Working Paper 14

Political Correctness

John Vincent

Abstract

This paper begins by discussing the history of debates around "political correctness" in public libraries, notably in relation to the social relevance of children's stock in the 1960s and 1970s. Developments up to the 1980s are described, followed by a discussion of the reaction to these, which was often negative. The current decline in concern with matters such as racism and sexism, in relation to library stock, is then discussed. It is concluded that stock selection principles should be restated in the context of accountability to the local community, and further recommendations are made (May 2000).

Introduction

This brief Paper explores some of the issues surrounding the notion of "political correctness" and looks at the effects it has had on public libraries in the UK. It also argues that fear of "political correctness" and its implications (and the constraints imposed by the climate created by some of the media and politicians) lie at the heart of the failure by public libraries to tackle successfully many areas of social exclusion. Finally, it recommends ways of dealing with these issues in the future.

What is "political correctness"?

The origins of the term are now rather hazy, but it is clear that, whatever the original meaning of the term, it is now used in a pejorative sense. In terms of the origins of the term, writer Richard Feldstein [1997] agrees with the view that:

> "... the phrase *political correctness* was not coined by right-wing rhetoricians or left-wing ironists, as has been claimed ... Instead, the phrase was employed to mock those who unthinkingly took the official party line without considering the consequences of their actions." (p4) (italics his)

However, as Teresa Brennan points out in her introduction to Richard Feldstein's book:

> "In an entirely conscious decision, at one of its numerous think tank meetings, the Right adopted this term and used it in an Orwellian series of misrepresentations that have left the liberal center, and for that matter, the Left itself, seriously bewildered. Because the Right used the term for affirmative action policies, the Left, in trying to defend those policies, has somehow felt obliged to defend the phantom of *political correctness.*" [Brennan, 1997, px] (italics hers)

Much of the detailed analysis of "political correctness" – and how it is being used in the war

94

against liberal education - has been carried out in the US; for example, a very useful summary can be found in John Annette's "The culture wars on the American campus" [Annette, 1994], where he highlights the main issues from both 'sides', and includes the main points raised by the two key critics of liberal/radical education, Dinesh D'Souza [1991] and Kimball [1991].

Many of the arguments used by writers such as D'Souza and Kimball are strongly refuted by John Wilson [1995]: Wilson looks at issues such as "sexual correctness" and "date rape"[1], "reverse discrimination", and speech codes - he concludes:

> "despite all the complaints about conservatives being censored by intolerant minorities, the average female, black, Hispanic, gay, or lesbian student is far more likely to face harassment and abuse than the average white male conservative. Despite all the complaints about 'political correctness', the truth is that radical students and faculty face much more discrimination and oppression on campus." (p164)

It is clear that the term, "political correctness", has now firmly entered the UK vocabulary; for example, here are two random quotations found whilst this Paper was being written (the first possibly ironic, the second not!):

> "'Materialistic Gal' treads dangerous territory. How politically correct is 'Gettin' Freaky With It' a shot of a tight-tight batty rider on a lithe fit body?" [Khesumaba, 1999].

> "... the absolutely vital thing is that the human capital of the people who are displaced is used in a way that helps the economy move forward ... To say that is not to make some politically-correct point about the need for a caring society. It is simple economics." [McRae, 2000]

and viewers of "Have I got news for you" [2000] will have heard panellist Angela Rippon asking to be called "Chairman" of the English National Ballet, and referring to "political correctness" as "tosh"!

Historical background: the role of public libraries

One of the tensions in librarianship has always been between those who considered that public libraries were neutral places and that, as such, they should purchase and stock all kinds of materials, and those who thought that no agency (including public libraries) could be neutral, that libraries in modern Britain were another product of the capitalist society within which they developed, and that published materials were equally value-laden.

