Historiographical Justice and the Conditions of Future Knowability in Community History Projects

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

Community history projects influence the conditions under which later investigators can encounter, interpret and contest accounts of a shared past. This paper develops a bounded account of historiographical justice around those prospective opportunities. It distinguishes the survival of a trace from discovery, permission, interpretive competence, warranted judgment and effective correction. A four-state coded-record example shows how a record and its interpretive convention can supply complementary information, and how preserving a present answer can leave a later question unresolved. These elementary results concern specified informational targets; they supply no independent obligation to retain everything. A separate normative argument connects affected interests, consequential project control, feasible alternatives and proportionate responsibilities. The discussion situates this proposal beside established accounts of historical production, archival care, epistemic injustice and professional preservation practice, including their existing attention to future communities. Five hypothetical project comparisons examine asymmetric recording, lost competence, restricted testimony, automated description and partial repair. Privacy, refusal, community disagreement and finite resources enter the argument as substantive considerations. The proposed contribution is a structured method for examining dependencies and assigning revisable responsibilities in community history projects. Empirical validation and the adequacy of particular allocations remain open.

Keywords: historiographical justice; community history; future knowability; archival care; interpretive access; preservation responsibilities

Research Purpose and Scope

This note states the purpose of circulation, the status of the argument, and the role of research assistance. The paper presents current insights for criticism and wider discussion in public and scholarly settings. It makes no claim to conceptual priority. Similar concepts and arguments may already exist in other disciplines, languages, and intellectual traditions; further comparison may alter the terminology, scope, or contribution.

Definitions organize a bounded inquiry. Conditional formal results carry their stated assumptions, and illustrative cases support conceptual analysis. Empirical validation, wider applicability, and the adequacy of proposed normative premises remain open where the main text identifies those obligations. Relational analysis supplies a method of investigation while stronger ontological questions remain suspended.

AI assistance contributed to source discovery and pre-use verification, argumentative development, formal checking, organization, and drafting. The accompanying project records distinguish retained research insights, newly proposed analysis, and verified literature. The manuscript is prepared for the author's review; circulation and submission decisions remain with the author. Critical responses concerning antecedents, assumptions, counterexamples, and alternative formulations are welcome.

DRAFT

1 Introduction

This paper examines prospective responsibilities in community history projects. Its objective is to clarify how present decisions about recording, preservation and interpretation can shape later opportunities to investigate a shared past. The discussion proceeds through working definitions, a bounded comparison with antecedent work, a small formal example, an explicit normative argument and hypothetical cases. The method combines conceptual distinctions with conditional reasoning; the hypothetical project comparisons identify questions for empirical investigation.

A community project can prepare an exhibition, assemble oral histories, preserve the records of an association, or document a shared place. Each activity leaves choices about the material that survives and the support available to its later users. A photograph may remain while the people able to identify its occasion become unavailable. A transcript may be searchable while the terms in which participants described their practices have been replaced by a catalogue's vocabulary. A participant may be included in a record while having little influence over the circumstances in which a sensitive account is circulated. These possibilities concern different relations between a historical activity and a later inquiry. Their practical significance becomes clearer when each relation receives an explicit description.

The paper uses *future knowability* for a supported possibility of responsible inquiry. The phrase names an opportunity whose exercise and success require further conditions. A preserved record can make an investigation possible while leaving its answer uncertain. A later investigator can have good reasons for revising an account while remaining unable to establish every detail of the event. The proposed concern therefore extends beyond the storage of determinate answers. It includes the resources through which a question can be formulated, a source can be evaluated and a defensible objection can receive consideration.

The normative question concerns the governance of these opportunities. Organizers may have the resources to document their own decisions while participants depend on voluntary time and fragile personal records. Custodians may control description and access. Funders may determine whether interpretation receives support alongside digitization. Such descriptions identify possible forms of influence. A judgment of injustice requires more: an affected interest, a defensible standard, a relevant comparison, evidence about the mechanism and an assessment of competing claims. The paper develops these connecting requirements so that a judgment about a wrong has an explicit basis beyond a description of unequal resources or selection.

The argument advances a limited position. Where a community history project foreseeably and materially shapes opportunities to investigate accounts concerning people, interests in epistemic participation, answerable historical authority and responsible correction can ground prospective responsibilities. The content and bearer of a responsibility depend on legitimate authority, effective means, proportionate burdens and the claims of other parties. A responsibility may concern a recording opportunity, contextual documentation, interpretive support, a review procedure, or a justified restriction. Its proper form remains connected to the particular obstacle and the feasible response.

This inquiry has substantial antecedents. Existing scholarship already examines power within historical production, relational responsibilities in archives and wrongs to people in epistemic practices. Professional guidance also connects preservation with access, consent and capacity. The present paper's contribution is consequently assessed through the clarity and usefulness of its conditional analysis. The verified antecedents already include prospective concern, and conceptual priority remains unclaimed. The literature comparison identifies both direct precedents and limits on the vocabulary adopted here.

The scope is deliberately specific. Community history projects provide a setting in which the production of future evidence and the interpretation of existing material often meet within an identifiable undertaking. The inquiry includes oral practices, material remains and embodied knowledge alongside documents. It leaves the applicable law, empirical prevalence of particular failures and the final allocation of public funding to further work. The recovered research materials preserve an initial proposal and selected insights; their missing conversational history remains unavailable. The argument presented here is a new, reviewable development of that retained material.

DRAFT

2 Scope and Working Definitions

This section establishes the objects and levels of assessment used throughout the paper. It first defines the project setting and the audience-relative character of future inquiry, then distinguishes historical opportunity from successful knowledge. It concludes by separating participants, communities and institutions so that later responsibility claims have identifiable bearers and subjects.

2.1 Community History Projects

The project definition provides a practical boundary for analysis. It identifies an organized undertaking and its historical objects while allowing variation in institutional form, medium and scale. The definition supports comparisons among concrete decisions without assuming that a community has a single historical perspective.

Definition 2.1 (Community history project)**.** A community history project is an organized undertaking that gathers, interprets, preserves or circulates accounts and materials concerning a named community, shared activity or historically connected group. Its scope includes its declared purposes, participants, custodial arrangements, resources and relevant period of operation.

An informal association can undertake such a project, as can a museum working with residents or a group preserving the history of a workshop. The definition concerns the undertaking's function. Representativeness, historical quality and community authorization require independent assessment. Those matters require evidence about participation, mandates, methods and the treatment of disagreement.

A community name may refer to a place, practice, organization, shared experience or contested identification. The relevant people can include current members, former participants, descendants, outsiders described in records and people whose connection is disputed. Their interests may diverge. A project should therefore specify the constituency relevant to each decision. Authority to lend a photograph, describe a ceremony, approve a personal interview and speak for an association can rest on different grounds. Combining these decisions under one community label can conceal the differences that a defensible arrangement needs to address.

