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*Between 1616 and 1697 Dutch skippers surveyed the coast of Western Australia. The country’s oldest-known written record of European exploration is a pewter plate left behind in 1697 and inscribed by Willem de Vlamingh (the plate is now in the Museum of Western Australia). Dutch maps, charts and journals transformed the unknown land into ‘a flat surface of paper that can be archived’, generating what Bruno Latour calls ‘immutable and combinable mobiles’. In Latour’s centres of calculation, events, places and people can be administered on a large scale and at a distance. Many things can be done with the archived world that cannot be done with the true world. This is as true today as it was in the seventeenth century. Reality is digitally virtualised and archived. Information about reality becomes information as reality (in Albert Borgmann’s terms). What are the implications for record professionals?*
As the title of this paper indicates, it invites the reader to move through time and space, back and forth from the past into the present and the future. There is a continuum between what we read from the records about the past and what we can learn from them about the present and the future.

Records about the past tell us about discovery and exploration by flying Dutchmen. In 1616, ten years after Willem Jansz with his ship Duyfken had explored the Queensland coast on Cape York Peninsula, Dirck Hartog, schipper of the Eendracht (Harmony) in the service of the VOC (the Dutch East India Company), was the first European to set foot on the shore of Western Australia, from then on called Eendrachtsland, country of harmony. Hartog was in the service of the VOC and he landed – quite by accident – on what was later called Dirck Hartog Island, some 75 kilometres from the mainland, in what is now Shark Bay. Dirck Hartog left a pewter plate nailed to a pole with the date of his arrival and departure, and the names of the supercargo (the upper-merchant), the schipper, the under-merchant and the uppersteersman (first mate). I will return to this oldest-known written record of European exploration later on.

Other Dutch ships followed, including those under command of Frederik de Houtman, with supercargo Jacob Dedel in 1619. They too left their traces: their names can still be found in geographical names in Western Australia: the Houtman rocks, (d’)Edelland. They go to show that the sailors followed the VOC instructions, which read: ‘To all the places which you will touch at, you will give names, befitting to the nature of the place, either using the names of the United Provinces and the cities situated therein, or any other worthy names.’ Naming the world is claiming the world. Linguist Jan Tent has calculated that today there are some 300 Dutch and Dutch-linked toponyms in Australia. Only about 35 date from before 1756, a small remnant of the names (about 200) the VOC schippers gave when they explored and charted the coast.

In the years following Dirck Hartog’s landing, several Dutch ships sighted Eendrachtsland. In 1622 the English Tryptal, following the Dutch route, made shipwreck there. Seven years later the same happened to the Batavia, under commander Pelsaert. The story of this shipwreck and
the ensuing mutiny, terrorisation and mass murder among the wrecked, and the punishment of the murderers was in the seventeenth century what we would now call front-page news. In its time ‘the tragedy of the *Batavia* had a greater impact on the public imagination than did the wreck of the *Titanic* in the 20th century.’

Eight of the crew were hanged on *Batavia’s* graveyard, others were keelhauled or brought to trial in Batavia (now Jakarta). Two men were punished by being left behind on the Eendrachtsland. They were instructed ‘to make themselves known to the folk of this land by tokens of friendship ... if God guards you, you will not suffer any damage from them, but on the contrary, because they have never seen any white men, they will offer all friendship.’

The two – the first European immigrants – were never heard of again, but maybe they survived. In Western Australia there are indigenous people affected by genetic factors introduced by Dutch mariners and passengers marooned in the seventeenth century. We must assume that there were close contacts at some point, since a particular genetic disease introduced in South Africa by Dutch people in the seventeenth century that has a high prevalence among Afrikaners of Dutch descent, also occurs among Aboriginal people along the Western Australian coast.

Also, sixteen per cent of the Nhandan language spoken on the coast seems to have been derived from the Dutch language. Other invisible and visible traces of the *Batavia* – one might say: records – are the ship and its contents, the ‘fort’ the survivors built, and human remains on West Wallabi, Long, East Wallabi and Beacon islands. In 2006 the *Batavia* shipwreck, survivors’ camps area and the Dirck Hartog landing site were declared national heritage. The *Batavia* continues to excite public imagination, stimulated by the bestseller *Batavia’s Graveyard* by Mike Dash (2002).

