This essay will discuss Turner's theses in two chapters of her book *Cataloguing Culture: Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation*. Each thesis explains the use of colonialism in museum documentation. There are multiple places of evidence throughout each chapter that support her theses. All of what Turner discusses ties into what I have learned in the INF 6210 course with the readings and textbooks. This essay also discusses the intersections and divergences between Turner's book and Buckland's *Information and Society*(2017) and how Buckland's book supports her thesis. Including what I learned from the chapters I read in Turner's book and the questions it created. Also, how they relate to our discussions and how I see the future of libraries.

Turner’s introduction thesis is that documentation media are not neutral forms but can be tied to colonial narratives in current practice; just by looking into anthropology and museum work, we can find a history of bureaucracy and oppression that shows not just why intellectual colonialism happens but how it becomes ingrained in institutions. In the first part of the introduction chapter, she provides multiple places where the evidence supports her thesis. The first one is found on p.4, which states, "Museum records are often taken to be neutral or privilege sources of knowledge, but they are both contextual and historical, as are many bureaucratic practices" (Turner 2020). The next place of evidence is shown on pages 5 and 6. As Turner explains, "At the same time, as many examples in this book will show, narratives belonging to these Indigenous communities were often excluded and considered to be unnecessary for the scientific pursuit of the study of humankind" (2020). Her third piece of evidence is shown on page 7. Turner states, "One of my concerns is the idea of "legacy data," a term used for information attached to museum objects in their records. This information includes names, places, and stories that collectors and museum workers assigned to objects in the past. The term is also a provocation to think critically about how documentation embeds certain narratives and occludes others" (2020). Then her next piece of evidence has to do with Marry Douglas on page 9. During her discussion of Douglas, she states, "In her book she compares "Western" ritual habits around holiness to those of smaller "primitive' cultural groups, as a way to demoralize the practices and beliefs of her contemporaries in the academy and "Western" society" (Turner 2020). Her final piece of evidence can be found on page 15. Turner explains, "As Mannemarie Mol teaches us, such a conceptual starting point supposes that multiple realities are practiced, or "done," and they are situated not in the realm of philosophy but in everyday, routinized work" (2020).

In Turner’s fourth chapter, called *The Pragmatic Classification: The Routine Work of Description after 1950,* her thesis can be found on page 126. Which states, "Unlike in the late nineteenth century, object classifications were not chosen because staff believed in a hierarchical scheme of material culture. Rather, they were chosen because of the functionality or created to solve the technical issues caused by computing and early databases. However, just as in times past, the choice about what terms to use and how to properly describe objects is not neutral, and it tells us something about the way that historic practices remain durable even when specific technologies change"(2020). Similarly, in the introduction chapter, evidence for her thesis is shown. Her first piece of evidence is in her discussion of William Sturtevant and the Union Catalogue. Turner mentions, "Sturtevant's practice was located in an entirely different disciplinary and ideological moment. He saw simplification -for example, the simplification of form and function with the typological method- as fundamentally misrepresentative" (P.127 2020). The next piece of evidence can be found on page 135, which explains the issues with the earlier catalog. Turner explains "Despite the departmental efforts to improve accessions data, the existing records provided the most confusion and dissatisfaction. Some of the information in the card catalogues had been entered decades earlier, and was often inconsistent and inaccurate" (2020). Another piece of evidence can be found on page 129, which states, "Perhaps the most significant change for earlier eras of collecting was the emphasis on collecting objects that showed "foreign influence": objects were not dismissed simply because they showed evidence of cross-cultural contact" (Turner 2020). Another piece of evidence has to do with issues in the catalog and the early computer era. As Turner states, "As it entered the computer era, the NMNH's Department of Anthropology relied on an organization and classification scheme that is regarded as pragmatic" (p.147 2020). Then the last piece of evidence is found on page 148, which states, "The NMNH faced a "universal museum cataloging problem"- the challenge of deciding the information needs of the institution, in addition to the technical limitations imposed by data values and expensive servers" (Turner 2020).

