

# Political Stances and Priorities in National Level General Classification Schemes

Yejun Wu

Louisiana State University and A&M College Ringgold standard institution

School of Information Studies Louisiana State University – School of Library and Information Science

267 Coates Hall Baton Rouge Louisiana 70803, United States

wuyj@lsu.edu

Yejun Wu is an Associate Professor in the School of Information Studies at the Louisiana State University. His research area is primarily focused on knowledge organization systems and their applications in facilitating learning, information retrieval, and knowledge discovery.



WU, Yejun. 2024. "Political Stances and Priorities in National Level General Classification Schemes". *Knowledge Organization* 51 (2): 73-82. 36 references. DOI:10.5771/0943-7444-2024-2-73.

**Abstract:** This paper investigates whether and how a national level general classification scheme expresses or reflects its creators' government's political stances and priorities. The following two national level general classification schemes were studied and compared: Chinese Library Classification, created by the People's Republic of China (PRC), and the New Classification Scheme for Chinese Libraries, created by the Republic of China (ROC).

It is found that a nation's or region's political stances and priorities are expressed or reflected in a national level comprehensive classification through the following four venues: (1) prioritizing classes that indicate a nation's, region's, or party's ideology, governance theory, or long-term policies and goals; (2) prioritizing classes of one's leading political party and/or leaders; putting rivalrous political parties and/or leaders in a lower-level class or making them invisible; (3) putting the territory or history of a rivalrous political entity under one's own political entity to show one is a part of the other and; (4) using terms that express the government's or political party's strong political stances (such as anti-, con-, pro-), or neutralizing political terms to soften one's political stances. In (3) and (4), the classification reflects the political stances of the creator's government.

**Received:** 25 September 2023; **Revised:** 15 January 2024; **Accepted:** 21 January 2024

**Keywords:** Chinese Library Classification; New Classification Scheme for Chinese Libraries; classification schemes; political stances

## 1.0 Introduction

A classification scheme is a spatial, temporal, or spatio-temporal segmentation of world knowledge (Bower and Star 1999). "Established philosophical systems of knowledge... underlie most traditional library classifications... Philosophical classification organizes knowledge... for the universal purpose of adequately representing the field of human learning" (Taylor 1992, 319). Therefore, philosophical classifications and traditional library classifications organize world knowledge. However, a philosophical classification scheme reflects a particular perspective of knowledge of the creator of the classification and may have embedded subjective value judgments or biases. A country's political stance is one type of subjective value judgment. According to Koch (1997), there are broadly four types of classification

schemes: universal schemes (such as the Dewey Decimal Classification), national-level general schemes, subject-specific schemes (which are designed for use by a particular subject community), and home-grown schemes (which are designed for use in a particular service). The first two types of classifications are comprehensive classifications. A national-level general classification scheme is universal in subject coverage but usually designed for use in a single country or region. The purpose of this paper is to investigate whether and how a national-level general classification scheme expresses or reflects its creators' government's political stances and priorities.

In this paper, two national level general classification schemes are compared: Chinese Library Classification (CLC), created in 2010 by the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the New Classification Scheme for Chinese Li-

braries (NCSCL), created in 2007 by the Republic of China (ROC). The selection of CLC and NCSCL is motivated by the more and more heightened political and military tension between Mainland China and Taiwan. An article from *The Economist* called the Taiwan Strait the most dangerous place on the Earth (Metz 2021) as Taiwan becomes the epicenter of a US-China rivalry (Lin 2021). It is assumed that the two classification schemes may include knowledge about the political disputes between the two sides.

Occasionally, two universal/national-level classifications are also discussed: the Library of Congress Classification, due to its use in academic libraries around the world, and the Russian Library-Bibliographical Classification (LBC), which was the Soviet classification and is now the national classification system of the Russian Federation. The newest available versions of the classifications are used in the study.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 encompasses a literature review of critical classification, and section 3 introduces the research question, novelty, and significance. Section 4 presents the method, including instruments, data collection, and analysis, and section 5 presents findings, discussions, and implications of the findings. Following are the conclusions of the paper with a discussion of limitations and future studies.

## 2.0 Literature review

This section reviews previous studies on critical analysis of Western comprehensive classifications, where this paper is situated. Earlier studies indicate that these classifications are incomplete and biased and may take a certain political position.

