

UCLA

InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies

Title

Perpetuating and Extending the Archival Paradigm: The Historical and Contemporary Roles of Professional Education and Pedagogy

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7wp1q908>

Journal

InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 5(1)

ISSN

1548-3320

Authors

Gilliland, Anne
White, Kelvin

Publication Date

2009-02-20

DOI

10.5070/D451000648

Peer reviewed

Introduction

In April 2006, a group of Native American and non-Native American archivists, librarians, museum curators, historians, and anthropologists gathered for a conference at Northern Arizona University to identify best professional practices for culturally responsive care and use of American Indian archival material held by non-tribal organizations. Emanating out of that conference was a draft set of *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials*. The Protocols, which urge archivists and librarians to consider Native American perspectives on professional policy and practice issues, have become the subject of much discussion and debate within the archival profession in the United States. The framers of the Protocols “hope that the lines of communication opened by this work will serve as the genesis for an ongoing national discussion around different approaches to the management, preservation, and transmission of Native American knowledge and information resources” (First Archivist Circle, 2007). With more than 5,000 members, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) is one of the largest and most prominent professional archival associations in the world. The Protocols were presented to the SAA Council for endorsement at its August 28, 2007 meeting. In response, the Council formed a Task Force and called for comment from its membership:

The SAA Council is taking the opportunity to disseminate widely, and call broadly for comment on, the Protocols because the Protocols encompass some significant and substantial changes in archival theory and practice (such as: giving Native American communities authority to restrict access to collections not only unrestricted by the donor but open and used by researchers for many decades past; and noting expectations for repatriation of certain material similar to that required under the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]). On the other hand, the Protocols include a wide range of actions that repositories can take to show respect for Native American people, some of which are already within traditional archival best practices (for example: informing Native American communities that one’s repository holds research collections related to their culture is basic outreach; working with Native American communities to ensure that relevant collections take account of their perspective in descriptions not only balances what may be culturally biased or offensive descriptions, but increases the research value of the collections by adding additional context).

At a minimum, the SAA Council believes that the Protocols give the archives profession the chance to examine its practices in light of a now global effort on the part of native populations to reclaim certain ethical and legal rights over property, at least some of which was acquired from them or created about them under circumstances that would not be tolerated today. Native peoples

around the globe have been involved in negotiating partnerships with the scholarly communities in their nations for changed relationships toward stewardship of human remains, recognition of indigenous intellectual property rights, and other cultural stewardship issues. To be sure, however, such negotiations have not been without difficulties, and thoughtful critics have emerged to challenge some indigenous claims. The archives profession should enter this conversation with as deep and broad a perspective as possible, benefiting from the theory and practice of other professions. Archivists are being asked to join anthropologists, archeologists, ethnobotanists, and other professionals in examining their past and current practices in regard to Native populations. (Society of American Archivists, 2007)

After discussion of the Task Force report, SAA Council announced at its annual conference in San Francisco in August, 2008 that it would not endorse the *Protocols*. Instead, the Council called for a 3-year period of debate and discussion as a means for arriving at better mutual understandings between non-Native and Native archivists. It should be noted that according to the 2005 A*Census conducted by SAA, only 1.9 % of its members reported being Native American, and a total of 11.2% of members reported belonging to any minority group, so the professional membership is overwhelmingly white (Banks, 2006). At a meeting of the Native American Round Table at the same conference, one Native archivist laid out four dimensions upon which archival ideas and practices can be based: the physical, the intellectual, the emotional, and the spiritual. She stated that Native archivists must consider all four, while non-Native archivists focus only on the physical and intellectual dimensions of archival materials and related practices. This statement vividly illustrates differences between paradigmatic aspects of archival thought and practice as promulgated through university and government programs designed to educate and train future professionals and scholars of Archival Science and the practices, objects, and beliefs around which many Indigenous groups around the world base their record and memory-keeping activities. Because many Native American groups in the United States have sovereignty status, their concerns about the handling of Native American materials by non-Native repositories and archivists have a distinctive legal basis to which archivists throughout the country must address themselves. However, there are many other communities without sovereignty rights whose ability to work with their own record according to their own practices has also historically not been recognized, or has been undermined by dominant groups. The archival profession and the education that supports it have played an important, often unreflexive, role in perpetuating these situations, right into the present day.

This article, therefore, analyzes the lineage of education and pedagogy in Archival Science, and deconstructs the concept of Archival Science by examining the development and evolution of its key ideas and principles, and the historical

interplay between them and such constructs as modernism, objectivity, scientific management, nationalism, sovereignty, and colonialism. It argues that archival education, which traditionally has included elements of both professional practice and scholarship and which has only scantily reflected upon the pedagogies it has employed, has played a fundamental role in perpetuating the cultural hegemony of dominant groups. It has done so by inculcating these ideas and principles without simultaneously providing sufficient historical analysis of their derivations or original intent, and without nurturing a critical perspective that would encourage sensitivity on the part of future archival professionals and scholars to the cultural and social implications of what are often regarded as “value-neutral” concepts and practices, particularly in terms of their impact on the record-keeping and memory practices of marginalized and underrepresented groups. The authors argue that although debates over the locus of archival education and core knowledge and skill requirements have recurred globally over the past 200 years, the role and prevailing methods of archival education have never been examined in terms of how they might promote more reflexive and inclusive archival theory and practice. The authors conclude by positing that a critical culturally relevant pedagogy (CCRP), discussed in detail in the companion article, could support pluralization of the archival paradigm.

Archival Ideas About Records

The practice of archivy has always been concerned, first and foremost, with the records of those with the need, the capability, and the power to keep written evidence of their activities. Records are defined by archivists in professional glossaries variously as written or printed work of a legal or official nature that may be used as evidence or proof; document; data or information that has been fixed on some medium that is created or received in the course of individual or institutional activity and set aside or preserved for future reference; and as objects that have content, context, and structure and that are used as an extension of human memory or to demonstrate accountability.¹ Records have been created and preserved since the earliest days of written cultures in order to enable efficient and accountable governance, to legitimate and perpetuate ruling administrations, to support commerce, and to sustain colonial and missionary infrastructures. In the region where Europe and Asia converge, historically referred to as the Fertile Crescent, surviving documentation indicates the routine creation and use of records as part of administrative activities of government and commerce such as tax collection, property transactions, and the levying of tolls on transit in and out of cities and towns. Records were also created and used to document and establish royal lineages, rights, and privileges. The Egyptians created censuses of conquered territory in order to document property ownership

and the availability of humans for labor and military conscription. Egyptian paintings indicate the use of architectural records created on papyri and carried to construction sites by architects. The Romans developed a system of records registration which became integral to the administration of Roman Law and which was exported throughout the Roman Empire. This registry system was subsequently adopted by and further disseminated by the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches, and reinforced throughout southern Europe and much of the New World by means of national juridical systems based in Civil Law.

