

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

Queens College

Spring 2018

The Story of "Subclass DJK- Eastern Europe (general)": Cold War Politics in the Organization of Knowledge

Regina Carra
CUNY Queens College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/qc_etds/10

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

The Story of "Subclass DJK- Eastern Europe (general)":
Cold War Politics in the Organization of Knowledge

Regina Carra

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in History
and graduation from the
Dual Degree MLS/MA program,
in the Graduate Division of
Queens College of the
City University of New York

Date: May 2018

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Chapter 1 - The Library of Congress Classification: History, Theory, and Practice	14
Chapter 2 - Reorienting Eastern Europe in the LCC: Cold War Librarianship, SEESHAC, and the LC	24
Conclusion	50
Bibliography	52

Introduction

A call number is not an innocent thing. In fact, it is insidiously powerful, controlling, and biased. A call number is derived from a complex intellectual system called a classification scheme. The written structure of a classification scheme, or classification schedule, is a rich text for historical analysis, particularly ones as old as the Library of Congress Classification (LCC). Observable over the course of its publication history are changes in taxonomy that reflect shifting vernacular, the rise and fall of empires, and the emergence of new fields of study. But along with these shifts are aspects of the classification that remain consistent despite change over time. In other words, the LCC not only mirrors historical notions of difference, but it also structures them as well, allowing them to remain in the scheme long past the context of their creation. Library science scholars have made this general observation about the LCC, but this research makes the unique contribution of analyzing the creation and persistence of one particular case in the LCC, Subclass DJK, within the context of shifting perceptions of the region it represents, Eastern Europe. Historians of Eastern Europe have observed these shifts by contextualizing cultural materials that reflect and effectively preserve past notions of Eastern Europe in subsequent historical contexts. By combining library and information theory with this intellectual history of Eastern Europe, this interdisciplinary essay makes Subclass DJK a visible remnant of past perceptions of Eastern Europe and posits the significance and consequence of its presence in the Library of Congress (LC) and in American libraries today.

This historical analysis of Subclass DJK stresses one basic concept: Library classifications schemes reflect and sustain historical perceptions of difference. For this research specifically, the emphasis is on how the LCC reflect and sustains perceptions of national and regional boundaries in Europe. When Subclass DJK was created in 1976, it reflected Cold War

perceptions of cultural, national, and regional boundaries, in particular the presumed permanence of Eastern Europe as a political and cultural concept. In the post-Cold War Era, however, the concept of Eastern Europe appears to be one of the past, rather than the present or future. With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, and the subsequent inclusion of former Communist nations into cooperative groups like NATO and the European Union, the division between East and West does not seem as stark as it did during the Cold War when there was a seemingly impermeable iron curtain longitudinally dividing Europe into politically charged East and West halves. Subclass DJK was created to reflect a Cold War configuration of Europe. The consequence of its continued existence in the LCC today, in the post-Cold War Era, is that librarians through their practices, and researchers in pursuit of research materials, cannot avoid interacting with and reinforcing this historical world-view.¹ This historical arrangement of knowledge is reinforced by the practical difficulty of shifting the LCC's structure, as well as the perception of the legitimacy of the LC and the subjects represented its scheme.

This thesis makes a unique contribution to two bodies of literature. The first is library science scholarship about imbedded historical anachronisms and cultural prejudices in the LCC. The second is the intellectual history of Eastern Europe written by historians. This historical scholarship makes the general argument that Eastern Europe is just as much an imagined construct of the West, as it is a geographic area. Although the region does have attributes that are distinct from its western counterpart, these differences have been utilized to perpetuate a pervasively pejorative narrative that the region is the West's backwards and semi-barbaric other.

¹ This essay is primarily speaking from an American perspective because libraries in the United States are the primary users of the LCC, however the concept of Eastern Europe is not an American construct, rather an invention of the West in general.

The value of the interdisciplinary approach taken by this project is that it introduces the discourse of each discipline to the other by centering libraries and librarians as the chief historical entities responding to and consequentially influencing perceptions of Eastern Europe. For Library Science scholarship specifically, it echoes observations made by library scholars and practitioners about the biases imbedded in the LCC in a uniquely comprehensive historical analysis of Subclass DJK. As for Eastern European history, this thesis may serve historians as a basic introduction to library theory and practice. Moreover, with library practice as its focus, it provides a reminder of the significant role that libraries, archives, and other cultural heritage institutions play in the formation of durable notions of Eastern Europe in scholarly discourse.

Due to its widespread use in libraries, the LCC is a target of criticism from library practitioners and is a popular focus of critical library scholarship. In her book *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the Organization of Knowledge*, published in 2017, Melissa Adler confronts the cataloging and classification of sexual perversion and sexuality in the LCC and in the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). These tools, like the LCC and LCSH, work to group, or collocate, materials that have seemingly similar subject matter while simultaneously inscribing a particular, sometimes prejudicial, world-view in the library stacks.² She argues that the prescribed similarity between perversion, homosexuality, and sexual deviance, as well as these subjects' relegated position to "outside" assumed social norms, is evidence of a blatant attempt to define heterosexual behavior as normal, mainstream, and good, by demonizing

² In her study, Adler identifies the term "paraphilias" utilized as a subject heading, as well as in the LCC under "HQ71- Sexual practice outside of the social norms. Paraphilias." Considering that one of the strengths of the LCC is to allow for patrons to browse adjacent shelves for similar material, Adler (2017) widens the scope of her analysis of the schedule to the subdivisions of HQ near HQ71. Some of the divisions she highlights are "HQ73- Sexual Minorities" (under which she identifies another division for "Special. Woman."), "HQ76- Gay Men," and "HQ79- Sadism. Masochism. Fetishism etc." Melissa Adler, *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the Organization of Knowledge* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017), 109.

homosexual behavior as uncommon, deviant behavior. Adler has made similar observations about the portrayal of disabled persons and African Americans as communities segregated from general subject areas in the LCC.³

One of Adler's main arguments in her work is that the LCC schedules need to be considered as texts developed to support the prevailing social, political, and scientific norms of a particular historical context, specifically the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. Because the LC is a national library, Adler argues that the LCC schedules are the product of "nation building," or the creation of cultural products by the state to be used by citizens to understand a national identity composed of seemingly collective cultural values. She contends that analysis of the LCC schedules as historical documents "reveals the extent to which a nation relies on unified categories in order to write its history and confirm the universality of the state as well as the way in which classifications support national interests."⁴ By identifying and dividing subjects by the "other" in the LCC – the gay person, the disabled person, the African American – the LC is effectively prescribing a model for the way American library patrons should conceive of the

³Adler, along with Jeffrey T. Huber and A. Tyler Nix, Adler has written about the classification of disability in the LCC and other classification schemes. They point out that while the LC has taken steps to reword the terms it uses to represent disability in its schedules and subject headings over the past century—"degeneration" and "defectives" to "disabilities" and "people with disabilities"—the structural thematic relationships that the scheme was based on remain in the schedule and inscribe a one-hundred year old world-view in the modern library stacks. Despite changing the wording to reflect a kinder, more modern way of addressing disabled individuals, the library stacks group materials about disabled persons near materials about eugenics— a movement of social science that had been radically utilized to justify violence against disabled individuals in the United States and around the World. Melissa Adler, Jeffrey T. Huber, and A. Tyler Nix, "Stigmatizing Disability: Library Classifications and the Marking and Marginalization of Books About People with Disabilities," *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 87, no.2 (2017): 120. See Adler's article "Classification Along the Color Line: Excavating Racism in the Stacks," for her discussion of the imbedded white hegemony in the LCC. One of her arguments here is that classifications (whether in society-at-large or in the library space only) instill a "double consciousness" amongst the African American community. These classifications, she says, perpetuate the notion "that one could not simply be American; one is a Negro or African American, removed from the 'general' population..." Melissa Adler, "Classification Along the Color Line: Excavating Racism in the Stacks," *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1, no. 1 (2017): 27.

⁴ Adler, *Cruising the Library*, 10.

ideal American citizen. While modern sensibilities may not harbor the same views as the developers of the LCC did one-hundred years ago, the systematic enshrinement of the scheme in the country's preeminent cultural heritage and research institution is a reminder that these prejudicial viewpoints were a prominent part of the United States' national identity in the past and still may be felt by some citizens today.

Library Science scholarship has analyzed the representation of nations in the LCC. As an authority on classification and cataloging theory, Lois Mai Chan identifies a nationalistic bias towards the United States as a major weakness of the LCC.⁵ Of course, the logical reason for this favoritism is that the LCC was created to classify the books at the LC, the de-facto national library of the United States. In one way, this bias should not be surprising. On the other hand, the breadth of scholarship available today and the fact that the LCC can be found in some libraries abroad, gives credence to arguments that the LC should be more mindful about how it classifies other national histories.⁶ Colin Higgins contends that the LCC is fundamentally structured to retain historically paternalistic relations between the nations, specifically the dominance of the United States. His article "*Library of Congress Classification: Teddy Roosevelt's World in Numbers*," traces the creation of the LCC to the age of American imperialism and the expansionist policies of the Theodore Roosevelt administration. The lack of robust classification

⁵ Lois Mai Chan, *Cataloging and Classification: An Introduction*, 3rd ed (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007), 385.

⁶ The author is unaware if there are exact numbers of how many libraries use the LCC, particularly libraries outside of the United States. Theoretically, the LC could make a hard estimate of these totals by analyzing subscriptions to its LCC database *Classification Web*, which is how the institution currently distributes its classification schedules. How the LCC is implemented outside of the United States could offer a rich avenue of study. The LCC is not a mandated system; a library is free to adapt it to its internal needs. It is possible that a library or library system utilizing the LCC outside of the United States might adapt and add to the schedule of the LCC to provide more robust classification of its national history. Considering Adler's argument that library classifications contribute to a country's understanding of itself, it would be valuable to compare how different schemes, developed in different countries or communities, classify a single topic (i.e. a nation's history, race, religion, gender etc.).

for other nations today shows that the LCC sustains an American cultural dominance in the modern library.⁷ Aimee Alger has made a similar argument by focusing on the classification of the Caribbean in the LCC. One of the major challenges for scholars researching the Caribbean, she says, are discrepancies in geographical names in the LCC. The schedules continue to represent the names given to places by European colonizers, instead of names given by local, native populations. Alger writes that this discrepancy between the local and European names of geographic places makes it hard for scholars to find materials in the library stacks. To achieve desired results a researcher must utilize the outdated European names imposed on locations by imperial powers.⁸ The prevalence of American culture and European imperialism in the LCC shows a preference for the worldviews of colonizers, rather than the cultural autonomy of the colonized.

In general, library science scholarship has analyzed the schedules as a primary text to study the social, political, and historical contexts in which information tools are created and used. Beyond focusing on specific subject areas, the main argument made by library scholars and practitioners is that the schedules reflect the historical context in which they were created and sustain this history in modern libraries today. Although library science scholars have made post-colonial arguments citing imbedded prejudices and biases in the LCC schedules, there has not been substantial scholarship analyzing the geopolitical structure of its classification of World History in the Class D, much less European History specifically.⁹ Nor has there been any

⁷ Colin Higgins, "Library of Congress Classification: Teddy Roosevelt's World in Numbers?" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 50, no.4 (2012): 249.

⁸ Aimee Alger, "The Dynamic Caribbean: A Challenge for the Library of Congress," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no.1 (2001): 36.

⁹ In his article, Higgins does point out that Irish History is classed under subclass DA for the history of Great Britain, but there is no mention of Ireland in the title of the subclass. While Ireland gained its independence

published historical or technical analysis on the significance of the addition of Subclass DJK to the LCC in 1976. This is despite a considerable body of literature written by historians that seeks to expose cultural materials that perpetuate the notion of Eastern Europe as a peripheral and backwards region in Europe.

