

## Archives, War, and Memory: Building a Framework

*Introduction: The Meaning of War (and Memory).* Today, the United States wages war in Afghanistan and Iraq, maintains a military presence in nearly every corner of the globe, and is engaged in covert operations we may never hear about. We can measure our lives by the wars we have witnessed. War also accelerates the creation of records supporting war, leading to growing quantities of materials to be sent into archives. Strangely enough, in the midst of conflict often involving the targeting or eradicating of a people's memory, the memory of war grows. Somewhere in this, the essential nature of archives in society can be discerned. Yes, in destroying archives, deliberately or accidentally, we see another way in how we value archives.

War leaves behind not just victors and losers, new political boundaries, heroes and the despised, and the dead and the maimed, but it creates the work for many seeking to make sense of it all. War tends to generate official views of the past, while also prompting writers and artists to explore alternative meanings.<sup>1</sup> War has often portrayed a kind of archival turn. Government officials producing more and new kinds of records, a poet's musings, a writer's novels, a director's films, a composer's work, or the creator of a war memorial archives may all be seeking the same end – providing meaning to something that very often seems so meaningless. However, we might see a contradiction between the purpose of archives, to provide documentation enabling us to possess some sense of the truth, warts and all, with the need to control access to the details of horrific events like war and violence, leading to controversial actions by governments to control official records through classification barriers and other forms of secrecy. Many personal collections capturing war experiences can be found in archives; indeed, nearly every

archives is at least partly a monument to war.

Every archival repository is also a part of public memory. Avishai Margalit argues that memory primarily relates to individuals, believing that “shared memory in a modern society travels from person to person through institutions, such as archives, and through communal mnemonic devices, such as monuments and the names of streets.”<sup>2</sup> He believes “modern shared memory is located between the push and pull of two poles: history and myth,”<sup>3</sup> and that an “ethics of memory is as much an ethics of forgetting as it is an ethics of memory.”<sup>4</sup> Here we begin to discern the great contradiction between war as destructive act and archives as the opposite. However, placing archives in war memory situates it as part of a process, one with constant shifting meanings. Historian David Blight asserts, “*History* . . . is a reasoned reconstruction of the past rooted in research” and “can be read by or belong to everyone. . . . *Memory*, however, is often treated as a sacred set of potentially absolute meanings and stories, possessed as the heritage or identity of a community. Memory is often owned; history, interpreted. Memory is passed down through generations; history is revised. Memory often coalesces in objects, sacred sites, and monuments; history seeks to understand contexts and the complexity of cause and effect. History asserts the authority of academic training and recognized canons of evidence; memory carries the often more powerful authority of community membership and experience.”<sup>5</sup>

Memory is a complicated term. It can be defined scientifically, medically, culturally, and legally.<sup>6</sup> My focus is on its cultural or societal aspects. Despite the many hundreds of studies on collective or public memory, there seem to be many different definitions of the concept. My intent is to indicate that the effort to destroy or create

archives is part of a process of destroying group identity by eradicating its memory or generating sources to create identity and cohesion of a group. Richard New Lebow, in his introduction to a collection of essays about memory in postwar Europe, provides a good, initial working definition: “We use *memory* in a double sense: to refer to what people remember – or more accurately, what they think they remember – and to describe efforts by individuals, groups, and states to foster or impose memory in the form of interpretations and commemorations of their country’s wartime role and experience.”<sup>7</sup>

Considering the nature of public or collective memory adds to the notion of what archivists do, while also expanding the definition of archives into why the seemingly fuzziest concept of archive is a dominant notion for so many. More importantly, it also explains how and why archives and archivists are viewed in the way they are and, just as critically, why archives are just as often designated for destruction as protected or valued.

*Our Capacity for Self-Destruction.* Depictions of war, both artistic and documentary, suggest that our capacity for destruction is part of our nature. Writer Wendell Berry, in his short story, “Making It Home,” follows the main character, Art Rowanberry, returning home to Kentucky after service in Europe during the Second World War, reflecting that fighting was “like work,” where “You had a thing on your mind that you wanted, or wanted to get to, and anything at all that stood in your way, you had the right to destroy. . . . Whatever you want to hit, you want to make dust out of it. Farms, houses, whole towns – things that people had made well and cared for a long time – you make nothing of.”<sup>8</sup> If the enemy is hunkered down behind the walls of an archives or museum, the focus is on dislodging the enemy no matter the cultural or other losses.

Archives, libraries, and museums have long been targets of war and terrorist activities. Robert Bevan draws the obvious connection between these institutions as memory repositories and military or terrorist targets, seeing these institutions as a “cache of historical memory, evidence that a given community’s presence extends into the past and legitimizing it in the present and on into the future. In these circumstances structures and places with certain meanings are selected for oblivion with deliberate intent. This is not ‘collateral damage.’ This is the *active* and often systematic destruction of particular building types or architectural traditions that happens in conflicts where the erasure of the memories, history and identity attached to architecture and place – enforced forgetting – is the goal itself. These buildings are attacked not because they are in the path of a military objective: to their destroyers they *are* the objective.”<sup>9</sup> War often breeds new memory repositories as well.

An interesting aspect in the relationship between war, memory, and archives is the inherent contradiction in the efforts to save and make available for use the documents and artifacts associated with war that were ephemeral from their creation and never really intended to be preserved over the long-term. One of the prominent examples of the efforts to contend with the fragility of documents associated with warfare has been Andrew Carroll’s Legacy Project, started in November 11, 1998 to collect and copy letters from the various wars involving American soldiers often thrown out, neglected, or forgotten in basements and attics.<sup>10</sup> Carroll’s project has had historical precursors. During the First World War German newspapers published war poems every day, families compiled scrapbooks, soldiers kept diaries, and letters went back and forth between the trenches and the home front. Many volumes of personal war letters were

published during the war.<sup>11</sup> And this kind of effort was not unique to Germany. After the First World War Australians tried to make sense of their place in the world and their part in the war, by collecting letters, diaries, and other soldiers' documents by established libraries and archives. The Australian War Memorial had difficulty from the soldiers themselves partly because so many of them had sent their letters and other documents to others, mostly their families, and did not possess masses of documentation. But the process of collecting from the families offered an opportunity for national and individual healing.<sup>12</sup>

The process by which personal archives and mementoes survived attests to the power of archives. Michelle Cloonan captures the stresses inherent in the documenting of war: "The twentieth century, a time of maturation for the fields of preservation and conservation, was also perhaps one of the bloodiest centuries on record. It is ironic that the period that fostered new technologies to aid conservation for paper records in danger of deterioration or damage was also the century that hosted two world wars and many other world conflicts. The number of items destroyed over the last hundred years probably exceeds the number saved."<sup>13</sup> It is similar to the advances made in medical practice caused by the need to perform medical triage at the battlefield. Perhaps this is a common element of human nature, that when we are often at our worst, seeking to destroy each other, we learn about how to care for ourselves and society.

*Documenting and Remembering.* When threatened with destruction, we resist oblivion by marking our existence -- writing fiction, creating art, producing memoirs, or composing poetry; everyone gets tallied in official statistics and records. The Civil War, for example, generated considerable debates about the conflict's memory, with

processions, parades, public ceremonies, monuments, and books. The Civil War was a remarkably well-documented conflict, noted by the federal government's decision in 1864 to publish the complete records of the war.<sup>14</sup> This is a characteristic of every subsequent war. Indeed, it may be a characteristic of the continuing growth of government in our lives. War, with its stresses and strains, prompts governments to be more careful and deliberate in both creating and archiving records (at least when it serves its purposes).<sup>15</sup>

As with government records, so it is with personal papers. We have an abundance of papers chronicling the personal experience of war, humanizing the face of war. Historian Martha Hanna thought she would work on a study of letter writing in the First World War until she discovered the letters of Paul and Marie Pireaud, who left behind correspondence about their experiences during that war, he in the military and she at home trying to maintain a domestic life.<sup>16</sup> Such correspondence, when it survives, is often the richest about the horrors, stresses, and strains of combat, suffering, and survival. Family members often learn to value archives by clinging to these documents as personal memory devices.

In the midst of battle, even as we are reduced to our basest human instincts to destroy, we still search for ways to document and remember. Matthew Brady, Alexander Gardner, and other pioneering photographers lugged their heavy equipment onto battlefields capturing some of the earliest images of battle, producing books and even mounting exhibitions of the conflict. Jewish scholars trapped in the Warsaw Ghetto during the Second World War, facing extermination against impossible odds, wrote about their experiences for future readers and buried letters, diaries, and other documents in

metal milk cans and other containers.<sup>17</sup> Civil War soldiers, on the eve of battle, wrote letters to loved ones and pinned them to their shirts - in the hopes that should they be killed, the letters would be sent on and their bodies identified. As warfare became a common way of life in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, essential to new forms of national identity, governments created units specifically designed to record events of military engagement; artists sketched and painted images of war in the First World War, movie directors were given commissions and filmed battles on land and sea, and journalists with camera men prowled the jungles of Vietnam helping to televise the war daily in America's living rooms.<sup>18</sup> The horror of war is embedded in our memories, even if it is not uncommon for veterans to not talk about what they experienced (we preserve their letters and associated relics, and, if necessary, fill in the blanks).

Destroying and preserving is just one of many contradictions in wartime. Chris Hedges, who as a journalist has experienced war personally, argues that while “war dominates culture, distorts memory, corrupts language, and infects everything around it,” war also provides meaning.<sup>19</sup> “Even with its destruction and carnage it can give us what we long for in life,” Hedges suggests. “It can give us purpose, meaning, a reason for living.”<sup>20</sup> Hedges even believes that “war fills our spiritual void.”<sup>21</sup> Hedges is not seeking to glorify the role of war, especially as he is well aware of its evils, stimulating governments to lie and transforming the ugliness of killing into some sort of heroic ideal.<sup>22</sup> The nature of war is changing, becoming less clear as war between nations slips into a never-ending conflict against a stateless terrorism.<sup>23</sup> If that is the case, what will we now commemorate? What we will now document? Does the nature and power of archives change, if archives are consistently tied in with memorial functions?

