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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

DISCIPLINES AND CONTEXTS

This is the somewhat abbreviated English translation of the book originally published in Dutch in 2001 commemorating the 150th birthday of the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (KITLV, literally Royal Institute of Linguistics, Geography and Anthropology) in Leiden. The institute’s official English name at that time was the Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology. That name was changed in 2003 to Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies. There was good reason to do so, as explained in the last chapter of this book. Between its establishment in 1851 and its 150th birthday, Indonesia was by far KITLV’s largest area of study. In the course of those 150 years, however, KITLV grew to host more academic disciplines than indicated in its original name. Although linguistics and anthropology continue to be important disciplines within the institute, geography was left to the specialists of the congenial KNAG, the Royal Dutch Geographical Society (Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap) soon after KITLV was established. However, the role played by a discipline not named at the time of the establishment, historical studies, has increasingly gained importance. This also holds true to a limited extent for jurisprudence, especially with reference to the study of Indonesian customary law in the interwar period.

Most historiographies about scientific institutions like KITLV have the nature of a descriptive chronicle, portraying major predecessors and memorable events from the institute’s history. Klein (1998) and his co-authors, for example, described the history of the KITLV’s current employer, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen), in terms of memorable individuals and events. The extremely detailed, two-volume history of anthropology in the Netherlands (Vermeulen and Kommers 2002) is actually a series of miniature descriptive chronicles: of university institutes in the first volume and of styles and specializations in the second. The second volume describes to the greatest degree the early styles and specializations within their context of colonialism. This is an understandable approach considering the extensive literature on Dutch
colonialism and the orientation of early anthropology towards actual practice. The most practically oriented discipline, geography, was not only the first to be discarded by the KITLV but also the discipline successfully placed within the context of European imperialism from a comparative perspective (Bell, Butlin and Heffernan 1995). Sadly, the history published on the occasion of the 150th birthday of Great Britain’s Royal Asiatic Society (Simmonds and Digby 1979) was written as a descriptive chronicle. This limits the comparative exploration that would have been so interesting based on the multidisciplinary nature of both that Society and KITLV.

In studying the history of KITLV, both discipline and context proved to be problematic terms demanding more detailed explanation. As already indicated, scientific disciplines were often described as if they had no context, while the contextualization of other disciplines, such as anthropology, was initially emphasized to such an extent that little was left of the discipline’s own scientific development. Kuhn’s well-known paradigms ignored context but justifiably focused on the internal dynamics of the history of sciences. For the more analytical disciplines like linguistics and anthropology, his definition of a paradigm – ‘universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide models and solutions to a community of scholars’ (Kuhn 1968: x) – remains relevant. Also relevant to research on KITLV was the literature on multidisciplinarity (Becher 1989) and interdisciplinarity (Hagedoorn, Komter and Maier 1994). However, even this literature basically ignores the successive contexts within which science was practiced in institutes like KITLV.

Initial attempts at contextualization, however, were no less one-sided due to disregard for those very internal dynamics of scientific disciplines. Asad, for example, analysed the development of British anthropology in the colonial era (Asad 1973) primarily in the still neo-Marxist idiom of the criticism of ideology. According to Asad, as a part of Western dominion over the entire non-Western world, British colonialism determined the choice, execution and application of anthropological studies, either directly or indirectly. No matter how good the intentions of British anthropologists towards the indigenous peoples they studied, their isolated partial criticism merely contributed to the modification and continuation of colonialism in the longer term. According to Asad (1973: 17):

The reason for this asymmetry is the dialectic of world power: Anthropologists can claim to have contributed to the cultural heritage of the societies they studied by a sympathetic recording of indigenous forms of life that would otherwise be lost to posterity. But they have also contributed, directly or indirectly, towards maintaining the structure of power represented by the colonial system.
By contrast, the more recent contextual study by Stocking (1991) differentiates more, offering many more nuances. Stocking notes the limitations of the earlier neo-Marxist criticism of ideology, even though it did manage to initiate a fundamental debate on the premises of anthropology. ‘Whatever its inadequacy as historical generalization’, he says of neo-Marxist analysis,

that conception is, however, a somewhat problematic one from the point of view of a history of anthropology concerned also with the activities of particular anthropologists in specific ethnographic locales. Such historiography demands a pluralization of the ‘colonial situation’ concept. Going beyond ideal (stereo?) typicalization, it would explore in greater depth a variety of differing ‘colonial situations’, the range of interaction of widely differing individuals and groups within them, and the ways in which these situational interactions conditioned the specific ethnographic knowledge that emerged. (Stocking 1991: 5).

Such a pluralization of the ‘colonial situation’ and that of the ‘post-colonial situation’ that followed was systematically aimed at in this study of KITLV from 1851 to 2001. From the analytical perspective, the various contexts within which multidisciplinary science was practiced in KITLV followed a pattern from general to specific. Even for an institute as scholarly as KITLV, world history sometimes had far-reaching effects. The process of decolonization is therefore the most important caesura in KITLV’s history. KITLV’s funding reflects more specific contexts. During the colonial period, that funding primarily came from the Ministry for the Colonies, the colonial business sector and the institute’s members. After decolonization, the Ministry of Education and Science was the primary source of subsidy. Since 1990, KITLV has been affiliated with KNAW, which was assigned direct responsibility for the working organization in 2001.

However, the rule that the one to pay has full say applies to only a limited degree to the history of KITLV. Even in the colonial period, the history of universities, and that of Leiden University in particular, was an autonomous context that greatly affected KITLV. The same holds true for intellectual trends such as the ethical orientation that affected scientific practice both in the colonial period and around the turn of the twentieth century. After the decolonization, KITLV’s ties with the Netherlands’ strongly growing universities were strengthened even more. The most specific context within which the KITLV developed was shaped by the scientific and extra-scientific activities of the members of its executive board and, after the decolonization, its staff members. This more personal context is concretized in this book, including a number of biographical sketches.
A wide and richly varied range of secondary literature made it possible to fill in the details of all these different contexts. In addition to recent manuals on the history of the Netherlands (Blom 1994), the history of the Netherlands’ colonies (Van Goor 1994) and the modern history of Indonesia (Ricklefs 2001), that literature includes a series of monographs. Only a few of the most useful of these studies are the university histories by Baggen (1998) and Rupp (1997), the collection of articles on Leyden University’s Eastern connections edited by Otterspeer (1989a), and the study on specialized education for civil servants for the East by Fasseur (1993).

The general trend identified in this contextual analysis was one of relative autonomy for the practice of science within KITLV. In specific situations, however, scientific and extra-scientific activities often proved to be entwined. Two pairs of concepts proved to be highly important in conceptualizing the cohesion between these scientific and extra-scientific activities, namely: Orientalism and Occidentalism, and Universalism and Relativism.

**Orientalism and Occidentalism; Universalism and Relativism**

With the introduction of the concept of ‘Orientalism’ as the negative approach to the Orient seen in Western science and culture, the American literature historian of Pakistani birth, Edward Said (1978), triggered a revolutionary paradigm shift in the relevant disciplines. According to Said, European scholars, authors and artists construed a generalizing, essentialist and dichotomous image starting at the end of the eighteenth century of a stagnating, despotic and irrational East as the opposite of the dynamic, well-governed and rational West. Said described the concept of Orientalism in detail; in his view it encompassed three related meanings.

According to Said, the concept is, in the first place, used as a synonym for oriental studies, the western academic discipline concerned with the Orient, a discipline which was long marked by ‘latent orientalism’, in which the East and the West were opposed to one another on the basis of their great differences. Even when the western perception was positive, as expressed in ‘the eternal wisdom of the East’, there was always an assumption of fundamental differences between East and West subending such estimations. In the second place, since the end of the eighteenth century a ‘manifest orientalism’, which attached a negative value to the
supposed opposition between East and West, emerged. In the third place latent and manifest orientalism fused in the context of western imperialism and colonialism to form

the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority of the Orient (Said 1978: 2–3, see also 222–4).

Inspired by the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault, Said saw orientalism (oriental studies) as a mental form of disciplining the Eastern ‘Other’ by the dominant Westerner. Kennedy (2000: 25–31) has however justly pointed out that Said’s use of Foucault’s analysis of the relationship between knowledge and power led to contradictions in Orientalism. Whereas the radical poststructuralist Foucault does not believe in any form of objective truth, Said suggested in many places that the western, orientalist view of the East was at odds with reality.

According to Said important aspects of orientalism continued to exist after decolonization in conjunction with new, informal forms of imperialism, both in Europe and the United States. In later publications Said further elaborated the relationship between orientalism, imperialism and postcolonial perceptions of the East (Said 1981, 1993). Besides the Middle East, which was central to Said’s analysis, his orientalism postulate has been applied to colonial and postcolonial South and Southeast Asia (Breckenridge and Van der Veer 1993; Legge 1992).

Said’s orientalism postulate has generated fruitful debate in all academic disciplines traditionally concerned with the East. Naturally western scholars of traditional oriental studies who saw their respectable intellectual status being branded by Said as an imperialistic ideology were particularly incensed (Lewis 1982). However, even the British historian John M. MacKenzie, who responded with greater detachment, has brought to light fundamental criticism of Said’s orientalism postulate in his solidly grounded cultural and historical analysis of European orientalism during the colonial period (MacKenzie 1995).

In his well-balanced overview of the debate sparked by Said’s Orientalism, MacKenzie (1995: 11) summarized the four most important points of criticism arising from Said’s postulate:

His binary approach to the ‘Other’ or ‘alterity’ as colonial discourse jargon has it; his notion of unchallenged western dominance and his handling of the character of imperial hegemony; his vacillations between truth and
ideology and his lack of theoretical consistency; and his identification of a monolithic and predominantly male-originated discourse, which equally subjects the West to ‘Occidentalism’.

By ‘feminizing’ and ‘pluralizing’ the concept of orientalism, authors such as Lisa Lowe (1991), who largely endorse Said’s postulate, have, to a certain measure, annulled this criticism. But according to MacKenzie they too are not able to free themselves from the binary opposition between East and West which Said reproduces in his critical analysis of the western representation of the East. His analysis of orientalism is thus paired with a kind of ‘occidentalism’, namely a negative, generalizing and essentialist view of the West as fundamentally imperialist, materialistic and ethnocentric. In the afterword to the second edition of Orientalism Said defended himself against this criticism by pointing out that recently in the West a promising “rainbow coalition” of emancipatory movements of women, ethnic minorities and environmentalists has arisen that can break free from traditional orientalism, while in the Middle East Islamic fundamentalism has unfortunately spread.

But from a historical perspective, in the context of colonialism and neocolonialism, Said’s recent subtle distinctions do not eliminate the anti-western Occidentalism identified by MacKenzie in his analysis of orientalism. Such an orientalism was also apparent during the 1960s and 1970s in radical leftwing western sympathizers of communist regimes in Cuba, Vietnam and China: ‘distant paradises’ where ‘the new man’, unblemished by western stains, is said to have stood up (Aarsbergen 1988; Kuitenbrouwer 1994). More recently a conservative variant of occidentalism, with authoritarian Asian leaders as its interpreters who, evoking the superiority of ‘Asian values’, rejected the western plea for universal human rights as a form of cultural imperialism (Bauer and Bell 1999).

By identifying the tension between moral universalism and moral relativism in the debate about human rights we arrive at a conceptual pair that Said sadly neglected. Because western ideas about the East were, in a historical context, characterized not only by orientalism (and to a lesser degree) by occidentalism, but also by universalism and relativism. Since the Enlightenment and the democratic revolutions toward the end of the eighteenth century many western intellectuals and politicians assumed that the East would undergo similar political, socioeconomic and cultural developments as the West, only later. In contrast to views based on orientalism, the East was seen through this universalism as being susceptible to development. During the colonial period universalism, like orientalism, was marked by a Eurocentric belief in the superiority of
western civilization. Western development was a model for the East, both according to liberal and Marxist universalists. According to some moral relativists in the present debate about human rights this is still, though more unintentionally, the case. ‘Imperialism is the necessary logical consequence of universalism’ is the warning the US political scientist Samuel Huntington (1996: 310) issued to human rights adepts.

Huntington's moral relativism has in common with orientalism its point of departure, the fundamental differences between the West and the East. But it differs from orientalism on two points: first, it assumes a plurality of civilizations or cultures and second, it rejects every claim to western superiority. During the colonial period this genre of cultural relativism, which presupposes the fundamental equality of different cultures, hardly existed. But certainly after World War II and decolonization cultural relativism became the dominant school of thought in anthropology. Subsequently it became the most important alternative for universalist paradigms in linguistics, history and legal studies. With postmodernism, which has recently become all the rage in the social sciences and humanities, relativism has increasingly become an issue.

Orientalism and occidentalism, universalism and relativism together cover the various paradigms that directed the scholarly pursuits at KITLV over the last century and a half. But there are certainly more additions to Said's concept of orientalism to be found. The US historian Michael Adas pointed out that racism is under-discussed in Said's historical analysis (Adas 1989: 176). According to Adas this has to do with the complicated relations between western Christian and Arabic Islamic and Jewish cultures in Palestine, Said's country of origin, and with the fact that the most overt forms of western racism were not aimed at the Orient, but at Africa and the African diaspora in America. For an analysis of KITLV publications about Suriname and the Antilles appearing during the colonial period it is important to take into account biological racism. Sometimes we encounter this colonial period racism with regards to Malay peoples. This racism can be conceived of as an extreme form of orientalism. While according to orientalism the East was already quasi-unchangeable, the development of coloured races was, on the basis of biological racism, virtually ruled out.

