

2021

Searching for Paumanok: 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: A Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, no.5 (2021): 409-441, doi: 10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627 To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627>

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: 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: A Study of Library of Congress Authorities and Classifications for Indigenous Long Island, New York,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, no.5 (2021): 409-441, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1929627>

Abstract

Long Island is a case in point of the United States settler state landscape co-opting Indigenous peoples and places for naming geographies, beaches, and spaces. Despite ubiquity, the historic Indigenous origins and contexts have been largely obscured and overwritten. This study assesses the availability and accuracy of terms for organizing, classifying, and describing works by and about Indigenous Long Island. It reveals a lack of representation in catalog records and suggests remediation through establishing subjects and names with accurate, culturally relevant terms. A symbolic form of land acknowledgment, this practice of accountability fosters commemoration, reclamation, and reparation processes.

Keywords

Indigenous peoples; vocabularies; 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 is a case in point in the United States settler state landscape co-opting Indigenous peoples and places for naming geographies, communities, beaches, and spaces. Yet despite ubiquity, Indigenous contexts and connections to land ownership remain obscured, overwritten, and erased. This study assesses the current state of representation for Indigenous peoples, histories, and cultures of the region in the Library of Congress Name Authority File (LCNAF), Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), and Library of Congress Classification (LCC) through examination of catalog records for published works by and about

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

Indigenous Long Island. It seeks to establish a foundation for improving access to under described library resources with the aim to foster new scholarship and understanding of Long Island's Indigenous past, present, and future.

To provide historical context, the authors present an overview of Long Island's evolution with respect to the Indigenous populations over the centuries. This history is framed by a discussion of the Library of Congress' policies, practices, and limits for representing Indigenous heritage in collections. To assess absences and inaccuracies in cataloging and authorities, an evaluation of catalog records in OCLC WorldCat was conducted in tandem with authority research.

Efficient searching requires that catalog records contain terms that accurately describe content. The article contends that existing names and headings do not correctly identify communities and their historical names, nor reflect the diversity, multiplicity, and individual local contexts. Additionally, omissions in Library of Congress (LC) authorities impede effective research. Libraries that hold resources by or about Indigenous Long Island could be incentivized to contribute to LC authority files.

The article also considers traditional cataloging tenets including literary warrant as unintentional, yet contributory factors in overlooking under- represented populations in LC Authorities.² For Long Island, neither Walt Whitman's iconic reference to "Paumanok" nor "Pommanoc" is represented in the LCNAF.³

The research underscores the relationship between erasure and the lack of authoritative source material to inform terms. Strategies are presented for identifying Indigenous communities, searching LC databases, and creating a taxonomy that can serve as a framework in support of proposing new and updated LC Authorities. Cataloging and authority work are equally valid as other library operations in ensuring presence and visibility for Indigenous peoples in libraries. The paper imagines what decolonization of the LC process might look like to enhance access to collections of, about, and by Indigenous Long Island.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to assess the existence and accuracy of terms in catalog records for organizing, classifying, and describing works by and about Indigenous Long Island. This research seeks to contribute toward redressing silences in the cataloging praxis.⁴ Long Island

² *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." June 2016, <https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/lcsh/PDF%20scripts/1-5%20Intro%20To%20LCSH.pdf>

³ 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.

⁴ Catalog records for books about Indigenous Long Island typically include the headings "Long Island (N.Y.) – History" and "Indians of North America – New York (State) – Long Island." These headings do not include the names of Indigenous groups or communities.

presents a unique regional context to examine because of the strikingly visible retention of Indigenous word origins in the public landscape. Four primary questions guided the scope of research:

- How and to what extent is Indigenous Long Island represented in Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), Library of Congress Name Authority File (LCNAF), and Library of Congress Classification (LCC)?
- 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?

Background

LC Authorities and Classification for Indigenous works

Wiederhold and Reeve describe the vital function of authority control in surfacing information “through the establishment and maintenance of consistent, reliable, and unique access points.”⁵ In the past two decades, a growing body of literature has examined LC’s inadequacies in assigning English-language words to express Indigenous experiences, cultures, beliefs, and traditions. According to Kam and Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, the vocabularies for these histories are rooted in legacies of U.S. colonialism, control, and power.⁶ Many entries remain unchanged and are insufficient to describe Indigenous histories and the nonlinear relationships among Indigenous peoples. Inherent incompatibilities have been attributed to the foundational mission of the Library of Congress, a political entity of the U.S. government.⁷ In a larger historical context, 1978 marked the first time the U.S. federal government published a list of “Indian tribal entities recognized and eligible to receive services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (44 FR 7235).”⁸ The 80-year gap between the formulation of LCC and the first listing of Indigenous groups in the *Federal Register* laid a foundation for omissions and absences in LC Authorities. Additionally, and within New York, only communities associated with the Iroquois Confederacy (Senecas, Cayugas, Onondagas, Oneidas, Mohawks, Tuscaroras) located in central

⁵ Rebecca A. Wiederhold and Gregory F. Reeve, “Authority Control Today: Principles, Practices, and Trends,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 59, no. 2–3 (2021): 129–58, 146, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2021.1881009](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1881009).

⁶ D. Vanessa Kam, “Subject Headings for Aboriginals: The Power of Naming,” *Art Documentation: Bulletin of the Art Libraries Society of North America* 26, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 18–22, doi: [10.1086/adx.26.2.27949465](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, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396).

⁷ Library of Congress, “Frequently Asked Questions,” accessed April 14, 2021, [https://www.loc.gov/about/frequently-asked-questions/#:~:text=The%20Library%20of%20Congress%20is%20a%20research%20library](https://www.loc.gov/about/frequently-asked-questions/#:~:text=The%20Library%20of%20Congress%20is%20a%20research%20library;); “The Library of Congress Classification (LCC) is a classification system that was first developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to organize and arrange the book collections of the Library of Congress.” The Library of Congress, Cataloging and Acquisitions “Library of Congress Classification,” accessed April 13, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsol/lcc.html>.

⁸ *Federal Register* 47, no. 227 Fed. Reg. 52957 (November 24, 1982): 53130–53137, <https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/service/ll/fedreg/fr047/fr047227/fr047227.pdf>.

New York were recognized as “having a special relationship with the United States.”⁹ Presently on Long Island, the Matinecock, Montaukett, Setalcott, Unkechaug, and Shinnecock peoples are sovereign Nations. Only the Shinnecock Indian Nation has been granted federal recognition.

The principle of “literary warrant” drives LC’s creation of subject headings and classifications. Introduced by E. Wyndham Hulme in 1911, the concept maintains that “classes and names of classes would be derived from existing literature rather than a preconceived philosophical order of sciences, the predominant and favored type of classification system in Hulme’s day.”¹⁰ Authority files represent entities and concepts needed for cataloging library resources and are not built as representation of the real world. The reliance on library collections to catalyze new vocabularies presents acute challenges for Indigenous collections. In this specific collecting area, LC acknowledges its “weakness/exclusion” in its holdings, as its “book and serial collections in linguistics, locally and tribally produced materials, and some Canadian materials, are not comprehensive. The Library also lacks locally produced recordings of contemporary Native American ceremonies and contemporary language recordings.”¹¹

Catalogers can create alternate modes of access points to compensate for a lack of comprehensiveness in LC Authorities. Tracing proper nouns is an acceptable principle in cataloging. When headings are lacking, authorized variants and “see from tracings” (MARC 4xx fields) can be used to enhance discovery of an item. However, tracings are “used in an established heading or established heading and subdivision record to trace a see from reference from a topical term not used in an established heading.”¹² This approach would not necessarily work for cases where established headings do not exist. And while catalogers can employ judgment and leeway in subject analysis, these practices presuppose subject expertise and the existence of authoritative works to inform decisions.

The process of proposing new entries and edits to LC Authorities is outlined by LC,¹³ but smaller libraries and cultural heritage organizations with significant, rare, and distinctive Indigenous collections may be minimally equipped to initiate these changes. Gaps and silences that could be corrected persist, as these institutions lack the infrastructure, resources, and training necessary to recommend updates and to submit new headings and names.¹⁴ Solutions put forth to reconcile LC’s threshold for change and improve access to Indigenous library collections have included adopting a “culturally appropriate metadata framework driven by community needs and

⁹ Ibid., 53131.

¹⁰ Robert D. Rodriguez, “Hulme’s Concept of Literary Warrant,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (2008): 17–26.

¹¹ Library of Congress, Cataloging and Acquisitions, “Process for Adding and Revising Library of Congress Subject Headings,” accessed April 13, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/acq/devpol/collovertviews/namer-indians.html>.

¹² Library of Congress: MARC Standards. “450 - See From Tracing-Topical Term,” accessed April 18, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/marc/authority/ad450.html>.

¹³ Library of Congress, Cataloging and Acquisitions, “Process for Adding and Revising Library of Congress Subject Headings.”

¹⁴ Terra Dankowski, “Removing Barriers to Indigenous Knowledge,” *American Libraries Magazine*, August 8, 2016, <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/blogs/the-scoop/removing-barriers-to-indigenous-knowledge>.

interests” and combining “local KOSs (knowledge organization systems) with universal approaches in web-based systems.”¹⁵

As per the LC, the “bulk of North American Indian related material in the general collections exists in classification E. Because North American Indians have contributed to, and have been studied by, the fields of anthropology, archaeology, ethnology, law, religion, language and art, relevant material also exists in classifications G, K, B, P and N.”¹⁶ Classification of “Law of Indigenous Peoples in the Americas” (KIA-KIX) relies on the source “Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the US Bureau of Indian Affairs” maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs/U.S. Department of the Interior.¹⁷ In the LCNAF, federally recognized tribes are tagged 151 (geographic name) in reference to their respective jurisdictions. Past practice was to tag Nation names as 110 (corporate name). The Library of Congress Policies and Standards Division states “these headings may also be used as geographic subdivisions, subdivided directly. This is in keeping with the guidance provided in rule 21.35 of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* 2nd edition (AACR2) for treating tribal entities as national governments.”¹⁸ However, this design imposes a semblance of geographic fixity and presumes accuracy in “official” sources. The Bureau of Indian Affairs map “Indian Lands of Federally Recognized Tribes of the United States” is one example with potential to misinform bibliographic description. It erroneously places the federally recognized Shinnecock Indian Nation of southeastern Long Island, New York in the U.S. state of Massachusetts.¹⁹ A pathway to this map is provided via the Library of Congress web page “General, Descriptive Cataloging” under the heading “Indian Tribes, Entities.”²⁰

Long Island, New York: Historical and Indigenous contexts

Comprising more than 100 miles of land and shorelines, Long Island’s history is intertwined with its geography and shaped by its location along the Mid-Atlantic coast. For an estimated 10,000 years, Native peoples have inhabited geographic Long Island spanning from present day Brooklyn and Queens (New York City) to the furthest points east of the island. Giovanni da Verrazano’s sighting of Long Island in 1524 was a signal event in history. His accounts of

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Library of Congress, Cataloging and Acquisitions, “Collections Overviews - American Studies: Indians of North America,” accessed January 17, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/acq/devpol/colloversviews/namer-indians.html>.

