Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm through Education: Critical Discussions around the Pacific Rim[1]

Anne Gilliland, Andrew Lau, Yang Lu,
Sue McKemmish, Shilpa Rele, Kelvin White

Anne Gilliland and **Sue McKemmish** lead the archival education and research programs at UCLA and Monash University respectively, and are Chief Investigators for the 'Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm Through Education' Project. Their co-authors include UCLA doctoral and masters students who have been undertaking aspects of this research in collaboration with Indigenous, ethnic and racial communities and archival practitioners and academics in the western and South-Western United States, Mexico, Australia, and Asia.

****

> The special contribution of ... education to the birth of the new society would have to be a critical education which could help to form critical attitudes, for the naïve consciousness with which the people had emerged into the historical process left them an easy prey to irrationality. Only an education facilitating the passage from naïve to critical transitivity, increasing men's ability to perceive the challenges of their time, could prepare the people to resist the emotional power of the transition.
>
> Paulo Freire, Education for Critical Consciousness[2]

Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm through Education is a collaborative project exploring the recordkeeping and archival education needs of Indigenous, ethnic and other marginalised communities in Pacific Rim nations and how far existing programs meet their needs. Funded by the UCLA Pacific Rim Program, the research is being undertaken by researchers at the University of California Los Angeles, Monash University in Melbourne and Renmin University in Beijing. Two invitational research workshops to report on the research to date and engage in critical discussion with stakeholders have been held, one at Monash University in March 2007, and one at UCLA in June 2007. The first part of this paper provides background information on the Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm through Education project, including its positioning in relation to advocating pluralism. An outline of the project follows. The rest of the paper reports on the two workshops, which focused on the educational needs of marginalised communities in Australia and the US, and the action agenda proposed by workshop participants. Workshop outcomes support the development and delivery of archival education that is culturally sensitive, inclusive of the community knowledge and experience of Indigenous, ethnic and other marginalised communities in Australia and the US, and responsive to community needs.

Advocating pluralism

The countries and regions surrounding and within the Pacific Ocean contain over half of the world's population and are variously referred to as the Pacific Rim, the Asian-Pacific Rim, and the Asia-Pacific Region. The Pacific Rim as a region and its individual nations teem with linguistic, cultural and religious diversities. Some of the larger nations, such as Australia, the United States and China, are prominent, established players on the world stage as well as strong national entities. Others, such as many Pacific Island nations, are small, remote communities that are highly susceptible to global economic, political and environmental forces. The Pacific Rim region today is also rife with the social and cultural legacies of colonialism, imperialism, evangelism, slavery, migration and displacement. The legacies of these activities include official narratives and collections of materials of all types relating to subjugated or displaced cultures and communities. The narratives and collections, however, created predominantly by the ruling administrations, overwhelmingly

omit or fail to represent adequately the experiences and perspectives of those people who were subjected to these administrations. In cases where one culture, community or belief system has assumed power over another, that power relationship remains embedded in how the activities are remembered and forgotten, in large part because of the administrative records created during that period and preserved within government, institutional and religious archives, and the way cultural collections portray the 'other'.

In Australia, a glaring example of this can be found in official records relating to the government programs to remove Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families and place them with state or church institutions, or white Australian families, whence they could be 'civilised' and assimilated into European society. The children, now referred to as the Stolen Generations, were given new names, and told that their parents were dead or had deserted them, and their parents were not told how they could contact their children. The use in the official records of the European names given to the children and European place names for their country meant that for many years it was very difficult or even impossible to trace the children, their parentage, or the places and communities from which they were taken.[3] Recent archival description and indexing projects have attempted to redress this situation, but there are still many barriers to accessing the records, not least being that description and indexing initiatives rely on project funding rather than being seen as the core business of archival institutions.[4]

Another example can be found in the official narratives of Mexico, which have almost completely erased the history of extensive slavery under Spanish rule, and the contributions of the large numbers of people of African descent to the formation of the modern nation of Mexico. Moreover, through a policy of *mestizaje*,[5] these narratives have perpetuated a legal colour blindness that omits references to ethnicity from the official record. As a result, there is a failure to acknowledge the continued existence today of communities and traditions of African heritage concentrated in areas such as the Costa Chica.

Multiple examples can be identified that relate to the widespread lack of recognition and acceptance of Indigenous sovereign rights and also the principle of self-determination that is one of the major tenets of the United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.[6] Indigenous communities worldwide are increasingly expressing and

acting upon their concerns regarding the ownership, location, preservation and handling, and access to and use of records and other preserved materials relating to their communities. In North America, these concerns underpin the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials recently developed by the First Archivists Circle. The Protocols seek 'to guide libraries and archives in engaging in culturally responsive care of Native American archival materials and in providing culturally appropriate service to communities'.[7] In contemporary Russia, which, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, had to address how to build an identity for the new nation, the approach taken was to place the civic interests of a nation as the main values on which a new and strong state should be built. This approach was manifested in archival terms by an emphasis on a centralised system for developing archives and preserving records - records that were, for the most part, generated by the bureaucratic and academic elite - and left little room for addressing the archival heritage and needs of the country's many Indigenous groups. Moreover, archives in Russia are for the most part state-owned and administered, making it difficult for a minority group such as an Indigenous community to gain visibility through its archives. This strategy has not only reinforced past discriminatory perceptions of the place of Indigenous peoples within the new Russia, but has also made it difficult for the Indigenous movement to grow.

These examples involve marginalisation, in which certain communities are discriminated against or disenfranchised socially, legally, economically, politically or culturally. Their marginalisation is clearly reflected in their under-representation in the archive. Definitions of what constitutes marginalisation are often hotly contested and vary by region. In Australia and the United States, many ethnic and racial minority communities have endured long histories of discrimination, as exemplified in the 'White Australia Policy' and the only US Act of legislation to specifically target and bar a group of people from immigrating to the United States, the *Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882*.[8] Discrimination that marginalises communities stems from many causes, including cultural differences. For example, the members of what is referred to as the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex, Queer/Questioning (LGBTIQ) community in the United States have had to contend with laws that mandated five to ten years in prison for acts of 'sodomy', as well as social ostracism and intolerance.[9] The history of

discrimination against the LGTBIQ community in the United States and similar communities in Australia and elsewhere is in part a story of embittered battles for recognition of identity and a place in the collective memory.