Over time, such records increasingly captured not only administrative, but social aspects of changing European societies and emerging nations. In a tower in a castle straddling the Dutch and German border, feudal estate records today not only reveal the business of managing an estate that found itself at different points within multiple national jurisdictions—such as levying taxes and militia, estate accounts, and building plans—but also provide insight into the complexities of the interdependent social hierarchies, roles, and obligations that made feudalism possible. Mercantile records of a wealthy clothmaking family in a small textile town in Medieval and Renaissance Tuscany reveal in their meticulousness not only the vast trade network supporting wool flow from northern Europe and of Islamic textiles and designs from the east to Tuscany and the subsequent distribution of completed cloth products across Europe, but also provide detailed insight into the evolving guild processes of the regulation and manufacturing of cloth. They also chronicle decades of daily, intimate letters between the head of the family and his wife, during which the entire painful process of her learning to write—at her own insistence, even though ladies of the time were not educated to write—rather than continue to be reliant upon dictating to a clerk.

Over the past two millennia, but particularly over the past 500 years, practices associated with the keeping of administrative records have been decreed, discerned, debated, and gradually rationalized (predominantly, as might be expected, in Europe) into what we now consider to be the paradigm of theory and practice that underpins modern Archival Science.²

Development, Codification, and Spread of Archival Ideas

Certain key tenets of Archival Science, distinctive among those professions that claim to be engaged with contemporary information management, have deep roots in early administrative record-keeping and in the importance to empires and emerging nation-states of bureaucratic records as evidence of administrative, legal, and fiscal activities, as well as of various rights and obligations. The central tenets of archival theory today—the principles of *respect des fonds* and provenance, and the Sanctity of Original Order—can be traced back directly to historical, pragmatic record-keeping practices that were developed to

keep pace with the need to organize changing forms of recording media. For example, as archival historians such as Ernst Posner, Maynard Brichford, and Luciana Duranti have pointed out, in the late second millennium, B.C.E, Sumeria and the Third Dynasty of Ur maintained records in clay containers by subject, and within containers, by order of creation or receipt. In Classical and Imperial Rome, the bound codex was used to fix the original order of relationships between records and this practice was applied in the Vatican Archives, established between the third and fourth centuries, A.D.

As populations and kingdoms began to stabilize and to conceive of themselves as nations with distinctive identities, archives in the modern sense of fixed repositories of records began to be established, and these led to the need for some kind of acceptable archival management practices and, ultimately, for mechanisms for developing a body of individuals with the necessary knowledge and skills to manage those archives. In the thirteenth century, the first archival inventories and regulations were developed by records custodians, and by the sixteenth century, archival practices began to be rationalized and disseminated beyond institutional and national boundaries within Europe by means of archival treatises.³ Between 1552 and 1738, Charles Du Molin, Jacob von Rammingen, Cesare Baronio, Ahsaver Fritsch, Faranciscus Neveu, Nicolaus Glussianus, Friedrich Rinckhamer, and Francisco Schmalzgrueber all wrote treatises on legal concepts related to archives. However, the first two texts that could be considered manuals that compiled existing archival knowledge were written by Italians Alberto Barisoni (1587-1667; *De Archivis commentarius*) and Baldassarre Bonifacio (*De Archivis*, 1631). According to Duranti (1998), “all the [above] authors... based their analyses on the Roman concept of archival documents derived from their uninterrupted custody in the archives of a sovereign body” (p. 3).

Between the late sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, archival regulations issued by the new European nation-states began to proliferate and were also extended to governance of colonies in the New World, evidencing the role that records and archives were playing in supporting the development of colonial legal and administrative infrastructures. For example, in 1588, Philip II of Spain published the *Instrucción para el gobierno del Archivo de Simancas* (Instructions for Governing the Archives of the Simancas) that applied the principle of provenance to the organization of title deeds or *escrituras*. In 1790, Carlos IV of Spain introduced *Ordinances* governing the handling of the recently created *Archivo General de Indias* (General Archive of the Indies) proposing that it be maintained according to its original order. The purpose of the *Archivo General de Indias* was to gather together all the documents relating to Spanish administration in the Americas and Philippines that had been held in the now overwhelmed *Archivo General de Simancas* (the central archives of the Spanish Crown) as well

as all future documents in order to facilitate writing the history of the Spanish presence in the Americas. Today areas of the world that were under Spanish or Portuguese administration still create and retain records according to the strict protocols established through the Civil Code. Countries such as Australia and Canada that fell under British rule or trading and banking enterprises also perpetuated the European registry system, albeit within a Common Law framework in most jurisdictions. The one notable exception is the United States, possibly because it ceased to be a colony before colonial record-keeping practices were fully articulated and institutionalized, but likely also because of a distrust by increasingly geographically dispersed colonists of the central governmental control that the registry system represented.

A watershed in the development of archival ideas occurred following the 1789 French Revolution. It is remarkable that one of the early acts of the new government was the issuance of the Messidor Decree, which asserted the principle of accessibility of archives to the citizenry, not just to those in power, and which underscored the historical as well as administrative value of records. The Decree required that there should be a central archival repository for all of France. In 1794, the approximately 1,225 archives that existed throughout France were consolidated into the Archives Nationales, which was to serve as a parliamentary archives office of the Assemblée Nationale and as a vehicle through which France's citizenry could hold its rulers accountable. Armand Gaston Camus, a Parisian lawyer and revolutionary, was named Archivist of the Assembly and directed the French archives until his death in 1804. The involvement of the French government in archival affairs did not end there, however. In 1839, François Guizot, French Minister of Public Instruction, issued regulations regarding the principle of *respect pour le fonds*. The principle stated that records should be grouped according to the nature of the institution that has accumulated them, and was to be applied to the records of the départements (counties) in the Archives Nationales. In 1841, Count Duchatel, French Minister of the Interior, issued a circular entitled *Instructions pour la mise en order et le classement des archives departementales et communales* elaborating on Guizot's regulations for the arrangement of departmental and communal archives. This conceptualization was further formalized in the same year by Natalis de Wailly, head of the Administrative Section of the Royal Archives.