In the past at least, the struggle in libraries in the US has tended to be between those who want to censor areas of stock (for religious reasons, for example); those who claim that "intellectual freedom" should ensure that public libraries stock all kinds of materials[2], maintain a balanced stock[3], and that to reject items is "censorship"[4]; those who saw

---

1 and argues strongly against, for example, Katie Roiphe [c1993], whom he describes as being part of a backlash against feminism.

2 see, for example, Manly [1993] who presents arguments asking whether the principle of intellectual freedom should protect the politically incorrect as well as the politically correct.

3 see, for example, Asheim [1983].

'traditional' values and materials (the "canon" of literature) under attack[5] - and these arguments were echoed in the UK; and those who want to take social issues into account when selecting stock.

This struggle climaxed in the late 1960s and the 1970s in the UK, particularly within the world of children's books, where there were increasing demands from schools, nursery workers and other educators of young children for materials which reflected a wider society than that of the traditional "Janet-and-John" style reader.

In 1971, the ground-breaking booklist, *Books for children: the homelands of immigrants*, edited by Lambeth's Children's Librarian, Janet Hill was published: this list, the result of analyses of children's books by children's and school librarians across London, was the first time that critical voices had been raised - and critical librarians' voices at that - on the topic of racism in children's books.

Despite this, developments in libraries in terms of beginning to meet the needs of 'real' children were painfully slow[6]. To speed up the process, and also to try to have some influence on the creators of children's books, a number of lobby groups began working, the most influential of which was probably the Children's Rights Workshop [CRW].

The CRW began by assessing and criticising children's books, and then had a real influence on writing, publishing, reviewing and bookselling, particularly through the setting up of the annual "Other Award"[7] which ran from 1974 to 1987[8], and which went from being a 'fringe' event to becoming part of the annual children's book world calendar. Although the "Award" consisted only of a recommendation and publicity (launched at well-attended evening events), nevertheless it became influential, and had some considerable success in promoting books which showed positive images of race, class, disability, gender, lesbians and gay men, age, and so on.

The climate in which children's books were being written, published, sold, and reviewed had definitely changed (although, as we shall see below, not for long). This was in large part through the work of committed critics (such as CRW), with strong support from some librarians; at the same time, in London at least, the positive effects of the Greater London Council and the Inner London Education Authority's (ILEA) equalities policies were creating a political context in which such issues could begin to be tackled.

As a result, many public library authorities across the UK introduced children's stock

---

4 see, for example, Davis [1998] which is concerned about the overwhelming of traditional librarianship perspectives, and Tastad [1997] which suggests that concentrating on "political correctness" can lead to controversial materials being omitted from stock (and thus creating mediocrity)

5 Ellis [1997] argues strongly that the literary "canon" is under threat, whilst Friedman and Narveson [1997] put the case for and against.

6 for an early summary of developments, see Vincent [1976].

7 of which I was a member

8 in 1987, the "Other Award" was killed off. There were two key reasons for this: firstly, in order to develop and to continue to respond to public interest, we would have had to obtain sponsorship, and none of us wanted to; and, secondly, in the words of co-founder, Rosemary Stones, "In these Smarties days, it's hard enough to see the books for the plethora of awards getting in the way … it's time to think of new and imaginative ways of winning [the 'other' battles]" [Stones, 1988].

selection policies which encouraged the presentation of positive images (of gender, race and so on) and which also began to be used to reject material which perpetuated stereotypes and other negative images. In addition, some librarians worked with publishers, writers and booksellers to help them produce materials to meet these growing demands.

From these beginnings in children's literature, the idea of discussing and selecting stock for adults also grew, and, following the lead of a handful of pioneering library authorities, work began on developing stock selection policies and criteria. For example, Lambeth developed stock selection policies on particular genres of adult fiction, and began to assess adult stock in ways similar to those used with children's stock [see, for example, Vincent, 1984].

Some writers began to scratch beneath the surface and to move to a deeper level: for example, E Salle [1994] argued that a book should be evaluated first, before looking at the author's culture - only then could the reviewer assess whether the author had transcended her/his cultural beliefs, or succumbed to them.

