Book Reviews

Through the Archival Looking Glass: A Reader on Diversity and Inclusion. MARY A. CALDERA and KATHRYN M. NEAL, eds. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2014. xxiv, 296 pp. ISBN 1-931666-70-9.

Archivists have been worrying diversity for some time, as *Through the Archival Looking Glass* editors Mary Caldera and Kathryn Neal[1] point out from the start (p. xii). They state that "the impulse to create archives or to find oneself in archives (as agent, subject, or both) has its roots, we believe, in the very need to leave one's mark on the world, to tell one's story, to be seen" (p. ix). This human desire is at the heart of inclusion. We want our stories to matter, to be *included* in the totality of the human record. Both editors take the time to tell their own stories, describing how they came to value diversity[2] in an archival context and how their pasts contributed to their individual paths to understanding that value.

In many ways, we archivists have looked at diversity as a journey.[3] We marked early progress by counting how many members of various groups were involved in archival work. Then we began to expand our collections to include documentation of broader and more varied experiences. Finally, we started to look at the power and authority relationships inherent in the archival endeavour, and have since begun to open a bigger tent to the troupe of archives, archivists, and users of archives. These ideas drive two major

---

1   Both Mary A. Caldera, Head of Arrangement and Description in Manuscripts and Archives at Yale University Archives in New Haven, CT, and Kathryn M. Neal, Associate University Archivist at the University of California, Berkeley, have spent decades as leaders in the archival profession, especially in the cause of diversity and inclusion.
2   Diversity and inclusion are related but not synonymous. I have tried to respect their context in the text when using them.
3   The frequency of citation for Elizabeth Adkins' 2007 essay "Our Journey Towards Diversity" demonstrates the resonance of this metaphor. I mean no disrespect toward that work here. It is one of the most powerful articulations in the archival literature of both professional accomplishments and needs related to diversity and inclusion.

components of many current conceptualizations of diversity. The first is that diversity, however that word is defined, is "there" and we are "here." In other words, there is some diverse place, distant in both time and space, that we can get to from here. The second is that we can get to that place through the incremental *construction* of a more diverse profession, record, and user base.

Through the Archival Looking Glass takes a different tack. It provides a framework that allows us to see more clearly the multitudinous stories of human action and thought that already exist and the people who create them, care for them, and listen to them: "Our desire is to *illustrate* the multitudes of perspectives and issues, to provide a vehicle by which new voices can be heard along with more familiar ones and new concepts examined along with new treatments of established ideas. We seek to stimulate further conversation" (p. xix, emphasis added).

The chapters in *Through the Archival Looking Glass* are loosely arranged by theme. While they are sophisticated enough to resist strict categorization, they are grouped around three conceptual themes, which the editors identify as the key components of diversity (p. xiii). One group discusses theoretical underpinnings for diversity, inclusion, and pluralism. A second group discusses the diversification of the archival record. A third group discusses the educational structures designed to enhance diversity in the workplace and the profession. Not only have Caldera and Neal chosen a stellar set of essays, but they have also arranged them in a way that builds an understanding of their views of diversity and inclusion. Each essay can stand alone, but when read together and in order, they present a cohesive and persuasive reflection of what diversity in archives can look like.

Chapters 1 through 3 present very different ways of understanding diversity in archives. In "Identity and Inclusion in the Archives," Valerie Love and Marisol Ramos discuss archivists as community insiders who must continually negotiate contextual boundaries in order to connect archival content with both its creating community and others who might have use for it. Mark Greene's "Into the Deep End" takes on the archivist as community outsider, using a theoretical rationale for the need for diversity and inclusion in the archival endeavour. Jeffrey Mifflin approaches diversity from an epistemological stance in "Regarding Indigenous Knowledge in Archives" and presents the argument that archival practice and theory can be more inclusive than it is in the traditional Euro-American standards currently employed.

Chapters 4 through 7 illustrate how institutions, individuals, and communities are revealing the diversity of the archival record. T-Kay Sangwand uses postcustodial theory to reveal Cuban hip hop as archives in "Revolutionizing the Archival Record Through Rap." Vivian Wong, Tom Ikeda, Ellen-Rae Cachola, and Florante Peter Ibanez discuss the

crystal frontier of Asian-American community archives in "Archives (Re)Imagined Elsewhere." Both Sonia Yaco and Beatriz Betancourt Hardy's "A Documentation Case Study" and Kim Walters' "Respecting the Word" illuminate how traditional archival organizations can work effectively with communities to reveal their stories in meaningful and respectful ways.