One of the factors that may compel us to constantly re-examine war and its aftermath is that nations, political and military leaders, combatants, and civilians seem to generate greater amounts and more compelling kinds of documentation than the same players under peace-time circumstances. We cannot manipulate fully the past because there are survivors, children of survivors, documents, and people to counter the lies or subterfuges of present regimes.<sup>24</sup> We often associate the memory of war with monuments constructed decades later, and often the result of contemporary political contests more informative about the politics of memory than about understanding war and its consequences.<sup>25</sup> Building monuments honoring Confederate generals affirmed Jim Crowism. Memoir writing by generals and other officers, commencing in earnest after the Civil War, are similarly the products of memory politics, advancing careers, supporting political agendas, and, most prominently in the case of Ulysses S. Grant, providing the economic future for one's family. A more poignant means to remembering war is through the creation of personal documents - letters, diaries, postcards, photographs - written or created in the immediate moment of death and destruction. Editing, selecting, and publishing the letters of combatants, at all levels, also often served a variety of political, economic, social, and historical agendas. And this is the essence of the archival impulse, one now well understood by scholars to be about various dimensions of power.<sup>26</sup>

War has been unkind to libraries, museums, and archives. Every kind of institution with some archival responsibility (one can think of churches, for example) has been targeted for destruction in conflicts. Lucien X. Polastron provides the reason: "The book [or document] is the double of the man, and burning it is the equivalent of killing him."<sup>27</sup> This simple statement suggests one reason why books, libraries, and archives are



often destroyed. When Hitler determined to proceed with his “final solution” for the European Jews, he destroyed their cultural heritage as well.<sup>28</sup>

*Questioning the Nature of Archives.* War museums, libraries and archives often display the ambivalence we feel toward war, victims, victors, and vanquished alike because war brings with it atrocities, pain, and anguish. Victory is never clean or even always clear. How do you interpret such matters and what goes into the archives?<sup>29</sup> Anyone who reads history knows that historians select evidence in order to shape a story, and war stories may require more rigor in their selection. Archives can be twisted to provide more mythic past than a real history, a process perhaps more evident in film and fictional portrayals. Nationalism overcomes any sense of rationally considering warfare. War not only can dominate society, but it can warp and twist it in ways almost unimaginable. It can distort the function of archives.

Most associate archives with substantial, permanent classical buildings, but few comprehend what goes on inside. Archives are essential to the meaning of community, reminding us that we have a past. Archives, museums, and libraries are visible landmarks on the landscape, in buildings exuding public memory and cultural significance, even sacred space. We also often associate warfare with the ground on which it was fought. And we often think of the past as being some sort of landscape.<sup>30</sup> Archival sources, both the traditional physical documents and their new virtual versions, can trigger such associations. The average person believes that every document is saved and available in an archives, ignoring what happens to their own personal and family papers. Archival repositories are highly selective in what they acquire, preserve, and make available, and even the digital era with some falsely promising that everything will be saved has done

little to change this. Rather than debate who is right and why, what we ought to recognize is that we have from the far distant past possessed an impulse to save evidence about us. Not everyone can articulate what the archival impulse is about, but we all can recognize that it is there. Moments of trauma, violence, disaster, and terror often bring the interest in remembering to the fore, even if it leads to debate and contests over what this memory is about.

What goes on inside cultural institutions such as archives might seem opaque to those working there, but society does sense the importance of these repositories (explaining why they are so often targets in war). Archives can be just like flags, explaining their architecture and location. While many archivists express dismay about their seemingly invisible role in society, their institutions are often readily identified as symbolic targets to be eradicated (maybe it is good that archivists seem invisible). Terrorists and other combatants might not understand the subtle differences between libraries, museums, historic sites, and archives, but they comprehend that these are all vessels carrying a people's history, identity, and community. Archives are seen as symbolic expressions of a connection to the past. Archives are often perceived to be positive affirmations of what the past informs us about the present, associating archives with an unbridled belief in Progress. One of the reasons archives have been associated with public memory is that it is more often the general association with the past than the specific evidence or information found in the documents that is important.

But this is not the only impulse that is evident. For every record safely housed within archives, there are many others that have been either lost along or deliberately destroyed. This is what prompted Andrew Carroll to start his campaign to collect from

private hands personal letters written from the battlefields of the Second World War back home (recognizing how many letters to the soldier in action had been lost under the extreme conditions of the war zone). Another impulse is to be selective, supporting our notion that not every documentary source possesses ongoing value (meaning archivists destroy as well). Although whether archivists have usefully documented such choices may be open to debate, no one complains that such choices were unnecessary given the immensity of the documentary universe. In fact, the powerful symbolic value archives hold in society suggests that archivists are doing something right in their appraising of records. Buried within this function, however, is another impulse, one contrary to what we normally associate with archives, that of forgetting.

We can understand something of this other impulse by examining war and its archival implications. Combatants often target archives, and other institutions with archival missions, for destruction in order to strike at the heart of a people's identity and to eradicate a community's memory. We could fill a substantial book just listing such incidents, from the destruction of the Alexandrian Library in the ancient world to the systematic looting by conquering nations and groups in the Napoleonic, Third Reich, and War on Terror eras. We can begin to discern the essential nature of archives and their significance in society by understanding this. Indeed, the wars on terror have generated an international trade in looted antiquities, one operating with an unprecedented level of sophistication and scale. Shaban Muffi reports that "Owning a piece of another culture's heritage seems to feed some primordial urge,"<sup>31</sup> and this urge is being supported by an immense trade network. During the Second World War, the Holocaust provided an opportunity for museums and private collectors to loot Jewish victims both eradicating

aspects of their culture while enriching the museums and collectors.<sup>32</sup>

*War Boxes and the Stories in Them.* Archival repositories are filled with documents concerning war. There are even archives specializing in particular wars.<sup>33</sup> Why is this the case? One reason is that soldiers, serving in the front lines, tend to use their idle moments (of which there are many) to try to stay connected with their normal lives. They try to describe the meaning they are searching for in the midst of great horror, suffering, and sorrow. This partially explains why war has given us great literature, art, monuments, and movies - building around the powerful stories that only war seems to be able to generate. And it also explains why archives are full of the personal papers (and stories) of former soldiers. Can we ever have too many diaries or letters of the private in the Civil War or the soldier fighting from the trenches in France in the First World War? Unlikely. The power of archives resides in both the evidence of the past, but more importantly in the stories that can captivate us.

Most archivists can tell you about revealing documents they have encountered, even if they cannot tell you about times they have been able to unleash the full power of these records (so many archivists have been constrained by the need to compress the vitality and variety of the documents into standardized catalogs, in the conviction that this is how researchers will find what they are looking for). Archivists, historians, museum specialists, and others have discovered other ways of revealing such stories, at times inspired by master storytellers such as Ken Burns who have been able to use a routine document, photograph, or piece of film footage to probe into a moment of self-discovery in the midst of battle confusion and chaos. David Glassberg believes “wars especially seem to furnish stories that make for popular history.”<sup>34</sup> This explains why the star of

Ken Burns's documentary on the Civil War was a Sullivan Ballou letter written to his wife and pledging his love to her and composed just on the eve of his death in battle.<sup>35</sup> Increasingly we see a synergy between the release of documentaries and archival exhibitions, with archivists mostly having learned by underestimating the impact of Burns's Civil War documentary and before it the *Roots* television miniseries. Archival sources enable us to feel how people experienced the past from very different orientations. Most archival repositories contain documents from an array of perspectives, perhaps explaining why archives and archivists are prone to become controversial and even to seem unpatriotic when working on war-related themes.

Participants in war told stories in their letters and, later, memoirs. David Blight, in considering the proliferation of Civil War memoirs in the generation after the war, describes how in writing these memoirs, veterans exchanged letters about their experiences, the battles, and other personal events: "The details of a man's war record were the markers in his life, symbols of some control exercised over an untidy, even a lost, past."<sup>36</sup> We don't have to wait for veterans or political leaders to pen memoirs to see the impact of war on the creation of letters, diaries, and other personal documentation. The desire to read letters describing warfare probably results from both our curiosity about the nature of war and our interest in reading other people's mail. Margaretta Jolly, considering an exhibition of wartime letters, notes, "Letters are not just the means of communication but a physical token of the absent other, that gives them a fetishistic quality, easily recognizable by the importance of their physical aspects: the handwriting; the envelope; the way they are hoarded or tied in ribbons."<sup>37</sup> The documents of war, especially personal letters with a close-up view of battle, are the stuff of mythology.

Soldiers' personal papers are often drawn upon by family to form the memory of the dead. Monuments do not always have to be stone or metal; they can be bound and published. The widow of the Confederate General George Pickett constantly shaped his Lost Cause memory in the public, even forging letters to portray a certain chivalric image and marketing autographs and relics when she could.<sup>38</sup>

*Archival Accountability.* War has brought with it both impulses to remember and to forget, to eradicate crimes and to hold aggressors and despots accountable. Japan and Germany have dealt differently with the Second World War. Both nations inflicted unspeakable atrocities on humanity. While Germany has revealed increasing awareness to recognize what it did, Japan has refused to come to terms with its crimes. While Germany has built monuments, passed laws to open archives, and established educational programs, Japan has censored efforts to recognize what it did, including barely discussing the war in school textbooks.<sup>39</sup> Increasingly, Japanese scholars have been combing through archives and libraries in other countries to get access to primary source materials that they are barred from in their own country. Archives hold records providing crucial evidence for organizations to be compliant to laws and policies, holding officials and other leaders accountable to the public. Records can be unsettling, and this is especially the case with documents connected to war. Just think of the photographic evidence related to the Holocaust, much of it compromised or manipulated for a variety of purposes. Reflect on the many instances when governments have closed down records to keep secret assassinations, covert operations, and military adventures. Records provide evidence of both the good and bad in humanity, and war reflects both extremes remarkably well.

