UNIVERSITY OF
FORWARD
THINKING
WESTMINSTER⌗

WestminsterResearch
http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch

'The Archive' as Theory & Reality: Engaging with Students in Cultural and Critical Studies

McNally, A.

This is a pre-publication version of a book chapter published in Theimer, K. (ed.) Educational Programs: Innovative Practices for Archives and Special Collections, Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 59-72.

The Archive as Theory and Reality: engaging with students in Cultural and Critical Studies

Anna McNally

In recent years the notion of *the archive* has gained enormous currency in academic and artistic circles.[1] Much of the discussion has centred on texts by Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault. For Foucault *the archive* is related to a system of language which produces meaning, not what can be said but the set of rules that govern what it say-able. Derrida meanwhile

> "leads us to understand that the professional view is invested with layers - veils - of poetic and political ambition, despite, or perhaps better put because, of the scientific, managerial and law-making aspirations of the archive.[…T]he meaning and use value of the archive will not be transparent, entirely evident, known or knowable. This is because the entirety of the motives of the archive founder, and the archivist's hands thereafter, is no more fully known to them than any individual can see the entire shape of their imagination and agency." [2]

Both understand archives to be "the source of power and control"[3] but their conception is entirely detached from any 'real' physical archive repository.

For artists, *the archive* – both conceptual and actual - can be seductive. Hal Foster has pinpointed this 'archival impulse' as being attracted to materials that are "fragmentary rather than fungible, and as such they call out for human interpretation not machinic reprocessing".[4]

None of these, of course, represent what most archive professionals would consider an accurate depiction of archives as they know them. Archivists have embraced these perspectives in their professional literature but, for the most part, have not entered the wider academic and artistic discourse. We could choose to stick our heads in the sand and ignore the conversation that is happening around us, or embark on a doomed attempt to reclaim the word 'archive', much as was once tried with our IT colleagues. Alternatively we can attempt to join in, re-invigorating both the academic discussion and an interest in the records themselves.

This chapter discusses how, in the context of two different institutions, I have sought to engage students and faculty from the broad field of Cultural and Critical Studies with *the archive* as I understand it. I will also discuss the impact this has had on our other teaching work, and the success we have had in replicating this approach with faculty in other fields.

Planning

The University of Westminster is an institution serving 22,000 students in the heart of London. Previously the Regent Street Polytechnic (and later, Polytechnic of Central London), it received its University charter in 1992 but can trace its roots back to 1838. Archive Services hold the records of the University and its predecessor institutions, as well as deposited collections supporting research. The first University Archivist was appointed in 1994 and, aside from occasional temporary staff, this was a solo post until I was appointed as University History Project Archivist in 2009.

My post formed part of a four year project ahead of the University's 175th anniversary celebrations in 2013. Although primarily supporting the production of two history books, I was also given the broader goal of raising awareness of the archive across the University.

Archive Services had a good relationship with the University's Corporate Services (including the Marketing and Alumni teams) and ran a Research Methods session for the undergraduate History students; however it had not been possible to pursue a large amount of student and faculty engagement due to limited staffing resources. With the Archive team now doubled, we had the increased resources to be able to effectively engage in more outreach work, confident that we could meet any demand we created. However I had no previous experience of working in a University prior to this job, and so was unclear about how best to promote the collections.

From 2004-2008 I had worked at the Tate Archive of 20th and 21st Century British Art, cataloguing collections including the administrative records of the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA), 1968-1987. I was working closely with Ben Cranfield[5] from the London Consortium[6], who was researching the ICA's history for his PhD thesis. Whilst knowledge of the acquisition process is always useful for understanding an organisation's archive, in this case it was absolutely crucial. The ICA's papers had been acquired by the Tate Archive in several distinct phases, each of which reflected the institution's history at that time. The papers also have some notable gaps, including the records relating to several key exhibitions and events. As a result we talked a lot about the archival process, the concept of original order, and the 'invisible hand' of the archivist. We came to the conclusion that the postgraduate students in the London Consortium's MRes in Humanities and Cultural Studies would also benefit from these discussions and so began developing a session for them.

The two hour session formed part of the core 'Research Methods in the Humanities' course. The Tate Archive's collections are primarily used for art historical research, for instance writing artists' biographies or proving the provenance of a painting. As they had chosen to study Cultural Studies rather than Art History, we assumed the London Consortium students would be more interested in ideas and discussion than in historical research, and so would be unlikely to feel that archival research could enrich their studies. We also presumed they would be familiar with the concepts of *the archive* as discussed by Derrida, Foucault and Foster, as these ideas were so prevalent in the Humanities at that time. The aim of the session was therefore to try to show them how an understanding of professional archival processes was relevant to theories around conceptual notions of *the archive*. We also wanted to show them that archival research could lead to fresh new thinking informed by the past, rather than simply producing historical writing.

