

---

## RETHINKING LIS AND ARCHIVAL EDUCATION AND PRACTICE IN THE PHILIPPINES: TAKING ON SOCIAL MEMORY AS A PARADIGM

**Iyra S. Buenrostro**

*School of Library and Information Studies  
University of the Philippines Diliman /  
Wee Kim Wee School of Communication and Information  
Nanyang Technological University*

### **Abstract**

*This article discusses the concept of social memory as a paradigm for the LIS and archival education and practice in the Philippines. The author argues that the close partnership between LIS and Archival Studies in the Philippines and the shift of functions from storage to access call for a “shared” paradigm, which is at the same time socially and culturally-sensitive. It is also explored in this essay the potential of the partnership or convergence between LIS and Archival Studies in the mediation of social memory, along with the ascribed responsibility and authority to archives and libraries in rendering access and information services. In this paradigm, both the librarians and archivists are brought into a position where they possess an understated power in collecting, establishing and propagating social memory.*

**Keywords:** archival education, social memory, library and information science education, libraries, archives

*“The archive is the metaphor used to describe memory...  
For many generations, the entry to this archive, remembering,  
was the golden path to wisdom and all knowledge  
that reaches beyond the here and now.”  
(Brockmeier, 2010, p.7)*

This essay revolves around the concept of *social memory* as a paradigm for the library and information science (LIS) and archival education and practice in the Philippines. Drawing on Thomas Kuhn’s definition of paradigm as an “entire constellation of beliefs and values, techniques and so on shared by the members of the community” (1970, p. 175), I argue that having a “shared” paradigm

---

from which the educators and practitioners of LIS and Archival Studies in the country can anchor their professional practice, pedagogy and scholarship is timely and significant. This paradigm may have already been in existence, deeply held and observed, yet we have not articulated or have been conscious of our philosophy and ontological principles that affect our views as librarians and archivists on the things we do and what we aim to achieve. This is an opportune time for us in the fields of LIS and Archival Studies to rethink or perhaps extend our mindset towards libraries and archives; especially for the archives as its theory and practice have been recently integrated in the curricula of LIS schools in the Philippines due to the growing concern on records, preservation and emerging technologies. This is not to say, however, that this paradigm is a replacement of the current system and structures in the education and practice of LIS and Archival Studies in the Philippines, but a progression away from the old hegemonic Anglo-American praxis and rather towards an alternative pluralist paradigm of thinking and being. Social memory as a paradigm will serve as a spectacle through which the libraries and archives set their vision to be institutions that embody heritage and collective identity (Cook, 2013; Jacobsen, Punzalan & Hedstrom, 2013; Taylor, 1982-83). It also offers an alternative trail to the past and facilitates our recognition of the enduring significance and impact of the materials that we are collecting and overseeing (Bastian, 2009).

Then, why articulate a “shared” paradigm for LIS and Archival Studies and not distinct paradigms for each discipline? How pronounced is the relationship between LIS and Archival Studies that the social memory paradigm is conceivably regarded as a sound grounding and direction for the pedagogy and practice of these fields? As we look closely at LIS and Archival Studies as ‘sister disciplines’, we would see that parallel to librarianship, the field of archiving itself and the professionalization of archivists have evolved through the years, albeit slower. In the early and mid-twentieth century, apprenticeship was traditionally the onset of an archival career, and having technical requirements including an advanced degree granted by schools of library and information or history only took place recently (Bastian & Yakel, 2006). Archival education has undergone many developments for the past three to four decades and it has thrived to make itself distinct from the major disciplines of library science and history (Yakel, 2004). In the Philippines, archival education still remains to be in the realm of library education even decades after the inception of the first formal archival courses in the country in 1954 at the University of the Philippines (UP) Department of Library Science (now UP School of Library and Information Studies or UP SLIS). This is due to the absence of a separate degree on Archives and Records Management and adequate number of local faculty with Archival Studies degree to handle the courses (Granda, Punzalan, & Montesa, 2001). Similarly, Archival Studies and LIS have instituted a close collaboration both in pedagogy and practice because of the preconceived notion of the library practitioners and even users about archives being components of libraries especially in academic environments (Golfo, 2014). Golfo further posits that since the pioneers in the archives profession in the Philippines were mostly professional librarians, the connection between the two disciplines has become more prominent through the years. At present, the convergence between LIS and Archival Studies is furthermore reflected in the CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) 46, s. 2012, the *Policies and Standards and Guidelines for the Bachelor of Library and*

---

*Information Science (LIS) Program*, which have been laid down to “institutionalize the profession’s central function of providing quality information service to library/information center clientele or users” (CMO 24, s. 2015, Sec 1.). This memorandum order contains program specifications, expected outcomes as well as competency standards for the library professionals. The personal and professional competencies expected of a graduate of the Bachelor of Library and Information Science (BLIS) programs include cultural competencies and knowledge and skills on preservation (CMO 24, s. 2015, Sec. 6.4). In the minimum requirements for designing the curricula, there are also suggested special topics on preservation of information resources as well as a course on indigenous knowledge and multi-culturalism.