Another factor that archivists need to take into consideration today is that there is a move in the opposite direction at the national level of many countries based on the view that we need common national values and the way to avoid discrimination is equality of treatment and non-recognition of different ethnic groups. Examples of this that have recently been in the news include France's approach to its ethnic minorities, efforts to integrate Muslims in the United Kingdom, and the 2007 controversy surrounding the Anglo-Celtic, Judaeo-Christian cultural and historical knowledge required for Australia's citizenship test. Even though liberal democratic societies are meant to espouse the incorporation of different sets of values with dominant ones as exemplified in anti-discrimination and human rights legislation, this has frequently not happened in practice.

In the workshops held at Monash and UCLA, and in this paper, we use the term 'marginalised communities' to refer to Indigenous, ethnic and other minority communities in Australia and the US that have been precluded from full participation in society due to the legacies of colonialism, imperialism, evangelism, slavery, migration and displacement as well as phenomena such as racism, ethnocentrism, homophobia, and heteronormativity.[10] Marginalised communities experience a concomitant under-representation in archives, cultural collections, and the recordkeeping and archival profession itself.

The recordkeeping and archival profession, by virtue of the paradigm that has governed its theory and practice, and the profile of its membership, has been an agent in perpetuating the dominance of the narratives, omissions and perspectives of the mainstream. Its body of theory and practice originated in Europe in order to support the bureaucratic, accountability and cultural needs of the monarchies, governments, corporations and churches, and their expanding empires. These institutions in turn exported their recordkeeping theories and practices to the Asia-Pacific region as key tools of colonialism, commerce, evangelism, cultural dominance and, more recently, globalisation. Archival theory, as articulated by such eminent figures as Mueller, Feith

and Fruin, and Jenkinson, has subsequently been augmented to address the needs of modern recordkeeping, and of digital records in particular. It has also been codified through the development of international standards and local, national and international legislation and policy. Currently, in the European Union, it is subject to a continent-wide endeavour to standardise archival education as part of the Bologna Process, which aims to create a European Higher Education Area by 2010.[11]

In more recent archival literature, some of the key tenets of archival science, including its narrow definition of the forms an archive might take, its constructs of records creation and provenance, and related socio-legal concepts of ownership, custody and rights in records, have been challenged:

> Archival literature increasingly points to the need to develop archival systems that can represent multiple recordkeeping realities, encompassing or at least accommodating the differing and temporally-bound world views of all those involved in the activities the records document, and providing meaningful access paths to all stakeholders. Writers also suggest that there is a need to re-think definitions of records and archives that exclude orality, literature, art, artefacts, the built environment, landscape, dance, ceremonies and rituals as archival forms. Postmodern ideas are opening up the possibility of 'refiguring the archive'. For example, in societies like South Africa, archivists are exploring 'the archive outside the archival inheritance of colonialism, and later, apartheid' - the oral record, literature, landscape, songs, dance, ritual, art, artefacts and so on.[12]

In the South African context, Verne Harris and his colleagues have written about the need to refigure the archive:

> The archive - all archive - every archive - is figured. Acceptance of this in South Africa has shaped fundamentally the argument - and the processes built upon it - that the country's archives require transformation, or refiguring. The figuring by our apartheid and longer pasts

> must be challenged, and spaces must be opened up in the archives by a transforming society.[13]

Although some mainstream archives and collecting institutions are increasingly sensitive to the cultural issues associated with service provision and the accessibility of records to marginalised communities, the more fundamental issues canvassed in the literature - the existence of different memory and evidence paradigms, the concept of 'parallel provenance', the implications of acknowledging communities as co-creators of official or anthropological records about them, and the web of mutual obligations and rights this would entail - have not yet impacted on practice. As Chris Hurley argues:

> Archival description tells a story about the formation of records and the activity they document. The stories we tell about provenance reflect a necessary choice to exclude contested narratives. We justify that choice by legitimising our point of view (inherent in any statement of ownership) according to archival principles we claim mandate taking a single view of provenance ... [but] records are linked to a dynamic set of diverse and changing relationships that cannot be properly described under that mandate ...[14]

The challenge of pluralism for those working within the mainstream paradigm is twofold - how to move beyond it towards more inclusive practices, perspectives, and experiences in order to meet the needs of those communities who have been marginalised; and how to diversify the profession itself. A related issue is the low level of awareness amongst most recordkeeping and archival professionals of how their theoretical frameworks and practices have affected and can affect the stories and lives of the marginalised.

Diversity in the archival profession has been a topic of increasing conversation in Australia and North America. And yet it is a surprisingly difficult construct to realise because it raises issues that are both complex and systemic. An additional difficulty, in a project which spans countries and communities such as the one reported on in this paper, is that the parameters and terminology of any discussion of diversity tend to be established based upon local and national political, social and cultural realities and concerns. However, what needs to be understood is that, whatever definition of diversity is adopted, nationally, regionally, and

globally, the recordkeeping and archival field lacks a critical mass of professionals who are themselves from marginalised communities, and professional associations and the profession everywhere seem unclear about how best to address this lack. In the case of immigrant communities, the profession may have a hard time attracting potential members from first generation immigrant families where children are more likely to be encouraged by family members to enter high status and better paying professions such as law and medicine. Second generation members of immigrant families may be more interested in their roots and less subject to these pressures, and thus more likely to be interested in a career as an archivist.

Government, business and other mainstream recordkeeping programs and archives do not necessarily have a mandate to record the experiences of communities that fall outside the mainstream, although they must be able to provide services to their publics who may come from Indigenous, ethnic or other marginalised communities. In Australia, records of many ethnic organisations are increasingly being transferred to collecting archives, and in the US in particular, the 'other' has been addressed through manuscript collections and collecting archives. But, with some notable exceptions, such collections perpetuate the perspective of the mainstream and primarily serve its purposes, for example in the development of cultural materials collections in universities to support academic research projects rather than in support of community needs. Recordkeeping programs, archives and collecting institutions that specifically address recordkeeping, archiving and other forms of remembering and forgetting for these communities are few and far between, and tend to be under-resourced and lacking in professionally qualified staff. Moreover, their experiences often indicate that the skills recordkeeping and archival professionals acquire in formal records and archives education programs do not adequately or appropriately equip them to work with the cultural protocols and practices, non-textual traditions, and traumatic histories that they are likely to encounter. Archival scholars are also not immune to criticism of perpetuating Eurocentric ideas and methods in their research. For example, little attention has been paid to understanding Indigenous knowledge systems and research methodologies, or incorporating these into investigations of identity, memory and the nature of the archive in Indigenous communities.

Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm through Education

Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm is a cooperative international effort between researchers at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in the United States, the Caulfield School of Information Technology at Monash University in Australia, and Renmin University of China in Beijing. The goals of the project, which began in June 2005, are to promote the development of culturally and politically sensitive education of qualified archival professionals in Pacific Rim communities, especially those which have no local archival education infrastructure; and the incorporation of the interests, needs, and cultural beliefs and practices of diverse communities into existing educational programs in the region. At the heart of the project's mission is the interrogation of the notion of multicultural pluralism in the archive, the acknowledgment of the relevance of multiple ontologies and diverse ways of knowing and being to recordkeeping and archival practice and scholarship, and identification of the degree to which such pluralism has been or could be incorporated into recordkeeping and archival education programs and initiatives.

The project has employed multiple methods to explore the state of recordkeeping and archival education in the Pacific Rim region and possible ways to develop culturally sensitive curricula and appropriate approaches to teaching and learning. To establish the existing educational context, the project first examined education programs around the Pacific Rim, and the variety of factors that historically and contemporarily have contributed to how these programs prepare recordkeeping and archival professionals and scholars. Three surveys were developed by the researchers and administered online to glean a multi-dimensional view of the current situation. The first survey was administered to educators in archival studies and related fields, such as library science, museum studies, and cultural studies. The second survey was directed toward professionals working in archival, cultural and/or government repositories and institutions. It queried them about the educational preparation of their staff, as well as their opinions about educational concerns, especially as these relate to training staff to work with Indigenous, ethnic and other marginalised communities and their needs. Finally, a third survey was distributed to community leaders as well as scholars in ancillary disciplines such as anthropology, history, archaeology and political science.[15]

Following preliminary analysis of the region-wide data, two invitational research workshops were organised in Australia and the US to report on the results of the surveys and develop a critical discussion about issues relating to how well recordkeeping and archival education in Australia and the US has supported and could further support pluralisation in practice and scholarship. Participants, identified because of their engagement with education and community concerns relating to records, archives, cultural materials, identity and memory, included academics, graduate students, archival professionals, community members, and representatives of professional associations and journals.[16] A majority of participants were able to draw directly on their own professional, academic and personal experiences in working with communities, and many are part of, and derive their identity from their membership of Australian and American Indigenous, ethnic and other marginalised communities.

The rest of this paper focuses on those workshops, providing an overview of the themes and action items that emerged from the presentations and the ensuing discussions. Detailed notes of the discussion at both workshops were taken. The themes reported below emerged from an analysis of the notes. The action items presented at the end of the paper were workshopped and agreed by participants. An exposure draft of the paper was circulated to all participants from both workshops for their feedback and confirmation that they wanted to be included in the paper as participants. The feedback received was incorporated into the final version of the paper, and all participants agreed to be included.

As referenced above, the main focus of the Pacific Rim Project has been on the professional education of archivists and recordkeeping professionals. The discussion at the workshops ranged more broadly across the educational spectrum, exploring alternative ways of delivering professional education, and education for user communities to provide the knowledge and skills needed to interact with all forms of records. The Action Agenda (outlined later in this article) reflects the outcomes of these discussions, including items relating to professional education programs as well as community archival training programs, apprenticeships and service learning.

Workshop descriptions

The first workshop was held 21 to 22 March 2007 at the Caulfield campus of Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. The first session, *Rethinking Archival Education in the Pacific,* featured presentations by three researchers from the Department of Information Studies at UCLA reporting on the analysis of data collected in the survey of archival educators in the Pacific Rim region, the application of the project research to Afro-Mexican communities, and the relevance of the project work to Hong Kong. The second session, *Archival Research and Training Needs in Indigenous Communities in Australia,* was led by a panel of Indigenous Australian archivists and records managers, graduate students, and community members. The third session, *Towards an Action Agenda,* reflected on the themes and issues raised and discussed an action agenda to reconfigure recordkeeping and archival education programs, theory and practice so that they are culturally sensitive and inclusive, and support the pluralisation of the archival paradigm.

The second workshop, held 1 to 2 June 2007 at UCLA, comprised sessions on *Archival Education and Research Training Needs in Indigenous, Ethnic and Marginalised Communities in Australia and North America,* arranged thematically to elicit perspectives from community members, graduate students, and educators. It reviewed and built upon the themes and issues raised at the Monash workshop, as well as the overarching research questions of the project. Whereas the Monash workshop highlighted many of the recordkeeping and archival education issues faced by Indigenous Australian communities, the second workshop focused on extending the critical discussion to marginalised communities in the US, such as Native American, Pacific Islander, Asian American, Latina/o, African American, migrant, refugee, and gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender communities. A number of Australian participants from the Monash Workshop, including Indigenous archivists and graduate students, also attended the UCLA workshop. Their involvement served as an important bridge and a remarkable opportunity to surface commonality of experience and needs. Indeed, both workshops benefited from the exchange of rich experiences and perspectives from a wide variety of Indigenous, ethnic and marginalised community members, emphasising both inter- and intra-community differences, as well as many common issues and obstacles relating to identity, memory and the archive.

The UCLA workshop also included a presentation by Dr Tyrone Howard of UCLA's Department of Education on *Developing Community-based and Culturally Sensitive Pedagogies for Professional Education*, and a final session which extended and refined the action agenda first developed in the Monash Workshop.

Emergent themes and issues

Discussions at the workshops supported the findings of the Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm project: that the Eurocentric recordkeeping and archival paradigm discussed in the introductory parts of this paper has also predominated in recordkeeping and archival education. Moreover, as with the profession more generally, there is a lack of diversity in the academy itself. One promising development is the diversification of the student body in a number of programs, as reflected in the profile of the participants in the workshops. Participants pointed to the role that more inclusive recordkeeping and archival education can play in raising and addressing complex issues relating to the needs of marginalised communities within the recordkeeping and archival profession - and the role that a more diverse student body might play as a driver for change. They argued that twenty-first century archival and recordkeeping practice globally, regionally, and locally must be informed by professional education that nurtures knowledge about economic, political, socio-legal and cultural drivers, as well as the impact and potential of evolving technology. It must support dramatically increased mobility of students and practitioners, as well as recordkeeping and archiving in highly diversified organisational contexts in government, business *and* civil society, including the community sector. It must provide the knowledge and skills needed to support diverse user communities in their interaction with all forms of records and archives in and across space and time, while addressing the challenges of differing cultural understandings and linguistic skills. The need for research about what curricula and teaching and learning styles would best support the development of such knowledge and skills by recordkeeping and archival educators, students and practitioners was highlighted, together with the fact that this cannot effectively be undertaken unilaterally, either by the academy or by practice, but can only be achieved by engagement with communities.

