

## **The Politics of Search: Archival Accountability in Aboriginal Australia**

Kimberly Christen  
Assistant Professor  
Washington State University  
kachristen@wsu.edu  
<http://www.kimberlychristen.com>

MIT5: Media in Transition 5 Conference  
Technological Translations and Digital Dilemmas Panel  
April 28, 2007

\*\* Draft copy please cite as a conference paper, work-in-progress, with the above title, date and location.

When Google emerged as an Internet giant in 2000, it was their ability to provide fast, relevant results to search queries that set them apart from their competitors. Their efficiency does not, however, explain their cultural significance or status. In 2006, Google was added to the Oxford English Dictionary as a verb meaning “to use the Google search engine to find information on the Internet.” Google—the verb, not the brand—names a set of practices not only related to the Internet’s information ecology, but also to an understanding of informational ownership, access, and distribution. In his book, *The Search: How Google and Its Rivals Rewrote the Rules of Business and Transformed Our Culture*, John Battelle chronicles the cultural rise of the seemingly mundane practice of “search.”

In the past few years, search has become a universally understood method of navigating our information universe: much as the Windows interface defined our interactions with the personal computer, *search defines our interactions with the Internet*. Put a search box in front of just about anyone, and he’ll know what to do with it. And the aggregate of all those searches, it turns out, is knowable: it constitutes the database of intensions (2005:4, my italics).

Search—entering queries into rectangular boxes online—constitutes not just the first point of entry for Internet users, but more importantly, for Battelle, a universally understood set of practices for accessing and aggregating human knowledge. In his scenario, search is significant, as a practice and business model, because it is defined by human intentions.

What are we creating, intention by single intention, when we tell the world what we want? Link by link, click by click, search is building possibly the most lasting, ponderous, and significant cultural artifact in the history of humankind: the Database of Intentions (2005:6).

Search queries as digital cultural artifacts. Sure. But Battelle's leap from that observation to the desirable, or even possible, creation of humankind's "database of intentions" needs some unpacking. As someone whose work teeters between the Humanities and Social Sciences, I am not prone to rely on statistics very often, but Battelle's celebration begs for at least a few sets of numbers to put humankind's production of the "database of intentions" into perspective. As of March 2007 between 14-16% of the world's population was online. Of those approximately 1.1 billion people, 2% from the Middle East, 3% are from Africa, 8% from Latin America, 21% from North America, 29% from Europe, and 36% from Asia ([www.internetstats.com](http://www.internetstats.com)). So while I do not doubt the very clear fact that there is a global Internet user population, all of whom, to some extent, use search functions like Google to find information and products online, it does not follow that those search queries amount to a digital representative of *humankind's* intentions. Battelle's wish for this to be so, however, does reveal the hope for such universal knowledge collections—a hope that has a long history.

Producing a “museum of mankind” was part of the logic of colonial exploration. The artifacts (and often times human beings) “collected” by explorers and others were curiosities to be sure. These objects, in fact, reinforced the public’s colonial curiosity in the metropolitan centers in which they were displayed. Like the museum of mankind before it, Battelle’s “database of intentions” relies on the ideal of search as discovery with the underlying arrogance of creating a viewable, open, dissectible repository of the world’s knowledge. Enhanced by digital technologies and the Internet’s open infrastructure, search engines like Google provide the mechanism for Battelle’s celebration. But this view of search continues the marginalization of indigenous populations for whom search has historically been connected with physical dispossession and theft. While search provides an apt metaphor for the commercial and archival dynamics on Web, it also eerily echoes the colonial quest for access to and ownership of indigenous lands, knowledge, and information systems.

Understanding search as a social-informational paradigm requires that divergent perspectives of knowledge acquisition, accessibility, distribution, and accountability be understood and contextualized in relation to this new social practice. The Internet’s default logic seems to be openness—search and you will find. The archive’s logic is preservation—seal and you may save. These default logics stem from the cultural and political communities who produced them and neither accounts for differently motivated searches and divergent knowledge systems. But how does one account for divergent systems of information

management, distribution, and access within the dynamics of search? What difference do indigenous systems make to a more complex understanding of the parameters of “search”? And how can indigenous knowledge systems help us rethink the dynamics of information distribution and archival accountability?

