Sharing: Collected Memories in Communities of Records

Eric Ketelaar

Eric Ketelaar is Professor of Archivistics in the Department of Media Studies (Faculty of Humanities) at the University of Amsterdam. He is Honorary Professor at Monash University, Melbourne (Faculty of Information Technology). His current teaching and research are concerned mainly with the social and cultural contexts of records creation and use.

He was National Archivist of The Netherlands from 1989 to 1997. From 1992 to 2002 he held the chair of archivistics in the Department of History of the University of Leiden. Over a twenty year period he served the International Council on Archives (ICA) in different capacities and was elected Honorary President in 2000. He is also president of the Records Management Convention of The Netherlands.

Professor Ketelaar has authored some 250 articles[1] mainly in Dutch, English, French and German and has written or co-authored several books, including two general introductions on archival research and a handbook on Dutch archives and records management law. He is one of the three editors-in-chief of Archival Science: International Journal on Recorded Information.

A recent book Owning Memory: How a Caribbean Community Lost its Archives and Found Its History, by Jeannette Bastian, has enriched archival discourse with the notion of a 'community of records', referring to a community both as a record-creating entity and as a memory frame that contextualises the records it creates. To what extent are records constructive in creating and maintaining memories, communities and identities - imagined or real - of individuals, families, corporate bodies, social groups, nations? Could we use the concept of

a 'community of records' in making the fourth dimension of the records continuum model more vigorous and its impact on shaping the three other dimensions more productive? The concepts of 'communities of records' and 'joint heritage' could become the components of a holistic view of the rights and duties of 'records stakeholders'. Such a view might help in repositioning the archive's (and the archivist's) role in shaping memories and identities.

Collective memories

Over the past decade, archival science has been challenged to strive for 'not only a more refined sense of what memory means in different contexts, but also a sensitivity to the differences between individual and social memory'.[2] Individual memory becomes social memory by social sharing of experiences and emotions.[3] Social sharing is mediated by cultural tools.[4] These tools are 'texts' in any form; written, oral, as well as physical. The landscape or a building or a monument may serve as a memory text, while bodily texts are presented in commemorations, rituals and performances.[5] Often, different media work together whenever society requires:

> both an archival and an embodied dimension: weddings need both the performative utterance of "I do" and the signed contract; the legality of a court decision lies in the combination of the live trial and the recorded outcome.[6]

Memory texts (in this broad sense) can be regarded as interfaces between an individual and the past, but I prefer to treat them (in actor-network theory) as agents (actors) which interact with human agents (actors).[7] Remembering is distributed between texts and other agents: neither operates autonomously, but they work together in a network. This networked or distributed remembering happens between one agent as between several agents and several texts. Memory texts do not 'speak for themselves' but only in communion with other agents. For example, a colleague asked me to recommend a book on collective memory. I knew the book I wanted to advise. I could 'see' its color and its size in my mind. I even knew the name of the author, but could not recollect the title. Therefore I involved another agent: amazon.com. By entering the author's name, the website yielded the title and a picture of the book, which I could then recommend. Who 'remembered' the book?

Neither I, nor amazon.com could remember in isolation: the two together were involved in a system of networked or distributed memory.

Social frameworks of memory

Maurice Halbwachs was the first to study individual memory in its social context. His book La mémoire collective was published in 1950, posthumously after the death of Halbwachs in the Buchenwald concentration camp.[8] At the time of writing, mainly during the years 1935 to 1938, it was not customary to speak, even metaphorically, of the memory of a group. Frederick Bartlett - the Cambridge psychologist and a contemporary of Halbwachs - wrote about memory in the group, instead of memory of the group.[9] According to Halbwachs each individual memory is a viewpoint on the collective memory.[10] In his earlier book Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire (1925) Halbwachs had developed the thesis that every memory is socially framed: 'no memory is possible outside frameworks used by people living in society to determine and retrieve their recollections'.[11] Individual memory, he wrote, is:

> a part or an aspect of group memory, since each impression and each fact, even if it apparently concerns a particular person exclusively, leaves a lasting memory only to the extent that one has thought it over - to the extent that it is connected with the thoughts that come from us from the social milieu.[12]

Pursuing Halbwachs' reasoning, I want to investigate the possibility of mapping a 'memory continuum' onto the records continuum, in which memories of the individual, the family, the organisation, the community, and society function, not in isolation, but in a flow of continuous interaction.