Who is best qualified to work with communities to address their recordkeeping and archival needs?

Many participants felt that members of marginalised communities are best positioned to be the most effective 'gatekeepers' of community memory, broadly defined to encompass the community archive in whatever form it takes, not only because they are closely associated with and knowledgeable about those communities, but also for symbolic reasons. Many marginalised communities have been subject to suppression or denial of their memories and, in some cases, eradication and erasure from the record. Participants therefore felt that endeavours to involve the members of those communities are symbolic of the reclamation of those narratives that have historically been denied, altered or under-represented. However, it was noted that outreach into communities to encourage members to become involved in activities relating to recordkeeping, archives, and cultural collections is a difficult and arduous undertaking. Many factors must be considered to ensure sustainability and successful progress, including a lack of technological skills and local access in resource-challenged communities; the incompatibility between current and historic recordkeeping and descriptive schema and the language and access points of oral traditions and community knowledge systems; cultural conflicts that may arise in the open provision of digitised documentation containing images, stories or language of Indigenous peoples in online repositories; difficulties in establishing trust between marginalised communities and archival repositories or researchers in order to undertake partnership projects; constraints imposed by short-term funding opportunities and research initiatives (such as reliance on grants that may or may not by renewed, encouraging so-called 'hit-and-run scholarship'); lack of community knowledge about what and how it should be recorded and preserved; and implicit and explicit resistance to incorporating multiculturalism into recordkeeping archival practice and scholarship.

A related issue highlighted at the Monash workshop is the high level of responsibility, expectation and commitment to community that Indigenous archivists carry - as archival professionals, they are expected to act in capacities that extend far beyond what are traditionally thought of as professional roles and responsibilities. Often, members of Indigenous communities lack the confidence and/or skill to navigate archives and libraries effectively, or to employ technology in attempts to access the

information that they seek. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous archivists must be prepared to take on a role assisting community members with their inquiries that moves beyond the demands of general reference services, and that may take the form of mediating between the user and the record, providing advice and suggestions relating to matters that might fall outside the scope of the archival profession, such as welfare and government services, negotiating between Indigenous languages and terminology and the language and terminology of the records, and supporting users dealing with pain-filled and confronting records. How can recordkeeping and archival education best equip recordkeeping and archival professionals to work in and with communities, and how can the recordkeeping and archival education and training needs of the communities themselves be addressed?

Reclaiming and recovering community identity, memory and history: what is the role of the archives?

Reclaiming or recovering community identity, memory and history was also highlighted as a significant part of the educational and professional mission for many workshop participants, whose areas of expertise were as diverse as the cultures and heritages represented at the workshops. In Los Angeles, representatives from Asian American communities discussed the use of media arts in not only reclaiming, but also redefining community identity and history. In particular, they cited the example of Visual Communications, a non-profit organisation that began as a filmmaking cooperative, and then grew to become instrumental in the cross-ethnic Asian American Movement in Los Angeles during the 1970s, helping to raise widespread awareness about the rounding up and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II by the US government, and other events by which the Asian American community has been and continues to be marginalised in the United States.[17] More recently, by equipping members of the Asian Pacific American community (Americans of Pacific Island heritage such as American Samoans, Chamorros, and Filipino Americans) with digital video cameras, film editing software, and other media equipment, Visual Communications aims to encourage Asian Pacific Americans to reflect upon their stories and commit them to media so that these narratives that are so often ignored can be presented and preserved.

Such efforts raise some interesting questions. A community tells many different kinds of stories about itself. Some stories are part of its history and culture, whether personal history or collective history and culture, such as myths and folktales, but other stories that community members tell have been turned into fiction although they might be inspired by experience. Some would argue that all of these 'stories' and their variations together comprise the archive. What kinds of stories might or should be collected? Do the stories have to be 'true' and what difference might their form of presentation, for example as documentaries or oral histories, make? Can 'stories' also include creative stories to make fiction films and visual media art pieces? One Visual Communications program that assists emerging media artists, the Armed with a Camera Fellowship, does not distinguish between the kinds of stories it supports as long as the end result is a new, original work. The stories resulting from that program include short narrative films and documentaries, and take many forms that run the gamut from traditional video to mockumentary, animation, and claymation.

The Koorie Heritage Trust in Melbourne, Australia was discussed as another exemplar of what can be achieved. The Trust works to help Koorie communities to recover, preserve and enhance their memory and group identity.[18] It is a non-profit Indigenous organisation initiated by Koorie community Elders, and takes a holistic approach, incorporating historical and contemporary materials, and all forms of community memory. In the Koorie Heritage Archive (KHA), Koorie people's oral history, related official records, images of Koorie artifacts, and moving images are digitised and made accessible via a database. Designed to be taken out into communities on a laptop computer, it is a living archive that uses technology to enable Koorie people to add their own stories and information and give their perspectives on other records in the Archive. Ideally in the future it will be in every Koorie community:

> There are generations after generations that need these documents and these photos and these archives and everything. And they need to be out front, out in the open for us to see in our own time; in our own houses; in our own homes; in our own community. Not in your exhibition halls, not in your libraries, not in your hallways, but on an archival system like the KHA.[19]

Participants also pointed to the role of official records in attempts to recover and reclaim community knowledge, memory and identity, and to the barriers to accessing these records. This issue relates to a larger problem already mentioned, the existence of community records outside the control of, and often unknown to, the community and the lack of access paths that are compatible with community knowledge systems and ontologies. Endeavours to reclaim or recover community knowledge and memories from records in archives and cultural collections may also involve the need to re-contextualise the record - to create parallel provenances that enable the community to access and interpret them. For example, access to information can be problematic for Indigenous communities because archival information was not and is not organised by Indigenous family, clan or country names, thereby forcing community members to navigate the immensity of records in ways incongruous with the way they perceive and label their world.