In this paper, I examine the production of an Aboriginal community digital archive in Central Australia to demonstrate its embedded critique of dominant information management paradigms and to highlight the possibilities for leveraging technologies to produce search models outside the Google-centric vision of Internet enthusiasts.<sup>1</sup> I begin with an overview of the information-commons discursive/technological field in which debates about search flourish. Then, I examine the role of archives in relation to both old and new models of search and cultural production. Finally, I demonstrate the search functionality of the Mukurtu Wumpurrani-kari archive as part of an Aboriginal system of accountability that exposes the limits of dominant search paradigms and intellectual property models.

### ***Information Freedom***

In the decade since John Perry Barlow famously declared that “information wants to be free” (1994:10) the dot com boom busted and utopic digital fantasies were replaced with both academic and popular concerns over those celebratory narratives.<sup>2</sup> Yet, the ideal of information freedom is still foundational to many digital discourses and productions (Bell 2001; Coombe and Herman 2004). In his “manifesto” on “critical information studies” (CIS)—an

interdisciplinary field with its roots in cultural studies—Siva Vaidhyathan argues that CIS scholars have a commitment to “semiotic democracy” and “positive liberty” in that they “respect an audience’s (or a citizenry’s) rights and abilities to manipulate, comment on, criticize, and play with the signs that their culture makes available.” This focus on liberty and democracy, he suggests, translates into “projects and experiments that facilitate access to and use of scholarship and information” (2006:304-05). Vaidhyathan focuses on a narrow aspect of technological/cultural debates in which information freedom upholds the right to re-mix, to “play” and to access “signs” that “their culture makes available.” The unstated privilege of the citizen-subject is presumed without acknowledging that the cultural reservoir from which these projects pull is inevitably a public domain replete with information/signs unhinged from the oppressive structures and regimes that defined them as “open.” The commons has never been open to all; in fact it has always relied on exclusions to maintain its appeal to the “public” (Berry and Moss 2005; Christen 2005; Coombe 2003; Chander and Sunder 2004; Seeger 2005).

Rhetorical appeals to freedom aimed at challenging stricter copyright laws through the popularization of re-mix and mash-ups certainly should not be dismissed as disingenuous and dangerous. Remix can be politically poignant and socially relevant. It can also hide the inequalities within the definition of the public domain and the information that populates it. The technologically inspired democracy gestured to in these appeals is limited by its failure to acknowledge the previous structural erasure of indigenous peoples whose knowledge was

defined as folklore/myth/legend and thus open for all (Boateng 2005; Seeger 2005). Critiquing this type of libertarian frame, Andrew Ross calls attention to those marginalized by and erased from these debates:

The crusade against IP monopolists continues to be dominated by strains of techno-libertarianism that lie at the doctrinal core of the 'information society,' obscuring the labor that built and maintains its foundations, highways, and routine production. The result? Voices proclaiming freedom in every direction, but justice in none." (2006:748)

Ross focuses on "below-the-line labor" in his analysis of the IP wars waged in relation to digital technologies, the public domain, and cultural products. Although he situates his critique within the United States and the global industries it seeks to control through the exportation of its own copyright system, Ross acknowledges that, "In non-Western societies where Anglo common law and the continental legal systems were colonial impositions, the property traditions that there codes honor are not always the best fit" (2006:761). In her discussion of the legal and discursive frameworks of intellectual property rights, Boatema Boateng demonstrates the inequitable power structures that define the assumed universal principles of IP rights:

The position of Third World nations has often been that their access to industrial property must be facilitated in order to achieve the technology transfer necessary for industrialization. On the other hand, much cultural production that Third World nations and indigenous peoples seek to protect is deemed by mainstream intellectual property law to reside in the public domain and therefore is legitimately open to exploitation by all and sundry. These positions are related to deep-seated differences over the terms by which the world's resources should be distributed. Rather than being absolute and universal, therefore, the basic premises of intellectual property law have emerged in a process of struggle between different positions and through the reiteration and reinforcement of those positions that win out in the process. (2005:65-66)

Boateng makes clear the linkages between notions of property, cultural production, and powerful states' rights often left out of discussions critiquing expanding intellectual property regimes from a pro-commons perspective.