Individual memory

Individual cultural memory (the autobiographical memory) fades if it is not supported and nourished in contact with other people or - as we will see - in contact with memory texts. Your memory is, as it were, rooted in other people's remembrances. When meeting a friend from university, after a ten year interval, you start sharing memories: 'do

you still remember that day when we ... '. Your own memories are intertwined with the memories of other people, the memories of a group. This is clear, even in what is mostly considered to be a reflection of the most personal remembering, the diary - both the traditional paper diary and the modern weblog or blog.[13] Annette Kuhn reported on her 'memory work', using photographs from her family album and linking them with other public and private memory texts, discovering that an individual's memories:

> spread into an extended network of meanings that bring together the personal with the familial, the cultural, the economic, the social, and the historical. Memory work makes it possible to explore connections between 'public' historical events, structures of feeling, family dramas, relations of class, national identity and gender and 'personal' memory.[14]

And Kuhn concludes, echoing Halbwachs:

> in all memory texts, personal and collective remembering emerge again and again as continuous with one another ... All memory texts ... constantly call to mind the collective nature of the activity of remembering.[15]

This has led people who studied diaries to question the demarcation between personal and corporate, or private and public records. The histories recorded in your personal records belong to 'those public narratives of community, religion, ethnicity and nation which make private identity possible'.[16] Australians have discovered, in the memory work involved in Bringing them Home, that there is no clear division between personal and collective stories, between public and private.[17] Life stories of Aboriginals are about we, rather than I[18] and the life stories of the Stolen Generation have constituted an Australian lieu de mémoire, both for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians.[19] In a comparable way life stories of immigrants have contributed to constituting collective memories within the immigrant groups and within society at large.[20]

I use the plural collective memories on purpose. There is no single collective memory. Even if members of a group have experienced what they remember, they do not remember the same or in the same way.

The Australian collective memory of the Vietnam War is shared by people who have not experienced the war or the anti-war movement, and even those who did take part remember other events. Their memories differ according to the nature of the social frameworks in which they did function then and do function now, the groups of which they were a member then and are a member now. This has led Ann Curthoys to state 'particular social groups are constructing different "Vietnams" ',[21] just as different people (re)construct a different Holocaust.[22] To a large extent these differences originate from differences in mediation, which transforms the 'historical' Vietnam War and the 'historical' Holocaust into a represented and symbolic Vietnam War and Holocaust.[23] Mediation not only through literature, film, and TV, but also through ceremonies, rituals, being performed and transformed, through monuments which we visit and view, and venerate or abominate in a context which is quite different from the one when they were created.[24] Mediation through archives too: archives whose 'tacit narratives' are constantly re-activated and re-shaped.[25] The sum of these collected rather than collective memories[26] one may call social memory. Some writers prefer this term social memory over collective memory, because the former indicates the social 'constructedness' of memory, of the social process of remembering.[27]

Social or collective memories are not fixed entities: their content will change over time, because they are contingent on societal norms and power. As David Gross argues, society plays a powerful role in determining which values, facts, or historical events are worth being recalled and which are not.[28] Secondly, society has a hand in shaping how information from the past is recalled, and, thirdly, society has a say in deciding the degree of emotional intensity to be attached to memories. And in most cases it is the State that decides on behalf of society, thus imposing the State's politics of memory.[29] Thus, 'none of the features of social memory are themselves by any means free from power relations, pre-existing discursive formations, and the effects of strongly influential forces,' as Tanabe and Keyes write in a recent book about social memory in Thailand and Laos.[30]

Family

The first social framework of any individual's memories is constituted by his or her family. Personal (or autobiographical) memory

(remembrance of what one has experienced) is not sealed off from other people's remembrances, from what Halbwachs called social or historical memory.[31] The family too, has a memory: as any other collective group the family has 'its memories which it alone commemorates, and its secrets that are revealed only to its members'.[32] Through the family memory the individual is connected with a past he or she has not experienced. This connectivity is the basis for any culture.