2.2 Future Inquiry and Its Targets

The concept of future knowability specifies an opportunity for a particular inquiry. Its target, audience and horizon determine which resources are relevant. This indexing prevents the existence of a collection from serving as a general guarantee of historical accessibility.

Definition 2.2 (Future knowability)**.** For a specified historical target, audience and future horizon, future knowability is a supported possibility of responsible investigation through available evidence, usable interpretive resources and appropriate critical practices. The term leaves the eventual answer, exercise of the opportunity and success of the investigation open.

A target may concern what a participant said, what happened at an event, how a description acquired authority, or the range of interpretations an object can sustain. These questions can require different evidence. The fact that a record accurately preserves a statement establishes a condition for investigating that statement. The historical truth of its content remains an additional question. Similarly, permission to view an object differs from the ability to understand its use, evaluate its provenance or challenge a catalogue description.

The horizon matters because conditions can change. An interview may remain intelligible to its participants now while requiring contextual support for users several decades later. A temporary restriction may preserve a future opportunity while protecting a current interest. A refusal to record can close one evidential path while leaving other permissible forms of inquiry available. The concept describes these differences without presuming that every possible future question deserves support.

DRAFT

2.3 Knowledge, Standing and Contestability

This distinction locates the epistemic and institutional outcomes that a project might influence. It separates the quality of a conclusion from a person's opportunity to contribute to its assessment. The separation allows a project to improve participation while keeping evidential standards available for criticism.

Definition 2.3 (Corrective possibility)**.** A corrective possibility is an effectively available route through which a relevant person can introduce evidence, identify a reasoned objection, challenge a classification or request reconsideration by an appropriate recipient. Its exercise can lead to confirmation, qualification, revision or a reasoned rejection.

Corrective possibility includes more than the physical ability to submit a message. A usable route requires a recipient, an intelligible procedure and some connection between a warranted objection and the decision it concerns. The strength of that connection can vary. A catalogue annotation, an editorial correction and a change in access policy are distinct responses. A project should explain which response a procedure can authorize.

Historical warrant concerns the reasons supporting an account. Standing concerns a person's grounds for participating in a decision or demanding an answer. Expertise may support an interpretive judgment; affectedness may support a request for explanation; consent may control a particular use of testimony. These grounds can coexist without conferring identical powers. Acknowledging a participant's standing leaves room to reject an unsupported historical assertion. Conversely, a sound historical inference can coexist with an objectionable manner of collection or circulation.

3 Antecedents and Epistemic Commitments

This section situates the proposed analysis beside verified antecedents and clarifies the commitments retained from each comparison. It considers historical production, archival care, epistemic injustice and professional guidance. The purpose is to identify inherited insights and genuine differences of scope before assessing the present framework's usefulness.

3.1 Historical Production and Its Material Conditions

The comparison with historical production establishes a process-sensitive starting point. It also supplies a caution about diagrams that arrange sources, archives and narratives into a simple temporal sequence. The present paper uses stages to locate dependencies while preserving interaction among them.

In the first chapter of *Silencing the Past*, Trouillot distinguishes conceptual moments involving the production of sources, archives, narratives and retrospective significance. He treats these moments as overlapping and mutually implicated analytical devices. His discussion also emphasizes the constraints that material traces place on historical narratives. Power operates within the production of history and can matter before the final narrative is composed [4, pp. 26–30].

This precedent directly supports examining recording conditions alongside later interpretation. The paper's project-level vocabulary adds a practical task: identify the role, resource or decision through which a specified future opportunity changes. Its proposed sequence remains a tool for that task. The scope of a historical mechanism and the causal importance of each proposed connection require evidence beyond a process diagram.

3.2 Archival Care and Future Communities

The comparison with archival ethics identifies the closest normative antecedent. It concerns relationships among custodians and affected parties, including people whose connection to a record extends beyond direct use. This comparison limits the novelty that can be claimed for prospective responsibility.

Caswell and Cifor develop a feminist archival ethics of radical empathy around relationships with record creators, record subjects, users and wider communities. Their discussion explicitly includes future

DRAFT

generations and the consequences of present archival work for communities yet to come. Responsibility extends beyond the interests of donors and immediate researchers [1, pp. 33–41].

The present paper shares the attention to differentiated relationships and future consequences. It focuses on the inferential steps connecting a particular resource dependency to a limited responsibility. That focus may complement an ethics of care by making the object, mechanism, feasible response and counterclaims explicit. It leaves open whether this additional organization improves practice. A framework that merely relabels conclusions already reached through careful archival care would have a correspondingly modest contribution.

3.3 Epistemic Injustice and Resource Disadvantage

The comparison with epistemic injustice sets a boundary around the normative vocabulary. It distinguishes resource conditions from particular wrongs in epistemic relations. This boundary prevents an ordinary failure of preservation from acquiring a stronger moral classification through terminology alone.

Fricker's opening distinction separates distributive questions about epistemic goods from testimonial and hermeneutical wrongs to people in their capacity as knowers. Her account connects prejudicial credibility deficits with testimonial injustice and structurally prejudicial interpretive disadvantage with hermeneutical injustice [2, pp. 1–2].

A lost codebook can obstruct interpretation without satisfying either description. The loss could result from an unforeseeable accident, a justified refusal or a negligent custodial decision. Each explanation changes the relevant assessment. The proposed category of historiographical justice therefore remains a locally defined organizing term. Its application requires a defended norm and case-specific evidence. Where a Fricker-style wrong is alleged, the relevant prejudicial mechanism must be established separately.

3.4 Preservation and Oral-History Guidance

Professional and institutional guidance provides a practical comparison for the proposed responsibilities. The selected documents show that recording, preservation, competence and governed access already appear together in established normative practice. Their recommendations retain their own audiences and authority.

UNESCO's 2015 Recommendation connects documentary preservation with contextual material, capacity building and access. It recognizes early decisions about digital preservation and specified restrictions for privacy, safety, confidentiality and other legitimate reasons, including review arrangements [5, sections 1–3]. These provisions are normative guidance addressed to Member States. Their presence establishes an antecedent for the concern; it leaves implementation and local legal obligations to separate investigation.

The Oral History Association's 2018 principles and ethics statement connect interviewing with later preservation and use through participation, consent, risk-sensitive practice and narrator review where possible. They include options to clarify, restrict or decline public release [3]. The present paper follows the underlying distinction between preserving a possibility and making every account public. Its project-level applications remain proposals requiring attention to the particular agreement and circumstances.

