Title

Implementing a Social Justice Framework in an Introduction to Archives Course: Lessons from Both Sides of the Classroom

Permalink

Journal

Authors

Caswell, Michelle
Broman, Giso
Kirmer, Jennifer
et al.

Publication Date

DOI

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Archivists, wherever they work and however they are positioned, are subject to the call of and for justice. For the archive can never be a quiet retreat for professionals and scholars and craftspersons. It is a crucible of human experience, a battleground for meaning and significance, a babel of stories, a place and a space of complex and ever-shifting power-plays. Here one cannot keep one's hands clean. Any attempt to be impartial, to stand above the power-plays, constitutes a choice, whether conscious or not, to replicate if not to reinforce prevailing relations of power. In contrast, archivists who hear the calling of justice, who understand and work with the archival record as an enchanted sliver, will always be troubling the prevailing relations of power. (Harris, 2002, p. 85)

Introduction

In the past decade, there has been a growing call from some archival scholars and practitioners for the field to reorient towards an explicit social justice mission (Harris, 2002; Jimerson, 2007, 2009; Wallace, 2010). Archival educators have been actively engaged in this shift, addressing the promises and perils of activism in the classroom, the ethical obligation to create culturally sensitive learning environments, and the role archival education can play in reorienting archival practice towards social justice and cultural sensitivity by training a new generation of archivists (Gilliland, 2011; Pluralism the Archival Curriculum Group, 2011).

Yet despite the theoretical groundwork laid by these scholars, little has yet been written that provides practical details on how archival educators might implement a social justice framework in the introductory classroom. This article, based on a collaborative action research project between an archival instructor and four MLIS students, fills this void. It assesses the effectiveness of three classroom exercises, reflecting a social justice mission in an introductory archives course. This research is not intended as an authoritative manual that definitively states how to conduct an archives course, but rather, as a reflective contribution to an ongoing conversation about social justice and archival education. The hope is that by sharing both the successes and failures of one particular introductory course, we can move forward the discussion surrounding archival education and social justice in a small but significant way.

Using the reflections of both the instructor and students about lesson plans from three course sessions, this paper argues that a social justice framework can be practically implemented in an introductory archives classroom setting, imparting to students both the rationale for classical Western archival concepts and functions, and the modes to critique such functions from a social justice

perspective. After a brief introduction summarizing course logistics and the action research methodology employed, this paper will propose a working definition of social justice and discuss in detail what constitutes a social justice pedagogical framework in archival education. Next, this paper will describe and analyze a small-group exercise on the concepts of record, provenance, and creatorship, detailing ways in which to teach prevailing archival concepts and encourage critiques of these concepts from a social justice perspective. This paper will then address a group discussion of power, marginalization, and listening for whispers in the archives, revealing how records can be used in the classroom to illustrate complex theoretical concepts. Finally, this paper will discuss the effectiveness of an exercise using three human-rights case studies to demonstrate the importance of ethical action in archival practice. Each of the paper's four main sections – the rationale for a social justice pedagogy; the small group exercise on records, provenance, and creatorship; the group discussion on power and marginalization; and the human rights ethics case studies – will include the instructor's rationale for and reflection on the lesson, as well as student commentary on its effectiveness. This paper will then conclude with suggestions for future research in this area.

Methodology and Logistics

This article reports on three class exercises from an introductory archives course offered by the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The course, "LIS 734: Introduction to Archives Administration," is a prerequisite for students completing the archives concentration, but is open to all graduate students at the university. The course instructor (the first author of this paper), was a doctoral candidate in the department; this was her first experience designing and teaching her own semester-long course. The course syllabus was designed after consultation with other educators in the field; the syllabi from analogous courses at the University of Michigan and the University of California, Los Angeles served as particularly helpful models. The class met for two- and-a-half hours every week over the course of a 14-week semester. On the first day of the semester, the instructor made explicit her intent to foster a culturally sensitive and dynamic learning environment, proposing to run the class as a collaborative idea laboratory and explaining how respectful disagreement would be encouraged. Class sessions involved a variety of methods in order to engage the different learning styles of students. A typical session included: brief student "archives in the news" presentations; a 45-minute lecture and discussion of the readings led by the instructor; and small group exercises in which students split into teams of four or

five to investigate a series of questions relating to a record, issue, or case study, and then report findings back to the entire group.

The instructor designed the course as a compromise between the more traditional Western approach centered around archival functions such as appraisal, arrangement, description, and a more cross-cultural, concept-based approach centered around diverse themes such as memory, trust, power, and accountability (Gilliland, 2011). As a new teacher, the instructor wanted to both ensure that the students would understand key functions and concepts to prepare them for jobs at mainstream archival institutions, as well as give them the tools to critique and expand archival approaches. Furthermore, the course was designed to offer students a solid theoretical foundation on which they could build their current and future archival practice; as such, the emphasis was on theory, with some demonstrations of the practical implications of theory in each session.

This paper employs a collaborative action research methodology. Collaborative research has developed as a rigorous alternative to more traditional forms of ethnographic research in which the researcher is seen as outside of and distinct from the community of research subjects. Rooted in feminist, postmodern and postcolonial theory, this methodology reflects a radical restructuring of traditional research hierarchies that place the researcher in a privileged position above those being studied. Explored in most detail by anthropologists, collaborative research approaches focus on creating a "dialogue between ethnographer and interlocutor" (Lassiter, 2005, p. 3). In some cases, as Lassiter (2005) suggests, collaborative research extends this dialogue to involve the co-authorship of scholarship between the researcher and research subjects. In this truly collaborative approach, research is not merely shared with or its accuracy confirmed by research subjects, but actively critiqued by them in a process known as "reciprocal ethnography" (Lawless, 1993, p. 5). It is an iterative, time-consuming process whereby a scholar may draft an initial text, share it with research subjects who then respond in writing, and the differences in perspectives are then acknowledged and co-interpreted (Lassiter, 2005).

For this paper, the first author chose not just to write about her students as research subjects, but engage four of them in a co-authored written dialogue aimed at improving future pedagogical practice. The instructor formulated the idea of writing this paper roughly halfway through the semester and soon thereafter asked the students to participate based on their outstanding contributions to the highlighted exercises; these classroom contributions were evaluated on their intellectual merit and not on their agreement with the instructor's social justice approach. The co-authoring students were not necessarily meant to represent the larger student body. While the first author made attempts to welcome dissenting voices in the classroom and did receive

some pushback from students who disagree with the social justice approach in course evaluations, it was impractical to coauthor an article with all 34 students.

Participation in this article was entirely voluntary and occurred after grades were submitted for the semester. The selected students were given an outline of the proposed article via email, and asked if they would like to participate by writing a brief response to the social justice framework or exercises. The group then met in person and the participating students collaboratively decided who would respond to each section. The instructor purposefully provided little direction to the students, but specified that the student responses should be "honest and critical, thoughtfully addressing what you learned during the exercise, how this impacts your understanding of archives and potentially your practice, and what you think could be improved." Some participating students based their responses on their own personal reflections on the course sessions, while others discussed the course content with their classmates and wrote more generally about how they observed all of the students respond.