Historians of Eastern Europe have approached the region from two angles: first as a geographic region that has unique cultural, historical, economic, and political characteristics that distinguish it from other parts of Europe; second as a product of the Western imagination. According to this second view, the idea of Eastern Europe was part of an intellectual framework to explain the emergence of the West as the pinnacle of civilization compared to the stagnation and apparent backwardness of the East. This research is primarily inspired by this latter interpretation of the region's history.¹⁰

Published in 1994, Larry Wolff's *Inventing Eastern Europe* is one of the most well-known pieces of scholarship to address the intellectual history associated with the construction of Eastern Europe as a distinct region. Utilizing the writings of Enlightenment thinkers like Voltaire and Rousseau (some of whom never actually traveled east) as well as traveler's accounts, Wolff argues that Eastern Europe was the intellectual creation of the Enlightenment. The invention of Eastern Europe equally corresponded to the invention of the idea of Western Europe. In other

from Britain in 1918 (after the Class D was first implemented in 1916), Higgins believes that by not including its country name in the title of Subclass DA, Ireland has not gained a "distinct place in the LCC's view of history." Perhaps this observation is part of future research, as the article itself is not written to be an in-depth analysis of Class D or Subclass DA. Higgins, 257.

¹⁰ To be clear, these two angles are not mutually exclusive. There are fair distinctions that can be made between Western and Eastern Europe. For example, until the twentieth century Eastern Europe was very underdeveloped compared to Western Europe; Eastern Europe was Communist during the Cold War; Eastern Europe has unique, landlocked geography. Rather the focus of this second body of scholarship is to understand how these observations have been deployed in historical context to advance pejorative notions of the region and to illuminate these notions as politically motivated, and constantly shifting over time.

words, to define themselves as civilized, Western Europeans found, categorized, and exploited with their words and imagery, Eastern Europe as the “other,” backwards region of Europe as a proverbial “yardstick” by which to measure the West’s greatness. The subjugation of Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union during the Cold War can be attributed to the persistence of this comparison between the seemingly semi-primitive East and the civilized West. According to Wolff, the “iron curtain,” a primarily imaginary boundary (except for the Berlin Wall and some barbed wire fencing) proclaimed by Winston Churchill to signal a sharp distinction between the communist East and the democratic West, was intellectually constructed during the Enlightenment by western travelers and thinkers who described their ventures to Eastern Europe in disparaging terms.¹¹

These Enlightened perceptions became socially and institutionally imbedded in the concept of a salient, unified geopolitical entity called “Eastern Europe.” “Inevitably,” Wolff writes, the “eyes” of Count Louis-Phillippe de Ségur, who in 1784 traveled from France to the court of Catherine II of Russia, “became *your* eyes, *your* gaze, the gaze of all travelers to St. Petersburg, even those who traveled only vicariously by reading the memoirs of Ségur.”¹² Wolff’s argument about the institutionalization of the idea of Eastern Europe was preceded by Edward Said’s seminal text *Orientalism*, published in 1978. Said argues that the idea of the Orient was constructed by western thinkers and expounds on the consequences of this imagining. Orientalism, he says, is a “tradition” with its own system of “thought, imagery, and vocabulary

¹¹Maria Todorova argues that there have been similar (although perhaps even more dire) consequences to the persistence of the idea of the Balkans. In *Imagining the Balkans*, published in 1997, she posits that the persistence of the idea of balkanism (a pejorative word applied to violently quarrelsome, uncooperative groups) and how its association with the peninsula has negatively affected how and when the West interacts with nations in the region. See also Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 3.

¹² Wolff, 22.

that have given it reality and presence in and for the West.”¹³ In other words, what was originally an imagined concept has been given permanence through Western institutions of learning and knowledge production.

The overall message conveyed by these scholars is that the concept of the region is not natural or objective, but rather was the artifact of its historical context and subsequently sustained in scholarship, politics, and popular culture. Indicative of its invention is the fact that in different moments the meaning, and the very existence, of Eastern Europe has changed with global conditions. As Wolff points out, before the Enlightenment, Europe was thought to be divided along north-south lines between the civilized and cultured Southern Europe of the Renaissance and the barbaric Northern Europe.¹⁴ The 1980s saw the emergence of the concept of “Central Europe,” particularly after the publication of Milan Kundera’s essay “The Tragedy of Central Europe” in 1984. Kundera argues that there had been a historic region called “Central Europe” but that it had effectively disappeared and was subsumed by foreign politics and culture from the East. The West, he argues, had lost a critical part of its cultural heritage when the Soviets “stole” Central Europe. In the post-Cold War Era, the concept of Central Europe would be used by countries like Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Poland to highlight their “Western” cultural qualities in the hope that they might be included in western diplomatic institutions and in the emerging project of European integration.¹⁵

¹³ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 5.

¹⁴ Wolff, 5.

¹⁵ See Milan Kundera, “The Tragedy of Central Europe,” *The New York Review of Books* (April 26, 1984). A compilation of Kundera’s article and scholarly responses to it was published in 1989. George Schöpflin and Nancy Wood, eds. *In Search of Central Europe* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1989). For a good historiographic summary of the idea of Central Europe see Joshua Hagen’s article “Redrawing the imagined map of Europe” *The Rise and Fall of the ‘Center.’* *Political Geography* 22, no. 5 (2003).

Since the end of the Cold War and with the inclusion of former Communist nations in western alliances, the idea of Eastern Europe, and more broadly ideas about the regional boundaries within Europe, have shifted. Rather than a stark division between East and West, there is simply one unified post-Communist Europe. In 2011, former President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy proclaimed at a joint summit between the European Union and the United States that “since the end of the Cold War, there is no East anymore,” although “there is still a West.”¹⁶ More recently, an article about the discovery of a “lost” 250-foot-long piece of the Berlin Wall in 2018 concluded that the finding was poignant but that visitors searching for “Cold War shivers” might be very disappointed if they visited the old Wall. Without the barbed wire on top and the sense that the Wall represented a dangerously charged fault line between East and West, the concrete slab looks like any other decrepit urban eyesore that has lost its original purpose.¹⁷

Historian Pamela Ballinger has defended the “critical purchase” of the notion of Eastern Europe.¹⁸ In a 2017 article entitled “Whatever Happened to Eastern Europe?” she makes an intriguing case for how the premise of “easterness” can be used by historians to discuss geographically and socially peripheral communities in Europe today. In the context of what she perceives to be the waning intellectual currency of the idea of Eastern Europe, it is historiographically significant that she frames her argument as an intervention. Her call for historians to reconsider the East-West framework is indicative of Eastern Europe’s perceived

¹⁶ H. Van Rompuy, “Remarks by Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council following the EU-US Summit,” EUCO 146/11 (November 28, 2011): 2.

¹⁷ Feargus O’Sullivan, “Rediscovered: 250 Missing Feet of the Berlin Wall,” *CityLab*, January 25, 2018, <https://www.citylab.com/life/2018/01/rediscovered-250-missing-feet-of-the-berlin-wall/551363/>

¹⁸ Pamela Ballinger, “Whatever Happened to Eastern Europe?: Revisiting Europe’s Eastern Peripheries,” *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*, 31, no. 1 (February 2017): 44.

lack of resonance outside of the Cold War context. But Ballinger echoes a message stated by Wolff in the early 1990s, which is that although historical contexts change, and perceptions of regions shift, there are concepts that achieve “durable afterlives.” The acts of discrimination against Poles in 2016 in the wake of the Brexit vote in the United Kingdom is, according to Ballinger, a sign of the “durable afterlife” of the East-West divide.¹⁹ She argues that like other moments in history where the concept of Eastern Europe has been contested, this divide has simply taken on a new form. Ballinger contends that Eastern Europe still exists, but that in an insidious development of the post-Cold War Era the region cannot be observed along geopolitical boundaries or man-made barriers, rather through cultural materials and social behaviors. This research makes the original argument that Subclass DJK should be considered as one of the “durable afterlives” Ballinger is concerned about.

Building on the work of both library science scholars, like Adler, and historians like Wolff, this research argues that Subclass DJK reflects Cold War perceptions of Eastern Europe as a legitimate political, cultural and economic region that was worthy of representation in the LCC equal to nations or groups of nations. In the history of this subclass, two perspectives emerge: first is a group of Slavic librarians within the American Library Association (ALA) that sought to represent Eastern Europe as multi-national and multi-ethnic; second is the LC which ultimately implemented Subclass DJK to represent Eastern Europe as politically and geographically distinct from the West. The difference between the motives of the Slavic librarians and the LC bolster arguments made by historians like Wolff and Ballinger that regional concepts are not static, but rather, these concepts are ephemeral because they reflect the

¹⁹ Ibid, 46.

historical context in which they are created. Today in the post-Cold War, Subclass DJK functions as a durable remnant of the Cold War politics that created it.

Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into two chapters followed by a conclusion and epilogue. The first chapter introduces the history of the LCC and discusses how it functions in theory and practice. This chapter situates the LCC as a product of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that reflects and sustains this historical context in its structure. In this chapter, the author presents her skepticism of library theories like *literary warrant* that suggest the LCC can be easily changed to reflect shifting historical contexts. The second chapter explores the history of Subclass DJK. The main question this chapter seeks to answer is this: considering the stability of the LCC, why was Subclass DJK deemed necessary to add to the LCC in 1976? This chapter discusses the emergence of Slavic studies and librarianship in the Cold War, followed by a discussion of two perspectives involved in the implementation of Subclass DJK. The first is that of the Slavic and East European Subject Heading and Classification (SEESHAC) committee within the ALA, which proposed Subclass DJK in 1974 to represent nations of the region as independent from Russian and Soviet domination yet unified in their common cultural history.²⁰ The second involves the perspective of the LC and their reasoning for ultimately implementing the Subclass DJK in 1976. This historical section is followed by a discussion of the implications of Subclass DJK in the LCC today.

²⁰ The committee was not consistent in how they referred to themselves. In correspondence, meeting minutes, and in publications the committee's name appears in various forms: "the SEESHAC committee," "the SEESHAC," and simply "SEESHAC." Even though the acronym appears to be missing a second "c" for "committee," the author is choosing to refer to the committee as "SEESHAC," following the naming convention used by Wasyl Veryha in an article published in 1977 about its work. See Wasyl Veryha, "A Proposal for the Revision of the Library of Congress Classification Schedule in History for Eastern Europe," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 21, no 4 (1977): 354.

Chapter 1

The Library of Congress Classification: History, Theory, and Practice

This chapter explores the history, theory, and implementation of the LCC. It begins with a brief backstory of the LC and the LCC beginning with the origins of the LC in 1800 through to the present, however its primary focus is from 1800 to the 1970s. This historical background is followed by a discussion of the LCC in theory and practice. The chapter concludes with specific analysis of Class D as a schedule that “maps” physical space in the form of classificatory groups. This chapter emphasizes the intentionality of the LCC from its origins to its current use in libraries today. The LCC reflects and sustains historical notions of subject differences because it was created and is revised within the context of political and social forces. Historical analysis of these forces, coupled with an understanding of library classification theory, illuminates the biases inherent in the scheme and their effect on the organization of knowledge.