The *Batavia* was discovered in 1963, more than three centuries after the shipwreck. Forty-five years later, on Sunday 16 March 2008, four days after the *Kormoran* had been found, the discovery of HMAS *Sydney II* – west of Dirck Hartog Island – was even more spectacular than the find of the *Batavia*. Do you remember where you were when you heard the press conference by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd, Ted Graham of the Finding Sydney Foundation and the chief of the Navy vice-admiral Russ Shalders over the news? Finding the *Sydney* and the *Kormoran* has not answered all questions, nor has it ended the controversies about
the loss of the Sydney and all of its 645 crew. As records professionals know, a record – be it a shipwreck, or any other document – does not speak for itself: the ‘tacit narratives’ of the record echo the user’s interests, hopes and fears. It is up to the user what meaning he or she derives from the archives. This empowers the user to explore and discover, to recontextualise in his or her own way what is found in the records that were initially created in the first dimension of the records continuum. That is why the archive is never closed and never complete: every individual, every generation is allowed his own exploration and interpretation of the archive, is allowed to re-invent and to reconstruct its view on the past and its narrative of it. That is to say, in Hannah Arendt’s words, every generation has ‘the right to write its own history. We admit no more than that it has the right to rearrange the facts in accordance with its own perspective; we don’t admit the right to touch the factual matter itself.’

The last flying Dutchman to explore the Western Australian coast was VOC schipper Willem de Vlamingh. After a voyage of eight months (with a stopover at the Cape), he landed on Rottnest Island on 31 December 1696. Four days later his upper-steersman Michiel Bloem and bookkeeper Joannes Bremer went ashore on the mainland. De Vlamingh deemed ‘it proper to postpone going there until I could be informed of the success of the first landing’. A reconnaissance party of 86 men went ashore on 5 January 1697 and explored the country south of Lake Claremont, and along the river which they named Swaene River, today known as the Swan River. They went as far as the present Perth Esplanade, camping there overnight. The company was divided into three platoons ‘to see whether we could lay aboard any of the inhabitants but all in vain.’ They followed the river to its mouth, and spent a second night on land, before returning to the main ships on 7 January.

De Vlamingh and his crew spent seven weeks in the region, exploring and charting the coast, describing flora and fauna, and trying to get in contact with the inhabitants. The crew had been warned that ‘the coast is inhabited by very savage, barbaric and cruel people’, but they still wanted to make contact, if only to catch a South Lander and bring him to Amsterdam, possibly as a source for anthropological and
linguistic studies which were the interests of Nicolaas Witsen, a VOC director and burgomaster of Amsterdam who had taken the initiative to send De Vlamingh to the South Land. De Vlamingh even had two ‘Indians’ from the Cape among the crew, who were supposed to act as interpreters. Two or three times the Dutch saw indigenous people, ‘sijnde swart en naeckt’, being black and naked, with short curly hair. They made signals to the Dutch with their feet and hands, but when approached they fled ‘at such an extraordinary speed that it was impossible for our people to follow them.’ The journals of De Vlamingh are among the earliest recorded observations of Australian people. They also inform about fauna and flora, but, as the governor-general reported from Batavia to the VOC directors in Amsterdam, the crew had not ‘discovered any singular animals or birds there, except mainly in the Swan River a species of black swan, of which they brought us three alive, and we should have liked to send them to you, but they died one after the other shortly after their arrival here.’ De Vlamingh collected other specimens too: scented wood, from which some oil was distilled in Batavia and sent to Amsterdam, ‘together with a small chest containing shells collected on the beaches, fruits, plants, etc., but which are of little importance and may be found elsewhere in the Indies of a much better quality. So that in general in this region of the South Land which they have properly observed and along which they have sailed in conformity with their instruction, it has proved to be nothing but a barren, dry waste land.’ The VOC board was disappointed, and Nicolaas Witsen specially so. An enthusiastic collector of anything foreign, he had hoped that the expedition could bring back a South Lander and other curiosities. Witsen had also ensured that there was a draughtsman on board, to paint whatever curiosity the Dutch would encounter. Seven profiles of the coast of Western Australia, watercolours painted by Victor Victorszoon, have survived: they were discovered in 1970 by the cartographic historian Günter Schilder among the papers of Claas Bichon, the commodore who had taken all De Vlamingh’s material to Holland in 1697 and who had apparently kept the paintings himself – and fortunately the family preserved them for three centuries. Who knows if some of the botanic specimens from the Australian coast that Witsen received ‘lie undiscovered in obscure places in modern herbaria’? Witsen was pleased with two Australian
shells ‘hitherto not sufficiently known’ and he sent a drawing to the English conchologist Martin Lister who published the two shells in one of the issues of his *Synopsis Conchyliorum*.

