

**Archives and the Archipelago:
The Influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* on Indonesian Archival Practices**

**Raistiwar Pratama
S1759000**

**Master Thesis – Submitted on August 29th 2017
Master in Archival Studies
Faculty of Humanities
University of Leiden
Thesis Supervisor: dr. Paul Brood**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

- A. Background
- B. Research Questions
- C. Previous Related Studies
- D. Methodology
- E. Structure

CHAPTER 1 UNDERSTANDING DUTCH ARCHIVISTIEK: THE MAIN RULES AND INFLUENCE OF *HANDLEIDING VOOR HET ORDENEN EN BESCHRIJVEN VAN ARCHIEVEN*

- A. The Manual and Its Main Rules
- B. The Manual and Its Influences

CHAPTER 2 THE COLONIAL AND NATIONAL ARCHIVAL POLICIES

- A. The Connection between *Algemeen Rijksarchief* and *Landsarchief*
- B. The Cooperation between the *Algemeen Rijksarchief/ Nationaal Archief* and the National Archives of Indonesia
- C. From Colonial Archives to National Memory

CHAPTER 3 DEFINING THE MAIN RULES OF THE MANUAL

- A. The Archive(s)
- B. Arrangement and Description
- C. Provenance and Original Order
- D. Indonesian Adapted Version of Dutch Manual

CHAPTER 4 IMPLEMENTING THE MAIN RULES OF THE MANUAL

- A. *Inventaris 's Landsarchief* and *Inventaris Hoge Regering*
- B. *Gewestelijke Archieven: Semarang* and *Java's Noordoostkust*
- C. Different Ways of Delivering the Rules

CONCLUSION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX: Indonesian Translation of *Handleiding voor het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven*

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The earliest codification of European archival tradition was compiled in *Handleiding voor Het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* or Manual for Arrangement and Description of Archives made by Samuel Muller, Johan Feith, and Robert Fruin, later known as the Dutch Manual (herein after the Manual).¹ The Manual marks the autonomy of archival science and separation from librarianship.² There are many writings discussing it but most of them only discuss the relationship with archival theory and methodology, and of course archival science. The Manual also marks the beginning of modern archiving and record-keeping within a global context.³ There are no other writings, except one well-known article written by Marjorie Rabe Barritt, concerning the influence on one certain region. She has written about the influence of the Manual and its core principles of archiving on American archival practice.⁴ Inspired by her article, this thesis aims to show how the Manual influences Indonesian archival practice from the period of the Netherlands East Indies to the recent development in the years since Indonesia's independence.⁵

The Manual has been translated and is available in many languages since its first publication in 1898, but there is still no Indonesian translation of it.⁶ Before the American-English translation was published in 1940, there were books mentioning the significance of

¹ *Handleiding voor het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* or—as translated by Arthur H. Leavitt and was published in 1940—*Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives, Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists* First published in 1898, it was partially revised in the second edition of 1920 and also revised in its German edition a few years before the second Dutch edition was revised. The three writers are known as the Dutch Trio. They are Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin. For the manuscript and draft versions, see Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, *Vereniging van Archivarissen in Nederland, nummer toegang 2.19.021, inventarisnummer 287*.

² Michel Duchein. “The History of European Archives and the Development of Archival Profession in Europe”, *American Archivist* Volume 55 1992: 14 – 25.

³ Eric Ketelaar, “Archival Theory and the Dutch Manual”, *Paper at the Annual Conference of the Society of American Archivists* (1995); Terry Cook, “What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift”, *Archivaria* 43 (1996): 17 – 63; John Ridener, “From Polders to Postmodernism: An Intellectual History of Archival Theory” (Master Thesis San Jose State University, 2007).

⁴ Marjorie Rabe Barritt, “Coming to America; Dutch *Archivistiek* and American Archival Practice”, in *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives: Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists*, eds Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin (Chicago: The Society of the American Archivists, 1993/ 2003): xxxv – xlx.

⁵ Raistiwar Pratama, “Mengenai *Dutch Manual*”, in: *Catatan Arsiparis: Rumah Ingatan Kearsipan Indonesia*, ed Nadia Fauziah Dwiandari (Jakarta: Ikatan Arsiparis Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2015): 39 – 48.

⁶ The Manual was first published in American-English in 1940 and then reissued twice afterwards, in 1968 and 2003. In the attachment of the thesis you will find the partial translation of the Manual.

the Manual.⁷ The Manual has influence worldwide, more than one hundred years after its first publication. In the Netherlands itself since its second and last edition of 1920, there has been no revised edition or complete new edition of the Manual to be published. In the first half of the twentieth century in the Netherlands East Indies, there was no need for the Manual to be translated into Malay due to the fact that the Indonesian who worked in *Landsarchief* had the ability to understand Dutch. Although there is no Indonesian (or Malay) translation, the influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* goes beyond the translation of the Manual, or in Barrit's words concerning its influence in the United States, "... the spread of ideas and theories can be subtle; they often do not wait for translation to begin to effect change". Arrangement and description are strongly related to provenance and original order. The last two are the main principles or rules explained in the Manual. The first twin pillars of archiving, arrangement and description, to use Terry Cook's phrase, are important not only in making inventories or finding aids but also to understand the original structure, function and historical context of the archives.⁸

As the *Archief-Ordonnantie* 1941 was applied in the Netherlands East Indies, the rules were explicitly stated. Years before, there was general instruction of archiving for *Landarchivaris* that was preceded by correspondence between *Vereniging Archivarissen in Nederland* (VAN), *Algemeen Rijksarchief* (ARA) and *Landsarchief*. One of its instructions was to use the Manual as guidance for archiving along with *A Manual on Archives Administration*'s Hilary Jenkinson. The instruction was partly released because of the letters sent by VAN, mostly written by Robert Fruin, in 1918.⁹ However after the independence of Indonesia, the principles remained unwritten until the second archival law in 2009 was signed. Since 2009 they are widely known, accepted and implemented among the Indonesian archivists and students of applied archival science.

Originally the two principles came from two different countries in Europe: *respect des fonds* from France and *registraturprinzip* from German.¹⁰ The Manual had its influence because it succeeded in codifying and combining the principles. To a certain extent the principles are typically Dutch even though there are two concepts, according to Horsman et.al., that are not typically Dutch. Those foreign concepts are "organic whole" and "natural

⁷ Theodore Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 2003): 173 – 8.

⁸ Cook, "What is Past": 21.

⁹ NL-HaNA, *Inventaris van het archief van F.J.R. Verhoeven [levensjaren 1905-1987], (1841) 1921 – 1987*, 2.21.281.04, 13, 46.

¹⁰ More about the history of the two principles in Europe, see Duchein, "The History of European Archives": 19. See also Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*: 173 – 8.

classification”. However, they stated that “... universal dimensions also have roots in typical Dutch situation...”.¹¹ According to Barrit, these three topics—provenance or *respect des fonds*, original order or *registraturprinzip*, and the Manual—are intertwined and were being taught at *Rijksarchiefschool* in The Hague. She refers the topics to Dutch *Archivistiek* (in 1988 she used the term *Archiefvistique*) based on her experience while she was studying there in 1985 – 1986. Arrangement and description were considered to be important for the courses. The theoretical foundation of the courses was built up from the Manual.¹²

The influence remained subtle in America until Arthur H. Leavitt wrote an American-English translation of the Manual in 1940. After this publication, it was possible to trace the influence in Indonesia because of the connection between ARA—the predecessor of *Nationaal Archief*—of the Netherlands and the *Landsarchief* of the Netherlands East Indies from 1893 to 1942. There were also several correspondences between *algemene rijksarchivaris* Robert Fruin, the governor general and *landsarchivaris* Frederik de Haan during 1922 – 1927.¹³ Due to the Japanese occupation in the archipelago from 1942 to 1945, the law never had an opportunity to be fully applied even after the return of the Netherlands to Indonesia from 1945 to 1949.¹⁴

In Indonesia the first archival law was signed in 1971. A few government regulations prior to the law had never been taken into consideration by the Indonesian government in dealing with archival management. In 2009, the second archival law was signed and archival management was considered to be important for administration and access of information. Archival cooperation between ARA/ NA and *Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia* (ANRI) since 1974 increased.¹⁵ Considering archival cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia after 1949, the end of 1960’s and mainly after 1974, this thesis aims to trace the influence of Dutch archival principles, which is often referred to as Dutch *Archivistiek* in Indonesian archival practice. The influence itself could be in a form of laws, regulations

¹¹ Peter Horsman, Eric Ketelaar and Theo Thomassen, “Introduction to the 2003 Reissue”, in *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives: Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists*, eds Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin (Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 1993/ 2003): xxxii – xxxiii.

¹² Barrit, “Coming to America”: xxxv; Barrit, “Archival Training in the Land of Muller, Feith, and Fruin: The Dutch National Archives School”, *American Archivist* Summer 1988: 338 – 9.

¹³ NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven 1921 – 1987*, 2.21.281.04, 1; NL-HaNA, *Koloniën Openbaar Verbaal 1901-1952*, 2.10.36.04, 2343; NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven 1921 – 1987*, 2.21.281.04, 46; Intan Lidwina, “Het Landsarchief, de plaats waar de herinnering aan het verleden ligt: The history of the Landsarchief in Indonesia 1892 – 1942” (Master Thesis Leiden University, 2012): 33, 68.

¹⁴ See footnote number 5.

¹⁵ M. G. H. A. de Graaff, *De eerste jaren van de samenwerking tussen de Nederlandse en Indonesische archiefdiensten: Verslagen 1974 – 1988 (2001)* (‘s Gravenhage: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 2013).

(national and local), standards, manuals, terminology, publication (journal and magazine), text books, articles and other collected writings.¹⁶

Nevertheless, Michel Duchein writes about the difficulties of implementing provenance and original order and the practical solution of overcoming the issues.¹⁷ The principles themselves are frequently quoted by Indonesian archivists, but in practice they tend to develop their own ideas concerning the principles and have differing opinions, even at times not fully committed to the principles. In Duchein's words, "... it is easier to state than to define and easier to define than to put into practice".¹⁸ In his view, the Manual and the principles are typically European, but the importance of the Manual is in the role of Dutch archivists in codifying the principles and making it available in a single and compact manual.

Although this thesis has stated its aims, there are three unavoidable limitations. First, the Manual was written when the only available archives were in paper-based form, so it focuses on how the laws and the standards deal with provenance and original order on paper-based archives. Second, in order to know the development of the twin rules within the Indonesian context, it focuses mainly on the simple understanding of provenance and original order. Third, the Manual was considered to be the codified version of Dutch *Archivistiek*, so it focuses on how the main principles of the Manual were transmitted to Indonesia in such a way as mirrored in the laws and the standards.

B. Research Questions

These are the main research questions concerning the topic. Each research question is related to each chapter. The four questions are as follows:

1. What are the main rules of the Manual?
2. What are the archival policies of the colonial and national government?
3. How does Dutch *Archivistiek* influence Indonesian archival practice in defining the main principles of the Manual?
4. How does Dutch *Archivistiek* influence Indonesian archival practice in preparing the inventories in the National Archives of Indonesia?

¹⁶ *Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, Kajian Arsip Statis Perguruan Tinggi* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2015); *Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, Kajian Fungsi Lembaga Kearsipan Daerah* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2015).

¹⁷ Michel Duchein. 1977/ 1983. "Theoretical Principles and Practical Problems of Respect de Fonds in Archival Science", *Archivaria* 16: 64 – 82.

¹⁸ Duchein, "Theoretical Principles": 64.

C. Previous Related Studies

There is a limited number of studies discussing the influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* and its main rules, as described in the Manual, on Indonesian archival practices. The existing studies discuss the history and the role of the (colonial and national) institutional archives since the region was named the Netherlands East Indies and subsequently Indonesia. Some of the studies mention provenance and original order, including their Dutch words, without making any reference to the original source itself: the Manual.

Mohammad Ali writes about the condition of the national institutional archives, contemporary archival situation, the absence of specific archival education and close relation between archival science and history from 1945 to 1970 in Indonesia. There are three main parts in his article: connection between archives and history, archival situation in Indonesia (*Kearsipan di Indonesia*) and other problems to be considered (*Masalah2 untuk dipertimbangkan*). The second and third parts are related to what is being discussed in this thesis. In his opinion, there were no significant meanings of archival matters in 1961 neither considering transfer of authority of *Arsip Nasional* (Arnas) from Ministry of Culture and Education to First Minister/ President nor implementing Presidential Section 19/ 1961 and Ministerial Decision 406/ 1961. He criticises the degrading condition of keeping archives properly and other administrative problems. In the third part, he describes four problems: archival institution, archival science, scientific role of Arnas and keeping archives properly in archival depots.¹⁹ Ali tends to overlook the important meaning of the principles. He does not mention the Manual and influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* at all.

Intan Lidwina in her writing focuses on the fifty year history of *Landsarchief* since 1892 until 1942, its personnel (*Landsarchivaris*, *Adjunct Landsarchivaris* and *Chartermeesteres*) and its connection with ARA. However she makes an interesting conclusion that goes beyond the period of her thesis about the role of ARA's successor, which is ANRI, by stating, "It seems that not many things changed since it became a government institution of the Indonesian government, except for the location. The archivists are still trying to make descriptions of the archives so that it can be accessed by the public.

¹⁹ Mohammad Ali, "Keadaan kearsipan di Indonesia dewasa ini serta akibatnja terhadap penelitian sedjarah dikelak-kemudian hari", Paper pada Seminar Sedjarah Nasional ke-2, 26 – 29 Agustus 1970 di Jogjakarta.

There are not many people who came to the ANRI except for the scholars and historians who are conducting their research. It seems that language still is an obstacle for many people who would make use of the archives as sources and also for the archivists who are trying to write descriptions of the archives.” This thesis will give a different point of view that opposes her conclusion that many tasks have been done by archivists of ANRI and their colleagues are only “to make descriptions of the archives”.²⁰ Her study is similar to an earlier study conducted by F. G. P. Jaquet and A. E. M. Ribberink. Jaquet and Ribberink describe the history of *Landsarchief* based on the roles played by each *Landsarchivaris*, from J. A. van der Chijs, F. de Haan, E. C. Godee Molsbergen and F. R. J. Verhoeven. The final chapter of their book gives only a very short description about the history of National Archives of Indonesia, *Arsip Negara* and *Arsip Nasional*. Yet again they focus on the roles played by its director-generals: Joan Maetsuyker, Soekanto, Mohammad Ali, Soemartini and Noerhadi Magetsari. It also gives limited information about the changing position of the institutional archives, since it was under the Ministry of Education (*Kementerian Pendidikan*), the Ministry of Teaching and Culture (*Kementerian Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Kebudayaan*), the Ministry of People Relation (*Hubungan dengan Rakyat [Hubra]*) until finally under the State Secretary (*Sekretariat Negara*). In their book they mention the archival law of 1971, cooperation with *archiefschool* in the Netherlands in the late 1960’s, establishment of national owned archives school in University of Indonesia and development of several regional archives in Indonesia.²¹ The two studies are all about the role of institutional archives but not about the transfer of knowledge of Dutch *Archivistiek*.

Continuing Lidwina, Michael Karabinos writes about the changing role of *Arnas*, the successor of *Landsarchief*, especially concerning the role played by the Director General Sumartini for twenty years since 1970 until 1990. The role of the institutional archives of Indonesia was in its transition to change when Sumartini was attending *Rijksarchiefschool* in The Hague for two years. Her attendance was part of the archival cooperation between ARA and Arnas that somehow also marked the changing political policy from Soekarno to Soeharto. An agreement was made between the Netherlands and Indonesia to exchange microfilms of shared histories in its first phase that concerned the Daily Journal (*Dagregister*) of the Netherlands East Indies Company (*Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie*). One part of the agreement was to provide opportunities for similar education as

²⁰ Intan Lidwina, “Het Landsarchief”.

²¹ F. G. P. Jaquet and A. E. M. Ribberink, *Van ‘s Lands Archief tot Arsip Nasional* (Den Haag: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1992).

Sumartini had for other archivists of Arnas.²² Some results of the agreement are compiled in the report of the archival cooperation 1974 – 1988 written by M. G. H. A. de Graaff. It focuses on the training of ANRI's civil servants and preparing inventories such as *Inventaris Residentie Archieven* and *Inventaris Arsip Perkebunan*.²³ In another article, Karabinos also reveals interesting information that there was also similar archival cooperation before 1970. The cooperation declared in 1948 through the effort made by *Stichting voor Culturele Samenwerking* (Sticusa) that Indonesia was part of it until 1955. During these years, Director General of National Archives of Malaysia and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco)-appointed overseer F. J. R. Verhoeven played an active role through his correspondence with Mohammad Ali as the Director General of Arnas before Sumartini concerning archives on Malacca and inventories made by Van der Chijs. Although it was a very limited cooperation due to Soekarno's Guided Democracy Policy (*Demokrasi Terpimpin*) and *Konfrontasi* with Malaysia, it opened the way to Sumartini to continue the archival cooperation. Ton Ribberink, the Director General of ARA, was the central figure on the Netherlands' side. Part of the cooperation was to return the original documents of the so-called *Djogdja Documenten* to ANRI that were gradually returned between 1975 and 1987.²⁴ Although the focus is on *Djogdja Documenten* and Migrated Archives, Karabinos writes in chapter four of his PhD thesis about the archival cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia and also the political situation surrounding the cooperation from 1955 until 1987.²⁵

Hein de Graaff describes in his book the development of archival practice in Indonesia since Sumartini joined the *Rijksarchiefschool* in 1967 and was followed by other archivists of the National Archives of Indonesia in 1974. The cooperation in archival education had been continued until 1988. The archival cooperation included the making of inventories, migrating of paper-based archives into microfilm format and arranging several

²² Michael Karabinos, "Returning to the Metropole: The Indonesian National Archives and Its Changing Roles at the Start of New Order", *Archives and Manuscript* Volume 39 Number 2 (2011): 139 – 50.

²³ M. G. H. A. de Graaff, *De eerste jaren van de samenwerking tussen de Nederlandse en Indonesische archiefdiensten: Verslagen 1974 – 1988 (2001)* ('s Gravenhage: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 2013).

²⁴ Michael Karabinos. "Displaced Archives, Displaced History: Recovering the Seized Archives of Indonesia", *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land en Volkenkunde* 169 (2013): 279 – 294; Michael Karabinos, "The Djogdja Documenten: The Dutch-Indonesian Relationship Following Independence through an Archival Lens", *Information and Culture: A Journal History* Volume 50 Number 3 (2015): 372 – 91; Michael Karabinos, "The Role of National Archives in the Creation of National Master Narratives in Southeast Asia", *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* Volume 2 Article 4 (2015): 1 – 8.

²⁵ Michael Joseph Karabinos, "The Shadow Continuum: Testing the Records Continuum Model through the Djogdja Documenten and the Migrated Archives" (PhD Thesis Leiden University, 2015): 70 – 90.

short courses on preservation. In this way he focuses on the cooperation between the two national institutional archives.²⁶

There were also three series of annual reports published by *Landsarchief* subsequently published in 1938, 1939 and 1940. The reports describe the involvement of professionals, some of whom were “Indonesian”, their professional activities (*werkzaamheden*), condition of the office, physical condition of the archival collection, the repository (*centraal archief-depot*), process of acquisition, visitors to the reading room and their consulted themes of the archives and other daily activities and news. These reports would help us to know the influence before the *Archief-Ordonnantie* 1941 was signed. In the part about professional activities, there are reports about making inventories of regional archives (*gewestelijke stukken*) such as Soerabaja and Semarang.²⁷

Meanwhile, Sulistyio Basuki writes about the significance of the Manual, in short sentences: “... the book that is written by the three Dutch archivists has an important meaning to archival practice in the world” and “The principle of archival arrangement is codified exactly by the three Netherlands’ archivists.”²⁸ Similar to Basuki, Syaui Hadiwardoyo and F. Yuniarti also argue that there was a close connection between the archivists of the Netherlands and Indonesian archivists. The principles of Dutch *Archivistiek* were adapted by the Indonesian archivists in the 1980’s in the way the Dutch archivists had dealt with their archives one century before. This was one result of the education of Indonesian archivists in the Netherlands.²⁹

In another text book, Anon Mirmani and Tumini mention the principles including their Dutch words without making any reference to the Manual itself. They also write the other five principles with its Dutch terms.³⁰ Similar to this, Azmi in several articles states that there are two principles of archiving: major (*utama*, Ind.) and minor (*alternatif*, Ind.) principles. He argues that provenance and original order are the main principles (*prinsip*

²⁶ De Graaff, *De eerste jaren*.

²⁷ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1938* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1939); *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1939* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1940) and *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1940* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1941).

²⁸ Sulistyio Basuki, 2007, *Pengantar Ilmu Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2007).

²⁹ Syaui Hadiwardoyo dan F. Yuniarti, *Sejarah Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2007).

³⁰ Anon Mirmani dan Tumini, *Deskripsi dan Penataan Arsip Statis* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2014/ 2007). The other five principles in Dutch are *bestemming*, *restauratie*, *functioneel*, *organisatie* and *pertinent*.

pokok, Ind.).³¹ These two studies define the key-terms related to archives and records similar to three archival terminology dictionaries that are published in Indonesia.³² Aside from these two studies, there are a few other writings of Noerhadi Magetsari, Banu Prabowo and Machmoed Effendhie.

These previous studies are not focusing on the dispersal of the Manual to the archipelago and the influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* as described in the Manual to Indonesian archival practice, especially the twin principles of provenance and original order. Furthermore, none of the studies are detailing the main rules and how the rules are understood, adapted and implemented by Indonesian archivists in the making of inventories from the collection of National Archives of Indonesia

D. Methodology

As it is indicated in the title, this part includes the research methodology of this thesis. This thesis will outline with more detail the archival, literature and field research to support the methodology. There are several collections of archives that provide information about the topic. Verhoeven's personal files, *Vereniging van Archivarissen in Nederland* (VAN), *Algemeen Rijksarchief* (ARA), *Nederlandse Ambassade te Indonesie* and verbal of *Ministerie van Kolonien* are important primary sources from 1930's to 1990's.

Literature research is conducted to gain information from articles, magazines, books, inventories, dictionaries, laws, rules and standards. There are several articles published in *het Nederlands Archievenblad* (NAB)/ *Archievenblad* which should be read to know the archival connection and archival cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia, both among the archivists and between the two national institutional archives, especially editions published in the 1920's, during the period of Robert Fruin, both as chairman of VAN and *Algemene Rijksarchivaris*, and in the 1970's when the archival cooperation between the two states was being revived. In order to know the influence during Indonesia's recent years, there are the

³¹ Azmi, *Deskripsi dan Penataan Arsip Statis* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2015). The minor principles are functional (fungsional), restoration (restorasi), organizational (organisasi), pertinent (masalah) and objectives (kegunaan).

³² Yayan Daryan dan Suhardi Hardi, *Terminologi Kearsipan Indonesia* (Bandung: Sigma Cipta Utama dan LP2A, 1998); Syauki Hadiwardoyo, *Terminologi Kearsipan Nasional* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2002); Sulistyio Basuki, *Kamus Istilah Kearsipan* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2005). The first two dictionaries are written by Indonesian archivists who work at Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia and heavily influenced by Dutch *Archivistiek*. The third dictionary is influenced by Anglo-Saxon. Basuki has his PhD from Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio, Amerika in 1984, and in 1995 received his professorship in Library and Informational Science from University of Indonesia.

two laws (Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1971 tentang Ketentuan-Ketentuan Pokok Kearsipan and Undang-Undang Nomor 43 Tahun 2009 tentang Kearsipan), the three standards (Keputusan Presiden Nomor 105 Tahun 2004, Peraturan Kepala Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 27 Tahun 2011 and Standar Deskripsi Arsip Statis 2015), inventories (published by ANRI and in cooperation with ARA/ NA), dictionary of terminology (written by Indonesian archivists) and text-books.

Field research has to be conducted in order to complement the archival and literature research. The field research itself takes place in several places in the Netherlands and Indonesia, including special collection *Universiteit Bibliotheek* of Leiden University, library and reading room of NA, *Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB) Nationaal Bibliotheek van Nederland*, library and reading room of ANRI, library of Open University (Universitas Terbuka), Archives of Open University, Archives of University of Indonesia, Archives of Bogor Agricultural University and Archives of Gadjah Mada University. There are also interviews with former participants of the *Rijksarchiefschool*, archivists, archival scholars and other prominent figures.

E. Structure

There will be four main chapters within this thesis. There is an introduction prior to the chapters. Chapter one describes the main rules of the Manual and the development of arrangement and description in the Netherlands and the influence—including the translations—outside the Netherlands. Chapter two describes archival connection and cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia.

Chapter three is based on main points of the Manual proposed by Horsman et.al.: The Archive, Arrangement, Original Order, Organic Whole, the Organization, the Archive (institutional archives) and Description.³³ Chapter three describes the influence of the Manual based on those points. There are some adjustments of the points to be adapted within the Indonesian context. First, the definition of the second (arrangement), fifth (the organization and the archive) and the six (description) points will be combined in a separate sub-chapter. Second, the definition of the third point (original order) will be explained in combination with provenance. Third, the definition of the fourth point (organic whole) and ‘fonds’ will be explained in relation with provenance and original order. Thus chapter three describes the

³³ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvii – xxiv.

definition of five basic concepts (the archives, arrangement, description, provenance and original order) in three sub-chapters. Its description is based on the two main laws (1971 and 2009), three standards (2004, 2011 and 2015) released by ANRI and writings. Chapter four analyses the implementation of the main rules of the Manual in preparing inventories in the collection of the National Archives of Indonesia. Finally, the thesis ends with the conclusion and an appendix of Indonesian translation of the Manual.

