Improving Subject Access to Resources on Oregon Indian Tribes

Good afternoon everyone. Thank you for that introduction. I’d like to begin by reading a land acknowledgement statement first, which seems especially appropriate given the nature of my presentation.

[read statement]

I. Introduction
On January 20, 2017, I attended an ALCTS pre-conference on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Creating a New Future for Library Collections. The day-long event consisted of many speakers addressing the issue of incorporating principles of equity, diversity and inclusion in all aspects of technical services. I was especially moved by the presentation by Hannah Buckland, the Director of Library Services at Leech Lake Tribal College in northern Minnesota. I asked myself what could I do as a cataloger to work toward a more inclusive and equitable future. This presentation is about what I chose to do.

I embarked on a project to ensure that library resources about Oregon Indian tribes are discoverable in online systems. This project is focused on making sure that the names of all Oregon Indian tribes are approved subject headings in LCSH and that the bibliographic records for resources about Oregon Indian tribes include those subject headings where appropriate. This is important because, as subject catalogers, we know that subject access is what our collections are all about. We need to facilitate how researchers find the resources they need for their work.

There is a second reason as well. Oregon State University has 150 American Indian and Alaskan native students (.5%), many from the Pacific Northwest, but also from other states. When these young people want to learn something about themselves, their history and culture, we in the library want to make sure that they can find that information readily. It makes sense for us to ensure that as the land grant institution in Oregon, we provide the best access possible to resources on Oregon’s Indians.

II. Oregon Indian tribes in LCSH
a. Background: Historically, Oregon’s indigenous peoples were incredibly diverse. Prior to the advent of European Americans, there were about 55 different tribes, each with its own language and representing about 13 different language families.
b. I need to digress briefly to comment on the term “tribe.” Without wanting to dive into anthropological definitions as to what constitutes a tribe, I do have to point out the difference between tribes that existed pre-European American contact and the term “federally recognized tribe.” As I mentioned, there were about 55 different tribes pre-contact. Today, there are 9 federally recognized
tribes in Oregon. Most of these federally recognized tribes are made up of several different tribes. For example, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon is made up of people from 26 different tribes, some of which originally lived in California or Washington. All of the federally-recognized tribes in Oregon (and probably the US) have been established as corporate bodies in the Name Authority File. However, the constituent, historical tribes are established as ethnic groups in LCSH per memo H1103 in the Subject Headings Manual. All are established as [Tribal name] Indians (example: Siletz Indians). I am skipping any discussion of using the term Indians as part of these subject headings because it is not the focus of my project.

c. The concept of a tribe has its own history which I also will not go into, but I do need to mention that some tribes are made up of sub-tribes or bands. Most notably, in Oregon’s Willamette Valley, we find the 12 or so bands of the Kalapuyas. The Kalapuyas consist of the Santiams, the ChePInefus, the Atfalatis, etc., in addition to the Kalapuya band of the Kalapuyas. I am not purposely trying to make this complex—it is complex.

III. I began this project by compiling a list of the tribes and bands of Oregon using several reference sources, everything from Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, 1907, to Wikipedia. Indian tribes of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, 1968 is actually a reprint of the 1952 Smithsonian publication, Indian Tribes of North America by John R. Swanton. In this step, I compiled a list of 55 tribes—some being bands or component groups of other tribes.

a. I then searched each tribal name in LCSH. Sometimes, I needed to search different spellings to find if a subject heading already was established.

b. Most of the tribes were represented by an LC subject heading. 19 tribal names were not found in LCSH.

c. Since subject headings are created based on literary warrant, my next step was to search OCLC’s WorldCat database to see if there were any works about these 19 tribes. This is easier said than done. The method I used initially was to do a keyword search for each tribe’s many names and variant spellings. These synonyms were found in the reference sources.

i. For some tribes, this method worked well. Only works about the tribe were retrieved. Easy!

ii. For other tribes, the name of the tribe also has been used as a geographic name. For example, the Clatsops are remembered in the names of Clatsop County, Fort Clatsop, Fort Clatsop National Memorial, etc. Limiting the search to keywords in the title helped to narrow the number of works to sift through. Sometimes using the name of the tribe as a keyword combined with the keyword Indians in the subject headings helped since many of the resources I was looking for had a subject heading “Indians of
North America” often with a geographic qualifier. Although my goal was to find at least one record that would benefit from having a subject heading for a specific tribe, I printed out bib records for all works that matched my criteria because of the 2nd phase of the project, adding an approved subject heading for the tribe. I also made notes on the subject headings already present in the records, recording whether those subject headings were overly broad or for the wrong tribe.