That Said's concept of orientalism, primarily supplemented with occidentalism, universalism and relativism, is not a strange, abstract perspective we have randomly projected on the history of KITLV is apparent from the fact that in the Netherlands, too, his postulate has led to a debate between proponents and detractors. The Amsterdam scholar of religious sociology, Peter van der Veer, whose main field of research is
India, in a recent, critical edited volume titled *Modern orientalisme* assailed Leiden indologists past and present with Said’s contention. A particular target was C. Snouck Hurgronje, the internationally renowned Leiden professor of Arabic studies and an influential chairman of KITLV, who as a government advisor played an important role around 1900 on the subjugation of Atjeh and other parts of the Indonesian archipelago. His bringing into practice imperialistically of orientalism, which was denounced by Said, lives on amongst his postcolonial apologists in Leiden according to Van der Veer. Additionally he compared Dutch colonialism in Indonesia with the German occupation of the Netherlands in World War II.

Several Leiden historians could not let this pass and responded to these wild accusations, each in his own way. The authoritative professor H.L. Wesseling used his column of 4 April 1996 in the Dutch newspaper *NRC*), with the lofty opening ‘modern stupidity’, to take down the Amsterdam sociologist. The science historian Willem Otterspeer coyly pointed out that whoever wanted to label Snouck Hurgronje an imperialist orientalist, as Said and Van der Veer did, had better make the effort of reading his voluminous oeuvre, in which other, ethical liberal and scientific-objective opinions predominated (Otterspeer 1996: 134–5). For the relatively young Leiden historian H.W. van den Doel, Snouck remained, despite all recent criticism, ‘the radiant sun in the Leiden universe’ (Van den Doel 1998). Apparently Van der Veer’s Amsterdam style was too polemical and too provoking to give rise to meaningful debate.

In a more detached way and with solid grounding other authors fleshed out Said’s postulate to suit the Dutch situation: for example Susan Legêne (1998) in her Rotterdam thesis on the culture of Dutch imperialism in the first half of the nineteenth century and Helena Spanjaard (1998) in her Leiden thesis about Indies and Indonesian painting between 1900 and 1995. Historiographically there is sufficient basis to formulate the central question about the contextualized history of KITLV as follows: to what extent was the scholarly practice of KITLV during the past century and a half characterized by universalism, relativism and – with less likelihood – occidentalism?

The Structure of the Book

In his introduction to the commemorative volume for one hundred fifty years of the *Bijdragen*, historian and KITLV employee Gerrit Knaap (1994: 638) remarked that
A detailed analysis of the content of individual articles, for instance to see what images of the non-western world were conveyed and how these were related to their political and ideological environments will not be attempted here. Such an analysis would require too much painstaking research for a short article like this one.

In this book there is an attempt made at such an analysis of the content of publications and at careful research of the context for a century and a half of KITLV history. This kind of ‘painstaking research’ was not always easy. The minutes of board meetings were not exactly lively and it seemed as though the learned authors had saved their most boring writings for the Bijdragen or the book series of the institute. But that was to be expected with a scholarly institute like KITLV, which since its inception has always placed great importance on objectivity and moral neutrality. Beyond their publications in KITLV series, prominent members were far more candid about their views on politics and society in their lectures for Indisch Genootschap and in brochures and articles for journals such as De Gids. If we include the activities and views of KITLV members that fall outside the spectrum of scholarship a far more variegated and compelling picture comes into being, one that increases our insight into their scholarly activities and views.

The biographical research on the most important members is the central point of this contextualized history of KITLV – the thread binding three other levels of research: research into the pluriform context based on literature analysis, research on the KITLV archive for the institute’s history proper and selective research into the institute’s publications, the journal Bijdragen and book series such as Werken and Verhandelingen.

As was remarked earlier, research on the context could be linked to respected historical literature, particularly about the colonial period. Aside from the aforementioned publications by Poeze (1994) about the Bijdragen, Fasseur (1993) about the academic training for ‘indologists’, Otterspeer (1989a) about the eastern connections of Leiden and Wachelder (1992), Baggen (1997) and Rupp (1997) about the history of science in the Netherlands, it was especially the monographs by Kuitenbrouwer (1985), Bossenbroek (1996) and Taselaar (1997) that gave insight into the context within which KITLV operated during the colonial period – that is to say, a good century of its existence. Literature about the half century of postcolonial context is scarcer. However the monograph by Kuitenbrouwer (1994) about postwar relations with the Third World, supplemented with several other works, offered sufficient correspondences.
Historian and linguist Koos Arens was responsible for a large proportion of the research into the institutional archive, with special attention for KITLV’s financial relations: during the colonial period this was particularly with the Ministry of Colonies and colonial businesses and during the postcolonial period it was the Ministry of Education and research institutions connected to it. Good inventories were helpful in this respect. However, the KITLV archive proved to be incomplete in several ways. The written minutes and appendices of board meetings were not retained in their entirety. This is unfortunate because the draft minutes and appendices sometimes show that there was more controversy within the board than appeared from the published minutes in the Bijdragen.

Research into the institute’s publications was because of the sheer volume necessarily selective. It proved to be impossible to investigate all PhD theses, published either at KITLV or elsewhere, by prominent KITLV scholars. But their mostly programmatic orations gave a good picture of their scholarly direction. In selecting KITLV publications it has been of primary interest that they were spread over the various disciplines and paradigms described in this introduction. The summary articles in the edited volume about 150 years of Bijdragen provided a good basis for this selection.

For biographical information the Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië and the standard biographical dictionaries were first consulted. Moreover, biographical books and articles had already been written about several prominent KITLV members, such as J.H.C. Kern, Snouck Hurgronje and C. van Vollenhoven. To fully understand their position within KITLV – and those of the lesser gods – the obituaries in the Bijdragen proved to be interesting. These often showed how a younger generation of scholars viewed the careers of their illustrious predecessors. For the most recent history of KITLV, for which the biographical information is naturally scant, there were interviews conducted with board members and members of the management team of KITLV.

The book resulting from this thickly layered examination of the history of KITLV since 1851 is structured chronologically. Per period, several prominent KITLV members and their principal themes are placed in the spotlight. Often the most important authors at KITLV were at the same time board members. Additionally there is space devoted to important outsiders among KITLV members, such as the eccentric linguist H.N. van der Tuuk during the colonial period and the radical leftwing sociologist W.F. Wertheim during the postcolonial period. The last two chapters, which treat the postwar and postcolonial period, are more elaborate than the
previous chapters. This is because the number of KITLV members, employees and publications increased sharply during the past few decades. The conclusion responds to the question central to this introduction, to what measure was the scholarship at KITLV since 1851 marked by orientalism. The author has not, in this history of KITLV, attempted to be exhaustive but does hope to have justified his claim of solid and reliable contextualization.
CHAPTER TWO

THE KITLV UNDER CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL ADMINISTRATION (1851–1870)

THE NETHERLANDS AND ITS COLONIES

Baud’s Conservative Colonial Policy

On 5 October 1849, the conservative former Minister of the Colonies, J.C. Baud, had a lengthy discussion with J.R. Thorbecke, the liberal politician appointed by the king to form a new government, regarding his possible return to that Ministry. Baud refused the position, favouring membership of parliament. He successfully proposed assigning the position to his confidant, C.F. Pahud. Baud could not resist, however, from seriously warning Thorbecke about Pahud’s plans for reforming the colonies. ‘In Europe, with its homogeneity between rulers and people, political tests can be performed’, Baud told Thorbecke.

In Java, such struggles would be lethal to the Netherlands. Everything there is heterogeneous. We have nothing in common with the people of Java. Language, colour, religion, morals, roots, historical memories – everything differs between the Dutch and the Javanese. We are the oppressors, they are the oppressed. That heterogeneity inherently plants a seed of disintegration or separation. It will run its course; with wisdom and due caution the point in time can be delayed, but systemization and recklessness will hasten it. (Alberts 1939: 172.)

This orientalist viewpoint tells us much about Baud’s motives for establishing the KITLV a few years later. Scientific knowledge of the language, geography and anthropology of Java could contribute to the well-informed, professional colonial administration of an eastern people so different as the Javanese, in order to ensure that Dutch control could be maintained as long as possible. Baud had already contacted Gerrit Simons and Taco Roorda in the 1840s regarding the establishment of an institution of this kind. Simons was the Director of the new Koninklijke Academie (Royal Academy) in Delft, where not only civil engineers but also colonial administrators had studied since 1842; Roorda was Javanese Studies professor in Delft (KITLV: H 380). From a political perspective, these two were Baud’s conservative kindred spirits. However, political developments in the year
of revolution, 1848, caused postponement. It was not until 1851 that the KITLV was actually established. Before discussing the establishment of the Institute in more detail, it is useful to review Baud’s conservative colonial policy between 1830 and 1848, the colonial reforms and compromises that followed between 1848 and 1870, and the modernization process in the Netherlands and the colonies, which was reflected in the colonial
policy for the entire period. This will serve as the background and context of the establishment of the KITLV and its early years.

Who was Jean Chrétien Baud? In 1789, the year of the French Revolution, Baud was born as the son of an officer of Swiss origin and a Dutch mother (Baud, 1983, I: 5–12). He trained with the Navy, where Baud made an adventurous journey around the world as naval cadet. As officer on the French frigate that was bringing the recently appointed Governor General J.W. Janssens to Java, Baud became his secretary and joined the civil service after arriving on Java. Baud continued in what was to be a stunning career as colonial civil servant, rapidly progressing up the career ladder in part thanks to his two marriages to daughters of prestigious East Indian families. As ‘Director for matters concerning the Dutch East Indies properties’ in The Hague, Baud had close contact with J. van den Bosch, who put an end to the draining Java War in 1830 and implemented the Cultivation System. Baud succeeded Van den Bosch as Governor General in 1833 and as Minister for the Colonies in 1839. After the liberal turn of events in 1848 forced him to resign, Rotterdam elected Baud as Member of Parliament, where he continued to exert extensive influence on colonial policy behind the scenes. He was named Minister of State in 1854 and awarded a noble title. Baud died in 1859. His former opponent Thorbecke later honoured him as ‘a capital, a classical man [...] a statesman, distinguished from men these days who, compared to him, are merely fence jumpers’ (Baud 1983, I: 12).

As a young adult, Baud was strongly influenced by the philosophy of the Enlightenment, with its universalistic faith in progress, and by the political ideals of the French Revolution. The failure, however, of the liberal colonial policy that proved incapable of convincing Javanese farmers to produce export crops and that seriously alienated the Javanese nobility in colonial service from Dutch authority, caused doubts. The Java War or Diponegoro revolt in Central Java, resulting in a draining war with some two hundred and fifty thousand casualties that completely exhausted all colonial finances, was the determining factor. Baud became a convinced advocate of the conservative colonial system that Van den Bosch implemented in Java. Now he became outspoken in his rejection of the ‘so-called liberalism (that) criticizes and finds fault with everything and that is attempting in every country to make things difficult for the authorities’ (Westendorp Boerma 1956, I: 184).

Nevertheless, Baud continued to be a relatively pragmatic conservative. The financial crisis in the Netherlands, intensified even further by King Willem I’s stubborn refusal to recognise the secession of Belgium, was the
most important motivation behind Baud’s conservative policy. The ‘Budget Surplus Policy’, in which any excess on the East Indian budget was automatically transferred to the treasury of the Netherlands, was the central element of the policy: the only system by which Java could remain ‘the cork on which the Netherlands floats’, according to Baud (Fasseur 1992: 57). All other conservative policy elements were attuned to that. These consisted in succession of the Cultivation System, which basically forced Javanese farmers to produce export crops as payment of taxes in kind; the Consignment System, which gave the Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappij (NHM, Netherlands Trading Company) a monopoly on the transport and sale of these crops; the re-feudalisation of the Javanese nobility, returning to them their former power, status and income; respect for the religion – the Islam – and the traditional institutions and customs – the adat – of the Javanese people in order to promote peace and order; a strict policy of abstention, meaning no interference in the domestic issues of the numerous (semi-)sovereign Indonesian states and mini-states outside of Java in order to avoid costly wars; and a reformation, if necessary the abolishment of slavery in the West Indies, in order to improve the productivity of the plantations and reduce the chronic shortfall on the budget (Van Goor 1994: 213–35).

Baud was not a conservative without a heart or conscience. When famine hit some of Java’s residencies in the 1840s, he distributed rice, reduced work pressure and had the hated indigo cultivation partially withdrawn (Fasseur 1992: 64–86). The pragmatic conservative Baud, however, always viewed the Javanese population through the eyes of an orientalist, not those of a relativist.

He showed little appreciation or respect for the Javanese culture in itself, a culture Baud believed inferior to European civilization. He stimulated the power of the aristocracy and respected the religion and adat of the farmers, primarily to promote the ‘uninterrupted management’ of Java under the Cultivation System and to avoid a repetition of the costly Java War. Even Fasseur, who somehow found a way to sympathize with the conservative statesman, found Baud’s instrumental logic cynical in this respect (Fasseur 1992: 50).

Baud did show some appreciation for a few individual aristocrats, such as the painter Raden Saleh, who stayed with Baud at his home in The Hague for a significant period (Spanjaard 1998: 18). This Raden Saleh, however, was a strongly westernized and successful painter for the royal court. Baud’s attitude toward those of colour, whether westernized or not, was relatively negative. He also reportedly kept the colonial administration
from employing Indo-Europeans in so far as possible (Fasseur 1993: 73). Baud was even more negative about negroes, his disgust with whom he had already shown as a young naval cadet in Brazil when he said that their ‘laziness and immorality’ were in part hereditary (Kuitenbrouwer 1995: 75).