Classification systems are incomplete. An ideal comprehensive classification scheme provides “a complete coverage of the world it describes” (Bowker and Star 1999, 11). An ideal comprehensive classification system “must encompass the whole field of knowledge as represented in collectible media of communication and information” (11). However, no real-world working classification is complete (Bowker and Star 1999) or “can anticipate or list all topics” (Evans et al. 2011, 380). There may be monetary, political, bureaucratic, or other reasons to “ignore data that would make a system more comprehensive” (Bower and Star 1999, 12). Merkley (2011) examined the topical coverage of the three major classification systems – Library of Congress Classification (LCC), Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), and Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), and found that none of them provides complete and systematic coverage of world knowledge. For example, the coverage of religion in LCC and DDC focuses on Christianity and provides incomplete coverage of other faiths (Merkley 2011).

“All [comprehensive] classification schemes contain inherited quirks and isolated biases” (Higgins 2012, 258). Bias

in classifications is inevitable (Comaromi and Satija 1985). A classification scheme reflects the culture in which it was created (Vann 1967), and any classification of knowledge can be influenced by the political and cultural philosophy of the individual(s) who first created the scheme (Sardar 1979). Therefore, it is not surprising that non-American or non-Western subjects have not been adequately represented in DDC (Comaromi and Satija 1985). DDC includes “bias toward Christianity and Anglo-Saxon culture” (Oh and Yeo 2001, 76). DDC exhibits the neglect of Third World subjects (Comaromi and Satija 1985). Higgins (2012) identified a late nineteenth-century American-centered view of the world and prejudices within the Library of Congress Classification (LCC). For example, by examining the arrangement of geographically localized subject bibliographies (Z1201–Z4980), Higgins (2012, 251) found that “the sequence in which they are arranged, North America, South America, Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and Oceania, reflects the order of the importance of these continents (culturally and politically) to the late nineteenth-century American political establishment.” For another example, a whole subject category was “devoted to Naval Science (V), implicitly granting it equal prominence with, for example, Philosophy, Psychology, and Religion (B)” (251), demonstrating the importance of navy to the U.S. in the late nineteenth century. Satija (2013, 287) reported the “reduction of Christian bias in religion and U.S. bias in public administration in DDC from the 19th (1979) to the 23rd edition (2011)”.

Adler (2017) examined the processes by which racism becomes systemic on American library shelves and revealed that white supremacy is embedded in the framework of American library classifications. The exclusion of certain groups of people also presents systematic bias in classifications. Olson (2010) revealed the marginalization and exclusion of specific topics and groups of people in large library classifications and argued that classifications embody the biases most common in the culture of a society.

Sahadath (2013) argued that some of the collections that contain material by, for, and about marginalized populations are mostly likely to be underserved by LCC and DDC. Green (2015) investigated the treatment of indigenous peoples in the U.S. from DDC 16 to DDC 23 and found that DDC failed to recognize indigenous people as sovereign nations. Higgins (2016) reported that Asian American representation in DDC, 1876-1996 was invisible. Thornley et al. (2022) discussed cultural bias in library classification systems such as DDC and the potential cultural and psychological harm of mislabeling, omitting, and inaccurately positioning groups of people or historical events in the world of knowledge.

LGBT2QIA+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, 2-spirited, queer, intersex, asexual, and nonbinary) subjects are ill-

served by the knowledge organization systems (KOSs) that currently dominate libraries because of KOSs' privileging of the majority or normative viewpoint (Bullard et al. 2020). Bednareks (2007, 234) reveals the colonial bias in library classification in Aotearoa New Zealand, and argues that "classification is political and context specific [...] The extent to which a particular social group's purposes and needs are not reflected in [...] library classification [...] reflects the minor importance this group holds in society."

Classification systems present systematic biases because they reflect the views and values of the creators of the classifications (Foskett, 1984), and a comprehensive classification scheme typically reflects the mainstream view and values in accordance with overall user interests (Olson and Schlegl 2001). LCC and Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) are biased "because they perceive and describe the world from a predominantly white, Christian, and Eurocentric perspective" (Kam 2007, 18).

### 3.0 Research question, novelty, significance

From the literature review, we see that previous studies on critical analysis of classifications focused on systematic biases in Western comprehensive classifications. Political positions may be reported occasionally in a Western comprehensive classification scheme but were not particularly studied, and political stances and priorities in non-Western comprehensive classification schemes are rarely studied. This study aims to compare two Chinese comprehensive classifications, one created by the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the other by the Republic of China (ROC). Therefore, the research question of this study is whether and how Chinese comprehensive classifications reflect political stances and priorities. The research question is new since it has not been studied before, and significant since the findings of the research aim to complement the previous research on critical classification, especially on political stances and priorities in comprehensive classifications.

