

Bright Specimens for the Curious or The Somewhat Imponderable Guided by the Unfathomable: Use, Users and Appraisal in Archival Literature

Danielle Wickman

Danielle Wickman is an Assistant Director in the National Archives of Australia's Collection Management Branch. She has been with the National Archives since 1994 when she joined as a Graduate Administrative Assistant. She has worked in many areas of the Archives, including in reference and access, intellectual control, electronic recordkeeping, publications and the Archives' Advisory Council secretariat. Danielle has degrees in communication (journalism) and library and information management from the University of Canberra, and a Masters in Information Management (Archives and Records) from Monash University. She is also a part-time tutor at the University of Canberra and Convenor of the ASA ACT Branch.

This article examines the purpose and methods of appraisal from the perspective of two major user groups – researchers and records creators.¹ It considers Dr Terry Cook's question of whether the dual roles of archives of preserving evidence and memory are reconcilable, and to what extent archivists have met and can meet the needs of both researcher groups.

An earlier version of this paper was presented as an assignment for the Appraisal and Description unit of the Master of Information Management (Archives and Records) course at Monash University.

At a seminar in Melbourne in March 1999, Terry Cook identified three theories of appraisal. These are: the Jenkinson model, concerned with values important to records creators; the Schellenberg model, concerned with the values important to users; and the macro-appraisal model, concerned with the values of society at large.² The macro-appraisal model, as a kind of 'third way', represents an attempt to reconcile the debate that has been fought between archivists over the purpose and methods of appraisal. The debate is a vital

one, because it goes to the core of archival work. Cook reminds us of the grave and somewhat frightening responsibility of archival appraisal: deciding what will be remembered and what will be forgotten. To ask how we appraise is also to ask for whom, and this is to ask why we keep archives at all.

The first two categories that Cook proposes are not mutually exclusive. Schellenberg asserted that, while the needs of future users should be acknowledged, the interests of the records creator must be considered first. Neither is the evidence-memory dichotomy absolute. As Cook argues, unremembered evidence is lost, and memory without evidence may be bogus.³ Researchers have need of evidence, and creators have need of memory. We might hope that this would mean that all their needs are the same, yet the literature seems often to focus on the differences.

The priorities and values of the two direct user groups – creators and researchers – have usually been perceived to be different. Much of the historical debate on appraisal has been over what these different sets of values are, and the degree to which archivists should be mindful of them. While records creators are largely silent, at least in the Australian literature, on how appraisal should meet their needs, this may be because archivists have articulated these needs for them. Researchers have been more vocal in the archival literature, arguing for a greater say in appraisal decisions, or at least more sensitivity to their needs. The foray of researchers into the appraisal debate may be a result of archivists failing to take adequate account of their needs.

Research users on appraisal

To read the contributions of research users to the appraisal debate is to be reminded of why archivists have at times chosen to dismiss secondary research or subject as an appraisal criterion. Their needs and interests are so varied that it is unsurprising that archivists have often taken refuge in the argument that we cannot please all our users, so will instead please the records creators, since their needs are relatively coherent and must at least in some cases coincide with the needs of other users.

The theme of the Australian Society of Archivists' 1981 annual conference was 'promoting the better use of archives in Australia'.⁴ The range of topics covered by the speakers gives an indication of range of subject matters users may come to archives to research. Most speakers outlined their own research interests and uses of archival records. Many bemoaned missing sources or sources that didn't contain the information they had hoped for. Some professed to understand the difficulties placed on archivists in selecting records for retention (with a few of these still insisting that the records they were interested in should have been among those kept).

Dr Marian Aveling reconstructed the life of Jane Geake, an immigrant to the Swan River Colony in 1830. Aveling's social history research is particularly concerned with the influence of power relationships on the powerless. Aveling's requirements for detailed documents about individuals are just the kind of research interests that some have traditionally argued that archives cannot cater for. Yet her explanation of the concerns of social history, that 'the working of a particular society at a particular time can only be understood by analysing wide ranges of relationships, and where possible, individual experience'⁵ is reminiscent of Cook's RAMP study on personal records and his idea of the 'sharpest focus' on citizen-state interaction, discussed later in this paper.