We therefore decided to focus on the archival process – How does an item get into the archive? And what impact does the archivist have on its journey? We wanted to challenge the students to consider archiving as an active, rather than passive, process. I began the class with a 45 minute lecture, explaining to the students the journey of the archives from acquisition through to the researcher looking at them in the reading room. This was my first taste of the response of a non-archivist audience when you tell them that you throw things away! The lecture provoked a lively debate, particular around ideas of selection and disposal, which made clear that the students hadn't considered these aspects of archives before.

The lecture was followed by a practical exercise looking at records from the Tate Archive. The aim of this exercise was to pique their interest in using the collections. I selected items that fitted into four themes that I thought might be relevant to their studies:

- *Archives of things that never happened*. Examples from the Tate's collections included correspondence relating to an exhibition that was cancelled at the last minute and drafts for a book that was never published. This was designed to show them that the archive couldn't necessarily be trusted, and also that it isn't just there to confirm what you knew, but can provide new avenues of research you didn't know existed.
- *Archives of ephemeral and intangible events*. In particular I wanted to look at the debates around the documentation of performance art and whether photographs and written descriptions can really capture a temporal event. While this is particularly

relevant in relation to performance art, it can of course be applied to wider activities, and the extent to which we can ever understand the past through the archive.

- *Archives of audience responses to art.* In particular we looked at the records of several seminal exhibitions at the ICA and to what extent we could gauge the audience's reaction to them at the time, especially where the work was considered challenging.
- *Research as archive.* This included showing them card indexes, notes and drafts compiled by art historians during their research that had then been acquired by the archive. This provided an opportunity to talk about different types of record-keeping technology and their modern parallels, as well as the circularity of research being incorporated into an archive.

The items were drawn from different fonds within the Tate Archive and were laid out on tables for browsing, with one theme per table[7]. I had originally intended to write descriptive labels for the files, explaining how each one met the theme but ran out of time ahead of the session. Instead I printed out the catalogue record for each file and used that as a label. Although not part of the original plan, this is a technique I have continued to use in teaching sessions because of its success on this occasion. It gave the students an opportunity to become acquainted with the language and structure of the archive catalogue record and to see first-hand how a file is usually far more interesting than an objective catalogue could ever convey.

The session was successful but was not repeated as both Ben and I moved on to other jobs shortly afterwards. I did, however, have the opportunity to further develop these themes into a paper given at the Arts Libraries Society UK (ARLIS UK) conference *Archiving the Artist* in 2009[8]. When I started at the University of Westminster, I was in the process of turning the paper into a book chapter[9] and so this research was at the forefront of my mind.

At the University, my first step in trying to expand Archive Services' teaching was to look through the University's website, to get a better feel for the range of subjects offered. I then tried to identify courses which might be amenable to input from the Archive Services. My initial focus was on the arts and humanities. I was aware of the current high levels of interest around notions of *the archive* in these areas, and so hoped the Faculty would be receptive. My previous experience at the Tate also meant I was comfortable and confident with discussing archives in these contexts.

Despite identifying several relevant courses, I struggled to know who to approach. Faculty Deans were obviously too important to concern with these things, but were Heads of Schools? It was often difficult to work out who the leader for a particular course was. I tried 'cold-emailing' a few lecturers who I thought might be interested in having us involved with their course but received no replies. I was struggling to know if I was emailing the wrong people, or contacting them at the wrong time of year, or whether they were simply uninterested.

I did however discover a course titled 'Knowledge, Cultural Memory, Archives and Research' [hereafter referred to as the *Knowledge and Research* course] on offer to postgraduate students within the School of Humanities[10]. This is a core course for students on the MA Visual Culture, Cultural and Critical Studies, English Literature programmes, and optional for students on the MA Museums, Galleries and Contemporary Culture. One of the course leaders, Marquard Smith[11], had edited a book[12] which I had made heavy use of in my writing, and so I felt I could offer him an approach that would fit in with his teaching. When I discussed the course with the University Archivist, she mentioned that the previous year a Visual Culture student had carried out research for her dissertation using the University Archive collections. We hoped therefore that we would be pushing on an open door.