CHAPTER ONE
UNDERSTANDING DUTCH ARCHIVISTIEK:
THE MAIN RULES AND INFLUENCE OF
HANDLEIDING VOOR HET ORDENEN EN BESCHRIJVEN VAN ARCHIEVEN

In his famous essay commemorating one hundred years of the Manual, Terry Cook names arrangement and description as the first twin pillars of archiving. It was a few years before the second ones, appraisal and selection, came to surface for the first time in Britain because of increasing numbers of paper-based document rights after the First World War (1916 – 18). Schellenberg even mentions the Manual as “the bible for the archivist”. Many years afterwards, John Ridener makes the Manual as his starting point in discussing the development of archival theory. In a way he follows Eric Ketelaar who previously expressed a related conclusion between the Manual and the development of archival theory and methodology in Europe, although to some extent, according to Ketelaar at the same time the Manual blocks the development of archival theory to become archival science or *Archivistiek*.³⁴ According to Michel Duchein the two principles are not from the Netherlands. Duchein writes about provenance or *respect des fonds* in France that was defined in 1841 by Natalis de Wailly, historian cum archivist; and original order or *Strukturprinzip* in German that was defined in 1880 by archivists of the Royal Archives of Prussia. Duchein argues that the two principles the basis for archival science and the Manual itself marks the separation of the science from librarianship.³⁵

Theodore Schellenberg, Michel Duchein, Eric Ketelaar, Marjorie Rabe Barritt, Terry Cook, David O. Stephens and John Ridener are among the scholars who consider that the first page of archival theory and archival science are marked by the publication of the Manual in 1898. This chapter would like to introduce the main rules (according to Peter Horsman, sections, while according to Eric Ketelaar and Theo Thomassen are considered to be similar to principle or instruction) of the Manual among its 100 sections.³⁶ Not only mentioning their

³⁴ It is also written *Archivistique* in France. Marjorie Rabe Barritt uses the term *Archiefvistique*, see Barritt, The term itself is stated in the inventory of *Algemeen Rijksarchief* in series of archives belong to Th. H. F. van Riemsdijk, the fifth *Algemene Rijksarchivaris* (1887 – 1912). Ketelaar considers van Riemsdijk as the fourth member of the Dutch Trio. See, Eric Ketelaar, “Archival Theory and Dutch Manual”, *Archivaria* 41 (1995): 31.

³⁵ Duchein, “The History of European Archives”: 19; Duchein, “Theoretical Principles”: 66.

³⁶ It refers to the second Dutch edition of the Manual which published in 1920 and the third English edition of the Manual which published in 2003. Samuel Muller, Johan Feith en Robert Fruin, *Handleiding voor Het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* (Groningen: Erven B. van der Kamp, 1920); Samuel Muller, Johan Feith

comments, this chapter also provides general explanation about the development of arrangement and description in the nineteenth century and first years of the twentieth century in Europe, mainly in Germany, French and the Netherlands that later became known as the Dutch *Archivistiek*. This chapter briefly describes the influence on America and the translated version of the Manual in many languages.

A. The Manual and Its Main Rules

Before the Manual was published for the first time in 1898, there were two developmental phases of arrangement and description in the Netherlands: 1795 – 1873 and 1874 – 1898. In the first phase (1795 – 1873), the situation changed from legal-antiquarian interest into historical-antiquarian interest. At that time archives had become a collection of series of historical sources. Hendrik van Wijn, the first national archivist, was appointed in 1802, soon followed by other cities that appointed their own archivist. In 1795 the Batavian Republic replaced the Republic of the United Netherlands, and archives were collected on what belonged together within its own state or city. There was only one primary rule, to place the archives according to the governmental body, city, province or state; and not to mix them with the archives of other governmental bodies, provinces or state. Then a general inventory of the entire repository was made and compiled in chronological order.³⁷

In the second phase (1874 – 1898), Samuel Muller Fz and Theodore van Riemsdijk refused to arrange and describe the archives in accordance with archival practice of the first phase. Muller published his own principles of archiving in 1880 in the annual report of the city of Utrecht where he was appointed as city archivist. Five years later Van Riemsdijk made a conclusion about the registry of States General. They had something in common, that “... the systematic structure of the archives must be matched to the old classification”. The combination of diplomatics and history took into account the importance of original order.³⁸

and Robert Fruin, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003).

³⁷ Peter J. Horsman, F. C. J. Ketelaar and T. H. F. M. Thomassen, “Introduction to the 2003 Reissue” in Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003): v – vii.

³⁸ *ibid*: ix. During this period, there was also instruction of arrangement and description (*Regelen voor het ordenen en beschrijven*). One of the archives of *Algemeen Rijksarchief*, dated in December 1887, provides a hand-written draft of the instruction. It is similar to the Manual, not only because of the similarity of the titles, but also because it has four sections as does the Manual. Under the title “Practische werken ten opzichte van de ordening en inventarisering van archieven”, the sections comprise three main subjects that deal with the making of an inventory: Description and making inventory in general (*Ordering en inventarisering in het algemeen*), Making an inventory model (*Bewerking van een uitvoerigen Inventaris*), Making summary of an

Seven years before the publication of the Manual, archivists of the Netherlands agreed to form the first archivist organization in the world, namely the Association of Archivists in the Netherlands (*Vereniging van Archivarissen in Nederland* [VAN]). In 1892, its regular publication *het Nederlandsch Archievenblad* (NAB) was first published. The annual meeting of the association and NAB were held to facilitate debate and discussion among the archivists. Seerp Gratama, the state archivist of Drenthe, wrote about the principles of archiving in the first edition of NAB. The principles then were written in section 1, 15, 16, 50 and 66 of the Manual.³⁹

In 1894, a year after Muller was elected as president of VAN, the fifth general meeting of VAN was held to structure guidelines for the arrangement and description of Dutch archives and to appoint a commission. A year later the commission members, Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin held their first meeting in autumn 1895. The discussion was about two main topics: defining archival fonds and original order. Formulating prepositions and dividing chapters were the first order of business. For each chapter, Muller wrote the introductory section. Fruin wrote chapter 6 and half of chapters 1 and 5. Muller and Feith wrote chapters 2 and 4 together. Muller and Fruin wrote chapter 3. In numbers of section (*regel*, rules or principles), Fruin wrote 43 sections, Feith wrote 26 sections, Muller wrote 30 sections; Muller and Feith wrote section 65 together. Muller wrote the introduction and did the final editing. While most of the examples were chosen from the Utrecht archives, German and France manuals were referred to, and the concept of custody which is stated in section 36 was adopted from the English, and finally explicit reference was made to Ministerial Regulation of 1897 in sections 1, 53 and 70.⁴⁰

The draft version was completed in the sixth general assembly of VAN in Utrecht on July 3, 1897. Finally in May 1898, *Handleiding voor Het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* was officially published. The Manual was presented for comments and revisions that would be published in NAB. In 1905, the Dutch Trio made some revisions for the German, Italian and French editions that for unknown reasons were not included in the second Dutch edition of 1920. The first American- English edition of 1940 was based in general on the second Dutch edition. By 1938 the second edition had sold out but there was no new edition being published. For some years, the Manual was unnoticed.⁴¹ However in

inventory (*Bewerking van een sommaires Inventaris*) and Recent working plan (*Tegenwoordig Plan van Bewerking*). See, NL-HaNA, *Algemeen Rijksarchief (ARA)*, nummer toegang 2.14.03, inventaris nummer 656.

³⁹ NL-HaNA, Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland, 2.19.021, inv.nr. 2; *ibid.*: xii – xiii.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*: xiv – xv.

⁴¹ NL-HaNA, Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland, 2.19.021, inv.nr. 2; *ibid.*: xv – xvi.

1941, the first, and also the last, archival law was signed in the Netherlands East Indies. The *Archief-Ordonnantie* 1941 made the influence of the Manual explicit following previous Instructions for *Landsarchivaris* in 1930.⁴²

The Manual contains six chapters (*hoofdstuk*): The Origin and Composition of Archival Repositories (*Ontstaan en indeeling van archiefdepots*) from section 1 to 14, The Arrangement of Archival Documents (*Het sorteeren der archiefstukken*) from section 15 to 36, The Description of Archival Documents (*Het beschrijven der archiefstukken*) from section 37 to 49, The Drawing Up of the Inventory (*Het ineenzetten van den inventaris*) from section 50 to 69, Further Directions for the Description of the Archives (*Verdere beschrijvingsmaatregelen*) from section 70 to 83 and On the Conventional Use of Certain Terms and Signs (*Over het conventioneel gebruik van eenige termen en teekens*) from section 84 to 100. In total there are one hundred sections or rules (*regel*) within the Manual.⁴³

According to Horsman, Ketelaar and Thomassen, there are six main points of the Manual. Those same points to be discussed in this sub-chapter are the Archive, Arrangement, Original Order, Organic Whole, the Organization and the Archive and Description.⁴⁴ Communal historical archive concept was replaced by an administrative body or one of its officers (... *eenig bestuur of een zijner ambtenaren, ...*). The archive belongs to the administration not the community. Sections 1, 4, 5, 8 and 17 deal with the archive that is only “applicable to government archives and archives established by associations, foundations and companies, not to private ..., family ... and personal archives”. The whole of chapter one of the Manual deals with defining the archive.

Section 15 deals with the arrangement. An archive must be systemically arranged (*een archief moet systematisch worden ingedeeld*) and its natural classification has to be applied (*het systeem van indeeling moet worden gegrond op de oorspronkelijke organisatie van het archief, die in hoofdzaak overeenstemt met de inrichting van het bestuur, waarvan het afkomstig is*). The chronological register and the arrangement of archives according to the subject are no longer applicable. Sections 8 – 13 and 52 – 55 are also dealing with arrangement although not in chapter two. The term original order (*respect des fonds* or *herkomstbeginsel*) was to be included in 1908, ten years after the publication of the Manual. Not only the natural classification is to be respected but also the archive “internal structure”

⁴² NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, 13, 46.

⁴³ Muller et.al., *Handleiding*: 161; Muller et.al., *Manual*: 3.

⁴⁴ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvii – xxiv. Horsman et.al. and Leavitt translate ‘regel’ into ‘section’.

should be respected as well. Muller brought this concept from Ecole des Chartes in France when he was attending a lecture about *respect des fonds*.

Section 2 describes the foundation of the original order. An archive is an organic whole (*een archief is een organisch geheel*). Sections 16 and 20 make the definition even clearer, heavily influenced by Darwinism, “the metaphor used there of the series that form the skeleton of the archive fits seamlessly into the organic way of thinking”.

Section 16 also marks the importance of the functional approach of making inventory. This section according to the Dutch Trio is the most important section of the Manual. Sections 17, 18, 22 and 25 explain the concept further. It also explains more about what is stated by section 2. Each task of the department could be generated and forms the general function of the administration. Explanation about description receives less attention than arrangement in the Manual. Chapter three focuses on this issue. Section 37 defines that an inventory must provide an outline of the contents of the archive, not of the contents of the documents (... *een overzicht van den inhoud van het archief, niet van den inhoud van der stukken*). Chapter 4 further develops the concept. Each archive must be described within their logical relationship and matches with the original organization. Chapter 5 “... deals with the relationship between the inventory of an archive and the general inventory of the repository, the indices of the registers, the creation of the calendars and the publication of archival documents”. For the sake of uniformity of inventories, chapter 6 was made. Although the terms are still used in the recently published *Archief terminologie voor Nederland en Vlaanderen*, the sections within the Manual are only available for charters not maps.⁴⁵

According to W. J. Formsma and F. C. J. Ketelaar the principle of provenance (*herkomstbeginsel*) has two sides that are complementary: first, the principle of originality (*bestemmingsbeginsel*) and second, the principle of structure (*structuurbeginsel*). These two principles should be applied as much as possible before turning to other alternative principles. The inventory or primary finding aid should reflect the former structure of the organization and its functions.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ A. J. M. den Teuling, *Archief terminologie voor Nederland en Vlaanderen* (‘s Gravenhage: Stichting Archiefpublicaties, 2003): i.

⁴⁶ “Het herkomstbeginsel is dus tweeledig: het geeft in de eerste plaats aan dat de stuk behoort te blijven in, eventueel teruggebracht moet worden naar het archief, waartoe het oorspronkelijk behoorde (bestemmingsbeginsel), in de tweede plaats, dat de oorspronkelijke structuur van een archief niet mag worden verstoord, eventueel moet worden hersteld (structuurbeginsel)”. See, W. J. Formsma and F. C. J. Ketelaar, *Gids voor de Nederlandse Archieven* (Weesp: Fibula-Van Dishoeck, 1985): 68.

B. The Manual and Its Influences

Schellenberg considers the Dutch Manual as the “bible for the modern archivists”. According to him, the Dutch Trio succeeded in combining the provenance and original order from France and Prussia that had already existed before 1898.⁴⁷ Ketelaar considers the Manual as the first codification of archival theory and methodology. Ketelaar also states that the Manual is not only important for arranging and describing but also for appraising the value of records. However the standardization and codification of archival theory and methodology within the Manual, and to some extent professionalization of archivists, blocked the development of archival theory for a long time. Van Riemsdijk also states that seeking for modern functional archival science and “a functional interpretation of the context surrounding the creation of the documents in order to understand the integrity of the fonds and the function of the archives” should continue.⁴⁸

Barritt considers the Manual and Dutch *Archivistiek* in the same sense. The Manual is a codification of Dutch *Archivistiek* that succeeded in combining *respect des fonds* from the French and *registraturprinzip* from the Germans. According to her, every archivist should understand the importance of their influence. Without understanding the principles it is impossible to understand American archival practice. The influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* was already in America even before Arthur H. Leavitt finished making his English-American translation in 1940. This occurred because of the important roles played by Arnold J. F. van Leur and Waldo G. Leland. According to Barritt, the Manual is important because “... it attempted to impose standardization on archival practice from records management to the management of archival repositories, from the use of archival terms to the preparation of inventories”.⁴⁹

Cook marks the publication of the Manual as the starting point of archival thoughts and ideas. Since 1898, the modern archival principles had been defined, although many of its principles are out-dated but still the Manual “... is the first and foremost about arrangement and description”. Moreover in his opinion, “the importance of the Dutch *Manual* rests on its codification of European archival theory and its enunciation of a methodology for treating archives”. Without its publication it would have been impossible for Hilary Jenkinson and

⁴⁷ Theodore R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 1996): 173 – 8; see also Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvii, xxxii.

⁴⁸ Ketelaar, “Archival Theory”: 31, 37.

⁴⁹ Barritt, “Coming to America”: xxxv, xlix.

Schellenberg to publish their books.⁵⁰ David O. Stephens expressed a similar opinion about the Manual and its relationship with the records management in the Netherlands to this day. Eventually, experience of the Netherlands in dealing with archives and records management prepared them well to welcome the era of information management.⁵¹

Following Cook, Ridener also marks the Manual as the first page of archival theory. He argues that the publication of the Manual in 1898 is the first of four phases of archival theory. He considers the first phase as Consolidation. After Consolidation, the phases of Reinforcement, Modern and Questioning are considered. The influence goes beyond the interest of historians, primary users of archives, and legal experts. In Ridener's words, "Written during a time in which a scientific approach was ideal for both archivists and historians, the "principles" contained in the Manual strive to be objective and directive. While they were able to create refined archival practices, Muller, Feith and Fruin were also successful in creating a tension between objectively derived prescription and subjective practice".⁵²

In addition to its influence across the globe, there was also influence within the Netherlands. The first archival law (*de archiefwet*) signed in 1918 in the Netherlands was influenced by the Manual. It was impossible to understand the connection between the Manual and the law without prior understanding of the important role of the Association of Archivists in the Netherlands (*Vereniging van Archivarissen in de Nederlands [VAN]*). The association was established in 1891.⁵³ It was the first skilled-professionals association in the world. The association formed a special committee to make the draft version of the law in 1900. The members of the committee were S. Gratama (a judge in Rotterdam), J. E. Heeres (a professor in Delft), H. Fruin (a state archivist in Zeeland), J. C. Overvoorde, (a local archivist in Dordrecht) and A. Telting (an assistant-archivist at *Algemeen Rijksarchief*).⁵⁴ The draft was finished May 22, 1906 under the title "Ontwerp van wet tot regeling van het Nederlandsche archiefwezen".⁵⁵

⁵⁰ Cook, "What is Past", *Archivaria* 43 (1996): 17.

⁵¹ David O. Stephens, "Archives and Records Management in the Netherlands", *Information Management Journal* October Volume 3 Number 4 (1999): 64.

⁵² John Ridener, "From Polders to Postmodernism: An Intellectual History of Archival History" (Master Thesis San Jose State University, 2007): iv, 40.

⁵³ "Goegekeurd bij Koninklijk Besluit van 29 September 1891, (laatstelijk gewijzigd bij Koninklijk Besluit van 15 April 1920, no. 54)", NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland 1891 – 1960*, 2.19.021, 1. Later on its name has changed into Koninklijk Vereniging van Archivarissen in de Nederlands (KVAN).

⁵⁴ NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland 1891 – 1960*, 2.19.021, 2, 294.

⁵⁵ NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland 1891 – 1960*, 2.19.021, 26.

Twenty years after the Manual had been published, the law adopted some of its main rules.⁵⁶ Concepts of “communal historical archives” and “city archives” that had existed before 1898 were replaced by archives of administration such as “archieff van een bestuur”, “de archieven van besturen” and “provinciale en departementale besturen” in sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Manual. Furthermore, the first law defined these sections by making separate chapters of “de Rijks en de Provinciale archieven” (Kingdom and Provincial Archives), of “de Gemeentearchieven” (Municipal Archives) and of “de Archieven der Waterschappen, Veenschappen and Veenpolders” (Departemental Archives of Watering, Peat and Polders).⁵⁷ The previous sections of the Manual had been revised and incorporated into the law. The law considered archival fonds and creating agencies to be important for each administrator. In general, the law was concerned about the decentralization policy of archival management, whereas the Manual was concerned about the basic principles of archiving and guidelines to make an inventory or a primary finding aid.

Effort was made by the Dutch archivists to publish a revised edition after the second edition of the Manual was published in 1920, but the revised edition had already been published in Germany and France before 1920. Although some of the rules had been revised and published in its German and French editions, there were writings published after World War II that discussed the issue of revising the Manual. Fockema Andreae wanted to revise the Manual because the contemporary generation of archivists, the generation after the Dutch Trio, dealt with “modern administration” (*de moderne administratie*) not “provincial archives” (*provinciale archieven*) and also because these younger archivists were not members of VAN. Andreae argued that the Manual should be more like “a text book” (*een leerboek*), adjusting its archival terms and setting up its focus for administration and not only about making an inventory. There was also a complete revision for didactical purpose proposed by J. L. van der Gouw. He wanted the Manual to be as simple as possible for beginners, so they might learn through the process of using it. Similar to Andreae, J. P. W. A. Smit wanted to focus on the connection between the administrator and the archives to understand how the archives were to be used by the administrator.⁵⁸ These three archivists had given their ideas in contrast to the position made by the Dutch Trio.

⁵⁶ *Archiefwet, Staatsblad* 1918 Number 378. More about other related archival laws see, Robert Fruin. *De archiefwet 1918 Staatsblad No. 378 zooals zij is gewijzigd en aangevuld bij de wet van 14 mei 1928 (Staatsblad No. 177) met uitvoeringsvoorschriften* (Aplhen aan den Rijn: N. Samsom, 1929).

⁵⁷ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvii.

⁵⁸ Peter Horsman, “Eeuwige roem: De VAN en de archivistiek”, in: *Respect voor de oude orde: Honderdjaar vereniging van archivariissen in Nederland 1891 – 1991* ed Paul Brood (Hilversum: Stichting Archiefpublicaties, 1991): 73, 82 – 4.

According to Horsman et.al., the Manual itself is open for discussion and further development. It is not a problem to have initiatives to make the Manual more technical, simple and specific. In words of W. E. Goelema, “the importance of the Manual lies more in its functional handbook for the latter generation of archivists and less in its innovation” (*De kracht van de Handleiding lijkt veel meer te liggen in de handboekfunctie voor latere generaties archivariissen en minder op het innovatieve vlak*).⁵⁹ In Barritt’s interview with The General State Archivist A. E. M. Ribberink, Director of the National Archives School Peter Sigmond and Eric Ketelaar (former director of the school, former president of VAN and director of provincial archives of Groningen), she asked about the “absence” of the textual form of the revised edition of the Manual. For Ribberink, the most important rule in the Manual was the “natural order” that should be maintained, but he added that it is almost impossible to implement that section in dealing with modern records. Sigmond argued that the Manual should be revised, that guidance for the archivist be scrutinized. In Ketelaar’s opinion, if the Manual is changed, the course of the school should be changed as well. There would be much more specialization in the near future, for example an introduction to the machine readable records.⁶⁰ As the Dutch Trio have already stated in their introduction of the first publication of the Manual, “One would be greatly mistaken, however, to imagine that we wish now to place the sections of this manual like a heavy yoke on the shoulders of our colleagues. We shall not mind if there are deviations from them in certain details or even in essentials.... We ask of the critics much criticism”.⁶¹

The Manual has served as a foundation, but it is open for development, not only in the field of archival science but also in the applied standard for describing and especially for making an inventory. Chapter two describes the development of the rules in Indonesia since its colonial period, when it was Netherlands East Indies and now Indonesia.

⁵⁹ W. E. Goelema, “De Handleiding: nieuwlichterij of codificatie”, in: *Respect voor de oude orde: Honderdjaar vereniging van archivariissen in Nederland 1891 – 1991* ed Paul Brood (Hilversum: Stichting Archiefpublicaties, 1991): 72.

⁶⁰ Barritt, “Archival Training”: 337 – 43.

⁶¹ Muller et.al., “Handleiding”: iii – iv; Muller et.al., “Manual”: 9 – 10.

CHAPTER TWO

THE COLONIAL AND NATIONAL ARCHIVAL POLICIES

This chapter describes the archival policies in Indonesia and in the past when the archipelago was named the Netherlands East Indies. It focuses on the policies of the institutional archives (colonial and national) as described in the Instruction for the *Landsarchivaris* in 1930 and three subsequent archival laws (*Archief-Ordonnantie* in 1941, *Pokok-Pokok Kearsipan* in 1971 and *Kearsipan* in 2009). After the transfer of sovereignty at the close of 1949, the National Archives of Indonesia, with its various official names, became the successor of the (*Algemeen*) *Landsarchief*. These two institutional archives played an important role in making archival policies in the archipelago.

The chapter also describes the connection between the Minister of Colonies, ARA, the Association of Archivists in the Netherlands (VAN) and the *Landsarchief* during the colonial period. Robert Fruin played an active role in making connections to these institutions. He is one of the Dutch Trio whose served as *Rijksarchivaris*. Between 1970 and 1990, Soemartini was the leading figure from Indonesia and Ribberink was the leader from the Netherlands.

A. The Connection between *Algemeen Rijksarchief* and *Algemeen Landsarchief*

Along with appointing a *Landsarchivaris*, the *Algemeen Landsarchief*, the institutional archives in the Netherlands East Indies, was also established on January 28, 1892.⁶² Prior to the establishment, there were questions and doubts raised in the Netherlands. Despite all the doubts, mainly because of the budget, there was growing interest in the historical paper-based archives kept in the *Landsarchief* among politicians and the populace. It began with the publication of J. K. J. de Jonge's *De opkomst van het Nederlandsch gezag* in 1862 when he was the Deputy of Country Archivist of ARA and then became an honorary member of the Royal Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences (*Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*).⁶³ The decision to build the *Landsarchief* was made fourteen years before its establishment because the archives of *Groetboeken*, *Journalen* and *Memorialen van de VOC* were sent to the Netherlands in the years between 1862 and

⁶² Frans Rijndert Johan (F. R. J.) Verhoeven, *Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie 1892 – 1942* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1942): 1; Lidwina, "Het Landsarchief": 22. See also *Staatsblad* 1892 Number 34.

⁶³ Lidwina, "Het Landsarchief": 55.

1878. These archives had been examined since 1860 by H. D. Levysohn and Jacob Anne (J. A.) van der Chijs. The sending of these archives stopped because the repository of ARA was overloaded. A member of *Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* and Governor General J. W. van den Langsberge had the idea to keep the archives in the Netherlands East Indies and so the copies of the archives were sent to the Netherlands.⁶⁴

Wolter Robert (W. R.) Baron van Hoëvell was a decisive figure in building up the colonial institutional archives. He was a former historian in the Netherlands East Indies who later became a member of the Lower Parliament (*Tweede Kamer*) of the Netherlands and a member of State Council (*Raad van State*) in the Netherlands East Indies (1849 – 79).⁶⁵ In 1854, he proposed that preservation and supervision of these archives should be taken into account by a professional archivist. Another concern was the tropical climate that threatened the physical condition of these paper-based archives.⁶⁶ Although the *Landsarchief* had been established in 1892, there was no proper repository to keep the archives. Since 1892 the repository was moved from one place to another, from *Westpakuizen*, to a building that belonged to *Harmonie Societeit*, then to a building owned by Reiner de Klerk in Molenvliet (today's Jalan Gadjah Mada Jakarta), to *Buitenzorg* (now Bogor) at the end of the 1940's and since the 1970's to Jalan Ampera Raya southern Jakarta.⁶⁷ Due to its volume and the limited space at the repository of the *Landsarchief*, some of these archives were then transferred to *Pasar Ikan* in 1940.⁶⁸

Frans Rijdert Johan (F. R. J.) Verhoeven was the *Landsarchivaris* in 1930 who considered the professional importance of archivist and theoretical consideration of archival science in the Netherlands East Indies. Under his leadership, *Landsarchief* succeeded in publishing three series of *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indië* from 1938 to 1940. In his personal files there is a draft of the professional tasks of an archivist. At that time there were no other archivists except the *Landsarchivaris*. The *Landsarchivaris* had several assistants but they were not considered to be equal in professional skill with the

⁶⁴ Sumartini, "Sumber Belanda dalam Arsip Nasional: Pemeliharaan dan Penggunaan", *Kongres Studi Belanda di Indonesia* 23 – 27 Desember 1987: 8 – 9.

