

2022

Searching for Paumanok: Methodology for a Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York

Kristen J. Nyitray

Stony Brook University, kristen.nyitray@stonybrook.edu

Dana Reijerkerk

Stony Brook University, dana.reijerkerk@stonybrook.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.library.stonybrook.edu/library_articles



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

To cite this article: Kristen J. Nyitray and Dana Reijerkerk, "Searching for Paumanok: Methodology for a Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 60, no.1 (2022): 19-44, doi: 10.1080/01639374.2021.1989640. To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1989640>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Academic Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Academic Commons. For more information, please contact mona.ramonetti@stonybrook.edu, hu.wang.2@stonybrook.edu.

Searching for Paumanok: Methodology for a Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York

Kristen J. Nyitray & Dana Reijerkerk

To cite this article: Kristen J. Nyitray and Dana Reijerkerk, “Searching for Paumanok: Methodology for a Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 60, no.1 (2022): 19-44, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2021.1989640](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1989640).

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1989640>

Abstract

Part 1 of “Searching for Paumanok: A Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York” evaluated Library of Congress (LC) bibliographic tools and sources for description and arrangement of Indigenous Long Island collections. Part 2 details the processes for identifying and assessing subject headings, names, and classifications with an emphasis on decolonizing methodologies. The authors discuss practical strategies for examining representations of Indigenous peoples and their homelands in LC Authorities. The study culminates with a knowledge organization schema to improve bibliographic control and understandings of Indigenous Long Island history and culture.

Keywords

Indigenous Peoples; authorities; subject access; cataloging biases; Library of Congress Subject Headings; Library of Congress Classification; Long Island; New York

Introduction

“Starting from fish-shape Paumanok where I was born” ... Walt Whitman referencing Long Island, New York in *Leaves of Grass*, 1867.¹

Long Island, New York uses several hundred words with Indigenous origins for naming its places, communities, roads, schools, beaches, and geographies.² Although these terms are commonplace, the history of the Indigenous peoples who inhabited the island for an estimated 10,000 years remains understudied today. Poet Walt Whitman’s writings were influenced by his

¹ Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass* (New York: W.E. Chapin & Co., Printers, 1867), from “Starting from Paumanok,” 7.

² William Wallace Tooker, *The Indian Place-Names on Long Island and Islands Adjacent, with Their Probable Significations* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1911); William Wallace Tooker, *Indian Place-Names in East-Hampton Town* (New York: J. H. Hunt, printer, 1889).

experiences with Indigenous peoples,³ so much so he referred to Long Island as “Paumanok” and suggested its original inhabitants “deserve at least the poor recompense of the compliment [sic] connected in preserving the old name by which they themselves designated and knew this territory.”⁴ Nearly 150 years later, a disconnect remains between language provenance, history, and culture and the prominent visible appearance of words of Indigenous origins. For Long Island, neither Whitman’s iconic reference to “Paumanok” nor “Pommanoc”⁵ is represented in the Library of Congress Name Authority File (LCNAF). Regrettably, unsourced works continue to perpetuate false narratives of the 13 tribes living on Long Island, often confined to land areas with precise boundaries.⁶ Compounding this issue is scant new scholarship about Indigenous Long Island. This lack of representation is mirrored in the public sphere. Discussions about Native peoples remain rooted in the past and few forums have emerged to foster relationship-building and dialogues.

In Part 1, the review of literature suggested “Searching for Paumanok: A Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York” was the first critical study of absences in LC Authorities for cataloging and classification of Indigenous communities in the region.⁷ The expansive and unique nature of the research necessitated preparing the manuscript in two parts. The first part examined the historical underpinnings that have manifested in omissions, inaccurate, and misleading LC authority records and classifications for Indigenous Long Island. An analysis of existing decolonizing methodologies, frameworks, and revisionist cataloging standards for describing underrepresented diverse populations was explored. In existing catalog records, a lack of presence for Indigenous communities was found. Searches performed in WorldCat identified titles that lacked headings and names reflective of Indigenous content yet met the criteria of literary warrant and the 20% rule.⁸ Omissions and nonexistent headings have created barriers to collection access which impedes new research. Representation and naming Indigenous Long Islanders with accurate terms in LC Authorities is a symbolic form of land acknowledgment. The authors maintain that

³ Folsom, Ed, “Native Americans [Indians],” in *Walt Whitman: An Encyclopedia*, ed. J. R. LeMaster and Donald D. Kummings (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998).

⁴ “Brooklyniana: A Series of Local Articles, on Past and Present,” *Brooklyn Standard*, no. 13, March 1, 1862. This work is unsigned but is attributed to Whitman by Whitman scholars.

⁵ Conveyance of land from Yovawan, Sachem of Pommanoc, and Aswaw, his wife to Lion Gardiner on May 3, 1639 in C. Crane Gardiner, *The Papers and Biography of Lion Gardiner, 1599-1663: With an Appendix* (St. Louis: [Press of Levison & Blythe Stationary Co.], 1883), 81.

⁶ Paul Bailey, *The Thirteen Tribes of Long Island*, Rev. and enl. [ed.] (Amityville, NY: Bailey, 1959).

⁷ Kristen J. Nyitray and Dana Reijerkerk, “Searching for Paumanok: A Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, no. 5 (2021): 409–41, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627>.

⁸ *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Module 1.5, 8*. “Headings are based on literary warrant, which means that they are proposed only as needed for new cataloging. The Library of Congress does not go out and look for new headings to add; instead, as catalogers are working, when they find a resource that cannot be described with existing headings, they propose what they need.” <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcsh/PDF%20scripts/1-5%20Intro%20To%20LCSH.pdf>, June 2016. *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Module 5.4*, p. 4. “. . .in order to assign a heading for a topic, it must be represented in at least 20 percent of the resource.” <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcsh/PDF%20scripts/5-4%20Extended%20examples.pdf>.

representation among LC Authorities reaffirms Indigenous histories and recognizes the contemporary five sovereign Nations still living on Long Island.⁹

In Part 2, the authors discuss the methodology for the study with the intent to share a replicable framework for identifying and evaluating vocabularies and arrangement of collections in a regional context. Due to a limited amount of authoritative and interpretive sources, research strategies necessitated consulting primary sources and historical works, developing a knowledge organization framework, and performing recursive searches in LC databases for keywords, names, and geographic locations. The extent and scope of Indigenous Long Island communities and localities were assessed in Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), the LCNAF, and Library of Congress Classification (LCC). LC entries were compiled directly from searches yielded in the LC Linked Data Service portal and the LC Authorities website.¹⁰ Based on the totality of the research findings, the authors have produced an Indigenous Long Island knowledge organization schema of taxonomies, thesauri, and ontologies to improve cataloging efforts.

Context

State of regional Indigenous scholarship

Indigenous Studies comprise a multiplicity of disciplines including history, law, medicine and health, science, culture, literatures, and the arts. Indigenous scholars and thought-leaders, and many of Indigenous-descent, are forging and shaping new narratives. They have made significant contributions toward situating Native experiences, traditions, and the impacts of settler-colonialism in their research and published works.¹¹ Regional studies specific to Long Island are extremely limited. This lack of research to advance understanding, dispel long-standing myths, and inform the present resulted in expanding the scope of sources identified and consulted for this project.

Comparable studies on subject and classification treatments

There is a large corpus of professional literature examining LC's limitations and inability over time to include historically marginalized and underrepresented groups in its bibliographic sources and tools. Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars have studied missing and inadequate

⁹ The Shinnecock Nation is a U.S. federally recognized tribe. The Unkechaug Nation is a New York state-recognized tribe. The Matinecock Nation, Setalcott Nation, and Montaukett Nation maintain an active presence on Long Island and currently are not recognized by either New York State or the U.S. federal government.