Colonial Reforms and Compromises

The conservative colonial structure that Baud thus helped to construct starting in 1830 gradually began to decay after the liberal constitutional reforms of 1848. Nevertheless, the central element of colonial policy – the Budget Surplus Policy – remained unaffected. Most liberals in the Netherlands, who in principle opposed the colonial monopoly system with its forced labour, did not want to lose the colonial funds in practice, as these would cover the costs for reforms including abolishing slavery in the West Indies as well as the construction of a railway system in the Netherlands. The colonial revenues were never terminated but diminished as a matter of course starting in 1877, as a result of the gradual decline of the government cultivations, the decreasing price of coffee, and the draining Atceh war (Fasseur 1975: 114–28; Fasseur 1991; Janny de Jong 1989: 85–139; Kuitenbrouwer 1978: 89–95).

Thorbecke’s liberal constitutional reforms knocked the first hole in Baud’s conservative colonial structure in 1848. Although the “supreme governing” of the colonies remained the responsibility of the King, it was no longer the King’s exclusive responsibility. The financial administration of the colonies was to be defined by law, as were the main lines of the colonial administration that were to be submitted to parliament for approval as Government Regulations for the East and the West. Moreover, as personification of the conservative ancien régime, Baud was forced to resign as Minister for the Colonies. In parliament a liberal ‘colonial opposition’ was formed to counter the conservative colonial policy that was led by the inspired former Batavian preacher W.R. van Hoëvell, an ethicist avant la lettre (Fasseur 1992: 102–26; Kuitenbrouwer 1985: 1–35).

However, Baud’s role was far from finished. The Department of the Colonies remained the responsibility of conservative ministers: Baud’s confidants Pahud and P.J. Mijer. As authoritative conservative MP, Baud was able to effectively support their policy, certainly when Thorbecke’s government was forced to resign in 1853 and was succeeded by a series of conservative ministries. Actually, it was Baud who dictated the new Government Regulations for the Netherlands Indies to Minister Pahud,
and Baud orchestrated their parliamentary ratification in 1854. Once again Baud proved to be a pragmatic conservative by declaring that in principle, a liberal colonial system was to be preferred. He therefore included a ‘conciliatory section’ in the Government Regulations specifying that in the near future, private entrepreneurs would have more access to Java and that the government cultures in the longer term would gradually be phased out. However, as long as the condition of the state’s treasury demanded such, the system applicable at that time was to be maintained along its main lines. Attempts by the liberal opposition to include more extensive reforms in the Cultivation System and in the policy of support given to the patrimonial Javanese leadership failed (Fasseur 1992: 132–140).

Baud’s influence was also extensive in the preparations for abolishing slavery in the West Indies. In 1844 he had already explained in a confidential report to the King the unavoidability of abolition by the Netherlands after the British abolition of 1834. However, Baud claimed that abolition by the Dutch should be regulated in such way as to avoid the loss of production that followed Britain’s abolition. When both the liberals and the Calvinist-inspired ‘anti-revolutionaries’ – in parliament called for rapid emancipation after 1848, Minister Pahud appointed Baud in 1853 as chairman of the state commission charged with making thorough preparations for the emancipation legislation. In two thick reports Baud proposed extremely conservative abolition regulations. In Suriname, where slavery was much more important than in the Netherlands Antilles, not only the slaves but also the plantations were to be expropriated by the state with generous compensation for damages for the owners. The emancipated slaves, however, were to earn back the costs of their emancipation by working in strictly state-controlled village communities in the vicinity of a number of central sugar factories. Once the expropriation costs were recouped, the plantations would become the collective property of these village communities, following the example set by Java. According to Baud, who had the successful Cultivation System in mind, this would even increase productivity.

Justifiably so, the liberals and anti-revolutionary MPs believed that emancipation in this manner would actually amount to nothing more than pretty words. A majority of parliament therefore quickly rejected the conservative proposal modelled after the Javanese Cultivation System. The conservative Ministers for the Colonies had now arrived at a stand-off against the growing liberal and anti-revolutionary parliamentary majority, and due to the relative weakness of the Dutch abolition movement as
compared to the earlier British movement, that stand-off could not be resolved from the outside. Ultimately, the first liberal Ministers for the Colonies – the moderate former colonial civil servants J.P. Cornets de Groot van Kraaijenburg, J. Loudon and G.H. Uhlenbeck – prepared compromise regulations that were not approved by parliament until 1862, a few years after Baud died. The state plantations had been removed from the proposed legislation, the costs for damages would not be compensated by the emancipated slaves but covered by the government, and the state’s control of the emancipated slaves would last not their entire lives but only a decade. Parliament rejected the immigration of new contract labourers from the British Indies proposed by the government as an unnecessary luxury (Kuitenbrouwer 1995).

While the abolition of slavery in the West Indies already attracted much parliamentary attention in the 1850s, the termination of the Javanese Cultivation System grew to become the colonial issue of the 1860s that dominated every aspect of politics in the Netherlands. Two new developments triggered this. In 1860, the liberals – supported by prosperous economic developments in the Netherlands and its colonies – won a parliamentary majority. In that same year, Max Havelaar, a novel by former civil servant Eduard Douwes Dekker, was published: a complaint against the close cooperation between the Netherlands-Indies colonial administration and the Javanese princes and regents that oppressed and exploited the Javanese farmers. The book sent a ‘shivers down spines’ throughout the country, as Van Hoëvells phrased it. The liberals were, however, unable to win over the fickle Bonapartist Multatuli (Douwes Dekker’s pseudonym) for their campaign against the Cultivation System (Fasseur 1995: 13–28).

The liberal colonial reformists came to be led by the young, former Javanese sugar contractor I.D. Fransen van de Putte, who joined the second Thorbecke government in 1862 as Minister for the Colonies. This new minister went straight to work, implementing a series of reforms in a short period of time. These included regulation of the colonial finances by law, albeit leaving the budget surplus unaffected; restrictions on the power of the Javanese princes and regents, and a modest expansion of the bare educational facilities in the colony. Thorbecke and Fransen van de Putte soon took separate sides, however, due to both personal rivalry and differences of opinion regarding content. Van de Putte was preparing a legislative proposal that would put an end to the Cultivation System in the short term and convert the communal property of the Javanese village communities into private property that could be freely traded after a period of
five years to Dutch, Javanese and – albeit with restrictions – Chinese entrepreneurs.

This was taking things much too far, not only for the conservatives but also for Thorbecke and his moderately liberal kindred spirits. Like Baud before him, Thorbecke declared that the proposed conversion was not in keeping with the traditional Javanese *adat*, which had allegedly been based on communal property for centuries. Thorbecke resigned as Prime Minister, and subsequently, as leader of the ‘old liberals’, joined forces with the conservative opposition to reject the Cultivation Act legislative proposal composed by the ‘young liberal’ Fransen van de Putte in 1866. The colonial policy of the Netherlands had once again reached a stand-off, and again this could only be resolved through compromise. In 1870, the moderate liberal and former colonial civil servant E. de Waal successfully piloted the Agrarian Act and the Sugar Act through parliamentary approval. Communal property was maintained, but the possibilities for conversion to private property were expanded if and when a majority of the village community so desired. Private entrepreneurs were allowed to lease communal property from the Javanese village communities and to acquire long leases on desolate lots from the colonial administration. The sugar culture, the most important government culture, was to be gradually phased out over a period of twenty years. However, De Waal’s proposal for a modest start in phasing out the Budget Surplus Policy was rejected by a large majority of parliament (Fasseur 1991; Janny de Jong 1989: 113–39).

The political controversy regarding the historical origins of property ownership on Java was also reflected in scientific circles. In particular, P.J. Veth, professor of anthropology in Amsterdam and later in Leiden and liberal editor of *De Gids*, and N.G. Pierson, a ‘young liberal’ economist and banker, argued against the conservative view that communal property, together with the close-knit village community, had always been dominant on Java and deeply anchored in the *adat*. In their opinion, communal property was not implemented on a large scale until the Dutch colonial administration did so, in particular within the framework of the Cultivation System. The discussion of property ownership on Java regularly returned in the KITLV, even to this day (Kuitenbrouwer 1981; Aerts 1997: 223–38; Van der Velde 2006).

*The Modernization Processes in the Netherlands and Its Colonies*

The conservative colonial policy of which Baud was the personification for nearly a quarter of a century inherently presented a striking paradox.
The policy focused on maintaining the social status quo, the traditional class society in the Netherlands and the traditional patrimonial society in Java. The enormous financial-economic success of the Cultivation System, however, actually undermined the social status quo and stimulated the modernization process in the Netherlands and its colonies. In the Netherlands, this modernization process brought growing social support for the liberal party, which wanted to replace the government cultivation in Java by private entrepreneurship. This was a trend that, for the record, was already developing during the conservative regime within the Cultivation System, under the influence of the economic expansion. The Cultivation System was eventually defeated by its own success.

Between 1831 and 1877, a total of 823 million guilders of colonial profits was deposited into the treasury of the Netherlands, averaging about a quarter of all government revenues (Fasseur 1982: 183). Initially these millions were used to reduce the state’s enormous level of debt in particular. However, once the national budget gradually became balanced in about 1850, the colonial profits – which had peaked as a result of the rising international prices for sugar and coffee – were increasingly used to finance the government’s modernization measures, mainly in the Netherlands, but to a certain extent in the colonies as well. In the Netherlands, these profits helped to modernize the infrastructure, the educational system and the defence, without significant tax increases (Te Velde 1999: 116–28). The railway network in the Netherlands, for example, grew from 335 kilometres in 1860 to 1355 kilometres in 1870. Although the Netherlands was far less industrialized than England in about 1870, in other ways it had become an equally modern society (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 53–60).

In Java, for example, the colonial administration experimented with new mass-production techniques for sugar processing constructed irrigation networks and expanded the educational system in Dutch and Malay (Leidelmeijer 1997: 262–69; Ravesteijn 1997: 51–77; Groeneboer 1998: 99–106). As already indicated, the abolition of slavery in the West Indies in 1863, finally putting the Netherlands in line with other modern nations, was primarily financed by profits from the East Indies.

Recent historical literature also reflects a clear, positive re-evaluation of the Cultivation System, which has been vilified by past generations of liberal and Marxist historians. According to many of today’s historians, the Cultivation System stimulated prosperity not only in the Netherlands, but also among the Javanese population (Fasseur 1992: 26–56; Elson 1994: 117–26; Van Goor 1994: 220–30; J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 203–31). For not only did the colonial administration collect tax in kind from the Javanese farmers
in the shape of forced labour and vassal service, but it also paid a plant fee in cash which left a significant sum after deducting the lost rice production and cash taxes. The social-economic consequences were significant, varying from a strong increase in the birth rate to growing textiles imports from the Netherlands.

The historian that has gone the furthest to date in his re-evaluation of the Cultivation System is J.J.P. de Jong, who characterizes the system as an ‘extraordinary success’, also for the Javanese population. According to him, the Cultivation System should be viewed as a predecessor of the recent successful export-oriented growth policy employed by South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan: ‘In rough lines – because naturally there are numerous differences – the Netherlands followed the same development in the nineteenth century as so many of Asia’s New Tigers have experienced since the 1960s and 1970s’ (J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 229–30).

Indeed there are numerous differences. To mention a few of the most obvious: Java was not an independent state but a colony, with profits primarily flowing to the Netherlands, while unilateral concentration on a few agrarian export products was done at the expense of the evolution of a modern, mechanical industry which served as the basis for the economic growth of the four New Tigers. Moreover, in the four tigers the GNP (Gross National Product) per capita grew during the four decades after 1960 by an annual average of about seven percent. During the period of the Cultivation System, however, the BNP in the Indies grew per capita by less than one percent per year, from 174 dollars (according to 1970 value) in 1830 to 187 dollars in 1870 (Maddison 1989: 27). Justifiably, historians such as Peter Boomgaard and Robert Van Niel, who also reject the traditional liberal and Marxist image of a general increase in poverty under the Cultivation System, are more interested in the shadow side of the effects the Cultivation System had on the Javanese population, for example the initial famine, the stagnating rice production and the unequal distribution of the growth in income among the Javanese farmers (Boomgaard 1989b: 96–101; Van Niel 1992: 223–8).

A Royal Institution

Baud, Roorda and Simons

Not only the colonial policy, but also the education policy of the Dutch government represents an important aspect of the background and context of the KITLV in its earliest phase. In correlation with the
modernization processes, the classical, encyclopaedic ideal of knowledge in advanced education was replaced by the ideal of the specialized, independently practicing scholar. This change in the university mission did not acquire a solid foundation until the new Act on Higher Education of 1876 was approved, bringing changes that included making use of Latin as the academic lingua franca facultative and doing away with the mandatory PhD in most faculties. However, changes had already occurred in a number of other aspects. Although the number of students increased only marginally in the period between the Decree on Education of 1815 and the new Act of 1876, a clear shift was seen in the choice of study. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, more than three-fourths of all students were reading law or theology, but their numbers had decreased to twenty and ten percent by the end of that century. This decrease greatly benefited the increasing number of students of medicine – more than half of all students in 1890 – and students of mathematics, physics and, to a moderate degree, the liberal arts (Baggen 1998: 117–8). Increasingly fewer students were coming from the traditional gymnasiums and increasingly more from the Hogere Burgerscholen (HBS, Higher Civilian Schools), the school type introduced in 1863 with Thorbecke’s new Secondary Education Act (Wachelder 1992: 46–62). Under pressure of the new social demands, an intermediate type of education had been created between the universities and secondary schools: academies for higher vocational education. The most important of these was the Koninklijke Akademie (Royal Academy) for the Education of Civil Engineers, which opened its doors in Delft in 1842. In this academy, the four civilian vocational programmes formerly given by the Koninklijke Militaire Akadmie (KMA, Royal Military Academy) and the Koninklijk Instituut voor de Marine (Royal Navy Institution) were made independent. These were the educational programmes for engineers in civil service, both in the Netherlands and in the colonies, engineers in industry, tax civil servants and administrative civil servants for the Netherlands Indies (Lintsen 1980: 150–72). This new two-to four-year administration programme was what brought the three founders of the KITLV together: Baud as Minister for the Colonies, Roorda as professor of Javanese and Simons as director of the Delft Academy.