⁶⁵ Sumartini, "Sumber Belanda": 8; http://www.parlement.com/id/vg09II1qeht1/w_r_baron_van_hoevell, accessed on March 7th 2017.

⁶⁶ Sumartini, "Sumber Belanda": 8; Lidwina: 2, 23 – 4, 52.

⁶⁷ Lidwina: 2, 22 – 3.

⁶⁸ It should be temporary but it lasts for more than thirty years. In 1975 the archives were then being moved to a place named Pasar Ikan Jakarta, see Sumartini, "Sumber Belanda": 11.

archivist. According to the draft version of a document which belongs to *Algemene Secretarie*, the tasks are as follows:⁶⁹

1. ... is required to always be present at the *Landsarchief*, He is to supervise the other staff during office hours, during which all *Landsarchief* staff are required to use their time working on their tasks.
2. ... is to consult with the *Commissie van Toezicht op het Landsarchief* concerning drafts or work plans in the *Landsarchief*, including the job descriptions of his staff. Any tasks, with few exceptions, which are not included in their job descriptions or an activity to be completed outside office hours, are permitted at the discretion of the *Commissie van Toezicht op het Landsarchief*.
3. ... delivers a financial accountability report to the *Algemene Secretarie* regarding the *Landsarchief's* annual spending of the state budget. The *Landsarchivaris* has to use the budget efficiently and follow the national treasury's regulations.
4. ... has to make a monthly written statement to the *Commissie van Toezicht op het Landsarchief* summarizing the activity of *Landsarchief*. He is also required to make an annual report every January. The monthly report is to include a specific statement covering the assignments that were completed by the *Landsarchivaris* and his staff in the previous month. This statement should include copied documents and its assigned index number or filing card. As part of the monthly report, the *Commissie van Toezicht op het Landsarchief* used the *Landsarchivaris* to ask the *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris* to submit a separate report of the specific tasks he completed as deputy archivist. The annual report was modelled after the ARA's annual reports in the Netherlands and contained information regarding the following: a) the staff of the *Landsarchief*; b) the arrangement of the archival collection; c) the condition of archival collection (including measurements of the archives' decay and deterioration of the archives caused by vermin, etc; d) the archive's acquisitions and losses; e) copies (of archival materials) which were made for the *Landsarchief* and served as the primary source of the information contained therein; f) the printing of published documents; and g) the rooms, furniture and tools, etc. The appendix covered the state of acquisitions under the following classifications: acquired or received as a gift, purchased, received on loan, copied or exchanged.

From 1926 to 1942, *Landsarchivaris* was accompanied by *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris*. For sixteen years, there were only two *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris*, Paul Constant Bloys van

⁶⁹ NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, invr nr 46.

Treslong Prins (1926–31) and J. Th. Vermeulen (1939–42). In detail, they reported separate tasks from the *Landsarchivaris*. There were four *Landsarchivarissen* (plural form of *Landsarchivaris*) from 1892–1942, Jacob Anne van der Chijs (1892–1905), Frederik de Haan (1905–22), Everhardus Cornelis Godee Molsbergen (1922–37) and F. R. J. Verhoeven (1937–42). The *Landsarchivaris* dealt with archival issues in general, new governmental and state archives added after 1811, and map collections. Meanwhile, the *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris* dealt with old state's archives from 1596 to 1811, and also historical-topographical picture and print collections.⁷⁰ On November 8, 1938, based on a letter from the first temporary Government's Secretary (Number 2201/ A),⁷¹ which was addressed to the heads of the departments of General Administration (*Algemeen Bestuur*), it was stated that before the department leaders decided to destroy documents from their departments, they must first consult the *Landsarchivaris* who would then give his judgement about the related documents, and determine the historical value of the documents.⁷²

Robert Fruin who became *Algemene Rijksarchivaris* in 1919 proposed a position of adjunct that could help *Landsarchivaris*,⁷³ besides *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris*, there was also important role played by the only *Chartermeesteres*, Maria Henriëtte Philippine Callenfels. She was in charge as *Chartermeesteres* from 1928 until 1942 with this task that was similar to *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris*.⁷⁴ According to Sumartini, there had been professionals who had performed similar tasks before these positions had been formed. In 1614, *Verenigde Oost Indische Compagnie* (VOC) passed initiatives to recruit skilled professionals who dealt with the archives of VOC. Official response came several years later in 1642 but could only be implemented in 1735. The profession called “archivarius” later was removed by Herman Willem Daendels on March 29, 1808, a decision that he would later regret.⁷⁵

The *Landsarchief* had its Netherlands' connection not only with the *Algemeen Rijksarchief* but also with the Association of Archivists in the Netherlands (*de Vereniging van Archivarissen in de Nederlands* [VAN]). Again Robert Fruin the chairman of the Association (1920 – 32) and also the *Algemene Rijksarchivaris* (1912 – 33) took action. He exchanged correspondence with H. T. Colenbrander, a historian from *Rijksuniversiteit* at Leiden, and F. de Haan, current *Landsarchivaris*, concerning requirements for

⁷⁰ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indië over 1938* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1939): 15.

⁷¹ *Staatsblad* 1938 No. 14117.

⁷² *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indië over 1937* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1938): 1.

⁷³ Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, invr nmr 23.

⁷⁴ Lidwina: 51 – 2.

⁷⁵ Sumartini, “Sumber Belanda”: 6 – 7.

Landsarchivaris and a need to have *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris* since 1919.⁷⁶ In 1927, he wrote about lack of inventories after J. A. van der Chijs no longer had the position as *Landsarchivaris*. In his opinion, a *Landsarchivaris* should make inventories and not source publications because a *Landsarchivaris* consider his role as an archivist not a historian. The more inventories made, the more access was open to the public and could increase interest among researchers to do research in the Netherlands East Indies (*Landsarchief*) not in the Netherlands (ARA).⁷⁷

Almost forty years later after its establishment, in 1930, a clear-defined instruction for the *Landsarchivaris* was implemented. The instruction was quite important, because it stated that preserving, arranging and describing the confiscated archives were some of the major tasks. The other three tasks are conducting the formation and development of the archives, contributing to the management of the new historical documents from the Netherlands East Indies and providing complete historical information.⁷⁸

The instruction for the *Landsarchivaris* (*de Instructie voor den Landsarchivaris*) was officially signed in December 17th 1930 and stated in *het Bijblad nummer 12459*. The description was made under supervision of ARA. Article 2 of the instruction described the task of the *Landsarchivaris*, “storing, keeping in a good condition, making inventories and description of the archives” (“*het bewaren, in goeden staat houden, inventarissen en beschrijven van de archivalia*”). Furthermore, Article 5 explicitly mentioned the use of the Manual (“*Handleiding voor het ordenen en beschrijven van archieven*”) to accomplish such tasks.⁷⁹

Along with Hilary Jenkinson’s *A Manual of Archive Administration* published in 1937, the Manual would help the *Landsarchivaris* in preparing the arrangement and description of the archives.⁸⁰ Making inventories was one of the tasks of *Landsarchivaris*, as

⁷⁶ NL-HaNA Ministerie Colonien, Openbaar Verbaal, 2.10.36.04, invr nr 2343.

⁷⁷ NL-HaNA Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, invr nr 12.

⁷⁸ *Nederlandsch Archieven Blad*, Number 51 1946 – 7: 7.

⁷⁹ Art. 2 specificieerde dit nader door de taak van de *Landsarchivaris* te omschrijven als “het bewaren, in goeden staat houden, inventarissen en beschrijven van de archivalia”...De instructie bevatte twee verwijzingen naar het Algemene Rijksarchief, nl. via de “*Handleiding voor het ordenen en beschrijven van archieven*” (art.5) en met de indeling van het jaarverslag (art.18), 5) By de ordening der archieven past hy het hoofdbeginsel toe, uitgedrukt in de “*Handleiding voor het ordenen en beschryven van archieven*”. (cf. Fruin Archiefwet 1918 II, 20/ 21), see NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, invr nmr 13, 23.

⁸⁰ Verhoeven wrode in his draft-paper (underlined sentences made by his own): “Uiteraard werd voor die regels nu de gezaghebbende Handleiding voor het ordenen en beschrijven van Archieven door Muller, Feith en Fruin gevolgd, maar voor het beheer in het algemeen werd een dankbaar gaebruikt gemaakt van het begin 1937 verschenen A Manual of Archive Administration van Jenkinson”, see NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.281.04, invr nr 46.

described in Article 2 of the instruction. According to Verhoeven, describing archives and making reliable inventories are two-third main tasks of *Landsarchivaris*.⁸¹

Between 1938 and 1940, *Landsarchief* had published three subsequent annual reports. In 1938 Soerabaja archives had been sorted and described in fiches, the arrangement of Semarang archives began, Archives of Commissaries-General (1791–1793) and Church Archives were completely sorted and described. Related to world events, there was a growing interest in historical archives.⁸² In 1939, *Landsarchief* was preparing a law about archives, and was soon to become a central repository (*centraldepot*) and a scientific institution (*wetenschappelijke instelling*). In the same year, *Landsarchief* sorted and described *de Kerkelijke archieven* as much as 405 bundels (1620–1898), *het archief van de Directie der Cultures* 319 bundels (1831–1877), *het Semarang-archief* 1.752 bundels (1816–1879), *het Tangerang-archief* 233 bundels (1810–1931), *het Japan-archief* 93 bundels en stukken (1744–1868), *het Regeeringsarchief uit den Engelschen tijd* (1811–1816), *het deel 18de eeuwse marginalia op de Kaapsche resoluties van Commissarissen-Generaal Nederburgh en Frijkenius* (1791–1793) and *de Testamentregisters voor Europeanen van 1706–1715*.⁸³

In 1940, *Landsarchief* had sorted and described *het archief van de Directie der Middelen en Domeinen* as much as 382 bundels (1827–1867) and *het oudere bestuursarchief van Tasikmalaja* (1868–1933) while the ordering and description of the historical prints and photo collection and the historical press cuttings collection continued on a regular basis.

In the annual reports, there are also names of “Indonesian” volunteers among the majority of European employees of *Landsarchief*. These volunteers understood Dutch fluently. After an interview with Hein de Graaff, this was the main reason why the Manual had never been translated into (Indonesian) Malay. These volunteers were Soenadji, Moediarti Poesponegoro, Tan Eng Kian, Soegondo, Nadjihoen, Achmad, Soetikno Slamet and Agus Setia.⁸⁴ But for the time being the main archivists (*Landsarchivaris*, *Adjunct-Landsarchivaris* and *Chartermeesteres*) were from the Netherlands. Referring to the annual report, Arthur H. Leavitt, who translated the Manual into American-English, declared the three annual reports would help to understand the slow impact of World War I on the

⁸¹ Aldus kan de taak van den Landsarchivaris als een drieledige worden opgevat:

1. ordening en inventarisering van de archiefmassa (De uitgifte van een nieuwe inventaris is dringend noodig!).
2. verzorging van de publicatie, in het belang van het archief, van historisch belangrijke documenten e.d. en het geven van voorlichting aan de Regeering en aan belanghebbenden;
3. organisatie van het Indische archiefwezen. See, NL-HaNA-Verhoeven, invr nmr 33.

⁸² *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1938* (Landsdrukkerij: Batavia: 1939): 10.

⁸³ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1939* (Landsdrukkerij: Batavia: 1940): 13.

⁸⁴ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1938* (Landsdrukkerij: Batavia: 1941): 7, 9.

activities of *Landsarchief*. In 1938, the *Landsarchief* had made preparatory works towards its function as the central depository and in building up the archival system for the Netherlands East Indies. According to a government circular letter of November 8, 1938, archivist's opinion was considered to be important concerning the historical value of records. During the three years, "the normal work on the arrangement and description of records was continued".⁸⁵

On October 28, 1941, Governor General A. W. L. Tjarda van Starckenborgh signed the only archival law in the Netherlands East Indies. Although the law was never implemented because of the Japanese occupation, there are a few interesting points worth to be discussed. The law was also known as *Archief-Ordonnantie*.⁸⁶ First, the law clearly stated its connection with *Archief-Wet* 1918 and that it was being influenced by the Manual. The Manual had higher legal position than before, and it reached not only within the *Landsarchief* but also the Netherlands East Indies. It is uncertain why both governments gave the title "ordonnantie" for the Netherlands East Indies and "wet" for the Netherlands. Are there any subordinate relationships between "ordonnantie" and "wet" in which the first is higher than the last? It is also unknown whether research has been conducted to investigate the two related archival laws. Second, this institutional archives of the Netherlands East Indies had to wait for more than forty years (1892–1941) to have their own archival law to state that they were the central archives (*central archiefbewaarplaats*) of the archipelago. Unfortunately, the law had never been fully implemented due to the coming of the Japanese to the archipelago that forced the colonial government to leave in March, 1942. The *Landsarchief* was the only central depository or proto-national institutional archives where the collections were kept in the colony and not delivered to the motherland, or in this case to be confiscated by *Algemeen Rijksarchief*. In the following years this is the main reason why the Algemeen Rijksarchief always had the cooperation or agreement with the National Archives of Indonesia concerning cultural and educational issues, and archival issues were one of them, no matter how good or bad the bilateral relationship between these two countries had been. Third, since 1892, Indonesian archival practices and policies (*archiefwezen*) were influenced by the Netherlands. The cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia in archival issues has been continued ever since. In that sense, Dutch *Archivistiek* has always influenced how the

⁸⁵ Arthur Leavitt, "Review of Books", *The American Archivists* Volume 5 Issue 3 (July 1942): 185 – 7.

⁸⁶ *Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad* van Donderdag 18 September 1941; NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.28.04, invr nmr 30, 38.

Indonesian archivist deals with the archives, both collections of the late *Landsarchief* and the current National Archives of Indonesia.

B. The Cooperation between the *Algemeen Rijksarchief/ Nationaal Archief* and the National Archives of Indonesia

Shortly after Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta declared Indonesia's independence in 1945, Willem Philippus (W. P.) Coolhas—without giving exact date—recalled what the vice president of this new republic said when he visited the archives. He, the vice president Mohammed Hatta, stated that his professor of Economic History at Rotterdam called 'Paatje Sneller', made him work in the archives as a student thus making him realize their importance. Hatta said, "Moreover, if I hadn't learned to work there, I wouldn't be what am I now!".⁸⁷ Years after, in April 1973, Dutch Ambassador Hugo Scheltema declared that Hatta's proposal was being implemented.⁸⁸ Hatta knew how important these colonial archives were, although the new Indonesian government did not prioritize steps to keep the archives in a safe place and to provide access to them.

After the first military campaign, named *Operatie Product*, on July 21, 1947 and the Linggajati Agreement, the Dutch launched their second military campaign, named *Operatie Kraai* (Operation Crow), in December 1948. The results were two fold: the arrest of high-ranking Indonesian officials and the seizure of government documents from various ministries. One of the documents was Hatta's personal files. The seizure was done, and was kept as provenance by The Netherlands Military Intelligence Agency (*Centrale Militaire Inlichtingendienst* [CMI]).⁸⁹ Due to this military campaign,⁹⁰ suspicion against the Dutch was even higher than before 1942 and any cooperation, including archival cooperation, was not taken into account for some years afterwards.

In 1954, more than four years after the Netherlands recognized Indonesian sovereignty, the first archival cooperation was in process but it failed three years later. The

⁸⁷ Coolhas wrote: Fortunately, help was at hand, and from an unexpected side, Mohammed Hatta, then ..., came to visit 'the archives': 'Paatje Sneller', he said, referring to the Rotterdam Professor of Economic History, 'made me work in the archives as a student and realize their importance. Moreover, if I hadn't learned to work there, I wouldn't be what I now am!'. See, W. P. Coolhas, "Wie es eigentlich gewesen": A Correction on the Interview with Prof. M. A. P. Meilink-Roelofs by Prof. W. P. Coolhas", *Itinerario* Number 1 (1978): 16.

⁸⁸ NL-HaNA, Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken Ambassade Indonesie 1962 – 1974, 2.05.188, inv.nr. 590.

⁸⁹ Michael Karabinos. "Displaced Archives, Displaced History: Recovering the Seized Archives of Indonesia", *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land en Volkenkunde* 169 (2013): 285; Karabinos, "The Shadow Continuum": 46, 54.

⁹⁰ Term "military action (aksi militer)" came from Indonesia's side referring to the action that was made by a state to another state. On the contrary the Dutch preferred the term "political action (actie politieel)" considering Indonesia was still part of Dutch territory.

cooperation included a Dutch-initiated microfilming project of 23,000 pages of Dagregister of Batavia Castle. There was a Dutch government-financed organization *Stichting voor Culturele Samenwerking* (Sticusa, Foundation for Cultural Cooperation) established in 1948 that was focused on the former colonies of the Netherlands, such as Suriname, Antilles and Indonesia. The focus on Indonesia lasted until 1955, two years before the West Irian dispute increased.⁹¹

There was growing feeling of nationalism in 1951–1957. Armijn Pane, Sanusi Pane and Mohammad Ali among others were involved in the making of an Indonesian center of national history. Ali stated that it should be more than a nationalistic view, thus a more systematic history writing should be made. On December 14-18, 1957, the first seminar on history took place in Yogyakarta. Six main themes were discussed at the seminar: philosophical conception of national history, periodization of Indonesian history, a standard work of national history, education of history, specialization in history and research and the use of historical sources.⁹²

In 1961 for the first time Indonesia made a “law” in the form of presidential regulation (*Peraturan Presiden* [Perpres]) Number 19 Year 1961 related to archives, entitled National Archival Substance (Pokok-Pokok Kearsipan Nasional).⁹³ In article 1 the definition of archives in the law (“any form of writings either in a single form or a group or have a single unity in form of shape and function”) reminds us of the first and second section of the Manual (“An archival collection is the whole An archival collection is an organic whole”). Although the definition had its influence from the manual, the two rules were remained unwritten. More details will be given about the influence on Indonesian archival laws in chapter three.

Two years later, in 1963, the Director General of the National Archives of Indonesia (*Arsip Negara*) Mohammad Ali exchanged correspondence with the former last *Landsarchivaris* who happened to be the Director General of National Archives of Malaysia (*Arkib Malaysia*) and Southeast Asian representatives of the United Nations for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco). In the letter, Verhoeven wrote to Ali

⁹¹ Karabinos, “The Shadow Continuum”: 70 – 1.

⁹² Klooster writes: “Naast de verscheidenheid van opvatting bij deze auteurs, propageert de overheid een gescheidvisie die overwegend aan het nationalistische schema beantwoordt. Daarbij wordt de prekoloniale tijd als “licht” en de koloniale tijd als “donker” afgeschilderd”. See, H. A. J. Klooster, *Indonesiers schrijven hun geschiedenis* (Dordrecht-Holland: Foris Publications, 1985): 75.

⁹³ “... wujud tulisan dalam bentuk corak teknis ..., baik dalam bentuk tunggal, berkelompok maupun ... kesatuan bentuk dan fungsi usaha perencanaan, pelaksanaan dan penyelenggaraan kehidupan-kebangsaan kumpulan surat dan bahan penolong lainnya, dengan fungsi memastikan ingatan dalam administrasi negara dibuat secara fisis dan yuridis dengan perkembangan organisasi, yang disimpan dan dipelihara selama diperlukan.”

requesting a copy of *Malacca* archives that Verhoeven was sure the National Archives of Indonesia kept.

In a reply to Verhoeven's request on September 14, 1963, Mohammad Ali wrote about the archival law and related rules regarding archives:

Acknowledging the receipt of your letter KPR (44) of July 12th 1963, I have to inform you that the "Archief-ordonantie 1941" never became reality. As a preliminary to a legal regulation of the organisation etc. of the archives in the whole of the Republic of Indonesia there are the Peraturan Presiden 19/ 1961 tentang Pokok2 Kearsipan Nasional and the Keputusan Menteri Pertama 406/ M.P/ 1961 tentang Arsip Nasional. On account of those regulations the Arsip Nasional is by no means the same as the formerly Landsarchief.⁹⁴

Hein de Graaff states in his project report that before his coming to help Indonesian archivists in 1974, in the late 1960's there was a "... need to organize it held records saved from the Dutch period, to preserve and make accessible to an increasing number of researchers". Furthermore, he writes: "This broadcast was followed by several long stays with thorough 'in-service training' incorporated and supervised for the staff. At the same training, staff in the Netherlands came here to learn the finer points of the profession".⁹⁵

In 1964, the Director of the First Section of ARA Marie Antoinette Petronella (M. A. P.) Meilink-Roelofs visited ANRI but had limited access to the collections. Frank Lequin wrote: "Owing to prevailing political circumstances, her visit was not to be a success. She was probably regarded as an official representative of the old colonial regime. She was barely allowed to set foot in the Archives, ...". However, later she helped to lay the basis of archival cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia, together with her lifelong friend Sumartini.⁹⁶

The archival cooperation continued amidst the transition from Soekarno's Guided Democracy to Soeharto's New Order in 1966.⁹⁷ At the same time Sumartini, who was soon to be the next Director General of National Archives of Indonesia after Ali, had finished her study at the *Rijksarchiefschool* in 1967. She and Machfoedi Mangkoedilaga were the first

⁹⁴ NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.28.04, invr nmr 55.

⁹⁵ <http://www.heindegraaff.nl/uncategorized/archiefsamenwerking-nederland-indonesie/>, accessed on March 9th 2017.

⁹⁶ NL-HaNA, Verhoeven, 2.21.28.04, invr nmr 30; Frank Lequin, "In Memoriam M.A.P. Meilink-Roelofs," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, Volume 146 Number 1 (1990): 135 – 6.

⁹⁷ Karabinos, "Displaced Archives, Displaced History": 288.

Indonesian archivists who studied and graduated from the school. They also had a chance of having an internship in the ARA.⁹⁸

Under the leadership of Harsja W. Bachtiar, the cooperation continued. A cultural agreement was signed in 1972.⁹⁹ One of the points of the agreement was the exchange of microfilmed-historical archives and intensified training regarding archival skills. Soon after Soemartini was named the Director General, she wanted to continue the archival cooperation between the two countries. On one occasion she asked Mr. A. L. Schneiders, Counsellor for Press and Cultural Affairs Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, on December 23, 1974 about making archival guides to the Indonesian history of ARA collection and studying at the *Rijksarchiefschool*. The archival cooperation was part of the cooperation shared with the National Library of Indonesia (*Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia*) and the

⁹⁸ The school was built in 1919 "... to provide lectures for candidates preparing for the national examinations". According to the *Archief-Wet* 1918, there are two levels of professional archivist: senior (*hoge*) and middle grade (*middelbare*). Due to decreasing enrolments the school was closed from 1924 to 1955. Since 1971 the school has been separated from ARA but the building was still next to ARA. The curriculum is filled with courses about the history of the Netherlands and its institutions that had produced the archives, and archival methods. There were twenty-two course-subjects. "Dutch Administrations before 1700," "History of Dutch Legal Institutions," "Outline of Dutch Governmental Organization," "History of Religious Institutions," and "Records Management in 19th Century National Government Department" were among them. Under the subject *Archiefvistique*, there were courses about processing and the preparation of inventories, research methods, management of archives, records management codes, conservation methods, methods of caring for visual materials, the use of computers in archives, and the development of archival law. According to Barritt, the most important course related to *Archiefvistique* is arrangement and description primarily based on the Manual. The internship could take place at ARA, provincial branches of ARA or municipal, regional or water archives for four days a week. The purpose of the internship is to know how the archival works from acquisition to the reading room. The internees had to make their own inventories that should be finished before they took the national examination. There were five steps in making inventory: listing all the material in the collection, writing preliminary descriptions for each item or record series on fiches, creating a preliminary new order, writing the definitive descriptions and creating the definitive new order. Barritt, "Archival Training": 337 – 43; Hein de Graaff. *Verslag van een bezoek aan het staatsarchief van indonesie in het kader van de overeenkomst tot uitwisseling van microfilms maart-april 1974* ('s Gravenhage: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 2013): 10.

