Indigenous Peoples in the U.S., Sovereign Nations, and the *DDC**

Rebecca Green

Assistant Editor, Dewey Editorial Office, LM-556, Library of Congress,
101 Independence Ave., S.E., Washington, DC, 20540 USA <greenre@oclc.org>

Rebecca Green is an assistant editor of the *DDC*, with specific responsibilities related to *DDC* training modules and investigation of relationships in the *DDC*, with a long-term goal of developing a topic-based version of the system to support automated applications. Other research interests include the ontological characterization of classes in classification systems, extension of the FRSAD model to accommodate a topic-centered view of the *DDC*, and automated methods for identifying the facet structure of a subject. Prior to joining OCLC, Rebecca was an associate professor in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland.

Green, Rebecca. **Indigenous Peoples in the U.S., Sovereign Nations, and the *DDC*.** *Knowledge Organization. 42(4)*, 211-221. 9 references.

Abstract: Claims of bias within the *Dewey Decimal Classification* (*DDC*) system in its treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. focus on marginalization through ghettoization, historicization, diasporization, and missing topics, such as the status of indigenous peoples as sovereign nations. Investigation into the treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. from *DDC* 16 to *DDC* 23 reveals that two of the most central concerns, ghettoization and historicization, are not borne out. Diasporization turns out to be a legitimate, but resolvable, concern. The current failure to recognize indigenous peoples as sovereign nations leads to a proposal for a series of expansions in Table 2 for the geographic areas over which indigenous peoples are sovereign; a mismatch between organization by the *DDC* and by indigenous peoples in the U.S. leads to the supplying of a Manual note table going from names of tribes (a Table 5 concept) to sovereign nations (a Table 2 concept).

Received: 4 May 2015; Accepted 4 May 2015

Keywords: indigenous, native, American, peoples, sovereign nations, DDC

1.0 Introduction

When European explorers and colonizers came to the Americas, the lands they laid claim to were already inhabited by peoples whose systems of language, religion, governance, medicine, etc., differed significantly from their own. Centuries later, descendants of the earlier inhabitants struggle to maintain their cultures and their sovereignty in contexts now largely dominated by descendants of later arrivals ("settlers").

Against this backdrop, we examine how indigenous peoples in the U.S. are treated in universal knowledge organization systems (KOS), focusing on the *Dewey Decimal Classification* (*DDC*) system. The paper will consider:

- Theoretical issues affecting the classification of indigenous peoples;
- Criticism leveled against the *DDC* and other universal KOS in their treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S.;
- Treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. in the *DDC* since Edition 16; and,
- Changes to the *DDC* to address legitimate criticisms.

2.0 Theoretical Issues Affecting the Classification of Indigenous Peoples

All classifications exhibit bias. A general scheme typically favors the mainstream view, in accordance with overall

user focus (Olson and Schlegl 2001). Tomren (2003, 8–9) notes that:

> A biased system may in fact be the most appropriate way to organize certain collections; it becomes problematic when the worldview represented by the classification system is incompatible with the worldview represented by items in the collection or the collection as a whole.

Thus, a mainstream bias may be appropriate in a classification scheme used for a general collection, while a special classification scheme may be more appropriate for a collection of materials for or about a specific group of people.

The structural bias of a classification is manifest in the sets of topics it classes together and in the organization of its classes, typically represented by both a hierarchical organization and a linear order. Large-scale bias is addressed by considering these questions: Are all aspects of a group of people gathered together in a single class or range of classes (thus "ghettoizing" the group of people)? Or are the various aspects dispersed across the classification? If dispersed, is the group of people individually recognizable in the KOS, or is it effectively hidden (thus "diasporizing" the group of people) (Olson and Ward 1997)?

Bias is also demonstrated in the description of a class and in the system providing access to the classes, that is, in the terms used to name or express topics (Olson 1998). Of particular import here are 1) umbrella terms for the indigenous peoples in the U.S. as a whole and 2) names for specific indigenous peoples (ethnonyms). Options include both 1) exonyms, that is, names applied by outsiders, including a) names designated by the U.S. government or its institutions, e.g., *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (*LCSH*s), and b) names used by other indigenous peoples, or 2) endonyms, the names the peoples use to refer to themselves (Berman 1995).