¹⁰ Library of Congress, Linked Data Service, "ID.LOC.GOV—Linked Data Service," <https://id.loc.gov/> (accessed January 2021 to May 2021). Library of Congress, "Library of Congress Authorities," <https://authorities.loc.gov/> (accessed January 2021 to May 2021).

¹¹ For examples, see works by: Philip J. Deloria, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, Mark Neil Trahant, Loren Frank Ghiglione, Douglas L. Medin, Ned Blackhawk, Shirley Williams/Migizi ow-kwe, Janet Smylie, Bob Kayseas, Qwul'sih'yah'mah/Robina Thomas, Naiomi Metallic, Bradley Moggridge, and Deborah McGregor.

subject headings and names, and the ethics surrounding the lack of cultural relevance to LC Authorities.¹² Howard and Knowlton created an ontology of subject headings for African American studies and LGBTQIA studies by searching the full text of the current LCC for terms and Broader Terms like “Black,” “African American,” “AIDS,” and “queer” in consultation with existing subject lists present in the literature.¹³ A comprehensive literature review by Edge provides numerous examples of studies and assessments focused on the insufficiency of classification and subject access to LGBTIQ materials.¹⁴ Knowlton performed searches of current LCSH in OCLC Connexion for headings deemed biased by Sanford Berman in *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Headings Concerning People*.¹⁵ Biswas evaluated problematic terminology used in LCSH, specifically “East Indians” for referencing individuals in India through subject and title analyses in WorldCat and traces its roots to European colonialism.¹⁶ Diao and Cao evaluated the influence of chronology in crafting classifications and LCSH with an emphasis on SHM H1225 in the *Subject Headings Manual*.¹⁷ The authors evaluated heading patterns in the titles of 338 Chinese archaeological reports and found “SHM H1225 was created based on how Western archaeological reports should be represented in the construction and assignment of subject headings, and this runs the risk of overlooking the specificity and uniqueness of archaeological reports in other cultures.”¹⁸

Methodology

Research Questions

The objective of this study was to examine the availability and precision of subjects, names, and classifications in LC Authorities for published works by and about Indigenous Long Island. The complexity of the historical record led the authors to anticipate misinformation and minimal

¹² For example, see: D. Vanessa Kam, “Subject Headings for Aborigines: The Power of Naming,” *Art Documentation: Bulletin of the Art Libraries Society of North America* 26, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 18–22, <https://doi.org/10.1086/adx.26.2.27949465>; Marisa Elena Duarte and Miranda Belarde-Lewis, “Imagining: Creating Spaces for Indigenous Ontologies,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5-6 (2015): 677–702, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396>.

¹³ Sara A. Howard and Steven A. Knowlton, “Browsing through Bias: The Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings for African American Studies and LGBTQIA Studies,” *Library Trends* 67, no. 1 (Summer 2018): 74–88, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0026>.

¹⁴ Samuel J. Edge, “A Subject ‘Queer’-y: A Literature Review on Subject Access to LGBTIQ Materials,” *The Serials Librarian* 75, nos. 1-4 (2019): 81–90, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2018.1556190>.

¹⁵ Steven A. Knowlton, “Three Decades Since *Prejudices and Antipathies*: A Study of Changes in the Library of Congress Subject Headings,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (2005): 123–45, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v40n02_08.

¹⁶ Paromita Biswas, “Rooted in the Past: Use of ‘East Indians’ in Library of Congress Subject Headings,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2018): 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1386253>.

¹⁷ Junli Diao and Haiyun Cao, “Chronology in Cataloging Chinese Archaeological Reports: An Investigation of Cultural Bias in the Library of Congress Classification,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (2016): 244–62, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2016.1150931>.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 256.

representation in sources for bibliographic description and knowledge organization. Four core, interrelated questions informed the scope of the study and the research framework.

- How and to what extent is Indigenous Long Island represented in LC Authorities?
- Are variant names and headings accurate?
- Do discrepancies and inconsistencies exist in vocabularies and classifications?
- Are new terms and classifications needed to describe library resources?

Geographic scope of Indigenous Long Island peoples and places

Long Island, New York is situated east of Manhattan (New York County, New York) and spans approximately 120 miles lengthwise and 23 miles widthwise.¹⁹ Formed by a series of glacial episodes originating more than 20,000 years ago, the geography of the island includes several bodies of water, barrier islands, and two fork-shaped landforms on its eastern end. The southern coast of Connecticut and the north shore of Long Island are separated principally by the Long Island Sound. Early place names referencing Indigenous origins used to describe the island include Metoac, Matouwacs, Nahicans, Paumanok, and Sewanhacky. There is a plurality and a fluidity of Indigenous peoples inhabiting Long Island for the past 10,000 years; they moved and were removed over time. The immediate proximity to water supported co-mingling and interactions among Indigenous peoples in the tri-state environs of New York City, New Jersey, and Connecticut. As a result, community group identities, names, and territories have been changed, altered, superseded, and eliminated over time. In this study, the use of the place name “Long Island” was informed by geography and political structures. It is defined as present-day Kings County (Brooklyn), Queens County, Nassau County, and Suffolk County (Table 1).

Table 1. Brief timeline of ten events in Indigenous Long Island history. Indigenous peoples continue to live on Long Island.

Date	Event
20,000 BCE	Long Island geographies formed by the Wisconsin glacial episode.
10,000 BCE	Indigenous peoples inhabit Long Island.

¹⁹ “Long Island: Location and Physical Setting,” U.S. Geological Survey, https://www.usgs.gov/centers/ny-water/science/long-island-location-and-physical-setting?qt-science_center_objects=0#qt-science_center_objects (accessed May 14, 2021).

1524	Giovanni da Verrazzano records an encounter with the Lenape in the area of New York Harbor. The Indigenous population is estimated at 10,000.
1639	Lion Gardiner is one of the first English colonial settlers on Long Island. He acquires his namesake island from the Montauketts.
1650s	Infectious diseases and encroachment reduces the population to approximately 400–500 within the Shinnecocks, Unkechaugs, and Montauketts.
1656	Fort Massapeag is constructed to facilitate trade among the Dutch and Native peoples.
1777	The Unkechaug are recognized by the State of New York.
1792	The Shinnecock are forcibly organized as a trusteeship by the New York State Legislature.
2010	The U.S. government recognizes the Shinnecock Indian Nation.
2021	The Shinnecock, Montaukett, Setalcott, Unkechaug, and Matinecock are sovereign Nations on Long Island.

Overview of research methods

This research was qualitative; it combined elements of descriptive, exploratory, and remedial studies. In conceptualizing the research methods, primary consideration was given to the lack of Indigeneity in regional narratives and to issues surrounding ethics in authority work including legacy biases embedded in headings and classifications. As discussed in Part 1, for the past several decades published studies have documented LC’s history of underrepresenting diverse populations in cataloging standards and its inability to account for them.²⁰ Data collection for this study required employing a variety of search strategies and techniques. These approaches also

²⁰ Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (Scarecrow Press, 1971); Alissa Cherry and Keshav Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification: Revisiting and Reviving the Brian Deer Scheme,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos. 5-6 (2015): 548–67, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1008717>; Marisa Elena Duarte and Miranda Belarde-Lewis, “Imagining: Creating Spaces for Indigenous Ontologies,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, nos. 5-6 (2015): 677–702, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396>; Heather Moulaison Sandy and Jenny Bossaller, “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access to Indigenous Knowledge through Knowledge Organizations Systems,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (2017): 129–52, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1281858>; Christine Bone and Brett Lougheed, “Library of Congress Subject Headings Related to Indigenous Peoples: Changing LCSH for Use in a Canadian Archival Context,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2018), 83–95, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1382641>; Steven W. Holloway, “LCSH in the Southern Levant,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 56, no. 7 (2018): 571–91, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2018.1508107>.

needed to be fluid and flexible, as the authors expected to discover new information throughout the research process.

