

AUTHORITY, PROVENANCE, AUTHENTICITY AND EVIDENCE AND ARCHIVAL HUMANITARIANISM

Anne J. Gilliland

*Department of Information Studies,
University of California,
Los Angeles, USA*

KEYWORDS:

*archivistics, evidence,
humanitarianism,
participatory archiving,
rights in records*

ABSTRACT

This paper contemplates archival understandings of authority, provenance, authenticity and evidence and their congruence with legal needs and the requirements of official recordkeeping functions, and how rigid constructions of these concepts may limit the potential for more humanitarian-oriented archival practices. It reviews several recent propositions for how archival ideas and practices might be reconceived in order to better address pressing human rights and social justice concerns. With these in mind, it questions whether current understandings are sufficiently expansive and nuanced to encompass traditional archival roles and stances as well as a more explicit humanitarian orientation, or whether the latter would require more fundamental reconceptualization.

Introduction

The professional field of archivistics (and its alternate conceptualizations, archival science and recordkeeping¹), has throughout its history been arguably more invested in, preoccupied with, and some might say strait-jacketed by the notion of concepts and associated principles that flow from them, than has any other sector of the information, cultural or memory professions. In archivistics the concepts of authenticity, provenance and evidence are all integral to the notion of authority and presumptions of trustworthiness. However, many or all of these concepts also feature prominently in related fields such as library and information science, and museum studies. Some have argued that they might thus provide a basis for creating more common understanding across these professions and even between archivistics and some of its ancillary disciplines such as history, law, philology and literature. If so, maybe they could also become key elements supporting descriptive interoperability? But just like the linguistic idea of “false friends ‘ where the same or similar words can diverge significantly in meaning in different languages, so too the use of the same or similar words in different fields does not necessarily mean that the underlying conceptualizations, semantics and roles associated with those words within those fields are also the same. The concepts, therefore, must first be unpacked and their roles examined within their various professional and disciplinary usages. Only then can these usages be juxtaposed to get a sense of the degree of convergence or overlap. Moreover, the semantics of many concepts do not and should not remain completely static, even if their essence remains the same. They are necessarily redefined and expanded in light of changing social, technological and professional dynamics, and emerging thinking and new demands within and across fields on an ongoing basis. For example, as will be discussed further later in this paper, in 2014, Caswell proposed a theoretical framework for managing records that document human rights abuse based on five key principles

1 For a fuller discussion of each of these terms, see Anne J. Gilliland, “Archival Traditions in the Multiverse and their Importance for Researching Situations and Situating Research,” Chapter 1, *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, A. J. Gilliland, A. Lau and S. McKemmish, eds. (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016), 31-73.

learned from work in community-based archiving:² participation, shared stewardship, multiplicity, archival activism, and reflexivity.³ Gilliland and McKemmish have suggested a suite of rights in records that could serve as a platform for participatory archiving and especially participatory appraisal and description.⁴ Gilliland, in examining how the archival field might play a more proactive role in supporting the survival, resettlement and recovery of those displaced through violence or environmental, economic or other exigencies, has argued that even further theoretical, organizational and practical reorientation of the ideas and practices of archivistics is required. Such reorientation should be based in transnational and transinstitutional thinking and proactive humanitarianism that engage at the level of affected individuals and their everyday lives.⁵ Caswell and Gilliland have also introduced the notions of imagined records and impossi-