Anthony Seeger puts the matter more bluntly: "We are faced with another case of cultural blindness" (2005:83). That is, for many indigenous communities in settler societies, the "information commons" is another colonial mash up where their cultural materials and knowledge remain separated from the social-property systems in which they were and continue to be produced. Ross reminds us that the materials within the public domain, as well as those owned privately by individuals or corporations, have long histories and often many claims to their production. Searching the information commons is sure to produce materials left out of the property assumptions and controls of both legal regimes and popular commons narratives.

The ideal of information freedom holds up the possibilities of search; it is the source code for the "database of intentions." For search to work, to bear fruit, there must be something to search and more importantly something to "discover" and "retrieve." In the temporary displacement of materiality conjured by the transfer of bits and bytes over the Internet, it is easy to downplay the linkages between the immateriality of information and the material, social, political and cultural systems from which it is produced and lived. The act of search, via engines like Google, further masks the situatedness of knowledge and its imbrication in the process of privileging one specific mode of access to and distribution of information over others.

Search, in these cases, facilitates the acquisition of information at the same time as it reinforces the discursive framing of information as bundles of immaterial knowledge waiting to be found, cataloged, dissected, and played with. Google is not shy about its claims for search. In their online mission statement they declare “Google's mission is to organize the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful” (<http://www.google.com/corporate/index.html>). Google cofounders, Larry Page and Sergey Brin, have made their goals clear. Page announced that, “Only a fraction of the world's information is indexed on our computers. We are continually working on new ways to index more.” While Brin links their mission to universalize and catalogue to a divine project: “The perfect search engine would be like the mind of God” (Ferguson 2005:2). Getting search right, making it functionally relevant to Internet users and businesses, in fact, is the next Internet frontier:

The search industry is the next place in which a vast architectural empire could be built. Some portions of the emerging search space are now occupied by Google, others by Microsoft, most by nobody. But in the end, there will probably be room for just one architecture (Ferguson 2005:3).

Search is a mode of information retrieval that powers business models on the one hand, and emergent creative cultural production on the other. This new search empire relies on algorithms that crawl and index the web's content, sift through the findings, and display relevant information. Like other indexing and cataloging systems, Google's algorithm is a biased technology. That is, it is not neutral. It makes choices based on the code that Google programmers write in order to produce results.<sup>3</sup> Search engines, and the algorithms that power them, leverage their invisibility to perform a type of information neutrality: we find what

you want; it's out there waiting to be found. The invisibility of powerful knowledge structures and institutions, did not, however, begin with the Internet.

### ***Archival Access and Cultural Property***

Archive: "from Gk. *ta arkheia* 'public records,' pl. of *arkheion* 'town hall,' from *arkhe* 'government,' lit. 'beginning, origin, first place,' from Gk. *arkhon* "ruler," prp. of *arkhein* "to rule," (Online Etymology Dictionary). The etymological roots of the term "archive" highlight the relationship between archives, state institutions, and public policies—they are places where government records are maintained and with those records the rule of law is given a history. Archives attempt to maintain the origins of nations through methodical paper trails. Archives are physical places where governmental order (power) is documented, held in trust, and collected in order to make the rule of law visible (Taylor 2003). The documents collected in the archive's stacks are not as ideologically significant as the walls themselves for reproducing the state's power.

National archives stand as physical testaments of the power of states to control lives, monitor communities, and define rights and liberties. The origins of modern archives are intimately linked to colonial logics of vanishing races and imperial projects of collection. Museums, libraries, and archives are institutions born from the desire of nations to claim and display their national treasures and emergent identities to themselves and to outsiders (Kratz and Karp 2006). Archives, particularly, worked to catalog national histories through indexing systems that allowed both access to documents and controlled those same

documents through cataloging standards. Critiques of the institutional marginalization of subaltern and indigenous communities from national arenas often used archival evidence as the lynchpin of their arguments. This type of romance with the archive in humanities scholarship—as a place to find the voices of the marginalized—often failed to recognize the continuing erasure of indigenous perspectives and histories (Freshwater 2003; Steedman 2002; Stoler 2002).<sup>4</sup>

As such, archives often engender ambivalent feelings amongst indigenous peoples who see them at once as testaments to the hyper-surveillance of their lives and marginal status in the nations in which they live, and at the same time, as potential sources for recovering lost histories, reconnecting with family members, and finding “evidence” of their legal claims to land and resources. Archives, then, represent one place where the documents of their attempted erasure remain, at least selectively, open. These repositories, however, have often been “largely inaccessible to indigenous owners” (Dyson et al 2007:xvi). Physical distances, educational and linguistic barriers, and poverty have all made archives unapproachable places for indigenous communities whose cultural materials and institutional histories are preserved within them.

