Building Collective Memory Archives*

Michael Piggott

Michael Piggott has been University Archivist and Head, Archives Special Collections and Grainger Museum, at the University of Melbourne since 1998. He was formerly with the National Archives of Australia, Australian War Memorial and National Library of Australia. He has postgraduate qualifications in librarianship, history and archives administration. His professional interests include appraisal, archival education and the history of archives. He has long-established links with the Australian Society of Archivists, including editorship of Archives and Manuscripts, and was conferred as a Laureate in 1997. He is a member of the editorial board of A&M and on that of Kluwer Academic Publishers' series, The Archivist's Library. In 2003 he was made an Honorary Research Fellow of Monash University's School of Information Management and Systems.

The article's point of departure is archivists' sweeping, uncritical and repeated equating of archives with personal corporate and social memory (despite the continuing use of memory by libraries and museums to explain their own roles), and the records continuum model's approach to 'memory' within its fourth dimension. It attempts to respond to memory related research questions raised by continuum proponents. The author suggests memory can be a motive behind the building of certain components of the collective archives, illustrated by recent published research on the motives of institutional collecting archives and those families who responded to approaches (the State Library of NSW and the Australian War Memorial), and by the example of the auto archivist and founder of the Grainger Museum, Percy Grainger. Following these two third dimension case studies, the article ends with a fourth dimension perspective by surveying ways collection policy frameworks might be coordinated in Australia, including memory inspired recordkeeping and

Introduction

The modern articulation of the term 'collective memory' was essentially the work of the French sociologist of knowledge Maurice Halbwachs (1877–1945).[1] His key insight argued that although it is always individuals who remember, it is as group members that they remember and recreate the past, regardless of whether the group is a class, a family, an army, a trade union or an institution. Since then 'collective memory' has entered general western discourse to be one of many terms from literature and the social sciences such as 'public opinion', 'newspeak ' and 'complex' which have come into common use. Now archivists worldwide seem to use it and the contraction 'memory' as a convenient and comforting shorthand when trying to express their cultural role or the ultimate meaning or purpose of archives, or when arguing that archives have great meaning and significance. And it feels right. Definitions from Jenkinson (the record as a convenient form of artificial memory) to Nesmith (archiving as the multifaceted process of making memories) have included 'memory' ideas.

Our use of 'memory' may be understandable but its cavalier treatment is hardly intellectually respectable, especially in face of the vast literature of memory studies. It presents complications too, quite apart from the confusing use of variants interchangeably (collective, social, cultural, historical memory; corporate, organisational memory).

One difficulty arises because we imply that archives result from and support remembering, and accordingly we deplore deliberate targeting of archives to enforce forgetting, as 'cultural cleansing' and more recently, as 'memoricide'. We represent failure to meet the challenge of electronic records preservation as resulting in amnesia. Remember the 1985 US Committee on the Records of Government report? Its headline grabbing opening sentence was 'The United States is in danger of losing its memory'. We are not so adept at explaining our own deliberate destruction regimes implemented directly via sentencing against schedules, or resulting by default via selective collecting programs, or by failure to ensure accountable records creation.

Secondly, deploying memory is hardly a smart way of differentiating archivists' societal role if libraries and museums say they too support society's memory. Last year the National Library of Australia exhibited a selection of recent acquisitions under the banner 'Future Memory'. Its

curator's essay led with an apt quote from Umberto Eco, and asserted the Library was the 'designated keeper' of our 'collective wisdom' in that it stored 'the documentary heritage of Australia and its people, recording the things we have forgotten, the things perhaps most of us never knew'.[2] And museums have long ago represented themselves and been conceived of as shapers and preservers of memory. So is there archival memory and a different library or museum memory, when all collectively are now to be styled as memory institutions?

Perhaps if the choice is all or nothing one should question archives' memory role altogether? Verne Harris has written of 'that giant spectre looming behind every claim to archives being the memory of a nation, a society, or a community'. He continued:

> ... these 'memory institutions' holding the treasure of records with archival value, these archives contribute relatively little to social memory. In my country, the vast majority of citizens have not even heard of such archives ... the tapestry of their memories, their stories, their myths, and their traditions - this tapestry is woven from other societal resources.[3]

In Australia, a memory-archives link emerged in the mid 1990s in parallel with a growing North American awareness of memory's relevance,[4] in standards, mission statements and the first articulations of the records continuum model.[5]

Memory and the continuum

The concept of memory features in the continuum model as part of the evidential axis, and more broadly it is the overall term for the third and fourth dimension processes (organising memory; pluralising memory). Explaining how to read these dimensions, and what it is they explain, Frank Upward wrote of building, recalling and disseminating corporate memory, or more succinctly 'organising the record as memory', and of building, recalling and disseminating social, cultural and historical collective memory. Other combinations he used were archives as a place of memory, a virtual memory palace and (pluralised) memory banks. For corporate memory there was a short explanatory note differentiating memory which is 'contained' in business documents from a broader organisational memory, while for personal memory, there is a reference

to Sue McKemmish's writing (at that time) on personal recordkeeping.[6] What the model's principal Australian proponents meant by memory and collective memory is not easy to discern, and there was little discussion even in their key references with but a single passing mention of the classic memory studies literature. Continuum model terms are essentially topological, leaving us free to apply our own understandings or dictionary.[7]

Identifying precisely what one of the continuum model's main theoretical inspirations, Anthony Giddens meant by memory is also a challenge, though one does not question employing the insights of a sociologist given the essential nature of recordkeeping and archiving.[8] For all that, if one had to come up with an alternative one word to describe what the collective totality of all archives everywhere anytime, amount to, there is no better concept to choose.

