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In Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory by Schwartz and Terry Cook they look at how they make sure the information is accurate. The authors have said in there text that, “Archivists have long been viewed from outside the profession as “hewers of wood and drawers of water,” as those who received records from their creators and passed them on to researchers” ( book). I like how the auteur also adds that the archivists and their materials seem to be the very antithesis of power. Archives and records on collective memory and human identity that help the citation and show proof that the history they are writing is true.

“Taken together, the on-going denial by archivists of their power over memory, the failure to explore the many factors that profoundly affect records before they come to the archives, and the continued assumptions by many users of archives that the records presented to them are not problematic, represent a prescription for sterility on both sides of the reference room desk”. I like how the authors of this article add that some things may be a problem in the historical context. Also they say that this helped reference the citing problem and other historians say this doesn't help because it is made up to a degree.

  The authors add that “When power is denied, overlooked, or unchallenged, it is misleading at best and dangerous at worst” . I like how the authgers add this in as well because power is very important to many people , governments, businesses, associations and other groups that need this to show how much power they have. The changes in the nature of records,  uses for those records, and the need to preserve them are very important to thesis history. It is nice that the authors add that  in recent years, the word “archive” has experienced a resurgence well beyond its popular connotation of dusty basements and old parchments like how in cultural studies it grew to show the difference between history.

It is easy to say that the authors seek with us to demonstrate that the theories, principles, nature, and historical evolution of “archives” as institutions and of “records” as documents – collectively “the archive” – are neither universal across space nor stable across time. I like how they add this in. This is very important because it shows a cross of each group.

We have to deal with two intimately related, but separately conceived themes: “knowledge and the shaping of archives” and “archives and the shaping of knowledge. I like how the authors add this because we can see that there are two sides of this histracl puzzle and no one is specify write.