The first author fully recognizes that there is an inherent power dynamic between instructors and students that may have influenced the student responses. (In this case, the power discrepancy may have been diminished by the instructor's status as a doctoral student.) In spite of this dynamic, the first author thinks the benefits of including some student voices, however selective, outweigh the risks of silencing students entirely in this important conversation about the future of archival education. Furthermore, the instructor asked all of the students to reflect critically on the course, gave them a robust introduction to the academic publication process, and encouraged them to submit their work—irrespective of topic or orientation—for publication.

The collaborative research methodology employed in this paper can also be used as a pedagogical tool that demystifies the research and publication process to the participating students. The coauthoring students were involved in every step of the process, from writing the first draft, to submission, to the review and revision process. By walking students through these steps, the instructor hoped to make publication less intimidating and to encourage their future research as critically reflective practitioners.

The instructor wrote the introduction, literature review, and rationale sections of this paper. Other sections of this paper include a section written by the instructor as well as an individual student response. After the instructor collated all of the sections, the instructor and students had another opportunity to comment before everyone agreed on a final draft.

This paper is the initial paper in a larger ongoing collaborative action research project proposed by the first author, which seeks to improve archival education through participatory discussion and critical reflection. Action research

methodology is commonly employed in the field of education. As Calhoun (2002) writes, action research is "continued disciplined inquiry conducted to inform and improve our practice as educators" (p. 18). Action research involves identification of an educational issue or problem, the collection of data regarding that problem, the creation of a plan for improvement, the implementation of that plan, and evaluation (Gordon, 2008). First the instructor identifies an educational problem (archival education is usually one-sided and does not properly empower students to use their skills as archivists to enact social change); presents observations regarding that problem (the first author's own experience as an archives student as well as conversations with other archival program graduates (as documented in PACG, 2011)); creates a plan for improvement (transform the introductory archives curriculum to reflect a social justice framework); and implements that plan (teach students to think critically about archival theory and practice from a social justice perspective, through, in part, the implementation of the three described classroom exercises). This paper departs from this model by using the reflections of the instructor and students rather than more formal evaluative data.

Key to this methodology is critical self-reflection on professional practice at every step with the goal of improvement (Costello, 2003; McNiff, 2002). At each stage, the first author and participating students reflected critically on their own roles. Other hallmarks of action research discussed in this article are collaboration, a commitment to social justice, and contextualizing inquiry into its broader political, historical, and ideological frameworks (Somekh, 2006). This paper reflects on the strengths and weaknesses of three class exercises and ultimately demonstrates that a social justice approach can be successfully implemented in an introductory course. The ultimate goal of this research is both to share it with other colleagues in the field, and improve archival education.

Rationale for a Social Justice Framework

While there has been a great deal of interest in incorporating a social justice perspective within archival practice, there is much confusion over the exact meaning of the term and its implications. Indeed, as David Wallace (2010) notes, the term "social justice" can appear so broad in scope and amorphous that its meaning can be elusive at best, and, at worst, watered down or co-opted by the very powers it seeks to critique. In other cases, the term is invoked on a list of lofty ideals such as accountability and diversity without a clear definition and little direction on how archivists can attain such lofty goals (Jimerson, 2007). While the term has been widely adopted in the fields of education and anthropology, there is still some resistance to it in library and information studies (LIS) (Gilliland, 2011). The first author of this paper has encountered significant

resistance to the term in LIS in general, but not within archival studies in particular.

Despite this resistance, there have been several attempts by archivists and archival scholars to define social justice and delineate its intersections with archival practice. Verne Harris (2011), while not specifically using the phrase "social justice," describes the basic tenets of the "memory for justice" movement in South Africa. He writes:

- the work of archives is an integral part of the struggles against apartheid…;
- the archivist is not an impartial custodian—rather, the archivist is a memory activist, either for or against the oppressive system;
- creating space for the voices and the narratives repressed or silenced by apartheid is an ethical imperative;
- as is countering the dominant metanarratives of the regime and building new ones;
- the work of archives is located within an endgame… (p. 114).

For Harris, justice, like the archival record itself, is "always in the process of becoming"; rather than a concrete goal whose achievement we can celebrate, justice must be constantly remade and reshaped as our future transforms it (Harris, 2011). Its one constant as applied to archives, in Harris's view, is the "ethics of hospitality" which welcome the voices of "the other" into the archives.

Building on Harris's work, Wallace (2010) posits some key themes for a social justice approach to archives. Summarizing the discussions from conferences on archives, memory, and ethics at the Nelson Mandela Foundation and the University of Michigan, he writes that such an approach:

> Embrac[es] ambiguity over clarity; accept[s] that social memory is always contestable and reconfigurable; understand[s] that politics and political power is always present in shaping social memory; consider[s] that archives and archival praxis always exist within contexts of power…; recognize[s] the paradox of archives and archivists of loci of both weak social power and significant social memory shaping potential; and acknowledge[s] that social justice itself is ambiguous and contingent on dissimilar space, time and cultural contexts. (Wallace, 2010, p. 184)

While this definition is purposefully ambiguous, Wallace also gives concrete historical examples of social justice in action; he writes, "Such social justice movements of the past challenged slavery, exploitative labor conditions, racism, colonialism; militarism and war; gender and ethnic inequities, violations of civil

liberties, immigrant rights; environmental health; and their linkages to structural inequalities and crushing poverty" (Wallace, 2010, p. 185).

Similarly, in an article about the application of critical race theory to archival studies, Anthony W. Dunbar (2006) turns to the field of education for an explicit delineation of the goals of social justice. Citing educational theorist Lee Anne Bell, Dunbar aptly posits that the social justice aims most applicable to archival studies are:

- to provide a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is more equitable;
- to seek vehicles for actors to express their own agency, reality, or representation;
- to develop strategies that broker dialogue between communities with unparallel cultural viewpoints;
- to create frameworks to clearly identify, define, and analyze oppression and how it operates… (Bell, 1997 as quoted in Dunbar, 2006, p. 117)

For Dunbar, critical race theory and its criticism of dominant power structures is an integral part of this social justice framework.

While Dunbar is concerned with archives in general, not directly addressing archival education per se, his four main points (as adopted from Bell) are crucial to this paper's conversation about what constitutes a social justice framework in the archives classroom. Following Bell's and Dunbar's lead, this paper defines a social justice approach to archival education as that which focuses on the following four underlying themes: the more equitable distribution of economic opportunity; the empowering effects of self representation; the encouragement of dialogue between those with incommensurate ontologies; and an analysis of power and its abuses. Archival education can practically address these themes through (respectively):

- the active recruitment of economically disadvantaged students in archival programs by the allocation of scholarship funds and support of affirmative action policies, as well as the creation of a culturally sensitive learning environment and community-based fieldwork programs that focus on recordkeeping in marginalized communities (PACG, 2011);
- a thorough and continuous exploration of the relationship between archival representation, identity, and the power to name;
- a pluralist approach to diverse ontologies and epistemologies that both acknowledges the realities of cultural differences and

encourage mutual respect and understanding despite such differences (PACG, 2011);

- ongoing discussing about the role of record keepers and archivists in dominant power structures, including but not limited to a discussion of archives and human rights, state repression, and violence.