- 2 This includes community-based archives and other forms of community-initiated documentary or memory activities that are created and managed by communities or groups that identify on the basis of race, ethnicity, class, status, experience, gender, sexual identity, and so forth. Sometimes referred to as community-centric or grass-roots archives, or archives from-the-bottom-up they often operate outside establishment archives and practices and with a social justice or other activist or oppositional stance and their defining characteristics tend to be that they are created and managed by the community for the community. Gilliland and Flinn note that: "Some of the factors that motivate community archives include the following:
The identification, collection and use of historical sources to document histories perceived to be ignored or misrepresented.
Active engagement in the construction of history rather than passive or disinterested curation.
History-making as a participative practice—as heritage activism.
Embodiment of DIY cultural and political engagement (i.e., without the aid of "professionals").
Making the past "useful"—community-based archiving as social movement activism and mobilization.
Community-based history-making and archiving for education and identity formation.
Creating spaces of aspiration and possibility.
Community-based archives as community-owned space (place of safety, place of resistance, as monument to presence)."
Anne J. Gilliland and Andrew Flinn, "The Wonderful and Frightening World of Community Archives: What Are We Really Talking About?" Keynote address, *Nexus, Confluence, and Difference: Community Archives meets Community Informatics: Prato CIRN Conference Oct 28-30 2013*, Larry Stillman, Amalia Sabiescu, Nemanja Memarovic, eds. (Melbourne: Centre for Community Networking Research, Centre for Social Informatics, Monash University, 2013).
- 3 Michelle Caswell, "Toward a Survivor-centered Approach to Records Documenting Human Rights Abuse: Lessons from Community Archives," *Archival Science* 14:3 (2014): 307-322.
- 4 Anne J. Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, "The Role of Participatory Archives in Furthering Human Rights, Reconciliation and Recovery," *Atlanti: Review for Modern Archival Theory and Practice* 24 (2014): 79-88; and Anne J. Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, "Rights in Records as a Platform for Participative Archiving," Chapter 14, Richard J. Cox, Alison Langmead and Eleanor Mattern, eds. *Archival Education and Research: Selected Papers from the 2014 AERI Conference* (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Press, 2015), 355-385.
- 5 Anne J. Gilliland, "A Matter of Life and Death: A Critical Examination of the Role of Official Records and Archives in Forced Displacement," *Critical Archival Studies*, special issue, Michelle Caswell, Ricardo Punzalan and T-Kay Sangwand, eds. *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1:2 (2017).

ble archival imaginaries, while Gilliland has argued for parallel notions of irregular records and records that are used in irregular ways.

Such propositions arise out of criticisms that archival concepts historically emanate out of archival roles that privilege the record-keeping needs and interests of state and other high power institutions, and support national juridical structures and narratives rather than affected individuals and their records' concerns. Key concepts such as authenticity, provenance, authority and evidence, therefore, were not necessarily designed to encourage or help the field to respond to past injustices and inequities or contemporary humanitarian⁶ crises. If such concepts are to function in a more liberatory or empowering mode, as they are increasingly called upon to do, they equally cannot become so closely defined by professional practices, standards and juridical usages as to be straitjacketed.

Background

These four concepts, separately and in various groupings, have been under continual re-examination and re-scoping within the archival field over the past two decades. In fact, it is possible to identify what amount to two distinct movements that are sometimes construed as being at odds with each other but which inevitably must interact if the demands being made upon the field today are to be fully addressed, and if it is to exercise its humanitarian potential effectively.

One movement, working to ensure the creation, management and preservation of trustworthy digital records and the operation of trusted digital repositories, has been supported by a considerable amount of professional momentum as well as investment in research and development worldwide. Successive InterPARES projects,⁷ for example, have been re-examining, re-articulating and re-emphasizing the validity and utility of the traditional concepts of authority, provenance, authenticity and evidence,

6 Defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as "the promotion of human welfare".

7 International research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES), www.interPARES.org and the InterPARES Trust, <https://interparestrust.org/>.

among others, as integral to the creation, preservation and provision of trustworthy digital records.⁸ In this they are also underscoring the close lineage from conceptual understandings about authenticity and evidence that lie at the heart of the science of diplomatics and those subsequently developed by both archivistics and legal theory.⁹ Standards and best practices developed for digital curation also address the need to establish and document provenance in order to clarify the authoritativeness of digital copies as well as of born-digital materials, and the nature of any relationships between originals and their copies and further digital versions created through different kinds of re-uses such as remixing and mash-ups.¹⁰ This is essential not only for version control but also for assigning and tracking intellectual property and other rights, tracing the evolution of an idea or product, and so forth. In the development of metadata schemes to support the networking or interoperability of digital resources, it is necessary to delineate and incorporate elements documenting assumptions of trust, source, version, relationships and rights in order to support mapping between disparate and distributed sources and resources. Similarly, for those trying to identify materials needed for the virtual reunification of a fond that has been divided or its contents otherwise displaced or dispersed, or to identify alternate copies of the same materials that may be located in different repositories/institution types/ nations, provenance tracing as well as authority work become key tools.¹¹

The necessities of consistent, closely articulated conceptual underpinnings in such applications are easy to grasp. However, there is a second movement or strand of reconceptualization that draws on critical theory to present equally compelling arguments for more contextualized and

8 Philip C. Bantin, ed., *Building Trustworthy Digital Repositories: Theory and Implementation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016); Jessica Bushey, Marie Demoulin, Robert McLelland, "Cloud Service Contracts: An Issue of Trust", *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 39:2 (2015): 128-153; Victoria L. Lemieux, ed. *Building Trust in Information: Perspectives on the Frontier of Provenance* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016).