I learned a lot from both the introduction chapter and from chapter four. Learning more about how colonial relations present themselves in museum catalogs and records and the history of anthropology as a paper media technology has co-created our understanding of the past. Both chapters tie into what I learned in the INF 6210 course. For example, it relates to Adler’s *Classification along the Color Line: Excavating Racism in the Stacks* (2017). Adler explains, "The early editions of the Decimal Classification are strikingly similar to the Cutter system with regard to race, anthropology, and slavery" (p.14 2017). Another way it relates is with Drabinski’s *Teaching the Radical Catalog* (2008). On page 3, Drabinski states, "First, the classifications are hierarchical, and prescribe a universalizing structure of "first terms" that masquerade as neutral when they are, in fact, culturally informed and reflective of social power" (2008). It also relates to Duarte and Belarde-Lewis’ *Imagining: Creating spaces for indigenous ontologies* (2015). For example, on page 678, it states, "At its most basic, decolonization work is about the divestment of foreign occupying powers from Indigenous homelands, modes of government, ways of caring for the people and living landscapes, and especially ways of thinking" (Duarte & Belarde-Lewis 2015). The last way it relates is with Rowley and Hartley’s *Organizing Knowledge: An Introduction to Managing Access to Information*(2008). For example, on page 171, they explain, "Some of the major bibliographic classification schemes, most notably the Dewey Decimal Classification Scheme and the Library of Congress Classification Scheme, have had a significant impact on the development of classification practices for documents in both traditional and digital libraries”(Rowley and Hartley 2008).

There are some intersections and divergences in Buckland(2017) when compared to Turner(2020). These intersections can be seen in multiple chapters of Buckland's *Information Society*. For example, in chapter one, Buckland explains, "Documents have increasingly become the means for monitoring, influencing, and negotiating relationships with others" (p. 17, 2017 ). While Buckland is not explicitly discussing reinscribed colonial narratives or colonialism in museum documentation. He explains what Turner discusses about museum documents which are not neutral and have bureaucratic, contextual, and historical ideologies that can monitor, influence, and negotiate relationships with others. However, some divergences are that Buckland only describes how certain things work, such as how the naming of certain things is done or arrangement and description but does not discuss their impact. In chapter 4, Buckland defines description and how it works but does not go into how particular descriptions can be used the way that Turner suggests.

Overall, Buckland’s *Information Society* supports Turner's thesis in multiple ways. For example, one of the intersections between the two is that in chapter 3, Buckland explains how information and one's environment can be influenced. He states, "The ability to influence what is known within a group can have important political, economic, and practical consequences. What people know is a constituent part of their culture and knowing, believing, and understandings always occur within a cultural context. In this way, information always has physical, mental, and social aspects that can never be fully separated" (Buckland 2017 p.38). Another example is shown on page 34, where Buckland discusses descriptive metadata. He states, "A particular problem is that descriptive metadata sufficient for the original compiler of the data is unlikely to be sufficient for someone else who comes to use it, years later, who may not know what the original compiler to took for granted and so did not provide an explanation" ( Buckland 2017 p.34).

However, I also have a couple of questions from the chapters I read. My first question is, are there ways to fix the issues with standardization, and what would be some other ways of doing that? Then my second question is, how do other museums differ from the Smithsonian NMNH, and how would the ramifications change if they are different? These questions relate to what was discussed in the readings, discussions, and other course materials. Including Buckland(2017), which states, "For more than a century there has been gradual international standardization of rules for representing the imprint(where and by whom published), collation(physical features of a document), proper names (authors, institutions, and places), and other attributes of documents" (p.62). He goes on to explain the difficulties with standardization and that there is not much literature on certain parts of standardization. It also relates to Drabinski’s *Teaching the radical catalog* (2008). At the beginning of the article, she gives the example of an information literacy session for a group of college Freshmen about the Library of Congress subject headings on Black and White women. It was found that in order to search for information about women of color, the terms "Black" or "African American" were needed in the search along with the term "women," while in order to search for information on white women, the only term that was needed was women. This leads to what Drabinski explains "While we might wish that LC acknowledged White as a racial category and marker for domination, it does not. LC is rooted in historical structures of White supremacy; as such, the catalog presumes White to be the normative term" (2008 p.198).

Lastly, based on what I learned, I see that the future of libraries is improving catalog systems, the end-user experience, and information retrieval and evaluation. One example of this is the articles I read throughout the course have brought an awareness of the fact that there is bias in cataloging systems, such as Olson’s *The power to name: Representation in library catalogs* (2001), McKinnon’s *Importing Hegemony: Library Information Systems and U.S. Hegemony in Canada and Latin America* (2006), Drabinski’ *Teaching the radical catalog* (2008), and many others. Another example is a short article from Library User Experience Community Blog called *A Library System for the Future* by Kelly Dagan. In her blog post, she states, "What if there were an on-boarding process (linked to orientations) where they could select Areas of Interest, preferred format(s), and library location(s)? What if students entering the site saw Your Research Guides, based on their course enrollments, and Your Librarians, with examples of the types of help they provide?" ( Dagan 2018). The last example comes from Rowley and Hartley's (2008) chapter 10, which states, "It should be self-evident that user satisfaction is an important criterion by which to evaluate a retrieval system. Even if a system has been shown to perform well in terms of retrieval effectiveness and usability, it is of little value if its potential users are dissatisfied with the experience of using the system" (p.298). In the future, I also feel that library services will be improved due to UX or user experience-librarians work.
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