ADVANCING EQUITABLE CATALOGING

Abstract

For nearly a century (1933 onwards), catalogers and others have engaged in discussions over the 'ethical' labeling of marginalized subjects in knowledge organization systems (KOS). In order to understand and contextualize contemporary conversations, I undertook a comprehensive review of this literature. The resulting project 1) synthesizes the broader history of these discussions, 2) examines its facets and subdomains, and 3) provides a foundation for the realignment of KO work towards social justice. To achieve these tasks, I replicated and expanded upon a now-unavailable database prepared by Hope A. Olson and Rose Schlegl in 1999. As this database suggests, the literature has expanded fivefold in the last two decades and taken a number of different directions. My analysis of these differences (here called KO ‘subdomains’) establishes a historiography of critical cataloging movements and a framework from which to understand them. It also demonstrates gaps in the literature, how contemporary authors have abandoned areas of early importance, and how certain subdomains have become nearly independent. Finally, my analysis indicates the insufficiency of a philosophical tradition descended from Ancient Greek Aristotelian “virtue” ethics as a method upon which to base twenty-first century KOS. Instead, I advance the concept of “equitable” knowledge organization and the realignment of KO work towards principals of social justice.

1. Introduction

The past two decades have seen a remarkable blossoming in publications focusing on the ethics of basic practices and approaches common in cultural heritage institutions such as galleries, archives, libraries, museums, and special collections (GLAMS). In Library and Information Science (LIS) literature, this discussion dates back to at least to the mid-1990 introduction of the ALA Code of Ethics (American Library Association 1997). While concerns over topics broadly described as “ethical” are just coming to the forefront of GLAMS-wide discussion, catalogers and technical services staff have engaged in discussions over the ethical labeling of marginalized subjects in knowledge organization systems (KOS) for nearly a century, since the publication of Dorothy Porter’s 1933 review of Oberlin’s Anti-Slavery Propaganda catalog (Porter 1933) and the development of her Moorland-Spingarn Research Center classification system (Helton 2019; Nunes 2018; Bledsoe 2018).

In order to understand and contextualize contemporary conversations, I undertook a comprehensive review of this literature. The resulting project 1) synthesizes the broader history of these discussions, 2) examines its facets and subdomains, and 3) provides a foundation for the realignment of KO work towards social justice. To achieve these tasks, I replicated and expanded the methods that produced a now-unavailable 1999 ProCite database prepared by Hope A. Olson and Rose Schlegl for their analysis “Bias in Subject Access Standards” (Olson and Schlegl 1999). This database gathered 93 “works documenting biases of gender, sexuality, race, age, ability, ethnicity, nationality, language and religion” in order to review the extant literature on “subject access for marginalized groups and to marginalized topics” and to provide a system for “addressing systemic subject access problems” (Olson and Schlegl 2001, 236). The results of this
search were added to an open-source, open access Zotero database, available at CritCat.org (Watson 2021a) and via the main Zotero website (Watson 2021b). Later this year, this database will be saved in institutional and international data repositories as an additional safeguard against loss.

As a review of this database suggests, the literature produced by these methods has expanded nearly sixfold in the past two decades (from 93 items to ~600) and taken on a number of different directions. Following this Introduction (1) the rest of this paper will: (2) document the methods used to produce the CritCat.org database; (3) offer a broad-brush history and periodization of revisionist/radical/critical KO from 1933 to the present; (4) characterize and describe a variety of what I call KO ‘subdomains’; and to (5) return to where this paper began by indicating the insufficiency of a philosophical tradition descended from Ancient Greek Aristotelian “virtue” ethics as a method upon which to base twenty-first century KOS. Instead, I will advance the concept of “equitable” knowledge organization and the realignment of KO work towards principals of social justice.