Family memory, in turn, is embedded in (and permeated[33] by) larger frameworks of kinship, local and regional memories, religion, nation, etc even if, as in the case of (im)migrants, the family replaces the nation as the frame of memory and identity.[34] Halbwachs therefore treats the collective memory of the family first, before he devotes chapters to religious collective memory and to social classes and their traditions. In many families, it is the women who are 'the historians, the guardians of memory, selecting and preserving the family archive'.[35] This gendered recordkeeping has, as far as I know, not yet been recognised sufficiently by scholars and practitioners in archival studies. Their recordkeeping is, as any recordkeeping, not a neutral activity, but contingent on social and cultural norms and beliefs.

Organisations

In the third dimension of the memory (and records) continuum, memories are organised, that is: constructed. The memory of a group is not merely the sum of the memories of its members, nor is the memory of an organisation merely the sum of the memories of its units. Mark Ackerman has found that people maintaining organisational memory systems are very aware of the political nature of the system.[36] They want to make their own unit 'look good' or 'more visible'. Records shape a group, because information 'directly influences the nature of the social relations which it helps to organize'.[37]

Group (or unit) members share memories, tacit knowledge, and social cohesion. Members of different groups, even within the same organisation, often inhabit different social and language worlds.[38] Once the unit's information is to be shared with other units within the organisation, that information has to be made understandable for outsiders. This is done by formalising the information, thereby stripping the information of particular information that was meant to stay inside

the group. Recordkeeping systems are 'active creators of categories in the world' and people in these systems 'classify away traces that they know to be relevant but which should not be officially recorded'.[39]

Every axis of the records continuum model offers different views of transactions, identities, evidence, and recordkeeping. The matryoska-like 'nesting' of all these views has as a consequence that no single view is permanent. Where individual memory is framed by family, group, organisational and societal memories, so are family and organisational memories permeated and changed by other social frameworks. The same goes for documents, which are, as Graeme Davison remarks:

> not only the products of their originators but of successive processes of editing, revision, translation and interpretation. They are potential evidence about all those who participated in the processes through which it was handed down to the present.[40]

The record is a 'mediated and ever-changing construction':[41] records are 'constantly evolving, ever mutating'[42] over time and space infusing and exhaling what I have called 'tacit narratives'. Every interaction, intervention, interrogation, and interpretation by creator, user, and archivist shapes or reshapes the meaning of the record. These 'activations' may happen consecutively or simultaneously, at different times, in different places and contexts.[43] Moreover, as argued before, any activation is distributed between texts and other agents in a network. The record, 'always in a state of becoming', has therefore many creators and, consequently, many who may claim the record's authorship and ownership.

Community of records

'Very little ethnographic work has been carried out which focuses on the relationship between people, communities and documentation', Laura Bear laments at the end of her study that shows how intimately public records and family histories can be interrelated.[44] A recent study of this relationship between people, communities and archives is Jeannette Bastian's Owning Memory.[45] Bastian was from 1987 to 1998 Director of the Territorial Libraries and Archives of the United States Virgin Islands. Named by Columbus in honour of Saint Ursula and her 11 000 virgins, the Virgin Islands were seized by the Spanish, occupied

by the Dutch, changed hands to the French, became a Danish colony, and were sold in 1917 to the United States. The indigenous Indian peoples had disappeared before the seventeenth century: the early colonists found the three islands uninhabited. The labour force needed by the white plantation owners and traders was built up by indentured immigrants, prisoners, and an increasing number of slaves imported from West Africa.