iii. Of the 19 tribes, I found bibliographic records to justify preparing subject authority records for 13. I can’t say that there are no works for the 6 other tribes; only that I did not find such works by searching WorldCat. I have it in mind to go back later and find research papers or other works about these 6 tribes that just haven’t been brought into our organized bibliographic universe yet.

a. Subject heading proposals were prepared or will be prepared for remaining 13 tribes and bands. As of November, 2018, seven proposals have been approved by the Library of Congress. Since I only work on this project as I have time, I admit that progress has been slow. I have focused on the easy ones so far. Each of the ones completed so far takes a few hours to put together. I have a set of 6 references that I consult and comb them for all the variant spellings for the names of the tribes. This results in an extensive list of “used for” terms. The Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, has been especially useful since it records the variant spellings and cites the books, papers, diaries, and other sources that mention each tribe. In some sources, unusual diacritics have been used and can be challenging to reproduce in the proposals. Despite these many variant spellings, it is usually not too difficult to pick out the one most commonly used or the one that is used consistently in the most recent publications. I have been asked when presenting on this topic if I ever consulted with the actual tribes for input. I did receive a document from the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community that had been proposed by their cultural resources department providing the official name for each component tribe, and including variant names or spellings for each tribe. I have cited this source in the subject heading proposals for several of these tribes. In one case, my proposed preferred form of the tribal name was changed by LC and swapped it with a name for the tribe in their language (Applegate Indians changed to Dakubetede Indians). I don’t want to put anyone from LC on the spot here and cannot blame them for changing my choice of term. The folks at the Grand Ronde Community preferred Applegate Indians.
I also want to note that LC has enhanced most of my proposals by adding in the language group for these tribes as a BT (e.g., Chinookan Indians as BT for Clatsop Indians)

The remaining tribes that have not yet been worked on are a bit trickier. They can be split into two groups, those in the Willamette Valley and those east of the Cascade Mountains living on the Warm Springs Reservation. The Willamette Valley Indians are known collectively as the Kalapuyas – I have already mentioned that they are made up of about a dozen bands. There is already a subject heading for the Kalapuyas (Kalapuya Indians). One of the bands, the Yoncalla Indians, is already represented as a narrower term. However, there are 2 Used For terms under Kalapuya Indians that I would like to move to narrower terms and add 1 more NT for the Tualatins. That means revising the record for Kalapuya Indians and submitting new proposals for the narrower terms at the same time. I just haven’t had the time to do that work as yet.

A similar situation is found with the Tenino Indians on the Warm Springs Reservation. The Teninos are comprised of four bands, some of which have works written about them and are therefore candidates for their own subject headings as narrower terms under Tenino Indians. (which has yet to be established). Tenino Indians are present in the LC Classification schedules under E99 where all the tribes are listed. I have included an 053 field in all the subject heading proposals and simultaneously submitted an LC class proposal.

IV. The purpose of creating these subject headings is to use them in bibliographic records. I have already mentioned that I made a note of all the bibliographic records concerning the tribes I was creating subject headings for. It is instructive to discuss the subject headings I found on these records before I tell you about adding the new subject headings.

a. I assume you are familiar with the situation where a subject heading is needed on a topic, but it hasn’t been proposed or approved yet, so the subject cataloger assigns a broader term. That has happened repeatedly with resources about Oregon Indian tribes. The subject heading “Indians of North America – Oregon” has been used often for works about a specific tribe or two.

b. I have also found records where a subject heading for a tribe has been assigned to a work about a closely related tribe. For example, the videorecording “A Clatsop winter story” about the encounter of the Clatsops with the Lewis and Clark Expedition originally was assigned the subject headings Nehalem Indians and Nehalem Indians – History. While the Nehalems are closely related geographically and culturally to the Clatsops, they are recognized by ethnographers as a separate tribe. Once the subject heading for “Clatsop Indians”
was approved, these subject headings were changed. I need to digress briefly: When I first came up with this idea of creating subject headings for Oregon tribes, I searched LCSH for Clatsop Indians and discovered that no such subject heading existed. I was surprised; I think every Oregon child is taught about Oregon history and learns that the Clatsop Indians befriended Lewis and Clark, resulting in the explorers naming their encampment near Astoria “Fort Clatsop.” I wonder how many Oregonians wishing to learn more about the Clatsops had difficulty finding anything on them at their library.

c. Once a new subject heading was approved, I went back to the bibliographic records in WorldCat and added the new heading(s), corrected existing subject headings if they were deemed incorrect (although I also left existing subject headings if, without the piece in hand, I felt uncertain if the old heading was truly inaccurate), and controlled all subject headings where possible.

d. Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bibliographic Records</th>
<th>Subject Headings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathlamet Indians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop Indians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakubetede Indians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galice Indians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latgawa Indians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilloot Indians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watlala Indians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. FUTURE ASPECTS – read slide

VI. Thank you!