Collections like Witsen’s were set up and their descriptions made, not with the coloniser’s gaze, nor with the interest in nature shown in the Age of Enlightenment by, for example, Joseph Banks. Witsen – like other merchants, diplomats, and sailors – acted out of a genuine curiosity in the natural world.

Curiosity is the root of discovery and exploration, and these in their turn lead to recording, collecting, ordering the world. Witsen had drawings made of the flora on Java, he sent someone to Sri Lanka to study the indigenous languages and he was keen to see what De Vlamingh brought back from the South Land. What the seventeenth-century Dutch sailors and merchants did in the way of recording and collecting may be regarded as a start of what was to become modernity’s quest for ordering and knowledge. The Dutch domination of the world economy, for a time, made it possible to collect facts and pursue knowledge on a global scale. As Harold Cook argues, in his recent book on commerce, medicine and science in the Dutch Golden Age, ‘The northern Dutch world had become an intellectual entrepôt as much as an entrepôt for goods and finances. In the home metropolis collections were accumulated, housed, and preserved, inventories were taken and sometimes published, and redistribution of the value-added information and objects was initiated. Material progress and utility became the watchwords of contemporary naturalists even when they revelled in curiosities. From careful investigation and reporting they wished to create enduring knowledge that could be handed down to others.’

The VOC entrepôt in Amsterdam received, through De Vlamingh, the pewter plate Hartog had left in 1616. It had been discovered by De Vlamingh’s steersman. This plate, together with other VOC artefacts, became state property in 1799 and is now in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam. Willem de Vlamingh replaced it by a new flattened pewter plate, recording both Hartog’s and his own landing. On his voyage to Eendrachtsland, De Vlamingh had left wooden tablets recording his arrival on Saint Paul and on Amsterdam islands. Peter Sigmond of the Rijksmuseum looks upon them as letters: as messages for the first reader.
to come ashore and – once read – becoming more or less meaningless. But on Hartog Island, De Vlamingh did not use wood, but pewter, the same material as Hartog had earlier used. De Vlamingh’s plate, with his inscription and the text of his predecessor, may also be interpreted as a letter, but it can also be seen as a memorial tablet meant to remain as a monument in honour of Hartog. The Hartog plate and the Vlamingh one are ‘at first sight, identical objects but because of their contexts and contents they are very different in meaning and significance,’ Sigmond concludes.\textsuperscript{33} Doesn’t that sound familiar to records professionals? As Joan Schwartz argues, the job of records professionals is to seek the intended function or role of a record ‘as a means of communicating a message across time and/or space and then to consider how to preserve and describe them in a way that respects, reveals, and retains their impact on human relations, power, and knowledge.’\textsuperscript{34}

In 1818 the De Vlamingh plate of 1697 was taken to Paris by a French expedition and finally, in 1947, presented to the government of Australia, and transferred to the Western Australian Museum. It is the country’s oldest written record of European discovery and exploration. Older yet is the 1616 Hartog plate, of which the museum displays a replica of the original, which is in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{35} The replica is a gift from the Dutch government (1966). However, supposing the internationally agreed rules for solving archival claims to be applied, one may wonder if the original Hartog plate shouldn’t be returned to its provenance, the territory where the record was created.\textsuperscript{36} In any case, the Hartog plate is a common heritage shared by the Dutch and the Australians.