Dr Miles Lewis informs us that architectural drawings have significant research value.⁶ He accuses archivists of failing to give architectural drawings the attention and care they deserve. Lewis is uncritical, however, of the fact that the emigration to Australia of one architect in whom he is interested was 'for reasons which are unclear'⁷ perhaps a gap in the 'total archive' that might be of vital significance to a biographer or descendant of that architect.

One of the researchers at the 1981 conference with some appreciation for the nature of archives was Dr Charles A Price. Price advocates culling, and was involved in assisting the then Commonwealth Archives Office (CAO) to develop a retention policy for immigration records.⁸ The quantity of immigration records with which Price was dealing would no doubt have brought home to him the difficulties archivists face in attempting to keep everything, even on one topic. He outlines his own sampling methods for intelligently examining the vast bulk of immigration case files with which he was presented.⁹ It is also worth noting that Price felt that government records were priceless for providing raw data, but 'the fascinating and colourful detail must come from other sources, such as the private papers of leading personalities.'¹⁰ Dr Aveling might have disagreed.

David Sissons goes further in his examination of the ways of archivists and their impact on a particular area of research. Sissons was dissatisfied with the CAO, both in its approach to disposal and its level of service to the researcher. The CAO is accused of allowing the destruction of Army headquarters records 'before it acquainted itself sufficiently with the control system to know how to get on without them.'¹¹ Also a problem for Sissons is the diversion of archives staff from 'essential services' such as arrangement and description and reference, to deal with sentencing and appraisal backlogs.¹² It seems odd to urge the national archival authority to better acquaint itself with the records whose disposal it must authorise by devoting fewer resources to the problem.

Sissons does, however, accept that destruction of records is essential, and even that 'some material of value to some future researcher will be destroyed',¹³

and demonstrates the difficulties of consulting one user group over another. The sampling process which Price, a demographer, participated in allowed the destruction of a file Sissons says documented 'the only case where the illicit landing of a Japanese woman stowaway was established beyond reasonable doubt in a court of law'. Sissons describes the destruction as 'unfortunate', and advocates a panel system where representatives of a number of disciplines review disposal decisions.¹⁴

Portia Robinson draws attention to the way the 1788 Victualling List, held by the then Archives Office of New South Wales, 'has historical value and significance...far [exceeding] its original purpose.'¹⁵ Also a social historian, Robinson derives insights from a record that, if created today, might barely survive a year, and at first thought her research might be compelling evidence of the inadequacy of the Jenkinson-creator-evidence school of thought. The nature of her research, which seeks to go beyond what those in power believed and recorded about convict society, also supports the arguments of those who see archives selected by their creators as a perpetuation of elites.

Too much might be made, however, of this example of unexpected uses of routine records. The survival of the victualling list might still be attributed to a provenance-focused appraisal philosophy, which might argue that where few records of a function or administrative body survive it is important to retain some trace of its activities, however prosaic. Archivists might ask if such a record would in modern circumstances have survived under either the provenance or pertinence approach. Perhaps a macro-appraisal approach might also have preserved this record, but this too would depend to a large extent on the other sources available.

The stories of individual researchers are often competing and incompatible tales of woe, and serve to demonstrate the difficulties archivists encounter when they seek the views of individual academics or disciplines on appraisal. Even if such an approach were feasible, it is clear that if archivists are to keep most of their users happy most of the time, more coordinated forums for user input are needed. Such attempts aren't unknown in Australia, but their effect on the appraisal process has been mixed.

Forums for researchers

The only consistent attempt to inject the views of users into the practices of the National Archives had been the work of the National Archives of Australia Advisory Council (NAAAC), and its predecessor, the Advisory Council on Australian Archives. There are two matters which the *Archives Act 1983* requires the Archives to report to the Council on: use of the special access provisions and disposal practices.¹⁶

These matters hint that the role of the Council is at least in part to inject community views into the disposal and public access activities of the Archives. In practice, and in accordance with the provisions of the Act, the Council is only briefed on disposal at the broadest level. It does not receive reports on individual disposal decisions, but rather statements on changes to existing disposal practices of the Archives, '*where possible, before the implementation of the practice has so altered*'.¹⁷

The Council has had some success in influencing the Archives and its environment. Council members have been involved in the Australian Law Reform Commission's review of the Archives Act, although more in other capacities than in their role as Council members.¹⁸ Members have spoken about disposal of records in professional forums,¹⁹ and the Council's continuing concern about the destruction of name-identified census records might be acknowledged as a factor in the establishment of a Parliamentary Inquiry into the practice.