Since my previous attempts at emailing lecturers had been unsuccessful, I decided instead to approach them in person. I was invited to a drinks reception at the University that summer, at which Marquard Smith was scheduled to speak. This gave me an opportunity to speak to him in an informal setting. I introduced myself and mentioned the dissertation by the former student. I explained that I had previously taught a session while at the Tate and was keen to offer a similar opportunity to the University's students. Marquard was interested, and, as a result of our conversation, I was invited to lead one of the course's two-hour sessions in the forthcoming year. I was fortunate that the instructors gave me free rein to prepare the session and only asked in advance for a title for the session – which I decided to call *The Role of the Archivist*.

In preparing the session I drew on the experience I had of running our *Introduction to Research Methods* class for undergraduate History students. In that case, the two-hour session also begins with a 45 minute introduction to what archives are and practical guidance on how to find relevant collections and what to expect when using them. Students are then provided with a box of archival materials and a theme, and they have an hour to work out how those items relate to their theme and to interrogate them for their trustworthiness.

Unfortunately using original archive materials in a classroom setting is difficult for us, because the University of Westminster is a multi-site institution. We have a small Reading Room but can only accommodate 8 visitors at any one time, and teaching for the Humanities subjects usually occurs in other buildings several blocks away. Our session with the History students is a long-standing arrangement, so we are able to arrange for this session to be timetabled in our building, meaning we can use archival material without the difficulties of transporting it. However as the arrangement with the Visual Culture module was a new one, I did not feel I could ask for the class to be moved. I therefore had to plan the *Knowledge and Research* session without using original material.

I had kept my notes from the London Consortium session and I drew heavily on these in my planning, especially as both were two hour sessions. I assumed that the students would be approaching the subject from a broadly similar background to the students from the London Consortium. The session took place within the context of a course about theories of *the archive*, and so I interpreted my role as being to introduce them to ideas of 'real', physical (and digital) archives as opposed to theoretical concepts. I had seen a syllabus of session titles, although not the reading list or detailed content. However as my session was intended to contrast to the other sessions, I was confident I wouldn't overlap with them.

I re-used much of the material in my introductory lecture for the London Consortium, alongside the research I was carrying out for my book chapter. However I had to consider how to incorporate the aspects of the handling session, without using originals. While presenting digitised material using Powerpoint does have some benefits – such as making it easy for the whole class to see the document or photograph, it does mean that they are losing the tactile experience of archives. I was certainly not trying to promote a fetishized 'old books smell nice' approach, but I was keen to show them as many examples of 'real' archives as possible.

As I didn't yet know the University's archive well, I wasn't confident that I could use it to repeat the four categories I had originally used at the Tate[13]. Instead I decided to develop my third theme of 'the audience'. History and art history have traditionally focused on well-known individuals, and that is the kind of research I thought our students would expect someone to do in an archive. I wanted to show them that archives also contain large numbers of people whose presence in this historical record is peripheral. These individuals, unnamed and unidentifiable, have often been recorded in the archive by accident –they happened to be there when a historical significant event was taking place but their presence wasn't

necessary for the event to occur. An example from the University's own history is 21st February 1896 when the Lumiere brothers Cinematographè machine was exhibited in our theatre – the first showing of cinema to a paying audience in the UK. There needed to be 'an audience' at this event but each one of the 54 individuals in that audience could have been replaced by a different person and the historical event would still have occurred. Moreover, we do not know who the individuals at that event were. The archive does not contain their names, there are no photographs of the audience at that event, and we don't know their motive for being there. 'The audience' here represents the information that the archive doesn't record.

I found examples from both the University's collections and the ICA Archive at the Tate to illustrate this theme, so that the taught part of my session concluded with a 'show and tell' slideshow. Including this section, I planned to speak for an hour, allowing an hour for questions.

Implementation

The session starts by dispelling a few myths about archives – namely that we require researchers to always use white cotton gloves, that the archive is some kind of Indiana Jones-style storeroom where things go to be forgotten, or that it is a bias-free historical resource. The aim is to get the students' attention.

One of the first images I show them is archives in a pre-sorted state. These include photographs taken by the University's first archivist showing mountains of boxes and disordered files. I had also sourced images (with permission) from colleagues on Twitter to show that this isn't a unique situation. As professionals we tend to take this for granted, and only show these 'before' images to colleagues. However the response they receive from students suggest these images are helpfully in conveying an understanding of our role.