In some of its articulations, the records continuum model has struggled to present itself to best advantage.[9] But its many positive features include the important questions it prompts, often resulting when its champions elaborate to counter critics. Thus, in their response to Verne Harris, Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish noted in passing that 'there has been little systematic exploration of the specific role recordkeeping and archiving plays in constituting personal corporate and collective memory'. They then turned endnote sixteen into a challenging ten point research agenda. They bear repeating:

- What are the operative relationships between remembering and forgetting, and recordkeeping and archiving?
- How do the recordkeeping and archiving professions contribute to the corporate memory of an organisation or the collective memory of a society?
- What role do they play in transforming personal memory into collective memory?
- What is the relationship between recordkeeping and archiving, and other 'inscribing' practices'?
- What is the relationship between oral records and written records?

- What is the relationship between personal and corporate records and other forms of 'memory' stores (i.e. social and organisational action-structures of all kinds, eg living memory, learned behaviours, gender and other roles, rituals, ceremonies, oral tradition, stories, memoirs, autobiographies, biographies, genealogies, histories, scholarly writings, mass communications, music, paintings, sculpture, literature, dance, film, artefacts, and the built environment)?
- How might the answers to these questions inform our thinking of other disciplines to our own field?
- What is the relevance of the memory metatext and *petit recits* of other fields to our own field?
- Can we really hope to identify and carve our way through such a continuum of content, with all the contradictions our findings will bring, and if so how?
- Is the growing spread of the continuum as a construct for meta-narratives the answer to this problem?[10]

We have said enough about models and the meaning of words – except that it is surely impossible to disagree with Brien Brothman's call for vigorous clarification of the concept of memory and his suggestion for a working archival concept of memory.[11] He, like those just quoted, had a research agenda, and what follows is offered as a contribution to their challenges.

Building *collective memory* archives

Society is more than its collective memories, and the totality of pluralised archives does not automatically equate with society's or any societal group's collective memory. Similarly human memory is only one element of our 'personhood', our consciousness, our mind (though a very important one). Memory is one of many metaphors[12] for, not a synonym of, archives. In turn, archives are shaped in a myriad ways and for many purposes, including to remember, forget, reinforce identity and memorialise. And the collective need to remember can result in many behaviours and many things, including the creation and the capture of archives: *collective memory* archives. Use and our interface

building activities can also influence the way archives support memory processes.[13] Put the two together as the Queensland State Archives attempts in its current vision statement 'connecting people to the recorded memory of government' and one has what might be styled *archival* collective memory. That however is not the topic under discussion here. Following others such as Sue McKemmish (evidence of me/evidence of us), Lukins (letting go) and Tom Griffiths (de-privatisation), I am interested in the building side, the supply side.[14]

To begin a series of elaborations of this view, take again Verne Harris's point quoted above that the majority of South Africa's citizens do *not* regard institutional archives as the place where their memories are stored, literally and figuratively. In fact those archives do *relate* to them, document their activities and transactions, are indeed about them. If we argued, as archivists sometimes do, that collective archives equate to collective memory, then citizens' memory is there regardless, stored in what the South African National Archives' mission statement calls 'a treasure house of national memory resources that is accessible to all'.[15] If so, for many it is like a house with no immediate key, a store of memories most South Africans did not help build and which they have no motivation to recall. It is a poor substitute for their own memory stores. As we have seen with Indigenous Australians in relation to the 'Stolen Generation', however, that can change. One can come to connect via interfaces with existing relevant memory resources of others (the dominant society, the coloniser, the former dictator's regime), as one nurtures one's own personal and collective memory.[16]

Building collective memory archives is a way of asserting (as opposed to preserving) one's place in the world. It is a very well known phenomenon within modern society. It is practised by families, historical societies, schools, businesses, clubs, community groups and a vast array of minorities. Typically it is anniversaries that stimulate awareness of or a heightened sense of the group's contribution to society. So too can crises, a defining event, threats, departures of very long serving personnel and occasionally, external encouragement. Collecting, followed by digitisation and website development, now increasingly the focus of so-called memory work or memory projects,[17] will typically embrace all forms of recorded information and is usually directed to supplying a commissioned history with source material. Oral history interviews, sets of newsletters and publications, and objects and other

memorabilia are among the most popular, but the pursuit of archival records will always be included for the authority as historical evidences they are presumed to carry. No group emphasising a strong self image to the wider society will exclude minute books, diaries, petitions and correspondence and especially photographs. The expression of national identity through foundation documents of various kinds, and through collecting by institutions focused on broad societal themes or historical events such as war, is also well known. Here the results of collecting were seen not primarily as resources for historical research, but as what Tanja Luckins calls objects of memory – part of the general transmission of memory.[18]

This memory archiving means there are occasions when the grandiloquent claims of the Australian Society of Archivists' Mission Statement are justified. When archives are collected and kept self-consciously, the intent (if not always the result) is to tell the present and the future: 'remember this, remember us, remember what we achieved, remember what they did to us'. Legally based records such as constitutions, charters of freedom, parliamentary proceedings, certified copies of treaties, official registrations of births and land sales are also the product of very deliberate public acts of recording. They are agreed statements, from the present to the future, which say that this is what we collectively and officially say happened, was done and was said.[19] Of course, such records do not guarantee that subsequently there will not be repudiations or disagreements, as New Zealand has discovered in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi.[20] And as we have noted earlier, other archives not deliberately selected to support memory can also become invested with enormous memorialising power. Some take on deep symbolic significance, while others evolve to become classic conduits of collective memory. They take up meaningful representativeness by answering the needs of a family, group, class, social strata or even a whole nation. One of the best-researched and still evolving examples of such documents from the twentieth century is Anne Frank's diary,[21] but every country and age produces such documents. All this acknowledged, here we are focused on collective memory archives built prospectively, across society, within social groups and institutions.