During his entire career as a civil servant, Baud devoted extensive effort towards establishing an independent, complete educational programme for colonial civil servants in which the languages, geography and anthropology of the Netherlands Indies would be central. England served as his shining example. As a young colonial civil servant on Java during the British regime from 1811 to 1816, Baud was deeply impressed by the
considerable language and administrative skills of the British civil servants in comparison to their Dutch colleagues. According to Baud, this was the result of their excellent academic training in England at the East India College established in 1804. An added advantage of this specialized vocational training institution near London was the fact that it primarily attracted students from Britain’s civilized upper class. In fact, in the nineteenth-century British civil servants were primarily recruited from some sixty to seventy families. To Baud’s complete disgust, ‘Creoles’ – meaning Eurasians from the colony itself – had much better access to the Dutch colonial administration. When he became minister, he therefore thwarted the Javanese language institution that offered a preliminary training programme for aspiring civil servants in Surakarta in the 1830s (Fasseur 1993: 60–77).

The introduction of a more extensive civil servant programme at the KMA in Breda was a considerable improvement in that respect. But according to Baud, this posed the significant danger that aspiring civil servants would receive training that was too military. After all, in Java the civil servant needed to be able to meet with the princes and regents and villagers with tact, not with an air of military authority. Baud finally grasped the chance to establish an independent, complete civil servant educational programme within the framework of the new Royal Academy in Delft. ‘It is a tangible truth’, he wrote to the King,

that an oppressed people cannot continue to be oppressed over time without violence if the oppressor does not apply himself to governing these people with fairness and justice, and especially with respect for the country’s parameters, customs and prejudices. The best instrument for learning about those parameters, customs and prejudices is extensive familiarity with that country’s language [...]. The Government of the Netherlands in Java displays the strange and embarrassing behaviour of a near total lack of the above requirement. (Fasseur 1993: 94.)

Although Baud could not speak Javanese, he always believed that language would play a central part in the educational programme. Thus he sought contact at an early stage with the few Javanese experts to be found in the Netherlands. Initially, such experts were primarily to be found in the circles of the Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap (Netherlands Bible Society). This society sent language experts on missions to make Bible translations in the indigenous languages of the Indonesian archipelago (Swellengrebel 1974, I: 21–39). As board members of this society, Baud and Roorda had already met in the 1830s. The liberal Veth was also a society board member.
Taco Roorda (1801–1874) was the most important founder of Javanese studies in the Netherlands (Kern 1976). He originally studied theology in Groningen, with eastern Languages, including Javanese, as his minor. After briefly holding a position as pastor, in 1828 and in 1834 he was

Illustration 2. Taco Roorda, professor of Javanese in Delft and Leiden and cofounder of KITLV.
appointed respectively as professor by special appointment and full professor in the eastern languages, Hebrew antiquity and Bible exegesis at the Athenaeum Illustre in Amsterdam. Fasseur characterized him as ‘the perfect example of a nineteenth-century scholar who paired virtually universal interest with an enormous work ethic’ (Fasseur 1993: 86). In addition to numerous studies in the area of the Javanese language and literature, he also published a Hebrew grammar and Arabic language guidebook. He also continued his development in the area of philosophy, in which field he was also made professor by special appointment in Amsterdam. Logic and metaphysics also influenced his study of Javanese, resulting in 1849 in his main work: *Zielkunde of beschouwing van de mens als beziend wezen* (Spiritualism or observations of the human being as a spiritual entity). As theologian, he adhered like Baud did to the liberal school, as explained in his work *Het geloof en de geloofsgronden van een modern christen* (The faith and the principles of faith of a modern Christian), which he published in 1871. As Javanist he acquired a considerable reputation with a Javanese-Dutch dictionary published in 1847 and a bilingual Javanese grammar guidebook published in 1855. From a political perspective, he was conservative and a declared supporter of the Cultivation System. In short, Roorda was Baud’s perfect professor Javanese for the new colonial programme in Delft. In part due to Baud’s insistence, Roorda was the only professor for the programme in Delft alongside regular lecturers for Malay, geography and anthropology and the other subjects.

The third founder of the KITLV, Gerrit Simons (1802–1868), was appointed as Director of the Royal Academy in Delft in 1846. His was a family of clerics and he had studied mathematics and physics in Utrecht. As civil engineer for the government, he held positions including member of the committee that made preparations for reclaiming land by draining the Haarlemmermeer. As Director of the Academy in Delft, he proved to take a relatively liberal approach to the students, who, carefree and often inebriated, often missed their lectures – especially the difficult lectures on Javanese given by the scholarly Roorda, whose nickname was the ‘Delft Oracle’ (Fasseur 1993: 146).

From a political perspective, however, Simons was a dogmatic conservative. Due to the fact that Simons’ political career led him to quickly resign as co-chairman of KITLV, this is perhaps the best place to sketch that career.

Together with his friend from college, professor of chemistry in Utrecht G.J. Mulder, Simons organised the Great-Protestant, anti-liberal and anti-Catholic April Movement in 1853. This was a people’s petition, indeed
signed by a great number of people, to King Willem III against the reinstatement of the Catholic hierarchy that triggered the fall of the first Thorbecke cabinet. Simons subsequently served for a brief period of time, from 1856 to 1857, as Minister of the Interior in the Van Brugghen Cabinet. Due to his lack of parliamentary experience, however, he operated so clumsily that parliament forced him to resign by rejecting his budget. King Willem III, a reactionary, chose to reward him for services rendered by appointing him as member of the Raad van State (Council of State).
In 1864 Simons exchanged this position for membership in parliament, where the issues he fought for until his death in 1868 included maintaining the Cultivation System (Lintsen 1980: 155–6; Boogman 1978a: 129–30, 162–6). Thus the initiative to establish the KITLV was taken by three well-to-do conservative men.

The Establishment of the KITLV

Baud had been pondering for quite some time about the idea of establishing a society to promote colonial studies in the Netherlands. Initially, Roorda was more interested in attracting scholarly correspondents through the civil servant programme in Delft, in both the Netherlands and the Netherlands Indies. In his letter to Baud of 11 August 1844, however, he said that after some consideration, he had come to the conclusion that a society would indeed be ‘the best method for strongly promoting the intended objective’ (KITLV: H 380–1).

Roorda had already included ‘some general ideas’ regarding the charter of the society in his letter to Baud, but it was Simons who presented a concrete, successful proposal a few years later. In 1847, Simons and a number of public works engineers established the Koninklijk Instituut voor Ingenieurs (KIVI, Royal Institute of Engineers) in order to promote the scholarly practice of the profession of engineer, and more in particular to strengthen the ties between the Delft Academy, Delft graduates and the military engineering programme at the KMA. Royal approval was quickly obtained, and honorary members of this society included Prince Hendrik, Prince Frederik and the Governor General of the Netherlands Indies, J.J. Rochussen. The latter is not surprising considering the fact that nearly a quarter of all engineers graduating from Delft went to work in the East Indies, primarily for the colonial administration. The KIVI was a success: in 1850 it already had 208 members. According to Lintsen (1980: 205–8), the society truly did help to promote the status and influence of Dutch engineers during the second half of the nineteenth century. It is remarkable that the KITLV was modelled after the scholarly institute for this profession with increasing power and status.

On 15 December 1847, Roorda announced to Baud in writing that he and Simons would visit him in The Hague to discuss drafts of a circular letter and a Charter for the establishment of the Institute. A draft charter with five sections was completed in January with an explanation that explicitly named the KIVI as example. The first article said: ‘The Institute will bear the name of Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en
Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië bij de Koninklijke Akademie te Delft (Institute of Linguistics, Geography and Anthropology of the Netherlands Indies at the Royal Academy in Delft), under the patronage of His Royal Highness the Prince of Orange, who has already expressed his willingness to act as such’ (KITLV: H 380). The membership fee was set at ten guilders per year. An elitist sum, as Jaquet (1993: 11) rightly commented, for which a servant had to work for a month at that time. For a contribution of twenty guilders or more, one obtained the title of member-donor. For this high contribution, however, all members would receive the Institute’s journal free of charge and be entitled to purchase Institute publications for a reduced price.

The political developments in 1848, which cost Baud his position as minister, postponed the establishment for a number of years. The draft charter of 1848, however, was in the main followed when KITLV was officially established in 1851, with a few modifications and amendments. The Royal Academy in Delft was removed from the Institute’s name, and the predicate Royal was added. King Willem III immediately agreed to grant royal approval and to become the Institute’s patron. The fees to be contributed by regular and donor members were increased to twelve and twenty-five guilders. However, for these sums the member would receive all Institute publications free of charge. The board was to consist of a chairman, a vice-chairman, a secretary who would also act as daily editor of the journal, a treasurer and eight regular members. For the time being, the three individuals who signed the circular letter, Baud, Simons and Roorda, would form the presidium. A total of 93 individuals subscribed to the circular letter of 3 February 1851. On 4 June 1851, the time had finally come: in a hall at the Delft Academy, the inaugural meeting of the KITLV was convened. As temporary chairman, Baud wrote a fine opening speech. However, an ‘indisposition’ caused him to be absent on 4 June. Vice-chairman Simons ultimately read the speech (BKI 1853: 1–6). Baud identified two core points in his speech that he believed would determine the nature of KITLV. ‘Those points are’, according to Baud, ‘the Institute’s relationships with the Government and with the civil servants of the Netherlands Indies’. In an era in which colonial policy was increasingly the subject of political debate, an Institute with the main objective of ‘promoting the language, geography and anthropology of the Netherlands Indies, in the broadest sense of the word’ could trigger timidity among both the Government and the accurate civil servant. However, the cooperation of both was indispensable to the Institute. To win their trust, Baud proposed an ingenious formula of freedom of values:
I hope, Gentlemen!, that I am expressing the conviction of us all by saying that the Institute must never evoke judgement of the government's actions by others nor express such itself; but that it will not hesitate to help to explain all ethnographic and statistical issues, even when these are related to the government's actions.

In this manner, according to Baud, KITLV would be able to serve ‘as a powerful tool for promoting not only scientific studies, but also the aims of a just, enlightened and benevolent Government’. Civil servants, primarily graduating from Delft, would play a special role in this, on the one hand by collecting facts and data on site that could be published by the institution, and on the other by receiving scientifically responsible recommendations from the affiliated professionals in the Netherlands. ‘May the scientific fruit that we will be harvesting from the Institute’s work’, Baud solemnly concluded his speech, ‘promote a steady increase in the growth and prosperity of the Indies, and in turn the fame and prosperity of the Netherlands!’

The fact that Baud inferred that the prevailing conservative colonial system would indirectly be supported quickly became evident in his first publications in *Bijdragen*, which will be discussed elsewhere. The composition of both the temporary board that was extended by the presidium with a number of new members and the initial register of members clearly indicated that upon its establishment KITLV was conservative by nature. The members, however, also included a number of prominent liberals, whose professions generated interest in the language, geography and anthropology of the Netherlands Indies, including Van Hoëvell and Veth.

Most of the board members and many of the members, however, were known to be supporters of the conservative colonial system. This applied first and foremost to Baud, Simons and Roorda, of course. It also held equally true for the temporary board members G.L. Baud (J.C. Baud’s cousin), E.H. von Schmidt auf Altenstadt, J.D. van Herwerden and J.W.H. Smissaert, all of whom had careers in the civil service in the Indies; the Secretary-General of the Ministry for the Colonies A.L. Weddik; former deputy to Van den Bosch and member of the municipal council of The Hague, P.C.G. Guyot; and the conservative member of parliament W. Wintgens. The first editorial staff of the *de BKI*, consisting of KITLV Secretary J. Pijnappel, Roorda and S. Keyzer, all of whom were affiliated with the colonial civil servant programme in Delft, was made up also of conservatives. The only Leiden scholar on the board was the Director of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden (National Museum of Antiquities) C. Leemans (*BK I* 1853: xxiii–xxiv).
The first members also included prominent conservatives, for example former Governor General Rochussen, members of parliament W.A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oye and D.Th. Gevers van Endegeest, and professors in Utrecht Mulder and G.W. Vreede. Naturally, however, many members joined whose interest in KITLV was not primarily political. A distinction can be made between five categories of members that would continue to be important for KITLV throughout the entire colonial period: in the first category were the scientists and scholars, especially from Delft and Leiden; the second the missionary societies like the Netherlands Bible Society and individual missionaries; the third the businesses and entrepreneurs with colonial connections; the fourth the civil servants and former administrators; and lastly the foreign members: five upon the establishment of the KITLV, including the well-known British historian John Crawfurd and the French linguist Edouard Dulaurier. Conservative or not, under the patronage of the King KITLV was at the very least a distinguished society. The same was evident from the first twenty donors, who included the three founders, Prince Hendrik and Prince Frederik, the NHM, Raden Saleh – the first Indonesian member of the KITLV –, Minister for the Colonies Pahud, the president of the Rotterdam Chamber of Commerce H. van Rijckevorsel, and the prominent Amsterdam contractors P. van Vlissingen and A.E. Dudok van Heel. While receiving donations and membership fees totalling £ 1713.00 in the first financial year, the Institute spent only £ 2.55 for postage. The Delft Academy gave the KITLV free use of its rooms and library. Under Minister Pahud, Baud's confidant, close ties were immediately established between KITLV and the Ministry for the Colonies, which passed on to the Institute a number of important documents from its archives for publication (BKI 1853: xxv–xxviii).