The practice of governments issuing regulations regarding the specifics of record-keeping and archival practice underscores the power relationships at work within the archival paradigm, and lest it be thought of as an historical occurrence, it should be noted that it still happens regularly today. A particularly prominent and influential recent example has been the passage in the United States of the 2002 Sarbanes-Oxley Act (Pub. L. No. 107-204, 116 Stat. 745) as an effort to hold corporations accountable through more transparent business practices.

Sarbanes-Oxley has affected the business community worldwide since all companies publicly trading in the United States must comply with the Act's stringent digital and paper records management requirements.

By the end of the eighteenth century, with the consolidation and contestation of boundaries between nation-states, as well as the encroachment of Protestant and secular rulers on lands held by the Roman Catholic Church, the need to use archival documents to prove patrimonial rights, particularly ecclesiastical, resulted in the development of a set of techniques for ascertaining authenticity. These techniques, which focus on understanding the genesis (including the documentary, administrative, and juridical contexts), the persons involved in creation, and the extrinsic and intrinsic elements of form of individual documents, formed the basis of what came to be referred to as the Science of Diplomats and the discipline of Special Diplomats. Beyond influencing archival practice, Diplomats was also a key intellectual influence in the development of modern historical methodology and the legal theories of evidence. As with archival practice, the science and practice of Diplomats were explicated in a series of contemporary texts.

In the early nineteenth century, archives were actively being used to support the emerging national identities of nations forming out of the Napoleonic Empire. By the mid-1830s, three leading Prussian archivists, Friedrich L. von Medem, Ludwig F. Hofer, and Heinrich A. Erhard published the *Zeitschrift für Archivkunde, Diplomatie und Geschichte*. According to Maynard Brichford (1982), this publication "marked the beginning of the debate over the future of archives newly freed from their former role as private repositories of the rulers. The three editors debated archival independence, the right of disposal, and the extent of archival responsibilities". Further landmark publications followed, including Heinrich von Sybel's 1881 *Regulative für die Ordnungsarbeiten im Geheimen Staatsarchiv* in Prussia, which articulated the principle of provenance or *Proviensprinzip* as a more precise delineation of ideas contained within the principle of *respect pour le fonds*. American archival theorist, Theodore Schellenberg (1961), in explaining these ideas to an American archival audience, noted that, "Regulations for arrangement work at the Prussian State Archives ... provided that public records should be grouped according to their origins in public administrative bodies" (p.151). The Prussians also formulated the principle of *Registraturprinzip*, or the Principle of Original Order, which stated that, "Official papers are to be maintained in the order and with the designations which they received in the course of the official activity of the agency concerned" (Schellenberg, 1961, p.156).

The most influential articulation of archival principles proved to be a manual published in Groningen in 1898 by three Dutch archivists, Muller, Feith, and Fruin, the *Manual on the Arrangement and Description of Archives*. A

remarkably straightforward text, this manual for the first time clearly and concisely delineated and elaborated upon the concepts and principles of archival arrangement and description that had evolved over the prior three centuries in European countries and especially in Prussia. The *Manual* upheld the Principles of *respect des fonds* and Provenance as the two fundamentals of archival theory and practice. It was subsequently translated and published in 1905 in Germany, 1908 in Italy, 1910 in France, 1940 in the United States, and 1960 in Brazil, and became the fundament upon which the twentieth century archival paradigm was based. In 1909, American historian Waldo Gifford Leland argued in favor of the principles articulated by Muller, Feith, and Fruin in his keynote address “American Archival Problems” presented at the First Conference of Archivists sponsored by the American Historical Association (AHA). In notes for the 1912 AHA report, Gifford wrote:

I think it is Langlois who estimates that in France, before the Revolution, there were upwards of 10,000 depositories of archives and in Paris alone many hundred. America of the 20th century, is as regards its care for the chief source of its history, about on a level with pre-revolutionary France, - perhaps indeed a trifle lower, for pre-revolutionary France had a king, and royal pride has always constituted one of the surest safe guards of a nation’s archives. The story of American archives – is one to craze the historians, to amaze the lay-man, and to leave the law-maker unconcerned as ever. It is a story in which the principal facts are assigned to the villain, and yet, strange to say, although the tale must be left but half-told, there are not lacking signs of promise for a satisfactory dénouement.

... As public archives present a complete record of public acts it follows that any alienation of portions of the archives make the record incomplete, while the incorporation of extraneous matter makes the record confused. Hence the necessity of maintaining the archives and any collections of historical manuscripts that may have become public property mutually distinct and separate, physically as well as theoretically. This is one of the fundamental principles of what we may call the science or economy of archives. Yet it is a principle that has been violated constantly in America. Even the enlightened policy that directs the Library of Congress has not always observed it. Not long ago the archives of the House of Representatives were offered to the Library. Instead of accepting them as a whole or rejecting them as a whole, the Library made what it termed a selection, that is it went through a quite inaccurate and misleading list that had been prepared in the House file room and selected a small number of bundles of papers which were supposed to be personnel[?] of unusual value. These bundles were placed with the collections of historical manuscripts in the Library; the remainder of the archives stayed in the attic of the House wing and in the metal file boxes of the file room.

Such an action not only violated the principle already set forth, but it violated another principle of archive economy, equally fundamental – that of the

respect des fonds: this untranslatable term means simply that the records of any administrative unit have in themselves a unity that is quasi-organic. The whole is necessary for an understanding of any of its parts, and a dispersion of these parts makes each and all of them unintelligible. Thus in the preservation of archives the records of each administrative unit must be preserved together. Further-more they must be so arranged that they reflect and make clear the processes by which they came into existence.