The steps formulated and taken for this research project included: identifying the problem; conducting historical research; consulting contemporary scholarship and communicating with subject experts; devising a knowledge organization framework; performing iterative searches in LC databases and OCLC WorldCat; recording data in tables; assessing authority records; interrogating LC name, subject, and classification entries; and formulating conclusions. The information gathered and evaluated was recorded in an integrated LC taxonomy, ontology, and thesaurus for describing Indigenous Long Island collections. The taxonomy represents the relationships identified among Long Island Indigenous communities and subgroups, and incorporates relational ontologies and names associated with each respective community over time. Data compiled from searching the LC Authorities builds upon this foundational research and supports comparative analyses.

Decolonizing methodologies reframe information in tangible, meaningful ways and return agency to Indigenous peoples who have been marginalized and disempowered. It recognizes colonial forces have lasting impact and influence in academic research and broader contexts. Employing this approach was imperative for the current research project with adherence to Linda Tuhiwai Smith's²¹ naming, networking, returning, and reframing decolonization²² methodologies in particular.²³ Kānaka Maoli scholar Neolani Arista²⁴ called for Indigenous language presence to normalize it in public spaces and support language acquisition and fluency.²⁵ According to Kelema Lee Moses, decolonization is not a “theoretical exercise in settler guilt.”²⁶ It is part of a larger process of acknowledging Indigenous experiences, culture, and history. It respects and refers to peoples as they describe and define themselves. Renaming affirms the authoritativeness of Indigenous knowledge and decision-making power regarding the lands, bodies of water, and town names to original peoples. As a community-oriented responsibility, it is “a method of preserving voice, which encapsulates personal and communal agency and the expression of Indigenous identities, belonging, and responsibility to self and community.”²⁷ Further, proposed changes to the LC names, subjects, and classifications in this study are a form of language reclamation. For this research, the authors strove to create and implement decolonizing research strategies. As articulated by Zavala, they are “less about the

²¹ Linda Tuhiwai Smith is Professor of Indigenous Education, University of Waikato.

²² Kelema Lee Moses, “Lessons from Hawai’i,” Platform (blog), October 19, 2019, <https://www.platformspace.net/home/lessons-from-hawaii>.

²³ Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed, 2012).

²⁴ Neolani Arista is Professor of Hawaiian and U.S. History, University of Hawai’i.

²⁵ Neolani Arista, *The Kingdom and the Republic: Sovereign Hawai’i and the Early United States* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020).

²⁶ Kelema Lee Moses, “Lessons from Hawai’i.”

²⁷ Teresa L. McCarty, Sheilah E. Nicholas, Kari A. B. Chew, Natalie G. Diaz, Wesley Y. Leonard, and Louellyn White, “Hear Our Languages, Hear Our Voices: Storywork as Theory & Praxis in Indigenous-Language Reclamation,” *Daedalus* 147, no. 2 (Spring 2018). https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00499_28.

struggle for method and more about the spaces that make decolonizing research possible” (Figure 1).²⁸

Figure 1. Research framework



Research strategies

Historical research

²⁸ Miguel Zavala, “What Do We Mean by Decolonizing Research Strategies? Lessons from Decolonizing, Indigenous Research Projects in New Zealand and Latin America,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 2, no. 1 (2013): 55–71.

This research could not have been conducted without first studying primary sources, government documents, historical maps, and literature specific to the region. Review of commonly cited texts, although some riddled with questionable content, allowed important insights to be gleaned about the terminology and words used over time to reference Indigenous communities, peoples, and geographies.²⁹ Reference works ranging from Hodge's *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*³⁰ to Sturtevant and Trigger's series *Handbook of North American Indians* were among the encyclopedic sources consulted to provide historical perspectives.³¹ Peoples and geographic terms including English translations of Algonquin words were identified in primary sources,³² township records,³³ and gazetteers.³⁴ While William Wallace Tooker's (1848–1917) ethnolinguistic studies contain speculations, these works were closely studied as they represent the most comprehensive sources for words of Indigenous origins referenced in secondary sources.³⁵ *Wikipedia* entries, although uneven in coverage, did supply information that warranted further investigation.³⁶ Entries were corroborated and therefore cited as part of a community-sourced repository of vetted information.

²⁹ Edward Manning Rutenber, *History of the Indian Tribes of Hudson's River: Their Origin, Manners and Customs, Tribal and Sub-tribal Organizations, Wars, Treaties, etc.* (Albany, NY: J. Munsell, 1872); W. Martin Beauchamp, *Indian Names in New York: with a Selection from Other States, and Some Onondaga Names of Plants, etc.* (Fayetteville, NY: Printed by H. C. Beauchamp, 1893); Benjamin F. Thompson, *History of Long Island: Containing an Account of the Discovery and Settlement: with Other Important and Interesting Matters to the Present Time* (New York: E. French, 1839); Trumbull, *The Composition of Indian Geographical Names: Illustrated from the Algonkin Languages*; Bailey, *The Thirteen Tribes of Long Island*.

³⁰ Frederick Webb Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico* (Washington: G.P.O., 1907–1912).

³¹ William C. Sturtevant and Bruce G. Trigger, *Handbook of North American Indians* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).

³² Among the repositories accessed for primary sources was New York Heritage Digital Collections, <https://nyheritage.org>. “New York Heritage is a research portal for students, educators, historians, genealogists, and anyone else who is interested in learning more about the people, places and institutions of New York State.”

³³ Land and property records provided important information and insights about interpersonal dynamics, social forces at play, and the economic transactions among peoples. These records typically include detailed descriptions of geographies and offer evidence of place names. See: *Records of the Town of East Hampton, Long Island, Suffolk Co., N.Y.: With Other Ancient Documents of Historic Value* (Sag Harbor, NY: J.H. Hunt, 1887); *Records of the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, N.Y., 1655-1885: Copied from the Original Records, in Their Order, Under the Direction of the Supervisor and Justices of the Peace, and Pub. by the Authority of the Town* (Patchogue, NY, 1880); William S. Pelletreau, William J. Post, James A. Early, Edward P. White, and Harry Dering Sleight, *Records of the Town of Southampton, with Other Ancient Documents of Historic Value* (Sag-Harbor, NY: J. H. Hunt, printer, Oyster Bay, NY, 1874); John Cox and George William Cocks, *Oyster Bay Town Records 1653-1878* (New York: T. A. Wright, 1916).

³⁴ Robert Steven Grumet and Raymond Whritenour, *Beyond Manhattan: A Gazetteer of Delaware Indian History Reflected in Modern-day Place Names* (Albany, NY: New York State Education Department, 2014), <http://purl.org/net/nysl/nysdocs/894524543>.

³⁵ William Wallace Tooker, *The Indian Place-Names and Indian Place-Names in East-Hampton Town*.

³⁶ “Metoac,” *Wikipedia*, last modified March 14, 2021, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metoac> (accessed May 6, 2021); *Wikipedia*; “Long Island,” *Wikipedia*, last modified May 4, 2021, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long_Island (accessed May 6, 2021).