Archives are full of significant evidence about war. Two journalists, Peter Eisner and Knut Royce, remind us that sometimes we need to be just as concerned with the veracity of the content of records. Eisner and Royce track the influence of a document alleged to have provided evidence that Iraq was seeking to acquire uranium from Niger, a letter determined to be not just a forgery but a poor one at that. The letter was the source of President George W. Bush's "sixteen words" about Saddam Hussein's threat to develop weapons of mass destruction in his 2003 State of the Union address.<sup>40</sup> This source was trumpeted by the Bush administration, even as its credibility declined very quickly, causing some to contend that the Bush-led government was intent on invading Iraq no matter what the evidence suggested. In recent years, wars have brought controversies about access to government records and what seems like increasing secrecy.<sup>41</sup>

Government archives figure prominently in the creation and management of war documentation. It has been the case, until recently and the emergence of terrorism, that war was between governments. Veterans groups were critical to the successful movement to found the U.S. National Archives, pitched for many decades as a war memorial.<sup>42</sup> The first American state government archives, created in the South, were promoted by and supported by the idea of the Lost Cause.<sup>43</sup> Governments are not always happy with how this documentation is used. Even in the midst of controversies about the interpretation of war, such as the acrimonious public scrutinizing of the Smithsonian's Air and Space Museum exhibition about the end of the Second World War and the bombing of Hiroshima, the significance of government records can shine through the fracas. Martin Harwit, that museum's director who ultimately lost his job as a result of

pressure exerted by veterans' groups and Congress, stated in the aftermath, "As the exhibition was taking shape, I was especially fascinated by a handful of documents involving President Truman and his secretary of war. Reading them as if breaking through a fog of historians' opinions, to personally glimpse fragments of truth. Would not veterans, whose lives had been so greatly affected, feel that same thrill on finding them in our exhibition?"<sup>44</sup> Much of the debate about this particular museum exhibition concentrated on document discoveries.<sup>45</sup> To ignore such discoveries is to allow the explanation of the decision to bomb Hiroshima to be acceptable as a fable, defined by political agendas.<sup>46</sup> Elizabeth Yakel, searching for lessons in this controversy, suggests that it "demonstrates what can happen when organizations ignore social, political, and cultural factors in the environment" and that it "should remind archivists and librarians to focus less on the limits to their power and more on the uniqueness of their power."<sup>47</sup> She suggests that archivists and librarians need to be better educated and prepared for such situations. We need to understand the roles of documents against the efforts of government and political leaders to shroud in secrecy the decisions to use atomic bombs on Japan.<sup>48</sup>

There is another new kind of archival accountability in war. Over the past couple of decades we have witnessed a burgeoning of interest in truth commissions and the records they generate and use. A lot of attention has been given to examining the records of secret police organizations in various nations, such as those of the Soviet secret police (the NKVD) files pertaining to the 700,000 political prisoners arrested and executed in 1937-1938.<sup>49</sup> As in the case of many despots, "Stalin manipulated and fabricated evidence to prove the existence of 'enemies of the people.'"<sup>50</sup> Sometimes today we hear



archivists lament that calls for a focus on keeping public officials accountable may cause these officials to not create or maintain records that future historians will use. Evidence suggests the contrary. Tom Adami, describing the work of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, asserts that “recordkeeping does aid the reconciliation process and that repressive regimes do in fact have a habit of maintaining vast amounts of records which invariably end up in the archives of post-conflict governments or judicial organizations.”<sup>51</sup> What is the archivist’s responsibility as a citizen of a nation? Trying to ensure that records are kept, as they ought to be for present accountability, is just as critical as the kind of accountability future scholars will bring to bear in tapping into such archival storehouses.

Before the advent of truth commissions, many of which have taken on an important archival function, archivists had seemed to eschew the essentialness of evidence found in their records, except as they understood archives and archival repositories to be part of a social (or official) construction of truth. Wars often bring controversies for governments and their recordkeeping. The Vietnam War generated many classified records quagmires. As records relating to this war have been opened, historians and other scholars have tried to unravel its events and sought to determine just where a reliable notion of what happened during this conflict might lead us. Jeffrey Kimball writes, “By ‘truth,’ I mean the property of being in accord with fact, reality, or the state of affairs. I do *not* mean ‘truth’ with a capital ‘T,’ that is, Truth is the sense of a transcendent or spiritual reality that explains the ‘meaning’ of existence or even the ‘meaning’ of the Vietnam War.”<sup>52</sup> Too much government secrecy leaves us in the hands of the leaders and their memoirs, and that is not necessarily the best scenario for gaining

a good understanding of any war. Kimball argues that Nixon and Kissinger managed to write their own interpretation – writing as “memoirists and polemicists” of their role in the Vietnam War while also blocking access to their records.<sup>53</sup> The declassification of records related to their roles easily and clearly reveals problems in their version of events. Even so, the United States government’s subsequent wars have brought with them more strident efforts to control information and to manipulate their media coverage.<sup>54</sup> The more a government seeks to control secrets, the more problems it is likely to have in dealing with its own citizens.

The Holocaust dramatically reveals the challenges of opening classified records. Stuart E. Eizenstat, the former Clinton administration official who led the negotiations for the federal government in Holocaust assets deliberations, gives a compelling account about the existence, discovery, and access to archives.<sup>55</sup> While he is very positive about the role of the U.S. National Archives, Eizenstat describes it as the “little-known archives facility in College Park, Maryland.”<sup>56</sup> Can you really argue for the importance of records, but downplay the importance or value of the primary government archives and records management program? This perspective suggests the kind of negative value the media assigns to recordkeeping, but in times of war and other such crises even ordinary records can take on extraordinary value. The importance of archival records is evident in the Holocaust assets case, as Eizenstat comments on the opening of records and data banks of eleven federal agencies, an effort demonstrating the “awesome resources the U.S. executive branch can muster when it receives presidential backing.”<sup>57</sup> Eizenstat relates that about a million records were declassified, the “largest single declassification in U.S. history.”<sup>58</sup> One success of the entire project was having twenty-eight historical

commissions established around the world to open other archives. Eizenstat believes that the “most lasting legacy of the effort [he] led was simply the emergence of the truth. . . . Historical facts can be suppressed, but eventually they bubble to the surface. What started as a tiny trickle from long-buried U.S. archives became a torrent of information that helps provide a final accounting for World War II.”<sup>59</sup>

*Creating New Documentary Forms and Places to Keep Them.* Warfare creates new and transforms old documentary forms. Philosophers and scholars from the time of Plato onward have worried about the impact of new technology on memory, cognition, and human relationships. War spurred the utility of both analog and digital information technologies; we can think of the telegraph, microphotography, radar, and, of course, the computer and the Web. We can add to these mail delivery systems, expanded and made more efficient to keep soldiers connected to home. The origins of information science rest with the rise of the military-industrial complex from the early days of the Second World War. While today archivists may worry about their efficacy in capturing and maintaining the evidence of war in newer digital forms (e-mail instead of snail mail, blogs instead of diaries, Web sites instead of scrapbooks), they nevertheless have endless opportunities to document war.

War is a great stimulant for creating archival documentation, even if such records are generated under the most adverse conditions. Diaries are, for example, created and maintained under all sorts of circumstances.<sup>60</sup> Other records forms are created, from soldiers taking personal photographs to the grand national initiatives to select, interpret, and publish soldiers’ wartime letters.<sup>61</sup> We have a new notion of the archive, made up of “moral witnesses” and sustaining the memory archive.<sup>62</sup> This is a more expansive notion

of the “archive” than the traditional perspective archivists often bring with them.

Some earlier documentary forms, also drawing on revolutionary technologies, spurred on war’s memorialization. The Civil War was the first American war captured by photography, and these “photographs took on a memorial character.”<sup>63</sup> In later wars, other kinds of then new technologies documented events, most notably “newspaper photographs, newsreels, motion pictures, and, eventually, television.”<sup>64</sup> We can think about this every time a national holiday, like Memorial Day or Independence Day, rolls around, and television leaps into full force featuring documentaries and war movies. Just stay tuned to the History Channel (often dubbed the World War Two channel) for one of those special holiday weekends and observe the use of iconic images in photographs, movies, and documentaries used by directors from John Ford to Clint Eastwood.

War has also sometimes deeply influenced the mission of professional archivists and records managers. Eric Enrenreich examines this in his study of Nazi genealogy, explaining why the German public accepted the Nazi cause for the eradication of what was perceived to be an inferior portion of the population.<sup>65</sup> Enrenreich considers the legitimatization of racial science in Germany, the creation of laws and bureaucratic structures for proof of racial ancestry (a system involving over 60 million individuals), and the use of documentation (such as birth, baptismal, and marriage certificates), the publishing of genealogical manuals, and the growth of the profession of state-licensed kinship researchers. There is, of course, sometimes a thin line between iconic and propaganda. Much of the employment of film in wartime relates to the propagandistic potential of this medium. War and propaganda are hardly new partners. It is difficult to think about war without propaganda, and it is also unimaginable to consider war without

literature and poetry as well. Peter Krauss chronicles eight artists officially sent into the First World War in Europe to document it, the “first artists recruited through official government channels, with the purpose of making a historical record of war.”<sup>66</sup> These artists struggled to determine what their role was and who was their audience.<sup>67</sup> Such questions tend to emerge among any group given the responsibility, in times of war, with documentation. Over and over again, especially over the past century, we see archivists and other records administrators often facing ethical issues about their responsibility to nation or professional mission, to present or future. This has proved to be especially challenging when government employs archivists and historians (and other scholars) to generate official archives as a war unfolds.

*Memorials as Archives, Archives as Memorials.* When most people reflect on remembering war, they first think of dramatic, granite memorials – large statues of men (until recently no women) in combat action or posed as dead or dying. We have seen these memorials countless times: lonely sentries in the middle of town squares, oversized equestrian statues on battlefields, and bronze plaques in front of court houses and city halls with the list of names of men and women who served in a war, often accompanied by a decommissioned artillery piece. Such expressions have long been the standard means by which we commemorate past warfare. Marita Sturken observes, “The memorial is perhaps the most traditional kind of memory object or technology.”<sup>68</sup> Since so many of our modern memorials comment on ancient memorial forms (arches and obelisks), few disagree with such an assessment. Memorials are not only common but they are particularly poignant, “an attempt by a society to deal with certain fundamental needs of those who survive a war. A monument records the dead, and so gives dignity to

their undignified deaths.”<sup>69</sup> Monuments are ubiquitous in our society.<sup>70</sup>

We now live in a society obsessed by memorials, evident by the rise of vernacular memorials and the roadside crosses ranging across our landscape.<sup>71</sup> It is particularly fascinating that many of the erected war monuments from the twentieth century mimic archives or libraries. The new Holocaust memorial in Vienna resembles “an inside-out library: its exterior is incised to simulate rows of identical books on shelves, spines facing inward,” books that “cannot be opened.”<sup>72</sup> The specter of a closed library or restricted archives is a disturbing image, understanding that such institutions are supposed to be open, at least in democratic societies.