Taken together, these comparisons establish a restrained epistemic position. Historical interpretation involves materially supported and socially organized practices; evidence and reasoning constrain what those practices warrant. Normative appraisal concerns how relevant opportunities and powers are governed. Neither a desirable social outcome nor an institution's approval independently establishes the truth of an account. The paper's formal example and ethical argument preserve these separate obligations.

4 Conditions of Later Inquiry

This section develops a description of the resources through which a later historical question becomes investigable. It distinguishes the existence of traces from the conditions of their use, then considers inter-

Table 1: Conditions relevant to a specified later historical inquiry. The distinctions guide investigation; project-level adequacy requires separate evidence.

Condition	Assessment target	Relevant evidence or comparison
Trace survival	The material available for the target	Inventory, condition and provenance
Discovery	Routes through which a user can locate it	Descriptions, search results and assistance
Permission	Authorized use by the specified audience	Agreements, restrictions and review routes
Practical access	Feasible encounter with the material	Time, format, equipment and support
Interpretation	Resources for understanding and criticism	Language, conventions, context and methods
Standing	Grounds for contribution or an answer	Roles, affected interests and mandates
Correction	Connection between warranted challenge and revision	Competent recipient, reasons and revision history

action among project activities and change across generations. The objective is to identify dependencies without turning a heterogeneous resource field into an unsupported numerical model.

4.1 Traces, Interpretation and Effective Access

The resource description begins with a specified inquiry and the people expected to undertake it. This starting point permits a comparison of relevant conditions while keeping institutional possession and practical availability distinct. Table 1 organizes the main distinctions and their corresponding evidence needs.

The historical resource field is denoted by C_t, with t identifying the period under consideration. The notation covers traces, languages, concepts, methods, education, material support and institutional arrangements. It is a schematic description whose components can differ in kind. The indexed expression $C_{g,t}$ refers to resources effectively available to a specified group or investigator g. The group index requires an explicit scope; variation within a group can warrant a more detailed description. Neither expression presupposes a common unit or a natural aggregate quantity.

A catalogue can increase discoverability while leaving permissions unchanged. A recording can be legally accessible while requiring equipment beyond a user's means. An experienced interpreter can understand a term while remaining unavailable during the relevant period. These differences matter because a future inquiry may require conditions jointly. In a hypothetical arrangement, the only suitable reader is available on Tuesday and the material can be consulted only on Thursday. Each resource exists, yet the proposed encounter lacks a compatible schedule. An assessment that counts available objects and qualified people separately would miss the joint condition.

Alternative routes also matter. A missing description can sometimes be supplied by another authenticated record, an independently justified interpretation or a consenting knowledge holder. The claim that a condition is necessary must specify the available alternatives and horizon. Without that boundary, the assessment can overstate the significance of a single institutional resource. Conversely, an imagined alternative provides little practical reassurance until its availability, relevance and permissible use have been established.

4.2 Interacting Activities and Feedback

The process description locates where opportunities can be shaped. It preserves the retained proposal's movement from experience through recording, survival, access, interpretation and historical claims, with later claims influencing subsequent recording. The discussion treats these as interacting activities and explicitly identifies the limits of the sequence.

A participant's experience can inform an interview; the project's questions and recording conditions

DRAFT

can affect what the interview contains. Preservation decisions then influence which traces remain available. Description, permission and competence affect their later use. A published account can subsequently alter the questions another project asks, the materials it values or the people it invites. These are possible dependencies. A specific case requires evidence connecting the relevant decisions and outcomes.

The sequence admits multiple entry points. Material remains can predate a project and acquire new interpretations through it. An oral practice can sustain understanding through repeated performance without first becoming a written record. A later objection can change the description of an existing object, stimulate a new interview and prompt reconsideration of an access agreement. Chronological order alone establishes none of these causal relations. The proposed analysis records both documented dependencies and unresolved mechanisms.

4.3 Interpretive Continuity and Regeneration

Interpretive continuity concerns the conditions under which later people can acquire or reconstruct a responsible understanding. It permits learning, translation and revision while distinguishing them from an unsupported recreation of missing history. The objective is to preserve useful possibilities without requiring an unchanged interpretive community.

Definition 4.1 (Interpretive continuity)**.** Interpretive continuity is the maintained or regenerable availability of resources sufficient for a specified interpretive task, under declared evidential standards, access conditions and limits. Continuity can involve transformed practices and newly trained interpreters.

A community project can preserve an explanation together with the object to which it refers. It can also support teaching through which another person becomes able to evaluate that explanation. These approaches differ in their dependence on particular people, materials and future institutions. A recording of a demonstration may retain relevant movements while losing aspects of tactile judgment. A written account may enable later criticism while omitting the social setting in which a term acquired its force. The assessment should specify the task each form can support and the uncertainties it leaves.

Regeneration acquires epistemic value through evidence and method. A plausible new story about an unfamiliar symbol may be useful as a hypothesis. Its plausibility establishes a candidate interpretation, while its historical correctness requires additional grounds. Preserving the distinction between a candidate and an established interpretation keeps the future inquiry open to correction. This distinction is particularly important when original participants or complete records are unavailable.

5 A Coded-Record Comparison

This section supplies a small formal comparison of record retention and interpretive support. It defines a four-state example, proves the informational consequences of several preservation choices and identifies the boundary between those consequences and historical warrant. The example illustrates target dependence and complementarity; its simplicity keeps the mathematics subordinate to the conceptual question.

5.1 Symbols, Domains and Assumptions

The construction represents a hypothetical record containing one binary token under one of two known possible conventions. Its purpose is to isolate the role of contextual information. The model stipulates its admissible situations explicitly, leaving empirical applicability to a separate inquiry.

Let $d \in \{0, 1\}$ be the retained token and $k \in \{0, 1\}$ the convention used in the original record. Convention $k = 0$ reads the token directly; convention $k = 1$ reverses its meaning. The admissible state space is $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^2$. The target $q(d, k)$ identifies which of two propositions the record asserts. Its definition is given in Equation 5.1.

DRAFT

Table 2: The complete hypothetical coded-record state space. Assertion labels concern the record's meaning; event truth remains an additional target.

Original token d	Convention k	Decoded assertion $q(d, k)$
0	0	0
0	1	1
1	0	1
1	1	0

$$q(d, k) = d \oplus k, \tag{5.1}$$

Here $\oplus$ denotes exclusive-or: the result is 1 exactly when its arguments differ. The assertion label is a formal object. Whether the asserted proposition accurately describes an event is outside the model. An authentic record can contain a mistaken assertion; determining its meaning and determining its truth remain different tasks.

Assumption 5.1 (Admissible coded records)**.** All four states in Ω remain possible before the retained information is consulted. The token and convention, when retained, are accurate. The later investigator knows the two-convention scheme and can apply Equation 5.1. Additional information about the original state is excluded from the comparison.