The Nation’s Library and Its Classification

The LC developed the LCC in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to take advantage of an opportunity to solve a literally growing problem. The Library’s collection had grown too large for its original home in a wing of the Capitol Building and was to be rehoused in the new Jefferson Building across Capitol Hill. Completed in 1897 and named after one of the LC’s first supporters, President Thomas Jefferson, the Jefferson Building provided the LC with a convenient opportunity to rethink the order and arrangement of its collection that would be moved out of the Capitol Building and into new stacks.²¹

²¹ Although officially founded by his predecessor President John Adams, Jefferson is credited with establishing the LC as an agency of the Legislature in 1802. This act included creating the role of the Librarian of Congress and allocating Congress the ability to oversee the Library’s budget and rules.

Prior to the LCC, the LC had been using a system of classification implemented by Jefferson. This appears to have been a result of circumstance rather than choice. In 1800, as the capital was being prepared to move from Philadelphia to Washington D.C, John Adams allocated \$5,000 for the purchase of “such books as may be necessary for the use of Congress.”²² In 1814, when the British burned the Capitol and the fledgling library, Jefferson offered his 6,500-volume collection as a replacement. It was purchased the following year by Congress for \$23,950.²³ Because of its subject scope, as well as its intrinsic value to the institution, Jefferson’s collection is sentimentally considered the core of the LC’s collection. Today, it remains on permanent display in the building that bears his name.

Although Congress paid for Jefferson’s extensive collection, the classification scheme by which it was pre-organized came to the LC for free. Jefferson conceived of his collection as being divided into three main branches inspired by English philosopher Francis Bacon’s three “faculties” of the mind: memory, imagination, and reason. According to Bacon, these thought processes corresponded to three distinct subject categories that could classify all human knowledge: Philosophy (the fruit of reason), History (which comes from memory), and Poetry (derived from imagination). Jefferson followed the spirit of Bacon’s rationale, although his final scheme expanded on the essence of “poetry.” He divided his personal library into three parts: History, Philosophy, and the Fine Arts.²⁴ Even though Jefferson’s Baconian system was serviceable as a classification scheme for nearly one hundred years, Chief of Cataloging James

²² John Y. Cole, *Jefferson’s Legacy: A Brief History of the Library of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1993), 12.

²³ John Y. Cole, “The Library of Congress Becomes a World Library, 1815-2005.” *Libraries & Culture* 40, no. 3 (2005): 386.

²⁴ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1898), 20.

Christian Meinrich and Head Classifier Charles Martel felt that the LC's collection in the late nineteenth century warranted departure from Jefferson's broad scheme, in favor of a more detailed classification that could better distinguish the books of the LC's growing collection.²⁵ It is unclear to what extent the LCC differed from the original Baconian system. (This would be a fascinating avenue of research for library historians to explore.) Nevertheless, the change of classification system does emphasize the fact that the LCC was an intentional invention that was developed at an important juncture in the LC's history. The Jefferson Building to which the collection was being moved represented progress, growth, and wealth. It is unsurprising that such a beautiful new building would also prompt the construction of a new classification to improve upon an old system and expand with the LC's collection in the future.

Initially the LCC was developed to be an internal classification for the LC only, however the system eventually became part of the LC's mission to serve not only Congress, but also the nation and its library system. The relationship between the LC and the professional library community was cultivated under the leadership of Herbert Putnam, who as Librarian of Congress from 1899 to 1939 had one of the most influential tenures in the LC's history. According to historian Jane Aiken Rosenberg, among Putnam's greatest achievements was defining the LC's "national role," particularly as a leading institution in the American professional library community.²⁶ Central to the emergence of the LC as a leading library was the standardization and dissemination of library cataloging rules and classification schemes, such as the LCC. At the time of Putnam's appointment, the LCC was already under development. Although reluctant at

²⁵ Jane Aiken Rosenberg, *The Nation's Great Library: Herbert Putnam and the Library of Congress, 1899-1939* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1993), 43.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

first, Putnam grew to agree with Meinrich and Martel that the LC needed its own unique system of classification. By 1915 virtually all the twenty-one Class schedules were complete and LC staff had even begun making revisions and additions.²⁷ Putnam believed that some of the Library's internal card catalog could be duplicated and distributed to other libraries as part of the LC's service to the nation. The opportunity to economize technical services for American libraries and situate the LC as the most important library in the United States, and perhaps the world, had too much appeal to ignore.²⁸

Adoption of the LCC was initially very slow. Its breadth of scope was best suited for academic and large research libraries, however most of these institutions at the beginning of the twentieth century were using the Dewey Decimal System. As these collections continued to grow, the merits of the LCC – its range of subjects and the LC's commitment to revising its scheme – became more appealing, prompting many institutions to reclassify materials by LCC standards in the 1960s. By the time Subclass DJK was implemented in 1976, nine-tenths of the largest American libraries and over half of academic libraries used the LCC.²⁹ Today, the LCC is one of the most widely used classification systems in the world.³⁰

²⁷ Ibid, 43.

²⁸ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), 34.

²⁹ Ibid, 44.

³⁰ This history about the adoption of the LCC underlines a key point about the wide-use of LC cataloging and classification standards and this is that libraries are under no mandate to adopt LC's standards. The decision to adopt the LCC is an institutional decision that is bolstered by the long-standing faith in the LC by the library community, the ease of copy-cataloging and using a "pre-made" scheme, and the general consensus that the LCC is a fairly good scheme.

Classification Theory and Structure

In libraries, classification schemes have the direct utility of collocating, or placing side by side, similar materials on the shelf, as well as generating a distinct mark—a call number—to distinguish a book from a similar title. Both the grouping of books and the call number allow the library patron to identify a particular item as well as browse the shelf for other relevant information. The dual utility of classification schemes (to group and distinguish books) has been observed in library science scholarship. Elin K. Jacob defines a classification scheme as a “set of mutually exclusive and non-overlapping classes arranged within a hierarchical structure and reflecting a predetermined ordering of reality.” She adds that “because a classification scheme mandates that an entity can be a member of one and only one class, it provides for communication of meaningful information through the systematic and principled ordering of classes.”³¹ The LCC, for example, organizes a library’s holdings into twenty-one subject-based classes that are each represented by a letter. It then further divides these classes into successively smaller, focused groups represented by letters and numbers, until a single book receives a distinction all its own, in the form of a call number. LCC call numbers begin with a class number which is made up of letters and numbers that correspond to subjects. The numbers that follow the letters divide the subject. A book with the letters "DJK" at the beginning of its call number is classified under Subclass DJK, which in the LCC is for the History of Eastern Europe. Subclass DJK divides the larger Class D, which more or less classifies History outside of the western hemisphere. For example, the call number for Larry Wolff’s book *Inventing Eastern Europe* begins with DJK13. “DJK” signifies that the book was classed in Subclass DJK and is about

³¹ Elin K. Jacob, “Classification and Categorization: A Difference that Makes a Difference,” *Library Trends* 52, no.3 (2004): 524.

Eastern Europe. The number “13” is the number designated for books about the history of travel in Eastern Europe. The class number portion of the call number should be the same at every library that utilizes LCC. In contrast to Adler’s characterization of classification as a “definitive decision,” it is perhaps more accurate to conceive of classification as a process composed of a complex series of definitive decisions, because these decisions occur within the context of a hierarchy that dictates that the placement of a book must be exclusive within its system of nested groups.³² While the structure of a classification scheme can be easily observed in its schedule, what is not apparent are the political and social forces that influenced the creation of the scheme. By contextualizing classification schemes like the LCC, historians and librarians can better understand the interpretative gaze that transforms the physical world into corresponding classificatory groups.

According to the LC, classification schemes “require constant additions and modifications to meet increasing accessions and new phases and developments of science, art, and letters.” This statement is ethically problematic because it falsely suggests that the LCC, and revisions made to the LCC, are natural and objective.³³ Specifically, it perpetuates the notion that the LCC is dictated only by a policy of *literary warrant*, which prescribes that the content of every book should be represented by the scheme. To accept literary warrant as the main principle governing the way the LCC works today is to subscribe to the notion that the scheme is merely a reflection of the content of the materials that have been cataloged and classified over time. This gives the impression of a “hospitable” and flexible classification scheme that will change

³² Adler, *Cruising the Library*, 92.

³³ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), 26.

accordingly as new topics emerge and are reflected in new books acquired by a library.³⁴ This rather optimistic view of the capacity for the LCC to classify all possible accessions does not address the interpretive process that determines whether a book is accurately represented by its placement on the stacks. Missing from this basic interpretation of how the LCC is revised is the labor of the librarian and the biases that unavoidably influence their interpretation of the content of the book as it relates to the subjects represented in the scheme. Furthermore, the LC's policy certainly does not address the structure of groups by which the subjects are arranged. Adler's analysis of the classification of sexuality in the LCC shows how *literary warrant* alone does not mandate that books about gay men be classed near books about sadism, merely that both subjects are represented in the scheme. Their proximity to one another reflects perceptions of sexuality at the time the LCC was created and unfortunately continues to have resonance in American society today. Furthermore, *literary warrant* cannot explain why homosexuality should be segregated as an "alternative" sexual orientation. The topic of "gay men" is named as a viable category for classification because heterosexuality is an assumed norm. This category is the product of American society and its dominant values, not of the book being classified. The LCC reflects the biases of the librarians that created it in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These

³⁴ Emily Drabinski's scholarship as an academic librarian has focused on library classification from a queer theory perspective. Like Adler she is interested in the classification of gender and sexuality in the LCC. However, as a reference and teaching librarian she is primarily interested in how imbedded bias in the schedules can be utilized as a pedagogical tool to teach library users to be critical of the catalog, and information systems in general. In a talk given to the Workshop for Instruction in Library Use (WILU) titled "Intersections with Power: Critical Teaching and the Library Catalogue," Drabinski aptly uses the word "hospitable" to describe popular perceptions of the LCC and other library catalogs. I give her credit for her word choice. In reality, the catalog is not "hospitable" to everyone, particularly if someone is outside of dominant power structures of gender and race. See UBC, "Emily Drabinski - Intersections with Power: Critical Teaching and the Library Catalogue," YouTube, July 6, 2016, accessed May 7, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NpCDqBOUY3c>. See also Emily Drabinski, "Queering the Catalog: Queer Theory and the Politics of Correction," *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 83, no. 2: 94-111. Chan's opinion of literary warrant appears very positive in her discussion of its use in the LCC. For a definition of literary warrant and basic description of the LCC, see Lois Mai Chan. "Library of Congress Classification (LCC)," in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, Third Edition*, ed. Marcia J. Bates and Mary Niles Maack, 3383-3391 (Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis, 2010), 3383.

biases persist in the scheme today, in part, because shifting subject groups requires the reclassification of books. This process that can be time-consuming and costly to underfunded libraries. However, as with Adler's example of the classification of sexuality, it is important to consider that these prejudicial subject relationships might also remain in the LCC because they continue to resonate with social and political hegemonies today. Building on Adler's work, this paper raises similar questions about the historical origins of regional classification in the LCC and their existence in the LCC today. Only by contextualizing the LCC can these regional categories be understood as products of historical perceptions of geopolitical boundaries.