Thus, given the current state of LIS and Archival Studies in the Philippines, where the latter is currently treated as a subfield of the former, archival education under LIS is expected to fulfill twofold roles: it must educate and train students to answer the needs of our society to meet the administrative, legal and functional requirements of public and private enterprises, and to preserve the documentary heritage for research and future generations (Huotari & Valtonen, 2003). If this trend will continue in the next several years, both librarians and archivists must strike a balance between treating the materials in their custody as information resources accessible for research, legal and administrative operations, and at the same time view these materials as community and societal resources devoted to social memory and identity construction. Cook and Schwartz (2002) emphasize that archives are places that do not only collect materials and memories of the past but these are spaces where memories are continuously made and where social power is traversed and corroborated. The negotiation of memories and power in the archives, as well as in the libraries, results in the creation of social memory which may shape and form collective or shared identity. This therefore brings both the librarians and archivists to a position where they possess an understated power in collecting, establishing and propagating social memory through various information services and access provisions.

At this juncture, there are two strands that I perceive as indicators of the need to have a shared paradigm among the LIS and archives professionals in the country: one is the *close partnership between LIS and Archival Studies*, which has been discussed earlier, and the other is the *shift of archives from storage to access*. I fully recognize that there are other reasons or grounds that can be studied, but for the confines of this paper, I will only focus on these two strands as well as the *concept of social memory*, and the *role of libraries and archives in the mediation of social memory*. I will not exactly define what memory is, as even scholars of memory find it difficult to find the precise meaning of this concept. But, I will review how it evolves from being inner or personal to social, and how it has been seen and represented in different disciplines. This will provide a deeper understanding of the importance of social memory and its malleable nature in the formation of history and identity, and the ability of libraries and archives to construct and shape it.

---

### **The Need for a Paradigm: Partnership and Shift**

Cook (2013) observes that the focus of archival thinking for the past 150 years has moved from evidence to memory to identity and community. In relation to the evolution of archival thinking, Cook claims that the focus or mindset of the archivists is what the paradigms or frameworks are about; most importantly the “ways of imagining archives and archiving” (p. 97). This imagination could also lead to ingenuity in terms of exhausting the possibilities of collaborations among disciplines involved with collecting, preserving and propagating memory. The partnership between LIS and Archival education and pedagogy can therefore help in enabling a shared understanding among the professionals and community that the libraries and archives are serving. However, Gilliland and White (2009) contend that despite the continuous debates over the locus of archival education as well as the needed core knowledge and skills for the last 200 years, there has been no attempt to examine the archival education in terms of its reflexivity and its potential to have culturally relevant pedagogy that could promote pluralization of the archival paradigm. In an earlier study, it has already been proposed for the archival education in the Pacific Rim to integrate a more inclusive and culturally sensitive recordkeeping archival education programs for the purpose of having a discourse on the pluralization of the archives – with implication on all aspects of archival thinking, practice, education, and research (Gilliland, McKemish, White, Lu, & Lao, 2008). The idea of archival pluralism embraces diversity and multiculturalism and paves way to the marginalized groups whose memories and identities are usually not visible due to the exclusion of evidences in libraries, archives, and even in museums. This therefore raises the challenge to archival education and practice in equalizing the requisites of the dominant groups, marginalized groups, and what shall be *remembered* and *forgotten*.

Along the same line, the status and expectations ascribed to library schools in the Philippines in providing both conceptual and practical competencies to future LIS professionals have extended from the conventional library and information services to archival functions with particular focus on the preservation of information artifacts such as historical and cultural documents. The boundaries that delineate these two disciplines from each other are becoming more and more blurry. The fields of LIS and Archival Studies may have different foundational theories, principles, and practices but their shared and transparent mission of creating bonds with people through the creation of information, cultural and memory agencies has prompted the practitioners of these fields to draw on their similarities rather than build rigid walls between them. Library guidelines and standards in the Philippines seem to have already recognized the heritage and cultural responsibilities of librarians as these professionals are also expected to perform archival functions, specifically access and preservation.