However, at the same time, there was much vocal opposition to this kind of work, equating it with censorship, for example [Malley, 1990], and, soon, these positive developments were targeted by the "political correctness" smear-campaigns.

Historical background: the forces of opposition gather ...

Whilst all this positive activity was taking place within the world of literature and libraries, the world outside was moving on. Rightly or wrongly, during the 1980s, particularly in London and other metropolitan areas, opposition was growing to what were seen as some of the over-indulgences of "Old Labour", and, at the same time, the Conservative Government embarked on a campaign to attack, ridicule and reduce the powers of local authorities. They were joined in this work by some of the media, so that a campaign built to vilify Labour Councils and their activities as "loony lefties"[9].

One of the tools which they employed was to pick up the negative usage of "political correctness" and to run series of stories criticising local authorities for their "politically correct" stance. As Yasmin Alibhai-Brown [1994] says:

> "Having created the Ultimate Threat, commentators and public figures felt free to let rip with the most rabid and cataclysmic language which they used to describe anything that questioned existing orthodoxies or iniquities."

This was the political basis on which attacks on stock selection (and other parallel activities) were based, and it is now clear that it was essentially a movement to smear local authorities (and thereby weaken their powers), to threaten attempts to introduce rights legislation, and, in the longer term, perhaps to halt some of the advances being made in changing the basic fabric of society.

This was recognised by other writers at the time, such as Terry Sanderson:

> "Now that the loony left is no more, right-wing propagandists have had to find another

---

9 I myself was branded a "loony leftie" in several newspapers in 1985 for writing to a reader to reject a title which she had requested and which Lambeth Library Service had decided not to purchase!

vehicle with which to launch attacks on their 'progressive' enemies. The new bogey is 'political correctness' which is, of course, a close cousin of the loony left. It began last year with a spate of stories about barmy 'left-wing' activities – like the revising of Enid Blyton's books in order to expunge all traces of racism, classism, homophobia and sexism … As a result of the emphasising of these extremes, it is now taken for granted that 'political correctness' is undesirable …" [Sanderson, 1993].

Public libraries were an easy target[10]. They had become high profile (particularly with some of the far-fetched stories circulating about "politically correctness" in some of the London boroughs and the ILEA), and, at the same time, were beginning to become the focus for possible contracting-out moves and/or severe cuts in resources. As a result, there was a spate of stories – true or otherwise - about books that libraries were supposed to have "banned"[11], and, to cope with this unwelcome focus, many libraries simply dropped all their positive stock selection and equalities work - for example:

> "The final area where, it seems to me, libraries are failing is in their adoption and development of Equal Opportunity Policies. I was extremely dismayed, when recently taking part in a debate at the Library Association on qualifications, to be accused by a librarian in the audience of peddling left-wing, trendy rubbish when I mentioned Equal Opportunity Policies." [Vincent, 1991].

In addition, many critics (of libraries, stock selection, equalities) have equated stock selection with censorship, thereby calling down all the threats of "political correctness": a typical example of this trend is:

> "... by the late 1960s, the children's book profession found itself confronting two quite contradictory sets of demands. On the one hand, there was enormous pressure to liberalize children's books ... so that they might better reflect the pluralism of contemporary ... society. At the same time, from the other side of a curious equation came an equally strong pressure on writers, publishers, reviewers, and selectors of children's books to rid the literature of racism and sexism ... It is one of the many ironies ... that more than a few liberals and radicals found themselves with a foot in each camp, demanding freedom in one cause, censorship in another." [Macleod, 1983].

The literary agent, Gina Pollinger (who, incidentally, was given the Eleanor Farjeon Award for her services to children's books last year) spoke at a PEN conference in November 1993 - and then wrote about it in *The Bookseller* [Pollinger, 1993] - equating "political correctness" with censorship. This is, of course, not actually the case: stock <u>selection</u> naturally implies <u>rejection</u>, but this is not at all the same as censorship[12], an issue which library workers are still grappling with in terms of Internet filtering.