**Difficult Early Years**

Yet newly established KITLV did not have an easy time in the beginning. Secretary Keyzer, professor of Javanese and Islamic law in Delft since 1859, discussed both the high points and low points of the Institute's first ten years in his annual report for 1860–1861. While the number of members had initially grown, especially in the Dutch East Indies, membership had stagnated at about two hundred and fifty, half of which in the Netherlands and half in the Indies. The nominal value of the Institute's capital had grown to £ 3233, but many members in the Far East and West were many years in arrears in paying their membership fees. Ties were close with both the Colonies department in The Hague and the colonial
administration in Batavia. These bodies had often subsidized KITLV publications and consulted the board for scientific advice. Thus, said Keyzer, KITLV had enjoyed ‘numerous unambiguous signs of the Government’s appreciation of the objective of our Association’. However, the members’ attitude often left much to be desired. Few members attended the general assemblies. Major initiatives taken by the board, including a contest based on an extensive questionnaire compiled by the board, had failed due to a lack of response. After only a few years, *Bijdragen* had been forced to downsize due to a lack of suitable contributions (*BK I 862: viii–xiii*).

Keyzer’s report went on to discuss the repeated complaints from a number of members regarding the Institute’s highly scientific approach, pleading for more attention for practical colonial issues. The absence of Baud, the KITLV’s first and authoritative President, was now painfully evident: to an increasing degree, members were insisting that the Institute merge with the Indisch Genootschap (IG, Indies Society). The year 1860–1861 – dominated by disquieting meetings and unpleasant correspondence regarding this merger – had been particularly difficult for the Secretary: ‘a year of troubles, one might say’. According to Keyzer, little if any time had been left to devote to KITLV’s true task: scientific research (*BK I 1862: xii*).

The conflict regarding a possible merger with the liberal Indisch Genootschap with its focus on actual practice will be discussed in more detail below. At this point a closer look is warranted at KITLV’s first difficult decade. For a Secretary of KITLV, Keyzer was unusually frank about the numerous minor internal and external problems. What he did not discuss, however, were the two more structural issues with which KITLV increasingly wrestled in 1850 and in 1860: firstly the dwindling conservative and increasing liberal influence in Dutch politics, economy and academics, and secondly the increasing rivalry between linguists, geographers and anthropologists in Leiden, traditionally the academic centre of Dutch orientalism, and their colleagues from the colonial civil service programme in Delft. These two developments were related. Until the end of its existence in 1901, the civil service programme in Delft remained a conservative bulwark while the University of Leiden already started to shift from conservatism to liberalism in 1850 (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 47–53; Otterspeer 1989b: 205–6). In 1864, the liberal Thorbecke Cabinet disbanded the Royal Academy in Delft within the framework of the new Secondary Education Act. The engineering programme was continued as a polytechnic college, but the colonial civil service programme was discontinued. In its place, a new governmental body was established for
training colonial civil servants in Leiden with close ties to the university. The Delft municipal council, however, decided to continue the colonial civil service programme in Delft as a municipal initiative, under the direction of the conservative Keyzer (Fasseur 1993: 189–209). From that point on, permanent rivalry existed between Delft and Leiden (Fasseur 1993: 209–36). The efforts devoted to the double rivalry between the conservatives and liberals and between Delft supporters and Leiden supporters gradually acquired major importance within KITLV in the course of the 1850s.

The increasing influence of both the liberals and the Leiden scholars first became evident among the members of KITLV. A growing number of prominent liberals joined Van Hoëvell and Veth, including Cornets de Groot van Kraayenburg, the founder of Indisch Genootschap and the first liberal Minister for the Colonies, former Minister for the Colonies Loudon, the medical zoologist P. Bleeker, who was to chair the committee responsible for disbanding the civil service training programme in Delft, J.K.W. Quarles van Ufford, a publicist and legal secretary with the Colonies Department, and the liberal MP W.T. Gevers Deynoot. Eight professors and lecturers from the liberal University of Leiden joined KITLV in its first ten years, as compared to only four from conservative Delft.

Throughout Baud’s chairmanship of the KITLV, until just before he died in 1859, the influence of the two new liberal board members, Cornets de Groot and Quarles van Ufford, remained limited. Most of the conservative former civil servants and Delft scholars who made up KITLV’s first temporary board returned in alternation as members of subsequent executive boards and editorial staffs. Baud’s successor Roorda, however, had less authority and found it almost impossible to deal with the growing liberal opposition being demonstrated at board meetings and general assemblies. The opposing views in KITLV were focused around 1860 on the question of whether or not the floundering Institute should merge with the Indisch Genootschap.

Merger With the Indisch Genootschap?

The Indisch Genootschap (IG) was established in 1854 by Cornets de Groot and a number of other liberal ‘Indian specialists’, including Van Hoëvell and Veth. The society’s objective was to ‘cooperate in spreading knowledge of the colonies and holdings of the Netherlands and to promote their interests in connection with those of the mother country’. Under the motto ‘research leads to the truth’, IG’s activities in achieving
this objective included the publication of its *Handelingen en geschriften*, in which the lectures and ensuing debates organized by the IG were published, and the establishment of a library. In 1856 this library already held 600 titles and employed a full-time librarian. This was thanks to a number of significant donations and publisher discounts IG was able to negotiate with its affiliate, the Indisch Leesgezelschap or Indies Reading Society. In comparison, in 1863 KITLV’s library only contained 128 monographs – mostly KITLV publications – along with 23 periodicals, 56 manuscripts and 6 maps. But because IG, unlike KITLV, had to pay for the space it used in The Hague, from the very beginning its financial position was inferior to that of KITLV. Clearly, KITLV and IG had something to offer each other (Jaquet 1993: 12–3).

The membership lists of IG and KITLV also already overlapped significantly in 1860. Those who joined IG were primarily liberal politicians, publicists, upper-class merchants and former plantation owners. IG had 130 members in 1860 and more than two hundred around 1870, slightly fewer than KITLV. From its start, the society debated current colonial issues, such as abolishing slavery and reforms to the Cultivation System. Initially the debates were relatively moderate, but as the 1860s progressed the society sailed into explicitly progressive, ‘young-liberal’ waters. By then, the debates were being concluded with a vote on political motions, earning the society its nickname as the ‘Indies preparliament’. After the Cultivation System was abandoned in 1870, the society returned to its original moderately liberal nature (Kuitenbrouwer 1985: 35–6).

The IG’s founder and first chairman, Johan Pieter Cornets de Groot van Kraaijburg (1808–1878) was a nobleman who had pursued a career in civil service in the Indies. Baud had passed him over a number of times when making important appointments, probably due to his liberal views. When the political balance began to shift after 1848, however, his moderate liberalism worked in his favour. Returning to the Netherlands as a private citizen, Cornets de Groot primarily devoted his energy to his board positions with IG and KITLV. In 1861, however, he briefly served as the Netherlands’ first liberal Minister for the Colonies, and was appointed to the Council of State in 1862 (Reinsma 1966: 229–53).

Cornets de Groot was accepted as member of KITLV in 1856 and was elected to the board in 1857, a symptom of increasing liberal influence including within KITLV. Already when he was elected to the board, Cornets de Groot proposed merging KITLV and IG based on the complementary interests of their finances and libraries. For the umpteenth time, however, he met with refusal from Baud, his former superior. After Baud’s
death, however, Cornets de Groot seized the opportunity. Profiting from the scheduled resignation of four conservative board members and attendance by all of his liberal supporters during the general assembly of 14 April 1860, his proposal to merge with IG, of which he was the President, was approved. When the conservative members subsequently threatened to secede, the provision was added that the merger must be based on the KITLV Charter, with at least three general assemblies per year to be devoted to scientific topics. President Roorda submitted the written merger proposal to the IG board on 11 December 1860; the response – under Cornets de Groot’s direction – was naturally positive (KITLV 242; see also KITLV, NB and NAV 1860–1861).

Illustration 4. J.P. Cornets de Groot van Kraaijenburg, Minister for the Colonies, founder of Indisch Genootschap and President of KITLV.
Nevertheless, this ‘hostile takeover’ would ultimately fail. Formally, this failure was the result of a procedural error: the KITLV board failed to have an extraordinary assembly of members approve the merger before the date specified by IG, 1 March 1861. As yet this assembly of KITLV members did approve the merger on 9 March. On 29 April, however, the general assembly of IG members decided they were not bound to the merger because the final date of 1 March had not been met. This put an end to the plan.

It was a relatively complicated course of events that cannot be completely reconstructed because the minutes of the board meetings are brief and vague, and – surprisingly – no incoming correspondence in the period from 1859 to 1861 can be found in the KITLV archives. Most probably, however, there are three reasons why Cornets de Groot and his supporters in both organizations refrained from pursuing the merger. In the first place it was the threat that Roorda, Keyzer and their conservative supporters would leave KITLV; in the second place the hesitancy among a number of IG members to merge based on the KITLV Charter, and lastly the second thoughts experienced by the liberal double members who also understood that the co-existence of the two informally affiliated organizations also offered advantages. After all, it allowed the double members to utilize both their politically neutral KITLV membership for more scientific activities and views and their membership of liberal IG for more politically oriented activities and views.

In the end, this was also the main argument used by the KITLV board – now virtually homogeneously liberal – to reject a new proposal for merging with IG in 1871 (BKI 1872: vi). Conservative dominance within KITLV came to a definite end in 1862, albeit that a grumbling conservative minority centring around Roorda and Keyzer continued to exist. This was the year in which Cornets de Groot was elected as President of KITLV, the first in a long series of liberal presidents. After his scheduled resignation in 1868, Gevers Deynoot and Bleeker alternately held the positions of President of both KITLV and IG until 1878. The relocation of a number of conservative Delft scholars to the liberal University of Leiden when the government’s civil service training programme was moved from Delft to Leiden in 1864 further reinforced KITLV’s liberal character. Roorda remained true to his conservative views, but former KITLV Secretary Pijnappel switched to a more liberal course in due time (Fasseur 1993: 150–1, 219–22).

The new liberal dominance within KITLV was also evident in the amendment to the Charter instigated by the new board in 1864. The board even went so far as to ask permission from the Minister for the Colonies,
the progressive Franse van de Putte, to include the following clauses in the new Charter:

1. The objective of the Royal Institute is to promote the Linguistics, Geography and Anthropology of the Empire's overseas holdings and Colonies in the interest of Science and at the government's service.

2. The Institute is registered in The Hague. It enjoys the patronage of the King and the support and cooperation of the Colonies Department (KITLV 246).

Fransen van de Putte believed that was taking things too far, requesting in his letter of 19 May 1864 that the board ensure 'that this Charter not contain anything that could infer any permanent relationship between the Institute and my Department' (KITLV 6, 246).

And so it was to be. In actual practice, however, the close ties with the Colonies Department were also continued under the new liberal regime. Because the Delft programme was discontinued KITLV did move to The Hague, seat of the friendly liberal government, instead of Leiden, home to the new civil service training programme. Initially the Institute rented a small building at number 4 Drie Hoekjes, but it moved to a larger building at number 41 Lange Pooten in 1868, where space was sublet to IG for its attractive library. To stimulate the Institute and devote more effort to actual practice in the colonies, the new Charter prescribed extra meetings with lectures on current topics, and four Institute departments were established. In each department, members in smaller groups under the direction of a board member would study a field more intensively than in the past. The four departments were devoted to the fields of language and literature, geography and anthropology, history and archaeology, and the West Indian colonies and Elmina on the Gold Coast. A KITLV commissioner was appointed in the Indies with the intention of stimulating members there both to undertake scientific research and to settle their fees in arrears (KITLV 6). Sadly, this new board's attempt to get the members involved also failed after a few years. The number of members continued to fluctuate around 250 in the 1860s. In that respect, the shift from a conservative to a liberal regime had little effect within KITLV.

**LINGUISTICS, GEOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**

*Bijdragen and Werken*

The effort devoted to merging with the Indisch Genootschap may easily give the impression that KITLV was becoming politicized. In truth,
however, the year 1860–1861 – Keyzer’s ‘year of troubles’ – was an exception in that respect. The board normally convened six or seven times a year, primarily discussing the Institute’s scientific publications, its periodical *Bijdragen*, and a series of monographs known as the *Werken*. Nineteen of the voluminous *Werken* were published in the 1850s and 1860s, some of which had already been published in *Bijdragen* as articles (Jaquet 1976: 1–3). The publication of *Bijdragen* and the *Werken* were the primary tasks of the KITLV Secretary, who was remunerated for that purpose. The three members of the editorial staff initially decided on the publication of monographs and articles by the Institute, but the entire board was ultimately responsible.

As indicated earlier, it was initially difficult for KITLV to find texts suitable for publication. Even offering a small reward had little effect in this respect. Most of the articles that appeared in the first twenty volumes of *Bijdragen* were therefore written by Institute members. Keyzer was particularly productive. However, the primary target audience at the time of KITLV’s establishment – the colonial civil servants – remained silent. The extensive questionnaire issued when the Institute was established, which will be discussed next in more detail, triggered only a few responses in these circles, despite the attractive prize on offer. Contributions from missionaries to *Bijdragen* and the *Werken*, including Pastor S. Müller’s reports on his journeys through Java and Sumatra, and Bible translator Van der Tuuk discussing the Malay, Javanese and Batak languages, compensated only partly for the disappointing response from civil servants.