But since the mid 1990s, museums, archives, and libraries in Australia (and other settler nations) have recognized the need to direct their energies towards outreach to the indigenous communities whose materials they hold. Many archives have signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with indigenous communities promising access and support in retrieving materials.

Some have gone further and have added indigenous protocols for access to gendered and sacred materials to their own organizational systems (Anderson and Koch 2004; Sullivan, Kelly, and Gordon 2003). Digital technologies have allowed archives to produce online databases and expand their physical catalogs with digital repositories. At the same time, archival mandates to preserve information intersect with the capabilities of digital technologies to distribute information over networks. In the context of “information freedom” rhetoric and appeals for “access to knowledge” archives have found themselves at the center of information management debates and strategies for new models for information indexing and distribution.

In his survey article, “Digital Technologies and Cultural Goods,” Kieran Healy argues that, “the explosion of online content has created something of a crisis amongst data librarians, archivists and curators” (2002:486-487). He sees two interrelated issues:

First, although people increasingly expect archival material to be available by digital means, it is not clear how to make this material available online easily and efficiently. Second, at least some material created solely for online consumption is worth keeping. It is not clear how best to select, categorize and store it. (2002:487)

While he does not state the concern explicitly, Healy’s focus on how to make material available online also begs the question, for whom is this material available and under what conditions has it been obtained, created, found, re-mixed, or “discovered”? Online repositories of cultural goods come with a set of expectations about access and openness. Healy suggests that with the popularity of services like Napster (and presumably iTunes), there has been a

shift from “the idea that access ought to be *free*” to the expectation “that it ought to be *complete*” (2002:490, his italics). In the online information/access culture, “as surfers moved from a stance of exploration to expectation, *search as a navigational metaphor* began to make more sense” (Battelle 2005:61, my italics). The technological capacity to index and archive web pages, rank them, and present them to Internet users redefined the expectations and the experience of Internet users. The dominant mode of interactivity with materials online was through “search” and what one found was assumed to be for the taking.

Expedient search functionality along with an emergent, and in some sectors and entrenched, remix-mash-up-Web 2.0-user-generated content-culture has produced the necessary social-technical field on which the most recent set of debates about cultural property, access, and ownership are being fought. On the one hand, there is a celebration of the information commons as a non-place where creativity, sharing, and revolution inspire people. On the other hand, there is a condemnation of this commons as a place populated by thieves and reckless anti-capitalists attempting to skirt the law. In this discursive field, debates over the accessibility of cultural materials and knowledge usually fall into a binary mantra where one is either a purchaser or a pirate, culture is either free or locked up. Outside of this narrow debate, though, many indigenous property systems disrupt these entrenched notions of property, ownership, and cultural production (Christen 2005; Leach 2005; Myers 2005; Seeger 2005).

The Warumungu system of accounting for the proper circulation routes for and production of cultural knowledge is a dynamic structure with two seemingly

fixed points: open and closed. That is, in English Warumungu people often refer to cultural materials and knowledge as either being open or closed. But this apparent dualism is not a rigid divide. Instead, it marks two nodes in a continuum of accountability where factors such as age, gender, ritual affiliation, and country-associations combine to produce variables of openness or closure. So, for example, an ancestral song series might be restricted based on gender, it may be for women only. Or, a ritual dance might involve a particular ancestral track that crosses through two distinct territories. Thus, rights to perform the song are negotiated by those who are related to those territories. Or an elder may pass away and their knowledge of a particular territory may be inaccessible to outsiders for some time.

The scenarios are endless. What is significant is that the relation between people, places, and ancestors continually combines with variable protocols to determine access, rights, and privileges. Human beings relationships to each other and to specific sets of knowledge and objects are continually redefined through their obligations to act, perform, and disseminate that knowledge to others and in relation to the countries to which they are related (Christen 2005; Myers 2005). This is a dynamic system that tacks back and forth between a fixed—but not static—set of criteria for the distribution, reproduction, and creation of knowledge in both its tangible and intangible forms.