Bastian proposes the concept of a community of records, starting from a new concept of provenance. Tom Nesmith recently defined provenance as consisting of:

> The societal and intellectual contexts shaping the action of the people and institutions who made and maintained the records, the functions the records perform, the capacities of information technologies to capture and preserve information at a given time, and the custodial history of the records.[46]

According to Bastian,

> the records of a community become the products of a multitiered process of creation that begins with the individual creator but can be fully realized only within the expanse of this creator's entire society. The records of individuals become part of an entire community of records.[47]

Communities, she argues, are defined through the relationship between actions and records, the actions creating a mirror in which records and actions reflect one another.

> A community of records may be further imagined as the aggregate of records in all forms generated by multiple layers of actions and interactions between and among the people and institutions within a community.[48]

And further on she writes (resounding Giddens' argument that recorded information is both an allocative resource and an authoritative resource):

> Records, oral or written, become both the creators as well as the products of the societal memory of a community.[49]

Owning records

The Virgin Islanders lost their archives, Bastian argues, because the majority of the records were removed from the islands to Denmark and the US.[50] Loss of custody of records is seen as equivalent to loss of the records. Virgin Islanders have to travel abroad to find their own history,[51] and that means loss of access to the primary sources of their history. This is the same argument used by Henrietta Fourmile who described Australian Aborigines 'as captives of the archives'.[52] Not only are virtually all records concerning Aborigines located thousands of kilometres away from the communities to whom they have relevance, there are other inequities in access too: lack of knowledge about the existence of the records, reticence of archivists, the jargon in which the records are written, etc. Furthermore, the records are crown property and Aboriginals have no sufficient control over the management of the records. Since Fourmile wrote this, the Bringing them Home report and the ensuing changes in archival policies and procedures may have abated most of Fourmile's concerns, but the main question 'who owns the documents?' is still being answered largely in legal terms of governmental ownership rather than in terms of the rights of a community of records.[53] Bastian, however, asserts that in a community of records:

> all layers of society are participants in the making of records, and the entire community becomes the larger provenance of the records. Seen from this view, all segments of the society have equal value.[54]

Especially the native inhabitants of the Virgin Islands, who were the primary subjects of the record-creating process, and thereby, as Bastian writes, a full partner in that process, might lay a claim to at least co-ownership of the records. This was also proposed by Fourmile: sharing the physical records and the responsibility for their custody and management 'so that the rights of one party are not prejudiced in order to benefit the other'.[55] She did not make a distinction between records of the central administration of Aboriginal affairs and others, like the tenancy records, of departments. And right she was, because such a distinction may be correct according to traditional archival methodology, but does not recognise the subject of the record being a party to the

business function which created the record, a co-creator.[56] The agency's file not only is 'my file',[57] but the file of a community of records.

For decades, the Dutch archival community has debated the destination of certain categories of records created by State agencies acting within a local community, like courts and chambers of commerce. In the 1970s the National Archivist and the municipal archivists of Amsterdam and Rotterdam were fighting for archival fonds which legally were State property, but which held information essential to (and having been submitted, and used by) the local communities. The legal argument of crown property and an interpretation of provenance which was more 'political' than archival prevailed. Those fonds stayed in the State's repositories in the provincial capitals, rather than being deposited in their places of origin.[58] Interestingly, at roughly the same time the Dutch National Archives were, at the international level, involved in shaping the idea of a joint archival heritage of Indonesia and The Netherlands.

Joint heritage

The concept of joint heritage was developed by the International Council on Archives and accepted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1978 as one of the basic principles which should guide the solution of conflicting archival claims.[59] The two other principles are: the principle of provenance (the respect for the integrity of archival fonds) and the principle of functional pertinence. The latter is the only exception to the principle of provenance, applicable when records of a non-sovereign political or administrative authority are needed by a successor State to carry on that authority's business. The concept of joint heritage is advisable where archives:

> form part of the national heritages of two or more States but cannot be divided without destroying its juridical, administrative, and historical value … The practical result of the application of this concept is that the archives group is left physically intact in one of the countries concerned, where it is treated as part of the national archival heritage, with all of the responsibilities with respect to security and handling implied thereby for the State acting as owner and custodian of that heritage. The States sharing this joint

heritage should then be given rights equal to those of the custodial State.[60]

This statement does not use the term co-ownership, which has a specific legal meaning, but makes clear that the parties to a joint heritage have equal rights. These rights encompass not only rights of access, but also rights with regard to appraisal, conservation, and other archival functions which might normally not be subsumed under access. I suggest that mutual rights correspond to mutual obligations, which entails that the owner and custodian is not free to exercise his part if that would obstruct the effectuation of the other party's rights.