One by-product of all this concentration on children's books, "political correctness", and what children should and should not have available to them was the drafting – and passing onto the statute books – of "Clause 28"[13], and it is arguable that this was the final blow for an already weakening position that social issues should be reflected in books, the classroom, and

---

10 see, for example, Waterhouse [1986].

11 for example, there was considerable coverage in some of the broadsheets of a story that Brent Library Service had "banned" 'Tintin' books.

12 space does not permit a lengthier discussion of this. For further information, please see Vincent [1986].

13 for further background on "Clause 28", please see Vincent [1999]; for further information on the goings-on in the London Borough of Haringey, which led to the creation of this legislation, see Cooper [1994].

everyday life for children and young people.

What effect has all this had on libraries? The situation today

There are still people who recognise that, whatever it is called, "political correctness" has its place. For example, Trevor Phillips [2000], referring to a recent report on the portrayal of disabled people, says "Why political correctness is all about respect":

> "... Thirty years ago when they called people like me 'Negroes' and 'coloured' and we said we wanted to be called black, it seemed to me absolutely right even as a child that I should have the right to say how I should be addressed ... Some people looking at this will suggest that this is all a piece of politically correct trivia. I think no one should be defensive about that: we should say absolutely clearly that this is about people's lives and their own self-esteem, their own belief in themselves, and they should have a right to have that respected by journalists ..."

This view is echoed in the work of those who continue to strive to raise awareness of the issues and problems in library materials - for example, Nandini Mane of the Working Group against Racism in Children's Resources, at the Arts Council Conference in 1998:

> "Nandini Mane ... went on to give some specific examples of the images which continue to exist in children's books, and discussed the dangers that these pose: for example, images from *Robinson Crusoe* have been regurgitated in numerous other books. The WGARCR are encouraging those involved with books to consciously decode materials, and to move towards finding new ways of looking at people: this is challenging imagery, not hair-splitting. Whilst some people argue that this is 'political correctness' (in the negative ways that this term is used), they consider this work to be about respect and equality, about taking responsibility for how children are affected." [Arts Council, 1998, p13].

Nevertheless, as Rosemary Stones, one of the founder members of the CRW and the "Other Award", succinctly puts it, there has grown up:

> "... a new social climate of ridicule and alienation around equalities issues which it has become socially acceptable to dismiss as 'political correctness'." [Stones, 1994, p5]

The effect on public libraries has been dramatic. Whilst many still operate stock selection using policy guidelines when choosing materials for children and young people, very few take the same stance when selecting for adults, and this area of work has virtually disappeared. For example, the *Review of the public library service ...* [1995] is very revealing:

> "There was general agreement amongst chief executives, politicians and chief librarians that some of the contentious issues of the 1980s involving, in particular, sexism and racism were not now matters of high debate in terms of library stock holdings." (p128)

and they go on to quote from two "high-level interviews":

> "'*Playboy* and *Penthouse* - there's something a bit demeaning about their view of women, and the stereotyping of women around that. And therefore probably, as a woman, I would quite like to keep that away from as many people as possible until they have actually formed some views from their own parents or other people first, so that the idea of them being very readily

available in a public place, I think, almost suggests that publicly we are reinforcing those stereotypes, that we think that's fine. So it's that sort of issue rather than what's actually in them, I suppose.'"(p128)

"'There were a number of issues that were running around five or ten years ago when unfortunately a number of librarians apparently seemed to abandon their first principles and pander to their own social consciences and try to inflict it on everyone else, and tried to ban all sorts of things. I think we've grown up and grown away from that now. I think the race issue and the sex issue, I think the sex issue is going to settle down and people are going to be more mature. There's still male chauvinism and there's militant feminism. Racism is still going to be an issue. And I would hope, again, maturity would prevail and a certain type of book would just cease to be written.'" (p128)