Aside from the partnership between LIS and Archival Studies in terms of education and practice is another aspect that calls for a shared paradigm among LIS and archives professionals – the archives’ change of focus. The focus of archives is said to have shifted from storage to access (Menne-Haritz, 2001). Before this shift, storage and preservation had been considered to be one of the earliest missions of libraries and archives. Public access, however, was not the utmost priority of the early libraries and

---

Buenrostro, I. S. (2015). *Rethinking LIS and Archival Education and Practice in the Philippines: Taking on Social Memory as a Paradigm*. *Journal of Philippine Librarianship*, 35, pp. 19-34.

---

archives. As we can see from the history of books and libraries, the earliest mission of the library was maintaining a repository, when the earliest Sumerian libraries kept clay tablets in their temple libraries to keep records on commercial accounts, treatises on medicine and astrology, hymns, prayers and incantations, literary works and early codifications of laws (Rubin, 2000). These objectifications of culture, as posited by Assmann (2008), were deliberately created and preserved in these early libraries and archives, not solely to support scholarship and religious practices, but to have evidence of the grandeur of the dynasty and civilization that built it (i.e. The Great Library of Alexandria in Egypt). This shows that social and historical memories are shaped to build a prestigious identity that will make the present remember and honor the past. Unfortunately, these objectifications or the materials in the early libraries, archives, and even the monuments could not survive for so long. The remaining fragments of these objectifications or surrogates, will therefore constitute what remains to be remembered. Thus, on top of the responsibility of librarians and archivists to preserve objects of memories is the communication of memory by making them available for use, and this is known to be one of the reasons why these memory institutions are in existence (Manzūch, 2009).

With the emergence of technology, the increasing availability of archives online and digitized surrogates of the originals has brought substantial transformations on how users access and utilize archival materials (McCausland, 2011). These changes require a different or perhaps a new kind of mediation or assistance from the archivists and archival institutions in rendering access services to their users. This gives us an impression that regardless of the subject or format of materials, providing access to materials may appear to be a universal function along with preservation. However, access and preservation as functions alone do not exactly show the nuances of the nature of archives, archiving, and what is being archived. *Remembering* and all the other means of bringing the past to life in an archives involve more than just access to documents (Blouin & Rosenberg, 2007). Remembering is a result of the convergence of all the other archival and library functions, which I argue to be not merely administrative or technical tasks, but have deeper and wider societal implications.

In this context, my proposition is to have and operationalize the social memory paradigm that situates the libraries and archives in the Philippines as places not only dedicated for the preservation of materials but more explicitly as *spaces of memory-practice, community sharing, and identity shaping* (Bastian, 2003; Cook, 2007, 2013; Derrida, 1995; Kaplan, 2002; Ketelaar, 2005, 2009). In building communities and identities, memory or more specifically social or collective memory, is a central concept because a certain group recognizes itself and its roots from its memory of a common past (Ketelaar, 2005). Individual and shared identities arising from memories of a common (or even uncommon and unpopular past) are and will always be subjected to questions relating to subjectivity and varying interpretations. In a similar vein, the memory and identity constructed and reflected in the library or archival collection based on administrative aspects of library and archival management such as collection development policy, institutional goals and direction, as well as the personal biases of the personnel or the librarians and archivists may also be seen as partial and are influenced by various forms of prejudice. While it is true that libraries and archives often claim objectivity, transparency and

---

neutrality in maintaining their position as repositories of memories that will help shape identity as well as history, it must be noted, however, that it is also the very nature of memory which permits itself to be construed in different ways – signifying subjective, biased or disputing perspectives. Memory is fragile, and is never linear nor neutral. There is neither a discrete nor an absolutely complete memory. There will always be an expanse of discourses and negotiations where memories will be continually discovered, accepted or/and contested. As archives and libraries build their collection, more memories will be added and fragments of them may likewise disappear. This shows the power of these memory institutions in selecting and (re)creating memory and identity. Thus, archives and libraries do not simply serve as gateways to these common or shared memories, but they are *enablers* of these memories. Having this paradigm in place necessitates a deeper understanding of the concept of memory and how the practice of librarianship and archiving, which ideally begins with education and training, transcends the traditional margins of collecting, preserving and providing access to materials under their custody. Libraries and archives as memory institutions both mediate the construction of social memory. The mediating power of these memory institutions have been recognized in literature, as Taylor (1995) has claimed that “our collective memory would be sadly deficient without printed material in libraries” (p. 11), and Cook (2007) has strongly argued that “archivists are active agents in constructing social and historical memory. In so doing, they have an obligation to remember and consider the needs and expectations of the future as much as to conserve the past” (p. 170).