¹⁷ Library of Congress Policies and Standards Division, “Law of Indigenous Peoples in Americas, Class KIA-KIX,” March 11, 2010, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/business/BERA/indigenous/kia.html>.

¹⁸ Library of Congress, “Headings for Indian Tribes Recognized by the U.S. Government,” accessed January 27, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsa/tribes.html>.

¹⁹ Bureau of Indian Affairs, “Indian Lands of Federally Recognized Tribes of the United States,” June 2016, <https://www.bia.gov/sites/bia.gov/files/assets/public/webteam/pdf/idc1-028635.pdf>. Shinnecock Indian Nation is assigned number 39 in the key. This place marker is mistakenly positioned on Massachusetts instead of the eastern, south shore of Long Island, New York.

²⁰ Library of Congress, “General, Descriptive Cataloging: Indian Tribes, Entities,” accessed January 17, 2021, <https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/policy>.

circumnavigating and discovering this mid-Atlantic “new world” were catalysts for exploration by cartographers, surveyors, traders, and land speculators. They also laid a foundation for land dispossession of Long Island’s original settlers.

Names of Indigenous peoples are linked to geography and land territories including variant spellings of Canarsies, Manhansets, Massapeguas, Matinecocks, Merricks, Montauketts, Nissequogues, and Rockaways.²¹ Dutch, English, and corrupted forms of Algonquian words are primarily found on early printed materials of the region. One of the most influential maps of the environs is *Nova Belgica et Anglia Nova*.²² Place names appearing on it of Indigenous origins include “Matouwac” (a possible corruption of *Metoac*, the Munsee Lenape geographic name for Long Island); “Gebrokeland” (a corruption of an Algonquian geographic name for western Long Island); and “Manatthans” (derived from the Munsee Lenape language term *manaháhtaan*). This map also depicts Indigenous people in mishoons (dugout canoes) off south shore waters and iconography of beavers, otters, and unfortified Indigenous villages to imply the economic potential of the “saltwater frontier.”²³

By the mid-18th century, the “trios of economic, ecological, and epidemiological forces” devastated and profoundly impacted Indigenous peoples as they contended with incompatible and encroaching imperial forces.²⁴ On Long Island, the population was reduced to approximately 400–500 within the three core groups of Shinnecocks, Unkechaugs, and Montauketts.²⁵ Attempts were made to retain aspects of Algonquian and Munsee Lenape word origins in maps, books, and travelogues, but they were oversimplified, lost context, or flawed with confluences of geography and people.²⁶ Works produced by ethnohistorian William Wallace Tooker (1848–1917) more than 100 years ago remain among the most cited sources for the linguistic history of coastal Algonquian peoples.²⁷ While Tooker’s research warrants respect, his studies of language and structure are speculative, and require careful review and examination.²⁸ In recent years, an

²¹ The names and spellings are the most commonly used forms today.

²² Willem Janszoon Blaeu and Joan Blaeu, *Nova Belgica et Anglia Nova* (Amsterdami: I. and C. Blaeu?, 1640).

²³ David Yehling Allen, *Long Island Maps and Their Makers: Five Centuries of Cartographic History* (Mattituck, N.Y.: Amereon House, 1997); Andrew Lipman, *The Saltwater Frontier: Indians and the Contest for the American Coast* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).

²⁴ Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 41.

²⁵ John A. Strong and Zsuzsanna Torok, “King the Middle Way: Algonquian Responses to the Reverend Azariah Horton’s Mission on Long Island (1741-1744),” *Long Island Historical Journal* 12, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 145–158.

²⁶ Paul Bailey, *The Thirteen Tribes of Long Island* (Amityville, N.Y.: Long Island Forum, 1956); W. Martin Beauchamp, *Indian Names in New-York: With a Selection from Other States, and Some Onondaga Names of Plants, etc...* (Fayetteville, N.Y.: H. C. Beauchamp, 1893); Edward Manning Ruttenger, *History of the Indian Tribes of Hudson’s River: Their Origin, Manners and Customs, Tribal and Sub-tribal Organizations, Wars, Treaties, etc...* (Albany, N.Y.: J. Munsell, 1872); J. Hammond Trumbull, Connecticut Historical Society, *The Composition of Indian Geographical Names: Illustrated from the Algonkin Languages* (Hartford, [Conn.]: Press of Case, Lockwood & Brainard, 1870); Silas Wood, *A Sketch of the First Settlement of the Several Towns on Long Island; with Their Political Condition, to the End of the American Revolution* (Brooklyn, NY: A. Spooner, 1828).

²⁷ 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* ([N.Y.]: J. H. Hunt, printer, 1889).

²⁸ John A. Strong, email message to author Kristen J. Nyitray, November 23, 2020.

excellent, albeit modest, amount of scholarship has been produced about Indigenous Long Island.²⁹

With nearly eight million residents, today Long Island is one of the most densely populated islands in the world. The Indigenous origins of the region are well represented in names of villages, bodies of waters, schools, streets, and mascots. Toponyms, eponyms, place names, and English-language exonyms relating to Indigenous peoples and places are pervasive. Forces contributing to the loss of original meanings are abbreviations, conflation of multiple places, evolution of parent language, and replacement of parent language.³⁰ A few references include famed residences (U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt evoked “Sagamore” for his Long Island home Sagamore Hill); sports (Shinnecock Hills Golf Club); national historic landmarks (Montauk Point Light); music (Irving Berlin’s *Yip Yap Yaphank*); and pop culture (the *Friends* television episode “The One in Massapequa”). Despite this prevalence, the Indigenous history of Long Island is both under documented and understudied, and published works that could foster new research and scholarship remain difficult to locate in library collections and catalogs.

Literature review

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. However, discussions surrounding Indigeneity continue to be limited and have minimal presence in library literature. Leading library organizations have affirmed commitments to equity and inclusion in their respective spheres of professional reach. The American Library Association (ALA),³¹ Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL),³² Society of American Archivists (SAA),³³ and Protocols for Native American Archival Materials (PNAAM)³⁴ assert social and ethical responsibility in librarianship/archivism as part of their respective missions. For Indigenous contexts, PNAAM provides a framework of best practices

²⁹ See works by John A. Strong: *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island from Earliest Times to 1700* (Empire State Books, Interlaken, N.Y.: Heart of the Lakes Publishing, 2000); *The Montauket Indians of Long Island* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2001); *The Unkechaug Indians of Eastern Long Island: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011). Also, Natalie A. Naylor, *Women in Long Island’s Past: A History of Eminent Ladies and Everyday Lives* (Charleston, SC: History Press, 2012), 13–22.

³⁰ “Place Name Origins,” 2020, *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Place_name_or-igins.

³¹ American Library Association, “Core Values of Librarianship,” American Library Association, January 2019, <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/corevalues#:~:text=Among%20these%20are%3A%20access%2C%20confidentiality,%2C%20social%20responsibility%2C%20and%20sustainability>.

³² Association of College and Research Libraries, *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010), http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.

³³ Society of American Archivists, “SAA Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics,” Society of American Archivists, August 2020, <https://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-core-values-statement-and-code-of-ethics>.

³⁴ First Archivist Circle, “Protocols for Native American Archival Materials,” Protocols for Native American Archival Materials, First Archivist Circle, 2007, <https://www2.nau.edu/libnap-p/protocols.html>.

for non-Indigenous institutions holding Indigenous collections to provide culturally responsive access and use of Indigenous materials.³⁵

Biases in LC headings, names, and classifications are frequently cited as a fundamental issue stemming from the origins of LCSH, established in 1898. The literature suggests the lens of LC remains reflective of a predominantly white, Eurocentric, Christian worldview.³⁶ In *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People*, Sanford Berman listed objectionable LC headings and proposed alterations.³⁷ He argued Indigenous headings should be changed or created to recognize the mass genocide of Indigenous peoples in the Americas. Kam further examined biases as extensions of social constructs in classification systems and hierarchical taxonomy.³⁸ Within LC Authorities there is no established term for the concept of Indigeneity. Terminology to describe Indigenous groups differs and is contested between communities, geographic regions, and socio-political contexts. Doyle, Lawson, and Dupont commented that Aboriginal contributors are often left out of MARC records and omitted as unnamed informants.³⁹ The absence of content producers and contributors persists in catalogs.

The LCC outline has been studied for its role in perpetuating the “vanishing Indian” myth, in particular by preserving the terminology “Indians of North America.” Many scholars have posited that its placement and classification (E75-99),⁴⁰ including the chronological order, conveys Indigenous peoples are part of the American historical past rather than present (the entry for modern U.S. history begins in the E895-904 range: “Twenty-first century”).⁴¹ For Indigenous materials, umbrella terminology invalidates distinctive words, epistemologies, languages, and peoples.⁴² A substantial number of Indigenous materials are placed in the range E75-99. However, the entries are divided and organized alphabetically into states or provinces which do not mirror how Indigenous peoples group themselves or the geographic boundaries of a community’s traditional homelands.⁴³ According to Yeh,⁴⁴ reasonable modifications to Class E-F

³⁵ First Archivist Circle, “Protocols for Native American Archival Materials.”

