"Priorities of Arrangement" or a "Hierarchy of Oppressions?": Perspectives on Intersectionality in Knowledge Organization

Melodie J. Fox

310 W. Wisconsin Ave. Suite 500E, Milwaukee, WI 53203, USA,
<melodie.j.fox@gmail.com>

Melodie J. Fox holds a PhD in information studies from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's School of Information Studies. She holds an MLIS, also from UWM, and an MA in English from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her research interests include epistemology and the social consequences of classification, particularly with gender and race.

Fox, Melodie J. 2016. "'Priorities of Arrangement' or a 'Hierarchy of Oppressions?': Perspectives on Intersectionality in Knowledge Organization." *Knowledge Organization* 43: 373-383. 60 references.

Abstract: The hallmark of Hope Olson's work has been to use a different set of analytical tools to examine our knowledge organization systems from humanistic, feminist, and philosophical angles. These perspectives have led to the uncovering of many instances and types of bias that lead to the marginalization of human groups. An important phenomenon her work has illuminated is intersectionality, a concept that arose from identity studies but has a literal embodiment in knowledge organization environments. Intersectionality describes the transformative, interlocking, and conflicting oppressions that occur when humans belong to more than one identity category. The concept arose with black women (but is not restricted to women) and has since extended to different variables beyond gender and race, such as sexual orientation, national origin, or able-bodiedness. In knowledge organization systems, mutual exclusivity, linearity, and hierarchy prohibit an easy solution for intersectional topics. Topics can be structurally or semantically misrepresented or erased. This article builds upon Olson's research to provide theoretical context from identity studies, further examples from knowledge organization, and describes some of the proposed methods of managing intersectionality.

Received: 2 March 2016; Revised: 25 April 2016; Accepted 25 April 2016

Keywords: intersectionality, Hope Olson, categories, knowledge organization, women, oppression, identities

1.0 Introduction

Audre Lorde (1984, 112) famously described the dilemma of addressing systemic racism and sexism by writing, "*For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house*. They may temporarily allow us to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change" (emphasis in the original). In knowledge organization, Hope Olson not only has been instrumental in identifying the studs and joists that make up the master's house of knowledge organization, but also by applying a different set of analytical tools—humanistic, linguistic, and philosophical, to name a few—to show that by hijacking and subverting the master's tools, we can (Olson 2001a, 660) "renovate the master's house to make space for the voices of excluded others." Her work has helped us view the knowledge organization landscape differently through identifying the systemic barriers embedded in our systems: our Western, Aristotelian, hierarchical thinking (Olson 1999, 2007); sexist language and ethnocentricism (Olson 1998, 1999); the cultural baggage that accompanies concepts (Olson 2001c, 2004); our masculine metaphors (Olson 2001b, 2004); the structural rules that lead to dead ends and topic ghettos (Olson and Schlegl 2001, Olson 2001b), all in the service of increasing access to marginalized voices while minimizing conceptual and structural oppression. Without Olson's work, many instances of oppression would have gone without notice, "embedded in unquestioned norms, habits, and symbols, in the assumptions underlying institutional rules and the

collective consequences of following those rules" (Young 1990, 41).

Olson's work clearly demonstrates the value of philosophical investigation and ethical examination in LIS, bringing not only the study of epistemology to knowledge organization (1996), but also the notion of different ways of thinking from humanistic and feminist perspectives. Her concern is not just the "what" of what ails knowledge organization systems, but rather the "how" (the "why" tends to be rather obvious, but she addresses that too). She recognizes that "classifications are created by the most powerful discourses in society" and that these methods "discover the processes by which powerful and privileged discourses shape information" (1997, 234). These processes are where she takes creative and ethical disruptive stances (as opposed to disruption for the sake of monetary profit) to encourage new ways of thinking and addressing these systemic barriers in order to lead to substantive change. Olson's work has always been underscored by the essential question of whether we want a useful classification or an accurate classification, with the recognition that neither is a perfect classification, and the best we can strive for ultimately will be a combination of the two that will require constant maintenance at both system and local levels.

Olson's favorite quotation from Trinh Min-ha (1989, 94), "despite all our desperate, eternal attempts to separate, contain and mend, categories always leak," exemplifies the instability and imperfection of reality and the consequent Sisyphusian challenge of knowledge organization. Olson dedicated her career to addressing leaky categories and the consequences of mopping aberrant instantiations back into their containers, as well as seeking alternatives and workarounds for the standard limiting discourses that mesh to contain mutually exclusive concepts.

A categorization concern she has addressed in knowledge organization that also has presence in feminist and identity studies is intersectionality, or the notion of belonging to one or more identity categories, in particular those that result in oppression or marginalization. Though she did not call it by name, Olson has addressed specifically intersectionality's manifestations in knowledge organization, which, because of the unforgiving linearity of library shelves, results in leaky, overlapping, or disappearing categories. Intersectionality is related to any concept complexity with which knowledge organization struggles; however, because of the sensitivity of classing human groups it holds not only the potential to misrepresent, but also to marginalize them. I will introduce the concept of intersectionality from an identity studies perspective and then relate intersectionality to LIS broadly and knowledge organization and Olson's work in this area specifically. I will describe some ways that scholars in identity studies have attempted to address intersectionality and how their ideas relate to KO, and finally I will conclude with recommendations for action, culled from Olson's legacy of the ethical engagement with KO research and practice.