The issue of ownership and control of records was also raised during both workshops. History repeatedly tells the story of colonialism and imperialism in the Asia-Pacific region from the perspective of the perpetrators supported by the dominant narratives in government, church and other institutional archives. Marginalised communities and community members are relegated to the role of subjects in these narratives, although the communities themselves may regard narratives about them in official records as their records, over which they should have some control, for example in decision-making about appraisal, description and access. Records and cultural materials, taken from communities, are decontextualised, and reinterpreted in the context of cultural collections devoid of the voices of the original record creators. Many participants stressed the importance of developing archival systems that recognise the rights of communities in relation to official records, and the need for 'bringing home' lost and stolen artifacts, records, and materials, returning them to their contexts amongst the people who created them.

Other participants highlighted the need for awareness of factors affecting recordkeeping, archiving and the preservation of cultural materials beyond the walls of repositories. This was underscored by the fact that most of the institutions and programs represented by workshop participants were academic or non-profit community-based. Such institutions and programs are often scrambling to secure short-term

funding, whether through government grants, philanthropic organisations or other external funders. The sustainability of community-based archives programs and projects is not being addressed in these frameworks.

All of the above issues have far-reaching implications for recordkeeping and archival education and scholarship and reinforce the need for education and research to play a vital role in pluralising the archival paradigm.[20]

How to integrate diversity concerns better into recordkeeping and archival education?

Graduate students were well represented at both workshops, thereby enriching the discussion with their voices and observations from behind the desk in their real or virtual classroom. While student perspectives came from a variety of backgrounds and research interests, their concerns were the same: how can recordkeeping and archival education be reconfigured to better address the needs of Indigenous, ethnic, and other marginalised communities. Student participants, in reflecting on their individual programs, concurred that they do not adequately address the recordkeeping and archival needs of marginalised communities, and lack curricular content which would foster and encourage cultural sensitivity to the bevy of issues that such communities face. Many students pointed to the need for further interrogation and reworking of the notions of 'multiculturalism' and 'diversity', and, more importantly, how they can be practically applied. There was a feeling that 'diversity' has become a buzzword, a curricular addendum included to satisfy the demand for academia to be culturally inclusive at first glance. The granularity of what constitutes cultural diversity is overshadowed by a rhetoric of political correctness that is often expressed in academia but rarely meaningfully interrogated. The discourse about the ethics of diversity and multiculturalism is often treated as an add-on or afterthought to the core of the curriculum. This points to an institutional deficiency and ignorance as to how diversity and multiculturalism can be appropriately incorporated into recordkeeping and archival education programs.

Participants also suggested that the small numbers of educators and professionals who themselves come from marginalised communities is evidence of the disconnect between the rhetoric and implementation of

diversity and multiculturalism in education programs. Fundamentally, how can academia teach and encourage multiculturalism and diversity when it has failed to embody them? For students who come from marginalised communities, the lack or under-representation of their communities is particularly problematic in that it points to larger systemic issues of diversity in academia, a resistance to the incorporation of diversity in the classroom, and the hypocrisy of academia that can ultimately demoralise and denigrate its students. This criticism raises questions about the extent to which academia is a mirror of its prevailing society, and whether effecting meaningful changes within academia is possible unless changes occur in society itself.

Another aspect of diversity relates to the role of multidisciplinary studies. Students, community representatives, professionals and educators all spoke of the need to incorporate multidisciplinary approaches in working with marginalised communities. Utilising frameworks and methods from anthropology, archaeology, education, history and sociology, among others, may prove to be illuminating for students and professionals by providing alternative lenses by which to understand the communities they seek to work in and with. Such lenses may provide students with the knowledge to understand community cultures and histories in ways that are not achievable within a single disciplinary approach. Furthermore, students would be encouraged to think broadly and critically about the larger societal and social factors that affect marginalised communities, and the archive, as well as to unravel and understand on multiple levels the complex identity politics with which they may be confronted, such as the dynamic nature of culture and identity, the diversity of sub-communities within larger communities, and the social effects of hegemony, including the role of the archives and cultural collections in that hegemony.

Participants at both workshops stressed the benefits of coalition-building between educational institutions and community organisations, supporting communities practically, for example through the pooling of resources, and encouraging what one community archivist referred to as 'seamless integration' - the capacity for students to move from the classroom and into the community, from talking about the issues that communities face to working professionally with those communities, while developing through their studies and experientially a knowledge base and attitude to perform the job effectively and comprehensively.

The research literature on developing culturally sensitive teaching and learning strongly emphasises the need for community engagement. This includes the involvement of traditional teachers, such as community Elders and leaders, in the development of curriculum, as well as locating education programs within communities, where learning can be supported through the participation of the entire community. Indigenous participants in the Monash workshop reiterated the difficulties community members face not only educationally and financially, but emotionally, in making it to and through postgraduate education, often as the only person from their community in a program and studying a long way from home. They reiterated the importance of community engagement in and support for the educational process, and integrating that process into traditional community-based and often oral learning structures.

How can students acquire the skills and knowledge to work in the community in culturally sensitive ways?

The recommendation that students should become more actively engaged with particular communities of interest as part of their academic program came up many times in the course of both workshops. It was felt that such an approach helped students not only to gain practical field experience in a real life context, but also to develop relationships with community members that could serve as a foundation for ongoing professional partnerships. Participants pointed to the need for students to invest their time and energy in working with communities early in their training programs, and to be consistent in their involvement. This engagement might take the form of internships and apprenticeships, service-learning, independent study options, or mentoring by community Elders and leaders, and academics who have demonstrated their commitment to exploring issues of diversity and multiculturalism. Such an approach is not as straightforward as it might seem, however. Nor is it unidirectional - pluralising the archival paradigm requires that students, professionals, academics, and community members build long-term relationships, partner with each other and recognise with honesty that the work of Indigenous, ethnic, and marginalised community archives is confounded by a spectrum of institutional, societal, systemic, and ideological obstacles.