Minutes of board meetings and annual reports, however, indicate that numerous interesting manuscripts were pinched from KITLV by other colonial societies or magazines. In that respect, KITLV was forced to contend with an increasing number of competitors, including: the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Batavian Society of the Arts and Science), which was established in 1774 and published its own periodical *Tijdschrift*; the Nederlandsch Zendelinggenootschap (Netherlands Missionary Society) established in 1779 which also published scientific articles in its *Mededeelingen*; the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië* launched by Van Hoëvell in 1838 and rejuvenated in 1867 by a ‘young-liberal’ editorial staff; the Indisch Genootschap established in 1854 that published its *Handelingen en geschriften*; and the Aardrijkskundig Genootschap or Geographic Society that was established by Veth in 1873 and which published its own *Tijdschrift*. There were even more periodicals that were bestowed with only a brief life such as *De Indiër* and the *Indisch Magazijn*. 
KITLV Secretary Pijnappel commented rather petulantly on this scientific competition in his annual report for 1856–1857: ‘This cannot continue in the long term. It is reminiscent of the time when a number of different Companies in our Country traded with the Indies, their eagerness to outdo their competitors doing more harm than good until the United East Indian Company [VOC] got everything more straightened out.’ (*BKI* 1857: xxxv.) The Institute most authorized to assume the position of a scientific VOC in Pijnappel’s view is not hard to guess. A number of decades would pass, however, before KITLV was to be recognized as the *primus inter pares* among the colonial societies and periodicals.

The conservative nature assigned to KITLV upon its establishment proved to be a handicap in terms of publications. Van Hoëvell, for example, withdrew his initial offer to publish an important Aceh manuscript in the first volume of *Bijdragen* in favour of Batavian Society’s *Tijdschrift*. The fact that colonial conservatism was initially also evident in the *BKI* was strongly thanks to the publications authored by Baud, KITLV’s first President. In hindsight, Baud’s publications were also scientifically interesting because they contained large amounts of empirical data and were, to a certain degree, interdisciplinary, mixing history, law, geography and anthropology into a kind of administrative science *avant la lettre*. Most striking to most of Baud’s contemporaries, however, would have been the extent to which the elder statesman was willing to go in an attempt to scientifically legitimize his earlier policies. For instance, the primary lesson to be learned from his articles on the colonial administration’s involvement in the disturbances that occurred in Palembang on Sumatra and in Bandjermasin on Borneo between 1811 and 1816 proved to be the appropriateness of the later policy of abstention in the Indies outside of Java and Sumatra, for which Baud was largely responsible (*BKI* 1853: 1–40, 1860: 1–25).

Baud’s most important publication, however, was the voluminous ‘Proeve van eene geschiedenis van den handel en het verbruik van opium in Nederlandsch Indië’ (Example of a history of the trade and use of opium in the Dutch East Indies), which took up nearly the entire first volume of *Bijdragen* (*BKI* 1853: 79–220). Because it contains extensive data, it is still considered an important scientific source today. Baud’s conclusions, however, were far from objective and strongly focused on legitimizing his own past policy. More than a century later, Vanvugt (1985: 172) commented in his *Wettig opium*: ‘Without Baud’s study, *Wettig opium* could not have been written. In his treatment of his own period of
administration, however, between the lines his historiography has become a plea defending his own policy.

The opium farm system, with which the government monopoly on the sale of opium was profitably farmed out to Chinese entrepreneurs and that led to a peak in revenues under Baud’s regime, were increasingly criticized after 1848 by liberals and ‘anti-revolutionaries’ in the Netherlands. Baud, however, told his liberal critics that not only would a prohibition against the addictive use of opium be detrimental to the treasury, but it would also violate the principle of free trade. ‘With such a principle, prohibition laws, which even if effectuated in the interest of humanity, are incompatible for their enforcement promotes the continuation and even reinforcement of that which we want to prohibit because it is not in keeping with the spirit of the times’, according to Baud’s shrewd reasoning (BKI 1853: 186). Moreover, if the Dutch government did not import the opium, England and the United States would undoubtedly demand that right for their own dealers. The high prices the colonial administration and Chinese charged, Baud said, were in the very interests of the Indonesian opium users: ‘Now the government of the Netherlands will have to ensure [...] that the opium will only reach its subjects at exorbitant prices, and this will have already done much good’. This argument was sustained thereafter by many governments in order to justify increasing the excise taxes on tobacco.

Baud did not address the consequences of the addictive use of opium. Not only from the perspective of Vanvugt’s engaged and critical historiography, but also from the perspective of the more distanced and better founded analysis by the American historian Rush (1990), the picture Baud painted of opium farming in the Indies was particularly rose-coloured. Such attempts at justifying the conservative colonial policies were, however, also less appreciated within KITLV as the influence of liberal scientists increased.

The research programme Baud advocated at the time of the establishment of KITLV, however, left room for subjects that were less directly of administrative importance and more purely of scientific interest. That research programme was set down in a sizeable list of 42 questions with which the first board attempted to entice civil servants into scientific research (BKI 1853: ix–xx). The list opened with three questions under the heading ‘linguistics’ that requested information about ‘the various languages and dialects’ practiced in Java, Madura and the outer regions. The most extensive section was found under the heading ‘geography and anthropology’, with 32 detailed questions varying from ‘collecting
skull – considered a highly scientific activity at the time – to a pragmatic question relevant to administration: ‘What are the values and habits and prejudices of the Javanese, the violation of which Europeans on Java can not only benevolently avoid while dealing with the Native but, in order to promote the best possible relations with him, should also carefully avoid?’ (BKI 1853: xii). The heading ‘archaeology and history’ contained questions about both the earliest civilizations on Java and the history of the Netherlands’ colonial administration, like Baud’s contribution about farming opium. The heading ‘agriculture’ also had an administrative aspect, with questions that primarily focused on the distribution of private and communal land ownership and on the state of rice production, the stagnation of which was a continuous source of concern under the Cultivation System.

It was a multidisciplinary programme of study dominated at first glance by geography and anthropology, the heading under which more than half of the questions were categorized. In terms of scientific status, however, linguistics was the most important discipline during KITLV’s early years.

The Hegemony of Linguistics

The hegemony of linguistics was appropriately expressed by KITLV’s Secretary, Pijnappel, who taught not only Malay but also geography and anthropology in Delft. In an article on the history of Dutch expansion in the Indonesian archipelago, he ironically submitted the following question to the historians, geographers and anthropologists: How could one be expected to study the peoples of Indonesia now and in the past without sound knowledge of the Indonesian languages? (BKI 1854: 118–27). In Pijnappel’s opinion, in general these disciplines were assigned only a low status in the hierarchy of scientific disciplines. ‘The reading of history is often similar to a pleasant trip one takes to foreign countries in the summer: no more than satisfying one’s curiosity’, said Pijnappel: ‘As long as science does not teach one what you are seeing, geography is no more than history justifiably entitled to the name of useful science in the case being sketched here’ (BKI 1854: 125). In comparison, Pijnappel claimed, linguistics – which not only collected facts but also uncovered universals – deserved a much higher status.

Keyzer, Pijnappel’s successor as Secretary of KITLV, expressed the same sentiments. Interestingly, especially from the viewpoint of interdisciplinarity, he called the ‘study of Indies linguistics, geography and anthropology’ a young but promising branch of science. ‘In the Institute’s opinion,’
Keyzer said, ‘that science, as indicated by its composite name, is a single whole that consists of various indivisibly related parts, with the languages holding the place of honour because they open the door to knowledge of other disciplines’ (BKI 1864: 11).

The higher scientific status of linguistics was also evident in the fact that most of KITLV’s linguistic publications were written by practicing scholars, in particular Roorda, Keyzer and Pijnappel, while most of the geographic, anthropological and historical publications were submitted by amateur researchers such as missionaries and civil servants. Within the linguistics of the Indonesian archipelago, Roorda’s Javanese was long recognized as the most important language. This applied both in practical terms – because a large majority of the natives lived in Java – and in scientific terms because Javanese was believed to be the most complicated and highly developed of the indigenous languages.

Roorda therefore, and logically, demanded priority both in Delft and in KITLV for the study of Javanese, preferably the High Javanese of the local aristocracy. The first twenty volumes of the Bijlagen were crammed with Javanese babad, wayang stories and other manuscripts annotated by Roorda, Keyzer and other Javanists. This was probably one of the reasons why a number of Javanese aristocrats followed suit with Raden Saleh by becoming members of the KITLV in the course of the 1850s and 1860s. Based on his lengthy professorship in Amsterdam, Delft and Leiden and the many students he had taught, Roorda’s insistence on a high scientific status for Javanese – which was intimately entwined in his own reputation – went unchallenged for a long time. In the mid-1860s, however, the genial, non-conformist Bible translator Van der Tuuk – a KITLV member, no less – shot a gaping hole in Roorda’s reputation and the high status he demanded for Javanese (Van der Tuuk 1864). Herman Neubronner van der Tuuk (1824–1894) was born on Malaka into a Eurasian Indies family (Nieuwenhuys 1962, 1967: 101–54). He went to the Netherlands at a young age, where he enjoyed his elementary and secondary schooling while living with an uncle. Van der Tuuk started studying law in Groningen but never finished these studies. Instead, he passionately dived into the study of languages, in which he proved to be extraordinarily gifted. Van der Tuuk began with the European languages and then turned to those of the East. It brought him into contact with Arabist Th.W. Juynboll, with whom Van der Tuuk continued his studies in Leiden. His favourite type of relaxation was fornication. ‘The maids let you sit on them free of charge’ and ‘I have only f...ed here once’, he wrote to a friend. According to his biographer Nieuwenhuys (1967: 106), this provocative language was
related to the crisis of faith he was experiencing with his Christianity. Despite his exceptionally high grades, Van der Tuuk once again refused to complete his studies and obtain a degree.

Albeit with difficulty, Juynboll convinced Van der Tuuk to accept employment with the Bijbelgenootschap, which needed a translator for the Batak language. This was the inaccessible language of a relatively wild and partly cannibalistic people in North Sumatra, not yet under Dutch control. Van der Tuuk lived and worked under appalling conditions among the Batak from 1849 to 1857. He was in the Netherlands from 1857 to 1868, when he published his *Bataksch-Nederduitsch woordenboek* (Batak-Dutch

Illustration 5. The non-conformist linguist Herman Neubronner Van der Tuuk.
dictionary), Tobasche spraakkunst (Toba grammar) and Maleisch leesboek (Malay reader), the last of which in 1868 in KITLV’s Werken series. Van der Tuuk also wrote a number of substantial articles for Bijdragen: about the Toba Batak, about the Malay Bible translation, and about Malay manuscripts in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London (BKI 1856: 1–54, 1857: 171–84, 1866: 409–74).

Van der Tuuk went back to the archipelago from 1868 until 1873, this time as Bible translator in South Sumatra and Bali. He joined the civil service as translator in 1873, making it possible for him to compile a Balinese-Old Javanese dictionary in Bali, where he lived as a Balinese among the Balinese, secluded in the desa. When he passed away in 1894, his life’s work – the voluminous Balinese dictionary – was not yet completed. The three completed volumes were published between 1897 and 1901 by the Leiden linguist J.L.A. Brandes, who had visited Van der Tuuk in Bali when he was a young civil servant. The fourth volume, compiled by Brandes, was posthumously published in 1912. The entire dictionary, Kawibalineesch-Nederlandsch woordenboek, totalled more than 3500 pages.

To this day, Van der Tuuk is considered one of the Netherlands’ most important nineteenth-century linguists, the founder of the comparative study of the Indonesian languages (Teeuw 1994a: 666). By nineteenth-century standards, however, Van der Tuuk was odd. An atheist, he remained within the Bible Society thanks only to the soothing efforts of the liberal board members Veth and H.C. Millies (Swellengrebel 1974, I: 127–32). Moreover, he had a sarcastic and polemic nature, caring nothing for academic degrees and reputations. This became overly evident in 1864 when he launched a frontal attack on Taco Roorda’s Javanese linguistics.

Van der Tuuk voiced three main objections to Roorda’s work. To begin with, he believed that in the use of Javanese, Roorda focused more on his own logical and historical constructions than on facts. Secondly, Van der Tuuk asserted that by myopically concentrating on Javanese, Roorda completely ignored the new data and insights being gained by comparative linguistics. Lastly, it was his conclusion that according to Roorda’s own criterion of complexity, a number of languages in the outer areas were more highly developed than the Javanese, which Van der Tuuk characterized as ‘an extremely worn-out language’. Roorda’s main work, the sizeable Javanese grammar Javaansche grammatica, was termed by Van der Tuuk as ‘extremely dangerous for non-independent persons’. He claimed that the grammar’s excellent reputation was primarily a result of ‘cowardly flattering’ by Roorda’s students. We should be thankful to Roorda,
however, Van der Tuuk sarcastically concluded, ‘for enabling us to see the cliff against which he has crashed’ (Van der Tuuk 1864: 50).

Of course, Roorda and his supporters were enraged by this caustic criticism. A number of his colleagues and students composed counter-critiques and the learned professor himself responded in *Bijdragen* (*BKI* 1864: 75–125). He opened his highly detailed reaction with dignity: ‘Others have already said enough about the tone in which this bit by Van der Tuuk was written. [...] Thus I will not respond to that tone.’ Roorda’s defence boiled down to the assertion that Javanese must first be further described and explained before it could be usefully compared to other Indonesian languages.

Initially, the conservative establishment centred on Roorda still dominated the most important scientific institutions in the area of the Indonesian languages, including the Delft Academy, KNAW and KITLV. Van der Tuuk had no choice but to pin his hopes on the future in particular: on the superiority of historical, comparative linguistics. ‘It is the method,’ he wrote, ‘that is final, and in principle that method is the same for every language because there is not a single language that can be understood well along the historical path, because language is not the expression of the thoughts of man as a philosopher, but an entity that succumbs to every impression’ (Groeneboer 2002: 432). For the here and now, in any event, Van der Tuuk claimed that direct contact with the *vox viva* – the languages spoken in the Indonesian archipelago – was crucial. That direct contact was also completely non-existent among the Delft linguists. This was also experienced by the civil servants trained in Delft upon their arrival on Java. As one of them commented:

> How desolate, knowing nothing, I was when I stepped from the ship in Batavia. Although I was equipped with an abundance of theoretical knowledge of language (sit venia verbis!), acquired at the Delft Academy, no one understood me. No matter how carefully and grammatically I attempted to express myself, they simply could not understand what I meant. (Fasseur 1993: 150.)