Discovery and exploration lead to recording. The VOC instructed the captains to keep a careful record or daily journal so ‘that we may get full information of all your doings and experiences, and the Company obtain due and perfect knowledge of the situation and natural features of these regions, in return for the heavy expenses to which she is put by this expedition.’\textsuperscript{37} The VOC clearly regarded recorded information as a substantial trade-off.\textsuperscript{38} Not only did the schipper have to keep a complete and elaborate journal of his voyage, he was also instructed ‘to make due observation of the direction of the winds, the trend of the coasts, the situation of bays, inlets and capes, and properly to note and make drawings of the same, that on your return you may be able
to hand us a full and perfect report of the whole undertaking, thus furnishing fresh material for the correction of the charts now in use, and perhaps also of the courses to be kept.”

Manning Clark sardonically writes that the Dutch were motivated by ‘their insatiable covetousness’. Making a profit was the rationale of the VOC: by trading gold, silver, tin, iron, lead and copper, nutmeg, cloves and pepper. Exploring foreign lands was primarily done to discover faster and safer sailing routes and to find new possibilities for trading, for making money. The Dutch were traders, not colonisers, at least not in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Mapping for money is the appropriate title of the authoritative book on VOC map-making, written in 1998 by Kees Zandvliet, formerly head of the map department of the Netherlands National Archives and until recently head of the department of Dutch history of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam.

We no longer regard maps as a mirror of nature, but as cultural texts shaped by their political and social context. It was Brian Harley who in the 1980s led the way in deconstructing the map, influenced by Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, thus uncovering the social practices that the map reflects and employs. Maps are indeed ‘sophisticated artefacts, to be read as much for what they reveal of the cultures that produce them as of the geographical information they represent.’ The very practice of mapping is culturally determined. Aboriginal belief-systems posit a ‘mapping’ of the land by ancestral beings: the primal making of space into place. An Aboriginal map therefore has a totally different purpose, just as it has a different meaning from a map drawn by a white explorer. Archivists and other records professionals know that the record is ‘far from being an innocent by-product of activity, a reflection of reality, it is a construction of realities expressing dominant relations of power.’

Records are not factual, neutral, technical documents alone, although while serving legitimate ends they must appear this way, and while serving illegitimate ones even more so. They are designed – implicitly or explicitly – to produce an effect in some kind of audience, which itself actively uses records to interpret events. This is not to
suggest conscious deceit or cynicism on the part of either record keepers or users (although ... this is certainly possible). Rather it is simply to acknowledge and open up for analysis the conditions under which organizational records are produced and used.46

As Simon Ryan has written with regard to the nineteenth-century explorers of Australia, the explorer does not just describe new land that he sees, and his journal is not a fresh and innocent transcription of the natural world: ‘the discursive construction in the journals of what is seen by the explorers is generated by already existing cultural formation.’47 A journal, or any other document is not a thing in itself, they are active constituents of social relations,48 an insight gained by ethnomethodology (the study of the methods people use for producing recognisable social orders) as early as in the 1960s. Only recently those insights have informed archivists’ discourse.49 The active power of the record is realised or activated by the reader, the record being ‘no more than an interpretive moment in a never-ending conversation with the texts’.50 The record speaks in a dialogue with the reader/viewer, who may be outside the visible text, but never outside its invisible narrative.51 Record users are explorers, they are also activators, and even creators, just as recordkeepers are record creators, because they too contribute to the creation and recreation of the record. As Brien Brothman writes, records do not

simply reach a final state or condition. Rather, objects and processes are enmeshed in a dynamic of departure and return, emerging sameness and difference, repetition and recursion along with distancing and differentiation.52

In the digital world, texts become ‘hypertexts’ which are reconstructed in the act of reading, rendering the reader an author.53 The text becomes an interactive dialogue between ‘the writer and her readers, and the reader could be asked to share the responsibility for the outcome’.54 Likewise, the record becomes an interactive dialogue between the discoverer who may record his discovery but only in interaction with the subject of the discovery, interaction between the mapmaker and what is mapped, between the organisation and the client, customer or citizen. The subject of the record is becoming a party to the business function
which created the record, a co-creator. An example is data protection legislation allowing people to request annotation or amendment of records containing personal information. This is what I have called an activation of the record, the data subject being the activator, even a co-creator. Co-creatorship is, I believe, what Archives 2.0 should really be about, both in record creation and in archival representation and outreach.