Two Australian institutions, the Australian War Memorial and the Grainger Museum are instructive here.[22]

The Australian War Memorial

The way Australia's memory of war is preserved and transmitted can be especially fruitful for fourth dimension analysis, particularly its premier national institutional locus, the Australian War Memorial in the national capital Canberra. The Memorial[23] is one of our genuine memory institutions, regardless of how national libraries and archives style themselves. In particular:

- The Memorial's first world war origins linked so closely to the immediate needs of CEW Bean, the official war correspondent who knew as he filled his notebooks that he was to be head of the official war history project.
- The determination of Bean and that of his influential supporters such as the long serving Memorial Director Colonel JL Treloar to ensure the capture of complete records (especially unit and formation war diaries) through the establishment of the Australian War Records Section and in support, collecting programs for relics and the appointment of war photographers, cinematographers and artists.
- Later, a Memorial Museum building comprising public galleries, an inner 'Hall of Memory' sanctum with the names of the dead listed by unit on a public 'Roll of Honour' and a library and archives, driven by a belief that the personal records of soldiers were sacred; in other words a multi functional hybrid *locus sanctus*, contrasting strongly with overseas models which separated the management of documentary sources from the cenotaph/shrine where ceremonies are held.

It should hardly need acknowledging that memory of war is manifested, reinforced and transmitted in many ways other than archivally, through what Eric Ketelaar has called memory texts - war memorials, annual ceremonies on special days, battlefield visits, reunions and reminiscing, Returned Services League rituals, and funerals of war heroes. These have been the subject of much scholarly analysis in Australia, by writers such as Ken Inglis (war memorials), Alistair Thompson (memory biographies) and Liz Reed (the 1995 Australia Remembers program). Given our interest here in the keeping and collecting of war archives to

build collective memory, we should note new research on the Memorial's archival collecting role.

In Anne-Marie Condé's studies[24] for example one can see several significant features of the continuum model at work. There were a number of stages to the pluralising: a very early campaign by the Mitchell Library (then part of the then Public Library of New South Wales) to collect diaries and letters, followed by the Memorial's efforts, then a resurgence from the 1970s as a new generation becomes interested in military history and the contents of various 'attics'. Her key insight concerns the differences between the two institutions' motives. The Mitchell advertised, offered to buy material (but would only accept originals), and like John West wanted only the best: fat diaries with plenty of meaty facts, dates, places and description, and photographs that didn't duplicate existing holdings. By May 1920 Condé concluded, the Mitchell Library 'having fed greedily of the records available from ex soldiers, ... decided it had had enough and ceased to advertise for any more material'.[25]

At the Memorial however, the end of the 1920s saw it actively seek out diaries and letters, using the opportunity of research necessitated by its project to build the Roll of Honour and by the cycle of official war history production. Unlike the Mitchell Library, it did not advertise and it did not offer cash. But it did negotiate around what was in many cases a deeply personal request that they part with mementoes of dead sons. Most families didn't even reply, and when the Memorial was successful, it settled for copies and items well down the classic primary source food chain (maps, photos, publicity material, ephemera, personal copies of official items) but still highly significant as personal memorials. Selection (censorship?) happened when material was lent for copying, and when families decided what would be sent, 'appraisal began around the kitchen table'. Motives for agreeing differed, Condé demonstrates, the returned men less committed to 'evidence of me/evidence of us' (us the grateful nation) than were the grieving families.

There was motive on the bereaved families' part too. Tanja Luckins, who examined the responses to requests of them from the Memorial's Director, came to challenge the views that collecting was about gaining knowledge:

> We have to cease treating diaries and letters simply as paper records of the War, waiting to be collected for and by an institution, and we have to question their status as nothing more than manuscripts or archival sources ...
>
> When treated as objects of memory, diaries and letters interrupt that seamless journey from the battlefield to the archive to the history book ... For those diaries and letters so eagerly sought by the War Memorial were also the possessions of the next-of-kin, whose collections were like museums, cabinets of curiosities, even collections of sacred or saints' relics. We can think of these collectors who, in the two decades after the War, were forced to make decisions about letting go. The collecting of paper records was part of the building of the nation's war memorial, and simultaneously part of the bereaved's process of letting go of diaries and letters – in both processes it throws light onto the general transmission of memory. The acts of collecting and letting go of diaries and letters reveal multiple views of the 'historical' nature of personal records of the Great War in the days before they were codified and reified.[26]

The Grainger Museum

War for Percy Grainger was a very different kettle of fish; more relevant here is the common documentary memoralising following a loss. Grainger[27] was a pianist, composer and musical innovator born in Brighton, Melbourne, in 1882 and who died in White Plains, New York in 1961. He was a cross between Norman Lindsay, Barrie Kosky, Jonathon Mills, Barry Humphries, Rolf Harris ... and Andy Warhol. His biographers have also acknowledged his considerable proficiency and originality in painting and clothing design; his interest in avant-garde sound experiments with music making machines (in the pre-electronic era); his athleticism; his theories about music, mankind, personal relationships, sex including flagellation, friendship, race and language; his contribution to the preservation of folk music; and his relationships with his mother, lovers and wife.