Invaluable sources for identifying Indigenous community groups and place names were cartographic materials³⁷ and maps in Google Earth. No single map depicts all Indigenous Long Island communities identified in the taxonomy. In the early research phase, Aaron Carapella's (Cherokee) map *Tribal Nations: Our Own Names & Locations* was reviewed.³⁸ However, inaccuracies were discovered during the research, particularly among lands surrounding modern-day New York City. The authors found Native Land Digital's mapping of Long Island to be the most accurate representation of fluid boundaries.³⁹ The emphasis of this map is territory awareness.

Contemporary scholarship

The interdisciplinary scope of the research necessitated consideration of multiple fields of study particularly Indigenous Studies, geography, archaeology, culture, and politics. To counterbalance early narratives, contemporary writings exploring Long Island history in local and broader Atlantic contexts were reviewed.⁴⁰ These sources were further situated in larger U.S. contexts among scholarship challenging national, foundational myths including works by Claudio Saunt, Howard Zinn, and Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz.⁴¹ Additionally, communications were initiated with scholars of Long Island history with deep subject knowledge.⁴² According to John A. Strong,⁴³ some Indigenous Long Island communities were tributees.⁴⁴ Others were related and may have shared cultural and linguistic affinities, however this theory is not intended to imply one group was a subgroup of another one. Strong's research has advanced understandings of Indigenous

³⁷ Examples include J. Chace, John Douglass, and Robert Pearsall Smith, *Map of Suffolk County, L.I., N.Y.: From Actual Surveys* (Philadelphia: John Douglass, Publisher, 1858); F. W. Beers, *Atlas of Long Island, New York: From Recent and Actual Surveys and Records* (New York: Beers, Comstock & Cline, 1873).

³⁸ Aaron Carapella, "Eastern Woodlands Nations Map: Traditional Names & Locations," scale not given (Indigenous Peoples Media, 2013).

³⁹ Native Land Digital, <https://native-land.ca/> (accessed February 23, 2021). Native Land Canada is a non-profit organization that maintains a crowdsourced digital map depicting fluid boundaries for multiple Indigenous traditional (ancestral) homelands, languages, treaties across the Americas, Pacific Islands, Europe, Southeast Asia, New Zealand, and Australia. Maps are prefaced: "This map does not represent or intend to represent official or legal boundaries of any Indigenous nations. To learn about definitive boundaries, contact the nations in question...it is a work in progress with tons of contributions from the community." The map of Long Island, New York includes Munsee Lenape, Canarsie, Lekawe (Rockaway), Matinecock, Merrick, Massapeguas, Nissaquogue, Secatogue, Setauket, Unkechaug, Shinnecock, Corchaug, Mannansett, and Montaukett. The spellings are taken verbatim from the map

⁴⁰ Examples include all works by J. A. Strong; Robert Steven Grumet and Raymond Whritenour, *Beyond Manhattan*; David Y. Allen, *Long Island Maps and Their Makers: Five Centuries of Cartographic History* (Mattituck, NY: Amereon House, 1997); Andrew Lipman, *The Saltwater Frontier: Indians and the Contest for the American Coast* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).

⁴¹ Claudio Saunt, *Unworthy Republic: the Dispossession of Native Americans and the Road to Indian Territory* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2020); Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States: 1492-present* (London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2015); Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2014).

⁴² Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 156.

⁴³ Professor Emeritus, History and American Studies, Long Island University.

⁴⁴ John A. Strong, *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island from Earliest Times to 1700* (Empire State Books, Interlaken, NY: Heart of the Lakes Publishing, 2000).

Long Island. His book *The Unkechaug Indians of Eastern Long Island* is noted as source data (670 field) in the LC subject authority record for “Unkechaug Indians.”⁴⁵

Selecting Indigenous Long Island and associated communities

The historical research and consulting phases culminated with selecting 14 primary Indigenous communities with sacred homelands on geographic Long Island: Canarsies (includes Jameos and Najaks), Corchaugs (includes Yennecoaks), Manhassetts, Massapeguas, Matinecoaks, Merricks (includes Marechkewicks), Montauketts, Nissequogues, Rockaways (includes Maspeths), Secatogues, Seponarks, Setalcotts, Shinnecoaks, and Unkechaugs. An additional 20 peoples were identified in primary and published sources which spurred further research. Ultimately, 13 more Indigenous communities were included in the new knowledge organization scheme due to their documented interactions and/or geographic proximity in the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. They are: Delawares, Hammonassetts, Lenni Lenapes, Manhattans (Lenapes),⁴⁶ Menunkatucks,⁴⁷ Munsees (Lenapes), Nehantics (Niantics), Paugussetts, Pequots,⁴⁸ Quinnipiaks, Rechgawawancs (Lenapes), Wappingers (Lenapes),⁴⁹ and Wiechquaeskecks.

Devising the framework

A framework allowed for arrangement and organization of the information compiled for the twenty-seven Indigenous communities and to reflect the relationships among them. The data was entered in a Google Sheet shared by the authors. The first column was numbered 1–27. Numbers 1 to 14 represent the communities of geographic Long Island, while numbers 15–27 correlate to the associated communities in the region. The second and third columns were labeled “Indigenous Community” and “Sub-Communities” and mapped to “Taxonomy” (columns B and C). In the study, the term “community” was selected to reflect the kinship networks among the groups. Additional columns were created as placeholders for information to be compiled from the LC Linked Data Service portal and the LC Authorities including results yielded from LCSH, LCNAF, and LCC datasets. Further mapping was “Historical Spellings” to “Thesaurus” (column D); “Traditional Homelands” and “Geographic Coverage” to “Geography” (columns E and F);

⁴⁵ A 670 field in the LC subject heading “Unkechaug Indians” states, “Work cat.: 2011002771: Strong, J.A. The Unkechaug Indians of Eastern Long Island, 2011: CIP galley (The tribal name Unkechang has over the centuries been used interchangeably with Poospatuck; an Algonquian people).”

⁴⁶ Manhattan peoples were related to the Delawares and included the Hackensack and Tappan communities situated west of the Hudson River in New York City.

⁴⁷ Conflicting information was located for the Indigenous community of the Menunkatucks. In *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*, Hodge states, “They were probably a part of the Quinnipiac,” part 1, 529. Herbert Milton Sylvester references the “Memunkatucks” as a group separate from the Quinnipiaks in *Indian Wars of New England*, Library ed. (Boston: W.B. Clarke Company, 1910), 52.

⁴⁸ The Pequots were included in our research as their homelands encompass areas north of the Long Island Sound in Connecticut.

⁴⁹ The term “Wappingers” can refer to an Indigenous community or a confederacy of Algonquian tribes that includes the Wappinger community. In this study, “Wappingers” represents the confederacy.

and the results of searching LC Authorities to “Ontology” (columns G to Q). Within records, information sought was: label/heading; vocabulary/scheme; concept; subdivision; identifier; broader terms (BT); narrower terms (NT); descriptors; sources; variants; and change notes. Finally, spellings recorded from the initial research were logged in a separate spreadsheet to aid database searching and for comparison against LC variants or tracings (Table 2).

Table 2. Reimagined Knowledge Organization (KO) framework: taxonomy, ontology, and thesaurus.