2.0 Intersectionality

2.1 Origins

During the second wave of the women's movement, poststructuralists and French feminists began to criticize the notion of categorization, particularly the binary and immutable nature of categories. Concurrently, minority women increasingly found that the feminism of white, affluent women did not speak to their experiences. The dominant viewpoint of white feminists ignored the plurality of oppressions caused by other sources of power, including race, class, or sexual orientation, erasing significant differences in experience and privilege. Rich (1979, 299) called this blindness the "white solipsism" of feminist theory and described it as the tendency to "think, imagine, and speak as if whiteness described the world." Lugones (Lugones and Spelman 1995, 497) later called this alienation "the complaint of exclusion, of silencing, of being included in a universe we have not chosen." The Combahee River Collective, a group of black feminists, wrote in their 1977 manifesto (2003, 166) that "we find it difficult to separate race from class from sex oppressions because in our lives they are most often experienced simultaneously," and black women described (King 1997, 43) their experiences in "dual and systematic discriminations of racism and sexism." The various struggles cannot be separated or compartmentalized because they mutually construct each other. This multidimensional system of interconnected oppression is known as "intersectionality." Intersectionality describes interlocking inequalities that lead to systemic oppression. McCall (2005, 1771) calls intersectionality probably "the most important theoretical contribution that women's studies … has made so far."

Oppression in general has been articulated in identity studies for some time. Though many nuanced types of oppression have been described, generally it can be said (Young 1990, 40), "oppressed people suffer some inhibition of their ability to develop and exercise their capacities and express their needs, thoughts, and feelings." Oppression can result in consequences from inadvertent discrimination to harassment to violence or death, solely resulting from membership in a human group. In KO, oppression can occur in classification, categorization and linguistic representation, and (Young 1990, 41) "injustices some groups suffer as a consequence of often unconscious assumptions of well-meaning people." Knowledge organization systems, according to research—much of it Olson's—treat users as a homogenous group who would search the

same way (Olson 2001a), scatter topics rather than gathering (Olson 2001b, Intner and Futas 1996), create hostile spaces by grouping unlike items (Fox 2014b, 2016), and use insulting terminology (Berman 1971). These have been identified through Olson and Schlegl's (2001) meta-analysis of bias in knowledge organization systems and built upon by Adler and Tennis (2013) in their taxonomy of harm. Intersectional harms relate to many of the above but will be specifically outlined below.

Intersectionality is transformative, not additive, in that it does not merely pile up oppressions but creates a new manifestation. King (1997, 47) argues that the assumption that "each discrimination has a single, direct, and independent effect" on women's status, "ignore[s] the fact that racism, sexism, and classism constitute three, interdependent control systems." Each identity category cannot be pulled apart like jigsaw pieces. Alcoff and Potter (1993, 3 emphasis in the original) argue that gender can never be extricated from its surroundings:

> Gender as a category of analysis cannot be abstracted from a particular context while other factors are held stable; gender can never be observed as a "pure" or solitary influence. Gender identity cannot be adequately understood—or even *perceived*—as a component of complex interrelationships with other systems of identification and hierarchy.

Simply put, people cannot separate various aspects of their identities, despite the messiness and inconvenience this causes for researchers and classifiers. Nash (2008, 10) believes that scholars need to develop "a nuanced conception of identity that recognizes the ways in which positions of dominance and subordination work in complex and intersecting ways to constitute subjects' experiences of personhood." In other words, how do multiply-identifying people use their identities—do they invoke "womanness" separately from "blackness" or invoke "black womanness," which is something entirely different?

Rather than examining or fighting each system of discrimination separately, intersectionality theorists look at the space where the various oppressions intersect and often conflict with each other. Crenshaw (1997, 116) defines three types of intersectionality: structural intersectionality confounds policies directed at "pure" groups without considering people who possess multiple markers; political intersectionality is for identities located within conflicting political groups, such as when black women must fight sexism with white women, but racism with black men. Finally, representational intersectionality occurs when intersectional identities are devalued because of cultural imagery, such as through the use of phrases like "welfare queens."

2.2 New manifestations of intersectionality

Traditionally, intersectionality referred specifically to the juncture of gender and race, originating with treatment of black women, but recent frameworks have included a variety of variables such as age (Taefi 2009), disability (Cramer and Plummer 2009), single motherhood (Utrata 2011), health (Hankivsky and Christoffersen 2008), developmental issues (Williams 2009), citizenship status (Romero 2008), as well as postcolonial status, and religious belief (or lack) depending on the originating culture and then applied to specific contexts, such as healthcare, social work and education. Anzaldúa (2008) addresses the cultural intersectionality experienced by mixed race people or others in the intersection of multiple cultures, calling the dual consciousness as a queer *mestiza* "the Borderlands," which again implies a transformation rather than separation. The concepts of "hybridity" or plural identities (Shields 2008, 305) describe the new culture that arises at a point of intersection.

