



INTRODUCTION

Two Sides of the Same Coin? Exploring the Relationship Between Archival Research and Practice

Mike Jones^{1*} and Rachel Tropea²

¹University of Tasmania; ²RMIT University

In 2009, a group of archivists, data archivists, and academics converged on a cottage at the edge of the Australian National University (ANU) campus carrying digital cameras, archive boxes, markers, labels, and laptops. Spread over several rooms were cardboard boxes of all shapes and sizes, some collapsing under the weight of their contents, along with shelves of ring binders, continuous form paper printouts, stacks of photocopies, piles of loose records, publications, large format handwritten data tables, and more – the accumulated papers of researchers Len Smith and Gordon Briscoe.

For several days the cottage was filled with conversations that spilled out into lunch breaks, dinners, and drinks at the ANU bar. Some were about archival principles, accession processes, capturing and preserving data on computer punch cards, options for digitising large format data sheets, and how to develop a series structure. Others covered the history of census data, demography, prosopography, and early social science computing; how to generate Aboriginal population estimates; Gordon Briscoe's experiences as one of the first Aboriginal people to obtain a PhD at an Australian University; and the policing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in the early twentieth century. At the same time the archivists introduced their colleagues to key archival concepts and led a process of labelling boxes, surveying and documenting the order of the records as found, boxing up loose material, considering provenance, and capturing accession metadata in the standards-based Heritage Documentation Management System (HDMS). It was a fascinating few days, filled with research, theoretical debate, and the time-bound practicalities of tackling a large unlisted archive. As Michelle Caswell writes:

One of the things I love about archival studies is that, on the one hand, you can discuss really abstract theoretical concepts but at the end of the day, you have to do something as an archivist ... do I keep this particular record or not? Do I digitize it? What words do I use to describe it? The rubber meets the road.¹

Work on Smith and Briscoe's articles – collectively named *Documenting Demography and Health Records of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders* – continues to this day, the complex archive raising issues related to digitisation and digital preservation, data archiving, Indigenous data sovereignty, privacy, and ethics that remain the subject of ongoing research and practice.

*Correspondence: Mike Jones, Email: info@mikejonesonline.com

Among the archivists working in the ANU cottage were the authors and guest editors of this issue of *Archives & Manuscripts*, Mike Jones and Rachel Tropea. We started working together in 2008 at the University of Melbourne's eScholarship Research Centre (ESRC)² under the leadership of Gavan McCarthy and Joanne Evans. It was here our long-standing interest in the intersections between theory, research and practice in archives began. Like many staff at the ESRC we worked across boundaries: as archivists without a repository, working for a range of large and small institutions; based in the library while collaborating with multiple university faculties; employed as professional staff while working on academic research projects and producing traditional and non-traditional research outputs; and exploring theoretical ideas while remaining engaged in numerous projects that allowed us to (in McCarthy's words) 'get our hands dirty'. Our collaborators were archivists, librarians, developers, information technology staff, academics, public servants, community members, and activists. The team implemented early incarnations of ISAD(G), EAD, ISAAR(CPF) and EAC through the HDMS and Online Heritage Resource Manager (OHRM) and went to work with these tools archiving Victoria's State Electricity Commission, documenting the history of Australian Science, and capturing the stories of Australian women, among many other projects.³ We also worked with communities on restorative justice projects such as *Find & Connect* and *Return, Reconcile, Renew*,⁴ using participatory and action research methods.