Yet despite these practical and attainable points, the proposed approach to archival pedagogy also acknowledges Wallace's and Harris's claims that social justice is an unattainable ideal for which we must continually strive even in the face of its impossibility. As such, this framework presents a contribution to an ongoing conversation rather than a one-size-fits-all solution.

Furthermore, the curricular component discussed in this paper (i.e., three classroom exercises) is simply one of many educational components that constitute a larger social justice-oriented archives program. Anne Gilliland, one of the leaders in this burgeoning pedagogical movement within the field, has thoughtfully written about the importance of service learning and community engagement in fulfilling UCLA's social justice mandate. As Gilliland (2011) reports, community-based fieldwork with grassroots archival organizations encourages students to expand the range of their practice outside traditional or mainstream institutions and to consider the impact of diverse memory-keeping traditions on their own archival practice – despite initial resistance to required participation in a service-learning class (Gilliland, 2011). Other key components of a social justice framework include: active diversity recruitment; guest speakers from and field trips to community-based archival organizations; encouragement of interdisciplinary coursework, especially foreign language coursework; and opportunities to study and practice abroad.

This social justice framework builds on recent work specifically applying notions of pluralism to archival education. Writing about archival curricula in Mexico, Kelvin White (2009) proposed a framework for pluralizing archival education to more accurately reflect indigenous and African contributions to Mexican culture; his six-point plan includes: conceptual expansion, embedding fieldwork within communities; collaboration with community-based groups; leadership, activism, and ethics; reflexivity of archival theory and practice; and sustainability (White, 2009). More recently, under the direction of Anne Gilliland and Tyrone Howard, a group of more than 20 diverse archival educators and doctoral students from around the world (including the first author of this paper) formed the Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG) during the 2009 meeting of the Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI) to address ways in which the archival curriculum could be expanded to include multiple (and

sometimes incommensurate) perspectives. In an article in the *American Archivist,* the group put forth three major approaches pluralizing archival education:

- identifying ways in which dominant cultural paradigms permeate archival pedagogy, theory, and practice;
- envisioning and exploring alternatives to these paradigms;
- developing an archival-education framework that can promote the critique of professional and societal norms and include and reflect upon diverse perspectives on archival theory and practice (PACG, 2011, p. 71).

At the 2011 meeting of AERI, the PACG group reconvened under the direction of Anne Gilliland and Sue McKemmish to discuss implementation of this pluralist approach through a concept-based archival curriculum that focuses on memory-keeping practices across diverse cultural traditions, rather than solely focusing on the dominant tradition of classical Western archival functions (Gilliland, 2011). Adding to this discussion, this paper argues that archival pluralism is a necessary component of the social justice framework to archival education; it represents a paradigm shift from the classical Western archival tradition to one that acknowledges archival pluralism as a prerequisite for the justice approach, while social justice's deep commitment to issues of difference, marginalization, and power has greatly influenced the pluralistic approach. In this way, social justice and pluralism are complementary approaches to archival education.

Student Response to Social Justice Pedagogical Framework: by Giso Broman

The implementation of this pedagogical framework was successful in our introductory archives class because of the flexible approach of our instructor, who struck a balance in emphasis between theoretical and practical aspects of archives. Not only did we discuss multiple definitions for social justice, but we also debated more fundamental concepts and archival functions, such as the definition of a record and the boundaries of what constitutes provenance. After exploring various foundational approaches to the study of archives, our class devoted some time each week to hands-on activities and short, topical presentations of current events that related to archives. These activities underscored the plural character of the modern archives, which many of our weekly readings had illustrated. In particular, we frequently discussed how one might use archival records to read against the grain of conventional historiography and discover the voice of the "other." To summarize, although many of the obstacles highlighted by the PACG offer significant challenges, the measured approach employed in our classroom

demonstrates that a social justice framework is well-suited to – and even highly desirable in – an introductory archives course.

Upon reflection after taking this course, it is abhorrent for me to consider that other introductory archives courses would be taught using a pedagogy based on the memorization of "correct" definitions. After reading even the smallest sample of the traditional archival literature, it is clear that there is considerable debate among scholars and archival practitioners about how to define and delineate such key archival functions as provenance, or, more elusive still, the role of an archives or the definition of a record. Thankfully, in our classroom, these concepts and debates were presented—alongside the definition of social justice, itself—as so many various paths towards sometimes overlapping truths. We were never encouraged to take one set of definitions over another, but rather to engage critically with them and draw our own conclusions. As a personal aside, I am not convinced that there are any singular definitions for these complex concepts, nor would I consider it desirable to discover any, but I can respect those who have settled on one over the others. Appropriate to our social justice context, we discussed each record and repository critically and sought to identify the various voices and memories represented in them, be they explicitly present or more hidden.

Many of our student presentations had themes that focused on issues of power, oppression, equality, agency, or other issues that made it easy for us to employ our social justice thinking caps. In these cases, it was often more challenging for us step outside of this framework and to think in terms of the more supposedly neutral, or at least more scientifically minded, practitioners of the past. In an archival collection that deals with genocide or human rights abuses, for example, it's nearly impossible to discuss the core archival functions without also considering more existential questions of justice, memory, or truth.

Conversely, there were instances when we were confronted with extremely factual documents that seemingly had very little to hide. In those cases, we sometimes agreed that a land deed or government-issued license was very little more than what it appeared to be. However, these moments also pointed to the ways that records can evolve and to the importance of key functions such as provenance, as well as the role of an archivist more generally. One only needs to consider the evolution of basic notions of race or gender in this country to recognize how a simple check mark on a form can be transformative; whether or not there is even a space for recording this type of information can alter the document's meaning over time. Any contemporary document that refers to "bride" or "groom" may well tell its own unintended story to historians 50 years hence, given our current debates about marriage in this country. In order to better care for and manage these records, archivists need to learn to listen for these voices and to anticipate how the archives might be used.

The primary difficulty that our class faced in transitioning to a more pluralized archival curriculum came from a general lack of cross-cultural study and research. We studied archives from around the world, but were still quite limited by basic issues such as language. In my own case, I chose to study Brazilian archives for each of my three major course projects, in part because I was curious about the currents of archival thought outside of North America, Western Europe, and Australia. Although my language skills allowed me to uncover quite a lot of information about contemporary Brazilian archival thought, the lack of engagement between the archival literature written in English and the Portuguese-language equivalents made it difficult to analyze the similarities and differences in a substantial way. In time, as more archivists and scholars engage with one another across cultures, these barriers will erode. For now, each article about an archival institution outside of one's own country of origin should be approached with the knowledge that the international community of archivists is still very fractured and dominated by a rather specific set of academic voices. Employing a social justice framework in archival curricula is not only an excellent first step to amplifying the silenced voices in the records that we keep, but also helps to emphasize the importance of building a more plural and diverse profession.

Exercise 1: Records, Societal Provenance, and Co-Creatorship

The goal for this session was to introduce students to basic archival concepts like record, document, provenance, and creatorship, as well as explore recent scholarship that challenges or expands these concepts. This lesson reflected a social justice framework in that it aimed to get students to acknowledge pluralist ontologies and epistemologies and their implications for archival practice. In preparation for this session, students were assigned the following readings: Buckland, 1997; Cook, 1997; Douglas 2010; Thomassen, 2001; Yeo, 2007. These readings were supplemented by a lecture that both further explored the traditional Western definitions of record, document, provenance, and creatorship, and introduced students to indigenous concepts of records. They were also presented with the notions of societal provenance and co-creatorship as culled from recent scholarship on postcolonial and indigenous archives (Bastian, 2005; Faulkhead, 2009).

