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Abstract

This thesis investigates the construction and negotiation of cultural memory within the national archive. Emerging under the same specific historical circumstances, the nation and the archive operate as two sides of the same coin. The nation provides the defining framing in which archives have traditionally been understood to function, and the archive serves as the prism through which the national past and national future can be viewed and ‘read’. Evolutions in archival theory in the last century have demonstrated that archives are socially and imaginatively constructed: like the nation, records do not possess a natural character or value, but are instead inscribed value through inclusion in the archive. Collecting for the nation is not, therefore, a process that requires the uncovering or identifying records with innate value, but constitutes a tacit commentary on the nation’s character and on how the nation’s past, present, and future is conceived.

Using the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum as a case study, I will examine how, as the key archival repository in the country, the National Library of Scotland conceived of the task of ‘collecting for the nation’ at a time when the very character of the nation was in question. I argue that the Referendum had a decidedly personal and archival character, but that an adherence to traditional archival principles in the management and presentation of material limits its representative capacity. I argue that embracing the narrative aspects of archival action would allow archivists to foreground the constructed nature of archival collections and invite greater deliberation on the ways in which the nation is represented.
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Whether the memory is being sought, reconstructed, or preserved, the ability of a community to conceptualise itself, now and into the future, depends to a great extent on its capacity for remembrance and its ability to express that remembrance communally.

- Jeannette Bastian and Ben Alexander¹

Introduction

During the course of this project, the political meanings and uses of ‘heritage’ have been contested with extraordinary intensity across the English-speaking world. The murder of George Floyd in Minnesota in May 2020 galvanised the Black Lives Matter movement and quickly inspired branches, allied organisations and public debate outside the United States.\(^1\) Drawing on the ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ movement in South African universities, a wave of passionate scrutiny – and furious reaction – quickly developed on both sides of the Atlantic. In academic terms, we could describe its focus as ‘racial justice and the institutions of public memory’, from statues and signage to museums and archives. But the key moments of this debate were conducted via street protests and social media rather than seminar discussion, and their educative and reforming dimension cannot be easily separated from ‘culture war’ media narratives and political responses.\(^2\) If the 2020 ‘moment’ was a notable mass exercise in subjecting official history to democratic critique – a sustained (if unruly) questioning of whose memory, for what purpose, in whose name – it also stimulated a fierce backlash. From strident columnists to government ministers, guardians of history denounced the ‘politicisation’ and ‘rewriting’ of the shared past (in equally political, counter-revisionist ways). Thus, the moral and intellectual contestation of public memory (and with it, cultural identity) was strongly mediated by powerful institutions in the present, and above all those premised on the nation, its unity, and its sacral past.

For an archival studies researcher, these events vividly concretised – and re-energised – a number of critical debates in the field. Rodney Harrison’s 2013 article on ‘late modern heritage practices’ was already valuable scholarship, and now it became a prescient guide to unfolding developments, and the responsibilities they may entail. In a passage worth citing at length, Harrison observes:

\(^1\) The BLM movement itself was founded in 2013, after earlier police killings of African Americans.
We live in a world in which heritage is ubiquitous, and in which we rarely reconsider the implications of past heritage decisions. Many of our heritage registers and lists throughout the world are overpopulated with particular forms of monuments and buildings which represent outmoded narratives of nation and class distinction. These objects and places often only hold continuing significance for a small group of local or national elites who own and revere them (and who coincidentally also tend to be those most closely involved in the process of making decisions to preserve them). These (and all other forms of heritage) need to be opened up to critical questioning regarding their relevance in the contemporary world... [This] means thinking actively about heritage and its role in contemporary society, and foregrounding the ways in which heritage is constantly produced and reproduced in the present. It is only through an active engagement with the present that we can produce the collective memories that will bind us to the future. ³

In calling for conscious attention to be paid to the mechanisms by which heritage is managed, by whom, and to the narratives that these management decisions produce and reproduce, Harrison calls for an examination of how thinking about the past in dialogue with the present allows us to imagine the future. This thesis is the result of my attempt to answer Harrison’s call, in the specific conditions of Scotland’s constitutional debate in the early twenty-first century. Using the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum as a case study, it explores how a record of the referendum was collected ‘for the nation’, to what ends, and in accordance with what tacit norms of archival practice. In exploring how the national future was conceived of in this process, and its influence on the collection, the project is concerned with three central questions: what function does national heritage – specifically, national archive collections – serve in the process of ‘thinking’ and shaping the nation? How, and on what intellectual scaffolding, are these collections built and reproduced? Finally, how do the decisions made in producing such collections extend or limit their usefulness as historical artefacts?

The UK ‘memory crisis’ begun in 2020 had specific and complex implications for Scotland’s political culture. Owing to its own constitutional divisions, the interrogation of British imperial history (and its continuing legacies) maps uneasily onto established narratives of progressive Scottish nationalism versus a secure and stable union-state. On the pro-union side victorious in 2014, a key argument for Scotland’s continuing place in the UK was the deep-rooted durability of the British political order. In whatever way it might be revised, the brittleness and volatility of British national memory exposed in 2020 was a discouraging and perhaps discrediting sign. For their part, proponents of a liberal and racially inclusive civic nationalism, with its strong emphasis on Scotland taking responsibility for its own affairs, could hardly disclaim the nation’s enthusiastic participation in Empire, and thus a considerable share of the resulting moral stain.

Indeed, the rise of modern Scottish nationalism in the 1960s coincided with a process of British decolonisation in which a tidy division between past and present held seductive appeal for many supporters of independence. John M. Mackenzie archly summarises this view:

> With the end of Empire the Scots could at last escape from their self-interested complicity and reunite nation with state after the dramatic rupture of that particular Union. With the loss of the colonies, the imperial cataracts can be removed from the eyes of the imperial collaborators and a new democratic dispensation can be discerned emerging from which the national ophthalmologist can free the Scots as much as the subordinate peoples of the white settler territories, India and the dependant empire.4

Closer than ever to political independence, in 2020 Scotland was confronted with the impossibility of ‘leaving behind’ its share of Empire – highly visible in the architecture of Glasgow’s Merchant City, or the Melville Monument in central Edinburgh5 – and thus, at

---


5 This 45m memorial to Henry Dundas became the focus of Scotland’s main 2020 controversy concerning the commemoration of slavery and anti-slavery, and resulted in the creation of a new but ‘temporary’ plaque highlighting the contested nature of Dundas’ role in the abolition of the British slave trade. See David Leask, ‘Dundas “key” to Britain’s slave army, investigation finds’, *Glasgow Herald*, 29 March 2021.
another level, of renouncing the *Britishness* of Scotland’s constitutive past. If it was through the post-1707 Union and Empire\(^6\) that modern Scotland became what it is (economically, culturally, institutionally), highlighting this fact may constrain, or redouble, the impulse to imagine an alternative national future ‘of our own’. Indeed, the demise of Empire was widely predicted to spell the end of Union in the 1960s and 70s. Sir Tom Devine cites Jan Morris’s memorable remark that ‘all that remained in the Union […] was “this grubby wreck of old glories” in which few could take any satisfaction’.\(^7\) Then, as in the post-2014 climate, shifting conditions of national memory were held to be crucial to Scotland’s constitutional future. My focus here is on the archival practices and institutions through which those conditions are managed, preserved, and made accessible to the public. As I will show, the specific political implications of a referendum on national independence – in which fundamental precepts of collective memory and belonging are in play – poses specific and unusual questions for institutions of national memory.

‘Indyref’

After the opening of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, Holyrood administrations were led by coalitions of unionist parties (Labour-Liberal Democrat) until 2007, when the Scottish National Party (SNP) formed a minority administration with the support of the Scottish Greens and renamed the Scottish Executive the Scottish Government. At the next election in May 2011, the SNP achieved a landslide majority on a platform seeking a referendum on independence. Under devolution the constitution is a reserved matter, so this mandate could only be given force with the agreement of the UK Government. Signed by the two

\(^6\)The extent of Scottish involvement (and self-advancement) in Empire is a commonplace, though beyond my purpose here. T.M. Devine: ‘as one author has put it, the Scots professional and middle classes claimed “not merely a reasonable but a quite indecent share of the [imperial] spoils”. Throughout the eighteenth and for much of the nineteenth centuries, Scottish educators, physicians, soldiers, administrators, missionaries, engineers, scientists and merchants relentlessly penetrated every corner of the empire and beyond so that when the statistical record for virtually any area of professional employment is examined, Scots are seen to be over-represented.’ T. M. Devine, "The Break-up of Britain? Scotland and the End of Empire," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 16 (2006): 169.

\(^7\)Ibid., 164.
governments in October 2012, the Edinburgh Agreement established the legal framework and wording of the referendum question, marking 18 September 2014 as referendum day.

The two primary campaign groups had already been launched earlier that year. Although predominantly funded and controlled by the SNP, the main pro-independence campaign (Yes Scotland) represented a broad alliance of campaign groups and smaller Holyrood parties, including the Scottish Greens and the Scottish Socialist Party. Journalist Blair Jenkins was appointed as chief executive officer and former Labour-turned-Independent MSP Dennis Canavan served as chair of an Advisory Board made up of individuals from across the political spectrum, as well as politically active arts luminaries such as Elaine C. Smith and Pat Kane, both of whom had been prominent campaigners for devolution in the 1990s. The pro-Union campaign group Better Together was a less comfortable cross-party alliance between Labour, Conservative and the Liberal Democrats. Chaired by former Chancellor Alistair Darling MP (who served in Blair/Brown governments), the campaign’s director, Blair McDougall, had previously been a special advisor to two Labour politicians, and prominent Better Together campaigners included the leaders of the main political parties - Ruth Davidson, Willie Rennie and Johann Lamont.

The referendum debates generated an outpouring of commentary and activism in the two years between the signing of the Edinburgh Agreement and polling day. The level of public engagement was unprecedented, and with around 84% of the electorate casting a vote, resulted in the highest turnout at a UK election or referendum for over a century. While the No side were ultimately victorious with 55% of the vote, the result was the start rather than the end of ‘indyref’’s political importance. Support for independence nearly doubled over the course of the campaign and its aftermath, rising from 23% in 2012 to 46% in 2016. In the Westminster elections of 2015, Scottish Labour suffered a major collapse – losing 40 of its

---

8 Christine Jeavans, "In Maps: How Close Was the Scottish Referendum Vote?" https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-29255449
Scottish seats – as it bore the brunt of pro-independence voters ‘punishing’ its alliance with the unpopular Conservatives in Better Together. After 2014, the dramatic expansion and unification of the pro-independence vote behind the ‘YeSNP’ – the party’s membership more than quadrupled after indyref – redefined Scottish electoral dynamics, and the party remains dominant in Holyrood and Westminster elections despite faltering progress toward a second referendum.

Michael Keating has observed that “a striking feature of the long [2012-14] referendum campaign is that it did not, by and large, pitch radically different visions of Scotland’s future against each other”.\textsuperscript{10} He suggests that in the referendum debate, “the goal [was] largely agreed but parties compete[d] on how best to get there”, reflecting the broad, social-democratic political consensus – and anti-Tory rhetoric – that both delivered and defined Scottish devolution. The Yes campaign’s arguments extended this earlier consensus, centring on the notion of a ‘democratic deficit’ which, as in the 1980s, prevented Scotland from getting the governments it votes for. Key domestic and international issues (from currency to welfare to Scotland’s future oil revenue and EU membership) were framed in terms emphasising constraints on Scotland’s democratic autonomy, with independence offering a first step towards a more equal, prosperous and confident nationhood. The No campaign’s central narrative emphasised the benefits and stability of Union alongside the risks and uncertainty posed by independence. This strategy “did not need to prove that independence would be damaging, just to suggest that it was a risky proposition”, and the No side “heightened perceptions of risk by refusing, as they put it, to ‘pre-negotiate’”\textsuperscript{11} hypothetical post-independence arrangements.

The mobilisation of national identity is a common feature of secessionist movements, and though clearly present in the 2014 debate, Scottish national sentiment has a complex and ambivalent place in constitutional politics. The Unionist tradition has its own traditions of


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 21.
'standing up for Scotland' and views the 1707 Anglo-Scottish compact as preserving and elevating (rather than erasing or diluting) Scotland’s national distinctions within the framework of the United Kingdom. As Keating observes, during the referendum the symbols and trappings of ‘Scottishness’ were “available to both sides, to reconstruct and press into the service of union or independence”. Nationalists emphasised hope, imagination and democratic possibility, casting fairness and equality as particularly Scottish values and independence as the best means of enacting them. On the pro-UK side, narratives of shared British history, achievement, sacrifice and solidarity emphasised the contribution of Scots to a Union which gave expression to their national virtues (e.g. via the British welfare state), rather than constraining Scotland’s place in the world. Gordon Brown argued that it was “thanks to Scottish ideas of fairness and opportunity” that the Union was “a union for social justice”.

Heritage and nationalism

The discursive prominence of ‘Scottish values’ in this debate, and their role in defining a national community, neatly illustrate Ernest Renan’s influential statement that “a nation is a soul, a spiritual principle”. This classic scholar of nationalism emphasised the role of the shared past – ‘national heritage’ – in the production and reproduction of national identity. Renan argued that a nation is predicated on memory and consent:

To have common glories in the past, a common will in the present; to have accomplished great things together, to wish to do so again, that is the essential condition for being a nation.

This model has been a productive starting point for other theorists of nationalism, most notably Anthony D. Smith, who has examined the mechanisms by which ‘cultural heritage’ is put to work in the service of nationalisms. Seen through the lens Renan provides, Smith

---

14 "Gordon Brown's Pro-Union Speech in Full," The Scotsman, 3 November 2012 2012.
15 Ernest Renan, "What Is a Nation?" (Sorbonne, 1882).
observes that the past becomes a treasure trove from which the nation’s “virtue, heroism, beauty, learning, holiness, power and wealth” can be evidenced, handled, re-founded. For Smith, “the road that the community expects to take in each generation” is traced from a map of the communal past, and the values and symbols of the nation’s heroic ages “form the basis and spur to heroic feats of communal self-sacrifice in the future, a future that can become as glorious and fulfilling as the days of old.”

The standards of golden ages come to define the normative character of the evolving community. They define what is and what is not to be admired and emulated. They define what is, and what is not, distinctive about that community. They define an ideal, which is not so much to be resurrected ... as to be recreated in modern terms.

Smith asserts that, because “most nationalism, viewed from inside, start out from a sense of decline, alienation and inner exile”, a common characteristic of such movements is that they “promise renewal, reintegration and restoration to a former glorious state”. But the Scottish case is only a partial fit with this paradigm. As Ben Jackson has argued in his recent study of nationalist thought, at the height of Thatcherism in the 1980s, “the case for Scottish independence had become an argument about how to recapture the authenticity of an earlier, pristine British labour movement, before the compromises and vacillations of the current Labour leadership”. Jackson illustrates the point via the novelist William McIlvanney’s influential 1987 speech to SNP annual conference, ‘Stands Scotland Where It Did?’ In this speech, McIlvanney refers anyone searching for ‘Scottish values’ to “the characteristic ways we [Scotland] found of responding to the industrialisation of our country”. For Jackson, McIlvanney identifies “a humanising ethic founded on social justice and community”, traceable to the struggles of the Scottish labour movement, as iconic embodiments of the Scottish national identity. This strays from Smith’s template in which

---

17 Ibid., 584.
18 Ibid.
“the memory of a volkish golden age” is invoked in order to “[focus] resentments of the new industrial population [and create] expectations of a new social order”. In the idiom of communitarian nationalism McIlvanney helped to crystallise in the 1980s, it is the glory of past struggle, unity, and resistance, and not a promised land of prosperity and esteem, that define the national image being mobilised. In the Unionist tradition, as Colin Kidd has shown, “a negative picture of Scotland’s feudal backwardness ... became the defining cliché of Scottish historical writing”. This elicited no nostalgia, no desire to remake the present in the image of the past, but rather “a consensual sigh of relief that through incorporating Union ... the course of Scottish history had been drastically and beneficially transformed”.

For both sides of the 2014 debate, historic identities were a live and charged issue. Four days before the vote, the front page of the Sunday Telegraph showed a military funeral with a casket draped in the Union Flag. Marshalling a shared past of glorious sacrifice, the emotive headline pleads: ‘Scottish soldiers lost their lives trying to preserve the United Kingdom. What will their families say now: “Well, it no longer matters?”’. But the matter of national memory has never been permanent or fixed. Renan’s famous essay ‘What is a Nation?’ highlights the mutability of the nation’s past as a condition of its continuity and cohesion (“the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things”). For all the various nationalisms at play in 2014, the terrain of collective memory was a site of struggle and contestation, as competing narratives of remembrance (and forgetting) were mobilised around a binary constitutional choice. If in Smith’s conception the nation is “ultimately a text, or a series of texts, that must be ‘read’ and

20 Christopher Harvie, Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707 to the Present (Taylor & Francis, 2004), 52.
22 Sunday Telegraph, 14 September 2014.
23 Renan, "What Is a Nation?"
‘narrated’; all nationalisms are concerned with how (and by whom) the national past can be shaped, protected and narrativised.

The nation’s memory: theorising archives
As the guardians of national (printed) heritage, archives are closely implicated in the process of ‘reading’ the national past. The questions underpinning this thesis – why do we keep national archives? Who are they for, and what function do they serve in society? How do we decide what is preserved for the future and what is passed over? – have come to dominate archival science for much of the last century. In order to grasp recent developments in archival theory and practice as they pertain to national collecting, we should first briefly establish some more fundamental principles of archivy.

Archives are accumulation of records, and records provide evidence of the outcomes of transactions and of decisions. Traditional definitions interpret any document that is made or received in the process of ‘doing something’ as a record, and managing an object as a record “commences with the placement of that object in the context of doing something, into a relationship with other objects, and ensures that all management processes to do with the object are documented”. This is achieved through the processes of arrangement and description, which are carried out in line with the archival principles of provenance, which is comprised of three elements - respect des fonds, original order, and provenance as context. The maxim of respect des fonds dictates that records be grouped according to their creating source and thus kept distinct from records created by other bodies. The principle of original order is an internal application of this philosophy and maintains that in order to fully ‘respect the fonds’ the arrangement bestowed on records by creators should likewise be respected, and records should therefore be arranged in a manner that reflects their ‘original’ order. Provenance as context performs a narrative function and forms the basis of archival

---

description, and it is the power of this contextual information to elucidate relationships between records and creators that differentiates archives from other forms of information.\footnote{Adrian Cunningham, Laura Millar, and Barbara Reed, "Peter J. Scott and the Australian ‘Series’ System: Its Origins, Features, Rationale, Impact and Continuing Relevance," \textit{Comma}, no. 1 (2013): 122.}

International Standard ISO 15489:2016 provides the following formal definition of a record:


While the standard purports to apply to all forms of record, there is a notable preoccupation with business records here. This is understandable when we examine the history of the archival endeavour: as will be discussed at length in Chapter 1, “archival theory has largely developed based on archivists’ understanding of and experience with the archives of government and other organizations”, and it is only in recent years that archivists have argued for greater attention to be paid to recordkeeping practices that do not fit into this model, “including those created by individuals and families and most often referred to as personal archives”.\footnote{Jennifer Douglas, "Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives" (2013), 2.}

How such personal records should be understood and approached, however, continues to divide opinion. Theorists such as Sue McKemmish have argued that personal records can also be analysed in terms of their ‘functionality’ and ‘transactionality’:\footnote{Sue McKemmish, "Evidence of Me," \textit{The Australian Library Journal} 45, no. 3 (1996): 176.}

McKemmish suggests that “just as [archivists] can identify significant business functions and activities and specify what records are captured as evidence of those activities, so they can analyse socially assigned roles and related activities and draw conclusions about what records individuals in their personal capacity capture as evidence of these roles and activities”.\footnote{Challenging this perspective, other theorists have taken exception to the notion that personal archives should be analysed as simply another breed of organisational record. Arguing that personal archives “represent a departure from the collective formality and}
systemic organization found in other types of records”,30 for example, Catherine Hobbs has questioned why “evidence of me’ [must] always be interpreted as ‘evidence of me interacting with persons and institutions in the conduct of affairs’”.31

Whether a different breed of record or not, personal records have come to occupy a larger portion of archival attention in the last fifty years, and this can be seen as a response to the social history or ‘history from below’ approaches that characterised historiography in the latter half of the twentieth century. Focused on telling the “stories of those traditionally ignored or cast to the periphery of most mainstream histories”,32 these approaches have exposed the inadequacy of traditional and mainstream archival repositories in meeting these new demands and have called for archivists to justify their exclusive (or perhaps excluding) traditional definitions of records and archives. This call is predicated on the notion that archives offer a fixed and immutable resource that can be drawn upon in the telling of the community’s story: an externalised form of the community's memory. Here we can observe what Terry Cook describes as a ‘paradigm shift’ in the archival profession away from ‘records as evidence’ and toward ‘records as memory’. Cook suggests that this shift has seen the archivist “transformed … from passive curator to active appraiser to societal mediator to community facilitator”.33 As a result, theorists have called for greater attention to be paid to the effects of such action, mediation, and facilitation: to the influence that archival processes have on the potential of archives as story-telling resources.

Critical archival studies

The discipline of archives has borne the name ‘archival science’ for much of its history, reflecting a preoccupation with scientific approaches that emphasise standardisation of processes and methods for the preservation, management and presentation of records. My

31 Ibid., 130.
decision to instead opt for ‘archivy’ is intentional, and reflects the humanities-based approach of critical archival studies that I adopt in this thesis. Michelle Caswell has described this approach as harbouring the intention of broadening “the field’s scope beyond an inward, practice-centered orientation”. By adopting “a critical stance regarding the role of archives in the production of knowledge and different types of narratives, as well as identity construction”, critical archival studies draws attention to the scaffolding of understanding that underpins archival action in order to “use archival studies to disrupt the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the humanities”. This approach is therefore concerned with “process rather than product, becoming rather than being, dynamic rather than static, context rather than text, reflecting time and place rather than universal absolutes”: that is, it is concerned with the how rather than the what of archives.

This reflects the influence of the digital on archval theory. As will be discussed in more detail later in this thesis, the capabilities (and needs) of the digital have challenged established understandings of record creation, management, and use. The development of systems and processes for the digital representation of records has thrown a light on how the archival process of identifying relationships between objects constitutes “an act of historical interpretation by the representation’s creator that signifies a convergence of historiographical and archival decisions”. Describing the digital as both a promise and a threat, Lilly Koltun has summarised this influence thus:

Ultimately, what is revealed by digital options in their new impact on archival actions is an older but unminded perception: archives expose not a finished past society, but [...] our own, present society, which does the selecting, the

---

keeping, the using, and the constituting of its many stories in continuous and contingent re-making.\textsuperscript{38}

A consideration of the issues raised by digital heritage practices is therefore a productive means by which to explore the gaps between theory and practice in archival institutions, and relevant literature will be drawn on throughout this thesis.

**Conducting the research**

**Context and evolution of the project**

This thesis represents the output of an Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) collaborative doctoral partnership (CDP) award. The CDP scheme intends to foster collaboration between higher education institutions and the museums, libraries, archives, and other heritage organisations that make up the CDP Consortium and provides doctoral candidates with valuable practical experience within a research-led professional environment\textsuperscript{39}. Each studentship covers three years of tuition fees at the university and a stipend for maintenance costs), with additional funding available through a Student Development Fund to extend the studentship (for example, for the purpose of undertaking a placement that is not an integral part of the research project). In developing projects, partners work together to identify research topics that align with the institutional objectives of the cultural partner in advance of the student being appointed. This collaborative relationship continues with doctoral candidates being jointly supervised by subject specialists at both the higher education institute and the cultural organisation within which they are located.

This particular project emerged from conversations in this vein between Dr Scott Hames (University of Stirling) and Dr Amy Todman (National Library of Scotland). The two had been involved in various Indyref-adjacent events during the final stretch of the referendum period, Hames in his capacity as “an academic working on connections between Scottish

\textsuperscript{38} Lilly Koltun, ”The Promise and Threat of Digital Options in an Archival Age,” *Archivaria* 47, no. 1 (1999): 133.

literature, language and politics”40 and Todman in her capacity as the then-Referendum Curator at the National Library of Scotland (NLS). As Chapter Five of this thesis will discuss, the intersection of literature and politics in the Scottish independence movement has long been an area of interest to scholars, and within this, both Hames and Todman had identified what could be described as an ‘auto-archival’ quality to the referendum discourse: a sense that indyref was being ‘remembered’ even as it was experienced, with campaigners and commentors positioning 2014 within stories looking back on it from the future. The original project proposal, as submitted to the AHRC in 2016, established that research would explore this archival nature of the referendum by “examin[ing] how archives of the 2014 referendum are constructed and used (both physical and digital), and the various factors that shape how the makers and users of such collections view the narrative possibilities and complexities presented by their materials”.41 The nature of the CDP scheme meant that a focus on the NLS’s Referendum Collection was therefore anticipated, but significant connections were made with the Scottish Political Archive (SPA, based at the University of Stirling): SPA Archivist Sarah Bromage joined the supervisory team in an informal capacity, and it was intended that she would be in a position to facilitate relationships to donors and campaigners other than those represented within the NLS collections.

As will be explored in Chapters Three and Four, the online sphere came to occupy a great deal of attention during the referendum, with Mark Shephard and Stephen Quinlan later suggesting that it could “be classed as 'the first social media referendum'”.42 Although the NLS had been attempting to collect web sites in some way since 2004, efforts prior to 2013 had been hampered by a lack of legislation mandating digital collection. The Library had undertaken significant work to capture the digital record of the referendum following the passing of the Legal Deposit Libraries (Non-Print Works) Regulations in 2013, and was keen

that this be explored and built upon in the course of this project. To this end, it was envisioned that a workshop or ‘hackathon’ would be held in which the resources captured in the digital collection could be made available to potential researchers and used as a ‘test-bed’ to explore research methods for the use of archived resources.

My interest in the project was informed by a variety of personal experiences, many of which had an influence on the final shape of the thesis. I grew up the daughter of an exhibition designer. I spent a great deal of my childhood 'behind the scenes' in the museum, witness to the sort of practical deliberations that inform heritage work. Later, as an undergraduate, I studied Classical Civilisation, a subject which constantly confronts one with the fragmentary nature of sources and the reality that there are a multitude of narratives and perspectives that have been lost to time – that what survives to us is only ever a ‘sliver of a sliver’ of what existed. As a result, I came to the project with a pre-existing interest in how the ‘archival slivers’ of the past are delivered to the present, and with a keen understanding that modern interpretations of the past do not to emerge naturally, but instead have been deliberated over, selected, and carefully curated. I had begun exploring some of these ideas in my previous academic work. My MSc thesis used the writing of avant-garde author B.S. Johnson to examine how a search for ‘truth’ in the archive can be complicated by the archival actions that creators and curators exert on a collection. Through this research, I became interested in the influence that archival theory’s administrative roots have on modern archival practice.

Recruitment for the project took place in Spring 2017, and I began in the role in October of that year. I was encouraged by the supervisory team to bring these experiences and perspectives with me and to make this project my own. I made it clear in my initial interview that my interest was on the mechanics behind how the collection was assembled rather than on the literary figuring of the referendum as an historic moment: I was keen to explore how this historical figuring was expressed in archival action. Before beginning the PhD my archival career experiences had been very much in the realm of ‘received’ archives rather than interventional collecting, and I was therefore interested to see how the NLS had managed such an active approach. I was keen to take advantage of the CDP scheme and use
an organisational ethnographical approach within the NLS to ascertain how the collection was envisioned and subsequently built.

Ethnographical research

Two placements at the NLS (funded through the Student Development Fund) were invaluable in this regard. The first was a twelve-week placement working with Web Archivist Eilidh MacGlone, in which I became familiar with the mechanics of the Annotated Curation Tool that powers the UK Web Archive (UKWA), and in the legislative restrictions that inform the capture and use of this material. This placement was completed in early Summer 2018 and was hugely influential on this study, not just in providing me with insight into the web archiving process but also into the relationships between different departments of the Library.

A second placement was undertaken in early 2020. This was intended to be focused on access, and was formed of two parts: the first, undertaken between January and March, provided an opportunity to conduct a survey of all the referendum-related material held in the library (both explicitly collected for the Scottish Independence Referendum Collection [SIRC] project and not), and to finish cataloguing the manuscript portion of the collection in order to make it accessible via ArchivesSpace, the Library’s archive catalogue software. The second part of the placement was intended to run from May to June 2020, and would have explored methods for presenting a disparate and scattered collection in one place – a ‘one stop shop’ for the NLS’s referendum-related collections which made links to those in other repositories.

This placement block would ideally have taken place well before 2020, however a significant hurdle to the project arose in 2018 with the departure of Amy Todman from the Library: she took personal leave in Spring of 2018 and formally left the Library and her supervisory role in July of that year. On reflection, her absence was surprisingly productive. While a lot of basic, practical information had not been recorded (about, for example, the status of ongoing conversations about donations, the real scale of the collection, and the circumstances surrounding deposits), the absence of this information meant that I was able to more effectively probe the collection from a position of remove and cast myself as a future
researcher with questions that demand answers. In an attempt to plug the institutional knowledge-gap that Todman’s departure left I was given access to her hard-drive, and the documentation I found there relating to the SIRC was invaluable. Having such files to work with further aided me in positioning myself as a future researcher, in that I found myself conducting archival research on Todman’s files to unpick how decisions, deposits, and arrangements were reached.\(^{43}\)

A further hurdle to overcome was that presented by the Coronavirus pandemic which began in early 2020 and required the placements to be cut short. In preparation for working with the collection, I had examined the available manuscript catalogues in detail and identified a number of questions that I wished to explore. Once in place in the Library I was then able to compare my expectations of the collection with the reality of the resource. Prior to the first national lockdown being imposed in March of that year, I was able to complete cataloguing of the remaining manuscript donations and with the approval, support, and supervision of Heidi Egginton, (Todman’s replacement as NLS Politics Curator) and Steve Ridgen (Digital Archivist) I redrafted existing finding aids to better reflect the content and the character of the acquisition while remaining in line with NLS policy\(^{44}\).

Being embedded within the Library’s Manuscripts Division also meant that I was able to informally uncover and access information that would otherwise have been out of reach. For example, through informal conversations I discovered another member of staff had conducted research into the Library’s past collection development strategies, and was still in possession of two of these documents – the 1983 and 1991 strategy documents I refer to in Chapter Two.

Conducting interviews
Spending time within the library and using the analogue collections during placement also helped me to identify potential interview candidates. I was keen to gain insight into the

\(^{43}\) These documents can be found in Appendix 4.
\(^{44}\) Changes made to the finding aids are detailed in Appendix 1.b.
collection development process from both the donor and the curators’ perspectives, and when considering potential interviewees from the donor side, I decided to restrict my focus to those who had contributed to the manuscript collections for a number of reasons. Firstly, as information on the circumstances that brought the papers to the SIRC was scarce, my selection of creating and donating interviewees was informed by identifying gaps in collection documentation that raised questions about the circumstances of the records’ creation, accrual and transfer. I was keen to compare and contrast the assumptions I had made in my guise of a future researcher viewing the material with the reality of the collection’s development as it emerged during interview. Secondly, (as will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three of this thesis) where the collecting carried out by other divisions was largely reactive rather than proactive, the material gathered as part of the manuscript portion had been obtained through direct conversation and collaboration. These donors therefore presented the strongest opportunity to glean information about how the collection had been envisioned, how that was communicated to potential donors, and what the motivations behind donation were. As can be seen in the list of interviewees, most creators that I spoke with were campaigners for the Yes side: only one interviewee (Professor Hugh Pennington) had campaigned for No. On reflection, a greater representation of No campaigners would have been preferable, however as I discuss in Chapter Five, the absence of this perspective is reflective of the general Yes-No balance of the collection.

More practical considerations informed my selection of professional interview subjects. As I was interested quite specifically in the role of a national institution in re/producing national identity, and in how this is interpreted and enacted by curators, I decided that involvement in the National Library of Scotland’s ‘Collecting the Referendum’ (CtR) project was a necessary criteria for involvement, The majority of staff who contributed to the project were still employed at the Library at the time, with the notable exceptions of Todman (discussed above) and Maria Castrillo, Todman’s predecessor as Curator of Political Collections and her line manager during the main collecting period of the CtR project. While I was able to make contact with Castrillo and conduct an interview, it was not possible to speak to Todman for this thesis. I had found informal conversations with SPA Archivist Sarah Bromage to be a productive means for exposing some of the assumptions that underpin national collecting
and felt that this was best communicated to the reader in the form of an interview. As well as attending to assumptions about future users and uses when speaking to creators, curators, and campaigners, I looked for evidence of the processes by which records came to be accumulated and transferred to the archive, and paid particularly close attention to where the information given in interview was not communicated alongside the collection items.

Prior to interview I provided each participant with information detailing how their data would be managed, and also supplied them with sample questions in advance to give them an idea of the areas I was interested in covering; as Scottish independence is still very much a live topic, I felt this was necessary to keep the focus on the archival project and keep it from straying into the referendum debates themselves. Interviews were conducted via Microsoft Teams and lasted around 45-60 mins. They were then transcribed by me and the transcripts returned to the interviewee for approval. At this point, I offered participants the opportunity to redact or remove any comments they did not wish to be preserved.

This area of my research was also heavily impacted by the pandemic both directly and indirectly. I was unable to conduct the interviews in person and was therefore unable to have the collection materials present for the interviewee to view: many creators remarked that that they did not fully remember what they had deposited, and while I was able to provide them with the redrafted inventories I had produced, I feel it would have been beneficial to have the collections in front of us to prompt memories and spark discussion. I was also impacted by the pandemic in that, like many others, I had circumstances arise that forced me to take a significant amount of time off from studying in order to care for family and therefore curtailed the amount of time available for me to conduct interviews before my submission date. A further, indirect impact of the pandemic was the rise in ‘rapid response’ collecting projects around the pandemic, as many traditional ‘receiving’ archives responded to the suspension of normal activities by undertaking their own contemporaneous collecting projects. This provided an interesting comparison point, and I explore this in detail in the conclusion of this thesis.

In attempting to determine what impact archival actions (or non-actions) may have had on the final shape of the archive, I posit that personal records within national collections hold
significant potential value for the understanding of individual experiences, but that those working with records must refine our expectations of archival representation in order to realise their full potential; that archivists should expand our conceptions of provenance to include a greater representation of the circumstances by which a record came to be transferred to the archive; and similarly, that archivists should not shy away from the narrative character of archival representation, but instead embrace and foreground this aspect in their documentation.

**Chapter outline**

Chapters 1 and 2 prepare the theoretical ground that this thesis operates within and are broadly concerned with the past. Chapter 1 surveys the dominant theoretical frameworks of nationalism studies and archival theory that shape this thesis. Having established a direct relationship between the archival endeavour and the historical formation of the nation, it then attends to recent developments in archivy that have been informed by factors such as the ‘digital turn’ and the rise in community or ‘activist’ archiving, and considers a number of challenges these developments pose for the concept of a unified national history. Chapter 2 then moves the focus to Scotland and explores the circumstances that contributed to the founding of the National Library of Scotland (NLS) in 1925. It considers the role of print capitalism and textual documents in the promotion of a distinctive Scottish identity, and explores how the Library’s understanding of its societal role has been influenced by the shifting political environment.

Chapter Three brings us into the present by examining how a record of the 2014 Independence Referendum was obtained for the nation by the NLS. Examining the rationale that informed the project, it situates the collecting project within the wider context of the Library’s collecting activities before detailing the specific mechanisms through which material was identified and acquired by each of the collecting divisions.

Chapters 4 and 5 transport us to an unspecified future in order to evaluate the usefulness of the Scottish Independence Referendum Collection (SIRC) from a temporal distance. Chapter 4 is concerned with how personal and local narratives are represented in the collection. First establishing the centrality of the personal and the local to the referendum experience, it
suggests that a lack of acquisition documentation and an uncertainty about the function of such records within a national collection limits their potential to offer insights into the referendum as experienced by the electorate. Chapter 5 similarly attends to how the processes that have contributed to the SIRC have been represented. Focusing on the notion of ‘archival silences’, it considers the gaps in documentation that a future researcher may encounter, and explores their potential impact for future histories of Indyref.
Chapter 1 – Nation, Memory, and Archive: Reproducing the National Past

Introduction

This chapter establishes the research context in which this thesis is grounded. It reviews the literature on the development of nationalist movements, paying particular attention to how the national past is invoked by such movements to foster a sense of a communal past and a shared future. Focusing on the textual dimension of such ‘political archaeology’, it then turns to examine the role of archives in this process and explores the relationship between the modern nation and the national archive. I establish that the archival endeavour harbours an inevitably ‘nationalist’ bent at its core: that is, the overarching logic of the archive places the nation at the centre of social life at the expense of other modes of identification.

The making of nations

Writing in 1996, Anthony D. Smith argued for a more nuanced perspective on nationalisms than that offered by scholars concerned with the “timing of the surges and resurrections” of nationalist movements.¹ Smith suggested that scholars such as Ernest Gellner - who had argued that nationalisms emerge as a consequence of and reaction to the uneven diffusion of modernisation² – were misguided in their focus on the ‘where and when’ questions of nationalism. Specifically, Smith argued that such an approach failed to explain “the paradox of variety and persistence in nationalism”, or “why nations and nationalisms have such staying power in the modern epoch, yet manifest such vast differences in their content and style of expression”.³

In order to understand “why some nations arise rather than others, why these nations and nationalisms possess a particular character, and why some nationalisms are more

---

intense and exclusive than others”, Smith argued it was crucial to reorient the discussion to examine the ‘who and what’ questions: that is, the “character and intensity of the ethnic nationalisms” and, in particular, the “ethno-symbolic resources which they command”. Smith proposed three key types of ‘ethno-symbolic resource’ underpinning nationalisms: ethno-history (the collective memories of the national community); myths of a ‘chosen people’ (often rooted in religious ideals and imagery); and the association of the people with a sacred or historic homeland. Of particular interest to the present study is Smith’s perspective on the role of ethno-history or national memory in the development of nationalisms.

Following Ernest Renan, Smith emphasised the significance of shared or collective memories in the development of a consciously ‘national’ community, suggesting that “ethnic identity… may be seen as the product of shared memories of collective experiences and activities of successive generations of a group claiming a common origin and ancestry”. Informed by Renan’s assertion that “common glories in the past and a will to continue them in the present” are essential conditions for ‘being’ a nation (and reproducing the affective bonds of nationality), Smith argued that the notion of a ‘golden age’ in the national past is crucial. Through this lens, the past becomes a treasure trove of material with which the nation’s “virtue, heroism, beauty, learning, holiness, power and wealth” can be evidenced, and in the hands of nationalist agitators working as ‘political archaeologists’ “the standards of golden ages come to define … an ideal, which is not so much to be resurrected … as to be recreated in modern terms”. Here, the nationalist conception of the past involves a constant rediscovery and reproduction of the nation’s historically distinctive qualities.

4 Ibid., 595.
5 Ibid., 583.
6 Ibid.
7 Anthony D. Smith, Myths and Memories of the Nation (Oxford University Press, 1999), 12.
National myths
The Czech historian Miroslav Hroch has identified national myths and folklore as a key means by which the past is recalled in order to inform the present. Developing a typology of such tales, Hroch noted that myths based on battles and conflict emphasised the distinctiveness of the nation in contrast or opposition to other, enemy nations – “an expression of the fact that national communities (‘we’) define themselves mainly against others (‘they’)” – while myths focusing on the “progressive transformations of the national state or national community” spoke to Enlightenment ideals of development and improvement. Establishing milestones in the nation’s development emphasised the continuity of the nation and strengthened the idea of a national community with a shared future as well as a shared past. A third type of myth were those based on notable figures in the nation’s past, with historical figures from “times when the nation was under threat or expanding” particularly lauded. Equally valuable to the building of a national past and national historical consciousness, though, were key actors from the arts and sciences – ‘men of letters.’ As well as serving as exempla for the nation – that is, as personifications of the values and qualities that the nation collectively venerates – the achievements of such individuals also contributed to the building of a specifically national culture that simultaneously participated in the advancement of universal human achievement. As Hroch summarised, “the purpose of all national cultures is to enrich the culture of mankind as a whole: each work of a nation would be a contribution to the culture of all mankind”.

Hroch has suggested that the objective veracity of such myths was unimportant: historians employing myths often “made it known when they were leaving scientifically verified data in support of myths”, but it should be noted that he advocates a more nuanced approach than that of the myth-busting, ‘invented traditions’ perspective associated with Eric Hobsbawm and Hugh Trevor-Roper. Rather than suggesting that the production of national histories to advance nationalists futures involved “fictitious inventions”, Hroch argued that such histories were produced through a process of “being

---

selective about historical facts and biased in [the] interpretation of objectively existing written and printed sources,” and that such selectivity was guided by an awareness that in order to “appeal to people who have certain attitudes and ideas about the past, [myths] have to respect and fit within the existing (given) framework of value systems”.

In a similar vein, Smith is keen to point out that “there is nothing fixed or immutable about a golden age or the principle of its selection”. Which qualities of the past are drawn upon and heralded at a given moment depends on the needs and specificities of that moment, with the consequence that “the ethno-history of a community may boast more than one golden age from which to choose, and different sections of the latter-day community may look back to quite different golden ages”. The political archaeologist is therefore not tasked with uncovering some pure truth about the national past for the benefit and inspiration of the present, but rather is concerned with “the rediscovery and reinterpretation of the ethnic past” for the purpose of “the regeneration of their national community”.