2.3 Intersectionality in whiteness

Intersectionality does not always occur between gender and race, and in some ways represents the complexity in which we live. Alcoff (1998, para. 15) points out that even "whiteness has always been fractured by class, gender, sex, ethnicity, age, and able-bodiedness. The privileges whiteness bestowed were differentially distributed and were also simply different." For example (Calhoun 1994), lesbian, feminist, and trans scholars disagree on goals and do not consider their work interchangeable merely because they are groups of women or because they address sex and gender discrimination. The oppression that white lesbians experience as women intersects with discrimination of heteronormativity; lesbians of color are subjected to a different burden (Martínez-Ávila, Fox and Olson 2012). Gender and sex and can also intersect in queer, trans, and intersex identities and bodies, which lead to different oppressions.

3.0 Intersectionality in knowledge organization

Of Crenshaw's three types of intersectionality, the most relevant to knowledge organization are representational and structural intersectionalities as the structural rendition relates to classification principles and the representational type relates to semantics and preferred terms. The connotations of intersectional identities, real or unreal, result in limited agency and freedom, which can result in invisibility or misrepresentation.

3.1 Structural intersectionality

Knowledge organization struggles with singular identity categories already, particularly with classification, where the linearity of the library shelf and multiple identities pool to complicate matters. Spelman (1988) provides a metaphor for intersectionality that is an apt analog for what occurs in KO. She imagines classification as a hypothetical custom hall, with doors for such categories as "men," "Asian-American," and "lower-class." Groups are forced to enter through specific doorways, and end up getting scattered, depending on the order of the specific traits (also cited in Olson 2001b, 653). Mutual exclusivity requires classification to treat intersectional identities additively, resulting in what Olson (2001b, 654) calls "a hierarchy of oppressions."

Olson realizes Spelman's metaphor by demonstrating how *DDC*'s 305 category (Social Groups) treats intersectionality by adding facets to a base number. The base number represents the first door through which people walk, and the facet order then dictates in what directions the groups will be scattered. Olson (2001c, 119, 120) points out that the base number is not always formulated with the same idea of sameness, either. In other words, "we do not always want to choose what the citation order gives us," which results in "a system that works for much of the mainstream status quo, but … is not usually effective for that which is marginalized or even slightly outside of a disciplinary discourse." Audre Lorde, who appeared at the opening of this piece, is an apt referent, because as a black feminist lesbian, her identity lies at the intersection of at least three identity categories. Is she a feminist lesbian black, a lesbian feminist black, a black lesbian feminist? Through which door would she enter first? The citation order matters (Olson 2001c, 119), as the rules for application are so strict and limiting that facets must be omitted, meaning that components of identity are erased.

A historical example of how arcane facet rules can cause erasure occurs in the *DDC*'s "Priorities of Arrangement" section of the instructions, which provides guidance for cases of intersectionality *(DDC* 17 1965, 14):

> You may have a book on labor by aged Negro women slaves; should you class it in 331.398, 331.4, 331.582, or 331.639 6? The instruction under centered heading 331.3-331.6 tells you, by a table of precedence, to use 331.398. Now, suppose your book is on night work by aged Negro women: 331.398 or 331.81? The first note under 331.3-331.6 specifies that work periods of special classes of workers belong there, but, if you happen to arrive first at 331.81, you will find at 331.8 an instruction to class the topics that follow in relation to special classes of workers in 331.3-331.6.

The choices offered above lead to the following classes, indicating that no option exists to reflect all parts:

> Special classes of workers/women
> Special classes of workers/aged
> Special classes of workers/slaves
> Special classes of workers/native-born, nonindigenous ethnic groups/Negros

The instructions then assert "Either way, the *correct* number is 331.398" (emphasis mine), which is "Special classes of workers/aged." The "correct" class omits three important characteristics—woman, black, slave—that affect the perception of the topic: and not to mention characterizes slaves as "workers." These affect the visibility and perception users have of the items when they access the library catalogs. Consequently, users may assume the missing components are nonexistent or assign disproportionate importance to the topics most readily found. A fixed citation order is still linear and thus requires characteristics to appear in order, which implies some kind of value judgment. In this case, the citation order values age and vocation over gender or race.

3.2 Representational intersectionality

Although intersectionality can only be addressed additively in classification by adding facets, thesauri can include ready-made intersectional categories. In some cases, the intersection is a named place (i.e. Lesbians) or coordinated (Older African-American Women). Nonetheless, even literary warrant does not mean all intersectional locations will be accurate, which is an example of representational intersectionality. De la tierra (2008, 95) found that "Despite established usage … Latina lesbians,' and 'Chicana lesbians' aren't official subject headings," but the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* does include Hispanic American Lesbians and Mexican American Lesbians, which de la tierra loathes, "because [Hispanic] is 'their' word for 'us'" (96). Also, because of pre-coordinated subject heading strings, sometimes the intersectional location is present but deconstructed. For example, a work could include the following subject headings but without "Hispanic Lesbians" together in one heading: American literature--Hispanic American authors--History and criticism and Lesbians' writings, American--History and criticism. De la tierra (2008) found, too, that unless the intersectional identities are clear from the title, catalogers often miss them.

4.0 Approaches to intersectionality

McCall (2005) characterizes the reactions to intersectionality as reactions to categorization in general, and these

are similar to stances taken within KO research, which generally mirror the epistemic views toward categories.