3.0 Criticism of KOS Treatment of Indigenous Peoples in the U.S.

Claims abound in the literature that indigenous peoples in the U.S. have been marginalized in universal knowledge organization systems "through historicization, omission, lack of specificity, lack of relevance and lack of recognition of sovereign nations" (Doyle 2006, 437). Complaints specific to the *DDC* include the following (Doyle 2006; Tomren 2003; Webster and Doyle 2008; Young and Doolittle 1994):

- Materials on indigenous groups in the U.S. are "ghettoized," in that materials on religion, philosophy, literature, art, etc., are all classed in 970.00497.
- Classing materials on indigenous groups in the U.S. in the 970s reinforces a stereotype that indigenous peoples are a "vanishing race."
- Many topics specific to indigenous groups in the U.S. are missing.
- The *DDC* doesn't group materials on indigenous peoples in the U.S. in ways typically used by them; for example, the structure of Table 5. Ethnic and national groups is based on linguistic relationships, while for indigenous peoples cultural relationships are more important.
- The use of Table 5 notation (T5—97 North American native peoples) isn't sufficient for collocating materials on indigenous groups in the U.S.
- The use of Table 5 notation for indigenous groups in the U.S. fails to communicate their unique status as sovereign nations.

4.0 Indigenous Peoples in the U.S. and the *DDC*

4.1 Treatment of Indigenous Peoples in the U.S. in the DDC: A Brief Survey

In *DDC* 16 (1958), the development under 970 for Indians of North America provided specific numbers for biography, tribes, Indians in specific places, and government relations, plus a number for specific subjects in relation to Indians. Several of the classes were subject to divide-like instructions, as can be seen in the following synopsis of that development:

970 North America
970.1 Indians of North America
970.2 Lives of Indians
Arrange alphabetically by name of biographee
970.3 Specific tribes
Arrange alphabetically by tribe
970.4 Indians in specific places
Divide like 971–979
970.5 Government relations with Indians
970.6 Specific subjects
Divide like 000–999

In *DDC* 17 (1965), both 970.2 Biography of Indians and 970.6 Specific subjects in relation to Indians were bracketed, meaning those numbers were no longer to be used. Biographies for persons associated with a specific subject were to be classed in the number for the subject, plus standard subdivision T1—092 Persons; biographies for persons not associated with a specific subject were to be classed in the appropriate subdivision of 920 General biography, genealogy, insignia. The bracketing of 970.2 led

to completely regularized treatment of biographies of Indians. Similarly, the new instruction under 970.6 said simply, "Class with the subject," also regularizing the treatment of specific subjects in relation to Indians. It has thus been fifty years since materials on the indigenous peoples in North America with respect to subjects outside of history and civilization have been placed into a 970 number by the *DDC*.

DDC 19 (1979) made the other specific numbers in the development under 970 into optional numbers. (We should note that when 970.6 was bracketed in *DDC* 17, it was not made into an optional number.) In making 970.1 optional, preference was given instead to 970.00497 for "general history and civilization of North American native races in North America." (This number is completely regular; a parallel number could be generated for any ethnic or national group in North America.) In like manner, use of 970.3 and 970.4 was made optional, with preference being given to 971–979, plus notation 00497 from the table under 930–990 (actually notation 004 from the table under 930–990, plus notation 97 from Table 5, Racial, Ethnic, National Groups), for "general history and civilization of North American native races in the area." Lastly, use of 970.5 for government relations with native races was made optional, with preference given instead, for comprehensive works, to 323.1197 Relation of state to North American native races, which again incorporates notation from Table 5; consistent with what took place with 970.6 in *DDC* 17, works on government relations with native races on specific subjects were to be classed with the subject.

This development from *DDC* 19 remains largely unchanged in *DDC* 23; the only differences relate to terminology, as shown in the following synopsis:

970(.1) North American native peoples
(Optional number; prefer 970.00497)

970(.3) Specific native peoples
(Optional number; prefer 971–979 with use of subdivisions 00497 from table under 930–990)

970(.4) Native peoples in specific places in North America
(Optional number; prefer 971–979 with use of subdivisions 00497 from table under 930–990)

970(.5) Government relations with North America native peoples
(Optional number; prefer 323.1197 for comprehensive works)

Table 5, whose use is now incorporated in essentially all standard numbers for North American indigenous peoples, was introduced into the *DDC* in *DDC* 18. In *DDC* 18 and *DDC* 19, T5—97, with the captions American aborigines and North American native races in their respective editions, stood alone, without subdivision. *DDC* 20 saw the introduction of eight subdivisions under T5—97, e.g., T5—972 Athapascan, Haida, Tlingit, with Apache, Navaho, and Chipewyan given in an examples note. *DDC* 21 replaced those subdivisions with an add instruction that had the effect of duplicating the structure of T6—97 North American native languages under T5—97 North American native peoples, with the peoples defined by the languages that they speak or that their ancestors spoke. This provided almost three times as many numbers under T5—97 in *DDC* 21 as had been available in *DDC* 20. *DDC* 22 retained the add instruction and substantially increased the number of subdivisions in Table 6 (and, by extension, in Table 5), adding over a hundred more. *DDC* 23 replaced the add instruction that made Table 5 explicitly dependent on Table 6, instead replicating the coverage afforded for North American native languages under the development for North American native peoples.