This last event is possibly the most important. The nature of the census records and the stature of the inquiry into their treatment makes the *Saving our Census and Preserving our History* report possibly the broadest assemblage of user input into a disposal decision in recent times in Australia. While its outcome was based as much on political as archival or community interest reasons, it gave a voice to far more interest groups than any other investigation into Australian appraisal practices.

The Inquiry also gave greater scope for the opinions of that most maligned group of archival researchers, genealogists and family historians. Of the 289 submissions the Inquiry received, more than 50 were from groups readily identifiable as family and local history groups.²⁰ In its report the inquiry committee gave equal weight to the views of genealogists and other research communities. The report does not question that genealogy is a valid research use of records or a valid reason for retaining records, but considers this type of research, and the submissions from family history groups, alongside other research interests.

The National Archives has never doubted the research value of name-identified census records. Their destruction has been authorised because the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has argued that to fail to destroy them would undermine citizens' confidence in the protection of their privacy and lead to inaccuracies in later censuses. The creator's interest in conducting an accurate census over-rode the researchers' interest in access to an unparalleled information source, although the Archives' reasoning has been explained in terms of value to the community, not only value to the records creator.²¹

The outcome of the inquiry into the treatment census forms does illustrate that it is possible for creators to recognise community needs for access to their records.²² The existence of the archives of large corporations such as BHP and Westpac also show that some organisations believe that their records may serve some larger good. The extent to which records are selected as archives according to perceived research needs of outsiders, as opposed to relying on these research interests coinciding with the interests of the corporation, might be questioned.

Appraisal for accountability

The contributions from researchers to the appraisal debate illustrate that researchers will not necessarily know what is important to other researchers. Neither is the records creator in any position to select archives according to all their possible research uses. Rather, the creator-evidence argument often contends that, since no-one can foresee research uses of the future, the role of the archives should be to document the organisation and its values, and researchers will have to make do with that. Sir Paul Hasluck argued in 1981 'the archives of any institution are not created for the sake of the historian or to provide a supply of bright specimens for the curious'.²³ Hasluck warned against selecting records on the basis of anyone's idea of history – creator or researcher. To Hasluck, selecting archives only for the later historian encouraged creation of records for the sake of history, a process that may even come close to what, in other circles, is called 'cooking the books'.²⁴

While accountability can be discussed in terms of historical accountability, which Duranti defines as 'a need to provide and receive explanation and understanding from one generation to another',²⁵ the concept of more contemporary accountability broadens the idea of users of archives, and might be the point at which primary and secondary interests in archives intersect. Eastwood argues that the three purposes of archives are history, accountability and the law, and that these combined make archives 'arsenals of democratic accountability and continuity'.²⁶ Accountability is often more closely aligned with the archivists' arguments about evidential values of records, which concentrate on documenting organisations and their activities, than with users' informational values, which seek to use archives for information sometimes incidental to the creators' activities. Records can hold individuals and organisations accountable without ever being used. The fact of their creation, capture and preservation helps to modify behaviour.²⁷

Inquiries into governments in Queensland and Western Australia concluded that a strong archival body with jurisdiction over current recordkeeping is

essential to public accountability.²⁸ Sue McKemish observes that archivists have 'incidentally...facilitated the provision of accountability through recordkeeping' while in pursuit of their archival goals.²⁹ In government archives, the archival role has for a long time been associated as much with accountable disposal as with identifying valuable records for research.

The guidance in the Australian standard on records management is based on accountability requirements for current recordkeeping. Appraisal should assess the requirements for records 'to meet business needs, the requirements of organisational accountability and community expectations'.³⁰ It determines what records should be created to document a process, and how long they should be kept, by determining the uses of the records within the system and by 'evaluating the further uses made of the record after current use of the record has ceased'.³¹ These uses are codified by identifying 'stakeholders with enforceable or legitimate interests in preserving the record'.³² These enforceable and/or legitimate claims are then assessed against the risks to the organisation of not meeting them. Only these third party needs are subject to a risk assessment. We may guess that destruction of records that are the subject of enforceable interests will pose a greater risk to organisations than those of merely legitimate but unenforceable interests.