The names on the Maya Lin designed Vietnam War memorial are arranged by date killed in action, the idea being that the memorial would read like an epic Greek poem and provide a time frame for the war; the listing of the 57, 000 names make a poignant narrative (one prompting visitors to make rubbings).<sup>73</sup> In the ancient world, stone monuments and their inscriptions were extensions of the official archives, making the connection between modern monuments and archives even closer.<sup>74</sup> The naming of war dead has been a preoccupation of war memorials for the past century, starting in the First World War, reflecting a new democratic impulse versus the anonymous process of earlier war commemoration.<sup>75</sup> The Vietnam War memorial is particularly interesting in its connection to the archival mission and function because of how the nation responded to it. The memorial not only mimics an archive with its names and their organization and maintenance, but the memorial became an archival repository, with veterans and their families leaving documents, artifacts, and other mementos behind at the base of the memorial.<sup>76</sup> This personal naming, such as the reading of each name of individuals killed

in the destruction of the World Trade Center, is particularly evocative of the function of archives where researchers gather information. While the archival edifice, images of shelves and row after row of boxes, and reference rooms filled with individuals reading documents provide great symbolic homage to the utility of archives, it is the individual researcher connecting with a long dead individual or finding the crucial evidence for understanding why something happened that speaks to the power of archives in society.

Monuments and archives share a purpose. Monuments create “common spaces for shared memories, sites that create the illusion that the residents of a town, region, or nation have a common past, present, and future. Creating a ‘common’ memory of war is important in forming a national identity, creating an overarching framework into which particular and diverse local interests can be inserted.”<sup>77</sup> Some monuments feature time capsules, directly linking to the archive. Archives also play a critical role in assisting communities and cultures to create an imagined past, if not by the specific contents of the documents they hold than by the physical neo-classical presence of the archives or repository. When we move into the realm of memorials, however, we open ourselves to other complicated issues. Memorials and the consecration of battlefields, for example, are often part of a contentious political process, aimed at exclusion or involving power (and power not always for the public good), contrary to how most archivists view their mission.<sup>78</sup> The two-decade quest to create a World War II memorial is one case, generating debate about why it had taken so long to build one, its location on the Mall in the nation’s capitol, its design, and how surviving veterans wanted to be honored and remembered.<sup>79</sup> Similar political battles were waged over the construction, scale, and location of monuments at Gettysburg.<sup>80</sup> Archivists do not aspire to engage in such

debates, but they recognize that acquiring records often generates controversy.

War memorials play many different roles in society, and their range of purposes is not unlike what has been assigned to archives. Memorials have been intended to unify society and settle differences,<sup>81</sup> but sometimes they have generated fundamental differences.<sup>82</sup> Disputes, controversies, and debates have plagued archives as well, whatever their intention. There has been a slowly growing body of testimony by archivists about how they have dealt with controversies because of changing political circumstances or because of actions taken by archivists (such as accessioning records from a controversial group or the exhibition of documents challenging prevailing viewpoints by powerful societal groups).<sup>83</sup> If monuments reflect the beliefs of the majority in power at the time of their construction, archives can't help but do the same. Nevertheless, there are differences.

In archives there are many voices, from the wealthy elite to the poorest, from the powerful to the disenfranchised; in many archival repositories there are the documents of both exploited and exploiters, victims and victimizers. Even when archives have been connected to efforts to control society, the voices of the oppressed and weak have managed to be heard. While archives are being constantly built, monuments are erected and are static unless removed or moved to another location. It is what Savage terms the “public monument’s terrifying finality.”<sup>84</sup> Some war memorials have had a connection to the creation and collecting of documentary sources, such as when the Bunker Hill Monument Association asked survivors to record their accounts of the battle, but many contradictory accounts caused these accounts to stay under lock and key.<sup>85</sup> As the nature of warfare has changed, we have seen new kinds of memorials embracing conflicting



notions of what is being remembered. Memorial museums, museums also functioning as research centers, portray different views of war, ones in which we have conflicted opinions.<sup>86</sup> We see contested notions of the archival function, raising questions about the relationship between war, memory, and the archival impulse.

*The Memory of War and the Role of Archives.* Sometimes people have a difficult time going back to look at their own papers or those of their family members if they might cause painful wartime memories. Historian Mark Roseman discovered a 1984 brief essay by Marianne Ellenbogen about her hiding in Germany during the Second World War, forging official papers, and carefully editing diaries and letters to help herself cope. While she was alive her papers were not available. “The painful truth, however,” Roseman recalls, “was that if Marianne had not died, many of the papers, and the names and addresses to which they helped me gain access, would have remained hidden. During our conversations she had known, as I then did not, that the house was heaving with records and mementos, yet she evidently could not bring herself to confront them. Vivian told me that his mother was normally orderly, filing everything in its proper place. These papers, however, were stuffed into envelopes and folders, nothing thrown away but nothing catalogued, in nooks and crannies all over the house.”<sup>87</sup> This is a fairly typical situation. Even today many personal and family papers with documentation about war experiences, both on the front and at home, await their discovery and placement in archives.

Efforts to commemorate war can lead to new archives projects. In Wisconsin, pressure and interest by state legislators and others in having a book project chronicling the state’s Vietnam War veterans led to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin

acquiring 137 archival collections documenting more than protests and domestic activities. Like war memorials, there was a therapeutic effect: “ One veteran who donated his collection reported that he was no longer plagued by disturbing, vivid dreams. Another veteran stated that the project had served as the vehicle that allowed him to talk to his sons for the first time about his war experiences. Several veterans were spurred to track down former company members and organize reunions. Still others began giving school presentations on their war experiences.”<sup>88</sup> Again, we see the value of archives.

Every time we hear of a new war archives or archival project, we can assume that such a healing process is at work. Sometimes these new projects are the work of individual collectors. The relatively recent creation of the Gilder Lehrman Collection, the work of two prominent collectors, at the New-York Historical Society provides insights into the letter writing of Civil War soldiers.<sup>89</sup> The Civil War was a “written war primarily because a regular exchange of letters allowed millions of personal stories to be recorded and preserved for posterity.”<sup>90</sup> Here we are reminded that the relationship between technology and the creation of documents is nothing new. Documents created in the midst of war, especially personal letters of soldiers, have always faced poor odds in survival. What emerges from studying wartime letters is the irony of the large portions of such documents we find in archival repositories today and the adverse conditions under which they were originally written and the subsequent care provided to them (affected by the ebb and flow of stationary supplies, the lack of military censorship during the Civil War, and the care afforded by the families, the “unofficial archivists”).

We can see something of this great contradiction between war’s destruction and

the creation of documentation when we consider memoirs. There has been no greater impetus for the writing of memoirs than war. Military leaders, politicians, and common soldiers all pen memoirs of their wartime experiences. Winston Churchill wrote one of the greatest of these memoirs, a six-volume history of the Second World War (but really a memoir of Churchill's role).<sup>91</sup> Churchill's historical and literary ventures are particularly insightful about the relationship of war and the archival impulse, since the authority of his work derives from the extensive use of documents. Churchill lived, most of his life, by writing, and he controlled his official papers (indeed, the writing of war memoirs is a major impetus for the preservation of archival materials).<sup>92</sup> The English government had worked since around the mid-1930s to prevent Cabinet officials from removing their official papers and writing memoirs revealing secrets. Since the First World War, the government required that individuals writing memoirs had to seek government approval of what they had written. Churchill was strict in following such requirements. Churchill's Literary Trust was established in 1946, requiring the use of any record since 1900 to have the permission of the current Prime Minister. Despite Churchill's reputation, it is obvious that he was not always faithful to the archival record, laboring either to conceal something or to make himself look better. In his volumes, the documents are carefully edited. Sometimes he skipped over something important, such as the development and use of radar, because he opposed it at the time and he desired not to look foolish in hindsight given radar's success. What is more interesting is how Churchill prepared for the writing of his history, requiring that he have monthly minutes and notes. After the war, when writing of the massive work, Churchill used a team to research and write.

Perhaps the greatest challenge, and a major explanation for why so many war memorials exist, is the fragility of human memory. This is more evident with the rapidly growing reliance on the Internet, a realm where documents and information are posted quickly but also can disappear rapidly. And the transitory nature of such evidence ought to be of special concern when such a horrific event as the Holocaust, occurring just little more than half a century ago, can be denied by some despite an abundance of written documents, eyewitness accounts, photographs, the physical remains of camps, and other evidence.<sup>93</sup> The desire to sustain remembrances about recent wars is also fraught with problems, endangering our memory. Wounds are still painful and veterans of these wars are still alive with a vested stake in how war is remembered. War, it seems, will always be with us, and we can see this inevitability even in the diversity of the ways we memorialize war, affirming the value of the sacrifices made by soldiers.<sup>94</sup> So, do archives, memorializing war, also serve to justify war? Probably not. Archives are far more complicated than this, providing room for many voices, with opposing viewpoints, than what granite memorials do.

*Capturing Archives.* War's changing nature may be driving archivists to reconsider their role in capturing and maintaining its documentation. The Society of American Archivists (SAA) and the Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) issued in 2008 a joint statement about the removal of archives in Iraq during the two Gulf Wars, demanding their return to Iraq. This statement suggests following the "spirit of the 1907 Hague IV Convention respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, which narrowly restricts the purposes for which a combatant can seize enemy records and forbids confiscation of private property, and of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of

Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict.”<sup>95</sup> This represents the beginning of a new archival awareness, at least in the North American context, about the nature of war and its impact on our documentary heritage. The scale of the problems represented by deliberate destruction and rampant looting, nevertheless, suggests many new archival challenges posed by warfare in our era, enabling looting, black market networks, and the sometimes-complicit support by repositories such as archives and museums. The United States lacks a cultural policy, not signing some important international agreements (such as the 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict). All of these matters endanger archives, some of the most ancient in the world, as well as other aspects of what constitutes our cultural heritage.

Commemorating war captures archives in another way. The commercialism of the past, especially concerning wartime, is common. Jim Weeks describes how quickly the residents of Gettysburg, the epoch 1863 battle in the American Civil War, were marketing battlefield debris and when that debris declined in availability they began to market souvenirs manufactured for sale.<sup>96</sup> All of this is part of a process by which we shape interpretations of such sites and events to fit our present needs. This is a typical element of the American capitalistic system, so evident in so many other events, no matter how tragic or traumatic, over the decades. In the late 1880s there was a spate of Confederate monument building, starting after the federal troops finally ended their occupation. The monuments served as a means for reconciliation, social order, and deference to authority, but they also were as much an effort to generate revenue by enterprising real estate and banking interests.<sup>97</sup> While archives are rarely seen as commercial ventures (they are expensive to administer, more a debit than a credit when

considering the financial aspects of institutions and governments), these same archives have often been associated with tourist sites. Indeed, the popularity of *Antiques Roadshow* and eBay suggest that we are likely to evaluate many of our historical and cultural sources mainly by assigning of dollar amounts.