4.1 Anticategorical complexity

Anticategorical complexity takes a critical view of categories, if not all out rejection, arguing (McCall 2005, 1773) that the messiness of reality is "too irreducibly complex—overflowing with multiple and fluid determinations of both subjects and structures—to make fixed categories anything but simplifying social fictions that produce inequalities in the process of producing differences." The underlying apprehension of essentialism drives these postmodern stances. Essentialism, or (Grosz 1994, 84) "the existence of fixed characteristics, given attributes, and ahistorical functions that limit the possibilities of change and thus social reorganization" is a limiting discourse that leads to fears of determinism. Grosz (1994, 89) breaks essentialism down into biologism, or the beliefs that create "biologically established limits," such as strength or emotion; naturalism, a belief that asserts a "fixed nature," often established by some sort of authority, such as a god or Freud; and universalism, or "socially-based requirements." The concept of essentialism tends to split scholars, as some feminists believe that no essential qualities exist for women or any human group, and others believe that the essential qualities exist but may be misidentified in order to oppress. Those who reject the possibility of losing "woman" as a unit of analysis but are unwilling to accept eternal, immutable Aristotelian essences, have tinkered with the concept of essences and the definition of essentialism. Some have chosen Lockian essences that are provisional and nominal, using such terms as "strategic" or "tactical" essentialism (for example, Spivak 1988, who then recanted in 1993). Similarly, Campbell (2000, 127) notes, "gay communities and gay theorists are split between essentialist and constructivist theories of homosexuality." Intersectional categories, too, can be considered essentialist. Treating cultural identity as singular and pure traits can also alienate users who identify with multiple nationalities or races.

Anticategorical stances directly oppose any kind of labeling or categorization, but without it, those who argue for rights do not have an organizing category to gain political traction and more practically, protection, as reflected by Downs's 1993 article, "If 'Woman' is Just an Empty Category, Then Why am I Afraid to Walk Alone at Night?" Furner (2007, 150) puts opposition to anticategorical complexity into terms of social justice: it would be fine to get rid of categories if goods were distributed equally, but reality reveals the "persistent monopolization of both economic and cultural goods by particular groups distinguished on the basis of class, race, [and] gender." Feminists of color (McCall 2005, 1779) tend to take a similar view as Furner in that a critique of categories "does not necessitate a total rejection of the social reality of categorization" but rather an examination of it, which results in what McCall calls "intracategorical" intersectionality.

4.2 Intracategorical complexity

In the middle of the continuum, intracategorical approaches exhibit less skepticism about the existence of categories, recognizing the utility of them while closely scrutinizing the process of creating categories rather than rejecting them out of hand. KO researchers who lean toward social constructivism generally take this stance. Olson (2001a, 2), uses an anticategorical tool, poststructuralism, because it "rejects the existence of absolute, singular truths or realities, making it an appropriate critical apparatus" for questioning classification. But she uses it to interrogate the process of boundary-making, through such analytical lenses as Cornell's philosophy of the limit and feminist deconstruction, characteristic of an intracategorical approach.

Intracategorial renditions of intersectionality research approach it from a structural level and look not at the groups themselves but the systems that put them in groups. Garry (2011), for example, draws inspiration from Wittgenstein's "family resemblance,"—commonly invoked in knowledge organization—where the identities may "resemble" each other, but the need to describe groups precisely is eliminated. In KO literature, Wittgenstein is often cited because his theories of meaning and language can relate to KO on several places on the epistemological continuum. He rejects the representational claim that language consists only of words that represent objects. Instead, language can only be understood in the context that it is being used, and each context makes up a nebulous concept that he calls a language-game. Language games, although never clearly defined, relate to the idea that meaning is made in context, and all fields (Kelly 2004, 127-8) have their own context and play. His discussion of family resemblance often is used in formulating definitions of "works" and "texts" (e.g. Blair 1990, Frohmann 2004). Fox (2011) proposed its descendant, prototype theory, for categorizing sex and gender. Similarly to language games, Garry (2011, 839) believes that "although there is nothing—neither a property, an experience, nor an interest—that all women have in common, we know what a woman is and who women are because of crisscrossing, overlapping characteristics that are clear within social contexts."

Garry (2011, 841) believes that the family resemblance alleviates the fragmentation that occurs as groups of women become "black women" or "lesbians" or "Latina lesbians," so that "because we are women in virtue of the

crisscrossing resemblances, similarities, reasons for places in the hierarchies of power, possible relations to reproduction, and so on." Furthermore, family resemblance can accommodate cases of ambiguous sex and borderland cases, which prevents the need to specifically conceptualize multiple genders. However, it appears Garry only refers to intersectional identities that include woman, with the goal of defining "woman." This works if woman is the category in question. However, whatever the chosen thread, that thread will always be the privileged descriptor even if the location is intersectional. This method treats oppression additively in that the non-gendered oppression rides on the coattails of some ostensibly more important quality. For example, the thread representing "woman" may include women of color, transgender women, infertile women, or poor women, but the condition "women" is always privileged over any other descriptor. Again in KO, we are back to citation order of facets. If a solution could be found, similar to integrative levels of reality, where the emphasis can shift depending on the context, this configuration could work. Perhaps the intersectional "threads" could be visualized through a classificatory web structure as envisioned by Olson (1998).