³⁶ 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, doi: [10.1086/adx.26.2.27949465](https://doi.org/10.1086/adx.26.2.27949465); Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1993), <http://www.sanfordberman.org/prejant.htm>.

³⁷ Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People*.

³⁸ Kam, “Subject Headings for Aborigines.”

³⁹ Ann M. Doyle, Kimberley Lawson, and Sarah Dupont, “Indigenization of Knowledge Organization at the Xwi7xwa Library,” *Journal of Library and Information Studies* 13, no. 2 (December 2015): 120.

⁴⁰ Library of Congress, “Library of Congress Classification PDF Files,” The Library of Congress, February 2020, <https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCC/freelcc.html>.

⁴¹ Marisa Elena Duarte and Miranda Belarde-Lewis, “Imagining: Creating Spaces for Indigenous Ontologies,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5–6 (2015): 684, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1018396); Alissa Cherry and Keshav Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification: Revisiting and Reviving the Brian Deer Scheme,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5-6 (2015): 551; Thomas Yen-Ran Yeh “The Treatment of the American Indian in the Library of Congress E-F Schedule,” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 15, no. 2 (1971): 122–26.

⁴² Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, “Imagining,” 681.

⁴³ Cherry and Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification,” 550–52; Heather Moulaison Sandy and Jenny Bossaller, “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access to Indigenous Knowledge through Knowledge Organization Systems,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (2017): 129–52, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2017.1281858](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1281858).

⁴⁴ Thomas Yen-Ran Yeh, “The Treatment of the American Indian in the Library of Congress E-F Schedule.”

could be accomplished by adding classes and revising language. For example, either the class for United States history could be moved to E77, or E77-99 could be changed to “American Indian.”⁴⁵ In response, Principal Subject Cataloger for the Library of Congress Eugene T. Frosio stated that E75-99 of the American History schedule remains useful and does not warrant changing while conceding the classification creators intended to treat modern Indigenous peoples as “remnants.”⁴⁶

There is considerable scholarship on the logistics of changing LCSH to include Indigenous epistemologies and to support information seeking behaviors for Indigenous scholarly resources. Recognition of the value of Indigenous knowledge organization has informed modifications of subject headings. In 2005, Steven A. Knowlton reevaluated and identified adjusted terms per Sanford Berman’s recommendations in *Prejudices and Antipathies* and found that compilers of LC subject headings “seriously addressed” bias by changing eighty-eight of Berman’s 225 items verbatim. In 2017, Berman published a personal scorecard of LCSH that evaluated when and how the LC Cataloging Policy and Support Office implemented his recommended revisions to subject headings and the ones that remained unedited. He found that while LC adopted many of his suggestions, a substantial number of headings he deemed problematic were unchanged.⁴⁷ In 1995, the Mashantucket Pequot Nation began developing a custom subject vocabulary thesaurus for Pequot-specific terms and more broadly Indigenous topics related to North American communities. *The Mashantucket Pequot Thesaurus of American Indian Terminology* is designed to be jointly used with LCSH as a way to incorporate Indigenous epistemologies into mainstream controlled vocabularies.⁴⁸ An example of Indigenous knowledge organization is the Brian Deer Classification Schema (BDC). Created in the 1970s by Kahnawake Mohawk librarian Brian Deer, the BDC described local context both in collection holdings and Indigenous concerns of the time, such as land claims and natural resource management.⁴⁹ Raegan Swanson described the implementation of the BDC at the Aanischaaukamikw Cree Cultural Institute, located in Oujé-Bougoumou, Canada, for its

⁴⁵ Ibid, 124.

⁴⁶ Eugene T. Frosio, “Comments on the Thomas Yen-Ran Yeh Proposals,” *Library Resources and Technical Services* 15, no. 2 (April 1971): 128.

⁴⁷ 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, doi: [10.1300/J104v40n02_08](https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v40n02_08); Memorandum, “Personal LCSH Scorecard,” June 2017, supplement to Sanford Berman and Tina Gross, “Expand, Humanize, Simplify: An Interview with Sandy Berman,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55, no. 6 (2017): 347–60, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2017.1327468](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2017.1327468).

⁴⁸ Sandra Littletree and Cheryl A. Metoyer, “Knowledge Organization from an Indigenous Perspective: The Mashantucket Pequot Thesaurus of American Indian Terminology Project,” *Classification & Cataloging Quarterly* 53, no. 5–6 (2015): 640–57, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2015.1010113](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1010113).

⁴⁹ Cherry and Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification,” 553; Moulaison Sandy and Bossaller, “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access,” 139; Isaac Gilman, “From Marginalization to Accessibility: Classification of Indigenous Materials” (Master’s thesis, Pacific University Oregon, 2006), <https://commons.pacificu.edu/work/sc/228e230c-de7a-4678-816f-44489f8fbac2>.

Quebec-focused classification.⁵⁰ First Nations House of Learning Subject Headings is an example of an Indigenous-based subject vocabulary designed for the MARC record format.⁵¹

Performing subject analyses of Indigenous materials is often challenging for catalogers due to limited reliable information and diversity in Indigenous knowledge vocabulary.⁵² Duarte and Belarde-Lewis argued that cataloging can be reductive work; it can divorce Indigenous materials from original contexts and sources of Indigenous knowledge.⁵³ Research by Moulaison Sandy and Bossaller found that library and information science degree programs in North America typically do not address Indigenous representation in cataloging and classification coursework.⁵⁴ Cristina Villanueva emphasized opportunities for collaboration in authority work among catalogers and specialists in Native contexts. Her suggestion that catalogers interact directly with researchers was characterized by Dankowski as “evocative of the user-centric approach popularized by Charles Ammi Cutter.”⁵⁵

Methodology

This research is qualitative; it combines elements of descriptive, exploratory, and remedial studies. The authors adhere to Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s decolonization methodologies, as this paper undertakes to embody this practice.⁵⁶ Fundamentally, decolonization work dissolves systems of oppression and power. According to Kelema Lee Moses, decolonization is not a “theoretical exercise in settler guilt”; it reframes information in a tangible, meaningful way.⁵⁷ Further, neutrality maintains the status quo of systems of power, which aids the settler colonial state and colonial systems of power.⁵⁸ In a library context, this perspective is echoed by Bourq, who writes from the premise “that it isn’t just that libraries aren’t perfectly equitable or neutral because we live in a society that still suffers from racism, sexism, ableism, transphobia, and other forms of bias and inequity; but libraries also fail to achieve any mythical state of neutrality because we contribute to bias and inequality in scholarship, and publishing, and information access.”⁵⁹ Naming involves observing Indigenous communal and ethical protocols and calling Indigenous groups by terms they use to define themselves. Kānaka Maoli scholar Neolani Arista

⁵⁰ Raegan Swanson, “Adapting the Brian Deer Classification System for Aanischaaukamikw Cree Cultural Institute,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53, no. 5–6 (2015): 568–79, doi: [10.1080/01639374.2015.1009669](https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1009669).

⁵¹ Doyle, Lawson, and Dupont, “Indigenization of Knowledge Organization,” 116–17.

⁵² Duarte and Belarde-Lewis, “Imagining.”

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 686.

⁵⁴ Moulaison Sandy and Bossaller, “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access,” 142.

⁵⁵ Terra Dankowski, “Removing.”

⁵⁶ Kelema Lee Moses, “Lessons from Hawai’i,” *Platform* (blog), October 19, 2019, <https://www.platformspace.net/home/lessons-from-hawaii>; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed, 2012).

⁵⁷ Kelema Lee Moses, “Lessons from Hawai’i.”

⁵⁸ 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>.

⁵⁹ Chris Bourq, “The Library Is Never Neutral,” in *Disrupting the Digital Humanities*, ed. Dorothy Kim and Jesse Stommel (Punctum Books, 2018), 455–72, 457.

asserted that naming in research should insist on Indigenous language presence and not default to translations because it fosters normalization of Indigenous languages in public spaces and pushes people to acquire language fluency.⁶⁰

Finally, the proposed changes to vocabularies and classifications are a form of language reclamation, a decolonizing methodology that positions Indigenous peoples and agencies as authoritative. Language reclamation is a community-oriented responsibility: “a method of preserving voice, which encapsulates personal and communal agency and the expression of Indigenous identities, belonging, and responsibility to self and community.”⁶¹

Given the lack of authoritative published sources to delineate Long Island Indigenous peoples and homelands, the authors conducted historical research prior to data collection. These findings provided the foundational information needed to develop a taxonomy of Indigenous Long Island peoples, and of places named with words of Indigenous origins. Once this information was organized, searches were performed for each term in LC authority databases to assess their presence as subject headings, names, and classifications. These terms were also searched as subjects and keywords in WorldCat to identify titles that meet the criteria of literary warrant and the 20% rule⁶² yet lack headings and names reflective of the content.

Part 2 of this study discusses the methodology in greater depth; it provides details about search strategies and analyzes a sampling of existing catalog records with an emphasis on syndetic structures of records in LCSH and LCNAF.

Defining the geographic coverage of Indigenous Long Island peoples and places

The geographic scope was defined as contiguous Long Island which includes present-day Kings County (Brooklyn), Queens County, Nassau County, and Suffolk County. Long Island’s coastal location supported interactions between more than a dozen Indigenous peoples and extended into other areas of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. The authors compiled a list of geographic terms representing rivers, creeks, beaches, towns, neighborhoods, lakes, peoples, and

⁶⁰ Neolani Arista, *The Kingdom and the Republic: Sovereign Hawai’i and the Early United States* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020).

⁶¹ 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 and Praxis in Indigenous-Language Reclamation,” *Daedalus* 147, no. 2 (2018): 160–72, doi: [10.1162/DAED_a_00499](https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00499).