Diversifying archival teaching and learning

Tyrone Howard presented UCLA workshop participants with a number of provocative issues to contemplate, including overarching questions such as: why are new pedagogical approaches and modes of inquiry necessary? And how do we develop cultural competence, awareness, and sensitivity in practicing professionals to work with the community history of marginalised populations? He challenged participants to consider the following questions and their implications not only for recordkeeping and archival education, but also for practice and scholarship: how do we record history in accurate and inclusive manners? What tools do we use? What questions guide our research? How do our positionalities (our positions and personalities) influence our inquiry? How do we create democratic epistemologies? How do we engage with the 'other' in an authentic and equitable manner? How do we create spaces of care and humanity in our work? What practices and ideologies need to be changed in order to develop historical consciousness? How do we develop pedagogy of empowerment?

Should archivists be trained to be activists?

The ideal of the impartial and objective archivist committed to the reliability, authenticity and future availability of the archival record can be used to underpin arguments that the profession should not be active in social justice issues. Archivists from marginalised communities increasingly take issue with this neutrality stance, and several workshop participants said that they felt that social justice issues underpinned most archival work in marginalised communities.[21] While all professions grapple with social justice in one way or another, and all should address it within their ethics education, there are arguably social justice concerns that are very specifically tied to the role and stance of archives in society. One community archivist referred to herself as an 'Activist Archivist', whose role in the preservation of cultural memory was driven by an imperative of advocacy and community empowerment. She argued that archivists, especially in dealing with community, regardless of their personal backgrounds, cannot merely act as passive sentries of archival repositories and their contents. They must work actively to address absences and inaccuracies in the records, to ensure that communities are able to retain control over and full use of their own records, and enable them to contest the official record.

Recognising the centrality of trauma

Many participants referred to the highly personal, painful and confronting nature of the archives of the marginalised and the trauma experienced in using the records. The traumatic nature of records of marginalised communities, and their potential to re-traumatise needs to be acknowledged and addressed by the profession and in educational programs. Using archives and cultural collections, community members experience or re-experience traumatic events through official records over which they have no control; discover records that have been decontextualised or misappropriated; and are confronted by offensive language, and versions of events that do not tally with their own stories and memories. Participants discussed how histories of pre-colonial, colonial and postcolonial cultures have largely been written from the perspectives of the dominant culture and involve various degrees of denigration, suppression and denial of the voices of the 'other'. It is difficult for marginalised communities to recover or reconstruct their own distinctive narratives and inevitably pain and trauma are central to this process.[22] In applying a social psychology perspective, Brison stated that revisiting traumatic events was essential to 'remaking' the self, and constructing narratives about before and after the traumatic event, as well as the traumatic event itself.[23] Participants felt that the archival profession should be poised to be an effective facilitator of such processes and an agent for social justice and redress, thus supporting the reclamation and recovery of community identity, memory and knowledge from the archival record. However they also acknowledged that playing this role involves a profound shift in the thinking and practice of many recordkeeping and archival professionals.

The significance of orality

The past and continuing significance of orality in many communities also profoundly challenges Western archival science. At both the Monash and UCLA workshops, Australian Indigenous and Native American participants emphasised the central role that orality has played and continues to play in the formation and transmission of knowledge, and the construct of the archive within Indigenous communities:

> through the song, the dance, the protocols, my archive comes to me; ... and I know what kind of record I am ...[24]

The experience of researchers, professionals and community members involved in the ARC Trust and Technology Project, and represented in both workshops, strongly supports this point. The project is exploring the archival needs of Koorie communities relating to oral memory, broadly defined to encompass Koorie knowledge that originates and/or is reinterpreted as orally transmitted narratives or stories. Oral transmission of knowledge continues to be fundamental to Indigenous personal and group identity, and may take many forms, including the spoken word, song, music, dance and ritual.[25] The focus of the Trust and Technology project within these broad definitions was on oral memory as captured in traditional storytelling, contemporary narratives, family stories, and narratives recovered from mainstream sources, and the interrelationship between oral memory and the mainstream narratives in government and institutional archives. As explored in an earlier issue of *Archives and Manuscripts*, the findings of the Trust and Technology project have significant implications for archival theory and practice - and for archival education and research.[26]

An Agenda for Action

Both workshops concluded with discussion of and agreement to an Action Agenda to support progress toward the objectives articulated during the workshops. The Agenda includes a range of action items, some of which could be immediately implemented, others involving more research and critical discussion, and some that target longer-term systemic changes.

Action Item 1: Develop a manifesto

A statement of values, principles and concepts relating to Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm through Education.

Action Item 2: Develop a statement of principles for inclusive, transformative recordkeeping and archival education

For adoption by professional associations and to inform course recognition/accreditation.[27]

Action Item 3: Build coalitions to progress the Agenda

Involving policy-makers, academics, community organisations, private funders, archival institutions and professional associations.

Action Item 4: Reconfigure educational programs to be more inclusive, culturally sensitive and diverse[28]

- Undertake a collaborative curriculum development research project using a community-centred participatory model of action research, develop a one-unit course,[29] exploring alternative curriculum development models, engagement of community Elders, leaders and members in developing curriculum content, exploring different teaching and learning styles, and modes and locations for delivery.
- Develop mentoring/cadetship schemes tailored to the needs of students from marginalised communities.
- Develop community-based learning modules within archival education programs, eg internships and apprenticeships, service-learning, independent study options, or mentoring by community Elders and leaders.
- Develop community archival training programs to support community members' involvement in recording, recovering and preserving their narratives, recordkeeping in community organisations, and managing community archives.
- Develop alternative professional education pathways, for example, certificate programs, distance-learning, apprenticeships, cadetships or internship.

Action Item 5: Establish a databank of resources to support inclusive, culturally sensitive education and research programs

Including use cases, community clinics and training programs, service learning, community-based assignments, use of community practitioners as instructors, examples of successful community-based recordkeeping and archival programs and initiatives, examples of research collaborations between communities, academia, archival institutions, and professional associations.[30]

Action Item 6: Continue to develop the research agenda relating to recordkeeping and archival education, training and scholarship that addresses the needs of marginalised communities

Action Item 7: Communicate findings and understandings via publications, conferences, scholarly, professional and community forums

Action Item 8: Develop strategies to recruit people from diverse backgrounds to study, work, teach and research in the field

Including courting students at the levels of secondary and higher education.

In relation to Action Item 8, measures to progress the whole Action Agenda would be greatly supported by engaging an increasingly diverse cohort of students, educators, and professionals in this endeavour. And undoubtedly successful progression of some of the other action items would support the achievement of the goals relating to diversification embodied in Action Item 8.