4.3 Categorical approach

The final approach that McCall (2005, 1786) outlines, intercategorical complexity, "focuses on the complexity of relationship among multiple social groups within and across analytical categories and not on complexities within single social groups, single categories, or both." This approach sees categorization as inevitable and takes a comparative approach between the categories. This seems to be the approach that knowledge organization takes presently, where the identity categories maintain their purity and are treated additively. McCall (2005, 1786) asks whether these stances "can adequately respond to legitimate, and often quite fatal, critiques of the homogenizing and simplifying dangers of category-based research," yet in KO, this approach has not proved fatal at all. The origins of our modern idea of bibliographic control and the tools of knowledge organization originated with Bacon, Hegel, Cutter, Dewey, Bliss, Richardson, Ranganathan, et al.—all men, and men who lived in particular historical moments. In the United States, the abolition of slavery, the Civil Rights Movement, voting rights legislation, and wider acceptance of different lifestyles have all contributed to a shift in attitudes toward race, gender, class, sexual orientation and ethnicity. Many researchers have recognized that the archaic, nineteenth-century subject representation, location and collocation practices of bibliographic control harms users, yet we still follow the fundamental structures.

5.0 Proposed solutions to intersectionality

As intersectionality has become more of a fixture within gender and race studies, more and more work has grappled with the methodological difficulties presented by the conflict between the need for categorization and resistance to it. So how can intersectionality be studied and addressed in an environment favoring anticategorical, postmodern epistemologies? Intersectional structural barriers have countless opportunities to occur in the OPAC: as a user meets the Western-style, Aristotelian classification; through copy-cataloged records created by a cataloger across the country with no knowledge of local practices and culture; through the literary warrant of limited collections, through cataloger's judgment, and many more ways. Various attempts to address intersectional locations exist, and some proposed solutions from within and without KO are described and discussed here.

5.1 Universalizing solutions

The idea of universalization is fraught with peril in knowledge organization, despite that it makes up the foundation of bibliographic control. On one hand, a standard must maintain its integrity; however, the dismissal of local adaptations in favor of universality only undermines the credibility of the standard to represent those who use it. Olson (2001a, 26) reminds us that "universality is a powerful discourse in organization of knowledge for retrieval and it governs our work with a firm, but largely invisible, hand." In terms of intersectionality, however, the idea of universality relates less to having concepts represented as universal truth and more to keeping broad umbrella categories rather than creating specific microclasses for intersectional categories. In other words, the classes would maintain the categorical approach, as outlined by McCall, hoping that the universalization addresses and reduces limiting discourses.

5.1.1 Structural intersectionality and the notion of freedom

A key to forming an ethical relationship with the Other is ensuring agency. Einspahr (2010) differentiates freedom and agency in demonstrating how structural intersectionality oppresses. With agency, one can make choices, but there may be subtle or insidious limitations of which one may not be aware within a restricted space. Real freedom means having not only agency, but also choosing and acting independently of limiting discourses that occur at a structural level. This hearkens back to Foucault (1995) in that multiple discourses, in the form of the state, self, and others intersect to maintain discipline and limit options for behav-

ior. The rules and regulations that allow institutions to function turn people into what Foucault (136) calls "docile bodies," who can be "used, subjected, transformed and improved." Einspahr (2010, 16) too, recognizes the contradicting products of structures, in that they both "enable and constrain, produce and restrict," which explains an individual's ability to affect or sustain an institution that oppresses another. Even if the oppression is recognized, Foucault (146) writes that discipline "individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations." In other words, the dominant structures prevent individuals from uniting so they cannot rise up against the structures that oppress them. Einspahr (2010, 12) recognizes how actors themselves can replicate and perpetuate those same structures by:

> Calling attention to the non-neutral nature of being in a position to enjoy the social goods produced by inequality; it is centred not on the individual and her choices but instead on the ways in which social actors are systematically positioned in relation to the structures that enable and constrain us in our collective lives.

Some may experience the limiting discourses differently, which is why the idea of enumerating and defining group memberships loses its relevance. The point becomes in some way that freedom is limited, no matter what combination of privilege and oppression one possesses.

Einspahr (2010) for one, suggests that the conditions or practices that lead to any oppression can be eliminated or revised, which prevents these oppressions from being enumerated in the first place. To address this conflict, she shifts the focus of intersectionality from how the groups identify themselves onto the dominant structures in place, which widens the pool of marginalized people without specifying identities. As Young (1990, 41) points out, structural oppression "need not have a correlate oppressing group," but historically speaking, intersecting power structures have been called "patriarchy" and sourced back to overt and covert systems by which men maintain cultural, political and economic dominance. However, patriarchy tends to be portrayed as one-sided and crushing, whereas in Einspahr's revision, structural intersectionality emphasizes interaction with the systems, which means people can also be implicated in their own oppression. Certainly Foucault (1980, 198) has demonstrated how power can be maintained through networks of discourses, as he writes that it does not emanate from one source, but "in reality power means relations, a more-or-less organised, hierarchical, co-ordinated cluster of relations."