⁶² *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Module 5.4*, 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>

Algonquin words. Localities and natural features were identified using historical maps,⁶³ government and township records, gazetteers,⁶⁴ Native Land Digital,⁶⁵ and Google Earth.⁶⁶

Identifying Indigenous Long Island peoples and communities

Through research and consultations with historians⁶⁷, fourteen primary Indigenous communities, represented here with modern spellings, were identified as having lived or continue to live on Long Island: Canarsies (includes Jameos and Najaks), Corchaugs (includes Yennecoaks), Manhansets, Massapeguas, Matinecocks, Merricks (includes Marechkewicks), Montauketts, Nissequogues, Rockaways (includes Maspeths), Secatogues, Seponarks, Setalcotts, Shinnecoaks, and Unkechaugs (includes Patchogues and Unquachogs). Matinecock, Montaukett, Setalcott, Unkechaug, and Shinnecock peoples are sovereign Nations still residing on Long Island. They comprise different sets of kinship networks with unique traditions and customs.

Indigenous peoples moved and were removed over time. With this in mind, the intent was to recognize the plurality and fluidity of Indigenous peoples in the nearby tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Thirteen peoples with homelands situated in the geographic environs were included to reflect the interconnectedness among groups, caused in part by migrations and consolidations resulting from wars and forced relocations. They are Delawares, Hammonassets, Lenni Lenapes, Manhattans (Lenapes), Menunkatucks, Munsees (Lenapes), Nehantics (Niantics), Paugussetts, Pequots, Quinnipiacs, Rechgawawancs (Lenapes), Wappingers (Lenapes), and Wiechquaeskecks.

While Manhattan Island is located just west of the boundary, sources suggest exchanges between Long Island groups and Lenni Lenapes due to the proximity of traditional homelands. The Manhattan peoples were related to the Delawares and part of the Hackensack and Tappan communities west of the Hudson River. In southern Connecticut, Indigenous communities with traditional territories near the Long Island Sound include Hammonassets, Menunkatucks,

⁶³ J. Blaeu 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).

⁶⁴ Robert S. Grumet and Raymond Whritenour, *Beyond Manhattan: A Gazetteer of Delaware Indian History Reflected in Modern-Day Place Names* (New York: State Education Department, 2014), <http://purl.org/net/nysl/nysdocs/894524543>; “NYS Gazetteer Interactive Search,” Bureau of Biometrics and Health Statistics, Department of Health, New York State, December 7, 2016, database, <https://health.data.ny.gov/Health/NYS-Gazetteer-Interactive-Search/xj6h-78ev>.

⁶⁵ Native Land Digital, “Native-Land.ca,” accessed January 27, 2021. “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.”

⁶⁶ Google Earth, accessed January 27, 2021, <https://www.google.com/earth>. This geo- browser combines GIS data, satellite imagery, and aerial photography.

⁶⁷ Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 156. Also see the Acknowledgments section.

Nehantics, (Niantics), Paugussetts, Pequots, and Quinnipiacs.⁶⁸ Some groups were tributees of Long Island Indigenous communities and express cultural and linguistic comparabilities.⁶⁹

Note on sources

A first step was to research contemporary web presences of Indigenous communities currently residing on Long Island. Sources included official tribal government websites and their social media channels (see Table 5 and Appendix). For historical context, primary sources and early writings chronicling Long Island history were also examined. Several important works provided information about how Indigenous names and places have been documented over time.⁷⁰ Town records and land deeds dating from the 17th century were also accessed.⁷¹ Land and property records provided important information and insights about interpersonal dynamics, social forces at play, and the economic transactions among peoples. Additionally, these records typically include detailed descriptions of geographies; they offer evidence of place names and bring clarity to questions concerning name origins. While Tooker's ethnolinguistic studies required interrogation, they were referenced as they represent some of the earliest scholarly works concerning Indigenous peoples on Long Island.⁷² Throughout this paper, *Wikipedia* sources are cited in the spirit that it is a community-sourced repository of information that corroborates findings found to be accurate based on reputable sources. Contemporary scholarship by historians of Long Island provided critical analysis and context.⁷³

Taxonomy and iterative data collection

A taxonomy was devised with the twenty-seven Indigenous communities most referenced from the research. It took the form of a Google sheet shared by the authors with initial column headings titled, "Indigenous people or term," "subgroups/subtribes," "language," and "traditional homelands." Additional sheets were created to document place names, localities, geographic headings, and the contemporary nations still residing on the land. The main sheet was expanded to accommodate the data collection phase of the study.

⁶⁸ Hayden L. Griswold, Mathias Spiess, and Mary Pierson Cheney, *Map of The State of Connecticut Showing Indian Trails, Villages & Sachemdoms* (Connecticut Society of the Colonial Dames of America, 1930).

⁶⁹ Strong, *Algonquian Peoples of Long Island*.

⁷⁰ Ruttenber, *History of the Indian Tribes of Hudson's River*; Beauchamp, *Indian Names in New-York*; 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); Bailey, *The Thirteen Tribes of Long Island*.

⁷¹ See: *Records of the Town of East Hampton, Long Island, Suffolk Co., N.Y.: with Other Ancient Documents of Historic Value* (Sag Harbor, New York: J.H. Hunt, 1887).

⁷² Tooker, *The Indian Place-Names on Long Island and Islands...; Indian Place-Names in East-Hampton Town*.

⁷³ Examples include all works by J. A. Strong; Robert S. Grumet, and Raymond Whritenour, *Beyond Manhattan*; Allen, *Long Island Maps and Their Makers: Five Centuries of Cartographic History*; Lipman, *The Saltwater Frontier: Indians and the Contest for the American Coast*.

Keyword searches were performed for peoples most referenced in the sources consulted and geographic terms using the LC Linked Data Service portal and the LC Authorities website.⁷⁴ Given the uncertainty of representation in the databases, searches were conducted for the twenty-seven Indigenous communities and the identified Indigenous geographic terms. Variant spellings discovered during the research phase were also searched. Information sought from the LC databases and recorded were: the presence of entries in the LCC outline, concept, broader terms, narrower terms, revision history, and associated content. This process further yielded new headings that warranted further investigation and additional searching.

Using the complete list of headings discovered in LC Authorities, the authors searched WorldCat. Finally, a secondary survey of further research and data collection was conducted to record correlations in geographic LC subject headings and name authority records of localities and natural features for the twenty-seven Indigenous community groups.

Results and Analysis

Searching LC Authority files

The authors compiled data for twenty-seven Indigenous peoples obtained from searches of LCSH, LCNAF, and LCC. Results are presented in Tables 1–3. Indigenous communities numbered 1 to 14 represent the primary peoples on Long Island. To provide broader cultural context, communities numbered 15 to 27 represent peoples that did or conceivably interacted with the primary communities. For further information about the tables, see the Appendix.

Table 1. Library of Congress Name Authority Records (NARs).

	Indigenous Community	NAR	NAR concept	NAR variant
1	Canarsies	none	n/a	n/a
2	Corchaugs	none	n/a	n/a
3	Manhansets	none	n/a	n/a
4	Massapeguas	none	n/a	n/a
5	Matinecocks	none	n/a	n/a
6	Merricks	none	n/a	n/a

⁷⁴ “Library of Congress Linked Data Service,” accessed December 23, 2020, <https://id.loc.gov/>; “Library of Congress Authorities,” accessed December 23, 2020, <https://authorities.loc.gov/>.

7	Montauketts	none	n/a	n/a
8	Nissequogues	none	n/a	n/a
9	Rockaways	none	n/a	n/a
10	Secatogues	none	n/a	n/a
11	Seponarks	none	n/a	n/a
12	Setalcotts	none	n/a	n/a
13	Shinnecoeks	Shinnecock Indian Nation	Geographic	n/a
14	Unkechaugs	none	n/a	n/a
15	Delawares	Delaware Tribe of Indians	Geographic	Delawares Delaware Tribe Delaware Nation Delaware Nation of Indians
		Delaware Nation, Oklahoma		Delaware Tribe of Indians Residing in Oklahoma
		Delaware Nation (To 1795)		Delaware (Confederacy)
		Moravian of the Thames (First Nation)		Delaware Nation at Monroviatown Delaware Nation at Monroviatown First Nation Moravian of the Thames Band First Nation
16	Hammonassets	none	n/a	n/a
17	Lenni Lenapes	none	n/a	n/a
18	Manhattans (Lenapes)	none	n/a	n/a
19	Menunkatucks	none	n/a	n/a

20	Munsees (Lenapes)	Munsee-Delaware Nation	Geographic	n/a
		Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin		Stockbridge Munsee Community Stockbridge Munsee Community of Wisconsin
		Stockbridge Tribe		n/a
		Munsee or Christian Band of Indians	Corporate Name	Munsee Band of Indians Christian Band of Indians Munsee or Christian Indians Munsee or Christian Indian Band Band of Munsee or Christian Indians
		Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians		Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians in the State of Wisconsin Stockbridge and Munsee Tribes of Indians Stockbridge-Munsee Tribe of Indians Stockbridge-Munsee Tribes of Indians Stockbridge (Mahican) and Munsee Tribes Stockbridge and Munsee Band of Mohican Indians
21	Nehantics (Niantics)	none	n/a	n/a
22	Paugussetts	none	n/a	n/a

23	Pequots	Mashantucket Pequot Indian Tribe	Geographic	Mashantucket (Western) Pequot Tribal Nation Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation MPTN (Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation)
24	Quinnipiacs	none	n/a	n/a
25	Rechgawawancs (Lenapes)	none	n/a	n/a
26	Wappingers (Lenapes)	none	n/a	n/a
27	Wiechquaeskecks	none	n/a	n/a

Table 2. Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH).