This principle of the *respect des fonds* has been so consistently violated in America that it is difficult to secure any recognition of it as a principle. When Joseph Felt arranged that great mass of colonial and provincial records known as the Massachusetts archives he cheerfully and conscientiously ignored the principle every hour that he worked. He had, it must be confessed, a precedent – of which he was doubtless quite ignorant – in the work of no less a personage than Daunou whose manipulation of the Archives Nationales has for nearly a century been the despair of French archivists and historians. When the collection of Continental Congress Papers was divided, a part of it going to the Library of Congress and the rest remaining to the Department of State, the principle was again shattered. And these are only two of hundreds of incidents.

It is not strange however that the principles of a science (or art or economy) that was developed in Europe only within the last fifty years should have been or should still be unappreciated in America. We should perhaps not quarrel with ourselves on that account. What is strange, however, what is even more dishonoring than strange is our failure to appreciate the importance of the public archives, and to make provision for their preservation. The history of our archives is one of the grossest neglect and indifference.

In the summer of 1910 four Americans attended an international congress of archivists that was held in Brussels. One of the officials of the congress, expressing his surprise at an American attendance said “but I thought there were no archives in America.” He was told that there were indeed archives in America, but that there were, was due mainly to the benevolence of Providence, and not due to the sagacity and foresight of government. (Leland, 1912)

The Conference of Archivists was instrumental in the founding of the U.S. National Archives in 1934 and the development, promotion, and improvement of other archives in America, and continued to meet annually until the founding of the Society of American Archivists in 1936.

Articulation and codification of archival principles continued into the twentieth century, and as the century progressed, new concerns began to emerge that related both to changing bureaucratic and record-keeping practices and media. Again, these were initiated in Europe, notably in England, but with the founding of the United States National Archives and the need for its staff to articulate a body of principles and practices for managing what were

overwhelmingly modern records, increasingly the United States took the lead. The most influential treatises of this period were *A Manual of Archive Administration*, published in London in 1922 and written by Sir Hilary Jenkinson, Keeper of the Public Record in England, and *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, written by Theodore Schellenberg of the newly created United States National Archives. Published in 1956, the latter text essentially engaged and reinterpreted European archival theory and practice in light of the particular challenges with modern records faced by what had become one of the world's largest bureaucracies—the U.S. Federal Government. Together with Muller, Feith, and Fruin's *Manual*, these texts became the core texts of Anglo-American archival education and practice right up until the late 1980s, when the challenges posed by records created, maintained, and distributed using digital technologies led to an unprecedented research movement examining whether notions such as Provenance and Original Order, or even of originality and authenticity held in this new environment.

Interactions with the History and Library Professions

Historical scholarship was also going through profound changes during the nineteenth century, first in Europe and then in the United States, which included its development as a recognized professional discipline and the rise of modern objective or scientific history promoted by Prussian scientific historian Leopold von Ranke. Ranke was a professor at the University of Berlin from 1827 to 1866 where he pioneered the seminar system. Ranke believed in objective fact as the basis for history. His scientific method of historical investigation, which he personified himself through his research in archives across Europe, emphasized exhaustive archival research and textual analysis of the sources. "Let the sources speak for themselves" was his call to historians. He insisted on using only contemporary accounts and related material as sources for historical writing, and research was to be documented with footnotes. His method spurred the development of modern source-based history as a professional and academic discipline. It had related archival consequences—these new historians, particularly those who had been American students who had traveled to Berlin to study with Ranke and then returned to the United States and participated in the AHA—began to agitate for the development of archival repositories and trained archivists to oversee them, eventually becoming an important part of the founding of the U.S. National Archives. One of Ranke's students, Max Duncker, became director and other former students of Ranke's, such as Heinrich von Sybel, staffed the Prussian State Archives in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and contributed to its burgeoning scholarly reputation.

Programs to publish documentary editions of historical sources also

became popular, especially in the United States, which at that time had only a very nascent archival infrastructure in the form of a few state historical societies, no national archives, no archival manuals or guidelines, no legal mandate to manage administrative records, and no mechanism for training archivists. Indeed, the drive to publish, rather than preserve archives, was based not only in the difficulties of travel across the new country and concerns about the risk of fire to any accumulation of unique records, but also in a strong distrust of centralized control and authority, as might be represented in a national archival repository. It was, therefore, associated with emergent American notions about democracy and accessibility that were different from those that fueled the establishment in France of the Archives Nationales.

In the nineteenth century, Archival Science also started to contemplate whether the developing field of Library Science might have something to offer. There was experimentation in France with applying library approaches to the arrangement and description of archives. Pierre Claude-François Daunou, a cleric and educator from Boulogne, succeeded Camus and became director of the Archives Nationales from 1804 until 1815, and again in the 1830s. He is said to have had library training and reorganized the Archives according to a subject and function-based arrangement system that became known as the Principle of Pertinence. This approach was further reinforced by Natalis De Wailly in 1861, who argued in support of the encyclopedic approach to classifying collections. This system turned out to be disastrous for archival practice, since it deconstructed the natural organic relationships between the records in ways that could not subsequently be reconstructed by archivists or scholars. These experiences reinforced the effectiveness of archival arrangement and description theory that was based around longstanding practices that documented the administrative history of the organization, the nature of records, the circumstances of their creation, and the complex relationships that exist between creators, record-keeping functions and processes, and the records themselves. However, interest in training archivists in professional library practices reemerged in the twentieth century to assist with burgeoning modern records and new record-keeping and information technologies, especially in the United States after the founding of the National Archives in 1934. Solon J. Buck, then Director of Publications at the new National Archives and the first person to offer a course in the United States in Archival Science (at Columbia University), wrote to Professor Austin P. Evans in the Department of History at Columbia that

While it is true that the work of archivists is very different from that of librarians, I am inclined to think that it might be desirable for would-be archivists to take some work in classification and cataloging in a library school, at least until such time as courses in the classification and cataloging of archives are worked out. After all, the fundamental principles involved in handling the two

types of material are somewhat the same. (Solon J. Buck, February 14, 1936)

As the twentieth century as well as information technology progressed, archival education was to be established within both History, especially Public History, and Library Science programs in the United States, and unlike Europe, never had a strong independent professional education tradition.