2. Methods

To find relevant LIS material related to ethical and equitable cataloging of minoritized subjects, I undertook a systematic literature review and analysis. First, I conducted Google Scholar keyword and Boolean searches, and then validated these results by repeating the same queries in several LIS-specific databases and comparing the results. Results of these queries included resources in French, Spanish, and several other languages. In order to properly evaluate the articles, I limited my review and the resulting database to English-language resources. The databases consulted were: Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA); Library Literature & Information Science Retrospective: 1905-1983 (LLISR); Library & Information Science Source (LISS); and Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (LISTA). In reviewing the results, I found that LISA provided the most relevant results; Google Scholar the greatest quantity; LISTA the highest quality; and LLISR provided only sporadic hits. Finally, I consulted several reading lists and bibliographies that focused on ethical, equitable, or critical cataloging (CritLib.org 2020; University of Cambridge Library 2019; Cook 2020; Snow 2020; Park n.d.), along with the citation lists of previously-conducted reviews (Kazuye Kimura 2018; Williams 1997; Skinner 2014; Gardner 2021; Starr Paiste 2003; Fagan 2010; Desale and Kumbhar 2013; Speller 2007; Homosaurus Editorial Board 2020; Martin 2021; Diao 2018; Sheetija Kathuria 2011; Dunsire 2018; Satija and Martinez-Avila 2017; Velez and Villa-Nicholas 2017; Hudon 2011; 2010). The results of all of these queries were added to an open-source and open access Zotero database available at https://CritCat.org (Watson 2021a) and via the main Zotero website (Watson 2021b).

Nearly all of the items (~600) were collected in full-text format, reviewed to determine their relevancy, and then either discarded or added to the database. The resulting corpus was first sorted into the eight categories identified by Rose and Schlegl (i.e. gender, sexuality, race, age, ability, ethnicity, nationality, language, and religion)
and then further refined. The resulting primary groupings in the CritCat.org database are:
1) Indigenous (including Aboriginal, Native American, American Indian, and other communities); 2) Race (i.e. Black and other communities of color); 3) Queer, which includes minoritized sexual orientations (such as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Asexual, Two-Spirit and others), but generally not gender identities (such as women, men, transgender, nonbinary, and others) that are addressed in the next section (there are overlapping articles however); 4) Names, Gender & Sex (which focuses specifically on marginalized gender identities but has significant overlaps with identities in the previous grouping); 5) Disability (Disabled and Crip people and communities); and 6) Others (a miscellaneous section that includes diverse topics such as American immigration, non-English issues, religion, children, and more).

Additionally, the CritCat.org database contains other groupings that overlap or expand upon the aforementioned categories, including a “Strategies” category (articles that offer practical solutions or approaches), a “Broad/Multiple Critiques” category, a Historical Context category, and more not expanded upon here in the interest of limited space. The discussion that follows is based upon qualitative and quantitative analysis, but as the current mode of analysis is historical, the quantitative results have been omitted for brevity reasons and will follow in another publication.

3. History

This section presents a broad-brush historiography of critical KO literature, and offers a four-part periodization scheme (Table 1). This table attempts to capture and summarize what I see as the date ranges, initiating events, trends, and some general events or characterizations of these periods. The date ranges should not be interpreted as cutoff dates. For example, there are still a number of catalogers that consider themselves radical catalogers and the RADCAT listserv is still active; relevant articles about folksonomies and OPACS are still being published and discussed (Yu and Chen 2020); and the iSchool movement is still ongoing. Again, for brevity reasons, the history presented here primarily focuses on LCSH and its use in North American academic libraries. Finally, many others (more than I can cite) have written far more eloquently and specifically about critical KO histories (Tennis 2012; 2013; Adler and Tennis 2013; Olson 2000; Homian 2012; Poole 2017; Velez and Villa-Nicholas 2017; Wenzler 2019; Gardner 2021; Hudon 2010; 2011; Dobreski and Kwaśnik 2017; Martin 2021).