9 Luciana Duranti, *Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science* (Scarecrow Press, 1998).

10 Gillian Oliver and Ross Harvey, *Digital Curation* (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 2016); International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 16363:2012 Space Data and Information Transfer Systems – Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories* (2012).

11 Anne J. Gilliland, "Networking Records in Their Diaspora: A Reconceptualization of "Displaced Records" in a Postnational World," Chapter 11, James Lowry, ed. *Displaced Records* (London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017), 180-196.

flexible understandings of these concepts. Critical theory focuses on social structures and power relations and, when applied in professional contexts, seeks to propose ways to redress inequities, marginalisations and oppression. There has been a notable decrease in confidence over the past decade in the fitness and appropriateness of traditional understandings and applications of archival concepts to encourage a humanitarian ethos in archival practice. Such an ethos would encompass the plural constituencies that must be addressed by the field's expanding societal roles and new forms of community and trans-cultural engagement; actively prioritise redress of past injustices and marginalisations in which recordkeeping and archival practices were conscious or unconscious participants; and promote an ethical consciousness as it relates to human rights, social justice, and more human welfare more broadly.

One example of what form this might take and the professional and conceptual issues that might encounter was Australian archival theorist Chris Hurley 1990s proposed expansion of the concept of provenance to encompass co-creatorship. Hurley, and various subsequent authors, have argued that co-creatorship offers a way to acknowledge, give voice to, and describe the roles of those who were involved with the creation of the record and its metadata as contributors, subjects, legatees, even victims in addition to the "official" author or office currently acknowledged through the designation of provenance.¹² However the identification of these additional parties as co-creators challenges traditional archival ideas about singular provenance or the assignment of provenance based upon the authority of the agent or function creating the record.¹³ It also, therefore, challenges established descriptive standards and practices that are based on those ideas, not to mention a whole world of rights management that would find it extremely difficult to accommodate Hurley's conceptualiza-

12 Chris Hurley, "Parallel Provenance: (1) What, If Anything, is Archival Description?" *Archives and Manuscripts* 33 (2005): 110-45, and "Parallel Provenance: (2) When Something is *Not* Related to Everything Else," *Archives and Manuscripts* 33 (2005): 52-91; Anne J. Gilliland, "Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description," *Knowledge Organization* 39:5 (September 2012): 340-346.

13 Since this paper was presented the International Council on Archives Expert Group on Archival Description (EGAD) released Records in Contexts (RIC), its draft conceptual model for archival description. The draft incorporates more ways for viewing and assigning provenance than has previously been possible, although it has yet to be finalised in light of feedback received during the period that was opened for comments. <http://www.ica.org/en/egad-ric-conceptual-model>.

tions of multiple simultaneous and parallel provenance or the social justice orientation of the notion of co-creation or of rights in records. Moreover, there is concern within this movement itself as to whether a designation as co-creator might convey a false sense of agency on the part of those who were coerced or unwitting participants in the activity that led to the creation of the record, such as the prisoners in Tuol Sleng prison in Cambodia who, as Michelle Caswell has observed, were forcibly photographed before being executed by the Pol Pot regime.¹⁴

A second, less abstract, example relates to the status of records created in a personal capacity by individuals using digital media in situations that make it impossible to meet stringent requirements for the creation of reliable and preservation of authentic records. In 2016, Croatian media carried an interview with a Syrian journalist who concluded that the most important things for those fleeing Syria and pouring through the Balkan states are money, mobile phones, and documents. Charged mobile phones are important not simply because of their communication and geolocation capabilities, but also because of the photographs they contain of home – often the last and only remaining images of their loved ones and their homeland as they once were – and photographed copies they have made of records or documents they need to establish their identity, to obtain status as refugees, to settle and interface with the bureaucracies of life elsewhere or eventually to return to their homeland, and to reconstruct or otherwise move on with their lives.¹⁵ If we are rigid in our understandings about reliability, authenticity, provenance, authority and evidence as these may be applied to the future archival value of the records they carry with them on their mobile phones, or indeed to the physical papers they might have on their persons, and are unable to take into account the circumstances of displacement, we run the risk of failing these desperate people. In other words, it is possible that we, like the legal and bureaucratic systems they will have to navigate, could impose value structures and other criteria at our own threshold that

14 Michelle Caswell, *Archiving the Unspeakable: Silence, Memory, and the Photographic Record in Cambodia* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014).

15 See also Nina Porzucki, "The Things They Carried With Them: What Refugees Take on Their Journey," in *PRI The World*, <http://www.pri.org/stories/2015-09-04/things-refugees-carry-them-their-journey>.

potentially say that these precious items, personal records, even if they were to be offered to us for safekeeping, as evidence, and as memory texts, do not meet our own tests as records. This, of course, is one reason why many such materials in the past have found their way to community archives and other memory and documentation projects where different criteria for value often operate.