We also have become more aware that organizations, such as financial institutions and manufacturing enterprises, have played enormous roles in war producing considerable documentation. The management of corporate and other private institutional records raises concerns, as seen in the case with the Swiss banks and the assets of Holocaust victims. The Swiss banks sought to hide their activities under the guise of normal financial records management functions of destroying routine, inactive accounts after set periods of time.<sup>98</sup> The Nazis were among the most efficient, if not the first, systematic looters of art treasures and other cultural assets during wartime.<sup>99</sup> Hector Feliciano describes how difficult it was to begin unravel the true story because of so much documentary material held in family, government, and institutional archives and the unwillingness of many art museums to provide any help. As government records were declassified, some of the story began to emerge, especially since there were “obsessively precise Nazi looting inventories and art files.”<sup>100</sup> We know that many of the artworks never made it into museums, that many are still hidden, and that much of the relevant documentation has not been opened.

In considering the repatriation of objects, treasures, and historical artifacts and documents stolen during wartime, we discover yet another connection between wartime and archives. While archives have often been the targets of thieves during wartime, archives are also sources to be used in recovering other stolen cultural assets. It is the

rare soldier or noncombatant taking advantage of battle chaos who could discern with any accuracy the value of archival documents or to be able to haul enough away to make it worth their while; objects with precious metals and jewels are the more likely thefts, but archival sources documenting their ownership and provenance attest to the importance of the evidence these sources provide. Whether or not these materials are returned or not, reunited with individual owners or placed back into museums and libraries from whence they came, is a complicated philosophical and legal issue.

It is in professional ethics and standards that the issue of war, memory, and archives also becomes complicated. There have been studies regarding corporate involvement in war, genocide, and repression that ought to disturb archivists and other records professionals. The most startling studies have concerned IBM's supplying information technology to the Third Reich to support its eradication of European Jews and other peoples that Hitler and his aides considered to be inferior, undesirable, or threats, the Swiss banking industry's support of the Nazis by laundering money and other assets usually acquired in illegal or immoral ways,<sup>101</sup> and the thriving art market in Paris and elsewhere enabling the Third Reich to market looted art and other treasures to support its war machinery or to pad the pockets of the German political and military leaders.<sup>102</sup> Modern corporations, despite evidence of a new social responsibility in the post-Enron era, have not always dealt effectively with the ethical administration of their records and information systems, and because other institutions, such as the university, are becoming more corporate-like. Given that we have seen repeated instances where corporations have engaged in suspect activities and where archivists and other records administrators working for these institutions have not been outspoken about the

implications of such behavior, it is likely that future wars will challenge archival documentation because the companies might methodically destroy the evidence of their involvement.<sup>103</sup>

*Cemeteries, Archives, and War.* When we think of wars, we also often think of the eerily beautiful military cemeteries at battlefield sites and other locations. Headstones and other markers are monuments, also connecting us to archives. Archives are like cemeteries, where the dead are buried in their records and the boxes containing them. Shelf after shelf of gray records boxes mimic the rows of cemetery headstones; if we arranged those boxes on a sloping lawn, we could achieve the same feeling. Just as in a cemetery, where the dead speak through their epitaphs, in an archives the dead speak through their documents; we can even imagine the labels on the records boxes, especially as so many have dates, to be the surrogates for the names, birth and death dates, and religious and other sentiments associated with the headstones.

Cemeteries unite us with the efforts of individuals and families to remember their dead.<sup>104</sup> The more one examines the nature of cemeteries, the more the similarities with archives become obvious. Building and stocking archives is a way of marking time and place in a culture. Placing one's family archives in a repository or digitizing them for a Web site is like burying the dead. Just as we understand that the first public cemeteries were places where people visited, much like parks, archives and Web sites are also places to be visited. Archives, like cemeteries, provide a place to keep the dead's remains, with the markers providing vital information; even if you don't know the person buried before you, you nevertheless feel some relationship with them (they were once alive like you, and they are now deceased like you will be one day).



Cemeteries associated with war casualties have had an interesting relationship, one suggesting that cemeteries are like archives. We have devoted great energy and resources to trying to identify and properly bury those killed in battle, often under the most horrendous circumstances. Early on in American warfare, recordkeeping about the dead was quite poor. Efforts have been made to correct this. During the Korean War, the personnel assigned to collect bodies were instructed not to accept them without basic information.<sup>105</sup> One of the problems in identifying war dead is the condition of the remains recovered, but this challenge may be comparable to the fragmentary documentary remains historians and other researchers wrestle with in their work. The recovery of the dead from battlefields reminds us of the efforts of archivists and collectors to gather up documentary remains. In the case of war, as is very similar to the archival impulse, there is a strong desire to ensure we remember those lost in war, soldiers and civilians alike. Archives are full of the dead, trying to be remembered by having their records discovered, their voices heard, and their stories repeated.

The American Civil War was a landmark in war documentation, a turning point recounted remarkably effectively by Drew Gilpin Faust. In a time when we are mired again in war dividing our nation, Faust reminds us that the American Civil War resulted in more American deaths than every other war combined.<sup>106</sup> Faust provides information about the creation of new kinds of public and private recordkeeping. Condolence letters sent to the families of the dead are held onto, the memory relics of loved ones lost. Hospital workers devised new ways to identify the dead, including the creating and using of recordkeeping forms sent to the battlefields to ensure that the identity of the dead would not be lost. Soldiers and civilians made efforts to leave markers behind on the

battlefields. The notion of national cemeteries emerged, with some of these cemeteries short distances from where the soldiers had fallen. Civilians, working with charitable organizations, voluntarily compiled data on the dead, developing printed notebooks to guide such information capture. Soldiers, as they went into battle, resorted to pinning nametags and even letters home to themselves in hopes they could be identified if killed. Military leaders worked to gather and protect information about the dead, where they were buried or reburied, and, after the war, to develop accurate lists of those killed.

Cemeteries also provide an interesting connection between collective memory and archives. As David Lowenthal notes, “Tombstones make up the great bulk of all memorials. . . . But all old graveyards become increasingly collective: as the interred lose personal significance for the living, their monuments no longer recall particular forebears but bespeak the common ancestral past.”<sup>107</sup> This assessment also speaks to one way archives contribute to public memory. Box after box of documents meld together to suggest a kind of collective shape or testimony to the past, the power of the past on the present. Even if the boxes are never opened and the documents never read, the accumulation of records provides a strong sense that we have a past that can be opened. If cemeteries remind us of how communities built themselves around these public spaces, archives, often festooned with memorial plaques and other markers, also play a similar role; both are “cities of the dead.”<sup>108</sup>

Considering the nature of modern warfare, we learn why both memory and archives are so important. The horrors of the Holocaust and other genocidal conflicts is the specter of the missing, the lost, where, nevertheless, routine government and organizational documents can fill in many blanks.<sup>109</sup> While archivists, and librarians and

museum curators, are fixated today on the potential negative impact on open access, intellectual property restrictions, and the power of digital technologies being shut down by profit-hungry corporations and secretive governments, we must remember that the impact of war has been more powerful in drowning the voices of the past.

*Technology of War and Archives.* Participants in, and witnesses of, war often tend to be more consistently expressive and eloquent, even if it is via e-mail or blogs. The issue is whether e-mail recipients or blog readers see these newer document forms as something to be treasured. It is one thing to hold a physical letter, dated 1942, and another to read an e-mail from the Iraqi front, dated 2005. Archivists, and other scholars, have much yet to learn about these fundamental differences in war letters. Even more important, spouses and relatives have another skill set to learn in order to maintain digital letters; the day of opening an old shoebox found in an attic to discover letters of a grandfather who served in the military during wartime is over. We need to be much more deliberate in how we view these newer documents.

Few would argue that war does not involve technology, but wars fought in what has become the digital era are different. In considering the release of the notorious Abu Ghraib photographs, Susan Sontag considers how this kind of photography reflects the impact of everyone being armed with a digital camera and possessing Web access.<sup>110</sup> This also reflects a shift in individuals documenting themselves, something archivists will need to come to terms within their work. As Rich Ling suggests, the “mobile telephone has evolved into a significant repository of personal information,” with its history of text messages, call logs, capturing of photographs.<sup>111</sup> It should be no surprise, then, that these devices are documenting warfare in a way never experienced in past conflicts.

Technology also has led to new kinds of memorialization. In the Internet Age, memorialization doesn't decline, it merely shifts. One commentator describes the idea of the "MEmorial – that allows students and citizens to use the Internet as a civic sphere."<sup>112</sup> Staged photographs, controlled media, and battle as a kind of ballet have disappeared in an onslaught of personal views of pain, suffering, death, and destruction. As Sontag worried, perhaps we have become numb to warfare in a way even Hollywood films never could do. With the new media, we have an intensive lens into battle providing far more first-hand documentation. While the ordinary soldiers of the Second World War may have belonged to the "greatest generation," the ordinary soldiers of today may be part of the greatest documented generation.

Long before the Internet, our notions of war, and our memories of it, were shaped by motion picture film. At times archivists have been embroiled in debates about the use of historical sources in documentaries, such as in Ken Burns's *Civil War* series in the early 1990s, and archivists have tended, like many historians, to be skeptical of the filmmaker's approach to historical assessment and interpretation. For quite some time, historians and other scholars have been contending with how film influences our sense of the past.<sup>113</sup> As a chief player in public history, then, archivists ought to be both cognizant about how they might use film to promote their own mission and be aware of their responsibility for managing this form of documentary material. This won't be easy, however, as Bill Ivey, in his assessment of the increasing corporate control of our documentary heritage notes. Ivey laments that archival programs have had particular difficulty dealing with the "intangible heritage," the sounds, images, tapes, and films that are a critical part of our documentary heritage, and all parts of the heritage most often

targeted by for-profits in terms of their controlling intellectual property. Film is, as Robert Rosenstone describes, a powerful means for orienting people to past events, in that they seem to “speak facts directly” and in an “unmediated” fashion.<sup>114</sup> But, as he contends, history is more than just raw evidence and facts; it is stories.<sup>115</sup> If we believe that archives are full of stories, and that stories about war are particularly compelling, then we can understand why films about war, both fictional accounts and documentaries, have been important. While we seem to be witnessing a swing back to the telling of stories, we must be aware of how we utilize archival sources in such storytelling.<sup>116</sup>

Archivists have to develop more critical methods for considering how documentary filmmakers are viewing events such as war, since they can have immense influence on the public and how it views not just war but the nature and purpose of archives. Robert Brent Toplin’s study about Michael Moore’s Iraq War documentary is a case in point. Toplin, sorting through the hype and rhetoric about Moore’s *Fahrenheit 9/11*, seeks to address what he believes is the “principal question” about the film, “whether the film . . . was truthful in its treatment of recent events.”<sup>117</sup> Moore is also a master storyteller, employing little-known sources or re-interpreting well-known sources. Toplin acknowledges that it is difficult at this stage to appreciate fully the importance of Moore’s film, but he ultimately suggests that it “will likely emerge as a significant source in American political history, for it demonstrated the potential of a feature-length documentary film to engage the American people in lively discussion about important political matters.”<sup>118</sup> Engaging the public – this is what archivists certainly need to do, and could do if they mine the depths of their holdings on war and all of its emotional overtones and implications.

