse communities and perspectives.” Gilliland also conceives of the possibility of “a specific track through an IS program that would allow students to focus on LGBT issues, perspectives and environments.” Gilliland does not see these approaches as mutually exclusive; each approach may be “enhanced by applying as appropriate, a pedagogy that is LGBT-sensitive (similar to movements to develop culturally-sensitive pedagogy).”

While there is consensus among the panelists about the value of experiential opportunities for students, they also see the need to combine theoretical and scholarly endeavors with praxis in LGBT information studies. Gilliland believes another way to approach LGBT education in information studies might be “to implement a reorientation of the entire educational and intellectual processes and methodologies being used...using sexual orientation (as could also be done with race, class or gender) as the lens through which all other activities are viewed. With the latter approach, individuals have the opportunity to take more direct control over what they study and how they present it, and may also bring to bear epistemological and methodological approaches that derive from Gender Studies rather than from Information Studies.”

However, Parker thinks “it can be tempting to engage with theory and discourse without getting experience in live environments. Engagement with theory is an important way to give meaning to the values you want to embrace as a professional, but practice is the centerpiece for most of us in our profession.” Gilliland acknowledges the difference between professional objectives concerned primarily with practice, and theoretical methodology and admits that a reorientation approach “might be easier to implement at the doctoral rather than MLIS level.” Parker sees theory valued alongside practice: “Understanding who you are, and who you are as a professional librarian, is a life-long process of self-examination that is modeled by work experience, theory, and critical thinking about values.” Agreeing with Parker, Carmichael adds, “It is in practice that

change is effected, and that puts the burden on each of us to model the best citizens and human beings we can, to be firmly resolute in our integrity, and to work for change, not always in a confrontational way.”

Professional as Activist or a Professional Activist?

Each of the panelists also believes that the LGBT struggle can illuminate and enrich information studies education and that future information professionals have a responsibility to address LGBT concerns. Dan Tsang, Social Science Bibliographer and Data Librarian at the Jack Langson Library at the University of California, Irvine, sees a need for real-world issues and activism in LGBT information studies education, particularly with regard to government and the law. “I see LGBT issues subsumed under state regulation,” claims Tsang.⁶ He continues: “Any IS education effort needs to address the role of the state in regulating sexual behavior, and the resources to understand that.” Gilliland also senses the value of activism in the information field. She points out that students must understand that “the information professions are not neutral agents in issues of social justice, or even the acquisition, preservation and provision of information. Information professionals play complex and central roles in marginalizing or enfranchising LGBT individuals and communities (as indeed they do for other communities also). For example, librarians assign classifications to literature that can represent majority or community values, but that can nevertheless characterize LGBT members in particular ways. They make decisions about the extent to which collections in school libraries, public libraries and so forth address the needs of LGBT and Questioning individuals. Archivists shape how society looks at LGBT communities and individuals over time, as well as document how those communities have evolved and changed.”

Yet, archivists must also tread carefully for the consequences of collection for and documentation of LGBT communities can be devastating. Gilliland reminds us that, “If [archivists] acquire collections or name individuals mentioned in collections as LGBT, those collections may become the focus of anti-LGBT activists or be subject to ‘hate’ attacks, and they may accidentally ‘out’ non-out LGBT individuals.” When hate emerges in a community, the panelists believe the information profession has a particular responsibility to act. A striking example of information-related anti-LGBT violence was discussed at the symposium, where Jim Van Buskirk recalled a highly publicized hate attack on LGBT materials when he was serving as Program Manager at the San Francisco Public Library’s Hormel Gay & Lesbian Center. In 2003, the SFPL experienced an explosion of vandalism. Over a period of months, a lone man with a sharp knife methodically used the card catalog to target the library’s gay and lesbian collection. One book’s inscription on the title page, which read, “To Richard with good warm wishes from Robert,” was slashed through. Van Buskirk said one could feel the hatred

emanating from the books, and he recalled that the incident was “nerve-racking” because he felt it was not “that big a leap from carving up books to carving up people.”