A preservation representation r is a function on Ω. Exact recovery of a target f from r means that a function h exists with $f = h \circ r$ on every admissible state. This definition concerns uniform correctness over the declared possibilities. It is stronger than obtaining a correct answer by chance in one actual case. The representations considered below retain d, retain k, retain the pair (d, k), or retain only the decoded assertion q.

5.2 Complementary Information

The first comparison tests whether a token or convention can individually determine the assertion. It then considers their combination. Table 2 displays the complete state space, making each step available for inspection.

Proposition 5.2 (Complementarity for assertion recovery)**.** *Under the stated assumptions, retaining either the token alone or the convention alone fails to support exact recovery of q. Retaining both supports exact recovery.*

Proof. First consider token-only retention. States $(0, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ produce the same retained token, namely 0. Equation 5.1 assigns their assertions different values. Any function of the retained token must return the same result for both states, so it cannot recover both assertions correctly. Next consider convention-only retention. States $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 0)$ share convention 0 and again have different assertions. The same argument applies. Finally, pair retention distinguishes every state in Ω. Applying the defining exclusive-or function to the retained pair returns q in each of the four cases. This constructs the required recovery function. □

The proposition expresses a limited form of complementarity. The token and convention together answer a question that each alone leaves unresolved. The relevance of a separate codebook depends on the historical object and its available alternatives. A more restricted state space could change the result. If the convention were independently known to be 0, token-only retention would suffice. A correct auxiliary source that establishes k can also change what becomes recoverable. Its value depends on evidential adequacy and effective access, not simply on its designation as context.

DRAFT

5.3 A Later Question about the Original Record

The second comparison holds the current assertion target fixed and then introduces a different question. It clarifies the distinction between retaining an answer and retaining the information from which other answers can be obtained. The result concerns a specified pair of targets; a general ranking of preservation policies would require additional criteria.

Proposition 5.3 (Target change after decoded retention)**.** *Retaining q supports exact recovery of the current assertion target. On the same state space, it fails to support exact recovery of the original token d.*

Proof. For the assertion target, the identity function applied to retained q returns the required answer. For the token target, compare states $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$. Both have decoded assertion 0, while their original tokens differ. Every function of retained q therefore returns one token value for both states. It must fail on at least one. This establishes the second statement without altering the admissible domain. □

A project might preserve a normalized interpretation while discarding the form of the original inscription. In the example, that choice preserves the present assertion perfectly. A later inquiry into the original token encounters a loss. The comparison shows why current interpretive success can coexist with reduced scope for another inquiry. It leaves the value of that later inquiry open. A project could reasonably prioritize the assertion under limited resources, provided that its description of what has been preserved remains accurate.

5.4 Historical and Normative Limits

The final distinction states the inferential boundary of the model. It identifies the premises that would be required to use the example in an actual project and the additional argument needed to justify a preservation responsibility.

Historical application requires a defensible target, an account of possible interpretations, evidence about the actual representation and a reason to believe that relevant alternatives have been captured. The binary construction offers an exact illustration with declared possibilities. Many real interpretations remain open-ended, contested or only partially formalizable. A model that excludes a plausible convention can falsely suggest a unique answer. The model's declared certainty must therefore remain separate from the warrant of its application.

The informational comparison also leaves ethical choice underdetermined. Retaining both coordinates may preserve more target distinctions while exposing information a participant has a legitimate reason to restrict. A later researcher may value a distinction whose preservation imposes excessive burdens now. The formal propositions identify consequences of specified representations. The next section supplies the independent premises through which some of those consequences can become reasons for action.

6 Normative Grounds of Prospective Responsibility

This section develops the ethical argument that the resource analysis requires. It identifies the interests at stake, states three proposed normative premises and derives a limited responsibility through explicit conditions. The discussion then distinguishes a reason for action from a final duty, keeping disagreement and competing claims visible.

6.1 Affected Interests and Temporal Reach

The interest analysis explains why future inquiry can matter to people before a particular controversy has formed. It considers present participants and possible future investigators separately. The objective is to defend a prospective concern without claiming advance knowledge of every future need.

DRAFT

People can have an interest in the manner in which accounts of their activities become available for later judgment. A participant may reasonably care that a future reader can distinguish a formal office from an informal contribution, or a recorded allegation from an established finding. This interest concerns the conditions of representation and assessment. Its significance can exist even when the eventual audience and exact dispute remain unknown.

Future people can also have interests in understanding the institutions, practices and inherited circumstances within which they act. Present decisions may affect the resources available for such inquiry. The existence of those interests supplies a reason to consider future opportunities; it leaves their strength and priority dependent on context. A minor curiosity, a consequential question about a person's treatment and an inquiry into a shared practice need not receive identical support.

These interests can conflict. Preserving a detailed account may aid future scrutiny while exposing a current participant. A community may value the continued availability of a practice while some knowledge holders prefer that particular material remain unrecorded. The argument therefore begins with a plural field of interests. Treating future inquiry as a valuable possibility allows comparison without turning the future investigator's convenience into an overriding entitlement.

6.2 Proposed Normative Premises

The following premises state the commitments that connect project decisions with ethical assessment. Each premise has a bounded role and remains available for philosophical criticism. Their combination supplies the ethical premises for an argument about fair governance.

Assumption 6.1 (Epistemic participation)**.** People have a morally relevant interest in fair opportunities to contribute evidence and reasoned interpretations concerning consequential accounts of their activities and circumstances. The appropriate opportunity depends on the decision, the person's relation to it and legitimate competing claims.

The justification begins with the consequences of historical representation for how people and their activities are understood. A person's relevant experience or evidence can be excluded through conditions unrelated to its quality. A fair opportunity protects against that avoidable exclusion while preserving assessment of the contribution itself. The premise supports access to a suitable process; it leaves the conclusion of that process answerable to evidence and reasons.

Assumption 6.2 (Answerability for consequential control)**.** An actor exercising consequential control over the historical representation of others has reason to make that control answerable to relevant affected interests through appropriate explanation, safeguards or review. The form and burden of answerability depend on the actor's role, authority and feasible alternatives.

The concern is practical dependence on decisions that others can make. An organizer can determine whether a category enters the catalogue, whether a recording opportunity is offered, or whether an objection reaches the editor. Answerability gives those decisions a relation to the interests they affect. It can involve professional explanation, participant review or another competent process. The premise leaves differentiated expertise and legitimate restrictions available.

Assumption 6.3 (Responsible correction)**.** Where a consequential historical account may require revision, maintaining a proportionate opportunity for evidence-based reconsideration has moral relevance. The opportunity should respect justified limits on collection, access and use.