⁹⁹ Van 20 tot 31 januari kwam te Jakarta een Indonesisch-Nederlandse conferentie over culturele samenwerking in de maatschappij- en geesteswetenschappen bijeen, die uitgangspunten, begrenzingen, plannen en organisatie, van een gezamenlijk. en tot wederzijds voordeel te ondernemen Programma Indonesische Studies vaststelde en uitwerkte. De Nederlandse delegatie bestond uit Prof. dr. A. Teeuw, voorzitter, Prof. dr. J. van Baal, Prof. dr. J. W. Schoorl, Dr. E. Meerum Terwogt, Mr. F. J. van der Dussen, Dr. J. Noorduyn, Mr. A. L. Schneiders en Drs. J. W. Minderhout; de Indonesische delegatie uit: Prof. dr. Samaun Samadikun, voorzitter, Prof. dr. Koentjaraningrat, Dr. Amran Halim, Dr. Haryati Soebadio, Prof. dr. G. J. Resink, Drs. Soemartini en Dr. Harsja Bachtiar. Het rapport dat de conferentie als resultaat van haar besprekingen vaststelde geeft een opsomming van de wetenschappelijke yakgebieden waarop het programma betrekking heeft en behandelt achtereenvolgens de onderwerpen training van mankracht, onderzoek, uitwisseling van personeel, vertaling en publicatie, archiefwerkzaamheden en organisatie, en administratieve zaken. Als belangrijke overweging en uitgangspunt van deze samenwerking constateert het rapport dat in Nederland het aantal experts in de Indonesische studies snel vermindert, terwijl in Indonesie slechts weinig jongere wetenschappers in staat zijn gebruik te maken van de grote hoeveelheid in het Nederlands geschreven bronnen over Indonesie. Daarom is het noodzakelijk het programma in de aanvang speciaal te richten op de ontwikkeling van nieuwe kennis betreffende Indonesie door onderwijs en onderzoek met bijzondere aandacht voor in het Nederlands geschreven bronnen. "Jaarverslag 1975", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Volume 132 Number 2/ 3 (1976): 386.

National Museum of Indonesia (*Museum Nasional*).¹⁰⁰ The results of the agreement are inventories about plants (*cultuur*) 1816–1900, finances (*financien*), regional archives (*residentie archieven*), *Algemeen Secretarie* and Governor General’s Cabinet 1944–1950 that were published in 1978.¹⁰¹ Another result was the repatriation of *Djogdja documenten* or *buitgemaakte archieven* from ARA to ANRI. It could be seen that archival practices in Indonesia had developed. The same inventories were made in the 1940’s during Verhoeven’s period as *Landsarchivaris*. The inventories were then being revised, rearranging and redescribing with some minor changes. Other results were microfilms and finding aids that their original forms stored in ARA.¹⁰²

Between late 1960’s and 1974, Indonesia for the first time had an archival law that was signed in 1971.¹⁰³ The law has a similar title to the previous presidential ruling and the first ministerial decision, as mentioned earlier in Mohammad Ali’s letter to Verhoeven, and has a subtly different definition about archives as stated in the Article 1 of the law. The law states that archives are “... made and received by state departments, governmental bodies, private and personal”. The sentences “... either in group (*berkelompok*) or single (*tunggal*)” remained within the definition. Nevertheless, within this first archival law the twin rules were not written but the concept of archival fonds was included.

After Soeharto’s visit in September 1970 and the first letter of Soemartini to the Dutch Minister of Cultures, the agreement between the two states was signed on September 1, 1972, in The Hague. The points of the agreement were:¹⁰⁴

1. There will be an exchange of microfilms between both institutions.
2. The purpose of this exchange is to facilitate research by the reciprocal supply of microfilms of records which are thought to be of importance for the history of the countries concerned.
3. The microfilms will be exchanged in the form of negatives.
4. The right to supply copies of the microfilms to third parties remains with those in authority who have the custody of the original records.

¹⁰⁰ NL-HaNA, *Nederlandse Ambassade in Indonesie (standplaats Jakarta)*, 2.05.188, invr nmr 590.

¹⁰¹ Sumartini “Sumber Belanda”: 4 – 5, 12.

¹⁰² Sumartini “Sumber Belanda”: 5 – 6.

¹⁰³ Law Number 7 Year 1971 (Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1971 tentang Ketentuan Pokok-Pokok Kearsipan). This is the first archival law in Indonesia that last for thirty eight years.

¹⁰⁴ Karabinos, “Returning to the Metropole”: 142 – 6.

5. Both parties declare that restrictive measures concerning accessibility of the original records will be adhered to by the authority which has received microfilm copies of these records.

Regarding rules that might not relate to archives accessibility, Sumartini argues that it is common to follow what had been implemented in the Netherlands. She clearly makes her point in 1987, sixteen years after the first archival law was issued, that the relationship was not only among the archivists of the two countries (the Netherlands and Indonesia) and between the two national archival institutions (ARA and ANRI), but also between the archival laws that were implemented in both countries. The cooperation continued until 1990. Although there was an incident related to the statement of Jan Pronk, it did not give any negative impact to the cooperation. The *Algemene Rijksarchivaris* A. E. M. Ribberink and the National Archives of the Netherlands supported her ideas.¹⁰⁵ Her position was replaced by Noerhadi Magetsari. Eric Ketelaar made a proposal to Magetsari to upgrade Indonesian archivists' skills. Ketelaar promised to share knowledge about Dutch *Archivistiek* and to provide them with a Dutch course in order to be able to understand information in Dutch archives. These subjects were parts of Soemartini's proposal in 1974 that continues until now.¹⁰⁶

In the end of 2009, the new archival law was signed and completely replaced the archival law of 1971. For the first time, the rules were stated clearly in the Article 4 (letter d and e) and 62, and Article 96 of Government Regulation Number 28 Year 2012 along with other minor sections. The latest law defines archives, in the Article 1, as "... recorded event in any form and media ...".¹⁰⁷ More details about this and other main rules of the Manual will be provided in chapters three and four.

¹⁰⁵ Sumartini, "Sumber Belanda dalam Arsip Nasional: Pemeliharaan dan Penggunaan", *Kongres Studi Belanda di Indonesia* 23 – 27 Desember 1987: 3.

¹⁰⁶ NL-HaNA, *Algemeen Rijksarchief, Tweede Afdeling*, 2.14.04, inv nr 318.

¹⁰⁷ The fourteen sections are: a. law certainty (kepastian hukum); b. authenticity and reliability (keautentikan dan kepercayaan); c. integrity (keutuhan); **d. principle of provenance (asal usul)**; **e. principle of original order (aturan asli)**; f. security and safety (keamanan dan keselamatan); g. professionalism (keprofesionalan); h. responsiveness (keresponsifan); i. anticipation (keantisipatifan); j. participation (kepartisipatifan); k. accountability (akuntabilitas); l. usefulness (kemanfaatan); m. accessibility (aksesibilitas); and n. public needs (kepentingan umum).

C. From Colonial Archives to National Memory

Michael Karabinos writes two particular phenomena following the Second World War: first, the intentional and systematic removal of archives and documents by invading nations and second, the revolutionary movements culminating in wars for independence against colonial powers weakened by wartime occupations—both in the metropole by Nazi Germany and in the Asian colonies by the Japanese. In some cases archival seizures and revolutions overlapped. That was the case in Indonesia when the Netherlands attempted to regain control of the Netherlands East Indies following the Japanese occupation. These phenomena are related to what Karabinos argues as displaced archives and in its turn also displaced history.¹⁰⁸

Different from what happened in other former colonies, the Netherlands decided not to return all of their colonial archives in the last decades of nineteenth century to the mother country. On the contrary the Netherlands decided to build its own repository in the colony, the (*Algemene*) *Landsarchief*. For fifty years (1892–1942), the *Landsarchief* had to play the role not only as a national depository but also in making inventories and source publications. In terms of handling the archives, the colonial government succeeded in making rules and guidelines. In the 1950's colonial archives continued to be primary sources, and provide more details, in the making of a national memory. Karabinos states that “Archives can simultaneously represent where a country was, where it is and where it is going”.¹⁰⁹

Defining colonial archives, Charles Jeurgens and Ton Kappelhof write (2012: 11), “... as process bound information that flows from the constitution, maintenance, direction, management, exploitation and development of the territories and populations which have a relationship of administrative dependency on an external ruling power.” In that sense, the archives were created “... in the colony or in the colonising state.”¹¹⁰ Soon after the proclamation of independence, the Indonesians gave their best effort to understand the colonial archives in a way that fit into Indonesian perspective. In line with this, Karabinos writes, “Archives are colonial remnants and artefacts of colonization, but using them does not equate to some form of neo-colonialism. Acceptance of their colonial nature can lead to a reversal of the archival power that previously kept the colonized world under the

¹⁰⁸ Karabinos, “Displaced Archives, Displaced History”: 281.

¹⁰⁹ Karabinos, “Displaced Archives, Displaced History”: 282.

¹¹⁰ Charles Jeurgens and Ton Kappelhof, “Introduction: Colonial Archives”, in: ed Charles Jeurgens and Ton Kappelhof, *Colonial Legacy in South East Asia: the Dutch archives*, 2012: 11.

administration of other nations.”¹¹¹ The creating of an Indonesian national memory was part of the decolonization process, in Karabinos’ words: “... the process of removing and deconstructing the colonial system in a country”.¹¹²

¹¹¹ Karabinos, “Displaced Archives, Displaced History”: 284.

¹¹² Karabinos, “The Shadow Continuum”: 6.

CHAPTER THREE

DEFINING THE MAIN RULES OF THE MANUAL

According to Peter Horsman there are three “pioneering works” of the Manual: 1. defining the archival fonds, 2. formulating the connection between the archive and the functions of the creator, and 3. making archivists aware of the boundaries and structure of an archive that needs to be respected, and the only way of doing it is by understanding its original context. These pioneering ideas can be found in sections 1, 2 and 16. These ideas were completely new in that the ideas were in combination one to another.¹¹³

The chapter describes the definition of the main rules of the Manual within the context of Indonesia as described in the laws and the standards. A few other related definitions that are made by Indonesian scholars and archivists are provided. There are five related concepts to be defined: archive(s), arrangement, description, provenance, and original order. These concepts were divided into three sub-chapters and were adapted from Horsman et.al.¹¹⁴

A. The Archive(s)¹¹⁵

Archive is the object of an inventory. The Manual starts with a careful definition of it. There are three close-related meanings of archives: a place (the repository or depository), an institution (the institutional archives) and a collection of documents.¹¹⁶ The Indonesian term for archive is *arsip*. Similar to Dutch tradition, there is similarity between *arsip* and *archieff*. The two refer to archive and record. According to Djoko Utomo, the word has its influence

¹¹³ Peter Horsman, “Taming the Elephants: An Orthodox Approach to the Principle of Provenance”, in eds. K. Abukhanfusa and J. Sydbeck, *The Principle of Provenance: Report from the First Stockholm Conference on Archival Theory and the Principle of Provenance* (Stockholm: Swedish National Archives, 1994): 51 – 63 as quoted in Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvi – xvii.

¹¹⁴ Despite six chapters of the Manual (the Origin and Composition of Archival Depositories, the Arrangement of Archival Description, the Description of Archival Documents, the Drawing Up of the Inventory, Further Directions for the Description of Archives and On the Conventional Use of Certain Terms and Signs), Horsman et.al. states that there are four main themes: the archive, arrangement, *respect des fonds*, organic whole and the organization and the archive. Muller et.al., *Handleiding*: 161; Muller et.al. *The Manual*: iii; Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xvi – xxiv.

¹¹⁵ According to Karabinos: “Most European traditions, unlike that of the United States, do not differentiate between the two linguistically. The Dutch *archieff* (plural *archieven*) means both records chosen for historical preservation, and those not chosen”. He prefers to use archives to refer to groups of records as one archival collection. See, Karabinos, “The Shadow Continuum”: 6.

¹¹⁶ Charles Juergens, “The Untamed Archives: History-writing in the Netherlands East Indies and the Use of Archives”, in *History of the Human Sciences* Volume 26 Number 4 (2012): 87; Karabinos, “The Shadow Continuum”: 6.

from the Dutch word, *archieff* because "... Indonesia was colonized by the Netherlands".¹¹⁷ Soemartini gives similar argument about the Dutch *Archivistiek* influence on Indonesian archival practice.¹¹⁸ Sulisty Basuki argues similarly to Utomo.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, Sauki Hadiwardoyo and F Yuniarti argue "... in 1980's archival technique in Indonesia focuses more on the safeguarding of archives similar to what had happened in the Netherlands one century before."¹²⁰

Referring to *arsip*, there are two related terms in Indonesian: *arsip dinamis* and *arsip statis*.¹²¹ The terms are translated into 'records' for the first and 'archives' for the second.¹²² The *arsip* can be both singular and plural. Utomo prefers to use the term *arsip* rather than records for archives, *arsip dinamis* for records and *arsip statis* for archives.¹²³ Leavitt translates *één archief (regel 1)*, *één archief vormen (regel 3)* and *archieven (regels 7 and 8)* into 'an archival collection' (sections 1, 2 and 3) or 'archives' (section 7) for both words. He also translates 'an archival depository' (section 4) and 'archival depositories' (title of chapter 1) both for *één archiefdepôt (regel 4)* and *archieffdepots (titel van eerste hoofdstuk)*. In his opinion, similar to Utomo, the Dutch singular word *één archief* always takes its English plural form, 'archives'.

In the first paragraph of the first Indonesian archival law, signed on May 18, 1971, by President Soeharto, the definition of 'arsip' is stated as 'scriptures' (*naskah-naskah*). These scriptures are made and accepted by the state bodies and state agencies or private bodies and private person in any media whether a single or group in order to fulfill their

¹¹⁷ Djoko Utomo, "Arsip as National Identity of Indonesia", *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1 2013: 100 – 1. He keeps saying several times about the concept of 'arsip' in the interview. He argues that Indonesian archivists should be proud of it.

¹¹⁸ Sumartini, "Pengantar Kearsipan", www.bapersip.jatimprov.go.id/images/artikel/Pengantar_kearsipan, accessed on April 27th 2017.

¹¹⁹ Sulisty Basuki argues that the term 'arsip' has its roots from Dutch 'archieff' because the first institutional archives was built by the Netherlands in the Netherlands East Indie. See, "Sulisty Basuki, "Pelestarian Dokumen Kearsipan Negara", <https://sulistybasuki.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/pelestarian-dokumen-kearsipan-negara/>, accessed on April 12th 2017.

¹²⁰ Hadiwardoyo dan Yuniarti, *Sejarah Kearsipan*: 2.21.

¹²¹ In relation to lifecycle model that common among Indonesian archivists, Dutch archival practice defining that there are three phases of archive management (*archieffbeheer*): dynamic (*dynamische fase*), semi-static (*semi-statische fase*) and static (*statische fase*). See under entry *archieffbeheer* and *archieffruimte*, *Archiefterminologie voor Nederland en Vlaanderen* ('s Gravenhage: Stichting Archiefpublicaties, 2007). Regarding to those three phase, Sumartini has similar argument. In her opinion, records (*arsip dinamis*) "... is influenced by the Dutch definition" (pengertian *arsip* dalam bahasa Belanda), see Sumartini, "Pengantar Kearsipan": 3.

¹²² Sulisty Basuki tends to translate records into 'rekod' instead 'arsip dinamis', see Sulisty Basuki, "Pelestarian Dokumen Kearsipan Negara", <https://sulistybasuki.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/pelestarian-dokumen-kearsipan-negara/>, accessed on April 12th 2017 and Sulisty Basuki, *Kamus Istilah Kearsipan* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2005). At Applied Archival Science of Diploma and Library Science of Undergradauate of University of Indonesia, there are certain courses under the title 'rekod', such as Manajemen Rekod, see <http://sap.ui.ac.id/main/period/02.03.07.01/20071>, accessed on May 11th 2017.

¹²³ Utomo, *Arsip as National Identity of Indonesia*: 100, 102.

governmental duties or their national duties.¹²⁴ The law prefers to choose the term ‘scriptures’ rather than ‘documents’. We can find the same points in the Manual about creating agencies (*bestuur, ambtenaar, privaatrechtelijke lichamen* and *person*, see sections 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7). Regarding the “whether a single or a group”, we can easily see the similarity with the term “an organic whole”, according to Leavitt, or *een organisch geheel* and ‘the skeleton of the collection’ or *het geraamte van het archief vormen* (see sections 2 and 20).

In the second paragraph, it is clearly seen that the life cycle model has been applied in the Indonesian archival practice since the beginning of the 1970’s, similar to the Netherlands. It distinguishes ‘arsip’ in their two forms: record (*arsip dinamis*) and archive (*arsip statis*). The difference between the two is in terms of frequency. The first is used directly while the second is used indirectly in the deliverance of state administrative matters. The Manual gives a definition about archive and makes no reference to “records” but Leavitt translates “*de nalatenschappen*” into “the records” (see section 55). Leavitt has given his own consideration regarding the term “records” and its effect goes on as the lifecycle model has been developed since the end of World War II.¹²⁵

Although the law pays attention to other non-governmental creating agencies, the government remains the main attention. The government is the main operator. The whole chapter 2 (paragraphs 4–7) states the rights and responsibilities of the government in dealing with both record and archive. The Manual also gave its main attention only to “... government archives and to archives established by associations, foundations and companies, not to private archives, family archives and personal archives”.¹²⁶ The law’s main point is administration (paragraph 3 and 10) that somehow relates to the Manual (sections number 1, 3 – 6). The government with its connected agencies and officials (*ambtenaren*) is the administrative bodies (*besturen*).

In the second Indonesian archival law, signed on October 23, 2009, by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, there were more details provided. “*Arsip* is the recorded activity or event within any form and media in accordance with the development of information communication and technology that are produced and accepted by state agencies, regional

¹²⁴ The original text: a. naskah-naskah yang dibuat dan diterima oleh Lembaga-lembaga Negara dan Badan-badan pemerintahan dalam bentuk corak apapun baik dalam keadaan tunggal maupun berkelompok, dalam rangka pelaksanaan kegiatan pemerintahan; b. naskah-naskah yang dibuat dan diterima oleh Badan-badan swasta dan/atau perorangan, dalam bentuk corak apapun, baik dalam keadaan tunggal maupun berkelompok, dalam rangka pelaksanaan kehidupan kebangsaan.

¹²⁵ Leavitt published his translation in 1940 based on the Manual 1920’s edition. At that time, the second twin principles, i.e appraisal and selection, came into being. There was a sense of Jenkinson and Schellenberg in Leavitt’s translation, see Cook, *What is Past is Prologue*: 23, 26 – 7.

¹²⁶ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xviii.

government, educational institute, company, political organization, societal organization and individual in the implementation of societal, nation and state activities".¹²⁷ Besides records (*arsip dinamis*) and archives (*arsip statis*), there are other types of *arsip*: vital, active, inactive, classified and general.¹²⁸ We can see there are growing numbers of creating agencies in the second archival law. Especially, the basic definition of *arsip* that has changed from scriptures to recorded activities.

In defining records and archives, this second law gives more detail. Records are described as *arsip dinamis* that are "... used directly by creating agencies and kept for a period of time."¹²⁹ Archives are described as *arsip statis* that are "... created by agencies because of their historical continuing values, although their retention schedule has ended, and validated permanently as verified directly or indirectly by the National Archives of Indonesia and/ or institutional archives."¹³⁰

In the 2000's three standards were made by ANRI. In 2004, the first standard was published and signed on October 18, 2004, by Megawati Soekarnoputri. In paragraph 1 and 6 of the standard, the definition of archives and records are exactly the same to the first archival law.¹³¹ The second standard, signed on December 22, 2011, and the third standard, signed in 2015, have exactly the same definition to the second archival law because they were published after 2009. Surprisingly, for the sake of description, it is similar to the first archival law and in return different to the second archival law, the standard distinguishes between records (*arsip dinamis*) and archives (*arsip statis*).¹³²

B. Arrangement and Description

Horsman et.al. argues that there are two types or phases of arrangement and description prior to the publication of the Manual in 1898. Between 1795 and 1873, archives

¹²⁷ The original text is: Arsip adalah rekaman kegiatan atau peristiwa dalam berbagai bentuk dan media sesuai dengan perkembangan teknologi informasi dan komunikasi yang dibuat dan diterima oleh lembaga negara, pemerintahan daerah, lembaga pendidikan, perusahaan, organisasi politik, organisasi kemasyarakatan, dan perseorangan dalam pelaksanaan kehidupan bermasyarakat, berbangsa, dan bernegara.

¹²⁸ Actually, except 'arsip statis', these types of 'arsip' are considered to be records. Based on the lifecycle model there should be a transitional phase between active records and archives. In-active records are similar to *semi-statische fase* of a document in Dutch archival term. Different from the first archival law, the second archival law provides more detail in relation to the model.

¹²⁹ The original text is: "Arsip dinamis adalah arsip yang digunakan secara langsung dalam kegiatan pencipta arsip dan disimpan selama jangka waktu tertentu".

¹³⁰ The original text is: "Arsip statis adalah arsip yang dihasilkan oleh pencipta arsip karena memiliki nilai guna kesejarahan, telah habis retensinya, dan berketerangan dipermanenkan yang telah diverifikasi baik secara langsung maupun tidak langsung oleh Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia dan/atau lembaga kearsipan".

¹³¹ Keputusan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 5 Tahun 2004 tentang Pengelolaan Arsip Statis.

¹³² Standar Deskripsi Arsip Statis: 10.

became a collection of historical sources and inventory became a general inventory or a chronological register of the entire repository. The problem when creating such an inventory was to choose between the size, the structure and the composition of the archives. In their words, “If they (the archives) consisted of charters and loose documents that were not too great in number, then the most appropriate choice was an item-by-item The larger the archive was, and the more it consisted of aggregated records and large series of registers, the less likely was it to be considered suitable for complete item-by-item” In the second phase, after 1874 and before 1898, provenance, replacing chronological order, and original order, in part deriving from diplomatics, were soon to be taken into consideration.¹³³

The first section (section 15) of the second chapter of the Manual begins with a statement: “an archive must be systematically arranged” or “een archief moet systematisch worden ingedeeld”.¹³⁴ Horsman et.al. translates “de oorspronkelijke organisatie” into “natural classification”,¹³⁵ whereas Leavitt’s translation for the same keywords is “the original organization”.¹³⁶ Actually there are similar meanings of three different keywords both in the original version of the Manual and the English-American translation: first (section 16), “the original organization” and “de oorspronkelijke organisatie”, second (section 17), “the original order” and “de oorspronkelijke orde” and third (section 18), “the original arrangement” and “de oorspronkelijke orde”.¹³⁷ Chapter on arrangement also could be found in sections 8–13 (on the formation and layout of archival repositories) and sections 52–55 (on the composition of the inventory).¹³⁸

According to Horsman et.al., the Manual pays more attention to arrangement than description. Although description is stated in the title and functions as a component of the inventory, description receives little attention. Inventory needs to serve as a signpost or *wegwijzer* (section 37). They argue that the inventory “... must provide an outline of the contents of the archive, not of the contents of the documents”, and also inventory has a different intention from calendar.¹³⁹

Indonesian archivists tend to combine arrangement and description into a single main task. The two are translated into Indonesian as *pengolahan*. In the making of inventory, *pengolahan* should deliver its double tasks: to arrange and to describe. The first archival law

¹³³ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: v – xii.

¹³⁴ Muller et.al. *Handleiding*: 27 – 30; Muller, et.al., *The Manual*: 48 – 52.

¹³⁵ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xix.

¹³⁶ Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 52.

¹³⁷ Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 52 – 64.

¹³⁸ Muller et.al., *Handleiding*: 15 – 24, 92 – 9; Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 33 – 46, 130 – 139.

¹³⁹ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xxiii.

and the first standard did not give attention to *pengolahan* at all. In paragraphs 59 and 62 of the second archival law it is stated that there are four main tasks of archives management: acquisition, arrangement and description, preservation and accessibility.

According to the first standard, archival management includes acquisition (*pengumpulan*), storing (*penyimpanan*), preservation (*perawatan*), safeguarding (*penyelamatan*), accessibility (*penggunaan*) and preparing for acquisition (*pembinaan*).¹⁴⁰ The second standard begins with a careful definition of *arsip* that refers to the second law, archives (*arsip statis*), archives management (*pengolahan arsip statis*), archival standard of description (*standar deskripsi arsip statis*) and many others. It defines archives management as the making of finding aids based on applied archival sections. It also defines archival standard of description as rules that are made to describe detailed information stated within the archives. Furthermore, description can be done gradually starting from macro, middle all the way to micro level.¹⁴¹ Description should cover: characteristic, summarized information, period, development stage (*ontwikkeling stadium*) and volume. It has to consider three main points: first, user friendly accessibility, second, form, media and creator and third, level or hierarchy of information unit.¹⁴² It also must be used for primary finding aids: calendar (*daftar*) and inventory (*inventaris*); not for secondary finding aid (archival guide).

In 2015, the first comprehensive standard (the third standard) was published. The standard provides more detail of instructions than the second and the first ones. The third one is intended to deliver multi-level description (from fonds, sub-fonds, series, sub-series to item).¹⁴³ The second archival law regulates to make such a standard available. The points of the standard are as follows:

1. Description starts from general to specific.
2. Description only provides information on each level of description.
3. No repetitive information.
4. Giving connection node between levels of description.¹⁴⁴

According to the third standard, a standard is a set of sections that is used to describe information and detailed information of archival documents. The objectives are to decide the type of information that can be included in the description of the institutional archives and to

¹⁴⁰ See Paragraph 3 – 32 Keputusan Presiden Nomor 105 Year 2004 tentang Pengelolaan Arsip Statis (Presidential Decision Number 105 Year 2004 on Archival Management).

¹⁴¹ Pedoman Penyusunan Sarana Bantu Penemuan Kembali Arsip Statis (The Manual of Drawing Up the Finding Aids): 4.