The final three chapters of the *Through the Archival Looking Glass* use theory and case study to analyze the diversification of the archival workforce. In Sharon Thibodeau's "Building Diversity Inside Archival Institutions," workforce diversity is examined in relation to human resources policies and practices. Daniel Hartwig and Christine Weideman discuss the introduction of the archives to high schools students in "The Family and Community Archives Project." Graduate archival education is the subject of Anne Gilliland's "Pluralizing Archival Education."

Through the Archival Looking Glass exhibits a maturing concept of diversity. Gilliland's discussion of the use of pluralism instead of diversity highlights this: "acknowledging, respecting and addressing the multiplicity of perspectives, practices, and people involved in the creation, preservation, use, and interrogation of the record in society today" (p. 236). The chapters in this book highlight this maturation in three key ways.

The first is the democratization of the archive. Many of the authors have embraced the concept of community archives. They have also described a number of ways in which communities, archivists, and records can interact. At the heart of these interactions are intertwined issues of power, collaboration, trust, and conversation. In the Manilatown Archives in San Francisco, for instance, traditional archival means for storage, preservation, and access gave way to community solutions focused on archivists as "facilitator[s] for present day discussions on deeper issues of Filipino displacement and how archives could help address that" (p. 126). Both Mifflin and Walters, within different contexts, discuss the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials*[4] and their importance in minimizing power imbalances in conversations among archivists and Indigenous communities. And the Desegregation of Virginia Education (DOVE) project explicitly developed practices for creating collaboration and power-sharing in the development of its collection. All of these interactions hinge on the recognition that, as Greene puts it, "to have any hope of acquiring collections or breaking down other barriers, we [archivists] had to be present in the communities, not expect the communities to come to us" (pp. 28–29).

The second way is through the acknowledgement of activism both as a driver of diversity and inclusion but also as a product of it. As Kim Christen

---

4   Protocols for Native American Archival Materials, accessed 4 July 2015, http://www2.nau
    .edu/libnap-p/.

notes, "Archivists could be at the foreground of this shifting terrain, fore-grounding not just ethical considerations, but redressing historical injustices and continued marginalization as well" (p. 77). Gilliland bases a good part of her chapter on the idea that educating archivists to value pluralism as part of their personal and professional codes will diversify the archival record. She points out that "the motivations for those coming into the archival profession may result … from a deeply personal activist impulse" and that "students such as these will provoke change in the nature of archival prac-tice and outlook from inside the archival profession" (p. 249). "Archives (Re)imagined Elsewhere" sees how "community archives play[s] such a role; they are spaces – at once physical, virtual, imaginary – where they can gather to create a different sense of belonging, one that is deliberate and enabling, for themselves in community" (p. 133).

Third, and most important, is that diversity (or pluralism) is revealed by the archival endeavour, not created by it. While most of the chapters in *Through the Archival Looking Glass* acknowledge this to one degree or another, Sangwand's chapter is the exemplar (maybe even for the entire book). The opening epigram states, "*¡Aquíestamos! Legitimando otras formas de mirarnos y expresar el tiempo y el espacio en quevivimos* / Here we are! Legitimizing other forms of seeing ourselves and expressing time and space in which we live" (p. 91). Sangwand uses a postcustodial frame-work to challenge many existing archival assumptions that have hidden diverse sets of community information from the archival record. In many ways, the lack of diversity in the archival profession, in the archival record, and in the users of archives is a result of the way that underlying professional structures and practices discount, or *hide*, unfamiliar types of archives. By focusing on revealing diversity instead of constructing it, the power inherent in diversity and inclusion is located in communities. It is not up to commun-ities to create diversity, since it already exists. It is up to archivists to see and reveal it.

Caldera and Neal are upfront about the goal of this book. It is intended to prompt archivists to look at themselves and their assumptions and practices. "Perhaps, then, the most important outcome of this project is not the "publi-cation of the essays … but the conversations, debates, rebuttals, initiatives, and projects that will follow" (p. xxi). As archivists reflect on this work and the reactions to it, the image of archival diversity and inclusion will come into sharper focus, allowing all to see it clearly.

Terry Baxter
Multnomah County Archives, Oregon