Such examples highlight key tensions that exist in how the archival field views its societal role and they lead us to ask: what business are archives in today? Is it institutional accountability and citizen rights? Is it memory and historical research? Is it national, community and personal identity? Is it human rights? In most cases it will be a combination of several or all of these, so to what extent and in which ways can the field's conceptual bases simultaneously drive principles, standards, functions and activities that address such a matrix of agendas and audiences? Canadian archival theorist Terry Cook described in 2013 the complex state of archival conceptualizations and roles as simultaneously an evolution, a progression and an overlapping in the frameworks and mindsets defining the contemporary identity of the field. Identifying four operative frameworks – juridical legacy, cultural memory, societal engagement and community archiving – he argued that the archivist has been transformed from:

passive curator to active appraiser to societal mediator to community facilitator. The focus of archival thinking has moved from evidence to memory to identity and community, as the broader intellectual currents have changed from pre-modern to modern to post-modern to contemporary.¹⁶

In order to be in a position to articulate to others, in ways that move beyond the mere use of terms of art, how concepts such as the ones that have been chosen as themes for this conference are understood and used inside the archival field, we first need, therefore, to unpack their shifting

¹⁶ Terry Cook, "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13 (2013). doi:10.1007/s10502-012-9180-7.

semantics with reference to the kinds of lineages and intellectual movements that Cook has laid out. Perhaps most importantly, we need to be transparent about how these lineages align with particular interests and standpoints and preclude others (and herein we can perhaps see exactly why we have these two seemingly divergent discourses that have been occurring in recent years around archival concepts).

Archival concepts were articulated as such largely in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, at a time when Western European establishment bureaucracies, upon and around whose practices these concepts were formally articulated, were invested in forms of governance and commerce that included colonialism, imperialism and institutionalised slavery, and at a time when many of the tenets of human rights that we see to be essential today, such as the universal right to run for office and to vote, or to participate in organised labour, or even the international acknowledgment that we all have fundamental inalienable rights as human beings, were still battles being fought. Today, as we endeavour to meet the potential and challenges of a digital era, we are also immersed in the social and political legacies and fallout of colonialism, imperialism and slavery, of the twentieth century's communist and fascist regimes, of widespread ethnic and religious conflicts, and of mass movements of populations, especially of populations displaced by oppression and war, or driven by famine and economic necessity. All of these have important records and recordkeeping dimensions, and for individuals caught up in them, there are often very personal and immediate consequences of as well as requirements for records. Is it realistic, then to expect these concepts, articulated in Western Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; endorsed in the twentieth century through a professional corpus of manuals, standards, best practices, professional competency exams and so forth; and re-validated and re-expressed in the last three decades to meet the challenges of digital applications and legal admissibility, to support a professional, humanitarian response to the legacies of the very systems that they helped to effect?

It might be scary for the archival field to contemplate too much critique and tampering with the concepts from which the principles, prac-

tices and activities of appraisal, arrangement, description and validation of their holdings, among others are derived. But without engaging in such a discussion as a profession, this archival preoccupation with concepts can easily become an internal obstacle to, and indeed I would argue, has been used in recent years to put a brake on, more expansive, pluralistic, reflexive, humanitarian, and certainly more radical and liberatory thinking about these concepts. Moreover, despite all the benefits of close specifications in supporting the standardization of professional practices, as already mentioned, every field also needs a space to allow for emergent and expanded concepts that respond to shifting social and intellectual currents and provide remediation for the errors and extremes of the past.

Some Observations about the Nature of Concepts

Records, and the process whereby they are created, kept, disseminated and used, are the most fundamental components of archival work. The archival field has consequently spent considerable energy debating what is considered to be a “record” both in terms of form and materiality and in terms of how “official” and controlled were the circumstances of its creation. After all, everything that is created is some form of trace that is a record of something and as such, it is also some form of evidence. Nevertheless, how one approaches archival conceptualizations and practices, depends on how one construes “records” and how they might be different from non-specified forms of information and cultural objects. An illustration of this can be seen in a meeting of experts from the UK, Australia, Canada and the US¹⁷ that was convened in Los Angeles by AERI in 2011 to discuss the possibility of developing concept-driven rather than function-based graduate archival education curricula, several overarching and inter-related concepts were identified as primary to the rationales within which the archival and broader recordkeeping field operates: accounta-