Nationalising the past
Through this rediscovery and reinterpretation, the nation’s past (Smith argues) is called upon to “provide cognitive maps and historical moralities for present generations drawn from the poetic spaces and golden ages of the communal past”. Accordingly, “the saints and sages of old become manifestations of the people’s national genius”; the landscape of the nation is presented as “the historic home of the people, the sacred repository of their memories”, and the material remains of past peoples – such as ruins, castles, and monuments – are “naturalized’ ... integrated into the landscape and treated as part of its special nature”. This effectively produces an impression of the nation as natural,
ancient, and enduring: an impression that is crucial to the nationalist endeavour. Such ‘naturalisation’ and nationalisation of heritage objects serves to unify land and people, creating an image of them as one ‘since time immemorial’ (there can be, after all, no memory of the land before people), and this sense of a coeval unity bolsters any political claims of the people on the land as natural and fated. The ‘educator-intellectuals’ at the helm of nationalist movements are therefore able to employ national symbols to increase identification with the past and “reconstruct a modern nation in the image of the past ethnie”, with the effect that rather than being “merely a chosen vessel of religious salvation and passive recipient of divine ordinance, the ‘people’ now become the source of salvation” for the new, national community: the power lies with, and in, the people.

The national past is therefore central to the constitution of national identity: invoked by nationalist intellectuals to foster an impression of a distinct community, a communal past and a shared (destined) future for the nation, the power of the nation’s memory could be used to support claims of right to both self-determination and to territory. As a consequence of this power, the nation’s memory becomes a sacred resource: its material relics must be protected from the ravages of the present, and institutions of public (national) memory become guardians of a sacred trust.

Thinking the nation
Exploring the textual dimension to how the national past becomes ‘sacralised’, the work of Benedict Anderson is of particular importance to the present study. Anderson’s seminal 1983 publication *Imagined Communities* focused on the emergence and influence of what he termed ‘print capitalism’. He argued that the interaction between “a system of production and productive relations (capitalism), a technology of communications (print), and the fatality of human linguistic diversity” served as the catalyst for a new kind of ‘national’ consciousness. Anderson observed that as printing became cheaper and more accessible, new audiences had to be found for a flourishing and competitive market. Accordingly, printers began to move away from producing material solely in the ‘sacred’

---
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languages (Greek, Latin, Hebrew, etc) and instead began to print in vernaculars, consequently elevating the status and perceived ‘worth’ of such languages.\textsuperscript{21} As these developing national languages came to occupy the same space that the holy languages had previously held, “the sacred communities integrated by old sacred languages ... gradually fragmented, pluralized and territorialised”,\textsuperscript{22} and the national – rather than the theological – became the primary frame of social and moral understanding.

Furthermore, as Anderson describes, “beneath the decline of sacred communities, languages and lineages, a fundamental change was taking place in modes of apprehending the world, which, more than anything else, made it possible to ‘think’ the nation”.\textsuperscript{23} A rise in vernacular languages was accompanied by the “expansion of bureaucratic middle classes” who differed significantly from the ruling classes in their conception of themselves.\textsuperscript{24} Anderson observed that while the “pre-bourgeois ruling class generated their cohesions in some sense outside language, or at least outside print-language”, the bourgeoisie were born in and of print:

Here was a class which, figuratively speaking, came into being as a class only in so many replications ... They had no necessary reason to know of one another's existence; they did not typically marry each other's daughters or inherit each other's property. But they did come to visualize in a general way the existence of thousands and thousands like themselves through print-language.\textsuperscript{25}

This new “unified field of communication”,\textsuperscript{26} Anderson argued, prepared the ground for a psychic space in which the nation as a collective could be conceived, and enabled the development of a national consciousness that was not tied to direct interaction and experience \textit{per se}, but to imagination: thus, “bourgeoisies were the first classes to achieve solidarities on an essentially imagined basis”.\textsuperscript{27} In a similar vein, the “new fixity to language” that print-capitalism enabled allowed for a much stronger sense of
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identification with the past via direct access to written records.\textsuperscript{28} Able to access the words of their forebears directly – without translation, and in their own tongue – the temporal distance between the people of ‘now’ and the people of ‘then’ became compressed, with the effect that the past could effectively be ‘resurrected’ and reproduced in the present, in textual form.

In a similar vein, Hroch has identified a particularly textual nature to the political archaeology of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. He observed that such a process generally began with a “passionate concern on the part of a group of ... intellectuals ... for the study of the language, culture, the history of the oppressed nationality”\textsuperscript{29} Such concern was typically motivated by “patriotism of the Enlightenment type”: that is, informed by notions of applying oneself for the common good and love for the sacred ‘homeland’, “the principles of enlightened patriotism obliged the educated to take care of the people living in their region (or state) and study their life and culture”.\textsuperscript{30} Following the model of the physical sciences, this patriotic endeavour carried an emphasis on a scientific approach to historiography which advocated the use of documentary sources as evidence and stressed the need for knowledge to be based on observable phenomena. Furthermore, as Hroch has noted, “throughout the whole of the nineteenth century, the vast majority of historians and the ‘public opinion’ of European society equated history with political history”.\textsuperscript{31} The history of the state was considered the prime subject for the Enlightenment historian, and as the repository of the nation’s memory the state archives were the logical starting place.

This chapter has thus far been concerned with the role and demands of the past within institutional processes of nation-building (and -maintaining). We have seen how nationalism fosters a sense of a unified, natural, and destined national community, and views and produces the national past accordingly. This is not achieved through outright invention, but rather through selective presentation, forgetting and re-interpretation. We
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have also observed that the process of nation-building has a particularly ‘textual’ character: not only did print-capitalism enable new social and linguistic conditions for ‘thinking the nation’, but the celebration and veneration of that nation is likewise textual in nature, with a strong emphasis on the value of documentary evidence to the ‘archaeology’ of the national past.

In recognition of the importance of textual sources to the nationalist endeavour, I now wish to move the discussion to focus on archives. In the following section, I will explore the relationship between archive and nation; how an evolving perception of the functional role of the archive in society challenges this relationship; and what the consequences of this evolution are for archivists concerned with collecting national history.

**The making of a national archive**

The relationship between archives and the formation of nationhood is longstanding. For example, Judith M. Panitch has noted that “the French Revolution has been widely regarded as a turning point in archival history”: in an attempt to cleanse the ‘reborn’ nation of its religious and monarchical heritage, huge swathes of records of the Ancien Régime were destroyed, effectively establishing the revolution as the new and true beginning – as ‘Day Zero’ on the calendar of the nation – and granting the records of the Assembly the status of national monuments. By “constitut[ing] its own papers as the national archives”, the revolutionary assembly introduced for the first time the notion of an archive that figured the state as its intellectual and organisational nucleus. That is to say, ‘French-ness’, the condition of being of the nation, became the provenancial precondition for archival value, reflecting the wider aspiration of the revolution – to retrieve power from unaccountable private space and return it to the public commons.

---

There are two key points to note here. Firstly, the relocation (metaphorically and literally) of archival activity from the ‘great houses’ of the nobility and the clergy to a centralised repository effectively created the possibility of a unifying historical narrative of the nation – a definitive *national* history. Just as the French Revolution assembled a range of (relatively) distinct regions, each with its own distinct linguistic and cultural traditions, and remade them as The Nation, the consolidation of archival activity created the possibility for The Archive, and thus, for The National Memory. Second, this transformation had the consequence of obscuring the narrative-shaping power of archival action. Where this had been explicitly acknowledged and valued by the noble houses of the Ancien Régime and the Assembly alike, the reconstitution of the archive as a national resource gave the illusion that it embodied the same qualities that were at the core of the new nation – an archive ‘of the people, by the people, for the people,’ as it were. In reality, the archive and the archival operations employed to build and manage it were still controlled by a small minority of men, and with little public input or oversight. Thus, the power wielded by the archive did not diminish, but was simply obscured by the rhetoric which accompanied its rebirth as the national archive.

Flotsam, jetsam, and the archival threshold

Archives are not collected: I wish the word ‘Collection’ could be banished from the Archivist’s vocabulary, if only to establish that important fact. They are not there because someone brought them together with the idea that they would be useful to Students of the future, or to prove a point or illustrate a theory. They came together, and reached their final arrangement, by a natural process: are a growth; almost, you might say, as much as an organism, as a tree or an animal.  

The above excerpt is taken from an address by the founding father of British record management, Sir Hilary Jenkinson. In this conception, archives are naturally occurring phenomenon, and archivists merely beachcombers who ensure any flotsam or jetsam is carried safely to secure stores. As Jenkinson is at pains to emphasise, archivists are not expected to concern themselves with any form of selection or appraisal of records, as any such meddling with the archival record may threaten the evidential quality of the

---

documents. Indeed, he cautions, “it is the indifference of the Official Custodian to the interests in which his documents come to be used which gives to Archives properly preserved one of their outstanding characteristics - their unbiased quality”. The extent to which the narrative power of the archive had become obscured through the codification of archival practice is clear here: adherence to principles based on ‘common sense’ and ‘accepted wisdom,’ the Jenkinsonian school advocated, would ensure that no bias on the part of the archivist could interfere with the record, and the record would continue to stand as a mute, neutral witness to history.

As Terry Cook has identified, the primary paradigm guiding archival practice at this time remained one of evidence. Archives were understood as being kept for their enduring value to their creators as evidence of past deeds and there was, broadly speaking, a lack of anticipation that records would be of interest or of use to anyone else. Accordingly, there was little consensus on the ‘right’ approach for ascertaining what records should be preserved: this decision should instead be left to the record-creators (typically government offices) to decide, as they were best acquainted with the records and their purpose within the creating organisation. This position could not long hold, however. The spread of industrialisation and the management of two world wars necessitated an unprecedented explosion in the quantities of records now being produced and archival practitioners began to acknowledge that the archive must be selective in what it applies its efforts to - that if an archive attempts to “collect everything, because every object may become useful in the future, it will soon succumb to entropy and chaos”.

Determining archival value
The first articulation of a value-based approach to deciding which records were worthy of preservation was put forwards by American archivist Theodore R. Schellenberg. Identifying the value to creators as the ‘primary’ value of records, Schellenberg suggested

that archivists should carefully analyse records to ascertain whether they held ‘secondary’ value for other potential users. In particular, Schellenberg “emphasised the role of archival institutions as storehouses for ... records that historians ... can draw on as authoritative sources of public memory”.39 While it is important to note here that the dominant rationale for keeping archives remains that of evidence, with its judicial and economic implications intact, Cook has described Schellenberg's consideration of the needs of secondary users as indicative of a shift in thinking about the purpose of archives – from records-as-evidence and towards records-for-memory. In this new mode, archives serve a more explicitly mnemonic function, and the archivists’ responsibilities expand to include facilitating access for researchers to this externally held memory.

Informed by the work of Matt K. Matsuda, Cook has suggested that both Jenkinson and Schellenberg formulated their views on records and archives in relation to ideas of ‘collective’ memory that were coloured by “modernity's Hegelian awareness of progress or, conversely, decay, as process over time, especially when considered through the organic metaphors of Darwinian biology”.40 Darwin’s writings on evolutilonal theory, Matsuda has noted, implied the existence of a type of memory that was an active agent. Where Darwin posited that evolutionary biology (acting via genetic ‘memory’) resulted in the survival of the fittest, Cook has suggested that Jenkinson and Schellenberg adopted a similar view of records: those records that were inherently most relevant ('fittest') would make themselves known to the receiving archive either by virtue of their provenance (Jenkinson's approach) or through the archivist's careful analysis of historiographical trends (Schellenberg's).41 Thus, the foundations of archival theory can be located in a positivist view of historical practice as a scientific pursuit, and an
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attendant concept of the role of the archivist as the handmaiden of historical research, dutifully delivering the requisite resource to the historian of the nation.\textsuperscript{42}

As Fiorella Foscarini noted, Schellenberg was aware that an appraisal of records based on perceived primary and secondary ‘values’ would necessarily be subjective, but “rather than aiming at as objective and impartial an appraisal outcome as possible” he embraced the inconsistency such an approach offers, asserting instead that “diverse judgements’ may result in a more adequate record of human activity”.\textsuperscript{43} The significance of Schellenberg’s model, then, is not that it produced an objective and impartial appraisal outcome, but rather, with its discussion of value and audience(s) it brought to the fore something that archivists had previously allowed themselves to be professionally delusional about: the power of the archival threshold.

The archival threshold
Archival preservation recreates and reaffirms our present reality. Barbara Craig has suggested that “appraisal transforms the objects of its activities” in that by conferring archival status on certain records they “carry forward accruing burdens of meaning arising from their status as objects of continuing importance”.\textsuperscript{44} Similarly, Tom Nesmith observed that “when a record is designated archival, it is assigned a special status. It is circled, framed, or privileged for a particular type of viewing, and often becomes a symbol of community aspirations or cherished values”.\textsuperscript{45} This is particularly significant when we consider the building of a national collection. As Jennie Hill and Will Slocombe noted in relation to the British literary manuscript tradition, “the decision to collect the papers of a particular author as a representative example of ‘British’ writing constitutes a cultural
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decision as to who is a ‘British’ author and what ‘British’ writing means”. Similarly, the decision to accept material into a national archival represents a tacit cultural judgement as to what the nation’s memory is or ‘should’ be.

Exploring the archival processes of selection and appraisal, Sarah Nuttall observed that the archive is driven by a tension between the forces of “excision and excess”. As any act of selection necessarily “implies a notion of ‘remains’”, any excision results in the creation of a new archival reality in which the ‘unpreserved’ subject (or individual, issue, or event) simply never occurred, and this reality is preserved at the expense of a myriad of other potential realities. In the words of Eric Ketelaar, “the archive reflects realities as perceived by the ‘archivers’”. Archival influence does not end with the accession of a record, however: its narrative power is reproduced and reaffirmed in the cultural products that emerge from archival research. In this vein, Ketelaar has suggested that records are “‘membranic’, the membrane allowing the infusing and exhaling of values which are embedded in each and every activation”. Thus, records which have been infused with ‘archival’ or – for our purposes – ‘national’ value “then become the focus of the meaning-making or interpretive process, which in turn makes and remakes them”.

The notion of curatorship in archives has been explored in detail by Theresa Rowat. Drawing a comparison between archives and other cultural heritage bodies, Rowat observed that while “other collecting cultural institutions, such as museums and galleries, have been more inclined to view their work in terms of curatorship, interpretation, and research”, for archives, “professional practice consists of ‘sound’ methodology, not interpretation and style”. Consequentially, archives are “aligned with systems of non-
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fiction” and linked to “notions of truth, fact, and reality” in a manner which bestows a sense of authenticity on the records: “while it is not assumed that everything held in an archive represents reality and truth, once a record is in an archive it acquires a legitimacy and is embraced within a context of non-fiction that refers back to the origins of archives as legal record repositories”.54

Rowat has appealed for archivists and historians to “contemplate blurring the distinctions between non-fiction and fiction in the documentary record, and analysing the documentary record as a cultural construct”.55 This neatly recalls Anthony D. Smith’s assertion that the nation is “ultimately a text, or a series of texts, that must be ‘read’ and ‘narrated’, a particular historical discourse with its peculiar set of practices and beliefs, which must first be ‘deconstructed’ for their power and character to be grasped”.56 This influential formulation of Smith has been taken up by number of thinkers who have sought to address the question it implies: if the nation is a text, who writes it; from what materials; and to what end?

Narrating the national past

Key amongst these is Laurajane Smith, who has argued that “there is no such thing as heritage”.57 Using the approach of critical discourse analysis to underpin her work, she stresses that heritage “is not an objective entity out there waiting to be discovered or identified; rather, it is more usefully seen as constituted and constructed (and at the same time, constitutive and constructing)”.58 The objects of our ‘heritage gaze’, Smith argues, possess no inherent value in themselves, but are instead bestowed with value through a discourse which both reflects and constructs a heritage reality: for Smith, heritage is “ultimately a cultural practice, involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings”.59 Smith employs the term ‘authorised heritage discourse’
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(AHD) to describe the hegemonic discourse that surrounds heritage concepts: ‘the accepted positions’ on what values might (should) be ‘discovered’ in heritage; who is able to make such pronouncements; and how such heritage objects should be approached in the present. Smith observes that AHDs are rooted primarily in the “grand narratives of nation and class”\(^{60}\) and notes that heritage and nation as concepts make up two sides of the same coin: both forged in the fires of the western Enlightenment, each are imbued with the emphases on progress and citizenship as discussed above. Accordingly, Smith argues that “the primary form of identity … associated with heritage is that of the nation”\(^{61}\) with the consequence that “other forms of identity are often obscured or devalued”.\(^{62}\) The centrality of the nation to individual lives is reproduced and reinforced by the framing of the AHD, and accordingly, ‘heritage values’ becomes the preserve of the state.

Smith poses that a second area in which the AHD is rooted is that of “technical expertise and aesthetic judgement”\(^{63}\), and highlights that “expert knowledge and experts are not simply another interest or stakeholder group in the use of heritage” but rather are often the source of the “epistemological frameworks that define debates about the meaning and nature of the past and its heritage”.\(^{64}\) She observes in this a realisation of Michel Foucault’s ‘governmentality thesis’, which poses that professional expertise can be mobilised to govern or shape the ‘conduct of conduct’ of populations.\(^{65}\) Smith suggests that “expert knowledge about the meaning and nature of the past” can be – and has been – used for the purpose of defining populations, ethnicities, peoples. Heritage can therefore be understood as a means for “regulating and governing identity claims and [simultaneously] making sense of the present”.\(^{66}\) Thus, heritage discourses underline the state-citizen framework at the expense of other modes of identity: as Smith notes,
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“providing a sense of national community, must, by definition, ignore a diversity of sub-national cultural and social experiences”.

Although she has faced criticism for her suggestion that there is a single, overriding AHD to be identified, rather than either “several competing heritage discourses” or potentially, multiple “sub-AHDs’ at work within the same organization”, Smith’s approach has been instrumental in “succinctly push[ing] the discussion from ‘what heritage is’ to ‘what heritage does’” and of particular importance for this study, in “focusing attention onto the many philosophical structures and arguments which underlie the ‘common-sense’ practice of heritage management in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries”. In this respect, Smith’s work puts flesh on the bones of the theories of nationalist agitation detailed earlier. It is curious, however, that an approach rooted in critical discourse analysis - often described as an approach concerned with “text and talk” – neglects to deal with the most explicitly textual of heritage objects: archives. The archive is noticeably absent from Smith’s monograph, mentioned only once in over three-hundred pages, and then only in a passing quotation. This omission is particularly striking when one considers the central position of her thesis - that “all heritage is intangible” and “not so much a ‘thing’ as a set of values and meanings” – and how neatly these statements articulate the dominant philosophical standpoint underpinning archivy at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The present study aims to rectify this by subjecting archives to this same critical lens and examining the assumptions and practices that inform the building of a national archive collection. This chapter will conclude by establishing the axes around which archival action is predicated, and how
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concepts of memory, community and representation have come to dominate our understanding of the role of archive in modern society.

**New directions in archival theory**

Expanding provenance

At its heart, archival action is “posited on the assumption that records can and do function as a mirror of their creator”;74 as Douglas has noted, “archives are acquired because of who creates them, arranged and described based on archivists’ understanding of that creator’s activities, and made available to researchers in record groups, fonds or collections identified by relation to the creator”.75 Accordingly, the professional concepts underlying it have been “designed precisely in order to preserve records as evidence of the functional-structural context and actions that caused their creation”.76 As Terry Cook has observed, the centrality of the creator and the emphasis on record-as-evidence saw archivy “defined as a descriptive science whose purpose was to illuminate that contextual origin of records, so that their properties as evidence would not be tainted”.77

In representing contexts of creation, archivy has typically conceived of records as having “a single creator, the individual (or corporate body) who created (i.e., made, received and/or set aside) the materials that make up the fonds and who is identified in the title of the fonds”.78 This view is baked into the structure of archival description: descriptive standards such as ISAD(G) and RAD, for instance, require an archivist to assign the fonds to a single creator, and allow for little flexibility. Douglas has argued that such simplification “obscures aspects of the records’ context that deserve archivists’ attention”79 with the consequence that creatorship remained understudied and little understood as a concept for most of the twentieth century.80 However, informed by
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postmodern emphases on subjectivity, individuality, and “the primacy of context and interpretation over simplistic and rationalist approaches to the past”, and practices emerging from social history disciplines (such as post-colonial studies and feminist studies) that advocate reading records “against the grain” in order to recover the voices of the marginalised, recent decades have seen a re-examination of archival creatorship, and a reappraisal of its centrality.

This reassessment can most clearly be observed in the transition away from a life-cycle model and towards a ‘records continuum’ approach for conceptualising record creation, use and ‘activation’. As Glenn Dingwall has explored, the life-cycle model emerged as a means to contend with an early-twentieth century boom in record creation, and “invokes an organic metaphor that considers records as objects which live out a life; records travel along the arrow of time from creation to destruction or preservation in an archive”. In this conception, once records have “fulfil[ed] their purpose in life” as tools to be used by their creator they are “sent to records purgatory, where the select wait to go on an archival afterlife, and the damned await the abyss of the shredder”. Faced with an increasing volume of electronic records, however, archivists found this model lacking: the lifecycle’s linear trajectory was harder to translate to the electronic environment, where “the retrieval and viewing of records occurs through an interface that obscures and abstracts the location of the media on which the information is actually written”. In this environment, delineations between stages were “merely a logical distinction, rather than a physical one with material impacts on access, retrieval and circulation”; additionally, it became apparent that “electronic records have an instant capability to act
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in roles other than participation in the creator's business activities ... without first needing to pass into archival custody".86

First explicitly described by Jay Atherton in 1985, and later developed by Frank Upward and colleagues from Monash University in the 1990s, the continuum model attempts to address these observations. It “departs altogether from the metaphor of a path by presenting a model that provides a multidimensional space for records to expand into from their point of creation”87 and refocuses attention on to “the processes through which records are used and given meaning to”.88 As Cook has neatly summarised, the continuum “incorporates records and record-keeping, records products and records processes, nouns and verbs, being and becoming, if you like”:89 that is, it emphasises the archive as a site of activity.

Pluralism: activations and assemblages
This approach has been described by Upward et al as “the integration of recordkeeping and archiving processes ..., together with a multi-dimensional and pluralist view of archival functionality”,90 and similarly, Michelle Caswell has noted how the continuum facilitates a ‘metaview’ of records: that is, it "accommodates a plurality of perspectives on the use and meaning of evidentiary texts".91 Caswell acknowledges Upward’s recognition that “memory gets ‘pluralised’ in the movement outward from documents to records, records to an archive, an archive to archives, and in this movement, grows to accommodate a diversity of functions, uses, and worldviews”,92 and advocates that this recognition be implemented through a commitment to archival pluralism. Caswell distinguishes pluralism from plurality (multivocality) and argues it should not merely be

86 Ibid.
87 Ibid., 150.
88 Ibid., 149.
89 Terry Cook, "Final Commentary Session of the Appraisal Seminar" (Monash University, Melbourne, 16 March 1999), 2.
92 Ibid., 277.
considered as a synonym for diversity; where diversity “simply results from an obvious observation”, pluralism is an active pursuit, constituting “what people do with the fact of diversity”. Archival pluralism, then, demands active “engagement with multiple coexisting archival realities—that is, fundamentally differing but equally valid ways of being and knowing [and] irreconcilably divergent—but still credible—ways of defining, transmitting, and interpreting evidence and memory”. In a similar vein, Gracen Brilmyer has advocated for a consideration of records as objects “embedded in an archival assemblage”. They argue that in order to accurately represent the full range of political and relational contexts that contribute to a record’s creation, archivists need to consider “the complex personal, material, political, and collective histories and connections this record has ... that produced and continues to (re)produce that record”. Such a consideration, Brilmyer asserts, must include a conscious assessment of the role of the archive and its actors. They decisively reject the notion of the archivist as neutral messenger in the transmission of past to future, and instead focus on the action in the present, taking the position that “politicizing archival material” and the archivist’s role in the nexus of creation is crucial. Drawing on feminist disability studies, Brilmyer is particularly concerned with how archival practice tends to “think ... in terms of a single, definitive, static arrangement and description process”, and instead suggests that by thinking (as Elizabeth Yakel has advocated) “in terms of continuous, relative, fluid arrangements and descriptions as ongoing representational processes” archivists can better utilise description to “include aspects such as people who may not be considered as either subject or creator of a record, a material’s history and alternative uses, evolving social understandings of difference, and an archivist’s positionality”. An assemblage approach, they therefore suggest, “makes space for the inclusion and recognition of
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counternarratives and also recognizes and makes apparent other influences, such as budgetary limits and archival traditions, on how descriptions are (re)produced.\textsuperscript{99}

An acknowledgement that “archivists in effect create, initiate or perpetuate an axiological commitment which is manifested in the permanence of the order that emerges”\textsuperscript{100} also underpins much of Eric Ketelaar’s writings on archival practice. In an influential 2001 article, he asserted that archival creation is not confined to the initial process of inscription, but instead occurs with each contact with the record:

> Every interaction, intervention, interrogation, and interpretation by creator, user, and archivist is an \textit{activitation} of the record. The archive is an infinite activation of the record. Each activation leaves fingerprints which are attributes to the archive’s infinite meaning. [The archive] is open yet enclosed, it is ‘membranic’, the membrane allowing the infusing and exhaling of values which are embedded in each and every activation.\textsuperscript{101}

Following the introduction of the continuum model, then, archivists began to examine more closely the “complex knots of provenance” that resulted from “trying to apply rigidly differentiated archival processes to much more fluid contexts of record creation and use”\textsuperscript{102} and develop more appropriate methods for representing the multiplicitous nature of records and their various activations. While the concept of provenance has been expanded in theory, though, “in practice that expansion remains difficult to operationalise”.\textsuperscript{103} Verne Harris and Wendy Duff have argued that this difficulty arises because although these standards are by nature rigid, operating from an assumption of objective neutrality, the act of “description is always story telling – intertwining facts with narratives, observation with narration”.\textsuperscript{104} Duff and Harris are blunt in their assertion that “no approach to archival description, no descriptive system or architecture can escape the reality that it is a way of constructing knowledge through processes of
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inscription, mediation and narration”. The task for archivists is, therefore, to “disclos[e] the lines of construction”:105 that is, to ‘open up’ the archive to the communities we document and serve, and to expose the scaffolding around which archival knowledge and assumptions have been constructed.

Community archives: representation and affect

Work in this area has been hugely informed by the ‘memory boom’ that has characterised the late twentieth century.106 As Cook has noted, “countless non-governmental organizations, lobbying groups, community activists, and ‘ordinary’ citizens [are] joining together, in numerous forums, to share interests reflecting every possible colour, creed, locale, belief, and activity, actual or hoped for. And they are creating records to bind their communities together, foster their group identities, and carry out their business”.107 While initially viewed with suspicion by some archivists wary of losing their ‘expert’ status, there is now a general acknowledgement that community archiving practices can offer a useful mirror in which to examine the ‘authorised heritage discourses’ on which archival action is predicated. As Randall C. Jimerson observed in 2009, “changes have already come, and more are on the way. If archivists do not engage these discourses and movements, we will lose yet another opportunity to make positive contributions to society”.108 Similarly, Jeannette A. Bastian notes that community approaches to the collection and management of heritage can “challenge archivists to look beyond traditional practice and embrace new ways of seeing and understanding records”,109 and indeed, while the profession may have certainly been slow in recognising the validity of community record-keeping practices, “community-based archiving is often a long-standing and well-established praxis from which we can learn much”.110

105 Ibid., 275.
109 Bastian and Alexander, ”Communities and Archives - a Symbiotic Relationship,” xxiii.
Community archives resist easy definitions. As Andrew Flinn has explored, the terms ‘community’ and ‘archives’ are themselves contested\textsuperscript{111} but a general consensus has emerged in archival literature that accepts the position put forth by Flinn, Mary Stevens and Elizabeth Shepherd: that community can be understood as “any manner of people who come together and present themselves as such, and a ‘community archive’ is the product of their attempts to document the history of their commonality”.\textsuperscript{112} As Bastian has noted “special collections and historical societies in the USA and Canada have been sites of regional and group expressions since the nineteenth century”.\textsuperscript{113} In the UK, however, community archiving can be understood as a more recent and “rapidly evolving phenomenon focusing primarily on minority social and ethnic groups”.\textsuperscript{114} Flinn has located the roots of these initiatives in the emergence of social history disciplines in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s such as post-colonial and feminist history studies that focused on “stories of those traditionally ignored or cast to the periphery of most mainstream histories rather than grander, larger narratives”. Such approaches “necessitated reflection on how such ‘new’ histories were to be written”,\textsuperscript{115} and crucially, they called attention to the inadequacy of traditional and mainstream archival repositories to meet these new demands. As a consequence, the discursive nature of the archive as “one of the ways in which the nation slowly constructs for itself a sort of collective social memory” is further exposed.\textsuperscript{116}

Exploring the impact of community archiving initiatives, Caswell et al have suggested that such approaches “can have important epistemological, ontological, and social impacts” on communities who have been “ignored, misrepresented or marginalised”\textsuperscript{117} by
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mainstream repositories. Using interviews with donors and archive users, they examined the affective impact of archival representation, and argued that feeling represented in an archives “has an ontological impact”:

…it changes [the viewer’s] sense of being in the world; she can ‘discover’ herself ‘existing’ in ways she did not before this record was created and made accessible. Representation in community archives catalyses this ontological shift from not being/not existing/not being documented to being/existing/being documented, with profound personal implications.118

This notion of representation is therefore central to such independent archival activity, and as the archival profession has begun to attend more closely to the social, mnemonic, and affective aspects of archives, this concept has come to occupy a central place in our understanding of what function archives and archival collections play in society.

Furthermore, Caswell et al have also established that “active participation in record creation”, particularly when this was seen to be either action against symbolic annihilation or ‘setting the record straight’, can provoke a powerful “emotional response”.119 This is important to consider in relation to Elizabeth Crooke’s work exploring how community heritage has become a central plank of government policy in the past few decades. Crooke observed how “the plethora of community policies published [in the UK during the] late 1990s and 2000s demonstrate that the notion of sustainable, inclusive, cohesive and regenerated communities was a major strategic government approach”,120 but suggested that while community is for many “a grass-roots concept, community policy, as it has developed in the UK, is largely a top-down approach”.121 While some community archives “are owned and controlled from within the community … others are inspired and sponsored by mainstream heritage organizations”, and those in the latter category are apt to reproduce hierarchies of
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knowledge that value the role of the ‘impartial expert’ over that of the community. Caswell has called on archivists to extend their understanding beyond communities-as-subject: she posits that that “notions of ‘community’ in community archives complicate common assumptions about clear distinctions between users, donors of materials, volunteers and staff”. Stevens, Flinn, and Shepherd have likewise suggested that there is room for archivists to better “interrogate prevailing definitions of ‘expertise’” and thus come to “appreciate the tremendous advantages of valuing the contribution of the bearers of alternative forms of knowledge – the ‘living archive’ – as much as the record itself”. In response, a particular ‘branch’ of community archives has emerged. This has been loosely termed ‘participatory archiving’, although (like much in this discussion) this is a label that holds different meanings in different contexts. While many mainstream organisations have experimented with inviting communities into the archival process through crowdsourced description projects or by soliciting contributions of material, it has been argued that such approaches reinforce the claim of the archive to ‘speak for’ communities: in their control of the terms on which the community can engage, power over final decisions regarding appraisal, arrangement and description still rests with the ‘experts’, and as Flinn notes, by prioritising acquisition and collection (and thus ownership of the materials by the archive) these methods reveal a mindset which “remains wedded to a very top-down custodial view of professional activity”. Instead, advocates for participatory archiving maintain that by “acknowledge[ing] a diversity of expertise" among participants, and operating “from a premise of shared authority”.
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such approaches can “subvert ... power relations between records, researchers and archivists”\textsuperscript{129} by ensuring that archival power is more evenly distributed.

Further exploring the affective dimensions to archival action, Flinn has identified how “independent cultural heritage initiatives often emerged directly out of a context of marginalisation, racism and struggle”.\textsuperscript{130} He suggests that engagement with the archive can offer participants (as creators, donors, users, or researchers) a space in which to “enact the politics of their communities”\textsuperscript{131} and proposes that such activity can be termed ‘archival activism’ or ‘activist archiving’.\textsuperscript{132} Flinn observed that where the conventional archive does document these communities “it ... rarely allows them to speak with their voice, through their own records”.\textsuperscript{133} Instead, “traces are generally one-dimensional, often reducing individuals to statistics, appearing as problems, occupations, rigid ethnic or faith-based identities which minimise or ignore complexity and deny them their own voice”.\textsuperscript{134} Community archival action can therefore “have an impact in diversifying and democratising heritage. Indeed, their very existence challenges and subverts the authority of mainstream histories and archives”.\textsuperscript{135} Flinn’s work has focused on the archival representation of Black and ethnic minority communities in British repositories, and stresses that it is important to remember that “these community histories are not separate histories, somehow not part of the mainstream, but that they are integral to a new inclusive history of all of us, of Britain as a ‘community of communities’”.\textsuperscript{136} We must tread carefully, however. As Crooke observes, “community is a multi-layered and politically charged concept that, with a change in context, alters in meaning and consequence”\textsuperscript{137} and can be exclusionary in its ‘othering’ of identities; similarly, Caswell
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cautions that “our evolving notion of archival pluralism must avoid claims of universality, inattention to power structures, the silencing of dissent, and the collapsing of difference”. 138 She notes that while “the promotion of greater social cohesion may be seen as laudable ... pluralism must also allow for varying degrees of disagreement, discord, and nonparticipation”. 139

Jarret Drake has likewise argued that archivists should “gravitate towards an orientation that envisions the political projects of archives”. He maintains that archivists “must shift their paradigms away from the fictive notions of ‘local’ and ‘community-based’” because, he argues, by “any metric of the definition of ‘community’, one is compelled to characterize literally every archive as a ‘community archive’”. Drake suggests that this shorthand of ‘community archives’ is used to gesture towards the political motivations that underlie such projects without explicitly naming them. This, he argues, is because a full acknowledgement of this point would require us to attend more closely to the activities of ‘mainstream’ institutions: as he points out, archives are not concerned with “collecting history for history’s sake” and “the notion that ‘mainstream’ or ‘state-like’ archives do so might be the biggest fiction of them all”. 140

**Conclusion**

In this survey of key theoretical frameworks in the fields of nationalism studies and archival theory, some separate but related ideas have emerged. Examining the historical conditions which produced the nation-state, we have seen that the nation is a socially (and imaginatively) constructed community. It possesses no innate or natural character itself but is, rather, a “porous vessel” 141 into which the concerns, desires, and preoccupations of the present can be poured. We have also seen the significance of heritage and print capitalism to the development of a national consciousness, and
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exploring the historical roots of the archival endeavour has demonstrated that as the repository of the nation’s (textual) memory, the archive and the nation operate in symbiosis as two sides of the same coin: the nation provides the defining framing in which archives have traditionally been understood, and the archive serves as the prism through which the national past and national future can be viewed and ‘read’. The latter part of this chapter discussed the evolution of archival theory in the last century, and demonstrated that archives, too, are socially and imaginatively constructed: like the nation, records do not possess a natural character or value, but are instead inscribed value through inclusion in the archive. Collecting for the nation is not, therefore, a process that requires the uncovering or identifying records with innate value, but constitutes a tacit commentary on the nation’s character: on how the nation’s past, present, and future is conceived. Using the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum as a case study, I will examine how, as the key archival repository in the country, the National Library of Scotland conceives of the task of ‘collecting for the nation’. The next chapter will explore the historical context in which the Library was established and the contribution of the NLS to the production and reproduction of Scottish national identity in the years between its founding in 1925 and the creation of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, and consider how the NLS has understood and negotiated its mnemonic role in Scottish society.
Chapter 2 – Collecting (for) the Nation: The Scottish National Library

Introduction

This chapter provides some historical context to the place and cultural position of the National Library of Scotland in Scottish society. It briefly outlines the history of Scotland’s documentary heritage before moving on to an examination of how the campaign for a national library was framed and the political context that surrounded it. Following the work of Graeme Morton and Colin Kidd, I will explore how prosperity in the imperial project resulted in the notion of Scottish social and economic ‘progress’ becoming inextricably associated with unionism; how the national past was invoked in order to emphasise the Scottish contribution to the Union rather than foster desires for separation; and how a network of voluntary and subscriber action enabled the Scottish bourgeoisie to administer and maintain public life “without recourse to the parliamentary state”.¹ Examining the relationship between the Scottish nationalist movement and the Scottish literary landscape it considers Benedict Anderson’s notion of the ‘imagined community’ in a Scottish context, arguing that Scotland’s centrality to the print industry effectively exported a version of Scotland to the world in which Scotland remained distinctive and independent – a nation in text. The latter part of this chapter will examine how the National Library of Scotland has understood and negotiated its role in Scottish public life and how this has been shaped by a changing political environment.

Scotland’s documentary heritage

Traditionally, there have been three key bodies involved in the safeguarding of Scotland’s documentary heritage: the National Archives of Scotland (NAS) and the General Register Office for Scotland (GROS), now merged to form the National Records of Scotland (NRS); and the National Library of Scotland (NLS). As the NLS serves as the archive of Scotland’s cultural (rather than administrative) output, I will discuss the NRS only briefly before

moving on to a detailed analysis of the NLS. It must be noted, however, that no archive nor institution exists in isolation: the relationship between the two is far more entwined than this approach may imply.

The history of Scotland’s documentary heritage is a turbulent one. Although there is evidence of a strong record-keeping tradition that dates back to the Middle Ages, the “earliest surviving Scottish public record is the Quitclaim of Canterbury of 1189”. The first recorded blow to the documentary landscape came in 1296 when Edward I “had all the symbols of Scots nationhood - the regalia, the national archives and the Stone of Destiny - removed to London”. Although the later Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton decreed the records should be returned to Scotland in full, this went unacted, and the archives remained in London. Many were lost or destroyed in the intervening years and when the records were finally returned, only around two hundred documents were found to have survived. A specially built register house within Edinburgh Castle served as a repository, and the records remained there safely until the castle was captured by Oliver Cromwell’s army in 1650. The records were then moved to Stirling Castle, and when this was also lost to the English in 1651 the archives were removed once more to London.

Administrative demand saw the legal registers returned to Scotland in 1657, but a Restoration attempt to repatriate the remaining records in 1660 ended in disaster when one of the two ships carrying them sank off the cost of Northumbria “with the loss of all the papers and parchments on board.” Although the Treaty of Union of 1707 decreed that the records remain in Scotland, no appropriate storage facility could be found, and with the nation still in dire financial straits, there was little possibility of building one. This remained the case for most of the century, until the opening of the General Register House in 1788. Government decree in 1854 created the General Register Office of Births, Deaths and Marriages and required that a registrar was appointed to each parish for the purpose of compiling population statistics. Compulsory civil registration was introduced in 1855, and duplicates of the parish registers were deposited regularly in General Register House, in a room known informally as the ‘Well of Souls’.

The two entities merged in April 2011 to become the National Records of Scotland, which now functions as a Non-Ministerial Department of the Scottish Government. In addition
to performing “the registration and statistical functions of the Registrar General for Scotland and the archival functions of the Keeper of the Records of Scotland”\(^2\), the NRS also acts as an industry leader and provides guidance to government bodies on the correct management and preservation of governmental and other records.\(^3\) There are a few points that deserve brief attention here before I move on. It is useful to note the relationship between archive and nationhood that is implicit in Edward I’s actions and is made explicit by NRS in their history: the records that make up the nation’s past are central to both its administration and sense of difference and distinction. Second, it could be argued that the restitution of the legal registers to Scotland effectively pre-empted the retention of control over law that was secured by the Treaty of Union in 1707. As ‘judicial and economic tools,’ the removal of those records to England would have hindered the ability of the Kingdom of Scotland to effectively govern itself. The demands for and subsequent return of the records further implies, perhaps, that where the archives go, so the nation’s sense of itself as judicially and economically unique goes too.

Thirdly, it is important to recognise that the NRS does not undertake ‘active’ or interventionist collecting but instead operates as a receiving repository for government records. This stands in contrast to the collection development function of the NLS, and offers a neat illustration of the “paradigm shift” in archival theory from records-as-evidence to records-as-memory that was discussed in the previous chapter. That is, where the NRS safeguards the procedural record of Scotland’s administrative functions, the Library occupies an interpretative, curatorial and narrative space

**National Library of Scotland**

The NLS has its roots in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates. Established in 1689, the Advocates’ Library was granted national recognition under the Copyright Act in 1710 when it was bestowed the right to claim a copy of every book published in Britain. Although the right of legal deposit was initially welcomed by the Faculty the maintenance
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of this ever-growing collection soon became overwhelming, and the first calls for a fully ‘national’ repositories were voiced in 1808. Ultimately, it was not until a private donation of £100,000 was made by Sir Alexander Grant that transfer of the library to the nation could be completed and, constituted by an Act of Parliament, the NLS formally came into being in 1925.

Two central motivations lay behind the campaign for a national library. The first was largely pragmatic: the costs incurred from managing the collections had long surpassed what the Scottish legal profession could manage, and by the early nineteenth century the ‘gift’ of copyright privileges had become more of a burden. The second reason, however, had more to do with issues of Scottish identity and nationhood: as Iain F. MacIver has observed, “the long but intermittent campaign for a national library echoes in a minor key the flow of assertion of national interests and identity evident in the political history of modern Scotland”. The campaign was often framed in terms that stressed the cultural distinctiveness of Scotland: for example, a pamphlet published by key figures in the library campaign drew on the image of Scotland as “a nation which above all others is tenacious of tradition and historic possession” and called on the Scottish elite to ensure that “a race which has carried the light of its learning through the globe [does not allow] the lamp of its own citadel to grow dim”.