### 4.0 Method

To answer the research question, this study compares two national level classifications: Chinese Library Classification (CLC, 2010 version) created by the National Library of the People's Republic of China (PRC), the New Classification Scheme for Chinese Libraries (NCSCL, 2007 version) created by the National Library of the Republic of China (ROC). They are the newest versions available online and are published in Chinese with CLC in simplified Chinese and NCSCL in traditional Chinese. Occasionally LCC and Russian LBC are also used to compare with them to make points.

First, the top categories of the three classifications are compared to identify political influences. Second, political parties, important political figures, country names, and specific historical periods are searched in CLC and NCSCL to examine how they are treated in the classifications. Specifically, the following terms in Chinese are searched: Chinese Communist Party (CCP), Chinese Nationalist Party (or Kuomintang, KMT), the People's Republic of China (PRC), the Republic of China (ROC), Taiwan, Mao Tze-Tung, Deng Xiaoping, Sun Yet-sun, Chiang Kai-shek, Wang Ching-wei, Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), and anti-Japanese war.

#### 4.1 Historical background of the relationship between PRC, ROC, CCP, KMT, and DPP

A brief historical background of the relationship between PRC, ROC, CCP, KMT, and DPP is presented in this section to help readers better understand the findings. In 1905, Sun Yat-sen organized a revolutionary league, the Alliance Society, aiming to overthrow the Qing dynasty. Sun was elected provisional president of the Republic of China (ROC) in December, 1911<sup>[1]</sup> and the Alliance Society was transformed into the Chinese Nationalist Party (or Kuomintang, KMT), with Sun serving as its director in 1912<sup>[2]</sup>. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) was founded in 1921. Under Soviet influence, the Kuomintang formed an alliance with CCP in 1924. Following Sun's death in 1925, the Kuomintang was led by Chiang Kai-shek<sup>[3]</sup>. This cooperation between the two parties lasted until 1927 when the communists were expelled<sup>[4]</sup>. The break between the two parties led to civil war until the Japanese invasion of China, which necessitated the second cooperation in 1937. According to the Britannica Encyclopaedia (2023) Wang Ching-wei was also a Chinese Nationalist Party leader, "rival of Chiang Kai-shek for control of the Nationalist government in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and finally head of the regime established in 1940 to govern the Japanese-conquered territory in China"<sup>[5]</sup>. After Japan's defeat in 1945, civil war was resumed until a communist victory in Mainland China in 1949 drove Chiang Kai-shek and his Kuomintang followers into exile in Taiwan<sup>[6]</sup>. Taiwan had been ceded to Japan since 1895 and until 1945, the Japanese army surrendered Taiwan to Chiang Kai-shek's KMT nationalist government.<sup>[7]</sup>

Mao Tze-Tung founded the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949 (Upshur 2016). Facing threats by the [PRC] to attack Taiwan, the USA undertook in 1955 to protect Taiwan from outside attacks. The ROC lost its seat at the United Nations in 1971 to the PRC, and in 1979, the USA, on establishing diplomatic relations with the PRC, terminated those relations with Taiwan<sup>[8]</sup>.

The Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), the leading party of the Taiwan independence movement, was founded

in Taiwan in 1986. By the 1990s, the DPP had developed a close relationship with many American politicians. In 2000, DPP leader Chen Shuibian won the presidential election in Taiwan, and was reelected in 2004 (Liu 2009).

PRC and ROC hold different political positions on their relationship with each other. Beijing's "one China principle" contends that: "There is but one China in the world, Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's territory, and the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government representing the whole of China" (Ian 2023). Under the constitution of ROC made by Kuomintang in 1946, it has maintained that it was the legitimate government of China, including the mainland and Taiwan (Ian 2023). DPP refuses the one-China policy and contends that "Taiwan is already a sovereign and independent nation and therefore has no need to declare its independence" (Yun and Chin, 2023). When the United States moved to recognize the PRC and de-recognize the ROC in 1979, they stated that the government of the PRC was "the sole legal government of China... The United States doesn't agree with Beijing's claim to sovereignty over Taiwan, nor does it agree with Taipei that the ROC is an independent, sovereign state" (Green and Glaser 2017).

In summary, PRC and ROC have a political dispute on their relationship between each other, that is, which is a part of which. Historically CCP and KMT had political and military conflicts. CCP and DPP have political disputes on the "one-China" principle. CCP, KMT, and DPP have political disputes on reunification and independence. The U.S. is between the PRC and ROC, maintaining a political stance of "strategic ambiguity" (Kuo, 2023).