### Understanding Social Memory

Memory has always been synonymous with remembering, which is also believed to be the antithesis of forgetting. Memory, or the sheer process of remembering, helps us identify ourselves, our history, and our culture. Memory acts around different frames at certain spheres of time, space and identity, and remembering brings a marked sense of belonging and social obligation among individuals (Nora, 1989). Hence, the nature of memory, particularly *social* or *collective* memory, has been a central concept of interest in different disciplines such as sociology, history, literary criticism, anthropology, psychology, art history, political science, and among other fields including archival scholarship (Brockmeier, 2010; Cook, 2013; Jacobsen et al., 2013; Olick & Robbins, 1998). There are many kinds of memory and their examination diverges across disciplines. Psychologists have agreed that there are three types of long-term memory systems alongside the 256 different kinds of memory mentioned and cataloged in psychology journals (Tulving, 2007, cited in Brown, et al., 2009). Historically, the concept of memory has been a major concern for social thinkers since the Greeks, yet it was only until the late 19<sup>th</sup> and earlier 20<sup>th</sup> century that different social perspectives on memory came about (Olick & Robbins, 1998). To explicate the nature of memory, Assmann (2008) presents a schema in which individual, communicative, and cultural memories are formed in different levels called *inner*, *social*, and *cultural*.

At the inner or personal level, Assmann (2008) explains that “memory is a matter of neurological system” which is also known as personal memory or “the only form of memory that had been recognized as such until the 1920’s” (p. 109). Initiatives to elucidate the neurological foundations of

---

memory were conducted as early as 1861 by Paul Broca, and were then followed by two of the forefathers of experimental psychology, Wilhelm Wundt and Hermann Ebbinghaus, who began to study the cognitive substrata of remembering methodically with the use of modern science tools (Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, & Levy, 2011). During this period where science was the highest, if not the only source of reason, psychoanalysts such as Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung were also forming theories on collective memory but these were not based on the dynamics of social conditions, but on the inner, neuro-mental system of a person (Assmann, 2008). Empiricist philosophers since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, such as Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, and Bertrand Russell, connected their notion of objective knowledge to a formation of objective remembering wherein memories are considered as “retained sense data” (Climo & Cattell, 2002, p. 13). Technologies, including media, also affect the formation of memories that lead to remembering and also forgetting. Technologies are either internal or external mechanisms. For instance, the human brain itself is said to be a “technology of memory and that even its operations are historically malleable” (Olick et al., 2011, p. 6). There are also more recent scientific studies done about neural plasticity and its occurrence in the human brain to control one’s processes, behavior, and emotions. One of the studies done is on the mediation of oxytocin (OXT), a type of hormone which has an important function and role in short-term social memory. The laboratory tests, however, are usually done in rats or rodents, to measure how powerful this hormone is in retaining social memory given a particular biological stimulus (Lukas, Toth, Veenema, & Neumann, 2012).

Moving from the inner or personal memory to social memory and cultural memory, Assmann (2008) recognizes the fluid relationship of individuals among themselves and with various social conditions as they form their memories. Furthermore, Maurice Halbwachs, a French philosopher and sociologist, was the one who coined the term “collective memory” and the first scholar who theorized that “individual memory is socially mediated and structured” (Climo & Cattell, 2002, p. 23). His seminal books on collective memory were published in 1925 and 1950, and many other social scientists followed his view of collective memory as a social phenomenon as well as the dismissal of collective memory in biological terms (Climo & Cattell, 2002; Assmann, 1995). Halbwachs, who was deeply influenced by Bergson and Durkheim in rejecting the highly objective nature of logocentrism and passiveness of memory, is said to have given the term collective memory a theoretical substance that was previously unknown (Olick et al., 2011). Halbwachs (1992) believes that collective memory is a social product because “it is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognize, and localize their memories” (p. 38). He also claims that even our own memories are recollected through the eyes of another (Halbwachs, 1980). It will be easy to assume though, that collective memory is a mere combination of individual memories or recollections, but Halbwachs (1992) asserts that collective memories are formed when individual or personal memories place themselves in a larger framework. These frameworks may be induced by the existing political, economic and social circumstances, certain dominant groups, as well as the course of action set by various places of memories or *lieux de mémoire* (Nora, 1989) such as libraries, archives, museums, and other commemorative objects, media, sites and rituals.