Students actively engaged the ideas of societal provenance and co-creatorship, and discussed the implications of this conceptual expansion for practice. The instructor challenged the students to stretch their notions of record to include non-textual records such as Native American wampum belts, which record historic events through the pattern and texture of their shells. An intense conversation ensued over whether or not such three-dimensional objects belong in

a mainstream archival repository. Some students claimed that it is not archivists' role to collect such objects, and others asserted that archival collections should accurately reflect the diversity of society, including Native American ways of remembering. The instructor told students that archiving the wampum belt was like appraising a collection in another language; just because the archivist doesn't speak that language does not mean the record doesn't have value. Not all of the students were convinced.

Students then divided into small groups and were given a record to discuss; some groups were given digital records, while others were given paper records. These records included:

- a black-and-white photograph dating from World War II of a woman in a military uniform, labeled "Pfc. Rita Wesolowski, U.S. Marines;"
- a digital image widely circulated on Twitter, showing an Egyptian man in Tahrir Square holding up a sign that says, "Egypt Supports Wisconsin Workers," as found at http://twitpic.com/419nfm
- a paper treaty between the State of Wisconsin and the Menominee Nation regarding the transfer of land;
- all of the tweets marked #wiunion, a hash tag commonly used during the protests at the Wisconsin State Capitol Building in Winter 2011;
- a zip drive containing the instructor's dissertation proposal.

Next, the students were asked to discuss the following questions in their small groups:

- Describe your object. Is it a record? Is it a document? According to whom? Why or why not?
- What is it evidence of?
- What is its provenance as traditionally conceived?
- What is its societal provenance? Is the archivist part of this provenance?
- Who is the creator of this record as traditionally conceived?
- Who might we conceive of as the co-creator?

Students then reported their findings back to the class. Based on this discussion, it was clear that the students understood the concepts of co-creatorship and societal provenance, as well as the complexities of determining provenance, authenticity, and creatorship in digital objects like tweets. Yet while the exercise successfully provided a space for students to try out these newly learned concepts, the records used in this exercise did not fully call into question traditional Western conceptions of record. In the future, the instructor plans to include non-textual records that reflect diverse ontologies and epistemologies, such as Hmong story

cloths, quilts made by African American women at Gee's Bend, and oral histories from local indigenous groups.

Student Response to Exercise on Records, Societal Provenance, and Co-Creatorship by Laura Martin

This activity was effective at getting students to reflect upon non-traditional definitions of documents, records, and provenance; however, it also raised questions about the use of the social justice framework in general. As one of the very first class activities in the semester, it was challenging for students, regardless of their previous archives experience. For those new to the archival world, they struggled learning both traditional and expanded definitions of theoretical concepts at once, while students who had worked in archives may have struggled to accept new theories that did not match their work experience. Being the first "hands-on" session of the semester, it was the students' first insight into what applying a social justice framework to archives means in practice.

The effectiveness of the activity lay in the instructor's choice of meaningful and appropriate examples of records. For this class in particular, the examples of the wampum belt and the Twitter photo from Egypt were especially elucidating. Several of the students in the class were actively involved in library and archive projects with local Native American communities, and they were able to speak to indigenous issues surrounding the wampum belt. The Twitter photo also generated a lot of interest because of its relationship to the protests in Madison, WI earlier in the year, in which many of the students' had participated or had witnessed first-hand.

The example of the wampum belt was useful in trying to convince skeptical students about the existence of non-traditional records and documents for which they may not have the knowledge or authority to interpret or describe them. The average student is unable to "read" a wampum belt because it does not contain written script on paper, the characteristics that have traditionally defined documents. It does not mean, however, that the wampum belt is void of information or that it does not serve as a record, but rather that we simply do not have the knowledge needed to interpret it. The idea was further supported by the instructor's analogy that a person with no knowledge of the German language could not interpret a document in written in German.

This particular example would have been even more striking if the instructor had been able to speak to the particular information that the wampum belt in question communicates to members of the community who made and use it. Providing the students with a "reading" of the record by an informed community member re-emphasizes the limitations of the Western worldview in properly accounting for other methods of memory and documentation. This type of limitation was hinted at, but not fully explored, in the instructor's anecdote

about a colleague, an archivist of Native American descent, who bristled at the idea that an item such as the wampum belt would be preserved in a plastic encasement by an archival institution when it is meant to be used actively within a community. Such lacunas in understanding about indigenous records and artifacts by archivists are common, and the wampum belt was a persuasive example of this.

The example of the Twitter photo also prompted a lot of interest amongst the students, primarily because it was related to the protests that had taken place in Madison in 2011. While this local connection caught the students' attention, they soon realized how complicated defining provenance could be. The Twitter photo – featuring an Egyptian man with a sign supporting Wisconsin protestors in the midst of a protest in Egypt – effectively showed how the idea of a single provenance is blurred, not only by societal circumstances, but also by social media on the Internet. Students had to consider whether or not this document was a product of the Wisconsin protest movement, in which many of them were involved, as well as the protests in Egypt, or if its provenance was restricted to the individual who took the picture or the one who was featured in it. Students also had to consider the role that the comments on the Twitter page had in shaping the photo as a document, and how they served as a record of a particular event, the respective protests. Opinion among the students was divided about the most accurate or appropriate interpretation of the provenance of this document on both the individual and societal level. However the digital, changeable nature of the document admittedly complicated this matter even further. Ultimately, the students had to learn to be comfortable with no "right" answer to the matter of the photo's provenance.

Overall, the activity succeeded at its goal of challenging the traditional definitions of documents, records, and provenance, and encouraging students to engage and wrestle with their expanded definitions of these concepts. It also raised philosophical and ethical questions for students about what it means to consider social justice issues in the archive. For some students, pluralism, post-modernism, and social justice are concepts with which they are comfortable, and actively choose to integrate them into their worldview; as a generalization, this seemed to be the case for the students in this class. However, the framework, purposefully or not, presents a moral imperative that may cause dissonance for some students who are attached to more traditional archival theory, but who wish to remain ethical in their practices. For example, even this student wondered about the ethical implications of defining a document: would it be racist to not consider a wampum belt a record? These questions can be uncomfortable for students to ask for fear of showing ignorance or narrow-mindedness. But they should be encouraged to raise them in order to enrich thoughtful discussion,

discourage the repetition of platitudes, and encourage students to conclude for themselves that the social justice framework truly is important.

Exercise 2: Power, Whispers and Reading against the Grain

Building on the previous week's discussion of societal provenance, in the third week of the course, students were asked to investigate the relationship between archives, power, and marginalization. Key to this relationship is the possibility of reading records created by the powerful "against the grain," to uncover the voices of marginalized. The lesson was driven primarily by the central question posed by Bastian (2005) in her article on colonial records in the Virgin Islands:

> Are there alternate ways in which these records can be interrogated to reveal the lives, the cultures, the feelings of those appropriated within them? How do the descendants of the enslaved… find the voices of their past, not the past as documented by the former planters, merchants, and colonial officials, but the past as experienced by their ancestors who created no official records themselves, but entered the record obliquely, as transactions perhaps, or as property (Bastian, 2005, p. 28).