Archives and archivists were subjected to a new criticism in the second half of the twentieth century by historians embracing the social history movement that archives were only relevant to the study of large and elite organizations. The rise of “new” social history from the 1960s onwards produced social historians interested in the ordinary individual, and in understanding phenomena such as social structures and the nature of communities, rather than in the bureaucratic activities of mainstream institutions or social elites. This, together with social movements in the United States and Europe, brought increasing pressure on archivists to be proactive in documenting minority groups, social movements, and scientific practices, and resulted in the articulation of the “documentation strategy” by archivists such as Hans Booms in West Germany and F. Gerald Ham in the U.S. Social history also increased pressure on archivists to introduce subject- as well as provenance-based access points to their collections.

Rise of International Collaboration

One final factor must be acknowledged in any discussion of the spread of archival ideas—already alluded to above in reference to Daunou as well as by Leland—and that is the impact of international interaction and collaboration between historians, archivists, documentalists, and librarians between the end of the nineteenth century and the start of the Second World War. In 1895, the International Institute for Bibliography (IIB; subsequently the International Federation for Information and Documentation, or FID) was founded by two lawyers, Paul Otlet and Henri La Fontaine, fascinated with emerging ideas of classification and the international organization of bibliography. The organization was interested in the creation of systems of document organization and distribution that unified library, archival, and documentalist practices. In 1910 the International Congress of Libraries and Archives convened in Brussels during the World’s Fair and was the first organized meeting of European and American archivists. The Congress was promoted by the *Association des Archivistes et Bibliothécaires Belges* founded by Joseph Cuvelier at the turn of the century in Brussels as an outgrowth of the IIB. Discussion at the Congress focused in particular on the Muller, Feith, and Fruin *Manual*, which Cuvelier had been involved in publishing that year in French. As a result, the concept of provenance advocated by the manual was formally endorsed by the Congress as “the basic

rule” of the profession. The First World War disrupted the interactions between archivists at an international level. Faced with widespread destruction of archives and records, archivists realized that they needed to work cooperatively to address the aftermath of the war as well as to develop better ways to protect and preserve records. Various projects were initiated, first under the auspices of L’Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle (the Institute for Intellectual Cooperation, the predecessor body to UNESCO) and later by the Committee of Expert Archivists of the League of Nations. These projects included an attempt to develop a directory identifying archives, and an international lexicon or dictionary of archival terminology that was proposed in 1933. Neither of these projects came to fruition at that time.

To help deal with such issues, the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) had been established in 1927, and in 1946, Solon J. Buck, by then the second Archivist of the United States and President of the Society of American Archivists, called for the establishment of an agency to administer international archives and an international professional association for archivists. The International Council of Museums (ICOM) was established in 1947. In the same year, representatives of the Society of American Archivists took a proposal for an international archives program to the UNESCO General Conference in Mexico where it was adopted, and a small budget was allocated to organize a meeting of official delegates in Paris during UNESCO’s first General Conference in 1948 to vote on the proposed constitution. At the Paris meeting, it was decided that UNESCO “should encourage the creation of an organization of professional archivists” and in the same year the International Council on Archives (ICA) was established with the support of UNESCO and headquartered in Paris. Charles Saraman, Director-General of the Archives de France, was first chairman. The first ICA assembly was held in 1950 in Paris with more than 350 archivists from 24 countries in attendance. Proceedings were published in the first volume of *Archivum*. The ICA, with financial backing from UNESCO, began its first long-term project, *Guides to the Sources of History of Nations*, in 1958. The Elsevier *Lexicon of Archival Terminology* was published in 1974 after 10 years of work in an attempt to define and rationalize archival terminology across archival traditions. In 1979, UNESCO began to publish the *RAMP Studies Series*, which were authored by well-known, predominantly European and American archivists on a wide range of archival topics, and distributed in multiple languages around the world. They were particularly influential in regions such as Africa and Latin America. ICA began to play a role in developing archival standards and, in particular, a suite of descriptive best practices starting with the 1993 *ISAD(G)*, *General International Standard Archival Description*. In 1995, the Executive Committee of the ICA adopted a statement on the settling of disputed claims, the main concepts and principles of which were the inalienability of public records,

respect for the integrity of the *fonds*, right of access and reproduction, and equity and international cooperation.

The Contingency of Archives and the Archival Paradigm

As the preceding discussion illustrates, archives and the archival paradigm are highly contingent upon their legal, administrative, and cultural contexts, and upon political and historical events. European archivists, as part of their education, are trained in several ancillary fields such as Diplomacy, Paleography, and History, and that helps them to understand the nuances of the social and cultural as well as the administrative contexts of the records with which they work. Thus, a fundamental archival principle such as *respect des fonds*, which literally means respecting the organic wholeness of the records—how they relate to each other, how they relate to and reflect the people or communities and practices by whom or through which they were created, and even what they mean and represent to those people and communities—should remain today a powerful vehicle for securing and honoring the cultural and social aspects of the record. However, the principle of *respect des fonds* has been more narrowly interpreted in recent years, in an era of information management and automation of the archives, as the *principle of provenance*, a principle that upholds the notion of records being organized collectively according to the source that created them. Many of the wonderful organic social and cultural nuances that are caught up in the terms *respect* and *fonds*—the source, the origin, the beginning—have been allowed to slip away.