---

In the literature succeeding the early works of Halbwachs, the terms *collective memory* and *social memory* are used interchangeably. James Wertsch (2002) remarks that the term collective memory, is “a term in search of meaning” (cited in Beiner, 2008, p. 107). Beiner further adds that the term ‘collective’ implies a connotation for homogeneity and scholars find this to be problematic. To avoid confusion, French (1995) suggests that instead of ‘collective,’ the term ‘social’ may be widely used to allow deeper exploration of the connection between social identity and historical memory. It also gives attention to the social context in which people shape their group and identity and a venue to deliberate their conflicting perceptions of the past. The use of the term social memory emerged in the late 1980s, which was also used by anthropologist James Fentress and medievalist Chris Wickham, who intended to move away from the notion of collective consciousness and overemphasis on group identities as well as abandonment of individual consciousness (French, 1995). Buck-Morss (1989) also recounts other theorists who made use of the concept of social memory, such as art historian Aby Warburg to interpret artworks as repositories of history, and Walter Benjamin to analyze the material world as an accrual of history, though he did not use the term social or collective memory (cited in Olick & Robbins, 1998). Media theorists Ong and Havelock in 1967 and 1988, respectively, also analyzed the relationship between collective memory and writing, as well as the other forms of inscription that laid the foundation for the later works of Jan and Aleida Assmann on cultural memory (Olick et al., 2011). Cultural memory evidently shares overlapping similarities with social memory, and is defined as a:

collective concept for all knowledge that directs behaviour and experience in the interactive framework of a society and one that obtains through generations in repeated societal practice and initiation  
(Assmann, 1995, p. 126).

Assmann (2008) emphasizes that cultural memory is communicated, manifested, objectified, and preserved in symbolic forms that serve as reminders, such as monuments, libraries, archives, and other mnemonic institutions. Further, cultural memory is based on “fixed points in the past”, that the past may not be wholly preserved as such but it is represented by symbols and things (Assmann, 2008, p. 113). Bietti (2011) likewise observes that the process of remembering and communication of memories is a dynamic, embodied and socio-cognitive phenomenon that is sustained by social agreement, and not merely a transmission of narratives of and from the past. Similar to how communication is viewed by Carey (1989) as a process not only primarily concerned with the mere transmission of messages from the sender to recipients, but having a shared experience, understanding and meaning among the actors is more essential. Moreover, Carey notes that the existence of society becomes possible because of the binding forces coming from shared information, including rituals and other cultural symbols and manifestations surrounding it. These shared information, experiences and manifestations of memories contribute to the process of remembering and establishment of identity which draw people together as a community.



Once more, remembering is a reconstruction of the past that is highly pliable and context-dependent. These memories can then be discussed, contested, negotiated, forgotten, suppressed or recovered, revised, invented or reinvented (Climo & Cattell, 2002). Once the communication of memories stops or the society declines to discuss and think about these memories, this will eventually lead to collective amnesia – or worse, loss of identity. As mentioned earlier, changes in the frames or frameworks will bring about forgetting, hence the stability or permanence of memories will depend on the strength of social bonds and frames (Nora, 1989). These social bonds and frames can be built and shaped in the libraries and archives as mediators of memory, as they collect materials from the past and present times, describe/catalog and preserve them, and make them accessible for the purpose of communicating memories to the present and future generations.

### **Libraries and Archives as Mediators of Social Memory**

One of the most contentious and still unsettled issues is the relationship of memory with culture and history – what memory to be captured and retained as cultural and historical memory. In the same vein, its long-standing relationship with libraries and archives as memory institutions is constantly being explored in both research and practice. This brings to the fore the notion of libraries and more so, archives being equated to evidence-keeping in order to avoid administrative mishaps, legal and ethical lapses as well as to combat collective amnesia. It can likewise be seen that the core archival functions, particularly appraisal and preservation, play a crucial role in the power and politics of societal remembering. Through the criteria used and the act of appraisal and selection, records worthy of permanent preservation are identified which in turn become a significant part of what is to be remembered – or should remain in societal consciousness subject to interpretation and contestation, and will then become part of history. This connection between memory and archives has therefore remained to be a dominant premise in the practice of archiving and in developing standards and guidelines that will equip the archives professionals with the much needed skills expected of them as archivists or “preservers of memory”.

If preservation of memory that is equivalent to remembering is a virtue, forgetting, on the other hand, is generally regarded as a failure (Connerton, 2008). However, it must be noted that remembering is neither absolute nor objective. The act of remembering is selective and manipulated to both increase the number of memories and hasten the process of remembering or to marginalize some realities not chosen to be commemorated by some dominant groups or those who hold power. However, Connerton (2008) argues that forgetting is not always a failure. The interplay between remembering and forgetting adds to the construct of social memory, where libraries and archives are part of. Archivists and those conventionally involved in the preservation of memory are also the same ones responsible for marginalizing recollections or *forgetting*. In the seminal work *Archive Fever: A Freudian Expression*, Derrida (1995) deconstructs the nature and function of the archive and posits that “the technical

---

structure of the *archiving* archive also determined the structure of the archivable content even in its very coming into existence and its relationship to the future. The archivization produces as much as it records the events” (p. 17). The act of archiving itself shapes reality, attempts to establish identity and creates social cohesion. Archives as well as libraries, therefore, are not only spaces for preserving and conserving materials of memory, but they arbitrate and evoke memories.