4.2 Treatment of Indigenous Peoples in the U.S. in the DDC: *Reality vs. Criticism*

4.2.1 Terminology

In the process of citing editions of the *DDC* from *DDC* 16 forward to *DDC* 23, we have used the terminology of the respective editions. The continuing (and often unsatisfactory) search for an acceptable umbrella term for the indigenous peoples in the U.S. reflects the fact that these peoples do not form an inherently natural group; any umbrella term tends to obscure the integrity of each people on its own. External forces (for example, the boundaries of the United States, bureaucratic functions of the United States government) have combined to make it desirable to have a way of referring to the indigenous peoples who now reside or whose ancestors resided on lands within the bounds of the United States. But the common generic names, i.e., American Indians, Native Americans, are problematic. The use of the term "American Indians" derives from the East Indies having been the intended destination of Columbus' expeditions, but the peoples of the land he did reach had and have nothing to do with the Indies. The use of the term "Native Americans" for peoples situated in the U.S. blithely ignores the fact that America refers to a much larger expanse than that of the U.S.; moreover, the term has typically not been used to refer to all indigenous peoples in the U.S., excluding native Hawaiians and some native Alaskans (e.g., Aleut, Yup'ik, Inuit). In addition, the peoples referred to inhabited the land long before it came to be known as America.

Descriptive phrases may be better able to avoid the problems associated with names. Some phrases, for example, aboriginal peoples, first nations, have been used more-or-less exclusively in the context of specific areas and may not thus lend themselves to be used generally. For purposes of this paper, the phrases "indigenous peoples in the U.S." and the slightly broader "North American indigenous peoples" have been used. The phrase "North American native peoples" has been chosen for use in *DDC* 23.

We now turn our attention from umbrella terms to terms for specific indigenous peoples in the U.S. At issue here are terms for ethnic groups (the corresponding *LCSH*s are topical headings) and terms for federally recognized tribes (the corresponding *LCSH*s are geographic name headings). We should note at the outset that ethnic groups and federally recognized tribes associated with indigenous peoples in the U.S. exist in a many-to-many relationship: a given ethnic group (e.g., Chippewa) may be associated with multiple federally recognized tribes (e.g., Chippewa tribes include, among others, Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation of Wisconsin, and Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Michigan); at the same time, a given federally recognized tribe may be a confederation of multiple ethnic groups (e.g., Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation).

LCSH headings for ethnic groups (e.g., Navajo Indians, Seminole Indians) have various origins. Literary warrant often favors names in common ("mainstream") use. But where do these names come from? Some are exonyms, that is, names supplied by outsiders. Of these, some (e.g., Nez Perce) are misnomers, based on inaccurate perceptions of European settlers; for example, the French used the name Nez Percé ("pierced nose") for a tribe that is not known to have engaged in nose piercing. Others are based on names assigned to a tribe by another tribe; for example, "'Algonquin' may have come from the Maliseet word *elehgumoqik* ('our allies'), the Mi'kmaq word *algoomaking* ('of the fish-spearing-place'), or the Maliseet word *elakanqin* ('they are good dancers')" (http://www.native-languages.org/algonquin.htm). Other names are based on endonyms, that is, the names tribes used for themselves in their native languages, e.g., [Navajo] Naabeehó; [Seminole] yat'siminoli; [Chippewa] Ojibwa. (Some indigenous peoples also referred to themselves by a word meaning "The People" or "the original people" in their native languages; examples include *Diné* for both Navajo and other Apacheans, *Nimíipuu* for the so-called Nez Perce, and *Anicinàbe* for the Algonquin.)

LCSH headings for federally recognized tribes (e.g., Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah; Seminole Tribe of Florida) are based on names supplied in petitions to the Bureau of Indian Affairs; tribal names may also be changed by petition.

Terms for specific indigenous peoples in the U.S. can be found in the captions and notes of Dewey classes, as well as in Relative Index terms. Names for these indigenous peoples as ethnic groups are found in Table 5 of the *DDC*, previously discussed in section 4.1. The names used in the captions and notes of T5—97 North American native peoples typically accord with the authorized access points given in corresponding *LCSH* records (or occasionally with variant forms). Both authorized and variant forms found in *LCSH* records are likely to be used as Relative Index terms. Names based in the languages of indigenous peoples present challenges, because only a few of these languages had associated writing systems when European settlers first encountered them. This accounts for widespread variation in how the names were spelled by early explorers. As a simple example, the Spanish-based "Navajo" has a similar pronunciation to the English-based "Navaho." Far less simply, the Wikipedia page for ethnonyms of the Ojibwa [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Ojibwa_ethnonyms] documents just shy of one hundred different spellings! Further investigation is needed to ensure that all appropriate variant forms are given as access points in the *DDC*.