## 4.2 Data analysis

This section compares the CLC and NCSCL on the following topics: top categories, Marxism, Chinese Communist Party, Chinese Nationalist Party, the collections of political leaders, Chinese history, anti-Japanese war, and term use of some historical periods. Occasionally LCC and Russian LBC are also used in the comparisons.

Table 1 shows the main classes of CLC, NCSCL, LCC, and LBC. Compared with NCSCL and LCC, CLC presents two prominent characteristics: (1) the first class is (A) Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tze-Tung's Thoughts, Deng Xiaoping Theory, which is the ideology and governance theory of PRC; (2) Classes N-Z are particular science and technology classes, probably reflecting PRC's national goal of four modernizations (i.e., modernization of agriculture, industry, defense, and science and technology). The characteristics probably reflected the influence of the Soviet LBC on CLC because the Soviet LBC also exhibits these two characteristics: emphasizing ideology as the first class, and putting many particular science and technology classes in the

main classes. LBC's main classes now do not include Marxism-Leninism. Due to the active Sino-Soviet exchange in librarianship in the 1950s, multiple Chinese classifications received influences from the Soviet LBC (Fan, 2008). NCSCL's main classes look similar to DDC. LCC also presents two characteristics: (1) two classes (E and F) are devoted to the history of the Americas, indicating the importance and abundance of the history of the Americas, (2) Naval science (class V) is granted implicit equal prominence with, for example, Science (S), indicating its importance to USA "when LCC was created in the background of the Spanish-American War of 1898, and the height of Anglo-German naval rivalry in 1910" (Higgins 2012, 258).

Table 2 compares CLC with CLNCS on the treatment of Marxism, Chinese Communist Party, Chinese Nationalist Party, and the collections of political leaders. In CLC, Marxism is put in the main class A, whereas in NCSCL, Marxism is put in a lower class under Social Sciences (549.3). In CLC, Mao Tze-Tung's thoughts and Deng Xiaoping's theory are put in a second level class (A8), whereas in NCSCL, they are put in the bottom class (500.421). In CLC, the Communist Party of China is put in a second level class (D2) whereas in NCSCL, it is put in a lower class under Political science (576.25). In NCSCL, the Nationalist's Party of China is put in a third level class (005.2), Sun Yat-Sen Collections is put in a second level class (005), Chiang Kai-shek collections and Chiang Ching-kuo collections are put in a third level class (005.7, 005.8) whereas in CLC, they are invisible. In NCSCL, the Three People's Principles, which is the ideology of the Nationalist's Party of China<sup>[9]</sup>, is put in a third-level class (005.12), where in CLC, it is invisible. In both CLC and NCSCL, Wang Ching-wei, a rival of Chiang Kai-shek in KMT and later the head of the puppet regime established by the Japanese in 1940 to govern the Japanese-conquered territory in China is invisible. However, CLC has "K265.65 Wang Ching-wei puppet regime" (shown in Table 3), which made Wang Ching-wei visible to some extent. In summary, in both classifications, one's ideology, political party, and political leaders are put in an upper-level class on one's classification but are put in a lower-level class on the other's classification or made invisible.

Table 3 compares CLC with CLNCS regarding the treatment of Chinese history. In CLC, ROC (K258) existed up to 1949. After 1949, Taiwan's (K295.8) history is a part of the PRC's local history, which is consistent with the PRC's "one-China principle" introduced above. In CLNCS, the "history of PRC" (628.7) is a part of the "history of ROC" (628), which is consistent with ROC's constitution (made by KMT in 1946). However, in the class of Political Science, PRC Politics (574.1) is put under "the governments of other countries" (574), which is not consistent with ROC's constitution, but seems to reflect DPP's political stance that "ROC Taiwan" is already an independent country, and so PRC and