17 Kelly Besser, Wendy Duff, Joanne Evans, Jonathan Furner, Anne J. Gilliland, David Kim, Andrew J. Lau, Gregory Leazer, Heather MacNeil, Joy Novak, Elizabeth Shepherd, Ramesh Srinivasan, Michael Wartenbe, Kelvin White.

bility, evidence, identity, memory, recordkeeping, records, and rights and responsibilities.¹⁸ Some of these concepts have been articulated and defined through theorising and empirical research in more robust ways than have others and they align directly with the roles that Cook delineated four years later. In the Los Angeles meeting, participants elucidated how underpinning several of these concepts were others, including authority, authenticity and provenance that are intimately tied to archival roles in promoting accountability and trust in the creation, stewardship and disposition of records over time. Ultimately the group was not successful in doing what it set out to do because it could not get around several key problems that often arise when one tries to do any exercise in conceptual analysis or modeling. For example, how do we distinguish between core concepts and those that are more at the periphery? What is the nature of their interrelationships and can we in some way cluster them? Is evidence a core concept and if so, are authenticity, authority and provenance constituent or sub-concepts? What is the difference between a concept, a principle, a property, a process, and a condition or contingency? What are the distinctions that can or should be made between the concept of provenance, the principle of provenance and the processes and methods for establishing or tracing provenance? Likewise, what are the distinctions that can or should be made between the concept of authenticity, the processes of authentication, and the property of being authentic? Do authenticity and authority have to co-exist and be co-present for some item to be considered to be evidence? Is provenance a condition for establishing authenticity and authority? And so forth.

This intellectual exercise, therefore, while inconclusive, was extremely helpful in sharpening how the group thought and talked about these concepts and how it considered the implications of their lineage and original intent, how they were defined and configured in each of our different national recordkeeping traditions, and what were the challenges and potential conceptual expansions that had come up in each member's individual research trajectories and teaching.

18 Working Meeting on Reconceptualizing Archival Education held at the University of California, Los Angeles, 5-7 November, 2011.

Expanding Archival Concepts to Promote Human Welfare

As already mentioned, several recent propositions have been made to expand archival concepts in order to more directly support humanity in living better lives, although each inevitably raises additional questions. The following examples are drawn from my own work and that of my collaborators, Michelle Caswell and Sue McKemmish, and have emerged out of our own individual and joint engagement with community-based archiving and human rights and social justice activism, and more broadly the desire to support a more humanitarian ethos that addresses both juridical needs for, and the often unacknowledged affective aspects of, records and recordkeeping in community and individual lives. The first two examples are really less directly about the concepts themselves and more about how our professional principles stance and ethos help to get us to the desired state or to support the desired activity.

Caswell's proposed human rights-based framework¹⁹ emphasises stances that we see repeatedly coming up in contemporary critical archival discourse, and especially in community archives discourse. In and of themselves, these stances should each be implementable and encouraged in other archival contexts. Many community-based archives, however, have been criticised by the archival field for a lack of control over content and practices that would help to establish the authority, provenance, authenticity and ultimately, in a juridical sense, the legal evidential value of the materials they hold or steward (and here we could think back to the earlier example of refugees' mobile phone contents). Of course, although they may well hold copies of official records that were in the possession of community donors, most community archives content tends to be made up of other kinds of documentary and artefactual materials that are less likely to be employed for legal evidentiary purposes. As a result, even though community archives are playing vital roles in giving voice to those who may have little or no voice or who are merely treated as subjects in official archives, they cannot replace official archives whose content is sanctioned

19 Caswell, "Toward a Survivor-centered Approach," op. cit.

through the presence of such controls and which is produced by official processes whose authority is recognised by other authorities. The question that comes up, therefore, is to what extent can Caswell's framework actually influence the conceptual bases upon which government and other archives manage the official records that they hold?

In 2015, Sue McKemmish and I, trying to address a very similar question, asked "how do we become more participatory and build bridges across communities and different types of record- and memory-keeping systems while keeping things open, dynamic and responsive?" The previous year we had addressed the moral and ethical imperative for the formation of "quite a different kind of archive"—a participatory archive that would work in the interests of those who have been wronged in order to further human rights, reconciliation and recovery.²⁰

Participatory archives acknowledge that multiple parties have rights, responsibilities, needs and perspectives with regard to the record. The archives consequently become a negotiated space in which these different communities share stewardship—they are created by, for and with multiple communities, according to and respectful of community values, practices, beliefs and needs.²¹

Our response to the question, therefore, was to propose a suite of rights in records that could serve as a platform for participatory archiving. "Rights in" and "rights to" records issues have been surfaced repeatedly by recent and ongoing research as well as in national privacy policy frameworks and rulings, inquiry and commission reports and community and personal testimonies.²² In responding to these issues, we were immediately confronted with the need to address the power exercised by dominant, gendered and age-bound notions of singular provenance, agency and au-

20 Gilliland and McKemmish, "The Role of Participatory Archives," op. cit.; Gilliland and McKemmish, "Rights in Records," op. cit.