Class D: The World According to the LC

In the LCC, there are three classes devoted to history: Classes D, E, and F. Classes E and F are for the history of the Americas. Although technically representing North and South America, these classes are primarily constructed to classify the history of the United States. Class D is for areas outside of the western hemisphere. Hence, where there are three classes to classify history in American research libraries today, in reality there are just two large groups: The history of the Americas (mostly the United States) and the history of everywhere else. The lengthy title for Class D illustrates the ambiguity of the latter group and reads as follows: Class D- World History and History of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, New Zealand, *etc.*

Class D appears to be one of the largest, most comprehensive classes in the LCC, although further analysis is required to know this for certain. Its schedule was first published in 1916, and at over six-hundred pages long was hailed as a "substantial volume."³⁵ Certainly, its size has grown over the past century in direct relation to the growth of the LC's collection. The Class D schedule has been reissued in multiple editions. Prior to the LCC becoming available

³⁵ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 1

online, the LC issued supplemental additions in print a couple times per year. After a substantial number of revisions were made, an entirely new edition was printed to compile the additions made since the previous edition. The first edition of Class D was published in 1916. Before its second edition would be published in 1959, two supplemental volumes of additions were issued for each of the World Wars. The third edition of Class D was published in five parts from 1987 to 1990. These piecemeal editions continue to be the trend for contemporary schedules of Class D because it has become so large that it is easier to revise, print, and distribute it in sections. The Subclasses for general history and European History (Subclass D-DR) were published again in 2001, 2007, 2011, and 2017.³⁶

Class D's subclasses primarily correspond to a nation, group of nations, or region.³⁷ Each was created by subject area specialists. Subclasses DK (Russia, Poland, and Finland) and DR (the Balkan Peninsula, Eastern Europe) were drafted by Alexis V. Babine, a Slavic literature specialist at the LC and Russian immigrant. One can think of the Class D schedule as a map: an interpretation of boundaries in Europe in the form of classificatory groups. This "map" reflects the organization of geographic areas in 1916. There were, however, considerable revisions made to the structure of the classification of European History in Class D beginning in 1976 with the adoption of Subclass DJK and ending in 1990 with the completion of the third edition of Class D and the inclusion of Subclass DAW for Central Europe. This thesis primarily focuses on Subclass DJK and the classification of Eastern Europe as a region in the LCC, although it will

³⁶ It appears that the LC has decided to break up the Class D schedule into two parts: General history and European History (Subclasses D-DR) and Asia, Africa, Australia, New Zealand (Subclasses DS-DX).

³⁷ In fact, the only subclass in Class D that is not associated with any geographic or political place is Subclass DX for this History of the Romanies, an itinerant ethnic group that has no single national affiliation.

address these other additions briefly to place the implementation of Subclass DJK in the context of the changing “map” of Europe prescribed by Class D.

Chapter 2

Reorienting Eastern Europe in the LCC:

Cold War Librarianship, SEESHAC, and the LC

Created in 1976, Subclass DJK was not original to the LCC, however the term “Eastern Europe” had been part of Class D schedule since 1916. Before it was designated its own subclass, the region “Eastern Europe” was the subtitle for Subclass DR, the schedule for the Balkan Peninsula. Therefore, the creation of Subclass DJK was an intellectual reorientation of the region within the LC’s organization of knowledge. From 1976 onwards, books about the region were to be placed in a new subclass in-between Subclass DJ (for the History of the Netherlands) and Subclass DK (which in 1976 was the subclass for the History of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Finland). Not only was Subclass DJK the first subclass added to Class D in its history, but it is also one of only two subclasses in the Class to be signified by three letters. It is worth appreciating the choice that was made in 1976 to create Subclass DJK and, as a consequence, admit an irregularity in Class D. The definitive placement of books about Eastern Europe on library shelves before Subclass DK was seemingly more important than the admission of a three-lettered Subclass, a phenomena that was, at the time, an anomaly in Class D, and uncommon in the LCC in general.³⁸ Subclass DJK did not exist until a decision was made in 1976 by the LC that the region of Eastern Europe was so significant, and fundamentally separate from the Balkan Peninsula, that it warranted its own subclass. So, what prompted this change? Why was it necessary to remove Eastern Europe from the schedule for the History of the Balkan Peninsula and designate it as its own subclass?

³⁸ In the LCC, there are only several subclasses that are signified by three letters. These are only found in Class D and Class K (Law), although most three-lettered subclasses are in Class K. In Class D, there are only two subclasses denoted by three letters. Subclass DJK and Subclass DAW for the History of Central Europe, which was added in 1990.

This chapter discusses two perspectives in the establishment of Subclass DJK in 1976. The first is that of an ad hoc committee of Slavic librarians within the American Library Association (ALA) called the Slavic and East European Subject Heading and Classification committee (SEESHAC). The second is the LC itself as the creator and maintainer of classification and cataloging standards for many libraries in the United States and for some institutions abroad. It is unclear which group came up with the idea for Subclass DJK first (the LC or SEESHAC), however two basic inferences can be made when comparing how each defined and conceived of the region of Eastern Europe: first, the common endorsement of Subclass DJK as a method of distinguishing Eastern Europe as a region in the LCC was influenced by the prevalence of the regional concept in political and scholarly discourse, as well as in library collections during the Cold War; second, the differences in how each group understood the utility of Subclass DJK reveals the ambiguity of the concept of Eastern Europe as influenced by international, national, and personal politics. This chapter begins with a discussion of the Cold War and its profound effect on library collections in the United States, followed by a discussion of SEESHAC's role in the implementation of Subclass DJK beginning in 1953 and ending in 1974. This chapter concludes with an analysis of the subclass the LC ultimately implemented in 1976, and which has remained virtually unchanged in the LCC ever since.

Cold War Librarianship

The Cold War played an integral role in the reorientation of Eastern Europe in the LCC, just as it also worked to solidify a political, cultural, and social divide between East and West. Beginning under the tenure of Librarian of Congress Luther Evans and continuing throughout the Cold War, the LC helped to facilitate the implementation of national programs aimed at bolstering the United States' information resources, particularly focusing on parts of the world

that were of foreign policy interest. The emergence of the Soviet Union as the preeminent geopolitical rival to the United States necessitated the expansion of nation's Slavic and Eastern European resources in the academe and in libraries. Evans recognized almost immediately after the Second World War that the LC should begin compiling information about the Soviet Union. "Most pressing is the Library's need for a great center of Russian studies," he wrote in 1945. "The Soviet Union has become the first nation in Europe, and the extent of our knowledge and understanding of it will have importance for the future." With funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, Evans established the Slavic Cataloging Project in cooperation with other large research libraries to survey and acquire Russian and Slavic books.³⁹

Despite Evans's insistence on the Slavic collection's importance, it was not until the launch of Sputnik in 1957 that there were concerted efforts by the United States and its western allies to mobilize information resources about the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. While the Warsaw Pact politically solidified the East-West divide in Europe, Sputnik's orbit established an uncertain reality for Americans. The Soviet Union was a global superpower with influence that was not, and could not, be contained to Eastern Europe. Able to see the Soviet Union's strength and technological prowess from their own backyards, Paul Dickson says that Americans experienced a "sudden crisis of confidence in American technology, values, politics and the military."⁴⁰ Despite waning belief in some institutions, the American people retained their belief in their national library to distribute accurate information about the emerging superpower and its new satellite. In 1958, the Library of Congress reported that because of the launch of Sputnik it saw an increase in reference queries to the Slavic and Central European Division. These ranged

³⁹ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945), 18.

⁴⁰ Paul Dickson, *Sputnik: The Shock of the Century* (New York: Walker & Company, 2001): 4.

from more complex reference requests for information about Soviet education, economics, and technology, to the basic question of how to pronounce the word “Sputnik.”⁴¹

After the launch of Sputnik, the United States began to invest heavily in Slavic Studies programs, hoping to create a cohort of students with the language skills and cultural knowledge to conduct diplomacy and business with the Soviet Union and Soviet bloc countries. According to Jacob Ornstein, before the First World War, Slavic Studies was “scarcely considered a legitimate discipline,” but in the Cold War the field emerged out of anonymity in pertinence to the political moment.⁴² In 1945, only 81 schools of higher education reported to have programs on Soviet affairs. By 1965 this number had grown to 420.⁴³ Geopolitical concerns in the late 1950s and early 1960s incited the United States and many other western governments “to pour millions of dollars into the few extant Slavic area studies programs, and prompted the formation of many more,” says librarian Robert H. Davis Jr. “There were ultimately many universities and colleges who benefited from the frenetic post-Sputnik assault on decades of national neglect of the resource base.”⁴⁴

The heightened interest of the American public, the growth of college programs, and the demands of the government prompted exceptional growth in Slavic library collections. Although there had been growth in Slavic library collections in the early nineteenth century and in the

⁴¹ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), 32.

⁴² Jacob Ornstein, *Slavic and East European Studies: Their Development and Status in the Western Hemisphere* (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1957), 4.

⁴³ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), 61.

⁴⁴ Robert H. Davis Jr. “The History of Slavic and East European Collections in the United States During the Interwar Period: An Agenda for Research,” in *Slavic and Russian Books and Libraries: Occasional Essays and Notes*, by Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr. (New York: Ross Publishing, 2007), 94.

interwar period, these do not compare to the growth of collections in the early Cold War period of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Indeed, in 1901, the collection of Slavic and East European books at the LC included 569 Russian and 97 Polish titles.⁴⁵ These totals contrast sharply with collection totals and rates of acquisition in the 1960s. By the beginning of that decade, the collection had grown to include over 300,000 volumes of books, 16,000 periodicals, and 1,400 newspapers. According to an estimate made in 1964 by Paul L. Horecky, then Assistant Chief of the Slavic and East European Division, the collection was growing at an annual rate of about 21,000 books, 5,000 current periodicals, and 450 current newspapers.⁴⁶

The groundswell of government, academic and public interest towards Slavic and East European studies shows that Americans perceived the emergence of a seemingly new global reality that required comprehensive library collections to confront. This reality included the supposed existence and likely persistence of an “iron curtain” separating Western Europe from Eastern Europe. Although this border was more metaphorical than concrete, it is no coincidence that its perceived permanence, coupled with the adversarial position of Soviet Union and Eastern Europe correspondingly produced in American society a need to compile and fortify the nation’s information resources in libraries and other institutions built for the basic purpose of preserving and providing authoritative information.

In 1972 within the context of growing Slavic studies university programs and Slavic and East European library collections, SEESHAC was formed in 1972 to lobby the LC to make changes to its classification and cataloging standards regarding the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe

⁴⁵ For early history of Russian and Eastern European collections see Paul L. Horecky, “The Slavic and East European Resources and Facilities of the Library of Congress,” *Slavic Review* 23, no. 2 (1964): 309.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 312.

and the Balkan Peninsula.⁴⁷ For over a decade before the committee was established, Slavic librarians expressed their concerns about the Class D schedule within a professional network of librarians and scholars that was increasing in size and prominence in 1960s Cold War America. SEESHAC was active into the early 1980s, however this essay primarily concerns the committee's work between 1972 and 1974. The founding members of the committee were five Slavic librarians: Dr. Ivan L. Kaldor, committee chairman and Dean of the School of Library and Information Science at the State University of New York at Geneseo; Dr. Stanley Humenuk, Head Catalog Librarian at Western Illinois University Libraries; Tatjana Lorković, Head of the Cataloging Department at University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City; Dr. Andrew Turchyn, Librarian for Slavic Studies at Indiana University Libraries, Bloomington; and Wasyl Veryha, Slavic Specialist in the Cataloging Department at University of Toronto, Canada.

Fixing “Slovenly Scholarship”: The Slavic and East European Subject Heading and Classification Committee (SEESHAC), 1953-1974

With increased funding for Slavic Studies programs and Slavic and East European library collections in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Slavic librarians enjoyed increased job opportunities, particularly as reference librarians and catalogers in academic libraries. These positions required language skills in multiple eastern European languages and extensive knowledge of the culture and history of eastern Europe. Although it is difficult to guess at their exact numbers in the field, what is clear by the activism of SEESHAC is that eastern European émigrés found purpose in libraries. Of the five members of SEESHAC, four were émigrés: Turchyn and Veryha were Ukrainian; Kaldor was Hungarian; and Lorković, Croatian. The

⁴⁷ This paper will primarily focus on SEESHAC's work to revise the LCC. The committee also proposed revisions to the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) as well, however because these systems are applied in conjunction many of the same arguments made against the structure of the LCC are similar to SEESHAC's criticisms of the LCSH.

outlier was Canadian Stanley Humenuk, who despite his nationality had similar skills and education to his co-committee members. All the members of SEESHAC were highly credentialed and had achieved multiple advanced degrees (some doctorate degrees) from universities in Europe and the United States.