CLC Main Classes	NCSCL Main Classes	LCC Main Classes	Soviet LBC Main Classes
A Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tze-Tung's Thoughts, Deng Xiaoping Theory	000 Generalities 100 Philosophy 200 Religion	A. General works B. Philosophy. Psychology. Religion C. Auxiliary sciences of history D. World history and history of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Etc. E. History of the Americas F. History of the Americas G. Geography. Anthropology. Recreation H. Social sciences J. Political science K. Law L. Education M. Music and books on music N. Fine arts P. Language and literature Q. Science R. Medicine S. Agriculture T. Technology U. Military science V. Naval science Z. Bibliography. Library science. Information resources (General)	A Marxism-Leninism Б/В Natural sciences as a whole Г Chemical sciences Д Earth sciences Е Biological sciences Ж Engineering and technology З Energetics И/К Mining engineering Л Chemical technology М Technology of felled timber Н Building industry О Transport industry П Agricultural industry, forestry Public Heath; Medical sciences С/Т Social sciences. History У Economics Ф Political parties Х State and law Ц Military science Ч Culture III Philological sciences ІІІ Art Э Religion. Atheism ІО Philosophical sciences. Psychology Я Universal content literature
B Philosophy	300 Sciences		
C Social sciences general	400 Applied sciences		
D Political science and law	440 Engineering		
E Military science	500 Social sciences		
F Economy	600-700 History and Geography		
G Culture, science, education, sports	800 Linguistics and Literature		
H Language and script			
I Literature	900 Arts		
J Arts			
K History and geography			
N Natural science general			
O Mathematical & physical sciences and chemistry			
P Astronomy and earth science			
Q Biological sciences			
R Medical sciences and health			
S Agricultural sciences			
T Industrial technologies			
U Traffic and transportation			
V Aeronautics and space science			
X Environmental sciences and safety sciences			
Z Generalities			

Table 1. Main classes of CLC, NCSCL, LCC, and Soviet LBC<sup>[10]</sup>

ROC are two different countries. Interestingly, there is a category of “K25 Semi-colonial, semi-feudalism” period, reflecting PRC’s stand of anti-colonialism and anti-feudalism.

Table 4 compares CLC with NCSCL on term use of some historical periods. In CLC, the use of “invasion of Japanese imperialism” (K264) and “anti-Japanese war” (K265) indicates PRC’s political stance of anti-imperialism and anti-Japanese invasion. By comparison, in NCSCL, the use of “Sino-Japanese war” (628.5) neutralizes the political stance of the war. More interestingly, the use of “Japan-occupation period” (733.28) suggests some sense of Japanese invasion, but “Japan governance period” neutralizes the political stance of Japanese occupation. Neutralization of terms with a political stance expresses an intention of softening the political stance. Term use in a classification re-

flects the political stances of the creator’s government. Another interesting point is that NSCL lists the terms of the same historical period used by CCP. Including different class labels (i.e., category names) used by a different political party shows the different political stances in describing the same historical period, presenting a balanced view on the description of the same historical period and helping readers see the political disputes between the two (or more) sides.

## 5.0 Findings, discussions, and implications

By comparing CLC with NCSCL and occasionally with LCC and LBC, it is found that a nation’s or region’s political stances and priorities are expressed or reflected in a national level comprehensive classification scheme through the fol-

CLC	NCSCL
A Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tze-Tung's Thoughts, Deng Xiaoping Theory	500 Social sciences 540 Sociology: general 549 Social Reform Movements
A1 Works of Marx and Engels	.3 Marxism; Communism .34 Works of Marx and Engels
A2 Works of Lenin	.348 Biography of Marx
A3 Works of Stalin	.349 Biography of Engels
A4 Works of Mao Tze-Tung	.35 Leninism
A5 Collection of works of Marx, Engles, Lenin, Mao Tze-Tung, and Deng Xiaoping	.4 Communism in various countries .42 Communism in China
A7 Biography of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Tze-Tung, and Deng Xiaoping	.421 Guiding theories .4211 Mao Tze-Tung's Thoughts .4216 Deng Xiaoping's theories.
A8 Learning and studies of Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tze-Tung Thoughts, and Deng Xiaoping Theory	
D Political science, law	000 Generalities
D0 Political theory	001 Rare Books
D1 International communism activities	002 Manuscripts
D2 the Communist Party of China	003 Fine transcript; old transcript 004 Old collections 005 Sun Yat-Sen Collections
	.1 Sun Yat-Senism studies .12 Three People's Principles (Principles of Nationalism, Principles of Democracy, Principles of People's Livelihood) .2 the Nationalist's Party of China .3 Biography of the VIPs of the Nationalist's Party of China .31 Biography of Sun Yat-Sen .32 Biography of Chiang Kai-shek .33 Biography of Chiang Ching-kuo .7 Chiang Kai-shek collections .8 Chiang Ching-kuo collections
	Political science 576 Political parties
	.2 Political parties in China [.21] the Nationalist's Party of China Should use 005.2 .25 the Communist's Party of China .334 Democratic Progressive Party

Table 2. Comparisons on the classes of Marxism, Chinese Communist Party, Chinese Nationalist Party, and the collections of political leaders

lowing four venues: (1) prioritizing classes that indicate a nation's, region's or party's ideology, governance theory, or long-term policies and goals; putting the rivalrous nation's, region's or party's ideology, governance theory, or long-term policies and goals in a lower-level classes or making them invisible; (2) prioritizing classes of one's leading political party and/or political leaders; putting rivalrous political parties and/or leaders in a lower-level class or making them invisible

in the classification. (3) putting the territory or history of a rivalrous political entity under one's own political entity to show one is a part of the other; (4) using terms that express the government's or political party's strong political stances (such as anti-, con-, pro-), or neutralizing political terms to soften one's political stances on certain issues. In venues (3) and (4), the classification simply reflects the political stances of the creator's government or political party.