21 Gilliland and McKemmish, "The Role of Participatory Archives," op. cit.

22 See, for example, Katarzyna Grabska and Lyla Mehta, eds. *Forced Displacement: Why Rights Matter* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

thority that govern so much of records creation and also archival practice. We argued that we should not just be contemplating the general liberation of the archives through digital affordances, but we should be doing so also with a specific aim to enfranchise and recognise the rights and needs of those whom archives and their principles have systematically failed, disempowered or deprived – such as those millions of individuals and families of refugees today fleeing countries in so many different parts of the world.

The final two propositions I want to mention directly challenge and seek to expand the current conceptual base of archivistics. Michelle Caswell and I have over the past two years articulated the paired phenomenological concepts of imagined records and archival imaginaries as a way for the field to understand the affective impact of the absence of evidence, either because it is unavailable (e.g., withheld, destroyed, lost) or was never created in the first place but nevertheless has a presence in that it is imagined, longed for, feared, acted upon and reacted to, and so forth.²³ Archival imaginaries and imagined records have wide applicability,²⁴ but both find especial resonances in diaspora and dispossession experiences – whether forced through conflict or famine, or inflicted through colonialisation and genocide – where personal and community memory and history have been ruptured, language and other forms of cultural expression have been lost, place has been irrevocably altered, rights have been removed, ignored or violated, and perpetrators remain unaccountable and in power.

In examining how the archival field might play a more proactive role in supporting the survival, resettlement and recovery of those displaced through violence or environmental, economic or other exigencies, and in seeking to rupture the tight coupling between archival and legal understandings of and tests for evidence, I have also suggested that the field take into account another pair of concepts, this time procedural, that often exist in parallel to imagined records and archival imaginaries, as well

23 Anne J. Gilliland and Michelle Caswell, “Impossible Archival Imaginaries and Imagined Records,” in *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 53-75. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z; and Michelle Caswell and Anne J. Gilliland, “False Promise and New Hope: Dead Perpetrators, Imagined Documents, and Emergent Archival Evidence,” *International Journal on Human Rights* 19:5 (2015): 615-627.

24 See Gilliland and Caswell, “Impossible Archival Imaginaries,” *ibid.*

as in complex juxtapositions with classic notions of reliable and authentic records and trusted recordkeeping. These are irregular records and regular records that are used in irregular ways, certainly sometimes for criminal purposes, but often out of exigency by tens of millions of individuals and families around the world for whom the official record is unavailable or inaccessible, has been removed from them, or because its official status or standpoint cannot support their case. The archival field has not substantially engaged with the challenges that such irregularity presents to the concepts being examined by this conference in terms of how records are created and deployed, and how bureaucracies and recordkeeping systems are circumvented or subverted during human exigency.²⁵ However, it also should be noted that such irregularity often presents enormous juridical and bureaucratic problems for these people as they attempt to go through asylum processes and later to interact with the bureaucracies of the countries in which they settle or bring claims against entities associated with the countries from which they fled or were expelled.

Conclusion

Archives and recordkeepers have societal and ethical responsibilities toward those individuals who are least empowered to engage with official records and recordkeeping practices or to maintain their own records. This paper has attempted to lay out some of the humanitarian directions in which the field has been challenged to go, and to ask whether the key concepts of authenticity, provenance, authority and evidence are sufficiently expansive and nuanced to address these ends. Indeed, is it possible for any central professional concept to be simultaneously sufficiently ex-

25 "This reality – that in crisis or desperation, people will act upon documentation expeditiously or emotionally, whether or not that documentation can be proved to be "truthful" or "reliable" – de-stabilizes and de-privileges classic archival understandings of trustworthiness. In its place, it insists that an expanded contextual understanding of the act itself with which the record is associated be brought to bear in any archival value judgment or prioritization; and serves as a visceral reminder that a record that has been tampered with or used for a purpose other than that for which it was created is nevertheless authentic in relation to the purpose for which it was used to achieve." Anne J. Gilliland, "Moving Past: Probing the Agency and Affect of Recordkeeping in Individual and Community Lives in Post-conflict Croatia," *Archival Science* 14:3-4 (2014): 249-274.

