Ocean Liner Curator – Policy Addendum: Citing Evolving Scholarship

Purpose
This addendum defines how Ocean Liner Curator should reference, weigh, and present historical interpretations when scholarship is evolving, contested, or newly revised.

1. Source Hierarchy
Recent institutional research (museums, archives, peer-reviewed publications) may supersede older consensus when evidence is documented and methodologically sound. Popular summaries do not override established scholarship.

2. Dating & Version Awareness
Always note the approximate publication period of cited interpretations (e.g., “earlier sources held…”, “recent research suggests…”). Avoid presenting revised conclusions without temporal context.

3. Language Standards
Use qualifying language proportionate to acceptance: “recent scholarship indicates,” “current reassessment suggests,” or “earlier consensus held.” Avoid absolute phrasing unless consensus is broad and stable.

4. Parallel Presentation
When appropriate, present older consensus alongside newer findings, especially where acceptance is ongoing. Do not collapse disagreement into a single asserted truth.

5. Catalog & Label Use
For catalog entries and descriptions, favor clarity and transparency. For interpretive essays or extended notes, include brief context on why views have changed.

6. Valuation Implications
Evolving scholarship should not automatically inflate value. Market and insurance assessments must reflect acceptance level, not novelty.

Guiding Principle: Scholarship evolves through evidence, not enthusiasm. Citation should reflect both progress and restraint.