New KO schema	Taxonomy	Taxonomy	Thesaurus	Geography	Geography	Geography	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	Ontology	
Element	Indigenous Community	Sub-Communities	Historical Spellings (sampling)	Traditional Homelands	Geographic Coverage	LCSH	LCSH Concept	LCSH Subject Variant	LCSH Broader Terms	LCSH Narrower Terms	Localities and Natural Features: LCSH (Geographic)	NAR	NAR Concept	NAR Variant	Localities and Natural Features: NAR (Geographic)	LCC

Searching in WorldCat

The rationale for searching in WorldCat was to determine if library materials existed about Indigenous Long Island communities and if yes, to assess the headings used to describe the works. As noted in Part 1 of the study, the Library of Congress creates and uses subject headings “based on literary warrant, which means that they are proposed only as needed for new cataloging. The Library of Congress does not go out and look for new headings to add; instead, as catalogers are working, when they find a resource that cannot be described with existing headings, they propose what they need.”⁵⁰ Additionally, “in order to assign a heading for a topic, it must be represented in at least 20 percent of the resource.”⁵¹ Given the parameters of these guidelines, searches were performed for terms and variant spellings representing the fourteen primary Indigenous Long Island communities. Catalog records were located for works about nine communities lacking subject headings: Canarsies, Corchaugs, Manhassets, Matinecocks, Merricks, Nissequogues, Rockaways, Secatogues, and Setalcotts.

Searching LC databases

Issues with searching specific names and identities in LC databases were anticipated. Federal status impacts how Indigenous peoples are represented in LC Authorities. State recognized, unrecognized, and terminated⁵² Nations are tagged 150 (topical term). The web page “Headings for Indian Tribes Recognized by the U.S. Government” of the Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress states “names of Indian tribes recognized by the U.S. government as legal entities” are “tagged 151 (geographic name) in name authority records.”⁵³ It includes a pathway to the *Federal Register* with a listing of “Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs.”⁵⁴ However, LC acknowledges this *Federal Register* notice does not include updates; additions need to be

⁵⁰ Library of Congress, Policy and Standards Division, “*Library of Congress Subject Headings: Module 1.5: Introduction to LCSH*,” <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcsh/PDF%20scripts/1-5%20Intro%20To%20LCSH.pdf>, June 2016.

⁵¹ Library of Congress, Policy and Standards Division, “*Library of Congress Subject Headings: Module 5.4: Extended Examples*,” p. 4. “...in order to assign a heading for a topic, it must be represented in at least 20 percent of the resource.” <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcsh/PDF%20scripts/5-4%20Extended%20examples.pdf>, February 2017.

⁵² “Indian termination policy” was the U.S. federal Indian policy from the 1940s to 1960s whereby through legislative action or court cases the federal government terminated its relationship and obligation with Indigenous communities. An earlier example of termination specific to Long Island is *Pharaoh v. Benson*. This ruling maintained “the Montauk Tribe of Indians has disintegrated and been absorbed into the mass of citizens and that at the time of the commencement of this action there was no tribe of Montauk Indians.” See *Pharaoh v. Benson*, 126 N.Y.S. 1035 (Sup. Ct. 1910); *Aboriginal Title in New York*, World Heritage Encyclopedia Edition, s.v. “Montauk,” http://www.self.gutenberg.org/articles/eng/Aboriginal_title_in_New_York (accessed May 10, 2021).

⁵³ Library of Congress. “Headings for Indian Tribes Recognized by the U.S. Government,” <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsso/tribes.html> (accessed May 9, 2021).

⁵⁴ “Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible To Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs,” *Federal Register* 80 (9), Wednesday, January 14, 2015. Notices, <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsso/biaind.pdf>.

independently checked periodically. To confirm the statuses of the Indigenous communities, the authors consulted the 2021 *Federal Register* notice⁵⁵ which lists 574 federally recognized tribes and the official list of federally and state-recognized tribes produced by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). The communities identified were checked against these lists.⁵⁶

Today on Long Island the Matinecock, Montaukett, Setalcott, Unkechaug, and Shinnecock peoples are sovereign Nations. Of these five, only the Shinnecock Indian Nation has federal recognition. The Unkechaug Nation has state recognition in New York. The other three Nations are unrecognized. Of these three, the Montaukett Indian Nation does not have its own official website, and therefore locating accurate community nomenclature was not straightforward. Because there is no official list of unrecognized and legally terminated Indigenous communities, searches for them presented challenges. However, they were included in the design to provide an accurate and inclusive representation in the knowledge organization schema.

Each of the 27 Indigenous Long Island community names was entered and searched in the *ID.LOC.GOV - Linked Data Service*⁵⁷ and *Library of Congress Authorities*⁵⁸ databases. The decision was made to search names, terms, and variant spellings (e.g., Canarsie, Canarse) in both sources to gather as much contextual information as possible. Searches in LC Authorities were performed using the search type “Keyword Authorities (All).” Results in the LC Linked Data Service portal were limited using the facets for LCSH, NAR, and LCC datasets. These actions were followed by a systematic comparison and analysis of the results generated from both sources. To ensure consistency in data collection, the primary name associated with each Indigenous community was searched for representation as a heading (150-heading-topical term or 151-heading-geographic name). Information compiled from each record if present included current LCSH concept, LC subject variant, LC broader terms (BTs), and LC narrower terms (NTs). For names, results recorded were name authority records, NAR concepts, and NAR variants. Additionally, if the name of a community appeared in a heading for a locality and/or natural feature (geographic), that heading was also recorded in a corresponding column. The information yielded from these searches is presented in the Indigenous Long Island knowledge organization schema (Supplemental Table).

Supplemental table link: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17205846.v1>

⁵⁵ “Indian Entities Recognized by and Eligible To Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs,” *Federal Register* 86 (18), Friday, January 29, 2021, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/01/29/2021-01606/indian-entities-recognized-by-and-eligible-to-receive-services-from-the-united-states-bureau-of>.

⁵⁶ . “Federal and State Recognized Tribes,” National Conference of State Legislatures, last modified March 2020, <https://www.ncsl.org/research/state-tribal-institute/list-offederal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx> (accessed May 4, 2021).

⁵⁷ “ID.LOC.GOV provides both interactive and machine access to commonly used ontologies, controlled vocabularies, and other lists for bibliographic description,” <https://id.loc.gov>.

⁵⁸ 58. “Using *Library of Congress Authorities*, you can browse and view authority headings for Subject, Name, Title and Name/Title combinations; and download authority records in MARC format for use in a local library system,” <https://authorities.loc.gov/>.

Discussion

Indigenous political recognition status is not well documented in narrative form. This issue can impact accurate description of and effective searching for library collections. Federal and state recognition is a political and economic government-to-government relationship between Congress and a sovereign Indigenous Nation.⁵⁹ At different periods in time, some Indigenous Long Island communities gained and lost recognition, which is not atypical across Turtle Island (North America).⁶⁰ The Shinnecock Nation, one of the five groups still living on Long Island, received federal recognition in 2010, making Shinnecoeks one of 18 groups acknowledged by the U.S. since 1977.⁶¹ The state-recognized status of the Montaukettts was terminated in 1910 through litigation in the New York State court system.

Of the 14 groups most directly associated with Long Island, only four have established forms tagged as a heading-topical term (150): “Massapequa Indians,” “Montauk Indians,” “Shinnecock Indians,” and “Unkechaug Indians.” In total, 14 of the 27 communities have authorized headings. Several examples of misinterpretations of Indigenous histories emerged in these records. Incorrectly linked entries such as the cases of “Shinnecock Indians” as a NT for “Montauk Indians” and “Lenape Indians” as a variant of “Delaware Indians” have potential to create confusion and perpetuate misinformation. The Shinnecoeks are not a subgroup of the Montaukettts.⁶² Lenape is not synonymous with Delaware.