CLC	CLNCS
<p>K History, geography</p> <p>K2 Chinese history</p> <p>K24 Sui, Tang to Ching (581-1840)</p> <p>K25 Semi-colonial, semi-feudalism (1840-1949)</p> <p>K258 Republic of China early period</p> <p>K26 New democratic revolution period (1919-1949)</p> <p>K265.65 Wang Ching-wei puppet regime</p> <p>K27 People's Republic of China (1949-)</p> <p>K28 Ethnic groups history</p> <p>K29 Local histories</p> <p>K295.8 Taiwan</p> <p>K296.58 Hong Kong</p> <p>K296.59 Macau</p>	<p>621-628 Chinese history by period</p> <p>621 Ancient (to 203 B.C.)</p> <p>622 Han, Three Kingdoms (202 B.C. to 280 A.D.)</p> <p>623 Tsin, South-North Dynasties (265-589)</p> <p>624 Tang, Five Dynasties (618-960)</p> <p>625 Sung, Liao, Chin, Yuan (960-1368)</p> <p>626 Ming (1368-1644)</p> <p>627 Ching (1644-1911)</p> <p>628 The Republic of China (1912-)</p> <p>.7 History of the People's Republic of China (1949-)</p> <p>629 Regional histories</p> <p>Political Science</p> <p>570 Political science: general</p> <p>573 Chinese government</p> <p>(governments of ancient China and ROC)</p> <p>574 The governments of other countries</p> <p>.1 PRC politics</p>

Table 3. Comparison on Chinese history

CLC	NCSC
<p>K History, geography</p> <p>K2 Chinese history</p> <p>K264 Invasion of Japanese imperialism and nationwide anti-Japanese democratic movements</p> <p>K265 Anti-Japanese war period</p> <p>K266 Third civil revolution (liberation war) period (1945-1949)</p> <p>K269 Revolution construction and development of liberated areas</p> <p>K27 People's Republic of China: socialism revolution and construction period (1949-)</p> <p>K28 Ethnic history</p> <p>K29 Local history</p> <p>K296.58 Hong Kong</p> <p>K296.59 Macau</p> <p>K295.8 Taiwan</p>	<p>Chinese history by period</p> <p>628 The Republic of China (1912- )</p> <p>.3 ROC government period (1926- )</p> <p>.4 ROC 1927-1937</p> <p>.5 Sino-Japanese war (1937-1945)</p> <p>.6 Post Sino-Japanese war (1945- )</p> <p>.63 After ROC government moved to Taiwan</p> <p>.7 PRC history</p> <p>History by period reference table by CCP:</p> <p>628.266 New democratism revolution period (1919-1949)</p> <p>628.29 First civil revolution war period (1924-1927)</p> <p>628.4 Second civil revolution war period (i.e., land revolution period) (1927-1937)</p> <p>628.5 Anti-Japanese war period (1937-1945)</p> <p>628.6 Third civil revolution war period (i.e., liberation war period) (1945-1949)</p> <p>628.7 Socialism revolution and construction period (1949- )</p> <p>733 Taiwan history and geography</p> <p>.2 Taiwan history</p> <p>.28 Japan occupation period (1895-1945): Same as Japan governance period</p>

Table 4. Comparison on term use of some historical periods.

Comprehensive Classification systems encode world knowledge. Various political systems and political stances on various issues are a part of world knowledge. Classification systems reflect not only subjective judgments and biases of the creators but also a nation's or region's political stances or political will. It is natural that a nation or region's comprehensive classification system expresses its political stances on certain issues. CLC exhibits strong political stances by prioritizing PRC's ideology and important classes, making ROC's ideology and categories of some political figures invisible, and using terms that reflect strong political stances such as anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-feudalism, and the "one-China" principle. CLC is more like LCC in terms of prioritizing important classes at top categories. By comparison, MCSCL is more like DDC in presenting top categories. NCSCL does exhibit political stances by putting ROC's political figures and KMT at upper-level classes and putting PRC's political figures and CCP at lower-level classes but does not exhibit political stances as strongly as CLC at top categories. NCSCL presents classes of the same historical period from both ROC's and CCP's view, presenting the political disputes in a balanced view, which may help users see the political stances from both sides. NCSCL also reflects ROC's neutralized political stances through neutralized term use (such as Sino-Japan war, Japan governance period).