Names for indigenous peoples as federally recognized tribes, that is, as legal entities or nations, are not currently used in the *DDC*. Section 5.3 addresses this gap.

4.2.2 Ghettoization and Diasporization

As noted previously, the claim has been made that materials on indigenous peoples in the U.S. are ghettoized in the *DDC* through the classing of materials on religion, philosophy, literature, art, etc., all in 970.00497. A closely related criticism is that classing materials on indigenous groups in the U.S. in the 970s reinforces a stereotype that indigenous peoples are a "vanishing race." It cannot be asserted too strongly that the number 970.00497 is completely regular (indigenous peoples in the U.S. are not treated differently from any other peoples connected with a geographic area) and applies only to general history and civilization of North American native peoples in North America; moreover, the temporal span of history in the 900s looks not just to the past, but also encompasses the ever-forward-moving current day. As shown in Table 1 below, the *DDC* Relative Index gives many numbers other than 970.00497 for specific topics related to North American native peoples (T5—97 North American native peoples is the number for comprehensive works on

Relative Index heading	***DDC* number**
American native peoples $x dwellings $x customs	392.3608997
American native peoples $x fiduciary trusts $z United States	346.7305908997
American native peoples $x government programs	353.53497
American native peoples $x military troops $x American Revolution	973.343
American native peoples $x military troops $x World War II	940.5403
American native peoples $x military troops $y War of 1812	973.5242
American native peoples $x religion	299.7
American native peoples $x religion $x music $x public worship	782.397
American native peoples $x social aspects	305.897
American native peoples $x social welfare	362.8497
American native peoples $x television programs	791.45652997
American native peoples $x theater	792.08997
American native peoples $x tribal land	333.2

Table 1. DDC numbers for topics related to North American native peoples

North and South American native peoples; the numbers given in Table 1 below for American native peoples thus apply equally to North American native peoples).

Classification schemes set out a standard approach to knowledge organization. Individual institutions may choose, however, to use options or adopt other local practices. A local institution may choose to class topics the classification scheme provides separate classes for in one class for the purpose of collocation. Perhaps 970.00497 has been used for specific Native American topics because individual institutions decided collocation would meet the needs of their users better.

Works on topics pertaining to (North) American native peoples will be classed in many different numbers given standard use of the *DDC*. This leads to a concern that is the opposite of ghettoization: diasporization. How easy is it to find works on the indigenous peoples in the U.S., or any other ethnic group for that matter, if they are dispersed throughout the collection? Many of the numbers in Table 1 above end in notation T5—97, meaning that more specific Table 5 numbers could be substituted to express individual tribes (e.g., T5—97314 Mesquakie) or to express indigenous peoples in the United States (T5—97073). Here the criticism that the use of Table 5 notation isn't sufficient for collocating materials on indigenous groups in the U.S. comes into play. While the use of Table 5 notation in the building of numbers for indigenous peoples does not make retrieval of relevant works possible all by itself, it is the first in a series of steps required to make such works retrievable. The MARC Bibliographic format now provides a field (085 - Synthesized Classification Number Components) in which Table 5 notation can be isolated. Supplying 085 fields in bibliographic records and creating indexes on that data in our online systems will complete the solution to diasporization.

5.0 Changes to the *DDC*

Our review of the indigenous peoples in the U.S. in light of criticisms expressed against the *DDC* leads us to recognize several areas in which improvements could be made.

5.1 Missing Topics

The inclusion of topics in the *DDC* is governed by the principle of literary warrant, a principle which also governs the creation of *Library of Congress Subject Headings*. Using *LCSH* structure and the classified content of WorldCat, we identified a set of LC subject headings associated with the indigenous peoples of the U.S. as candidates for mapping. In some cases, no current mappings exist; in other cases, existing mappings need correction. Table 2 below indicates the tentative *DDC* numbers with which this set of headings would be associated, pending consultation with members of the indigenous communities.

5.2 Territorial Sovereignty

A legitimate criticism of the *DDC*'s treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. is its "lack of recognition of the sovereignty of American Indian nations" (Webster and Doyle 2008, 191). That is, while indigenous peoples are represented by Table 5 notation as ethnic groups, they are not represented as sovereign nations. Given that nations associated with geographic areas are represented in the *DDC* as Table 2 (geographic areas) concepts by virtue of the area over which they exercise territorial sovereignty, the *DDC* should provide Table 2 notation for indigenous peoples in the U.S. and should relate corresponding Table 2 and Table 5 numbers.