¹⁴² *ibid.*: 13, 18.

¹⁴³ Standar Deskripsi Arsip Statis (Archival Standard of Description): 8, 44, 48, 63, 69, 86, 87.

¹⁴⁴ *ibid.*: 8.

give guidance on how the description should be applied in an archival information system.¹⁴⁵ The standard defines description as the making of an accurate representation of a single unit of description and its parts, if they exist, by sorting, analysing, organizing and recording information in order to identify, arrange and describe, find and explain the related archives, and their creational context and archival management system.¹⁴⁶

The standard combines the previous standard (*Tata Kearsipan Statis*) published by the National Archives of Indonesia in 1979, General International Standard of Archival Description (ISAD-G) of International Commission on Archives (ICA) and a few other standards such as the International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ISAAR [CPF]) and International Standard for Describing Institutions with Archival Holdings (ISDIAH), Sections of Archival Description, Manual of Archival Description (not the Dutch Manual), Describing Archives: A Content Standard and *Archiefbeheer in het praktijk: Inventarisatie van statische archieven*.¹⁴⁷ Yayan Daryan and Hardi define description as detailed information of the archives and should have at least five subjects: inner form, short description, *ontwikkeling stadium*, dates and outer form.¹⁴⁸

Although the Manual is not written in the main reference of the third standard, it provides a definition of arrangement and description. Description should have information regarding to the history, structure and policy of the repository. The standard gives more details of description than the Manual. We can see the creative response of Indonesian archivists and how they develop their understanding to arrangement and description.

C. Provenance and Original Order

Horsman et.al. state that the Manual "... does not provide a definition of *respect des fonds*... the *herkomstbeginsel*". Although one of the writers, Samuel Muller, had lectured on

¹⁴⁵ *ibid.*: 12, 18.

¹⁴⁶ *ibid.*: 10 – 1. The definition originated from similar standard previously published in 2011. This standard was released as the Rule of the Director General of National Archives of Indonesia Number 21 Year 2011 under the title Standard of Data Element for Records and Archives in Organization of System of National Archival and Informational System (*Standar Elemen Data Arsip Dinamis dan Statis untuk Penyelenggaraan Sistem Informasi Kearsipan Nasional*). Differing from the Standard of 2015, the Standard of 2011 deals with archival management system, not the description itself and not to support arrangement and description. Another difference is that the standard of 2011 tends to be theoretical in such a way that there are no cases or examples taken from the collection of ANRI itself.

¹⁴⁷ *ibid.*: 7.

¹⁴⁸ Rincian informasi yang terkandung dalam arsip yang dimaksudkan sebagai sarana penemuan terdiri dari lima unsur: bentuk redaksi, isi singkat, tingkat perkembangan, tanggal, dan bentuk luar, see Daryan dan Hardi. *Terminologi*: 46 – 47. A series of files is a unity of files or folder that is classified according to the same system, see Daryan dan Hardi, *Terminologi*: 70, 149. There are three considerations of filing: numbers, alphabets and problems, see Daryan dan Hardi, *Terminologi*: 71, 153 – 7.

provenance at Ecole des Chartes in France, a place where the principle was derived from. Provenance is a principle in which the archives are not to be mixed with others. Original order is to be understood as respected internal structure of the records and its relationship with creation and development of the creator.¹⁴⁹ This thesis finds that the term “organization” is similar to “arrangement” and “order”.¹⁵⁰ Thus in a way it has a close relationship with provenance and original order. Section 16 clearly states that “The system of arrangement must be based on the original organization The original organization of an archival collection must naturally correspond in its main lines to the old organization of the administrative body which produced it.”¹⁵¹ There are two options: subject or natural classification. The latter will be the best option because it “... is closely bound up with it.”¹⁵² This is the fundamental section from which other sections follow (sections 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 25).

There is no mention of the twin rules in the first law and the first standard. Only the second archival law clearly states the twin rules. It is stated in paragraph 4 of the second law that archival management should be delivered by using the rules, including the other twelve rules.¹⁵³ The rules are first stated in the second standard. The standard makes two general principles (*asas*, Ind.) of drawing up finding aids: major and minor. The principles are placed under the major section. The definition of provenance is in line with what is stated in the Manual, that the archives are not to be mixed with others and they have connection with its creational context. The definition of original order is also in line with the Manual, that the arrangement and description should be delivered by respecting the archives’ natural structure. In case the major section is impossible to deliver, the standard gives five rules of minor principles to be taken into consideration. The five principles are as follow: functional, restoration, organization, problem and usefulness.¹⁵⁴ In a theoretical way, the standard

¹⁴⁹ Horsman et.al., “Introduction”: xx.

¹⁵⁰ Organization is the coordination and relationship between items, <http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/o/organization>, accessed on May 8th 2017.

¹⁵¹ “Het systeem van indeeling moet worden gegrond op de oorspronkelijke organisatie De oorspronkelijke organisatie van een archief moet natuurlijk in hoofdzaken overeenkomst met de oude inrichting van het bestuur, waarvan het archief afkomstig is.” Muller et.al., *Handleiding*: 30 – 6; Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 52 – 9.

¹⁵² Muller, et.al. *Handleiding*: 36; Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 60.

¹⁵³ The fourteen sections are: law certainty, authenticity and reliability, integrity, **principle of provenance**, **principle of original order**, security and safety, professional, responsive, anticipate, participate, accountability, usefulness, accessibility, and public needs.

¹⁵⁴ Pedoman Penyusunan Sarana Bantu Penemuan Kembali Arsip Statis: 8 – 9.

follows what Muller et.al. urged their colleagues to do as written in the preface of the Manual.¹⁵⁵

Although there is no mentioning of the Manual within the main reference of the third standard, the rules are clearly defined. Provenance is a principle in which the created, collected and aggregated archives of an institution or a person should be represented in a single unity, and should be distinguished from archives of other creating institutions or persons. Original order is a principle in which the structure of archives should follow the previous rules of records, in order to keep the relationship between the archives and evidential value which is inherent within their structure.¹⁵⁶

In 1979, Djoko Utomo has already defined the rules and their practical solution to be implemented in the making of inventory. He argues that archives cannot be separated from their original sources or their creating agencies, but are a unity. Their original order should be maintained as best as possible, unless the archives are not in good order or have mixed fonds. In a way he tends to be practical by giving solution for the unarranged archives to be arranged according to subject, similarity of series, rubric and dossier. In the same writing, he includes the Manual within the bibliography.¹⁵⁷

According to Daryan and Hardi, 'archives group' and 'fonds' have different meanings. Archives group is a group of archives arranged based on series or rubric or dossier and should be in chronological order. Grouping is done based on principle of provenance.¹⁵⁸ The rules, in their opinion, are "*herkomst beginsel* or principle of provenance or *respect des fonds* is a principle which considers the archives belong to the creator".¹⁵⁹ They also explain the principles' development in France, the Netherlands, America and Australia. Original order is a principle which considers the archives as they were.¹⁶⁰ Besides the twin principles,

¹⁵⁵ They write: "We shall not mind if there are deviations from them (the sections) in certain details or even in essentials. We merely hope that our colleagues will be willing to consider these sections and that they will not deviate from them (the sections) without first having given notice, preferably with explanations, in the introduction to their inventories. See Muller et.al., *The Manual*: 9.

¹⁵⁶ Standard Deskripsi Arsip Statis: 8.

¹⁵⁷ Djoko Utomo, "Pemikiran Mengenai Penanganan Arsip Inaktif", *Temu Karya Arsip Inaktif 10 – 11 Desember 1979*

¹⁵⁸ Its Indonesian version: "Kelompok arsip yang ditata berdasarkan kesamaan jenisnya (seri), atau kesamaan masalahnya (rubrik) atau kesamaan urusan (dossier) maupun kronologis kurun waktunya. Pengelompokkan berdasarkan asal-usul", see Daryan dan Hardi, *Terminologi*: 6.

¹⁵⁹ Its Indonesian version: "*Herkomst beginsel*, prinsip asal-usul: disebut juga *principle of provenance*. Suatu prinsip yang mengaitkan arsip ke sumber asalnya dengan pengertian bahwa arsip diatur tanpa melepaskan arsip dan instansi yang menciptakannya. Prinsip ini adalah prinsip yang bersifat filosofi. See, Daryan dan Hardi. *Terminologi*: 81, 141 – 2.

¹⁶⁰ Daryan dan Hardi. *Terminologi*: 127, 142.

they also mention five other principles: *bestemming beginsel*,¹⁶¹ *restoratie beginsel*,¹⁶² *functioneel beginsel*,¹⁶³ *organisatie beginsel*¹⁶⁴ and *pertinent beginsel*.¹⁶⁵

Suprayitno,¹⁶⁶ Sulisty Basuki,¹⁶⁷ Azmi,¹⁶⁸ Banu Prabowo¹⁶⁹ and Machmoed Effendhie¹⁷⁰ only give the definition of the rules which is basically similar to the second archival law. Noerhadi Magetsari gives a completely different understanding towards the rules. He revises and gives the rules a new definition, even a completely new understanding. According to him, principle of provenance is a principle to understand the function and certain events related to the creating agency, not only a matter of structure or physical place; principle of original order is a principle that deals with digital born archives not only paper-based archives, as it is also about medium and software that have changed rapidly. In his opinion, provenance has become “a virtual concept in a more flexible way” and original order has changed into “varying types of orders”.¹⁷¹

D. The Indonesian Adapted Version of Dutch Manual

There are other archival standards that have been made by other institutional archives: regional archives and university archives. These regional archives and university archives tend to literally translate every point of the standards made by ANRI without trying to look upon their own archival collection and to apply the sections in making inventory. In other words the standards can not be applied because they can not give examples from their repository. There are four regional archives that explicitly state the rules, although without

¹⁶¹ *ibid.*: 142.

¹⁶² *ibid.*: 142 – 3.

¹⁶³ *ibid.*: 143.

¹⁶⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ Accessed via www.arsiparis.blogspot.co.id on April 20th 2017.

¹⁶⁷ Sulisty Basuki. *Pengantar Ilmu Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2007): 10.3 – 10.8.

¹⁶⁸ Azmi. “Strategi Pengaturan Arsip Statis pada Lembaga Kearsipan dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Akses dan Mutu Layanan Arsip Statis kepada Publik” accessed www.anri.go.id on March 23rd 2017; Azmi. “Analisis Pengelolaan Arsip Dinamis dan Statis dalam Menjamin Otentisitas dan Reliabilitas Arsip bagi Kepentingan Publik”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 3 Nomor 1 (2008): 103 – 29; Azmi. “Scenario Planning Peningkatan Kinerja Lembaga Kearsipan dalam Pengolahan Arsip Statis Guna Meningkatkan Akses dan Pelayanan Publik”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1 (2013): 1 – 35; Azmi. *Deskripsi dan Penataan Arsip Statis* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka, 2015).

¹⁶⁹ Banu Prabowo. “Upaya Menyingkap Filsafat Kearsipan: Suatu Kajian Awal Filsafat Kearsipan”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 5 Nomor 1 (2010): 1 – 34.

¹⁷⁰ Machmoed Effendhie. “Ilmu dan Pendidikan Kearsipan: Sebuah Pengantar”, *Seminar Nasional Pengembangan Keilmuan Kearsipan*, Yogyakarta 6 September 2014.

¹⁷¹ Noerhadi Magetsari. “Organisasi dan Layanan Kearsipan”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 3 Nomor 1 (2008): 11 – 13.

further definition and by simply following what it stated in the latest archival law of 2009.¹⁷² These four have the same title for their general standards: archival management (*penyelenggaraan kearsipan*). The term “general” means to cover not only management of archives but the whole business process of archival management from creation of records to keep the archives, both records and archival records. In 2011 the Governor of West Java Province signed a regulation about archival management.¹⁷³ In 2013 the Mayor of Surabaya signed the same topic of regulation.¹⁷⁴ In 2015 the Province of Central Java added a similar regulation.¹⁷⁵ In the same year, the Madiun regency of the Province of East Java also signed the same one.¹⁷⁶ Some of these institutional regional archives plan to make their archival standards of description following the example of the Province of Central Java and the City of Surabaya.

Archives of Gadjah Mada University deal with the management of archives, including acquisition and records appraisal, description, restorative or curative conservation, information services and sources publication. It does mention explicitly the rules but the university archives prefer to provide a general inventory and source publication.¹⁷⁷ Archives of Bogor Agricultural University has a set of standards of archival management not only archives management. It details the flowchart of tasks but it does not mention the rules.¹⁷⁸ Archives University of Indonesia are planning to have a comprehensive standard which covers archives management. The title of this upcoming standard that shall be released the end of 2017 would be Management of Information, Document and Archives (*Pengelolaan*

¹⁷² In a survey done by ANRI in 2011, there was no question concerning the availability of archival standard in relation with archival management of regional institutional archives, see Pusat Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Sistem Kearsipan. *Laporan Pengkajian Lembaga Kearsipan dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Pengelolaan Arsip Statis* (Jakarta: ANRI, 2011): 20 – 1. Two years later, in a similar survey, there was also no question about it for archives university, see Pusat Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Sistem Kearsipan. *Kajian Arsip Statis Perguruan Tinggi* (Jakarta: ANRI, 2011).

¹⁷³ Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Barat Nomor 18 Tahun 2011 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan. Article 4 (letter d and e, together with 13 other sections) and 27 (no mention at all about the principles) and Peraturan Gubernur Nomor 37 Tahun 2012 tentang Petunjuk Pelaksanaan.

¹⁷⁴ Peraturan Daerah Kota Surabaya Nomor 3 Tahun 2013 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan. Article 51.

¹⁷⁵ Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Tengah Nomor 1 Tahun 2015 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan, Article 4 and 44.

¹⁷⁶ Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Madiun Provinsi Jawa Timur Nomor 12 Tahun 2015 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan, Article 34 Number 2.

¹⁷⁷ Machmoed Effendhie. *Program University Archives UGM: Desain, Implementasi, Tantangan Sekarang dan Mendatang*, 2007: 8, Seminar Kearsipan di Badan Arsip Jawa Timur 2007; interview with Musliichah, archivist at Archives of Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta on May 18th 2017.

¹⁷⁸ Prosedur Operasional Baku Pengolahan Arsip Statis 2014 Bogor Agricultural University Kegiatan 7; interview with Setyo Edi Susanto, archivist at Archives of Bogor Agricultural University, in Bogor on April 11th 2017.

Informasi, Dokumen dan Arsip).¹⁷⁹ There are a few other university archives, such as Archives of Eleventh of March University in Surakarta and Archives of University of Udayana in Bali, as well as some private universities, but there are no writings about these university archives and their archival standards.¹⁸⁰

Although the Manual has never been translated into Malay or Indonesian, the main rules of the Manual have influenced Indonesian archival practice in a subtle way. Indonesian archivists define the rules in a flexible way through the reading, arranging and describing archival collection to make inventory. If we read carefully we could see that there are similarities between the definition of the main rules and of the Indonesian laws and standards, including terms that can not be translated such as components of multi-level description (fonds, sub-fonds, seri, file and item), similar terms (arrangement, order and organization) and even common terms such as archive(s) and record(s).

The creation of Indonesian archival standards has recently been increasing in numbers since the second archival law was signed in 2009, not only within the national institutional archives (ANRI) itself but also in regional archives and university archives. The making of such standard is a bit too late since it was more than one century after the publication of the Manual, although considering Indonesian archival practices it was not too late after all. This lateness happens at the time when historical interest of archives is no longer to be considered as the only interest. From the archival point of view, there are increasing amounts of digital-born records and the rising of record continuum model.¹⁸¹ These standards only deal with paper-based archives. The way the main rules of the Manual entered Indonesia was not only through the published standards of ICA (ISAD-G, ISAARCPF, ISDIAH and ISDF), but also as we have seen earlier the rules entered long before various standards made by ICA that were adapted by Indonesian archivists. The archival connection between Indonesia and the Netherlands began in the early twentieth century long before Indonesian started its

¹⁷⁹ Interview with Anon Mirmani in Depok on April 6th 2017; Interview with Bayu Setyawan, archivist at Archives University of Indonesia, in Depok on April 6th 2017.

¹⁸⁰ Zaenudin. "Lembaga Kearsipan Perguruan Tinggi di Indonesia: Bentuk, Tugas dan Kelengkapannya," *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1 2013: 36 – 58.

¹⁸¹ According to Hani Qonitah, lecturer at University of Indonesia (UI), Australian influence on archival management has shifted Dutch influence mainly because of the publication of ISO 15489: Records Management which adopted from Australian records management. Sumartini's role in building up Archival Diploma (Diploma Kearsipan) at UI in 1970's which heavily influenced by Dutch Archivistiek is crucial. Until 2010, Archival Diploma had been the official name of the course. Between 2010 – 7, the name was changed into Information and Document Management. Since 2017, the name Archival Diploma has been once again its official name. Similar to other universities, archival science is put together with library science.

connection with ICA. By translating¹⁸² and then reading closely each section within the Manual, Indonesian archivists can understand better the historical context of the life cycle model that has close connection with paper-based archives and be prepared in facing digital-born records.

Due to the connection and cooperation between the two states, it is natural to accept the third standard of 2015 to be an Indonesian version of the Dutch Manual. There are more logical reasons than the historical one. The version is not only translated into Indonesian but also has to be annotated because the rules have been developed for more than 100 years after its first publication. Various standards of ICA and references of the third standard make unclear statements about the standard's connection to the Manual (since the Manual is not in the standard's bibliography) although the main rules of the Manual have been attached to them. By this, Indonesian archivists could have a better understanding of the Dutch influence and then practice the main rules in making of inventories of paper-based archives. Knowledge of the Dutch influence can help Indonesian archivists to deliver the life-cycle model used to deal with paper-based archives. After gaining this understanding, the archivists expect to understand digital-born records which have a connection to the record continuum model. The expectation is that there will be a combined standard of archiving developed that has its roots all the way back to the Manual.¹⁸³

¹⁸² In the first edition of American-English publication of the Manual, Leavitt (1940: 7) writes in Translator's Preface: "Strangely enough, the book has not hitherto been translated into English, although it has been regarded with high esteem and the principles set forth in it have influenced the development of archival economy in England as well as on the Continent of Europe."

¹⁸³ This is similar to the courses of archival diploma in University of Indonesia that has both influences in the courses: Dutch influence in (life-cycle model) 1980's – 1990's and Australian influence (record continuum model) in 2000's.

CHAPTER FOUR

IMPLEMENTING THE MAIN RULES OF THE MANUAL

This chapter describes the final influence in the archipelago and the actual objectives of the Manual: making primary finding aids or inventory. By doing this, this chapter will describe how the rules are implemented in the making of inventory and why due to theoretical and practical reasons there are certain inventories needing to be revised after some years. Several inventories will be described that explicitly state and implement the rules. After some years, the previous and the latter archivists who made the inventories have different understanding of the rules and have different ways of implementing the principles, including not strictly obeying the principles. It is natural for the latter archivists to have different thoughts from the first ones. It reflects the theoretical development of archival science and archival knowledge which might differ from one region to another.

The first sub-chapter describes an inventory that is considered to be revised because of theoretical and practical reasons. These two inventories are from the same fonds or archival group. The second sub-chapter describes two inventories that have intersected fonds. These two inventories were considered at first to have one fond and one inventory but later it was found that the first inventory should exclude some of its archives because it has different fonds. The second inventory should be revised because it is no longer accessible and a number of its archives belong to different fonds. There was confusion among the archivists how to differentiate the name of the region and the name of its capital.

Inventaris Hoge Regering and *Inventaris Java's Noordoostkust* represent how the rules have been applied and are being developed. Indeed the principles are the main principles but to understand the rules and the way the rules are being implemented in the two inventories are different. The two inventories have connection with regional archives (*gewestelijke archieven* or *residentie archieven*). These regional archives were part of the first arrangement and description implementation in the collection of *Landsarchief*. Years later, the National Archives of Indonesia published separate inventories, or sub-inventories, of these archives. There are two major periods, VOC (within this period there are three important dates in the beginning: September 1, 1609, November 27, 1609 and November 27, 1609; ending on September 11, 1811) and the Netherlands East Indies (officially from 1816 to 1942). It requires thorough knowledge of the autonomy of the creating agencies of these archives in order to enable the archivists to decide regarding whose fonds these archives are.

The main question is which approaches were applied at the time by the central government: centralized or decentralized?

A. *Inventaris's Lands Archief and Inventaris Hoge Regering*

The Archives of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) and the Local Institutions in Batavia or simply known as *Inventaris Hoge Regering*¹⁸⁴ was meant to replace a series of inventories made by the first *Landsarchivaris* J. A. van der Chijs, *Inventaris 's Lands Archief 1602–1816* which he finished in 1882.¹⁸⁵ Although the Manual was not yet published, some of the main rules of the Manual had been adapted in setting up the inventory. To provide an inventory no matter how general it was, one of the main rules should be applied. Climate problem, changing repository and no concordance between the number in the inventory and the physical archives in the repository are some of the technical reasons that make the archives no longer accessible and in need of revision.

There are three reasons why the inventories made by Van der Chijs need to be revised. Two of them are practical reasons: there are no numbers in the inventory and it is a confusing mixture of an inventory and a catalogue. One of them is a theoretical reason: there is no natural structure of the creating agencies and who the creating agencies were. Van der Chijs was more interested in subject rather than the creating agency.¹⁸⁶ The Manual was not yet published. The inventories were published six years before the first publication of the Manual. There were several related or even similar inventories before them. After six years of collaborative work, the brand new revised combined inventory was published in 2007. Besides the Manual, the archivists also applied General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD-G) of International Council on Archives (ICA).¹⁸⁷

There are fifteen sub-inventories, also considered to be fifteen sub-fonds: *Hoge Regering, Hoge Commissie, Algemene Rekenkamer, Raad van Justitie, Schepenbank, Heemraden, Weeskamer, Boedelkamer, Bank van Lening, Vendukantoor, Amphioensocieteit, Notarissen, Kerken, Burgelijke Stand* and *Engelhard*. The collection of Engelhard has a

¹⁸⁴ The making of this inventory was part of a larger project named *Tanap*. The inventory project itself began on May 1st 2011. See the description of *Tanap* in the previous chapter.

¹⁸⁵ Jacob Anne van der Chijs. *Inventaris van 's Lands Archief* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1882).

¹⁸⁶ “De inventaris bevatte overigens geen enkele nummering en was een verwarrende mengeling van een inventaris en een repertorium. De uitgangspunten die Van der Chijs hanteerde bij zijn ordening en beschrijving van het archief dateerden van vóór de door de Nederlanders Muller, Feith en Fruin in 1898 geïntroduceerde grondbeginselen van de archivaliek: het ‘herkomst-’ en het ‘bestemmingsbeginsel’ (‘respect des fonds’).... Van der Chijs was, als kind van zijn tijd, geïnteresseerd in onderwerpen en niet in archiefvormers die in de moderne archivaliek de structuur van een inventaris bepalen.” See, *The Archives of VOC*: 161.

¹⁸⁷ *The Archives of VOC*: 144.

connection with *Java's Noordoostkust*.¹⁸⁸ Nicolaas Engelhard was the governor of *Java's Noordoostkust* for seven years, from 1801–1808.

Not all collections could be saved because of the limited number of archivists, the absence of archival policy especially during the period of Daendels, no permanent repository and climate condition. Verne Harris refers to this phenomenon as “a sliver of a sliver of a sliver”.¹⁸⁹ According to Michael Karabinos, by this he means that not everything is documented, and what is documented is not always archived, and what is archived is not always preserved, making “the archive” (the place) a skewed representation created by those controlling information.¹⁹⁰ Adding to this, although what is preserved is not always accessed, by making standardized inventory, archives (the document) that are preserved or kept can be accessed.

B. *Gewestelijke Stukken: Semarang and Java's Noordoostkust*

Regional archives, a collection of several regional archives, were among the first collections to be described in 1938. Collections of Surabaya and Semarang were among the described collections. In Collection of Surabaya as described in 1939 there were more than 1400 bundels. In 1939, the description of collections of Tangerang and Semarang was finished. Semarang itself had 1.752 bundels covering the period from 1816 to 1879.¹⁹¹ Unfortunately, the first inventory of Semarang can not be found because even though the description was finished, the inventory was not yet provided. In 1988, the National Archives of Indonesia published another Inventory of Semarang Residency 1808–1880.¹⁹² By seeing the period of the two archival fonds, differences between the two are apparent. The second inventory considers the period of British Interregnum (*Engelse tussenbestuur*) while the first one does not. Different from the two, when the first stage of arrangement and description was being done and the inventory was not yet finished, there is also the period of 1718–1890. It seems that the period itself is open for discussion and the diverse opinion among the archivists is natural. The latter inventory of Semarang, after excluding some of its archives because it was considered to come from two separate fonds, has added 25 linear meters of its

¹⁸⁸ Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Java's Noordoostkust 1694 – 1816* (Jakarta: ANRI, 2013): 10 – 1.

¹⁸⁹ Harris, Verne. “The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa”, *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 65.

¹⁹⁰ Karabinos, “Displaced Archives, Displaced History”: 282.

¹⁹¹ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1939* (Landsdrukkerij: Batavia: 1940): 13.