The findings have theoretical and practical implications. Previous research indicates that comprehensive classification schemes may reflect political positions. This study enriches the existing literature by revealing the ways that political positions can be presented in a national level comprehensive classification scheme. Users of classification schemes should be aware of the political stances in these classifications and be aware of the possible political disputes that may not be reflected in a classification. Users such as political scientists can also use national level comprehensive classification schemes to study a nation or region's political positions. If possible, creators of classifications are recommended to present a balanced view on certain political disputes (including difference on term use of same historical or political events) to help readers get an unbiased view of the disputes.

## 6.0 Conclusions, limitations, and future work

This paper investigates how political stances and priorities are expressed or reflected in a national level comprehensive classification scheme by comparing two Chinese national level comprehensive classification schemes: CLC and NCSCL. Four venues by which political stances and priorities are expressed or reflected in a classification system are identified. The findings strengthen previous research on the critical classification that classification systems are sub-

jective and biased and enrich the existing literature by revealing the ways that political positions can be presented in a national level comprehensive classification scheme. Presenting competing political stances on the same issues in the classification system can help readers get a balanced view of certain political disputes.

The study has limitations. It has studied only two classification schemes and identified four venues by which political stances can be reflected in classification systems. It has studied a limited number of political topics in both classifications. In the future, we plan to explore other classification systems related to political topics to locate additional venues.

## Endnotes

1. *Encyclopedia Columbia*, 8th ed. 2018. s.v. "Sun Yat-sen."
2. *Encyclopedia Macmillan*. 2003a. s.v. "Guomindang (or Kuomintang)."
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2017. s.v. "Chinese Communist Party," accessed February 15, 2024, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Chinese-Communist-Party>.
5. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2023. s.v. "Four Modernizations," accessed 15, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Four-Modernizations>
6. *Encyclopedia Macmillan*. 2003b. s.v. "Taiwan (official name: Republic of China)."
7. *Philip's Encyclopedia* 2008. s.v. "Taiwan."
8. *Encyclopedia Macmillan*. 2003b. s.v. "Taiwan" (official name: Republic of China)
9. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2023. s.v. "Three Principles of the People: Chinese Ideology", accessed 15, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Three-Principles-of-the-People>
10. CLC, NCSCL, LCC main classes are available at <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcco/> and Soviet LBC main classes are available at <https://www.isko.org/cyclo/lbc>

## References

Adler, Melissa. 2017. "Classification along the Color Line: Excavating Racism in the Stacks." *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1, no. 1. <https://doi.org/10.24242/jcls.v1i1.17>

Bednareks, Antje. 2007. "The Colonial Bias: Library Classification in Aotearoa New Zealand." *New Zealand Library & Information Management Journal* 50, no. 3: 232-45.

Bowker, Geoffrey C. and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting Things Out: Classifications and its Consequences*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.

Bullard, Julia, Amber Dierking, and Avi Grundner. 2020. "Centering LGBT2QIA+ Subjects in Knowledge Organization Systems." *Knowledge Organization* 47, no. 5: 393-403. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2020-5-393>

China National Library. 2010. "Chinese Library Classification," Version 5, last modified 2010, <https://www.clc-index.com>

Comaromi, John Phillip and Mohinder Partap Satija. 1985. "History of Indianization of the Dewey Decimal Classification". *Libri*, 35, no. 1: 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libr.1985.35.1.1>

Evans, G. Edward, Sheila S Intner, and Jean Weihs. 2011. *Introduction to Technical Services*. 8th ed. Santa Barbara, California: Libraries Unlimited.

Fan, Xingkun. 2008. A Study on Sino-Soviet Exchanging in Librarianship and its Influence in the years of 1950s. *Library and Information Service* 53, no.3: 132-137 (in Chinese).

Foskett, Anthony Charles. 1984. "Better Dead than Read: Further Studies in Critical Classification." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 28, no.4: 346-59.