The introduction of the Commonwealth Archives Act also had more to do with accountable government recordkeeping than with the potential for historical research. As Acland and Taylor note, the Act doesn't mention the term 'historical' at all.³³ While Commonwealth accountability players already had enforceable rights of access to records that existed, there was no way of forcing agencies to maintain records so that third-party access could be ensured for an appropriate period. It also gave enforceable access rights to the public.

The Act is part of an administrative law package, along with the Freedom of Information Act, 'aimed at making public administration in Australia more accountable and responsive.'³⁴ While the Commonwealth access regime evolved largely to serve the research community,³⁵ the codification of archival processes was most concerned with accountability. In the early days of its administration of the Act, the Australian Archives certainly seemed to see the appraisal and disposal process in this way. The disposal process was seen to be of 'critical importance...in controlling the accumulation of commonwealth records', and appraisal as 'the critical procedure on which a number of administrative actions depend'.³⁶ The placement of the Archives for much of its post-legislation existence in administrative services departments also helped to emphasise the role of the Archives as servant of government.³⁷

Kim Rubenstein notes that, while the National Archives must account to citizens for its reasons for withholding records, this measure is meaningless

where the records don't exist. Citizens can appeal against access restrictions, but no such rights exist for disposal decisions.³⁸ Nowhere does the Act require the Archives to explain the rationale behind its disposal decisions, although the NAAC must be informed of changes to disposal practice.

The NAA considers its primary responsibility to be 'to provide a concise record of the source of authority, machinery and most important decisions and activities of the Commonwealth and Commonwealth institutions'.³⁹ Social historians would argue that this is not sufficient to sift out the records that best document a community or a nation, as opposed to its institutions and those in power within them, although this aim of appraisal does not necessarily exclude the interests of researchers. The second aim of appraisal – 'to enable future generations to gain knowledge about significant aspects of Australia's culture, heritage and people' – is more readily recognisable as researcher-oriented.⁴⁰ Presented in order of priority, the NAA's aims of appraisal may act to perpetuate the memory of the creating organisation, while catering to the research interests of the community only secondarily.

Clearly, in the Commonwealth at least (although we can probably generalise for most in-house archives) disposal regimes generally give the first priority in appraisal decisions to the needs of records creators. Archives are expected to ratify these decisions after imposing the views of interested parties on the process. Archivists, in intent at least, do not merely accept the judgement of the records' creator, but instruct and guide the creator in taking into account the needs of other stakeholders. This archivists-as-auditor role has as much to do with accountability as it does with identifying research values.

What these guiding documents such as AS 4390, *Making Choices*, and the Archives Act do not specify is who these external stakeholders might be and to what extent their views should be incorporated into the appraisal process. *Making Choices* does not mention consultation with stakeholders at all, although it is in itself an attempt to do so. The Archives Act allows for such consultation only indirectly, and AS 4390 asks only for stakeholder needs to be identified with the creator having the right of veto. To codify stakeholders would inevitably be to exclude some present or future group. However, the United States FBI case, as only one example, illustrates that archivists must identify stakeholders, and not only allow them scrutinise the records of the organisation, but also the appraisal process itself.⁴¹

Whose memory? What evidence?

If researchers and records creators have need of both memory and evidence, what should archivists aim to document when they select records for the

archives? Is it the 'concise record of the source of authority, machinery and most important decisions and activities' of the organisation? Perhaps it is Aveling's 'wide range of relationships' that help us to understand 'the working of a particular society at a particular time'. Whose memories and what evidence do archivists seek to preserve?

Various schools of thought have 'relied on the assumption that there is a close relationship between continuing administrative relevance and continuing research significance, and therefore there is an affinity between the purposes of creators...and archivists'.⁴² The views of researchers, the emergence of social history, and archival practice would tend to indicate that this is not the case.

Boles describes how the interests of the archives' parent organisation determine what will be preserved, with the result that some subjects or activities may not be documented in archives at all.⁴³ While Boles is examining collecting archives, his observations are true also for in-house archives. Where institutions, archives and archivists derive their ideas of relative importance defines the appraisal policy.