In her survey of the attitudes of library directors[14] in Canada and the UK, Ann Curry [1997] uncovered some interesting, and ultimately horrifying, attitudes:

"[A] factor noted only by the British directors involves a different kind of 'high' demand: that of special interest groups and council politicians for 'politically correct literature on politically correct themes'. Material dealing with women's and gay/lesbian issues was mentioned specifically in this context. Four directors felt that their libraries were being exploited in a power struggle when they purchased widely and deeply in these areas, only to discover that the people who had demanded specific items were not reading them." (p51)
"Most directors, while agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'positive' homosexual literature should be included in public library collections, feel that positive images should be provided for *all* groups in society and that negative images of homosexuals should also be provided." [emphasis author's own] (p69)

Curry concludes, worryingly, that "Overall, the British appear to be reluctantly compromising services to gays/lesbians to avoid Section 28 prosecution ...", although she is also clear that personal views may have an effect:

"'Sex, politics and religion are things which one keeps to oneself. I have no objection to homosexuality, provided it is kept quiet and out of sight as that sort of thing should be. I object to it being paraded.'" (UK director) (p224)

At the same time, the developments of 'community librarianship' in the 1970s and 1980s were also seen as being part of this "political correctness" movement – and, as such, were regarded by the librarianship 'establishment' as being a threat to the traditional "neutrality" of the public library and to the profession itself. Inevitably, this strengthened opposition to the various aspects of 'community librarianship', and this, coupled with the new, Thatcherite 'market economy' view of libraries of the 1980s and 1990s, meant that it was extremely difficult to continue to select positive stock for and target services towards socially excluded communities.

This situation was made worse by the 'struggle' between 'traditional' library workers – who were predominantly middle-class and upheld middle-class views about libraries, reading and "good books" – and those who wanted the public library to become something different[15].

---

14 the views of 30 UK and 30 Canadian directors were surveyed

15 as John Pateman says: "public library staff are part of the problem rather than the solution … the service is managed and operated by middle class people who share their middle class values with middle class library users." [1999]

Just as in the 1960s, when there had been a real battle over introducing paperbacks into libraries (this was seen as 'cheapening' them, what today would be called "dumbing down"), so there were – and still are – parallel arguments about libraries' providing only "good" books, and that to provide popular material – which might, for example, attract working-class people into libraries – is somehow against the public library ethos. For sure, we would not want to see public libraries full only of bestsellers, but this is a different argument again.

As can be seen from some of the discussion above, there has never been a satisfactory resolution for public libraries of all these conflicts, and this situation is exacerbated by the contradictory messages given by the Library Association's Code of Professional Conduct [1983] which states:

> "… members have an obligation to facilitate the flow of information and ideas and to protect and promote the rights of every individual to have free and equal access to sources of information
> without discrimination and within the limits of the law" (para e)

whilst, at the same time:

> "Members should not knowingly promote material the prime purpose of which is to encourage discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, creed, gender or sexual orientation. It shall not be regarded as promoting such material to divulge it for the purpose of studying the subject of that discrimination." (para g)

Whilst the Library Association is in the process of reassessing all its roles and functions, prior to the amalgamation with the IIS, it would be valuable if it also reviewed the Code to clarify this anomaly.

With the ending of the Net Book Agreement in 1995 and the increase in use of library suppliers as sources of sponsorship and partnership, the relationship between public libraries and their suppliers has radically shifted, and, with "business ethics" to the fore, the active criticism of suppliers and their wares seems to have virtually disappeared. It is therefore particularly disappointing that "political correctness" has pushed back many critics as:

> "Publishers have drawn back from non-sexist and non-racist books, because of the recession ... Publishers are going for safe commercial ventures ... There are fewer titles by new authors and fewer with black children taking the main roles" [*The Bookseller*, 1995].