The origins of SEESHAC appear to begin with Dr. Andrew Turchyn in 1953. Turchyn was a vocal member of the Slavic and East European library community in its very early stages. In 1953, as a recent graduate of the Library School at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor and a new Slavic Cataloger at Indiana University Library in Bloomington, he raised the possibility of creating a special subsection for Slavic librarians to discuss and advocate for Slavic and Eastern European library collections at the ALA Conference in Washington D.C. Recounting the conference in 1986, he said that one of the reasons he advocated for a unified group for Slavic librarians was that there was an urgent need to update the LC classification and cataloging standards relating to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.⁴⁸ His idea appears to have gone nowhere in 1953. There may have been no appetite to establish a subsection for a small constituency of librarians overseeing small collections. although this would change very quickly in the years to follow. Although it would take a decade, in 1963 the Slavic and East European Subsection (SEES) was created in the ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

The classification of eastern European nations, particularly in the Class D schedule, continued to be an area of concern for Turchyn and his colleagues when SEES was established. Although supplemental revisions had been published for each of the World Wars, the second edition of Class D published in 1959 was the first complete edition compiled since Class D was

⁴⁸ Andrew Turchyn, "The History of SEES," *Slavic & East European Section Newsletter* (1986): 26.

implemented in 1916. Class D was, as Turchyn would recall in 1968, “the most striking example of much needed revision.”⁴⁹ The schedule prompted Turchyn to write a memo to the LC in 1960. The LCC schedules, he explained, reflected the political situation in Eastern Europe in the mid-1910s “when many countries were parts of other countries, and when the mere existence of some peoples was being denied” by the imperial powers of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian Empires.⁵⁰ It appears that Turchyn had seen enough. Over forty years had passed since the first and second editions of Class D were published, and the new edition was not just disappointing, it was dangerous. SEES leaders argued that its application to growing Slavic and East European collections perpetuated anachronistic notions of national and ethnic dominance in Europe. The creation of SEES in 1963 was the first step in solidifying this message and creating an energized cohort of Slavic library professionals to demand that the LC make changes to the portion of the Class D schedule regarding the history of eastern European nations and peoples.

Throughout the 1960s Turchyn and his colleagues in SEES continued to speak at conferences and write letters to the LC demanding change to the LCC. With the growth of Slavic and East European collections in the United States, the librarians of SEES feared that the misrepresentation of newer nation-states in the LCC’s arrangement would be further imbedded in American libraries with each new book classified. One the LC’s main arguments for why revisions to the LCC could not be made was because of the financial cost these changes entailed. Written replies to Turchyn’s letters, however, suggest that there was sympathy at the LC for revisions to the LCC, but that revisions could not be undertaken because of the costs involved.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Andrew Turchyn, “Nearly a Century of Errors.” *Library News Letter: Indiana University* 3, no.5 (1968): 17.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ In this context I am primarily referring to a letter Turchyn received from John Cronin, Director of Processing Department at the LC in 1965, however the LC would use limited funding as its excuse a few times in

For SEES the financial implications of inaction were precisely why changes were urgently required. The longer the LC waited to make changes, the more Slavic and East European books would be classed using prejudicial schedules. If more books required reclassification, more money and work would be required, thus strengthening the LC's position that reclassification would be too costly to complete.

Financial constraints may have been a legitimate excuse from the LC, however Turchyn was skeptical. Thoroughly exasperated and willing to test the LC's apparent budgeting issues, in 1967 Turchyn wrote to North Dakota U.S. Senator Milton R. Young and expressed his concerns about the LCC and the LC's reluctance to fix its classification schedules. Although he was not one of Young's constituents, Turchyn chose to contact Senator Young because of his membership on the Appropriations Committee. If the LC could not afford to serve Americans of Slavic heritage and the professional library community, Turchyn thought, then surely Congress should be made aware so that it could distribute funds accordingly to rectify the problem. This would not be the last time a member of SEESHAC would contact a member of Congress. Writing letters to Congresspersons was an extreme, yet effective, way of receiving a response from the LC because unlike letters from private individuals, the LC could not ignore inquiries from Congresspersons like Young. When Young wrote to the LC asking for a response to Turchyn's concerns, he got a reply from the Librarian of Congress, Quincey Mumford. In his letter to Senator Young, Mumford questioned the legitimacy of Turchyn's complaints, and characterized them as personal and overly emotional, rather than professional. If the LCC was as

their writing to Turchyn and eventually to SEESHAC. See Andrew Turchyn, "Nearly a Century of Errors," 18. See also the [Letter from Joseph A. Placek to Andrew Turchyn, January 21, 1970], Association of College and Research Libraries, Slavic and East European Section Subject Files, Records Series 22/21/6, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

“objectionable” to Slavic librarians as Turchyn claimed, Mumford wrote, “it would be reasonable to suppose that we would have been under constant and widespread criticism for it.” The LC’s standards were hardly perfect, Mumford added, but the absence of criticism from the library community led LC librarians to believe that they were “acceptable” to most Slavic librarians.⁵²

At the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) Conference in Denver in 1971, SEES sought to disprove Mumford’s assumption. Chaired by Kaldor (then Chairperson of SEES), a joint session between the members of AAASS and SEES heard presentations from Turchyn and Veryha. A resolution was reached that mandated the Executive Committee of SEES to elect an ad hoc committee to negotiate with the LC for the changes in the LCC that Slavic librarians and scholars felt were desperately needed. The Slavic and East European Subject Headings and Classification committee (SEESHAC) was established the following year.

To say that the schedules were simply out-of-date does not quite capture the fundamental problem Slavic librarians identified with Class D. To use a term coined in 1976 by George Gerbner to refer to the underrepresentation or lack of representation of minority communities in the media, these librarians felt that the schedule was a tool of “symbolic annihilation,” because it failed to accurately represent the cultures and histories of independent nations that emerged in the wake of the collapse of imperial powers.⁵³ Despite significant shifts in eastern Europe since the end of World War I, such as the fall of empires and the emergence of independent nation-

⁵² [Letter from Librarian of Congress Mumford to Senator Young, June 15, 1967], the Association of College and Research Libraries, Slavic and East European Section Subject Files, Records Series 22/21/6, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

⁵³ George Gerbner and Larry Gross, “Living with Television: The Violence Profile,” *Journal of Communication*, 26 (1976): 172-199.

states, the LCC was structured as if these monumental changes had not occurred. It instead reflected the moment it was created in 1916, which was when the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian Empires dominated Eastern Europe. For example, according to the second edition of Class D published in 1959, materials related to the history of Budapest, the capital of Hungary, were classified under Austria in Subclass DB. This error can be directly attributed to the LC's choice to forgo revising the placement of materials relating to Budapest in the creation of Class D's second edition. Inaccuracies in the classification of local areas could also be observed regarding Polish cities and towns. Although Poland in name was written as a local area under Subclass DK for Russia, Polish cities were classed among the German (Subclass DD), Austro-Hungarian, and Russian areas of the schedule, thus representing the nation as it was in 1916 – partitioned and lacking independent existence. A similar problem plagued the classification of cities and towns in Yugoslavia.

The prevalence of the Russian Empire and Russia in the schedule was particularly dire. The librarians of SEES believed its prevalence to be intentionally imbedded in the structure of Subclass DK by Babine in 1916. In 1916, the Russian Empire did have widespread control of the eastern half of the continent. It can be argued that any Russian dominance perceived in the schedules reflected the holdings of the LC at the time. The collection of Slavic and East European materials was primarily composed of the collection of Gennadii Vasil'evich Yudin, a Siberian merchant and collector. Babine was instrumental in helping the LC acquire this collection. Although Veryha suggested that Babine was politically motivated by his Russian heritage to construct Subclass DK to encompass Slavic culture and Eastern Europe, there was

practical cause for Babine's involvement in drafting the subclass.⁵⁴ Babine's familiarity with the Yudin collection, his professional background as a cataloger at Stanford University, and his familiarity with Russian history and language, made his expertise particularly valuable when elaborating the LC's new classification scheme. Whether Veryha was correct in his assessment of Babine's motivation is not as significant as the fact that Veryha chose to publicly question Babine in a professional journal. Veryha's speculation was motivated by his own political outlook as a Ukrainian émigré living in Canada, working with an American library system that seemed not to care that it was incorrectly representing his culture. Babine's work on subclasses DK seemed politically motivated because Russian dominance was threatening towards the political and cultural autonomy of Eastern European states and peoples.

Although Babine may have imbedded a Russian bias in the schedule originally, SEESHAC also focused on how subsequent revisions to Class D symbolically perpetuated Russian dominance in Eastern Europe. This was apparent to the committee when the 1959 schedule appeared to equate Russia with the Soviet Union. Between the 1916 and 1959 versions of Class D, Subclass DK's title "Russia" was updated to "Russia (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [USSR])" in the attempt to recognize the Soviet Union. Similar to the problem with the placement of Budapest in the portion of the Subclass DB schedule for Austria, simply adding "USSR" to the name of Subclass DK created an inaccuracy in the schedule. If one were to deconstruct the meaning of the title one might interpret it as saying *Russia, or in other words, the Soviet Union*. The problem with this statement is that it is factually incorrect in its assumption of a direct correlation between its subjects. States like Poland, Finland, and Ukraine were classed as

⁵⁴ Wasył Veryha, "Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings Relating to Slavic and Eastern Europe," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 16, no.4 (1973): 473.

local areas to Russia (USSR), suggesting a subordinate relationship to Russia. Exemplifying this phenomenon most clearly was the classification of anti-Russian struggles as Russian history. Ukrainian librarians like Turchyn and Veryha found this particularly galling. They would often use the example of the Russo-Ukrainian War to show how the schedule *Russified* Ukrainian history in American Libraries. In a letter later sent to John Cole at the LC on July 5, 1976, (a day after American Independence Day), Veryha implored his colleague to consider the implications of the structure of Subclass DK. “How is it possible,” he asked, “that the independence movement and uprisings and Russo-Ukrainian war, 1917-1920 should be classed as part of Russian history? What events are most important for each national history if not the events connected with a struggle for independence?”⁵⁵

Indeed, Subclass DK was interpreted as a political attack on non-Russian Slavic nations because the schedule symbolically denied these nations their individual histories, particularly histories of resistance and independence. Thus, the schedules perpetuated a stereotype of Eastern European nations as weak and habitually vulnerable to whichever power was dominant in the region, whether the imperial powers before World War I, the Nazis, or the Soviet Union.⁵⁶ SEESHAC’s argument that the histories of independent nations should be separated from

⁵⁵ [Letter from Wasyl Veryha to John Cole, July 5, 1976], Tanja Lorković Papers (MS 1627). Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁵⁶ During the Cold War, historians like Robin Okey argued that one can observe a convergence between the past and the present in Eastern Europe as a regional destiny. Recognizing a pattern from the peak of feudalism in mid-eighteenth century to state controlled labor under Communism, Okey argues that the history of Eastern Europe is not a linear timeline of progressive development, but one of side-ways motion from struggle to struggle, as the region attempts (and fails) to overcome its state of backwardness compared to the West and dependence on larger, more powerful neighbors, like Germany and Russia. See Robin Okey, *Eastern Europe 1740-1985: Feudalism to Communism* (2nd ed.), (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 9.