The idea of the Grainger collection and the Grainger Museum[28] has many sources and elements. The general concept of an autobiographical museum was there quite early and relates to his belief that he had the gift of genius, and his awareness of other great men (or 'life masters' as he termed them) such as Goethe, Wagner, Beethoven, Dickens, Carlisle, Hans Christian Anderson and Grieg, and some of whom were also the focus of museums. Opinions differ as to the specific prompt for acting on this self-awareness, but each suggestion (including his enlistment in the US Army in 1917 and his marriage in 1928) relates to reminders of the transitory nature of life and need to make arrangements to preserve one's material memories. The suicide of his mother in 1922 was perhaps the strongest factor. Grainger had a very close relationship with his mother and on several occasions represented the museum idea as acknowledging the enduring results of her nurturing, in a sense echoing her example in documenting him through such things as his baby cloths, juvenilia, and early press reports. As Naomi Cass put it, 'From an early age Grainger's mother curated a space for her son's genius, and under her complex support Grainger lived a life worthy of a museum'.[29]

By middle age, Grainger's ideas had settled on the University of Melbourne, although something approximating a second museum, initially little more than a fireproof holding store, had already been started in White Plains, where he and briefly his mother (and later his wife) lived just outside New York city from 1921 onwards. Another was contemplated as an 'Aldridge Grainger Museum' when, in 1944, he inherited the family home Claremont in Adelaide from his aunt Clara. Through copying he also established 'sub-collections' at the Elder Conservatorium of Music, Adelaide, the Sibley Music Library at Rochester, the British Museum and the Library of Congress.

Although Grainger lived in the land of his birth for only thirteen years (1882–95) he always strongly identified himself as Australian, and returned for tours and visits six or seven times, and never forgot Melbourne's generosity in raising fifty pounds to cover his education expenses when leaving for further study in Frankfurt in 1895. The University, with its Conservatorium, was an obvious location. His initial proposal in 1932 to the head of the Conservatorium of Music, Professor (later Sir Bernard) Heinze was enthusiastically received. University Council acceptance shortly thereafter led to construction starting in 1935. The Museum was sufficiently completed for a public opening by 1938.

Grainger had funded it, helped design it, prepared exhibits and explanatory panels for it, wrote the collecting philosophy, secured staff for it, and for the rest of his life never stopped collecting for it and adding to its capital base.

For all his 'great man' theories, the aims of the museum as articulated by Grainger variously in the 1930s - 1950s were not straightforward. Essentially however it had a twofold aim, which resulted in talk of two museums (the Grainger Museum and Music Museum), but more realistically two 'wings' in the one building. The first in fact had multiple aims and embraced early music and folksong and ethnomusicology, but was primarily to illustrate and explain through a museum-library-archive collection the achievements of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Nordic/English composers such as Grieg, Elgar, Delius, (Richard) Strauss and Scott. Grainger identified himself strongly with this group. The second though subordinate aim was focused on areas of general musical interest, including Australian musical life.

Grainger was simultaneously a diligent and meticulous recordkeeper; a collector who began very early in life and was astoundingly catholic in taste (he intended even his skeleton to be included in the museum).[30] He was a scholarly and honest documenter too, hence his interest in English and Scandinavian folk songs, arising from musical interest and a concern to preserve a fading cultural phenomenon. He recorded hundreds of folksongs with unusual attention to the authentic dialect and also noting the singer's appearance, personality and environment, and from respect for what today would be termed 'moral rights' (whenever he used a folksong in one of his compositions he specifically acknowledged who had first sung it for him).

In record continuum terms, Grainger's life may be placed simultaneously on all four dimensions. You might say he was a shameless and global 'self pluraliser' who operated across several continents:

- Creating documentary traces deliberately to memorialise (his wife complained about his writing 'Museum letters').
- Capturing records of and about himself (diaries, letters, photos, autobiographical sketches, self documented sexual activities) into his highly individual recordkeeping systems, and making arrangements with his mother (who managed his business affairs), girlfriend, and later wife to do likewise.

- Collecting material of and about his family and circle, making multiple copies of manuscripts and letters, transcribing other people's compositions and recording other cultural materials (folk songs), and managing his own papers including instructing correspondents about dating typing and copying return letters ('one for me & one for the museum').
- Organising his museum (design, funds, displays) in Melbourne and to a lesser extent his house museum in White Plains New York.

Grainger regarded all cultural material important to the memorialising function, operating in and beyond the information continuum as well. The pluralising continued after his death, by his wife and then her second husband Stuart Manville who runs the White Plains Percy Grainger Library Society. It continues still with the Melbourne Grainger Museum adding further Grainger documents as they become available, and by various Grainger societies around the world. His pluralised legacy is also continued by Edgell every time their advertisements play 'Country Gardens', in film (Peter Duncan's *Passion*), by performances of his music, Chandos with their complete re-recording, through exhibitions, and through the results of continuing scholarly interest in his life and works.

Building fourth dimension frameworks

We have seen then that in memory of a son's mother and his circle (Grainger), in memory of a family's son (the war bereaved), archives were added to public institutions and over time, the memorialising was institutionalised and perpetuated. But what of the sum of all such processes, and indeed what of the sum of all archiving regardless of motive behind their origins? How are collective memory archives to be understood, to be built, collectively?