The discussion that follows sets forth a proposed approach for remedying this gap, which has been shared with the American Indian Library Association. Perhaps the most important feedback we have received so far is that the process of working through changes is as important as the result; it is crucial that the voice and perspective of indigenous Americans be reflected in the representation of their nations in the *DDC*. Additionally we

***LCSH*s**	**Mapping(s)**
Buffalo jump	639.11643 Hunting bison
Calumets	299.7138 Religions of North American native origin—rites and ceremonies 394.4 Official ceremonies and observances 745.593 Handicrafts—making useful object
Indian councils	328.7008997 Legislative process/bodies—North America—North American native peoples
Indian dance	299.7138 Religions of North American native origin—rites and ceremonies 394.3 Recreational customs 793.3108997 Folk and national dancing—North American native peoples
Indian dance lodges	725.8 Recreation buildings 726.9 Other buildings for religious and related purposes
Indian Removal, 1813–1903	323.119707309045 Civil and political rights—North American native peoples —United States—19th century 973.0497009034 United States—North American native peoples—19th century
Indian reservations	333.2 Ownership of land by nongovernmental groups
Indian termination policy	323.119707309045 Civil and political rights—North American native peoples —United States—1950–1959 973.0497009045 United States—North American native peoples—late 20th century
Indians of North America—cultural assimilation	303.48208997 Contact between cultures—North American native peoples 306.44908997 Language planning and policy—North American native peoples
Medicine bundles	299.7144 Religions of North American native origin—religious life and practice
Medicine wheels	299.713 Public worship – Native American religions 725.9 Other public structures
Peyotism	299.7 Religions of North American native origin
Potlatch	394.2 General customs, special occasions
Powwows	394.3 Recreational customs
Sweatbaths	299.7138 Rites – Native American religions 391.64 Personal cleanliness and hygiene 725.7308997 Bathhouses—North American native peoples
Wampum belts	302.222 Nonverbal communication 745.58208997 Handicrafts—beads—North American native peoples

Table 2. LCSH mappings of topics pertaining to indigenous peoples in the U.S.

are seeking help through the Indigenous Information Research Group at the University of Washington's Information School. The proposal below is thus at an initial stage and has not yet benefited from feedback from the affected peoples.

Three approaches have been considered in what we anticipate to be a major development in the *DDC*:

– Add indigenous peoples of the U.S. as class-here concepts to the notes for existing classes in T2—74–79 Specific states of United States.
– Develop provision for indigenous peoples of the U.S. in unused notation within Table 2.
– Expand for indigenous peoples of the U.S under the classes for the region or county with which they are most closely associated.

The second approach would be best; however, unused notation in the appropriate parts of Table 2 is not always available.

We started our work by establishing new Table 2 classes for federally recognized tribes meeting a certain set of criteria (including recognition of the people in Table 5 and the meeting of our regular literary warrant threshold; we are also seeking feedback on other federally recognized tribes who may meet literary warrant thresholds in tribal libraries). However, we have since adopted the use of reservations as the focus of the new classes, with federally recognized tribes present in class-here notes in those classes. *Library of Congress Subject Headings* for both federally recognized tribes (e.g., Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California) and reservations (e.g., Agua Caliente Indian Reservation) are coded in MARC authority records in 151 fields as geographic names; technically speaking, both are T2 concepts. But we suspect that for many persons federally recognized tribes feel more like T5 concepts than T2 concepts (since the indigenous peoples / tribes are T5 concepts). Moreover, the relationship between indigenous peoples in the U.S. and reserva-

T2—779 Indian reservations of north central United States
See Manual at T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79; also at T2—74–79
T2—779 4 Indian reservations colocated with Michigan
T2—779 41 Isabella Reservation
Class here Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan
T2—779 42 Bay Mills Indian Reservation
Class here Bay Mills Indian Community, Michigan
T2—779 43 L'Anse Indian Reservation
Class here Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, Michigan

Figure 1. Sample classes for reservations in unused notation

tions is many-to-many (a tribe/people may be associated with more than one reservation, while a reservation may be associated with more than one tribe/people), making it more difficult to situate a tribe geographically than to situate a reservation. That is, if we focus our new classes around federally recognized tribes, we fear that the somewhat non-intuitive relationship between indigenous peoples / tribes as T5 concepts and federally recognized tribes as T2 concepts would prove confusing.

We have used the list of Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible To Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, a list that by law should appear annually in the Federal Register (http://www.bia.gov/cs/groups/webteam/documents/document/idc1-029026.pdf is current as of January 29, 2015) as our source for names of federally recognized tribes. We have used the Native American Consultation Database (http://grants.cr.nps.gov/nacd/index.cfm) as our source for reservation names.