I explain some of the transfer procedures within the University – from orderly relationships with some departments, to the less systematic occasions when space is suddenly required or an academic is retiring. Images of items that have been simply 'found' in the University's buildings in recent years - such as hand-cut silhouettes from the 1920s - convey an idea of the amount of chance that influences the survival of archives. Conversely, I explain why we also purchase items from rare book dealers and auctions, and how the provenance of the each item is recorded through the acquisition register.

The importance of recording provenance in archives has obvious parallels with its use in the Art world, and so discussing it with the students allows me to bring in ideas of value and

trustworthiness. As provenance also plays a role in the arrangement of archives, I then move on to discussing original order and the concept of *respect des fonds.* I have found it is easiest to explain archival arrangement by comparing it to the approaches of museums and libraries, as students are likely to be more familiar with these. In particular I explain the concept of hierarchical arrangement, and how this ensures that no particular research theme is prioritised over others.

Discussing archival arrangement is a good opportunity to explain some of the reasons why archival research can be difficult and frustrating. Explaining the importance of not disturbing original order justifies why many archives will not allow researchers to access unprocessed archival collections. An understanding of *respects des fonds* can help researchers to appreciate why we have not split the collection into thematic areas for them. Acknowledging that this creates difficulties for some types of research helps ensure that students aren't put off at the first hurdle.

For example, one of our key genealogical resources in the University Archive is the registers of members of the Polytechnic's social and sporting clubs. The registers contain an individual's name, date of birth, address and occupation, and so are very useful for family historians. Unfortunately the information is recorded by the date they registered (and therefore their membership number), not by surname. A separate register of subscription payments lists members in alphabetical order and can be used to discover the membership number. Understanding how and why these records were created is therefore vital to their research use. It is easiest to explain this principle by using example of bound registers, as it is clear that the contents cannot be re-arranged with a drastic and destructive intervention. I then explain that the same principle is applied to loose-leaf papers, even though at first sight it appears they could be re-sorted into a more convenient order.

Arrangement leads on to a discussion of the appraisal and disposal of records. This is a contentious issue as many people seem to believe that archivists have taken a Hippocratic oath to do no harm to any old paper. I explain the various decisions that archivists make when deciding to dispose of records – from simple cases such as duplication, to more subjective decisions based on their long-term value. I also discuss what would happen if archivists threw nothing away and how quickly the quantity of material would spiral out of control and cease to be useful.

From appraisal, I move to an explanation of archival description. In the UK it is normal to describe archive collections to file and item level. I explain the usefulness of description both for accessing the collections, but also for security reasons (for example noting a particularly significant stamp or autograph). Archival thefts are not necessarily well-known

outside the profession – often they occur gradually over a long period and aren't as sudden and high-profile as a theft from a gallery. Explaining this threat to archives can make sense of what might seem like archaic searchroom rules, such as not allowing bags.

A large proportion of the talk is taken up with discussing the need for objectivity in archival description, and its impossibility. I use examples from the archive – firstly showing an amusing letter, and then bringing up my very detached description of it. Secondly, showing the description of a photograph, and then showing the photograph itself.

This particular photograph is our most popular image on Flickr. Our catalogue description reads: Photograph showing two people in fancy dress, one as a skeleton (carrying a football rattle), the other as a clown. Annotated on reverse 'Polytechnic magazine July 1920. Football match in costume'.

[image]

[Image caption: This photograph is used to show students the challenge of describing an image in words (Courtesy of University of Westminster Archive Services).]

The actual image usually comes as a surprise to the students. I have asked if they can come up with a better description whilst staying objective and so far none of them have.

Photographic archives are discussed in some detail as they are likely to be a source that the students want to use. I explain the difference between an archive and a picture library (many of which call themselves archives) and how the latter are catalogued and accessed in a different way to a 'traditional' archive. I also talk about the ways in which we have used images from the archive in the University's marketing, and have sold them commercially for books and films. This gave me the opportunity to discuss why the University keeps its archives and the financial pressures we face.

I conclude the discussion of use of archive collections with ways in which archives can and have supported projects that aren't strictly historical research. These include exhibitions, publications and creative writing projects. I describe how we helped the artists, writers and curators involved in these projects to find documents that were useful to them and the research process in general.