pansive and nuanced and still play a central and definitive role in guiding archival practice, never mind bridging between that practice and those of related professions? Recent research would suggest that records held by official archives are trusted by legal and bureaucratic systems specifically because they adhere to rigorous and familiar concepts and procedures for acquiring and preserving reliable and authentic records. It would also suggest that the contents of community archives are similarly trusted by their source communities because they operate outside such official institutions and their conceptualizations and requirements. If we take this divide into account and sum up each of the propositions reviewed in this paper, we can construct one final large, complex question that perhaps punts, but perhaps holds some of the keys to a possible way forward: Can proactive participatory approaches, entered into with transparency, respect and good faith, jointly steward the *bureaucratic and legal record* and the *human and humanitarian record* (in all its artefactual, imaginary and irregular aspects), where type of record is assessed on its own terms as authentic, authoritative co-existing, action-informing and complementary and countervailing evidence?

REFERENCES

- BANTIN, PHILIP C. ed. *Building Trustworthy Digital Repositories: Theory and Implementation*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
- BUSHEY, JESSICA, MARIE DEMOULIN, ROBERT MCLELLAND. "Cloud Service Contracts: An Issue of Trust," *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 39:2 (2015): 128-153.
- CASWELL, MICHELLE. *Archiving the Unspeakable: Silence, Memory, and the Photographic Record in Cambodia*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014.
- CASWELL, MICHELLE. "Toward a Survivor-centered Approach to Records Documenting Human Rights Abuse: Lessons from Community Archives," *Archival Science* 14:3 (2014): 307-322.
- CASWELL, MICHELLE and ANNE J. GILLILAND. "False Promise and New Hope: Dead Perpetrators, Imagined Documents, and Emergent Archival Evidence," *International Journal on Human Rights* 19:5 (2015): 615-627.
- COOK, TERRY. "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13 (2013): 95-120. doi:10.1007/s10502-012-9180-7.
- DURANTI, LUCIANA. "The Concepts of Reliability and Authenticity and Their Implications," *Archivaria* 39 (1995): 5-10.
- DURANTI, LUCIANA. *Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science*. Scarecrow Press, 1998.
- EVANS, JOANNE, SUE MCKEMMISH, LIZ DANIELS and GAVAN MCCARTHY. "Self-determination and Archival Autonomy: Advocating Activism," *Archival Science* 16 (2016).
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. and SUE MCKEMMISH. "The Role of Participatory Archives in Furthering Human Rights, Reconciliation and Recovery," *Atlanti: Review for Modern Archival Theory and Practice* 24 (2014), 79-88.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. "A Matter of Life and Death: A Critical Examination of the Role of Official Records and Archives in Forced Displacement,"

- Critical Archival Studies*, special issue, Michelle Caswell, Ricardo Punzalan and T-Kay Sangwand, eds. *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 2 (2017).
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. "Archival Traditions in the Multiverse and their Importance for Researching Situations and Situating Research," Chapter 1, *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, A. J. Gilliland, A. Lau and S. McKemmish, eds. Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2016, 31-73.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. *Conceptualizing Twenty-first-century Archives*. Chicago, IL: Society of American Archivists, 2014.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. "Contemplating Co-creator Rights in Archival Description," *Knowledge Organization* 39:5 (September 2012): 340-346.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. "Moving Past: Probing the Agency and Affect of Recordkeeping in Individual and Community Lives in Post-conflict Croatia," *Archival Science* 14:3-4 (2014): 249-274.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. "Networking Records in Their Diaspora: A Reconceptualization of "Displaced Records" in a Postnational World," Chapter 11, James Lowry, ed. *Displaced Records*. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017, 180-196.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. and MICHELLE CASWELL. "Impossible Archival Imaginaries and Imagined Records," *Archival Science* 16 (2016): 53-75. DOI: 10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. and ANDREW FLINN. "The Wonderful and Frightening World of Community Archives: What Are We Really Talking About?" Keynote address, *Nexus, Confluence, and Difference: Community Archives meets Community Informatics: Prato CIRN Conference Oct 28-30 2013*, Larry Stillman, Amalia Sabiescu, Nemanja Memarovic, eds. Melbourne: Centre for Community Networking Research, Centre for Social Informatics, Monash University, 2013.
- GILLILAND, ANNE J. and SUE MCKEMMISH. "The Role of Participatory Archives in Furthering Human Rights, Reconciliation and Recovery," *Atlanti: Review for Modern Archival Theory and Practice* 24 (2014): 79-88.
- GILLILAND ANNE J. and SUE MCKEMMISH. "Rights in Records as a Platform for Participative Archiving," Chapter 14, Richard J. Cox, Alison Langmead and Eleanor Mattern, eds. *Archival Education and Research:*