MacKinnon also sees categories as discursively created but as relics of a particular moment. She writes (2013, 1023), "Categories and stereotypes and classifications are authentic instruments of inequality. And they are static and hard to move. But they are the ossified outcomes of the dynamic intersection of multiple hierarchies, not the dynamic that creates them," meaning that times can change without the classifications changing. Similarly, Nash (2008, 13) suggests looking at intersections as processes that inform each other—examining how power structures "utilize differing technologies of categorization and control, disciplining bodies in distinctive ways, and coalescing (or colliding) in particular formation in certain historical, social, cultural, representation, legal, and technological moments." An example of how this occurs in KO can be found in Fox (2014b, in press) on the treatment of women, trans, and intersex people in the *DDC* and legal and medical discourses at certain points in time.

5.3 Minoritizing solutions

If universality elides difference, minoritizing views narrow groups to accommodate specific intersectional groups. As the number of intersectional categories increases, so does the specificity, which brings up more methodological and logistical problems of how to cater to each specific population. Campbell (2000, 123) has suggested "community-based" classifications that arise from the actual user's communities, but Campbell wonders if a standard vocabulary schema even exists for all types of homosexual experience, and indeed, a library needs assessment (Beiriger and Jackson 2007, 51) conducted with the trans community in Portland resulted in 61 unique gender and sex descriptors, which may or may not have included intersectional identities.

One fleetingly popular attempt to supplement bibliographic control has been through social tagging either in OPACs or on web pages. Social tagging, of course, is unregulated with uneven and inconsistent participation and may not reach the community that needs the input. Domain analysis (Hjørland 2004, 18), which treats users as "belonging to different cultures, social structures and … communities that share common languages, genres and other typified communication practices" is another proposed option that has met with acceptance in the field. However, by definition, domain analysis caters to prescribed domains, and thus has limited effectiveness for general collections, and moreover, identity categories such as gender and race relate to many human activities and have relevance across collections and domains.

6.0 Conclusion: What to do?

A lack of viable models makes addressing intersectionality in a literal library environment difficult. Once the intersection is identified, what should be done? No one has come up with an adequate answer to this question quite yet. KO is unusual in that the very realization of intersectionality occurs in subject headings and classification. Yet no overarching method of addressing intersectional identities exists other than faceting and literary warrant, which still can be done structurally or representatively inconsistently, as the examples of "aged Negro woman slaves" and "Hispanic lesbians" show.

Olson acknowledges (2001b, 660) that in knowledge organization, "the scale of change would be massive if systems were totally replaced," but solutions for specific problems can be implemented locally, which reduces the universality of the standard but increases local control (2001c). Olson's suggestions for ameliorative change are not to wipe everything out and start fresh, but rather to exercise an "ethical relation" with the Other by making our systems permeable through a different and creative arsenal of philosophical, postcolonial, technological and feminist methodological tools that always relate to practice. Since no model exists for tearing down the master's house, below are some ways she recommends (2001a, 22) we do some "serious redecorating."

6.1 Participation and collaboration

The first step toward change is in providing feedback to our systems or what Olson calls (Fox and Olson 2013, 55) "constructive complaining." Rather than be victimized by the structures, use what agency exists to help to break down and recreate them, even if it means building a ladder over them with minor changes at a local level that increase access for users. Einspahr (2010, 17), too, sees the only way as "participat[ing] in the processes of social construction and 'rule-making.'" Rather than merely identifying where particular groups are victimized, everyone gets involved in working out a better system. They revise and collaborate together, exercising an ethic of care that focuses on solutions.

For standardization to be successful, a broad array of perspectives must be represented, and the feedback must come from the stakeholders as well as the administrators of the standard. The lack of user input reifies a self-reinforcing, privileged viewpoint, like being barred from the political process. Thus, the oppressed groups would need to get involved with the creation and maintenance of the standards and processes even if the discursive superstructures may not fully welcome change. Einspahr (2010, 12) recognizes the difficulty of including a representative voice to every intersectional location. She writes, "Can one person (or a group) substitute his or her judgment for that of an 'other' (or 'other' group), and have this condition supported institutionally?" In order to ensure ethical use of the views of the oppressed person, a utilitarian ethic of J.S. Mill can be employed, where "the judgment of the reflective person of experience" can guide the process where oppression limits participation (Fox and Reece 2012, 379). Participation requires a certain amount of activism that may not be possible in some contexts, but with sensitivity and outreach an expert can assist.

Olson also recognizes the need for collaboration between humanistic and technical approaches to bring about change. She characterizes technology not as a masculine tool, but one that "wear[s] a masculine face" that can be applied innovatively (2001b, 661, 559). For example, Ward and Olson (1998) mapped *A Women's Thesaurus* to the *DDC* to provide a user-group-created crosswalk that could be adapted to use in other contexts. She also recommends (Olson 2001a, 2) using technology in "mundane but subversive ways" which can mean subtle changes meant to decentralize control rather than ceding it to a central, universalist power.