	Indigenous Community	LCSH	LCSH concept	LC subject variant	LC broader terms
1	Canarsies	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	Corchaugs	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
3	Manhansets	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	Massapeguas	Massapequa Indians	Topic	n/a	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–New York (State)
5	Matinecocks	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	Merricks	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
7	Montauketts	Montauk Indians	Topic	n/a	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–New

					York (State)
8	Nissequogues	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
9	Rockaways	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
10	Secatogues	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
11	Seponarks	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
12	Setalcotts	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
13	Shinnecocks	Shinnecock Indians	Topic	n/a	Indians of North America–New York (State) Montauk Indians
14	Unkechaugs	Unkechaug Indians	Topic	Onecchechaug Indians Patchague Indians Patchoag Indians Patchogue Indians Poospatuck Indians Unachog Indians Uncachage Indians Unchachaug Indians Unquachock Indians Unquachog Indians	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–New York (State)
15	Delawares	Delaware Indians	Topic	Lenape Indians Lenni Lenape Indians Linapi Indians	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Middle Atlantic States

16	Hammonassets	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
17	Lenni Lenapes	Delaware Indians	Topic	Lenape Indians Lenni Lenape Indians Linapi Indians	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Middle Atlantic States
18	Manhattans (Lenapes)	Manhattan Indians	Topic	n/a	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–New York (State)
19	Menunkatucks	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
20	Munsees (Lenapes)	Munsee Indians	Topic	Minsi Indians Monsey Indians Moonsee Indians Muncey Indians Muncie Indians Ontario Delaware Indians	Delaware Indians Indians of North America–Northeastern States Indians of North America–Ontario
21	Nehantics (Niantics)	Niantic Indians	Topic	Nehântick Indians Nehantucket Indians	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut Indians of North America–Rhode Island
22	Paugussetts	Paugusset Indians	Topic	Paugussett Indians	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut

23	Pequots	Pequot Indians	Topic	n/a	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut Indians of North America–Rhode Island
24	Quinnipiacs	Quinnipiac Indians	Topic	n/a	Algonquian Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut
25	Rechgawawancs (Lenapes)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
26	Wappingers (Lenapes)	Wappinger Indians	Topic	Guilford Indians Hammonasset Indians Massacoe Indians Menunkatuk Indians Naugatuck Indians Nochpeem Indians Podunk Indians	Delaware Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut Indians of North America–New York (State)
27	Wiechquaeskecks	Wiechquaeskeck Indians	Topic	Wechquaesgeek Indians Wecquaesgeek Indians Wickquaskeek Indians Wiequaskeck Indians Wiquaeskeck Indians	Delaware Indians Indians of North America–Connecticut

The analysis revealed several Indigenous communities are not represented in LCSH, LCNAF, and LCC. Of the twenty-seven terms searched (column 1), only four Indigenous communities are represented with Name Authority Records (NARs): Delawares, Munsees, Shinnecoeks, and Pequots. The Lenni Lenapes have the most representation in LC Authorities, yet the name Lenni Lenape does not have a NAR or an LC subject heading. LC identified two other subgroups of Lenni Lenapes: Mannhattans, Rechgawawancs, Siwanoy, and Wappingers. They do not have NARs but do have subject headings. The Manhattan, Massapequa, Montaukett, and Unkechaug peoples have entries as subjects. Thirteen communities lack a NAR or an LC subject heading (e.g., Nissequogues). “Montauk Indians” is an LC subject heading but is not represented with a NAR because they are not a federally recognized tribe.⁷⁵ All subject headings are topical, and all NARs are geographic concepts.

The enhancement level of existing NARs varies greatly. “Unkechaug Indians” (ten subject variants), “Wappinger Indians” (seven subject variants), and “Munsee Indians” (six subject variants) have the greatest number of subject variants. “Delaware Indians” have three subject variants, all of which reference the term Lenni Lenapes in some manner. Comparatively, the LC subject heading “Algonquin Indians” only has one subject variant, the key difference being spelling.

Fourteen communities have broader terms (BT) that include the subject headings “Indians of North America” with a geographic subdivision. The BT for “Unkechaug Indians,” “Montauk Indians,” “Massapequa Indians,” “Manhattan Indians,” and “Delaware Indians” are “Algonquin Indians” and “Indians of North America–New York (State).” The “Munsee Indians” and “Wappinger Indians” share the BT “Delaware Indians.” Nested under the BT “Algonquin Indians” and “Indians of North America–New York (State)” are “Manhattan Indians,” “Massapequa Indians,” “Montauk Indians,” and “Unkechaug Indians.” The BT for Shinnecoeks include “Montauk Indians” and “Indians of North America–New York (State).” However, while the Shinnecoeks are closely related to the Montauketts, they are not considered a Montaukett subgroup.⁷⁶ “Shinnecock Indians” should have the BT “Algonquian Indians” but it is omitted. The BT for Munsees include “Indians of North America–Northeastern States” and “Indians of North America–Ontario.”

A review of the LCC outline presented variable results. The Montauketts, Shinnecoeks, Unkechaugs, Delawares, Lenni Lenapes, Mannhattans (Lenapes), Munsees (Lenapes), Nehantics (Niantics), Paugussetts, Pequots, Quinnipiaks, Wappingers (Lenapes), and Wiechquaeskecks are assigned an E99 classification. The Massapequas have no LCC. The languages of the Delawares (referring to Lenapes), Montauketts, Munsees, and Algonquins have associated PM (language) classifications. The Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut, Shinnecock Nation, and Munsee-Delaware Nation have KF, KIF, and KIC classifications, respectively.

⁷⁵ United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interiors, Notice, “Indian Entities Recognized by and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs,” *Federal Register* 85, no. 20 (January 30, 2020): 5462, <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2020-01707>.

⁷⁶ John A. Strong, email message to author Kristen J. Nyitray, January 31, 2021.

Table 3. Library of Congress Classification (LCC).

	Indigenous Community	LCC
1	Canarsies	none
2	Corchaugs	none
3	Manhansets	none
4	Massapequas	none
5	Matinecocks	none
6	Merricks	none
7	Montauketts	Montauk (E99) Montauk (PM)
8	Nissequogues	none
9	Rockaways	none
10	Secatogues	none
11	Seponarks	none
12	Setalcotts	none
13	Shinnecoeks	Shinnecock (E99) Shinnecock Nation (KIF)
14	Unkechaugs	Unkechaug (E99) Unkechaug Nation (KIF)
15	Delawares	Delaware (E99) Delaware Indians (KF)
16	Hammonassets	none
17	Lenni Lenapes	Delaware (Lenape) (PM)
18	Manhattans (Lenapes)	Manhattan (E99)
19	Menunkatucks	none

20	Munsees (Lenapes)	Munsee (E99) Munsee (PM) Munsee-Delaware Nation (KIC)
		Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Wisconsin (KIH)
21	Nehantics (Niantics)	Niantic (E99)
22	Paugussetts	Paugusset (E99)
23	Pequots	Pequot (E99) Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut (KF)
24	Quinnipiacs	Quinnipiac (E99)
25	Rechgawawancs (Lenapes)	none
26	Wappingers (Lenapes)	Wappinger (E99)
27	Wiechquaeskecks	Wiechquaeskeck (E99)

Searching WorldCat

The final part of data collection was conducting searches in the WorldCat union catalog. Primary names and variant spellings of Indigenous Long Island groups were entered. This exercise yielded several existing catalog records for materials in book format. While these works meet LC's criteria of literary warrant and/or the 20% rule, they lack subject headings for their respective groups. These books are under described according to the parameters prescribed by LC. Below is a sampling of results from searches conducted between March and April of 2021.

Indigenous Community: Canarsies

Citation: Jaffe, Herman J. 1976. *The Canarsee Indians: The Original Inhabitants*.

OCLC Number: 1084270527

Subjects:

Delaware Indians – New York (State) – History.

Canarsie (New York, N.Y.) – History.

Brooklyn (New York, N.Y.) – History.

Delaware Indians.

New York (State) – New York – Canarsie.

New York (State) – New York – Brooklyn.

New York (State)

Recommended new subject heading: Canarsies

Indigenous Community: Corchaugs

Citation: Hunter, Paul. 2014. *Corchaug and its Fort: A Brief Perspective on Its Origin*.

OCLC Number: 909025291

Subjects:

Indians of North America – New York (State) – Long Island – History.

Long Island (N.Y.) – History.

Fort Corchaug.

Indians of North America.

New York (State) – Long Island.

Recommended new subject heading: Corchaugs

Indigenous Community: Manhansets

Citation: Carse, Robert, and Joseph Cellini. 1961. *Winter of the Whale: A Novel*. New York: Putnam.

OCLC Number: 1418265

Subjects:

Indians of North America – Juvenile fiction.

Pequot Indians – Juvenile fiction. [note: heading should be deleted]

Whales – Juvenile fiction.

Manhasset Neck (N.Y.) – Juvenile fiction. [note: the correct location is Shelter Island]

Indians of North America.

Pequot Indians. [note: heading should be deleted]

Whales.

New York (State) – Manhasset Neck. [note: the correct location is Shelter Island]

Recommended new subject heading: Manhansets

Indigenous Community: Matinecocks

OCLC Number: 36048637

Citation: Underhill, David Harris, and Francis Jay Underhill. 1926. *The Underhill Burying Ground: An Account of a Parcel of Land Situate at Locust Valley, Long Island, New York, Deeded by the Matinecock Indians, February Twentieth, Sixteen Hundred and Sixty Seven, to Captain John Underhill for Meritorious Service and Known as the Underhill Burying Ground*. New York: Printed by the Hine Pub. Co.

Subjects:

Underhill family.

Underhill, John, 1597–1672.
Underhill Burying Ground (Locust Valley, N.Y.)
Locust Valley (N.Y.) – History.
New York (State) – Locust Valley.

Recommended new subject heading: Matinecocks

Indigenous Community: Merricks
Citation: Simpson, Ray. 2010. *Meroke Indian Sites Long Forgotten*.
OCLC Number: 1048259369
Subjects:

Indians of North America – New York (State) – Long Island.
Indians of North America.
New York (State) – Long Island.

Recommended new subject heading: Merricks

Indigenous Community: Nissequogues
Citation: Smith, J. Lawrence. 1961. *The History of Smithtown*. Smithtown, N.Y. Smithtown Historical Society.
OCLC Number: 945175485
Subjects:

Smithtown (N.Y. : Town) – History.
New York (State) – Smithtown (Town)
United States, New York, Suffolk, Smithtown – History.
United States, New York, Suffolk, Smithtown – Genealogy.