In the Netherlands, Van der Tuuk initially had to rely in particular on liberal magazines to publish his work. Veth, who was not only professor of anthropology but also the editor of *De Gids*, the most influential of all liberal magazines, played an important part in this respect. His reviews of Van der Tuuk’s books in *De Gids* were positive, and he mediated in the publication of the linguist’s contributions in publications including the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië*. The correspondence between the two men was intensive while Van der Tuuk was in the Netherlands (Groeneboer
2002: 357–631). When the liberals acquired a majority in the KITLV executive board, the columns of *Bijdragen* also welcomed Van der Tuuk’s articles and reviews. In his view, however, KITLV continued to be a ‘lame bunch’ due to a lack of initiative and effectiveness (Groeneboer 2002: 605).

Van der Tuuk’s expectations for the future of historical comparative linguistics soon came true. More and more Indonesian linguists shifted their focus to this area, and the results were bountiful. Roorda ended up in Leiden as a professor without students. When he died in 1874, his nephew and student J.J. Meinsma, professor of Javanese in Delft, actually admitted that Roorda had concentrated too much on the Javanese language. He did mention Roorda’s defence that Javanese had to be thoroughly studied before it could be useful to compare it to related languages. However, Meinsma concluded, ‘in an era in which comparative and historical linguistics was becoming so popular and had so many practitioners, it was only natural that many would not agree with this philosophy’ (*BKI* 1874: 323–4).

In Kuhn’s terms, Van der Tuuk had taken a major step in triggering a fundamental paradigm shift in the study of Indonesian languages in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, he was too much of a non-conformist loner to take the lead in directing this new comparative-evolutionistic paradigm. That part was to be played by Kern, professor of Sanskrit in Leiden and long-term President of KITLV.

*Geography and Anthropology, Law and History*

Kuhn’s paradigm analysis, however, is less relevant to KITLV publications in the fields of geography, anthropology, law and history, which were generally highly descriptive in the 1850s and 1860s. Within KITLV these disciplines enjoyed less scientific prestige than linguistics, as is evident in the words of Pijnappel and Keyzer quoted above. That did not mean, however, that these disciplines were ignored by the Institute’s publications. Of the nineteen *Werken* published by the KITLV in the 1850s and 1860s, only three pertained to linguistics while ten were related to geography and anthropology, and two each to law, history and other disciplines.

The works in the field of geography and anthropology in both the *Werken* and the *Bijdrage* were mostly travel journals and expedition reports. The reports written by Pastor Müller during his extensive travels on Java and Sumatra in the 1830s and 1840s, written in government service and privately, for example, were published in both the *Werken* and
Bijdragen. Official reports of government expeditions to less-known parts of the archipelago that were not yet subject to colonial administration indicate that the primary objective of these expeditions was to explore the agricultural and mining possibilities. However, the report on the 1858 expedition to the coasts of New Guinea that was published in 1862 in Bijdragen and the Werken also contained particularly interesting geographic, anthropological and political information. The team had not found ore or minerals in the coastal areas, but who knew ‘what treasures the protracted high mountains [...] might hold?’ (BKI 1862: 142). According to the report, sooner or later the Dutch claims on western New Guinea would have to result in the establishment of a permanent administration, also in the interests of the continually warring Papua tribes. The current state of affairs, the report concluded, was ‘all the more woeful because it thus obstructs all other possible development of the peoples of New Guinea and sustains their wild nature and uncivilized state’ (BKI 1862: 200).

In the first twenty volumes of Bijdragen, only two articles were devoted to Suriname: one discussing its flora and fauna and one exploring the values and habits of the Maroons (BKI 1864: 192–207, 1866: 1–36). Two other articles were published about the Antilles in which S. van Dissel described the geography and anthropology of Curaçao and Bonaire. According to Van Dissel, poverty was not all that bad on these two dry islands. ‘The word poverty virtually does not apply to the negro race’, according to Van Dissel, ‘because their way of life is so plain, their needs so small; they are so accustomed to destitute dwellings, land and clothing that, if they are not intoxicated, a few cents a day will suffice to keep and feed them’ (BKI 1868: 468–9).

The fact that the practice of geography and anthropology within KITLV was not free of ethnocentric stereotyping is also evident in the rather one-sided publications discussing the Chinese in the Indonesian archipelago. These primarily portray the Chinese as opium traders, usurers, members of secret societies and slaveholders. In the case of the ‘Mededeelingen over de Chinezen op het eiland Java’ by the black Asante prince, engineer for the colonial administration and KITLV member Aquasie Boachi, that is doubly sad (BKI 1856: 278–301). Recently, Arthur Japin (1997) wrote a moving and trustworthy historical novel about Boachi. The Afro-American historian Blakely (1993: 256–9) also devoted attention to Boachi as an extraordinary example of a well-educated black in an Asian colony around the middle of the nineteenth century. In both the Netherlands and the Indies, however, discrimination was strong against the black prince who
was sent together with his younger brother by the powerful king of the Asante kingdom, near Dutch Elmina, to the King of the Netherlands as a token of peace and friendship.

Governor-General Rochussen seriously objected to his appointment in government service due to the ‘aristocracy of the skin’ (Fasseur 1995: 143). Not only Europeans, but Javanese also discriminated against Boachi. And now Boachi himself wrote of the Chinese: ‘in general they are sneaky, unreliable, greedy and crafty’. They lacked courage but were also ambitious. Their secret societies brought ‘horrifying examples of cruelty’, according to the westernised Prince of Asante. Particularly disturbing is the fact that *Bijdragen*’s editors paternalistically added many footnotes and comments to the article in order to enhance its scientific value, but left the negative comments about the Chinese unexplained and unappended.

The fact that the practice of geography and anthropology in KITLV sometimes hardly rose above the level of gossip in the 1850s and 1860s is also evident in the 1862 discussion among the board and members regarding the question already posed upon the Institute’s establishment about the ‘values and habits and prejudices of the Javanese’ that Europeans should avoid violating. This took place in a special assembly convened by the new board and chaired by Cornets de Groot within the framework of more attention within KITLV for current and practical topics. In addition to a plea for ‘an even and placid manner when speaking’ with the Javanese and the warning that one must refrain from ‘gallantry’ towards their wives and daughters, most of the discussion was about ‘belching’: ‘as something that is considered not at all indecent after a meal’ (*BKI* 1863: vii).

How to tactfully respond to this custom was the burning issue that dominated the discussion. Roorda finally lifted the discussion to a higher level while simultaneously shifting it to his own discipline by advocating more knowledge of the Javanese language, in particular among colonial civil servants: ‘The language that will teach us to read the heart and soul of a people [...] is then also the mirror reflecting the character of the people of Java’, according to Roorda (*BKI* 1863: iv).

The publications in the area of law can be divided into two categories. On the one hand the contributions by Baud in particular about colonial administration discussed above; on the other contributions, especially by Keyzer, discussing Islamic law. These articles, which also discussed the then current topic of land ownership in accordance with *adat*, are more suitably to be reviewed in the next section.
KITLV’s historical publications in the 1850s and 1860s can also be divided into two extremely different categories. R.A. Leupe, a former naval officer and keeper of the records at the National Archives, wrote numerous nationally tinted articles about the deeds of the archipelago’s illustrious predecessors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, primarily based on sources from the rich VOC archives (Knaap 1994: 639). According to Leupe, J.P. Coen had rightfully acquired a reputation ‘that, even though two centuries have passed, […] lives on unspoiled in the hearts of every righteous Dutchman’ (BKI 1859: 1). It was time to finally erect a fitting monument honouring this great patriot, Leupe said. For the record, he was not blind to the financial-economic aspects of Dutch expansion, for example the implementation of the lucrative coffee culture in Java early in the eighteenth century (BKI 1859: 53–70). Publications in the other area of historical research, Java’s ancient history, originated from Dutch amateur archaeologists in Java like Pastor Müller and Dutch linguists, including Roorda, Keyzer and Kern, who deciphered ancient inscriptions and manuscripts. Java’s history also played an important part in the political debate held in the Netherlands in the 1850s and 1860s regarding land ownership on Java.

‘Eastern and Western Standards’

In his extensive, five-part summary article discussing the draft Cultivation Act by the liberal Minister for the Colonies Fransen van de Putte, Veth (1866) concluded in De Gids that an intellectual debate was running parallel to the political debate between supporters and their opponents in parliament that could be found in publications, pamphlets and institutions like the Indisch Genootschap. In Veth’s view, the issue being debated was whether Java should be administrated according to ‘eastern’ or ‘western’ standards. In principle the parties agreed on the superiority of western standards, such as free labour and private land ownership. According to Veth, however, the supporters of the eastern standards ‘consider the East Indies to be some type of wrong world, where everything was different from the West’. Traditionally characteristic for Java were not free labour and private land ownership, but slave labour and communal land ownership. ‘And this has been ensured so often and with so much emphasis, that the very thought of administrating the East based on western principles is horrifying to many’ (Veth 1866: 241). In Veth’s view, however, a trend towards individualizing land ownership in Java had begun in the past but was reversed by the Cultivation System, in the interests of the colonial administration and the Javanese elders.
In the Netherlands in the 1850s and 1860s, KITLV members played an important part in the intellectual debate regarding Java's past, present and future. Of the liberal supporters of the ‘western standards’, Veth was a founding member of the KITLV, and the young economist N.G. Pierson became a member in 1867, when he held a series of influential lectures on the Cultivation System. Their conservative opponents, supporters of the ‘eastern standards’, including Baud, Roorda and Keyzer, were the initial leaders of the KITLV. They had been defending the Cultivation System in terms of ‘eastern standards’ long before KITLV had been established.

When the King visited the Royal Institute – forerunner of KNAW – in Amsterdam in 1841, for example, Roorda said of the current colonial system: ‘One could not say that the Javanese are being treated like slaves under this system. At least the Javanese themselves do not think so: not according to their standards. If we attempt to inspire the Javanese with European standards of freedom, Java will be lost to us!’ (Fasseur 1993: 91.) Baud expressed his views in similar terms to Thorbecke in 1849, as described at the beginning of this Chapter. In the 1850s, Keyzer published a conservative colonial periodical with financial support from Baud and Minister for the Colonies Pahud, at first titled *Tjaraka Welanda* and later
to counter the increasing influence of the liberal press. Neither was Keyzer shy in expressing his conservative views within KITLV. In an article on Islamic law, he claimed that ‘little good can be expected for our civilization among the Javanese, no less than elsewhere in the Islamic world’ (BKI 1863: 321).

At the same time, however, Keyzer emphasized KITLV’s own scientific obligation with reference to the political debate, namely: performing more research into the historical origins of land ownership in Java and the relevant positions of the sovereigns – first the Javanese princes and later the Dutch Crown – and the Javanese aristocracy. According to Keyzer, the interests of ‘actual practice and science’ ran parallel in this respect. Due to a lack of sound knowledge, Keyzer argued, the political debate threatened to become bogged down: ‘they are running around in circles’ without making any progress (BKI 1863: 271). The liberals in KITLV respected this view, also submitting their most opinionated contributions to the debate to other forums including the Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië and the Indisch Genootschap. In the course of the 1860s, KITLV impartially published both the secret memorandum written by the conservative inventor of the Cultivation System, Van den Bosch, in its Werken and a detailed register of the historical source publication of land ownership on Java compiled by S. van Deventer by order of the liberal Minister for the Colonies Fransen van de Putte.

Reviewing the content of the intellectual debate regarding Java’s past, present and future that was not held directly within KITLV but had prominent KITLV members on both sides, the advocates of applying ‘eastern standards’ in the administration of the East Indies can generally be considered orientalists as defined by Said. By contrast, advocates of the ‘western standards’ were universalists who believed that differences between the development of the West and that of the East were actually nothing more than a difference in phase.

According to Veth and Pierson, at that time Java was highly similar to late-Medieval Europe. The progressive owner of a tea plantation, advisor to the colonial administration and Indies KITLV member K.F. Holle believed that the difference was merely a few generations. After all, the last marke (communal village grounds) in the eastern Netherlands were not converted to private lands until the first half of the nineteenth century (Van den Berge 1998: 86–7). During a presentation held for KITLV, the young, liberal Sanskrit expert Kern discussed his stay in British India, using the British colonial administration as a positive example that the implementation of western standards, such as private land ownership...
and education in English, rapidly triggered major progress in the development of the indigenous society (BKI 1868: 273–308).

For the record, the intellectual debate between orientalists and universalists did not run entirely parallel with the political opposition between conservatives and liberals. Pijnappel, for example, increasingly showed his liberalism in the 1860s but continued to spread orientalist if not racist views regarding the development possibilities of ‘the Malay race’. The little development achieved by the Malay race, Pijnappel (1863) opined in an often used ethnographic manual, was solely thanks to the influence of foreign civilizations, in succession the Hindu, the Islamic and the European. ‘The history of the Malay civilization justifies us in suspecting that the Malaysian race simply lacks the proclivity for, the inclination towards, the mind for a higher, an independent civilization’, according to Pijnappel. They were like children, said Pijnappel, who personally never visited the Indies: ‘a race in need of direction and that, in order to ensure that it does not deteriorate, [...] will never be able to do without that direction’ (Pijnappel 1863: 76).