Indeed, many elements have conspired to detract from the potential of such principles as *respect des fonds* to empower the record and all the communities to which it relates. Newer conceptualizations of the archival role in society, such as to hold governments accountable to their citizenry, support historical research, to manage the flood of documentation resulting from newer recording and reproduction technologies, or to document personal lives and social movements, emerged as a result of socio-political developments including the rise of the European nation-state, the modern scientific history movement, the upheaval and dislocation caused by two World Wars, the rise of Communism and socialist movements worldwide, and the collapse of colonialism. Duranti (1998), for example, has argued that the related principle of *provenance*, “as applied to appraisal [that is, in from the twentieth century onwards when archives began to be much more discriminate about the records they preserved because of the burgeoning volume of paper records], leads us to evaluate records on the basis of the importance of the creator's mandate and functions, and fosters the use of a hierarchical method, a 'top-down' approach, which has proved to be unsatisfactory because it excludes the 'powerless transactions,' which might throw light on the

broader social context, from the permanent record of society”. Archives are also instrumental in the political economy of information and more generally, in the social and political economy of nations, governments, communities, and organizations. Archivists, however, have long taken the position that they are a disinterested party in the long-term preservation and use of records. This is a position that indisputably has helped archivists to engender sufficient trust on the part of records creators that they will turn records over to the archives, rather than abandon or even destroy them when they no longer need them on a regular basis. These records are then preserved for use by posterity, both to laud the achievements of prior administrations, and to hold them accountable for actions that they carried out. In recent years, this view of the archivist—one of objectivity and impartiality—has been critiqued for its lack of proactivity and challenged in light of postmodern reflections which, over the past quarter century, have charged that, far from being disinterested and value-neutral, the archives and the archivist wield significant amounts of power. Archival scholars Cook and Schwartz (2002) write that

Archives—as institutions—wield power over the administrative, legal, and fiscal accountability of governments, corporations, and individuals.... Archives—as records—wield power over the shape and direction of historical scholarship, collective memory, and national identity...[and] archivists—as keepers of the archive—wield power over those very records central to memory and identity formation...[through] their appraisal and selection [of records] as archives, and...[through] their constantly evolving description, preservation, and use [of the record]. (p. 2)

In the essay that was used to inaugurate the new international scholarly archival journal *Archival Science*, Cook (2002) writes that

The role of archival science in a postmodernist world challenges archivists everywhere to rethink their discipline and practice. A profession rooted in nineteenth-century positivism, let alone in earlier diplomatics, may now be adhering to concepts, and thus resulting strategies and methodologies, that are no longer viable in a postmodern and computerized world. Even “archival science,” as a term and a body of knowledge, raises conceptual problems, quite aside from the impact of postmodernism, that need clarification in the new realities in which we live and work. Do these changes amount to a paradigm shift, as the editors invited me to address, or is the profession merely adapting its principles, as it has before, to new media and new record-creating techniques? In this essay, I confirm my answer elsewhere that an archival paradigm shift is indeed occurring, and will grow in intensity in the new century to challenge how archivists think and thus how they do their work.

At the heart of the new paradigm is a shift away from viewing records as static physical objects, and towards understanding them as dynamic virtual

concepts; a shift away from looking at records as the passive products of human or administrative activity and towards considering records as active agents themselves in the formation of human and organizational memory; a shift equally away from seeing the context of records creation resting within stable hierarchical organizations to situating records within fluid horizontal networks of work-flow functionality. For archivists, the paradigm shift requires moving away from identifying themselves as passive guardians of an inherited legacy to celebrating their role in actively shaping collective (or social) memory. Stated another way, archival theoretical discourse is shifting from product to process, from structure to function, from archives to archiving, from the record to the recording context, from the “natural” residue or passive by-product of administrative activity to the consciously constructed and actively mediated “archivalisation” of social memory. (pp. 3-4)

Post-colonial scholars such as Stoler (2002) have also have criticized Eurocentric archival and record-keeping practices for their role in supporting colonialism, undercutting or even obliterating native memory practices and hampering national and ethnic identity as well as administrative development in post-colonial settings. While this may very well be the case, in some ways what is missing in this discussion is acknowledging and discussing in the classroom and in the field, as Cook (2000) indicates, that the body of principles and practices of Archival Science as first developed in Europe was never designed to be applied in the ways it is currently being used in non-governmental, even non-institutional settings, or with digital documentation. And even in Europe, its power and inclusiveness has been eroded by modern record-keeping and communications practices and technologies, the breakdown of traditional bureaucratic structures, shifting ideas about national identities and challenges to notions about the textual and fixed nature of the record. However, with a movement to standardize archival practice globally and develop interoperable digital information systems that is emanating primarily out of Anglo-Western nations, it is incumbent upon archivists to recognize and address the assumptions, practices, and constraints that are embedded in such standardization and the perspectives and interests they have traditionally supported. Thus, we can return to the critique that was leveled at the archival paradigm in the Native American Roundtable, namely that it addresses only the physical and intellectual dimensions of the record, and fails to recognize other dimensions that are essential to how non-European and non-elite groups conceptualize, value, and use their records.

Propagation of the Paradigm through Education in Archival Science

As archives proliferated in Europe and then in other parts of the world, it became necessary to train archivists to oversee them. In 1770, archivists began to

be educated at the University of Bologna, and at the University of Naples in 1777, with the first self-contained archival school established in Naples in 1811. Several models emerged and continue today, with several countries moving between models as educational ideas and policies have evolved. In 1821, the *École des Chartes* was established in Paris as a national school for palaeological studies by Louis XVIII, although it had previously been approved by Napoleon. The school gradually won respect as the leading archival training school. In 1850, a decree reserved posts in the French departments for graduates of the *École des Chartes*. In other countries, several national or state archives took on an educational role, either through multi-year educational programs in Archival Science, or through shorter, more vocational in-house training programs, with a strong emphasis on preparing students to work with government records. In some European countries, such as Germany, professional archivists were predominantly male, and were expected to have a doctorate, thereby practical guaranteeing their middle-class background. The past 50 years have seen enormous increase in both the number of programs being established—predominantly in universities, and especially in countries and new nations that are emerging in the wake of colonialism, Communism, and ethnic strife—and in the number of students entering those programs.

To a greater or lesser extent, each model represents tensions, probably inevitable, between disciplinary and vocational education and pedagogical techniques based around scholarship and practice, and between the exigencies of the academy and practice. For example, in 1931, Portuguese archival education was transferred from university administration to administration by the *Inspecção das Bibliotecas e Arquivos* (the Directorate of Libraries and Archives). It also changed in focus to an exclusively vocational course of study oriented towards “providing students with the technical preparation required to become senior officers in public libraries and archives.” Fernanda Ribeiro (2007) writes that

Complementarity between the academic component and the practical one was already an important issue in those early years. On the one hand, an excess of academic instruction, general culture and erudite training was seen as detrimental in a course directly linked to a specific profession; but on the other, exclusively technical training, disconnected from a theoretical basis and a general and cultural framework was also considered a handicap for LIS (and archive) professionals, since they were expected to be skilled specialists with an extensive cultural background. (p.2)

The second rationale prevailed and by 1935, a Librarian-Archivist course was established at the University of Coimbra.