To the extent possible, we have developed the new classes in notation not already in use within the United States. By doing so, we show that tribal reservations are autonomous, not parts of states, counties, or parishes. This autonomy is reinforced by indicating that the reservations are colocated (as in co-located) with other geographic units in the U.S. The sample classes under T2—779 Indian reservations of north central United States in Figure 1 reveal how reservations and federally recognized tribes outside the northeastern and southeastern regions of the U.S. could be accommodated.

Unfortunately, open notation is not always available. As a next-best approach, for reservations lying in the northeastern or southeastern regions of the United States, we propose to expand for the reservations by creating new classes under numbers for the counties in which the largest part of the reservation lies. The phrase "and colocated reservation[s]" would be added to captions for geographic units higher in the notational hierarchy to show that reservations are not part of or subordinate to those geographic units. Given our criteria for development of new classes, this aspect of the proposal affects only T2—746 Connecticut and colocated reservation, T2—747 New York and colocated reservations, T2—756 North Carolina and colocated reservation, and T2—759 Florida and colocated reservations. Figure 2 shows the development required for this approach for the reservations colocated with Cattaraugus County, New York.

This figure also shows how we propose to treat circumstances in which a tribe has multiple reservations: we designate one number for reservations of the tribe (e.g., T2—747949 Reservations of Seneca Nation of Indians) and then create subdivisions under that number for individual reservations (e.g., T2—7479491 Allegany Indian Reservation).

Reservation boundaries often extend across the boundaries of two or more counties, states, or even countries. Standard Dewey practice is to associate such a jurisdiction, region, or feature with a footnote reading: "For a specific part of this jurisdiction, region, or feature, see the part and follow instructions under T2—4–9," as also seen in Figure 2 under T2—74 Northeastern United States. This means that a work focusing on the part of the Connecticut River that flows through Coos County, New Hampshire (the northern-most county of New Hampshire) should be classed using T2—7421 Coos County, not T2—74 Northeastern United States. Comprehensive works on the Connecticut River would, however, be classed using T2—74.

We were concerned that extending this practice to federally recognized tribes and reservations would mistakenly communicate that county boundaries, etc., take precedence over reservation boundaries. This is a key reason why we have chosen, where possible, to develop classes for reservations and federally recognized tribes in previously unused notation. But the issue still arises for reservations in the eastern United States, where we have had to provide numbers for reservations amidst the numbers for counties. Here we propose not classing specific parts of reservations in other numbers, but classing both comprehensive works about federally recognized tribes and/

T2—74 Northeastern United States (New England and Middle Atlantic states)

Class here United States east of Allegheny Mountains, east of Mississippi River; *Appalachian Mountains; *Connecticut River

For southeastern United States, see —75; for south central United States, see —76; for north central United States, see —77

T2—747 New York and colocated reservations

Subdivisions are added for New York and colocated reservations together, for New York alone

T2—747 9 Western counties of New York and colocated reservations

Class here *Lake Ontario

Subdivisions are added for western counties of New York and colocated reservations together, for western counties of New York alone

T2—747 94 Cattaraugus County and colocated reservations

Subdivisions are added for Cattaraugus County and colocated reservations together, for Cattaraugus County alone

T2—747 949 Reservations of Seneca Nation of Indians

Class here Seneca Nation of Indians

See Manual at T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79; also at T2—74–79

T2—747 949 1 Allegany Indian Reservation

T2—747 949 2 Cattaraugus Indian Reservation

T2—747 96 Erie County and colocated reservation

Subdivisions are added for Erie County alone

For Cattaraugus Indian Reservation, see —7479492; for Buffalo, see —74797

Figure 2. Sample classes for reservations under existing notation

or reservations and works about specific parts of them in the same (newly expanded) number.

Oklahoma presents a unique challenge, since, except for the reservation of The Osage Nation, Oklahoma has only former reservations, Oklahoma Tribal Statistical Areas, and Tribal Jurisdictional Areas. Our approach has been to accommodate Indian nations headquartered in Oklahoma, using the names of federally recognized tribes in captions instead of reservation names, for example, T2—76532 Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma.

We anticipate that some classifiers will have difficulty knowing when Table 2 notation should be used and when Table 5 notation should be used (typically in the context of T1—089 plus T5 notation). To help clarify, we propose the inclusion of a Manual note for T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79 North American native peoples, with a table showing the correspondence between tribes as ethnic groups and federally recognized tribes as sovereign nations. The proposed text of the Manual note is shown in Figure 3.

A second Manual note, this one for T2—74–79, indicates that as division of the United States into states and counties or parishes is exhaustive, geographic locations can simultaneously fall within the boundaries of a county or parish and a reservation. This proposed Manual note provides advice on when to classify a work in a county or parish number or when to classify it in a reservation number. Essential parts of the note are shown in Figure 4.