The materials found in archives and libraries or any other materials that are by-products of activities or documentations are not the memories themselves, but these are carriers of what can or will be remembered. Even the act of documentation is partial, although the documentalist will affirm objectivity in capturing information and memories. The archival function of selection and appraisal, which is considered to be the most intellectually demanding task for the archivists, is likewise subjected to some prejudice and judgment of the archivists, the institutional mandate, and the political, social, and cultural climate that envelope the existence of the archives. Even though, Sir Hilary Jenkinson (1922), the Father of Classical Appraisal Theory, warned the archivists that prejudice and subjectivity in evaluating the value of the records should be avoided (cited in Ridener, 2009), the subsequent modern theories of appraisal and selection, such as the modern appraisal theory of Theodore Schellenberg, call for a more evaluative function in selecting and appraising records that will establish evidential value and institutional memory.

The archival functions appraisal and selection of records are said to be one form of writing history. This goes along with taking the initiative of preserving them to make these surrogates of memory last. Archival theorists have put forward the dynamics of records creation and preservation in pluralizing the archives in society. For instance, the records continuum theory by Upward (1996) defies the traditional, linear, and time-bound records life cycle as a framework for recordkeeping. In the records continuum, it emphasizes the transcendental nature of memories to be created and captured by different forms of documentation and recordkeeping systems, especially in the last dimension where particular records are required to be preserved for the purposes of societal memory. One of its vectors is the *pluralization*, wherein records are now seen as part of the collective or social memory. It can be gleaned from here that archives, as representations of the past and spaces for memories, are social constructs. Their origins lie in the information needs and values of the stakeholders who have control over the collection and overall operations in the archives and libraries. These stakeholders are the leaders, governments, businesses, associations and individuals who created and established these memory institutions, as well as the librarians and archivists.

As regards exercising power and control over memories, Brown and Davis-Brown (1998) raise some political questions on who manipulates the libraries and archives and how the daily and basic activities in the library and archives such as acquisition, classification, and preservation affect what to include or exclude in the collection. For instance, the authors suppose that collection development in these memory institutions necessitates decisions on what is and what is not collected, what is to be stored but not catalogued, and what is to be thrown away. In the practice of librarianship, archiving,

---

and even museum curatorship, not everything can be kept and preserved because of certain limitations. These constraints include space, budget, expertise of the professionals who will manage the resources, some mandatory requisites, policies, censorship, and political and social conditions. The process of weeding and deselection in libraries and archives can be seen as a double-sided frame of remembering and forgetting. If remembering has a commemorative “selection” component, then what comprises forgetting? Connerton (2008) postulates that forgetting has different types and these can take place in various sites of memories: *repressive erasure*, *prescriptive forgetting*, *forgetting that is constitutive in the formation of a new identity*, *structural amnesia*, *forgetting as annulment*, *forgetting as planned obsolescence*, and *forgetting as humiliated silence*. The first three types manifest how libraries and archives aid in forgetting as much as they preserve memories. Repressive erasure may appear to be damaging, similar to what happened after the French Revolution where all the remnants of the past regime were wished to be eliminated. This entails historical revisionism that contradicts reality and the overriding social memory of the people. Prescriptive forgetting is also similar to repressive erasure, except that this is done for the benefit of all parties and to re-establish legitimacy and authority that had been lost. While forgetting is seen as a loss and gain in repressive and prescriptive forgetting, respectively, the third type of forgetting that is constitutive in the formation of a new identity is perceived to be valuable and rewarding. Connerton explains that:

The emphasis here is not so much on the loss entailed in being unable to retain certain things as rather on the gain that accrues in the management of one’s current identity and ongoing purposes. Forgetting then becomes a part of the process by which newly shared memories are constructed because a new set of memories are frequently accompanied by a set of tacitly shared silences (2008, p. 63).

Many factors can lead to forgetting such as traumatic memories. Forgetting can take place especially if majority of the society deems these occurrences or events to be too painful to remember. For instance, the memories of Holocaust, genocides, wars and other political and social upheavals in the history such as the effects and aftermath of colonialism, social injustices, and dictatorship influence the functions and operations in libraries and archives. It is also a dilemma for the libraries and archives whether to focus on canons and traditions, or to attempt to have diversity (Brown & Davis-Brown, 1998).