The concepts of 'communities of records' and 'joint heritage' could become the components of a holistic view of the rights and duties of 'records stakeholders'. Such a view might help primarily in solving archival claims, but, more importantly, in repositioning the archives' (and the archivists') role in shaping memories and identities.

Identities

Collective identity is based on the elective processes of memory, so that a given group recognises itself through its memory of a common past. A community is a 'community of memory'.[61] That common past is not merely genealogical or traditional, something which you can take or leave. It is more: a moral imperative for one's belonging to a community.[62] The common past, sustained through time into the present, is what gives continuity, cohesion and coherence to a community.[63] To be a community, a family, a religious community, a profession involves an embeddedness in its past and, consequently, in the memory texts through which that past is mediated. For the Virgin Islanders and most other formerly colonised and indigenous communities, these texts are predominantly the records created by colonial powers. The record of governance has to be contextualized, however, 'by reading it within the larger discursive formation in which it emerged - a formation in which multiple cultural sites, texts, and contexts were active'.[64] Colonial archiving 'shaped' local communities in the coloniser's taxonomies, while these communities 'asserted their identity and agency in response to the authority of colonial rule.'[65] This reciprocal 'production' and 'consumption' (shaping and, what Wertsch calls 'mastery'[66]) of the colonial narrative of history and identity entail that former colonisers

and former colonised are a community of records, sharing a joint archival heritage. The same is true for other mutually associated groups, like indigenous and immigrant Australians. As Upward and McKemmish wrote, 'The Aboriginal experience, in many different ways, is "evidence of us" ' - and I would add: so are the concurrent records.[67] One might look to the joint archival heritage of communities of records as a 'boundary object' which connects two or more communities.[68]

Connecting, however, is not enough. Shaping a community and its identity unavoidably involves 'presupposing or assigning an obligatory identification or reidentification'.[69] The search for roots and belonging[70] may contribute to making the community into a community of records. But that will also contribute to marking the limits to other groups and their members. We have to be aware of the fact that this 'dual process of inclusion and exclusion'[71] may lead to intolerance, discrimination, cleansing and usurpation. And records professionals especially have to be mindful that records can be used as props or tools in these processes.[72] They should be mindful of the opportunities that communities of records have for sharing, which, according to Jacques Derrida:

· both says what it is possible up to a point to have in common, and it takes into account dissociations, singularities, diffractions, the fact that several people or groups can, in places, cities or non-cities ... have access to the same programs.[73]

Sharing collected memories and sharing communities of records is imperative - keeping in mind that 'we must practice a politics of memory and, simultaneously, in the same movement, a critique of the politics of memory'.[74]

Endnotes

1 A selection of publications and works available at <http://cf.hum.uva.nl/bai/home/eketelaar/publication.html>.

2 Margaret Hedstrom, 'Archives, Memory, and Interfaces with the Past', *Archival Science*, vol. 2, 2002, pp. 21–43, here pp. 31–32. See also Brien Brothman, 'The Past that Archives Keep: Memory, History, and the Preservation of Archival Records', *Archivaria* vol. 51, 2002, pp. 48–80; Eric Ketelaar, 'The Archive as a Time Machine', *Proceedings of the DLM-Forum 2002: @ccess and Preservation of Electronic Information: Best Practices and Solutions, Barcelona, 6–8 May 2002, INSAR European Archives News, Supplement* VII (Luxembourg 2002) pp. 576–

581; Barbara L Craig, 'Selected Themes on the Literature on Memory and Their Pertinence to Archives', *American Archivist* vol. 65, 2002, pp. 276-289; Laura Millar, 'Evidence, Memory, and Knowledge: The Relationship between Memory and Archives', paper presented at the International Congress on Archives, Vienna 2004 <http://www.wien2004.ica.org/imagesUpload/pres_166_MILLAR_ZMIL01.pdf>; Michael Piggott, 'Archives and memory', in: Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds.), *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society,* Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, 2005, pp. 299-328. A comprehensive and very readable text on collective memories is: Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering,* Open University Press, Maidenhead and Philadelphia, 2003 with an extensive bibliography.