Today, even the term *Archival Science* has been contested, not by those who might critique it as the legacy of modernist ideas about scientific

management and professional objectivity, but by practitioners who see it as representing the supremacy of theory over practice; and by academics who see it as the trumping of archival scholarship by the practical skills-based training and who prepare the broader, more multi-disciplinary and scholarship-oriented rubric of *Archival Studies*. In different national settings, education takes place at a variety of levels—undergraduate, graduate diploma or master’s degrees, and most recently, adding another level of complexity, at the doctoral level—and within different disciplinary contexts, including Archival Science, Business Administration, History, Library and Information Science, Preservation Management, even Military Science, as in the case of China. It also, importantly, takes place through workshops, both introductory and advanced, offered by professional archival associations; and in locations where on-site education is not available, through distance education (often developed and taught from another country).

Most education programs prepare students to work directly in archival repositories, sometimes in specific positions or specific types of archival repositories. Increasingly, there is a focus in North America on preparing students with archival skills and perspectives who can apply those beyond traditional archival settings, often in digital or other memory-institution-type settings. Doctoral programs, however, have emerged in order to address a new issue being faced by the archival professions—the requirement that educators who teach within academic institutions have doctoral degrees and are specifically trained not only as instructors but also as researchers at a level competitive with their peers within the academy.

As might be expected, with the development of archival professional best practices, both nationally and internationally, there have been concomitant movements to develop guidelines and accreditation and certification processes for archival education, and these have become the locus for contestation between the field and the academy, and between traditional and emergent practices and technologies. For example, between 1979 and 1981, the German Committee for Reform in Archival Education agreed “that the government should provide a common or uniform education of scholarly archivists, with specialization coming later on the job.” They concluded that archival education must “become adapted to a changing professional image as an ever smaller part of the profession will [deal] with older historical records and private records.” This reform emphasis was controversial, however, and lacked consensus among archivists about how to prepare archivists for contemporary work (Brichford, 1985). In Mexico, today’s archival education curriculum is government-mandated and is based on what are regarded to be “best practices,” and recent research, which is discussed further in the second part of this article, has demonstrated how such a strategy, while in

keeping with international professional standards, lacks sensitivity to local needs, practices, and perspective of the country's Native and ethnic communities.

Another set of issues has emerged with the European Union's Bologna Process, which seeks to support mobility of students, professionals, and educators throughout Europe and flexibility in terms of their ability to move between employment sectors. Tied up with this are issues of framework of course (program) cycles, standardization of curricula, quality control of programs, recognition of comparable qualifications, and balance of "high level universal principles" against local needs and practices. Although the Bologna Process in time may evoke this aspect, what archival education has never truly become is a site for debate or contestation over cultural practices and perspectives, either in terms of curriculum or in terms of pedagogy. While all indications are that the chief driver of change in archival education programs is a demand from the field for professionals who can address the implications for the record and for practice of new digital technologies, as well as continuing concerns about securing external recognition and appropriate compensation for archivists as professionals, critical analysis of the underlying principles and practices being taught and how they may or may not equip archivists to function with the records and communities of a plural and globalized world.

The Role of Archival Education

What can we learn, then, from this exposition of the lineage and epidemiology of archival ideas and their perpetuation through education in Archival Science? If indeed archivists need to make the kinds of shifts that Cook advocates; and if they are to rethink the very concepts of the record and the archive and what these might be or represent in the context of communities who have had little or no control over how or to what extent their record is recognized and handled, as has been the case with the Native American communities, then one aspect that unquestionably needs to be examined is Archival Science education. While the ideal of education today is to generate thoughtful, innovative, and critical individuals who can transfer their learning into different work/implementation contexts, education has arguably been one of the most hegemonic forces in world history, with differing degrees of consciousness on the part of educational institutions and teachers.⁴ What role has that education played, through what is taught, how, and to whom, in promoting archival thinking and practice worldwide, and how it might be used as a tool to promote a more reflexive and inclusive archival paradigm? The sense that there are right and wrong knowledge and practices, that certain methodologies are more rigorous or valid, that learning should take place in particular environments using particular pedagogies, or that more developed nations can help less developed nations by

teaching them to conduct themselves in similar ways all contribute to the hegemonic effect. While these views are slowly changing within what is still a Western and elite-dominated academy, the effect is arguably further exacerbated today by English-language dominated information dissemination and delivery systems such as the Internet, and trans-community and trans-national distance education that is often delivered by such means.

As stated earlier, the purpose of accentuating the development of the archival paradigm and how its central ideas were enunciated, disseminated, and taught is to raise awareness of the close relationships between the ideas encompassing the archival paradigm and the political, governmental, and technological power structures and exigencies that created and implemented them. Given this overview, it is reasonable to assume that there are power relationships embedded within the underlying theories underpinning Archival Science whose primary purpose was to support the bureaucratic, accountability, and cultural needs of monarchies, governments, corporations, churches, and expanding empires. Apple (1990) reminds us that the nature of education—its origins, purposes, methods of evaluation, curriculum, and so forth—should not be examined as if it developed in isolation, apart from other systems such as economics, culture, and power because each of those are mediated by human action. Each one is interconnected with the other. When the underlying assumptions of why and how things are the way they are are no longer questioned, hegemony has already set in; and the world that we see and interact with becomes the “world tout court”—the only world. This is the world in which mainstream Archival Science resides, as is partly evidenced by the overall lack of sufficient historical analysis of the origins and use of the theories that underpin Archival Science. This has also played a significant role in perpetuating the cultural hegemony of dominant groups. With this in mind, what then are the implications for *what* is remembered and forgotten? *How* activities and events are recorded and *by* whom and *why*? Furthermore, what are the implications for cultures that were invaded by “civilized” nations seeking to expand their borders in the name of seeking the common good for all mankind?

Both archival educators and practitioners, by virtue of the paradigm that has governed archival theory and practice and the rhetoric of value neutrality, have been agents, consciously or unconsciously, in perpetuating the dominance of narratives, omissions, and perspectives of the mainstream. The challenge of pluralism for those working within the dominant paradigm is how to move beyond it towards more inclusive practices, perspectives, and experiences in order to meet the needs of those communities that have been marginalized. It is time to consider seriously how to move toward a more critical, culturally-relevant education base and pedagogy for preparing archival professionals, educators, and scholars.