Safety may sell, but it also means the perpetuation of racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, handicapism and all the other negative images of people which we had hoped to halt back in the 1980s.

Conclusions

As can be seen, there is a great deal of misinformation about "political correctness", particularly in relation to library stock selection. As I wrote in 1986:

> "These comments confuse the right to intellectual freedom with the damage that some materials do: how can intellectual freedom be achieved at the expense of the rights of women, blacks, gays, working people? It is within this framework that librarians must select stock, and selection cannot be made in isolation. Librarians must select stock in relation to their communities, must have constant contact with their in-library users and non-users in the locality, not just with vocal minorities, but all kinds of people. Gone are the days when librarians can rest back in *their* libraries, waiting for people to come to them; active participation by librarians in the community, and by local people in the library has to develop. Only from the range of contact that this gives can a real picture of the community be drawn, and a start made to direct scarce resources to the priority needs of the locality." [Vincent, 1986]

and 1993:

> "What is required is a re-stating of the principles of stock selection in the context of accountability to the local community … This needs to take the form of a reaffirmation of the principles of community librarianship; a proper national-level debate and adoption of stock selection principles which truly relate to the needs of black people, women, people with disabilities, and so on; a firm opposition to the ridiculing of these initiatives by any destructive forces; and a reclaiming of the true importance of the arguments short-handed as being 'politically correct'." [Vincent, 1993].

I think that both these pieces are equally true today – let's grab the opportunity!

Recommendations

1. investigate the potential value of introducing equalities standards into libraries (similar, for example, to the guidelines produced by OFSTED [1999] for inspecting equalities work)

2. the development of materials selection policies to cover all forms of discrimination and social exclusion

3. ensure that the widest possible range of materials is made available, related to the needs of local communities, including for example promoting the writings of black authors, investigating the supply of stock which may not be easily available

4. training, both in areas of service delivery and stock awareness, including the development of staff training to combat all forms of discrimination and social exclusion

5. the Library Association and local government organisations to press for the (re)introduction of equalities policies into all local authorities, and to ensure that, as part of developing a positive action programme, a materials selection policy is

included within this

6. the Library Association to reassess the Code of Professional Conduct in the light of the contradictions outlined above

7. the Library Association and other bodies to combat the erroneous information given about "political correctness"

8. consideration to be given to the introduction of an award, similar to the "Other Award", in recognition of materials which present positive images[16].

References

Alibhai-Brown, Y. (1994), "The great backlash" in Dunant, S. (editor) (1994), *The war of the words: the political correctness debate*. London: Virago, pp55-75.

Annette, J. (1994), "The culture wars on the American campus" in Dunant, S. (editor) (1994), *The war of the words: the political correctness debate*. London: Virago, pp1-14.

Arts Council of England. (1998), *Reading for Life: the Arts Council's National Conference for the promotion of literature in public libraries*.

Asheim, L. (1983), "Selection and censorship: a reappraisal" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 58 (3) November, pp180-4.

The Bookseller (1995), "Schools can't afford books for revised national curriculum, says EPC" 21 April.

Brennan, T. (1997), "Foreword" to Feldstein, R. (1997), *Political correctness: a response from the Cultural Left*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cooper, D. (1994), *Sexing the city: lesbian and gay politics within the activist state*. London: Rivers Oram Press.

Curry, A. (1997), *The limits of tolerance: censorship and intellectual freedom in public libraries*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press.

Davis, D.G. (1998), "Wars in American libraries: ideological battles in the selection of materials" *Libraries & Culture* 33 (1) Winter, pp40-6.

D'Souza, D. (1991), *Illiberal education: the politics of race and sex on campus*. New York: Free Press.

Dunant, S. (editor) (1994), *The war of the words: the political correctness debate*. London: Virago.