In many ways the ESRC was unique. There were no other places in Australia where we could perform work like this, and the Centre's longevity was dependent on continuing support from people within an organisation often poorly suited to groups that did not fit neatly within existing frameworks of academic research or service provision. Heather MacNeil writes:

whether theory is actualized in practice will depend less on the power of the theory than on the actions of individuals, professional organizations, and institutions. We may not control institutional resources and priorities to the extent we would like ... We do, however, have control over the direction in which we move as individuals and as a profession.⁵

When institutional priorities shifted and the Centre closed in 2020, Mike moved into academia and Rachel into a managerial role at a university archive. Keeping a foot in both worlds, or working in the in between, is now harder, but we have both tried in our own ways to retain control over the directions we move in, and remain committed to working with the broader profession. In 2018 Rachel and her colleagues at University of Melbourne started a Critical Archives Reading Group⁶ for memory workers interested in the nexus between academic and practitioner work in archives, and how they influence or could influence each other. The readings are framed within postcolonialism, critical race studies, feminism, queer theory and deconstructionism, and themes of social justice and equity.⁷ After completing his PhD, Mike moved into roles in academic history departments while continuing to regularly write and speak about archives and the GLAM sector. Pursuing cross-disciplinary work in history, museums, archives, and Indigenous studies, he continues to seek out opportunities that allow him to 'get his hands dirty'.

Mike is also an active member of the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA), and is the inaugural convenor of the Research and Education Special Interest Group (REDSIG) from which the idea for this issue emerged. The objectives of REDSIG include: to develop Australia's research capacity and capability with regard to archives; to promote research capability as a valued professional attribute for all archivists and affiliated professionals, and foster opportunities, which create and invigorate connections between archival theory and practice in Australia and to raise awareness of and advocate for the value of archival scholarship, thinking, and practice.⁸

The process of putting together this special issue on research and practice has been fascinating. We are very grateful to all of the contributors who made time among the seemingly endless stream of online meetings, competing deadlines (including impending PhD submission dates!) and busy lives to reflect on these ideas and communicate their thoughts to the broader community. This willingness to engage helps to ensure that archival work continues to adapt and remain relevant in a rapidly changing world.

Which is not to say these preoccupations are new. Our call for papers for this issue included a quote from Benjamin Brewster, writing in 1882: ‘In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice, while in practice there is’.⁹

In the first half of the twentieth century archivists did little to separate the two. Often the terms were combined to reference the guiding principles (provenance, original order, *respect des fonds*) and core activities (appraisal, arrangement, description, preservation, provision of access) that characterise archival work. For example, the *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (1898) has been called the ‘starting point of archival theory and methodology’¹⁰; and Hilary Jenkinson’s 1922 *A Manual of Archive Administration* sought to draw together ‘a complete body of illustration of general Archive theory and practice’ based on English archives.¹¹ In North America Solon J. Buck (Second Archivist of the United States) used the phrase ‘principles and techniques’ to mean something similar,¹² as did Theodore R. Schellenberg whose *The Management of Archives* was divided into two parts: ‘Development of Principles and Techniques,’ and ‘Application of Principles and Techniques’.

Perhaps in part due to such language, by the early 1980s Harold Pinkett argued that a distinct American archival *theory* did not exist. Archives, according to Pinkett, combined European principles with ‘pragmatic concepts’.¹³ Such claims were part of an emerging debate in North America that would run for the next 20 years. Frank Burke was among the first, suggesting archives had policies and procedures rather than ‘theories’. While some archivists might consider moving to the academy to ponder research questions such as the social context of records creation, the nature of history, and the purpose of archivists, Burke did not see these as part of day-to-day work: ‘It is reasonable to expect that on slow days and after hours, when one’s spouse is otherwise occupied, the kids are in bed, and the income tax is finished, a few archivists will contemplate these mysteries’.¹⁴

John W. Roberts went further in two strident articles for *American Archivist*: ‘Archival Theory: Much Ado about Shelving’ (1987), and ‘Archival Theory: Myth or Banality?’ (1990). The first piece pulls few punches, suggesting archival theory arises not from an objective need, but ‘from an emotional need for greater professional acceptance’.¹⁵ He claims concepts such as provenance and original order as ‘largely practical tools,’ critiques theorists for stating the obvious ‘in unduly complicated terms,’ and argues that many of the theoretical questions proposed by people such as Burke are not in fact archival questions. In fact, they provide ‘no assistance whatsoever’ in carrying out what is at its heart ‘a fairly straight-forward, down to earth service occupation’.¹⁶ He concludes:

Great things are happening in the world of ideas. Poems are being written, symphonies composed, diseases mastered, historical eras probed, and economic dilemmas analyzed. In the midst of all this, it is extreme intellectual silliness to boggle oneself with such preposterous phantoms as archival paradigms, symbiotic links of medium and message, philosophy of mylar, and other prostheses that some archivists would thrust forward as credentials to sit at the grown-ups’ table.¹⁷

His second article goes even further, suggesting the whole of archival work ‘can be known empirically,’ criticising theoretical research for uncovering ‘vacuous principles,’ and dismissing

archival theory as unimportant, intellectually frivolous, narcissistic, self-involved, and ‘an out-growth of the archival profession’s colossal inferiority complex’.¹⁸

Many questioned Roberts’ position. Some did so in *American Archivist*, including amused Norwegian archivist Ole Kolsrud: ‘How seriously is Roberts to be taken? He is not the first barbarian I have come across among archivists, but at least he is an entertaining one’.¹⁹ But the most effective responses were published across the border, in the Canadian journal *Archivaria*. The 1990s saw, among others: Mary Sue Stephenson, on the close and productive relationships between theorists, writers, researchers, and practitioners in archives (unlike in library science) and the dangers of trying to build a wall between research and practice; Terry Eastwood, who responded to Roberts with a clear outline of the importance of theory, its object, and its relation to method and practice; Heather MacNeil on the foundational role of theory and methodological principles in archival work; and Preben Mortensen, who concludes that, despite the views of Roberts and other ‘anti-theoretical’ archivists, theory and practice are in fact inseparable.²⁰

Meanwhile, in the second half of the twentieth century Australia started to develop its own ways of working. In his foreword to Schellenberg’s *Modern Archives*, the Commonwealth National Librarian and Archival Authority, H.L. White, recognised that the English and European focus on earlier records was inhibiting ‘the necessary thinking and experiment which the control of modern records in young countries requires. Despite this, there is evidence that some of the younger countries are in fact breaking new ground’.²¹ We see this in the work of Commonwealth Archivist Ian Maclean and colleagues. While they initially drew on Jenkinson (who started out working on medieval records) and Schellenberg (who visited as an adviser in 1954²²), their attempts to use the ‘record group’ concept to arrange and describe Australian Government records were fraught, in part due to the rate of change in Government departments and bureaucracy in the twentieth century. New ground was then broken in the 1960s, with the well-documented development of the Australian series system by Peter J. Scott.²³

The series system was more than just a practical solution to a practical problem. As Barbara Reed has argued, Scott was a conceptual thinker who ‘consciously pursued archival theory’ to produce a framework for practice that influenced recordkeeping and continuum theorists, archival standards development, digital records management, and more.²⁴ While continuum theory in particular is often held up as complex and difficult (as discussed in the conversation piece included in this issue), these practical roots and its role as a framework for action mean that many in the community were keen to apply the continuum in their work. Sue McKemmish writes of the community of practice that emerged in Australia during the 1990s, ‘made up of records managers and archivists, consultants, educators and researchers, archival institutions, corporate records and archives programs, and professional associations, who consciously worked within an evolving records continuum framework, and adopted post-custodial approaches to recordkeeping and archiving’.²⁵

Though McKemmish (like her predecessors) repeatedly uses the phrase ‘theory and practice,’ and references archival theorists, it is notable that her description of the community of practice does not explicitly include theory or theorists. Instead McKemmish refers to researchers more broadly, elsewhere highlighting how the continuum – including continuum theory, the continuum framework, the continuum model, and ‘continuum thinking and practice’ – is itself ‘a distillation of research findings drawn from discourse, literary warrant and historical analysis, as well as case studies, participant observation and reflection’.²⁶

As touched on by James Lowry and Elliot Freeman in this issue, research and theory are not necessarily the same thing, and their relationship to practice can vary. Lowry notes that some researchers do significant translation work themselves, examining how theories from disparate fields can be applied in practice, while in other cases (like some continuum theory

work) this translation work mostly happens outside of the research space, including through communities of practice like those described by McKemmish.