It is this Warumungu property system that operates both within and against national and international intellectual property standards that demand originality and individual authors, as well as the open distributional logic of the

Web that does not distinguish between types of content or users. Up against the information libertarianism so prevalent in technology rhetoric and the increasing association of digital archives and online spaces as information frontiers, some indigenous communities are putting technology to use to re-code the parameters of information management and distribution and within their own communities. Unsure that legal mechanisms will help protect their cultural materials and knowledge, many communities are looking to extra legal solutions as one step towards articulating their own cultural-property systems.<sup>5</sup>

### ***A 'Safe Keeping Place'***

Late in 2006, I took the first demo of the digital community archive back to Tennant Creek to get community feedback. Armed with my MacBook Pro, I made the rounds to town camps, front porches, and Aboriginal organizations showing individuals and groups the archive. Near the end of my visit after discussions about the protocols, how people would gain access to the materials, and deliberations over what the archive should be called, Michael Jampin, a senior Warumungu man, discussed the name of the archive and its importance:

Mukurtu Wumpurrani-kari we named it. Mukurtu is that dilly bag. The way that Warumungu people use it, they used to have them old dilly bags. In them early days, old people keep their stuff in that bag and no one else was allowed to open it up or even to look to it. In those times, if people do that, they were cursed. Long, long time ago.

Now we have this archive, it's good. In every archive that you go to there's a lot of stuff that's in a safe place, in South Australia, Queensland. But this archive will be different, it will be here, it will be the safe place for man like me I can't see women's stories or even if she is my daughter or niece I'm not allowed to see, so it won't open up for me, because we have different passwords. That is very important to make it safe.

Jampin's emphasis on safety and access gestures to the set of Warumungu protocols that dictate human accountability towards the cultural materials and knowledge archived in the database. Permissions must be sought. Access is not total. There are consequences for breaching the protocols of the community. The dilly bag was one layer of protection against improper use or viewing of cultural materials. The owner of the bag, however, also had the responsibility to ensure that when the proper conditions had been met the knowledge associated with those objects would be transferred to others. The archive, like the dilly bag, is not meant to close off or hide knowledge. It is a material representation of a system of accountability in which many actors—human and non-human—contribute to the perpetuation of a dynamic cultural knowledge tradition.

For the Warumungu community the archive is just one part of several ongoing projects aimed at facilitating an awareness of their cultural systems. In 2003, the Nyinkka Nyunyu Art and Culture Centre opened in town. A three million dollar Aboriginal owned and operated venture, the Centre is at once a tourist attraction, museum for repatriated objects, and community center. Over the last few years the Centre has accumulated literally thousands of digital images—some returned from national museums, some from former missionary schoolteachers, and academics. As the digital objects piled up, the talk at the Centre turned to protection, preservation and the possibilities of enlisting digital technologies in both these projects.

The goal of creating a community archive, then, was to leverage the technological functionality of search, database retrieval, and interface design to create a system built from Warumungu protocols and knowledge systems. After lengthy consultation (over several years) between myself, community members, and two technical and design consultants, Chris Cooney and Craig Dietrich, we came up with a list of must haves for the archive: variable user access, community focused metadata so that the archive could be easily searchable by a number of variables, restricted content based on Warumungu protocols, and the ability to print, edit and or remix content for their own use.

The current prototype of the archive uses Warumungu cultural protocols as the basis for both cataloging the materials and for searching the database. In order to achieve this integration we needed a set of metadata that would tag each piece of content with the necessary information to properly manage access. In addition to standard archive metadata including a unique ID number for each piece of content, dates, names, places, all content is tagged with a set of restrictions relating to family relations, gender, and country affiliations. When content is uploaded a specific set of criteria must be considered: which families can see the image (a pull down menu allows families be added); is the content restricted to men only or women only; is the image restricted only to those related to specific countries (a pull down menu allows countries to be checked); is the image sacred and thus restricted to elders only; is anyone in the photo or video deceased; and finally is this content “open” to everyone? This time consuming, but necessary, process ensures a standard set of metadata attached to each

piece of content ensuring that cultural protocols around viewing, reproducing, and circulating information are upheld.

