

Letter to the Editor

The Scientific Nature of Archivology: A Proper Attribution

In his article "The Master of Archival Studies and the American Education Standards: An Argument for the Continued Development of Graduate Archival Education in the United States," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), at page 228, Richard Cox attributes to me and quotes a long paragraph about the scientific nature of archivology and its internal structure. While it can be technically said that the quoted words were written by me in the article "The Archival Body of Knowledge: Archival Theory, Method, and Practice, and Graduate and Continuing Education," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 34 (Winter 1993), at page 10, they constituted one paragraph of a one-page summary of an argument first presented and fully developed by Trevor Livelton in "Public Records: A Study in Archival Theory," (Master of Archival Studies thesis, the University of British Columbia, 1991), pp. 10-19, a revision and amplification of which is in course of being published by Scarecrow Press and the Society of American Archivists, with the title, *Archival Theory, Records, and the Public*. In the article in question, Livelton's ideas were properly attributed to him at page 23, note 7. I am certain that Richard Cox innocently misinterpreted the citation, and I wish to make sure that paternity of ideas is rightly assigned.

This letter should not be interpreted as an attempt to disassociate myself from Livelton's position. On the contrary, I wish I were the person who conceived such a brilliant conceptual construct. Thus, I am glad to take this opportunity to acknowledge, with a pride that anyone who has been an educator can understand, that the student has surpassed his teacher, who is anxiously waiting to learn more from him.

Luciana Duranti
Associate Professor
Master of Archival Studies
The University of British
Columbia