3 Véronique Christophe and Bernard Rimé, 'Exposure to the social sharing of emotion: Emotional impact, listener responses and secondary social sharing,' *European Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 27, 1997, pp. 37-54.

4 José van Dijck, 'Mediated Memories: Personal Cultural Memory as Object of Cultural Analysis', *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 18 (2004) pp. 261-277.

5 Stephen Muecke, *Textual Spaces. Aboriginality and Cultural Studies,* New South Wales University Press, Kensington, 1992, Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas,* Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2003, Paul Connerton, *How societies remember,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, Thomas A Markus and Deborah Cameron, *The words between the spaces: Buildings and language,* Routledge, London and New York, 2002.

6 Taylor (as note 5) p. 21.

7 Hedstrom (as note 2); Bruno Latour, 'On technical mediation – Philosophy, sociology, genealogy', *Common Knowledge* vol.3, no.2, 1994, pp. 29-64; James R Taylor et al., *The computerization of work: A communication perspective,* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi, 2001.

8 Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory,* Francis J Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter, transl. Harper & Row, New York, 1980. Original edition: *La Mémoire collective,* Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1950. The newest critical edition is: *La mémoire collective* (Gérard Namer, ed.) Paris Albin Michel 1997. References are to the 1980 translation.

9 Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (as note 8), p. 50.

10 In the English translation (Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, p. 48) the word 'individual' is missing.

11 Maurice Halbwachs, *On collective memory* (Lewis A Coser, ed.) The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1992, p. 43 (translated abstracts from: *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris, Librairie Alcan, 1925). The newest critical

edition is: Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Gérard Namer, ed.), Paris, Albin Michel, 1994. References are to the 1992 translation.

12 Halbwachs, *On collective memory* (as note 11), p. 53.

13 Michael Piggott, 'The Diary: Social Phenomenon, Professional Challenge,' *Archives and Manuscripts* vol. 31 no.1 May 2003, pp. 83-90; Van Dijck (as note 4).

14 Annette Kuhn, *Family secrets: acts of memory and imagination,* Verso, London and New York, 1995, p. 4.

15 Kuhn (as note 14) p. 5. Kuhn uses 'memory texts' in a narrower sense than I do in this paper.

16 Patricia Holland and Jo Spence, *Family snaps: the meanings of domestic photography* Virago, London, 1991, p. 3 and p. 91.

17 Paula Hamilton, 'Memory studies and cultural history', in: Hsu-Ming Teo and Richard White (eds.), *Cultural history in Australia,* New South Wales University Press, Sydney 2003, pp. 92-93.

18 Bain Attwood and Fiona Magowan, *Telling stories: indigenous history and memory in Australia and New Zealand,* Bridget Williams Books, Wellington, NZ, 2001, p. xiv.

19 Bain Attwood, "Learning about the truth': the stolen generations narrative ", in: Attwood and Magowan (as note 18) pp. 183-212, here p. 199.

20 Alistair Thomson, "The Empire was a bar of soap': life stories and race identity among British emigrants travelling to Australia, 1945-1971 ", in: Teo and White (as note 17) pp. 201-213.

21 Ann Curthoys, "Vietnam': Public Memory of an Anti-War Movement ", in: Kate Darian-Smith and Paula Hamilton (eds.), *Memory and history in twentieth-century Australia,* Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1994, p. 114.

22 Lynn Rapaport, *Jews in Germany after the Holocaust: memory, identity, and Jewish-German relations,* Cambridge University Press, New York, 1997.