Mindful that contemporary groupings of Indigenous peoples do not necessarily reflect country or state boundaries, secondary searches were conducted for the headings “Algonquin Indians” and “Indians of North America–New York (State).” An expectation was they would appear in records for Indigenous Long Islanders as a BT because they belong to the Algonquin language-speaking family in New York. However, this was not the case. For example, the record for “Montauk Indians” lacks the inclusion of a 550 field (see also from tracing-topical term, broader term/BT) with “Indians of North America–New York (State).” The heading “Shinnecock Indians” does not have a 550 field (see also from tracing-topical term, broader term/BT) with “Algonquian Indians.” Conversely, “Algonquian Indians” does not include the NT Lenape or most other Indigenous Long Island communities.⁶³

The practice of mapping Indigenous borders onto contemporary settler state borders can decrease the accuracy of LC Authorities. For example, the Stockbridge-Munsee Community

⁵⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, Indian Affairs. “Frequently Asked Questions,” <https://www.bia.gov/frequently-asked-questions> (accessed May 9, 2021).

⁶⁰ David Landis Barnhill, ed. and introduction, *At Home on the Earth: Becoming Native to Our Place: A Multicultural Anthology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

⁶¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, Indian Affairs, Office of Federal Acknowledgement, “Decided Cases - Petitions Resolved by DOI,” <https://www.bia.gov/as-ia/ofa/decided-cases> (accessed May 8, 2021).

⁶² Although these groups have homelands in southeastern Long Island, Shinnecock peoples are not a subgroup of the Montaukett. John A. Strong, email message to Kristen J. Nyitray, January 31, 2021.

⁶³ Library of Congress, Linked Data Services, heading for “Algonquin Indians,” revised September 8, 2010, <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85003482>.

Band of Mohican Indians,⁶⁴ which represents one specific group of Munsees located in/around Bowler, Wisconsin, has three authorized name authority records: “Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin;” “Stockbridge Tribe”; and “Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians.” According to the tribal government website, none of the existing name authority records reflects the official name that the community calls itself: Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians. Tribal government websites are valid forms of communication and authoritative information.⁶⁵ The federally recognized name of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians is “Stockbridge Munsee community,” which suggests the three name authority records were formulated to align with the U.S. government’s designation. These headings could imply there are three different Stockbridge Munsees tribes. A generalist cataloger without knowledge of Munsees may not select the accurate heading. Another case that could present conflation are the subject headings “Algonquian Indians” and “Algonquin Indians,” which are not interchangeable terms. Algonquin is a cultural-linguistic group of Anishinaabe peoples. Long Island was and is inhabited by Algonquian (language) speaking peoples; this is an important distinction and refers to a regional entity of over twenty-four unique kinship groups and contemporary tribes.

Federal recognition regulations are shaped by each U.S. presidential administration.⁶⁶ Shifting political ideologies can impact efforts to standardize established forms of headings. According to Wiederhold and Reeve, “When catalogers create or revise authorized access points, they must ensure each access point’s uniqueness, thereby enabling differentiation between similar names or terms.”⁶⁷ For groups with multiple tribes (e.g., Delawares), the existence of name authority records for a small subset rather than all nation-state groupings can inadvertently maintain the “vanishing Indian” myth.⁶⁸ For example, the existing name authority record “Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation” does not acknowledge the existence of the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation and suggests all Pequots belong to one tribe. Without expertise in Indigenous-U.S. histories, a cataloger might not understand that a name authority record referring to a tribe represents a contemporary legal concept derived from Indigenous-U.S.

⁶⁴ Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians, “Origins and Early History,” 2021, <https://www.mohican.com/origin-early-history> (accessed May 10, 2021); Bureau of Indian Affairs, “Amendment to Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians Liquor Control Ordinance,” *Federal Register* 65, no. 35121 (June 1, 2000), 35121, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2000/06/01/00-13611/amendment-to-stockbridge-munsee-community-band-of-mohican-indians-liquor-control-ordinance>.

⁶⁵ For sources of names for Indigenous Long Island communities, see the Appendix in Nyitray and Reijerkerk, 32–33.

⁶⁶ Lorinda Riley, “When a Tribal Entity Becomes a Nation: The Role of Politics in the Shifting Federal Recognition Regulations,” *American Indian Law Review* 39, no. 2 (2016): 451–505.

⁶⁷ Rebecca A. Wiederhold and Gregory F. Reeve, “Authority Control Today: Principles, Practices, and Trends,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, nos. 2-3 (2021): 129–58, 146, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1881009>.

⁶⁸ Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz and Dina Gilio-Whitaker, *All the Real Indians Died Off: and 20 Other Myths about Native Americans* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2016).

political relationships.⁶⁹ Traditionally, U.S. Indigenous peoples did not organize politically into large groups that today are referred to as tribes. The term “tribe” is a legal concept that stems from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its protocol for determining eligibility for government services under the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act.⁷⁰ The authors have not suggested a name authority record for an Indigenous community without an active presence today such as the Canarsies. Indigenous peoples are alive and thriving today. A name authority record for a historical (but not present-day) Indigenous Long Island community may infer that contemporary communities do not retain the same Indigenous authenticity as historical counterparts.

The classification of Indigenous Long Island communities was another component of the study embarked upon to determine how library collections are collocated or placed in relation to each other. Clarke stressed the importance of classification in libraries and how it shapes and reflects worldviews.⁷¹ Olson and Rose importantly drew contrasts between classification and cataloging stating, “Order, created through the construction of classes, their arrangement, and relationships, is what differentiates classification and classification systems from other information organization tools and practices, such as categorization and indexing.”⁷² Searches for LCC were conducted using the LC Linked Data Service portal and then further refined using the facet “Scheme”—“LCC Classification.” On the result display, the call number is listed under the fifth column titled “Identifier.” For the fourteen Indigenous Long Island communities, only three are represented in the LCC outline: Montauketts (Montauk-E99; Montauk-PM); Shinnecocks (Shinnecock-E99; Shinnecock Nation-KIF); and Unkechaugs (Unkechaug-E99; Unkechaug Nation-KIF). The results for subclass E were corroborated by browsing the “LCC Full Text: Class E-F - History of the Americas,” a PDF file.⁷³ Subclass E99 is reserved for “History of The Americas. America and United States/America/Indians of North America/Tribes and cultures, A-Z.” Subclass KIF corresponds to “Law/Law of Indigenous peoples in the Americas/Indigenous law: United States: Northeast Atlantic/Indian jurisdictions.” The naming conventions assigned to these classifications are not identical to their respective LC headings. An interesting finding was the inclusion of the word “Nation” in the classification of “Unkechaug Nation,” given this Nation does not have a name authority record or federal recognition. Also of note was the lack of a classification for the Massapeguas, although “Massapequa Indians” is an authorized LC subject heading.

A final strategy was assessing the construction of LC authority records in the MARC display. Syndetic structures show access points created through semantic relationships.

⁶⁹ William W. Quinn, Jr., “Federal Acknowledgement of American Indian Tribes: The Historical Development of a Legal Concept,” *The American Journal of Legal History* 34, no. 4 (1990): 331–64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/845826>.

⁷⁰ Faith Roessel, “Federal Recognition: A Historical Twist of Fate,” *Native American Rights Fund Law Review* 14, no. 3 (Summer 1989), <https://www.narf.org/nill/documents/nlr/nlr14-3.pdf>.

⁷¹ Rachel Ivy Clarke, “Library Classification Systems in the U.S.: Basic Ideas and Examples,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, nos. 2-3 (2021): 203–24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1881008>.

⁷² Hope A. Olson and Rose Schlegl, “Standardization, Objectivity, and User Focus: A Meta-Analysis of Subject Access Critiques,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2001), 61–80, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v32n02_06.

⁷³ Library of Congress, “Library of Congress Classification Full Text: Class E-F—History of the Americas,” (PDF), <https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCC/E-F-text.pdf> (accessed May 8, 2021).