However, given the tendency to conflate research and theory (noticed by Freeman, and evident in our call for papers for this issue), perhaps our conversation piece should have started with the basics: what is archival research, and (just as importantly) *where* is archival research? Carol Couture and Daniel Ducharme provided a useful summary in 2005, developing a typology of research fields in archival science, including the role of archives in society; the management of archival programmes; investigations into different types of records (including digital and other media); and archival ethics.²⁷ Research happens in universities and educational institutions; but professionals in a range of institutions also ask research questions and use research methodologies in their work, as do consultants, and project teams initiated by sectoral organisations such as the ASA, Records and Information Management Practitioners Alliance (RIMPA), GLAM Peak, and the International Council on Archives (ICA). As Luciana Duranti and Giovanni Michetti note, some of this research focus on ideas and activities that are clearly part of the ‘archival field’ (investigating the nature of records, key principles like original order, or exploring provenance), while other research brings in theories, concepts, and methodologies from elsewhere to help understand archives and records, and to develop (or seek to change) professional practice.²⁸ External influences include closely allied disciplines such as history, knowledge management, computer science, and library science, as well as diverse theoretical and methodological approaches drawn from feminist theory, Critical Race Theory, Indigenous standpoint theory, data sovereignty, postcolonial studies, queer theory, and so on.²⁹

Most of this work is pursued with at least one eye on practice. Archival science has long been recognised as an applied science, combining diverse theories and methodologies with empirical evidence and experience, developed and tested through practice.³⁰ Michelle Caswell writes: ‘For most archival studies scholars, our research is rooted in practice. Most of us either worked as archivists before becoming researchers or still have a significant practice on the side ... my research informs my practice and my practice informs my research’.³¹ Theoretical discussions and in-depth research can be fascinating in their own right, but if they do not achieve anything useful in the world perhaps (as suggested by Burke) we should leave them to those times out of hours when partners are occupied, kids are in bed, and our taxes are done. When combined with practice though, such discussions are a vital part of ensuring our profession remains relevant and responsive. Schellenberg argues that even supposedly foundational principles such as provenance and original order ‘should be applied only insofar as something can be achieved by their application’.³²

Archival research is about continuing to ask such questions. What should we aim to achieve by the application of principles, theories and methods in the archival field? How can we best achieve these things? What are the current limitations of practice? How can we continue to do things better? How do we make ourselves accountable for our actions along the way? As Kieran Hegarty and Jodie Boyd note in the introduction to the recent ‘research and practice’ issue of the *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*, we cannot effectively answer these questions by dividing research and practice; nor do we gain by trying to unite the two. Instead we need to embrace multiplicity, recognising diverse perspectives and ways of working and the many positions and relationships we as individuals can and do hold within the archival field.³³

In keeping with this, the contributors to this special issue of *Archives & Manuscripts* speak from multiple perspectives. In the opening Conversation piece, eight ‘academics’ and ‘practitioners’ (Mike Jones and Rachel Tropea with Rose Barrowcliffe, Annie Cameron,

Elliot Freeman, James Lowry, Duncan Loxton, and Eva Samaras) reflect on the arbitrary separation or conflation of research, theory and practice in archives. Participants discuss how archival education and theory is relevant to practice and practitioners and vice versa and the ways in which research can be theoretical, directed, applied, and practical. In doing so, the participants provide a contemporary perspective on many of the ideas summarised above.