Technology has always been a factor in warfare, and not just because of weapons development. Many people believe that there are true histories of particular battles that can be unearthed by diligence, using technology and its changes. Thomas Desjardin, considering the interpretation of the Gettysburg battle, states, “While people seldom ponder how this story may have come into being, they seem to believe that somewhere and somehow the truth is recorded in a place that hardworking scholars can locate and pass on to the rest of us. The fact of the matter, however, is that history does not spontaneously appear from the mists of battle and find a home on the shelves of musty old archives.”<sup>119</sup> Desjardin dotes on storytelling, the role of myths and legends, portrait painters, and other approaches to discovering this battle’s past. Desjardin also considers how modern technologies have exaggerated the process of interpretation, noting that the struggle of the past is “greatly intensified by technological advances in communication. While it took John Bachelder nearly half a lifetime to create the idea of the High Water Mark of the Rebellion, today a handful of e-mails and a website can create powerful urban legends in a matter of weeks.”<sup>120</sup> In battle after battle, war after war, we can see how technology has both enhanced and complicated our understanding of the history and legacy of war.

A large portion of the scholarship about war and memory has focused on the Holocaust, due to its horrific consequences and that this effort to eradicate a people occurred when documentation technologies had advanced. The photograph plays a compelling role in documenting the Holocaust. Janina Struk analyses such photographs, building from the period just before the Nazi era as one establishing the authority of the photograph as “scientific evidence,” a belief exploited by the National Socialists to be

used against the Jews. The Nazis were great users of photographs, documenting nearly every phase of their horrific regime, although the victims of the Holocaust also used this technology. As a result, we have photographs from both victims and their oppressors, with guards in concentration camps and Jewish and other Holocaust victims all clandestinely snapping away with their cameras. The Holocaust is one of the best-documented (and certainly most studied) atrocities in history. As Struk writes, “Photography was integral to the operation of some of the concentration camps. Whether taken for prisoners’ identity papers, or as evidence of the most abhorrent medical experiments, photographs appear to have played an important role.”<sup>121</sup> Yet, these photographs still represent some amazing challenges concerning their use. Photographs taken both by the inflictors of genocide and the victims were used and re-used in ways different from their original intent, being retrofitted into propagandistic purposes or completely misinterpreted. Many of the photographs were copied, recopied, and recopied again without attribution (or they never had any attribution) to the point where their evidential value has become fuzzy. As the Holocaust industry has taken off in the past two decades, issues of copyright and intellectual property ownership have become obstacles to the use of certain images. The access to Holocaust images has become more widespread thanks to the Internet, but increased dissemination has lessened control as well as minimized accurate interpretation. Examining Holocaust photography reminds us of how technologies are intertwined with war and our ability to understand the societal implications of humanity’s efforts to destroy itself. There may not be another era in history as the Second World War whereby images have played such an important, if conflicted, role. We see the same image being used to tell very different stories. There

are photographs that have been cropped and used in startlingly different ways from their original purpose. Holocaust images residing in personal scrapbooks occasionally become public. Holocaust photographs, often with uncertain identifying information, have been used by controversial deniers of the Holocaust as proof that they are fabrications. And these images, increasingly used in museum exhibitions, movies, and publications, have tended to have a history of numbing one's sense to what they are depicting.

Wars bring difficult times for citizens and soldiers alike, and how individuals and governments create sometimes become prominent issues. The continuing debate over individuals detained by the federal government without access to legal counsel because they are suspected of terrorist activities brings to mind other earlier sad moments in American justice and fail play. The work of documentary photographer Dorothea Lange in photography for the federal government about the internment of Japanese-Americans, suggests that even though these photographs have been in the public domain, they nevertheless represent a little known aspect of Lange's career. The images, capturing a disturbing aspect in our past, were suppressed during the Second World War and, then, after the war were "quietly placed" in the National Archives.<sup>122</sup> This depositing of photographs in the archives was intended more as a burial than an act of preservation. The War Relocation Authority hired Lange to document the Japanese-America internment, then seemingly impeded many of her efforts: "A photographic record could protect against false allegations of mistreatment and violations of international law, but it carried the risk, of course, of documenting actual mistreatment."<sup>123</sup> Unfortunately, it is not unusual for governments to restrict records and information.<sup>124</sup>



Technology has also been employed to deal with the aftermath of both hot and cold wars. Archivists have struggled with the implications of computers for their work, but now it seems that technology is being used in creative ways to support them. Andrew Curry describes how efforts are being made, with the help of computers, to put back together Stasi files shredded as the Iron Curtain crashed. The Stasi, the East German secret police, sought to destroy its records, shredding by machine and ripping by hand 45 million documents into 600 million paper scraps. In May 2007 German computer scientists announced they had developed a way of doing this digitally, and that they could do it in five years.<sup>125</sup> Archivists and other records administrators have often worried about the weakening of the documentary heritage by the loss of its digital portion, here we have a complete reversal and digital technologies being used to rescue what was thought to be lost from the paper records. The Stasi documentation provides remarkable views into how police states develop new information technologies to control their citizens.<sup>126</sup> One study of these files notes, “artifacts often reflect the ideas, beliefs, achievements, and attitudes of long-lost civilizations; they also mirror their culture. Technology talks, it speaks the language of culture . . . the technological artifacts offer us rare and valuable insight into a very secret culture and community within which like in a secret cult, every member was trained to keep the methods and sources of their work hidden from the enemy and outsiders.”<sup>127</sup> This is a compelling argument for why archivists need to pay attention to both the documentary sources and the devices that created and stored them.

*Conclusion.* As I have written elsewhere, archivists face risks in documenting controversial political activities, including war (declared and undeclared).<sup>128</sup> Even if

their motives are honorable, striving to gather and preserve fragile documentary and other evidence that might otherwise be lost or compromised, archivists create the possibility of having their enterprise associated with patriotic and hagiographic functions. If archivists and museum curators can find themselves in trouble with interpreting events fifty years after, as in the case of the *Enola Gay* exhibition, what kinds of troubles will they find themselves in working on events just days after? Tasslyn Frame, using comment cards filled out by visitors to the redesigned exhibition featuring segments of the *Enola Gay*, with little commentary on the bombing and its effects, suggests the problems that an effort to avoid controversy also raised; Frame believes that the Smithsonian “lost its power to write national stories and histories,” leading to a conclusion that the museum ought to “support, memorialize, and commemorate American power, nationalism and national identity, not to question or critically examine that power and authority.”<sup>129</sup> It is difficult, however, if archives could operate effectively by seeking to avoid controversies.

Every document is the product of power relationships and other characteristics challenging any notion of neutrality. Robert McIntosh, considering Canadians’ efforts to document their experiences during the First World War, made this observation: “Are archivists independent creators of memory or handmaidens to the actual writers of our past? The answer is clear. Our memory of the past is embedded in a vast array of documents whose contents and meaning have been constituted and shaped along a long continuum of records manufacture astride which archivists are crucially poised. To be prepared to explain our archives-making across the spectrum of our work is to accept our accountability for these actions. It is also fully to acknowledge our authorship, our vital place in the creation of society’s memory. This is the agenda for a modern archival

science.”<sup>130</sup> Considering the ways in which war memory is constructed, of which archives are both product and producer, also poses other questions about the archival mission that archivists and the users of archives need to answer. At the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary meeting of the Society of American Archivists, an effort was begun to form a Military Archives Round Table, an action suggesting that archivists are beginning to be serious about at least a portion of our documentation related to war.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977).

<sup>2</sup> Avishai Margalit, *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> David W. Blight, *Beyond the Battlefield: Love, Memory, and the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), pp. 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> The idea of public memory has generated considerable reflections and studies, although the consensus seems to be that it is difficult to define with any precision. Scholars tend to adopt what can best be described as practical, working definitions. Alon Confino, for example, states "I would like to view memory as an outcome of the relationship between a distinct representation of the past and the full spectrum of symbolic representations available in a given culture"; Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *American Historical Review* 102 (December 1997), 1391. Barbie Zelizer suggests one reason why the idea of memory is so difficult to pin down, while also highlighting one of its most distinctive characteristics: "Collective memory is both

---

more mobile and mutable than history;" Barbie Zelizer, "Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12(June 1995), p. 216. Public memory is seen to be a process, different in different places and times, and distinctive from the effort to determine the truthfulness of the past. Perhaps viewing archives in war helps us to understand more fully archives as a process as well.

<sup>7</sup> Richard Ned Lebow, "The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe," in Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Wendell Berry, *Fidelity: Five Stories* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), p. 86.

<sup>9</sup> Robert Bevan, *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War* (London: Reaktion Books, 2006), p. 8.

<sup>10</sup> Andrew Carroll, ed., *War Letters: Extraordinary Correspondence from American Wars* (New York: Washington Square Press, 2002), p. 36. There are exceptions to the general trend. Louise Steinman discovered an old ammunition box of 500 letters written in 1941-1945 by her father to her mother when he was an infantryman in the Second World War in the Pacific. Her mother's letters were lost as he moved about during the war. Also there was a Japanese flag, and Steinman returned the flag to the Japanese soldier's family; Louise Steinman, *The Souvenir: A Daughter Discovers Her Father's War* (Chapel Hill: Alonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> Peter Fritzsche, "The Archive," *History & Memory* 17, no. 1/2 (2005): 22.

<sup>12</sup> Anne-Marie Condé, "Capturing the Records of War: Collecting at the Mitchell Library and the Australian War Memorial," *Australian Historical Studies*, 125 (2005): 152. For a fuller study of the war memorial and its archival activities and responsibilities, see

---

Alistair Thomson, *ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994). There were deliberate efforts by ANZAC soldiers to document secretly their experiences; see Annette Hamilton, "Skeletons of Empire: Australians and the Burma-Thailand Railway," in Kate Darian-Smith and Paula Hamilton, eds., *Memory and History in Twentieth-Century Australia* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 92-112.