At the same time, students were also asked to read records "along the grain" to uncover the intentions of their creators, revealing the anxieties and uncertainties associated with the maintenance of power (Stoler, 2009). The goal of this week was not only to introduce students to the ways in which power is made manifest by both the creation of records and their archivization, but to open them up to the possibility of hearing the voices of the marginalized in the records. This lesson laid the groundwork for future lessons that showed how the theoretical discussion of power is directly applicable to archival practice through selection, appraisal, arrangement, and description.

The instructor began the session with a lecture explaining the more theoretical concepts introduced in the readings for this week, which included: Bastian, 2005; Caswell, 2010; Stoler, 2009. The instructor then presented students with three records for discussion: a letter from a maid to her employer; a letter from one slave owner to another regarding the marriage of their slaves; and a letter documenting race riots in Bellingham, WA. For each record, students were asked:
- How do you read this record along the grain?
- How do you read this record against the grain?
- Can you hear any whispers of the powerless in this record?
- How is power manifest in the creation of the record?

Each record and the ensuing discussion will now be detailed.

Case #1: Letter from a Maid to Her Employer

This handwritten letter, dated January 31, 1935, is from a domestic servant identified only by her first name, Evelyn, to her employer, Mrs. Greenthal and was found by the instructor while doing unrelated research in the Alex and Irma Greenthal Papers at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Archives (Evelyn, 1935). The two-page note, written on the back of the page of a daily tear-off calendar, describes how Evelyn can no longer continue working for Mrs. Greenthal because she is two months "in a family way," that she is leaving town that night, that she "prays" Mrs. Greenthal "won't say anything to [her] aunt," and that she took two dollars "because Lord knows I'll need it and more yet before this is over." Written across the back of the envelope in Evelyn's handwriting is, "The key is in the mailbox—Forgive Me!" and across the front of the envelope, in Mrs. Greenthal's handwriting, is, "letter a former maid left for me when she left pregnant and took our laundry money" (Evelyn, 1935).

The letter was projected onto a large screen and read aloud to the students, who then discussed how it is a rare instance in which the marginalized is not merely whispering through a record, but screaming. Students noted how this record, co-created by a maid and her employer, did not need to be read against the grain in order to uncover a disempowered voice. Students discussed how this record is evidence of the types of relationships domestic servants had with their employers as well as how unmarried pregnant women were treated in 1930s Milwaukee. The instructor made the connection between the importance of recognizing power relationships manifested in records and archival practice, explaining how there was no indication in this collection's finding aid that this letter existed; here, working class women's voices were rendered silent—deemed unworthy of mention—through the act of archival description. The instructor then encouraged the students to find ways to render marginalized voices audible in their practice.

Case #2: Letter between Two Slaveholders

The second record presented to students was a digitized copy of a letter dated March 10, 1861, from James William Shirley to his uncle, John Billups Larue, regarding the marriage of Shirley's slave, Harrison, to Larue's slave, Mary (Shirley, 1861). The letter has been digitized and made available online via the Virginia Historical Society's impressive project to reclaim African American voices and names from history, Unknown No Longer (Virginia Historical Society, 2011). In the letter, Shirley informs Larue that he has granted permission for

Harrison and Mary to get married in "as early a period as is practicable," and vouches, "as far as my knowledge extends, or as far as I have been able to judge, he [Harrison] possesses a good moral character, as well as honest, temperate, and industrious habits" (Shirley, 1861). Through this brief note, the absolute power of slaveholders over the lives of their captives is made manifest; without Larue's permission, Harrison and Mary will not be able to continue their relationship. The silence of Harrison, "the bearer of this note," and his probable inability to read the note concerning his fate is deafening.

Students were first asked to read along the grain of this record, and accurately described Shirley's purpose in writing it. Students were then asked to read against the grain of this record, and after some false starts, a student astutely responded that this letter serves as powerful evidence of the determination of African Americans to maintain family relationships in the face of an inhumane system that granted them little to no agency over their lives. The students then discussed to what extent Harrison and Mary's whispers could be heard, how they might be considered co-creators of this record, and the role that archivists have in listening carefully for their voices in creating descriptive tools.

Case #3: Letter on the Anti-Indian Riots in Bellingham, WA

The third record students discussed was a letter dated September 8, 1907 from Adolphus W. Mangum, a scientist working in Washington, to his mother in North Carolina. The letter has been digitized and made available by the South Asian American Digital Archive (of which the first author of this paper is a cofounder) (Mangum, 1908). The lengthy letter reads, in part:

> We had a riot here about a week ago, the people ran out the Hindos, who have come here in great numbers and have been working in the lumber mills…. These Hindos are very undesirable citizens. They are dirty and mean and will work for wages that a white man can't live on. I am not in sympathy with the laboring men who started this riot, because they ought to mob the mill men who hire these laborers rather than mob the Hindos themselves. If the mill owners did not hire them, they would not come here in such crowds. They are worse than the Japs and China men and have caused trouble ever since they began to be numerous…. The people in the east cant realize what these people are up against with these Orientals. They will live in crowds, in one house and as nobody can live near them, people begin to move out of the neighborhood, and soon they will practically own a whole section of a town, and the value of property in that section will take a drop, to about ½ of what it was before they

came. They can live on "nothing per day" and it looks like they will
eventually crowd out the American workman (Mangum, 1908).

The casual tone of the letter belies the violence of the event it describes, in which
a joyous white mob of approximately 600 attacked the barracks of local Sikh
laborers, many of whom were seriously injured, and all of whom permanently left
town within two days.

A lively discussion ensued in which students strained to hear the voices of
the marginalized – in this case the Indian immigrants – in this record of the
powerful. Students described this record as evidence of the inhumane working
conditions to which early Indian immigrants to the U.S. were subject – crowded
accommodations, "nothing" for pay, hostile neighbors. Another student cautioned
against using this document as evidence at all, claiming the racist views of its
author cloud any possible reflection of reality. Interestingly, one student read this
document along class lines, uncovering the voice of working class whites, whose
day rates were undercut by the mill owners' quest for cheap labor. Students
discussed the difference between how these marginalized voices might be better
heard by an identity-based repository like the South Asian American Digital
Archive than by the University of North Carolina Archives from which the record
originated, and the implications of this orientation to archival functions.

These three case studies successfully illustrated to the students both the
importance of understanding abstract concepts to archival practice and paying
attention to issues of power. The incorporation of historical records into the lesson
plan provided concrete examples for students who were challenged by the
theoretical nature of the assigned articles. After this session, one student
expressed to the instructor that she was confused by the readings, but that the
concepts were made clear after the lecture and class discussion. Many of the
students continued to engage issues of marginalization and power throughout the
semester, including in their final papers.

Student Response to Power, Whispers, and Reading against the Grain
by Nathan Sowry

This exercise presented an eye-opening experience, introducing several
key issues dealing with power and recognizing plural voices within archival
records. Up to this point in the semester, various discussions over creatorship,
ownership, and provenance had taken place, but this was the first time that many
students began to perceive the existing power relations contained within records,
and how records are described in archival finding aids. Through this week's
readings and discussions, the instructor encouraged students to examine records
from various perspectives, such as along or against the grain, to listen for

whispers of the powerless, and finally to contemplate how power is made manifest through the creation and description of archival records.