The earliest and longest period in this scheme reflects the broader society it existed in: the dominant perspectives (LCC and DDC) are centered and respected and critical voices and perspectives are marginalized and sporadic, and practitioners often operate in parallel with no knowledge of each other. This stage is represented by pioneering Black librarian Dorothy Porter and the white librarian Francis Yocom; it is characterized by the development of bibliographies, the building-up of knowledge, the gathering of resources, and individual case studies. The initiating event for the second period was the publication of Sanford Berman’s 1971 book Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People (Berman 1971). Berman, perhaps the best-known radical cataloger, began his campaign after the experience of working in
Zambia as a librarian, where he was told that the term *kaffir*—present in LCSH as a ‘neutral’ descriptor—was considered a particularly racist slur (Berman 1971; 1981; Berman and Gross 2017). The result of his investigation was the aforementioned *Tract*, which amounted to a full-fledged attack on the racist, sexist, and Eurocentric nature of LCSH. This period is also characterized by collaboration and public remonstrance as Berman and other activists, including the Poor People’s Campaign and the American Library Association’s Task Force on Gay Liberation, worked from within the cataloging world to pressure changes change to LCSH with varying levels of success. By 2012, Berman’s personal LCSH ‘scorecard’ documented nearly 100 accepted revisions or proposals alongside over 200 that LC had rejected or not yet acted upon (Berman 2016).

Berman’s initial documentation of LC’s “insidious labelling processes” initiated a near-continuous tradition of librarians and catalogers re-reading of subject terms with an eye towards revision. It also undoubtedly contributed to the founding of the LC’s Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) in 1992, as well as the Policy and Standards Division, which effectively institutionalized a process previously conducted via public petition and political remonstrance. The PCC, as discussed in Gregor and Mandel’s landmark article “Cataloging Must Change!” (1991), was also founded in response to the shift to online public access catalogs (OPACs) (Stegaeva 2016; Culbertson and Schottlaender 2020). In the years following a significant portion of LIS and KO literature discussed or experimented with the possibilities of patron tagging and folksonomies (Speller 2007; Ornelas 2011; M. A. Adler 2009; 2015; 2016; Bates and Rowley 2011) as a critical way of to enhancing catalogs and potentially reducing bias. Folksonomies and tagging are not problem-free as Keilty and others have pointed out: “however productive folksonomies are for counteracting ‘information imperialism,’ and however productive they are for retrieving information, they are also highly regulatory” (Keilty 2012b, 491). Any community-developed term is problematized by the fact that it exists within the society that minoritized it. Additionally, as Gross, Taylor, and Joudrey (2015) have demonstrated, there is “still a lot to lose:” the removal of controlled vocabularies from catalogs results in the loss of nearly thirty percent of the hits in a keyword search, which would have a deleterious impact on users.

Finally, I would like to tentatively propose that, since 2016, there has been a shift away from working “within” the system (e.g. revising LCSH or DDC, engaging in PCC or other SACO funnels) and towards a variety of alternatives (e.g. the creation of alternative KOS, the development of alternative ways of knowing) of I will now turn to what I see as the primary emerging “subdomains” of KO literature.

Table 1: A proposed periodization of critical KO history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Initiating Event</th>
<th>Characterizations / Trends</th>
<th>CritCat Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933–1970</td>
<td>Publication of Porter’s Review &amp; development of her class scheme.</td>
<td>Bibliographies, literature reviews, historical accounts, case studies.</td>
<td>~ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Range</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Vocab Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–2015</td>
<td>Creation of Program for Cooperative Cataloging</td>
<td>~200 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–Present</td>
<td>“Illegal Aliens” debacle.</td>
<td>~300 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Subdomains

As the CritCat.org database suggests, the literature has expanded sixfold in the last two decades and taken a number of different directions. Due to lack of space, in this section I am mainly interested in signposting and pointing to relevant articles in each area in order to demonstrate several decades-long traditions of critical KO (here called KO ‘subdomains’). Each of these areas deserve (and hopefully will receive) a fuller historical treatment. Finally, neither the items cited below, nor the CritCat.org database generally are meant are authoritative or comprehensive.