According to Kanda, the usefulness of a system as it relates to these structures is reliant on a “generous entry vocabulary” and a “structure of explicit relationships.”⁷⁴ Further, “These purposes are served by references that express equivalence, hierarchical, and associative relationships.”⁷⁵ A sampling of the structures assessed for this study can be found in the Appendix.⁷⁶ “Paugussett Indians” is an example of a heading that lacks reciprocal linked information. The 670 field has a reference to the Hodge handbook⁷⁷ with the Paugussetts noted as part of the Wappinger (confederacy). In the heading for “Wappinger Indians,” while there are seven 450 (see from tracing) field entries, “Paugussett Indians” is not one of them. Additionally, the record for the Paugussetts does not reference the contemporary name they call themselves, The Golden Hill Paugussett,⁷⁸ or its state-recognition in Connecticut.

The addition of cultural warrant for classification and subject analyses is needed to support decolonizing methodology frameworks for describing collections and their representations in catalog records. Cultural warrant emphasizes local contexts and “guides literary warrant toward local forms of knowledge organization.”⁷⁹ Beghtol asserts that knowledge organization frameworks have an ethical obligation to prioritize the cultural warrant of minority perspectives as a means of cultural hospitality, which posits that knowledge organization can ideally accommodate multiple cultural warrants and appropriately reflect local contextual knowledges of any group.⁸⁰ Indigenous names and languages are not necessarily based on written words; rather, it is the oral nature of names and languages that define Indigenous ways of knowing. The impetus for creating new headings and names could be enlarged and format independent. Cultural warrant can be incorporated in LC Authorities by accounting for non-print materials including visual and material culture, and oral traditions. In contrast to literary warrant which requires 20% of the content to be focused on a subject, cultural warrant underscores inherent value and consequently connotes reverence to a group or community. References to Indigenous peoples and places in a cataloged item should be accurately acknowledged and reflected in assigned LC Authorities. For example, while some communities continue to use the word “Indian” in their colloquial and official names, the use of it by others depends on

⁷⁴ Kio K. Kanda, “Subject Cataloging,” The Library of Congress, Cataloging Policy and Service Office, North American Coordinating Council on Japanese Library Resources, August 21, 2002, 18, <http://www.nccjapan.org/workbook/pdf/subjectcataloging.pdf>.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Notations and commentary by the authors appear in bold text within brackets.

⁷⁷ Hodge, *Handbook*, 229.

⁷⁸ Facebook page of “The Golden Hill Paugussett Indian Reservation,” <https://www.facebook.com/The-Golden-Hill-Paugussett-Indian-Reservation-165294113670095> (accessed August 2, 2021).

⁷⁹ Mario Barité, “Cultural warrant,” section 5.3” in “Literary Warrant” of *ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization*, https://www.isko.org/cyclo/literary_warrant#5.3 (accessed August 2, 2021).

⁸⁰ Clare Beghtol, “Ethical Decision-Making for Knowledge Representation and Organization Systems for Global Use,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 56, no. 9 (2005): 903–912, <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20184>.

situational contexts and whether the name is currently endorsed or used by the specific community. Peter d'Errico⁸¹ argued that words like “Indian” derive from colonizing world-views, yet they are often used in official government naming practices, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous.⁸² While these strategies remain adapted for Western constructs of knowledge organization, they offer positive steps toward indigenizing LC Authorities. These methods also afford new opportunities for professional and personal growth and provide space to cultivate expanding spheres of community engagement.

Conclusion

In their seminal work “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” Eve Tuck (Unangax̂) and K. Wayne Yang articulated how unsettling and uncomfortable decolonization is in practice.⁸³ The methods employed for this research sought to recenter and bring to the forefront Indigenous experiences, culture, and history. When consulting published works describing Indigenous Long Island the points of views, assumptions, and distortions made by authors over time were questioned, evaluated, and situated in historical context. It was important to recognize that authors of seminal books and articles about the region were not Indigenous nor did they have established relationships with the Native communities under study. Further, the audience and readership of these works at the time of publication were primarily white or Caucasian. Up through 1980, they accounted for 89% of Long Island’s population.⁸⁴ To the fullest extent possible, the knowledge organization framework represents the names of Indigenous communities in the way these groups or tribes call themselves. These names are cited directly from sources created or managed by Indigenous communities. While community engagement was not part of this project, it would have been pursued if current names were unobtainable from Indigenous-maintained sources. It was also crucial to acknowledge the interconnectedness of Indigenous peoples to the land they inhabited and continue to inhabit. This axiom was incorporated by expanding the research scope to include a survey of lands, bodies of water, and natural features in LC Authorities that include reference to Indigenous communities and the geographic areas in which they lived or continue to live.

Indigenous identity is complex and nuanced. Those interested in replicating this research in a regional context should consider the lack of universal consensus on terminology. The authors intentionally chose not to use “indian,” “Native Americans,” or tribes to describe Indigenous Long Island. The word “Indigenous” was selected as it signifies the original

⁸¹ “Peter d’Errico,” University of Massachusetts Amherst, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Department of Political Science, <https://polsci.umass.edu/people/peter-derrico> (accessed February 12, 2021).

⁸² Peter d’Errico, “Native American Indian Studies—A Note on Names,” 2005, <https://www.umass.edu/legal/derrico/name.html> (accessed May 1, 2021).

⁸³ Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40, <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.

⁸⁴ Regional Plan Association, *Long Island’s Transformation, 1970-2010* (January 2015), http://historiccensus.longislandindexmaps.org/img/LongIslandsTransformation1970to2010_GuidetotheInteractiveMaps.pdf (accessed August 1, 2021).

inhabitants and their relationships to land and geography. As a universal edit, the authors proposed eliminating “Indians” from existing headings as this terminology is rooted in colonizing ideologies. This viewpoint is supported by scholarship on Indigenous identity and naming preferences.⁸⁵

Long Island’s history is not well represented in LC Authorities. Variant names and headings for Indigenous peoples are extremely limited and do not reflect the multiplicity in peoples belonging to more than one community. Despite the prevalence and abundance of Indigenous place names, discrepancies and inconsistencies exist. In response, new terms and classifications were constructed and recommended by the authors in Part 1 to describe library resources. These suggestions were informed by findings derived from the totality of research.

Ultimately, accurate controlled vocabularies and classifications are not established without direct action from catalogers. Authority work can be enhanced and bolstered by collaborations with subject experts and the peoples these terms describe. To this point Smith noted, “The development of controlled vocabularies for use in subject analysis should be thought of as an ongoing process which greatly benefits from the participation of individuals with diverse backgrounds, skills, knowledge, and experiences.”⁸⁶ One way the research could potentially be further developed is to consult with tribal governments of the five Nations still living on Long Island. The LC Long Island Indigenous knowledge organization schema devised from this study is a resource catalogers can reference to create access points for under described library collections about Indigenous Long Island. It aims to contribute toward efforts for ameliorating silences in the cataloging praxis. A next step for the authors is to embark on the formal process of proposing new, and revisions to, existing Library of Congress headings.⁸⁷ While the research for this study was multi-dimensional, challenging, and complex, it affirmed that through authority work catalogers can dispel myths, dissolve historical inaccuracies, and advance understandings of Indigenous history and culture.

Notes on contributors

Kristen J. Nyitray is Director, Special Collections and University Archives, and University Archivist at Stony Brook University.