Correction matters because current judgments can be incomplete or mistaken, while their consequences can persist. A route for reconsideration allows later evidence and better reasons to affect those judgments. The premise protects a capacity for responsible revision. The appropriate duration and grounds for reopening a matter require a case-specific assessment. Standards of relevance, evidence and competent review remain part of the opportunity being defended.

DRAFT

6.3 A Conditional Responsibility Argument

The derivation connects these premises with a specific project arrangement. It requires an effective relation between the proposed response and the interest at risk. The numbered steps identify the additional work needed before a general concern can support a particular responsibility.

Claim 6.4 (Prospective project responsibility)**.** Where the proposed normative premises apply, and a project has legitimate and effective means to protect a materially threatened opportunity for consequential historical inquiry at a proportionate cost, the relevant project role has a pro tanto reason to take a suitable protective or enabling response. A final duty depends on the remaining competing claims and the scope of that role.

Step 1: identify the interest. Specify the people, historical target and future opportunity at issue. Establish why the opportunity matters under at least one of the proposed premises. A generic appeal to preserving history leaves this task incomplete.

Step 2: establish the mechanism. Identify the project decision that foreseeably and materially affects that opportunity. Compare the current arrangement with a feasible alternative. Evidence should connect the decision to the relevant condition, such as a recording opportunity or a usable interpretive resource. Mere temporal sequence is insufficient for this connection.

Step 3: identify an effective response. Show how an available action can protect or improve the opportunity. A response aimed at a different condition may leave the problem intact. Digitizing a record, for example, changes one aspect of access while leaving an interpretive gap unresolved unless a further connection is supplied.

Step 4: locate a legitimate bearer. Identify a role with authority to take the action or coordinate its provision. A volunteer's authority and the scope of any personal obligation require grounds beyond knowledge of a problem. Organizational arrangements and resources may determine whether the response belongs to a custodian, organizer, funder or shared process.

Step 5: assess burdens and counterclaims. Examine privacy, refusal, safety, expertise, cultural restrictions and other responsibilities. Compare less burdensome alternatives that protect the same relevant interest. An action whose costs defeat its justification cannot be recovered merely by describing its informational benefits more strongly.

Step 6: state the limited conclusion. The preceding steps establish a reason for a specified response when their conditions hold. Record its object, bearer, horizon, review conditions and remaining conflicts. A final duty follows only after those conflicts have been assessed. This qualification identifies the work still required; it preserves the practical force of a supported reason while avoiding an unsupported universal demand.

7 Responsibilities across Project Roles

This section translates the conditional argument into role-specific questions for community history projects. It examines production, custody, description and correction, then considers coordination and discharge. The aim is to connect a proposed responsibility with an actor able and entitled to address the relevant condition.

7.1 Recording and Custodial Decisions

The distinction between recording and custody identifies responsibilities that arise at different points in a project's work. Some decisions determine whether a usable trace comes into existence; others concern material already entrusted to the project. Their grounds and feasible responses can differ substantially.

An organizer may control the invitation, language, timing and equipment through which participants can contribute. These choices can affect the range of accounts that later investigators encounter. A justified recording responsibility could involve offering a feasible opportunity to contribute, explaining its

DRAFT

purpose or supporting an accessible format. It leaves the participant's decision to speak and the eventual content of the account open. A project cannot obtain representative testimony simply by increasing its recording hours.

A custodian's position concerns material received under particular terms. Relevant responsibilities can include preserving its condition, documenting a known limitation, honoring an agreed restriction and explaining a foreseeable change of custody. Their content depends on the actual undertaking and the resources needed to perform it. A project that accepts a collection while lacking a feasible preservation arrangement should address that mismatch explicitly. Possible responses include a narrower commitment, a suitable partner or a supported transfer, subject to the legitimate interests involved.

Creation and custody can occur together. An interview project can shape the initial record while also determining its future home. Treating the final deposit as the beginning of responsibility would obscure earlier decisions that affected the material. The appropriate assessment traces the relevant undertaking through these activities while keeping each decision's authority and evidential basis clear.

7.2 Description and Interpretive Support

Description and interpretation concern the route from retained material to a usable historical object. Their responsibilities depend on the purposes of a description and the uncertainty it carries. A project can facilitate discovery while preserving room to evaluate or revise its categories.

A catalogue term can help users locate material, express an interpretation or reproduce language from a source. Those functions deserve explicit differentiation. A participant's term may be retained alongside an editorial description when that arrangement is feasible and justified. The project can explain who supplied each expression, what it is intended to do and how a proposed correction can be considered. Such documentation preserves a distinction between the historical source and the project's present organization of it.

Interpretive support can involve contextual notes, language assistance, equipment, teaching or access to a consenting knowledgeable person. The relevant form depends on the task. Supporting a person to interpret material may be more effective than adding another summary; in another setting, a concise contextual note may remove the principal obstacle. The proposed method selects among these possibilities through the mechanism and comparison established in the responsibility argument. The merits of human assistance and documentary supplementation depend on their functions in the specified arrangement.

7.3 Coordination, Review and Discharge

The allocation of responsibility often requires coordination across roles. This subsection identifies the conditions under which a shared response can become effective and the circumstances in which a bounded undertaking can be completed or revised. The objective is to avoid assigning every unmet need to the person nearest the material.

Where one role controls permission and another supplies interpretation, the needed support may depend on their cooperation. A project can specify a recipient for requests, the authority of that recipient and the route through which another role becomes involved. A nominal contact point has limited value when it lacks either competence or a connection to a decision-maker. Conversely, an effective review arrangement can be modest where the project and decision are modest.

Discharge requires a criterion connected to the responsibility. Providing an agreed contextual record may complete a bounded undertaking; making a collection generally visible may leave an agreed correction unresolved. A responsibility can also be revised through a legitimate agreement, a change in need or an effective reassignment under appropriate conditions. The duration of a personal obligation requires grounds beyond the persistence of a historical consequence. Continuing institutional answerability and the completion of an individual's role can coexist.

The allocation should remain revisable when evidence changes. A previously adequate description can become questionable, an access arrangement can become impractical, or a proposed support can

DRAFT

create an unforeseen burden. A review procedure provides a means to reconsider the response without assuming that every original decision was wrongful. It connects responsible maintenance with the changing conditions that make the project historically consequential.

8 Privacy, Refusal and Community Authority

This section considers the strongest counterclaims to expanding future inquiry. It examines privacy and refusal, differentiated access, and disagreement within a community. The discussion treats these considerations as part of a defensible project arrangement, with evidential opportunity and permissible use assessed together.

8.1 Refusal and the Scope of Preservation

Refusal concerns a person's participation in the production or use of a record. Its importance becomes visible when future informational value is separated from present entitlement to obtain the material. The analysis distinguishes an evidential loss from the moral assessment of the decision that occasions it.