23 David Morley and Kevin Robins, *Spaces of identity: global media, electronic landscapes, and cultural boundaries,* Routledge, London and New York, 1995, p. 93.

24 Shigeharu Tanabe and Charles F Keyes (eds.), *Cultural crisis and social memory: modernity and identity in Thailand and Laos,* University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, 2002.

25 Eric Ketelaar, 'Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives', *Archival Science* vol.1, 2001, pp. 143-155.

26 James E Young, *The Texture of Memory,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 1993 preface; Jeffrey K Olick, 'Collective Memory: The Two Cultures', *Sociological Theory* vol. 17, 1999, pp. 333-347.

27 James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social memory, New perspectives on the past* Blackwell, Oxford, UK and Cambridge, Mass. 1992. See Piggott (as note 2) p. 306, and Michael Piggott, 'Building collective memory archives' in this issue.

28 David Gross, *Lost Time. On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture,* University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst 2000, p. 77.

29 Jacques Derrida and Bernard Stiegler, *Echographies of Television. Filmed Interviews,* Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002, 62. On the issue of politics of memory and the power of the State see Eric Ketelaar, 'Archival Temples, Archival Prisons: Modes of Power and Protection', *Archival Science* vol. 2, 2002, pp. 221-238, and the other articles in the two thematic issues of *Archival Science* vol. 2, 2002, on 'Archives, Records, and Power', edited by Joan M Schwartz and Terry Cook.

30 Tanabe and Keyes (as note 24).

31 Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (as note 8), p. 52.

32 Halbwachs, *On collective memory* (as note 11), p. 59.

33 Halbwachs, *On collective memory* (as note 11), p. 184.

34 Anne Marie Fortier, *Migrant belongings: memory, space, identity,* Berg, Oxford, 2000, p. 166.

35 Holland and Spence (as note 16) pages 9, 107, 172, 211; Graeme Davison, *The Use and Abuse of Australian History,* Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, NSW, 2000, p. 81.

36 Mark S. Ackerman, 'Definitional and contextual issues in organisational and group memories', *Information Technology & People,* vol.9,1996, pp. 10-24.

37 Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration,* Polity Press, Cambridge 1984 p. 262, referring to McLuhan.

38 John L King and Susan Leigh Star, 'Conceptual foundations for the development of organizational decision support systems', *Proceedings of the Hawaii International Conference on Systems Science,* 1990, pp. 143-151.

39 Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star, *Sorting things out: classification and its consequences,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1999.

40 Davison (as note 35) p. 144.

41 Terry Cook, 'Archival science and postmodernism: new formulations for old concepts', *Archival Science* vol. 1, 2001, pp. 3-24, here p. 10.

42 Sue McKemmish, 'Traces: Document, record, archive, archives', in: Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds.), *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society* Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, 2005,p. 1-20, here p. 14.

43 Ketelaar (as note 25).

44 Laura Bear, 'Public Genealogies: Documents, Bodies and Nations in Anglo-Indian Railway Family Histories,' *Contributions to Indian Sociology,* 2001, p. 386.

45 Jeannette A Bastian, *Owning Memory. How a Caribbean Community Lost its Archives and Found Its History,* Libraries Unlimited, Westport Conn. and London, 2003.

46 Tom Nesmith, 'Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives', *American Archivist* vol. 65, 2002, p. 35. Nesmith's earlier definition as follows: 'the social and technical processes of the records' inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpretation which account for its [the record's] existence, characteristics, and continuing history' see also Tom Nesmith, 'Still Fuzzy, But More Accurate: Some Thoughts on the 'Ghosts' of Archival Theory', *Archivaria* vol. 47, 1999, p. 146.

47 Bastian (as note 45) p. 3.

48 Bastian (as note 45) p. 5.

49 Bastian (as note 45) p. 5.

50 Jeannette A. Bastian, 'Question of Custody: The Colonial Archives of the United States Virgin Islands', *American Archivist* vol. 64, 2001, p. 96-114.