The three records presented to the class illustrated the inherent power relations within archival records, and provided students the opportunity to listen for the various implicit and explicit voices contained therein. For instance, in the letter from a maid to her employer, the voice of the maid did not require a reading against the grain, as she was the record creator, yet it nevertheless illustrated issues of power between these two women, one dominant and the other her subordinate. Similarly, another example of recognizing power relations and marginalized voices within the archival record included a letter between two slaveholders. In this instance, students read both against the grain to try to uncover the voices of those enslaved, as well as along the grain, to better understand the thoughts and fears of those in power. The final record presented to the class, a letter on the anti-Indian riots in Bellingham, WA, also dealt with issues of power and the plight of the marginalized in society, encouraging students to listen for the competing voices of Sikh immigrant laborers and Washington mill workers contained within the writing of a member of the privileged elite.

Each of these examples illustrated issues of power within the archival record, as well as provided students with the knowledge of how to question, interpret, and recover the voices of the marginalized. Hands-on experience with, and open discussion of, these materials not only helped to prepare students for future careers within archival institutions, but also to perceive the plurality of voices within the records. Further, as a result of the theoretical foundations of class readings, students were better equipped to detect the power relations not only within the archival records, but also within archival practice that tends to favor one voice or one group over another. Through this exercise, students gained the knowledge and skills to recognize and uncover the voices of the marginalized, as well as to present a more complete and pluralized image of the archives. Complementing this exercise, a later reading of Verne Harris' (2002) work also introduced students to some possible dangers of reading records against the grain, advising students to avoid the danger of "speaking *for*" the marginalized through the "hospitality to otherness."

Exercise 3: Ethics Case Studies

In the eighth week of the semester, the course featured a unit on ethics. While ethical practice had been discussed throughout the course of the class, this unit provided a dedicated space to discuss the meaning of ethics, examine common codes of ethics in the field, and apply ethical guidelines to archival practice via three case studies. The readings for this unit were comprised of: First

Archivist Circle, 2007; ICA, 1996, 2010; Iacovino, 2010; Levitt, 2005; SAA, 2005; Wallace, 2010; and Whorley, 2005. The instructor began the class with a 45-minute lecture contextualizing and evaluating professional codes of ethics, highlighting important and contentious issues surrounding the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials, and addressing concepts such as accountability, privacy, and access in relation to ethical considerations.

Students were then presented with three case studies to explore as a class: Khmer Rouge records and the ethics of international preservation partnerships; photographs of Native American women and the ethics of digital repatriation; and Iraqi records and the ethics of the removal of cultural patrimony during wartime. These case studies were selected because they exemplify ethically ambiguous situations that might plausibly arise during the course of practice, as well as the instructor's familiarity with them; in each case, no clear-cut solution is obvious. In each case, the instructor aimed to guide students to appreciate the importance of cultural and historical specificity in ethical practice, avoiding blanket decisions of what does and does not constitute such practice, and evaluating all possibilities before reaching a decision. After an explanation of each case study, students were asked:

- What ethical issues might arise?
- What would the SAA code of ethics recommend? What would the ICA code of ethics recommend? If applicable, what guidance does the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials provide?
- Based on our readings of Wallace (2010), does the social justice approach as described by Wallace provide any guidance?
- What would you do?

Each of these case studies and the subsequent discussions will now be described in detail.

Case Study 1

You are an archivist at major American university. One of the faculty members does research in Cambodia and is working closely with a repository there that has 5,190 black-and-white photographic portraits in its collection. You learn these photographs were taken at Tuol Sleng Prison, a Khmer Rouge torture center where 20,000 people were processed between 1975 and 1979. The people in the photographs were under arrest, about to be tortured, and sent to the killing fields for execution. Only seven prisoners survived. The people depicted in the majority of the photographs are unidentified. While you are far away from Cambodia, the city in which the university is located has a sizable Cambodian

refugee population. It is possible that the family members of the people in these photographs reside close by. Many more family members of victims might see the photographs if they were put online.

The current political situation in Cambodia is tenuous. The archive in Cambodia has received numerous threats from former Khmer Rouge officials and the archivists there are worried that the collection could be destroyed or stolen, or the building set on fire. It is possible that a law could soon be passed in Cambodia restricting access to these photographs.

In the ensuing discussion, students asked about the cultural context of the photographs, and the relationship between the faculty member and the archival staff in Cambodia. It was generally agreed that the SAA and ICA codes of ethics provided little guidance in this situation. A lively discussion ensued in which students suggested consulting the local Cambodian community for culturally sensitive solutions, while at the same time cautioning against the possibility of obtaining a community-wide consensus on such a potentially contentious issue. Students weighed the benefits of making preservation copies of the endangered records against the costs of getting involved in another country's complex political situation. Based on the reading of the Levitt (2005) article, students suggested some possibilities for ways in which archivists could contextualize the photographs online. They also evaluated the ethical implications and logistics of limiting online access to the photographs to Cambodians searching for family members and serious researchers. As the discussion progressed, a general consensus seemed to arise in the classroom that acquiring preservation copies of the photographs was an ethical course of action and that, depending on the results of community consultations, digitization might be ethically warranted due to the increased access it would allow.

Case Study 2

You are an archivist for a public university's archives. In your repository are several collections related to a local tribal group. None of these collections were created by members of that group, but rather were created by white people about that tribal group. None of these collections are currently digitized, but there is talk about applying for funding to digitize them in the near future. Everything is freely accessible to the public onsite.

Of particular concern is a collection of photographs taken by a white male photographer in the early 1910s. Many of the photographs show Native American women with their shirts unbuttoned or removed and their breasts exposed. You know this is not how these women typically dressed, but rather that they were paid by the photographer to remove their clothes for the photos. The original

labels to the photos do not identify these women by name, but rather by types such as "sunbathing squaw" and "corn-harvesting squaw." You do some research and discover that the word squaw is perceived to be derogatory. While you do not know the names of the women pictured in the photos, it is clear they are members of a local tribal nation. Some of the women pictured may still be alive; their descendants certainly are.

An elder from the tribe has just contacted you expressing concern that these photos are accessible to the public. He asks for a meeting during which you expect him to ask that the photos be repatriated to the tribal archives and/ or given limited access.

In the discussion that followed, students identified the privacy of the women in the photographs as a prime ethical and legal consideration, as well as the rights of indigenous peoples to reply to erroneous information in archival collections and accurately represent themselves. One student framed the situation as a basic human rights issue, in which the dignity of the women was called into question by the circumstances under which the photographs were taken and their widespread accessibility. Another student argued that these records provide important evidence of the history of mistreatment of Native Americans and, as such, should continue to remain accessible to researchers.