The project team has created a wiki to facilitate implementation of the Agenda, and serve as a forum for those already involved with the project and those who are interested in becoming involved to engage in a continuing dialogue about the project and progressing the Action Agenda.[31]

Conclusion

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Michel Foucault cautions that we must be aware of the gaps, voids, and limitations of what we consider knowledge.[32] Excavating dominant knowledge systems and ontologies can aid in determining where those gaps and limitations exist, as well as how they originated and have been perpetuated. In the view of the workshop participants, legacies of those discontinuities in history include the under-representation of Indigenous, ethnic, and other marginalised community memories in archives and cultural collections, and the myriad of threats to the sustainability of community-based programs and initiatives that struggle to exist beyond the repository walls.

At the same time, participants envisioned a role for a diversified and reconfigured recordkeeping and archival profession in facilitating the recovery and reclamation work of those attuned to the deficiencies of the record. They highlighted the need for proactive approaches to 'filling the gaps'. They also pointed to the need to move beyond the existing boundaries of the repository, the academy and the profession, building long-term partnerships between communities, the academy, the archival institutions and the profession. Such alliances can serve to facilitate the realisation and renegotiation of agendas and strategies for pluralising the archival paradigm, and developing a more diverse, inclusive and culturally sensitive profession.

Educational theorist and cultural commentator Paulo Freire, in speaking of the potential that education possesses for democratic participation and social awareness, advocated that education paradigms should encourage critical consciousness. Paradigms that fail to nurture critical consciousness risk perpetuating the exclusionary ideologies and practices that created the hegemony in the first place. Thus, the methods for training recordkeeping archival professionals should integrally engage in discourse about diversity and marginalisation in order for research and practice to become more reflexive, inclusive, and culturally sensitive, and to identify and elucidate factors that have contributed to the lack of cultural diversity in the past and present. Educational programs need to be responsive to imperatives for change, while themselves being agents of change, with a significant role to play in redrawing or obliterating boundaries and supporting pluralism in the archive.

We should not be complacent or naïve in thinking that diversity will somehow work itself into the content of our recordkeeping and archival education by osmosis; there is significant and challenging work to be done. Sporadic symposia, intermittent publications about community needs, and short-term project based approaches to the issues are not sufficient. To meet the needs of marginalised communities, our profession needs activist archivists, people dedicated to the cause, driven and resolved to support profound change, and resolute in persisting until it occurs. Above all, we need to develop professionals, educators and scholars who demonstrate reflexivity in their work, are prepared to address the recordkeeping and archival dimensions of social justice issues, and are equipped to work together with those who have been

marginalised or silenced by the record in the past, and have the critical tools to take on their own canon of theory and practice when they find existing paradigms deficient.

Endnotes

[1] The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions to this article of the following participants in the workshops held at Monash University in Melbourne and the University California, Los Angeles on which this paper is based. Monash workshop: Peter Adds (Victoria University, Wellington NZ), Karen Anderson (Edith Cowan University, Australia), Ryan Brinkworth (Monash University and member ASA IISIG, Australian Society of Archivists, Indigenous Issues Special Interest Group), Jill Caldwell (Committee Member, ASA IISIG), Ineke Deserno (Monash University), Shannon Faulkhead (CAIS, Centre for Australian Indigenous Studies, Monash University), Simon Flagg (Public Record Office Victoria and member ASA IISIG), Sharon Huebner (Koorie Heritage Trust), Livia Iacovino (COSI, Centre for Organisational and Social Informatics, Monash University), Dianne Jarrett (NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs), Graeme Johanson (COSI, Monash University), Eric Ketelaar (COSI, Monash University), Gavan McCarthy (Melbourne University eScholarship Research Centre), Sigrid McCausland (ASA Education Officer), Lynette Russell (CAIS, Monash University), Tania Schafer (Monash University); Diane Singh (CAIS, Monash University), Kirsten Thorpe (ASA IISIG, and State Records, New South Wales); Narissa Timbery (Monash University), Frank Upward (COSI, Monash University); UCLA workshop: Ben Alexander, Kim Anderson, Ruth Bayhylle, Jean-François Blanchette, Renate Chancellor, Clara Chu, Anthony Dunbar, Jonathan Furner, Laura Gonzalez, Ulia Gosart, Shari Lee, Sylva Manoogian, Stacy Meeker, Tiffany-Kay Sangwand, Katie Shilton, Ramesh Srinivasan, Melanee Vicedo, Virginia Walter, Deborah Weissman, Eunha Youn (UCLA Department of Information Studies); Keith Camacho (UCLA Department of Asian American Studies), Mitchell Chang, Tyrone Howard and Kehaulani Vaughn (UCLA Department of Education); SuKim Chung (University of Nevada Las Vegas and UCLA Department of Information Studies); Tim Church and Sharon Huebner (Koorie Heritage Trust, Melbourne); Aimee Dorr (UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies); Mahnaz Ghaznavi (Getty Research Institute); Salvador Guereña (California Ethnic and Multicultural Archive, University of California, Santa Barbara); Dalena Hunter (UCLA Ralph J Bunche Center for African American Studies Library and Media Center); Lori Lindberg and Supriya Wronkiewicz (San José State University School of Library & Information Science); Jeff Liu (Visual Communications, Little Tokyo, Los Angeles); Mike McLaughlin (American Indian Resource Center, Huntington Park); Robert A Nakamura and Vivian Wong (UCLA Center for EthnoCommunications, Asian American Studies Center); Joy Novak (Center for Political graphics and

Department of Information Studies, UCLA); Liladhar Pendse (UCLA University Library); Ricardo Punzalan (Institute of Library and Information Science, University of the Philippines Diliman and University of Michigan School of Information), Steve Ricci (UCLA Department of Information Studies and Department of Film, Television and Digital Media); Horacio Roque Ramirez (Department of Chicana/o Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara), Yolanda Retter (UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Library); Tania Schafer (Monash University, Melbourne); Patricia Tarin (Knowledge River Program, University of Arizona School of Information Resources and Library Science); Kirsten Thorpe (ASA IISIG and State Records, New South Wales); Roberto Trujillo (Department of Special Collections, Stanford University); Anne Wright (ASA IISIG). The authors would also like to thank the University of California Pacific Rim Research Program, the Centre for Organisational and Social Informatics at Monash University, and the Center for Information as Evidence at UCLA for their financial support of this work.