A desire to protect and assert the cultural equality of Scotland to England was also a key theme of motivation for the campaigners, as is demonstrated by the following memorandum of 1873 from the Faculty to the Chancellor of the Exchequer:

Would it be fair to the inhabitants of Scotland, that the only great Library to which the Legislature of the three kingdoms afforded State assistance should be in London? Is it not the duty, as well as the best policy, of the Legislature to provide reasonable facility for the prosecution of literary
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and scientific pursuits to the inhabitants of all three Kingdoms, as far as practicable, on a footing of fair equality?7

Much was made of the discrepancies in the funding granted to cultural institutions on either side of the border: the Faculty noted in the same memorandum that “no less than £20,000 per annum is in use to be voted to the Library of the British Museum” in comparison to the £5,000 that was being requested for Scotland. Demands for a Scottish national library did not go completely unheeded by Westminster: indeed, then-Prime Minister Lord Aberdeen expressed support for the idea of “making the Advocates’ Library really publick, and accessible to all the world under proper regulations,”8 but the apparent unwillingness of the Faculty to cede any control over their library complicated the matter, and in response the government took the position that to grant public aid to a private organisation “would make a precedent of the most dangerous kind”.9

It is interesting to consider why Parliament exhibited such hostility to the library project when, as Maclver has noted, “the enormous success of the Great Exhibition of 1851 had shown the depths of public demand for organised public display of art, design and technology”.10 Indeed, a crop of similar institutions had recently been established north of the border: the National Gallery of Scotland was opened by Prince Albert in 1859; the “museum of the Society of Antiquaries was transferred to the custody of the state in 1851” and “in 1854, responding to many petitions and memorials from learned societies and public bodies in favour of a national museum for the sciences, funds were voted by Parliament for a new ‘Industrial Museum of Scotland’”.11 What, then, made the Advocates’ Library an unworthy recipient of ‘national’ status?

Institutions of difference?
Smith has suggested that for nations to develop successful emancipatory political movements they must operate “on two levels: the socio-political and the cultural-

7 “Statement by the Curators,” ed. Advocates’ Library (Edinburgh1873).
11 Ibid., 21. These last two institutions would later merge to form the National Museum of Scotland.
psychological”. Involved as they were with the interpretation and enactment of the law – the arena in which the relationship between the state and the citizen is negotiated – it could be argued that the Faculty of Advocates already represented the socio-political aspect of the nation. The collecting of manuscripts, however, points more to the cultural-psychological side of the nation’s identity: to unite these two forces with the endorsement and financial support of the British government, then, may have been perceived as akin to building a shrine to Scottish socio-political and cultural-psychological distinction.

It is unlikely, however, that the desire for this ‘shrine’ was perceived as a threat or danger by the British government: rather, it was because such a move was not seen to serve any purpose that the requests for funding were not fulfilled. It is interesting to note that there is no (named) ‘English’ national library. As a potential explanation for this, we could turn to Colin Kidd’s suggestion that there was “a lack of English commitment to a British idea which was more than either an alternative name for England or a euphemism which disguised the nature of England’s core imperial relationships with her associated peripheries”. It is quite possible, therefore, that as far as Parliament was concerned the existence of the British Museum Library was sufficient for the purposes of research in Britain, regardless of whether Scots felt “it [was] not fair that the only great Library ... to which the legislature of the three Kingdoms affords pecuniary assistance should be in London”.

A comparison with the situation in Wales illustrates this. The Welsh campaign for a national library “had a later start (1873) [but] was conspicuously more efficient and successful”. This was in part because the campaign was but one aspect of a wider “rising tide of renewed national consciousness, in which a perceived need for cultural institutions to consolidate and defend the Welsh language provided much of its drive”. Whereas Wales had endured sustained attacks on its native linguistic tradition
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(evidenced, for example, by the use of the Welsh Not\textsuperscript{17}) the Scottish language never posed the same barrier to advancement that models of nationalism would consider a catalyst for a national movement. Indeed, Graeme Morton observed, while “it is true that anxiety about a Scottish accent or writing in Scottish idioms was widespread”\textsuperscript{18} amongst those with aspirations to social mobility, Scottish elites simply “sent their children to school in England to learn polite language”.\textsuperscript{19} Accordingly, there was far less need to “consolidate and defend” a Scottish linguistic tradition against Anglicisation.

This comparison with Wales raises two points that are crucial to an understanding of Scottish national identity at the turn of the century. Firstly, it is important to acknowledge that a Scottish sense of difference and distinctiveness was not bound to a linguistic tradition: simply put, it was not language which kept this sense of difference alive and thriving, but rather the institutions and organisations through which Scotland governed itself. Morton has explored this notion in detail. Taking as his starting point Michael Fry’s statement that the Union of Parliaments in 1707 “allowed the Scots to dispense with the distraction of politics”\textsuperscript{20}, Morton suggested that the loss of an independent Parliament resulted in the development of a strong civil society which effectively ‘managed’ the nation through a network of voluntary institutions and charitable organisations. This was partly enabled by the Treaty of Union itself. Described by Tom Nairn as “a peculiarly patrician bargain between two ruling classes”,\textsuperscript{21} the Treaty ensured that Scotland enjoyed continued rights of control over its legal system, church and education system, and in doing so, maintained “the framework of nationhood, and of potential statehood, and so enhance[d] and [gave] a practical reality to Scottish ethnic identity”.\textsuperscript{22} It is important to note, however, that “the sheer strength of Scottish civil society was much

\textsuperscript{17} A Welsh Not or Knot was typically a piece of wood or other marker that would be given to a child found speaking Welsh in school: the child in possession of the Welsh Not at the end of the school session would be punished, often physically.
\textsuperscript{18} Morton, \textit{Unionist-Nationalism}, 17.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Nairn, \textit{The break-up of Britain}, 129
\textsuperscript{22} Morton, \textit{Unionist-Nationalism}, 11.
more than any perceived ‘difference’ of church law and education”:23 Morton illustrates at length that voluntary and subscriber action “allowed the middle class to deal with the challenges of urban society without recourse to the parliamentary state”,24 and argues that “it was the self-sustaining independence of this [voluntary] action which ... was the means whereby Scottishness was encapsulated”.25

The second point to note from a comparison with the Welsh campaign is that while Wales had been incorporated into England by the Laws in Wales Acts of 1535 and 1542, Scotland had entered into its Union with England as an independent nation, and this point was a powerful factor of Scottish identity: as Nairn has stressed, “Scotland is not a colony, a semi-colony, a pseudo-colony, a near-colony, a neo-colony, or any kind of colony of the English”.26 The campaign for a national library, therefore, was not particularly concerned with ‘salvaging’ symbols of a lost and oppressed nation from the past. Rather than aiming to mobilise the people towards a political movement that would emancipate them from Union, it was geared instead towards ensuring the contribution of the Scots to the Union was not obscured. As Nairn observed, “the Scottish middle classes were never compelled to turn to [this] substantial inheritance and harness it en bloc, to mobilise it and the social classes beneath them in a developmental struggle. The usual ‘raw material’ of nationalism remained, in Scotland, latent and unexploited”.27 In other words, the Scottishness that was encapsulated by voluntary action was a Scottishness that was felt to exist not just within but – crucially – because of the Union. Rooted in enlightenment notions of improvement, such a position required a particular configuration of the national past.

Deliverance through Union

For nineteenth century thinkers there was a clear demarcation between the violent, chaotic world of Scotland’s feudal past and the ordered and civilised world that they occupied, and the Union served as the threshold between the two. Kidd has suggested that the stability and opportunity that the Union delivered saw English constitutionalism

23 Ibid., 64.
24 Ibid., 131.
25 Ibid., 132.
come to be perceived as ‘rescuing’ a backwards and primitive Scotland from itself, and suggests that the notion of the social and economic ‘progress’ of civilisation became inextricably associated with unionism:

The Scottish conception of liberty had from the mid-eighteenth century become associated with the benefits of Union with England, including liberation from anachronistic feudal institutions. The communal memory of Scottish national independence did persist, but it was now impossible to detach the idea of freedom completely from the experience of Anglicisation.28

Cairns Craig has argued that in the decades immediately following the Union, this perception led to a situation in which “pre-Union Scotland was to be remembered only to be rejected”.29 As Scotland’s economic fortunes increased and the feudal past came to belong to a time and place safely removed from contemporary Scotland, this rejection evolved into a form of revivalism that sought not to resurrect the past, but instead to give thanks to a past that had paved the way for the salvation of the nation by way of the Union. As Nairn remarked of Sir Walter Scott: “the whole purpose of his unmatched evocation of a national past is never to revive it: that is, never to resuscitate it as part of political or social mobilisation in the present … On the contrary, his essential point is always that the past really is gone”,30 – or, rather, that something better has followed in its wake.

The continuing independence of Scotland’s institutions meant that Scotland had never lost a sense of itself as an independent Kingdom. It was tethered to England by Union, perhaps – but central to the Scottish mindset at this time was the conviction that the Union was the outcome of a partnership, not a conquest. The Scottish elite therefore felt free to celebrate and venerate historical figures such as William Wallace and Robert the Bruce “for their contribution – not to Scotland’s independence – but to Scotland’s equality
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with England at the time of Union”.\(^{31}\) Terming this ‘unionist nationalism’, Morton has explored the contemporary interpretation of historical figures such as Wallace and Bruce to illustrate this, and examining an 1859 proposal to build a monument to the two men, detected a theme “of Scotland’s two great leaders in her fight for independence from England in the fourth century now being used as symbols of support for the Union”.\(^{32}\)

As Morton noted, the wording of the monument proposal makes this clear:

> It is not to be a Monument to either Wallace or Bruce – a point as to which it is necessary that the utmost explicitness should exist. It is the Deliverance and its results, as distinguished from the Deliverers, that is here sought to be commemorated…”\(^{33}\)

The acts of these men had enabled Scotland to enter into partnership with England as equals, and through this Union with their southern neighbours Scotland had been ‘saved’. Therefore, while both figures certainly fit the criteria for the national myths Hroch describes, it was because they had delivered unionism to Scotland that they could be celebrated as \textit{exempla} of a feudal warrior past without inspiring nationalistic imitators or posing a threat to the Union.

It is in the light of this ‘unionist nationalism’ and its associated strong civil society that we must consider the outcome of the campaign for a national library in Scotland. The campaign offers a clear illustration of the crucial role played by Scotland’s civil society in administering and maintaining public life. That this was well understood (and perhaps even welcomed) by the powers at Westminster is apparent from a response sent by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the campaigners in 1873: denying any requests for public aid, the letter remarked that “any greater facilities of access to the Library would doubtless be beneficial to the citizens of Edinburgh; and Mr Lowe thinks it is to them rather than to the Government that the Faculty should apply if they find themselves

\(^{31}\) Morton, \textit{Unionist-Nationalism}, 182.
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unable any longer to maintain the Library out of their own resources”.34 Unable to rely on government support, then, the elite of Scottish society did what they had become accustomed to doing, and took the matter of guarding ‘the light of Scottish learning’ into their own hands. This supports the notion that the ‘framework of potential statehood’ was well established in Edinburgh: it was simply being operated independently of the parliamentary state. That such independent management of Scotland’s affairs could take place at all owes to the fact that although “Scotland and England came together in 1707, ... this did not result in a British civil society”.35 Kidd has suggested that this “half-way house” of an Anglo-British identity was “broadly acceptable to both English and Scottish political nations,” but never developed beyond a euphemism for the English. Accordingly, Kidd argues, the compromise of Britishness “made possible the continuation of a wounded but operative Scottish national tradition”: a tradition that maintained its Scottishness under a cloak of Britishness.36

A nation in text

In a similar vein, Craig has argued that “Scottish nationalism did not need to assert itself within the British state because the world was its field”. He posited that the sense of being an equal (if somewhat junior) partner in the business of Union and Empire saw a sustained effort to “make Scotland the spiritual core of the imperial project”.37 Like Morton, Craig notes that “after 1707, Scotland was a nation which existed only in and through its institutions”, and suggests that “this seems to have made Scots ... sensitive to the significance of institutions as a means of maintaining and transmitting distinctive Scottish values”.38 Accordingly, Scots ‘on the make’ in empire took their lead from their brothers at home and established “Scottish churches, Scottish schools, Scottish-style universities and medical schools” across the globe, effectively creating a “distinct Scottish Empire within the British Empire”.39 This project to remake Scotland in the far-flung
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corners of the imperial world “was characterised ... by the fact that its institutions ... were designed to establish Scottish values as the foundations from which a new culture could be built”.\textsuperscript{40} And the spread and influence of these values, Craig continues, was “amplified by the ongoing impact of Scottish publishing”.\textsuperscript{41} Magazines such as Edinburgh Review and Blackwood’s Magazine, for example, became “standard reading matter throughout the Empire and across the English-speaking world”,\textsuperscript{42} and it was Edinburgh’s prevailing independence as a publishing centre that “not only inspired a continual flow of books on Scottish topics” but also “ensured that Scottish works and Scottish concerns were projected to an international audience”.\textsuperscript{43} As Craig summarised:

In the ‘world republic of letters’ of the nineteenth century, Scotland was not a supplicant, waiting on recognition from Paris or London but, by the accumulated wealth of its cultural capital, able not only to claim the attention of a global readership but able to shape the cultural environment in which its writings were received.\textsuperscript{44}

Through this triad of opportunity in Empire, a sense of national difference that was exercised through institutions rather than government, and a robust and wide-reaching publishing industry, a textual version of Scotland “as a distinct, and still largely independent, cultural entity – the originator of an empire which was not limited by political or economic boundaries” was disseminated through the imperial world.\textsuperscript{45} In turn, this created and fortified Scotland’s image of itself, creating a situation where advocates for a national library could speak of Scotland as “a nation which above all others is tenacious of tradition and historic possession” and of the Scots as “a race which has carried the light of its learning through the globe”.\textsuperscript{46} By the end of the nineteenth century, Craig argues, the popularity of the works of Scott and Burns had “transformed Scotland into a place which resonated with literary associations”,\textsuperscript{47} a resonance that was felt as strongly within Scotland as it was without. It is this Scotland, then – the Scotland
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that retained its place as an independent nation in the ‘world republic of letters’ – that is memorialised in the national archive and through the establishment of the NLS: the documents that constitute Scotland’s cultural heritage – its distinctive contribution to world culture – become monuments to a past not lost nor alive, but instead kept suspended in a state of perpetual waiting.

Patrick Cadell, Keeper of Manuscripts at the NLS from 1983-1990,48 has acknowledged that “there is no canon which lays down what the functions of the manuscript department of a national library should be, or what it should collect”,49 and examining how the NLS has interpreted its manuscript collecting function provides us with some insight into how it has understood its role in Scottish society. Cadell observes two factors in the founding of the NLS that influenced its approach to manuscript collecting: “having a clearly defined manuscript department” and “a regular supply of money” specifically for the purpose of purchasing manuscripts meant that “for the first time, the Library was not dependent upon the fortuitous coming together of opportunity and finance”, and could instead develop a strategy for the acquisition of manuscript material. He further suggests that the NLS modelled its activities in this area on the approach of the British Museum, and partly ascribes this to the influence of the Library’s first Keeper of Manuscripts, Henry W. Meikle. Having previously held the post of Librarian at the Institute of Historical Research, Meikle was well-acquainted with “how things were done in London”, and in adopting the British Museum’s view that “anything manuscriptus was within the province of a manuscript department”, Meikle departed from the previous approach of the Faculty, which had “held to the distinction … that a library should only collect books, and that loose papers were the province of an archive or record office”. As Cadell notes, the “importance of this change lay not merely in the physical aspect of the material collected” but in how it “ensured that the Library was able to bring in almost any type of material that was made available to it”. The collecting remit of the department was thus significantly broadened to the extent that Cadell (writing in 1989) was able to suggest

that throughout the twentieth century there had been "little need to establish specialist subject repositories in Scotland, since what did not go to the Scottish Record Office, or later to local archives, could go to the National Library, regardless of its subject matter."\(^{50}\)

Here, we can see a shift in the focus of the manuscript collecting function, a move away from collecting single items of high historical or literary prestige (such as, for example, the Bannatyne Manuscript or the original manuscript of *The Heart of Midlothian*) and towards a consideration of the Library's collections as *representative* of the nation. Accordingly, this required more active collection of "the archive[s] of individuals of distinction in all walks of life, the archives of institutions which are national but not government run, and the written records of all the arts as practised in Scotland",\(^{51}\) and Cadell uses the example of political papers to illustrate the effect this had on the Library's holdings:

A determined attempt has been made to see that the political life of Scotland in the late 20\(^{th}\) century is represented in all its shades. The papers of individual politicians, of political parties at both national and constitutional level, of quasi-political organisations such as the Scottish Trades Union Congress, and of a very wide range of trades unions are an unrivalled source of information on the social and political life of Scotland in this century.\(^{52}\)

**Writing the nation**

One area which the NLS approached with particular enthusiasm was the collecting of literary papers, to the extent that Cadell asserts that "the Library's collection of modern literary manuscripts is probably more comprehensive than that of any other national library".\(^{53}\) This area of the Library's activities deserve attention here, and must be considered in relation to the wider Scottish literary revival that took place in the early to mid-twentieth century. Reflecting the dominant theories around the relationship between nationalism and heritage discussed in the previous chapter, this movement was concerned with the 'salvaging' of "Scottish traditions which had been submerged by
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anglicisation”.

As Duncan Glen has examined, “many of the young Scottish writers who returned to Scotland after the 1914-18 war filled with nationalistic feelings soon began to see their country as culturally bankrupt and in grave danger of losing its national identity in the larger political entity of Great Britain”, and felt that “the very existence of a distinctive Scottish literary identity, as opposed to a provincial North British one, could no longer be taken for granted”. Recognising that “the educated Scot regarded English as the language for polite speech and serious writing” and that “the Scottish poet who wished to reach a sophisticated or educated public felt compelled to write in English and largely for a public outside Scotland”, figures such as Neil Gunn, Edwin Muir and (most notably) Hugh MacDiarmid rejected the sentimental ‘kailyard’ tradition in Scottish literature which, they argued, “presented the English and the American reader with a picture of Scotland as a sort of collection of picturesque rural parishes peopled by ‘pawky’ or ‘nippy’ characters”. In response, many writers “came to believe that the only hope for a distinctively Scottish literature was through a revival of the native languages of Scotland – Scots and Gaelic” and undertook a conscious grappling with and redefinition of the condition of Scottish literature, producing realistic and often satiric works that engaged directly with social and political issues.

This movement had an explicitly political character. As Margery Palmer McCulloch has described, “those involved [in the Scottish literary revival] believed that there could be no regeneration of the nation’s artistic culture which did not also involve the
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regeneration of the social, economic and political life of the nation". 60 MacDiarmid, most often identified as an instigator of the Scottish renaissance movement, was explicit in his intention that Scottish literature (and by extension, the Scottish nation) should take its rightful place in the pantheon of world culture:

No revival of Scots can be of consequence to a literary aspirant worthy of his salt unless it is so aligned with contemporary tendencies in European thought and expression that it has with it the possibility of eventually carrying Scots work once more into the mainstream of European literature. 61

Here we can see Smith’s theory, which figures “the rediscovery and reinterpretation of the ethnic past” as a necessary condition for “the regeneration of [the] national community” 62 in action, in that Scottish renaissance writers were “concerned with reviving not only Scottish literature or the arts in Scotland but with reviving ‘Scotland the Nation’”. 63 Examining the “complex and pervasive intermingling of Scottish literature and politics” in the decades leading to devolution, Hames has demonstrated how “a story of cultural vanguardism in which writers and artists play the starring role in the recuperation of national identity, cultural confidence and democratic agency” has largely overshadowed “a longer, thinner political history of devolution as a shrewd and sometimes grubby saga of electoral expediency”. 64 Indeed, this relationship has acquired fabled status, with Robert Crawford contending that “a reassertion of Scottish nationhood [was] imagined by poets and writers long before being enacted by politicians”. 65 As the institutional guardian of this ‘recovered’ national memory, and the associated efforts to redefine the qualities of ‘Scottish’ and ‘Scottish literature,’ then, we can understand the broadening of the NLS’s manuscript ‘heritage gaze’ as an archival expression of a wider movement to rescue Scottish culture from the ravages of anglicisation and ensure that it is preserved for the benefit of future ‘political archaeologists’.
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A changing remit

Further examining the available NLS collection development policy documents over time give an idea of how the NLS itself has understood this aspect of its collecting function and – by extension – its cultural role in society. The ‘Manuscripts Division Collection Development Policy’ document published in 1983 acknowledges a change in the archival landscape that had had a significant impact on the Library’s collecting activities – one that would have implications for the collection of Indyref related material three decades later. The document notes that the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1975 had resulted in a number of local record offices being set up, and in many areas, these had become “active collectors of local material”.66 While this meant the Library now had to take care to ensure “that any local material [the NLS] acquire[s] is not acquired at the expense of or in competition with a local repository”, as Cadell, the then-Head of the Manuscripts Division, reflected, this also provided opportunities for the Library to take a step back from some of its collecting areas:

Now, although our remit still covers everything to do with Scotland, we have allies who are able to remove from us some of our obligations towards local material, business records, and to some extent family and legal papers.67

Similarly, a 1991 collection development policy from the Department of Printed Books commented on the increased competition the Library faced from academic collecting institutions such as the Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and on the need to work collaboratively with other bodies to avoid duplication and ensure coverage:

General agreements about areas of responsibility in collection development, or, at least, a knowledge of subjects of special interest to particular libraries derived from detailed descriptions of the policies for collection development … may offer some scope for savings through the avoidance of duplication in several libraries.68

67 Ibid.
Notably absent here is any reflection on what constitutes ‘national’ vs ‘local’ material: instead, the focus is kept firmly on the practical operations of a national library. The 1991 document opens with excerpts from a definition of the national library taken from the British Standard Institution’s *Glossary of Documentation Terms* (BS 5408:1976), which emphasises the Library’s responsibilities for securing a record of the printed output of the nation, and ensuring foreign publications that relate to Scotland are well represented in the NLS collections: here, again, practicalities are the focus. By 2010, however, this focus has shifted to include a consideration of the Library’s cultural (or spiritual) function. *Thriving or Surviving?: National Library of Scotland in 2030* was a formal discussion paper published by the NLS in 2010. In this document we see the Library move away from the British Standard Institution’s definition of a national library and instead embrace that provided by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, which figures national libraries as “custodians of the nation’s intellectual heritage”. Under this definition, the national library has a responsibility not only for “the preservation and promotion of the national cultural heritage” but also for “the promotion of national cultural policy”.\(^{69}\)

This marks a significant shift in the way the NLS understood its function in Scottish society, a shift that had not occurred in a vacuum: as a 2005 report in the library-science journal *Alexandria* makes clear, with both cultural and educational provision having been devolved in 1997 it became apparent that “the Library’s principal areas of operation [were] at the heart of some of the Scottish Executive’s most innovative policies” for the development of an “increasingly distinctive political agenda”.\(^{70}\) This had prompted much examination of the Library’s ability to meet “the demands of an increasingly confident devolved nation in the twenty-first century information society”.\(^{71}\) The report highlights that in the 1925 Act of Parliament that constituted the NLS, “no specific mission for the


\(^{71}\) Ibid., 134.
Library, other than to exist, is specified”. In the post-devolution landscape, however, it was clear that “the institution is expected to take an active role in the cultural and educational life of the nation, and contribute to the developing identity and profile of Scotland abroad”, and that in this respect, “the essentially passive responsibilities of collecting and preserving material are no longer sufficient”.

Cultural entitlement

In response to this changed political environment, the NLS introduced a new mission statement that envisioned “an aspirational role for the Library as an active part of the Scottish nation”. The strategy for supporting this new vision - “developed in parallel with the developing agenda of the new Parliament - was set out in the Library’s 2004 strategy document Breaking Through the Walls”. As the title suggests, the strategy was specifically concerned with dismantling barriers to using the Library, both actual and perceived. A particular development in this respect was the embrace of ideas around ‘cultural entitlement’ that had been introduced in the Cultural Policy Statement issued in 2004 by the Scottish Executive. Accompanied by a quote from First Minister Jack McConnell which cast “arts for all” as “a democratic right”, the Cultural Policy Statement asserted that “every citizen has the right to access and excellence in our diverse culture, and to pursue the means of fulfilling whatever talents may be within them”. Recognising that traditionally stringent criteria for admission had led to a perception of the NLS as “forbidding and exclusive”, the Breaking Through strategy instituted an open and egalitarian position to access, maintaining that “potential customers will not need to demonstrate why they need to use NLS, it will be their right to use the Library's services”. Emphasising this shift in mindset away from granting permission and towards facilitating access, the Library's new attitude was neatly summarised as a commitment to “ensure

72 Ibid., 136.
73 Ibid., 135.
74 Ibid., 136.
75 Ibid., 135.
76 The Library's own 'entitlement' had been extended in the previous year, with the Legal Deposit Libraries Act 2003 introduced in order to address non-print materials and bring existing legislation up to date.
that all citizens of Scotland are inherent members of the Library”.78 The Expanding our Horizons strategy (2008-2011) continued this theme of “placing the customer at the heart of everything we do”.79 The entrance to the George IV Bridge building was redesigned and redeveloped as a new visitor centre: opening in 2009, this enabled an “informal drop-in experience for visitors to the Library” and was intended to provide “a clear signal that NLS is welcoming and accessible to all”.

The specifics of how the Library could deliver in its ‘active role’ proved difficult to pin down. Initial moves towards the articulation of a framework for assessing the value or relevance of material can be detected in a 2008 Integrated Collecting Strategy, a document that had developed out of a recognition that “while progress [had] been made since the first release of Breaking through the Walls the Library’s collecting policies [had] not yet caught up with the pace of change in how information [was] being produced and accessed”.81 Four key areas are proposed for curators to consider in relation to collecting - the uniqueness, format, preservation needs, and relevance of the material – but although it is acknowledged that “within the current geopolitical landscape a definition of ‘national’ is complex”,82 no formal matrix is offered.

By the time the Library’s Connecting Knowledge strategy for 2011-2014 was launched in November 2010, however, the appetite for philosophical considerations of the Library’s social and mnemonic function had been supplanted. Here, instead, a palpable attitude of ‘Library-as-business’ can be detected: for example, there are fourteen references to ‘customers’, but only three uses of the word ‘people’. Given that Connecting Knowledge was drawn up as austerity measures implemented across the country in the wake of the 2007/8 financial crisis were being felt, it is little surprise that the primary concern is how the Library will respond to “a period which is expected to see considerable reductions in
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82 Ibid., 3.
public spending”,\textsuperscript{83} and the emphasis is placed on the NLS’s “key role in supporting education, research, business and innovation”.\textsuperscript{84}

Six months after Connecting Knowledge was launched, the 2011 Scottish Election saw the Scottish National Party (SNP) achieve a landslide win of 69 seats and the first majority government since the opening of Holyrood – a majority that effectively delivered a mandate to call a referendum on independence. While Connecting Knowledge had been produced by an organisational body keen to “demonstrate the importance of the Library to Scotland” in order to “make the case vigorously for public funding”,\textsuperscript{85} the publication of the next strategy – The Way Forward – in 2015 demonstrated a notable return to a consideration of the Library’s mnemonic position in Scottish society. Just as Breaking Through provided an indication as to the impact of devolution on the Library’s self-image, The Way Forward was similarly informed by its political context, and presented the value of the NLS to the nation in terms of the unique role it plays in Scottish “research, learning and cultural enrichment”.\textsuperscript{86}

**Conclusion**

In 1888, Douglas Brymner – soon to become the first head of the National Archives of Canada - outlined the vision he had for that institution of “a Mecca to which historical investigators would turn their eyes and direct their steps”.\textsuperscript{87} In a similar vein, the establishment of the NLS can be understood as the building of a shrine to the cultural difference of Scotland: built on a foundation that emphasised and encouraged Scotland’s hermeneutic right to legal difference, and as part of a “revival ... built not on Scotland’s affinities with England but on the differences between the two countries”,\textsuperscript{88} the NLS harbours an unavoidably nationalist bent at its core. While it may initially appear paradoxical that this does not equate to a politically nationalist outlook for the library, an

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 1.
\textsuperscript{87} Douglas Brymner, "Report on Canadian Archives 1889," (Ottawa1890), xv.
\textsuperscript{88} Glen, *Hugh Macdiarmid and the Scottish Renaissance*, 3.
examination of the roots of Scotland’s sense of difference – that is, its continued independence via institutions, rather than government – explains this. Just as the ‘wandering Scots’ of the Empire attempted to preserve and maintain the culture of their native land through the building of ‘Scottish’ institutions, thus ‘carrying the light of Scotland’s learning’ to far-flung places, the campaign for a national library for Scotland sought to establish “foundations from which a new culture could be built” on home soil, and in doing so, effectively enshrined the textual version of Scotland as distinctive, unique and independent. These foundations “then become the focus of the meaning-making or interpretive process, which in turn makes and remakes them”, and (to recall Ketelaar) ensure Scotland’s distinctiveness is ‘infused and exhaled’ with every activation of the national archive.

Denis Smith reflected in 1989 that “it is only relatively recently that there [has] been critical scrutiny of [the NLS’s] role as a national library and a deliberate attempt to formulate comprehensive policies”, and indeed, as this chapter has explored, for much of its existence the NLS occupied the position of a mute storehouse for the national past, maintaining a delusion common amongst heritage institutions that it is merely a receptor and not a transmitter of culture, particularly in areas of literature and history. The years following devolution, however, have required the Library to take a more active role in forging a distinct cultural national tradition in order to emphasise its own contribution to Scottish national life. At the time the polls opened in September 2014, the NLS was not only aware of its position as a cultural agent but prepared to engage actively with the role and with the challenges this posed. This active awareness of the Library’s mnemonic role and involvement in shaping and exporting an image of Scotland is not simply reflective of the changes in the political environment, but is also in line with wider developments in the heritage sector and the result of numerous conversations surrounding representation in national institutions. As the frequently voiced refrains of “BBC bias”
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demonstrate, representation at the cultural level was as much of an issue during Indyref as representation at the political level, and this issue has by no means diminished.

Tracing the intellectual and social origins of the NLS allows us to perceive the Library not as a neutral observer to cultural change, but an active agent in the production of it. The following chapter of this thesis will explore in detail how the Library navigates this when collecting (for) the nation. Using the effort to collect the 2014 Independence referendum as a case study, it will explore how the project was envisioned and enacted, and will use interviews with curators and creators as well as close reading of the collection management documents and the collections themselves to identify the dominant lines of thinking that contributed to its design.
Chapter 3 – Collecting Indyref (and #indyref) 2014

This chapter examines how the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum Collection (SIRC) was built. It begins by situating the collecting project within the wider context of the Library’s collecting activities, and examining the rationale that informed the SIRC project. I then detail the processes by which material was identified and acquired by each of the collecting divisions and discuss what material was acquired, before briefly considering the collecting efforts of other repositories, namely the Scottish Political Archive at the University of Stirling.

Situating the Indyref project

The Library's primary collecting activities are carried out by the Collections and Research department, which is comprised of four collecting divisions: Rare Books, Maps, and Music; Archives and Manuscripts (MSS); Moving Image and Sound; and General Collections – the last of which is a relatively new entity within the Library, having been constituted in 2013. Within each division, a curator is appointed to oversee a particular subject area but there is often overlap between divisions: as example, both the Rare Books and the Archives and Manuscripts divisions include a curator of materials of the Long 18th Century.

Through Legal Deposit privilege, the Library is able to automatically claim a copy of all material published in the UK and Ireland. As well as traditional printed volumes, this also includes items such as academic journals, magazines, pamphlets, newspapers and reports. The introduction of Legal Deposit Libraries (Non-Print) Regulations 2013 extended the Library’s ability to collect non-print material by more thoroughly addressing material published electronically, such as e-books and websites.1 The General Collections division (working with staff in the Collections Management department) coordinates the ingest and description of legal deposit items and is also active in identifying and acquiring other forms of material that relate to Scottish politics and culture. The division aspires to “comprehensively collect the Scottish published

memory”, and to do this in a manner that reflects the full spectrum of the Scottish experience. Material is sought in a number of languages, with particular efforts made to represent the Gaelic language – the Library launched its Gaelic Language plan in 2012 in response to the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005. The collecting activities of the division are therefore wide-ranging. As a brief example, the division has a dedicated curator of Official Publications who (amongst other duties) is responsible for ensuring the transfer of both print and electronic material from the Westminster and Scottish Parliaments and for the development of collections relating to intergovernmental organisation such as the World Health Organisation and the United Nations; a curator of Scottish Communities and Organisations has a similarly broad remit, covering the published output of local organisations as well as more ‘ephemeral’ items such as election leaflets, event flyers and community newsletters. The division also sets internal research themes around which to guide collection activities, such as “Scottish national identity as revealed through works of the imagination”; “constitutional history and development”, and the “democratisation of writing, publishing and reading (paperbacks to tweets)”.4

The collection of manuscript material relating to modern politics has been a core element of the Library’s activities since its inception in 1925. It is the principal repository for the national archives of four of the political parties currently represented in the Scottish Parliament (The Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party; The Scottish Green Party; The Scottish Liberal Democrat Party; and The Scottish National Party), and these core collections are supplemented by collections of local branch papers, and the papers of individual politicians such as Margo MacDonald, Robert D. McIntyre and Jo Grimond. While the Library is not the main repository for the archives of the Scottish Labour Party, it has collected manuscript material relating to the Scottish labour and trade union movements since the 1960s, and the published output of the party is obtained through the Library’s Legal Deposit function.5 Campaigns and debates around home rule,
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2 "Introducing the General Collections Division," General Collections (National Library of Scotland).
4 "Introducing the General Collections Division."
devolution, and independence are also represented through records that are not directly
drawn from a single political party – for example, papers of campaign and pressure
groups such as Scottish is British, Campaign for a Scottish Assembly and Democracy for
Scotland. As can be seen from the variety represented in the collections, the Library has
adopted quite a broad position on what constitutes ‘political papers’, with many of the
collections having been acquired from individual campaigners rather than organisations.
Additionally, personal papers of commentators, academics, and civil servants such as
Neal Ascherson and Professor Gavin McCrone have also been included, providing an
additional perspective on Scottish politics.

**Collecting the Referendum**

**Background**

While diverse collecting practices have long been a feature of the Library’s activities, the
effort to acquire a documentary record of the 2014 referendum marked a significant
departure from previous collecting approaches. In May 2014 a stand-alone project
entitled ‘Collecting the Referendum’ (CtR) was initiated “at the behest of the Scottish
Government”\(^6\) and a dedicated curator was recruited to carry out the project. Although
based in the Archives and Manuscripts division, it was intended that the Curator, Dr Amy
Todman, would “cut across traditional collecting boundaries” and liaise with staff in
various areas of the Library to help develop a collection that was as comprehensive as
possible.\(^7\)

The establishment of this post was informed by a number of factors. Key amongst these
was the encouragement the Library received from the Scottish Government to capture a
record of the referendum. As Holyrood is the primary funding body for the NLS, Library
management is keenly aware of the need to demonstrate the “the relevance of [NLS] work

\(^6\) Amy Todman to Social science blog, 18 November, 2014,
\(^7\) "Job Description: Referendum Curator," National Library of Scotland,
hhttps://www.nls.engageats.co.uk/ViewVacancy.aspx?enc=mEgrBL4XQK0+ld8aNkwYmE9+4tiO4jrlmdrp
OG1ADYTj0yxyDBeY9ul2V+V8FZ1gggLmLzyCV8YXTM9h7E3s0T20N8xsA0+wKo/W/BN8cM/G/pqCD04
Y0T1/hI31I6qm.
programme to governmental priorities” and thus ensure that the value of the Library and its operations is framed in terms that reflect the aspiration expressed by the Scottish Government. As the Scottish Government had indicated they would like collection of the referendum to be a priority for the Library, attention turned to how this was to be achieved. As discussed in the previous chapter, the years 2012-2014 were a time of flux and change for the Library: the 1925 Act of Parliament that had constituted the NLS was repealed in 2012 and replaced with a new Act which explicitly set out the functions of the Library; the introduction of Legal Deposit Libraries (Non-Print) Regulations 2013 had extended the Library’s ability to collect non-print material by more thoroughly addressing material published electronically, such as e-books and websites; and as part of an effort to more efficiently utilise resources in light of tightened budgets following the 2008 financial crash, the Library’s organisational structure had undergone review and redesign in 2012-13. At the time the referendum collecting project was in its infancy, then, the Library was in a period of transition. As Jennifer Giles (Curator of Scottish Communities and Organisations) recalled, the restructure saw the Modern British Collections department replaced by General Collections, and the relationship between the administrative and curatorial aspects of roles was reassessed:

The curatorial element, the sort of knowing the landscape, who’s who and what there might be available to collect at all became part of the role of a new team called General Collections [...] But the practical work of actually legal deposit and the practical work of purchasing and the administration of donations is all handled by what is now the Acquisitions Team. So the work got split.  

Therefore, while the library now had the legal authority to collect electronic materials, it was still grappling with the practicalities of just how to do this. This contributed to a recognition within the Library that collecting the referendum by established means would prove challenging: Giles recalled an acknowledgment that

we couldn’t hope to collect the referendum as well as we would want to for such a big and … significant event just with the normal resources that we
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had, that we would need to develop these new processes for collecting across formats and developing new skills with social media collection at a time when workflows were changing, and the digital challenge was there.

Occurring at a time of change, then, the referendum provided the Library with an opportunity to experiment with new collecting processes and develop new approaches for the identification, acquisition and ingest of material.

This coincided with a rise in the practice of contemporaneous or ‘rapid response’ collecting in the heritage industries. While some have traced the introduction of this approach to specific institutions, or suggested it developed from a response to a specific event (such as 11th September 2001 World Trade Centre attack) rapid response collecting approaches reflect wider changes in both record-creation and record-keeping. As was discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the digital shift has greatly transformed how individuals create, perceive, and engage with records. While there is a common misperception that digital material has a greater longevity than analogue or paper material, the reality is that digital objects are threatened by several factors, such as obsolescence of the software or hardware environments required to render the object; commercial and copyright-related constraints on proprietary platforms or software; and chiefly, the sheer scale of digital material being created and shared. The risk of loss in the digital environment is therefore great, and securing such materials requires an active and engaged approach. Additionally, as chapter one also discussed, in the last half-century the archival profession has experienced a reconceptualization of the archivists’ relationship to and influence on the record. A particular consequence of this is how definitions of ‘recordness’ have been expanded beyond the “realms of legal and bureaucratic evidence”: for example, where personal and ephemeral items have largely been excluded from the archival remit, community archiving practices (alongside the demands of present researchers) have challenged why such material has traditionally “failed to

meet archivists’ strict criteria [for] archival ‘value’, and hence preservation”. Accordingly, rapid response collecting attempts to capture the diversity in how an event or historical phenomena is experienced by the populace, and reflects Michelle Caswell’s observation that “whatever society, agency, community or individual acts upon or invests in as a record, indeed functions in that context as a record”.15

In summary, the decision to create a dedicated post for collecting the referendum was informed by these three key factors: the encouragement from the Scottish government (and as was previously discussed, we can assume a desire on the part of NLS management to demonstrate the value of the Library to Holyrood’s vision for Scotland), the scale of the challenge, and the increasing application of ‘rapid response’ collecting methods within the heritage sector.

Collecting priorities
As then-Curator of Political Collections Maria Castrillo recalled, inspiration for the CtR project had been taken from The National Archives (TNA)’s approach to the 2012 London Olympics. As this was a new mode of collecting for the NLS, Library staff engaged in conversations with staff at TNA to discuss how they had approached the 2012 project and to share experience, with Castrillo acknowledging that the CtR project was largely experimental in its approach: “at that time contemporary collecting wasn’t as developed as it is today. I think today, it's something which people have a bit of a better understanding of how it should be done, so other than we were kind of experimenting with the idea of collecting in real time”.16 As Castrillo described, a key concern at the start of the project was how to approach the volume of potential material that was being produced:

... to begin the collecting proper, one of the things that was quite important was to define the collecting criteria, y’know, what we’re going to be
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collecting? We couldn't collect everything. So it was important to begin to define those collecting criteria.\textsuperscript{17}

This criteria was set out in a document published on the NLS website in June 2014 entitled “Collecting the Referendum on Scottish independence’: Statement of collecting priorities’.\textsuperscript{18} Seven key areas for collection and the kind of material that it was hoped would be collected from each area were identified.