Recommended new subject heading: Nissequogues

Indigenous Community: Rockaways
Citation: *Old Rockaway's Curious History: It is a Tale of Early Indian Grants, Shifting Sands and Endless Litigation*. 1974.
OCLC Number: 431373108
Subjects:

Rockaway (New York, N.Y.) – History.
New York (N.Y.) – History.
New York (State) – New York.
New York (State) – New York – Rockaway.

Recommended new subject heading: Rockaways

Indigenous Community: Secatogues
Citation: Starace, Carl A. 1983. *A Secatogue Legend*. [Islip?, N.Y.]: Distributed by Islip Town Board.

OCLC Number: 28654271

Subjects:

Islip (N.Y.) – History.

Indians of North America – New York (State) – Suffolk County.

Indians of North America.

New York (State) – Islip.

New York (State) – Suffolk County.

Recommended new subject heading: Secatogues

Indigenous Community: Setalcotts

Ritchie, William A. 1965. *The Stony Brook Site and Its Relation to Archaic and Transitional Cultures on Long Island*. Albany: University of the State of New York.

OCLC Number: 41345012

Subjects:

Long Island (N.Y.) – Antiquities.

Indians of North America – New York (State) – Long Island.

Antiquities.

Indians of North America.

New York (State) – Long Island.

Recommended new subject heading: Setalcotts

Secondary survey: Correlation of Indigenous peoples and locality names

The authors searched LCSH and LCNAF for localities and natural features that directly reference the twenty-seven identified Indigenous peoples. The total number of geographic LC subject headings and geographic name authority records are thirty-nine and sixty-six, respectively (105 total). Eight of the twenty-seven communities lack representation as both geographic subject headings and geographic name authority records. The subject headings typically reference bodies of water including watersheds, bays, brooks, inlets, creeks, lakes, and falls and not lands. For Long Island, twelve subject headings are associated with Indigenous peoples. With fourteen entries, Rockaway has the most total occurrences. Place names often share the same “-ogue” or “gue” endings, e.g., “Aquebogue (N.Y.)” and “Copiague (N.Y.)” There is also representation of words in entries outside of New York including New Jersey, Nebraska, California, and Oregon (Table 4).

Table 4. Geographic LC subject headings (LCSHs) and geographic name authority records (NARs) of localities and natural features.

	Indigenous Community	Geographic coverage	Localities and natural features: LCSH (Geographic)	Localities and natural features: NAR (Geographic)
1	Canarsies	Long Island	none	Canarsie (New York, N.Y.)
2	Corchaugs	Long Island	Fort Corchaug (N.Y.)	none
3	Manhansets	Long Island	Manhasset Bay (N.Y.); Manhasset Neck (N.Y.)	Manhasset (N.Y.); Manhasset Hills (N.Y.)
4	Massapeguas	Long Island	none	Massapequa (N.Y.); Massapequa Park (N.Y.); East Massapequa (N.Y.); North Massapequa (N.Y.)
5	Matinecocks	Long Island	none	Matinecock (N.Y.)
6	Merricks	Long Island	none	Merrick (N.Y.); Merrick County (Neb.); Merrick (Okla.); North Merrick (N.Y.)
7	Montauketts	Long Island	Montauk Point (N.Y.); Montauk Point State Park (N.Y.)	Montauk (N.Y.)
8	Nissequogues	Long Island	none	Nissequogue (N.Y.)
9	Rockaways	Long Island	Rockaway Inlet (N.Y.); Rockaway River (N.J.); Rockaway River Watershed (N.J.)	Rockaway Beach (Calif.); Rockaway (N.J.); Rockaway (N.J. : Township); Rockaway Valley (N.J.); East Rockaway (N.Y.); Far Rockaway (New York, N.Y.); Rockaway (New York, N.Y.); Rockaway Beach (New York, N.Y.); Rockaway Park (New York, N.Y.); Rockaway Point (New York, N.Y.); Rockaway (Ore.)
10	Secatogues	Long Island	none	none
11	Seponarks	Long Island	none	none

12	Setalcotts	Long Island	none	Setauket (N.Y.); East Setauket (N.Y.); South Setauket (N.Y.)
13	Shinnecoeks	Long Island	Shinnecock Bay (N.Y.); Shinnecock Hills (N.Y.); Shinnecock Reservation (N.Y.); Shinnecock East County Park (N.Y.)	none
14	Unkechaugs	Long Island	none	Patchogue (N.Y.); East Patchogue (N.Y.)
15	Delawares	Tri-State	Delaware River Valley (N.Y.-Del. and N.J.); Delaware River Estuary; Delaware and Raritan Canal State Park (N.J.); Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River (N.Y. and Pa.); Delaware River Watershed (N.Y.-Del. and N.J.); Delaware Bay (Del. and N.J.); Delaware River (N.Y.-Del. and N.J.); Delaware Bay Watershed (Del. and N.J.); Delaware Basin (Tex. and N. Mex.); Delaware Canal State Park (Pa.); Delaware Canal (Pa.); Delaware River (Kan.); Delaware State Forest (Pa.); Chesapeake and Delaware Canal (Del. and Md.); Delaware Seashore State Park (Del.); Delaware and Hudson Canal (N.Y. and Pa.); Delaware and Raritan Canal (N.J.); Delaware River Watershed (Kan.); Delaware Water Gap (N.J.)	Delaware County (N.Y.); Delaware (Warren County, N.J.); Delaware (N.Y. : Town); Delaware (Hunterdon County, N.J.); Delaware (Camden County, N.J. : Township); Delaware County (Ind.); Delaware County (Pa.); Delaware Water Gap (Pa.); Delaware County (Okla.); Delaware County (Iowa); Delaware (Juniata County, Pa. : Township); Delaware (Northumberland County, Pa. : Township); Delaware (Hancock County, Ohio : Township); Delaware County (Ohio); Delaware (Mercer County, Pa. : Township); Delaware City (Del.); Delaware (Ohio); Delaware (Mich.); Delaware (Ont. : Township); Delaware (Pike County, Pa. : Township)

			and Pa.)	
16	Hammonassets	Tri-State	Hammonasset Beach State Park (Madison, Conn.)	none
17	Lenni Lenapes	Tri-State	none	none
18	Manhattans (Lenapes)	Tri-State	none	Manhattan (Colo.); Manhattan (Ill. : Township); Manhattan (Kan.); Manhattan (Mont.); Manhattan (Nev.); Lower Manhattan (New York, N.Y.); Manhattan (New York, N.Y.); Manhattan Beach (New York, N.Y.); Manhattanville (New York, N.Y.); Manhattan Beach (Minn.); Midtown Manhattan (New York, N.Y.); Manhattan Heights (El Paso, Tex.)
19	Menunkatucks	Tri-State	none	none
20	Munsees (Lenapes)	Tri-State	none	none
21	Nehantics (Niantics)	Tri-State	Niantic (Conn.); Niantic Bay (Conn.); Niantic River (Conn.)	Niantic (Conn.); Niantic (Ill.)
22	Paugussetts	Tri-State	none	none
23	Pequots	Tri-State	none	Pequot Lakes (Minn.)
24	Quinnipiacs	Tri-State	Quinnipiac River (Conn.); Quinnipiac River Watershed (Conn.)	none
25	Rechgawawancs (Lenapes)	Tri-State	none	none
26	Wappingers (Lenapes)	Tri-State	Wappinger Creek (N.Y.)	Wappinger (N.Y.: Town); Wappingers Falls (N.Y.)

27	Wiechquaeskecks	Tri-State	none	none
----	-----------------	-----------	------	------

Discussion

Omissions, lack of completeness, and inaccurate terms in catalog records limit and hinder opportunities for research. Within LC Authorities, there is minimal presence of Indigenous Long Island *peoples* yet substantial presence of *localities* with Indigenous word origins. Names and subject headings were sparse and found to include inaccuracies, misleading information, and misinformation. While geographic subject headings exist for the communities of Canarsies, Manhansets, Matinecocks, Merricks, Nissequogues, and Rockaways, there is no representation of the peoples that inhabited these land areas in LC Authorities. The majority of Indigenous Long Islanders lack a NAR, LC subject heading, and/or an LCC; they are Canarsies, Corchaugs, Manhansets, Matinecocks, Merricks, Nissequogues, Rockaways, Secatogues, Seponarks, Setalcotts, and Rechgawawancs (Lenapes). The four Indigenous communities with no representation in LCSH, LCNAF, and LCC are Secatogues, Seponarks, Menunkatucks, and Rechgawawancs (Lenapes).

The case of Lenni Lenapes and Lenape-related peoples illustrates imprecision in describing kin networks and historical diaspora. There are over seven tribes of federally and/or state recognized Lenape peoples dispersed across Turtle Island (North America).⁷⁷ The existing subject heading for Lenni Lenapes and Lenape-related peoples (“Delaware”) does not account for multiple Indigenous histories. The NAR for Lenapes only recognizes the Delaware Tribe of Indians. The omission of other Lenape tribes suggests they are a homogenous group belonging to one tribe/community. Further, the subject heading “Delaware” is currently used to collectively describe groups of Munsee, Unami, and Unalachtigo peoples (specific Lenape communities). Delaware is not synonymous with Lenape; the current position of Lenape as a “see reference” or cross reference to Delawares is incorrect because Lenape is not a variant form of the name. From a cultural standpoint, it is inaccurate to generally use Delaware to describe Lenapes.

The use of geographic concepts to describe Indigenous places and nations is a matter of contention. According to NACO, geographic name headings typically describe geographic features, regions, and other collective names for jurisdictional boundaries.⁷⁸ The headings associated with Shinnecoeks are “Shinnecock Indian Nation” (geographic name authority

⁷⁷ Lenape peoples belong to contemporary tribes called: Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware (Delaware); Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribal Nation (New Jersey); Ramapough Lenape Nation (New Jersey); Delaware Nation (Oklahoma); Delaware Tribe of Indians (Oklahoma); and Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians (Wisconsin). See: National Conference of State Legislatures, “Federal and State Recognized Tribes,” National Conference of State Legislatures, 2020,

<https://www.ncsl.org/research/state-trib-al-institute/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx>.