Booms argues that, rather being divorced from the organisation whose records they appraise, archivists should free themselves from the values of their own time. Booms' thesis is that archival value is linked to concepts of the state, nation and the people. As these concepts are too broad to be applied in a meaningful way to records, archivists have turned to documenting the administrative structures that represent these concepts. This led to an assumption that every government activity must be documented in the archives in some way. While he acknowledges that 'subject-related documents, tied to specific events, answer only the particular research questions for which they were collected,' and 'provenance must remain the immutable foundation of the appraisal process',⁴⁴ Booms does not see this as the equivalent of documenting administrative structures and the policies of those in power. Rather, appraisal should show the link between individuals and the values of the society at the time of the transaction that is recorded. Booms trusts the advice of neither the records creators nor historians on appraisal, but argues for broader public scrutiny of the process.⁴⁵

Others have encouraged archivists to follow the research trends of the time and adjust their appraisal priorities accordingly. Miller argues that, since the archival and historical professions have a symbiotic relationship, archivists must eventually alter all of their practices to suit the needs of historians.⁴⁶ Miller calls an emphasis on administrative and evidential values 'questionable', and believes that archives will become irrelevant if they do not begin shaping their holdings around what they 'reveal about human activity' as opposed to administrative structures.⁴⁷

Eastwood says that the only possible uses of archives are 'for the conduct of affairs or to generate understanding of those affairs...In either case, archives assist people to reflect on how human relations have been conducted in the past. To facilitate either task, the value of archives as evidence must be protected.'⁴⁸ He agrees that archives are about public memory making, rather than merely administrative or scholarly exercises, and must be analysed 'with the closest attention to the immediate social context of creation'.⁴⁹ Archives are reflections of what was deemed to be important at the time of their appraisal, and to reevaluate archives from current perspectives is to 'fall prey to the relative value judgements of each succeeding age...We cannot legitimately criticize another age for deciding what was important to it.'⁵⁰

Eastwood makes no distinction between primary and secondary use when analysing the usefulness of records and therefore their importance. Miller, however, regards current or administrative use as largely superfluous to the later value of the record. Miller appears to argue that because social history has become popular, institutional history is less so, and there is less of a need to preserve the records that explain the lives of institutions. Eastwood's theory would have it that records of most use to the organisation would continue to have later importance to researchers, alongside, rather than subordinate to other uses.

The differences between Miller's and Eastwood's positions are most obvious when the two are compared with the primary aim of appraisal proposed by the NAA: to provide a record of the source of authority, machinery, decisions and activities of the Commonwealth. Eastwood's view is not in conflict with this approach, although it would also encompass the other NAA criterion. The basis for action of administrations, and the documents that legitimise those actions, have an importance for organisations and are also important not only to demonstrate the legitimacy of actions but to a later understanding of the reasons behind them. Miller's view sees these kinds of records only as perpetuating elites, without giving any detailed insight into the activity of ordinary citizens.

Terry Cook's RAMP (Records and Archives Management Programme) study on the appraisal of records containing personal information seeks to incorporate both sides of the equation. The study begins by acknowledging that 'the history of our "civilisation" cannot be told without these records containing personal information, and it therefore becomes essential for archivists to preserve the most important of them'.⁵¹

Cook argues that, for government archives, the purpose of appraisal should be to represent the interaction of the citizen and the state, by selecting the records that provide the most sharply focused view of this interaction. This is

most likely to be found at the intersection of 'the three factors which define the citizen-state interaction: the programme, the agency, and the citizen'.⁵²

This approach does not seek to reflect the policies of institutions alone, but rather the ways in which administrators sought to implement those policies (successfully or otherwise), the affect this implementation had on citizens, and the ways in which citizens influenced, changed, or subverted the policy. It does not only perpetuate the ideas of elites, but tempers them with the influences citizens, programs and institutions had on those ideas.

As Cook explained the Canadian implementation of the macro-appraisal model in Melbourne, where the records documenting the policy of an institution reflect accurately the way the policy was implemented, it is likely that these are all the records that would be retained of the activity. Where the reality of the implementation was different to the articulation of the policy, more and more 'layers' of documentation may be acquired until the sharpest focus is achieved. Where the implementation of policies did not have the intended outcome, or where there was great community resistance to the policy, the case files reflecting its implementation and affect at the individual level may provide the best picture of the citizen-state interaction.⁵³ Macro-appraisal, then, seeks to strike a balance between pure Jenkinsonianism, which would retain only the records of the ideas and interests of the creator, and Miller's social history approach, which would discard the records reflecting the intent of the institution and keep only those documenting its effect.