6.2 Teach

Finally, for those who teach, teach critical viewpoints at every level, not just at the doctoral level. Though some might find it risky beginning an introductory organization of information course with epistemology, Olson realized that without this foundational understanding of nature of knowledge, students would have difficulty comprehending viewpoints beyond their lived experience, an imperative for serving the mission of the library (Fox 2014a). Privilege is powerful and deafening, and it infiltrates and creates so many of our systems. LIS students at all levels must cast a discerning eye at these systems, which at times this requires thinking differently—using an imaginative set of tools. Olson's research is characterized by her erudite and elegant writing, her gift for metaphor, her generosity and wit, and of course, her intellectual bravery and brilliance. As in her research, in the classroom she applied her novel thinking to mine hurricane classifications, weaving principles, shushing librarians, beer ontologies, feng shui, T.S. Eliot's poem *The Naming of Cats*, and anything she could find for their instructive nuggets. Though Hope's influence on scholars and researchers is surely measureable through bibliometric algorithms, her greater imprint on knowledge organization and library and information science broadly is largely immeasurable. Her lessons have been internalized by legions of former students, guiding them to practice librarianship with empathy, sensibility, practicality, and care.

References

Adler, Melissa and Joseph T. Tennis. 2013. "Toward a Taxonomy of Harm in Knowledge Organization Systems." *Knowledge Organization* 40:266-72.

Alcoff, Linda. M. 1998. "What Should White People Do?" *Hypatia* 13: 6-26.

Alcoff, Linda M. and Elizabeth Potter. 1993. "Introduction: When Feminisms Intersect Epistemology." In *Feminist Epistemologies,* ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter. New York: Routledge, 1-14.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 2008. "La Conciencia de la Mestiza: Towards a New Consciousness." In *The Feminist Philosophy Reader*, ed. Alison Bailey and Chris Cuomo. NewYork: McGraw Hill, 870-8.

Beiriger, Angie and Rose A. Jackson. 2007. "An Assessment of the Information Needs of Transgender Communities in Portland, Oregon." *Public Library Quarterly* 46:45–60. doi:10.1300/J118v26n01_03

Berman, Sandford. 1971. *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Blair, David. 1990. *Language and Representation in Information Retrieval*. New York: Elsevier Science.

Calhoun, Cheshire. 1994. "Separating Lesbian Theory from Feminist Theory." *Ethics* 104:558-81.

Campbell, Grant. 2000. "Queer Theory and the Creation of Contextual Subject Access Tools for Gay and Lesbian Communities." *Knowledge Organization* 27:122-31.

The Combahee River Collective. 2003. "A Black Feminist Statement." In *Feminist Theory Reader,* ed. Carole R. McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim. New York: Routledge, 164-71.

Cramer, Elizabeth P. and Sara-Beth Plummer. 2009. "People of Color with Disabilities: Intersectionality as a Framework for Analyzing Intimate Partner Violence in Social, Historical, and Political Contexts." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 18:162-82.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. W. 1997. "Beyond Racism and Misogyny." In *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*, ed. Diana Tietjens Meyers. New York: Routledge, 245-63.

de La Tierra, Tatiana. 2008. "Latina Lesbian Subject Headings: The Power of Naming." In *Radical Cataloging: Essays at the Front*, ed. K.R. Roberto. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 94-102.

Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index: Devised by Melvil Dewey. 1965. 17th ed., edited by Benjamin Custer. Essex County, NY: Forest Press.

Einspahr, Jennifer. 2010. "Structural Domination and Structural Freedom: A Feminist Perspective." *Feminist Review* 94:1-19.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. "The Confession of the Flesh." In *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper, ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 194-228.

Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage.

Fox, Melodie J. 2014a. "Enabling Gender-Inclusivity In LIS Education Through Epistemology, Ethics, And Essential Questions." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 55:241-9.

Fox, Melodie J. 2014b. "Medical Discourse's Influence on Gender Classification in Three Editions of the *Dewey Decimal Classification*." In *Knowledge Organization in the 21st Century: Between Historical Patterns and Future Prospects: Proceedings of the 13th International ISKO Conference, 19-22 May 2014 Krakow, Poland,* ed. Wieslaw Babik, Advances in Knowledge Organization 14. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag, 228-35.

Fox, Melodie J. 2011. "Prototype Theory: An Alternate Concept Theory for Sex and Gender?" *Knowledge Organization* 38:328-34.

Fox, Melodie J. 2016. "Legal Discourse's Epistemic Interplay with Sex and Gender Classification in the *Dewey Decimal Classification*." *Library Trends* 64, no. 4 (forthcoming).

Fox, Melodie J. and Hope A. Olson. 2013. "Essentialism and Care in a Female-intensive Profession." In *Gender, Sexuality, Information: A Reader*, ed. Rebecca Dean and Patrick Keilty. Los Angeles: Library Juice Press, 48-61.

Fox, Melodie J. and Austin M. Reece. 2012. "Which Ethic? Whose Morality?: An Analysis of Ethical Standards for the Organization of Information." *Knowledge Organization* 39:377-83.

Frohmann, Bernd. 2004. "Documentation Redux: Prolegomenon to (Another) Philosophy of Information." *Library Trends* 52, no. 3:387-407.

Furner, Jonathan. 2007. "Dewey Deracialized: A Critical Race-Theoretic Perspective." *Knowledge Organization* 34:144-68.

Garry, Ann. 2011. "Intersectionality, Metaphor, and the Multiplicity of Gender." *Hypatia* 26:826-50.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 1994. "Sexual Difference and the Problem of Essentialism." In *The Essential Difference*, ed. Naomi Schor and Elizabeth Weed. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 82-97.