After 600 books were mutilated the perpetrator was caught, but the library could not re-shelve the damaged books. Van Buskirk had the idea to give books to artists and see what they would do to them. The result was an exhibit of sculpted and re-structured books called “Reversing Vandalism.” It was meant to erase the hate crime inscribed onto the books (Van Buskirk, 2005).⁷ As Van Buskirk’s proactive stance shows, information professionals cannot take a passive role in information services; they must actively work to make social injustice and prejudice visible. Additionally, Carmichael reminds us that for some communities, access to information may mean life or death. He considers that in “recent phenomena like the high rate of suicide among LGBT teens and the AIDS crisis in the 1980s gay community (and the continuing imperative to teach safe-sex practices); one can certainly see crucial roles for culturally sensitive individuals in our profession. The struggle against censorship and bigotry is a literal fight for life.”

L,G,B,T...?

One of the recurring debates in LGBT education is about how far it will make sense to conceptualize lesbian, gay male, bisexual, and transgender identities together or separately. Our panelists were undecided on whether there is a logical coherence that creates and sustains a term like LGBT, which Retter calls “the ever-expanding acronym.” While some feel it should be disrupted, others see its usefulness. For Carmichael the term and its attendant theoretical tools have proved extremely helpful, but he shares some reservations about academic activism. “My own emergence from the closet can be directly attributed to my own awareness of feminist theory, pedagogy, and practice during my doctoral studies program. On the other hand, it would be presumptuous of me to speak for, say, Virginia Woolf or Vita Sackville-West, or the womyn viewpoint generally. There are many valid reasons for separatism—see for example, Polly Thistlethwaite’s very fine essay on the Lesbian Herstory Archives in *Daring to Find Our Names*.⁸ I think the LGBT community has matured considerably in the past thirty years, and all of us, whatever our particular label, get what we need one way or another. In presenting ourselves collectively to the world I think LGBT is very appropriately inclusive, and we should really not tax the general public with our own nomenclature refinement wars.”

However, Carmichael also points out, “Social, political, and interpersonal activism among our number will always be necessary, because people are always coming out, political climates are always changing, and people forget. Change is cyclical. Academic activism, on the other hand, can become tedious and pedantic, because academics talk anything to death, because the resource stakes are so

small, and because, in the United States at least, the public increasingly expects The Academy to resolve problems it can't resolve itself." For Gilliland, sustaining the term LGBT depends on what is being studied and how it's being used: "A study of power within the LGBT 'community' or political discourse might require extensive differentiation, while a study of the effects of invisibility or classification in the library or the archive on LGBT individuals and communities might not."

In contrast, Tsang succinctly remarks, "Definitely disrupt the term LGBT, which is already out of date." Retter, too, takes issue with the term, "There is really no logical coherence except if one uses the concept of 'sexual outlaws'." For Retter LGBT studies has come to embody all the disadvantages of critical theory without any of its advantages. She sees it as offering few solutions to real world concerns, and as problematizing for the sake of intellectual sport. "For political reasons and as a life-long lesbian, I identify as an essentialist modified by my socially constructed life experiences. I agree with Emma Pérez and other women of color regarding strategic essentialism, identity politics and our ability to manage difference. That means that I disagree with Pomohomo theory/queer studies and its focus on logical consistency and personal gain (tenure) while it pays scant attention to social justice, which after all is still the basic individual and collective struggle for most members of marginalized/ target groups." Retter recalls, "A gay student of color came to my office yesterday to discuss Emma Pérez's essay on *Sitios y Lenguas* and Irigaray. After some discussion he realized that although the essay made a lot of sense to him, he felt compelled to problematize it simply because that is what he has been taught to do. I don't think he is alone. The discourse game and its attendant skills in most cases will not help the LGBTIQQ struggles."

LGBT, Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnic issues have long been overlooked in LGBT discussions. It had been a point of contention at the symposium, so the panelists were asked to discuss the relationship between LGBT and ethnic/ racial studies in information studies. Many of them addressed specific ways they felt information studies can combat LGBT-phobia in ethnic communities and ways in which to confront racism in the LGBT community. Tsang believes LGBT struggles are intricately tied to the struggles of ethnic minorities in the U.S. "Part of this intricate linkage," claims Tsang, "must be explicated in the classroom by having classes, for example, on the bibliography of social movements. Why do we have legal bibliography classes but not have similar classes that address the literature of social history and social movements?"

Carmichael believes information studies education should also include socioeconomic discussions. "The ill effects of ethnic machismo and religious fanaticism generally (ethnic or not) will be with us always. Race, ethnicity, and

sexuality are all the obverse of the power coin and capitalist bureaucracy functions on the existence of an underclass. I agree with Kenji Yoshino in *Covering* that the time for collective civil rights agitation has ended, the struggle needs now to be engaged in individual interactions.”⁹ He adds, “our information theory discussions, LGBT or not, should be broadened to include class and socioeconomic strata. At the present moment, the country and the profession seem enamored of labels, with too little commentary and research on the interactions of race, ethnicity, sex, and sexuality with other factors such as level of education, income level, or government immigration policy. These other factors will only increase in the LGBT community in the future.”