Drawings, journals, maps and charts were essential tools for the VOC, both for the schippers and the directors. Together with detailed instructions, Willem de Vlamingh received extensive information about earlier expeditions to the South Land, in the form of copies of reports and maps. Each ship was supplied with several sets – one for each schipper, upper- and under-steersman and third mate – some 30 to 50 parchment maps, with globes and navigation instructions, costing around some 200 to 300 guilders per ship. After each journey, logs and maps had to be delivered at the East India House in Amsterdam: today the seat of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Amsterdam. You can still visit the VOC boardroom, where the walls are adorned with replicas of the maps and paintings which formerly surrounded the VOC directors. Elsewhere in the Amsterdam headquarters was the navigation room where all the maps to be taken aboard were inventoried and kept ready. The ships’ logs and the maps that formed part of the reports from Asia were kept in the records room.

What is left of the immense VOC archives, created between 1602 and 1795? Many of the records were destroyed in the nineteenth century. What we have in the Netherlands, in the National Archives, is only a small part (even then some 1,300 metres of shelving) of the total amount. But VOC records can also be found in Jakarta, Cape Town, Chennai (Madras), Colombo, Kuala Lumpur, London and Paris, totalling 4 kilometres. These records often fill the hiatus in the Dutch archives. The instructions for Willem de Vlamingh cannot be found in the Netherlands, for instance, but fortunately a copy has been preserved in the VOC archives in Capetown. The records kept in the Netherlands, on the other hand, form a unique source for the study of the history of countries in the large area navigated and controlled by the VOC: they often contain information that cannot be found in
the countries concerned. This is truly a common archival heritage. UNESCO has registered this common heritage as Memory of the World, the only item registered on a joint nomination by five countries. A large project is underway to preserve all the VOC archives in the world, to connect and to describe all components of the VOC archives in a detailed ‘super inventory’, accessible on the Internet. Linked with the project is the ENCOMPASS (ENcountering a COMmon Past in ASia) program launched by Leiden University in cooperation with several universities in South East Asia. The program involves education of Asian students and research. My colleague, Charles Jeurgens, Professor of Archivistics at Leiden University, presented the program at the ICA congress in Kuala Lumpur. He aims to study the dialectics of 400 years of Asian–European interaction. He will explore knowledge production, archives creation and the use of information, knowledge systems and archives.58

The knowledge system of the VOC concerned seafaring routes, countries, people and goods. In an accumulation cycle stretching from South East Asia to Amsterdam, everything was transformed into what Bruno Latour calls ‘a flat surface of paper that can be archived, pinned on a wall and combined with others’.59 This echoes the inscription on the second important general map of the Dutch discoveries in Australia, the Eugene map (dating from around 1666) which reads: ‘Here are projected on a flat surface … all the sailing routes, and newly found lands, observed and sailed … under the direction and command of Commander Abel Janssen Tasman’, the map referring to Tasman’s journal for more information.60 The VOC is a perfect example of what Latour has described as ‘centres of calculation’. Such a centre conditions and controls events, places and people from a distance. These long-distance operations are made possible by somehow ‘bringing home’ events, places and people, by making them mobile, while keeping them stable (allowing to move them to and fro without deforming them) and making them combinable.61 Latour uses the term ‘immutable and combinable mobiles’, which can ‘be cumulated, aggregated, or shuffled like a pack of cards’.62 The centres of calculation condense the incoming primary information into secondary, which is then aggregated to new information of the third order and so forth: a never ending ‘cascade of the fourth, fifth and $n^{th}$ order inscription’.63 Each aggregation adds
value and provides new insight. Latour uses this model to explain how
science in action works: when someone says that he or she performs
better, or discovers something new, first look for any changes in the
mobility, stability or versatility of the traces, ‘the many ways through
which inscriptions are gathered, combined, tied together and sent back’,
says one of Latour’s seven rules of method.64