Articles from Kirsten Thorpe; Frank Golding, Sue McKemmish and Barbara Reed; and Catherine Nicholls focus on the role of research in action, and how it can serve individuals and communities. Thorpe examines how practice and research methodologies aligned with Indigenous ways of knowing, being and doing – including Indigenous methodologies such as Yarning, Indigenous Standpoint and Indigenous Storywork – support First Nations archival priorities and increase Indigenous agency and well-being in the archives. In fact, Thorpe writes: ‘An Indigenous-led and community-driven approach has the potential to bring mutual benefits for all involved’. Golding, McKemmish and Reed explore the challenges of actualising community-centred, participatory recordkeeping and archiving research in practice, using the implementation of the Charter of Lifelong Rights in Childhood Recordkeeping in Out of Home Care as an illustrative example. Catherine Nicholls discusses her research journey through autoethnographic narrative, providing insight into the various paths practitioners and researchers take through and between these domains. Research and professional development are rarely linear or neat, and research does not necessitate taking on a passive, formal, or supposedly ‘objective’ voice. As Nicholls shows, it can also be personal and reflective.

James Doig and Vanessa Finney reflect on the impact of archival thought in national events and institutions in recent history. Doig analyses the theoretical ideas developed by Terry Cook, Frank Upward and others in the 1990s, and explores the degree to which they have been implemented within foundational policy, recordkeeping standards and guidance in Australia. Focusing on the results of the National Archives *Big Data Project* (2022) he explores the enduring impact of these post-custodial concepts, including the development of the world-first records management standard *AS 4390 – 1996 Records Management* – work that involved close collaboration between researchers and practitioners who espoused post-custodial approaches to archival and records management. Finney reaches further back when discussing the archival turn in Australia’s colonial-era museums and in particular Australia’s first and oldest cultural-scientific institution, The Australian Museum (AM), founded in 1827. Citing examples of key initiatives such as ‘cultural diplomacy’ work around the Thomas Dick Birrpai Collection, Finney explores the significant act of re-making archival practice, reviewing past protocols, knowledge structures, and descriptive standards to reimagine ‘museum-archival practice and the possibilities (and challenges) for opening the archives to new ways of encounter, reading and use’.

Our perception of the archives depends on whether we are staff, contractor, maintainer, manager, researcher, scholar, student, donor, subject of the records, or (as is often the case) a mixture of these roles. The issue concludes with two pieces that highlight the many different hats and life experiences we bring to our encounter with the archive. Master’s student Bryony Cavallaro reflects on the interplay between her theoretical education, gamer experience and practicum at the Digital Heritage Lab in shaping her knowledge and skills as a digital archivist, while Jessica Moran shows how her experience as a manager and steward of archival collections and digitisation projects, work as a researcher and editor, and knowledge of archival theory have influenced her approach to digital preservation. Theory, research and practice are intertwined, allowing for a more nuanced, considered and multi-layered effort.

Throughout, a consistent theme emerges. Many in the archival field have moved beyond the debates of the twentieth century about the existence and relevance of theory, with recent

generations of archivists less inclined than their predecessors to draw distinctions. While the mix may differ depending on context, research, theory, and practice are all part of what we do.

There are many developments that threaten our ability to work effectively in this way. As MacNeil notes, actualising theory in practice relies on individuals, professional organisations, and institutions working together. At a time when institutional and research funding cuts continue to bite, when universities are closing or downsizing archives and information studies courses across the country, when so many academics remain precariously employed, when governments and corporations pursue automation and poorly-implemented IT solutions, and when archivists and records managers are faced with growing backlogs and dwindling resources – when all this provides the context for our day-to-day work, deep engagement with research and theory might seem a luxury only accessible to a lucky few.

But we must use the control we have over our individual and professional pathways to continue to make space for this essential work. Acting collectively, we can advocate for the value of archival research and practice; remain engaged and involved in communities; foster relationships; actively think about what we do and why we do it; discuss archival ideas with each other, and with colleagues from other professions and disciplines; read and engage with new developments in theory and practice; ask for a seat at the table; listen and make space for other voices and perspectives; and keep asking questions.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to everyone who contributed to this issue, to our peer reviewers for your considered feedback, and to the general editors of *Archives & Manuscripts* for your support along the way.