Parker claims that values of acceptance should be broadly spread without forcing a division of alliances. She says, “Many people belong to multiple minorities. For the African-American lesbian or the Chicano gay man, multiple identities can be a positive way to cross these bridges. Being out and open about our multiple identities can help to demonstrate the very real, very artificial choices ethnic community members make when they are uncomfortable with LGBT persons, and when LGBT persons exhibit racism.”

Retter puts the onus on people for whom the LGBT issue is not a primary one. “Work overtime to learn, listen, and apply what those who have suffered from a particular prejudice (and sometimes more than one) tell them in conversations, reading, presentations, etc. To do this one must refrain from arguing with the informant or becoming defensive. Over time one must resist the temptation to lose interest in the issue. One must also commit to interrupting prejudice and to examining how one passively or actively benefits from structural prejudice.” She further suggests information studies programs hire faculty with a background in ethnic, gender and sexuality studies. “While that process is taking place,” she adds, “lecturers who care about and are informed about a variety of social issues can be hired to supplement the deficit in the curriculum and the faculty.”

Parker agrees and believes that there is often a breakdown in sustaining dialogue and activism around ethnicity, race and class: “Until more scholars, including GLBTQ scholars, are from different races, classes, and ethnic experiences, focusing on scholarship to the exclusion of activism and debates in more popular arenas will contribute to a theoretical discourse that is irrelevant to many people. This may be one reason why in our community we elevate the importance of the divisions between genders or age groups: this is easier to tackle than race, class, and ethnicity.”

In response, Carmichael draws attention to academia’s limited efforts to attract more minority faculty: “[Retter] is right to criticize our tunnel vision with regards to race, but here the problem is that there are so few qualified racial minorities in our applicant pools, let alone ones who are LGBT. Librarianship

doesn't pay salaries likely to attract a minority supermen or superwomyn, who are likely to find more lucrative work elsewhere, and who are in demand throughout the academy, not just in our field, in order to meet various governmental and professional requirements for 'diversity.' And of course, lack of power is our dilemma: in our public life, so many decisions are made not because they are the morally right decisions, but because doing so will mean increased resources."

Community Value Conflicts

Raising the issue of homophobia within various communities inevitably leads to a discussion about how educators balance a respect for diverse community values with respect for their own democratic ideals, particularly where community values may run counter to them. Gilliland believes such an occurrence can provide an ideal teachable moment: "[instructors] need to point out to students that as future information professionals they need to be able to recognize and acknowledge their own personal moral/ethical/religious frame; and then recognize and acknowledge their professional ethics and legal responsibilities and act according to the latter, even if they come into conflict with their personal values (or be prepared to step down or aside)." Gilliland adds, "If such discussions prove to be difficult in class, educators can lay down some ground rules for the class in advance, such as requiring that students give each other room to express their own opinions, and they will discuss those opinions respectfully."

Parker draws from her own experience in the profession and notes that "as a librarian I have been able to take advantage of that stance to advocate on behalf of different kinds of people and the library's effort to support their needs for information.... It wasn't until I started working in libraries every day that I realized how much it's necessary to be aware of my actions, choices, and decisions in order to satisfy my professional obligations, but also to live, demonstrate, and advocate for the values that are important to me." For Tsang, the challenge is to find common ground "even if you know the community may hate your existence. So for example, look at the concept of difference and start the discussion around that, and not about sexual identities."

Technology

Any discussion of 21st-century LGBT information issues must eventually address the role that new digital technologies and the development of web-based information dissemination and access can and will play in LGBT studies. Judith Halberstam's essay "Reflections on Queer Studies and Queer Pedagogy" reminds us that younger generations are finding more of their information online. She describes creating an archive of subcultural materials on digital reserve in the

library for one of her classes, which she felt would allow students to “write about and connect with small queer bands and queer zines and all manner of ephemera which otherwise could not be studied. As she says, “these databases create a new future for queer history by making place for materials that otherwise would be lost in the ebb and flow of a paper history.” (Halberstam, 2004, p.364)