<sup>13</sup> Michele V. Cloonan, "The Moral Imperative to Preserve," *Library Trends* 55, no. 3 (Winter 2007): 748-749.

<sup>14</sup> Joan Waugh, "Ulysses S. Grant, Historian," in Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh, eds., *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), pp. 5-38. See also Jim Cullen, *The Civil War in Popular Culture: A Reusable Past* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995).

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Brian Massachaele, "Memos and Minutes: Arnold Heaney, the Cabinet War Committee, and the Establishment of an Canadian Cabinet Secretariat During the Second World War," *Archivaria* 46 (Fall 1998): 147-174.

<sup>16</sup> Martha Hanna, *Your Death Would Be Mine: Paul and Marie Pireaud in the Great War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

<sup>17</sup> Samuel D. Kassow, *Who Will Write Our History? Emanuel Ringelblum, the Warsaw Ghetto, and the Oyneg Shabes Archive* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007).

<sup>18</sup> Tim Cook, *Clio's Warriors: Canadian Historians and the Writing of the World Wars* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006) is the best study of such an organized government effort, enhanced by Cook's knowledge of and sensitivity to archival issues. As Cook reminds us, "archives are not just the bare bones of history for

---

future generations; they are part of the history-making process. Archives are not neutral, nor are their creation impartial” (p. 38). See also Robert McIntosh, “The Great War, Archives, and Modern Memory,” *Archivaria* 46 (Fall 1998): 1-31.

<sup>19</sup> Chris Hedges, *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning* (New York: Anchor Books, 2002), p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., pp. 23, 26.

<sup>23</sup> Bernard-henri Lévy, *War, Evil, and the End of History*, trans. Charlotte Mandrell (Hoboken, N. J.: Melville House Publishing, 2004), pp. 3-4.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, Erna Paris, *Long Shadows: Truth, Lies and History* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2001).

<sup>25</sup> Historian John Bodnar believes that “public memory emerges from the intersection of official and vernacular cultural expressions”; John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 13.

<sup>26</sup> Historian Joseph Ellis writes, “all the vanguard members of the revolutionary generation developed a keen sense of their historical significance even while they were still making the history on which their reputations would rest. They began posing for posterity, writing letters to us as much as to one another. . . .”<sup>26</sup> a process effectively dramatized in the *John Adams* seven week series aired on HBO in the late winter 2008; Joseph Ellis, *Founding Brothers: The Revolutionary Generation* (New York: Vintage Books, 2002), p. 18. Just as David McCullough and Tom Hanks provided their cinematic

---

interpretations, these historical figures looked to the future, leaving us a legacy of their words, careers, institutions, and the nation they built. They wanted to instruct us, and they worried that this new nation was a fragile experiment – and they seemed conscious that their documents would form archives and their memoirs and other writings would fill libraries, all materials to be used in future generations. Jefferson bequeathed his personal library to be the nucleus of the Library of Congress, while he carefully arranged and indexed his personal papers. Adams labored to save every letter, note, and financial record and his heirs followed suit to build perhaps the most impressive family archives in American history. And the two engaged in a lengthy correspondence about the *meaning* of the American Revolution over the last fourteen years of their lives that was more for eventual public edification than for personal enjoyment and instruction. Their efforts reflected the intersection of war, memory, and the archival impulse as clearly as we can see in any time or place.

<sup>27</sup> Lucien X. Polastron, *Books on Fire: The Destruction of Libraries Throughout History*, translated by Jon E. Graham (Rochester, Vermont: Inner Traditions, 2007), p. x.

<sup>28</sup> Marek Sroka, “The Destruction of Jewish Libraries and Archives in Cracow during World War II,” *Libraries and Culture* 38 (Spring 2003): 147-165.

<sup>29</sup> See, for example, Michael A. Elliott, *Custerology: The Enduring Legacy of the Indian Wars and George Armstrong Custer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

<sup>30</sup> Denis Byrne, for example, makes a plea for using the notion of memory in cultural heritage work: “People who move through a landscape where they have lived or spent time in the past inevitably encounter traces of themselves there. These are not just physical traces, like old bicycles and discarded toys, left behind by their younger selves.

---

They also ‘encounter’ associations. Recollections and emotions are triggered by the sight of traces in the form of objects; they are also triggered by the sight, smell and feel of familiar places even when there is no tangible/physical trace of their former presence.”

Denis Byrne in Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson, Jr., and John Schofield, eds., *The Heritage Reader* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 155.

<sup>31</sup> Shahan Muffi, “Spoils of War: Excavating the Underground Trade in Buddhist Antiquities,” *Harper’s Magazine* 322 (April 2011), p. 39.

<sup>32</sup> Ori Z. Soltes, “Politics, Ethics, and Memory: Nazi Art Plunder and Holocaust Art Restitution,” in Elaine A. King and Gail Levin, eds., *Ethics and the Visual Arts* (New York: Allworth Press, 2006), pp. 75-78.

<sup>33</sup> One example is the Sayer Archive in London filled with Second World War materials, more than a hundred thousand items, acquired by private collector Ian Sayer, a businessman. See Andrew Roberts, “Raider of the Lost Archive,” *London Financial Times*, July 31, 2009, available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/b6759648-7d60-11de-b8ee-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1SuETThjP>, accessed July 23, 2011. We have *government military archives* (such as the Air Force Historical Research Agency, located at the Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama), *museums* (such as the Submarine Force Museum, located on the Thames River in Groton, Connecticut, operated by the U.S. Navy, and *battlefield and other historic sites* (such as the archival collections at the Chickamauga & Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia).

<sup>34</sup> David Glassberg, *Sense of History: The Place of the Past in American Life* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), p. 89.



---

<sup>35</sup> If one wants to understand Ken Burns and his use of documentary materials, I recommend that you start with Gary R. Edgerton, *Ken Burns's America* (New York: Palgrave, 2001) and Robert Brent Toplin, *Ken Burns's the Civil War: The Historian's Response* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). Both provide interesting insights into how Burns works and how he uses documentary sources.

<sup>36</sup> David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 187.

<sup>37</sup> Margaretta Jolly, "Love Letters versus Letters Carved in Stone: Gender, Memory and the 'Forces Sweethearts Exhibitions,'" in Martin Evans and Ken Lunn, eds., *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Berg, 1997), p. 115.

<sup>38</sup> Lesley J. Gordon, *General George E. Pickett in Life and Legend* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

<sup>39</sup> See Ian Buruma, *The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in Germany and Japan* (New York: Meridian Books, 1994).

<sup>40</sup> Peter Eisner and Knut Royce, *The Italian Letter: How the Bush Administration Used a Fake Letter to Build the Case for War in Iraq* (New York: Rodale, 2007), p. 4.

<sup>41</sup> See Robert M. Pallitto and William G. Weaver, *Presidential Secrecy and the Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007) and Ted Gup, *Nation of Secrets: The Threat to Democracy and the American Way of Life* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), as examples.

<sup>42</sup> See Victor Gondos, Jr. *J. Franklin Jameson and the Birth of the National Archives, 1906-1926* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).

- 
- <sup>43</sup> See, for example, W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005).
- <sup>44</sup> Martin Harwit, *An Exhibit Denied: Lobbying the History of Enola Gay* (New York: Copernicus, 1996), p. 225.
- <sup>45</sup> Philip Nobile, ed., *Judgment at the Smithsonian* (New York: Marlowe and Co., 1995), p. xix.
- <sup>46</sup> Kai Bird and Lawrence Lifschultz, eds., *Hiroshima's Shadow* (Stony Creek, Conn.: The Pamphleteer's Press, 1998), p. xxxvi; Nobile, p. xxxix.
- <sup>47</sup> Elizabeth Yakel, "Museums, Management, Media, and Memory: Lessons from the *Enola Gay* Exhibition," *Libraries & Culture* 35 (Spring 2000): 299.
- <sup>48</sup> See Robert Jay Lifton and Greg Mitchell, *Hiroshima in America: A Half Century of Denial* (New York: Avon Books, 1995).
- <sup>49</sup> Hiroaki Kuromiya, *The Voices of the Dead: Stalin's Great Terror in the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
- <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 254.
- <sup>51</sup> Tom A. Adami, "'Who Will Be Left to Tell the Tale?' Recordkeeping and International Criminal Jurisprudence," *Archival Science* 7 (2007): 214.
- <sup>52</sup> Jeffrey Kimball, *The Vietnam War Files: Uncovering the Secret History of Nixon-Era Strategy* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), p. 1.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 297.
- <sup>54</sup> John R. MacArthur, *Second Front: Censorship and Propaganda in the Gulf War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

---

<sup>55</sup> Stuart E. Eizenstat, *Imperfect Justice: Looted Assets, Slave Labor, and the Unfinished Business of World War II* (New York: Public Affairs, 2003).

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 346. There are suggestions, as well, for how records may be used differently in the future. In light of the continuing controversies about the role of auditing firms in corporate America, *Imperfect Justice* provides evidence of their critical role when they are used properly. Eizenstat relates how the three year \$200 million audit of the Swiss banks, refusing to centralize their records and reluctant to cooperate at nearly every stage, was the “most extensive and expensive audit in history,” locating over four million accounts from the 1933-1945 era (p. 179). The implications are even greater for future wars, muses Eizenstat: “For the first time in the annals of warfare, systematic compensation was sought and achieved for individual civilian victims for injuries sustained by private companies as well as by government – for everything from forced labor to lost property rights arising from bank accounts, insurance policies, artworks, and other physical property. This will provide a benchmark for future battles” (p. 343). The value of archives for accountability is a major thesis of his book.

<sup>60</sup> Zlata Filipovic and Melanie Challenger, *Stolen Voices: Young People’s War Diaries, From World War I to Iraq* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006). Compare this to Alexandra Garbarini’s study of Holocaust diaries – *Numbered Days: Diaries and the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). Garbarini suggests, while diarists

---

through history compiled diaries as a mechanism to record their experiences, these Jewish diarists also wrote in order to live, “writing themselves into the future” (p. 5).

<sup>61</sup> Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271.

<sup>63</sup> G. Kurt Piehler, *Remembering War the American Way* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1995), p. 54.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>65</sup> Eric Enrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof: Genealogy, Racial Science, and the Final Solution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007). See also Astrid M. Eckart, “Managing Their Own Past: German Archivists Between National Socialism and Democracy,” *Archival Science* 7 (2007): 223-244.

<sup>66</sup> Peter Krauss, *Portrait of War: The U.S. Army’s First Combat Artists and the Doughboy’s Experience in WWI* (New York: John Wiley & Sons. Inc., 2007), p. 2.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 178.