We would like to acknowledge the *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*, a constant source of inspiration driving us to forge ahead with the important work of interrogating what it means to be an archivist³⁴; to Kirsten Thorpe, whose work and article ‘Transformative Praxis – Building Spaces for Indigenous Self-Determination in Libraries and Archives’³⁵ inspired Rachel to start the Critical Archives Reading Group; to all the members of the Research and Education Special Interest Group who have attended meetings and catch-ups, and contributed to the development of the SIG; and to all the archival researchers, theorists, and practitioners we have worked with over the years. Without the broader collective our work would not be what it is today.

Notes

1. Michelle Caswell and Rachel Tropea, ‘Interview with Michelle Caswell,’ *Archive Matters*, no. 116, May 5, 2021, n.p.
2. The eScholarship Research Centre (ESRC) (2007–2020) was previously known as the Australian Science and Technology Heritage Centre (Austehc) (1999–2006), and Australian Science Archives Project (ASAP) (1985–1989). For more information, see <https://www.eoas.info/biogs/A002361b.htm>.
3. ‘About,’ *Encyclopedia of Australian Science and Innovation*, <https://www.eoas.info/about.html> (accessed March 2024); ‘About,’ *Australian Women’s Register*, <https://www.womenaustralia.info/about/> (accessed 25 July 2024).
4. <https://www.findandconnect.gov.au/> and <https://returnreconcilerenew.info/>
5. Heather MacNeil, ‘Archival Theory and Practice: Between Two Paradigms,’ *Archivaria*, February 6, 1994, 16.
6. <https://www.criticalarchivesreading.com/>
7. About – Critical Archives Reading Group, URL: <https://www.criticalarchivesreading.com/p/about.html> (accessed March 2024).
8. A full list of the REDSIG objectives are available in the REDSIG Rules, available here: <https://www.archivists.org.au/community/research-and-education>
9. Benjamin Brewster, *The Yale Literary Magazine*, February 1882, quoted in ‘In Theory There Is No Difference Between Theory and Practice, While In Practice There Is,’ *Quote Investigator*, April 14, 2018, <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2018/04/14/theory/>. Our call for papers featured an adapted version of this