⁷⁸ NACO, “Frequently Asked Questions on Establishing Geographic Names for NACO,” Library of Congress, 2017, <https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/naco/geogfaq.html#6>.

record), “Shinnecock Indians” (topical subject heading), and “Shinnecock Reservation (N.Y.)” (geographic subject heading). Indigenous peoples on Long Island have been dispossessed from their lands and political power, therefore, the use of geographic references today has little correlation to the actual stolen lands. Furthermore, the headings are intended for jurisdictions that do not function as national governments.

The LC subject heading “Montauk Indians” is an example of a heading that does not reflect the modern history of the Montaukett Indian Nation. The narrower term is “Shinnecock Indians.” Montauketts are rooted in the most eastern Town of East Hampton, New York. While groups co-mingled due to geographic proximity, there is no historical evidence to substantiate claims that Shinnecoeks are a subgroup of the Montauketts; they are culturally a different Indigenous people. Identifying the Shinnecoeks as Montauketts has potential to compromise both sovereignty and recognition statuses for both tribes. Conflation of Indigenous identity has an acute negative impact on the Montauketts, as they are an unrecognized Indigenous people in the State of New York.

Indigenous Long Island history is invisible in the public sphere. Even after extensive research, precise names and territories of Long Island Indigeneity remain inconclusive. Adding to the complexity of this project is the lack of contemporary scholarship about Indigenous Long Island. Books authored by historian John A. Strong have been instrumental in informing newer LC Authorities; the change notes for existing Long Island entries strongly suggest they exist only because of Strong’s publications. Authority control work is intensive and relies on international initiatives, e.g., LCNAF.⁷⁹ According to the Library of Congress, “It is important to note that the formulation of a name, or subject heading in an authority record is based on generally accepted cataloging and thesaurus-building conventions.”⁸⁰ In the case of Indigenous Long Islanders, many names remain unformulated. Without new studies of Indigenous history, there is little push to create new authorities and to remediate existing ones. To redress this issue, the authors intend to propose subjects and names to the Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) and Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO), respectively, to establish presences and to consequently enhance access to library materials.

Proposed changes to LC Authorities

For catalog records to truly account for multiple Indigenous contexts, the reliance on literary warrant needs to be reconsidered and interrogated in cultural and historical contexts. According to Tomren, a primary issue when cataloging Indigenous-centric published works is that a majority of items, whether about history or not, are assigned to class E “History of

⁷⁹ IFLA Bibliography Section, *Common Practices for National Bibliographies* (London: IFLA, 2015), <https://www.ifla.org/node/7858>.

⁸⁰ Library of Congress, “What Is a MARC Record, and Why Is It Important?” Library of Congress, October 28, 2005, <https://www.loc.gov/marc/uma/pt1-7.html>.

America.”⁸¹ Reese (Nambé Pueblo) argues the emotional and culturally-sensitive impact this decision has on Indigenous students searching the stacks; Reese asks, “Does finding the material in the history section affirm the idea that we’ve all vanished?”⁸² Proposed changes to NARs and LC subject headings for Indigenous Long Island follow. The section is organized by proposed alterations, additions/edits, and finally a section dedicated to unpacking the term “Siwanoy,” a commonly used term for a collective group of Indigenous people of present-day New York and Connecticut. Siwanoy is an example of misinformation in LC Authorities.

Alterations

Steps can be taken to name groups by tribal affiliation instead of present-day land boundaries. Within the existing MARC 21 Authority structure, the 110 tag (Heading-Corporate Name) could be used rather than 151 (Heading-Geographic Name). Correlations to modern political nation-state geography should be reconsidered, as land boundaries may be artificial, fluid, and imprecise. According to NACO, established geographic headings in the name authority file are eligible to be used as a jurisdiction or government heading (MARC 110 field).⁸³ By omitting nation-state terms, subject headings more accurately describe the diversity and multiplicity in Indigenous national governments. This modification would support imagining of realities beyond the settler colonial state.

The Brian Deer Classification Schema (BDCS) mitigates ascribing Indigenous peoples to geographic LC subject headings. The BDCS is an Indigenous-based customizable library classification system that organizes based on continent, region, or Indigenous status.⁸⁴ The Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs Resource Centre’s version of the BDCS classifies materials by region rather than by Canadian province. Materials are organized across nation-state boundaries (e.g., Canada, U.S.) thereby accounting for Indigenous definitions of geographic boundaries, which often do not neatly fit conventional state or country boundaries.⁸⁵ In a similar manner, names of Long Island Indigenous people could be classified without a geographic locality attached to an official name. For example, the current NAR “Delaware Nation, Oklahoma” would be reformed as “Delaware Nation.”

⁸¹ Holly Tomren, “Classification, Bias, and American Indian Materials” (unpublished manuscript, 2004), <http://ailasacc.pbworks.com/f/BiasClassification2004.pdf>.

⁸² Debbie Reese, “American Indians and Bias in Cataloging (Shelving),” *American Indians in Children’s Literature* (blog), November 10, 2007, <https://americanindiansinchildrens-literature.blogspot.com/2007/11/american-indians-and-bias-in-cataloging.html>.

⁸³ NACO, “Frequently Asked Questions on Establishing Geographic Names for NACO.”

⁸⁴ Cherry and Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification: Revisiting and Reviving the Brian Deer Scheme,” 553; Moulaison Sandy and Bossaller, “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access to Indigenous Knowledge through Knowledge Organization Systems,” 139; Isaac Gilman, “From Marginalization to Accessibility: Classification of Indigenous Materials,” *Faculty Scholarship at Pacific University Libraries* (2006), <https://commons.pacificu.edu/work/sc/228e230c-de7a-4678-816f-44489f8fbac2>

⁸⁵ Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs Resource Centre, “UBCIC Resource Centre Classification Plan,” last modified July 14, 2015, <https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloud-front.net/ubcic/pages/1166/attachments/original/1507335846/UBCICClassification.pdf?1507335846>; Cherry and Mukunda, “A Case Study in Indigenous Classification,” 555–56.

Additions and edits

Based upon research findings, the authors suggest and propose:

- consulting with tribes and experts to the fullest extent possible when creating authorized headings, vocabularies, and classifications;
- adding Pommanocc, Sewanhacky, and Lenapehoking⁸⁶ as variants of the LC subject heading “Long Island (N.Y.)”;
- creating subject headings for groups represented in cataloged works (20%) but lacking entries as LCSHs and based on how they reference their respective groups;
- creating name authorities for groups represented in cataloged works (20%) but lacking entries in the LCNAF based on how they reference their respective groups;
- deleting “Delaware” as a variant form of Lenape; changing the “see reference” for “Delaware” to a “see also reference” for Lenapes;
- establishing LCC for groups represented in cataloged works (20%) but lacking presence in the outline (see Table 3);
- adding a NAR for the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation; possibly adding a variant name for the existing Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation to help differentiate both Pequot tribes;
- deleting states from the NARs “Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin” and “Delaware Nation, Oklahoma.” There is no other tribe in those respective nation-states with the same name; adding state designations is unnecessarily confusing; and
- adding an LC subject heading for Fort Massapeag (N.Y.).

Siwanoy Indians

The Library of Congress subject heading “Siwanoy Indians” illustrates a case of misinformation in LC Authorities. Blake Bell, Town Historian of Pelham, New York, argues there were no Indigenous peoples called Siwanoy.⁸⁷ The authors agree with this determination. The term Siwanoy, allegedly related to the Wappingers, appears in two early-20th century works; the facts asserted continue to be cited by later scholars with no actual evidence supporting the claims. Bell convincingly demonstrates the name Siwanoy is in fact a colloquial term to reference Indigenous persons and not a specific band. As per Bell, scholarship about Siwanoy perpetuated false claims that were never carefully fact-checked; Indigenous peoples referred to as Siwanoy were most likely Munsees or Wiechquaeskecks. Continued inclusion of “Siwanoy Indians” perpetuates this inaccurate history. Issues arise when catalogers or researchers look at other parts of the LC existing record. The subject heading “Siwanoy Indians” includes the BT “Delaware Indians” and other Indigenous peoples in Connecticut and New York State. Further, the term

⁸⁶ The Lenape name “Lenapehoking” refers to Lenape homelands. The geographic range includes Queens and Brooklyn, New York.

⁸⁷ Blake A. Bell, “There Were No Native Americans Known as Siwanoy,” *Historic Pelham* (blog), January 29, 2014, <http://historicpelham.blogspot.com/2014/01/there-were-no-native-americans-known-as.html>.

appears in other closely matching schema concepts including *Wikidata* and OCLC FAST. The authors strongly suggest this heading be deleted (Table 5).