A participant can have a legitimate reason to decline an interview or withhold a sensitive part of an account. The resulting absence may limit a later inquiry. That limitation describes a consequence; it leaves the refusal's legitimacy intact unless a separate argument establishes an overriding claim. A project should therefore avoid treating incomplete documentation as a defect to be remedied through persistent pressure on the person whose participation is sought.

Some alternatives may preserve a useful opportunity at a lower cost. A participant might permit an account with omitted names, a delayed release, a restricted audience or a contextual statement about the limits of the collection. Each option requires appropriate agreement and an honest description of its practical limits. A restriction on one copy cannot reliably promise control over every copy already circulated. The project should connect its undertaking to the means it actually possesses.

The existence of an alternative creates a possibility for consideration, not an obligation on the participant to accept it. Refusal may concern the act of recording itself, the relationship with the institution or the future uses that remain uncertain. A project can acknowledge that decision while documenting its own evidential limits in a permissible way. Even a statement that material is absent can reveal sensitive information, so the form of that documentation requires care.

8.2 Differentiated Access and Accountability

Access restrictions determine which audiences can undertake which inquiries under specified conditions. Their legitimacy depends on the grounds, scope and procedures that support them. The proposed framework examines both the protection they offer and the opportunities they constrain.

A protected account may remain available to a defined group while being inaccessible to a general audience. This arrangement can preserve meaningful inquiry within its permitted scope. Assessing it requires attention to who sets the boundary, whose interests it protects, the relevant risks and the route for reconsideration where appropriate. A single measure of public accessibility would obscure these features.

Professional or institutional review can help test a restriction's justification. It may also be inappropriate to require the disclosure of the protected material merely to explain why protection is needed. A proportionate procedure can distinguish a general account of the grounds from access to the sensitive content itself. The strength of the explanation, the competence of the reviewer and the rights of affected people remain substantive questions. Transparency has a purpose and an audience; it is not exhausted by unrestricted publication.

DRAFT

8.3 Internal Difference and Representative Authority

Community authority becomes difficult when members disagree about preservation or circulation. This subsection distinguishes collective decision arrangements from an assumption of unanimity. It considers how a project can respect an established relationship while retaining attention to people whose interests its representatives may overlook.

A spokesperson may have authority over an association's records while lacking authority over each member's personal testimony. A knowledgeable participant may offer an informed interpretation while having a contested mandate to authorize publication. These distinctions should be recorded at the level of the decision. Treating all forms of community involvement as equivalent can transfer powers without a sufficient basis.

A project can seek a route through which dissenting participants raise a relevant concern without being required to endorse the prevailing interpretation. The appropriate route depends on the stakes and the existing governance arrangement. Independent advice, a separate contribution or a confidential review may be suitable in some settings. Their value requires evidence that they address the actual obstacle and respect the legitimate claims of others.

Future knowability consequently has a plural audience structure. One group's access can coexist with another group's exclusion, and both can have reasons for their positions. The proposed normative argument requires those reasons to be examined. It supplies a method for exposing the conflict and identifying feasible responses, while leaving difficult judgments open where the available premises fail to settle them.

9 Hypothetical Project Comparisons

This section tests the proposed analysis through five hypothetical community history projects. Each case identifies a mechanism, a rival interpretation and a possible response whose justification remains conditional. The comparisons preserve the retained research examples while giving them explicit evidential and normative boundaries.

9.1 Asymmetric Recording Resources

The first case concerns the production of future evidence before a settled controversy exists. It compares support for an institution's own account with the opportunities available to informal participants. The objective is to distinguish recording asymmetry from a conclusion about the truth of either account.

Suppose an association funds detailed minutes and an official anniversary narrative. Informal participants are invited to contribute their experiences through an unpaid, technically demanding process during a short interval. The project plans to make every received contribution equally accessible. That future access policy leaves the earlier production conditions different. If those conditions materially deter relevant contributions, later users may encounter a collection shaped by the asymmetry.

The example supplies a hypothesis about opportunity formation. Evidence would be needed about the actual burden, participants' interests, available alternatives and the reasons for the arrangement. The official account could be accurate, and missing accounts could agree with it. A justified response might support an accessible contribution process or explain the collection's limits. The response aims to improve a relevant opportunity; it leaves the resulting testimony and its warrant open.

9.2 Preserved Objects and Lost Competence

The second case concerns a collection whose objects survive while the resources for interpreting them become fragile. It tests the distinction between object access and effective inquiry. The comparison includes the possibility that a later interpretation can be responsibly regenerated.

Suppose a project digitizes annotated diagrams of a local craft and publishes them online. Their notation was intelligible within a practice that has become difficult to access. A later user can obtain

DRAFT

every image but cannot determine the meaning of several marks. Additional image copies leave that obstacle unchanged. Contextual explanation, a consenting knowledgeable person or an independently justified reconstruction might supply relevant support.

The project should first establish the actual task and available alternatives. Some users may already possess the necessary competence; some marks may remain irrelevant to their questions. A claim of lost interpretability requires a specified target and evidence of the gap. Where the gap is consequential and a proportionate response is available, support for interpretation may have stronger justification than further duplication. The comparison permits new interpretations while requiring them to distinguish evidence from speculation.

9.3 Governed Testimony and Protected Participation

The third case concerns testimony whose value for future inquiry coexists with a legitimate restriction. It compares public visibility with a governed opportunity for use. The objective is to identify the role of consent and internal disagreement without presuming that either openness or restriction is always preferable.

Suppose participants agree to preserve interviews for a defined future community audience while restricting names and particular practices from general publication. The arrangement can retain meaningful historical possibilities within its scope. A public-access assessment that counts the interviews as wholly unavailable would miss those opportunities. A claim that the arrangement is fully just would also require more evidence about agreement, representation, dissent and practical enforcement.

If one participant contests a representative's decision about their own account, the project must identify the relevant authorization. A suitable response could separate personal testimony from collectively controlled material or provide a competent review route. The example supports a differentiated inquiry into powers and interests. Community decision powers and outsider claims require justification for the particular decision.

9.4 Automated Description and Category Change

The fourth case concerns an AI-assisted catalogue that normalizes unfamiliar expressions. It separates the proposed mechanism from an empirical finding about any system. The comparison identifies the evidence needed to determine whether an apparent improvement in discovery also changes interpretive possibilities.

Suppose a project uses an automated tool to replace several local terms with more familiar catalogue categories. Search becomes easier for some users. A participant raises concern that the replacement obscures distinctions important to the original practice. The relevant investigation should examine actual source terms, generated descriptions, retained versions, search behavior and examples of the allegedly lost distinction. A finding of erasure or improvement requires evidence about the actual transformation and its consequences.