My short answer is that any serious efforts must be based on realism. Broadly speaking Sue McKemmish is surely correct to say that, as yet, there is 'no coherent, collaborative, nationally coordinated, encompassing fourth dimension collection policy framework for the whole of Australian society'.[31] This lack has been noted many times in Australia, but we are better at analysing the problem and recommending rather than implementing solutions.[32] Sectoral infrastructure such as

the former Australian Council of Archives and the Council of Federal State and Territory Archives flirted with the issue's politics and other complexities. It remains to be seen what the Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities and the Collections Council of Australia intend and are able to do.

Much has been and can be done nevertheless. Collecting institutions have reasonable understandings of each other's strengths and intents, and some have loose bilateral agreements. There is some evidence too that government archives are using 'place of deposit' powers to redistribute custody of series to more appropriate community settings and looking at appraisal of cross jurisdictional and common functions. Cultural institutions sometimes act similarly, having been foster parents until a local council or historical society develops the means to manage their patrimony. Sometimes too split collections will be reunited, as happened recently between the Victoria's state library and gallery concerning the archive of photographer Ruth Hollick. Collaborative frameworks can be developed, if not nationally, and there are encouraging signs this is happening. Thus in Tasmania last year its Cultural Collections Sector Forum developed a draft *Tasmanian Private Records Collection Policy* to ensure personal and private records created by prominent Tasmanians remain in the state and that dispute resolution protocols and a priority list of individuals and organisations are developed. The latter aspect is critical of course. Until gaps are identified and remedial action taken, we will not approach achieving a collection representative of the whole of Australian society.[33]

Finally, scaling back the focus to memory archiving, how do we foster and support *collective memory* archives? Fortunately those with a burning motivation to assert their place in the world through archiving, those who want to say it loud via collecting 'lest we forget' need not wait for collection policy frameworks to be promulgated. Nor have they. We can help nevertheless; for example by advising about selection and providing custody as the University of Melbourne Archives has for the numerous collections of the Victorian Women's Liberation and Feminist Lesbian Archive (identity archiving) and as the Noel Butlin Archives Centre has for the 1997–98 Waterfront dispute collection (event memory archiving). We could build on new editions of the ASA's *Keeping Archives* and 'archival support programs', just as the National Library of Australia did through its 2003–04 multicultural documentary heritage project

(generic identity archiving) and as the Australian Centre for Oral History has with its new product 'Oral history in a suitcase' (generic testimony archiving).[34] And it need not stop there; perhaps we could issue advice about scrapbooking (memorialising recordkeeping) and blogging (instant memorialising)?[35]

Conclusion: the research agenda remains

Blogging, such a private yet public practice, brings us to a natural endpoint. Beyond the commanding sites of government and corporations and their archiving and recordkeeping programs, and inadequately acknowledged in the third and fourth dimensions, people document their memories. More specifically, they pursue their memory agendas through documentation. They are members of families, clubs and victims' groups; they are cam girls, minorities and ex POWs; they are self taught oral historians, volunteer librarians and auto archivists. They are self organising, but sometimes draw on established institutions and tentative fourth dimension frameworks.

This article has advocated greater care in archivists' use of the concept memory, but championed its relevance to understanding certain modes of capturing, keeping and transmitting archives via the concept of collective memory. This helps a little with the challenging Upward and McKemmish research agenda, as certainly do others' explorations of the communities which share such memories, but leaves many annoying loose ends. (For example, if we are all storytelling animals who experience the urge to witness, why did some bereaved families respond to the War Memorial's requests while others did not? And why the Grainger Museum and the auto archivist; was it all his mother's fault?). Finally, from the broadest fourth dimension perspective, there is much yet to be resolved: whether to, and how to, collectively shape and coordinate *collective memory* archiving.

Endnotes

* This paper develops points from 'Archives and Memory', ch. 12 of Sue McKemmish et. al., eds., *Archives; Recordkeeping in Society*, Charles Sturt University Centre for Information Studies, 2005 and a paper presented at the *Archives and collective memory: challenges and issues in the pluralised archival role* seminar offered in Melbourne in August 2004 by the Recordkeeping Institute and Monash University's School of Information Management and Systems.

The author thanks the Guest Editor Glenda Acland and colleagues Anne-Marie Condé, Stephen Yorke, Belinda Nemec, Adrian Cunningham, Sigrid McCausland and Eric Ketelaar for comments on earlier drafts of this article.

1 See Maurice Halbwachs, *On collective memory*. Edited translated and with an introduction by Lewis A Coser. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.

2 *Future Memory*, National Library of Australia May 2004, p.14. (The Eco item was 'Vegetal and Mineral Memory: The Future of Books', November 2003. Any number of similar representations of libraries abound; for instance to novelist Ben Macintyre they are a 'citadel of memory'. See 'Paradise is paper, vellum and dust', *Times online*, 18 December 2004, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,1068-1407490,00.html> [accessed 13 January 2005]. My point is hardly original. Hugh Taylor was thinking about this in the early 1980s, but for a convenient summary see his ' "Heritage" revisited: documents as artefacts in the context of museums and material culture,' *Archivaria*, no. 40, Fall 1995, pp. 8-20 at p. 11.