One aspect that the proposed development has not yet taken into account is how to handle the temporal aspects of the relationship between tribes and their lands. The current proposal addresses relationships holding in the present day, but also needs to consider the geographical state of tribal sovereignty before the arrival of European settlers (as well as times in between). For example, in the 17th century, the Choctaw Nation was situated in lands across present-day Mississippi and other parts of the Deep South. Only after the Indian Removal Act of 1830 did many (but not all) Choctaw relocate to Oklahoma. Literary warrant thresholds may mean that T2 notation will need to be provided for only few, if any, indigenous

T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79

North American native peoples

The United States recognizes the sovereignty of specific groups of North American native peoples in two ways: (1) by designating groups that meet established criteria as federally recognized tribes and (2) by designating specific land areas as reservations. The tribal sovereignty of federally recognized tribes is manifest as territorial sovereignty on their reservations. The relationship between federally recognized tribes and reservations is complex: some tribes have more than one reservation; some tribes have no reservation; some reservations are home to more than one tribe.

Use T1—08997 (i.e., T1—089 plus T5—97) and its subdivisions for North American native peoples as social or ethnic groups. A single ethnic group (e.g., the Cherokee) may be part of more than one federally recognized tribe.

Use subdivisions of T2—74–79 (e.g., T2—79914 Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah) for North American native peoples as federally recognized tribes or sovereign nations with identifiable territorial sovereignty, but only in contexts (e.g., law, history) where jurisdiction is important. (The Secretary of the Interior annually publishes a list of federally recognized tribes in the *Federal Register*.) Examples of land areas with identifiable territorial sovereignty include reservations and Oklahoma's tribal statistical areas (OTSAs). Use subdivisions of T1—08997 for North American native peoples as sovereign nations for tribes that are not recognized by the federal government, for federally recognized tribes prior to their achieving federally recognized status, or for federally recognized tribes outside the context of their identifiable territorial sovereignty or where jurisdiction is not important (e.g., federally recognized tribes treated in the context of more than two of their reservations or federally recognized tribes with no reservation). If in doubt, use T1—08997.

Figure 3. Text of Manual note clarifying use of T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79

Use reservation numbers for the following: application of a subject (e.g., history, sociology) to the reservation of a federally recognized tribe with sovereignty over the reservation; governance of the reservation or tribe, including all executive, legislative, or judicial activities; and services provided by the United States government in fulfillment of its federal Indian trust responsibility, including education, social services (e.g., welfare assistance, police protection, disaster relief), management of natural resources, economic development assistance, maintenance of infrastructure (e.g., roads, bridges). Follow the direction of the author in determining if the work focuses on a reservation or federally recognized tribe. Consult the web site of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (www.bia.gov) to determine which activities of the United States government are in fulfillment of its federal Indian trust responsibility.

Use county or parish numbers for the following: activities, events, conditions, locations (e.g., towns, physiographic features), etc., taking place or existing within the boundaries of a reservation that do not focus on the reservation or associated tribe; and activities or services of the United States government that are not in fulfillment of its federal Indian trust responsibility (e.g., postal services), except where instructed otherwise (e.g., federal law).

If in doubt, use county or parish numbers.

Figure 4. Text of proposed Manual note on reservation vs. county/parish numbers

peoples for earlier periods of time, but the possible need to provide such numbers should certainly be acknowledged.

Another key aspect of concern to the proposed development is the degree to which it can be generalized to indigenous peoples in other places. The exact configuration of federally recognized tribes and reservations at the heart of the current proposal is not replicated elsewhere, but the underlying phenomena involved in indigenous peoples, settlers, and territorial claims are to be found in many places. We will look for unifying principles that carry across a variety of circumstances.

5.3 Organization among Indigenous Peoples in the U.S.

Another criticism of *DDC*'s treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. is that the organizational principles used in the *DDC* do not always mirror those used by indigenous

Ethnic group	Table 5 notation	Federally recognized tribe	Reservation / Oklahoma Tribal Statistical Area	Table 2 notation
Cahuilla	T5—9745	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California	Agua Caliente Indian Reservation	T2—79942
Kutenai	T5—97992	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	Flathead Indian Reservation	T2—78567
Navajo (Diné)	T5—9726	Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona and California	Colorado River Indian Reservation	T2—79921
Navajo (Diné)	T5—9726	Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah	Navajo Indian Reservation	T2—79914
Salish	T5—979435	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	Flathead Indian Reservation	T2—78567
Salish	T5—979435	Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation, Washington	Lummi Reservation	T2—79974
Salish	T5—979435	Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation	Puyallup Indian Reservation	T2—79975
Salish	T5—979435	Tulalip Tribes of Washington	Tulalip Indian Reservation	T2—79973
Seminole	T5—973859	The Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	Seminole OTSA	T2—76571
Seminole	T5—973859	Seminole Tribe of Florida	[Big Cypress Reservation, Brighton Reservation, Fort Pierce Reservation, Hollywood Reservation, Immokalee Reservation, Tampa Reservation]	T2—759359