In emphasising equality of access, William Joyce points to outreach activities as a way of broadening the use of archives and fulfilling the purpose of cultivating and maintaining collective memory. He notes that outreach can help 'shape the type of future research use and understanding of documents'.⁵⁴ This shaping of use by improving intellectual and physical access to records, and its reverse – the hindrance of use through the lack of promotion or intellectual inaccessibility of records – is a point Leonard Rapport has been accused of disregarding in his arguing the case for reappraisal and deaccessioning of unused records in archives.⁵⁵

Outreach activities such as publications and exhibitions are perhaps the logical extension to appraising for the values of society as a whole, rather than the interests of narrower groups. For government archives in particular, outreach programs offer a way of catering to a broad and largely undefinable stakeholder community. Helen Nosworthy argues that the principal client of a government archives is the public, making its primary focus a cultural one.⁵⁶ Like Joyce, Nosworthy deplors a hierarchy of users which she says results in a view that scarce resources should be used to cater for the serious researcher rather than genealogists and 'hobby' historians.⁵⁷

Cook (whom Nosworthy describes as elitist) fears that the arguments for user-driven archives lead to appraisal on the basis of research use and current historical trends alone:

Records are not appraised and acquired to support use; rather they are acquired...to reflect the functions, ideas and activities of records creators and those with whom they interact. Following such an approach, all kinds of research will be supported. Acquisition, in other words, should *never* be dictated by the transient whims of users...no matter how well articulated.⁵⁸

Instead, Cook advocates public programming that educates users about archives and their context, allowing them to take knowledge, rather than just information or facts, from their experience.⁵⁹ Cook has been followed in this argument by other writers such as Barbara Craig and Glenda Acland, who argue that 'our real clients are the records while the user is our product'.⁶⁰ Public programs can encourage the use of archives by highlighting the existence of particular records, making them more readily accessible to the 'in-person' researcher, and interpreting them for tertiary users who may never come, or even think of coming, to use the archives.

Cook's desire to explain the full context of records to users is echoed by Hedstrom, who highlights the importance of making archival processes, including appraisal, apparent to the user. Hedstrom reminds us that 'no universal system of appraisal has emerged, and there is no consensus on the values that different institutions and different archivists place on records'.⁶¹ She asks archivists to explain for researchers 'the breach between theory and practice', so that researchers might 'attempt to make sense of which records have been preserved and try to place the fragments that remain in the context of what might have existed'.⁶² We must maintain our best efforts to identify, seek out and listen to all of our stakeholders, and select records that best represent the world as it was, at all times recognising that there will never be true consensus, and we must explain about who we have listened to and why.

The consensus of the users debate seems to be that there is no one identifiable user group whose interests must be represented above all others in appraisal decisions. Rather, because the interests in records are so various, and the interested often unable or unaware of the need to speak, archivists must attempt to find ways to articulate a broad and contemporary societal value of archives. It is also to the broader society that archivists must account for their appraisal decisions. As contributors to the collective memory, archivists need to explain why the documentary record came to be shaped as it is.

Social historians have accused archives of perpetuating elites by preserving the interests, ideas and acts of those in power. In one sense, they can do nothing else. By their very nature, records reflect the priorities of organisations

and individuals that have the resources and power to set up their own systems for recording, managing, and exploiting information.

Archives by nature most often memorise the acts of the powerful. But powerful organisations – government or otherwise – interact with citizens, and it is these interactions, documented in records and archives, that perpetuate the memory of the organisation, but also witness the effect of the organisation on its human and physical environment. Institutional archives cannot tell us about individuals without speaking about their relationship with the organisation that created the records. To document the relationship without any understanding of the identity of the participants would be to lose our understanding of the transaction that is taking place.

Where the social historians and other users may be right is in the ability of archivists to document both sides of the transaction. It is the business of the archivist to document records creators. Whose business is it to document other parties to the transactions represented in the records? While archives can and do cater to the needs and interests of records creators in preserving records, there is no such clear mandate for catering for other parties affected by or interested in the creator's activities. As Cook reminds us, 'without the patterns and themes uncovered by research in such records [case files], the history of institutions could be told, but not that of the people'.⁶³ Archives do not and cannot document fully the lives of more than a few individuals – usually powerful or otherwise noteworthy – but they can document individuals' interaction with institutions.

