

Charles Kecskeméti

## INTEGRATION OF SEPARATED ARCHIVES FOR THE PRESERVATION OF NATIONAL MEMORY

UDK 930.251(4)

Izlaganje sa znanstvenog skupa

*Od Francuske revolucije naovamo u svim je europskim zemljama osnovana nacionalna arhivska služba. Pregled organizacije i nadležnosti pojedinih nacionalnih arhivskih službi pokazuje da ne postoje dvije identične službe, što je posljedica političkih prilika i povijesti pojedinih zemalja, strukture uprave i nacionalnog zakonodavstva, financijskih mogućnosti, obrazovnog sustava i dotadašnje prakse čuvanja arhivskog gradiva. Ovo vrijedi i za zemlje s dužim razdobljima zajedničke povijesti i uprave, kao što su zemlje nastale raspadom Habsburške monarhije ili skandinavske zemlje.*

*Uza sve razlike, nacionalne arhivske službe se mogu razvrstati u dvije osnovne skupine s obzirom na njihovu organizaciju i nadležnosti. Prvu skupinu predstavlja francuski model, raširen na europskome kontinentu. Za ovaj model karakterističan je visok stupanj nadležnosti nacionalne (državne) arhivske službe nad zaštitom gradiva na lokalnoj razini i gradiva privatne provenijencije, što se u Francuskoj može smatrati posljedicom revolucionarnog zakonodavstva kojim su nacionalizirani crkveni i drugi privatni arhivi i izjednačeni s gradivom javne provenijencije, kao dio nacionalne arhivske baštine. Model je doveden do krajnosti u bivšem Sovjetskom Savezu u kojem se praktički cjelokupno arhivsko gradivo smatralo dijelom državnog arhivskog fonda. Arhivisti u zemljama u tranziciji još uvijek nisu spremni izmijeniti ovaj model kojeg snažno podupire ideal čuvanja nacionalne arhivske baštine u njezinoj cjelokupnosti.*

*Drugo obilježje ovoga modela jest podijeljenost arhivskih fondova na nacionalnoj razini na više ustanova. Iz nadležnosti nacionalnog arhiva u pravilu su izuzeta tzv. politička ministarstva (obrana, unutarnji i vanjski poslovi), a u bivšim komunističkim zemljama i odgovarajuće paradržavne organizacije. Stvarateljima je dana vrlo velika, ako ne i potpuna autonomija, ne samo u pogledu čuvanja arhivskog*

*gradiva, nego i u pogledu uvjeta korištenja i dostupnosti i procjene o tome koji će se dokumenti trajno čuvati i eventualno biti dostupni.*

*Drugi model može se ilustrirati organizacijom arhivske službe u Engleskoj. S obzirom na doseg nadležnosti nacionalnog arhiva on je daleko manje ambiciozan i u pravilu se ograničava na gradivo nastalo djelovanjem ministarstava i ostalih središnjih tijela državne vlasti, ostavljajući "institucionalnu" ili "kolektivnu memoriju" ostalih institucija društva, javnih i privatnih, njima samima. Engleski model, međutim, ne poznaje izuzetke na nacionalnoj razini i ne dopušta pojedinim ministarstvima da trajno čuvaju arhivsko gradivo nastalo njihovim djelovanjem, izvan sustava nacionalne arhivske službe. Posljedica toga je i u pravilu znatno bolji položaj nacionalnog arhiva u sustavu državne uprave.*

*Oba su modela nastala u vrijeme potpune prevlasti gradiva pisanoga na papiru i s podjednakim su se uspjehom prilagođavali administrativnim i tehnološkim promjenama u okruženju u kojemu su djelovali, sve do promjene paradigme u arhivistici izazvane procesima globalizacije, elektroničkom revolucijom i naraslim zanimanjem za suvremeno arhivsko gradivo. Pokazalo se da jedino "engleski model" može odgovoriti na narasle zahtjeve i da on pruža daleko bolje uvjete za rad arhiva u kontekstu suvremene uprave i informacijskog društva. Arhivske službe zemalja koje pripadaju ovoj skupini uspješno su odgovorile na izazove okoline, uspjele su se pravno, tehnološki i organizacijski prilagoditi novim zahtjevima i osigurati daleko bolji položaj i težinu unutar uprave. Pokazale su se daleko sposobnijima u komunikaciji sa stvarateljima gradiva i uspijevaju nametnuti zajednička pravila zaštite i korištenja. Arhivske službe organizirane prema "francuskom modelu" imaju daleko manje izgleda da stvarateljima nametnu zajedničku transparentnu politiku zaštite i dostupnosti. Njihova razmjerno manja osposobljenost da odgovore na tehnološke i s njima povezane izazove može ih dovesti u situaciju da postanu spremišta zatvorenih fondova, bez ozbiljnog kontakta sa stvarateljima i gradivom koje tamo nastaje. Time bi se zatvorio povijesni krug: zemlje koje su izmislile koncept nacionalnog arhiva, vratile bi se na arhivski sustav "starog režima". Znakovito je da arhivske službe "engleskog modela" u osamdesetima i devedesetima ipak uspijevaju rješavati svoje financijske, prostorne ili upravne probleme, dok "francuski model" više nije u stanju na zadovoljavajući način provoditi upravnu funkciju zaštite i osiguranja dostupnosti gradiva. Zemlje koje su ga usvojile bit će prisiljene, prije ili kasnije, rekonstruirati svoj arhivski sustav. U zemljama u tranziciji problem je još izraženiji zbog velikih količina gradiva koje nije preuzeto u arhive. Snaženje središnje arhivske uprave i ukidanje izdvojenih arhiva po ministarstvima vjerojatno je jedna od nužnih pretpostavki za opstanak arhivske službe kao čuvara "pamćenja nacije".*