3 Verne Harris, 'On (Archival) Odyssey(s)', *Archivaria*, no. 51, Spring 2001, pp. 2-13 at pp. 5-6.

4 See for example Kenneth E Foote, 'To Remember and Forget: Archives, Memory and Culture', *The American Archivist*, vol. 53, Summer 1990, pp. 378-392; Richard Cox, 'The Concept of Public Memory and Its Impact on Archival Public Programming', *Archivaria*, vol. 36, Autumn 1993, pp. 122-135; Brien Brothman, 'The Past that Archives Keep: Memory, History and the Preservation of Archival Records', *Archivaria*, no. 51 Spring 2001, pp. 48-80; Barbara L Craig, 'Selected Themes in the Literature on Memory and Their Pertinence to Archives,' *The American Archivist*, vol. 65, Fall/Winter 2002, pp. 276-289, and practically all of the first issue for 2002 of *Archival Science*. On a number of occasions since the early 1990s Terry Cook has also drawn attention to the archives-memory nexus, including his keynote address to the ASA annual conference in Melbourne in 2000, 'Beyond the Screen: The Records Continuum and Archival Cultural Heritage': see <http://www.archivists.org.au/sem/conf2000/terrycook.pdf> [accessed 29 January 2005].

5 See Frank Upward, 'Structuring the Records Continuum, Part One: Post-custodial Principles and Properties', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 24, no. 2, November 1996, pp. 268-85 and Structuring the Records Continuum, Part Two: Structuration Theory and Recordkeeping, *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 25, no. 1, May 1997, pp. 11-35. Subsequent key continuum writing include Frank Upward, 'Modelling the continuum as paradigm shift in recordkeeping and archiving processes, and beyond - a personal reflection', *Records Management Journal*, November 2001, available at <http://www.sims.monash.edu.au/research/rcrg/publications/Frank%20U%20RMJ%202001.pdf> [accessed 25 January 2005]; Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, 'In Search of the Lost Tiger, by Way of Sainte-Beuvre: Re-constructing the Possibilities in 'Evidence

of me', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 29, no. 1, May 2001, pp. 22-42; Sue McKemmish, 'Placing records continuum theory and practice', *Archival Science,* no. 1, 2001, pp. 333-59; Frank Upward, 'The Records Continuum and the Concept of an End Product', p 45. *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 32, no. 1, May 2004, pp. 40-62

6 Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of me ...', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 24, no. 1, May 1996, pp. 28-45.

7 Frank Upward, 'The Records Continuum and the Concept of an End Product', p 45. One remains puzzled by the contrasting intense interest in discussing certain critical terms such as 'document', 'record' and 'archive' and seeming uninterest in equally crucial terms like 'memory'. Is it a 'certain postmodern fondness for not knowing what you think about anything' as discussed in Terry Eagleton, *After Theory.* Allen Lane, London, 2003, p. 104?

8 On the value of Giddens to the model, see part two of the original 1996 article (note 7 above) and Frank Upward, 'Modelling the continuum ...'. The key Giddens' ideas underpinning the continuum model are in *The Constitution of Society; Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Memory has two meanings which more or less parallel the common dichotomy of what neuroscientist Steven Rose calls individual brain memory and social/collective memory. In relation to the first, Giddens talks about 'memory traces' which form part of his notion of 'structure'. (This is a crucial concept in structuration theory but space constraints prevent explaining that term and the terms that definition depends on, even had I the relevant ability with words.) Here memory is part of an individual's psychological qualities which helps orients his/her self aware conduct ('knowledgeability'); it is part of the constitution of their temporal consciousness. (pp. xxii, 49 and 261 of the 1984 University of California Press edition). The phrase 'memory traces' itself, an unfortunate choice given its other meanings for example in neurobiology and philosophy, is not defined but is clearly meant to be seen as part of a person's day-to-day life. Giddens' second use, and the one deployed in the continuum model, sees memory as a form of information control and retention, an authoritative resource 'inhering' in the community itself. The metaphors of 'storage' and 'containers' are also used in such explanations, human memory for example being 'stored' within language and the city and the nation state being likened to 'containers'. At an earlier Monash University seminar Professor Eric Ketelaar deftly toyed with and extended this via a companion metaphor involving Russian nesting dolls or *matryoska.* See 'Communities of Records' presented at the School of Information Management and Systems, Monash University Melbourne, 23 July 2004 (copy in author's possession).

9 Courageously it attempts to present sixteen insights in a simple graphic, complicated at times by explanations in something less than plain English, frustrated in the face of often confused reactions and ignorant criticisms, and

all presented in a country where a rich vein of anti-intellectualism runs deep and (I sometimes fear) in its archives and records community too.

10 Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, 'In Search of the Lost Tiger ...', p. 41. To these I would add an eleventh question arising directly from the four dimensions of the continuum model's so-called evidential axis, viz in what sense is corporate/ personal and collective memory *evidence*? It is an issue which has troubled Terry Cook ('Beyond the Screen ...', p. 12 and, there is even something to be said for regarding the evidential axis entirely in memory terms. Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward themselves have separately hinted as much ('Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, p. 10; 'Continuum Part Two, p. 279), although McKemmish has also explained her use of *evidence* to be a very cultural and eclectic one (Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice ...', p. 337 note 5). It is undoubtedly true that sometimes a memory motive lies behind the same recordkeeping and archiving in the first two dimensions as in the latter two. An example is the embellishment practices which can accompany photography, which transform the visual trace into a memory object. For a sumptuously illustrated survey of this transforming process of families and sometimes larger entities, what Geoffrey Batchen calls an 'extended act of remembrance', see his *Forget me not; photography and remembrance.* Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 2004. Bruce Scates has also noted grieving families' habit of mounting photos of fallen relatives above telephones as a perpetual reminder, and holding them so as to be included whenever a group family photo was being taken. See 'In Gallipoli's Shadow; Pilgrimage, Memory, Mourning and the Great War', *Australian Historical Studies,* vol. 33, no. 119, April 2002, pp. 1-21 at p. 4.