Russian history was an expression of nationalism and likely an anti-Soviet attitude.⁵⁷ Although, anti-Communist sentiment and activism had been expressed in Eastern bloc countries during the Cold War without much success, what was important to SEESHAC was to highlight this rich and long-standing history of resistance in the schedules by upending a structure of Class D that suggested subservience to Russian and Soviet power.

SEESHAC also felt that the schedule coerced American libraries to classify aspects of common Slavic history as Russian history only, like the history of Kievan Rus'. The committee contended that the LCC should reflect the fact that Ukrainians and Byelorussians also considered Kiev Rus as part of their national origins. By classifying the history of Kiev Rus as Russian only, the LC was separating works about Kiev Rus from histories about Ukraine and Belarus, thus symbolically denying a common lineage between the great ancient empire and the modern states of Ukraine and Belarus.

On December 6, 1972, Ivan Kaldor, the newly elected chairperson of SEESHAC, sent a letter to Mumford. "This is to invite you to cooperate in arranging a meeting between representatives of the Library of Congress and a special committee of [SEES and AAASS]," he

⁵⁷ There is no direct documentation that the members of SEESHAC harbored anti-Soviet views, however their proposals for revision as well as the discourse they contributed to suggest an anti-Soviet, anti-Russian position. Turchyn, in particular, published articles about the need for LCC revisions on a couple occasions in the *Ukrainian Weekly*, an English-language newspaper about Ukraine and Ukrainian cultural identity for the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States and Canada. During the Cold War, the paper's owner, the Ukrainian National Association, aided Ukrainians, particularly Ukrainian dissidents, from the "Russocommunist threat" to Ukraine's sovereignty. The organization also established Ukrainian studies departments in American colleges, funded scholarship awards, and erected monuments to Ukrainian artists and thinkers. In the same issue of the paper as one of Turchyn's articles is an article about Ukrainian street names as markers of Ukrainian contributions to American communities. This is to say that when Turchyn was writing about the changes needed in the LCC regarding the classification of Eastern European nations, particularly Ukraine, he was contributing to this Ukrainian nationalist discourse in western society. See Alvin J. Schmidt, *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of American Institutions: Fraternal Organizations* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980), 335. See Andrew Turchyn, "Toward Accuracy in Classification at the Library of Congress," *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 3, 1982: 10 and Stephen P. Holutiak-Hallick Jr. "Ukrainian Street Names Abound Throughout U.S." *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 3, 1982: 11.

wrote. “The professional and political implications of many of the antiquated headings throughout the LC Classification System suggest that this meeting has now been long overdue and would be extremely beneficial for all parties involved.”⁵⁸ On January 30, 1973, the meeting was held between the members of SEESHAC, a few members of AAASS, and members of the LC’s Subject Cataloging Division, including the head of the division, Edward J. Blume. Although Humenuk’s minutes suggest moments of tension, such as Veryha charging the LC with lazy, “slovenly” scholarship, the meeting apparently ended cordially. SEESHAC agreed to send the LC ideas for revision by the ALA Conference in June 1973.⁵⁹

The committee would miss its June 1973 deadline by nearly fifteen months. Much of the blame for its belatedness appears to reside with Kaldor, who had failed to return letters and show up to committee meetings since the initial meeting with the LC in January 1973. Writing to Kaldor in February 1974, Lorković implored him to reengage with the committee’s work to publish a formal proposal for the LC to review. “It is my opinion, that we should not delay it any longer,” she wrote. “If we do, our committee’s reputation will be stained and we shall become just one more proof of the fact that these Slavs should not be taken seriously.”⁶⁰ Conscious of pejorative typecasts of Slavs as inferior, hostile, and uncooperative (typical stereotypes associated with Balkanism), Lorković feared that the committee would lose its credibility and

⁵⁸ [Letter from Ivan Kaldor to Librarian of Congress Mumford, December 20, 1972], Tanja Lorković Papers (MS 1627). Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁵⁹ Stanley Humenuk, Meeting with Members of the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division and the ACRL Slavic Section Committee on LC Classification and LC Subject Heading Use with Respect to Cataloging Slavic and East European Materials: January 30, 1973, Association of College and Research Libraries, Sections Correspondence, 1962-2008, Records Series 22/2/50, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: 3.

⁶⁰ [Letter from Lorković to Kaldor, February 4, 1974], Tanja Lorković Papers (MS 1627). Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

that the librarians would be no closer to revising the LCC than they were when Turchyn sent his first letter to the LC in 1960.

Eventually SEESHAC did achieve its goal of sending revisions to the LC. In November 1974, SEESHAC published a draft report outlining how the LC could revise its schedules. Over one-hundred and forty pages long, this comprehensive proposal primarily focused on Class D and was divided into chapters by subclass. Each chapter included text explaining the revisions being proposed, a justification for why it was needed, and a mock outline of the proposed schedule for the subclass. Each committee member's contribution to the report was based on their subject expertise or role on the committee. As committee chairman, Kaldor wrote the introduction to the report summarizing the history of the committee, the background of its members and basic concerns. Lorković concentrated on problems related to the classification of the Southern Slavs and certain areas of Eastern Europe.⁶¹ Turchyn prepared revised schedules for "ancient history" and the literature of the Slavs and outlined the proposed revised schedule for the Soviet Union.⁶² Veryha developed the proposal for the revision of the history schedules for the Baltics, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Balkan Peninsula. Finally, as the committee's secretary, Humenuk recorded decisions made by the committee throughout the process of writing the proposal and in compiling the report, coordinated the work of his committee mates. This report was widely distributed to many people and organizations including the Library of Congress, Congress people with substantial Eastern European constituencies, diplomats, scholars, and other librarians.

⁶¹ Lorković's exact role is vague in the report. It does not go into any further detail about exactly which areas of Eastern Europe she contributed to. See Slavic and East European Section, Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, *A Proposal for the Revision and Updating of the Library of Congress Classification Schedules and Subject Heading List Pertaining to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and the Balkan Peninsula* (Geneseo, NY: State University of New York at Geneseo, 1974), xi.

⁶² Besides Class D, SEESHAC also proposed revisions for Subclass PG for Literature.

The most extensive revisions proposed by the committee were to Subclass DK. These revisions had three aims. The first was to accurately represent the Soviet Union in the schedule. To do this SEESHAC proposed that the name of the subclass to be changed to “the Soviet Union,” with separate numbers designated to Russian history and the histories of each Soviet republic.⁶³ This change would also solve the issue of designating nations like Poland or Ukraine as localized areas of Russia. Second, was to relieve crowding in the subclass for future subject growth by reclassifying certain nations and cities.⁶⁴ SEESHAC believed that this redistribution would allow for more robust classification of the histories of non-Russian nations and symbolically create more equitable representation of countries in Subclass DK.

The third goal of the revisions was to clearly designate topics relating to common Slavic history under “Eastern Europe” or “Eastern Europe and the Slavs,” so that histories like the history of Kievan Rus’ could not be construed as exclusively Russian. To do this SEESHAC proposed three options. The first was to designate the first forty numbers of Subclass DK to Eastern Europe. This option would involve the complete reclassification of books already under those numbers. The second option was to place Eastern Europe in the open numbers at the end of Subclass DJ for the Netherlands. This second option would not require any reclassification of books, however the grouping of the Netherlands and Eastern Europe was not an ideal match for

⁶³ With the exception to the Soviet Baltic republics (proposed by the committee to be classed in DL with Scandinavian countries) and the Armenian Soviet republic (Classed in Subclass DS). These republics were proposed to be classed separately from the rest of the Soviet republics in accordance with regional precedence over political affiliation. For example, the committee felt strongly that all countries surrounding the Baltic Sea, except Germany and Poland (i.e. Scandinavian countries and the Baltic States) should be classed in Subclass DL.

⁶⁴ For example, the committee proposed that Finland and the Soviet Baltic States be placed in Subclass DL with other Scandinavian countries so that all countries bordering the Baltic Sea (except for Germany and Poland) could be classed together. Furthermore, SEESHAC proposed a reduction of numbers designated to Russian cities, like Leningrad and Moscow. These cities had received thirty-nine and nineteen numbers, respectively, while entire nations like Ukraine and Belarus received only one number of classification.

the same subclass. The third option was the creation of a new subclass altogether, Subclass DJK. This option would require the least amount of reclassification and was described by SEESHAC as the easiest fix to the issue of classifying Slavic history.⁶⁵

In conclusion, the committee proposed Subclass DJK as an option to represent this history as multinational and multiethnic. The proposal of Subclass DJK was an expression nationalism by committee members in so far that it helped to achieve their wish to make the Class D schedule reflect the geopolitical conditions in Europe in the 1970s. This included symbolically recognizing the legitimate independence of non-Russian nations from Soviet Union and Russia domination in the organization of library books. However, the committee's justification for Subclass DJK also suggests an acknowledgement that these independent countries were indelibly linked politically, culturally, and historically. If SEESHAC wanted to represent each independent nation separately in the schedule they might have instead proposed that each nation receive its own subclass, a right that is afforded to some countries like Germany (Subclass DD) and Switzerland (Subclass DQ). The committee however did not advocate for this complete overhaul of the schedule, but rather proposed that Poland and other Soviet Republics be given separate numbers *within* Subclass DK. The committee's proposal suggests its belief that although these countries were independent in the 1970s, they could lay equal claim to a common Slavic lineage that was to be represented in Subclass DJK. While the aim of the committee was to represent non-Russian eastern European nations as distinct from Russia and the Soviet Union, the schedule it proposed also reinforces the notion of Eastern Europe as a unified entity: a

⁶⁵ It is unclear if SEESHAC proposed these options for classifying Slavic history in order of its preference. If so, Subclass DJK would have been its least preferred fix to the issue. The goal of committee was to designate a separate place in the schedule for Slavic history but also suggest a relationship between Slavdom and the Soviet Republics and Poland. With its placement before Subclass DK, Subclass DJK succeeds in indicating this relationship, however if Eastern Europe had been designated to the first forty numbers of Subclass DK this relationship would have been more explicit, as Subclass DK would have represented the Soviet Union, Poland *and* Eastern Europe.

construct was developed during the Enlightenment and given geopolitical validity by the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

The Library of Congress: Class D Revised, 1975- 1990

Although revisions occurred much slower than the committee would have liked, the LC did enact extensive revisions to its Class D schedule. The first of these changes was the revision of Poland's schedule in 1975. These were followed by revisions to Subclass DB, so that Budapest was no longer under "Austrian captivity," as well as the addition of Subclass DJK. With Subclass DJK, the LC explained, it was no longer necessary to equate Eastern Europe with the Soviet Union or the Balkan Peninsula. In its announcement of these revisions in its 1976 annual report, the LC assured that these changes would aid in the LC's efforts to make the schedules "reflect the world of 1976 instead of 1918."⁶⁶ The 1976 revisions were followed by changes to the Czechoslovakia schedule in Subclass DB in 1977 and the schedule for Yugoslavia in Subclass DR in 1982. Additional changes were made to Subclass DK in the 1980s in preparation for the third edition of Class D published in five parts beginning in 1987.⁶⁷ The final revision to Class D was the adoption of Subclass DAW for Central Europe in 1990.⁶⁸ The

⁶⁶ Library of Congress, *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), 10.