Table 5. LC subject headings (LCSHs) and name authority records (NARs) for Long Island and associated Indigenous communities in the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

	Indigenous Community	Geographic coverage	Current LCSH	Possible LCSH	Current LC NAR	Possible LC NAR ^a
1	Canarsies	Long Island	none	Canarsies	none	n/a
2	Corchaugs	Long Island	none	Corchaugs	none	n/a
3	Manhansets	Long Island	none	Manhansets	none	n/a
4	Massapeguas	Long Island	Massapequa Indians	Massapeguas	none	n/a
5	Matinecocks	Long Island	none	Matinecocks	none	Matinecock Tribal Nation
6	Merricks	Long Island	none	Merricks	none	n/a
7	Montauketts	Long Island	Montauk Indians	Montauketts	none	Montaukett Indian Nation
8	Nissequogues	Long Island	none	Nissequogues	none	n/a
9	Rockaways	Long Island	none	Rockaways	none	n/a
10	Secatogues	Long Island	none	Secatogues	none	n/a
11	Seponarks	Long Island	none	Seponarks	none	n/a
12	Setalcotts	Long Island	none	Setacolts	none	Setalcott Indian Nation
13	Shinnecoaks	Long Island	Shinnecock Indians	Shinnecoaks	Shinnecock Indian Nation	n/a

14	Unkechaugs	Long Island	Unkechaug Indians	Unkechaug	none	Unkechaug Indian Nation
15	Delawares	Tri-State	Delaware Indians	Delawares	Delaware Tribe of Indians	no change
					Delaware Nation, Oklahoma	Delaware Nation
					Delaware Nation (To 1795)	no change
					Moravian of the Thames (First Nation)	Delaware Nation at Moraviantown
16	Hammonassets	Tri-State	none	Hammonassets	none	n/a
17	Lenni Lenapes	Tri-State	Delaware Indians	Lenapes	none	Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware
						Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribal Nation
						Ramapough Lenape Nation
18	Manhattans (Lenapes)	Tri-State	Manhattan Indians	Manhattans	none	n/a
19	Menunkatucks	Tri-State	none	Menunkatucks	none	n/a
20	Munsees (Lenapes)	Tri-State	Munsee Indians	Munsees	Munsee-Delaware Nation	no change

					Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin	Stockbridge Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians
					Stockbridge Tribe	Stockbridge Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians
					Munsee or Christian Band of Indians	Munsee Tribe of Indians of Kansas
					Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians	Stockbridge Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians
21	Nehantics (Niantics)	Tri-State	Niantic Indians	Nehantics	none	n/a
22	Paugussetts	Tri-State	Paugusset Indians	Paugussetts	none	Golden Hill Paugussett Indian Nation
23	Pequots	Tri-State	Pequot Indians	Pequots	Mashantucket Pequot Indian Tribe	alternative: Mashantucket (Western) Pequot Tribal Nation
					none	Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation

24	Quinnipiacs	Tri-State	Quinnipiac Indians	Quinnipiacs	none	Algonquian Confederacy of the Quinnipiac Tribal Council
25	Rechgawawancs (Lenapes)	Tri-State	n/a	Rechgawawancs	none	n/a
26	Wappingers (Lenapes)	Tri-State	Wappinger Indians	Wappingers	none	n/a
27	Wiechquaeskecks	Tri-State	Wiechquaeskeck Indians	Wiechquaeskecks	none	n/a

a The possible LC NAR entry is based on how each Indigenous Nation presently refers to itself in official community-created sources. See the Appendix. This list represents federal, state, and unrecognized Nations.

Conclusion

Authority records and classifications are powerful bridges to information, but their effectiveness is compromised when accurate names and words are not used, and when there is a lack of comprehensiveness in content standards. Without precise and correct entries in LC Authorities, researchers will encounter barriers to library collections. A form of library outreach, authority work can be leveraged to promote the understanding, study, and recognition of Indigenous languages, history, and culture.⁸⁸ Advocacy by library professionals can increase the presence of Indigenous histories in the public consciousness. In crafting vocabularies, if institutions have the resources and capacity, consultation and collaboration with the peoples belonging to the Indigenous groups and with subject experts is exemplar. From a research perspective, improvements to LC Authorities would expand collection access. They have the potential to enhance the discoverability of hidden materials and heighten awareness of histories and peoples. Consequently, new understandings and areas of inquiry can be developed and supported.

Establishing vocabularies with precise and culturally relevant terms are forms of land and territory acknowledgment, a practice of accountability that fosters commemoration, reclamation, and reparation processes. It recenters and empowers Indigenous peoples to their rightful position in local and national dialogues and landscapes. Representation and inclusion in LC Authorities would reaffirm both the largely forgotten past history and the contemporary histories of the five

⁸⁸ Tina Gross and Violet B. Fox, “Authority Work as Outreach,” in *Ethical Questions in Name Authority Control*, ed. Jane Sandberg (Sacramento: Library Juice Press, 2019), 335–48.

sovereign Nations⁸⁹ still living on Long Island. Referencing Indigenous peoples and localities by names they call themselves captures the spirit of land acknowledgment and recognizes Long Island as Indigenous land. This reaffirms contemporary Setalcotts, Matinecocks, Unkechaugs, Shinnecoeks, and Montaukett histories.

From an ethical standpoint contemporary, transdisciplinary scholarship argues the lack of representation continues to colonize contemporary Indigenous communities.⁹⁰ To this point, in 1862 Walt Whitman wrote about changing the place name Long Island to an Indigenous name, among them “Paumanok” in reverence to the first settlers of the region and to advance “the idea of home.”⁹¹

So upon the whole we think it might be not only a verbal, but a utilitarian, piece of improvement to restore the old name of the island. It would be a kind of poetic justice to the departed tribes of the great nation of the Lenni-Lenape, or Delawares, of which stock the aborigines of this region were a part ... Now that they have all forever departed, it seems as if their shades 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.⁹²

While Whitman’s assumption that Indigenous peoples “have all forever departed” was inaccurate, his sentiment of re-indigenizing Long Island was a call to return power to them through land acknowledgment.

According to historian Daniel K. Richter, a holistic view of history requires knowledge of a place’s progenitors (“a person or thing from which a person, animal, or plant is descended or originates; an ancestor or parent”) and contextualization of the cultural and social factors that preceded the period under study.⁹³ In this construct, history is fluid, malleable, and variable. It is both local and global, and allows for the interrogation of time, space, and peoples along with contemplation of the causes and effects of convergences. Cataloging Indigenous content requires consideration of all these elements. A decolonizing methodology for cataloging regional

⁸⁹ 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 are currently not recognized by either New York State or the U.S. federal government.

⁹⁰ Dwanna L. McKay, Kirsten Vinyeta, and Kari Marie Norgaard, “Theorizing Race and Settler Colonialism Within U.S. Sociology,” *Sociology Compass* 14, no. 9 (2020), doi: [10.1111/soc4.12821](https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12821); Adam J. Alejandro, Carlton J. Fong, and Yvonne M. De La Rosa, “Indigenous Graduate and Professional Students Decolonizing, Reconciling, and Indigenizing Belongingness in Higher Education,” *Journal of College Student Development* 61, no. 6 (2020): 679–96, doi: [10.1353/csd.2020.0069](https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0069); Michael Q. Dudley, “A Library Matter of Genocide: The Library of Congress and the Historiography of the Native American Holocaust,” *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 8, no. 2 (2017), doi: [10.18584/iipj.2017.8.2.9](https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2017.8.2.9).

⁹¹ “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 Walt Whitman by Whitman scholars.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Daniel K. Richter, *Before the Revolution: America’s Ancient Pasts* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, Reprint edition, 2013).

collections returns agency to Indigenous peoples.⁹⁴ It also illuminates the vital role of catalogers in restoring it.

Appendix

Notes on Table entries.

Table 1

Indigenous Community 17, Lenape: Lenape peoples formed different groups but not tribes per se; different Lenape groups are identified in the table in addition to the broader term, Lenape.

Table 5

Indigenous Community 5, Matinecocks. Possible NAR “Matinecock Tribal Nation” derived from the web presence of the Matinecock Tribal Nation at:

<http://www.matinecocktribalnation.org/>.

Indigenous Community 7, Montauketts. Possible NAR “Montaukett Indian Nation” entry derived from NY A05411, a state bill to provide state recognition and acknowledgment of the Montaukett people at <https://www.billtrack50.com/billdetail/1064594>.

Indigenous Community 12, Setalcotts. Possible NAR “Setalcott Indian Nation” derived from the web presence of the Setalcott Indian Nation at <https://www.facebook.com/groups/258965614147293>.

Indigenous Community 14, Unkechaugs. Possible NAR entry for “Unkechaug Indian Nation” is pulled from: National Congress of American Indians, “Tribal Directory: Tribes,” <https://www.ncai.org/tribal-directory?area=11&page=2&submit=Search&utf8=%E2%9C%93>, accessed December 23, 2020.

Indigenous Community 15, Delawares. Entry derives from the Lunaapeew (Lenape) name the tribe calls itself on their official government website. See Eelünaapéewi Lahkéwiit (Delaware Nation), “Home,” 2020, <http://delawarenation.on.ca/>.

Indigenous Community 20, Munsees (Lenapes). The Stockbridge Munsee Community does not include the term “Wisconsin” in its official name. The current NAR follows language outlined in the *Federal Register* and reflects the name given by the United States federal government. See: Stockbridge-Munsee Community, “Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians,” 2020, <https://www.mohican.com/>; United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interiors, Notice, “Indian Entities Recognized by and Eligible to Receive Services.” There is no contemporary tribe, people, or group that called/calls itself the Munsee or Christian Band of Indians. Munsee communities were forcibly removed to what is now Kansas. Today, a Munsees community living in Kansas is seeking federal recognition; this community calls itself the Munsee Tribe of Indians of Kansas.

Indigenous Community 22, Paugussetts. Possible NAR “Golden Hill Paugussett Indian

⁹⁴ Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*.

Nation” derived from the web presence of The Golden Hill Paugussett Indian Reservation at:
<https://www.facebook.com/The-Golden-Hill-Paugussett-Indian-Reservation-165294113670095>.

Indigenous Community 23, Pequots. Alternative: “Mashantucket (Western) Pequot Tribal Nation” entry derived from terminology used on the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation government website homepage. See the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation website:
<https://www.mptn-nsn.gov/default.aspx>. In 2002, the Secretary of the Interior granted federal recognition to the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation; the Bureau of Indian Affairs revoked federal recognition in 2005; today the EPTN is unrecognized by the federal government and the state of Connecticut. See: United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interiors, Notice, “Final Determination To Acknowledge the Historical Eastern Pequot Tribe,” *Federal Register* 67, no 126 (July 1, 2002): 44234, <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/02-16625>; Amy Martin, “This Hard Land: The Eastern Pequots struggle to reclaim tribal territory,” *Connecticut College Magazine*, Winter 2020, <https://www.conncoll.edu/news/cc-magazine/past-is-sues/2020-issues/winter-2020/this-hard-land> ; Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation, “History,” accessed December 27, 2020, <http://easternpequottribalnation.org/history.htm>.

Indigenous Community 24, Quinnipiacs. Possible NAR “Algonquian Confederacy of the Quinnipiac Tribal Council” derived from the archived web presence of the Algonquian Confederacy of the Quinnipiac Tribal Council at:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20161003222533/http://acqtc.org>.