¹⁹² Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Semarang 1808 – 1880* (Jakarta: ANRI, 1988): x – xi.

collection from Pasar Ikan's collection. This latter inventory has 350 linear meters before the arrangement took place and ended up with 291 linear meters.¹⁹³

The focus of this sub-chapter is the two connected inventories that have intersected fonds, Semarang and *Java's Noordoostkust*.¹⁹⁴ One of the collections considered does not belong to Semarang but belongs to *Java's Noordoostkust*. The reason why the two fonds were combined was because Semarang used to be the capital of the region's *Java's Noordoostkust*, between 1748 and 1808. In *Guide to the Sources of Asian History*, *Java's Noordoostkust* is considered to be part of Semarang. Period of Semarang (1718–1890) includes period *Java's Noordoostkust* (1743–1848).¹⁹⁵ The two regions, the two fonds, are also connected to other regions in the northern part of the island of Java, such as Tegal, Demak, Jepara Joana, Rembang and Grisee.¹⁹⁶

In 2013, *Inventory of Java's Noordoostkust* was published. The period is 1748–1808.¹⁹⁷ It is clear that the periods between the inventory and the time when Semarang used to be the capital of region *Java's Noordoostkust* are the same. According to *Guide to the Sources of Asian History*, the period of *Java's Noordoostkust* is between 1743 and 1848.¹⁹⁸ During its processing, there were collections considered that did not belong to the fonds of *Java's Noordoostkust*. There were a collection of commandment of *Java's Noordoostkust*, a period when the archival management was centralized to the *Hoge Regering*, and a collection of the personal files of Nicolaas Engelhard that were considered to be excluded, neither included in the collection of *Hoge Regering* nor Semarang or in the personal files of Engelhard.

Based on the cases of Semarang and *Java's Noordoostkust*, the problem of defining fonds could be understood easily by seeing the periods of various inventories. Each inventory that is made by an Indonesian archivist has its own reasoning. The archivists who were involved in the making of the inventories expressed their own considerations concerning the principles.

¹⁹³ Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Semarang 1808 – 1880* (Jakarta: ANRI, 1988): xi. See also National Archives of Indonesia. *Guide to the Sources of Asian History 4 (Indonesia)* (Jakarta: ANRI and Unesco, 1989): 61.

¹⁹⁴ *Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie over 1938* (Landsdrukkerij: Batavia: 1939): 10.

¹⁹⁵ *Guide to the Sources*: 61.

¹⁹⁶ Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Semarang 1808 – 1880* (Jakarta: ANRI, 1988): xiii; Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Java's Noordoostkust 1748 – 1808* (Jakarta: ANRI, 2014): 11.

¹⁹⁷ Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. *Inventaris Java's Noordoostkust 1748 – 1808* (Jakarta: ANRI, 2014): 11.

¹⁹⁸ National Archives of Indonesia. *Guide to the Sources of Asian History 4 (Indonesia)* (Jakarta: ANRI and Unesco, 1989): 61 – 2.

C. Different Ways of Implementing the Rules

Indeed there are some different features between inventories that were made before and after the publication of the Manual in 1898 but it would be more efficient to revise than to completely change the inventories. The rules themselves were already available before being codified in the Manual and also before the Manual was translated into Indonesian. Defining archival fonds is crucial and yet highly subjective because every generation of archivists has their own contemporary understanding that might be slightly different from their forerunners.

The archivists are expected to have a better understanding of the historical context of the archives and of the autonomy of creating agencies in decision making by knowing the fonds or sub-fonds and other elements of multiple description (files, series and item). In this case, the rules help to understand the fonds. Are the fonds connected in a certain period and separated in other periods, and reunited in some period or completely independent? As primary finding aid, inventory should provide a profile of the creating agencies, the original archival system, acquisition and access to the archives from the reading room to the repository.

Rule of provenance has its meaning if the archives are complete in recording certain events and after the archives have been confiscated to the national archives or in other words the archives no longer belong to or are being kept by the creating agencies. Rule of original order should be understood in a way that paper-based archives are connected physically and when the information is integrated. The twin rules serve the best historical purpose of the archives because they help to understand the historical context of the function and the structure of the creators. The rules also help to find information of the creating agencies not only information about the existence of the creating agencies, but also to know how autonomous the agencies were in making decisions.

CONCLUSION

The main rules of the Manual are actually from French (provenance, *respect des fonds*) and German (original order, *strukturprinzip* or *registraturprinzip*). The Manual has its importance in combining the rules to help archivists in preparing inventory. The Manual is the first codified manual of archiving and provides the first systematic definition of archives and other related terms. Furthermore, the Manual helps to understand the life-cycle model because it was made in a time when the only existing documents were paper-based archives. It is impossible to implement record continuum model which deals with digital-born archives without having enough knowledge of previous model, the life cycle model. The Manual helps Indonesian archivists to know how the European archivists (French, German and Dutch) dealt with paper-based archives because they have a hundred years of experience of recording historical events and registering them in a systematic order. The rules are beyond historical interest but are aimed at providing historical context of the creating agencies, including their structures and functions. In a way it will help researchers to know information of, not only about, the creating agencies. In the end it will put archives as the subject of research.

Arrangement, description and preservation are among the colonial archival policies delivered by *Landsarchief. Archief Ordonnantie* 1941, and also *Archief Wet* 1918, have had close connection with the Manual. In the 1950's, the national archival policies consider colonial archives as a primary source in writing national history. These archives are intended to provide source for national memory. Decolonization of archives in Indonesia was happening at the same time when teaching of applied archival science was valued. After 2009, the national policies changed from historical interest to archival interest. This occurred in part because of the long years of archival connection and cooperation with the Netherlands.

The Dutch *Archivistiek* influences Indonesian archival laws (1971 and 2009), the standards (2004, 2011 and 2015) and other writings about the the main rules of the Manual: archives, arrangement, description, provenance and original order. The influence came to Indonesia through the ideas of Indonesian archivists who had learned Dutch *Archivistiek* in the Netherlands, the establishment of an archival diploma in several universities and archival cooperations between Indonesia and the Netherland. After the law of 2009, there is increasing interest in making archival standards of description. The making of such standards was

initiated by ANRI. The standards, especially the standard of 2015, should not only translate other international standards, including the Manual. The standards should also consider the collections of ANRI. Although the standards were based on the experience of ANRI that was heavily influenced by Dutch *Archivistiek*, many other institutional archives simply copied the standards without considering their archival experiences and their collection.

The rules of the Manual are open to different interpretation because archival science is an applied science and is subject to change in preparing inventories. The influences are accepted by Indonesian archivists although they have different understanding about the rules while still considering the rules important. As in the case of the inventories in which the rules are applied, the interpretation of the rules can also change.

This thesis suggests that ANRI should improve the quality of archival standards of description and implement the main rules of archiving in preparing inventories. As the national institutional archives, ANRI is the role model for other institutional archives: regional archives and university archives. Because of the connection and cooperation with the Netherlands and the fact that major parts of their collection used to belong to the *Landsarchief*, archivists of ANRI should actively adopt the main rules of the Manual, adapt the influence of the rules in making standards and inventories, and share their experience of preparing such archival standard of description with their international colleagues. The improvement of archival standards has made progress in the international context and hence ANRI has the responsibility of improving the quality of archival standards of describing. In September 2016, ICA published *Records in Context: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description* (RiC-CM). The RiC-CM combines four current standards (ISAD-G, ISAAR, ISDF and ISDIAH) published between 1988–2008. In the progress report of Expert Group on Archival Description (EGAD), Daniel Pitti states that there are four archival principles of RiC. The first two principles are *principle* of provenance and *respect* for the original order to which the third and fourth principles refer.¹⁹⁹ The two rules have lasted for more than one hundred years after the publication of the Manual in 1898 and provide the basis for the rules to be developed. Commenting on the matter of provenance of the RiC-CM, Julia Mant,

¹⁹⁹ In late 2012, ICA formed the Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD) which is the partial successor to the Committee on Best Practices and Standards. The group has been developing the new standard for the description of records based on archival principles. International Council on Archives Experts Group on Archival Description (ICA EGAD), *Records in Contexts: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description* (International Council on Archives (ICA, 2016); *Records in Context (RiC): An International standard for archival description, Progress report* (Cleveland: ICA, 2015). The American-English translated second edition of the Manual is included in Bibliography of RIC Consultation Draft, see ICA, *RiC-CM*: 105.

quoting Chris Hurley, states that there are other types of parallels: parallel provenance and multiple simultaneous provenance. These new parallels give space for communities and individuals to record their events and activities “... which then coexist with those of the ‘official’ archives”. Alternative interpretations of records and their context should coexist.²⁰⁰ The RiC-CM defines the principle of provenance with two major facets: respect des fonds and respect for original order,²⁰¹ which is different from the previous understanding which included provenance and original order in a single task and method for arrangement and description, Pitti and RiC-CM define provenance as the principle where fonds and original order are to be respected. Similar to Duchein and Mant, RiC-CM also criticises the two and makes a revised definition.²⁰²

This thesis is a preliminary study, not only because it is the first study regarding the influence of Dutch *Archivistiek* on Indonesian archival practices, but also because it gives limited information about the influence on the Indonesian archival laws, Indonesian standards of archival description and inventories in the National Archives of Indonesia. This thesis is an introductory thesis, an introduction to and invitation for further research.

²⁰⁰ Australian Society of Archivists (ASA), *Response of the Australian Society of Archivists to the International Council of Archives Expert Group on Archival Description Records in Context-Conceptual Model* (Australia: ASA, 2017): 2.

²⁰¹ The EGAD plans to publish a two-part standard: a conceptual model for archival description (RiC-CM) and ontology (RiC-O), see ICA, *RiC-CM*: 2.

²⁰² ICA, *RiC-CM*: 4 – 5.

Appendix

Indonesian Translation of *Handleiding voor het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven*²⁰³

²⁰³ This is a partial and annotated translation. The translation is based on the second edition of the Manual which was published in 1920, twenty years after the first edition. S. Muller Fz, J. A. Feith en R. Fruin, *Handleiding voor Het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* (Groningen: Erven B. van der Kamp, 1920). The edition remains the same with the first one. There is no revised edition. In addition to it, the American-English translation by Arthur H. Leavitt is also used. *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives; Drawn Up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists by Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1940/ 2003). Further explanation is based on the online publication of glossary terms of Society of American Archivists (SAA, <http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms>). After certain keywords, there are English words and Dutch words following them in brackets in order to give annotation and to make them easier to be understood for Indonesian readers. It also helps to understand the keywords. For example, for word ‘*één archief*’ (regel 1), ‘*één archief vormen*’ (regel 3) and ‘*archieven*’ (regels 7 and 8) Arthur H. Leavitt uses the same translation ‘an archival collection’ (rule 1, 2 and 3) or ‘archives’ (rule 7) for both words. He also translates ‘an archival depository’ (rule 4) and ‘archival depositories’ (title of chapter 1) both for ‘*één archiefdepôt*’ (regel 4) and ‘*archiefdépôts*’ (titel van eerste hoofdstuk).

Panduan Pengolahan Arsip: Susunan Samuel Muller, Johan Feith dan Robert Fruin Sesuai Arahan Asosiasi Arsiparis Belanda

Pengantar Pengarang (Edisi Pertama, 1898)

Ini merupakan buku yang menjemukan dan teliti. Peringatan bagi para pembaca.

Kami perlu tegaskan sejak awal. Jika cermat memperhatikan tulisan kami, maka publik akan segera mengetahuinya. Kami harus akui bahwa uraian Jacob van Lennep lebih menghibur daripada tulisan kami; dan kami nyatakan bahwa kami tidak risau apakah sebuah tanggal mesti dicetak dalam kurung, ataukah dokumen mesti dinomori dengan simbol atau huruf.

Lalu mengapa kami pikir penting untuk cermat menguraikannya dan secara rinci bagaimana kita memahami penyusunan inventaris arsip? Kami akan senang hati menjelaskannya.

Kami yakin bahwa keseragaman dalam pembuatan inventaris, baik secara mendasar maupun terperinci, berguna sekali. Merupakan kenyamanan tersendiri bagi peneliti, yang cepat memahami makna praktek yang tekun, dan hal tersebut dapat mencegah banyak kesalahpahaman.

Seseorang kelak salah paham, bagaimanapun, membayangkan bahwa kami ingin menempatkan aturan-aturan Pedoman ini selayaknya beban berat pada pundak rekan-rekan kami. Kami tidak akan berkeberatan jika terdapat penyimpangan dari aturan-aturan tersebut secara terperinci atau bahkan secara mendasar. Kami hanya berharap bahwa rekan-rekan kami akan bersedia untuk mempertimbangkan aturan-aturan ini dan mereka tidak akan menyimpang dari aturan-aturan itu tanpa terlebih dahulu memperhatikan, terutama dengan penjelasan, dalam pendahuluan inventaris mereka. Dengan demikian kita akan berkembang dan secara mendasar mencapai tujuan kita bersama. Publik akan mengetahui aturan-aturan apa yang diikuti. Dan kita akan mengetahui pada bagian mana dari aturan-aturan ini yang memerlukan penjelasan lanjutan bahkan mungkin perbaikan.

Kami meminta kritik sebanyak mungkin. Hanya setelah pertukaran yang saling menguntungkan antaranggota Asosiasi²⁰⁴ maka kelak mungkin tercapai hasil yang memuaskan. Merupakan harapan kami bahwa dalam beberapa tahun mendatang edisi kedua dapat terbit,²⁰⁵ oleh karenanya memungkinkan untuk meminta, dan mungkin mendapatkan, persetujuan Asosiasi.

Edisi kedua tersebut, kami yakini, kelak miliki kekurangan lebih sedikit daripada edisi pertama ini. Teks mutakhir ini menunjukkan kekurangan asal-muasalnya. Setiap kami telah mempersiapkan setiap bagiannya, dan bersama-sama kami telah mengulas secara keseluruhannya. Dengan revisi tersebut kami berharap pertentangan di antara kami dapat dihilangkan. Akan tetapi, pengulangan tidak selalu dapat dihindarkan, sebagaimana halnya pengamatan yang selalu berubah-ubah sehingga tidak bisa dihilangkan.

Bagian Pertama

Asal-Muasal dan Persiapan Depo-Depo Arsip (*Archiefdepots, Archival Depositories*)

²⁰⁴ Asosiasi Arsiparis Belanda (The Netherlands Association of Archivists, Vereeniging van Archivarissen in de Nederlands).

²⁰⁵ Edisi Kedua memang terbit namun tanpa revisi.

1. Suatu koleksi arsip (*an archival collection, een archief*) merupakan keseluruhan (*the whole, het geheel*) dokumen tertulis, gambar dan bahan cetakan, secara resmi (*ex officio*) diterima atau dihasilkan (*produced by, opgemaakt door*) suatu badan administratif (*body, bestuur*) atau salah satu petugasnya (*officials, ambtenaren*), selama dokumen-dokumen tersebut dimaksudkan untuk tetap disimpan di bawah pertanggungjawaban (*custodian, berusten*) badan (*body, bestuur*) atau petugas (*official, ambtenaar*) tersebut.

Definisi ini merupakan fondasi yang pada mulanya mengemuka dari pertemuan Asosiasi Arsiparis Belanda dan Arsiparis Negara; Menteri Dalam Negeri menyetujuinya dengan sedikit perubahan melalui sirkuler pada 10 Juni 1897. Jika sulit merumuskan definisi, mungkin sepertinya tidak perlu untuk melakukan itu pada kasus mutakhir. Tidaklah berlebihan untuk memahami keragaman tujuan, karena penting bahwa makna definisi jelas dipahami pada semua aspeknya di mana pengertian lanjutan kelak mengemuka secara alami darinya.

Keseluruhan. Arsip (*an archival collection, een archief*) merupakan suatu “keseluruhan” seketika berhenti menjadi “bagian”, seketika bagian-bagian lain dari arsip tidak diketahui keberadaannya. Jika diketahui, maka mungkin saja membentuk kembali keseluruhan dari bagian-bagian tersebut. Jika hanya secerik kertas tunggal dari arsip yang dipertahankan, maka kertas tersebut yang membentuk arsip; maka dengan sendirinya itu merupakan keseluruhan dan harus dideskripsi sendirian.

Dokumen Tulisan, Gambar dan Cetakan. “Gambar” mencakup peta dan diagram yang mudah sekali ditemukan di *dossier*, baik dibuat atas perintah badan-badan administratif atau para petugas maupun dikirim kepada mereka untuk mendapatkan penjelasan terkait. Tidak ada alasan untuk mengecualikan peta-peta itu dari arsip. Hal yang sama berlaku pula untuk “cetakan”, yang sering terdapat di arsip, terutama sejak akhir abad XVII. Keadaan di mana surat yang banyak kopinya dikirim, atau resolusi suatu badan (atau abstrak resolusi) yang ditujukan kepada para anggota rapat, dicetak bukan merupakan alasan untuk menyingkirkan dokumen tercetak dari arsip. Objek selain ketiganya tidak bisa membentuk bagian dari arsip.

Resmi. Hanya dokumen resmi yaitu dokumen yang diterima dan dihasilkan badan-badan administratif atau para petugas “sesuai kapasitas resmi mereka”, yang merupakan bagian dari arsip. Dokumen yang diterima atau dihasilkan anggota suatu badan administratif atau para petugas tidak membentuk bagian dari arsip. Sikap skeptis (*cum grano salis*) mesti ditempuh. Terutama di daerah terpencil dan jauh, sering terjadi keadaan di mana dokumen yang diterima hanya dokumen resmi, dan bahkan semua rincian terkait sering ditemukan di dalamnya. Jelas, berlawanan dengan tujuan awal apabila dokumen itu harus dikeluarkan dari koleksi untuk mempertahankan bentuk prinsip ini.

Diterima oleh suatu Badan Administratif. Transposisi oleh Menteri perihal istilah “officially”, di mana menurut definisi Asosiasi kami berdampingan dengan kata “official” (suatu transposisi yang dengan sendirinya dimungkinkan karena teks kami mungkin membiarkan miskonsepsi sehingga ekspresi “officially” hanya sesuai untuk “officials”) menarik perhatian bahwa terdapat fakta kata-kata “dikirim kepada suatu badan administratif” tidak dipilih. Bagi pengirim suatu surat kepada badan administrative tidak perlu diperlakukan resmi; hanya tanda terima dokumen yang memperoleh status resmi. Kami beruntung telah mengambil definisi Menteri, yang kalau tidak diambil kami, kata-kata “dikirim kepada” menjadi “diterima oleh”.

Dihasilkan oleh suatu Badan Administratif. Ekspresi ini dipilih, bukan hal sebelumnya—“berasal dari badan administratif (*emanating from the administrative body, uitgegaan van het*

bestuur)”—karena kalau tidak, terlihat meragukan, misalnya, apakah notulen badan itu disertakan ataukah tidak.

Suatu Badan Administratif. Badan yudisial merupakan bagian dari badan-badan administratif. Otoritas administratif yang terdiri dari pribadi tunggal juga termasuk. Asosiasi kami tidak berbincang mengenai “suatu badan administratif” tetapi mengenai “badan administratif dari entitas korporat”. Ekspresi ini dipilih untuk menyesuaikan dengan terminologi yang selalu digunakan the State Archivist General. Kini, karena Menteri tidak memasukkan istilah “entitas korporat” ke dalam definisi yang diajukan the State Archivists, kami telah menghilangkannya, hanya karena bagi kami itu merupakan sesuatu yang samar dan mengarah pada kesalahpahaman tanpa penjelasan khusus.

Salah satu dari para pejabatnya. Definisi Asosiasi kami mulanya mengenai “salah satu dari para pengurusnya” yaitu para pengurus (*functionaries, beampten*) entitas korporat. Kini, istilah terakhir dikeluarkan dari definisi, ekspresi ini harus diubah. Lebih lanjut, karena Menteri lebih menyukai kata “para petugas” daripada “para pengurus”, kami tidak melihat alasan untuk tidak menyetujui hal ini. Semua petugas tidak menciptakan suatu arsip yang mandiri (lihat bagian 55).

Suatu Badan Administratif atau Salah Satu dari Para Petugasnya. Apa yang menjadi perhatian adalah badan administratif dan para petugasnya, bukan entitas korporat yang mereka administrasikan. Entitas korporat sendiri tidak memiliki arsip, tetapi badan-badan administratifnya dan para petugasnya itulah yang memiliki arsip. Maka dari itu, ketika memperbincangkan “arsip entitas korporat”, kita mesti menggunakan istilah “arsip” secara metaforis; sesuatu yang disebut “arsip”, sebenarnya terdiri dari beberapa koleksi. Begitu pula, Negara sendiri tidak punya arsip, dan istilah “Arsip Negara” pada kenyataannya tidak benar: hanya ada arsip berbagai Kementerian, dua Kamar Bikameral, dll. (Kami tidak memperbincangkan mengenai kepemilikan arsip: apabila demikian adanya maka istilah “Arsip Negara” tentu saja benar, karena seluruh arsip Kementerian, Kamar dll milik Negara.)

Selama dokumen-dokumen tersebut dimaksudkan untuk tetap disimpan di bawah pemeliharaan badan (body, bestuur) atau petugas (official, ambtenaar) tersebut. Definisi ini berbeda dari definisinya Kementerian. Definisi kami “dimaksudkan” itu jelas lebih benar, karena transfer suatu dokumen oleh penanggung jawab selanjutnya tidak bisa menghilangkan karakter kearsipannya. Penggantian kata-kata “dalam pertanggungjawaban entitas korporat” menjadi “dalam pertanggungjawaban badan atau kantor itu” lebih akurat. Maka, perhatian utama tertuju pada draf yang ditulis suatu badan administratif bagian dari arsip, tetapi bukan kopi final yang dikirim, yang menjadi bagian dari arsip penerima. Lebih lanjut, dokumen jenis lain dikecualikan dari definisi ini, yaitu aturan tercetak atau pemberitahuan tercetak dan bahan lain yang, walaupun dimaksudkan untuk diposkan atau disirkulasikan, tersisa di depot. Jika peraturan itu masih digunakan badan administratif, tentu saja ini tidak dikecualikan; karena jelas dimaksudkan bahwa itu mesti disimpan dengan badan itu.

Pemilahan kadang-kadang mesti dibuat antara arsip dan perpustakaan, dengan menyatakan bahwa arsip menyimpan semua manuskrip yang dimiliki suatu badan administratif *jure publico* dan perpustakaan menyimpan apa yang termasuk *jure privato*. Definisi ini tidaklah benar; tetapi ada keberatan lain. Beberapa tahun lalu Wackermagel mendefinisikan arsip sebagai berikut: “Arsip merupakan agregat dokumen-dokumen itu yang dihasilkan sewaktu dan untuk tujuan administrasi public, sebagaimana dokumen yang dihasilkan Negara membutuhkan karakter publik.” (*Das archiv ist die Sammlung derjenigen Schriftstücke, welche auf dem Wege und zu Zwecken der öffentlichen Verwaltung entstanden sind, sowie derjenigen, welche auf dem Weg privater Verwaltung entstanden, aber durch Uebergang derselben an den Staat nachträglich öffentlichen Charakter erhalten haben*). Definisi ini, benar untuk Arsip Negara, tidak benar sebagai definisi umum arsip; karena pula badan-badan sipil swasta juga membentuk arsip (lihat Bagian 3).

2. Suatu koleksi arsip merupakan kesatuan organis (*an organic whole, een organisch geheel*).

Pada bagian sebelumnya telah ditunjukkan bagaimana arsip mengemuka sebagai hasil kegiatan suatu badan administratif atau petugas, dan bagaimana adanya selalu merupakan cerminan fungsi badan itu atau petugas itu. Arsip bukan dihasilkan sebagaimana manuskrip bersejarah dikumpulkan, walau kumpulan seperti itu, misalnya Military History Collection, kadang-kadang merupakan arsip. Sebaliknya, arsip merupakan kesatuan organis, organisme yang hidup, yang tumbuh, berubah bentuk, dan melakukan perubahan menurut aturan-aturan pasti. Jika fungsi-fungsi badan tersebut berubah, watak arsip pun berubah. Aturan-aturan yang mengatur komposisi, pengaturan dan pembentukan arsip tidak bisa diperbaiki arsiparis bersangkutan; dia hanya bisa mempelajari organisme dan memastikan aturan-aturan yang membentuknya. Setiap arsip hadir sebagaimana adanya, kepribadiannya, individualitasnya, yang arsiparis itu harus berkenalan dengannya sebelum dia berlanjut ke pengaturan. Akibatnya, dalam aturan-aturan yang mengikutinya terdapat penghindaran cermat pemberian sembarang skema untuk pengaturan dan pengelompokkan arsip (*archiefordening en – indeeling*). Setiap arsip harus diperlakukan sesuai karakternya, dan panduan ini tidak punya pilihan lain kecuali memberikan sarana untuk menjadi akrab dengan struktur suatu koleksi arsip dan muncul dari apa yang dipelajari mengenai prinsip-prinsip pengaturannya. Tanpa pengamatan sebelumnya terhadap struktur organisme, upaya ini tidak bisa ditempuh. Ini bukan merupakan “systematizer” pertama yang seseorang temui—dan masih sedikit sejarawan pertama-tama—yang mumpuni untuk mengatur arsip, tetapi hanya seseorang yang telah mempelajari pengaturan arsip.