#### 4.1 Indigenous KO

Of all the proposed subdomains, the Indigenous and Queer ones are likely the most developed. There has been a vital, lively, and consistent literature on indigenous KO for decades covering a range of topics, places, ideas, and concepts (Yeh 1971; Parezo 1990; MacDonell, Tagami, and Washington 2003; Stroud 2005; Beall 2006; D. Lee 2008; Stevens 2008; Xwi7xwa Library First Nations 2009; D. Lee 2011; Sahadath 2013; Tomren 2014; Bardenheier, Wilkinson, and Hēmi Dale (Te Rarawa 2015; Duarte and Belarde-Lewis 2015; Green 2015; Lilley 2015; Littletree and Metoyer 2015; Lougheed, Moran, and Callison 2015; O’Neal 2015; Rigby 2015; Smith 2015; Swanson 2015; Bowers, Crowe, and Keeran 2017; Dudley 2017; MAIN (Manitoba Archival Information Network) - LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings) Working Group 2017; Roy and Frydman 2017; Sandy and Bossaller 2017; Steeves 2017). If this critical area of KO continues to develop it may be possible to eventually discuss traits among subsubdomains (i.e. New Zealand/Australia Indigenous KO and Canada/United States Indigenous KO).

#### 4.2 Racialized KO

While this subdomain has significant citational and authorial overlap with the Indigenous subdomain, there has been an emerging discussion around racist terminology in cataloging and classification (M. A. Adler 2017b; Roberts and Noble 2016; Knowlton 2005; Mai 2016; Antracoli et al. 2019; Antracoli and Rawdon 2019; Hobart 2020; A. Coleman 2020; Velez and Villa-Nicholas 2017; Brook, Ellenwood, and Eannace Lazzaro 2015; Rigby and Gallant 2019; Hughes and Crowe 2019; Biswas 2018; Holloway 2018).
that is worth acknowledgement. There are also a number of articles that discuss non-
English topics such as misspelled or miscopied non-Western or non-English name authority records (Shiraishi 2019; Arastoopoor and Ahmadinasab 2019; Cohen 2019; Whittaker 2019; Rigby and Gallant 2019).

4.3 Queer KO

As a subdomain, Queer KO also has a lively and active history dating back decades (Adler 2012; Poole 2020; Michel 1985; Gough and Greenblatt 1990; Greenblatt 1990; Huber and Gillaspy 1998; Hamer 2003; Christensen 2008; Matt Johnson 2008; Adler 2009; Matt Johnson 2010; Greenblatt 2011; Roberto 2011; Passet 2012; Nichols and Cortez 2013; Sahadath 2013; M. J. Fox 2016a; Howard and Knowlton 2018; Bullard, Dierking, and Grundner 2020; Huber and Gillaspy 1998; Matt Johnson 2007; Bates and Rowley 2011; Ornelas 2011; Keilty 2012a; Wakimoto, Hansen, and Bruce 2013; Thompson 2016; Guimarães et al. 2017).

4.4 Names, Sex, and Gender KO

This subdomain overlaps heavily with the previous one due to concerns around the use of names and gender as access points and in catalog records. It seemed appropriate to gender and sexual identities into a separate categories due to the fact that feminist critiques of KO were one of the earliest (A. C. Foskett 1971; Marshall 1977; Carlyle 1989; Capek 1987; Claudia Card and Lorraine Code 1992; Margaret N. Rogers 1993) and consistently-discussed areas, most notably by Hope Olson and her coauthors (2001a; 2002a; 1999; 2000; 2001b; 2001c; 2002b; Olson and Schlegl 1999; 2001; Olson and Ward 1997a; 1997b). Wood (2010) has written a fantastic examination of the changes to women’s studies headings over time.