This subject-wide perspective to collecting marked a departure from the Library’s traditional, division-led approach, as Giles commented:

\begin{quote}
We produced a collection policy for the referendum ... to be across both published and the manuscript sources, and I think that’s probably the first time that a policy had been done for a specific topic. Obviously, there’s the library-wide collecting policies which covered the different formats, and address things in different ways, but that was for one topic.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

The sheer volume of material was not the only concern in the design of the CtR project. Castrillo suggested in interview that “at the time the biggest concern was that the NLS wasn't seen as being political in the sense that ... we were favouring Yes or were favouring No”. The statement explicitly included an acknowledgement of “the sensitive nature of the debate” and an attendant determination to “build a collection that is un-biased, representative and inclusive of the varied and often complex angles surrounding the debate”.\textsuperscript{20} As Castrillo noted, Indyref presented the people of Scotland with “a very, very big, important existential question that was going to generate a lot of emotion, ... it wasn't just about making a rational choice, it was about making an emotional choice”.\textsuperscript{21} Castrillo further indicated that awareness of the emotional dimension to the debate was considered crucial:

\begin{quote}
It was very important to be aware of those emotions ... and make sure that people felt represented in that content, and I know that's a very abstract thing to do because you're doing it as a curator, as an archivist, as a y'know,
\end{quote}
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heritage professional, and it’s not the same as being a campaigner, or a politician, but ultimately the idea was that the collection, people could see themselves in that collection - whether it was in a leaflet, whether it was in the minutes of a meeting of Women For Independence, whether it was in a photograph taken in a rally - people could feel that, yes, that was the referendum basically, and that was the moment when Scotland had to decide, yes or no.22

As discussed elsewhere in this thesis, although archival theory has traditionally held affect in opposition to objectivity, recent years have seen a wave of archivists advocating for greater consideration to be paid to the role of emotion in archival action. Amongst these is Marika Cifor, who asserts that affect is “at the core of how we form, sustain and break social relations, differences and individual and collective identities”.23 Cifor advocates for affective value (that is, a subjective value related to emotional response, rather than objective value adhering to external criteria) to be “surfaced” and “shift[ed] from a tacit concern to an explicit focus”;24 this, she argues, will enable archivists to “rethink, reframe and re-centre the discussion on the individuals and communities such organizations serve” and better understand the reasons why societies preserve, keep, and value archives and records.25 Castrillo’s remarks above, and her statement that she was “inspired by the idea that such an important event, which obviously was going to touch the lives of many people, was being recorded in different ways”26 reflects such an approach, and suggests that it was hoped that the rapid response methods employed by the CtR project might allow for greater representation of the affective aspects of the referendum.

The desire for the collection to be representative is also closely related to the idea of cultural entitlement. As was discussed in the previous chapter, an awareness of the contribution of the Library to “the cultural and educational life of the nation” and “to the

22 Castrillo, interviewed by author.
24 Ibid., 12.
26 Castrillo, interviewed by author.
developing identity and profile of Scotland abroad”\textsuperscript{27} is at the core of how the NLS has understood its position in post-devolution Scotland. Both Castrillo and Giles alluded to the notion of cultural entitlement in their interviews. Suggesting that “it is ... one of the signs of a civilized society that we actually collect our history,” Giles stressed the affective qualities of ephemeral material, asserting that it is valuable precisely “because it belongs to everybody, and this is everybody’s history”.\textsuperscript{28} Similarly, when discussing how she envisioned the collection being used in the future, Castrillo spoke in terms of rights of access, stating that she felt that “people have the right to have this material available to them at some point in the future”:

For me it was really important to make sure that the people of Scotland had this material available to them, and anybody who was interested in Scottish political history or British history or European history had access to this content, so that was one of the most important things.\textsuperscript{29}

Methods

Having established the rationale for the project, this chapter will now cover the specifics and practicalities of producing such a collection, and examine how material was identified, selected, and ingested into the collection. As discussed above, political material has long been a feature of the Library’s collecting activity, and when approaching the referendum, curators were able to build on these long-standing relationships with many of the key players and organisations in Scottish politics. Open days were held at the Library in July and August of 2014, which provided an opportunity to publicise the project and to build relationships with various record-creating groups. The first open day was centred around the positions of the main political parties. Representatives from Scottish Labour, Scottish Liberal Democrats, Scottish Conservatives, Scottish Greens, Scottish Socialist Party and the Scottish National Party were each invited to set up a table of campaign literature and given an opportunity to discuss referendum-related issues.

\textsuperscript{27} Wade, Hunt, and Wisdom, "Breaking through the Walls: A Summary of Current Developments at the National Library of Scotland," 135.
\textsuperscript{28} Giles, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{29} Castrillo, interviewed by author.
with Library staff and members of the public. Giles reflected on the usefulness of these relationships in the early stages of the collecting process:

We had established contacts within the political parties, and we just kept liaising with them to find out what was going on as things evolved, and the parties and all the relevant bodies perhaps, I suppose, the political parties, decided how they would actually run a referendum campaign ... we were able to get in very quickly on the ground when the two main groups Yes Scotland and Better Together started.30

The second of the Library’s open days focused on how the debate was being conducted outwith party lines: representatives of sectoral campaign groups Women for Independence, National Collective, Academics Together and Women Together attended, along with figures from Open Democracy, and the ESRC-funded research group ‘Future of the UK and Scotland.31 Both curators spoke of the importance of meeting early on with record creators to explain the rationale and ethos behind the collecting project, and to explain how varied the Library’s collecting outlook was. Castrillo suggested that an early challenge was “to make sure that everybody understood the importance of preserving their content and also not destroying it after the referendum”, and observed that many campaigners were unaware of the archival value of much of the material they were producing:

I think they were extremely aware of the importance of what they were doing ... that’s what they were focusing on: winning the debate, winning the people’s minds and hearts, and making sure that their side of the debate won. But I don't think they had the sense that the evidence of that campaigning was important, that that needed to be kept.32

Similarly, Giles spoke of the need for curators to discuss what material the Library hoped to acquire, and the legislative basis for their collecting:

You can’t just say ‘we want what you’re publishing’, you have to explain what published is ... You have to explain that it includes the sort of throwaway materials, the leaflets, because often people assume that you don’t want that because they’re just little things that are throwaway things,

30 Giles, interviewed by author.
31 Todman Collecting the Referendum.
32 Castrillo, interviewed by author.
but actually they’re the gold dust of the collections, really, they’re really the things that say it all.\textsuperscript{33}

Castrillo also suggested that some organisations were wary of depositing material in the collection because of a fear that doing so may expose aspects of their campaign strategy to their opponents:

I remember going to the Yes headquarters in Glasgow, actually with Jennifer, to talk to the activists there and that was quite sensitive because obviously they were concerned that if we did the collecting in real time, maybe their campaign strategy could be revealed to their opponents. And that would undermine the efforts.\textsuperscript{34}

This fear was not unfounded. When asked for an item in the collection that epitomised their Indyref experience, both Castrillo and Giles described a pair of campaign leaflets made by the two main campaign groups:

One is from Yes Scotland and the wording on it is ‘Goodbye’. And it says “Leaving the UK means waving goodbye to Tory governments we didn’t vote for. With a Yes, we'll keep the pound and ditch the Tories.” And in the middle of ‘goodbye,’ in the two Os, there’s a wee picture of David Cameron in one and of George Osborne in the other. And there’s also one from Better Together, and it says “Positive! The only way to keep the pound is to vote to remain within the United Kingdom. Keeping the pound means more jobs, cheaper mortgages, and lower credit card bills”. And within the O, there’s a picture of the pound coin.

Now these are really cheeky. They came out on consecutive days, and one produces a direct response to the other. … They mirror each other completely in the typeface and the layout, and it’s just a really nice example of the speed of the campaign and of some of the issues and how they, they were tit-for-tat, sort of, responding to each other in a way that possibly previous campaigns could never have done because of … how easy it is for them to print things and to be responsive.\textsuperscript{35}

I remember there was-, there were two leaflets which I absolutely love. One of them - you know how a lot of the debate was about whether we keep the pound or not, y’know … Yes said well if we leave, I think, we still keep the pound. We can still keep the pound, and then the No campaign came with a leaflet exactly the same the following morning, saying that if Scotland

\textsuperscript{33} Giles, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{34} Castrillo, interviewed by author
\textsuperscript{35} Gilles, interviewed by author.
leaves, no, you won’t, won’t keep, we won’t let you keep the pound. But the most interesting things about it is that they both look the same. They both look the same and you would really need to look hard to see which one was coming from the Yes campaign and which one was coming from the No campaign.\textsuperscript{36}

As this example demonstrates, the campaigns were fast-paced and in constant dialogue with one another - particularly as they gathered speed in the final nine months of the debate - and this required a high degree of flexibility and ‘nimbleness’ in collecting. This was a further area where having a dedicated Referendum Curator was beneficial. As Giles reflected, for other Library staff “the referendum was only one wee bit of our work, it wasn’t full-time for any of us”, whereas the Referendum Curator was able to “tailor [collecting] much more over that two-year period [and] sort of keep it narrow and very focused”.\textsuperscript{37}

Further considering the challenges of contemporary collecting, Castrillo noted that the demands of the present on campaigners often overtook any concerns for a future legacy they may have had, observing that “…people working in politics, they don’t live for the future, they live for now, winning an election, winning the next campaign and, and making sure … that they succeed, so they’re not so worried about even the legacy, which is quite interesting”. She reflected that situating the referendum collecting project within a context of wider Library collecting was often helpful for conveying the mission and aim of the project:

One thing that was very useful was to explain to them that we already had collected previous referendums material… you know, the devolution … ‘79 and then 1997. And, you know, all the campaigning groups, grassroots groups, so just telling them “oh, and do you know that we have content relating to X group, or people who were involved with the Yes campaign or these people who were involved with the No campaign, and the papers of X,Y and Z politician…”. So, that kind of helped them realize that this is, this wasn’t just a capricious exercise or a vanity project, that it was something important, and I think … little by little they understood that.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{36} Castrillo, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{37} Gilles, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{38} Castrillo, interviewed by author.
Collecting the online debate
An additional challenge posed by contemporaneous collecting is the need to be highly responsive and to move quickly to secure materials. The referendum brought a new challenge for the Library in the shape of the online world, which had proved to be a significant battleground in the debate.\textsuperscript{39} Launching the official Yes Scotland campaign in May 2012, then-SNP leader Alex Salmond asserted that the case for independence “would be taken to the people by community activism and ‘online wizardry’”,\textsuperscript{40} a forecast which proved to be astute. Exploring the use of the internet during the two-year campaign period, Mark Shephard and Stephen Quinlan have suggested “the 2014 Scottish referendum could indeed be classed as ‘the first social media referendum’”.\textsuperscript{41} Similarly, a study in the month following the vote clearly showed the influence of the online world on the debate:

When asked about information that did influence decisions, more people said they’d used information from social media and other websites (39 per cent) than newspapers (34 per cent), although TV and radio was the strongest source (42 per cent), and nearly a third (30 per cent) said they used information from the Yes and No campaigns when deciding how to vote.\textsuperscript{42}

Indeed, “public participation in the independence debate on Facebook and Twitter was so extensive that on 20 December 2014 it was announced that the Scottish referendum was the UK’s most discussed subject on Facebook, and one of the most featured topics on Twitter”.\textsuperscript{43} As “activists and supporters of both camps took to social media to make their case … the outcome was a vibrant - and at times vicious - multiplication of online claims

\textsuperscript{40} "Scottish Independence: One Million Scots Urged to Sign 'Yes' Declaration," https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-18162832.
\textsuperscript{41} Quinlan, Shephard, and Paterson, "Online Discussion and the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum: Flaming Keyboards or Forums for Deliberation?," 17.
and counterclaims”, and commentary surrounding the online aspect of the debate often concerned the vitriolic exchanges between ‘cybernats’ and ‘unitrolls’. As will be discussed in the following chapter, much of this online engagement took the form of ‘hashtag activism’ and introduced a decidedly personal character to the otherwise public discussions. Occupying a significant position in the referendum debate, then, capturing the output of this online engagement was crucial for the CtR project, and in recognition, a web archivist was appointed in May 2014 to aid in the identification and ingest of web-based material.

Although there is a commonly held perception that digital media (particularly web resources) are more resilient than analogue materials, the reality is that such material is at far greater risk of loss. In the digital world, a third-party platform is required to ‘render’ an object readable, meaning that preservation of the object must also include preservation of the platform, and while analogue materials can often still be accessed even after being stored undisturbed for centuries, digital materials require constant maintenance (in the form of migration, emulation, or refreshment) to ensure they remain in a readable, accessible state. The situation regarding online resources is similar: estimates suggest that around two percent of websites disappear each week, with the average website having a life-span of two years and seven months. To capture web-based material, the NLS utilised its status as a member of the UK Web Archiving (UKWA) consortium. Although the Library had been attempting targeted web collecting as far back as 2004, efforts had been hampered by the lack of legislation mandating collecting prior to 2013, and the SIRC was one outcome of renewed efforts in this direction. Much effort was made to mirror the analogue collecting activities of the CtR by, for example,

ensuring that where the papers of a campaign group had been accessioned, any corresponding web material was likewise collected. Reflecting the links between the web collection and the wider collection, archived web resources are organised by reference to the categories identified in the Statement, with the substitution of ‘Press, Media, and Comment’ for the Statement’s category ‘Individuals’.

It is important to note that in the web archiving environment, little regard is given to the content of websites. A glance at the statistics explains why - the first domain crawl in 2013 captured 3.8 million seeds (starting URLs), and by 2014 this had grown to over 20 million seeds.\(^49\) Evidently, any attempt to appraise web sites on a case-by-case basis is doomed to failure. Accordingly, there is no consideration of ‘recordness’ when it comes to the web archive: UK-based sites are captured regardless of content, format, design, or function. This will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, but it is worth noting at this stage that this is a consequence of the legislative background of the UKWA, which considers web sites to be online publications.\(^50\) Thus, all websites are deemed to be records, and all deemed to be possessing of equal ‘archival’ value.

Web archiving encounters many of the same obstacles that are detailed above, such as the need to engage with creators to explain the parameters of collecting legislation, but the digital world makes these concerns more pressing. Giles explained that the legislation surrounding non-print legal deposit “mirrors print [because] that was the agreement with all the publishing bodies when the regulations were being drawn up”\(^51\). Consequently, material can only be captured by the UKWA if it has been ‘published’ within the UK. As web archivist Eilidh MacGlone discussed, identifying UK-published material in an online environment is not straightforward:

> You could quite often find ... a blog where you would have an academic, perhaps, writing regularly about the referendum, their thoughts on what it all meant, and they might not say that they were with a university, or they might not say where 'cause sometimes people remark well, “Hello, my


\(^{50}\) "Frequently Asked Questions," UK Web Archive, [https://www.webarchive.org.uk/ukwa/info/faq](https://www.webarchive.org.uk/ukwa/info/faq).

\(^{51}\) Giles, interviewed by author.
name is... I live in Edinburgh” and that means that that whole web blog is in scope, so that’s quite simple from my perspective to scope it in. ... It isn’t enough that it’s just about events in Scotland ... it really does need to be backed up by an author who is sitting in Scotland or the United Kingdom somewhere.\textsuperscript{52} 

Additionally, while the legislation surrounding legal deposit allows UKWA members the ‘right in principle’ to make a copy of all in-scope UK websites, it severely limits how the archived websites are then made accessible. When a target is added to ACT the archivist is able to input contact details of the website’s creator or administrator and subsequently issue a request for permission. The UKWA does not require a publishers’ approval to archive a copy of a website and offer access to that copy via an on-site terminal, but the explicit permission of the website owner must be obtained in order for the copy to be made accessible to off-site users via the UKWA’s playback tool. While the right to refuse access is reserved to the creator, it is more frequently a lack of response on the part of the website owner, rather than any explicit refusal, that results in access to a resource being restricted. Informal conversation with the web archive staff at NLS suggests that only around 10% of the requests issued by the library receive a response.

A further challenge lay in how to capture web-based material in a way that was ethical. Discussing some of the issues that the CtR project had to grapple with, MacGlone indicated that the question of informed consent was a particular concern:

Something that we were careful [about] from the start was collecting individuals, because I think we tend to think that people are using [social media] not necessarily in the understanding that they’re in public... It seemed not unlikely that people would be unaware of such a thing as a web archiving project around Twitter. It seemed like something people might not think about, although I, I don’t think that would be the case now.\textsuperscript{53} 

Furthermore, due to the technical specifications of the web archiving platform and the nature of social media itself, identifying a particular creator to secure consent for accession is particularly difficult. In order to navigate this issue, it was decided that collection of social media feeds would be generally limited to the accounts of individuals

\textsuperscript{52} Eilidh MacGlone, interviewed by author.  
\textsuperscript{53} MacGlone, interviewed by author.
such as journalists who were, as MacGlone says, using social media “in a publishing mindset. They were very much thinking about speaking to the public and taking part in debates”. As well as alleviating some of the ethical concerns around consent, this also helped to reduce the sphere of potential content to a manageable size:

People were saying so much, and you felt really quite overwhelmed by the volume of material, and you’re trying to be methodical and thinking, well, “we can’t collect everything” ... [but] we could collect around people who were publishing material and were really engaged in the, the debate.54

In a similar vein, it was crucial for the web archivist to stay up to date with an ever-changing and fast-moving environment to identify sites, accounts and platforms that were playing a key role in the constitutional debate. Significant effort was made to mirror the analogue collecting: for example, where the papers of a campaign group had been accessioned, any corresponding web material was likewise collected. Where Giles suggested that once relationships had been established and the intentions of the collecting project conveyed, she was able to adopt a level of passivity in the collection of printed materials (“sometimes they [campaigners] just put a box on their desks and they pop everything into it as it appears”55), MacGlone indicated that because of the technical requirements of the web archiving platform, it was imperative that appraisal be conducted before (and in order to enable) ingest. She reflected that “you can’t be passive when you’re trying to identify what you’re going to collect [from the web]. You have to know exactly what it is, or the crawl might fail”.56

This chapter has so far covered how curators conceived of and actioned the identification, selection and ingest of material, and how they engaged with curators to enable transfer to the Library. The remainder of the chapter will detail what material was secured for the collection, before considering how material was collected by the Scottish Political Archive.

54 MacGlone, interviewed by author.
55 Giles, interviewed by author.
56 MacGlone, interviewed by author.
Outcome – the Scottish Independence Referendum Collection

Manuscripts & Archives

There are 22 manuscript accessions within the Scottish Independence Referendum Collection (SIRC). The collections are a mixture of personal and organisational papers, and include reflective memoirs of the debate period, promotional material, community engagement activities and campaign strategy documents. Details of what was received, from whom, and when are set out in the document presented as Appendix 2.1.

In line with Library processes, a donor agreement was required to be completed for all deposited material: this establishes the legal transfer of material to the NLS, while preserving the intellectual property rights of the creator. The donor’s details were recorded in the MSS department’s Accessions Register, and an accession number was allocated to each donation or deposit. Inventories were produced for roughly half of the accessions, and while born-digital material remains uncatalogued, file names have been extracted from some collections.

General Collections

Material brought into the Library via General Collections was managed in a slightly different manner. A collection level record (CLR) was created for cataloguing purposes, and material was catalogued and assigned to the collection as it was received. The printed collection is vast: it includes a large volume of ephemera from campaigns groups such as mailouts and promotional memorabilia; official parliamentary and government publications; reports and other outputs from think-tanks, non-profits, and other NGOs; and posters and flyers advertising events. As well as items created in the process of ‘doing Indyref’, the CLR is also applied to non-fiction printed material from both before and after the referendum date which takes Indyref as its subject, such as journal articles or monographs, like those by Iain Macwhirter (Road to Referendum, 2013), David Torrance (100 Days of Hope and Fear: How Scotland’s Referendum was Lost and Won, 2014) and Alasdair Gray (Independence: An Argument for Home Rule, 2014). The CLR has not been applied to works of fiction that are concerned with the referendum, such as Craig Smith’s The Mile (2013) or Effie Deans’ An Indyref Romance: Harmony and Dissonance (2015). An inventory of items currently assigned to the CLR can be found in Appendix 2.3.
A brief description of the mechanisms by which the UK Web Archive (UKWA) captures material may be useful here. Speaking broadly, there are two key processes which gather online material into the web archive, both of which employ web crawlers or robots. These web crawlers use hyperlinks to move systematically through the internet and capture snapshots of the HTML and associated code that make up a website. I find it useful to consider the two methods of gathering material as ‘trawling’ on one hand and ‘deep diving’ on the other. In the trawling method (also referred to as scraping or crawling), the geographical location of a website is the only metric used to select material: it is only those sites with a top-level domain that indicate a UK origin that are crawled. As such an approach would omit any sites that do not utilise a UK domain address, targeted selection (‘deep-diving’) is also employed. Using the Web Curator Tool (WCT) – an open-source application developed for use by libraries – staff with appropriate permissions direct the crawler at a specific target and stipulate the ‘depth’ to which the resource will be crawled. The WCT also provides an opportunity for curators to record limited additional information about the target: pre-determined fields prompt staff to justify the target’s inclusion in the UKWA (e.g. where a site would appear out of scope to the crawler); apply tags to associate it with a larger collection; and issue the necessary request for permission to display the material outwith the premises of a Legal Deposit library.

Web-based material was gathered for the SIRC using a targeted ‘deep dive’ approach, and where sites were found to have been previously picked up by the domain crawl, these were processed for inclusion: basic descriptive metadata such as the title of the page and a brief description of the resource was added, and the target was tagged and incorporated into the SIRC.

Moving Image Archive
As with the web archive, selection of moving image material was directed by the referendum curator working in collaboration with staff in the Moving Image Archive (MIA, formerly known as the Scottish Screen Archive). There are 15 entries relating to

---

57 i.e. Those websites with a .uk, .scot, .cymru, or other UK-based suffix.
the SIRC in the Moving Image Archive’s internal accessions register, and these are identified as being part of the SIRC via a scope note that signifies the accession was “acquired via Amy Todman, NLS Referendum curator in MSS collecting material to represent the Scottish Independence Referendum”. The accessions are difficult to classify as each entry is often comprised of multiple films. Furthermore, much of this material has not been fully catalogued, and therefore it is not always clear what the content of each accession is but the information available suggests a great range of material: there are documentary films made about the campaigns, recordings of events such as the ‘Songs for Scotland’ concert held in September 2014, and recordings of lectures, as a small example. A redacted list of these accessions is provided in the appendices, as is a comprehensive list of the titles within them (Appendix 4a and 4b respectively).

Other Indyref collecting
The need for the NLS to also collaborate with other heritage bodies in order to “foster collaboration and avoid competition, overlap or duplication of effort” was acknowledged early on. A group of representatives from NLS, Glasgow Life and National Museums Scotland had already begun meeting in summer of 2013 to discuss future collecting plans, and an email list was set up for the exchange of information. The invitation was extended to other heritage institutions in Scotland and curators from various additional organisations expressed an interest in being involved in coordination efforts. This informal group later became the Collecting the Referendum Network. In interview, curators reflected on the benefits of working with other institutions and suggested that such relationships were particularly useful in the context of a rapid response or contemporary collecting approach: as Giles reflected, “it was helpful for us because we were able to hear about more things that were happening locally and just put our word out that we actually wanted things as well”.

An examination of what – and how – other repositories collected sheds further light on how the Library CtR project was envisioned and enacted, and on the Library’s awareness

58 “‘Collecting the Referendum on Scottish Independence’ Statement of Collecting Priorities,” 1.
59 Giles, interviewed by author.
of its position within a network of national and local collecting repositories. While there appears to have been an expectation that collecting would be carried out at a local level by local repositories, this does not seem to have been the case. A mapping exercise conducted in January 2015 to establish how “collecting organisations across Scotland and beyond had responded to the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum” found that of the 32 respondents, “just under half were engaged in some form of referendum collecting, though in a number of cases this was described as passive rather than active collecting”. The report notes that the majority of collecting concerned “printed ephemera, but also included digital photographs, newspaper articles and some archival materials”. Exploring why more local manuscript material was not collected, the mapping exercise found that while respondents were keen to collect around the referendum, they did not have the capacity for such ‘rapid response’ collecting. One organisation reflected that they were “limited to collecting printed ephemera due to not having the facilities or funding to cope with other media,” while another organisation highlighted the difficulty in differentiating the local from the national:

Much of the material was national in scope. More local material would have required a more active approach - contacting activist groups, writers, and politicians. It was not a service priority.

The only other Scottish archive repository to carry out significant indyref collecting is the Scottish Political Archive (SPA). Located within the University of Stirling, the SPA was established in 2010 in response to a perceived lack of resources for the study of political movements in Scotland, and accordingly, has a particular focus on the campaigns relating to Scottish devolution and independence. The SPA began its collecting early in the referendum period and took a markedly active approach, with a key example being the decision to produce a photographic record of the debate as it unfolded. Archivist Sarah Bromage explained that this was achieved through a combination of crowdsourcing ("we got a group of people throughout the country [and] I just basically said ‘if anything comes

61 Ibid., 3.
through your door, if you go into town and you see a campaign stall, take a photo for me’”) and active attendance at events:

We had a sort of body of students who basically were quite interested in volunteering, and we’d say to them, like, for example, “there’s an event on in Edinburgh, on Saturday. Do you wanna go through, pick up some leaflets, take some photos and chat to people who are there and find out a little bit about what’s going on?” So that’s kind of how we did it and it was- it was quite organic, really.\(^{62}\)

As Bromage reflected, this approach was partly informed by necessity – with limited resources and staff, there was an awareness that the SPA could not attempt to collect on the same scale as a national repository like the NLS – but the SPA approach was also very much informed by Bromage’s experience of researching previous referendums:

I was very conscious that when I’d interviewed people about ’79 and ’97 ... there wasn’t a lot of stuff anywhere for me to look at in archives, and people didn’t remember a lot of things either, so I was quite keen that we would collect material from the outset so that there wouldn’t be this big gap where there was nothing, that we would try and get what was happening locally.\(^{63}\)

Rather than trying to capture the breadth of the referendum output, the SPA instead focused on trying to capture “the ephemeral stuff like campaign leaflets, things that were distributed at stalls, photographs ... things that I hoped I might find for ’79 and ’97 and never did. I thought “actually, that’s what I would have been interested in”, and we wanted to make sure that that really existed for 2014”.\(^{64}\) Like NLS staff, Bromage spoke of the importance of situating collection development efforts within the wider collecting landscape. She recalled a degree of uncertainty around what activity was taking place in other archives (“there wasn’t much going on, maybe until late 2013, early 2014, so we were kind of like. ‘OK, we’re doing this, but we don’t want to duplicate other repositories, but we don’t know what they’re collecting and maybe they’re not collecting, we don’t

\(^{62}\) Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author, 27 April 2021.
\(^{63}\) Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author.
\(^{64}\) Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author.
know”\textsuperscript{65}) and described how SPA’s collecting was intended to complement collecting that was being done elsewhere:

\begin{quote}
We were very conscious that the big institutions like the NLS and various places would get ... the large movement material, so they would get Better Together, they would get Yes Scotland material, but we wanted to have something slightly different to ... reflect the kind of grassroots campaign and what was happening throughout the country.\textsuperscript{66}
\end{quote}

The SPA’s approach to collecting Indyref provides an interesting comparison to the NLS CtR project, and particularly in respect to the relationship between existing collections and contemporary collecting efforts. As noted earlier, Castrillo suggested that existing collections held by the NLS provided a useful reference point for the project, both for explaining aims and intentions to potential donors and when establishing the parameters of the collecting strategy. Similarly, a blog by the Referendum Curator notes that the display of existing holdings at open days “was useful to show people the kind of leaflets and flyers that [the Library] want[ed] for the collection, and how these fit into a wider historical context”.\textsuperscript{67} In comparison, Bromage’s comments indicate that the approach of the SPA was informed by perceived omissions in the documentary landscape surrounding previous referendums – that rather than attempting to reproduce previous collecting, the SPA instead aimed to pre-emptively plug gaps that had been encountered by researchers. In this respect, the SPA was able to capitalise on its smaller and more focused remit:

\begin{quote}
I think we’ve been very clear about ... what is our focus and how what we want to collect and to do something that’s slightly different. ... What’s the point of collecting the same as the NLS collects, ‘cause they can do it bigger and better than us! But ... we can actually carve something interesting and collect stuff which nobody else has that’s important in a different way.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{quote}

The comparison between the two repositories illustrates how the broad remit of the NLS influences collecting practice. As Bromage reflected, being situated within an academic

\textsuperscript{65} Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{66} Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{67} Todman Collecting the Referendum.
\textsuperscript{68} Sarah Bromage, interviewed by author.
environment considerably informs where and how the SPA focuses its collecting efforts ("the idea ... is to actually collect things that reflect the research interests of the institution"). The repository was established by lecturers in politics and history, and this close relationship with a relatively defined user base enables the SPA to be reflective, responsive, and engage directly with its audience to create a collection that meets their needs. While independence would not significantly alter the position of the University in Scottish society, the NLS does not enjoy the same freedom: indeed, the notion of collecting ‘for the nation’ becomes complicated by the very nature of a constitutional referendum in which the character of ‘the nation’ is the subject under question. As we move on to a full analysis of the CtR project, it is useful to bear in mind that the NLS was in some respects collecting for the benefit of an unknown entity.
Chapter 4 – Assessing the Indyref Collection: Sources, Narratives and Archival Futures

Introduction

The previous chapter established how the goal of collecting the referendum was envisioned and enacted. It covered the rationale behind the NLS collecting project, outlined the key challenges and considerations, and detailed the methods by which material was identified and acquired. In this chapter, I want to consider the consequences of the decisions outlined above and explore the impact these decisions may have on how future histories of Indyref are researched and produced. It may be useful to clarify what is meant by my use of the term ‘future’ here. This chapter takes a cue from the thought experiment carried out by Susanne Belovari in her 2017 article ‘Historians and Web Archives’, in which Belovari positioned herself as a researcher in the year 2050 who had turned to the web archive to understand society in 2015.¹ Orienting this more specifically to the study of the Scottish independence movement, I will also consider Sarah Bromage’s reflections on the scarcity of materials relating to the 1979 and 1997 referendums. This approach assumes the researcher is approaching the study of Indyref with no (or significantly limited) access to contemporary actors and is therefore reliant solely on the archival resources for their research.

This work builds on the theoretical framework established in Chapter One, which examined the relationship between archives and nationalism and established that archival practice has historically served to reinforce the centrality of the state to the lives of citizens: that the ‘archive’ serves as a place of authority, and this authority implies that a definitive history of the nation is achievable, waiting to be discovered. Drawing on the work of Laurajane Smith, I argue that archives, like nations, are textual – to be read and narrated – and that attending to how archival material is acquired and managed allows us to examine the scaffolding on which our perceptions of the archive and the nation are built. I then covered how the post-modern turn in archival studies has prompted

examination of how archival authority is enacted and the consequences for archival practice, paying particular attention to how the profession has come to centre its efforts around the pillars of equality, representation, and participation.

**Indyref as personal: ‘individuated Indyref discourse’**

Before progressing to an analysis of how the personal aspect of Indyref experience is represented in the collection, it is necessary to first establish why this is important in the context of the 2014 Referendum. Indyref, Scott Hames has contended, was a “mass exercise in highly mediated self-representation”. He notes “a jarring mismatch between referendum mechanics and the explosion of individuated indyref discourse” – that is, despite the “massifying, aggregative binary logic of the referendum itself”, Indyref was framed and discussed as a personal journey of self-discovery, albeit one with a limited range of potential destinations.² Peter Lynch has described how many of the individuals who engaged with the movement – at festivals, music events, and drop-in cafes, or more conventional outlets such as rallies and marches – “came from outside the ranks of party memberships”.³ Indeed, Indyref saw “many of these people became politically active for the first time,” and Lynch has argued that a key legacy of Indyref was the creation of a mass “political movement where none existed before”.⁴

This position was borne out at interview by both campaigners and curators. Many donors to the SIRC talked about the close relationship between their campaigning activities and their personal identities, and their comments indicate that the independence referendum established a defined discursive space in which these personal journeys could be undertaken. The writer Alan Bissett, for example, commented that “I couldn't tell you about where I ended and the cause began”.⁵ He reflected that his “creative life and ... political activism, they kind of meshed at that time, [and] became the one thing”, and suggested that his activities during the independence referendum can be understood as public expression of his own ‘personal journey’ (“a lot of the themes that would find their

² Scott Hames, Democracy and the Indyref Novel, Forthcoming.
⁴ Ibid., 2.
⁵ Alan Bissett, interviewed by author, 25 May 2021.
way into the independence referendum debate I had already been looking at as part of my creative life”.

Asked whether a particular moment encapsulated his Indyref experience, Bissett recalled the ‘March and Rally for Scottish Independence’ that took place in Edinburgh in September 2012:

I read 'Vote Britain', and the place was absolutely silent for the duration of it, and then at the end there was this enormous roar, and I remember thinking ‘these are my people’... It was like, ‘I am among my people. Scotland is waking up’. ... The positive feeling that I experienced then is probably the most powerful thing I've ever felt outside of my own personal life.

Bissett views this ostensibly ‘public’, collective journey (“Scotland is waking up”) through a very personal lens. Similarly, touching on the blurred lines between political activism and wider lived experience, author and campaigner Aimee Chalmers reflected:

My work, my life has been trying to empower ... trying to make sure that people could access services that they were entitled to, that sort of thing. So no, not political activism other than living it. Something like that.

Chalmers described a particular desire to open up the debates beyond the usual realms of political discussion: she recalled wanting to engage with people “who would not be involved otherwise. ... I knew there were a lot of women who say, ‘oh well, politics isn’t for me, y’know, I’ll leave that to somebody else’, so these were the people that I wanted to get to”.

Two creative projects were initiated and organised by Chalmers: ‘Scotland Hand-knit/Knitting a Nation’ (an open, collaborative effort to produce a handknitted map of Scotland) and ‘A New Chapter’, an interactive exhibition of 307 altered books (“one for each year of Scotland's political union with England”). These creative activities were accompanied by listening groups, “spaces where people can listen respectfully to the
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views of others [and] talk about their own hopes and fears in a non-threatening way”,¹¹ and in interview Chalmers described how she hoped that providing this space for debate would facilitate a 'personal journey' to Yes for others:

The whole point of the campaign, I thought, was to bring new people over to the Yes side. Now, in my naivety, I thought that the more people understood the issues, the more were likely to vote Yes. I still think that's true, actually - ... the more people understand, the more they will be willing to vote Yes, so that was the main point behind it. And just to increase the level of participation. I wanted everybody to have their say not just the people who were normally interested in politics.¹²

These comments suggest that campaigners (particularly Yes supporters) not only acknowledged but actively strove to harness personal perspectives in support of the cause. A brief overview of the manuscript collections in the SIRC indicates that there are significantly more donations from pro-independence campaigners than pro-Union. It could be surmised that there existed a stronger motivation on the behalf of Yes campaigners to ensure their voices were recorded for posterity, and it is certainly plausible to consider the donation of personal records to the SIRC to be an extension of Indyref activism that was centred on personal narratives - particularly in light of the No result.

Collecting staff were similarly attuned to the value of these personal narratives in the independence debate. When talking about the importance of engaging with creators to communicate the aims of the collecting work, Giles reflected on the contribution of such narratives to the production of a 'big picture':

People ... tend to assume that a national library is only interested in ... the really big and beautiful things and expensive things, but in fact we're interested in everything, because it is the stuff of life ... and that's what tells the stories.¹³

¹² Chalmers, interviewed by author.
¹³ Giles, interviewed by author.
Similarly, Castrillo recalled an acute awareness of the affective dimension of the referendum debate and the importance of capturing this. Establishing a direct connection between lived experience of Indyref and archival representation, Castrillo’s comments suggest that an ability to ‘reconstruct’ Indyref through archival traces is crucial for an understanding of how the referendum was experienced.

...ultimately the idea was that ... people could see themselves in that collection, ... [that] people could feel that, y’know, yes, that was the referendum basically, and that was the moment when Scotland had to decide, yes or no.\textsuperscript{14}

Speaking at an event held to mark the first anniversary of the vote, Referendum Curator Amy Todman similarly reflected on the “importance of an archival landscape that is representative of all of society” and expressed her desire that the SIRC would be “representative ... not just [of the main] campaign groups but also smaller groups and individuals”.\textsuperscript{15}

**Personal narratives in the SIRC**

While staff involved in curating the SIRC took a broader view on what experiences are ‘worthy’ of being represented, then, no clear idea of how to enact this in collecting appears to have been developed. The NLS has long included personal papers in its definition of political archives, with the 1983 Collection Development Policy document confidently asserting that “a selection of archives broadly representative of parliamentary life both in political and personal terms will make a sound basis for the study of politics in the mid 20\textsuperscript{th} century”.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, while these collections often contain records of the campaign groups that such individuals were involved with (for example, a 2014 article in the NLS magazine Discovery notes that “the records of Scotland is British ... can be found among the papers of Labour MP George Lawson” and the papers of John P Mackintosh “chart the rationale behind the [Alliance for a Scottish Assembly] campaign”\textsuperscript{17}), the focus here has been placed firmly on the parliamentary experience of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] Castrillo, interviewed by author.
\item[16] "Manuscripts Division Collection Development Policy," 5.
\end{footnotes}
those individuals at the highest level of government. Similarly, the statement of collecting priorities makes reference to collecting ‘key individuals’, but fails to identify any means for collecting the papers of ‘ordinary citizens’ involved with the democratic process at a grassroots level, and while such papers have been included in the SIRC, I will argue here that the way these personal collections have been represented (with corporate or professional characteristics brought to the foreground) obscures the crucially personal aspect of the records and undermines their usefulness and relevance for a ‘reconstruction’ of Indyref as a personal experience.

There are two collections in the SIRC that illustrate this particularly well. Accession 13607 was originally given the title ‘Papers of Women for Independence North-East Fife’, but this is not entirely accurate. The original inventory neglects to mention that the papers were collated and donated by Aimee Chalmers, and by instead describing the papers as “agendas, minutes and other planning information produced as part of the activities organised by ‘Women for independence North-East Fife’”, the inventory demonstrates an inclination to interpret the records through the lens of ‘corporate’ recordkeeping practices. This is a particular point for consideration given Chalmers’ own recollections on the relationship between the sub-group producing the creative projects and the larger Women for Independence campaign network:

[The projects were] nothing to do with the Women for Independence project, but obviously at least two of us were [members], had joined Women for Independence and there was a meeting in Stirling took place about that time and we thought “well, that’ll give us a chance to hand out flyers about the project”. ... There were one or two people interested in what we were doing, I think, but there were a lot of people in Women for Independence who weren’t interested in it, and fair enough, but, y’know, we did a lot of work on the listening groups and ... I put reports in regularly and ... I offered to do more, in fact, in relation to the reports, y’know, collate them in some kind of way, but I never got any feedback back from them at all. But ... we were all busy doing our own thing so ... I'm not criticizing anybody for that, it was just the way it happened.19

19 Chalmers, interviewed by author.
Chalmers’ comments here prompt us to question how accurately the original descriptions provided for the Indyref collections reflect the reality of the experiences they purport to represent, and Women for Independence provides an interesting case study in which to explore this question. Founded in 2012, Women for Independence (WfI) was established to increase and improve the representation of women in the 2014 referendum debate and to tackle the gender gap in support for independence. While the group is typically described as an example of the grassroots activist organisations that sprung up during the referendum, many of its founding members and key figures are seasoned political actors (including former MSPs Carolyn Leckie and Rosie Kane, and Jeanne Freeman, former advisor to Jack McConnell). By the time of polling, WfI claimed to have become “a national network of thousands of women and more than 40 local groups” and although many of these smaller satellite groups boasted just a handful of members, uniting them under the WfI branding effectively created the impression of an organically evolving movement ‘of the people’ – a common strategy of the Yes campaign.

The way the fonds has been named and described here – emphasising the group over the individual and obscuring the role of Chalmers in the creation and accumulation of the records – not only minimises the role of legitimately grassroots activists such as Chalmers in the referendum debate, but it also masks the porous relationship between personal actions and group membership in Indyref campaigning: affiliation with a group ‘brand’ was often more tangential than appears, and in some cases these tangential relations were deliberately obscured in order to foster the image of an nation-wide organic, ‘uprising’ in motion. From an archival perspective, this prompts us to question how far the representative value of these papers can be extended: do these papers accurately represent the membership, core functions and activities of WfI as a national campaigning body? Can they accurately be extrapolated to other satellite groups? Indeed, can they actually be considered representative of the local WfI branch (NE Fife) at all, or just of

21 Carolyn Leckie, ”Women for Indy Won’t Be Disappearing to Drink Tea and Eat Cereal,” The Herald, 21 September 2014.
22 Euan McColm, ”The Danger Now Scotland Poses Is to the Snp,” The Scotsman, 14 February 2021.
Chalmers herself? In the course of revisiting the inventory, I renamed this collection “Papers of Aimee Chalmers relating to ‘Knitting a Nation’ and ‘A New Chapter’, creative projects responding to the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014”. I hoped that placing Chalmers at the start of the title would return the focus to her, foreground that her engagement with the referendum debate was achieved through her creative practices, and additionally remove the implied association with the WfI NE Fife group.

A further example from the manuscript portion of the SIRC demonstrates how an inclination towards a corporate framework of recordkeeping has the potential to significantly alter the future reception of a fonds. At the time of donation, Accession 13682 was titled ‘Papers of Yes Musselburgh and SNP Musselburgh relating to the Scottish Independence Referendum’. The papers were collated by a private individual, Ann (‘Nan’) Proudfoot, who was involved with the two groups in a personal capacity. Proudfoot was an active member of Musselburgh civil society: she was closely involved in the running of a local older persons’ day centre; she served as a Justice of the Peace and worked with the local community council; and in 2009 was named Citizen of the Year by Musselburgh and Inveresk Community Council in recognition of her voluntary work.23 Following her death in October 2015, the papers were donated for inclusion in the SIRC by her son.