The panelists heartily agreed with Halberstam’s observations and encouraged a queer future that takes advantage of new technologies. “There are no limits to the opportunities technology brings for expanding the availability of queer information and LGBT studies,” claims Parker, who adds, “Information studies can help by providing cutting-edge education about the use of technology, and awareness about the growing technologies available.” Gilliland points out LGBT benefits of new technologies and addresses potential information policy concerns: “Technology offers the potential for anonymity as well as direct contact with other LGBT individuals, both of which may be very supportable of non ‘out’ or semi ‘out’ LGBT individuals. Information studies education should think about how information systems can provide such opportunities to users, as well as reassure them that their online use patterns are not being tracked and any identity information about them is not being retained or disclosed to third parties.” For Retter, the technology provides for new ways of conceptualizing activism: “It can be used to interrupt/bypass oppressive structures and to support ones that strive for social justice and change. For example, making the history of marginalized groups more accessible.”

Going Forward

Discussion with our panelists strongly suggests that as information studies continues to grow and expand into to new areas of research it calls its own, LGBT studies will become increasingly important, not merely because society is coming to accept “sexual outlaws” (as Retter describes LGBT people), but also because the need for more information for and about LGBT people will be crucial for any emancipation effort. LGBT education among information scholars and professionals is necessary to achieve this goal. Several ideas have been suggested for making this happen: information professionals must conceive of themselves as activists; LGBT education must include experiential opportunities; we cannot know in advance how far it will make sense to conceive of ‘LGBT’ as a coherent term together or separately; race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality are intricately linked; and one cannot underestimate the influence new technology will have in disseminating and accessing LGBT information. However, positive change can occur only through people, and as all panelists agreed, activism can take the form of engaging one person at a time. Information professionals need to recognize that it is probably people with the experience of oppression or subordination who most *need* to know. And what are we, if not a profession who organizes and provides

such knowledge? That is the crux of our solicitous profession. We help accomplish the work of needing to know.

Biographies

James Carmichael is a professor of Library and Information Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, where he has taught reference, humanities literature, and an Academic Libraries course since 1989. Primarily a library historian concentrating on the southern states, he has also written extensively on gender roles in the profession and LGBT issues. In 1998, he collected essays from founders, practitioners, and students for a volume entitled *Daring to Find Our Names: The Search for Lesbian and Gay Library History*. Before receiving his doctorate from UNC-Chapel Hill in 1988, he worked a split assignment as a reference librarian/cataloger/special collections librarian at Georgia College in Milledgeville, Georgia.

Anne Gilliland, who moderated the symposium, is Professor and Chair of the Department of Information Studies at UCLA. She has received major grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. She has served as a member of the Council of the Society of American Archivists and of the Editorial Board of the *American Archivist*. She is a recipient of the Society's C.F.W. Coker Award and the Midwest Archives Conference Margaret Cross Norton Award. She is also a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists.

Susan Parker has held leadership positions in the libraries at Tufts University, Harvard Law School, and California State University Northridge. She is currently Deputy University Librarian and CFO for the University Library at UCLA. Susan began her career as a reference librarian specializing in law, history, and government publications. A past chair of the ACRL Law and Political Science Section and a member of LAMA, Parker served as a member of the Book Award Committee of the ALA GLBT Round Table and was a long-time book reviewer for *Library Journal*. She is a doctoral student in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at Capella University.

Yolanda Retter is a lesbian history and visibility activist who manages the UCLA Chicano Studies Library and Archive and the Lesbian History Project web site. Her doctoral dissertation dealt with lesbian activism in Los Angeles. Retter also holds an MSW and has worked as a community organizer. She has co-edited two books, written articles, and taught classes on LGBTIQ history. She serves on a number of LGBTIQ publication and archives projects where her primary role

has been to advocate for the inclusion of women and people of color. She is specifically interested in creating and supporting:

- Diverse curriculum content in IS programs;
- Support systems for LGBTI students and students of color;
- Diversity in staffing and collection building;
- Competence in the area of services to marginalized groups;
- Subject expertise in finding aids for the collections of marginalized groups.

Dan Tsang has been a politics, economics and Asian American studies bibliographer at UC Irvine since 1986. He heads the Ethnic Studies Librarians Network in the UC system. Research interests include: Alternative and gay archiving, the alternative press, moral panics, FBI files on homosexuals, chemical castration of sex offenders, queer Asian sex dating in cyberspace, and more recently, queer depictions in Vietnamese film. He has published numerous articles and essays in alternative and mainstream papers. Dan edited *Gay Insurgent*, a left journal. He hosts *Subversity*, a weekly progressive interview program on [KUCL](#), and he serves on the boards of the Southern California Library for Social Studies and Research and of the *Journal of Homosexuality*.