Few archivists have argued that archives are selected with only one use and one group of users in mind. Legislation, standards and appraisal criteria have all recognised that there is not single constituency of archives users, and that archives are created and maintained for many purposes. In practice, however, the range of users and purposes of archives has been restricted by archivists' ability and willingness to seek out voices other than the most numerous or most powerful. While the tension between evidence and memory, creators and users, Jenkinson and Schellenberg, may be more imagined than real, appraisal has been best able to select what is important to only one side of the transactional relationship.

ENDNOTES

1 The quotes used in the title are borrowed from Sir Paul Hasluck and Terry Eastwood respectively.

2 Terry Cook, 'Overview of Appraisal', unpublished paper presented on day 1 of the seminar *Appraisal and the Continuum*, Melbourne, 15 March 1999. These three schools of thought

- are analysed in more detail in Terry Cook, 'What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas since 1898 and the Future Paradigm Shift', *Archivaria*, no. 43, Spring 1997, pp. 17–63.
- 3 Terry Cook, 'Are the Administrative and Cultural Values of Archives Compatible?', unpublished paper presented on day 2 of the seminar *Appraisal and the Continuum*, Melbourne, 16 March 1999, p. 9. These arguments are also made in Terry Cook, 'Archives, Evidence and Memory: Thoughts on a Divided Tradition', *Archival Issues*, no. 22, 1997, pp. 177–82.
- 4 *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia: Papers from the 1981 Conference of the Australian Society of Archivists, Melbourne, 23–25 May 1981*, Australian Society of Archivists, 1981.
- 5 Dr Marian Aveling, 'Jane Geake (1816 - 1833?): Reconstructing a Lost Life', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 32.
- 6 Dr Miles Lewis, 'The Survival and Use of Architectural Drawings', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 69.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 71.
- 8 Charles A Price, 'Certain Archives Concerning Ethnic Minorities', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 63.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- 11 DCS Sissons, 'Archives and the History of Australian-Japanese Relations', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 137.
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 137.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 141.
- 15 Portia Robinson, 'The Convict Records', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 36.
- 16 *Archives Act 1983* (Cth), s.25(1) and (5) respectively.
- 17 *Archives Act*, ss.25(1)(b), emphasis added.
- 18 Bill Blick, Ron McLeod and Robert Sharman, all members of the Council at the time, were consultants to the Review. *Report No 85: Australia's Federal Record, A Review of the Archives Act 1983*, Australian Law Reform Commission, Sydney, 1998, pp. 377–8.
- 19 For example, Beverley Schurr, 'Destroying our History: In Whose Interest, ASIO, the Police and the Census', in *Secrets and Sources: Records Uses and Abuses in the 1990s, Conference papers, 11–14 September 1994, Adelaide*, Records Management Association of Australia, pp. 64–73.
- 20 House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, *Saving our Census and Preserving our History: A Report on the Inquiry into the Treatment of Name-Identified Census Forms*, AGPS, Canberra, 1998, pp. 143–51.
- 21 *Ibid.*, pp. 18–22.
- 22 Although note that the government has not yet responded to the committee report.
- 23 Sir Paul Hasluck, 'Opening Address', in *Promoting the Better Use of Archives in Australia*, p. 2.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 3.