⁶⁷ The LC accepted SEESHAC's recommendation to move Finland to Subclass DL. Despite moving Finland, the LC rejected SEESHAC's proposal to also move the Baltic nations to Subclass DL. Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia remain in Subclass DK. The schedule for Poland within Subclass DK also underwent a substantial revision. Along with ensuring that all Polish towns were classed under Poland, and not within other areas of Class D, the LC moved the Polish schedule to the end of Subclass DK by adding a number "0" to all the numbers for Polish history. For example, in 1959 the history of Poland began at DK401, effectively ingrained in the schedule for Russian history. In the third edition of Class D published in the late 1980s, this same history was classed to begin at DK4010. The addition of the "0" was an intentional decision to remove Poland from the schedules for Russia and the Soviet Union. Regarding Russia and the Soviet Union, the LC renamed Subclass DK "the Soviet Union and Poland." It also designated separate numbers for all the Soviet republics, including Soviet Russia. Thus, Kievan Rus', Muscovy, and Imperial Russia were classed as the common history of all Soviet States, not just the Russian state.

incorporation of Subclass DJK in a supplemental revision to the LCC in 1976 shows that the LC accepted SEESHAC's third option for representing general Slavic and Eastern European history. However, the structure of the subclass, as well as the LC's justification for implementing it, suggest that the LC had its own agenda for crafting Subclass DJK that more closely aligned to a desire to represent the region based on American perceptions of Eastern Europe as a seemingly politically and geographically distinct union during the Cold War.

The LC met with SEESHAC only a few times before it published its report in November 1974. As the institution that maintains the LCC, the LC ultimately has the final decision on how its scheme will be structured. SEESHAC may have been formed to "negotiate" with the LC for the changes it wished to see, however it is likely that the LC did not view the LCC as negotiable. Much of the tension between SEESHAC and the LC can be attributed to this disconnect. SEESHAC believed its concerns were entitled to the LC's time and attention, while the LC, thinking internally about its needs and more broadly about the consequences of giving too much attention to the arguments of one interest group, appears never to have intended to make all the changes with the urgency that the committee demanded. Although the LC indicated that the members of SEESHAC and the professional library community had a stake in how the LCC worked, cataloging and classification standards were created and maintained by prioritizing the LC's needs first, while the desires of outside libraries were secondary. During his meeting with

⁶⁸ This subclass appears to have been inserted in the LCC along a similar principle to Subclass DJK. The addition of a third letter was used to ensure the definitive placement of the regional name before the subclass representing the individual nations within the region, in this case Subclass DB- Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia.

SEESHAC in January 1973, Head of Subject Cataloging Edward Blume made the LC's position clear: changes to the LCC would be decided internally.⁶⁹

The formation of a committee to work on classification issues was above and beyond the normal process for submitting concerns to the LC. Typically, the LC asks librarians to submit cataloging and classification issues in writing and, if applicable, with an example of the specific book that prompted the inquiry.⁷⁰ Thus the Library of Congress Archives is full of letters written to the Subject Cataloging Department. From asking for clarification and guidance on classification and cataloging rules to expressing distain for these rules, the LC was receiving (and continues to receive) many requests for comment about its standards.⁷¹ On February 2, 1977, one such letter was sent to the LC concerning the scope of its new subclass, Subclass DJK. The letter garnered a response from Blume. He explained that after years of uncertainty about whether to classify materials about the region – in Subclass DK for Russia, Poland and Finland (the Subclass that represented the largest geographic area of Eastern Europe), or in Subclass DR for the Balkan Peninsula (the most comprehensive Subclass in terms of how many East European countries were represented) – Subclass DJK was established as a separate category. The Balkan Peninsula, he explained, does not extend above Romania and Yugoslavia. “Eastern Europe,” he wrote, “usually means Communist Europe so it frequently does not include Greece and Finland

⁶⁹ Stanley Humenuk, Meeting with Members of the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division and the ACRL Slavic Section Committee on LC Classification and LC Subject Heading Use with Respect to Cataloging Slavic and East European Materials: January 30, 1973, Association of College and Research Libraries, Sections Correspondence, 1962-2008, Records Series 22/2/50, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: 2.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 3.

⁷¹ It is not clear how retention decisions for letters written to LC are decided. As of December 2017, the author was unable to find letters written by SEESHAC to the LC. Obviously, we know these letters were written because copies are stored in other repositories. The letters within the LC Archives today likely represent a small fraction of the total inquiries received by the Subject Cataloging Division.

in actual works but in definition it does, of course. If we use the subject heading for Eastern Europe, it should class in DJK.”⁷²

Blume’s response is rather inconclusive, however, it does give a glimpse into the LC’s thought process for creating Subclass DJK. It suggests that the LC was considering the region both geographically and politically. As Blume aptly recognizes, these two conceptual frames produced different regional outcomes in context of the Cold War. The geographic eastern Europe, simply the eastern half of the continent, was not the same as Eastern Europe, the area comprised of communist countries under Soviet control, because geographic eastern Europe included non-communist nations like Greece and Finland. Classification schemes are comprised of strict groups, however in his correspondence Blume is admitting that the emergence of a politicized notion of the region appears to have made Eastern Europe a somewhat ambiguous region during the Cold War. Is Eastern Europe akin to communist Europe, or is it merely the eastern half of Europe? The LC did not settle this question in the 1980s and it appears that it has declined to make a conclusive definition of Eastern Europe ever since. Indeed, the subject heading for “Europe, Eastern” echoes this conflict stating that Eastern Europe is “the region extending from the western borders of Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Slovenia eastward to the Ural Mountains, and sometimes expanded to include East Germany.”⁷³ The fact that Eastern Europe can sometimes be defined by geographic features or political borders, or by reference to a former communist state, suggests that the LC believes in the

⁷² [Letter from Caroline Fleming to Edward Blume, with Blume response typed below, February 2 and February 12, 1977], Library of Congress Archives: Cataloging Activities, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington D.C.

⁷³ Library of Congress, Linked Data Service, “Europe, Eastern,” <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85045765.html> (accessed February 28, 2018)

concept of Eastern Europe as a valuable category of distinction and description, but that the region itself has different meanings in different contexts.

The Implications of Subclass DJK, 1976-2017

The creation of Subclass DJK highlights the historically constructed nature of Eastern Europe as a regional concept. Both SEESHAC and the LC believed in the existence of Eastern Europe as a salient regional entity which, when properly distinguished in the LCC, would resonate as a meaningful category for library patrons, particularly as Slavic and East European library collections continued to grow. In other words, neither group questioned the East-West framework that validated the term “Eastern Europe” as a distinct category. Instead, each utilized the framework differently based on their relationship to the East-West dichotomy of the Cold War. SEEHAC constructed Subclass DJK as part of its overall goal of representing Eastern Europe as a region composed of independent nations and cultures, to combat perceptions that the countries behind the “iron curtain” were politically or culturally bound to the Soviet Union. As the de-facto national library of the United States, the LC implemented a subclass that reflects American and western notions of the region as politically and culturally unified, although one could argue that it instead revised the individual schedules for nations like Poland and Ukraine to better represent these nations as independent. In this way, Subclass DJK reflects the perception of a Europe divided into East and West halves which emerged during the Enlightenment and was seemingly given validity and permanency under Soviet domination during the Cold War.

Today, this interpretation of the region remains in the LCC. Library practice and the research process sustain this worldview. As the history of Subclass DJK shows, however, the convergence of multiple definitions of Eastern Europe in the development of Subclass DJK in 1970s, serves as another example of the political nature of classification and how the concept of

Eastern Europe is not fixed or objective, but rather is highly influenced by historical context. The structuring of Eastern Europe in Subclass DJK, as well as the inclusion of Central Europe (Subclass DAW) in 1990, showcases how Cold War politics influenced the organization of knowledge. These regional concepts were so politically charged during the Cold War, so intellectually prevalent, that including them in Class D's "map" of Europe would be to maintain a schedule that was out-of-date, and seemingly out-of-touch with prevailing global conditions.

Much of this chapter has been about change and revision, but the story of DJK is primarily about what is sustained. Subclass DJK was created in 1976 as part of an effort to make the Class D schedule reflect Cold War perceptions of geopolitical boundaries in Europe. Although each had different motives for wanting to revise the LCC, Subclass DJK was part of a concerted effort by the LC and SEESHAC to make the schedules reflect current global conditions and conceptions of the prevalence of Eastern Europe in scholarship, libraries, and wider American society. These changes, in addition to the substantial development of Slavic and Eastern European Studies and Librarianship illustrates the power Cold War politics had in creating a seemingly salient regional identity for Eastern Europe. The cover of the 1990 SEES Newsletter included a map of Eastern Europe reprinted from Raymond Ellsworth and John Stuart Martin's *Picture History of Eastern Europe*, with the caption "The Future of Eastern Europe?"⁷⁴ The caption betrays the notion that Eastern Europe was merely a geographic or ethnic distinction in the Cold War period. When the Berlin Wall was destroyed, and Communism collapsed in Eastern Europe, the importance of Slavic librarianship in the United States diminished,

⁷⁴ Association of College and Research Libraries, Slavic and East European Section, "Newsletter" *American Library Association* no. 6 (1990): cover.

prompting a reconsideration Slavic subject expertise in the post-Cold War Era.⁷⁵ The current trends in professional organizations suggest European unity instead of division. In September 2017, SEES and the Western European Studies Section (WESS) of the ACRL merged into the European Studies Section (ESS). Today, Subclass DJK survives, but one of its main advocates in the 1970s does not. Despite the end of the Cold War and the declining intellectual purchase of the concept of Eastern Europe, Subclass DJK continues to exist in the LCC today.

Considering post-Cold War notions of the decreased utility of the East-West framework for understanding Europe, one might ask why we (the LC, librarians in general, researchers, scholars, “society” in the abstract) cannot just get rid of Subclass DJK? There are both practical and intellectual reasons why Subclass DJK persists and will likely remain in the Class D schedule. Shifting the structure of the LCC to reflect current perceptions of subject relationships would involve an extensive revision to the LCC, resulting in the reclassification of books. For the LC, such a revision would require a significant investment of money for staff to develop entirely new classification schedules. For the average library, books would need to be relabeled and subsequently shifted on shelves, causing a massive disruption to library operations and services. To get rid of Subclass DJK would also require librarians to find a new spot in the structure of the classification. Moreover, the act of creating a new classification forces someone to confront the intellectual constraints imposed by the system itself. The LCC prescribes a way of viewing reality – in this case it prescribes a map of Europe – that is based on historical perceptions of difference yet reinforced in the present through library technical services and the research process. With suggested cataloging data provided by the LC, the librarian is inclined to

⁷⁵ Aaron Trehub, “‘Slavic Studies and Slavic Librarianship’ Revisited: Notes of a Former Slavic Librarian,” *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 10 (2009): 171.

comply with what the LC feels is the “best” placement for the content of the book. In terms of how researchers interact with the classification scheme, the LCC requires researchers to search by, and therefore reinforce, the *lingua franca* prescribed by the structure. Subclass DJK, as Ballinger would say, is a “durable afterlife” of the East-West divide of Europe, however this subclass is a particularly powerful remnant of the past because it prescribes a fixed way by which materials about Eastern European history, and European history in general, can be understood, discussed, researched, and organized. In this way, Eastern Europe, and the East-West regional construction it is derived from, continues to exist, in part, because the LC says it does by including it as a category by which to organize information.