11 Brien Brothman, 'The Past that Archives Keep ...', pp. 71-2.

12 In turn, the archives and archiving, with over forty other notions, has been used a metaphor for memory. See Douwe Draaisma, *Metaphors of memory; a history of ideas about the mind* Translated by Paul Vincent. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 3, 217 and 314. Draaisma's later work, *Why Life Speeds Up As You Get Older; How Memory Shapes Our Past* (CUP, 2004) is also relevant more generally - and less demanding on the reader.

13 Margaret Hedstrom has articulated this process both in seminars in Australia and in the international literature. See especially her 'Archives, memory, and Interfaces with the Past', *Archival Science* vol. 2, 2002, pp. 21-43.

14 See Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of me ...', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 24 no. 1 May 1996, pp. 28-45 and Tom Griffiths, 'Collecting Culture', *National Library of Australia News,* July 1997, pp. 9-17. For Lukins, see note 26 below.

15 See <http://www.national.archives.gov.za/aboutnasa_content.
html#mission> [accessed 21 January 2005].

16 There is a vast literature on Stolen Generation 'interface' activities and enabling mechanisms. For a recent illustration of the results, in which archives and oral traditions combine, see Rene Powell and Bernadette Kennedy, *Rene Baker # 28 EDP* Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2005.

17 The more loaded term is *Denkmal-Arbeit,* denoting both 'memorial activity as collectively or publicly initiated' but also 'the work of the individual in memory, or re-memory'. See Noam Lupu, 'Memory vanished, absent and confined; The countermemorial project in 1980s and 1990s Germany', *History & Memory,* vol. 15, no. 2, Fall/Winter 2003, pp. 130-164 at p. 130. There are innumerable examples of memory projects, as a simple web search on the term will attest. For a recent Australian example on the Black Friday bushfires of 1939, visit <http://www.abc.gov.au/blackfriday/home/default.htm> [accessed 9 February 2005]. The stand out overseas example would be the many efforts to document the events of September 11 2001 in the US.

18 Case studies and discussion on how archives have been collected, recovered and re-interpreted to underpin group identity in the archival literature is surprisingly thin, but include Elisabeth Kaplan, 'We are what we collect, we collect what we are; archives and the construction of identity', *The American Archivist,* vol. 63, Spring/Summer 2000, pp. 125-151, and locally Graham Carbery, 'Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 23, no. 1, May 1995, pp. 30-37 and its website <http://home.vicnet.net.au/~alga/aboutus.htm> [accessed 1 February 2005]. See also the many relevant chapters in Carolyn Hamilton, et.al., eds., *Refiguring the Archive,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002. The studies referenced below by Anne-Marie Condé and Tanja Luckins are also relevant here.

19 On this point, particularly in relation to photographs, see Susan Sontag, *Regarding the pain of others.* Picador, New York, 2003, pp. 85-88.

20 For a survey of recent treaty and tribunal histories, see Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh, eds., *Histories, Power and Loss; Uses of the Past – A New Zealand Commentary,* Bridget Williams Books, 2001.

21 According to Melissa Muller, the diary made Anne Frank 'one of the best-known figures of the twentieth century'. See her *Anne Frank; the biography.* Metropolitan Books, 1998, ix. The Anne Frank phenomenon can be readily tracked in the diary's publishing history, the films, plays and debates it has triggered, and through internet searches on her name which run to over a million; see also Robert Sackett, 'Memory by Way of Anne Frank; Enlightenment and Denial Among West Germans, Circa 1960', *Holocaust and Genocide Studies,* vol. 16 no. 2 Fall 2002, pp. 243-265. Of course, for holocaust deniers, the diary supports a completely different collective memory.

22 Equally fruitful to 'building collective memory' interpretations of their history would be studies of the role of archives (or lack of it) in the myth making

surrounding key Australian events (eg the Eureka stockade; the 'captive white woman of Gipps land') and individuals (eg Breaker Morant, Ned Kelly, and John Simpson Kirkpatrick).

23 The standard reference is Michael McKernan, *Here is their spirit; a history of the Australian War Memorial, 1917-1990.* University of Queensland Press, 1991. References relevant to later points in this section include Anne-Marie Schwirtlich, 'The Australian War Memorial and Commonwealth Records, 1942-1952' in Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, eds., *The Records Continuum; Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years,* Ancora Press, Clayton, 1994, pp. 18-34; and Michael Piggott, 'The Australian War Records Section and its aftermath, 1917-1925,' *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 2, no. 8, December 1980, pp. 41-50.

24 Anne-Marie Condé, 'Capturing the records of war: collecting at the Mitchell Library and the Australian War Memorial', *Australian Historical Studies,* vol. 36, no. 125, April 2005, pp.134-52.

25 Anne-Marie Condé, pp. 141-2.

26 Tanja Luckins, *The gates of memory; Australian people's experiences and memories of loss and the Great War.* Curtin University Books, Fremantle, 2004, pp. 223-4. Luckins' work builds on existing Australian scholar particularly that of Professor Joy Damousi. For interesting parallels from another country and another war, see Michael Stevens, 'Voices from Vietnam; building a collection from a controversial war,' *The American Archivist,* vol. 64, Spring/Summer 2001, pp. 115-120.