- 25 Luciana Duranti, 'The Concept of Appraisal and Archival Theory', *American Archivist*, vol. 57, Spring 1994, p. 341.
- 26 Terrence M Eastwood, 'Reflections on the Development of Archives in Canada and Australia' in Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward (eds), *Archival Documents: Providing Accountability Through Recordkeeping*, Ancora Press, Melbourne, 1993, p. 36.
- 27 Danielle Wickman, 'Functional Requirements for Evidence and Ethics in Recordkeeping', *Informaa Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 2, May 1999, pp. 10-14.
- 28 See Sue McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping, Accountability and Continuity: The Australian Reality', in McKemmish and Upward, pp. 9-26.
- 29 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- 30 *Australian Standard: Records Management* (AS 4390 - 1996), Standards Association of Australia, 1996, Part 1: General, 4.3, p. 6.
- 31 *Ibid.*, Part 5: Appraisal and Disposal, 6.4, pp. 6-7.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 6.4.3, p. 7.
- 33 Glenda Acland and Philip Taylor, 'Influence, Persuasion and Accountability: Queensland Review of Archives Legislation', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 21, no. 1, May 1993, p. 96.
- 34 Beverly Hart, Stephen Ellis and Ian Pritchard, 'The Appraisal and Scheduling of Government Records: A New Approach by the Australian Archives', *American Archivist*, Fall 1987, p. 592.
- 35 HJW Stokes, 'The Evolution of Commonwealth Access Policy', in Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott (eds), *The Records Continuum: Ian Maclean and the Australian Archives First Fifty Years*, Ancora Press in assoc. with the Australian Archives, Melbourne, 1994.
- 36 Hart, Ellis and Pritchard, p. 591.
- 37 Helen Nosworthy, 'Reaching Out: A Core Program for Australian Archives', in McKemmish and Piggott, p. 66.
- 38 Kim Rubenstein, 'Erring on the Side of Destruction?: Administrative Law Principles and Disposal Practices under the Archives Act 1983 (Cth)', *Australian Journal of Administrative Law*, vol. 4, no. 2, February 1997, pp. 78-91.
- 39 *Making Choices: Deciding which Commonwealth Records to Keep for Posterity - A Discussion Paper* (Keeping Records 3), National Archives of Australia, Canberra, 1998, p. 10.
- 40 *Ibid.*
- 41 Susan D Steinwall, 'Appraisal and the FBI Files Case: For Whom do Archivists Retain Records?', *American Archivist*, vol. 49, no. 1, Winter 1986.
- 42 Duranti, p. 337.
- 43 Frank Boles, 'Mix Two Parts Interest and One Part Information and Appraise Until Done: Understanding Contemporary Record Selection Processes', *American Archivist*, vol. 50, Summer 1987, pp. 356-68.
- 44 Hans Booms, 'Überlieferungsbildung: Keeping Archives as a Social and Political Activity', *Archivaria*, vol. 33, Winter 1991-92, p. 32.
- 45 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- 46 Frederic M Miller, 'Social History and Archival Practice', *American Archivist*, vol. 44, no. 2, Spring 1981, p. 113.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 118.

- 48 Terry Eastwood, 'Towards a Social Theory of Appraisal', in Barbara L Craig (ed.), *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A Taylor*, Association of Canadian Archivists, 1992, p. 75.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 83.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 85.
- 51 Terry Cook, *The Archival Appraisal of Records Containing Personal Information: A RAMP Study with Guidelines*, UNESCO, Paris, 1991, at www.unesco.org/webworld/ramp/html/r9103e00.htm (March 1999). For later and more detailed articulation of Cook's theory see also Terry Cook, 'Mind Over Matter: Towards a New Theory of Archival Appraisal', in Barbara L Craig, pp. 38–70.
- 52 *Ibid.*
- 53 Author's notes from a presentation by Terry Cook on day 4 of the seminar *Appraisal and the Continuum*, Melbourne, 18 March 1999.
- 54 William L Joyce, 'Archivists and Research Use', *American Archivist*, vol. 47, no. 2, Spring 1984, p. 133.
- 55 Leonard Rapport, 'No Grandfather Clause: Reappraising Accessioned Records', *American Archivist*, vol. 44, no. 2, Spring 1981, pp. 143–50. For a counter to Rapport's view, see for example Sheila Powell, 'Archival Reappraisal: The Immigration Case Files', *Archivaria*, vol. 33, Winter 1991–92, pp. 104–16.
- 56 Nosworthy, p. 67.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 69.
- 58 Terry Cook, 'Viewing the World Upside Down: Reflections on the Theoretical Underpinnings of Archival Public Programming', *Archivaria*, vol. 31, Winter 1990–91, p. 130.
- 59 *Ibid.*, pp. 129–30.
- 60 Barbara L Craig, 'What are the Clients? Who are the Products? The Future of Archival Public Services in Perspective', *Archivaria*, vol. 31, Winter 1990–91, pp. 135–41. See also Glenda Acland, 'Managing the Record Rather than the Relic', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 20, no. 1, May 1992, p. 60.
- 61 Margaret Hedstrom, 'Interfaces with Time: Keynote Address for the Australian Society of Archivists', 5 August 1998, at www.sims.monash.edu.au/rcrg/consulting/hedstrom.html (March 1999).
- 62 *Ibid.*
- 63 Terry Cook, 'Many are Called, but Few are Chosen: Appraisal Guidelines for Sampling and Selecting Case Files', *Archivaria*, vol. 32, Summer 1991, p. 25.