Latour’s point is again proven by the VOC. The information the VOC
map-maker – between 1633 and 1705 always a member of the Blaeu
family – distilled from the ships’ logs and charts, enabled the company
to do more than was possible on board the ships. In their turn the
draughtsmen on board could observe more – and from a different
perspective – than the indigenous people on the coast. Aggregation of
information is characteristic for the VOC: the trading posts in different
places all over Asia sent their reports and copies of correspondence
to Batavia, where they were copied into a register of incoming letters,
but also recapitulated and summarised in one single Generale Missive,
the general letter, an aggregation of the second order, reporting on
everything the VOC was interested in, using a fixed classification.65 In
Amsterdam these reports were integrated into the Overgekomen brieven
en papieren (Letters and papers received): many volumes for one year,
totalling 2,942 volumes between 1614 and 1794.

Through combining those letters and papers, both copies and originals,
and by using an established classification and several indexes, the
information was reformatted, recontextualised, and aggregated. This
enormous archive constituted the basis for knowledge, control, and
power: ‘Files of files can be generated and this process can be continued
until a few men consider millions as if they were in the palms of their
hands’, as Latour writes.66

This is done by what Latour reverentially calls gratte papiers (paper
shufflers), who create and manage records in a way that allows
mobility, stability and versatility of events, places and people, linking
various centres of calculation. Many people despise ‘this curious breed
of lunatics that prefers to believe a piece of paper to any other source
of information.’67 Latour, however, thinks this unjustified. Engineers,
scientists and all who work in a centre of calculation with phenomena
that, by definition, are not present (such as the stars for the astronomer,
and faraway countries and people for the VOC) trust the \( n^{th} \) order paper form, the archiving of the ‘immutable and combinable mobiles’. Even stronger: the results of scientific enquiry become ‘immutable and combinable mobiles’ themselves, because, once recorded into files they are integrated into the results in other fields, those of economy, strategy, law and geology. ‘All these unrelated domains are woven together once they become sheets of this most despised of all objects, the record, the dusty record.’\(^{68}\) Without it, though, the inscriptions would stay where they were, on board the ship, in the laboratory, in the explorer’s tent, without any relevance to other issues.

Seen in this way, records professionals – Latour’s paper shufflers – have great power because the records enable the representation of reality.\(^{69}\) Thus they control reality. This is true especially for the paper shufflers who have entered the digital world. In the words of the philosopher Albert Borgmann, paper archives contain information about reality and information for shaping reality.\(^{70}\) The first is information about something, for example a report, the second is information with which one can make something, for example a recipe, or a plan. These two are not yet information as reality, that is, information that coincides with or performs in reality. I will give you one of Borgmann’s examples.\(^{71}\) The four words ‘Bach’s cantata nr. 10’ (answering the question: what did they play?) are information about the cantata, but far removed from the musical performance itself. The score of that cantata (information for reality) contains about 164,000 bits, making the resolution approximately 900 times higher than the 176 bits that make up the phrase ‘Bach’s cantata nr. 10’ when written down. The information density of the musical score, however, is nothing when compared to that of the performance as recorded on CD: 1.2 million bits (150 megabytes)! What the CD with the cantata produces is not something about or for Bach’s music, it is the music itself.

What we see happening in the digital era is to some extent a sequel to the production and use of ‘immutable and combinable mobiles’ bringing faraway reality nearby and enabling control at a distance. Reality can be captured as digital information, and information as reality is combinable and mobile to a degree unimaginable by the traditional paper shufflers. But is the information stable? Borgmann does not deal with stability or archiving.
A digital document is variable and changeable, fluid and unstable. An original no longer exists because, intrinsically, each instantiation (on a medium, a screen or as a printout) is a representation performed by the operating system and the application software. We may try to reconstruct that information as reality through information about or for reality. The pudding can be reconstructed with the help of a gourmet’s review about the pudding or the recipe for the pudding. But if no one keeps the information about and for, then we will never be able to cook the pudding again. Paper shufflers are becoming (re)constructors of digital records, enabling (re)discovery and (re)exploration of realities.