*Arhivska reforma koja uvodi "engleski model" nužno će utjecati na položaj i organizaciju arhiva na regionalnoj i lokalnoj razini. Vjerojatno će ubrzati trend ka de-*

*centralizaciji i povećanju autonomije na lokalnoj razini, uz stvaranje novih oblika suradnje u stručnim pitanjima.*

*Sažetak izradio Jozo Ivanović*

Lester K. Born, the first Secretary General of the International Council on Archives, in an excellent entry on Archives, written for the 1968 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, summarises the birth of modern archival systems in the following terms:

"Although the institution of archives and something of archival administration may be traced from antiquity, as they are understood today they date from the French Revolution. With the establishment of the Archives Nationales in 1789 and of the Archives Départementales in 1796, there was for the first time a unified administration of archives, which embraced all extant repositories and record-producing public agencies. The second result was the implicit acknowledgement that the state was responsible for the care of its documentary heritage. The third result was the principle of the accessibility of archives to the public." The half-sentence of the above presentation on the comprehensive coverage of the unified French administration of archives is inaccurate. That is why I choose the quotation as a starting point for this paper.

From the 1790s on, European States, one after another, added to their competencies the memory-keeping function. At the breakout of the First World War, more than half of Europe was served by national archival institutions. The movement continued after 1918 in a reorganised Europe. At the time of the bicentennial of the French Revolution, a national archival agency or institution operated in all countries of the European region and in the majority of the Member States of the UN system.

From the inception of the national archival function, divergent approaches developed as to its objective: keeping all evidences of the past or only those produced by public services? The continental approach, in all its variants, has been influenced by the pioneering French experience, which included in the national memory, together with the records of public provenance, Church and other private archives nationalised under the revolutionary legislation. This archival logic was brought to its extreme in the USSR with the creation of the State Archival Fonds, encompassing all documents of (almost) all provenance's, created in the territory of the Union. In the new European democracies, the profession hesitates to drop this concept which expresses perfectly the ideal of preserving the archival heritage in its entirety.

England had opted for another archive-building conception. It was less ambitious with respect to the width of the State archival jurisdiction, but more thorough in its implementation. The new (i.e. archival) function of the State was limited to the records created by the Government Departments and Royal Courts of Justice, but

none of these agencies and courts was given the right to remain the perpetual custodian of its own memory. Because of this uncompromising thoroughness and the resistance of the agencies, the organisation of archives took time. The process started in 1802, the Public Records Act was adopted and the PRO established in 1838.

The English conception established a radical distinction between the traditional institutional memory based on the rule that the records are to be preserved by their creator and the memory of the nation, preservation of which is entrusted to the State. It broke more radically with the Ancien Regime, than revolutionary France, where large bodies of records remained outside the control of the national archival authority.

The French model, followed by quite a number of countries, with its independent diplomatic and military archives, implies that the memory of the State may be partitioned, that the archival function allotted to the State may put up with exceptions granted to agencies dealing with high politics. But in this model, the State is vested with responsibilities for the preservation of records created at provincial/local government level.

The English model, intransigent in protecting the memory of the State (it forbids joint custody of public records and private papers as well as autonomous Ministry archives) excludes from the competency of the national archival authority the records produced at the lower levels of public administration.

As Sir Hilary Jenkinson observed, when presenting an overview of the English archival system: "Before going further it will be convenient to set out a highly curious fact – at least it would appear so to any continental Archivist. Practically none of the Archive-owning bodies or individuals we are now to enumerate owe any allegiance to the Central Authority (the Public Record Office) or, with certain comparatively trifling exceptions, are accountable for, their treatment of their Archives to anyone save themselves." (Jenkinson Selected Writings, p. 202–203.)

The international surveys, enquiries, round table debates etc. on archival policies and practices, published during the last half century make it clear that in our professional field there are no two identical national situations.

Each of them is shaped by a unique combination of a wide range of factors: political history, government-structure, record-creating and record-keeping rules and practices, climate, educational and training system, financial capability, date, sources and promoters of the initial archival legislation etc. Even countries with long periods of common history (e.g. Scandinavia, Benelux, the Indian Subcontinent, the Habsburg Monarchy, Ibero-America etc.), once separated will have different archival heritages and will quickly build up distinct (and unique) archival systems.