3. Kantor-kantor (*offices, besturen*) administratif atau unit-unit badan swasta (*private social bodies, privaatrechtelijke lichamen*) dapat saja menghasilkan suatu koleksi arsip (*an archival collection, een archief vormen*).
4. Pemilahan yang jelas mesti dibuat antara koleksi arsip (*an archival collection, een archief*) dan isi dari depo arsip (*an archival depository, een archiefdepôt*) sebagai suatu kesatuan. Di dalam depo arsip seseorang dapat menemukan enam macam arsip (*archieven, archives*): (1) koleksi arsip (*the archival collection, het archief*) suatu badan administratif itu sendiri; (2) arsip (*archives, archieven*) komisi-komisi atau petugas yang dibawah badan tersebut; (3) arsip komisi-komisi dan pribadi yang hak-hak dan fungsi-fungsinya telah diwakilkan pada badan tersebut; (4) arsip komisi-komisi atau pribadi yang kepadanya badan tersebut harus melakukan pengawasan dan koleksinya telah ditempatkan di depo; (5) arsip yang telah ditempatkan di depo melalui upaya administratif; (6) arsip yang telah diterima sebagai pinjaman, pemberian atau pembelian.
5. Untuk koleksi arsip (*the archival collection, het archief*) badan administratif (*body, bestuur*), baik dewan (*board, college*) maupun pribadi (*person, persoon*), di depo mesti ditambahkan arsip keseluruhan badan, dewan-dewan atau pribadi, yang hak-hak dan fungsi-fungsinya telah diwakilkan kepadanya.
6. Koleksi arsip (*archival collection, archieven*) badan-badan administratif, baik dewan-dewan maupun pribadi, yang hak-haknya, setelah 1798, diserahkan kepada Negara (*State, staat*) mesti disimpan di depo Negara (*State depository, rijksdepôt*) di ibukota provinsi yang di wilayahnya badan tersebut pernah berfungsi.
7. Depo arsip lama negara (*Het depôt der oude rijksarchieven, The depository of the old State archives*) di suatu provinsi (juga sebagai depo arsip kabupaten/ kota) terdiri atas: (1) arsip badan-badan administratif terdahulu, baik provinsi maupun kabupaten/ kota; (2) badan administratif provinsi (atau kabupaten/ kota) terkini selama arsip tersebut telah dipindahkan padanya; (3) badan-badan administratif (dewan-dewan atau pribadi) yang hak dan fungsinya diserahkan kepada badan-badan provinsi atau departemen

- (atau kabupaten/ kota); (4) dewan-dewan atau pribadi yang pernah berfungsi di wilayah provinsi (atau kabupaten/ kota) yang sekarang, yang telah ditempatkan di penyimpanan melalui kerja administratif.
8. Beragam koleksi arsip (*archival collections, archieven*) yang disimpan di depo harus ditempatkan secara terpisah dan seksama. Jika terdapat beberapa salinan suatu dokumen (*a document, één stuk*), suatu kajian mesti dilakukan untuk melihat di koleksi mana setiap salinan terkait.
 9. Jika tidak terbukti dari inventaris-inventaris lama, tanda-tanda tampak luar (*external marks, uiterlijke kenteekenen*), atau sarana-sarana lain bahwa koleksi arsip (*archival collection, archiefstuk*) merupakan suatu instrumen formal atau bagian dari arsip lainnya, isi dokumen mesti menentukannya. Jika terlihat dari isinya bahwa dokumen tersebut mungkin bagian dari satu atau dua koleksi, maka mesti ditempatkan di salah satu dari keduanya dengan memberikan tunjuk silang di dokumen lainnya.
 10. Ketika koleksi arsip (*an archival collection, een archief*) sudah utuh, maka tidak harus diserahkan pada dua atau lebih depo arsip (*archival depositories, archiefdepôts*).
 11. Jika memungkinkan, perlu menata ulang koleksi arsip yang telah tercerai-berai.
 12. Jika sulit menata ulang koleksi arsip yang tercerai-berai (*dismembered archival collection, de splitsing van archief*), bagian-bagian yang tercecer dari koleksi itu, di mana pun disimpannya, mesti diuraikan petugas yang tunggal atau inventaris yang tunggal, dengan mengacu pada tempat di mana dokumen (*the documents, archiefstukken*) tersebut berada.
 13. Koleksi-koleksi arsip (*archival collections, archieven*) yang memiliki kondisi khusus mesti ditempatkan di luar penyimpanan utama dapat dipindahkan secara keseluruhan.
 14. Jika memungkinkan koleksi-koleksi arsip (*the administrative offices, de bureaux der administratie*) yang disimpan di depo dapat secara bertahap dilengkapi dari kantor-kantor administrative (*the administrative offices, de bureaux der administratie*). Sebagai acuan pemilahan, seseorang mesti menerima prinsip bahwa dokumen-dokumen dari cabang-cabang administratif mesti dipindahkan merujuk pada waktu ketika perubahan administratif yang penting terjadi. Akan tetapi ketika perubahan tersebut tidak terjadi selama lima tahun, dokumen-dokumen yang lebih tua mesti dipindahkan ke depo arsip.

Bagian Kedua **Pengaturan Arsip (*Archival Documents, Archiefstukken*)**

15. Suatu koleksi arsip mesti diatur secara sistematis (*systematically arranged, systematisch worden ingedeeld*).

Aturan ini diadopsi Asosiasi.

Selain pengaturan sistematis, seseorang mungkin juga memikirkan pengaturan alfabetis dan kronologis.

Pengaturan alfabetis, tidak memiliki pendukung. Inventaris yang alfabetis hanya dari Deventer dan Vlissingen.

16. Sistem pengaturan (*The system of arrangement, Het systeem van indeeling*) harus berdasarkan pada klasifikasi awal (*the original organization, de oorspronkelijke organisatie*) koleksi arsip tersebut, yang utamanya mengacu pada organisasi badan administratif pencipta (*the organization of the administrative body, de inrichting van het bestuur*).

17. Ketika melakukan pengaturan (*the arrangement, de ordening*) suatu koleksi arsip (*an archival collection, een archief*), pengaturan asli (*the original order, de oorspronkelijke orde*) mesti dipatuhi sebisa mungkin. Maka seseorang bisa menilai apakah, dan untuk tujuan apa, memungkinkan untuk menyimpang dari pengaturan (*order, orde*) itu.
18. Pengaturan asli (*the original arrangement, de oorspronkelijke orde*) suatu koleksi arsip dapat saja disesuaikan dengan tujuan memperbaiki penyimpangan dari struktur umum koleksi tersebut, baik penyimpangan tersebut terjadi karena kesalahan administrator koleksi maupun merupakan hasil perubahan sementara di sistem preservasi arsip (*the archival documents, der archief stukken*).
19. Ketika melakukan pengaturan (*the arrangement, de ordening*) koleksi arsip, pertimbangan penelitian sejarah mesti menjadi pertimbangan sekunder.
20. Ketika melakukan pengolahan koleksi arsip, seseorang mesti paham bahwa dokumen yang merekam kegiatan badan administratif atau salah satu kantornya yang bertindak berdasarkan tugas resminya membentuk rangka pada koleksi tersebut (*the skeleton of the collection, het geraamte van het archief vormen*).
21. Bukanlah subjek dokumen (*subject of a document, het onderwerp van een stuk*) tetapi tujuan dokumen (*its destination, zijne bestemming*) yang menjadi pertimbangan keberadaan koleksi arsip (*the archival collection, het archief*).
22. Tidak ada *volume (deel), file (lias)* atau berkas (*bundle, bundel*) yang rusak selama motif yang menentukan keberadaannya tidak diketahui.
23. Pemisahan *volumes (deelen)* atau berkas (*bundles*) dari dokumen yang tercecer (*loose documents, losse stukken*) yang dikumpulkan administrator koleksi arsip (*later administrators of the archival collection, latere beheerders van het archief*) diperbolehkan jika memungkinkan. Jika *volume* atau bunga rampai yang sedang dicari seringkali dipakai administrasi itu sendiri atau oleh para cendekiawan, dan dikutip sebagai suatu kesatuan, juga deskripsi terpisah setiap dokumen dapat ditambahkan di suatu tempat di inventaris yang merupakan bagian darinya.
24. Jika suatu koleksi arsip diatur berdasarkan suatu sistem yang berasal dari administrator belakangan dan tidak merujuk pada persyaratan doktrin kearsipan modern, maka memungkinkan, ketika mempersiapkan inventaris baru, tidak merujuk pada pedoman pengolahan baru dan pemisahan volume dan jilid yang mungkin saling terkait hingga inventaris baru selesai disusun. Dan bahkan kemudian, penting untuk menyimpan inventaris lama (*the inventory of the former arrangement*) dan pada setiap *item* di dalamnya untuk mengacu pada nomor di inventaris baru.
25. Seri-seri yang pada mulanya membentuk ulang pengolahan suatu koleksi arsip (resolusi, surat, protokol, keuangan, tanda terima, dll) mengatur alur utama yang merupakan acuan dokumen yang tercecer mesti digabungkan menurut aturan pasti (*in a definite order, eene bepaalde orde*).
26. Dokumen yang tercecer yang dari sudut internal dan eksternal sebelumnya telah membentuk bagian seri-seri atau *dossier* harus, jika memungkinkan, digabungkan kembali ke dalam seri-seri atau *dossier*.
27. Ketika sulit menemukan aturan lama (*old arrangement, oude rangschikking*) pada dokumen yang tercecer tersebut, jawaban atas pertanyaan bagaimana semestinya dokumen tersebut diolah tergantung setiap keadaan koleksi arsip yang melatarbelakanginya, dan terutama keutuhannya. Di situasi ini, kompromi merupakan jalan terbaik.
28. Ketika melakukan pengolahan (*the arrangement, de rangschikking*) dokumen yang tercecer, tidak ada pemilahan utama yang saling diadopsi, namun dapat

- dikelompokkan berdasarkan pada *series* (*serie*) atau *volumes* (*deelen*) atau *files* (*lias*) yang mengemuka dari *series* atau *volumes* atau *files* lama.
29. Seseorang tidaklah memasukkan draf (*drafts, minuten*) dan kopi tertentu (*engrossed copies, grossen*), atau dokumen-dokumen asli (*origineelen*) dan salinan (*transcripts, afschriften*) dan dokumen sejenis lainnya di *series* yang sama.
 30. Dokumen yang disebutkan di resolusi dapat digabungkan ke dalam *series* lampiran sebelumnya, bahwa *dossier* ditempatkan terpisah.
 31. Dokumen yang pada mulanya tidak ditempatkan secara bersama-sama hanya dapat digabungkan pada satu ketentuan: (a) jika dokumen tersebut seluruhnya berasal dari sumber yang sama; (b) jika dokumen tersebut sangat tidak penting untuk diolah terpisah.
 32. Dapat dipahami bahwa suatu *series* dokumen masuk tidaklah bermula di hadapan *series* resolusi, ataupun suatu *series* tanda terima di *series* piutang, yang saling terkait. Maka memungkinkan untuk tidak menggabungkan dokumen-dokumen ini ke suatu *series*, tetapi melakukan deskripsi secara terpisah atau mengelompokkannya menjadi bentuk jilid.
 33. Instrumen-instrumen formal awal (*original formal instruments, origineele oorkonden*), sebarang rusak atau kecilnya, semestinya tidak pernah dihancurkan, bahkan ketika terdapat duplikat, *confirmations*, atau salinan otentik (*authentic copies, authentieke afschriften*).
 34. Jika bentuk asli suatu dokumen dalam kondisi bagus, salinan lepas (tidak *vidimuses*) yang bukan merupakan bagian *dossier* atau *series* manapun dan tanpa nilai paleografis, dapat saja dihancurkan.
 35. Memungkinkan untuk melengkapi kembali koleksi arsip; maka dari itu daftar (*list, lijst*) dokumen-dokumen tersebut mesti disusun untuk memudahkan pencarian atau, jika daftar itu tidak ada, untuk memperoleh transkrip asli atau salinan yang disimpan di tempat-tempat tertentu.
 36. Dokumen yang pernah hilang dari koleksi arsip yang dikembalikan lagi melalui mekanisme pemberian atau pembelian dapat ditempatkan kembali jika sudah jelas dokumen tersebut memang berasal dari koleksi itu.

Bagian Ketiga **Deskripsi Arsip (*Archival Documents, Archiefstukken*)**

37. Ketika melakukan deskripsi (*description, beschrijven*) suatu koleksi arsip, maksud utamanya adalah bahwa inventaris mesti berfungsi hanya sebagai panduan (*guide, wegwijzer*); yang semestinya memberikan kerangka isi koleksi tersebut dan bukan isi dokumen.
38. Sebelum melakukan deskripsi suatu *volume* atau berkas (*a bundle*), konsepsi yang jelas perihal pembentukan yang mendahuluinya mesti dimengerti.
39. Ketika melakukan deskripsi suatu koleksi arsip seseorang mesti mengerti bahwa dokumen-dokumen tertua lebih penting daripada dokumen-dokumen kemudian. Memungkinkan untuk menguraikan lebih rinci daripada sebelumnya. Maka dari itu perbedaan perlakuan boleh saja dilakukan dan menyebutkannya di pendahuluan inventaris.
40. Tabulasi semestinya dihindari di suatu inventaris.

41. Seseorang mesti melakukan deskripsi *series* dan *volumes* tertentu untuk mendapatkan pandangan menyeluruh terhadap koleksi arsip, kemudian baru menyusul dokumen-dokumen yang tercecer.
42. *Series* tidak diolah dokumen per dokumen, tetapi berdasarkan pada nomor tunggal. Jika pengaturan suatu seri diubah, berbagai sub-divisi dapat dibentuk.
43. Penanggalan suatu arsip (*an archival document, een archiefstuk*) tergantung waktu ketika diterima atau dihasilkan dewan atau petugas yang memiliki koleksi arsip tersebut. Jika pengolahan mengarah pada miskonsepsi, tanggal-tanggal produksi dan penerimaan keduanya mesti disebutkan. Pengecualian mesti dilakukan untuk seri piutang. Bukan tanggal sewaktu dokumen tersebut diaudit, namun berdasarkan pada periode yang meliputinya.
44. Ketika ditemukan di dokumen *dossier*, baik asli maupun kopi, yang tanggalnya lebih awal daripada tanggal pada *dossier* (*retroacta*), maka dokumen itu mesti dipertimbangkan sebagai lampiran. Itu tidak lantas memengaruhi tanggal pada *dossier* di inventaris, tidak juga memengaruhi pengaturan dokumen di *dossier*, jika diatur secara kronologis.
45. Daftar-daftar isi (*tables of contents*) *volumes* tunggal atau *files* mesti diberikan hanya ketika daftar tersebut mencatat dokumen yang berbeda bentuk dan subjek, yang keberadaannya sebagai suatu unit di sistem sebelumnya atau dikopi ke suatu volume.
46. Instrumen resmi yang asli sebagai aturan mesti diuraikan terpisah, ketika di masa lampau itu membentuk sebagian *series* atau *dossier*.
47. Ketika piagam (*transfixed charters, getransfigeerde charters*) menjadi bagian koleksi arsip, maka piagam terakhir mesti mendapatkan tempat utama di bagian deskripsi. Di sisi lain, piagam yang belakangan dilampirkan pada dokumen yang sudah disimpan di koleksi arsip semestinya tidak menempati tempat utama.
48. Setiap bagian inventaris mesti mencakup: (a) judul lama *item* tersebut, jika ada; (b) uraian umum isi; (c) tahun atau tahun-tahun yang dicakup dokumen itu; (d) pernyataan apakah item terdiri dari satu atau lebih *volumes*, paket, amplop, *files*, dokumen atau piagam; (e) pernyataan perihal dokumen tambahan yang ditemukan di bagian *item* walaupun tidak terkait dengan isinya. Pernyataan lanjutan perihal isi atau bentuk mesti dibuat di catatan.
49. Ketika menyusun inventaris suatu koleksi arsip, mesti diperhatikan bahwa deskripsi *series*, *dossiers*, dokumen formal, manuskrip, dll, ditempatkan di secarik kertas terpisah yang ukurannya seragam, dengan nomor sementara yang juga terdapat di dokumen.

Bagian Keempat Penyusunan Inventaris

50. Inventaris suatu koleksi arsip harus diatur berdasarkan bentuk organisasi awal (*original organization, de oorspronkelijke organisatie*) koleksi tersebut.
51. Di arsip badan-badan administrasi publik (*een zelfstandig bestuur, public administrative bodies*), perlu dilakukan pemisahan berdasarkan pemilahan kronologis; dengan setiap perubahan penting kelembagaan badan administratif, seseorang mesti memulai suatu pemilahan baru dari inventaris tersebut.
52. Koleksi arsip badan administratif mandiri mesti diolah (*be arranged and described, worden geordend en beschreven*) terpisah, meskipun hak dan fungsi badan tersebut telah diberikan kepada badan lainnya.

53. Jika hak dan fungsi suatu badan administratif diberikan kepada badan lain sehingga bidang kerja badan tersebut bertambah, maka koleksi arsip badan yang telah dilebur dapat diuraikan di inventaris yang sama. Koleksi ini semestinya disertakan di tempat yang masuk akal di susunan inventaris, dan bukan di tempat di mana hal tersebut terjadi di koleksi utama.
54. Arsip (*The archives, De archieven*) komisi-komisi (*committees, commissiën*) dan petugas-petugas (*officials, ambtenaren*) merupakan bagian dari koleksi arsip (*the archival collection, het archief*) badan administratif (*the administrative body, het bestuur*) yang dengannya badan-badan tersebut melaksanakan fungsinya.
55. Komisi-komisi (*Committees, Commissies*) yang telah meninggalkan resolusi (atau *notulen rapat*) telah menciptakan suatu koleksi arsip mereka sendiri. Koleksi ini semestinya tetap mandiri. Arsip dinamis (*The records, De nalatenschappen*) komisi-komisi yang tidak meninggalkan resolusi (atau notulen rapat) yang semestinya dipertimbangkan sebagai *dossier* membentuk bagian koleksi arsip dewan (*board, college*) sehingga komite tersebut hanya bersifat sementara.
56. Koleksi arsip mesti dipilah menjadi bagian-bagian yang seragam (*homogeneous sections, een zelfde criterium*) berdasarkan pada kriteria yang seragam (*uniform criterion, gelijksoortige afdeelingen*). Dokumen yang termasuk karakter umum (*general character, algemeen aard*) mesti ditempatkan di bagian pertama, setelahnya dokumen karakter spesial (*special character, bijzonderen aard*) ditempatkan di bagian yang berbeda.
57. Memungkinkan untuk semua inventaris koleksi arsip yang serupa, rangkaian yang sama juga diikuti untuk bagian utama.
58. *Volumes*, dokumen yang tercecce, piagam dan peta mesti ditempatkan di seri yang tunggal, bukan di bagian terpisah yang berdasarkan pada bentuk tampilan luarnya.
59. Pengaturan piagam (*arrange the charters, title deeds of real state, titels van aankomst van vast goederen*) mesti dipilah berdasarkan tempat dan kemudian diatur secara alfabetis berdasarkan pada lokalitas, jalan, dll, di mana properti tersebut berada. Ketika properti tersebut tersebar di berbagai distrik, maka persebaran juga mesti ditata.
60. Dokumen perihal tunjangan hidup, hadiah dan warisan dari properti pribadi mesti ditata secara alfabetis berdasarkan nama-nama penerima manfaat, donor dan pewaris.
61. Sebagai judul setiap bagian utama inventaris, seseorang mesti menuliskan catatan yang secara jelas menguraikan sejarah dan fungsi dewan atau petugas yang melaluinya pemilahan tersebut berasal.
62. Setiap *item* dari inventaris mesti dinomori. Untuk menandai aturan deskripsi isi *item* tersebut, huruf-huruf yang berurutan mesti dipakai di inventaris sehingga pemilahan antara dua penomoran terlihat jelas.
63. Salinan-salinan belakangan (*modern copies, moderne afschriften*) mestinya tidak dimasukkan ke inventaris; karena pada dasarnya merupakan suatu kesalahan untuk mengisi kekosongan di koleksi arsip. Jika dokumen formal hilang, yang keberadaan sebelumnya tidak diragukan lagi, sebutkan saja di catatan di inventaris atau di daftar (*calendar*).
64. Inventaris mesti menyertakan indeks. Pertimbangkan pula indeks nama-nama pribadi dan indeks nama-nama tempat.
65. Pemilahan yang jelas mesti dilakukan antara arsip (*archival documents, archiefstukken*) dan manuskrip (*manuscripts, handschriften*). Manuskrip juga mencakup bunga rampai hukum, uraian mengenai kota, hal lain-lain, dokumen formal, peta, dll, yang merupakan bagian dari pribadi swasta.

66. Dokumen yang bukan merupakan bagian dari arsip, harus dipisahkan. Dokumen tersebut harus dipindahkan ke koleksi arsip lain atau ke suatu perpustakaan. Dokumen tersebut mungkin juga ditempatkan di bagian terpisah di bagian akhir inventaris di mana dicantumkan; bersama, dokumen tersebut membentuk suatu perpustakaan untuk guna sejarah, topografis, statistik dan lainnya di depo arsip.
67. Mekanisme penyimpanan (*storing, berging*) suatu koleksi arsip sepenuhnya terpisah dari pengaturan (*the arrangement, de indeeling*) dan penyusunan inventaris. Adapun pengaturan lama (*old organization, oude organization*) mesti dimasukkan di pengaturan inventaris (*the arrangement of the inventory, de berging der stukken*), seseorang bebas memberkaskan dokumen. Dengannya, perhatian atas preservasi arsip (*archival documents, archiefstukken*) menjadi penting.
68. Dokumen formal dan peta yang ditemukan di suatu *dossier* yang dirujuk dan tersedia penjelasan tentang dokumen asli yang telah dipindahkan dan disimpan di tempat lain, dikembalikan ke tempat semula.
69. Dianjurkan bahwa setiap manuskrip, setiap amplop suatu dokumen formal, setiap seri dan setiap *dossier* yang dilengkapi dengan alamat surat yang terdapat uraian dokumen di inventaris atau di daftar dan tempat di mana *dossier* disimpan di depo arsip.

Bagian Kelima **Langkah-Langkah Lanjutan Penyusunan Inventaris**

70. Faktor yang menentukan ketika melakukan deskripsi suatu koleksi arsip di inventaris umum (*general inventory, algemeenen inventaris*) dari depo tersebut adalah asal koleksi dalam kaitannya dengan bagian-bagian lain dari inventaris tersebut, bukan kondisi sewaktu hal tersebut dilakukan melalui badan administratif tertentu.
71. Deskripsi setiap *item* dalam inventaris tersebut mesti dilengkapi dengan indeks yang merujuk pada beragam register, dan terutama pada *series* resolusi. Tidak perlu semua itu dicetak.
72. Oleh karena beberapa bagian yang sangat penting suatu koleksi arsip, maka dimungkinkan untuk membuat daftar-daftar (*calendars, lijsten*) isinya. Daftar-daftar ini, mesti diterbitkan secara terpisah atau, untuk koleksi arsip yang jumlahnya sedikit, dicetak sebagai lampiran pada bagian akhir inventaris.
73. Daftar koleksi arsip (*a calendar of an archival collection, regestenlijst*) atau bagian dari suatu koleksi disusun dalam tabel isi yang kronologis yang menampilkan semua dokumen formal yang asli atau yang berbentuk transkrip di koleksi tersebut atau bagian dari suatu koleksi.
74. Ketika menyusun daftar-daftar dokumen otentik (*calendars of the authentic documents, regestenlijsten der oorkonden*) dari suatu koleksi arsip maka hal-hal berikut mesti ditempuh: (a) semua dokumen formal asli yang ditulis di perkamen atau kertas; (b) semua dokumen yang ditranskripsikan di buku-buku catatan (*cartularies, cartularia*); (c) dokumen yang tercerai berai, jika transkripnya terdapat di buku-buku catatan, atau jika itu berasal dari sumber yang sama sebagaimana dokumen yang dicatatkan di buku-buku catatan, atau jika ditulis di perkamen; (d) dokumen formal yang *in extenso* dicatatkan di register, atau yang terkait dengan (*are interpolated, zijn opgenomen*) di dokumen formal lainnya, atau secara umum dokumen yang terdapat transkripnya.