In order to filter search queries and generate content, all of the material held in the database has to be linked via the metadata to individual user profiles. Community members create a user profile the first time they log into the archive. Each person enters their name, nicknames, skin name, and gender before they choose a password. These are standard archival metadata. But following this, each individual connects to their larger kin networks: mother's family and father's family; to their countries, mother's country and father's country; and to their ancestral territories, mother's dreaming and father's dreaming. Finally each individual is assigned one of three status levels: community member, traditional owner, and elder—each status has associated levels of access to sacred materials, the ability to add content, and edit materials.

One's status (determined by the community archive administrator) combines with one's user profile to link one to the proper content in the archive and defines one's ability to add, edit, and tag content. For example, only elders can view and edit sacred material, but anyone can add tags to their own collections. Similarly, because men and women may not view the same ritual materials a person logged in as a man would not be able to view women's materials. Or a person logged in with the user profile attached to the "Flying Fox" ancestral country would not be able to view content from another family group's country. In a sense, each user views a personalized segment of the archive generated by the communities' own cultural terms.

Once a user has accessed the content (video, photos, audio, documents, and artifacts) they can do more than just view the item, they can also add comments and stories to any piece of content. This feature generates a dynamic and up-datable community dialogue about each item. In addition to the community generated content, individual users can also create their own “MyCollections” page to annotate, store, tag, customize, and if they wish print content related to themselves and their family.<sup>6</sup> This is an especially powerful tool to aid in reconstructing family and community histories disrupted by national policies of forced assimilation. This functionality also presumes that archival material—like all cultural material—is dynamic. Far from understanding the act of preservation through archival adaptations as a means of freezing of content, the social-technological framework for the Mukurtu Wumpurrani-kari archive assumes a fluid, ever-changing set of relationships to and with the content stored in its database. Preservation, in this case, is a type of cultural production.

The archive also has a public section where any user—Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal—can access any content that has been tagged as “open.” This “public” archive will (eventually) be available to visitors to the Nyinkka Nyunyu Art and Culture Centre as part of the educational function of the archive. Thus, the archive’s goal is not to “shut off” information, as is often thought in debates about “access to information.” To the contrary, the archive is an explicit articulation of an indigenous information management system, whereby knowledge is constantly updated and distributed within a system of accountability to people based on their status within the community (Christen 2005).

## ***Reframing Search***

The motivations of indigenous communities to maintain their own informational management systems should not be dismissed as technophobic, anti-modern, or separatist. Instead, technologists, Internet enthusiasts, and information freedom lobbyists should acknowledge the ways in which these systems demonstrate the inherent sociality of knowledge. These knowledge systems challenge the normalization of incentive based frameworks for cultural production by focusing instead on the social property relations that both produce and manage knowledge.

The Mukurtu Wumpurrani-kari Archive's emphasis on multiple protocols for user access to and accountability for the viewing, distribution, and creation of cultural materials and knowledge undoes the standard association of Internet search functionality with discovery and recovery. Far from Google's mission to "organize the world's information and make it universally accessible," the Warumungu community lays bare the tangible, material, and social relationships people have to knowledge and the cultural materials in which they are embodied.

Technology-centric debates concerning search tend to focus on functionality, usability, and the scalability of search engines. The proponents of this search framework and functionality are not, however, as concerned with the *politics of search*—the relationship between search functionality and the social structures and systems of accountability that privilege particular sets of knowledge over others and in doing so produce and reinforce specific material and social inequalities. The Mukurtu Wumpurrani-kari archive redefines search

as a deeply social and obligation-filled act framed by accountability in which social relations are enacted and engaged at multiple, dynamic levels. There is no arrogance of “discovering” something unhinged from a set of family, country, and community relations. Neutrality is neither assumed, nor desired. Instead search is fundamentally *an act of relationality*.

---

<sup>1</sup> I have worked with the Warumungu community in Tennant Creek in Australia’s Northern Territory for the last decade. Work on the archive has been underway since 2005. Funding for the archive comes from the Washington State University New Faculty Seed Grant. The archive is currently being developed with an August 2007 implementation date.

<sup>2</sup> In his overview of “cybercultures,” David Bell shows that “cyber-hype” despite its critiques by academics and mainstream sources alike, is still alive and well and fueling the erasure of the “material stories” that define the “realities of cyberspace” still embedded in inequitable social and economic structures (2001:18-20).

<sup>3</sup> Google’s algorithms are what drive their business (income generated by advertisements from their AdWords, as such the code is kept secret).