Jim Van Buskirk has been developing the programs of the James C. Hormel Gay & Lesbian Center at San Francisco Public Library since 1992. In 2002, Jim conceived the "Reversing Vandalism" project in which hundreds of vandalized library books were transformed into works of art, as featured in the recent documentary, *Not in Our Town Northern California: When Hate Happens Here*. His award-winning reviews have appeared in numerous alternative and mainstream publications. Jim has also authored and co-authored numerous groundbreaking books and anthologies, including the highly acclaimed *Gay by the Bay: a History of Queer Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area*, with Susan Stryker.

Notes

¹. See James V. Carmichael and Marilyn L. Shontz. (January 1996). The last socially acceptable prejudice: gay and lesbian issues, social responsibilities, and coverage of these topics in M.L.I.S./M.L.S. programs. *Library Quarterly*, 66, 21-58.

². All of Jim Carmichael's remarks date from 1/25/07 and 2/15/07.

³. All of Yolanda Retter's remarks date from 1/26/07.

⁴. All of Anne Gilliland's remarks date from 1/25/07.

⁵. All of Susan Parker's remarks date from 1/28/07 and 2/16/07.

⁶. All of Dan Tsang's remarks date from 2/20/07.

⁷. Portions of the exhibit *Reversing Vandalism: Destroyed Books Turned into Art* can be seen in *Out at the Library*.(2005). San Francisco: San Francisco Public Library. Highlights can be viewed online at <http://sfpl.lib.ca.us/news/onlineexhibits/rv/>

⁸. See Polly J. Thistlewaite. (1998). Building "a home of our own": the construction of the lesbian herstory archives in James v. Carmichael (Ed.) *Daring to Find Our Names: the Search for Lesbian Library History*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. (pp. 153-74).

⁹. See Kenji Yoshino. (2006) *Covering: The Hidden Assault on Our Civil Rights*. New York: Random House.

Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks to all of the panelists for allowing me to share their ideas: Anne Gilliland, Jim Carmichael, Susan Parker, Yolanda Retter, Dan Tsang, and Jim Van Buskirk. The symposium was made possible thanks to the UCLA Campus Programs Committee, Center for Student Programming, Department of Information Studies, and Graduate Student Association. Faculty support for the event also came from Clara Chu and Beverly Lynch. The symposium would not be possible without help from fellow members of the graduate student group Library & Archive OUTreach. Thanks also to Stacey Meeker for her amazing patience while I developed this paper. And very special thanks to Barbara Gittings for her inspiration. Any errors contained herein are wholly my own.

References

- Berman, S. (1981). Gay access. *The Joy of Cataloging: Essays, Letters, Reviews, and Other Explosions* (pp. 110-112). New York: Oryx Press.
- Fikar, C. & Keith, L.. (2004, January). Information needs of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered health care professionals: results of an Internet survey. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 92(1). Retrieved on February 28, 2007 from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=314103>
- Gittings, B. (1990). *Gays in library land: the Gay and Lesbian Task Force of the American Library Association: the first sixteen years*. Philadelphia: B. Gittings.
- Greenblatt, E. (1990). Homosexuality: the evolution of a concept in the Library of Congress Subject Headings. In C. Gough & E. Greenblatt(Eds.), *Gay and Lesbian Library Service* (pp.75-101). London: McFarland.

- Greenblatt, E. (1990). AIDS information in libraries. In C. Gough & E. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Gay and Lesbian Library Service* (pp. 171-198). London: McFarland.
- Halberstam, J. (2004). Reflections on queer studies and queer pedagogy. In, G.A. Yep, K. Lovaas & J.P. Elia (Eds.), *Queer theory and communication: from disciplining queers to queering the discipline(s)* (pp. 361-364). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 2004.
- Sedgwick, E. (1993). *Tendencies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Van Buskirk, J. (Speaker). [Archived radio program] *How to destroy a book*. Dir. Peter Crimmins. <http://www.prx.org>, December 29, 2005. Retrieved February 22, 2007.

Author

Patrick Keilty is a graduate student in the Department of Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is the Founding President of UCLA Library & Archive OUTreach.