The taught part of the session concludes with a slideshow of images, as it is not possible to use original documents in this session. My examples are chosen to demonstrate how the anonymous public is recorded in the archive as 'the audience' participating in historical events. Using scanned documents means I can take examples from the University's

collections, and others I have worked with elsewhere. From the ICA archive, I use documents relating to exhibitions that are now considered canonical but may have been received quite differently at the time. This included audience response forms for *When Attitudes Become Form*, and a photograph of visitors to *Cybernetic Serendipity*[14]*.* A review of the same exhibition from the University's student magazines not only provides a nice connection between the two archives, but showed the importance of researching beyond the obvious collection for your topic. As discussed above, documents relating to the 1896 Cinematographè exhibition show some of the limits of archival research, whereas photographs of the crowd at the 1929 Lord Mayor's Parade, where the audience's faces are clearly visible, show how people can be captured for posterity and yet be untraceable to the genealogist. The parade photographs also capture details of everyday life beyond the out-of-the-ordinary event that they intended to capture.

After showing images of these items, I give examples of the keywords I used to find these items - *response*, *comments*, *audience*, *survey*,*crowd*, *demonstration*. These indicate how you need to think widely and creatively when you are using archives for thematic work and the importance of considering how the item might have been described. This returns the discussion to my title - *The role of the archivist* - and the impact that the archivist's appraisal, arrangement and description decisions have on researchers.

Although I had planned to speak for an hour, and allow the second hour for discussion, the nerves involved in speaking before a new audience meant I ended up only speaking for 45 minutes. Fortunately this left additional time for a robust discussion with the students. As before with the London Consortium students, much of the discussion centred on the idea of disposal for the archive. This also led to a comparison with digital records, where the perception was that it was possible and easy to keep 'everything'. I explained the practical difficulties around the migration of digital formats, but we also discussed the notions of value and selection. Would the archive be better if it was more complete or would it just be bigger? This was also not long after the news that the Library of Congress had acquired Twitter's archive[15] and so a large proportion of the time was taken up in discussing this acquisition, and whether or not it would prove useful to current and future researchers.

Results

The first session was very successful, with a thank you email from Marquard the next day asking to make this a regular session on the course. The first session was taught in 2011, and was scheduled towards the end of the second semester. I have repeated it each year

since then, but the session has now been moved earlier in the second semester. Course leader Sas Mays explained that they found

> "that students who were new to issues of the materialities of institutional and cultural memory found the theoretical material dauntingly abstract, and in the following year we reversed the order. Having [the discussion of practical archiving] at the outset gave students a firmer sense of the issues at hand, including the theoretical, and this subsequently enabled us to build up their knowledge of archival issues. In addition, discussion [in this session] worked very well in the multi-disciplinary context of the module, and enabled students from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds to engage with issues of memory, and with each other's interests and knowledge-bases."[16]

I had hoped that this session would see more of the students visiting the University Archive to use our collections. After the first session, one student visited for a follow-up interview as part of her coursework. However we have not seen an increase in student research visits from this course as a result of the session. Nonetheless, it has become clear during the discussions that the students are often already working at or researching in archive collections elsewhere. It is therefore important that we are sending them out into the research community well-equipped with a detailed understanding of archive procedures, and we see this as an important contribution to the employability of our students.

As a wider result, the increased role of the Archive in the teaching work of the University helped to secure permanent funding for an Assistant Archivist post. I was fortunate enough to be appointed to this post in summer 2013. This has enabled us to develop longer-term relationships with teaching faculty and to plan future activities with confidence.

Lessons Learned

The content of the *Archives and Knowledge* session is constantly evolving. In response to questions from the students, I have included more detailed discussion of the opportunities and difficulties surrounding digital archives. However subsequent years have brought up other issues, in particular responding to news stories around privacy and data. After the session I make notes for myself about which topics were discussed, and try to ensure that these are included incorporated the following year. I also keep an eye on the news in the weeks leading up to the class so I have an idea of what the students are likely to ask about.

Recent news stories are also helpful in stimulating discussion. Once I have finished speaking it often takes them a short time to formulate their thoughts into questions, and

therefore for the discussion to get going. It helps to have the tutor present to make the links with other topics they have studied, but mentioning high profile events like Wikileaks and the Hillsborough Independent Panel[17] in the UK helps to move the discussion onto familiar and pragmatic territory for them.

The experience of planning and teaching the *Knowledge and Research* session has had a huge impact on our work across the University. Firstly, it has given us a pathway for approaching other departments within the University. A similar scenario of one student from the undergraduate Multimedia Computing course using the University Archive for their final year coursework has led to an unexpected but fruitful relationship with the Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering. We now work with both the first and final year students on archive-related projects. Sometimes the example of one interested student is the easiest way to approach faculty members, as it provides a clear example of what can be achieved.