Notes

¹ See, for example, the Society of American Archivist's *Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*. Available at http://www.archivists.org/glossary/term_details.asp?DefinitionKey=54 (accessed January 14, 2008).

² The use of the term *science* here indicates a preoccupation in the nineteenth century with the demonstrating that an organized system or set of principles and practices existed for acquiring knowledge about records and archival administration. See Duranti, Luciana, & MacNeil, Heather. (1996, Fall). The protection of the integrity of electronic records: An overview of the UBC-MAS research project. *Archivaria*, 42, 46-67 for a tracing of the genesis of Archival Science to the documentary analytical approaches of nineteenth century Diplomatics, and thus their definition of Archival Science as "a body of concepts and methods directed toward the study of records in terms of their documentary and functional relationships and the ways in which they are controlled and communicated."

³ For example, authors who were based in states that are now part of Germany and Italy included Charles Du Molin (1522), Jacob von Rammingen (1571), Cesare Baronio (1578), Ahasver Fritsch (1664), Franciscus Neveu (1668), Nicolaus Glussianus (1684), Friedrich Rinckhamer (1688), and Francisco Schmalzgrueber (1738).

⁴ See, for example, Jay, Michelle. (2003). Critical race theory, multicultural education, and the hidden curriculum of hegemony. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 3-9. Available at http://www.informaworld.com/10.1207/S15327892MCP0504_2 (accessed 20 September 20, 2008); and Apple, Michael W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York & London: RoutledgeFalmer.

References

- Abukhanfusa, K., & Sydbeck, J. (Eds.). (1994). The principle of provenance. Report from the *First Stockholm Conference on Archival Theory and the Principle of Provenance, September 2-3, 1993*. Stockholm: Swedish National Archives.
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, B. (2006). Part 6: A*CENSUS: Report on Diversity. *American Archivist*, 69(2), 396-406.
- Brenneke, A. (1953). *Archivkunde. Ein Beitrag zur Theorie und Geschichte des europäischen Archivwesens*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.
- Brichford, M. (1982). The origins of modern archival theory. *Midwestern*

- Archivist*, 7(2), 86-101.
- Brichford, M. (1985, July). European archival education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists.
- Buck, S. J. [Papers, Library of Congress Manuscript Division]. Papers not fully processed.
- Cook, T. (2000). Archival science and postmodernism: New formulations for old concepts. *Archival Science*, 1(1), 3-24.
- Cook, T. & Schwartz, J. (2002). Archives, records, and power: The making of modern memory. *Archival Science*, 2(1,2), 1-19.
- Duranti, L. (1996). Archives as a place. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 24(2), 242-255.
- Duranti, L. (1998). *Diplomatics: New uses for an old science*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists and Association of Canadian Archivists in association with Scarecrow Press.
- Duranti, L. (1998). The future of archival scholarship. Retrieved January 26, 2009, from <http://www.ucd.ie/archives/html/conferences/cyber1.htm>
- Duranti, L. (2007). Models of archival education: Four, two, one or a thousand? *Archives & Social Studies: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 1(1), 41-62.
- Duranti, L., & MacNeil, H. (1996). The protection of the integrity of electronic records: An Overview of the UBC-MAS Research Project. *Archivaria*, 42, 46-67.
- First Archivist Circle. (2007). Protocols for Native American archival materials. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www2.nau.edu/libnapp/index.html>
- Irons Walch, V. (2006). Part 2. A* CENSUS: A call to action. *American Archivist*, 69(2), 310-326.
- Jenkinson, H. (1965). *A manual of archive administration*. London: Lund Humphries.
- Leland, W. G. Papers, 1879-1966, mm 78029900. Library of Congress Manuscript Division.
- McKemmish, S., Gilliland, A., & Ketelaar, E. (2005). Communities of memory: Pluralising archival research and education agendas. *Archives & Manuscripts*, 33, 146-175.
- Menne-Haritz, A. (1994). Archival training in Germany: A balance between specialization in historical research and administrative needs. *American Archivist*, 57(2), 400-408.
- Muller, S., Feith, J.A., and Fruin, R. (2003). *Manual on the arrangement and description of archives*. Chicago: SAA Archival Classics Series.
- Posner, E. (2003). *Archives in the ancient world*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists Archival Classics Series.

- Posner, E. (1940). Some aspects of archival development since the French Revolution. *American Archivist*, 3, 159-172.
- Ribeiro, F. (2007). LIS education in Portugal between academia and practice. In proceedings of *Librarians@2010* conference in Lisbon, Portugal. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from http://www.apbad.pt/Librarian@2010/Abstract_01.pdf
- Schellenberg, T. (1961). Archival principles of arrangement. *American Archivist*, 24, 11-24.
- Society of American Archivists. (2007). Council call for comments on protocols for Native American archival materials. Retrieved January 12, 2009, from <http://www.archivists.org/news/2007-NatAmerProtocols.asp>
- Stoler, L. (2002). Colonial archives and the arts of governance. *Archival Science*, 2, 87-109.

Authors

Anne Gilliland is Professor and Chair of the UCLA Department of Information Studies and Director of the Center for Information as Evidence within the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies. She also directs the Archival Studies specialization within the Department of Information Studies and is a faculty member in the inter-departmental M.A. Program in Moving Image Archive Studies. She has published widely on archival informatics, social justice and human rights issues as they relate to archives and records, and archival education. She is a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists.

Kelvin White is an Assistant Professor at University of Oklahoma's School of Library and Information Studies. He received a Master's degree in Afro-American Studies and his Ph.D. in Information Studies from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Using social justice as a framework, his work examines the interconnections between the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which recordkeeping activities exist and the implications they have for marginalized or underrepresented communities. Currently, his research examines issues of memory and remembering in Afro-Mexican communities in the Costa Chica (Mexico); critically interrogates contemporary archival theory and constructs; and develops ways in which education and pedagogy might contribute to cultural relevancy and sensitivity in archival practice and research.