While libraries and archives are often portrayed as institutions where memories are preserved to avoid collective forgetting or amnesia, we must bear in mind that both remembering and forgetting take place in these memory spaces. In the preceding discussion about the nature of memory, memory is described as organic, active, temporal and context-dependent. These inherent characteristics of memory make it malleable and even more fragmented. In the frames of *lieux de mémoire*, there is no spontaneous or unprompted form of memory (Nora, 1989). Sites of memory such as archives and libraries, as well as museums and monuments are deliberately created, as well as anniversaries,

---

celebrations, and other constantly organized commemorative activities. Deciding what is significant in the libraries and archives lies on the interests to be acknowledged and what history or memory is to be privileged (Lloyd, 2007). The heritage that we know of today are the things from our past that still haunt us and which are mostly the ones that we, including the major stakeholders or decision-makers, want to remember as revealed through displays, libraries, archives and museums (Taylor, 1995). It is therefore the predicament of these information, cultural and “memory” institutions to maintain balance, *if possible*, between the dominant memories and the marginalized ones; and whether to adhere to autocratic selection of materials or to promote egalitarianism.

### Conclusion

We should begin and continuously take part in the social and cultural role of libraries and archives through a productive partnership between LIS and Archival Studies. Convergence must be seen as a “two-way street” because in this kind of environment, “students in other information disciplines can also benefit from archival perspectives, approaches to managing information, and skills” (Yakel, 2004, p. 154). Instead of being defensive as regards the existence and role of archives and try to veer away from its ‘sister’ discipline, the familiarity with libraries must be seen as an advantage where both libraries and archives can continue with the convergence process within the sphere of the social memory paradigm. This should start with understanding social memory as a concept and mindset for the practice, education and training that will hone our future librarians and archivists. I totally acknowledge that inevitably, Archival Studies in the Philippines will have its autonomy, and become an independent discipline from LIS. For now, with the current state of LIS and Archival Studies in our country, we must take advantage of the emerging potential of educating and training more professionals that will play crucial and influential roles in the formation of social memory.

As I end this essay, I believe that one of the more important questions to ponder is *why do librarians develop and continuously maintain libraries? Or why do archivists archive the archives?* The rhetoric of “what makes us all archivists”, articulated by Cook (2013), points out that “archivists are not archivists because they do the same things in different places...but what they do has its own significance” (p. 99). Archivists and librarians may assume that it is best to adhere to the prescribed pedagogical methods and widely standardized practices for the collection development, access and preservation of records and other materials of knowledge and memories. But, the underpinning intention of *why* they do it and *how important* it is to them and to the community they are serving is what matters most. This is where the value of having a common consciousness or paradigm lies as it will primarily set the grounding for the LIS and archives professionals, both in terms of education and practice. The LIS and archives professionals must allow themselves to be in a path that broadens their understanding of their mission, power, authority and responsibility; hence the need to have a more socially and culturally-sensitive paradigm, such as the social memory paradigm, that guides our education and professional practices as librarians and archivists.

---

**References**

- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, 95(65), 125-133.
- Assmann, J. (2008). Communicative and cultural memory. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook* (pp. 109-118). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bastian, J. A. (2003). *Owning memory: How a Caribbean community lost its archives and found its history*. Westport, CN: Libraries Unlimited.
- Bastian, J. A. (2009). Flowers for homestead: A case study in archives and collective memory. *American Archivist*, 72(1), 113–132.
- Bastian, J. A., & Yakel, E. (2006). Towards the development of an archival core curriculum: The United States and Canada. *Archival Science*, 6, 133-150.
- Beiner, G. (2008). In anticipation of a post-memory boom syndrome. *Cultural Analysis*, 7, 107-112.
- Bietti, L. M. (2011). Joint remembering: cognition, communication and interaction in processes of memory-making. *Memory Studies*, 5(2), 182-205.
- Blouin, F. X., & Rosenberg, W. G. (2007). Preface. In F. X. Blouin & W. G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Archives, documentation and institutions of social memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (pp. vi-ix). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Brockmeier, J. (2010). After the archive: Remapping the memory. *Culture and Psychology*, 16(1), 5-35.
- Brown, A. D., Gutman, Y., Freeman, L., Sodaro, A., & Coman, A. (2009). Introduction: Is an interdisciplinary field of memory studies possible? *International Journal for Politics, Culture, and Society*, 22, 117-124.
- Brown, R. H., & Davis-Brown, B. (1998). The making of memory: The politics of archives, libraries, and museums in the construction of national consciousness. *History of the Human Sciences*, 11(4), 17-32.
- Carey, J. W. (1989). A cultural approach to communication. In *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society* (pp. 13-36). Boston: Unwin Hyman.