Ellis, J.M. (1997), *Literature lost: social agendas and the corruption of the humanities*. New

---

16 a similar recommendation in relation to materials for lesbians, gay men, bisexuals and transgendered people arose from the Arts Council Conference, *Reading for Life*, in 1998 (and was noted in Vincent [1999]).

Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Feldstein, R. (1997), *Political correctness: a response from the Cultural Left*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Friedman, J. and Narveson, J. (1997), *Political correctness: for and against*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

"Have I got new for you" (2000), BBC-TV, transmitted 5 May.

Hill, J. (editor) (1971), *Books for children: the homelands of immigrants*. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Khesumaba (1999), "Ragga Gal" [review of the exhibition, 'Materialistic Gal', by artist Kamala] *Black Media Journal* no.1 Winter, pp52-3.

Kimball, R. (1991), *Tenured radicals: how politics has corrupted our higher education*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Library Association (1983), *The Library Association's Code of Professional Conduct*. London: Library Association. (accessed on the LA Website http://www.la-hq.org.uk/directory/about/conduct.html 10 May 2000).

Macleod, A.S. (1983), "Censorship and children's literature" *Library Quarterly* 53 (1) January, pp26-38.

McRae, H. (2000), "It's a shame, but there is no way to protect jobs in the old economy" *The Independent* The Thursday Review 23 March, p4.

Malley, I. (1990), *Censorship and libraries*. London: Library Association (Viewpoints in LIS 5).

Manly, W. (1993), "Does intellectual freedom protect the politically incorrect?" *American Libraries* 24 (11) December, pp1003-4.

OFSTED (1999), *Inspecting subjects and aspects 11-18: equal opportunities*. London: Office for Standards in Education.

Pateman, J. (1999), *Public libraries and social class*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University (Public Library Policy and Social Exclusion Working Paper no.3).

Phillips, T. (2000), "Why political correctness is all about respect" *The Independent* The Tuesday Review, 14 March, p4.

Pollinger, G. (1993), "Give the Devil his big D" *The Bookseller* 4590 10 December, pp20-1.

Review of the public library service in England and Wales for the Department of National Heritage (1995), London: ASLIB.

Roiphe, K. (c1993), *The morning after: sex, fear and feminism on campus*. Boston, Mass: Little, Brown & Co.

Salle, E. (1994), "Ethnicity and authenticity, or: how Black (Hispanic, Native American, etc) do I gotta be?" *Emergency Librarian* 22 (2) November-December, pp22-7.

Sanderson, T. (1993), "Media Watch" column *Gay Times*, April.

Stones, R. (1994), "I din do nuttin ... to Gregory Cool" *Books for Keeps* 88, September.

Tastad, S.A. (1997), "Censoring by omission: has the United States progressed in promoting diversity through children's books?" *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries* 10 (4) Summer, pp399-404.

Vincent, J. (1976), "Bias in children's books" *Assistant Librarian* 69 (4) April, pp68-70.

Vincent, J. (1984), "Multicultural library services in the London Borough of Lambeth" *Assignation* 1 (3) April, pp6-7.

Vincent, J. (1986), "Censorship and selection in public libraries" in Dixon, J. (editor) (1986), *Fiction in libraries*. London: Library Association (Handbooks on Library Practice), pp127-134.

Vincent, J. (1991), "Meeting information needs for 1992 and beyond" [an edited version of the talk given at the Community Services Group conference, "Librarians for Cultural Diversity", part of "Under One UmbrelLA", Leeds 6 July 1991, unpublished].

Vincent, J. (1993), "A broken heart?" *Assistant Librarian* 86 (7) July, pp98-9.

Vincent, J. (1999), *Lesbians, bisexuals, gay men and transgendered people*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University (Public Library Policy and Social Exclusion Working Paper no.5).

Waterhouse, K. (1986), "Book-banning is like having Squeers in charge of a holiday camp …" *Daily Mail* 20 November.

Wilson, J. (1995), *Myth of political correctness: the conservative attack on higher education*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.