Secondly, we have changed the way that we promote and assess our outreach activities within the University. In the past we have concentrated on promoting our collections and history as subjects for research, and counted our success purely on the number of visits to the Reading Room. We are now offering broader research skills sessions. These sessions use our collections as examples of archival material, but focus on conveying a wider message about the benefits of archival research to our students. The success of these sessions is judged on the projects and opportunities that come about as a result of our higher profile in the University, rather than on numbers visiting the Reading Room.

Thirdly, I have incorporated some of the theoretical teaching from this session into the *Research Methods* session we offer to BA History students. This session was traditionally focussed on the practical aspects of finding and accessing the archives they need for their final year research. It now includes an explanation of the archival process and an introduction to the broader conceptual debate around *the archive*. My hope is that this will help them challenge and interrogate the archive sources they use, and so make them better historical researchers.

Conclusion

I now teach around 6-8 sessions per academic year, but the *Knowledge and Research* session remains one of the highlights for me. It provides me with an impetus to keep up with the wider debate around archives in the media and critical thinking, and an opportunity to present any new ideas I have absorbed or developed in the previous 12 months. It also

provides me with regular experience of be challenged on those ideas by an intelligent and engaged audience in the discussion afterwards.

Focussing on the archival process provides a structure to the talks as well as an important understanding of what archives are – and are not. Demystifying archives gives the students more confidence when dealing with them either as a historical source or as an object of critical theorizing. We try to ensure that students are also provided with all the relevant information they would need if they choose to research in an archive, either our own or elsewhere. However even if they never actually visit an archive, we hope that their theoretical writing is bolstered by an understanding of 'real life archives'.

By expanding the work of Archive Services into teaching, we have also gained a greater profile for ourselves in the University as professionals, rather than just collection holders. This has opened up opportunities for a wide range of collaborations including academic projects, mobile apps, and exhibitions. It has also enabled us to reach a wider range of students beyond those subjects our collections could easily support, and has enabled us to play a wider role within the research community of the University. At the University of Westminster we are trying to ensure that archivists' voices heard in the training of researchers, so that while we cannot reclaim the concept of *the archive*, we can at least re-balance it.

---

[1] An excellent introduction to theories around archives across Art and Critical Theory can be found in Sue Breakell "Perspectives: Negotiating the Archive" in Tate Papers, Spring 2008 http://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/perspectives-negotiating-archive

[2] Julie Bacon "Archive, Archive, Archive!" in *Circa*, No. 119 (Spring, 2007), pp. 50-59

[3] Dr Louise Craven *What are Archives?: Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: a reader* (Aldershot UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2012)

[4] Hal Foster "An Archival Impulse" in *October* 110 (Autumn 2004) p3-22

[5] Now Dr Ben Cranfield, based at Birkbeck College (University of London).

[6] The London Consortium was a multi-disciplinary graduate programme in Humanities and Cultural Studies, run as a collaboration between the Architectural Association, Birkbeck College (University of London), the Institute of Contemporary Arts, the Science Museum, and Tate.

[7] The Tate's Archive Reading Room was used for this session and the number of themes was constrained by the number of tables available in the space.

[8] Recordings from the conference are available online at http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/audio/archiving-artist-audio-recordings

[9] Anna McNally "All That Stuff! Organising records of Creative Processes" in *All This Stuff: Archiving the Artist* eds. Vaknin, Stuckey, Lane (Faringdon UK, ARLIS, 2013)

[10] The module is taught at level 6 and 7 and is worth 20 credits over 2 semesters.

[11] Dr Marquard Smith has now left the University of Westminster and is currently Research Leader/Head of Doctoral Studies at RCA. The other course leader is Dr Sas Mays, Senior Lecturer in English Literature

[12] Michael Ann Holly and Marquard Smith eds. *What is Research in the Visual Arts? Obsession, Archive, Encounter* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press/Clark Art Institute, 2008)

[13] I have since incorporated more material from the University's archive into the session, as I have found documents with a strong relevance to the theme.

[14] TGA 955/7/2/12 and TGA 955/18/2 Scans of these had kindly been provided to me by the Tate Archive for the purposes of this session.

[15] T*witter Donates Entire Tweet Archive to Library of Congress* April 15, 2010 http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2010/10-081.html

[16] Sas Mays, email message to author, 17 August 2014

[17] On 15 April 1989, 96 men women and children lost their lives in a tragedy at the Hillsborough Stadium in Sheffield. The Hillsborough Independent Panel was appointed to oversee the disclosure of all relevant information, a large proportion of which came from archives.