Rival explanations include an already ambiguous source, an editorial decision made before automation, or a normalization that adds a useful access route while preserving the original terms. A proportionate response could retain source language, identify editorial additions and provide a correction process. Its adequacy depends on whether the arrangement preserves the distinctions relevant to justified inquiry and whether affected contributors can use it. Each condition requires evidence about the actual arrangement, beyond publicity about technological innovation.

9.5 Returned Copies and Interpretive Support

The fifth case concerns partial repair after a collection has become difficult for a community to use. It compares the return of copies with a broader response that also supports interpretation. The objective is to identify a meaningful improvement while preserving the limits of recovery.

DRAFT

Suppose a custodian provides a community with copies of its historical materials and funds a programme through which interested members can learn to interpret them. Some original objects and contextual knowledge remain irrecoverably lost. The response may restore a particular inquiry opportunity that was previously unavailable. Its value can be assessed through usable access, competence, appropriate permission and the questions participants can responsibly investigate.

The missing material remains missing. A successful teaching programme cannot retroactively recreate an undocumented conversation or authenticate an invented account. The response also requires assessment of its burdens, governance and continuity after initial funding. A defensible claim of partial repair identifies what improved, for whom and under which conditions, while retaining the unresolved losses and other claims.

10 Partial Repair and Continuing Conditions

This section develops the repair implications of the preceding cases. It distinguishes restored objects from restored opportunities, examines continuity after an initial intervention and states criteria for a bounded repair claim. The discussion keeps irrecoverable losses and remaining disagreements visible while explaining how a partial response can still matter.

10.1 Objects and Opportunities of Repair

Repair requires an identified target and a comparison with the condition it aims to improve. This subsection distinguishes several targets that can diverge within the same project. The distinction connects a response to its intended effect and prevents an institutional gesture from serving as evidence of success by itself.

A damaged record, an inaccessible collection, a missing interpretive resource and an ineffective correction route present different problems. Replacing a carrier can restore an object without changing access. Returning copies can change possession while leaving a language or equipment obstacle intact. Publishing an apology can acknowledge a wrong while leaving the relevant description unrevised. These responses may each have value, but their justification and success require a target-specific account.

The proposed framework treats repair as a relation among an identified problem, affected people, an intervention and a defensible improvement criterion. For an inquiry opportunity, the criterion could concern the availability of an evidentially adequate route to a specified question. For standing, it could concern a usable process through which a relevant person can seek an answer. These criteria remain different from the satisfaction of every affected interest or the truth of every resulting account.

Claim 10.1 (Meaningful partial repair)**.** Where a response permissibly restores a consequential inquiry opportunity that was previously unavailable, its failure to recover other lost opportunities alone does not defeat the claim that it achieves a meaningful partial repair. The value and sufficiency of the response remain subject to its burdens and outstanding claims.

The argument has four steps. First, identify the particular opportunity and defend its significance. Second, establish the prior obstacle and the response's effective relation to it. Third, show that the relevant conditions now permit the opportunity within its stated audience and horizon. Fourth, distinguish this supported improvement from unresolved losses. A claim of complete restoration would require a wider target and additional evidence. The limited conclusion follows from the specified improvement, not from a comparison with an imagined perfect archive.

10.2 Maintenance and Institutional Handover

Continuing conditions determine whether an initially restored opportunity remains usable. This subsection examines resources, custodial change and the scope of future undertakings. The objective is to connect the duration of an undertaking with the feasible arrangements needed to sustain it.

DRAFT

A teaching programme may depend on a particular instructor, venue or access agreement. A digital collection may depend on a maintained format and a responsible custodian. The repair assessment should identify the conditions material to its declared horizon and the arrangements for foreseeable changes. It need not predict every future disruption. It should explain which commitments have been undertaken and where uncertainty remains.

Handover introduces a further distinction between transfer of material and transfer of responsibility. A recipient may possess the files while lacking the resources, permission or competence needed for the agreed role. An effective reassignment requires an appropriate recipient and a feasible understanding of the undertaking. A project can also legitimately revise its scope when continuation becomes disproportionate, provided that the revision addresses relevant commitments and affected interests.

Maintenance can involve regeneration. New participants may acquire the necessary competence, revise a description or identify a better preservation method. Such changes can sustain an inquiry opportunity while altering the practice through which it is supported. The criterion remains connected to the target and the evidence, leaving historical reproduction and present adaptation distinct.

11 Objections and Revision Conditions

This section examines objections to the proposed framework's scope, normative force and practical contribution. It considers unavoidable selection, uncertain future interests, professional mediation and the possibility of theoretical redundancy. Each objection identifies conditions under which the argument should be narrowed, revised or set aside.

11.1 Selection and Finite Resources

The selection objection challenges any inference from a lost possibility to an unjust arrangement. It emphasizes the limits of recording, preservation and attention. A defensible response must distinguish the consequences of selection from the reasons that justify or criticize it.

Every project has a scope. Choosing one interview, object or period leaves other material outside it. A project may reasonably preserve a smaller collection well, honor a participant's refusal or allocate resources to a more consequential need. These possibilities defeat a universal requirement to maximize retained distinctions. The coded-record example demonstrates a difference between preservation choices, while the normative argument determines whether that difference has practical moral significance in a particular setting.

The framework remains useful only if it can distinguish justified selection from a problematic mechanism. A criticism should identify the relevant interest, feasible alternative and disproportionate or otherwise objectionable effect. Where those premises are unavailable, the result is an open question or an acknowledged limitation of the collection. The vocabulary of justice should reflect that status.

11.2 Uncertain Interests and Professional Judgment

The uncertainty objection concerns future questions and the expertise required to prepare for them. It asks whether an emphasis on participation can displace the professional judgment that makes preservation feasible. The response distinguishes revisable support for inquiry from advance control over its conclusions.

Future investigators may ask questions current participants cannot anticipate. This uncertainty can support preserving a diversity of relevant materials or documenting the basis of selection where feasible. It cannot establish a requirement to retain every possible resource. Decisions still require a comparison of costs, risks, likely significance and opportunities for revision. The framework offers a way to expose those judgments, not a formula that replaces them.

Professional mediation can supply valuable expertise in description, preservation and interpretation. Its presence is compatible with fair governance. The relevant question concerns the scope of authority, the

DRAFT

reasons for a decision and the treatment of affected interests. Participant control over a personal account, scholarly evaluation of evidence and custodial management of a collection can remain differentiated. A proposed participation arrangement that disables necessary expertise would need revision.

11.3 Contribution and Redundancy

The redundancy objection asks whether the proposed terminology adds anything to established archival ethics and historical practice. This objection is especially important because the verified antecedents already address relational responsibility and future communities. The paper's contribution must therefore be assessed through the work its distinctions perform.