Conclusion

In December 2017, I was fortunate to receive a personal tour of the LC's stacks in the Jefferson Building. I saw the DJKs. Nestled in a confusing maze of stacks that span multiple floors of the library's basement storage, they occupied a row and a half of shelving. Perhaps there are more books classed DJK in offsite storage, but what I saw likely comprised most of the LC's collection of the "History of Eastern Europe (general)." According to the LC catalog on May 14, 2018, the LC holds 2,984 books classed under Subclass DJK. Of course, one can find books classed DJK is just about every academic and large research library in the United States. In fact, when I began this project as a graduate student in Spring 2017 my first research visit was to my college's library, Rosenthal Library at Queens College – City University of New York (CUNY), to see its DJK section. This visit could not compare to standing in the basement of the largest library in the world and viewing *the* Subclass DJK section. Amongst a sea of books, it is easy to appreciate the structure of the LCC and the value of a call number. Books must be definitively placed exactly as prescribed by the catalog, or they will be effectively lost to the LC and to its researchers. What is not so apparent in the library space (whether in the closed stacks of the LC or in the open stacks of Rosenthal Library) is the history behind how Subclass DJK came to be. This thesis has sought to remedy this problem by contextualizing Subclass DJK in the political and social history of the Cold War.

Subclass DJK reflects and sustains perceptions of the permanence of Eastern Europe as a regional concept. Although they had distinct reasons for endorsing the inclusion of the subclass in 1976, both SEESHAC and the LC fundamentally believed that including the region as a subclass held value for American libraries. It is no coincidence that the seemingly stark and irreconcilable division between East and West during the Cold War was given virtual

permanence by the LCC in the 1970s. However, the fact that there were various opinions about how this subclass could be utilized in the 1970s underscores the reality that perceptions of differences and regional boundaries shift over time. What may appear salient and intellectually resonant in one historical context appears irrelevant, dated, biased, and offensive in another. Despite the reality that notions of subject differences constantly change, the classification structure sustains past perceptions subject areas, rather than adapting to new ones. This reality cannot be easily observed by librarians and library patrons within the stacks, thus making studies like this one important for understanding how political and social forces in the past and present shape both our physical and intellectual access to information.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Collections:

Association of College and Research Libraries, Sections Correspondence, 1962-2008, Records Series 22/2/50, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Association of College and Research Libraries, Slavic and East European Section Subject Files, Records Series 22/21/6, American Library Association Archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Library of Congress Archives: Cataloging Activities, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington D.C.

Tanja Lorković Papers (MS 1627). Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

Periodicals:

Association of College and Research Libraries Slavic and East European Section. *Slavic & East European Section Newsletter*, [1985-2016].

Library of Congress. *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress*, [1869-2015].

_____. *Library of Congress Information Bulletin*, 1973.

Library of Congress, Processing Services. *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, [1982- 1983, 1985, 1991].

Library of Congress Classification Schedules and Outlines:

Library of Congress. *Classification: Class D- History General and Old World*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Processing Department, Subject Cataloging Division, 1959.

_____. *Classification: Class D- Universal and Old World History*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1916.

_____. *Classification: Class D- Subclasses D-DJ History (General), History of Europe, Part 1*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Processing Department, Subject Cataloging Division, 1990.

_____. *Classification: Class D- Subclasses DJK-DK History of Eastern Europe (General), Soviet Union, Poland*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Processing Department, Subject Cataloging Division, 1987.

- ____. *Classification: Class D- Subclasses DL-DR History (General), History of Europe, Part 2*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Processing Department, Subject Cataloging Division, 1990.
- ____. “Class D- World History and History of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Etc.” https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/classification/lcco/lcco_d.pdf (accessed April 11, 2017)
- ____. “Library of Congress Classification: D-DR Outline- History (General) and History of Europe.” <https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCC/D-DR-outline.pdf>

Other Published Primary Sources:

- Holutiak-Hallick Jr., Stephen P. “Ukrainian Street Names Abound Throughout U.S.” *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 3, 1982.
- “‘Library and Ukrainian Community’ Discussed by Professionals in New York.” *Ukrainian Weekly*. June 19, 1965.
- O’Sullivan, Feargus. “Rediscovered: 250 Missing Feet of the Berlin Wall.” *CityLab*, January 25, 2018, <https://www.citylab.com/life/2018/01/rediscovered-250-missing-feet-of-the-berlin-wall/551363/>
- Rompuy, H. Van. “Remarks by Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council following the EU-US Summit.” EUCO 146/11. November 28, 2011.
- Slavic and East European Section, Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association. *A Proposal for the Revision and Updating of the Library of Congress Classification Schedules and Subject Heading List Pertaining to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and the Balkan Peninsula*. Geneseo, NY: State University of New York at Geneseo, 1974.
- Small, Herbert, comp. *Handbook of the New Library of Congress*. Boston: Curtis & Cameron, 1897.
- Turchyn, Andrew. “Nearly a Century of Errors.” *Library News Letter: Indiana University* 3, no.5 (1968): 17-8.
- ____. “Needed at the Library of Congress: Classification Changes.” *Ukrainian Quarterly* 29 (1973): 179-84.
- ____. “Toward Accuracy in Classification at the Library of Congress.” *Ukrainian Weekly*. October 3, 1982.
- ____. “Slavic Publications: Their Cataloging and Classification in American Libraries.” In *Cataloging and Classification of Non-Western Material: Concerns, Issues and Practices*, edited by Mohammed M. Aman, 297-320. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1980.

Veryha, Wasyl. "Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings Relating to Slavic and Eastern Europe." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 16, no.4 (1973): 470-87.

_____. "Problems in Classification of Slavic Books with Library of Congress Schedules and Subject Headings." *College & Research Libraries* 28, no.4 (1967): 277-83.

_____. "A Proposal for the Revision of the Library of Congress Classification Schedule in History for Eastern Europe." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 21, no 4 (1977): 354-67.

Secondary Sources

Adler, Melissa. "Classification Along the Color Line: Excavating Racism in the Stacks." *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1, no. 1 (2017): 1-32.

_____. *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the Organization of Knowledge*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017.

Adler, Melissa, Jeffrey T. Huber, and A. Tyler Nix. "Stigmatizing Disability: Library Classifications and the Marking and Marginalization of Books About People with Disabilities." *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 87, no.2 (2017): 117-53.

Alger, Aimee. "The Dynamic Caribbean: A Challenge for the Library of Congress." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no.1 (2001): 29-38.

Blouin Jr., Francis X. and William G. Rosenberg. *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Ballinger, Pamela. "Whatever Happened to Eastern Europe?: Revisiting Europe's Eastern Peripheries." *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*. 31, no. 1 (February 2017): 44-67

Byrd, Jacqueline. "In Memoriam: Andrew Turchyn (1912-2004)." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 6, no. 4 (2005): 43-4.

Carra, Regina. "When the Scheme Must Change... Again: The Classification of European History in the LCC, 1916-2017." Master's capstone project, Queens College – CUNY, 2017.

Chan, Lois Mai. *Cataloging and Classification: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007.

_____. "Library of Congress Classification (LCC)." In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, Third Edition*, ed. Marcia J. Bates and Mary Niles Maack, 3383-91. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis, 2010.

- Cole, John Y. *Jefferson's Legacy: A Brief History of the Library of Congress*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1993.
- _____. "The Library of Congress Becomes a World Library, 1815-2005." *Libraries & Culture* 40, no. 3 (2005): 385-98.
- Davis, Jr., Robert H. "The Higher Education Act's Title II-C Entitlement Program (from the Roundtable on Federal Support, AAASS 1990)." In *Essays on Slavic Collections, Bibliography & Bookculture, 1984-2008*, by Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr., 166-168. New York: Ross Publishing, 2010.
- _____. "The History of Slavic and East European Collections in the United States During the Interwar Period: An Agenda for Research." In *Slavic and Russian Books and Libraries: Occasional Essays and Notes*, by Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr., 87-101. New York: Ross Publishing, 2007.
- _____. "'Indispensable to Students in the Slavic Field': A First History of the Development of the Slavic, Baltic, and East European Collections of The Research Libraries, The New York Public Library." In *Slavic and Russian Books and Libraries: Occasional Essays and Notes*, by Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr., 43-59. New York: Ross Publishing, 2007.
- _____. "The New York Public Library's Émigré Readership and Collections: Past, Present, and Future." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 4, no.4 (2003): 63-75.
- _____. *Slavic and Baltic Library Resources at The New York Public Library: A First History and Practical Guide*. New York: New York Public Library, 1994.
- Dickson, Paul. *Sputnik: The Shock of the Century*. New York: Walker & Company, 2001.
- Drabinski, Emily. "Queering the Catalog: Queer Theory and the Politics of Correction," *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 83, no. 2: 94-111.
- _____. "Intersections with Power: Critical Teaching and the Library Catalogue." Video of conference presentation seen on UBC, "Emily Drabinski - Intersections with Power: Critical Teaching and the Library Catalogue," YouTube, July 6, 2016, accessed May 7, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NpCDqBOUY3c>
- Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, "Living with Television: The Violence Profile," *Journal of Communication*, 26 (1976): 172-199.
- Goy, Peter A., comp. *A Biographical Directory of Librarians in the Field of Slavic and East European Studies*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967.
- Hagen, Joshua. "Redrawing the imagined map of Europe: The Rise and Fall of the 'Center.'" *Political Geography* 22, no. 5 (2003): 489-517.

Higgins, Colin. "Library of Congress Classification: Teddy Roosevelt's World in Numbers?" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 50, no.4 (2012): 249-62.

Horecky, Paul L. "The Slavic and East European Resources and Facilities of the Library of Congress." *Slavic Review* 23, no. 2 (1964): 309-27.

Jacob, Elin K. "Classification and Categorization: A Difference That Makes a Difference." *Library Trends* 52, no.3 (2004): 515-40.

Kasinec, Edward. "Yudin's Books in America: A View from the 21st Century," In *Essays on Slavic Collections, Bibliography & Bookculture, 1984-2008*, by Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr., 135-38. New York: Ross Publishing, 2010.

Kundera, Milan. "The Tragedy of Central Europe." *New York Review of Books*. April 26. 1984.

Leich, Harold M. "'What Do You Want to Be... When You Grow Up?' Recollections of a Slavic Librarian Part I: The Cold War, Dartmouth, and University of Illinois Years, 1945-1987." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 12, no. 2/3 (2011): 158-74.

Library of Congress. "General Information," Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/about/general-information/> (accessed May 8, 2017)

Library of Congress, Cataloging and Acquisitions. "Library of Congress Classification." Library of Congress. <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsolcc.html> (accessed May 23, 2017).

Library of Congress, Linked Data Service, "Europe, Eastern," <http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh85045765.html> (accessed May 24, 2017)

Lunt, Horace G. "On the History of Slavic Studies in the United States." *Slavic Review* 46, no.2 (Summer 1987): 294-301.

Okey, Robin. *Eastern Europe 1740-1985: Feudalism to Communism* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Ornstein, Jacob. "Facilities and Activities of the Library of Congress in the Slavic and East European Field." *American Slavic and Easter European Review* 12, no. 4 (1953):549-54.

_____. *Slavic and East European Studies: Their Development and Status in the Western Hemisphere*. Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1957.

Pivovarov, Eugene. "Alexis V. Babine in the Library of Congress." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 3, no. 1 (2002): 59-68.

_____. "Sergius Yakobson in Europe and America." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 11 (2010): 369-79.

Rosenberg, Jane Aiken. *The Nation's Great Library: Herbert Putnam and the Library of Congress, 1899-1939*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1993.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Schöpflin, George and Nancy Wood, eds. *In Search of Central Europe*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1989.

Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York, Oxford Press, 1997.

Trehub, Aaron. "Slavic Studies and Slavic Librarianship in the United States: A Post-Cold War Perspective (Excerpts)." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 10 (2009): 158-69.

_____. "Slavic Studies and Slavic Librarianship' Revisited: Notes of a Former Slavic Librarian." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 10 (2009): 170-84.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.