A starting point for rediscovery and re-exploration of the archived and the archiving world are the archival principles. These derive from the concept of the organic nature of records, presented in section 2 of the Dutch Manual of 1898. This concept is linked to the principle of provenance. ‘The core idea is that an archive is not so much an arbitrary collection, but a whole that has arisen organically, originally even a ‘living organism’, which grows and changes with the organization that creates it.’ Nowadays, ICT enables new modes of collaborative work, greater flexibility, interactivity, and control in organisations. This blurs the relationship between record creator and record, because both their boundaries have become blurred. In e-business and e-government records are more and more created in a network with different partners contributing to the record, to the extent that it is difficult, even impossible, to attribute the record to any of the partnering creators. To cope with this, Australians developed the concept of ‘multiple provenance’. Chris Hurley is now proposing a theory of parallel provenance, allowing to identify two or more entities, residing in a different context, that establish the provenance of a record, even involved in different actions, for example creation and control. The concept of parallel provenance also makes it possible to account for the creative contributions to record formation in the interactive dialogue between organisation and client, customer or citizen, to which I referred earlier when discussing the constructed nature of explorers’ maps and journals. Records, as I said, are cultural texts shaped by their political and social context. To quote Stephen Lubar from the Smithsonian: ‘Archives reflect and reinforce the power relationships of the institution that organises them; they represent not just a technological solution, but also an organizational solution. They document and carry out not only
knowledge and technique, but also culture and power.’\textsuperscript{76} This insight might be implied in a new reading of the Dutch Manual’s concept of the organic nature of records. And if Muller, Feith and Fruin were alive, they might even subsume under the organic nature Jacques Derrida’s famous statement ‘the mutation in technology changes not simply the archiving process, but what is archivable – that is, the content of what has to be archived is changed by the technology.’\textsuperscript{77} More difficult for the Dutch trio would be to acknowledge – as I did earlier in this paper – that archivists and recordkeepers are record creators, because they too contribute to the creation and recreation of the record. Record professionals shape and reshape the context, the structure, the form and thereby the meaning of records and archives throughout the records continuum. They have to, because in the digital age records cannot be left alone, they require, as Margaret Hedstrom once said, life-support systems that are evolving constantly and that force interventions by the recordkeeper. Still, I do not believe that this entails a paradigmatic change of the archival principles of provenance and original order, or the concept of the organic nature of records. What it does entail is redesigning our methodologies in order to adapt our practices to the digital realities. As I said before, the Hartog plate and the De Vlamingh plate are ‘at first sight, identical objects but because of their contexts and contents they are very different in meaning and significance’. In the digital age we will be constantly required to assess the meaning and significance of seemingly identical digital objects carrying information. We will continue to be – more than any other profession – specialists of and contributors to the contexts of record creation, their use and abuse, constructing, reconstructing and even deconstructing the archive. The archive is never closed and never complete – the archive is a Flying Dutchman sailing outside time and space, never resting, never arriving at its final shore.

**Endnotes**

1 An abridged version of this paper was presented as a keynote address at the Annual Conference of the Australian Society of Archivists Archives: Discovery and Exploration, Perth, 8 August 2008. Most of the research for this paper was done while staying at Monash University (Faculty of Information Technology).


4 My translation: 1616, on the 25th of October is here arrived the ship de Eendracht of Amsterdam; the upper-merchant Gillis Miebais, from Luick; schipper Dirck Hatichs, from Amsterdam; on the 27th do. set sail again for Bantam; the under-merchant Jan [Stins]; the uppersteersman Pieter [Doekes from Bil]. Anno 1616. The words between brackets are no longer readable, but I have interpolated them, using the De Vlamingh journal in Schilder, *Voyage to the Great South Land*, p. 134 (which, however, has Dirck Hartoog instead of the clearly readable Dirck Hatichs). Sigmond and Zuiderbaan (p. 36) and Schilder, *Voyage to the Great South Land* (p. 223) read Mibais; Stins; Doekes van Bil. Playford (p. 57 and endnote 69) reads Dooke van Bill.
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