51 Bastian (as note 45) pages 1 and 6.

52 Henrietta Fourmile, 'Who owns the past? Aborigines as captives of the archives', in: Valerie Chapman and Peter Read (eds.), *Terrible hard biscuits: a reader in Aboriginal history,* Allen & Unwin and Journal of Aboriginal History, St. Leonards, NSW, 1996, pp. 16-27.

53 Danielle Wickman, 'The Failure of Commonwealth Recordkeeping: the Stolen Generations in Corporate and Collective Memory', *Comma* vol.1, 2003 pp. 117-128; George Morgan, 'Decolonising the Archives: Who Owns the Documents', *Comma* vol.1, 2003, pp. 147-151.

54 Bastian (as note 45) p. 83.

55 Fourmile (as note 52) p. 25.

56 Michael Piggott and Sue McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping, Reconciliation and Political Reality', in: Susan Lloyd (ed.), *Past Caring? What does Society Expect of Archivists? Proceedings of the Australian Society of Archivists Conference. Sydney 13-17 August 2002,*Canberra, Australian Society of Archivists, 2002, pp. 111-122, here p. 117 and on <http://www.sims.monash.edu.au/research/rcrg/publications/piggottmckemmish2002.pdf>.

57 Eric Ketelaar, 'Recordkeeping and Societal Power', in: Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds.), *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society* Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, 2005, pp. 277-298, here pp. 281-282.

58 In a comparable Dutch case the archives (of a state school) were returned by the State Archives to the municipal archives, but they had been made

meaningless 'as all files relating to the school and its staff in the local community had been removed': Joan van Albada, 'Archives, Particles of Memory or More', *Comma* 2001 (1/2) pp. 13-18, here p. 16.

59 Hervé Bastien, 'Reference Dossier on Archival Claims', *Janus. Special issue: Proceedings of the twenty-ninth, thirtieth and thirty-first International Conference of the Round Table on Archives,*1998, pp. 209-268.

60 Bastien (as note 59).

61 The term community of memory was used by Robert N Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart. Individualism and Commitment in American Life,* University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1985, pp. 152-155.

62 W James Booth, 'Communities of Memory: On Identity, Memory, and Debt', *American Political Science Review* vol.93, 1999, pp. 249-263.

63 Morley and Robins (as note 23) p. 72.

64 Betty Joseph, *Reading the East India Company, 1720-1840. Colonial Currencies of Gender,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 2004, p. 10.

65 Saloni Mathur, 'History and anthropology in South Asia: rethinking the archive,' *Annual Review Anthropology* 29 (2000) 95; Ann L Stoler, 'Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance', *Archival Science* 2 (2002) pp. 87-109; Joseph (as note 64).

66 James V Wertsch, 'Narrative Tools of History and Identity', *Culture & Psychology,* vol. 3, 1997, pp. 5-20.

67 Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, "In Search of the Lost Tiger, by Way of Sainte-Beuve: Re-construction of the Possibilities in 'Evidence of Me' ", *Archives and Manuscripts* vol. 29 no. 1 May 2001, pp. 22-42, here 37. Michael Piggott, 'Building collective memory archives' (in this issue) points to the interfaces via which we can come to connect with memory resources of others: the dominant society, the coloniser, the former dictator's regime. I agree but would go further. Instead of interfaces I prefer agents who network to constitute co-partnership and sharing of memory resources.

68 Bowker and Star (as note 39) pp. 296-314.

69 Derrida and Stiegler (as note 29).

70 Gerard Delanty, *Community* Routledge, New York, 2003, pp. 189.

71 Paula Hamilton, 'The Knife Edge: Debates about Memory and History', in Darian-Smith and Hamilton (as note 21) p. 23.

72 Elisabeth Kaplan, 'We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity,' *American Archivist* vol. 63, 2000, pp. 126-151, here p. 151; Ketelaar (as note 57).

73 Derrida and Stiegler (as note 29) p. 66. I have slightly changed the translation of the French: Jacques Derrida and Bernard Stiegler, *Échographies de la télévision. Éntretiens filmés,* Galilée and INA, Paris, 1996, p. 78.

74 Derrida and Stiegler (as note 29) p. 63.