- quote: 'In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. But, in practice, there is'. Variations on this phrase are often misattributed, including to Yogi Berra, Albert Einstein, Richard Feynman, and various computer scientists.
10. Peter Horsman, Eric Ketelaar, Theo Thomassen, 'Introduction to the 2003 Reissue,' in Samuel Muller, Robert Fruin, and Johan Adriaan Feith, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives: Drawn up by Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists, Translation of the 2nd ed., Society of American Archivists*, Chicago, IL, 2003, p. v, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015057022447>.
 11. Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration Including the Problems of War Archives and Archive Making*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1922, p. 17, <http://archive.org/details/manualofarchivea00jenkuoft>.
 12. Solon J. Buck quoted in Lester Cappon, 'What, Then, Is There To Theorize About?,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 45, no. 1, January 1, 1982, p. 24. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.45.1.q03v972668401056>
 13. Harold Pinkett, 'American Archival Theory: The State of the Art,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 44, no. 3, July 1, 1981, p. 222. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.44.3.n22253t6262t2101>
 14. Frank G. Burke, 'The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 44, no. 1, 1981, p. 44. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.44.1.4853801307551286>
 15. John W. Roberts, 'Archival Theory: Much Ado about Shelving,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1987, p. 67.
 16. Roberts, p. 68, 69, 74.
 17. Roberts, p. 74.
 18. John Roberts, 'Archival Theory: Myth or Banality?,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 53, no. 1, 1990, p. 111, 112, 115, 119, 120. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.53.1.a56364w710276424>
 19. Ole Kolsrud, 'The Evolution of Basic Appraisal Principles – Some Comparative Observations,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 55, no. 1, January 1, 1992, p. 36. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.55.1.v05w2kg671667v6h>
 20. Mary Sue Stephenson, 'Deciding Not to Build the Wall: Research and the Archival Profession,' *Archivaria*, vol. 32, Summer 1991, pp. 145–51; Terry Eastwood, 'What Is Archival Theory and Why Is It Important?,' *Archivaria*, February 6, 1994, pp. 122–30; MacNeil, 'Archival Theory and Practice'; Preben Mortensen, 'The Place of Theory in Archival Practice,' *Archivaria*, vol. 47, February 16, 1999, <http://www.archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12695>.
 21. See H.L. White, 'Foreword,' in Theodore R. Schellenberg (ed.), *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1956, p. vii.
 22. See Michael Piggott, 'The Visit of Dr. T.R. Schellenberg to Australia 1954: A Study of Its Origins and Some Repercussions on Archival Development in Australia', *Masters*, Sydney, Australia, University of New South Wales, 1989.
 23. Adrian Cunningham, Laura Millar, and Barbara Reed, 'Peter J. Scott and the Australian 'Series' System: Its Origins, Features, Rationale, Impact and Continuing Relevance', *International Congress on Archives*, Brisbane, Australia, 2012, <http://ica2012.ica.org/files/pdf/Full%20papers%20upload/ica12Final00414.pdf>; see also Clive Smith, 'The Australian Series System,' *Archivaria*, vol. 40, January 1, 1995, <http://www.archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12098>; Australian Society of Archivists, Peter J. Scott, and Adrian Cunningham (eds.), *The Arrangement and Description of Archives amid Administrative and Technological Change: Essays and Reflections by and about Peter J. Scott*, Australian Society of Archivists, Brisbane, 2010.
 24. Barbara Reed, "'Standing on the Shoulders of Giants': The Legacy of Peter Scott's Archival Thinking,' in Cunningham, Millar, and Reed (eds.), *Peter J. Scott and the Australian 'Series' System: Its Origins, Features, Rationale, Impact and Continuing Relevance*.
 25. Sue McKemmish, 'Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice,' *Archival Science*, vol. 1, no. 4, December 1, 2001, p. 336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02438901>
 26. McKemmish, p. 333.
 27. Carol Couture and Daniel Ducharme, 'Research in Archival Science: A Status Report,' *Archivaria*, 2005, pp. 63–4.
 28. Luciana Duranti and Giovanni Michetti, 'The Archival Method,' in Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau (eds.), *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, Monash University Publishing, Clayton, Victoria, 2017, p. 80, <http://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=628143>.
 29. For example, see Catherine Banks, 'The Influence of Feminist Archival Theory on State Archival Exhibitions,' *Archives & Manuscripts*, February 14, 2024, p. e10933. <https://doi.org/10.37683/asa.v51.10933>; Anthony W. Dunbar, 'Introducing Critical Race Theory to Archival Discourse: Getting the Conversation Started,' *Archival Science*, vol. 6, no. 1, March 1, 2006, pp. 109–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-006-9022-6>;

- Kirsten Thorpe, 'Unclasping the White Hand: Reclaiming and Refiguring the Archives to Support Indigenous Wellbeing and Sovereignty', PhD, Melbourne, Australia, Monash University, 2021.
30. Buck, quoted in Cappon, 'What, Then, Is There To Theorize About?,' p. 24.
 31. Caswell and Tropea, 'Interview with Michelle Caswell'.
 32. T. Schellenberg, 'Archival Principles of Arrangement,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 24, no. 1, January 1, 1961, p. 13. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.24.1.1330351406231083>
 33. Kieran Hegarty and Jodie Boyd, 'Useful Divides: Games of Truth in Library and Information Studies Research and Practice,' *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*, vol. 4, December 15, 2023, p. 21.
 34. The Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies (JCLIS) is an online journal which 'aims to showcase innovative research that queries and critiques current and prevailing paradigms in library and information studies, in theory and practice through critical approaches and perspectives that originate from across the humanities and social science.' The issue: Vol. 4: Assemblage, Inquiry, and Common Work in Library and Information Studies is particularly relevant to our theme.
 35. Kirsten Thorpe, 'Transformative Praxis – Building Spaces for Indigenous Self-Determination in Libraries and Archives,' 23 January 2019, *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, URL: <https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2019/transformative-praxis/>.