There are a few points to consider here. Firstly, as with the Chalmers fonds, foregrounding the organisation over the individual in the naming of the fonds effectively erases the role of Nan Proudfoot as active participant in the independence debate and potentially obscures the relationship between Indyref activism and pre-existing networks of Scottish civil society. Secondly, there is a lack of provenancial information accompanying this fonds, and we must consider the impact this has on the Indyref collection as a whole. As noted, there is a higher representation in the collection of Yes material than No material. Without a record of the full circumstances of this accession it could be assumed that the donation of this fonds was motivated by a desire on the part

of Nan Proudfoot to see her dissent towards the British state recorded for posterity, but we must ask: was Nan Proudfoot aware her papers would be donated to the SIRC? Was she aware of the SIRC project at all? There is no publicly available documentation that outlines what actions (if any) had been performed on the Proudfoot collection prior to donation. Were documents removed? Added? Were all these papers kept together by Proudfoot, or brought together by her son? Such questions may initially seem trivial, but as Douglas has shown, such issues can have a significant impact on how a collection (and its creator) is understood. The omission of any such information - and the application of the group identity to personal papers – might erroneously give the impression that others in the Yes Musselburgh and SNP Musselburgh groups were aware of the collecting project and that it was decided that Nan Proudfoot should be the one to contribute on their behalf. We must consider who – and significantly, whose memorialising instinct - is being represented in the donation of this collection, and how far the ‘representativeness’ of these papers can be extended beyond Nan Proudfoot herself.24

Furthermore, attending to the affective motivations behind archival donation will enable us to better understand the role of affect in record creation, use, and reception. For example, in her typology of alternative or parallel modes of creation, Jennifer Douglas has identified a form of creation in the actions taken by ‘keepers of the flame’: persons and organisations to whom guardianship of the records falls, in many cases following the passing of the original creator.25 In the case of literary papers, she characterises such actors as motivated by a desire to “keep alive particular memories of the writer and her work” through “exerting control over the writer’s archival remains, including by determining where they will be placed, what will be donated, sold or destroyed, how materials will be organized, and sometimes even through the addition of new materials or the alteration of existing documents”.26

24 As with the Chalmers fonds, I renamed this collection to more accurately reflect Nan Proudfoot’s role in the creation and accrual of the records: ‘Acc.13682: Papers of Nan Proudfoot relating to the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014’.
26 Ibid.
We can certainly extend this notion beyond literary archives to the collections in question here. Recalling the circumstances which led to the donation, donor Tom Proudfoot drew a connection between securing a record of his mother as a person and preserving a record of Indyref: (“For me as well, y’know, for my Mum, knowing she’d done so much for [the community]. She wasn’t selfless … she had a good active social life and all … she had a prolific family life as well, but it was really nice to know at some point in the future somebody looks at these things and goes “oh, well, that’s, yeah, that’s what was happening on the ground”.

27) The donation of Nan Proudfoot’s papers effectively inscribes her name into the annals of history: through inclusion in the SIRC, records that shed light on her personal Indyref experience serve as a window for future viewers into Indyref activism, and the figure of ‘Nan Proudfoot’ becomes a proxy for the relationship between community activism and national campaigns of this nature. Here, Proudfoot’s donation of his mother’s papers effectively memorialises her engagement with the Indyref campaigns, forging a relationship between ‘Nan the individual’ and ‘Scotland the nation’ that will endure through the years.

Here, we can see how archival action is used to memorialise an individual, pointing at the influential role that emotion can play in archival deposit and in political campaigning. A similar memorialising instinct can also be detected in the ‘Margo-mobile’, a crowd-sourced campaign vehicle established by former Labour MP Jim Sillars in memory of his late wife, former SNP deputy leader Margo MacDonald. The vehicle, which toured “housing estates and working communities in Scotland”, was intended to “make sure that [Margo’s] voice and her ideals, which inspired so many will continue to be heard in the referendum campaign,” and was described as “a testimony to Margo’s political legacy”. 28

These examples demonstrate that while Indyref campaigning was a political act, it was one hugely informed by affective, emotional forces. Neglecting to represent the affective motivations behind record creation and record donation, then, potentially misrepresents

27 Tom Proudfoot, interviewed by author, 13 May 2021.
the role of the nation and the citizens’ relationship to it in identity-formation, and hinders how useful these records may be as representative sources.

Archival future thought
Investigating the acquisition history of the Proudfoot fonds, I established that Tom Proudfoot is an employee of the NLS. Further reflecting on what motivated him to donate his mother’s papers to the SIRC, he suggested that he had been inspired by his personal experiences as a member of Library staff and his own encounters with heritage collections:

I could see from…invigilating [that] the interesting stuff in exhibitions was always the personal stuff… personal notes, letters, y’know, and it kinda made me think of that... I was thinking ‘well, somebody's gonna be looking at [Indyref] and want to find out what happened on the ground’ ’cause nobody seemed to be – as far as I was aware - recording all these little groups which sprung up.²⁹

Proudfoot’s comments here echo Bromage’s reflections on the motivation behind her own collecting (and memorialising) activities – gesturing not only at a recognition of the affective aspect of such records, but an attendant desire to secure contemporary history for the benefit of an undefined ‘future’ generation. This consideration of what record is being left for future generations can be understood as archival future thought, and as the work of Douglas and Michelle Caswell has demonstrated, such anticipatory thought can have a significant impact on how a fonds is produced. To what extent, then, do the descriptive approaches employed in the SIRC accurately reflect the activities of these groups and the individuals that comprised them, how they viewed their own records, and the archival future thought that influenced their creation? This in turn reflects a much larger question for archival collecting, and particularly for contemporary, ‘rapid response’ collecting approaches such as the CtR project: are archival processes adequately capable of representing the personal, affective, emotional dimensions that influence records and record creation?

²⁹ Proudfoot, interviewed by author.
As discussed earlier in this thesis, archival theory has traditionally been sceptical about the value of ‘personal’ records as personal records. Rooted in a positivist perspective that considered records to be neutral carriers of information, early theorists such as Sir Hilary Jenkinson posed that such records were sullied by an “intrusion of self”\(^{30}\); that having “been drawn up with an eye to posterity” they could not be considered neutral carriers of information and were therefore incompatible with the dominant category of evidence.\(^{31}\)

Chapter Two discussed how notions of representation have been introduced to the archival paradigm. Consequently, there is now a recognition amongst archivists that personal records of a wide range ‘ordinary citizens’ can not only offer an alternative form of ‘value’ in themselves, but can also serve as a useful mirror in which to examine the broader assumptions that underpin our understanding of record creation. Building on the work of life-writing scholars such as Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, who posit that “the author of a life-writing text does not, by writing autobiographically, simply reflect herself in the text” but rather navigates between the tensions of a ‘narrated I’ and a ‘narrating I’ to “[create] a version of herself that exists only in the text”, Douglas has argued that the ‘archiving I’ is the figure who makes decisions about what will represent the ‘real’ or historical figure as part of her archive: through these “acts of selection, retention, and representation” a carefully constructed and curated ‘archived I’ emerges.\(^{32}\)

An accurate representation of the personal is therefore crucial when we remember the underlying idea that motivates the principle of provenance – the “assumption that records can and do function as a mirror of their creator”.\(^{33}\)

Douglas’ work is specifically concerned with the archives of writers – a class of creators that are acutely aware of the power of textual objects in shaping perception – but other


\(^{33}\) Douglas and MacNeil, "Arranging the Self: Literary and Archival Perspectives on Writers’ Archives," 33.
archival scholars have made a case for extending this notion of archival future thought to other categories of record. Michelle Caswell, for example, posits that archival action is “not only about creating a more representative record of the past” but also “about changing what we envision is possible for the future”. She introduces the concept of the ‘archival imaginary’ as a means to describe the interrelation of past, present, and future in archival action: the way in which a conception or ‘dream’ of the future can shape the perception and treatment of the past.

The archival imaginary is the dynamic way in which communities creatively and collectively re-envision the future through archival interventions in representations of the shared past. Through the archival imaginary, the past becomes a lens to the future, the future is rooted in that which preceded it. Through the archival imaginary, the future can be conceived through the seeds of what was possible in the past.

Consideration of this concept in the literature has largely been confined to discussions of community archives, where an ‘intrusion of the self’ into the record has generally been not just accepted but embraced, but as Caswell is keen to stress, “the archival imaginary has always been active through the work of mainstream repositories”. In this context, however, it has been buried beneath a rhetoric of professional expertise, neutrality, and ‘impartial’ approaches to representation: Caswell observes that “unlike mainstream repositories which serve broad-based constituencies and whose funding structures often enforce the status quo,” such “identity-based community archives ... have never suffered from the same illusion of neutrality”.

**Imagining Scotland**

A recognition of the shaping power of such future thought is particularly relevant to the present study. As was discussed in Chapter Two fostering and cultivating nationalisms involves harnessing the imagination of the national community – or rather, appealing to individuals to imagine themselves as part of a national community – and heritage plays a central role in this process. As Elizabeth Crooke states, “the community group is defined

---

35 Ibid., 49.
36 Ibid., 46.
and justified because of its heritage and that heritage is fostered and sustained by the creation of community”; national heritage and the national community are interrelated, existing as two sides of the same coin. Indyref can be understood as a particularly discursive ‘imaginative’ moment. The referendum saw various potential ‘future Scotlands’ conjured through collective imagination and debate, and this aspect of Indyref was actively embraced by campaigners, particularly those hoping for a Yes result.

The Dearest Scotland project provides a particularly good illustration of such archival future thought in action. Launched in 2014 as an “apolitical campaign focused on crowdsourcing future visions for Scotland for a common good,” Dearest Scotland invited “folks with a Scottish connection to write to the country’s future.” Participants were encouraged to interpret the prompt in a broad manner (from the website: “we accept letters written literally, fictionally, poetically, metaphorically and more”) and in interview, Sarah Drummond of Snook (the creative design company behind the project) reflected on her surprise at just how personal many of the letters received were:

We said … “write a letter to the future of Scotland,” but … in some sense I think people just interpreted that as a sort of romantic love letter to the country. Recalling a frustration with the reductive binary framework of the referendum (and with representative democracy more generally), Drummond suggested that Dearest Scotland was intended to provide “a space for people to … air things out”.

I’ve seen through Snook’s work [that] people are so used to being just, like, asked really closed questions through consultation and never really given the space to sort of think more freely. Maybe because … they don't believe that that actually can be analysed and taken forward into something, […] We don’t really ever get the space to do it, and especially to a country at a macro level, y’know. You can kind of go around being like “oh it's so hard to get GP appointment” or “it’s really dirty in the streets”. Or, y’know, like,

---

40 Sarah Drummond, interviewed by author, 23 July 2021.
“I wish like, this”, but “what do you want for the future of the country?” is such a big question.41

In this respect, the project placed emotional and affective personal narratives at the forefront in contrast to a mainstream campaign narrative that has long figured the case for independence as predicated on logic rather than identity and feeling.42 While the project was open to submissions from all sides of the debate, Drummond noted that the majority of submissions were from Yes supporters. Considering why this was, she suggested that the concept “did speak more to people who were Yes voters. It was kind of more hopeful and optimistic, and I think the No vote was probably more stringently risk assured in their vote”.43 It could also be argued (as touched on above) that Yes voters were more actively engaged in the process of imagining the future: that while those who supported No were more concerned with a desire to maintain the status quo of the present moment, those who were inclined to support independence were also more inclined to have one eye to the future.

Another campaign that was particularly concerned with eliciting visions of a future independent Scotland was National Collective. Founded in 2011 by Ross Colquhoun, Andrew Redmond Barr and Rory Scothorne, National Collective was an “open and non-party political platform” through which “artists and creatives [could] engage with the Scottish independence campaign”. The Collective aimed to inspire engagement with the pro-independence cause “through art, written and spoken word, events, local groups and social media” and facilitate the “imagining [of] a better Scotland”.44 A collection of records relating to National Collective activities was acquired by the NLS in April 2016. The bulk of the fonds (Acc.13717/3-17) is comprised of display items used by National Collective at various events, most notably during ‘Yestival’, a month-long touring grassroots festival held in July 2014.45 These include photographs of individuals holding signs proclaiming

41 Drummond, interviewed by author.
42 See, for example, Ross Bond, “Squaring the Circles: Demonstrating and Explaining the Political "Non-Alignment" of Scottish National Identity,” Scottish Affairs 32, no. Summer (2000).
43 Drummond, interviewed by author.
“I Am National Collective”, large wooden display letters spelling the group’s rallying cry of “imagine a better Scotland”, and handmade cardboard signs bearing pro-Yes iconography and slogans. The remainder of the fonds (Acc.13717/1-2) are papers of co-founder Ross Colquhoun, whose idea the group and project was. Aside from notes for talks given by Colquhoun after the referendum, this sub-fonds largely concerns the ‘Vitol controversy’ that took place in 2013: a few early emails between Colquhoun and lawyer Aamer Anwar discuss the issue, and the rest of the sub-fonds is made up of printouts of National Collective’s blog posts concerning the allegations and response.

When assessing the character of the ‘archived I’ that has been produced by the acts of selection, retention and representation in the National Collective fonds, it is worth noting that the donor of the fonds (visual artist and graphic designer Ross Colquhoun) would later go on to “[join] the SNP payroll as an engagement strategist”. Indeed, the catalogue title for the fonds originally indicated that the papers were obtained ‘through the good offices of the SNP’. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that the collection displays an evident ‘professional’ concern with how the organisation is perceived, from the focus on display materials to scripts for presentations. There is a notable absence of any internal communications or any other administrative documents aside from those relating to the Vitol incident, from which we can conclude that Colquhoun is keen to ensure this episode is recorded for posterity: understandable, as it could be argued that in serving the cease-and-desist order Vitol effectively ‘legitimised’ National Collective in the eyes of the press and commentators - or at the very least, gave one of its three founders the sense of being of legitimate enough influence that a cease-and-desist order was necessary. We must

---

46 In summary: National Collective had, in April 2013, published an article on their website which “questioned the background of Ian Taylor, Chief Executive and President of [Dutch energy company] Vitol and a major donor to Better Together”. Three days following this, the National Collective website was “replaced by a single page with only the message ‘NOT FOR PUBLICATION’, with no further explanation offered”. It was then revealed that National Collective had been issued with a ‘cease and desist’ order by Vitol in relation to what they perceived as the “grossly defamatory” nature of the article. “Our Statements & Legal Response to Ian Taylor/Vitol Group,” National Collective, http://www.nationalcollective.com/2013/04/20/our-statements-legal-response-to-ian-taylorvitol-group/


48 The incident certainly garnered a great deal of media coverage, and drew the attention of the wider press to Ian Taylor.
therefore recognise the influence of Colquhoun’s ‘archiving I’ on the collection, and question whether the descriptive choices made when managing these papers accurately reflect this force. Can we really consider these papers the records of the organisation National Collective, then? Or are they be better described as the personal papers of Ross Colquhoun?

On reviewing the collection and the original inventory, I felt that it was necessary to distinguish between the material that related specifically to Colquhoun’s activities and perspective, and the material that related to National Collective’s activities more generally. I achieved this by creating a separate series within the hierarchy for the Colquhoun papers, and situated this at the top of the structure to foreground his influence on the rest of the fonds. Naming the latter two series ‘Display’, I emphasised the visual element of the National Collective material, thus foregrounding this aspect of the collection for the user.

#YesBecause – capturing hashtag activism

National Collective were also highly attuned to the power of the personal narrative as a campaign tool, and were particularly effective in harnessing this online. In 2014 a number of hashtag campaigns were launched by the group, inviting “those in favour of independence ... to share their reasons for doing so on social media.”49 Indyref ‘hashtag activism’50 was a prominent feature of the debates and has since enjoyed academic attention with studies examining, for example, the geographical distribution of tweets relating to the referendum,51 the application of legislation surrounding the ‘regulated period’ to the social media sphere,52 and a comparison of the use of indyref-related

51 Tom Holby, "#Indyref: A Geographical Comparison of Tweets Related to the Scottish Independence Referendum of 2014" (George Mason University, 2015).
hashtags on Instagram and Twitter.\textsuperscript{53} When we consider the premise introduced at the start of this chapter [of a researcher attempting to investigate indyref from a distance of 36 years], it is key to note that these studies all rely on the existence of the live web – a position that is understandable when we consider the barriers that hinder the collection of such material.

Under legal deposit legislation, a site must have been ‘published’ within the UK in order to be considered in scope for capture. The targeted deep-dive approach provides curators the ability to override the automatic detection system and provide justification for a site’s inclusion, but any site hosted on a server outwith the UK (as many social media platforms are) will not be picked by the automatic yearly domain crawl: social media accounts must be individually added if they are to be captured. Where an account has been targeted, the crawler has no ability to interact with a webpage meaning that any site requiring log in details to progress beyond a certain page is inaccessible to the crawler: this includes an inability to scroll down the page, meaning (for example) that only the most recent Tweets from an account can be captured. Additionally, the proprietary and global nature of these large platforms makes ‘reaching’ the code that they are built on very difficult: many platforms use Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) which obscure the code that supports the site,\textsuperscript{54} and where sites have been captured, they are often rendered incorrectly as a result of ‘cookies’ – for example, site text surrounding tweets may appear in a language other than English.\textsuperscript{55}

There are also ethical issues to be considered. As was discussed in the previous chapter, in order to mitigate the risks associated with informed consent, the collection of social media sites was largely limited to those individuals who were specifically positioning themselves as ‘publishing’, however some content-led collecting was carried out in the form of targeting hashtags. This collecting approach offers an interesting means by which

\textsuperscript{53} Tom Feltwell, Jamie Mahoney, and Shaun Lawson, “"Aye, Have a Dream #Indyref": Use of Instagram During the Scottish Referendum,” (2015).


to examine our understanding of ‘personal’ and ‘public’ in the digital world. The use of a hashtag on Twitter, Instagram or Facebook, for example, effectively incorporates an individual post into a larger collection and thus explicitly positions it as ‘for public consumption’. Conversely, it could be argued (as Eilidh MacGlone suggested in interview) that users posting to a personal Twitter account with, say, 45 followers are generally not anticipating that their post will be circulated outwith this immediate audience. While hashtag-led collection may avoid some of the ethical pitfalls of collecting, then, it is important to consider the usefulness of such resources for future study. As MacGlone reflected, no contextual information surrounding hashtagged posts is collected, making assessing the relevance of a post a difficult task:

There was a lot of ... international interest in the referendum, so if you were to pick a hashtag, you had to ... wonder whether or not it was all published [in] the UK. I mean, in retrospect, probably not, but we did choose ... six hashtags and collected them for a short period of time.56

The efficacy and impact of this kind of digital activism is still being investigated, but it is undeniable that personal narratives were heavily leveraged on- and offline during the run up to Indyref, and have continued to play a significant role in the debate surrounding Scottish independence. The sixth anniversary of the vote in 2020, for example, saw a wave of people take to Twitter to share their personal journey since polling day (with the hashtags #NoToYes and #YesToNo) or to reaffirm the stance they took in 2014 (#StillYesBecause, #StillNoBecause). The continuing prevalence of these types of posts suggest that personal narratives are of significant relevance to understanding the process of (national) identity formation in a globalised world, and it is therefore imperative that we re-examine the value of personal narratives to a national archive project, and how web-based material of this nature is made available to researchers.

In summary, exploring how personal narratives are represented in the SIRC illustrates how decisions made in the management of archival sources can extend or limit the possibilities for research into the referendum experience and suggests that a greater acknowledgement of the personal and affective aspects to record creation and use might

56 MacGlone, interviewed by author.
be beneficial. The CtR project demonstrates an acute awareness of the centrality of personal narratives to Indyref campaigning and the Indyref ‘experience’. Campaigners were keenly aware of the benefit to be found in giving the debate a personal face, but while curators’ reflections indicate a recognition of this and a willingness to engage with such personal narratives, there appears to be a general hesitancy surrounding the practicalities of how to interpret, represent and provide access to such records. The NLS as a body is unused to dealing with such records on their own terms as personal records, but while the CtR project appears to have been approached as a testbed in which the Library could experiment with alternative collecting processes and new ways of working that would allow for personal narratives to emerge from the collections, it is not clear how (and to what extent) the Library has been able to review and take account of the lessons learned here. Consequentially, where personal narratives have been captured in collecting, they have generally been made to stand as proxy for a vast and diverse range of experiences, revealing an institutional uncertainty about what function such records serve in a national collection, and what larger function such national collections are intended to serve: who, or what, are these records representative of?

**Indyref as local: ‘peopled territories’**

In many ways, examining the representation of local narratives in the collection tells a parallel story to that detailed above. It is again useful to pause and clarify what is meant by ‘local’ and why an accurate archival record of it is important. The democratic question at the heart of the referendum asks the electorate to consider how political geographies are established, and according to what criteria: is a populace defined by their language, borders, customs, heritage? Additionally, the independence debate had (and continues to have) a highly regional dimension to it, with one manifestation of this being the emergence of numerous campaign groups with a local focus, with activity often being organised around a particular geographic area (such as Yes Edinburgh North and Leith or Stirlingshire for No Thanks). Lynch described how “Yes had tens of thousands of activists involved on the ground on a weekly basis, learning political campaigning
techniques and becoming familiar with the political terrain in their communities,"\(^{57}\) and this ‘bottom-up’ approach to campaigning sat in stark opposition to the sort of ‘top-down’ “electoral-professional communications that came to dominate contemporary UK campaigning” prior to 2014.\(^{58}\) As Lynch notes, recent decades have seen the emergence of the “the electoral-professional party as parties became centralised, political communications machines that connected with voters through the mass media and direct mailing operations”.\(^{59}\) The No campaign certainly took this tack – significantly outspending Yes £3,546,208 to £3,118,772\(^{60}\) - but (as we explored in the previous section) the Yes movement appeared to place a higher value on local narratives and perspectives to the independence cause.

Not only were the referendum debates understood and engaged with through a local lens then, (that is, securing or preventing national autonomy was presented as the first step in finding solutions to local issues), they also had a highly regionalised character, with experiences of Indyref differing greatly across the nation. Exploring how the landscape was co-opted and ‘politicised’ during the debates, Elizabeth Ritchie has identified differences in how Indyref allegiances were expressed in urban centres and rural areas, and asserted that the creation of “political micro-landscapes in ‘natural’ locations” effectively “blurred the dichotomy between nature and culture, between what is ‘out there’ and what is ‘in me’”.\(^{61}\) For our purposes, we can also identify here a blurring of the line between ‘local’ and ‘national’ in the way that local landscapes were manipulated in order to make a comment on a national issue; likewise, the debate around the ‘national question’ was largely conducted in a local dialect, with voters prompted to consider what a Yes or a No vote would mean for a particular region.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 3.
\(^{59}\) Ibid., 4.
It is important to acknowledge the historical context to this strand of the 'local' story. In Chapter Three, I discussed Graeme Morton's examination of how Scottish civil society exercised 'national' power and self-administration in the absence of a national parliament after 1707. As Morton argued, voluntary and subscriber action in the nineteenth century "allowed the middle class to deal with the challenges of urban society without recourse to the parliamentary state" and it was through the "self-sustaining independence of this [voluntary] action" that "Scottishness was encapsulated". The prevalence during Indyref of local and community campaigning networks can therefore be understood as an evolution of this voluntary action into the twentieth-first century. As Michael Keating observed, Indyref saw Scottish society "repoliticised" and new social movements emerge, and a consideration of the post-referendum fortunes of these groups provides further grounds for representing the local dimension of the independence debate.

In the wake of a No result, pro-Yes parties saw their membership figures soar following the referendum: “membership of the SNP increased more than fourfold within a few weeks, while the pro-independence Scottish Greens also massively expanded” and by March 2015 “membership had reached the landmark figure of 100,000 which, at approximately 3.0% of the Scottish electorate, made the SNP the kind of mass membership party not seen in the UK for decades”. While this has undoubtedly boosted the political standing of these parties, there are some who argue that this surge has come at the expense of local activist networks and single-issue campaigning. As Keating observed, the referendum was seized on by some factions as a “form of protest against established parties and institutions – although paradoxically the SNP is itself a party of government and the Scottish Parliament an established institution” and the years

62 Morton, Unionist-Nationalism, 131.
63 Ibid., 132.
following the referendum have seen the impact of this paradoxical nature. Activists such as Cat Boyd (formerly of Radical Independence Campaign) have argued that the years since the referendum have seen the radical element of the independence movement co-opted and ‘watered down’ by the mainstream movement. Suggesting that the “populist right have monopolised the protest vote”, Boyd points to the “railroading of the pro-independence movement behind the People’s Vote campaign” as example of how the momentum and enthusiasm generated by Indyref has been cannily harnessed and redirected by the governing SNP, while not returning any benefit to the independence movement.67 On the other side of this coin are accusations that the constitutional question has come to be the only frame through which any local or single-issue campaigns can be interpreted (see, for example, comments by Conservative councillor Thomas Kerr that insinuate a direct link between the Glasgow ‘refuse crisis’ and the nationalist cause,68 or criticism about the ‘appropriation’ of a global climate march by pro-independence group All Under One Banner69). The local aspect to the 2014 debate is therefore one part of a larger and continuing story of the intersections between state, community, and individual in Scotland, and marks a significant break in the dominant narratives about this relationship. For this to be fully appreciated and understood, the relationships between these spheres of activity deserve to be accurately represented in the SIRC.

Local narratives in the SIRC
When considering how this regional dimension to the referendum is represented by the SIRC it is useful to examine how curators understood the relationship between national and local collecting. When asked in interview whether there was a particular picture of
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67 Cat Boyd, "Can We Still Say That ‘Scottish Politics Has Changed Forever’?,” The National, 18 December 2018.
the referendum that she hoped to capture, Giles explicitly spoke about the importance of acknowledging and representing regional differences:

For me personally, I was sort of wanting to make sure that the geographic coverage was as best as possible ... I think it was important because obviously there are a lot of regional differences throughout the country and we have a lot of islands as well, and viewpoints are quite different in different parts of the country.\textsuperscript{70}

Similarly, in anticipation of a two-week residency in Helmsdale, Caithness, Todman ruminated on how a further examination of the ‘geographic angle’ to the referendum might expand our understanding of the Indyref experience more generally:

Given this widespread engagement with the political moment, and noting in particular the part played by the web, it is pertinent to consider a geographical angle to the referendum experience. To what extent, for example, did the digital character of much of the referendum – social media presence for example, or blogs as ‘alternative media’ outlets – challenge established geographical centres, shifting the focus onto the peripheries, and particularly northwards?\textsuperscript{71}

However, as Todman later noted when reporting on the residency, collecting ‘from afar’ poses significant challenges, even in the digital age:

For practical reasons, places further from the National Library of Scotland’s geographical base in the central belt, but which still fall within its national remit, can be harder to collect from ... Creating contacts in these areas, whether with other collecting organisations or campaign groups and individuals, usually have to be made by email, phone, or letter rather than face-to-face.\textsuperscript{72}

Indeed, while there certainly appears to have been a will to represent regional experiences, it appears that the practical execution of the collecting project fails to make space for this. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is a strong impression that collection of the local dimension was assumed to be the purview of local repositories. Certainly, the project website stresses the desire for ‘local items’ to be brought to the

\textsuperscript{70} Giles, interviewed by author.
\textsuperscript{71} Amy Todman, ‘Digital local? : Where was the Scottish Independence referendum?’, n.d.
\textsuperscript{72} Amy Todman, ‘AT 2015-03-23 Timespan Residency report’, n.d.
Library’s attention for inclusion in the SIRC\textsuperscript{73} and an appeal flyer circulated prior to the referendum similarly called on the public to “help [the NLS] to collect history” by providing information about local campaign groups,\textsuperscript{74} but save an assertion that local and grassroots organisations “largely, although not exclusively, operate in the social media sphere,” there is no explicit acknowledgement of communities below the national level in the statement of collecting priorities.\textsuperscript{75} As Lynch has discussed, Yes campaign activities were not orchestrated by a single party or organisation, but rather emerged from a diverse base – the movement generally demonstrated a “strong DIY element,” with a “wide expanse of Yes activities outside of electioneering that sought to build support across the long campaign from different political directions”.\textsuperscript{76} Conversely, in her reflection on the residency, Todman reported that while Indyref “did provide a pointed focus for community activism ... these communities were often very active already”, with the consequence that that “the referendum campaigns were not perhaps as transformative in some rural contexts as they have been seen to be in the cities”. She further noted that “the idea of a grass roots campaign was complicated in the northern context by touring campaigners coming into communities to work with local populations”.\textsuperscript{77}

The SIRC appears to be skewed towards organisations and individuals based in the Central Belt and to the top-level, national campaign groups, a prioritisation of the national over the local that risks only portraying the reality of Indyref as it was experienced by the electorate in the Central Belt.\textsuperscript{78} Greater archival representation of the regional differences in how Indyref was experienced would allow for more detailed analysis of the relationship between national and local Indyref campaigning, and between government and civil society more generally. To unpick why the SIRC does not fully represent this

\textsuperscript{75} "Collecting the Referendum on Scottish Independence' Statement of Collecting Priorities," 2.
\textsuperscript{77} Todman, ‘AT 2015-03-23 Timespan Residency report’.
\textsuperscript{78} This is most notable in the manuscript collections, with only two \emph{fonds} originating from outwith this area.
aspect of the referendum, it is helpful to consider the CtR project in the context of the Library’s existing collecting practice. As discussed earlier in this thesis, the CtR project marked a significant departure from previous collecting practices. This ‘rapid response’ collecting was a relatively new approach for the Library, and given that there had been no event like Indyref in Scotland since the 1997 referendum on devolution (with the digital environment making a significant addition to the documentary landscape since then), there was no obvious precedent to follow for the identification and acquisition of manuscript materials. There were, however, well-established mechanisms in place for the collection of printed materials under the auspices of legal deposit legislation, and evidence indicates that the CtR project was built on these mechanisms. Observing that the Library has “routinely collected general and Scottish Parliament elections” for some time, Giles suggested these established relationships were instrumental in ensuring the smooth transfer of material (“because we had existing contacts with all the political parties ... we just needed to say that we were collecting this and they knew what we wanted”79); the Discovery article mentioned above contextualises the CtR project by way of reference to existing manuscript collections; similarly, a blog post by Todman, recapping the open day events, notes that the display of existing holdings “was useful to show people the kind of leaflets and flyers that [the Library] want[ed] for the collection, and how these fit into a wider historical context”.80 These reflections casts the Library’s desires and assumptions as paramount and suggest that existing collections had a significant shaping impact on how ‘potential’ archival material for the SIRC was conceived of.

Furthermore, it can be argued that the Library’s preconceptions about where material was being produced, and by whom, effectively limited the capacity for the CtR to tailor its collecting practices to the particular characteristics and idiosyncrasies of Indyref as it was experienced – particularly in terms of the Yes campaign. As indicated by Bissett’s claim that the Yes campaign was “a genuine uprising”, the high level of engagement with the debate (and the emergence of numerous local, non-party, and grassroots groups) was

79 Giles, interviewed by author.
80 Todman Collecting the Referendum.
somewhat unexpected: as such, while the Library was well poised to acquire printed and published material through the tried-and-tested mechanisms used by the General Collections division, it had less experience in the kind of rapid response collecting that the CtR project aimed to employ and in managing material acquired through these means.

The sub-collections of ephemera in the SIRC illustrate these concerns particularly well. There are 107 such sub-collections that were acquired through the General Collections division, and while most of these are named in the catalogue by reference to the creating body which published them (i.e. ‘Farming for Yes ephemera’, ‘Save the Union ephemera’), one entry in the catalogue is simply titled ‘Scottish independence referendum 2014 miscellaneous ephemera’. The catalogue describes this sub-collection as being comprised of 77 items of “miscellaneous ephemera produced in response to the Scottish independence referendum 2014” such as “leaflets, posters, flyers, badge, etc,” but no explanatory information is supplied as to how, when, where, or by whom this sub-collection was collated. Are these 77 items a snapshot from a single day, or week, or month in the two-year debate period? Most of the flyers appear to relate to events or organisations in the Edinburgh/Central Belt region – was this area selected for a particular reason, or is this focus simply a consequence of where Library staff are based? At what time of year were these items acquired? Was it during the Edinburgh Festivals, which see around 600,000 visitors enter the city each year? The sub-collection provides a valuable insight into the diverse ways that the referendum was discussed and experienced, and while these questions may appear trivial, without answers to them it is difficult to establish the extent to which this sub-collection can be considered representative of the national experience of Indyref, or just of the Edinburgh experience.

**Conclusion**

In many ways, this sub-collection serves as a microcosm for the SIRC as a whole: divorced from the circumstances of their creation, accrual and transfer to the archive, the usefulness of these records as historical sources is limited by a lack of contextual
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information. Just as description can “only represent a slice, or a slice of a slice, or a slice of a slice of a slice, of a record’s reality,” it isn’t possible for any repository or recording project to capture everything that contributed to the ‘Indyref experience’ and we must instead settle for a ‘representative sample’. This was touched upon in interview by Castrillo, who reflected on the thorniness of representation in a national collection:

I think for the NLS ... it has a national remit, so it’s not like a local authority archive, for example, or a local library, where you can perhaps get away with [focusing on personal or local stories], but when you are in an institution like that which is publicly funded, which ... has such a prominence in the cultural life of the country, I think you need to be even more careful about presenting picture.

As Castrillo indicates, the challenge for archivists lies less in what (and how) material is collected and more in how it is then presented and made available, and a deeper issue here is the extent to which archival description can – or should – be expected to provide a ‘narrative backstory’ to a resource. Unlike libraries, archives are closed spaces where prospective users are rarely given the opportunity to freely ‘browse’ collections, and instead must rely on archivist-supplied descriptions in order to identify and assess the potential relevance of material. There is a necessary balance to be struck between providing a contextual background for a record and dictating to the user how a resource should be received, and various standards for descriptive work (such as ISAD (G), ISAAR (CPF) and Rules for Archival Description (RAD)) have been developed and are in common use. Scholars such as Geoffrey Yeo, however, have argued that these “are based on illusory assumptions about the possibility of reducing complex and ever-changing realities to defined stages and formalized elements of data”. Exploring the limitations of descriptive standards, Wendy Duff and Verne Harris have established that “no approach to archival description ... can escape the reality that it is a way of constructing knowledge through processes of inscription, mediation, and narration”:

82 Duff and Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings," 278.
83 Castrillo, interviewed by author.
Archivists cannot describe records in an unbiased, neutral, or objective way ... Description tells a story. Description is always story telling - intertwining facts with narratives, observation with interpretation.85

This is not to say that descriptive standards have no place in modern archival practice – indeed, by encouraging uniformity they can enable the exchange of information between organisations and facilitate interoperability between different metadata schemas – but simply, we must consider how such an approach to archival description might shape and influence the reception of the record.

As Tom Nesmith has pointed out, "the intellectual history of the archival profession is the history of thinking about the nature of contextual knowledge about records"86: he notes a ‘contextual turn’ “toward deepening appreciation of the role of contextual knowledge about records in archival work”87 and has attempted a rearticulation of archival provenance:

The provenance of a given record or body of records consists of the social and technical processes of the records’ inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpretation which account for its existence, characteristics, and continuing history.88

Reflecting a recognition that meaning in records is never ‘fixed’, but rather, operates in a “continual dialectical interaction with diverse present knowers”,89 Nesmith emphasises ‘interpretation’ and ‘continuing history’ as aspects of a record’s context that require to be foregrounded in description. Drawing on the school of ‘mnemohistory’,90 such a position

85 Duff and Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings," 275.
87 Ibid., 260.
90 Mnemohistory, first coined by Jan Assman in 1997, can best be described as “reception theory applied to history.” In rejecting a view of history as the telling of ‘what really happened’ in the past, the mnemohistorical position instead emphasises that “the past is not simply ‘received’ by the present. The present is ‘haunted’ by the past and the past is modelled, invented, reinvented and reconstructed by the present”. Jan Assmann, Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism (London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 9.
supposes that the various layers of meaning that have been heaped upon a record during its ‘lifetime’ can impact, obscure, and shape different aspects of its being.

Returning our focus to personal Indyref archives, when we consider the often loose, informal structure of many of the organisations involved in Indyref, the long campaign period, and the prevalence of the digital in Indyref recordkeeping practices, it is not impossible to foresee that the personal records that have been donated to the SIRC may ultimately be the only archival record of such activism. If these personal records are to be considered representative of the Indyref experience, then a political context must be provided in order to locate them in a wider public sphere; conversely, if they have been acquired in order to shed light on personal engagements with Indyref, then this must too be made clear. As will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis, this requires a more explicit narration of the records and an honesty about the act of archival representation as a work of exposition in itself. A key part of this involves ensuring that the circumstances of accession are fully communicated to researchers: how and why were these particular objects acquired for the collection; on what grounds were they considered to be representative, and of whose experience? The examples detailed in this chapter demonstrate that if we hope to employ these records as historical artefacts of the independence referendum, we must ensure that the contexts of their creation, accrual, use, and transfer to the archive – their lives and afterlives – is adequately represented in our finding aids and catalogues.
Chapter 5 – Unpicking Archival Silences: Infrastructure, Culture, and Tacit Knowledge

Introduction
In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson extended Hegel’s comment that “newspapers serve modern man as a substitute for morning prayers” in creating a shared national consciousness. Commenting on the “profound fictiveness” of the newspaper, he observed that events that occur “independently without the actors being aware of each other” are united on the page as though sharing a commonality, and suggested that it is “the arbitrariness of their inclusion and juxtaposition [that] shows the linkage between them is imagined”.\(^1\) Here, the collation of individual, ‘micro’ narratives effectively produces a ‘macro’ narrative, a national Ur-text that obscures difference in order to forge a coherent narrative of the nation. In a similar vein, when considering how traditional models of nationalist development have anticipated “the ruling elite maintain their cultural dominance in the move towards statehood”, Hames has noted that it could be expected that “the tartan waistcoat” of an elite-led Scottish nationalist thought “is let out to cover an expanded, truly national body which includes (by overwriting) all of Scotland’s internal conflicts and distinctions”.\(^2\) Borrowing this metaphor, I suggested in the previous chapter that the capacity for personal and local archival narratives to be representative is diminished as such narratives are figured as proxy for too-large a group or area: the print becomes distorted, and the frays that appear in the fabric of this overly-stretched material reflect the points of discordance and disagreement within the national body. Rather than looking to smooth out the wrinkles and differences in an attempt to homogenise such *fonds*, therefore, I argued that we should instead strive to emphasise the unique, idiosyncratic elements of each. Continuing with this textile metaphor, the present chapter will examine the ‘rips and tears’ in the national fabric – that is, the lacunae or ‘archival silences’ in the documentary landscape of the referendum where records (or the contextual data required to interpret them) were unavailable to a future researcher. By drawing attention to what information *cannot* be found in the finding aids,
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\(^1\) Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 33.

catalogues, or through the records themselves, it highlighted how ‘tacit information’ that does not find its way into the record can extend or limit the representative capacity of records.

Marlene Manoff has suggested that the concept of archival silence “serves as a productive metaphor as well as a kind of shorthand to refer to gaps, omissions and distortions in the historical record”, and the attention paid to such silences has only grown in recent years as society has become more dependent on ‘technologies of the interface’. As discussed in the previous chapter, a ‘digital object’ has no inherent ‘quality’ of its own: instead of the fixity of a printed word that endures through time, the digital presents us with an encoding that renders an object visible on a screen in a particular moment, and with no longevity. A digital object that cannot be rendered because the interface has become outdated or inaccessible is doomed to remain silent. However, as Tim Gollins has asserted, “while the threat of obsolescence is real in some particular cases, the major threat to the survival of digital records does not come from media, hardware or software obsolescence”. This has also been stressed by David Thomas who has suggested that the culture of the digital world (rather than technology it is predicated on) poses more of a risk than archivists have been willing to grapple with, and that silences in the digital archive are more often man-made than technological.

Interest in archival ‘silences’ amongst scholars in fields such as human rights and memory studies has increased in recent years, but it has long been a topic of study. In 1987, Debra Barr asserted that “we cannot assume that every document originally forming part of a fonds will necessarily find its way into an archives”. Expanding on this, Laura Millar has examined how provenance is conceived of in the worlds of archaeology and museology: archaeologists use the term ‘provenience’ to denote the findspot or “final
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physical environment where the object was set aside, or cast away, by the one who had last used it,” and in the museum profession the term describes an item’s custodial history, “the life of an object over time.” In these fields, neither archaeologist nor curator assert that the object they have responsibility for represents the ‘whole’ of a potential body of objects, and nor should archivists. Rather, we should accept that “no archives ever had the ‘whole of the records’ of any creating agency... Archivists manage the residue, not the entirety.” A full representation of the life and afterlife of a collection would therefore involve a representation of the ‘shadow’ or ‘ghost’ archives that accompany it: that is, an account of the records which may have been removed, destroyed, or censored from an accession; the records that may never have been included in an archive; and the records that may never have been created at all.

Overcoming the gaps in the documentary record (and reconstructing the reasons behind these omissions) will be crucial for our future researcher of Indyref. There are a number of silences that our researcher might encounter in the manuscript portion of the SIRC – some brought about unintentionally, and some cultivated deliberately. An ‘expected’ silence may be that caused when records are withheld from an archive: this may be an entire collection that is kept away from the repository, single documents that are weeded from a fonds prior to donation, or records proactively destroyed. For example, our researcher may be disappointed not to find any organisational records of Yes Scotland or Better Together that might shed light on how these groups were structured and managed. Although curators forged relationships with both groups that appear to have been effective in ensuring the smooth transfer of printed material to the Library, it is largely marketing and display materials (posters, flyers, photographs and placards, for example) produced by both of the major campaign groups that is well represented in the collections. Castrillo suggested that hesitation to deposit may have been motivated by a fear of exposing campaign strategies, but this does not explain why this hesitation endured post-referendum. It is possible to connect this to the notion that for many, the
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referendum did not effectively ‘settle’ the constitutional issue, but it is also important to acknowledge that Freedom of Information (FoI) legislation and the emergence of a ‘receipts culture’ has resulted in a political class acutely concerned with reputation and reception management.