27 The standard biography though there are others, is John Bird, *Percy Grainger* (Sydney Currency Press, Third edition, 1999). A promised more definitive study is in development by Professor Malcolm Gillies. He and David Pear have also edited *The All-Round Man; Selected Letters of Percy Grainger 1914-61* (Oxford University Press, 1994) and *Portrait of Percy Grainger* (University of Rochester Press, Rochester, 2000. Other important sources are Malcolm Gillies and Bruce Clunies Ross, eds. *Grainger on Music* (Oxford University Press, 1999), Kay Dreyfus, ed., *The Farthest North of Humanness: Letters of Percy Grainger 1901-14* (Macmillan, Melbourne, 1985), and the Grainger theme issue of *Australasian Music Research* (vol. 5, 2000) edited by Malcolm Gillies. For an early attempt of my own to understand this 'auto-archivist', see my 'Percy Grainger and the Grainger Museum, University of Melbourne', in Jenni Jeremy, ed., *Someone Special: Issues in the development of person specific libraries, archives and collections: proceedings of a national conference presented by the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Library, 18-20 October 2001.* Adelaide, University of South Australia Library, 2003.

28 On the Museum today, see <http://www.lib.unimelb.edu.au/collections/grainger/index.html> [accessed 9 February 2005].On its origins specifically, see Helen Reeves, *The 'Past-hoard-house': A study of the Grainger Museum.*

Graduate Diploma in Material Culture thesis, James Cook University of North Queensland, 1984; Gillies and Pear, *The All-Round Man*, pp. 147-153; and George Tibbits, 'Building the Grainger Museum' in Kate Darian-Smith and Alessandro Servadei, eds., *Talking Grainger; perspectives on the life, music and legacy of Percy Grainger*. The Australian Centre and Grainger Museum, University of Melbourne, 1998.

29 Naomi Cass, 'Making a museum of oneself: the Grainger Museum', *Meanjin*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2000, pp. 140-151 at p. 141.

30 Grainger specified this in his will, though it was ignored. He is buried in Adelaide. The memorialising role of bodies, whether symbolically via tombs of unknown soldiers or literally present yet still unknown is a fascinating if separate topic. For a recent instance of the latter, see Jean-Yves Le Naour, *The living unknown soldier; a story of grief and the Great War*. William Heinemann, 2004. Finally there is the archival body embalmed and visible in mausoleums, and much contested as we see now in the current debates over whether Lenin should be finally buried. I touch on this in my 'Australian Prime Ministerial Libraries, comments and reflections', *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 36, no. 1, March 2005, pp. 74- 83.

31 Sue McKemmish, 'Placing records continuum theory and practice', p. 351. Similarly University Librarian Alan Bundy recently called for action by the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee towards the 'development of policy frameworks within [universities]... to maintain and extend their responsibilities within a national collecting framework in the 21st century'. See his 'For someone special: the development of the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Library', *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 36, no. 1, March 2005, pp. 15-24 at p. 24.

32 One could also see the Conference of Commonwealth and State Archives in 1949, the Schellenberg seminars in 1954, the Conference on Source Materials for Australian Studies in 1961, the Australian Libraries Summit in 1988 and the Archives in the National Research Infrastructure Round Table No. 10 in 1999 as attempts in part to examine common approaches to appraisal and collecting. On the vexed issue generally, see Adrian Cunningham, 'From here to eternity: collecting archives and the need for a national documentation strategy', *LASIE*, vol. 29, no. 1, March 1998 see: <http://www.sl.nsw.gov.au/lasie/prepdf.htm> [accessed 25 April 2005]; Michael Piggott, 'A national approach to archival appraisal and collecting,' paper presented to the Archives in the National Research Infrastructure Round Table No. 10; see <http://www.asap.unimelb.edu.au/nscf/roundtables/r10/r10_piggott.html>.

33 Systematic society-wide documentary gap analysis and mapping has yet to be undertaken in Australia. Its need is typically highlighted when the focus is on specific historical or societal issue, inquiry or theme, though on one occasion

format was the concern ('The Last Film Search'). The typical response has been calls for oral history, copying or improved access programs. Australian archivists themselves have recently made a start; for example attempting to adapt the 'Minnesota method' (see J Ellen et.al., 'Making archival choices for business history', *Australian Economic History Review*, vol. 44, no. 2, July 2004, pp. 185-196), and examining available documentation on themes such as protest movements, sport and literature (see Maggie Shapley's Editorial and articles in the vol. 29 no. 2 November 2001 issue of *Archives and Manuscripts*).

34 While I have deliberately cited local examples, one is not implying any lack of overseas instances, viz the Welcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London's support for oral history via its Witness Seminars. See <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/histmed/witness-seminars.html> [accessed 25 April 2005] and the support offered by the Library of Congress, Smithsonian Institution and others for various archiving efforts about September 11. See <http://www.911digitalarchive.org/> [accessed 25 April 2000].

35 Scrapbooking and blogging, vastly popular modes of contemporary auto-archiving, are rediscoveries and reinventions of older practices, and now the subject of scholarly and popular analysis. They have been noted in this journal, for example, on the former see Eric Ketelaar, 'Being Digital in People's Archives', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 31, no. 2, November 2003, pp. 8-22 and on the latter, see my review 'The Diary: social phenomenon, professional challenge', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 31 no. 1, May 2003, pp. 83-90. Blogging long ago became the focus of scholarly research. For a sampling to the literature, see Theresa Senft's doctoral thesis *Camgirls: Webcams, LiveJournals and the Personal as Political in the age of the global brand* profiled at her site <http://www.echonyc.com/~janedoe/diss/synopsis.html> [accessed 26 April 2005] and José van Dijck, 'Composing the Self: Of Diaries and Lifelogs,' in *Fibreculture Journal* no. 3, at <http://journal.fibreculture.org/issue3/issue3_vandijck.html> [accessed 24 May 2005].