- Climo, J. J., & Cattell, M. G. (2002). *Social memory and history: Anthropological perspectives*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order (CMO) 46, s. 2012. Policies and Standards and Guidelines for the Bachelor of Library and Information Science (LIS) Program.
- Connerton, P. (2008). Seven types of forgetting. *Memory Studies*, 1(59), 59-70.
- Cook, T. (2013). Evidence, memory, identity, and community: Four shifting archival paradigms. *Archival Science*, 13, 95-120.
- Cook, T. (2007). Remembering the future: Appraisal of records and the roles of archives in constructing social memory. In F. X. Blouin & W. G. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Archives, documentation and institutions of social memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (pp. 169-181). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cook, T., & Schwartz, J. M. (2002). Archives, records, and power: From (postmodern) theory to (archival) performance. *Archival Science*, 2, 171-185.
- Derrida, J., & Prenowitz, E. (1995). Archive fever: A Freudian expression. *Diacritics*, 25(2), 9-63.
- French, S. A. (1995). What is social memory? *Southern Cultures*, 2(1), 9-18.
- Gilliland, A., McKemmish, S., White, K., Lu, Y., & Lau, A. (2008). Pluralizing the archival paradigm: Can archival education in Pacific Rim communities address the challenge? *The American Archivist*, 71, 87-117.
- Gilliland, A., & White, K. (2009). Perpetuating and extending the archival paradigm: the historical and contemporary roles of professional education and pedagogy. *Interactions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Golfo, M. G. P. (2014). Educating Filipino archivists amidst the challenges of the 21st century archival profession. *Journal of Philippine Librarianship*, 34, 70-78.
- Granda, Y. C., Punzalan, R. L., & Montesa, T. S. (2001). Insight and foresight: Developing the Master of Archival Studies at the Institute of Library and Information Science, University of the Philippines. *Journal of Philippine Librarianship*, 22, 31-60.

- 
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. (L.A. Coser, Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Huotari, M. L., & Valtonen, M. R. (2003). Emerging themes in Finnish archival science and records management education. *Archival Science*, 3, 117-129.
- Jacobsen, T., Punzalan, R. L., & Hedstrom, M. L. (2013). Invoking “collective memory”: Mapping the emergence of a concept in archival science. *Archival Science*, 13, 217-251.
- Kaplan, E. (2002). ‘Many paths to partial truths’: Archives, anthropology, and the power of representation. *Archival Science*, 2, 209-220.
- Ketelaar, E. (2005). Sharing: Collected memories in communities of records. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 33, 44-61.
- Ketelaar, E. (2009). A living archive, shared by communities of records. In J. A. Bastian & B. Alexander, (Eds.), *Community archives: The shaping of memory* (pp.109-132). London: Facet Publishing.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lloyd, A. (2007). Guarding against collective amnesia? Making significance problematic: an exploration of issues. *Library Trends*, 56(1), 53-79.
- Lukas, M., Toth, I., Veenema, A. H., & Neumann, I. D. (2012). Oxytocin mediates rodent social memory within the lateral septum and the medial amygdala depending on the relevance of the social stimulus: Male juvenile versus female adult conspecifics. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 38, 916-926.
- Manzūch, Z. (2009). Archives, libraries and museum as communicators of memory in the European Union projects. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 14(2), 1-25.
- McCausland, S. (2011). A future without mediation? Online archives, archivists, and the future of archival research. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, 42(4), 309-319.
- Menne-Haritz, A. (2001). Access – the reformulation of an archival paradigm. *Archival Science*, 1, 57-82.

- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7-24.
- Olick, J. K., & Robbins, J. (1998). Social memory studies: From “collective memory” to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 105-140.
- Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (2011). *The collective memory reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ridener, J. (2009). *From polders to postmodernism: A concise history of archival theory*. Minnesota: Litwin Books.
- Rubin, R. (2000). *Foundations of library and information science*. New York: Neal Schuman Publishers.
- Taylor, H. A. (1982-83). The collective memory: archives and libraries as heritage. *Archivaria*, 15, 118-130.
- Taylor, H. A. (1995). Heritage revisited: Documents as artifacts in the context of museums and material culture. *Archivaria*, 40, 8-20.
- Upward, F. (1996). Structuring the records continuum-part one: Postcustodial principles and practices. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 24(2), 268-285.
- Yakel, E. (2004). Educating archival professionals in the twenty-first century. *OCLC Systems and Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, 20(4), 152-154.