Table 3. Correspondence between sample T5 and T2 classes

peoples with respect to themselves. In particular, the organization of ethnic groups in Table 5 is based on the organization of languages in Table 6. While linguistic relationships often reflect cultural and geographic relationships, the large-scale removal and resettlement of indigenous peoples in the U.S. has weakened the correspondence between (historic) linguistic relationships and (present-day) cultural relationships in T5—97 North American native peoples; at the same time the correspondence between these two types of relationships is strong in other portions of Table 5.

A more common way for indigenous peoples in the U.S. to organize and access materials about themselves is to organize first by a large-scale geographic area (e.g., a state or region), then by overall tribe (that is, Table 5 ethnic group), and then within that by a federally recognized tribe, each of which is limited typically to a single reservation. (This is the approach being taken in the Library of Congress *Classification* law schedules.)

Recognizing that access to material on the nations of indigenous peoples in the U.S. will often start through the name of a Table 5 / ethnic group tribe, we propose to include within the Manual note for T1—08997 vs. T2—74–79 a table showing the correspondence between Table 5 tribe nations and T2 federally recognized tribal names and reservations. Sample entries are found in Table 3 above. Where a tribe has multiple reservations or bands, but a specific reservation or band is not given its own number, its name appears in square brackets.

6.0 Conclusion

Relationships between indigenous peoples in the U.S. and the U.S. government are complex, as reflected in treaties, in the designation of federally recognized tribes, and in the sovereignty of tribes over reserved lands / reservations. The frequent oppression of indigenous peoples in the colonization of the Americas has led to a natural wariness on their part with respect to products associated with the mainstream culture. Claims of bias against general knowledge organization systems in general and against the *DDC* in particular have been examined. Some claims are perhaps based on misunderstanding, but some point to areas where the *DDC* can be improved.

In response to this investigation, the *DDC* proposes to undertake a major development to represent the indigenous peoples in the U.S. as nations, which will require many new numbers for geographical areas in Table 2 and the supplying of significant new Manual notes. Mapping of important topics relevant to indigenous peoples that are currently missing from the scheme has been proposed. Additional indexing of variant forms of names will be undertaken.

But as yet these proposals represent work on the part of persons outside the indigenous groups. Communication between the *DDC* and members of the indigenous communities will be required to improve the classification in a way that is true not only to the principles and practices of the *DDC*, but that are also true to the voice and perspective of the peoples being represented.

References

Berman, Sanford. 1995. "When the Subject is Indian." *American Indian Libraries Newsletter* 18, no. 2: 1–2. http://www.nativeculture.com/lisamitten/ailanewsW95_LCIndians.html.

Doyle, Ann. 2006. "Naming and Reclaiming Indigenous Knowledge: Intersections of Landscape and Experience." In *Knowledge Organization for a Global Learning Society: Proceedings of the Ninth International ISKO Conference, 4-7 July 2006, Vienna, Austria,* edited by Gerhard Budin, Christian Swertz, Konstantin Mitgutsch. Advances in knowledge organization 10. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 435–42.

Library of Congress. 2015. "Headings for Indian Tribes Recognized by the U.S. Government." http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/tribes.html.

Olson, Hope A. 1998. "Mapping Beyond Dewey's Boundaries: Constructing Classificatory Space for Marginalized Knowledge Domains." *Library Trends* 47: 233–55.

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.

Olson, Hope A. and Dennis B. Ward. 1997. "Ghettoes and Diaspora in Classification: Communicating across the Limits." In *Communication and Information in Context: Society, Technology, and the Professions. Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference / Travaux du 25e congrès annuel, Canadian Association for Information Science (CAIS) / Association canadienne des sciences de l'information*, edited by Bernd Frohmann. Toronto: Canadian Association for Information Science, 19–31.

Tomren, Holly. 2003. "Classification, Bias and American Indian Materials." Unpublished manuscript. http://ailasacc.pbworks.com/f/BiasClassification2004.pdf.

Webster, Kelly and Ann Doyle. 2008. "Don't Class Me in Antiquities! Giving Voice to Native American Materials." In *Radical Cataloging: Essays at the Front*, edited by K. R. Roberto, 189–97. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Young, Mary L. and Dara L. Doolittle. 1994. "The Halt of Stereotyping: When Does the American Indian Enter the Mainstream?" *Reference Librarian* 22, no. 47: 109–19.