Douglas demonstrated how a certain narrative regarding an author or her archive can be cemented by the critical literature surrounding that material. Also addressing literary archives, specifically those where creators are still living, Robert McGill has maintained that “archival scholars...cannot study a living author without affecting the life and even the writing of that person. Living authors read criticism and respond to it, they give interviews or refuse to give them, they defend or relinquish their right to privacy...". He asserts that “scholars will have to accept that the ‘observer effect’ of physics applies to literary criticism, too: agents who investigate phenomena are inseparable from those phenomena and must account for their own involvement in them”. There are clearly parallels to be drawn here with political activity. Democracies are predicated on the assumption that they are representative, that legislators are elected to enact the wishes and desires of 'the people'. It is therefore crucial in this relationship that those purporting to express those wishes – be they career politicians or community activists - “read criticism and respond to it”. As can be observed in the practice of both posting and ‘withdrawing’ or deleting tweets, political actors are often keen to demonstrate the extent to which they are attuned to contemporary discourse. It is therefore not difficult to imagine that this ‘observer effect’ also operates in political archives, and that individuals and organisations may remove or withhold records in order to avoid scrutiny or encourage the production of a particular reception.

Furthermore, archives may be one area of the political system in which politicians and political actors have very limited control. Although he concedes that it is “imperfect in execution” Simon Fowler asserts that “FoI is still a powerful tool in the armoury of the
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researcher” and suggests that it has “changed the relationship between the public, the archival institution and public agencies”. As Thomas points out, however, when applied to the digital world there is a worrying trend in which “laws intended to promote greater access or to protect individual privacy have resulted in the mass destruction of digital records”. Thomas suggests that as processing requests made under FoI “is expensive and difficult, organisations seem increasingly to delete material before it can be subject to an access request”, and indicates that this might particularly be the case with records that contain sensitive or private information:

Because Data Protection legislation imposes penalties for the release of personal data, there is a very real risk that government departments will proactively close material which has not been reviewed to protect themselves against possible legal action. The consequence will be the same – a further deterioration in public access to the nation’s history.

Exploring the relationship between FoI legislation and digital recordkeeping practices, Thomas warns of an “apparent tendency of some civil servants and elected ministers to not document decision-making processes, or to use informal technologies which are outside the scope of FoI” such as encrypted messaging services like WhatsApp or Signal. Here, we can see archival future thought in operation through omission and repression as much as inclusion and emphasis – limiting what is available to the archive in the first place allows an individual some measure of control over their archival legacy, and encourages the development of a particular future reception.

Elusive records
This idea of records that may have eluded the archive is particularly pertinent when considering silences in the SIRC as there are a variety of potential or ghost records that
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fall into this category. This was touched upon at interview by SPA Archivist Sarah Bromage. Discussing the higher prevalence of Yes campaign material than No in the collection, Bromage suggested that in some respects this reflected the visual reality of the Indyref campaigns.

I’d spoken to a Conservative No campaigner and he said that [the No campaign] were working on the assumption that most windows that didn't show a poster were No voters, and at the time I thought that was quite interesting but he was proved to be right, so I think [there was a] silent majority of people who had already decided quietly that they were voting [No] and didn’t really talk about it, and I certainly know from my friends who voted No that they didn’t really talk about it, but they were never going to vote Yes.16

Considering how to convey this to users, Bromage then reflected on the difficulty of representing such a ‘silent majority’ in an archive catalogue:

I talked to you before about ... noting that on catalogues and maybe ... having something to say on the catalogue, 'cause y’know, we know this, but if you look back in 100 years time, you're gonna look at this and [think] “there's hardly any [No] campaign material yet that side won, how is that? how does that work?” And then you look at all the photos [and there is] all this stuff happening for Yes but, it didn't win, so how ... does that work? I don't know, it's interesting.17

Similarly, as has been discussed, many of the satellite campaign groups operated in something of an informal manner using platforms such as WhatsApp, Twitter, or Facebook Messenger to communicate with members and coordinate activity. While it is possible to transfer, store, preserve and access such records in theory, the practical execution of this encounters many problems, ethical and otherwise.18 Social media posts that appear on a personal or private page (such as a personal Facebook profile or a closed Twitter account) are not available for collection by the web archive, as the crawler is incapable of interacting with a page to login. This results in a documentary landscape that still bears the marks of records that once existed but are no longer accessible to the

16 Bromage, interviewed by author.
17 Ibid.
researcher. As Bromage suggests here, where the absence of records can speak loudly, it is incumbent on archivists to be explicit about the nature of the documentary landscape they are trying to represent.

An additional factor which can render records inaccessible is what Thomas calls the paradox of “more information equals less knowledge”. He warns that unless contextual metadata is secured for the vast quantities of digital records that are currently being created “future researchers will effectively be dipping their hands into an information bran tub and pulling out snippets of information without seeing its true meaning because it will be deprived of context”.

The preservation of context is, as Adrian Cunningham asserted, “the thing that separates archives from other forms of information” and this becomes even more crucial in the digital world where users are not required to navigate through a catalogue or finding aid to locate a record: a ‘snippet’ may be retrieved by search without any circumstantial information to contextualise it, and a remote researcher will likely have no archivist on hand to supply this. Digital interfaces for archive collections will need to be developed “for the current and future generations of users who demand instant, easy access to resources”, or “archives will effectively impose silences on themselves”.

Infrastructure silences

It is with this warning in mind that this chapter will now turn to the web archive component of the SIRC. Here, the manner in which web-based material has been presented poses a number of barriers to be overcome by our future researcher. The first hurdle is a physical one. Legal Deposit legislation severely limits how archived websites are made accessible to researchers, as while permission is not required to archive a copy of a website and offer access to that copy via an on-site terminal, the explicit permission of the website owner must be obtained in order for the copy to be made accessible to off-
site users via the UKWA’s playback tool.\textsuperscript{23} As the response rate for permission requests is very low (around 10%), the majority of the resources in the SIRC are viewable only on the premises of a Legal Deposit Library. This effectively restricts the opportunity to access this national resource to a narrow group of potential users who have the means and the time to travel to Edinburgh, Dublin, Cambridge, Oxford, or Aberystwyth, and clearly does not align with the governing logic that informs internet use. David Nicholas has observed that “searching and reading now takes place in the social space and often on the hoof, in Starbucks or the pub, rather than the university library”,\textsuperscript{24} and Ian Chowcat has similarly noted that “users of online resources expect to be able to access resources anywhere from any device”. This is particularly the case for the generations of future researchers who “see online and offline experiences as seamlessly blended” – for these researchers, being informed that they need to be in a specific physical location will not fly.

Assuming that access to the web archive can be secured, then, the next challenge our researcher faces will be to assess the relevance and usefulness of the archived websites to their research. A minimal amount of description is provided for each resource, and there is a 60-character limit (including spaces) for both the series and the item descriptors. This regularly renders descriptions futile (or at least, severely minimises their usefulness) as can be seen in the below example:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Alex Neil MSP - Member of the Scottish Parliament for Airdrie & Shotts}

Viewable only on Library premises

The website of Alex Neil, Member of the Scottish Parliame...

Archived date: 2014-09-20

\url{http://www.alexneilmsp.net/}
\end{quote}

\textit{Fig. 1: Screenshot of the catalogue listing for \url{http://www.alexneilmsp.net/} as it appears in the SIRC subcategory of ‘Political Parties and Trade Unions’.}\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[23] "Frequently Asked Questions".
\end{footnotes}
As the descriptor is merely a repetition of the title, no further information can be gleaned here. Additionally, clicking on the resource simply opens the archived resource in the Wayback Machine (the software used to browse archived web material) – it does not expand the descriptive section of the entry. Additionally, it is unclear what the minimal technical metadata provided in this example (the broadly-phrased ‘Archived date’) is actually referring to. An interrogation of the Web Curator Tool (WCT) used to ingest sites indicates that this URL was added to WCT on 2014-08-20, with the first capture subsequently occurring at 00:08:15 on 2014-08-21. This means that the resource existed in the archive as an identified target for a full month longer than the user-facing side of the system would suggest. With access to WCT restricted to UKWA approved staff, however, this information would not normally be available to the researcher.

A further complication here is that web resources are difficult to describe. As Clement Oury and Roswitha Poll have noted “there is no straightforward way to define what [a] discrete ‘document’ is on the web. ... HTML pages group together several, sometimes tens of different files, and generally individual files are meaningless if they are not considered in relation to the other files to which they are connected”. In the SIRC we find that some individual listings appear to direct to a single web page but are in fact linked to a capture of a whole website, and locating the individual page that is referred to by the listing is by no means straightforward. An example of this is an item listed under the ‘Charities, Religious Organisations and Third Sector’ heading.

![A new take on so-called Jekyll and Hyde Scotland: Centre for Confidence and Well-being, Blogs and Forum](http://www.centreforconfidence.co.uk/archblog.php??)

*Fig. 2: Screenshot of the catalogue listing for http://www.centreforconfidence.co.uk/carolsblog.php?? as it appears in the SIRC subcategory of 'Charities, Religious Organisations and Third Sector'.*
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26 Date and time formats in the UKWA follow ISO 8601
The format of the listing title – ‘A new take on so-called Jekyll and Hyde Scotland: Centre for Confidence and Well-being, Blogs and Forum’ – suggests that the resource being pointed to is a blog post entitled ‘A new take on so-called Jekyll and Hyde Scotland’ that has been published by the Centre for Confidence and Well-being in its ‘Blogs and Forum’ section. However, when the catalogue listing is selected, the user is instead directed to an archived copy of the landing page for ‘Carole’s Blog’, a subsection of the ‘Blogs and Forum’ section. In order to locate the individual blog post that was advertised by the catalogue listing, the user must navigate through the archived web site, a feat not so easily accomplished due to a general inability of the web archive to adequately capture the style and navigational elements that support this (see Fig. 5).

Thus, the title assigned to the resource does not tally with the reality of the target. This can be seen by comparing the two URLs: the full URL of the individual blog post is http://www.centreforconfidence.co.uk/carolsblog.php?&p=aWQ9ODc2JmJsb2dpZD0x, https://web.archive.org/web/20141030023127/http://www.centreforconfidence.co.uk/carolsblog.php. Accessed 17 September 2019.
but the listing in the catalogue is for http://www.centreforconfidence.co.uk/carolsblog.php?.

The social life of records
An additional challenge posed by description in web archives concerns how to convey the ‘social life’ of such resources. In a 2007 discussion on the ‘digital turn’, Richard Pearce-Moses asserted that “familiar formats are being digitally transformed. Correspondence is e-mail. Diaries are now blogs. Typescripts are word processing files [and] reports are Web pages”.30 This is, however, a particularly narrow view of creation in the digital environment, and one that significantly underestimates the dynamic fluidity that characterises web use. While many individuals do indeed use blogging platforms as a form of online diary, to apply the term ‘diary’ to all uses of these platforms is to misunderstand (and crucially, misrepresent) the performative and collaborative nature of web publishing: a traditional diary, kept safe in a desk drawer, does not provide an opportunity for others to read it – much less invite the reader to comment, critique, rework and republish it.

The phenomenon of the ‘meme’ illustrates this well. Both Yes Scotland and Better Together were prolific at producing and making available infographics communicating the key points of their campaigns that were regularly shared, narrated and critiqued on social media, and as Olga A. Blinova has investigated, a large proportion of Indyref-related memes appear to have been originated by individuals from outside the main campaigns.31 Originally coined by Richard Dawkins in 1976 to describe “small units of culture that spread from person to person by copying or imitation”, the phrase ‘Internet meme’ is most often used to gesture towards the intertextual and self-referential way that objects (jokes, rumours, videos, and websites) are communicated online.32 Arguing that memes should be considered as “an arena of bottom-up expression [that] can blend pop culture,

politics, and participation in unexpected ways,” Limor Shifman has explored meme culture in the context of political participation and suggested that political memes can act “as forms of persuasion or political advocacy”; “as grassroots action”, and “as modes of expression and public discussion”. Memes of these types occupied significant real estate in the digital landscape during Indyref, and the myriad reactions to the Better Together campaign advert ‘The Woman Who Made Up Her Mind’ offer an illustrative example of how campaign messaging and imagery were engaged with online. Airing on Scottish television in the month before the vote, the advert depicted a woman alone in her kitchen discussing her uncertainty about the upcoming vote and bemoaning the difficulty of making a decision (“there’s only so many hours in the day and ... a lot to weigh up”) before deciding to vote No. Specifically aimed at women voters, as this was deemed to be a particularly large proportion of the ‘undecided’ vote, the advert attracted considerable criticism on social media, memes featuring images from the advert proliferated, emphasising what critics saw as a patronising and sexist message, and within hours the hashtag ‘#PatronisingBTLady’ was trending on Twitter.34

![Memes of the Better Together advert](image)

**Fig. 4: #PatronisingBTLady memes**
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Memes are often described as the digital era’s answer to the political cartoon, but as Shifman has observed, “a central attribute” of memes is “their sparking of user-created derivatives articulated as parodies, remixes, or mashups”. Where political cartoons are static and reproducible, memes are dynamic and invite reworking, and it is these qualities that make them difficult to successfully archive. Reviewing approaches to the preservation of memes as artefacts of ‘digital folklore’, Fátima García López and Sara Martínez Cardama have argued that we should consider “pre-crawling human intervention to be essential to process these collections” and of particular importance in such an area where “meaning and communicational potential are closely associated with the context in which they are created”. The technical challenges of preserving memes are similar to those faced when archiving social media: the UKWA regards memes “tangentially either as content embedded in other materials such as tweets or to illustrate documents contained in thematic collections (elections, political campaigns)”. Accordingly, APIs must be navigated and permission for access secured in order to make the archived object available, and there is no means for identifying memes that are preserved within archived pages. Copyright and intellectual property concerns abound. When authorship is undefined (and often withheld), determining the rightful property holder can be a minefield, and meme culture tends not to secure copyright permission before engaging in remixes and reworking. Furthermore, there are ethical concerns to consider. As with much social media use, “digital remix culture sometimes entails forms of self-disclosure by people, who without using digital platforms and/or online anonymity, may not otherwise publicly express such sentiments”. While this online disclosure may allow for us to identify and examine perspectives that might not otherwise come to light, we must consider the ethics of preserving such discourse in perpetuity.

36 Shifman, Memes in Digital Culture, 2.
38 Ibid., 903.
Considering the ‘social lives’ of records highlights a general issue that plagues the SIRC as a whole but is particularly problematic in the context of web archives: how can we explicate the connections between records across differing formats? Within the web archive, archived objects have been organised into broad categories or series that correspond to the areas of collection outlined in the previous chapter. An alphabetic method of ordering has been applied to both the series themselves and the individual resources within them: thus, the first category of material is ‘Charities, Religious Organisations and Third Sector’ and the first web page listed within that category is the entry discussed above, ‘A new take on so-called Jekyll and Hyde Scotland: Centre for Confidence and Well-being, Blogs and Forum’. It is important to note, however, that this is the only aspect of the SIRC in which material is organised in accordance with the collecting categories: elsewhere, format (i.e. moving image, sound, manuscript or printed) appears to be the defining factor that determines where material is presented.

One example from the collections clearly illustrates why this is a problem. David Torrance is a journalist and writer who has a long-standing interest in Scottish politics. He has published numerous books on the topic, including biographies of Alex Salmond and Nicola Sturgeon, and guides for voters, and in 2014 returned to Scotland to report on the referendum. In September 2015, just over a year after the vote, Torrance donated a collection of papers to the SIRC, including notebooks, working papers, and transcripts of speeches, as well as various ephemera he had gathered in the process of his reporting. Also contained in the collection are papers relating to Five Million Questions, a University of Dundee-led “knowledge-exchange programme” established with the intention of “engaging with the wider public as to the questions they wish to have answered” that Torrance was co-director of.40 Unsurprisingly, then, Torrance appears in almost every area of the SIRC. His blog has been included in the web archive under the heading of ‘Press, Media and Comment’; he appears in recordings of debates that are held in the Moving Image collection; the notebooks and papers he donated to the manuscript

collection provide a journalistic insight to the referendum experience; and his published output is well represented in the printed collections.

When considering how our future researcher might encounter these collections, it is important to recognise that information-seeking behaviours have been significantly altered by the introduction of the commercial search-engine. The ‘Google effect’ (whereby users expect a keyword-based search will return all relevant records) is clearly illogical to archivists, yet for many users – who are likely to be accessing a digital historical representation having no notion of the mechanisms of archival description – it is a reliable and infallible means of interrogating a collection. This can encourage a false assumption that if a search query does not return the results expected, this is because the material sought does not exist – the idea that ‘if it isn’t found, it isn’t there, and never has been’. Returning to David Torrance, then, a note in the original manuscript inventory of Torrance’s papers informing the reader that “a number of leaflets and flyers from this collection have been incorporated into the Scottish Independence Referendum ephemera collection”.41 Interrogating the main Library Search retrieves no entry that suggest the ephemera contained within was removed from the Torrance papers; and there is no explanation as to why some items have been removed while others remain in this accession.

It is also crucial to note that there is no single place in which the researcher can browse all these disparate elements together (for example, there is no indication for the researcher viewing Torrance’s blog in the web archive that his manuscript papers are also held by the Library, nor that he appears in debate recordings, etc), and a lack of acquisition and collection management information severely limits the potential usefulness of these resources. As example, while it has been crawled for the web archive and is tagged into the main Scottish Independence Referendum 2014 web archive collection, Torrance’s Twitter profile does not appear as a listed target on the themed collection page. This omission potentially masks the influence that Torrance’s heavy online presence may have had on his reporting and his subsequent account of Indyref,

100 Days of Hope and Fear and begs the question of why this has been omitted, and on what grounds. A consideration of user behaviour and expectations further impresses the need for digital historical representations to provide clear contextual and provenancial information alongside records, and to include the mechanisms of archival representation into our understanding of context so that users can fully interrogate the relevance, integrity, and reliability of records for themselves.

Cultural silences

A sub-collection of ephemera similarly sheds light on how dividing the collection along the lines of format might influence its future reception. Entitled ‘Ephemera produced by Alan Bissett for the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum’, the catalogue entry for this sub-collection indicates it contains a program for Bissett’s 2014 play ‘The Pure, The Dead and The Brilliant’ and a newspaper article.⁴² It is unclear from the catalogue listing whether or not these items were acquired by the Library via the same donation as the material held in the manuscript collection (Acc.13720), and why they were either removed to the printed collection, or otherwise not amalgamated into that manuscript collection. It could be argued that a straightforward logic of ‘published or unpublished’ governs the division of material, but this doesn’t appear to be applied consistently throughout the SIRC: for example print-outs of published blog posts are included in National Collective papers (Acc.13717/1) and Acc.13614/4 contains newspaper clippings collated by Professor Hugh Pennington. Keeping these ‘published’ items in the manuscript collections with which they were included suggests an awareness of the core archival principle of respect de fonds, which asserts that in order to maintain the integrity of a fonds records should be preserved “as a group, without division, separation, or addition, to protect the evidential and informational value that can be discerned from its context”.⁴³ Why, then, the division of material in the Bisset sub-collection? Does this reflect a conscious and deliberate collection management decision, or an arbitrary one
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that has arisen as a consequence of the Library being a large organisation with four different teams of acquisition staff?

In a similar vein, the division between fiction and non-fiction in the collection offers an interesting insight into how the imposition of such boundaries in the SIRC can inform perceptions of Indyref. Chapter Three noted that while non-fiction publications that take indyref as their subject have been ‘tagged’ with the SIRC collection level record, those fictional or creative works that do likewise have not. The exclusion of works of fiction from the collection is of particular note given the wealth of critical attention paid to “how the ideal of Scottish independence has spurred, been sparked by and generally come into contact with writerly imaginations”\(^\text{44}\) that has been acknowledged elsewhere in this thesis. The notion of an ‘indyref reading list’, then, raises questions that expose the subjectivity of archival practices as “a way of constructing knowledge through processes of inscription, mediation and narration”.\(^\text{45}\) Any attempt to compile such a list would have to grapple with the difficulty of ‘imposing frameworks’ on a fluid, dynamic documentary universe: when, for example does Indyref as a cultural and historical moment begin and end? While the legislative framework that made provision for the referendum provides clear temporal boundaries (from the signing of the Edinburgh Agreement on 15 October 2012 to polling day itself), this is less true of the campaigns and the debates that surrounded it, and certainly less true of the cultural and literary aspect to the Scottish nationalist movement. Could (should?) such a reading list include Gray’s Poor Things (1992) along with his Independence: An Argument for Home Rule (2014)? Can such clear boundaries be erected between fiction and non-fiction? If they must, how can we otherwise depict the porous, ‘membranic’ nature of the relationship between Indyref and Scottish literature? And how can the Library’s central position in this nexus of nation-building be accurately represented without jeopardising its claim to serve the whole nation.


Activism and ‘activitations’

It is also pertinent to consider the archival character of many of the literary responses to the referendum: as Hames has observed, the novels that emerged directly from the referendum adopt a “stable, objective, even journalistic orientation to ‘politics’ in the sense evoked by newspapers, parliament and electioneering”. He suggests that “the reification of political debate into canned talking-points defines not only the ‘content’ of indyref articles, but the whole texture of public life and democratic engagement they depict, partly reflecting how the referendum constitutes and reproduces political community”. The propensity for Indyref fiction to distil “a whole nation of thronging disagreements ... down to a determinate binary choice, ... where everyone’s views and aspirations (and spite and passion) [are] reified into allegiance to one or another monological narratives” echoes the archival endeavour, which similarly involves a simplification of reality via the imposition of conceptual frameworks “upon an indifferent documentary universe”. Furthermore, as Hames has explored, a particular feature of these ‘indyref novels’ is their participation in this process of building a nation in/of text: they are “poised to take an active role in the event (or the shaping of its memory), rather than holding it up to the light of contemplation”.

Alec Finlay’s book-length ‘found’ poem A Better Tale to Tell (published in collaboration with the NLS and the Scottish Poetry Library) illustrates this effectively. The poem is “composed entirely from individuals’ submissions to the Smith Commission,” the body established as a means of fulfilling the commitment by the leaders of the three main pro-Union parties to investigate the devolution of further powers in the event of a No vote. The Smith Commission was open to submissions from any member of the Scottish public, and the online submission page provided respondents with a free-text form allowing
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them up to 5000 characters in which to express their views on the devolution of further powers to the Scottish government.51

As Finlay reflects, these responses deserve attention because they “catch the language of a diverse range of people ... who are attempting to describe ... the future of their home, land, community, or nation”.52 A Better Tale to Tell offers itself as an archive in miniature in its self-conscious attempt to “shape a historical record”, and it is crucial for our purposes to recognise that it also strives to influence the future – that is, by drawing from these submissions, Finlay uses the words of the recent past-present to call for a more ‘representative’ future:

nobody in power
    wants to give it up
politicians must become
    better messengers
with a better tale
    to tell53

As Hames has suggested, by “engag[ing] directly with the prosaic, procedural qualities of Scottish constitutional ‘participation’ while preserving the individual voice”,54 Finlay’s poem both reflects and challenges the logic of the democratic mechanisms that produced the referendum. As Hames observes, the reader encounters “living critical speech, but confined within the grey and nebulous limits of British constitutional reform”,55 and by taking these free-form responses and producing a tightly structured poem through a process of refinement and excision, Finlay draws the reader’s attention to the material fact of the text’s production. He asserts that he has “included all shades of opinion ... so that the reader has to consider the entanglement of certainties and doubts we all have

51 Indeed, as submissions were received through an open, online form with no verification of residency, the Commission also accepted responses from those outwith Scotland - “Have Your Say (Accessed Via Wayback Machine),” The Smith Commission, https://web.archive.org/web/20141023043241/http://www.smith-commission.scot/have-your-say/.
53 Ibid.
54 Hames, "Democracy and the Indyref Novel."
55 Ibid.
our part in” but offers no guidance on what criteria responses were judged against for incorporation into the poem, nor is the reader able to discern what has not been included. Through this process of selection and excision, Finlay prompts the reader to consider the notion of representation, both within the poem and in the democratic process more generally: to what extent is this poem representative of submissions to the Smith Commission? To what extent are submissions to the Smith Commission representative of the views of the wider Scottish electorate? To what extent did the authors of the Commission report intend to take these submissions into account? And underpinning these questions - are governmental mechanisms like the Smith Commission (and, indeed, like the referendum itself) intended to provide a platform for citizens to engage with the process of government, or do they merely play lip-service to the idea of representation?

_A Better Tale to Tell_ provides a clear example of a creative work that does not conform to the distinctions of pre-, during- and post-Indyref that the collection demands, and in its direct engagement with the mechanics of the referendum, it operates as both a contribution to and an activitation of the archive. I use the term activitation here to make explicit reference to Eric Ketelaar’s assertion that “every interaction, intervention, interrogation, and interpretation by creator, user, and archivist is an activitation [sic] of the record”, and one that invites further activations. Ketelaar argues that “the archive…is not just a sheltering of the past: it is an anticipation of the future”. Considering the layers of meaning that a record accumulates over time, he suggests that “every activitation [sic] of the archive not only adds a branch to … the semantic genealogy of the record and the archive”, but also “changes the significant of earlier activations” with the consequence that subsequent “use of these records affects retrospectively all earlier meanings, or to put it differently: we can no longer read the record as our predecessors have read that record”.
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This is certainly of consideration with regards to Indyref. As Lynch noted, “the long campaign had significant legacy effects”.\textsuperscript{58} Michael Keating has similarly suggested that the “huge public engagement in the campaign ... has left a legacy for Scottish and UK politics” and that while the No side may have won out, “it has not settled the constitutional issue”.\textsuperscript{59} Furthermore, parties on both the Yes and No sides have seen the foundations on which their arguments were built shaken in the intervening years: on the No side, the Brexit vote has dismantled their case that Scotland’s continued membership of the EU could only be assured through remaining in the UK; and the Yes side – most particularly the SNP - has struggled to overcome infighting regarding proposed reforms of the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and responses to the climate crisis. These events have naturally coloured the way in which Indyref is approached in retrospect. Reflecting on a 2019 event entitled 'Indyref: Culture and Politics Five Years On’, Hames mused that while he had “anticipated a mood of warm reminiscence” in planning, he “found little appetite for the pleasures of evocation and reconstruction” on the day. “Instead, there was a general air of disenchantment, as a number of former Yes activists dismantled their passions of five summers ago, while others sought to pluck the democratic baby from the bathwater of disillusion”.\textsuperscript{60} Amongst those former Yes activists were poets Jenny Lindsay and Josie Giles, both of whom expressed a dissatisfaction with the legacy of their involvement with the pro-Yes campaign. Taking a similar tone to Cat Boyd’s appraisal of the post-referendum landscape, Lindsay suggested that the creative passion that Indyref inspired has since been appropriated by a centrist political mainstream and redirected “directly into party politics via the explosion of the ‘YeSNP’ in 2014-15 [leaving] a meagre legacy in creative expression and progressive activism.” Similarly, Giles expressed regret at “lending their energy to a project” which they once felt offered ‘radical possibility’ but now consider to have been instrumental in strengthening “‘rump populist

\textsuperscript{58} Lynch, ”Bottom-up Versus Top-Down Campaigning at the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014,” 10.
\textsuperscript{59} Keating, ”The Scottish Independence Referendum and After,” 97.
nationalism". Writing on Twitter on St Andrew’s Day 2021, Scotland’s ‘national day’, Giles explicitly spoke out against the ‘nationing’ of their writing:

all my poetry is against scotland, and i refuse my poetry’s rehabilitation into scotland’s national literature as mere internal criticism. i am against scotland.

These reflections invite us to consider the ethical implications of assigning labels and identifying descriptors to the work of writers (and other creators) in perpetuity: what opportunities are provided for record creators and record subjects to challenge any such labels? And is providing such an opportunity beneficial or desirable?

While by no means a new concept, the practice of redescription has received much attention in recent years, particularly as a means of working towards ‘decolonisation’ of collections and institutional practices, and as networked technologies have allowed for multiple narratives to emerge around a single object. Various foci for redescription efforts have been proposed, such as reviewing existing catalogues for outdated or offensive language, ascribing new subject access terms to enhance discoverability of previously ‘hidden’ (or repressed, neglected and marginalised) stories, and developing institutional cataloguing policies for ensuring that the correct names of “transgender, nonbinary, gender non-conforming authors, people who change their names due to marriage or divorce, indigenous authors with name changes, or foreign authors with misspellings” are used. Such efforts further highlight the subjectivity and temporality of archival description, and demonstrate that, as Dale Spender has asserted, “all naming is of necessity biased and the process of naming is one of encoding that bias, of making a selection of what to emphasise and what to overlook”.

61 Ibid.
Conclusion
Joshua Sternfeld has asserted that “all digital historical representations implement a selection process for historical content, driven by selection criteria that guide the content’s acquisition, arrangement, and description”. This chapter has explored the ways that archival action can be productive and influential on the record even by its absence, and the ways that traditional archival theory can obscure the influence of such archival decisions. In this discussion we have seen how choices made (or not made) in the arrangement, description, and presentation of archival objects can significantly influence how the archive can be ‘read’ and understood. Archival description is not fixed and immutable but serving as interlocutor between record and viewer, exists in constant textual dialogue with the objects of its focus. Observing a “disingenuousness” that results from “sincere efforts to conform to archival principles”, Douglas had advocated for archivists and records users to “treat the archive as a thing in itself, rather than as a reflection of another thing”: she suggests that “if we try to tell [the archive’s] story instead of – or at least in addition to – its creator’s, we might be freed from some of the limits that adherence to traditional archival theory places upon us”.

The challenge for archivists, then, lies in the question of how to ensure that finding aids, catalogues, and other descriptive tools reflect the contextual circumstances of creation on each side of the archival threshold that produced the record. Rowat observed that “the language of heritage documentation still carries the connotations of neutral witness”. A greater embrace and acceptance of the narrative aspect of archival description may be useful at addressing this, in that foregrounding the creative and subjective dimension to archival processing can encourage and enable a focus on the “archival aggregation itself as a referent, rather than interpreting the archive primarily as a referent to something else”. As a means of rectifying this, an argument has been made for the use of colophons and annotations over such elements in descriptive standards as those identified above:
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Michelle Light and Tom Hyry suggest that the inclusion of processing information outwith the confines of a standard “represent[s] a self-conscious perspective that acknowledges the processor’s role in shaping a collection and presenting a specific view of it to patrons [...] In this way, the suggestion for a colophon is not so much a challenge to existing data structure standards, but rather a push towards reconfiguring the tone, intent, and honesty of their content”.69

A further step in this direction may be to highlight the way that archival logic assembles fragments as though constituting a ‘whole’ entity. Jennifer Meehan has observed that “as presently conceived and created across the profession, the finding aid offers only a partial representation of a given collection, one that doesn’t properly allow for the lacunae in the collection and in the archivist’s understanding of the collection”.70 In answer to this, Terry Cook has advocated for finding aids to be designed to explicitly acknowledge the ‘lacunae’. He suggested that ‘ghost entries’ in finding aids could be employed to alert researchers to where records currently held by other repositories may have sat in a collection; what has not been taken on by the repository; and, additionally, what was not offered to the repository at the time of accession. As well as educating researchers on the archivists’ impact on the archive as they find it, this would also emphasise the fragmented nature of collections and, as Carolyn Harris affirmed, “inform users not only of the nature of what is present in the fonds but of what is not”.71 Elizabeth Yakel has questioned the use of the terms ‘arrangement and description’ to denote archival work, suggesting instead that this work be described as ‘archival representation’, “which more precisely captures the actual work of the archivist in (re)ordering, interpreting, creating surrogates, and designing architectures for representational systems that contain those surrogates to stand in for or represent actual archival materials”.72 To this end, making greater use of certain elements of descriptive standards may go some way towards

removing the veil of authority and completeness from the finding aid. Both the ISAD(G) and Encoded Archival Description (EAD) standards contain fields that are currently optional and largely underutilised: EAD’s <processinfo> element offers a space in which “information about accessioning, arranging, describing, preserving, storing, or otherwise preparing the described materials for research use” can be provided⁷³; and ISAD(G)’s corresponding element (3.7.1 Archivist’s Note⁷⁴) could similarly be adopted as a core tenant of descriptive practice, and thus provide archivists with a more prominent space in which to provide “details about the analytical work done during processing, including the rationale for a particular arrangement, the reasoning behind decisions, and the sources of information used in reaching a particular decision”⁷⁵.

Operating in the intersection between national past, national present, and national future, the Indyref experience harboured a decidedly archival outlook, and as a repository and arbiter of national memory the NLS is well-placed to engage with and harness this. For example, a web archiving project could invite individual citizens to produce small, micro collections that reflect their own personal Internet use during events like the referendum; this would not only serve to introduce the web archive to a wider audience and invite discussion on the process of identifying, selecting and securing materials, but such micro-collections could be analysed comparatively, enabling researchers to identify points of divergence and overlap, allowing for greater understanding of how societies produce, share and access information online. As I noted in the introduction to this thesis, although the absence of Referendum Curator Dr. Amy Todman from the project was initially challenging, the inability to obtain answers to questions ultimately proved a productive tool for interrogating the collections. Where appropriate, the discussion in this thesis refers to internal documents found on Todman’s Library hard drive, and in a number of places the information contained within has been invaluable for gaining a greater understanding of how decisions around the presentation
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⁷⁵ Meehan, "Making the Leap from Parts to Whole: Evidence and Inference in Archival Arrangement and Description " 86.
of material were arrived at. The free-prose style documents in which Dr. Todman reflected on how the collections were imagined and collated were particularly useful, and I submit here that it is precisely this type of documentation – that invites users 'behind the scenes' of archival processing - that should be made available to researchers. Encouraging archivists to reflect on their practice *in dialogue with users*, rather than just in the pages of academic journals, may go some way towards diminishing the perception of the archive as a neutral and naturally occurring phenomenon.
Conclusion

This thesis set out to investigate the construction and negotiation of cultural memory within the national archive. Efforts by individuals and institutions to collect a documentary record of the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum allowed us to consider how collecting (for) the nation is conceived of, and the impact of collecting choices and assumptions on potential future histories.

Several distinct but related conclusions have emerged from this discussion. First, I have argued that the national archive and the nation-state are inextricably linked, and an awareness that the national archive plays a significant role in shaping the cultural image of the nation can itself shape how collecting for the nation is conceived of. To this end, Chapter One examined the role of heritage in 'thinking the nation'. Drawing on the work of nationalism scholars Anthony D. Smith, Benedict Anderson, and Miroslav Hroch, it explored how the national past serves as a sacred resource for nationalist movements. An invocation of the figures, myths, and landscapes of the national past can foster an impression of a distinct community, a communal past and a shared (destined) future for the nation, and through such invocation, the nation’s past can be called upon as evidence to support claims of right to both territory and self-determination. As the repository of the nation’s (textual) collective memory, the archive is implicated in this process, in that it serves as the prism through which the national past and the national future are viewed and ‘read’. Archives have traditionally been aligned with systems of evidence, fact, and neutrality, associations that have been significantly reappraised in the past half-century. Scholars such as Eric Ketelaar, Barbara Craig, and Tom Nesmith have observed the epistemic power of the archive, and suggested that when an record crosses the ‘archival threshold’ and is “designated archival, it is assigned a special status [and] often becomes a symbol of community aspirations or cherished values”.¹ Chapter One combined these strands of archival and nationalism theory to set out the implications of Laurajane Smith’s view that “there is no such thing as [national] heritage” and, accordingly, no such thing as ‘archival value’: value in records is not discovered, but ascribed, and heritage is

¹ Nesmith, "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives," 32.
“ultimately a cultural practice, involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings”.\(^2\)

Applying this interpretative framework to the Scottish case, Chapter Two examined how Scottish national heritage has been understood and negotiated in the centuries following the Union. Informed by the work of Colin Kidd and Graeme Morton, it considered how the figures, myths, and tropes of the Scottish past were employed in service of a unionist national identity. Rather than being concerned with ‘salvaging’ symbols of a lost and oppressed nation, this construction of a unionist-nationalist emphasised Scotland’s distinct contribution to Union and Empire. This chapter also established some of the key narratives in the scholarship on Scottish national identity. The specific conditions of the 1707 settlement enabled the preservation of a distinctive Scottish identity within autonomous institutions of law, religion, and education, and a network of voluntary and subscriber action emerged that effectively kept ‘Scottishness’ alive through its institutions. Taking note of Iain MacIver’s assertion that the founding of the National Library of Scotland “echoes in a minor key the flow of assertion of national interests and identity evident in the political history of modern Scotland”,\(^3\) it considered the centrality of print capitalism in the development of Scottish nationalist thought and the central position of the Library in this nexus of nation-building. The second half of the chapter explored how the Library’s understanding of its role in society has evolved in response to a changing political environment. Developing the theoretical groundwork established in Chapter One, this section demonstrates that the identification and collection of records that are ‘representative’ of Scotland is a subjective process that requires a tacit decision on what constitutes and evidences ‘Scottish’ culture. A close reading of the Library’s policy and strategy documents in the decades prior to the 2014 referendum indicate that the NLS is conscious of its societal function and of the challenges it can pose.

Chapter Three explored how the NLS negotiated the challenge of collecting the nation in a ‘neutral and unbiased’ way in the collection of the documentary record of the 2014

\(^{2}\) Smith, \textit{Uses of Heritage}, 11.

Independence Referendum. It observed that the Collecting the Referendum project marked a significant departure from the Library’s previous collection approaches in its use of ‘rapid response’ practices, and suggested the project intended to produce a collection that was representative and diverse, reflecting the contemporary discussions regarding the mnemonic social role of the archive that were outlined in Chapter One.

Chapters Four and Five use this concept of ‘representativeness’ to evaluate the SIRC. In Chapter Four I argue that the project’s experimentation with alternative methods for identifying and acquiring records suggests an adherence to traditional archival principles and perspectives on what constitutes a record with ‘national’ heritage status. I argue that much Indyref discourse framed the referendum experience as a personal journey of self-discovery and determination, and that an accurate representation of the personal aspect of the referendum is therefore crucial, but an examination of the management of the manuscript collections post-ingest suggests that they were presented in a way that emphasises the corporate characteristics of the records at the expense of their personal aspects. It is important to recognise here that personal narratives are indivisible from national narratives: for Renan and Anderson, the nation exists only as and if it is conceived of by its citizens. Renan famously asserted that the “the nation’s existence” requires “a daily plebiscite”; that is, while the nation “presupposes a past [it] is reiterated in the present by a tangible fact: consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life”. In 2014, an actual plebiscite on Scotland’s place in the United Kingdom posed far-reaching questions for the national past, and future memory, which could no longer be ‘presupposed’ without contestation. This placed the NLS at the crux of the ideological debates – concerning the nature, basis and reproduction of Scottish nationhood – that underpinned the referendum, though were seldom overtly expressed within it.

Even as the 2014 referendum exposed – and widened – deep divisions in the Scottish polity, institutions such as national archives were required to record these developments in the frame of a single and continuous national history. Constitutively bound to a

4 Renan, "What Is a Nation?"
totalised conception of ‘Scotland’, the Library faced a deep challenge – intellectual and practical – in curating material which often seems to erode the founding premises and impulses of national collecting. This tension recalls Nancy Fraser’s influential critique of modern political rubrics which ‘reify group identity’ in seeking its institutional ‘recognition’. Such frameworks, she writes, often “obscur[e] the politics of cultural identification, the struggles within the group for the authority – and the power – to represent it”. Furthermore, “by shielding such struggles from view, this approach masks the power of dominant fractions and reinforces intragroup domination”.5 Arianna Introna extends this critique in her analysis of ‘the missing Scotland’, an indyref media trope concerning ‘non-engaged’ (and economically marginalised) sections of the national community, largely omitted from the dominant narratives of 2014. Connecting the struggle for group authority to the question of archival memory, Introna argues that the ‘missing Scotland’ “was made missing in indyref imaginings while Yes radicals became the icon to be repackaged and transmitted to posterity as representative of the new Scotland”.6 The voluntaristic basis on which SIRC gathered material has (inevitably) reproduced this pattern, accepting donations from groups and individuals who (consciously or otherwise) view themselves as protagonists and participants in momentous political developments. In addition to the challenge of collecting material which reflects the points of discordance and disagreement within the national body, the Library faced the additional problem of silence – of indyref experiences and perspectives which it could not effectively represent (even though ‘the missing Scotland’ was also entitled to vote in the referendum).

Rather than seeking to homogenise or re-frame such fonds and silences, I draw critical attention to their significance in constituting the referendum collection. Chapter Five examined lacunae or gaps in the documentary landscape of the referendum where records (or the contextual data required to interpret them) were unavailable to a future researcher. By drawing attention to what information cannot be found in the finding aids, catalogues, or through the records themselves, it highlighted how ‘tacit information’ that

5 Quoted by Hames, The Literary Politics of Scottish Devolution: Voice, Class, Nation, 16.
6 Quoted by ibid., 145.
does not find its way into the record can extend or limit the representative capacity of records.

Concluding these two chapters, I argue that archivists need to recognise the limitations of the concept of ‘representation’ in archives and be more explicit about the representative intentions of their own work and actions. As has been discussed, national consciousness is predicated on the idea of a shared national past and collective national future, and as the ‘storehouse’ of this collective memory, the archive presupposes (and produces) a homogenous national narrative by emphasising shared characteristics over differences. Making efforts to highlight these points of divergence, then, challenges the very logic of the national archive, and in doing so, calls into question the notion of ‘representation’ that underpins the archival endeavour. That there are parallels between the mechanisms of representative democracy and archivy has already been acknowledged in this thesis. The SIRC is predicated on the idea that it can (and should) be representative of how Scotland understood, negotiated, and engaged with the questions posed during the independence referendum, but what does it mean to collect ‘for the nation’ at a time when the very character of the nation is being debated?