Addresses for correspondence:

Professor Anne Gilliland

Department of Information Studies

212 GSEIS Building

University of California, Los Angeles

Box 951520

Los Angeles, CA 90095-1520

<Gilliland@gseis.ucla.edu>

Professor Sue McKemmish

Caulfield School of Information Technology

Monash University

<Sue.mckemmish@infotech.monash.edu.au>

[2] Paulo Freire, *Education for Critical Consciousness*, 2nd ed., NY, Continuum, 2005, p. 29.

[3] Australia, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families*, Canberra, HREOC, 1997.

[4] Loris Williams, Kirsten Thorpe and Andrew Wilson, 'Identity and Access to Government Records: Empowering the Community', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 34, no. 1, May, 2006.

[5] *Mestizaje* is a New World construct that refers to the racial mixing that occurred between the Indigenous peoples of the Americas and Europeans,

and the ideology that such mixing created a new and better mestizo race. See, for example, Florence Mallon, 'Constructing Mestizahe in Latin America: Authenticity, Marginality, and Gender in the Claiming of Ethnic Identities', *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, vol. 2, no. 1, September, 1996, pp. 170-81. Available at: <http://www.anthrosource.net/doi/abs/10.1525/jlat.1996.2.1.170>.

[6] See Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/1994/2/Add.1, 1994.

[7] See Protocols for Native American Archival Materials, <http://www.firstarchivistscircle.org/_files/protocols_update/archive.protocols/protocols.html>.

[8] Forty-Seventh Congress. Session I. 1882. Chapter 126. *An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese.* See Iris Chang, *The Chinese in America,* New York, Penguin, 2003; Ronald Takaki, *Strangers From A Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans,* New York, Back Bay, 1998.

[9] For more information regarding the history of the LGBTIQ community in the United States, see Martin Duberman, *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past,* New York, Merdian, 1991; Daniel Hurewitz, *Bohemian Los Angeles and the Making of Modern Politics,* Berkeley, University of California Press, 2007.

[10] For more discussion of homophobia and heteronormativity, see Barry D Adam, 'Theorizing Homophobia', *Sexualities,* vol. 1, no. 4, 1998, pp. 387-404.

[11] For further information, see the European Commission, Education and Training, <http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna_en.html>.

[12] Sue McKemmish, Anne Gilliland and Eric Ketelaar, "Communities of Memory': Pluralising the Archival Research and Education Agendas', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 33, no.1, May, 2005, pp. 152-3; quoted material from Carolyn Hamilton et al, *Refiguring the Archive,* Dordrecht, Kluwers, 2002, p. 11.

[13] Hamilton, *op.cit.*, p.7, Canadian authors Terry Cook, Tom Nesmith, and Brien Brothman among others, have also explored related issues.

[14] Chris Hurley, 'Parallel Provenance: (1) What, if Anything, is Archival Description?', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 33, no. 1, May, 2005, p. 110.

[15] Further information on the survey of archival educators can be found in Anne Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, Kelvin White, Yang Lu and Andrew Lau, 'Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm: Can Archival Education in Pacific Rim Communities Address the Challenge?' forthcoming in the *American Archivist,* Spring 2008; and Anne Gilliland, Kelvin White, Yang Lu, Sue McKemmish and Zhang Bin, 'Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm: A Needs Assessment for Archival Education in Pacific Rim Communities' in *Proceedings of the Second Asia Pacific Conference on Archival Education,* Tokyo, November, 2006.

[16] For further detail on workshop content and discussions, see <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~pacrim/>.

[17] Ronald Takaki, *Strangers From A Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans,* New York, Back Bay, 1998.

[18] Koorie is a term used by many Indigenous people of Victoria and the South-Eastern part of NSW when referring to themselves.

[19] Sharon Huebner and Kooramyee Cooper, 'Koorie Culture and Technology: A digital archive project for Victorian Koorie communities', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 35, no. 1, May 2007, p. 29.

[20] Some of these issues were also raised in the *Memories, Communities, Technologies Search* Conference, October 4 to 6, 2006, Prato, Theme 2: Research Governance and Protocols.

[21] See, for example, Jennifer Osorio, 'Proof of a Life Lived: The Plight of the *Braceros* and What It Says About How We Treat Records', vol. 29, issue 2, *Archival Issues* (forthcoming).

[22] For further discussion of the effect of this experience, see Ann Laura Stoler, 'Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance', Archival Science, 2:3-4, 2002, pp. 87-109, and Evelyn Wareham, 'From Explorers to Evangelists: Archivists, Recordkeeping, and Remembering in the Pacific Islands', *Archival Science,* vol. 2, no's 3-4, 2002.

[23] Susan J Brison, 'Trauma Narratives and the Remaking of Self', in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, Hanover, NH, University of New England Press, 1999, p. 46.

[24] Ruth Bayhylle, speaking at the UCLA Workshop.

[25] The term oral memory was used rather than oral history as the latter carries connotations of past not living narratives. Likewise the term Indigenous or Koorie knowledge rather than cultural knowledge or traditional knowledge was used to denote a living, dynamic knowledge system encompassing all forms and types of knowledge.

[26] Fiona Ross, Sue McKemmish and Shannon Faulkhead, 'Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing trusted archival systems for Koorie communities', *Archives and Manuscripts,* vol. 34, no. 2, November 2006, pp. 112-151. Of particular note in this context are the views of Koorie community Elders and members relating to government and church records that relate to them - that as they contain their stories, they are their records; that the subjects of the records should have rights in the records, including the right to know there are records about them, and to participate in decision-making about appraisal, custody and access; and that there should be avenues for 'setting the record straight'.

[27] Australian Society of Archivist IISIG members and Australian archival educators who participated in the Workshops are pursuing this action item.

[28] Workshop participants are planning to apply for curriculum development grants in Australia and the US to support this action item.

[29] The authors note that unit designations vary across educational institutions. In the Australian context, a one unit course is equivalent to one-eighth of a year's full-time enrolment.

[30] Work has already begun on this database, led by Monash Workshop participants Jill Caldwell and Narissa Timbery. See the project wiki for more information: <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~pluralizingthearchive/index.php/Main_Page>.

[31] *ibid.* <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~pluralizingthearchive/index.php/Main_Page>.

[32] Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* NY, Pantheon, 1972.