Green, Rebecca. 2015. "Indigenous Peoples in the U.S., Sovereign Nations, and the DDC." *Knowledge Organization* 42, no.4: 211-21. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2015-4-211>

Green, Michael J., and Bonnie S Glaser. 2017. "What is the U.S. 'One China' policy, and why does it matter?" *Center for Strategic & International Studies*. January 13, 2017 <https://www.csis.org/analysis/what-us-one-china-policy-and-why-does-it-matter>

Higgins, Colin. 2012. "Library of Congress Classification: Teddy Roosevelt's World in Numbers?" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 50, no. 4: 249-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2012.658989>

Higgins, Molly. 2016. "Totally Invisible: Asian American representation in the Dewey Decimal Classification, 1876-1996." *Knowledge Organization* 43, no.8: 609-21. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2016-8-609>

Ian, Chong Ja. 2023. "The Many 'One Chinas': Multiple Approaches to Taiwan and China." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. February 03, 2023. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/02/09/many-one-chinas-multiple-approaches-to-taiwan-and-china-pub-89003>

Kam, D. Vanessa. 2007. "Subject Headings for Aboriginals: The Power of Naming." *Art Documentation* 26, no 2: 18-22.

Koch, Traugott. 1997. "The Role of Classification Schemes Internet Resource Description and Discovery." UKOLN Metadata Group. May 14, 1997. [http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/desire/classification/class\\_1.htm](http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/desire/classification/class_1.htm)

Kuo, Raymond. 2023. "'Strategic ambiguity' may have U.S. and Taiwan trapped in a prisoner's dilemma." *Rand Corporation*. January 18, 2023. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2023/01/strategic-ambiguity-may-have-us-and-taiwan-trapped.html>

Library of Congress, 2023a. "Library of Congress Classification Outline." Last modified 2023, <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcco/>

Library of Congress, 2023b. "Library of Congress Classification." Last modified March 31, 2014, <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcc.html>

Lin, Chia-nan. 2021. "Taiwan Strait Most Dangerous Place on Earth: 'Economist'." *Taipei Times*, May 1st, 2021. <https://www.taipeitimes.com/News/front/archives/2021/05/01/2003756631>

Liu, Hsiang-Wang. 2009. "Democratic Progressive Party (DPP)." *Encyclopedia of Chinese-American Relations*, edited by Yuwu Song. McFarland Publisher.

Merkley, C. 2011. "The Library of Congress, Dewey Decimal, and Universal Decimal Classification Systems are Incomplete and Unsystematic." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 6, no.4: 134–36. <https://doi.org.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/10.18438/B8QK7S>

Metz, Justin. 2021. "The Most Dangerous Place On Earth." *The Economist*, May 1st, 2021. <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2021/05/01/the-most-dangerous-place-on-earth>

National Library. 2007. "New Classification Scheme for Chinese Libraries," Version 2007, last modified March 31, 2008, <http://catweb.ncl.edu.tw/class2007/96-1-1.htm>

Oh, Dong-Geun and Ji-Suk Yeo. 2001. "Suggesting an Option for DDC Class Religion (200) for Nations in which Religious, Diversity Predominates." *Knowledge Organization* 28, no. 2: 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2001-2-75>

Olson, Hope A. 2010 "Social Influences on Classification." In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*, 3rd ed., 4806-13, edited by Marcia J. Bates and Mary Niles Maack. New York: Taylor and Francis.

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. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v32n02\\_06](https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v32n02_06)

Sahadath, Catelynne. 2013. "Classifying the Margins: Using Alternative Classification Schemes to Empower Diverse and Marginalized Users." *Feliciter* 3, no. 59: 15-17.

Sardar, Ziauddin. 1979. *Islam: Outline of a Classification Scheme*. London: Clive Bingley.

Satija, M. 2013. "Briefs on the 19th (1979) to the 23rd edition (2011) of Dewey Decimal Classification." *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 33, no.4: 277-88. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.33.4.4882>

Taylor, Arlene G. 1992. *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification*. 8th ed. Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.

Thornley, Clare, Marta Bustillo, and Christoph Schmidt Supprian. 2022. "The Ethics of Classifying the World: From Library Catalogues to AI." In *Proceedings of the 23rd European Conference on Knowledge Management, 1-2 September 2022 Federico II, Italy*, edited by Roberto Cerchione and Piera Centobelli, 1462-65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34190/eckm.23.2.514>

Upshur, Jiu-Hwa Lo. 2016. "Mao Zedong." *World History: A Comprehensive Reference Set*. Facts on File.

Vann, Sarah K. 1967. "Dewey Abroad: The Field Survey of 1964." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 11, 67.

Yun, Chen, and Jonathan Chin. 2023. "Taiwan Already Independent, Lai says." *Taipei Times*. Jan 19, 2023. <https://www.taipeitimes.com/News/front/archives/2023/01/19/2003792832>