This uncertainty manifests within the SIRC as a tension between a desire to stress the unique, potentially pathbreaking historical quality of Indyref and an uncertainty about how to achieve this in a ‘neutral’ way. The decision to experiment with alternative collecting methods signifies a tacit acknowledgement that capturing an accurate record of Indyref required deviating from the tried-and-tested approaches previously employed by the NLS, but the full potential of these this for extending the ‘representativeness’ of the record is limited by an uncertainty surrounding the nature of representation in a national collection. ‘Rapid response’ collecting is part philosophy and part practicality, and while it has certainly been advocated as a means of meeting calls for archive collections to be representative of a wider range of perspectives and experiences, it is significant to note that it is often rendered necessary by the demands and typically short lifespan of records in the digital age. A glance at the literature suggests this collecting approach has most often been used to capture what we can call ‘flashbulb’ moments such as the 2016 Pulse
Nightclub Massacre in Orlando and the 2017 Manchester Arena bombing\textsuperscript{7}. Flashbulb memories are generally understood to arise from events with “a high level of surprise ... and perhaps emotional arousal”, and “a high level of consequentiality”,\textsuperscript{8} and it is here that the crux of the issue lies: where these moments are just that – definable \textit{moments}, that have distinctive ‘before-during-after’ periods – an experience like the independence referendum is not. Taking place over a long period of nearly two years, ‘Indyref’ as experience became inextricably woven into the wider fabric of Scottish life. In the course of that two-year period couples met, fell in love, had children; people embarked on new careers or wound up long-running ones; some came to the polling booth having spent years considering the constitutional status of Scotland, others were new to both the country and the question. Faced with two years of Indyref-infused memories, which does the archive preserve: do the collections purport to represent how the debates unfolded, or the state of play on polling day? In both archival and political terms, it is naturally much harder to identify and describe positions that occupy the middle of the spectrum – campaigns need to be broad and inclusive, and in the search for a coherent narrative, differences are (by necessity) flattened. Will our future researcher be able to access the liminal positions that occupy the space between Yes and No through the collections? Can we detect the shifting tides of opinion in the materials? To what extent is the ‘voice’ of the electorate represented by the collection? And extending this question – to what extent can the archive be asked to serve as the Ur-text of the nation?

\textbf{Beyond Indyref}

Looking beyond the Indyref collections, a consideration of these issues has relevance for other national ‘rapid response’ collecting initiatives. The past two years have seen archivists and other heritage professionals grapple with many of the issues discussed in this thesis as they attempt to meet the challenge of collecting a documentary record of the Covid-19 pandemic and the protests against police violence that were mentioned in the introduction: How should parameters for collection be established when the object

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{7} Pam Schwartz et al., "Rapid-Response Collecting after the Pulse Nightclub Massacre," \textit{The Public Historian} 40, no. 1 (2018); Kostas Arvanitis, "The 'Manchester Together Archive': Researching and Developing a Museum Practice of Spontaneous Memorials," \textit{Museum and Society} 17, no. 3 (2019).
\textsuperscript{8} Ayesh Perera, "Flashbulb Memory," https://www.simplypsychology.org/flashbulb-memory.html.
\end{flushleft}
of collection is nebulous, mutable, and resists definition? Are the collecting practices initiated at the start of the pandemic – designed to capture a specific temporal moment of lockdown, quarantine, and isolation – still appropriate in a ‘post-pandemic’ society that is learning to blend the restrictions of the early days with a return to ‘normal’ life? What are the ethical considerations of such ‘rapid response’ collecting? Do such collecting practices afford space for minds and opinions to change? For example, Eira Tansey has argued forcefully against what she calls the “commodification of contemporaneous collecting”. Arguing that “there is something really unsettling about archivists ... suggesting that the historical record should be a high priority while people are trying to keep their shit together and attempt to not die”, she urges archive and heritage professionals to “understand that respecting people’s privacy and right to forget their own past means accepting that we will lose parts of the historical record that others may wish we had gone to great lengths to get”.9

Indeed, this acceptance is crucial for achieving a better grasp on the function and purpose of representation in archives and, consequently, for extending the representative capacity of the records we hold. A key step in this direction would be a more explicit and conscious narration of the lives and afterlives of records. Rather than shy away from the narrative character of archival representation, archivists should harness and foreground this, emphasising that archival action – on either side of the archival threshold – is a narrative or literary act that involves selection, omission, foregrounding and forgetting. Providing description that does not attempt to homogenise archives, that is open to adjustment and revision, and that rejects any suggestion that it is comprehensive would allow us to stress this constructed and conditional nature of archival value. I am by no means the first to call for definitions of provenance to be expanded and for greater space in finding aids to be given to the archival process, and the work of theorists such as Jennifer Douglas, Gracen Brilmyer, and Michelle Caswell has been invaluable to the arguments developed in this thesis. What I hope is new here is an emphasis on evidencing specifically how archival interventions can extend or limit the possibilities of archival

research in the context of the national past, and I conclude this thesis by offering some recommendations for future contemporary collecting of this type.

Recommendations

- Prior to collecting, **define and justify** your scope.
- **Survey existing research** in relevant areas to establish the type of research currently being done in this field, **what sources/source types are currently being used**, and **what value they offer as representative sources**.
- Wherever possible, **engage with relevant researchers** to establish what resources are sought after but difficult to obtain, and use this data **to identify equivalent sources** from within the present documentary landscape.
- Be cognisant of **cultural entitlement**, and that national collections belong to the citizenry as a whole. **Consider employing participatory collection development** activities where possible, and (crucially) ensure that an opportunity is provided for the outcome of these to be **integrated into formal collection development discussions**.
- During collecting, **document decisions as well as their outcomes**. Encourage both curators and creators to **engage in critical thinking and reflective writing** around the creation process on either side of the archival threshold.
- As example, curators could:
  - **Document the evolution of collecting strategies** throughout the collecting period as much as possible: how has the focus of collecting efforts changed? Have institutional processes changed? Have collect efforts by other institutions impacted the strategy?
  - **Document the unobtainable**: what materials have emerged to challenge the strategy as it was initially conceived? What materials were anticipated but have not emerged? Where are there perceived gaps or lacunae in the collection? What materials are sought but not acquired? How have creator attitudes and concerns impacted collecting?
  - During acquisition, **creators could be encouraged to record their reflections on the physical, technological, and affective circumstances of the records’ creation**: see Appendix 5 for a sample Acquisition Survey.
• When making collections available, **reflective documents should also be provided to the user.** Where descriptive standards can invoke an air of authority and certainty, free-text narrative documents can offset this and **encourage the user to approach the collection and finding aids with a critical eye.**

• **Expand concepts of provenance** to include archival creation both pre- and post-ingest: where possible, exploit the functionality offered by networked cataloguing systems/platforms to represent multiple creators.

• **Be explicit about the level of representational intention** of an acquisition: have these records been acquired as a typical example of a wider field? Do the records hold particular qualities or characteristics that have informed their acquisition? Where necessary, **embrace the granular** and the idiosyncratic.
### Appendix 1 – Statement of Collecting Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Priority Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Campaigning Groups</td>
<td>publications, records and archives, moving image and audio, websites and social media streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties and Trade Unions</td>
<td>publications, records and archives, moving image and audio, websites and social media streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Tanks and Research Institutes</td>
<td>primarily publications, websites and social media streams; a selective approach must be followed to collect their records and archives at a later stage and if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (UK and Scottish)</td>
<td>official publications and websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>a targeted and selective approach should inform the collecting of material relating to key individuals involved in the debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities, Churches and Third Sector</td>
<td>publications and websites and possibly social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial publishers</td>
<td>publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Priority areas for collection. 'Statement of Collecting Priorities', National Library of Scotland (2014)*
# Appendix 2 - Accessions

## 2.1a Manuscripts and Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession no.</th>
<th>Date of accession</th>
<th>Name of donor/creator</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Circumstances of accession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13550</td>
<td>06/10/2014</td>
<td>Arise Ministries and Churches Together, Huntington, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>Public letter offering an apology to the churches, civic leaders and all the people of Scotland on behalf of Oliver Cromwell.</td>
<td>Public letter</td>
<td>Received via Falkirk Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13577</td>
<td>11/12/2014</td>
<td>Herbert Walters</td>
<td>6 photographic prints; 49 digital photographs on USB stick</td>
<td>Digital and analogue photographs taken during the week of the Scottish Independence Referendum.</td>
<td>Personal campaign records</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13585</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>David Greig</td>
<td>25 folders and 24 podcast files</td>
<td>Podcasts and associated papers from the 2014 Fringe festival show 'All Back to Bowie’s'.</td>
<td>Artistic work with audience responses</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13590</td>
<td>14/01/2015</td>
<td>Derek Suttie</td>
<td>4 folders</td>
<td>Material from engagement activities relating to the referendum, largely created for use by Workers Educational Association (WEA) Scotland, Adult Learning Project (ALP) Edinburgh and Crisis (part of The Salvation Army).</td>
<td>Community engagement activities,</td>
<td>Donated by creator with consent of course providers and course participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13607</td>
<td>11/03/2015</td>
<td>Aimee Chalmers</td>
<td>5 folders; digital photographs and ‘other resources’</td>
<td>Papers of Aimee Chalmers relating to 'Knitting a Nation' and 'A New Chapter', creative projects initiated in response to the referendum.</td>
<td>Personal campaign records</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13614</td>
<td>31/03/2015</td>
<td>Professor Hugh Pennington</td>
<td>1 folder</td>
<td>Papers relating to the involvement of Professor Hugh Pennington with campaign groups Better Together and Academics Together.</td>
<td>Personal papers, ephemera, campaign records</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Creator/Panel</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13615</td>
<td>31/03/2015</td>
<td>Joan Rowley</td>
<td>12 folders; born-digital meeting minutes</td>
<td>Papers of Joan Rowley relating to the referendum, including papers arising from her involvement in pro-independence groups 'Yes Tweeddale' and 'Women for Independence Scottish Borders'.</td>
<td>Personal campaign records</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13621</td>
<td>14/04/2015</td>
<td>Priscilla Cheung-Nainby &amp; Citadel Youth Centre</td>
<td>1 folder</td>
<td>Papers, photographs, and workshop content relating to a Referendum Weave exercise held in conjunction with Edinburgh Active Citizens Group.</td>
<td>Artistic work from event</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13622</td>
<td>14/04/2015</td>
<td>Priscilla Cheung-Nainby &amp; National Library of Scotland</td>
<td>5 folders</td>
<td>Papers, photographs and workshop content relating to a Referendum Weave exercise held as part of the National Library of Scotland’s open days.</td>
<td>Artistic work from event</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13624</td>
<td>22/04/2015</td>
<td>Dr Steven Main</td>
<td>4 folders</td>
<td>Academic research papers, chiefly articles from Russian digital and print media.</td>
<td>Research materials: press cuttings</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13625</td>
<td>22/04/2015</td>
<td>'Future of the UK and Scotland' research group, University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>15 folders; born-digital and moving image materials</td>
<td>Academic research papers, press cuttings, podcast and event recordings and photographs relating to the ESRC-funded 'Future of the UK and Scotland' research group.</td>
<td>Research materials: press cuttings, photographs, and podcasts</td>
<td>Donated by creators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13642</td>
<td>30/06/2015</td>
<td>Peter McNally</td>
<td>Born-digital</td>
<td>Photographs taken as part of 'Documenting Yes', a photography project intended to document the grassroots Yes campaign for Scottish independence.</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13653</td>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>Nancy Somerville</td>
<td>6 folders</td>
<td>Material arising from engagement activities relating to the referendum held by Edinburgh City Council and associated community groups.</td>
<td>Community engagement activities</td>
<td>Donated by creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13670</td>
<td>30/09/2015</td>
<td>David Torrance</td>
<td>17 folders</td>
<td>Papers arising from the activities of David Torrance relating to the referendum, including notebooks, speech transcripts, campaign ephemera.</td>
<td>Personal papers and ephemera</td>
<td>Creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13672</td>
<td>14/10/2015</td>
<td>Yes Scotland</td>
<td>14 oversized items; born-digital</td>
<td>Promotional material (posters, signage etc) and ephemera from the Yes Scotland campaign.</td>
<td>Campaign materials</td>
<td>Donated via Scott Martin, SNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13682</td>
<td>01/12/2015</td>
<td>Nan Proudfoot</td>
<td>2 folders</td>
<td>Papers collated by Nan Proudfoot relating to the referendum, arising from her involvement in pro-independence groups 'Yes Musselburgh and 'SNP Musselburgh'.</td>
<td>Personal campaign records</td>
<td>Donated by Tom Proudfoot, son of creator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Acc.13684 | 01/12/2015  | Michael Greenwell       | Born-digital | 178 podcasts produced in the year preceding the campaign for Scottish Independence and in the following months. There are two different audio shows represented in the collection:  
- ‘Scottish Independence Podcast’: mostly interview format with various activists from the campaign, writers, musicians, journalists, academics, MSPs, and party leaders.  
- ‘For A’ That’: discussion show featuring similar guests, but essentially a reactive show, in that discussions focussed on reactions to the events of the previous weeks | Podcasts                        | Donated by creator              |
| Acc.13688 | 14/12/2015  | Sir Charles Fraser      | 1 volume   | Referendum journal.                                                                                                                                                                                         | Personal papers                  | Donated by creator |
| Acc.13713 | 05/04/2016  | Kathleen Caskie         | Born-digital | Papers of Kathleen Caskie relating to the referendum, arising from her involvement in the pro-independence group Women for Independence.                                                                      | Campaign records                 | Donated on behalf of Women for Independence |
Acc.13717 | 11/04/2016 | Ross Colquhoun | 2 boxes; 5 oversized items | Promotional material, display items, photographs, and papers relating to the activities of National Collective during the referendum. | Personal papers and campaign records | Donated by creator.

Acc.13720 | 26/04/2016 | Alan Bissett | 1 box; born-digital files | Papers (predominantly articles) arising from Alan Bissett’s activities relating to the referendum. | Personal papers | Donated by creator.

Acc.13822 | 27/06/2017 | Dr. Iain Gordon Brown | 1 folder | Typescript memoir of the referendum entitled 'What did you do in the Great Referendum War, Daddy?' | Personal papers | Donated by creator.

2.1b Adjustments made to Manuscripts and Archives finding aids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession no.</th>
<th>Name of donor/creator</th>
<th>Original title</th>
<th>Revised title</th>
<th>Notes/ reflections</th>
<th>Previous inventory</th>
<th>ArchivesSpace entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13577</td>
<td>Herbert Walters</td>
<td>Digital and analogue photographs taken during the week of the Scottish Independence Referendum, by Herbert Walters, Birmingham</td>
<td>Photographs by Herbert Walters of people and events captured during the week of the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13577.pdf">https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13577.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/4430">https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/4430</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13585</td>
<td>David Greig</td>
<td>'All Back to Bowie's' [Edinburgh Fringe Show] papers and podcasts</td>
<td>Papers and audio recordings produced as part of the Edinburgh Festival Fringe show &quot;All Back to Bowie's&quot;.</td>
<td>Renamed for clarity.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/20345">https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/20345</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Acc.13590 | Derek Suttie | Records related to Derek Suttie's involvement with the Referendum campaign, specifically through engagement with Workers Educational Association (WEA), Adult Learning Project Edinburgh (ALP) and Crisis, The Salvation Army | Papers of Derek Suttie relating to the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014. | Renamed for clarity and brevity. | https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13590.pdf | https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/20347 |}
| Acc.13614 | Professor Hugh Pennington | Papers of Professor Hugh Pennington, relating to the 'Academics Together' and 'Better Together Aberdeen' campaigns | Papers relating to the involvement of Professor Hugh Pennington with campaign groups Better Together and Academics Together during the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014. | Renamed to emphasise Pennington’s role in the collation of the records; relisted to indicate content and relevance of the correspondence with Sutherland. | https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13614.pdf | https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/16607 |}
<p>| Acc.13615 | Joan Rowley | Assorted papers of pro-independence groups 'Yes Tweeddale' and 'Women for Independence Scottish Borders', presented by Aimee Chalmers | Papers of Joan Rowley relating to the Scottish Independence Referendum 2014. | Relisted to better reflect the character of the material: administrative papers; events and promotional material; post-referendum papers. This fonds had been incorrectly identified as donated by Aimee Chalmers, and was renamed to correct this. | <a href="https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13615.pdf">https://digital.nls.uk/catalogues/guide-to-manuscript-collections/inventories/acc13615.pdf</a> | <a href="https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/20660">https://manuscripts.nls.uk/repositories/2/resources/20660</a> | The updated finding aid is not yet live. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13621</td>
<td>Priscilla Cheung-Nainby &amp; Citadel Youth Centre&lt;br&gt;Materials, including photographic print-outs, samples of content, promotional material and information about Citadel Youth Centre, from creative Referendum event&lt;br&gt;Priscilla Cheung-Nainby and Citadel Youth Centre, Referendum creative weave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13622</td>
<td>Priscilla Cheung-Nainby &amp; National Library of Scotland&lt;br&gt;Materials from National Library of Scotland Referendum event, created in collaboration with Priscilla Cheung-Nainby&lt;br&gt;Papers from the Priscilla Chueng-Nainby and National Library of Scotland, Collecting the Referendum open day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13624</td>
<td>Dr Steven Main&lt;br&gt;Papers donated by Dr Steven Main (academic and consultant on Russian affairs) comprising articles from Russian newspapers reporting on the Referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13625</td>
<td>'Future of the UK and Scotland' research group, University of Edinburgh&lt;br&gt;Material from the ESRC-funded 'Future of the UK and Scotland' research group, University of Edinburgh (digital and analogue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13642</td>
<td>Peter McNally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13653</td>
<td>Nancy Somerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13670</td>
<td>David Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13672</td>
<td>Yes Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13682</td>
<td>Nan Proudfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13684</td>
<td>Michael Greenwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13688</td>
<td>Sir Charles Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>Creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13713</td>
<td>Kathleen Caskie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13717</td>
<td>Ross Colquhoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13720</td>
<td>Alan Bissett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.13822</td>
<td>Dr. Iain Gordon Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 General Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creator / Imprint</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual material ([Scotland?] : [Publisher not identified], 2014.)</td>
<td>Scotland's momentous independence referendum, September 18th 2014.</td>
<td>CDROM.3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Cube.Box.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Shelf Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Cube.Box.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Cube.Box.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Cube.Box.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Cube.Box.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betteridge, David (Glasgow : Rhizome Press, 2014.)</td>
<td>Won &amp; Lost : two poem-sequences, written from two standpoints in time, giving one view of Scotland's great argument with and about itself. / David Betteridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So Say Scotland (Association) ([Edinburgh?] : So Say Scotland, [2014?])</td>
<td>Wee play Scotland : the referendum game changer : get your head around the independence referendum / created by So Say Scotland, Open Up and Edinethics Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain. Foreign and Commonwealth Office. ([London]: [The Stationery Office], [2014])</td>
<td>Scotland analysis: energy / presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Department of Energy and Climate Change by Command of Her Majesty.</td>
<td>P.P. 2013-14 Cm 8826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish National Party. ([Edinburgh] : [SNP], [2011])</td>
<td>Your Scotland, your future.</td>
<td>PB1.215.71/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Editor, Title</td>
<td>Title/Details</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie, Allan, (Edinburgh : Saltire Society Scotland, 2014.)</td>
<td>Nevertheless / Allan Massie.</td>
<td>PB2.215.15/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland. Church and Society Council. ([Edinburgh?] : Church of Scotland?, [2014])</td>
<td>Our vision : imagining Scotland's future / The Church of Scotland, Church and Society Council.</td>
<td>PB3.214.47/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betteridge, David (Glasgow : Rhizome Press, 2014.)</td>
<td>Won &amp; Lost : two poem-sequences, written from two standpoints in time, giving one view of Scotland's great argument with and about itself... / David Betteridge.</td>
<td>PB3.215.8/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremner, Stewart (Edinburgh : Imagined Images Editions, 2015.)</td>
<td>The early days of a better nation : or how we laid the foundation for the campaign that will win an independent Scotland / by Stewart Bremner.</td>
<td>PB3.215.34/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayman, David, (Glasgow : FairPley, [2014])</td>
<td>David Hayman in The pitiless storm by Chris Dolan.</td>
<td>PB4.216.72/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrone, Gavin (Edinburgh : Birlinn Limited, 2013.)</td>
<td>Scottish independence : weighing up the economics / Gavin McCrone.</td>
<td>PB5.213.1362/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Colin, (Glasgow : Scottish Socialist Party, [2014?])</td>
<td>The case for an independent socialist Scotland / by Colin Fox.</td>
<td>PB5.214.646/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallwood, James</td>
<td>If Scotland says ‘No’ : what next for the union? / edited by James Hallwood.</td>
<td>PB5.214.783/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, Alan</td>
<td>After the referendum : options for a constitutional convention / Alan Renwick.</td>
<td>PB5.214.783/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, James</td>
<td>The day after the referendum : what kind of Scotland do you want? : an essay intended to provoke debate / James Robertson.</td>
<td>PB5.214.850/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Patsy</td>
<td>The wee wumin looks at the referendum : a rambling poem-like thing / by Patsy Mason.</td>
<td>PB5.214.865/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign)</td>
<td>Yes - the financial facts / YesScotland.net</td>
<td>PB5.214.920/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist Party of Britain. Scottish Committee</td>
<td>The debate on Scotland’s future : a communist view / a pamphlet by the Communist Party.</td>
<td>PB5.214.920/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Alasdair</td>
<td>Independence : arguing that all folk in Scotland should be the only electors of a Scots government / Alasdair Gray.</td>
<td>PB5.214.936/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macwhirter, Iain</td>
<td>Road to referendum / Iain Macwhirter.</td>
<td>PB5.214.950/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrone, Gavin</td>
<td>Scottish independence : weighing up the economics / Gavin McCrone.</td>
<td>PB5.214.990/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Hamish</td>
<td>Scotlan's richt : thirteen poems anent the 2014 independence referendum / bi Hamish Scott.</td>
<td>PB5.214.990/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery, Charlie</td>
<td>Scotland's decision : 16 questions to think about for the referendum on 18 September / edited by Charlie Jeffery &amp; Ray Perman ; foreword by Sir Tom Hunter.</td>
<td>PB5.214.1083/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Commission (Great Britain) (Edinburgh : Electoral Comission, [2014])</td>
<td>The 2014 Scottish independence referendum voting guide.</td>
<td>PB5.214.1118/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerevan, George. (Stroud : The History Press, 2014.)</td>
<td>Scottish independence / Yes - George Kerevan, No - Alan Cochrane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindigo (Referendum campaign) ([Scotland] : Sindigo Corp, 2014.)</td>
<td>Ready for aye.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) ([Edinburgh?] : Yes Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>It's good to talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betteridge, David (Glasgow : Rhizome Press, 2014.)</td>
<td>The experience of defeat &amp; prior states : six elegies compiled after a majority &quot;No&quot; vote was returned in the Referendum on Scottish Independence of 18 September, 2014 / David Betteridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betteridge, David (Glasgow : Rhizome Press, 2014.)</td>
<td>A rising route &amp; other poems : six celebrations, written in anticipation of a majority &quot;Yes&quot; vote in the Referendum on Scottish Independence of 18 September, 2014 / David Betteridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Socialist Group. ([Glasgow] : [International Socialist Group], [2013])</td>
<td>Britain must break : the internationalist case for independence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Library Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, David N. F. (Hamburg : Helmut Schmidt Universität, 2014.)</td>
<td>The economic consequences of Scottish independence / edited by David Bell, David Eiser, Klaus Beckmann.</td>
<td>PBS.215.206/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland. Church and Society Council. (Edinburgh : Church and Society Council, Church of Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Our vision: imagining Scotland's future. Discussion points / The Church of Scotland, Church and Society Council.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Democratic Alliance. (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>The PPP/PFI debt burden: the debts Labour has left for our children / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Democratic Alliance. (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>The European Union in or out?: what's best for Scotland / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Democratic Alliance. (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Vote Yes with the SDA / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, James (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Scotland in Europe / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, James (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Scotland in the world / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Democratic Alliance. (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Our vision: an SDA paper / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Democratic Alliance. (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Putting our proposals into practice: what would it mean? / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslen, Niall, (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>The great obfuscation / by Niall Aslen.</td>
<td>PBS.215.213/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Scotland] : [publisher not identified], [2014])</td>
<td>Planning to use your vote in the forthcoming independence referendum? Some things worth knowing before you decide: particularly if you are under 30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Scotland] : [publisher not identified], [2014])</td>
<td>Planning to use your vote in the forthcoming independence referendum? Some historical things worth knowing before you decide: particularly if you are under 30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, James (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>The Scotland-UN committee: the truth behind the 1998 devolution settlement / Dr James Wilkie ; The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, James (Halkirk : SDA Publishing Department, [2012])</td>
<td>Scotland's status / The Scottish Democratic Alliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay, Douglas, (Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2014.)</td>
<td>From #indyref to eternity: the battle for a nation, and how proud Scotia came within a whisker of breaking free / Douglas Lindsay ; with illustrations by Bob Dewar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Saint Paul's Scottish Episcopal Church (Edinburgh, Scotland) ([Edinburgh] : [Old Saint Paul's Scottish Episcopal Church], [2014])</td>
<td>Praying for Scotland's referendum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Luca, Christine. ([Edinburgh] : [Mayfield Salisbury Parish Church], [2014])</td>
<td>Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.</td>
<td>PBS.215.1211/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place for Hope (Organization) ([Edinburgh] : Place for Hope, [2014])</td>
<td>Place for hope: reconciliation beyond referendum: prayers and resources for positive dialogue for the people of Scotland.</td>
<td>PBS.216.485/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr, Andrew Redmond (Edinburgh : WP Books, 2016.)</td>
<td>The summer of independence: stories from a nation in the making / Andrew Redmond Barr.</td>
<td>PBS.216.897/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Labour Party. (Glasgow : Scottish Labour Party, [2014])</td>
<td>Together we can: grow, care, achieve, prosper, succeed.</td>
<td>PB6.214.472/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) ([Glasgow] : [Yes Scotland], [2013])</td>
<td>Yes to a Just Scotland: response to the STUC's interim report: February 2013.</td>
<td>PB6.214.488/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling, Alistair (Glasgow : Better Together, [2013])</td>
<td>We belong together: the case for a United Kingdom / Alistair Darling.</td>
<td>PB6.214.488/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author/Publication Details</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormston, Rachel (Edinburgh : ScotCen Social Research, [2013])</td>
<td>The option not on the table : attitudes to more devolution / authors Rachel Ormston &amp; John Curtice.</td>
<td>PB6.214.674/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Glasgow : Yes Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland FAQ document]</td>
<td>PB6.214.716/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainslie, John (Glasgow : Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, [2014])</td>
<td>No place for Trident : Scottish independence and nuclear disarmament / John Ainslie.</td>
<td>PB6.214.857/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes LGBTI (Referendum campaign) (Glasgow : Yes LGBTI, [2014])</td>
<td>Rainbow paper.</td>
<td>PB6.214.860/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Institution</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall, Blair. (Glasgow : Blair McDougall for Better Together, [2014])</td>
<td>100 letters from woman across Scotland saying No thanks.</td>
<td>PB6.215.166/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnachie, Alistair. (Glasgow : A Force For Good, 2014.)</td>
<td>Devo-danger / content written by Alistair McConnachie.</td>
<td>PB6.215.166/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacks, Peter ([Edinburgh] : [Beyond Borders Scotland], [2014])</td>
<td>The debatable land / Peter Sacks.</td>
<td>PB6.215.230/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Workers Union (Great Britain) (London : CWU, [2014])</td>
<td>Scottish referendum on independence : your union's views.</td>
<td>PB6.215.573/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Giles' Cathedral (Edinburgh, Scotland) ([Edinburgh] : [St Giles' Cathedral], [2014])</td>
<td>A service reflecting shared values and common purpose on the Sunday after the referendum.</td>
<td>PB6.215.820/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) ([Edinburgh?] : Yes Scotland, [2014?])</td>
<td>Briefing document: opportunities for an independent Scotland.</td>
<td>PB7.214.154/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minten, Dominique, ([Groot-Bijgaarden] : [Standaard], 2014.)</td>
<td>&quot;Ik moet jouw accent niet&quot; / Dominique Minten.</td>
<td>PB7.215.27/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect (Organization) ([Edinburgh] : Prospect Scotland, [2014?])</td>
<td>Referendum questions to campaigns / Prospect.</td>
<td>PB7.215.34/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns, Christopher, ([Edinburgh?] : Greg Moodie, [2015])</td>
<td>Welcome to Cairnstoorn : please read carefully. Political cartoons vol. 1 / Chris Cairns ; foreword by Kevin McKenna ; introduction by Rev Stuart Campbell.</td>
<td>PB7.216.14/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCredie, Alan (Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2015.)</td>
<td>100 weeks of Scotland : a portrait of a nation on the verge / Alan McCredie.</td>
<td>PB8.207.930/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Glasgow : Yes Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Why independence will be the best thing for generations : referendum communication - Yes Scotland.</td>
<td>PB8.214.724/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Glasgow : Yes Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Your choice : opportunities in an independent Scotland.</td>
<td>PB8.214.724/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Glasgow : Yes Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Your future : your free guide to Scotland's referendum.</td>
<td>PB8.214.724/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddoch, Lesley (Edinburgh : Luath Press, 2013.)</td>
<td>Blossom : what Scotland needs to flourish / Lesley Riddoch.</td>
<td>PB8.214.847/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyfe, Maria, (Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2014.)</td>
<td>Women saying no : making a positive case against independence / edited by Maria Fyfe.</td>
<td>PB8.214.915/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan, Gerry (Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2014.)</td>
<td>Caledonian dreaming : the quest for a different Scotland / Gerry Hassan with a foreword by Fintan O'Toole.</td>
<td>PB8.214.946/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Alexander, (Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2014.)</td>
<td>The people we could be : or, how to be £500 better off, build a fairer society and a safer world / Alex Bell.</td>
<td>PB8.214.970/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect (Organization) (Edinburgh : Prospect Scotland, 2014.)</td>
<td>Prospect Scotland : our voice - our future / Prospect.</td>
<td>PB8.215.165/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance, David</td>
<td>Edinburgh : Luath Press, 2014.</td>
<td>100 days of hope and fear : how Scotland’s referendum was lost and won / by David Torrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoghegan, Peter</td>
<td>Edinburgh : Luath Press Limited, 2015.</td>
<td>The people's referendum : why Scotland will never be the same again / Peter Geoghegan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Together (Referendum campaign)</td>
<td>Glasgow : Better Together, [2014?])</td>
<td>The facts : why we are better together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Union Ltd., (Edinburgh : Save the Union, [2014-2015])</td>
<td>[Save the Union ephemera].</td>
<td>PB9.215.28/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (Glasgow : Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, [2014])</td>
<td>[Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>PB9.215.28/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Orange Lodge of Scotland (Glasgow)</td>
<td>[2012-2014]</td>
<td>[Grand Orange Lodge of Scotland ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissett, Alan ([2014])</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Ephemera produced by Alan Bissett for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ara és l'hora (Campaign) ([2014])</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Catalan independence referendum 2014 ephemera].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland, Scottish Government (Edinburgh)</td>
<td>[2014]</td>
<td>[The Scottish Government ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Socialist Party (Glasgow)</td>
<td>[2013-2014]</td>
<td>[Scottish Socialist Party ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liberal Democrats (Edinburgh)</td>
<td>[2014]</td>
<td>[Scottish Liberal Democrats ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Friends of the Union (Campaign), ([Edinburgh] : Conservative Friends of the Union, [2013-2014])</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Conservative Friends of the Union ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Party (Scotland) ([Glasgow?] : Scottish Conservatives, [2014])</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Scottish Conservatives ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindigo (Referendum campaign), ([Scotland] : Sindigo, [2014])</td>
<td>[Sindigo ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Democrats (Political party), ([Willingale, Ongar, Essex] : English Democrats, [2014])</td>
<td>[English Democrats ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Centre for Social Research (Great Britain) (London : NatCen, [2013])</td>
<td>[National Centre for Social Research ephemera related to the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Scotland (Firm) ([Glasgow] : [Herald Scotland], [2014])</td>
<td>Herald Scotland produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Scotland (Conference) (2014 : University of Stirling), ([Stirling] : [If Scotland], [2014])</td>
<td>If Scotland conference ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Scotland (Organization), ([Edinburgh] : Collaborative Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Collaborative Scotland ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearest Scotland (Campaign), (Glasgow : Dearest Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>Dearest Scotland ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour for Independence (Referendum campaign), (Barrhead : Labour for Independence, [2014])</td>
<td>Labour for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced All Inclusive Referendum Debate (Campaign), ([Edinburgh] : BARD2014, [2014])</td>
<td>Balanced All Inclusive Referendum Debate ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Million Questions (Program), (Dundee : Five Million Questions, [2014])</td>
<td>Five Million Questions ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley, James ([London] : [Pluto Press], [2014])</td>
<td>Yes: the radical case for Scottish independence advertisements.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming for Yes (Referendum campaign), ([Scotland] : [Farming for Yes], [2014])</td>
<td>Farming for Yes ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians for Independence (Campaign group), ([Scotland] : [Christians for Independence], [2014])</td>
<td>Christians for Independence ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots Asians for Independence (Campaign group), ([Scotland] : [Scots Asians for Independence], [2013-2014])</td>
<td>Scots Asians for Independence ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Scots for Yes (Campaign group), ([Scotland] : [English Scots for Yes], [2014])</td>
<td>English Scots for Yes ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>PB9.215.30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Group</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africans for an Independent Scotland (Campaign group)</td>
<td>([Glasgow] : [Africans for an Independent Scotland], [2013-2014])</td>
<td>[Africans for an Independent Scotland ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and College Union (Great Britain) ( [Edinburgh? ] : University and College Union, [2013]-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[University and College Union ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearest Scotland (Campaign)</td>
<td>([Glasgow] : Dearest Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>[Dearest Scotland ephemera].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devéria, Richard A. A.</td>
<td>([2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Scottish independence referendum 2014 miscellaneous ephemera].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain. Scotland Office</td>
<td>([Great Britain] : [Scotland Office], [2014])</td>
<td>[Scotland Office ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Workers’ Party (Great Britain)</td>
<td>([Great Britain] : [Socialist Workers’ Party], [2014])</td>
<td>[Socialist Workers’ Party ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women for Independence</td>
<td>([2014])</td>
<td>Women for Independence ephemera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher/Author/Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women for Independence ([2014])</td>
<td>Women for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.31/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women for Independence ([2014])</td>
<td>Women for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>PB9.215.31/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodie, Fraser, ([Scotland] : [Fraser Moodie], [2014-2015])</td>
<td>Profound / editor-in-chief/creative director Fraser Moodie.</td>
<td>PB10.214.4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Labour Party (Glasgow: The Scottish Labour Party, [2014])</td>
<td>Scottish referendum special / Scottish Labour.</td>
<td>PB10.214.4/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Together (Referendum campaign) ([Glasgow] : Better Together, [2014?])</td>
<td>The best of both worlds for Scotland: why we are Better Together.</td>
<td>PB10.214.4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodie, Greg (Scotland : Greg Moodie, [2015])</td>
<td>Greg Moodie's election dissection / foreword by Lesley Riddoch.</td>
<td>PB10.215.4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodie, Greg (Scotland : Greg Moodie, [2015])</td>
<td>Greg Moodie's election dissection / foreword by Lesley Riddoch.</td>
<td>PB10.215.6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.el.3[122/1-2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.la.2[122]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsman Publications, ([Edinburgh]: [Scotsman Publications], [2014])</td>
<td>[The Scotsman ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.2[223/1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh: Yes Scotland, 2012-2014)</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.2[224/1-6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodie, Greg ([2012?–2014])</td>
<td>[Ephemera produced by Greg Moodie for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.2[229/1-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodie, Greg ([2012?–2014])</td>
<td>[Ephemera produced by Greg Moodie for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.2[229/1-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual material By Bremner, Stewart ([Edinburgh]: [Stewart Bremner], 2014.)</td>
<td>[Indyref prints] / by Stewart Bremner.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.3[18/1-18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh: Yes Scotland, 2012-2014)</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.3[20/1-6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald Scotland (Firm) ([Glasgow]: [Herald Scotland], [2014])</td>
<td>[Herald Scotland produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.med.3[21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh: Yes Scotland, 2012-2014)</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[35/1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (campaign)</td>
<td>(Campaign location: [2012-2014])</td>
<td>Ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>Yes Scotland ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[118/1-14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liberal Democrats (Edinburgh : Scottish Liberal Democrats, [2014])</td>
<td>Scottish Liberal Democrats ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[119/1-12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish for Yes (Referendum campaign), (Glasgow : Polish for Yes, [2014])</td>
<td>Polish for Yes ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[121]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women for Independence ([2014])</td>
<td>Women for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[122]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour for Independence (Referendum campaign), (Barrhead : Labour for Independence, [2014])</td>
<td>Labour for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.3[123/1-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>Yes Scotland ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.4[8/1-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Islands Our Future (Campaign), (Scotland : Our Islands Our Future, [2013-2014])</td>
<td>Our Islands Our Future ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.4[25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs for Scotland Festival, ([Glasgow]: Songs for Scotland Festival, [2014])</td>
<td>[Songs for Scotland Festival ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.4[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scotland (Referendum campaign) (Edinburgh : Yes Scotland, [2012-2014])</td>
<td>[Yes Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.5[1/1-10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearest Scotland (Campaign), (Glasgow: Dearest Scotland, [2014])</td>
<td>[Dearest Scotland ephemera].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.6[37/1-4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liberal Democrats (Edinburgh : Scottish Liberal Democrats, [2014])</td>
<td>[Scottish Liberal Democrats ephemera produced for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum].</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.6[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women for Independence ([2014])</td>
<td>Women for Independence ephemera.</td>
<td>Pos.Box.sm.8[27/1-2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Moving Image Archive accessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aamer Anwar Bbc Meeting [11422]</td>
<td>Webcast of an interview with lawyer Aamer Anwar about a meeting with the delegation from the pro-Palestine protest and BBC Scotland in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After The Referendum - What Now? [12136]</td>
<td>Webcast of a panel discussion at the Admiral Bar in Glasgow about the effects of the result of the Scottish independence referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Cumming Campaign [11452]</td>
<td>Webcast of an appearance by actor Alan Cumming campaigning for Scottish independence in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fracking Protest At Ineos In Grangemouth [12199]</td>
<td>Webcast of an anti-fracking protest organised by No Fracking Falkirk outside the premises of Ineos at Grangemouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects For Yes [12141]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting at the Royal Incorporation of Architects Scotland in Edinburgh to discuss independence and the architecture profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist Taxi Driver, Yes Cafe Edinburgh [12209]</td>
<td>Webcast of a talk in the Yes Cafe in Edinburgh by Mark McGowan, Artist Taxi Driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bbc Bias Protest 3 [11424]</td>
<td>Webcast of a pro-independence protest outside the BBC Scotland headquarters at Pacific Quay, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bbc Bias Protest 5 [12174]</td>
<td>Webcast of a pro-independence protest outside the BBC Scotland headquarters at Pacific Quay, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIGGER THE LIE, The: Media Bias In The Scottish Independence Referendum [12430]</td>
<td>Talking head Professor John Robertson of University of the West of Scotland discussing his research into bias in the mainstream media during the Scottish independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Sides The Tweed [12406]</td>
<td>The Independence Choir sing &quot;Both Sides the Tweed&quot; to a tune by Dick Gaughan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brora Question Time - Scotland’s Referendum [12145]</td>
<td>Webcast of a debate in Brora Primary School about Scottish independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business For Scotland - Greenock Referendum Discussion [12152]</td>
<td>Webcast of a panel discussion event at the Tontine Hotel, Greenock, hosted by Business for Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing The Campaign: Chris Cairns’ Horrible Wonderful Indyref Year [12427]</td>
<td>Documentary about the work of cartoonist and illustrator Chris Cairns, as he works on a new cartoon and reminisces about events leading up to the Scottish independence referendum in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE FOR SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE, The [11425]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting about the case for Scottish independence in Whiterose Community Hall, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation With Matt Lygate [12202]</td>
<td>Webcast of David McGowran talking to activist Matt Lygate about various topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRACY BY DESIGN: A Profile Of Graphic Artist Stewart Bremner [12428]</td>
<td>Graphic artist Stewart Bremner talks about getting involved with the Yes Scotland campaign during the run-up to the Scottish independence referendum, and about how the work of various artists influenced the style of his graphic work and posters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Rights Discussion From Glasgow Caledonian University [11409]</td>
<td>Webcast of a panel discussion about digital rights at Glasgow Caledonian University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Davies [12159]</td>
<td>Webcast of a talk by Welsh historian Dr. John Davies providing a historical perspective on Welsh and Scottish politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumchapel Mass Canvas [11430]</td>
<td>Webcast of a group of pro-independence canvassers in Drumchapel, Glasgow, organised by the Radical Independence Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunoon Public Meeting [12127]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting about Scottish independence organised by Yes Cowal in Dunoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh People's Festival [12139]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish independence referendum panel debate debate at the Carlton Hotel, Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh, W.O.S. 4 [11446]</td>
<td>Webcast of a social gathering of Friends of Wings over Scotland, the pro-independence blog, in the Newsroom bar in Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodbanks And Welfare Reform [12130]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting in Westerton Hall in Glasgow addressing the issues of foodbanks, welfare reform and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Convoy - Aberdeen To Glasgow [12140]</td>
<td>Webcast of a journey from Edinburgh to Strathclyde Park as part of the Freedom Convoy from Aberdeen, and a rally in Strathclyde Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of W.O.S. 2 [11438]</td>
<td>Webcast of a social gathering of supporters of Wings over Scotland, the pro-independence blog in Broughty Ferry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Galloway, Coatbridge [11416]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event at St. Andrew’s High School, Coatbridge, featuring speaker George Galloway and audience discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Green, Bbc Bias Peaceful Protest 4 [11427]</td>
<td>Webcast of a protest rally at Glasgow Green featuring speakers Councillor Shabbar Jaffri; Joshua Brown; Pat Lee; Tommy Sheridan; John Allan-LF; Math Campbell - English Scots for YES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Today: Scottish Independence Referendum Debate [8792]</td>
<td>An episode of the University of the District of Columbia’s magazine programme 'Higher Education Today', presented by Steven Roy Goodman. Features a debate about Scottish independence and its effect on academia between Dr Stephen Watson, University of Glasgow, founder of 'Academics for Yes' and Professor Hugh Pennington, University of Aberdeen, leader of 'Academics Together'. [Filmed in the Linklater Rooms, University of Aberdeen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homecoming For Indy Cyclist Mark Coburn [11441]</td>
<td>Webcast of the return to Glasgow of cyclist Mark Coburn, who undertook a 1421 mile sponsored bike ride from Rome to Glasgow to raise money for the campaign for Scottish independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Over Fear [12128]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting in Wishaw with speaker Tommy Sheridan and a question and answer session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineos Protest Preview [12195]</td>
<td>Webcast from outside the INEOS complex at Grangemouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info For Bbc Bias Protest [11423]</td>
<td>Webcast providing information from organisers Geordie McArthur and Moira Williams about arrangements for a protest at the BBC Scotland headquarters planned for 27 July 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Dr Mark McNaught [11445]</td>
<td>Webcast of an interview in Paris with Dr Mark McNaught about the concept of a political constitution for an independent Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Q&amp;A, Nicola Sturgeon [11449]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event at the Castlepark Community Centre in Irvine, where members of the public put questions to Deputy First Minister Nicola Sturgeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sillars And Tommy Sheridan [11439]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Socialists for Independence event at Lourdes Primary School, Glasgow - featuring speakers Jim Sillars, Tommy Sheridan and David Hayman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sillars, Final Public Meeting [12175]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event at Ashpark Primary School in Glasgow, including a speech by Jim Sillars and entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinning Park [11412]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Yes Scotland panel discussion at Kinning Park Complex, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark Debate [11442]</td>
<td>Webcast of an independence debate in Lanark Memorial Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWYERS' DEBATE, The [12142]</td>
<td>Webcast of a debate at the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh, featuring academics, advocates and solicitors from both sides of the independence debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live At The Yes Bar: Max Keiser [12162]</td>
<td>Webcast of a performance by economist and broadcaster Max Keiser at the Yes Bar in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live In George Square [12177]</td>
<td>Webcast of activities in George Square, Glasgow, as pro-independence supporters gather in advance of the independence referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN'S A MAN FOR A'THAT, A [12405]</td>
<td>The Independence Choir sing the Robert Burns song &quot;A Man's a Man for a That&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mcgowan, Artist Taxi Driver [11440]</td>
<td>Webcast of a talk by Mark McGowan, Artist Taxi Driver, at Queen's Park Railway Club in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Day Rally, Owen Jones [11437]</td>
<td>Webcast of a speech by journalist and Labour Party activist Owen Jones at the O2 in Glasgow as part of May Day celebrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million Mask March, Glasgow [12184]</td>
<td>Webcast of a We Are Anonymous march from George Square in Glasgow to Glasgow Green, including interviews with participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherwell Q&amp;A, Nicola Sturgeon Msp [11448]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Yes Motherwell &amp; Wishaw event at the GLO Centre in Motherwell where members of the public put questions to Deputy First Minister Nicola Sturgeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL COLLECTIVE: Artists And Creatives For Scottish Independence [12429]</td>
<td>A National Collective event at Stirling University featuring author and playwright Alan Bissett, who talks about the National Collective grassroots campaign for independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhs For Yes [12132]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting hosted by NHS For Yes entitled &quot;NHS Scotland ... In Five Years?&quot; at the Pearce Institute in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBERS GAME, The: Politics And Polling In The Independence Referendum [12432]</td>
<td>Political commentator James Kelly of the blog 'Scot Goes Pop!' talks about the effect of opinion polls on the Scottish independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIL ON THE CLYDE: An Audience With Chic Brodie [12135]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event in which Chic Brodie MSP discusses his research into oil in the Clyde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Last Glesga Push, Buchanan Street [12164]</td>
<td>Webcast of activities on Buchanan Street and Sauchiehall Street in Glasgow on the last Saturday before the independence referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Labour Gala Dinner [12183]</td>
<td>Webcast of a protest outside the Central Hotel in Glasgow, as a Scottish Labour Party gala dinner took place inside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest Against Bbc Bias 2 [12426]</td>
<td>Footage of a protest at the BBC Scotland headquarters in Glasgow - Yes supporters expressing their opinions about BBC Scotland’s coverage of the independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest Against Bbc Bias: Pacific Quay Glasgow 1 June 2014 [12425]</td>
<td>Footage of a protest at the BBC Scotland headquarters in Glasgow - Yes supporters expressing their opinions about BBC Scotland’s coverage of the independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.C. Lecture With Danny Dorling [12117]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public lecture by Professor Danny Dorling of Oxford University about inequality in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections On The Referendum [12179]</td>
<td>Webcast of a conversation with Darren McGarvey (Loki), Matt Lygate and Mark McGhee about the run-up to the Scottish independence referendum and the aftermath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Coverage In George Square [11428]</td>
<td>Webcast of activities in George Square, Glasgow, on the night of the Scottish independence referendum polling day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Coverage Inside The Glasgow Count [11453]</td>
<td>Webcast of proceedings at the Glasgow vote count for the Scottish independence referendum at the Velodrome, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Glasgow Takeover [11450]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Radical Independence Campaign event in Buchanan Street, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Gorbals Public Meeting [11418]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Radical Independence Campaign public meeting at St. Francis Community Centre, Gorbals, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say Yes! / When Love Had No Road [12408]</td>
<td>The Independence Choir sing &quot;Say Yes!&quot; and &quot;When Love Had No Road&quot; by Alison Burns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: English Scots For Yes [12116]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing presenting speakers from campaign group English Scots for Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: Focus On Unemployed</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA, Glasgow, focussing on the issue of unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: From Hiroshima To Faslane:</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing, presenting the case against the renewal of nuclear weapons in Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Case Against The Renewal Of Trident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: Generation Yes</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA in Glasgow, with speakers from youth group Generation Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: Global Forum Report On</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA in Glasgow, to coincide with the publication of a Common Weal report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Independence Convention Press Briefing: Grassroots Groups</td>
<td>Webcast of the first Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA in Glasgow, introducing the new film 'Scotland Yet'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Independence Convention Press Briefing: If We Vote No, Scotland</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Be Punished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: NHS And TTIP</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing, discussing the privatisation threat to NHS Scotland posed by TTIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Independence Convention Press Briefing: R.I.C. Canvassing Results</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing at the CCA in Glasgow about the results of RIC's canvassing in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE CONVENTION PRESS BRIEFING: Voter Registration And Participation [12115]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Independence Convention press briefing presenting a panel of speakers from across the grassroots YES movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party Scotland Public Meeting [12194]</td>
<td>Webcast of a meeting hosted in Glasgow by the Socialist Party Scotland about how to defeat austerity, with lessons from both Scotland and Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssp Paisley [11414]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Scottish Socialist Party public meeting about Scottish independence at St. Mary's Primary School, Paisley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stop Bombing Gaza’ Demo [11421]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers For Yes [12144]</td>
<td>Webcast of a debate in Glasgow about Scottish independence and its impact on education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers For Yes [12153]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Teachers for Yes meeting in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CHARLIE HEBDO MASSACRE: Exploring Media Ethics And Responsibility [12207]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event organised by the National Union of Journalists Scotland and media website CommonSpace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People United [12148]</td>
<td>Webcast of a panel discussion in Glasgow about the possibility of a new radical socialist Scotland after independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Land Is A Song [12411]</td>
<td>The Independence Choir sing &quot;This Land is a Song&quot; by Alison Burns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Sheppard, Edinburgh Yes Cafe [12208]</td>
<td>Webcast of a talk in the Yes Cafe in Edinburgh by Tommy Sheppard, discussing his disillusionment with the Labour Party and his support for Scottish independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Sheridan, Lennoxtown [12134]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting in Campsie Memorial Hall, Lennoxtown, with speakers Deborah Shepherd and Tommy Sheridan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troon Yes/No Debate [12143]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public debate about Scottish independence between Yes and No supporters in Troon Concert Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided About The Referendum? [11432]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Yes Renfrew panel discussion event at Renfrew Town Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided About The Referendum? [11447]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event in Edinburgh discussing the positive case for a Yes vote in the independence referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety Show Fundraiser For Yes [12138]</td>
<td>Webcast of an evening of music, song, story-telling, poetry, dance and comedy in Edinburgh to raise funds for YES Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans For Independence [12133]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting in Glasgow, featuring speakers from Veterans for Independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.O.S. 3 Social [11443]</td>
<td>Webcast of a social gathering of Friends of Wings over Scotland, the pro-independence blog, in the Counting House, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales Supporting Yes [12173]</td>
<td>Webcast of an event in Cardiff organised to demonstrate support for Scottish independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We Need To Talk About Fracking - Glasgow Debate</strong> [11413]</td>
<td>Webcast of a discussion event about fracking at the Arches, Glasgow, and interviews with some participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wee County Freedom Fighters</strong> [12434]</td>
<td>The Yes Hub in Alloa in Clackmannanshire have a 'Super Saturday' during the Scottish independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING OFF SCOTLAND: Press Bias In The Independence Referendum</strong> [12435]</td>
<td>Dr David Patrick discusses his research into UK press bias during the Scottish independence referendum campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Car Cavalcade: Dunoon - Oban</strong> [12163]</td>
<td>Webcast and highlights of a pro-independence car cavalcade from Dunoon to Oban, featuring Michael Russell MSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Cowal Extravaganza</strong> [12149]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Yes Cowal event in the Queen’s Hall, Dunoon, chaired by Michael Russell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Cowal New Shop Opening</strong> [12181]</td>
<td>The opening of a new shop by Yes Cowal in Dunoon, and interviews with actors Martin Compston and Paul Brannigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES FILMS 10 + 1, The</strong> [9463]</td>
<td>A series of ten-second films promoting a Yes vote in the Scottish Independence referendum of 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Glasgow Big Debate</strong> [11111]</td>
<td>Webcast of a debate about Scottish independence at the Radisson Blu Hotel, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes In The Park</strong> [11444]</td>
<td>Webcast of a pro-independence family event in Strathclyde Park, featuring speakers including Humza Yousaf, entertainment and stalls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Kirkintilloch, Lenzie And Villages - Public Meeting</strong> [12129]</td>
<td>Webcast of a public meeting in Kirkintilloch featuring speakers Robin McAlpine and Dr John O’Dowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Pollok Campaign Base Opening</strong> [11454]</td>
<td>Webcast of the opening ceremony of the Yes Pollok campaign office in Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes Rally, George Square</strong> [12178]</td>
<td>Webcast of activities in and around George Square, Glasgow, as pro-independence supporters gather on the eve of the independence referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes To Independence</strong> [11431]</td>
<td>Webcast of a Lanarkshire for Independence event in Motherwell, featuring speakers Cat Boyd, Jim Sillars and Robin McAlpine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yestival, Govanhill Baths</strong> [11419]</td>
<td>A very brief interview with First Minister Nicola Sturgeon outside a Yestival event at Govanhill Baths, Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 - Interviews