<sup>68</sup> Marita Sturken, *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the Aids Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 10.

<sup>69</sup> Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York: Collier Books, 1990), p. 270.

<sup>70</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, p. 77.

<sup>71</sup> Holly Everett describes these memorials in this fashion: “Like formal tragedy and war memorials, vernacular memorials attempt to acknowledge and commemorate the unthinkable, as well as to address significantly different perceptions of the past and the

---

present. Here, too, are struggles between the vernacular and the governmentally sanctioned – the private and public interpretation of tragic and sometimes criminal events.” Holly Everett, *Roadside Crosses in Contemporary Memorial Culture* (Denton, Texas: University of North Texas Press, 2002), p. 119.

<sup>72</sup> Michael Kimmelman, “A Stark Memorial in Vienna Confronts a Dark Legacy,” *New York Times*, 30 October 2000.

<sup>73</sup> Sturken, *Tangled Memories*, p. 60

<sup>74</sup> Maya Lin, “Making the Memorial,” *New York Review of Books* (November 2, 2000), pp. 53-55.

<sup>75</sup> See Thomas W. Laqueur, “Memory and Naming in the Great War,” in John R. Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 150-167.

<sup>76</sup> Kristin Ann Hass, *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), p. 22.

<sup>77</sup> David Glassberg and J. Michael Moore, “Patriotism in Orange: The Memory of World War I in a Massachusetts Town,” in John Bodnar, ed., *Bonds of Affection: Americans Define Their Patriotism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

<sup>78</sup> Edward Tabor Linenthal, *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003), p. 216.

<sup>79</sup> Nicolaus Mills, *Their Last Battle: The Fight for the National World War II Memorial* (New York: Basic Books, 2004).

<sup>80</sup> Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and An American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

---

<sup>81</sup> Piehler, *Remembering War*, p. 2.

<sup>82</sup> Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 4.

<sup>83</sup> See, for example, Margaret Procter, Michael Cook, and Caroline Williams, eds., *Political Pressure and the Archival Record* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005).

<sup>84</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers*., p. 65.

<sup>85</sup> Piehler, *Remembering War*, p. 33.

<sup>86</sup> Paul Williams, *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities* (New York: Berg, 2007), pp. 4-5.

<sup>87</sup> Mark Roseman, *A Past in Hiding: Memory and Survival in Nazi Germany* (New York: Picador USA, 2000), p. 13.

<sup>88</sup> Michael E. Stevens, "Voices From Vietnam: Building a Collection from a Controversial War," *American Archivist* 64 (Spring/Summer 2001): 120.

<sup>89</sup> Robert E. Bonner, *The Soldier's Pen: Firsthand Impressions of the Civil War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006).

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>91</sup> David Reynolds, *In Command of History: Churchill Fighting and Writing the Second World War* (New York: Random House, 2005), p. xix.

<sup>92</sup> Many of the leading figures of warfare went to great lengths not only to use their experiences for their later careers but also to preserve documentary sources that would ensure they were remembered. We know a lot about the production and fate of the personal papers of prominent military leaders, such as Robert E. Lee, who benefitted

---

from the increased accessibility to good paper and writing materials, the creation of a postal system, improved schooling, and standardization in grammar. When Federal troops took over Arlington at the beginning of the Civil War, Mrs. Lee removed various family and personal papers to other residences; Elizabeth Brown Pryor, *Reading the Man: A Portrait of Robert E. Lee Through His Private Letters* (New York: Viking, 2007).

<sup>93</sup> See, for example, Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

<sup>94</sup> Deborah D. Buffton, “Memorialization and the Selling of War,” *Peace Review* 17 (2005): 26.

<sup>95</sup> SAA/ACA Joint Statement on Iraqi Records, issued April 22, 2008, available at <http://www.archivists.org/statements/IraqiRecords.asp>, accessed May 6, 2008.

<sup>96</sup> Weeks, *Gettysburg*, p. 182.

<sup>97</sup> See Cecilia Elizabeth O’ Leary, “‘B’Blood Brotherhood’: The Racialization of Patriotism, 1865-1918,” in Bodnar, *Bonds of Affection*, pp. 70-72.

<sup>98</sup> See, for example, Itamar Levin, *The Last Deposit: Swiss Banks and Holocaust Victims’ Accounts*, translated by Natasha Dornberg (New York: Praeger, 1999) and Tom Bower, *Nazi Gold: The Full Story of the Fifty-Year Swiss-Nazi Conspiracy to Steal Billions from Europe’s Jews and Holocaust Survivors* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997).

<sup>99</sup> For example, consider Napoleon and his ransacking of cultural materials in Europe and the Middle East, such as the Rosetta Stone – one of the most famous of ancient documents. John Ray writes, “It was fought, or quarreled, over by two superpowers, and even now the question of who owns it, or who ought to own it, is an important one. The

---

stone, if we listen to it carefully, may be telling us about our future as well as our past”;

John Ray, *The Rosetta Stone and the Rebirth of Ancient Egypt* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), p. 7.

<sup>100</sup> Hector Feliciano, *The Lost Museum: The Nazi Conspiracy to Steal the World’s Greatest Works of Art* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), p. 7. For other valuable accounts, refer to Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe’s Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* ((New York: Vintage, 1995) and Konstantin Akinsha and Grigoril Kozlov, with Sylvia Hochfield, *Beautiful Loot: The Soviet Plunder of Europe’s Art Treasures* (New York: Random House, 1995).

<sup>101</sup> See, for example, Edwin Black, *IBM and the Holocaust: The Strategic Alliance Between Nazi Germany and America’s Most Powerful Corporation* (New York: Crown Books, 2001) and Isabel Vincent, *Hitler’s Silent Partners: Swiss Banks, Nazi Gold, and the Pursuit of Justice* (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1997).

<sup>102</sup> See, for example, Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996) and *The Faustian Bargain: The Art World in Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

<sup>103</sup> Today, we can see how this will work out, in this case in another kind of war, as companies control more and more intellectual property with potentially deadly implications for the arts, cultural expression, and the general quality of life.<sup>103</sup> In the meantime, it is clear that corporate archivists also suffer from a weak professional ethics framework, perhaps not unique to them and their work environment, but certainly more noticeable because of the influence that corporations have on our society. See, for



---

example, Bill Ivey, *Arts, Inc.: How Greed and Neglect Have Destroyed Our Cultural Rights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

<sup>104</sup> Robert Pogue Harrison, *The Dominion of the Dead* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. x.

<sup>105</sup> Michael Sledge, *Soldier Dead: How We Recover, Identify, Bury, and Honor Our Military Fallen* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), p. 57.

<sup>106</sup> Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), p. xviii.

<sup>107</sup> David Lowenthal, *The Past Is A Foreign Country* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 323.

<sup>108</sup> William Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), p. 1.

<sup>109</sup> See Götz Aly, *Into the Tunnel: The Brief Life of Marion Samuel, 1931-1943* (New York: Metropolitan Books, published in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2007).

<sup>110</sup> Susan Sontag, *At the Same Time: Essays and Speeches*, eds. Paolo Dilonardo and Anne Jump (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 2007). pp. 132-133.

<sup>111</sup> Rich Ling, *New Tech, New Ties: How Mobile Communication Is Reshaping Social Cohesion* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), p. 97.

<sup>112</sup> Gregory L. Ulmer, *Electronic Monuments* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), p. xvii.

<sup>113</sup> Such as Robert Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History* (Harlow, U.K.: Pearson Longman, 2006).

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., p. 155,

<sup>116</sup> While archivists need to be aware of how documentary materials are used and represented in film, they must be sensitive to the fact that filmmakers are entertaining not educating the public. Archivists can learn about telling stories, but they must be restrained in how they critique the films from their own perspective. See Kathleen Epp, "Television from the Trenches: An Archival Review of *No Price Too High*," *Archivaria* 50 (Fall 2000): 137 and Ernest J. Dick, "History on Television: A Critical Archival Examination of 'The Valour and the Horror,'" *Archivaria* 34 (Summer 1992): 199-216. Some movies, such as *Schindler's List*, have expressed such powerful messages as to become in their own right critical documentary sources; Tim Cole, *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler; How History Is Bought, Packaged, and Sold* (New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 75.

<sup>117</sup> Robert Brent Toplin *Michael Moore's Fahrenheit 9/11: How One Film Divided a Nation* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2006), p. 6.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>119</sup> Thomas A. Desjardin, *These Honored Dead: How the Story of Gettysburg Shaped American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2003), p. 13.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, p. 206.

<sup>121</sup> Janina Struk, *Photographing the Holocaust: Interpretations of the Evidence* (London: I. B. Taurus in association with European Jewish Publications Society, 2004), p. 102.

---

<sup>122</sup> Linda Gordon and Gary Y. Okihiro, eds., *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the Censored Images of Japanese American Internment* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2006), p. 6.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>124</sup> The U. S. National Archives has become more energetic in opening records related to the Japanese and the Second World War, publishing *Researching Japanese War Crimes Records: Introductory Essays* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration for the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group, 2006), with essays by half-a-dozen archivists and scholars. There is also a separate publication of *Select Documents on Japanese War Crimes and Japanese Biological Warfare, 1934-2006*, compiled by William H. Cunliffe, and a 1700 page finding aid on an accompanying CD compiled by Greg Bradsher. Growing concerns – by victims, scholars, and others wanting to provide greater disclosure of what had occurred during the war – led the U.S. Congress to pass the Japanese Imperial Disclosure Act in December 2000, establishing a group to identify and open any records on the matter of Japanese war crimes.

<sup>125</sup> Andrew Curry, “Intel Inside,” *Wired* 16 (February 2008): 149. You can read the story at [http://www.wired.com/politics/security/magazine/16-02/ff\\_stasi](http://www.wired.com/politics/security/magazine/16-02/ff_stasi).

<sup>126</sup> Kristie Macrakis. *Seduced by Secrets: Inside the Stasi's Spy-Tech World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>128</sup> See my *Flowers After the Funeral: Reflections on the Post 9/11 Digital Age* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 2003).

---

<sup>129</sup> Tasslyn Frame, “‘Our Nation’s Attic?’ Making American National Identity at the Smithsonian Institution,” *Material History Review* 50 (Fall 1999): 58.

<sup>130</sup> McIntosh, “The Great War, Archives, and Modern Memory,” p. 20.

<sup>131</sup> Kathy Wisser to SAA Archival Educators Roundtable Discussion List, 6 December 2011, 4:22 PM.