- Selected Papers from the 2014 AERI Conference* (Sacramento, CA: Litwin Press, 2015), 355-385.
- GRABSKA, KATARZYNA and LYLA MEHTA, eds. *Forced Displacement: Why Rights Matter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- HURLEY, CHRIS. "Parallel Provenance: (1) What, If Anything, is Archival Description?" *Archives and Manuscripts* 33 (2005): 110-45.
- HURLEY, CHRIS. "Parallel Provenance: (2) When Something is *Not* Related to Everything Else." *Archives and Manuscripts* 33 (2005): 52-91.
- International Council on Archives Expert Group on Archival Description. *Records in Contexts - Conceptual Model* (29 August, 2016), <http://www.ica.org/en/egad-ric-conceptual-model>.
- International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 16363:2012 Space Data and Information Transfer Systems – Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories* (2012).
- International research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES), www.interPARES.org.
- InterPARES Trust, <https://interparestrust.org/>.
- Lemieux, Victoria L. ed. *Building Trust in Information: Perspectives on the Frontier of Provenance*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- OLIVER, GILLIAN and ROSS HARVEY. *Digital Curation*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 2016.
- PORZUCKI, NINA. "The Things They Carried With Them: What Refugees Take on Their Journey," *PRI The World*, <http://www.pri.org/stories/2015-09-04/things-refugees-carry-them-their-journey>.

STVARATELJ, PROVENIJENCIJA, AUTENTIČNOST I DOKAZNA VRIJEDNOST GRADIVA I HUMANITARNA PITANJA

KLJUČNE RIJEČI:

arhivistika, dokazna vrijednost gradiva, humanitarna pitanja, participativno arhiviranje, ljudska prava u zapisima

SAŽETAK

U radu se razmatraju arhivska poimanja stvaratelja, provenijencije, autentičnosti i dokazne vrijednosti gradiva, njihova usklađenost s pravnim potrebama i zahtjevima spisovodstvenih funkcija te načini na koje suviše rigidne konstrukcije navedenih koncepata mogu ograničiti mogućnosti humanitarno orijentiranih arhivskih praksi. Arhivi i imatelji arhivskog gradiva imaju društvenu i etičku odgovornost prema pojedincima koji nisu ovlašteni i dovoljno osposobljeni za bavljenje službenim zapisima i spisovodstvenim praksama ili za čuvanje vlastitih zapisa. Suvremeni izazovi usmjerili su polje arhivistike prema humanitarnim pitanjima. Stoga se u radu predstavljaju pojedina humanitarna usmjerenja te ispituje jesu li ključni koncepti autentičnosti, provenijencije, stvaratelja i dokazne vrijednosti gradiva dostatno široki i kontekstualno osjetljivi da bi se nosili s tim pitanjima. Je li moguće da ikoji temeljni stručni koncept koji je istovremeno dostatno rastezljiv i kontekstualno osjetljiv i dalje zadrži središnju i odlučujuću ulogu u arhivskoj praksi te ujedno služi kao poveznica između te prakse i praksa povezanih struka? Suvremena istraživanja upućuju na činjenicu da zapisima u službenim arhivima vjeruju upravni i administrativni sustavi posebice stoga što se zasnivaju na strogim i poznatim konceptima i procedurama prikupljanja i čuvanja pouzdanih i autentičnih zapisa. Istraživanja također upućuju da povjerenje u sadržaj arhiva pojedinih zajednica imaju zajednice koje su ih stvorile i koje njima upravljaju upravo zato što oni

djeluju izvan službenih ustanova i njihovih konceptualizacija i zahtjeva. Uzmemo li u obzir tu opreku te sažmemo li prijedloge izložene u ovom radu, možemo postaviti jedno složeno, donekle neizravno, pitanje koje ujedno implicira mogućnosti daljnjeg djelovanja: može li proaktivni participativni pristup, od početka kreiran transparentno, s poštovanjem i u dobroj namjeri, zajednički upravljati administrativnim i pravnim zapisima te zapisima pojedinih zajednica, primjerice onih nastalih u humanitarne svrhe (u svim njihovim izvornim, imaginarnim i nepravilnim aspektima), u kojem je vrsta zapisa procijenjena po vlastitim uvjetima kao autentična, informativna te predstavlja komplementarni i alternativni dokaz službenom narativu?