Additionally, there has been much written about authorial names. The use of an author’s name for cataloging and authority control is one of the fundamental tenets of library and information science (LIS): Melvil Dewey felt that proper naming warranted more concern in the first edition Classification and Subject Index for Cataloguing and Arranging the Books and Pamphlets of a Library than subject cataloging (1876, 41–42); it remains one of the most important fields in MARC 21 (1XX); it occupies a significant portion of RDA (Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA et al. 2015, Chapters 9-11); and explaining it required both Daniel N. Joudrey, Arlene G. Taylor, and David P. Miller (2015, 313–419) and Lois Mai Chan and Athena Salaba (2016, Chapter 8) over a hundred pages to properly discuss. In recent years, a number of authors—including academics, activists, and classically-trained catalogers—have raised issues around the use of names as identifiers and access points. These ethical concerns include the use of women’s maternal or “married” names (Kazmer 2019; Martin 2019; Whittaker 2019; Olson and Schlegl 2001), issues with the names and pronouns of transgender, transsexual, gender nonconforming or nonbinary authors (Tanenbaum, Theresa Jean et al. 2021; K. Wood 2019; Beemyn 2019; Sinclair-Palm 2017; Marine and Nicolazzo 2014; Rawson 2018). There has also been a couple of articles that touch on intersex
individuals and classification in Dewey Decimal (M. J. Fox 2016b) and LCSH (Sullivan 2016).

4.5 Disability and Crip KO

Superficially, the hundreds of results returned by literature queries for “disabled” “disability” or “crip” along with “catalog” or “library” promises an engaging and lively conversation dating back decades. Unfortunately, when these articles are reviewed, it quickly becomes apparent that most of them have little to do with disabled or crip-preferred terminology or subject vocabulary. Instead, nearly all of the literature is taken up by discussion among seemingly-abled librarians about how to make libraries or public access catalogs accessible to disabled people—here meaning Deafblind, B/blind, low/limited-vision, and/or wheelchair users. These articles are (ironically) easy to spot because of their use of terminology or subject terms considered awkward or offensive by disabled people. The most unique euphemism was “differently-abled” (Copeland 2011), which is likely a reflection of the fact that there currently exists no appropriate disability subject cataloging vocabularies, tough there are a number of glossaries (Disabled People’s Association of Singapore 2015; National Center on Disability and Journalism 2018) and one study on disability tags (MacKenzie Johnson and Forsythe 2019). In recent years however, disability has been discussed by a number of authors in LIS fields, most notably Schomberg (2014; 2018) and Brilmeyer (2018a; 2018b; 2018; 2020), but includes others (Koford 2014; M. A. Adler, Huber, and Nix 2017; Robinson 2017; Hollich 2020; Dali and Caidi 2021, (various chapters)).

4.6 Other KO /Areas

A number of other areas or articles are worthy of mention. Despite Berman’s early focus on poverty in LCSH (1971; 2005; 2007) and a couple of other articles (Chatman 1996; Hunger and Force 2005) this area has failed to inspire much action or further discussion, which is likely a reflection of the relatively privileged and middle-class nature of GLAMS professionals (Bastian 2020; Farkas 2017; Galvan 2015; Farrell, Medvedeva, and Cultural Policy Center 2010; Westermann, Sweeney, and Schonfeld 2019). Discussion around immigration resulted from the fallout from the 2016 Library of Congress cancellation of the subject headings “Illegal Aliens” and “Illegal Immigration” and their replacement with “Noncitizens” and “Unauthorized immigration” in LCSH (Library of Congress 2016; Aguilera 2016; Taylor 2016; Broadley and Baron 2019; Lacey 2019; Lo 2019). Several authors have discussed how non-English subjects or individuals are poorly served by LCSH (Diao 2015; Correa and Marcano 2009; Diao and Cao 2016; Sheetija Kathuria 2011; Shoki and Oyelude 2006; Randall B. Kemp 2011; Holloway 2018; Cohen 2019). Religion (Broughton and Lomas 2020; Dong-Geun and Ji-Suk 2001; Idrees 2011), children (Beak 2015), and sizeism (Waldorf and Furner 2021) have also been identified as problematic areas within KO. There are further areas that must be omitted from this discussion due to space reasons.
5. Equitable Cataloging

