Keeping records can be seen as ‘a social phenomenon’ (Dingwall, 2010. p.7), stemming from a basic drive in humans to organize (Taylor & Joudrey, 2009. p.1). People start doing so from the moment they are born and as they grow up they “develop more sophisticated, cognitive abilities to categorize, to recognize patterns, to sort, to relate and to create groups of things and ideas” and these abilities, which allow us to retrieve, form the basis of human learning (Taylor & Joudrey, 2009. p.1,2). Many of these abilities have also, over the course of centuries, been translated into an amazing range of human-produced information organisation tools and systems that might also be seen as efforts to learn from each other.

*recordkeeping affects our privacy, our rights as citizens, and the way we conduct all aspects of public life. Thus, recordkeeping and records are like other technologies in that they are not value-free tools to create order in the world (Winner, 1985). They, and the standards and assumptions that co-constitute them, clearly have political, moral, ethical, and social implications. They are intentional uses of language and meaning (Recordkeeping in the Production of Scientific Knowledge: An Ethnographic Study, Shankar)*

*“a successful infrastructure becomes invisible and ‘‘natural’’ to those who use it” (Recordkeeping in the Production of Scientific Knowledge: An Ethnographic Study, Shankar)*

*The processes by which infrastructures are stabilized and ‘‘naturalized’’ foreground and privilege some viewpoints, de-legitimate others, and are intricately tied with organizational and administrative power, standards, and work practices. How that state of affairs comes to be is often invisible and post-hoc deemed normative, a point of view that confers upon the act of recordkeeping and the records themselves a misplaced neutrality and impartiality. (Recordkeeping in the Production of Scientific Knowledge: An Ethnographic Study, Shankar)*