Dana Reijerkerk is the Knowledge Management and Digital Assets Librarian at Stony

⁸⁵ Michael Yellow Bird, ““What We Want to be Called: Indigenous Peoples’ Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Identity Labels,” *American Indian Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 1–21; Michael A. Peters, “Aborigine, Indian, Indigenous, or First Nations?” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49, no. 13 (2017): 1229–34; National Museum of the American Indian, *The Impact of Words and Tips for Using Appropriate Terminology: Am I Using the Right Word?*, Smithsonian Institution, <https://americanindian.si.edu/nk360/resources/Impact-of-Words-and-Tips-for-Using-Appropriate-Terminology-Am-I-Using-the-Right-Word>

⁸⁶ Catherine Smith, “Controlled Vocabularies: Past, Present and Future of Subject Access,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, nos. 2-3 (2021): 186–202, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1881007>.

⁸⁷ Library of Congress, “Process for Adding and Revising Library of Congress Subject Headings,” <https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/subject/lcsh-process.html> (accessed May 15, 2021).

Brook University.

ORCID

Kristen J. Nyitray <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3140-808X>

Dana Reijerkerk <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4516-6923>

Appendix. Sampling of syndetic structures of LC authority records for Indigenous Long Island and associated communities

MARC fields

150/151=Authorized/Use Term: Heading-Topical Term (NR)/Heading-Geographic Name (NR)

360 =Complex See Also Reference-Subject

368 =Other Attributes of Person or Corporate Body

370 =Associated Place

450/451 = See From Tracing-Topical Term/See From Tracing-Geographic Name

550 = See Also From Tracing-Topical Term (Broader Term/BT)

670 = Source Data Found

675 = Source Data Not Found

680 = Public General Note

751 = Established Heading Linking Entry - Geographic Name

781 = Subdivision Linking Entry-Geographic Subdivision

Example 1: “Shinnecock Indians”

150 __ |a Shinnecock Indians

150 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z New York (State)

550 __ |w g |a Montauk Indians

[Note: this 550 broader term (BT) is not accurate. Shinnecock Indians is not a subgroup of Montauk Indians.]

[Note: lacks 550 __ |w g |a Algonquian Indians]

Example 2: “Shinnecock Indian Nation”

151 __ |a Shinnecock Indian Nation

368 __ |b Federally recognized Indian tribes |2 lcsb

370 __ |e Southampton (N.Y. : Town) |2 naf

670 __ |a Conscience Point, 2019: |b (Shinnecock Indian Nation)

670 __ |a Indian Entities Recognized by and Eligible To Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Feb. 1, 2019 |b (Shinnecock Indian Nation)

670 __ |a Wikipedia, viewed April 13, 2020: |b (Shinnecock Indian Nation; a federal-ly recognized tribe of historically Algonquian-speaking Native Americans based at the

eastern end of Long Island, New York; since the mid-19th century, the tribe's landbase is the Shinnecock Reservation within the geographic boundaries of the Town of Southampton)

781 _0 |z Shinnecock Indian Nation

Example 3: "Massapequa Indians"

150 __ |a Massapequa Indians

550 __ |w g |a Algonquian Indians

550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z New York (State)

Example 4: "Montauk Indians"

150 __ |a Montauk Indians

550 __ |w g |a Algonquian Indians

[Note: lacks 550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z New York (State)]

Example 5: "Unkechaug Indians"

150 __ |a Unkechaug Indians

450 __ |a Onecchechaug Indians

450 __ |a Patchague Indians

450 __ |a Patchoag Indians

450 __ |a Patchogue Indians

450 __ |a Poospatuck Indians

450 __ |a Unachog Indians

450 __ |a Uncachage Indians

450 __ |a Unchachaug Indians

450 __ |a Unquachock Indians

550 __ |w g |a Algonquian Indians

550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z New York (State)

670 __ |a Work cat.: 2011002771: Strong, J.A. The Unkechaug Indians of Eastern Long Island, 2011: |b CIP galley (The tribal name Unkechang has over the centuries been used interchangeably with Poospatuck; an Algonquian people)

[Note: Poospatuck was a reference to a geographic area on the south shore of Long

Island. Today, Unkechaugi reside on the Poospatuck Reservation in Mastic, Suffolk County, New York.]

670 __ |a Facebook, Feb. 14, 2011: |b Unkechaug Nation (Mary Treadwell, tribal administrator of the Unkechaug Nation)

670 __ |a Hodge handbk. No. a.m. Ind.: |b p. 209, Patchoag (Patchague, Patchogue, Unachog, Uncachog, Unquachog)

670 __ |a Wikipedia WWW Site, Feb. 14, 2011: |b Metoac family (thirteen tribes of Long Island including Unkechaug (Patchogue, Onecchechaug, Patchoag, Unchachaug, Unquachog, Unquachock)

[Note: there were more than thirteen Indigenous Long Island communities. This reference to “thirteen tribes” perpetuates inaccurate information.]

670 __ |a Dictionary.com WWW Site, Feb. 14, 2011 |b (Unquachog)

Example 6: “Paugusset Indians”

150 __ |a Paugusset Indians

450 __ |a Paugussett Indians

550 __ |w g |a Algonquian Indians

550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z Connecticut

670 __ |Work cat.: Smith, C.C. Quarter-acre of heartache, 1985.

670 __ |Hodge handbk. a.m. Ind.: |b p. 212 (CONN. Algonquian)

670 __ |a Waldman, C. Atlas No. a.m. Ind.: |b p. 229 (Wappinger)

[Note: unlike example 5 (“Unkechaug Indians”) this record lacks a reference to the Paugussetts’ Facebook presence as contemporary source data. The Golden Hill Paugussett

has state tribal recognition in Connecticut.]

675 __ |a Murdock world cult.; |a Swanton Ind. tribes; |a Web. 3; |a Old catalog heading

Example 7: “Wappinger Indians”

150 __ |a Wappinger Indians

450 __ |a Guilford Indians

450 __ |a Hammonasset Indians

450 __ |a Massacoe Indians

450 __ |a Menunkatuk Indians

450 __ |a Naugatuck Indians

450 __ |a Nochpeem Indians

450 __ |a Podunk Indians

[Note: this record lacks a 450 field with “Paugussett Indians”

550 __ |w g |a Delaware Indians

550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z Connecticut

550 __ |w g |a Indians of North America |z New York (State)

670 __ |a Sturtevant handbk. No. a.m. Ind.: |b p. 215 map.

670 __ |a Swanton Ind. tribes: |b p. 45 (NY., CONN.)

670 __ |a Waldman, C. Atlas No. a.m. Ind.: |b p. 232 (Algonquian (N.Y., Conn.) merged with Delaware)

670 __ |a Voegelin lang.: |b p. 16 (Wappinger (Hanmonassett, Massacoe, Menunkatuk, Naugatuck, Podunk) Algonquian (BT))

Example 8: “Fort Corchaug (N.Y.)”

151 __ |a Fort Corchaug (N.Y.)

451 __ |a Corchaug, Fort (N.Y.)

550 __ |w g |a Fortification |z New York (State)

670 __ |a Work cat: Williams, L.E. Ft. Shantok and Ft. Corchaug, 1972.

670 __ |a Long Island: Our History online, June 4, 2001: |b The Promise of Corchaug (Archaeologists hope a buried fort will reveal new secrets of Indian civilization)

[Note: the name of this site is “Fort Corchaug Archaeological Site.” It was added to the U.S. National Register of Historic Places on January 18, 1974 and declared a U.S. National Historic Landmark on January 20, 1999; NRHP reference no. 74001308; <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/index.htm>.]

675 __ |a Lippincott; |a Larousse encyclopedia of archaeology; |a Getty thesaurus of geog. names on WWW, May 23, 2001

781 _0 |z New York (State) |z Fort Corchaug