A useful application should change at least one of three things: the diagnosis of an obstacle, the evidence required to assess it, or the response that can be justified. Distinguishing object access from compatible interpretive support can reveal an obstacle that another copy leaves intact. Distinguishing an assertion from its original form can identify a later question lost through normalization. Separating a recording opportunity from a public-release entitlement can support participation while respecting refusal.

These examples establish possible uses of the analysis. Comparative work may show that careful applications of existing approaches already produce the same results with greater economy. In that event, the paper's framework should be simplified or absorbed into those approaches. Its retention depends on explanatory and practical value, with conceptual priority left unclaimed.

12 Open Questions and Research Design

This section identifies unresolved theoretical and empirical questions and proposes ways to investigate them. It distinguishes dependency evidence, normative deliberation and intervention assessment. The purpose is to make further work testable and revisable without turning hypothetical examples into findings.

12.1 Dependency Evidence and Comparative Cases

Empirical inquiry should begin with a bounded project and a specified historical task. This subsection outlines evidence that could distinguish competing explanations for an obstructed inquiry. It keeps the presence of a resource separate from its causal contribution to a later outcome.

Open Problem 12.1 (Interpretive support and usable inquiry)**.** Under which project conditions does contextual documentation, language assistance or practice-based teaching materially change users' ability to undertake a specified historical inquiry, and which alternative resources explain the same improvement?

A study could trace a small set of historical questions through existing records, descriptions, access agreements and available support. It could compare the obstacles encountered by differently situated users, with their permission and an appropriate account of the study's burdens. Evidence should distinguish inability to locate material, inability to obtain it, interpretive uncertainty and a justified rejection of its evidential value. These outcomes can look similar in a general report of unsuccessful access while requiring different explanations.

The temporal mechanism also requires care. An improved interpretation following a workshop could reflect instruction, newly supplied evidence, prior competence or interaction among these conditions. A credible account should document the relevant changes and consider rival explanations. The study's findings would apply to the participants, tasks and arrangements investigated; broader causal claims would require further comparison.

DRAFT

12.2 Governance and Normative Deliberation

Normative inquiry concerns the interests and authority relevant to a project decision. It should identify disagreement, test feasible alternatives and establish the grounds of legitimacy beyond the occurrence of consultation. The following problem focuses on the distribution of powers within a community setting.

Open Problem 12.2 (Differentiated standing)**.** How should a community history project distinguish personal consent, collective mandate, interpretive expertise and affected standing when these grounds support conflicting claims about recording, description or use?

Research could examine a decision's actual authorization, the people affected, the available review process and the reasons offered for alternatives. Participant accounts can illuminate burdens and meanings that a project description omits. They remain evidence requiring interpretation, and participants can disagree. A defensible analysis should preserve that disagreement while explaining the norm used to reach a limited conclusion.

Future interests introduce an additional question about representation. A present actor may reasonably consider possible future users while lacking a mandate to speak for them. Revisable decisions, contextual documentation and multiple inquiry routes may help under appropriate conditions. Their justification requires comparison with privacy, resources and present commitments; the value of greater optionality depends on that assessment.

12.3 Repair Assessment and Preservation Limits

Repair research should assess a declared target over a relevant horizon. This subsection identifies the evidence needed to distinguish an announced intervention from an effective improvement. It also preserves the uncertainty surrounding materials and practices that cannot be reconstructed.

Open Problem 12.3 (Sustained partial repair)**.** Which combinations of returned materials, interpretive support and governance arrangements sustain a defensible inquiry opportunity after the initial intervention, and under which conditions should the undertaking be revised or concluded?

A study could examine actual access, task-relevant competence, appropriate permission and the functioning of correction routes before and after a response. Institutional publicity and participant satisfaction may provide relevant information while leaving the target outcome unsettled. The assessment should identify whose opportunity improved, the evidence of that improvement and the conditions on which it continues to depend.

The scope of irrecoverable loss deserves explicit treatment. Missing evidence may leave several interpretations open indefinitely. A responsible project can preserve that uncertainty, explain the limits of a reconstruction and support further inquiry where a new source becomes available. Its success should be assessed against the justified target it can pursue, with remaining losses explicitly recorded and reconstructed content accurately identified.

13 Conclusion

This section states the paper's bounded result and its remaining obligations. It brings together the resource distinctions, the formal comparison and the conditional responsibility argument. The resulting position concerns the governance of future inquiry in community history projects, with implementation and difficult normative conflicts left to further investigation.

Present project decisions can shape the conditions under which later people investigate a shared past. The relevant conditions include the production and survival of traces, discovery, permission, practical access, interpretation, standing and correction. Their relations can involve complementarity, alternatives and feedback. A project-level analysis should therefore identify the actual inquiry, audience and horizon before judging what has been preserved or made available.

DRAFT

The coded-record comparison establishes two elementary limits. A token and its convention can jointly determine an assertion that either alone leaves unresolved. Preserving the decoded assertion can answer the present question while losing a distinction required for a later inquiry into the original record. These results follow under a declared finite model. Their application to history requires evidence, and a preservation duty requires additional normative premises.

The normative argument adds the required premises. Affected interests in epistemic participation, answerable historical authority and responsible correction can support prospective responsibilities when a project has relevant control, legitimate means and proportionate alternatives. The resulting reason must be assigned to an appropriate role and assessed alongside privacy, refusal, expertise, cultural restrictions and competing obligations. A final duty requires that further judgment.

Established work already gives substantial attention to historical production, archival relationships and future communities. The proposed contribution is a scoped organization of dependencies and responsibility conditions. Its value lies in helping identify the evidence an assessment needs and the response capable of addressing a particular obstacle. The five hypothetical cases show possible uses of that organization while preserving their status as inference probes.

Meaningful partial repair can restore an opportunity without recovering every lost record or practice. Responsible preservation can also include a justified limit on collection or circulation. Both conclusions follow from treating future knowability as a supported and governed possibility of inquiry. Further work should test the framework against actual projects, rival explanations and the perspectives of people whose histories and future opportunities are at stake.

DRAFT

References

[1] Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor. From human rights to feminist ethics: Radical empathy in the archives. *Archivaria*, 81:23–43, 2016.

[2] Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

[3] Oral History Association. Principles and best practices, 2018. Adopted October 2018; selected 2018 principles and ethics statement consulted in the updated 2022 print compilation.

[4] Michel-Rolph Trouillot. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Beacon Press, 2015. Original text published 1995; selected pp. 26–30 consulted.

[5] UNESCO. Recommendation concerning the preservation of, and access to, documentary heritage including in digital form, 2015. Adopted 17 November 2015; official text consulted 14 September 2026.

DRAFT