3.1 List of interviewees

**Alan Bissett**
Author and playwright. During the 2014 Independence Referendum he became a Cultural Ambassador for the pro-independence group National Collective.

**Sarah Bromage**
Curator of the University of Stirling Art Collection. She has worked in various roles within the heritage sector, and at the time of the 2014 Referendum, Sarah was the Archivist at the Scottish Political Archive, University of Stirling.

**Maria Castrillo**
Archivist and historian, currently Head of Collections Access and Research at the Imperial War Museums. At the time of the 2014 Referendum Maria was Curator of Political Collections at the National Library of Scotland.

**Aimee Chalmers**
Writer and artist based in Fife. During the 2014 Referendum she led on two creative projects responding to the constitutional question: ‘Knitting a Nation’ and ‘A New Chapter’.

**Jennifer Giles**
Historian and librarian. During the Referendum, she was Curator of Scottish Communities and Organisations at the National Library of Scotland.

**Eilidh MacGlone**
Web Archivist at the National Library of Scotland.

**Professor Hugh Pennington**
Emeritus professor of bacteriology at the University of Aberdeen. During the referendum he established the Academics Together campaign group, an arm of pro-Union group Better Together.

**Tom Proudfoot**
Visitor Services Assistant at the National Library of Scotland.
3.2 Participant Information Sheet

1. Research Project Title:

Archive and Narrative in the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum

2. Background, aims of project

You are invited to take part in oral history interviews as part of ‘Archive and Narrative in the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum’, a collaborative PhD project that is examining how a record of Scotland’s 2014 referendum was collected for the benefit of the nation. In particular, the project is examining the National Library of Scotland’s ‘Collecting the Referendum’ project.

3. Why have I been invited to take part?

You have been invited because I am interested in your views, memories and impressions of Indyref record creation and collection, based on your involvement with the Collecting the Referendum project.

4. Do I have to take part?

No. You do not have to take part.

If you do decide to take part, you can withdraw your participation at any time without needing to explain and without penalty by advising the researcher of this decision. You will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to complete an electronic consent form.

5. What will happen if I take part?

Interviews will be conducted online via Teams. Interviews will take around an hour and will be recorded for transcription purposes. After the recording of your interview has been transcribed, a written version will be returned to you for comment and review. If you wish to clarify or amend your answers, you may do so at this stage. You can also redact any sensitive information you do not wish to make public.

6. Are there any potential risks in taking part?

There are no foreseeable risks in taking part.

7. Are there any benefits in taking part?

While there will be no payment for taking part in this project, benefits may include assisting scholars to better understand the role of rapid response collecting in archival practice and the role of archives in the formation and contestation of nationalism.

8. Legal basis for processing personal data

As part of the project I will be recording personal data relating to you. This will be processed in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Under
GDPR the legal basis for processing your personal data will be public interest/the official authority of the University.

9. What happens to the data I provide?

Interview recordings and transcripts will be treated as confidential until you have approved a final written version for deposit in a research archive, and potential publication. Prior to giving this approval, you will have the opportunity to redact private or sensitive information. Your personal data will be kept for 10 years on Research Drive, a secure data centre on the Stirling campus, and then securely destroyed.

All participants will be asked for their permission to use direct quotes.

10. Recorded media

With your permission (given on a separate consent form), your interview will be recorded on audio and video media, using the standard features of videoconferencing software (e.g. Teams). These recordings will be used for transcription purposes only. These recordings will be stored securely on the university’s Research Drive and will only be accessed by the project team.

The final written version of your interview may be deposited in a research archive (such as the Scottish Political Archive, or the National Library of Scotland), where it will be accessible by students and researchers. A copy of the recording will be accessioned into the National Library of Scotland’s political collections with a closure period of 5 years imposed.

11. Will the research be published?

The research will be published in my thesis. The University of Stirling is committed to making the outputs of research publicly accessible and supports this commitment through our online open access repository STORRE. Unless funder/publisher requirements prevent us, this research will be publicly disseminated through our open access repository.

12. Who is organising and funding the research?

The Arts and Humanities Research Council is funding this research.

13. Who has reviewed this research project?

The ethical approaches of this project have been approved via The University of Stirling General University Ethics Panel

14. Your rights

You have the right to request to see a copy of the information we hold about you and to request corrections or deletions of the information that is no longer required.
You have the right to withdraw from this project at any time without giving reasons and without consequences to you. You also have the right to object to us processing relevant personal data.

Please note that if consent is withdrawn once the research has been completed and the findings submitted for publication, the data will be used nonetheless.

15. **Who do I contact if I have concerns about this study or I wish to complain?**

If you wish to discuss this study with someone, please contact Alice Doyle (a.m.doyle1@stir.ac.uk) or Dr Scott Hames (supervisor - scott.hames@stir.ac.uk).

To raise a complaint about this project, please contact litandlangHOD@stir.ac.uk. You have the right to lodge a complaint against the University regarding data protection issues with the Information Commissioner's Office (https://ico.org.uk/concerns/). The University’s Data Protection Officer is Joanna Morrow, Deputy Secretary. If you have any questions relating to data protection these can be addressed to data.protection@stir.ac.uk in the first instance.

You will be given a copy of this information sheet to keep.

**Thank you for your participation.**
3.4 Sample questions

[These indicate the nature and range of likely interview questions; more tailored and specific details will be incorporated to jog the participants' memory and elicit more detailed responses.]

1. Could you describe how and why you first became involved with the collecting project?
2. What do you recall of the context in which the project emerged/developed?
3. What would you say were the key challenges or concerns in collecting the referendum?
4. Was there a particular 'picture' of the referendum that you strove to capture?
5. Who were the key players in driving the project?
6. What was the intended outcome of the project? Who did you envision as the end users of the collection?
7. In what ways has the project informed your collection or record creation practices more broadly?
8. Is there a single item (in the collection or otherwise) that epitomises 'Indyref' for you?
26/04/2021

Dear Alice

Change request form : Archive and Narrative in the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum 0306

Thank you for your submission of the above ethics application.

The ethical approaches of this project have been approved and you can now proceed with your project.

Please note that should any of your proposal change, a further amendment submission will be necessary.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact the Panel by email to ethics@stir.ac.uk

Yours sincerely,

General University Ethics Panel
Appendix 4 – Unpublished documents

Included below are unpublished documents from Amy Todman’s institutional hard drive that were made available to me for use during my placement. Additional documents not listed were also consulted for context, such as meeting agendas and minutes, but I have chosen to include only those documents where Todman reflects on her collecting practice. It is my hope that these stand to counter her absence from the project interviews.

4.1 refconftalk-FINAL.doc

Notes for a talk given by Todman at a conference entitled ‘Poetic Politics: Culture and the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum, One Year On’, held at the NLS on 23rd September 2015.

**Intro – slide 1:** For those of you that I haven’t yet met, I’m Amy Todman, Referendum Curator here at the NLS. I’m also an artist of sorts, with an undergraduate degree in drawing and painting, and that’s been very much in my mind when working on this talk. I’ll keep this short, as we near the end of a packed and thought-provoking day, so I’ll talk for around 20 minutes and then welcome any questions from the floor. First, I’d like to thank Katie and Sarah for providing this opportunity for discussion and reflection one year on, it seems an important moment to step back and consider, and it’s good to see so many of you that have worked with me to bring material into the collection here today. As ever, I’d also like to thank my colleagues at NLS for their help in making this event happen and in particular to my line manager Dr Maria Castrillo, Curator of Political Manuscripts, for her invaluable assistance in all things referendum and archive. While I have the stage, I might also mention that I’d be delighted to talk to anyone who thinks they might have anything for the referendum collection – please just come and find me – or my contact details will be on the last slide of this presentation.

I don’t think I’m giving anything away if I say that the ref. coll. has posed many questions for us at the library – the struggle to ‘keep up’ with the pace of material produced for this event is a dictum that I am intimately familiar with, and it is undoubtedly important. Much of this time-sensitivity relates to digital and online material, an aspect that only grows in complexity when combined with the creative, fast pace and short timescale which characterises the event. The referendum has certainly asked us to respond quickly to events as they unfold, requiring working together across traditional collecting and organisational boundaries, as well as prompting important conversations internally and externally about what, how and why we collect. The challenges presented to archives and libraries by the proliferation of digital, online material have by now been well-documented. Similarly, there has been a recognition of the importance of an archival landscape that is representative of all of society, addressing a fundamental bias towards, in the words of radical historian Howard Zinn, ‘the most important and powerful people’. Reader in Archival Studies at UCL Andrew Flinn, wrote recently about the relationship between these issues, noting ‘the responsibility of the archivist to ensure that their collections more fully
represent all within society, including the more transitory, often web-based material. Flinn suggests that this requires archivists to step in proactively within a national and perhaps international framework to identify and support the preservation of contemporary collections for future use. This is certainly the aim of the ref. coll. Perhaps less often discussed, however, is the impact that managing the challenges of digital and online content, as well as analogue, trying to ensure a representative collection, particularly when a short, very active campaign with a high level of engagement from an artistic and creative community, is added to the mix, might have on other aspects of the process of collection and preservation.

Groups, individuals and events whose members and affiliates are drawn from the creative sectors of society, who may hold a range of at times contrasting views on activist activity, came together to support the campaign for Scottish independence. The impact of this activity on a post-indy ref. Scotland has been articulated by many, and is well-expressed by green activist, writer and artist, Sara Beattie Smith in a recent blog ‘On Lanark, creativity and the cultural cringe’, noting ‘a newly awakened citizenry in these post referendum days’. Those who responded to the prompt of the referendum might include designers, those from the voluntary sector or from community and participatory arts, arts professionals - trained with and existing within various ‘art worlds’, that might be plastic, literary and performative, academics with interests in particular arts or the arts, artists who dip their toes in academia and those existing outside of art worlds, intentionally or not. My point here is that the referendum brought many forms of creativity together around a common cause, prompting new ways of working and highlighting as they did so, the complexities of what relates politics and the arts, while forging new ways forward in the process.

Though producing many of the same formats as more traditional campaign groups, those with high levels of creative (however it is quantified) input, might be seen to differ in various, interesting ways. These differences may manifest structurally; being often quite particular, less likely to take a generic ‘group’ as exemplar, and more likely to create a ‘bespoke’ structure that fits more exactly a particular, perhaps shifting, world-view, ethos or values. We have perhaps seen this most clearly with groups like National Collective and events like All Back to Bowies, but also in loose consortiums such as The Poetry Society commission by the pro-union Hands Across the Border campaign, and in the many individual voices and one-off events that have emerged during the campaign and after, including performers Lady Alba and The Independence Choir, events like Songs for Scotland, and writers, actors and producers such as David Maclellan, David Greig and Alan Bissett. However, as well as these examples of more bespoke groupings, the referendum also seemed to highlight differences between forms of creative activity in approaches to the referendum. I’m thinking, for example, where we can see more direct and immediate responses to the event set against a more oblique, indirect approach, and I’ll come back to this later. Understanding the diverse aims of such groups, individuals and alliances with differing approaches, as they drew together, stepped apart and re-form in new, often short-lived partnerships, in a campaign as fast-paced as the referendum, is perhaps impossible for those on the outside, as a formal archiving institution inevitably is. On the other hand, in order to collect from such an event, a level of understanding, and ability to keep pace with what is happening, is required. It is this balance that I want to consider today.

Slide 3: So, what is the referendum collection? Ref. specs. aims to build...
The collection cuts across all collecting areas of the library and each format comes with its own collecting challenges. It also fits comfortably within the library’s existing collections of both print and unpublished material, perhaps most clearly with the library’s strong political archival holdings, including the records of the Scottish political parties and previous home rule and independence campaigns, as well as literary collections including Alasdair Gray, Kathleen Jamie and Ian Hamilton Finlay. When I have gone the ref. material will be findable through tagging added at cataloguing stage. It should be obvious but we want a meaningful collection – representative. Not just the campaign groups but also smaller groups and individuals.

**Slide 4** At this point I’d like to introduce *All Back to Bowie’s* as a case study. It’s a good example of the kinds of material that are forming part of the collection and I’ll refer to it throughout this talk. As many, if not all of you, will know, Bowie’s was a daily, lunchtime event that ran in Edinburgh during August last year, responding to pop icon David Bowie’s call for ‘Scotland, ‘to stay with us’ made at the Brit awards in February 2014. **Slide 5** (Key points about bowies) **Slide 6** Includes born-digital, analogue (paper) material, both published and unpublished. The collection is relatively discrete, which is reflective of much referendum material. Rather than 50 boxes, representing the lifetime of an organisation or individual, the referendum collection is comprised of many smaller collections, donated by a wide range of individuals or groups. What is inescapable is that if we want to capture these kinds of events then we need to be flexible enough to work at the different paces that such events require, and be increasingly communicative and pro-active with producers of content.

As has already been suggested - The kind of events that happened during the referendum – not all, but a large number, were creative at least as much as they were political, the two going hand in hand. Poetry readings, musical events, cake afternoons and a whole range of creative activities were combined with political discussion and conversation in a way that was certainly new for a generation, if not for all. Indeed, when I think of literary or creative responses to the ref. it is performances and public events that come to mind, events which often created new platforms for those involved to explore or develop a creative practice. A number of critics have noted the trend towards multiplicity in creative practice as part of a wider, global, cultural landscape. For example a recent article by William Deresewicz in the well-known American magazine *The Atlantic* notes a shift towards versatility in young creators, ‘their tendency to construct a multiplicity of artistic identities. You’re a musician and a photographer and a poet; a storyteller and a dancer and a designer—a multiplatform artist, in the term one sometimes sees... technique or expertise is not the point. The point is versatility.’

This in itself does not pose a greater or lesser problem for the archive; a creative social event is likely to be recorded in the same sorts of formats and at the same paces as a ‘not so creative event’. However, in situations such as the one we found ourselves in last year, in which the mechanisms of governance appear to be somewhat unveiled, and there is a chance for a much wider audience to become involved, the voices of artists often emerge to highlight what is uncovered, whether directly or more obliquely. The referendum campaign certainly prompted some artists, performers and other creative to use the tools of these trades, and I use the word tools in its broadest sense, to promote their cause as well as challenging and changing the way that they worked. Good design and engaging content, on and off the web, was important, but so too was being an alternative to an established political voice. The bespoke structure of certain groups,
coupled with a high degree of design skills, for example, in a short and fast campaign, where events happened off the cuff and planning may have been minimal, might mean that traditional forms of record-keeping are superseded - instead of minutes and agendas, private Facebook groups might become the most obvious way to communicate, for example. This kind of material is simply too sensitive to be donated, at least for now. The record of many groups formed around the referendum will therefore likely be their public face; websites, films of public events and photographs, printed ephemera etc. rather than unpublished records, papers and email, for example. While we’re getting some of this, that’s not the bulk of what people are offering or have. The underlying network that draws these issues together, of course, is the digital and online world, and it has been noted that the referendum has highlighted, perhaps hastened, a shift in production of material, in which the internet as a tool for dissemination, has played a central role. The increasing volume of digital material and the possibilities for data sharing afforded by the internet have opened the archival community to greater collaborative possibilities, both between each other and record-creator’s. It also creates a situation in which publishing is much more prevalent, many more voices can be heard and politics begins to give way to the collective interests of diverse communities. At the same time these advantages are offset by new risks.

And here we come to a fundamental issue with the collection of born-digital content. If we waited for five years to collect this content, it is likely that most of would be gone, or at least scattered so widely that it would be incredibly difficult to collect and therefore provide public access to. Though, as time passes, those involved might be more comfortable donating more ‘private’, unpublished material, the very real concern is that this material will have simply disappeared from hard drives and computers, and the software in which it was created will be obsolescent - In essence, digital material is much more vulnerable than traditional (not to say that paper, particularly flyers etc. are not vulnerable and they are, but digital presents us with an even greater set of challenges). Research, though estimates vary quite wildly, suggests that the average lifespan of a digital object is between 5-7 years, a website around 40 days. However much we debate the figures, this is clearly substantially shorter than the lifespan of a paper item, for example, so it’s a practical issue but also one of understanding. We’ve had hundreds of years to understand traditional materials and a much shorter amount of time to get to grips with digital by comparison.

**Forms of creative culture slide 10** – Beyond the practicalities of collecting digital, perhaps because the creative aspect of the ref. has become such a key narrative, and for the reasons I’ve already discussed, it has also highlighted a distinction between forms of creative culture as they engaged with the independence referendum, which has in turn shown up a potential issue for the archive. These forms of creative culture might be described as on the one hand those with more immediate practices that respond to the moment, and those whose practices are shaped by longer term engagement with one or another threads of enquiry.

Examples of the more immediate form of engagement can be found in work like Bowie’s and National Collective.

Example of longer term engagement might be exemplified by an exhibition at Stills gallery in Aug to October 2014, The King’s Peace, intended to resonate with issues raised by ref. but not directly about the referendum and ‘The Shock of Victory’, which opened last week at the CCA, and which
considers ‘artistic approaches, techniques, provocations and motivations in a post-referendum reality’, considers the way that artistic practices were impacted by the ref. but is not directed only towards that moment.

For the archive, this is somewhat significant. As we are collecting the documentary record of the referendum (which, as we’ve just seen, is no small task), there is necessarily a focus on what can be clearly described as ‘part of the Scottish independence referendum’. (mention collecting priorities and integration within wider collecting strategy). In the quite necessary rush to collect what is immediate, digital, online (and undeniably important), there is, therefore an interesting dilemma. How do we allow for and predict the eventual significance of content that might have been produced in a less direct manner in a collecting environment necessarily (because of digital output) focussed on collecting in the present, almost as content is produced? While we may be able to practically keep up with the technological and cultural changes that the ref. are certainly a part of, in such a fast-changing collecting landscape there are inevitably more unknowns than knowns.

Slide 11 - For NLS there are various answers to such questions – most importantly, is that I work within a network of colleagues who engage with the collection of material from a much broader cultural landscape, including specialisms in political and literary manuscripts, printed material from Scottish communities and organisations, the arts and official publications. The issue then becomes one of discovery, of making accessible what we have through cataloguing and description, and working across different organisations (distributed collections – as we have with the ref.) to make findable and accessible what has been collected. Another answer is to promote self-archiving of digital as well as analogue material from within communities of practice (slide – activist archives), which is something I hope we will see more of in coming years. This could be anything from learning how to make your website more archivable to considering how your computer filing system might impact future preservation of your documents. (Activist Archives and National Archives).

Artists, of whatever kind, though they might affiliate with politics, are likely to also hold other, more broadly cultural, or more narrowly artistic, considerations when considering a political campaign such as the referendum. These ideals might at times be complimentary, but they might also at times come into conflict. One of the great strengths of the referendum was its diversity of voices, and skilful use of web platforms to provide spaces for these voices, connecting the digital with the physical world. For the archive, such structural complexity, both of groups and individuals, but also their affiliation or orientation towards the various campaign narratives - the internal structures of the referendum groups and individuals, if you will, provide a free flowing and constantly changing narrative which requires new approaches and a re-thinking of what, how and why we collect. What seems clear from the case of the Scottish Independence Referendum is that producers of content and those who would preserve it will be required to work more closely in the future, to preserve meaningful content from such vital and vibrant events, and to consider the importance of being responsive to events as they happen, as well as those which are more tangentially related. As the pace slows for this referendum at least, for the archive and for the many creative practitioners involved, the tempo has moved up a gear. Only time will tell in which ways such shifts in the production, dissemination and the subsequent collection of such work as that prompted by the referendum will continue to transform Scotland’s cultural landscape.
4.2 Digital local.doc

Application to undertake a two-week residency with Timespan Arts and Heritage Centre, Helmsdale.

**Digital local? : Where was the Scottish Independence referendum?**

The Scottish independence referendum raises significant issues for the collection of its documentary record. These are at times geographical, political and time-sensitive. Added to this, and cutting across all aspects of the referendum campaigns, is its significant digital aspect, visible via blogs, web sites and social media. Responding to the way that the campaigns developed, the referendum collection at the National Library of Scotland includes publications in print and digital format, analogue and born digital archives and records, moving image and sound, websites and social media streams. Situated in Edinburgh, NLS is arguably at times, oriented more towards the central belt than other regions of Scotland which also fall within its national remit. For practical reasons, places further from this region are traditionally harder to collect materials from. Digital materials, however, like websites and social media, do not at first sight pose this problem, as they are widely available across geographical boundaries. Despite this, physical distance can still pose a challenge to the attempt to build a comprehensive collection, even in digital archiving. The importance of the digital campaign, and in particular the extent to which it shaped and developed grass-roots campaigns, gains heightened significance when we consider that the preservation of digital technology is increasingly acknowledged to be of crucial significance to many major industries, not least the cultural sector.

From our own experiences we know that the referendum reverberated across Scotland, the rest of the UK and the international community, resulting in the highest Scottish election turnout in generations. Given this widespread engagement with the political moment, and noting in particular the part played by the web, it is pertinent to consider a geographical angle to the referendum experience. To what extent, for example, did the digital character of much of the referendum – social media presence for example, or blogs as ‘alternative media’ outlets, challenge established geographical centres, shifting the focus onto the peripheries, and particularly northwards? What challenges are faced by local archives in the context of the increasing volume and significance of born-digital material? Answers to these questions have a particular resonance with those involved in collecting the referendum. Here, the role of the internet and digital material more generally, is increasingly challenging traditional collecting models.

The two-week mini residency at Timespan would provide an invaluable opportunity to gain a greater understanding of these geographical and digital aspects of the referendum in the northern Scottish context. This experience would help to shape the NLS referendum collection northwards, and also to examine further the increasingly complex landscape of contemporary collecting, in its digital and hybrid forms. The residency would be approached as an exchange of ideas around the referendum as documentary experience. It would include engagement with the local community, discussion with individuals and organisations who documented the referendum, whether formally or informally, and the promotion of reflection on the personal and public nature of its document. It is likely that these experiences would lead to more structured discussions, opening a dialogue around the role of digital culture in relation to local experience.
Understanding gained from working closely with the Timespan community during the residency would add significantly to my proposed conference presentation. Indeed, if successful, my paper would be shaped by direct engagement with the community of Helmsdale, creating a relevant and timely contribution to True North. Conference engagement would likely take the form of structured reflection, presentation and discussion forums built around concerns identified during the previous weeks, exploring practical solutions to the questions of digital culture and geographical difference posed by the challenges of collecting the referendum.

4.3 AT 2015-03-23 Timespan Residency report.doc

Reflections on the above residency.

**Referendum Curator, True North conference presentation & mini-residency**

**Timespan Arts and Heritage Centre, Helmsdale, 23 February-8 March 2015**

The Scottish Independence Referendum raises significant issues for the collection of its documentary record, which are at times geographical, political and time-sensitive. A part of this, and cutting across all aspects of the referendum campaigns, is its significant digital aspect, visible via blogs, web sites and social media, and the vast geographical range of referendum campaign activity. The unique challenges posed by this landscape require a pro-active collecting approach and sensitivity to a wide range of issues which may be political, but also more broadly cultural. Referendum narratives, now common-place in the media, refer most often to the experiences of those within the urban centres, though this geographical perspective is rarely discussed beyond a commentary on which area (usually city) voted which way. In order to collect in a representative manner, understanding the wider cultural and technological landscape of the Scottish Independence Referendum is important.

For practical reasons, places further from the National Library of Scotland's geographical base in the central belt, but which still fall within its national remit, can be harder to collect from than those further away. Creating contacts in these areas, whether with other collecting organisations or campaign groups and individuals, usually have to be made by email, phone or letter rather than face-to-face. For such a significant and emotive event as the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum, which reverberated through communities across the breadth of Scotland and beyond, making personal contact with those who may have recorded aspects of the campaigns in their local area, or collected material, is of key importance.

Responding to these challenges, NLS Referendum curator sought an opportunity offered by Timespan Arts and Heritage to spend time in the north of Scotland as part of their established residency and conference programmes. This was a valuable chance to develop and reflect on the collection, with a particular focus on the northern Scottish context. A two-week residency culminated in participation at Timespan's vibrant True North conference, with the theme *Recording the past, present and future* and including a range of speakers from across Scotland and beyond. As well as promoting the work of the National Library of Scotland and *Collecting the*
Referendum to new audiences, the presence of the Referendum Curator at Timespan for this period provided important first-hand understanding of the complexities of the Scottish Independence Referendum outside of urban centres. In turn this experience prompted a greater awareness of how this geographical aspect might have had an impact upon the creation, and subsequent collecting, of referendum material.

While in residence at Timespan the Referendum Curator contacted a wide variety of collecting organisations, as well as groups and individuals involved in the referendum campaigns on either side of the debate. This resulted in a number of significant contacts with campaigners and collecting organisations from across the north of Scotland. These contacts include: Jo Clements, Timespan Archives Development Manager; David Worthington, University of the Highlands and Islands; Christine Gunn, Caithness Horizons; Elizabeth Richie, UHI; Sam Eccles, Touring Network; Women for Independence Moray, Jean Urquart, MSP; Helmsdale Knitting group; Helmsdale Local History Group; Timespan Heritage Committee; Helmsdale Library; Helmsdale Community Development Officer; Gordon Reid, Caithness Archives Centre; Golspie Heritage Centre; Brora Heritage Centre; Dornoch Community Centre; Stevan Lockhart, Digital Community Archivist, Assynt; Issie Macphail, Researcher and Archives Development; Alan Miller, Lecturer, School of Computer Science, University of St. Andrews; Lisa Collinson, University of St. Andrews; Claudia Zeiske, Deveron Arts, Huntly; Emma Woffenden, Northlands Glass, Lybster; Erin Catriona Fairley, School of Scottish Studies, Edinburgh.

As well as more formal conversations such as those outlined above, there were many informal chats with individuals who did not wish their names to be recorded. These conversations were often short, but at times could be very illuminating. What quickly became clear is that a project to collect the referendum prompts conversation about much broader issues relating to local, regional and national histories and the relationship of rural communities in the highlands with urban centres such as Edinburgh and Inverness. Dominant referendum narratives, as portrayed in the media, quickly required re-assessment in the light of being in a different, specifically rural, community. Indeed, increasingly it appeared that a number of key narratives that have emerged around the referendum campaigns, were often produced from within urban centres, and not entirely representative of smaller, rural and remote communities. Also important, and discovered through dialogue around the referendum project, was the potential for new collaborations with a range of collecting organisations. For example, the Referendum Curator developed a more in depth dialogue, resulting in short texts, with several key individuals, Jo Clements, David Worthington and Gordon Reid, in order to gain their differing but complementary perspectives on referendum collecting in the context of the Scottish highlands. Gordon Reid, Caithness Archives Centre, for example, wrote about the issue of how to approach short, informal discussions with campaigners as an archivist.

Many of the Referendum Curator's initial observations on the residency were encapsulated within a presentation, titled, Collecting the Referendum: thoughts on archiving and communities, given at the True North conference at Timespan. The Referendum Curator and Jo Clements, Timespan Archives Development Manager also held a workshop on issues around referendum collecting during the True North conference and an open to the public drop-in group. These events were well attended and provoked considerable dialogue on the complex issues related to collecting
the referendum as are outlined above. Below is a short outline of the presentation, made on 7 March 2015.

The presentation began with an introduction on the nature of the Referendum Curator’s involvement with Timespan, providing an overview of the Referendum Collection at NLS and key challenges in the collection of this material. A short discussion on the geographical aspect of the referendum collection ensued, highlighting the importance of being in a new place, a different environment, in order to address the challenge of collecting such an encompassing event, and to gain a greater understanding of the way that different kinds of communities engaged with the referendum. This discussion was contextualized with a description of the Scottish Government’s settlement classifications, and the idea of remoteness, before progressing with key issues emerging from the residency and how these observations, though anecdotal, begin to usefully complicate some dominant narratives of the referendum campaigns.

Discussed, were four related narratives; that the referendum campaigns galvanized communities to action; that campaign groups were part of communities, that particularly on the pro-independence side, this was a grass roots campaign; that there was a culture of recording referendum events, particularly large events; and that the internet, particularly blogs and social media, were transformative to the efficacy of the campaign. Each of these narratives was explored through examples taken from discussions with different groups and individuals. For example, it was discussed that the recording of public events, a crucial part of the urban referendum narrative, happened significantly less in smaller communities like Helmsdale. For example, Helmsdale held two well-attended public events before the referendum but the Referendum Curator was informed on several occasions that these were not recorded at all, because if they had been people would have been less likely to attend. This story was echoed in a number of conversations and stands in marked contrast to the way that events were recorded in the central belt, as is evidenced by the range of moving image material that is beginning to come into the collection.

The Referendum Curator was also told that while Referendum campaigns did provide a pointed focus for community activism, that these communities were often very active already, and that the referendum campaigns were not perhaps as transformative in some rural contexts as they have been seen to be in the cities. Also mentioned was that campaign groups were not always composed of people from local communities and that the idea of a grass roots campaign was complicated in the northern context by touring campaigners coming into communities to work with local populations. The importance of the internet to the referendum was also considered, and set against the reality of problems with access to the internet in many remote communities. With this in mind the digital storm that has characterized much discussion of the referendum may have had less of an impact in remote communities than in the urban centres. At the same time, while social media may still have played an important role, and despite the ability to see, or ‘follow’, individuals and groups from any location, it became clear that being in a place would give important local points of reference, and therefore a more representative snapshot of activity in a given area.

The paper concluded by stressing the importance of recognizing that there may be differences in the way that the referendum played out in different communities, and that these differences may
have important implications for the collection of referendum material. Future acquisitions for the referendum collection may include material from Women for Independence Moray and Yes Moray, Yes Inverness, some Better Together material, and photographs and moving image from various individuals. Having the chance to initiate these discussions through conversation as well as presentation and workshops was invaluable, and it is hard to predict the way that such contacts may produce new collaborations, projects and material for the *Collecting the Referendum* project at NLS.
Appendix 5 – Sample Acquisition Survey

- How would you describe yourself?
- How would you describe the records?
- How did you hear about the collecting project, and what led you to want to be involved?
- How were these documents created?
  - Were they created by an individual, an organisation, an informal group?
  - Were they created in the same time period or in relation to the same activity?
  - How did the documents come to be together? Where and how were they stored?
- How have the records been readied for transfer? Has anything been removed, rearranged, or added?
- Who do you imagine will be using these records in the future?
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