Attempting to understand the variety of ways that the term ‘ethics’ or ‘ethical’ was applied to cataloging, classification, ontology, metadata, and KO is no small matter. To quote the title of one article that put it particularly succinctly: “Which Ethics? Whose Morality?” (M. J. Fox and Reece 2012) Indeed, an initial plunge into this literature resulted in a range of approaches to answering this question. An incomplete list would range from critiques or extensions of Aristotle, Immanuel Kant, or other Western philosophers (Olson 1999; Day 2015); poststructuralism (Olson 2001a; Avila and Guimarães 2013); critical theory (Martínez-Ávila, Semídão, and Ferreira 2016); proposals for an theoretical system that could arise after deconstruction of our current ones with Derridean theory (Olson 2002b, Chapter 3.; Deodato 2010; Olson 2001a); frameworks built around the work of philosopher John Rawls’ concept of justice as fairness or philosopher John Dewey’s model of pragmatism (Budd 2006; Fallis 2007); others still encourage models of social justice that are implicitly or explicitly inclusive (or exclusive) of Rawls or Dewey. Most recently there has been a rise in proposals grounded on a feminist ethics of care (Adler 2017a; Brilmyer 2018b; Caswell and Cifor 2016; 2019; Losh and Wernimont 2018; Sandberg 2019), including methodologies such as affect theory (Day 2020; Slonikowski 2016; Cifor and Gilliland 2016; Keilty and Leazer 2014) and feminist standpoint appraisal (Caswell 2019). These latter approaches are much more prevalent in archival literature—with the notable exception of Fox and Swickard and Fox and Gross’ recent work (2019; 2019). Finally, there are a small number of approaches that attempt to combine multiple angles (M. J. Fox and Reece 2012). Additionally, as already mentioned, there are a number of articles that focus on various aspects of “ethical” cataloging (but more accurately falling under the umbrella of social justice).

The overwhelming majority of this literature is rooted in (and dependent upon) the Western European and American philosophical tradition of ethics descended from the Ancient Greek Aristotelian “virtue” ethics (Parry 2014), and “almost any modern version still shows” its neo-Aristotelian nature (Hursthouse and Pettigrove 2018). In the words of none other than Rafael Capurro, the former head of the International Center for Information Ethics (ICIE):

As a self-referential process, ethics is an unending quest on explicit and implicit use of the moral code, that is to say of respect or disrespect, with regard to individual and social communication. In other words, ethics observes the ways we communicate with each other as moral persons and the ways this moral identity is understood. There is, indeed, no unbiased ethical observer. (El Hadi 2019, 26)

Jens-Erik Mai develops this point while skewering the idea of a neutral point of view: librarians “make decisions about which material to provide access to, how to classify that material, and which terms to use when naming ideas and subject matter. There is no view from nowhere”(Mai 2013, 246). Phrased slightly differently, classification and cataloging systems rooted wholly in a philosophy promulgated and sponsored by white, ethnically European, bourgeoisie, Christian, cisgender, citizen,
heterosexual, able-bodied, allosexual, monogamous, men (WEB3CH2A2M)\textsuperscript{1} are not desirable, possible, or sustainable. Rather than cycling about in the endless gyre of WEB3CH2A2M-based systems whose center cannot (and should not) hold, knowledge organizers should aim to align themselves closer the principals of social justice.