Hankivsky, Olena and Ashlee Christoffersen. 2008. "Intersectionality and the Determinants of Health: A Canadian Perspective." *Critical Public Health* 18:271-84.

Hjørland, Birger. 2004. "Domain Analysis: A Socio-Cognitive Orientation for Information Science Research." *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 30:17-21.

Intner, Sheila S. and Elizabeth Futas. 1996. "The Role and Impact of Library of Congress Classification on

The Assessment of Women's Studies Collections." *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 20:267-79.

Kelly, Eugene. 2004. *The Basics of Western Philosophy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

King, Deborah K. 1997. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." In *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*, ed. Diana Tietjens Meyers. New York: Routledge, 219-42.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches,* 110-114. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

Lugones Maria C. and Elizabeth V. Spelman. 1995. "Have We got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'The Woman's Voice.'" In *Feminism & Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application*, ed. Nancy Tuana and Rosemarie Tong. Boulder: Westview Press, 494-507.

MacKinnon, Catherine. 2013. "Intersectionality as a Method: A Note." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 39:1119-30.

Martinez-Avila, Daniel, Melodie J. Fox and Hope A. Olson. 2012. "Intersectionality in Users of Library Knowledge Organization Systems: Lessons Learned from the Misrepresentation of Latina Lesbians." *Desafios e perspectivas científicas para a organização e representação do conhecimento na atualidade, Marília, São Paulo,* ed. José Augusto Chaves Guimarães e Vera Dodebei. Estudos Avançados em Organização do Conhecimento. v.1 (Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of International Society for Knowledge Organization, Brazil Chapter). Marília: ISKO-Brasil; FUNDEPE, 160-3.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30:1771-800.

Trinh, Minh-ha T. 1989. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.

Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89:1-15.

Olson, Hope A. 1996. "Dewey Thinks Therefore he is: The Epistemic Stance of Dewey and *DDC*." In *Knowledge organization and change. Proceedings of the Fourth International ISKO Conference 15-18 July 1996, Washington, D.C. USA,* ed. Rebecca Green. Advances in knowledge organization 5. Frankfort/Main: Indeks Verlag, 302-12.

Olson, Hope A. 1997. "The Feminist and the Emperor's New Clothes: Feminist Deconstruction as a Critical Methodology for Library and Information Studies." *Library & Information Science Research* 19:181-98.

Olson, Hope A. 1998. "Mapping Beyond Dewey's Boundaries: Constructing Classificatory Space for Marginalized Knowledge Domains." *Library Trends* 47, no. 2:233-54.

Olson, Hope A. 1999b. "Exclusivity, Teleology and Hierarchy: Our Aristotelian Legacy." *Knowledge Organization* 26:65-73.

Olson, Hope A. 2001a. "Patriarchal Structures of Subject Access and Subversive Techniques for Change." *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science* 26:1-26.

Olson, Hope A. 2001b. "The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26:639-66.

Olson, Hope A. 2001c. "Sameness and Difference: A Cultural Foundation of Classification." *Library Resources and Technical Services* 45:115-22.

Olson, Hope A. 2004. "The Ubiquitous Hierarchy: An Army to Overcome the Threat of a Mob." *Library Trends* 52, no. 3:604-16.

Olson, Hope A. 2007. "How We Construct Subjects: A Feminist Analysis." *Library Trends* 56, no. 2:509-41.

Olson Hope A. and Rose Schlegl. 2001. "Standardization, Objectivity, and User Focus: A Meta-Analysis of Subject Access Critiques." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no. 2:61-80.

Rich, Adrienne. 1979. "Disloyal to Civilization: Feminism, Racism, Gynephobia." In *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978, 275-299*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Romero, Mary. 2008. "The Inclusion of Citizenship Status in Intersectionality: What Immigration Raids Tells us about Mixed-Status Families, the State and Assimilation." *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 34:131-53.

Shields, Stephanie A. 2008. "Gender: An Intersectionality Perspective." *Sex Roles* 59:301-11. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8

Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Spivak, Gayatri C. 1988. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." In *In Other Worlds*. New York: Routledge, 197-221.

Spivak, Gayatri C. 1993. "In a Word: Interview by Ellen Rooney, 1989." In *The Essential Difference*, ed. Naomi Schor and Elizabeth Weed. New York: Routledge, 1–23.

Taefi, Nura. 2009. "The Synthesis of Age And Gender: Intersectionality*International Journal of Children's Rights* 17:345-77. doi:10.1163/157181809X458049

Utrata, Jennifer. 2011. "Youth Privilege: Doing Age and Gender in Russia's Single-Mother Families." *Gender & Society* 25:616-41. doi:10.1177/0891243211421781

Ward, Dennis B. and Hope A. Olson. 1998. "A Shelf Browsing Search System for Marginalized User Groups." In *Information Access in the Global Information Economy: Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science, 25-29 October 1998*

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Medford, N.J.: Information Today, 342-7.

Williams, Rhonda L. 2009. "Developmental Issues as a Component of Intersectionality: Defining the Smart-Girl Program." *Race, Gender & Class* 16:82-101.

Young, Iris M. 1990. "Five Faces of Oppression." In *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, with a new foreword by Danielle Allen. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 39-65.