Students discussed the importance of using culturally sensitive terminology in archival description of the materials, and noted specifically how they would directly address the use of the word "squaw" in the finding aid. Students posited that, as recommended by the Protocols, the archivist should work to build a strong, ongoing relationship with local tribal communities and work together to reach a mutually beneficial solution. This solution may include repatriation, depending on the specific issues raised by the tribal elder. Yet, as one student mentioned, repatriation may be complicated by the specifics of the deed of gift for acquisition of this collection and the existence of a stewardship relationship with the descendents of the photographer. Short of repatriation, students also discussed the possibility of limiting access to these records, using a policy developed in consultation with the tribal nation if possible.

The instructor then gave students a further development regarding the same collection:

You have been approached by a publisher of art books who wants to make a glossy coffee table book of these images. The images are out of copyright but the only existing copies are in your physical custody. Your archives could profit heavily from the collaboration and you are desperately in need of funds. What do you do?

Students who participated in this discussion universally agreed that it would be unethical to participate in this project, despite the repository's economic situation. The ethical implications, together with the public relations fallout and the irreparable damage that participation could cause to relationships with local tribal nations, outweigh any financial benefits.

Case Study 3

You are an archivist at a major American library. Through various connections, your institution is offered a collection of high-level records from Saddam Hussein's government in Iraq. The records were removed from the country during the 2003 U.S. invasion by a U.S.-based nonprofit organization with the permission of the U.S. Army. It is unclear if the removal of these records was a violation of international law, but it is the subject of much ongoing debate.

The records themselves contain high-level correspondence within the Hussein government, revealing culpability for massive human rights violations such as the Anfal genocide, as well as police surveillance files and prison records of prominent dissidents. You know that many former Baath Party members in Iraq are implicated by name in these records, possibly for crimes that are punishable under international law.

The director of the nonprofit organization that removed the records from Iraq claims the records will not be secure there. The director of the Iraqi National Library and Archives knows that the records have been removed, and has publicly demanded their immediate repatriation. He claims they are the property of the Iraqi people and that it is up to them to make decisions about access, description, and preservation. You know the records would be very useful to the scholars at your institution. You also know that by keeping the records in the U.S., they will not be accessible to the citizens of Iraq.

This case study provoked the most interesting and contentious discussion, with students divided over the preservation benefits of keeping the records in the U.S. versus the symbolic, informational, and evidential importance of the records to the Iraqi people. One student compared this situation with that of the Elgin Marbles in the British Museum, while another suggested that digitizing these records and making them accessible online might provide an equitable solution to all involved parties. While some students clearly thought the records should be immediately repatriated to Iraq, others stressed the importance of American access to these records for strategic and humanitarian aims. Students also expressed the need for more information on pertinent international law. Some students placed this discussion in the context of a Bastian (2005) article read in a

previous week regarding the importance of access to records for the formation of national identity and collective memory.

From the instructor's perspective, these case studies and the ensuing conversations were among the most successful learning experiences of the course. While students complained that other course sessions were too theoretical, these case studies illustrated the importance of archival theory to ethical practice. The cases allowed students an opportunity to formulate their own opinions informed by the theoretical foundation laid during the first few weeks of the course. It was clear from this discussion that students had begun to synthesize course readings and were starting to make broader connections between the lessons for each week.

Student Response to Ethics Case Studies by Jennifer Kirmer

The case studies utilized by the instructor in this section of the course encouraged students to develop an understanding of ethical standards related to real-life situations that could strain traditional approaches to codes of ethics in the field today. The three case studies presented to the class required students to build on the principles that had been learned throughout the course. Discussion initially felt rather slow, no doubt due in large part to the ethical ambiguity that each case posed, but quickly developed into lively dialogues regarding the best courses of action to ensure proper care for the records and what they represent.

As the first case study relates to the instructor's dissertation work, students had a fair amount of background on the topic. When considering the photographs from Tuol Sleng Prison, students were asked to bring up possible ethical issues and consider how to approach them from the standpoint of the SAA and ICA codes of ethics. In the course of discussion, the feelings of the Cambodian people and the tenuous political situation in Cambodia brought the class to a relative agreement on the need to respect the wishes of people who may have connections to people depicted in the photographs. It also brought to light the need to protect the photographs for future generations. In the end, creation of preservation copies was seen as the best option for this set of records. This exercise allowed students to walk through real-world situations and consider how each of them would react if confronted by such a case.

Student approaches and discussion regarding the second case study were relatively cohesive and in agreement. The use of the finding aids and supplementary materials that could be created to accompany the collection of photographs was seen as a major example of how historical context could help the researcher to understand the language used in the original materials. Students felt that it would be appropriate to work with the Native American communities to accommodate their cultural needs regarding the photographs. This case study allowed students to consider a situation that is not uncommon in the United States. Using protocols such as NAGPRA, those preparing to be archivists are

encountering new opportunities to work together with Native Americans and strive to make agreements with the tribal communities, but also to continue making records accessible in a respectful manner.

The third case study regarding Iraqi records that were removed by the U.S. Army during the U.S. invasion of 2003 brought about the most diverse and heated dialogue. Considerations of the true ownership of the records and accessibility for the Iraqi people were some of the major points of contention. Discussants generally agreed on the need to understand what the law would say about the situation, and whether the U.S. had any right to remove the records in order to prevent their destruction in the ensuing war. Both the SAA and ICA codes of ethics outline that archivists should work toward repatriation of materials to their rightful owners, but this case caused consternation as it was far from clear who would own the records. Students also voiced the idea that both the American and Iraqi people could benefit from access to the information, and that there should be some consideration of how to provide this accessibility.

Over the course of this class session, students were given the opportunity to discuss the SAA and ICA ethical standards and consider how they can be applied to different situations that they are likely to encounter in the professional world. Students largely agreed that depending on the situation, some elements of each code of ethics may be more of a hindrance than an advantage. For example, full adherence to ethical standards may not lead to the best care of documents as seen in the third case study. Discussion of these case studies also allowed students to bring in themes that were presented in our different readings from the rest of the semester. Wallace (2010) contributed a different approach to the ethical standards, and gave students the opportunity to learn about the importance of ethical standards but also consider flaws and deficiencies in documents such as the SAA code of ethics.

The discussions and opportunities for student contribution were the most valuable elements of this course. As students were learning complex theoretical principles, and many had little or no archival background, the discussions gave them opportunities to work through situations where different principles were in play or could be applied. A number of students commented that they were not comfortable with the large amount of theoretical material in the class, but found themselves much more comfortable and able to participate when they were encouraged to talk through the issues with the entire class or in small groups. Discussion was especially valuable in this class session, permitting the students to consider various implementation strategies for different codes of ethics and the possible influence they could have on archival materials and practice.

Challenges

The instructor noted three major challenges to implementing a social justice framework: resistance to theoretical thinking, resistance to pluralist worldviews, and ethnic homogeneity.

Some students complained that the course was too theoretical in nature. This complaint reflects a general misunderstanding among beginning LIS students regarding the purpose of their master's degree programs and a larger resistance to theory that is endemic to the U.S. As the instructor explained on both the first and last day of class, the purpose of an introductory archives course is to lay the theoretical foundation for reflexive professional practice, with the understanding that practical experience should be gained through internships, fieldwork placement, and on-the-job practice. The instructor compared LIS master's programs with medical school; no first-year medical student would complain that he or she did not interact with patients because they were too busy learning anatomy and chemistry. Yet while the professor tried to convince students of the importance of laying the theoretical groundwork for future professional practice, some students remained unconvinced. This resistance to theory presents a larger ongoing challenge to LIS programs in general.