75. Memungkinkan juga untuk mengkompilasi dalam bentuk daftar (*calendar*), sebagian atau keseluruhan, kandungan setiap huruf dan dokumen satuan lainnya yang ditemukan baik bentuk aslinya maupun bentuk transkripnya di suatu koleksi arsip.
76. Mesti diperhatikan bahwa daftar berbeda dari inventaris; perbedaan ini mesti terlihat pada deskripsi dokumen. Di daftar (*a calendar, regestenlijst*), deskripsi mesti mencantumkan kegiatan yang direkam di dokumen yang diuraikan; di inventaris, keadaan dokumen merupakan hal yang penting.
77. Deskripsi dokumen di daftar (*calendar*) harus lebih rinci daripada di inventaris.
78. Di daftar (*calendar*), nama-nama sandang harus sesuai ejaan aslinya. Gelar mesti ditulis utuh, kecuali pada kasus penguasa asing, di mana judul utama saja sudah mencukupi.
79. Di suatu daftar, hal-hal berikut harus mengemuka di setiap jalan masuk (*entry, regest*): (1) tanggal dari dokumen formal berdasarkan pada gaya lama dan baru. Untuk dokumen tanpa tanggal, tanggal mesti dicantumkan seakurat mungkin, termasuk alasannya; (2) tempat di mana dokumen tersebut dirilis. Tidaklah perlu untuk memasukkan seluruh uraian sejak awal hingga akhir; (3) pencacahan segel-segel yang ada (*the existing seals, der voorhandene zegels*); (4) pernyataan perihal keadaan dokumen (asli atau kopi, perkamen atau kertas); (5) pernyataan perihal kesesuaian (*transfixes, transfixen*) yang disertakan sebagai lampiran dari dokumen tersebut.
80. Jika dokumen formal tidak tersedia bentuk aslinya, namun hanya tersedia bentuk transkripnya di manuskrip yang merupakan bagian dari koleksi arsip tersebut, sedangkan di inventaris tersebut, hanya manuskrip tersebut yang perlu disebutkan.
81. Daftar-daftar mesti menyertakan indeks, seperti, (a) indeks nama pribadi, dan (b) indeks nama tempat. Suatu indeks segel juga dimungkinkan.
82. Ketika mempersiapkan indeks alfabetis nama-nama pribadi, yang mesti mengikutsertakan daftar-daftar, mestilah hal-hal berikut diperhatikan: (a) nama-nama pribadi mesti disusun alfabetis berdasarkan nama keluarga, atau apabila tidak ada, maka mengacu pada gelarnya, dan jika juga masih tidak ada, berdasarkan nama bawaaan, (b) nama-nama keluarga Belanda mesti dialfabetkan secara fonetis berdasarkan ejaannya; huruf-huruf yang tidak dilafalkan tidak usah ditulis, (c) nama-nama keluarga asing mesti dialfabetkan berdasarkan ejaan yang paling umum jika dapat diketahui, (d) nama-nama sandang mesti dialfabetkan sesuai ejaan yang paling umum di daftar, sesuai aturan sebelumnya (lihat bagian b); (e) nama-nama keluarga dan nama-nama sandang mesti ditempatkan bersamaan di indeks.
83. Memungkinkan bagi arsiparis mengetahui dokumen yang paling penting dari koleksinya. Dia tidak mesti menerbitkan dokumen pertama yang pertama kali disortir dan sepertinya penting. Memungkinkan mendapatkan pemahaman umum koleksi arsip tersebut dan menentukan dokumen mana yang mesti diterbitkan pertama kali, dan terutama apakah dokumen tersebut merupakan bagian dari seri atau *dossier* atukah tidak sehingga sejumlah dokumen mesti diterbitkan pada waktu bersamaan. Pada koleksi arsip yang sedikit, bahkan memungkinkan untuk melengkapi inventaris sebelum mencetaknya. Di sini bukanlah tempatnya untuk mendiskusikan publikasi arsip (*publication of archival document, uitgave van archiefstukken te spreken*). Aturan yang dianjurkan Asosiasi Sejarah Belanda (*Historisch Genootschap*) mesti diikuti, baik publikasi dokumen Abad Pertengahan maupun tahun-tahun belakangan.

Bagian Keenam
Perihal Kesepakatan Pemakaian Beberapa Istilah dan Lema

84. Gunakanlah terminologi yang sama pada berbagai inventaris. Juga memungkinkan untuk menyeragamkan terminologi pada inventaris-inventaris.
85. Mengacu pada volume, seseorang mesti membedakan register, *protocols*, dan kumpulan dokumen terkait (*bound documents, banden*). Kumpulan dokumen terkait terjadi karena dokumen yang tercerai berai dijilid, sedangkan pada kasus *protocols* dan register, uraian isi disertakan hanya setelah volume tersebut telah disatukan. *Protocols* terdiri dari draf itu sendiri, register terdiri dari transkrip-transkrip.
86. Seseorang mesti membedakan suatu *dossier* dan berkas (*a bundle of documents, bundel stukken*). *Dossier* dibentuk sewaktu koleksi arsip masih merupakan organisme yang hidup (*was still a living organism, het archief nog leefde*); berkas dibentuk administrator belakangan setelah koleksi tidak lagi menjadi bagian dari organisme yang hidup (*a living organism*).
87. Pada bagian pernyataan suatu *volume*, perbedaan mesti dibedakan antara tabel, indeks dan repertoar. Suatu tabel disusun sedemikian rupa sehingga susunan uraian isi dan volume sesuai; suatu indeks dan repertoar menempatkan uraian isi suatu volume di bawah beragam judul berdasarkan karakternya, bagaimanapun cara judul-judul tersebut disusun. Perbedaan antara indeks dan repertoar adalah repertoar menguraikan rangkuman yang jelas setiap *item* dari volume yang diacunya, sedangkan indeks hanya memberikan acuan.
88. Mengacu pada arsip dinamis/ dokumen (*records, stukken*) yang merekam transaksi suatu badan administratif, perbedaan antara resolusi dan notulen mesti dibuat. Resolusi hanya mencakup keputusan komisaris. Notulen juga menyertakan pertimbangan.
89. Mengacu pada resolusi dan notulen maka mestilah dibedakan hal-hal berikut: (a) draf awal (*the rough drafts, het klad*) atau memorandum. Ini disusun sewaktu pertemuan berlangsung; (b) konsep atau draf yang dikoreksi. Ini disusun sewaktu pertemuan tetapi belum disetujui; (c) minut yang diadopsi (*adopted minute, minuut*) atau *lap*. Ini disahkan ketika pertemuan; (d) catatan seketika (*fair copy, net*). Ini merupakan salinan notulen, yang dimaksudkan untuk disimpan komisaris (*the board, het college*) yang resolusinya atau notulen-nya disertakan; (e) salinan-salinan.
90. Mengacu pada piutang (*accounts, rekeningen*), seseorang mesti membedakan: (a) draf laporan piutang yang belum disetujui; (b) laporan keuangan yang diaudit. Ini berarti mencakup laporan yang diaudit dan disahkan, jika laporan yang disahkan dibuat segera setelah audit dimaksudkan untuk diberikan kepada orang yang bertanggung jawab atau orang yang melakukan audit. Memungkinkan untuk memperjelas deskripsi bagi mereka yang menghendaki salinan laporan keuangan yang diaudit; (c) kopi-kopi lainnya, baik sah maupun tidak. Jurnal merupakan suatu register di mana petugas yang bertanggung jawab menyertakan bukti penerimaan dan pengeluaran di bawah tema di mana dia akan mengesahkannya di laporan piutang.
91. Mengacu pada instrumen legal (*legal instruments, akten*), seseorang mesti membedakan: (a) draf, instrumen yang belum disetujui; (b) notulen rapat, instrumen sebagaimana yang disetujui; (c) kopi awal (*engrossed copy, de gresse*), instrumen yang akan diberikan kepada pihak-pihak terkait.
92. Dokumen formal adalah dokumen tertulis yang disusun dalam bentuk yang layak, sehingga berfungsi sebagai bukti sesuai isinya.
93. Piagam (*charter*) adalah kopi awal dari dokumen formal. Oleh karena piagam-piagam ditulis di perkamen, catatan perlu ditulis hanya ketika ditulis di kertas.

94. *Vidimus* adalah dokumen formal (*a formal document, eene oorkonde*) di mana pihak berwenang atau orang lain yang diberikan wewenang memberikan suatu salinan dari dokumen formal lainnya untuk memastikannya, atau orang yang dapat membuktikan keaslian dokumen memberikan salinan yang memadai dari dokumen formal lainnya. *Transumpt* adalah kopi otentik dari suatu dokumen formal.
95. *Transfix* adalah piagam yang direkatkan pada piagam yang lain sedemikian rupa sehingga pita atau tali (*cords*) dari segel dokumen kedua berulir melalui piagam pertama sebelum piagam kedua disegel.
96. Mengacu pada segel, seseorang mesti membedakan segel yang *pendent, applied* dan *drawn*. Hanya ketika segel dicabut atau dibiarkan, maka perlu dijelaskan.
97. Dua tahun yang terhubung menandakan awal dan akhir suatu periode (*a date, eener datering*). Jika suatu periode usai di mana suatu kejadian bermula dan berakhir di pertengahan tahun, kedua tahun tersebut dipisahkan dengan tanda hubung cetak miring (*a slanting stroke, eene schuine streep gescheiden*)
98. Jika suatu periode (*a date, eene dagteekening*) ditulis dalam tanda kurung, hal ini menandakan bahwa penanggalan (*the dating, de dateering*) bukan berasal dari dokumen itu sendiri namun berasal dari sumber yang lain. Jika penanggalan dapat diperkirakan maka mesti diawali kata 'kira-kira' (*circa*) dan diberikan tanda kurung.
99. Pada penanggalan, tahun mesti disebutkan pertama kali, lalu bulan, dan akhirnya hari.
100. Ketika sejumlah dokumen diatur secara kronologis, baik secara seri maupun *calendar*, seseorang mesti menempatkan pertama kali tanggal (*dates, datum*) yang paling lengkap lalu penanggalan (*date, jaar*) yang diperkirakan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Archiefwet 1918, Staatsblad 1918 Number 378.

Archief-Ordonnantie 1941.

Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie 1938.

Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie 1939.

Jaarverslag van het Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie 1940.

Keputusan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 105 Tahun 2004 tentang Pengelolaan Arsip Statis.

Nationaal Archief, Den Haag (NL-HaNA), *Ministerie van Koloniën: Openbaar Verbaal*, nummer toegang 2.10.36.02, inventarisnummer 2343.

NL-HaNA, *Algemeen Rijksarchief, Tweede Afdeling*, 2.14.04, inv. nr. 318.

NL-HaNA, *Algemeen Rijksarchief, Tweede Afdeling*, 2.14.04, inv. nr. 656.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging van Archivarissen in Nederland, 1891 – 1960*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 1.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 2.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 26.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 287.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 294.

NL-HaNA, *Vereniging Archivarissen Nederland*, 2.19.021, inv. nr. 295.

NL-HaNA, *Collectie 441 F. R. J. Verhoeven, 1921 – 1987*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 1.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 12.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 13.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 23.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 30.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 33.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 38.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 46.

NL-HaNA, *Verhoeven*, 2.21.281.04, inv. nr. 55.

NL-HaNA, *Nederlandse Ambassade in Indonesië [standplaats Jakarta]*, 2.05.188, inv. nr 590.

Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Madiun Provinsi Jawa Timur Nomor 12 Tahun 2015 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan.

Peraturan Daerah Kota Surabaya Nomor 3 Tahun 2013 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan.

Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Barat Nomor 18 Tahun 2011 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan.

Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Jawa Tengah Nomor 1 Tahun 2015 tentang Penyelenggaraan Kearsipan.

Peraturan Kepala Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 21 Tahun 2011 tentang Standar Elemen Data Arsip Dinamis dan Statis untuk Penyelenggaraan Sistem Kearsipan Nasional.

Peraturan Kepala Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 27 Tahun 2011 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Sarana Bantu Penemuan Kembali Arsip Statis.

Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 1961 tentang Pokok-Pokok Kearsipan Nasional.

Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 28 Tahun 2012 tentang Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 43 Tahun 2009 tentang Kearsipan.

Staatsblad 1892 Nummer 34.

Staatsblad 1938 Nummer 14117.

Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1971 tentang Ketentuan-Ketentuan Pokok Kearsipan.

Undang-Undang Nomor 43 Tahun 2009 tentang Kearsipan.

Secondary Sources

Ali, Mohammad. 1970. "Keadaan kearsipan di Indonesia dewasa ini serta akibatnya terhadap penelitian sedjarah dikelak-kemudian hari", Paper pada Seminar Sedjarah Nasional ke-2, 26 – 29 Agustus 1970 di Jogjakarta.

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2009. *Modul Manajemen Arsip Statis* (Bogor: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2009. *Modul Pengantar Kearsipan* (Bogor: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2009. *Modul Filsafat Kearsipan* (Bogor: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2011. *Laporan Pengkajian Lembaga Kearsipan Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Pengelolaan Arsip Statis* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2013. *Kajian Arsip Statis Perguruan Tinggi* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2015. *Standar Deskripsi Arsip Statis* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Australian Society of Archivists (ASA). 2017. *Response of the Australian Society of Archivists to the International Council of Archives Expert Group on Archival Description Records in Context-Conceptual Model* (Australia: ASA).

Azmi. Tanpa tahun. “Strategi Pengaturan Arsip Statis pada Lembaga Kearsipan dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Akses dan Mutu Layanan Arsip Statis kepada Publik” accessed www.anri.go.id on March 23rd 2017.

-----.. 2008. “Analisis Pengelolaan Arsip Dinamis dan Statis dalam Menjamin Otentisitas dan Reliabilitas Arsip bagi Kepentingan Publik”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 3 Nomor 1: 103 – 29.

-----.. 2013. “*Scenario Planning* Peningkatan Kinerja Lembaga Kearsipan dalam Pengolahan Arsip Statis Guna Meningkatkan Akses dan Pelayanan Publik”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1: 1 – 35.

-----.. 2015. *Deskripsi dan Penataan Arsip Statis* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka).

Barritt, Marjorie Rabe. 1988. “Archival Training in the Land of Muller, Feith, and Fruin: The Dutch National Archives School”, *American Archivist* Summer: 336 – 44.

-----.. 1993/ 2003. “Coming to America; Dutch *Archivistiek* and American Archival Practice”, in *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives: Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists*, eds Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin (Chicago: the Society of American Archivists): xxxv – xlx.

Basuki, Sulistyoyo. 2005. *Kamus Istilah Kearsipan* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius).

-----.. 2007. *Pengantar Ilmu Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka).

-----.. Tanpa tahun. “Pelestarian Dokumen Kearsipan Negara”, <https://sulistyobasuki.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/pelestarian-dokumen-kearsipan-negara/>, accessed on April 12th 2017.

Bogor Agricultural University. 2014. *Prosedur Operasional Baku Pengolahan Arsip Statis Bogor Agricultural University Kegiatan 7*.

Cook, Terry. 1997. “What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift”, *Archivaria* 43: 17 – 63.

Coolhaas, W. P. 1978. “‘Wie es eigentlich gewesen’: A Correction on the Interview with Prof. M. A. P. Meilink-Roelofs by Prof. W. P. Coolhaas”, *Itinerario* Number 1: 15 – 17.

Daryan, Yayan dan Suhardi Hardi. 1998. *Terminologi Kearsipan Indonesia* (Bandung: Sigma Cipta Utama dan LP2A).

- De Graaff, M. G. H. A. 1974. *Verlag van een bezoek aan het Staatsarchief van Indonesie in het kader van de overeenkomst tot uitwisseling van microfilms maart-april 1974* ('s Gravenhage: Algemeen Rijksarchief).
- , 2013. *De eerste jaren van de samenwerking tussen de Nederlandse en Indonesische archiefdiensten: Verslagen 1974 – 1988 (2001)* ('s Gravenhage: Algemeen Rijksarchief).
- Den Teuling, A. J. M. 2003. *Archiefterminologie voor Nederland en Vlaanderen* ('s Gravenhage: Stichting Archiefpublicaties).
- Duchemin, Michel. 1977/ 1983. "Theoretical Principles and Practical Problems of Respect de Fonds in Archival Science", *Archivaria 16*: 64 – 82.
- , 1992. "The History of European Archives and the Development of Archival Profession in Europe", *American Archivist* Volume 55: 14 – 25.
- Effendhie, Machmoed. 2007. "Program University Archives UGM: Desain, Implementasi, Tantangan Sekarang dan Mendatang". *Seminar Kearsipan di Badan Arsip Jawa Timur, 2007*: 1 – 15.
- , 2014. "Ilmu dan Pendidikan Kearsipan: Sebuah Pengantar," *Seminar Nasional Pengembangan Keilmuan Kearsipan*, Yogyakarta, 6 September 2014.
- Formsma, W. J en F. C. J. Ketelaar. 1985. *Gids voor de Nederlandse Archieven* (Weesp: Fibula-Van Dischoeck).
- Fruin, Robert. 1929. *De Zarchiefwet 1918 Staatsblad No. 378 zooals zij is gewijzigd en aangevuld bij de wet van 14 mei 1928 (Staatsblad No, 177) met uitvoeringsvoorschriften* (Alphen aan den Rijn: N. Samsom).
- Goelema, W. E. 1991. "De Handleiding: nieuwlichterij of codificatie", in: *Respect voor de oude orde: Honderdjaar vereniging van archivariissen in Nederland 1891 – 1991*" ed Paul Brood (Hilversum: Stichting Archiefpublicaties, 1991): 61 – 72.
- Hadiwardoyo, Syauki. 2002. "Merumuskan Jadwal Retensi Arsip", *Suara Badar IV*: 3 – 8.
- , 2002. *Terminologi Kearsipan Nasional* (Jakarta: ANRI).
- Hadiwardoyo, Syauki dan F. Yuniarti. 2007. *Sejarah Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka).
- Handayani, Tri. 2012. "Manajemen Arsip Perguruan Tinggi di Era New Public Service", *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 7 Nomor 1: 39 – 88.
- Horsman, Peter. 1991. "Eeuwige roem: De VAN en de archivistiek", in: *Respect voor de Oude Orde: Honderdjaar Vereniging van Archivariissen in Nederland*, ed Paul Brood (Hilversum: Stichting Archiefpublicaties): 73 – 91.

- Horsman, Peter; Eric Ketelaar and Theo Thomassen. 1998/ 2003. "Introduction to the 2003 Reissue", in *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives: Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists*, eds Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin (Chicago: the Society of American Archivists): v – xxxiii.
- International Council on Archives (ICA). 2015. *Records in Context (RiC): An International standard for archival description, Progress report* (Cleveland: ICA).
- International Council on Archives Experts Group on Archival Description (ICA EGAD). 2016. *Records in Contexts: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description (International Council on Archives (ICA Consultation Draft)*.
- Jaquet, F. G. P en A. E. M. Ribberink. 1992. *Van 's Lands Archief tot Arsip Nasional* (Den Haag: Algemeen Rijksarchief).
- Jenkinson, Hilary. 1922. *A Manual of Archive Administration Including the Problems of War Archives and Archive Making* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- Juergens, Charles. 2012. "The Untamed Archives: History-writing in the Netherlands East Indies and the Use of Archives", *History of the Human Sciences* Volume 26 Number 4: 84 – 106.
- Harris, Verne. 2002. "The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa", *Archival Science* 2: 63 – 86.
- Karabinos, Michael. 2011. "Returning to the Metropole: The Indonesian National Archives and Its Changing Roles at the Start of New Order", *Archives and Manuscript* Volume 39 Number 2: 139 – 50.
- . 2013. "Displaced Archives, Displaced History: Recovering the Seized Archives of Indonesia", *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land en Volkenkunde* 169: 279 – 294.
- . 2015. "The Djogdja Documenten: The Dutch-Indonesian Relationship Following Independence through an Archival Lens", *Information and Culture: A Journal History* Volume 50 Number 3: 372 – 91.
- . 2015. "The Role of National Archives in the Creation of National Master Narratives in Southeast Asia", *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* Volume 2 Article 4: 1 – 8.
- Karabinos, Michael Joseph. 2015. "The Shadow Continuum: Testing the Records Continuum Model through the Djogdja Documenten and the Migrated Archives" (PhD Thesis Leiden University).
- Ketelaar, Eric. 1995. "Archival Theory and the Dutch Manual", *Archivaria* 41: 31 – 40.
- . 2011. "Archivistics: Science or Art?", in: *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping: A Reader*, ed Jennie Hill (London: Facet Publishing): 89 – 100.

- Lequin, F. 1990. "In Memoriam M. A. P. Meilink-Roelofs", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 1990 Number 1: 127 – 46.
- Lidwina, Intan. 2012. "Het Landsarchief, de Plaats waar de herinnering aan het verleden ligt: The History of the Landsarchief in Indonesia 1892 – 1942" (Master Thesis Leiden University).
- Magetsari, Noerhadi. 2008. "Organisasi dan Layanan Kearsipan", *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 3 Nomor 1 2008: 1 – 17.
- Mirmani, Anon dan Tumini. 2007. *Deskripsi dan Penataan Arsip Statis* (Tangerang: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka).
- Mirmani, Anon. 2009. *Pengantar Kearsipan* (Tangerang Selatan: Penerbit Universitas Terbuka).
- Muller, Samuel, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin. 1920. *Handleiding voor het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven* (Groningen: Erven B. van der Kamp).
- , 2003. *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of the Archives, Drawn up by the Direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists*. Translated by Arthur H. Leavitt (Chicago: The Society of American Archivists).
- Prabowo, Banu. 2010. "Upaya Menyingkap Filsafat Kearsipan: Suatu Kajian Awal Filsafat Kearsipan", *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 5: 1 – 34.
- Pratama, Raistiwar. 2015. "Mengenal *Dutch Manual*", in: *Catatan Arsiparis: Rumah Ingatan Kearsipan Indonesia*, ed Nadia Fauziah Dwiandari (Jakarta: Ikatan Arsiparis Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia): 39 – 48.
- Ridener, John. 2007. "From Polders to Postmodernism: An Intellectual History of Archival Theory" (Master Thesis San Jose State University).
- Schellenberg, Theodore R. 1965. *The Management of Archives* (New York and London: Columbia University Press).
- , 2003/ 1956. *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: The Society of American Archivists).
- Siti Samsiyah. Tanpa tahun. "Prototipe Bahan Ajar Praktik sebagai Upaya Peningkatan Kompetensi Lulusan Program Diploma Kearsipan Sesuai Standar Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia," accessed via www.arsip.ugm.ac.id on March 20th 2017.
- Stephens, David O. 1999. "Archives and Records Management in the Netherlands", *Information Management Journal* October Volume 3 Number 4: 64 – 9.
- Sudiyanto. "Upaya Pemerintah Menyiapkan SDM Kearsipan Melalui Pendidikan Formal", accessed via www.arsip.ugm.ac.id on March 20th 2017.

Sumartini. “Sumber Belanda dalam Arsip Nasional: Pemeliharaan dan Penggunaan”, *Kongres Studi Belanda di Indonesia 23 – 27 November 1987*.

Sumartini. Tanpa tahun. “Pengantar Kearsipan”. [www.bapersip.jatimprov.go.id/images/artikel/Pengantar kearsipan](http://www.bapersip.jatimprov.go.id/images/artikel/Pengantar_kearsipan), accessed on April 27th 2017.

Thomassen, Theo. 2002. “A First Introduction to Archival Science”, *Archival Science* I: 373 – 385.

Utomo, Djoko. 1979. “Pemikiran Mengenai Penanganan Arsip Inaktif”, *Temu Karya Arsip Inaktif 10 – 11 Desember 1979*.

-----, 2012. “Arsip sebagai Simpul Pemersatu Bangsa”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 7 Nomor 1: 1 – 38.

-----, 2013. “Arsip as National Identity of Indonesia”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1: 100 – 19.

Van der Chijs, Jacob Anne. 1882. *Inventaris 's Lands Archief 1602 – 1816* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij).

Verhoeven, Frans Rijndert Johan. 1942. *Landsarchief van Nederlandsch-Indie* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij).

Zaenudin. 2013. “Lembaga Kearsipan Perguruan Tinggi di Indonesia: Bentuk, Tugas, dan Kelengkapannya”, *Jurnal Kearsipan* Volume 8 Nomor 1: 36 – 58.

Finding Aids

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 1978. *Inventaris Residentie Archieven “Pasar Ikan”* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 1982. *Inventaris Arsip Perkebunan* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 1988. *Inventaris Arsip Semarang* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2013. *Inventaris Arsip Java's Noordoost Kust 1694 – 1816* (Jakarta: Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia).

Nationaal Archief, Leiden University and Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2007. *The Archives of Dutch East Indie Company (VOC) and the Local Institutions in Batavia* (Leiden, Boston: Brill).

National Archives of Indonesia and International Council on Archives. 1989. *Guide to the Sources of Asian History* (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization).

Newspapers, Magazines

Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad van Donderdag 18 September 1941.

Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde. 1976. "Jaarverslag 1975". *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Volume 132 Number 2/ 3: 386.

Nederlandsch Archieven Blad. Number 51 1946 – 7.

Interviewees

Ani Ismarini, former student of *Rijksarchiefschool* and former archivist at National Archives of Indonesia. Interviewed in Bandung on May 24th 2017.

Anon Mirmani, Head of Archives University of Indonesia and lecture at Vocational School of University of Indonesia majoring in Archival Diploma. Interviewed in Depok on April 6th 2017.

Bayu Setyawan, archivist at Archives University of Indonesia. Interviewed in Depok on April 6th 2017.

Djoko Utomo, former student of *Rijksarchiefschool* and former Director General of National Archives of Indonesia. Interviewed in Jakarta on April 11th 2017.

Hani Qonitah, former lecture at Vocational School of University of Indonesia majoring in Archival Diploma and risk analyst at ExxonMobil Cepu Limited. Interviewed via electronic mail on April 10th and 17th 2017.

Hein de Graaff, former lecturer at *Rijksarchiefschool* and former archivist at National Archives of the Netherlands. Interviewed in Den Haag on March 15th 2017.

Machmoed Effendhie, former Head of Archives of Gadjah Mada University and lecturer at Vocational School of Gadjah Mada University majoring in Archival Diploma. Interviewed in Yogyakarta on May 9th 2017.

Musliichah, former student of Archival Diploma of Gadjah Mada University and archivist at Archives of Gadjah Mada University. Interviewed in Yogyakarta on May 18th 2017.

Senja Kala Yahya, former student of *Rijksarchiefschool* and archivist at National Archives of Indonesia. Interviewed in Jakarta on April 27th 2017.

Setyo Edi Susanto, archivist at Archives of Bogor Agricultural University. Interviewed in Bogor on April 11th 2017.