These principals are not particularly radical, nor are they at odds with LIS professional organizations. Nearly every GLAMS-centered professional organization, including the IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) 2016), CFLA-FCAB (Canadian Federation of Library Associations 2019), CILIP (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals 2018), ALA (American Library Association 2019; 2008), ICOM (International Council of Museums 2004), AAM (American Alliance of Museums 2000), SAA (Society of American Archivists 2020), and the ICA (International Council on Archives 1996) call upon their members to respect all regardless of “age, citizenship, political belief, physical or mental ability, gender identity, heritage, education, income, immigration and asylum-seeking status, marital status, origin, race, religion or sexual orientation” (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) 2016). Indeed, as Michelle Farkas points out, upholding neutrality is the same as upholding inequality and marginalization (Farkas 2017). Crystal Vaughn extends this idea, pointing out that ethically speaking, therefore, a librarian’s job is not just to preserve and provide access to information, but to also be an instrument for social justice. And this is why the language of cataloguing is so important: it is a librarian’s job to work at decolonizing colonial structures so that everyone has equitable access to information (Vaughan 2018, 10).

Conclusion

Over the course of this paper, I have presented a case for multiplicity of critical KO histories and subdomains. In concluding, I would like to advance the concept of “equitable” rather than “ethical” knowledge organization. Although the two terms are closely related, they are distinct concepts: per the Oxford English Dictionary, ethics (Oxford English Dictionary 2020b) are “moral principles… a system of these [or] branch of knowledge or study dealing with moral principles,” whereas equity (Oxford English Dictionary 2020a) is the “quality of being equal or fair; fairness, impartiality; even-handed dealing... [and the] recourse to general principles of justice... to correct or supplement the provisions of the law.” One way of supplementing the law (or, in this case, traditional knowledge organization systems) would be to consider commonalities between subdomain literatures. When considering these various areas as a whole, five recommendations appear and reappear across various subdomains:

\textsuperscript{1} Originally WEBCHAM from Hope Olson’s naming of the default and assumed universal center of cataloging and classification systems, expanded by Michelle Caswell to include “cis” and “citizen” at the encouragement of Marika Cifor, and here expanded by me to include relationship and romantic orientations. See (Olson 2001a, 4; Caswell 2019, 7)
1. the use of multiple or alternative vocabularies or classifications, where available (Cherry and Mukunda 2015; Swanson 2015; Bosum and Dunne 2017; Michel 1985; Carlyle 1989; Colbert 2017; Lorberfeld and Rinck 2015; Matt Johnson 2007; Schultz and Braddy 2017; Marcondes 2020; Disabled People’s Association of Singapore 2015; A. S. Coleman 2017; North Carolina Council on Developmental Disabilities 2019; Homosaurus et al. 2020; Dobreski and Kwaśnik 2017; Dobreski, Qin, and Resnick 2019; 2020);
2. the practice of “cultural competency” when considering historic identities, items, or groups (Moody and O’Dell 2017; Engseth 2018; Tang et al. 2018);
3. the use of “ethical outreach” when dealing with still-living identities, items, or groups (V. B. Fox and Gross 2019; Buccicone and Leaman 2021);
4. “trickster” practices of “alteration,” “subversion,” “extension,” or replacement of dominant classification or cataloging on a local level (Clarke and Schoonmaker 2020; 2019; Angela Kublik et al. 2003; Kwaśnik and Rubin 2003; Gilman 2006; Speller 2007; Bullard 2018; María Montenegro and María Montenegro 2019; Ann Pettingill and Pamela Morgan 1996; Ockerbloom 2013; Sahadath 2013; libraries Australia nd; MAIN (Manitoba Archival Information Network) - LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings) Working Group 2017; Bone et al. 2015; Smiraglia 2015);
5. consultation with described subjects (S. Lee, Nam, and Nam 2013; Mai 2013; 2010; Lorberfeld and Rinck 2015; Lougheed, Moran, and Callison 2015; Bone and Lougheed 2018; Bone et al. 2015; Marcondes 2020; Chilcott 2019; Antracoli et al. 2019; Antracoli and Rawdon 2019).

These five recommendations parallel recommendations from social justice and equity literature (Walster and Walster 1975; Botes 2000).
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