Nevertheless, when it comes to essentials, all these extremely varied situations may be classified according to their affinities with one of the two (i.e. English and French) models with respect to the competencies of the national archival authority. They may also be classified into three, four or more groups according to their level of development, i.e. according to their practical capability of performing the duties prescribed by the relevant legislation (facilities, staff, operational budget, regulations etc.) but this classification goes beyond the topic of this paper.

Both models were developed in the age of the undivided rule of the hand-written paper-record. Both could operate with an equal success ratio and were equally adaptable to the constantly emerging new administrative, scholarly and technological needs and constraints until the three dramatic and simultaneous events, of the 1990s, affecting the archival field: globalisation, the electronic revolution and the outburst of public interest for the knowledge of the history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Even if it hurts our professional convictions, we have to accept the fact that the two models are not equally adaptable to the new circumstances. The "English model" only is compatible with the archival requirements of the emerging information age. This statement may sound excessive and unreasonable, but it is based on facts.

In the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany and probably some other countries belonging to the "English model" group, the national archival authority coped successfully with the new administrative, scholarly, technological and even environmental challenges. They have gained an improved status and have increased their weight within Government through new legislation. Since the politically sensitive archive groups are under their control after transfer, they are in a position to implement the legally established access rules in a coherent way. They are naturally involved in decision-making on special access issues such as exceptional research authorisations or declassification of restricted units.

In the "French model" group, the record-creating agencies have fairly good chances to impose over-cautious access rules, so as to prevent the unveiling of facts or failures that might -they think – tarnish their reputation. Against their pressure, the liberalising efforts of a national archival authority, which has only partial control of the heritage, can hardly prevail. The progress achieved in securing free access to administrative information by citizens does not necessarily benefit to the users of archives. It may even lead to reinforce restrictions on files, which were excepted from the free access regime before their transfer to the archives.

But the main factor, which makes obsolete the partitioned State memory model, is technological. Cross-government electronic record-production and information systems may operate, for securing long-term preservation of records, in collaboration with a National Archives linked to and serving all Government Departments

or by direct connection and co-ordination between agencies. They are not compatible with a national archival agency severed from a significant part of the Government records produced.

Recent developments in France tend to indicate that the model is no more viable. The political weight of the archival administration within Government is weakening year after year. Contrary to the "English model" countries, where adequate new facilities were constructed in the 1980s and 90s for the national archival agencies, the French Archives nationales have to manage in their beautiful but totally antiquated historical site and in a records-centre type annex 54 kilometres from Paris downtown. The plan for constructing new joint facilities in Regims for the archives of the Fifth Republic and the Military Archives have been adjourned. Under these conditions, those Departments, which can afford it financially, organise permanent archives for themselves. The partition of the national memory is progressing.

This vicious circle may, of course, be broken by a radical decision, but short of it, the "French model" risks to undergo an ironic transformation. The Archives nationales are in danger of becoming a repository preserving closed fonds, like the General Archives of the Indies in Seville or the Russian Historical Archives in Saint Petersburg, and the Government Departments will recover their pre-1789 status. They will be given full and legal responsibility for the permanent preservation of their records created from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century on. A perfect historical cycle would be thus closed. The country, which invented the concept of modern national archives, would reinvent the archival system of the Ancien Regime.

The "French model" is no more in a position to perform the Government function of preserving and making available the memory of the nation. The countries, which have adopted it, will be compelled, sooner or later, to reconstruct their archival system.

The new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, emerging from the collapsed communist system had also inherited a partitioned national memory. The Party-State had no control over the archives of the State-Party, preserved in separate repositories and hardly available at all for research. This anomaly, excluding the essential evidence from the national memory, could be terminated in the majority of the countries. The archives of the State-Party were taken into custody by the public archival system.

No reliable statistics have been published on the pre-1970 record accumulations still maintained in the originating agencies in Central and Eastern Europe. Fragmentary information indicate that, probably in half of the new democracies, due to a shortage of facilities, a significant percentage of public records, created since the Second World War, have not yet been transferred to archival custody. Solving this problem needs capital investment so as to increase the storage capacity of the State Ar-

chives. Not all countries concerned are in a position to undertake building programmes for their national archives.

It seems also that the privilege of maintaining permanent archives, granted under the former legislation of certain countries to "political" Departments (Foreign Affairs, Defence, Interior), in the spirit of the "French model", are still in force. The take-over of the Party archives, although a decisive step towards integration had not completed the process in these countries.

As underscored earlier, there is little doubt, that the survival of the memory function of the State requires, in the new democracies too, a strong central archival agency, totally dedicated to the preservation, processing and communication of the records produced by the national Government, including its external services. It requires also the suppression of the independent ministerial archives.

An archival reform introducing the "English model" at the level of the national Government would necessarily affect the status and the organisation of the archives at the provincial and local level. It would very likely accelerate the trend towards decentralisation and the strengthening, of local autonomy, together with the creation of new associative structures for professional co-operation. This evolution is already underway in Russia, Hungary, Slovenia and, probably, in several other countries. I wish that this matter be considered at a future conference.