The second major challenge to the social justice curriculum was resistance to validating or even recognizing pluralist ontologies and epistemologies. While some students had clearly dealt with cultural difference before, others were not comfortable confronting such difference or acknowledging the legitimacy of worldviews that differed from their own. Again, this is an endemic problem that may not be resolved by a single archives course. The instructor hopes to have planted some small seed in the minds of students who initially resisted this exposure to cultural pluralism.

A third challenge to implementing a social justice approach in this class was the lack of ethnic diversity. Of the 34 enrolled students, there was only one student of color. While the students represented a diversity of class backgrounds, ages, religions, genders, and sexual orientations, the racial and ethnic homogeneity spoke to how LIS faculty simply must do a better job of attracting a diverse student population to archives programs.

Conclusion

This paper has reported the initial findings of a collaborative action research project exploring the implementation of a social justice framework in an introductory archives course. First, this paper summarized research on social justice and pluralism in archival pedagogy and suggested four main components

of a social justice curriculum: economic and racial diversity; an exploration of identity, archival representation and the power to name; a pluralistic approach to cultural difference; and a discussion of archives and dominant power structures with a particular emphasis on human rights. This paper then described three class activities that illustrate the implementation of this framework in the classroom. By exploring how three exercises reflect a social justice pedagogy and evaluating their success from the perspective of both the instructor and students, this paper aimed to contribute to an ongoing conversation about best practices for archival education, as well as challenges to implementing a social justice framework.

Further research needs to be done on other aspects of implementing a social justice framework in archival education, including the role of concept-based curricula, study abroad opportunities, and interdisciplinarity in preparing students for professional practice. As research continues in this vein, the authors encourage the use of collaborative action research methodologies in future investigations and hope that the voices of students are not left out of this important conversation.

References

Bastian, J. (2005). Whispers in the archives: finding the voices of the colonized in the records of the colonizer. In M. Procter, M. Cook, C. Williams (Eds.), *Political pressure and the archival record* (pp. 25-43). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Buckland, M. (1997). What is a document? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 48*, 804-809.

Calhoun, E. (2002). Action research for school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 18-24.

Caswell, M. (2010). Khmer Rouge archives: accountability, truth, and memory in Cambodia. *Archival Science, 10*, 1-23.

Cook, T. (1997). What is past is prologue: a history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift. *Archivaria, 43*, 17-63.

Costello, P. (2003). *Action research*. New York: Continuum.

Douglas, J. (2010). Origins: Evolving Ideas about the Principle of Provenance. In T. Eastwood & H. MacNeil (Eds.), *Currents in archival thinking* (pp. 23-43). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Dunbar, A. (2006). Introducing critical race theory to archival discourse: getting the conversation started. *Archival Science, 6*, 109-129.

Evelyn. (1935). Letter to Irma Greenthal. Alex and Irma Greenthal Papers, Milwaukee Manuscript Collection 144 PH 3969. Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Archives.

Faulkhead, S. (2009). Connecting through records: narratives of Koorie Victoria. *Archives & Manuscripts* 37 (2), 60-88.

First Archivist Circle. (2007). Protocols for Native American archival materials. Retrieved from http://www2.nau.edu/libnap-p/protocols.html

Gilliland, A. (2011). Neutrality, social justice, and the obligations of archival education and educators in the twenty-first century. *Archival Science, 11*, 193-209.

Gordon, S. (2008). *Collaborative action research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harris, V. (2002). Power, memory, and archives in South Africa. *Archival Science, 2*, 63-86.

Harris, V. (2011). Jacques Derrida meets Nelson Mandela: Archival ethics at the endgame. *Archival Science, 11*, 113-124.

Iacovino, L. (2010). Archives as arsenals of accountability. In T. Eastwood & H. MacNeil (Eds.), *Currents in archival thinking* (pp. 181-212). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

International Council on Archives (1996). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.ica.org/5555/reference-documents/ica-code-of-ethics.html

International Council on Archives (2010). *Universal declaration on archives*. Retrieved from http://www.ica.org/6573/reference-documents/universal-declaration-onarchives.html

Jimerson, R. (2007). Archives for all: Professional responsibility and social justice. *American Archivist, 70* (2), 252-281.

Jimerson, R. (2010). *Archives power: Memory, accountability, and social justice*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Lassiter, L. (2005). *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lawless, E. (1993). *Holy women, wholly women: Sharing ministries through life stories and reciprocal ethnographies.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Levitt, M. L. (2005). Ethical issues in constructing a eugenics website." In M. L. Behrnd-Klodt, & P. J. Wosh (Eds.), *Privacy and confidentiality perspectives: Archivists and archival records* (pp. 112-125). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Mangum, A.W. (1908). Letter to mother. South Asian American Digital Archive. Retrieved from http://www.saadigitalarchive.org/item/20110910-354

McNiff, J. (2002). *Action research: principles and practice*. New York: Routledge/ Falmer.

Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (2011). Educating for the archival multiverse. *American Archivist*, *74* (1), 69-101.

Shirley, J.W. (1861). Letter to John Billups Larue. Virginia Historical Society. Retrieved from http://unknownnolonger.vahistorical.org/record/1446/83

Society of American Archivists (2005). *Code of ethics for archivists*. Retrieved
    from
        http://www.archivists.org/governance/handbook/app_ethics.asp#code
Somekh, B. (2006). *Action research: a methodology of change and development.*
    New York: Open University Press.
Stoler, A.N. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial
    common sense*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Thomassen, T. (2001). A first introduction to archival science. *Archival Science*,
    1, 373-385.
Virginia Historical Society. (2011). Unknown no longer. Retrieved from
        http://unknownnolonger.vahistorical.org
White, K. (2009). Meztizaje and remembering in Afro-Mexican communities of
    the Costa Chica: implications for archival education in Mexico. *Archival
    Science, 9*, 43-55.

Wallace, D. (2010). Locating agency: interdisciplinary perspectives on professional ethics and archival morality. *Journal of Information Ethics 19(*1*)*, 172-189.

Whorley, T. (2005). The Tuskegee Syphilis study: access and control over controversial records. In M. Procter, M. Cook, C. Williams, (Eds.), *Political pressure and the archival record* (pp. 109-117). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Yeo, G. (2007). Concepts of record (1): evidence, information, and persistent representations," *American Archivist, 70,* 315-43.

Authors

Dr. Michelle Caswell graduated from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 2012. As of July 2012, she is Assistant Professor of Archival Studies at UCLA.

Giso Broman is a first-year Master's student at the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison specializing in Digital Libraries. He received his Bachelor's degree in Geography and Portuguese from the UW-Madison.

Jennifer Kirmer is a master's student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison specializing in Archives and Records Administration. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology with a minor in History from the University of Kansas.

Laura Martin is a second-year MLIS student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with an interest in academic librarianship and collection preservation. She received her M.A. in French literature from the University of Georgia and her B.A. in French from Mercer University.

Nathan Sowry is a Master's student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison specializing in Archives and Records Administration. He received a Master of Arts in History at Washington State University, and a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology and Religious Studies at the University of Pittsburgh.