

**Mikaela Slade** (<https://dominicanu.instructure.com/courses/1818110/users/3683846>)

Apr 11, 2022

As noted in Tang's article "Sex in the Archives: The Politics of Processing and Preserving Pornography in the Digital Age" there is usually a difference between the donor of archival material and the creator and/or subject. This brings up many ethical and legal implications: "Cyberporn is a mess of copyright infringement, privacy issues, and consent violations" (Tang, 448). It's apparent to me that the "mess" Tang describes goes beyond pornography and can apply to any potentially sensitive archival material such as when the Special Collections and Archives of Idaho State University encountered images in their files of a sacred Native American ceremony and a funeral which the Tribal Archivist and Ancestral Researcher was unaware that ISU had such images. ISU worked with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Language and cultural preservation department to restrict access to photos of the Sun Dance in progress and funeral photos to be only available to those doing relevant family research (Ryan).

Especially when handling personal records, archives will always have to grapple with the privacy of the individual vs. accountability and history-keeping. A current example is legislative measures happening in the European Union around the concept of the "right to be forgotten" (RTBF ). This is the ability of an individual to request links be removed from search results. The intention behind RTBF is to protect individual privacy & offer "digital redemption" to those who have had their lives impacted by negative search results. On the surface, it seems like a good solution to a very modern problem of having your private life affected by public access. However, there is some very strong opposition from search engines, who claim it is too expensive to devote resources to removing links; authors and web publishers, whose work might be impacted; and archivists, librarians, etc., who are worried about the public's right to information. In fact, IFLA and SAA have each cited how RTBF could violate their ethical codes/core standards: "IFLA's ethical code holds that librarians have a social responsibility to support the recording of and access to information" (Vavra, 2018, p. 106). It does not take much imagination to see how powerful individuals could use RTBF to remove unflattering information about themselves to manipulate others.

Yet, governments often use restrictions or limited access to archival information to control the narrative about various issues. We see this in Marek Tesar's article "Ethics and truth in archival research," the censorship created by incompetent bureaucracy to hide the recent history of Czechoslovakia under totalitarian rule: "Most importantly, the concern for all involved, for both researchers and the guardians, is the unspoken notion of what kind of secrets about the sensitive past these institutions may hold. Therefore, the power of the guardians, I argue, is exerted not only in protecting the documents, but in controlling and

shaping the research subject; by allowing the researcher to access some materials, and not others" (105). Archives are not neutral institutions but have the ability to display or hide certain materials, often for governmental benefit. We see this in the case of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), whose goal was to improve the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada but was met with opposition from their own government when the Canadian government initially "declined to produce millions of relevant records held in Library and Archives Canada (LAC)" (Ghaddar, 9-10).

It seems to me that archives will always be balancing privacy with the right to information and offering accountability. I also think that is easier for groups like IFLA and SAA to criticize legislation like RTBF because it deals with individuals rather than criticize people within their own profession such as the archivists and record-keepers who work within governments to protect histories that those in power would rather remain hidden.

### References

Ghaddar, J.J. "The Spectre in the Archive: Truth, Reconciliation, and Indigenous Archival Memory." *Archivaria* 82 (Fall 2016): 3-26.

Ryan, Ellen M. "Identifying Culturally Sensitive American Indian Material in a Non-tribal Institution." *Case Studies in Archival Ethics*.

Tang, GVGK. "Sex in the Archives: The Politics of Processing and Preserving Pornography in the Digital Age." *The American Archivist* 80, 2 (Fall/Winter 2017): 439-452.

Tesar, Marek. "Ethics and truth in archival research." *History of Education* 44, no. 1 (Jan 2015): 101-114.

Vavra, A.N. "The Right to Be Forgotten: An Archival Perspective." *The American Archivist* 81, 1 (Spring/Summer 2018): 100-111.