<sup>4</sup> Jacques Derrida’s *Archive Fever* (1996) is commonly associated with the deconstruction of the archive’s allure for historians (although as Steedman points out Michel Foucault had elaborated in the archives institutional power in the *Archeology of Knowledge* decades before Derrida took up the cause (2002: 2)).

<sup>5</sup> See generally Nakata and Langton (2007) for examples in Australia of these collaborations between archives and libraries and indigenous communities. See also Sullivan, Kelly and Gordon (2003) for examples of the approaches of museums in Australia towards more inclusive measures and protocols for dealing with Aboriginal materials.

<sup>6</sup> We are currently working on the “production” functionality for the archive. Warumungu community members wanted a space where they could put together content from the archive to produce their own DVDs, CDs, slideshows etc. This functionality is not part of the first iteration of the archive, but it is currently in development.

## References:

Anderson, Jane and Grace Koch. 2004. “The Politics of Context: Issues for Law, Researchers and the Creation of Databases” In *Researchers, Communities, Institutions, Sound Recordings*. Linda Barwick, Alan Marett and Jane Simpson, editors. Sydney: University of Sydney.

Barlow, John Perry. 1994. “Selling Wine Without Bottles: The Economy of Mind on the Global Net.” Electronic document available at: [http://www.eff.org/IP//idea\\_economy.article](http://www.eff.org/IP//idea_economy.article). Accessed December 2003.

---

Battelle, John. 2005. *The Search: How Google and Its Rivals Rewrote the Rules of Business and Transformed Our Culture*. New York: Penguin Group.

Bell, David. 2001. *An Introduction to Cybercultures*. London: Routledge.

Boateng, Boatema. 2005. "Square Pegs in Round Holes? Cultural Production, Intellectual Property Frameworks and Discourses of Power." In *CODE: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy*, 61-74. Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, editor. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chander, Anupam and Madhavi Sunder. 2004. "The Romance of the Public Domain." *California Law Review* 42: 1331-1374.

Dyson, Laural Evelyn, Max Hendriks and Stephen Grant, editors. 2007 *Information Technology And Indigenous People*. Sydney: Information Science Publishing.

Christen, Kimberly. 2005. "Gone Digital: Aboriginal Remix and the Cultural Commons." *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 12 (3): 315-345.

Coombe, Rosemary. 2003. "Fear, Hope and Longing for the Future of Authorship and a Revitalized Public Domain in Global Regimes of Intellectual Property." *De Paul Law Review* 52: 1171-1191.

Derrida, Jacques. 1996. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freashwater, Helen. 2003. "The Allure of the Archive." *Poetics Today* 24(4): 729-758.

Ferguson, Charles. 2005. "What's Next for Google?" *Technology Review*. Electronic Document available at: <http://www.technologyreview.com/Infotech/14065/>. Accessed January 2007.

Healy, Kieran. 2002. "Digital Technologies and Cultural Goods." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 10(4):478-500.

Kratz, Corinne and Ivan Karp. 2006. Introduction. In *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*. 1-31. Durham: Duke University Press.

Leach, James. 2005. Modes of Creativity and the Register of Ownership." In *CODE: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy*, 29-44. Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, editor. Cambridge: MIT Press.

---

Lessig, Lawrence. 2004. *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity*. New York: The Penguin Press.

Myers, Fred. 2005. "Some Properties of Culture and Persons." In *CODE: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy*, 45-60. Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, editor. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ross, Andrew. 2006. "Technology and Below-the-Line Labor in the Copyfight over Intellectual Property." *American Quarterly*. 743-766.

Seeger, Anthony. 2005. "Who Got Left out of the Property Grab Again: Oral Traditions, Indigenous Rights, and Valuable Old Knowledge." In *CODE: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy*, 75-84. Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, editor. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Steedman, Carolyn. 2002. *Dust: the Archive and Cultural History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Stoler, Ann. 2002. "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance." *Archival Science* 2(1-2): 87-109.

Sullivan, Tim, Lynda Kelly and Phil Gordon. 2003. Museums and Indigenous People in Australia: A Review of Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People. *Curator* 46 (2):208-227.

Taylor, Diana. 2003. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Vaidhyathan, Siva. 2001. *Copyrights and Copywrongs: the Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity*. New York: New York University Press.

----- 2006. "Critical Information Studies: A Bibliographic Manifesto." *Cultural Studies* 20(2-3): 292-315