As Veth had already concluded, the orientalists and universalists agreed in principle on the superiority of western civilization. They only held different opinions regarding the capacity of the eastern peoples to adopt western civilisation. Culture relativism, characterized by belief in the equality of the western and eastern cultures, was extremely rare, including in the Netherlands, in the 1850s and 1860s. Among the KITLV’s members, Van der Tuuk was actually the only true culture relativist: the only author who truly respected the Indonesian languages and cultures, of which he had intimate knowledge (Swellengrebel 1974, I: 142). In an article discussing a number of KITLV linguistic publications, Van der Tuuk (1866) himself expressed that very conclusion.

With his usual sarcasm, he criticised the misplaced cultural arrogance displayed by the Dutch in the East. The inability of the Dutch to properly master the indigenous languages was characteristic. They are not aware, according to Van der Tuuk, ‘that the finely perceptive native can give us nothing more than a disparaging smile upon seeing the gibberish with which we imagine we can civilize him’. Van der Tuuk said that although the missionaries were the closest to the indigenous population, their beliefs sadly made them too narrow-minded to actually have respect: ‘their contempt for the indigenous civilization prescribed by their intolerance blinds them to the good to be found there’ (Van der Tuuk 1866: 178).

As far as respect for Indonesian cultures is concerned, Van der Tuuk was an exception in KITLV’s early years. That would change little in the period of modern imperialism, when KITLV experienced major growth.
CHAPTER THREE

IMPERIALISM, ORIENTALISM AND ETHICS (1870–1914)

KITLV and Dutch Imperialism

The Imperialism Debate: Then and Now

Around the turn of the twentieth century, both the second Anglo-Boer war and the last phase of the Aceh war were taking place. In the nationalist climate that dominated the Netherlands in that period, a majority of the Dutch parliament and public opinion forcefully condemned British imperialism against the kindred Boer republics while fervently supporting the Dutch ‘pacification’ of Aceh. Only the social democrats pointed out the similarities between the two wars, which they both considered imperialist. Former engineer for the administration in the Indies, KITLV member and socialist MP H. Van Kol, for example, declared in parliament in 1899:

_Both_ are unjust wars, waged against a weaker nation and motivated purely by greed and a hunger for power. _Both_ were made possible by the attitude of a larger part of the press, the government and parliament. _Both_ wars were caused by lust for profit; and in _both_ countries the armed forces had a special interest in the war, which enabled them to enjoy promotion and distinction. In _both_ countries there was only a small minority who showed any resistance to the conflict. (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 312.)

Editor-in-chief of the socialist party publication _Het Volk_, P.J. Troelstra, put particular focus on the editor-in-chief of the liberal _Algemeen Handelsblad_, Charles Boissevain. Boissevain was a passionate nationalist who enthusiastically cheered both the Boer generals and General J.B. van Heutsz.

The colonial editor of the _Handelsblad_, E.B. Kielstra, was the person who ultimately published a retort against the unpatriotic, socialist critics in his article ‘De Atjehoorlog verdedigd’ (In defence of the Aceh War) that appeared in 1901 in the periodical _Onze Eeuw_ (Kielstra 1910: 179–99). Egbert Broer Kielstra (1844–1920) was recognized as an authoritative colonial expert in the Netherlands (Blok 1921–22). As officer of the engineer corps, he had served in the Indies from 1862 to 1884, participating in the first two Aceh expeditions in 1873 and 1874. He published a voluminous, three-part study on the first phase of the Aceh War in which he criticized both the
overly hasty nature of the first expedition and the premature establishment of a civil administration in 1881 (Kielstra 1883–85). When he returned to the Netherlands, he was elected twice as MP for the Liberale Unie (Liberal Union). Both inside and outside of parliament, he advocated perseverance in taking a hard line against the headstrong population of Aceh, citing J.P. Coen.

Kielstra was also a member of the supervisory boards of many colonial enterprises and the official government commissioner with both the Nederlandsch-Indische Spoorwegmaatschappij (Dutch East Indies Railway Company) and the Koninklijke Paketvaart-Maatschappij (KPM, Royal Packet Navigation Company), which played such an important part in the military pacification and economic liberation of Aceh and the Outer Territories. He received a special appointment as State Councillor
in 1913. Kielstra was also KITLV’s Secretary from 1894 to 1915. He wrote numerous pieces on the pacification and development of the West Coast of Sumatra in *Bijdragen* towards the end of the nineteenth century. Kielstra also wrote a similar series of articles about West Borneo for the *Indische Gids*. The liberal arts faculty of Leiden University awarded him an honorary doctorate for his contribution to colonial historiography.

In his defence of the Aceh War against socialist criticism, Kielstra specifically opposed the view that the war was caused by the Netherlands’ lust for profit. Aceh, an infamous bulwark for pirates, forced the Dutch into the war, he claimed, by seeking support from foreign powers. That took place in 1873, before the rise of the large-scale tobacco crops and oil drilling on the neighbouring East Coast of Sumatra. ‘We trust that the above will have convinced our readers that any comparison between South Africa and Aceh is lame’, Kielstra (1910: 1916) concluded. ‘We did not declare war against Aceh for reasons of greed, as servants of Mammon; we were forced into this war by the actions of the Aceh leaders.’

Kielstra’s conclusion was authoritative in Dutch colonial historiography for a long time. Imperialism was for the great powers, not the tiny country of the Netherlands that had been in the Indonesian archipelago for centuries with what was moreover a highly ‘ethical’ policy towards the indigenous population. In 1960, Utrecht Professor Coolhaas (1960: 99–102) was still voicing this view in his KITLV bibliography in English on Dutch colonial history. But since the cautious introduction of the term imperialism in 1970 for the Dutch expansion in the Outer Territories between 1870 and 1914, during a conference of the Nederlands Historisch Genootschap (Netherlands Historical Society), a lively debate has got under way. In that debate, an increasing number of historians have concluded that Dutch imperialism had indeed existed (Locher-Scholten 1994a; Kuitenbrouwer 1998).

Wesseling and I were the primary debaters. That sounds rather egotistical, but is nevertheless vital to a proper understanding of this Chapter. The conclusion of my 1985 thesis, that Dutch imperialism was fundamentally similar to the normative British imperialism, was forcefully contested by Wesseling in his review published in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*. According to Wesseling, of the many political, economic, cultural and peripheral motives for British imperialism, only one had applied in the case of the Netherlands: the external factor exerted by the imperialism of other powers (Wesseling 1988: 177–95).

Our views drew closer together over the course of the debate. Wesseling also started to refer to a Dutch imperialism, in itself similar to British
imperialism. In turn, I toned down the fundamental nature of the similarities between the Dutch and British forms of imperialism. After all, Great Britain not only expanded in its historical, Asian sphere of influence as the Netherlands did, but also annexed large parts of the newly discovered African continent while the Netherlands did the exact opposite by withdrawing from Africa over the course of the nineteenth century despite the massive enthusiasm for the kindred Boers. However, Wesseling and I continue to clearly differ on one point. In my view, domestic factors also played a part in Dutch imperialism, among which nationalism and a capitalist thirst for profit, while Wesseling believes that such factors are virtually irrelevant. Other historians, including Locher-Scholten (1994b: 267–93), are also convinced that Dutch imperialism was primarily inspired by administrative motives in the periphery of the colonies. Therefore: reader be warned! It is my belief that domestic, specifically Dutch motives of imperialism also contributed to the growth and rise of KITLV around the turn of the twentieth century.

However, KITLV’s involvement in Dutch imperialism is about the same as its earlier involvement in the Cultivation System and the abolishment thereof. Prominent KITLV members developed their most explicit political views and activities primarily outside of KITLV, albeit that these reverberated within the Institute. On a higher level of abstraction concerning the Dutch and colonial context within which KITLV operated in the period from 1870 to 1914, the line of the preceding process of modernization also continued. Informed now by the sizeable and multi-facetted literature on Dutch imperialism, a distinction can be made between four areas within that process of modernisation: the technological area of improved weaponry and communication; the political area of colonial state formation; the economic area of capitalist expansion; and lastly the cultural area of the Christian or nationalistic culture offensive and ‘ethical’ vocation. The process of modernization, however, was neither linear nor uniform in any of these areas. In both the Netherlands and the Indies, the 1800s was a period of crisis, conflict and malaise. If we compare the situation in 1914 to that in 1870, however, significant changes can be seen in every one of these areas (Kuitenbrouwer 1985: 38–43, 134–40; Bossenbroek 1996: 9–21, 343–59; J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 283–363).

A brief sketch of the situation at the beginning of this period will be given here. In 1870, the primary route between the Indies and the Netherlands was taken by sailing around the Cape of Good Hope, albeit that the Suez Canal and the first telegraph connections had been recently established. Colonial administration of the many islands in the Indies
other than Java was still limited to a number of enclaves along the coasts. The Cultivation System was still in effect and the number of private business owners still limited. A few voices were heard advocating a Dutch responsibility to civilize the islands, but education for the indigenous inhabitants was still in an early stage of development. The large technological, political, economic and cultural changes that occurred after 1870 will be repeatedly reviewed in this and following sections discussing KITLV in the era of modern imperialism.

**Aceh and the Outer Territories**

Many authors pinpoint 1873 as the beginning of Dutch imperialism: when the Netherlands declared war on the strategically located, independent sultanate of Aceh in North Sumatra, even though the official policy of restraint had been deviated from earlier, as emphasized by Fasseur (1995: 47–74) and Legêne (1998: 13–6). It was in about 1870, however, that the era of modern imperialism emphatically commenced with a number of new domestic and foreign developments; the abolition of the Cultivation System that shifted attention from Java to the Outer Territories, the discovery of promising ore and fruitful soil on Sumatra, the opening of the Suez Canal, and the rise of new powers, including Germany, Italy and the United States, were the most important of these developments. As established colonial powers, Great Britain and the Netherlands decided to settle a number of long-standing issues overseas before new rivals could enter the picture. The two states entered into three somewhat cohesive agreements around 1870, by means of which the Netherlands relinquished Elmina on the Gold Coast to Great Britain in exchange for permission to recruit contract labourers in British India for plantations in Suriname, and termination of the British guarantee of Aceh’s independence.

While discussing approval of the three treaties in parliament, some liberals advocated eliminating the ‘pirates’ bulwark’ Aceh, but other conservatives warned this would involve a war that would be highly costly in terms of both money and human lives (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 60–7). The Sultan of Aceh saw what was coming and sent out representatives to recruit support in his conflict with the Netherlands. Rumours that Aceh representatives had reached agreements with the American and Italian consulates in Singapore induced Governor-General Loudon to declare war on Aceh with approval, albeit initially reticent, from Minister for the Colonies Fransen van de Putte. The first, hastily organized, military expedition against Aceh, however, ended in derisive defeat; a second,
large-scale expedition in 1874 merely resulted in capture of the capital and formal annexation of the Sultanate (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 107–8).

What followed was a lengthy and cruel colonial war that eventually demanded, prior to the Lombok expedition in 1894, that the policy of restraint be continued in the Outer Territories for fear of a ‘second Aceh’. General Van Heutsz succeeded in forcing Aceh into submission from 1898 until 1904. The guerrilla warfare, however, continued for many years. With a population of about half a million, between 1873 and 1909 this war is believed to have cost the lives of some 100,000 Aceh inhabitants, including those that succumbed to hunger and disease. The Netherlands lost 2,500 military men and another 10,000 died of disease; some 25,000 forced labourers from Java also died as a result of deprivation and disease. As Governor-General of the Indies, Van Heutsz forced all of the remaining small sovereign or semi-sovereign states in the Outer Territories to accept colonial administration from 1904 to 1909.

Of the three British-Dutch treaties that were the overture to these developments, KITLV was closely involved in the issue of Aceh. The Institute remained mute on the issue of relinquishing Elmina, the last Dutch settlement in Africa. Only once, some three-quarters of a century later, did an article appear in Bijdragen (1931: 287–313) that pertained to Elmina: an unedited report by the colonial administration of 1851 discussing ‘indigenous laws and customs’. For the record, in about 1870 nearly all liberal politicians and publicists were in favour of relinquishing this ‘nuisance’ to England.

The few Suriname members of KITLV, however, were quite vocal around 1870. After collecting and submitting various examples of Suriname’s rich flora and fauna, the true intentions of this KITLV department became clear. They attempted to convince the KITLV board to submit requests addressed to the King, the government and parliament to guarantee the immigration of new contract labourers now that the ten-year plantation duty for the emancipated slaves was drawing to an end (BKI 1871: xxxii–lv). The board refused, both graciously and unconditionally, motivating their decision based on the scientific character of KITLV. When recruitment of British-Indian contract labourers was guaranteed based on the ‘coolie’ agreement between the Netherlands and Great Britain, nothing more was heard from the Suriname KITLV members for quite some time.

Despite the reticent response to the Suriname members’ request for political support of their immigration plans, the KITLV board had less difficulty getting involved in the other current political issue: the Aceh War that erupted in 1873. Here, too, however, the board was motivated by
scientific interests. Little was known as yet about Aceh in the Netherlands. During the parliamentary discussion of the British-Dutch Suriname agreement, liberal former Foreign Minister E.J.J.B. Cremers even portrayed Aceh as ‘one of the most barbarian states where human flesh is still considered a delicacy’, confusing the Islamic Sultanate with the neighbouring animistic Batak states. When the Aceh War commenced, Professor Veth collected all of the available historical, geographic and anthropological data in a handy booklet in which, like so many liberal politicians and publicists, he advocated subjugation of Aceh. His map of Aceh, however, showed merely ‘an extremely mountainous yet completely unknown interior’ (Veth 1873).

When the first military expedition was defeated and careful preparations were being made for a second expedition, Veth came up with the luminous idea of sending a Dutch team of scientific researchers along with the expedition. His own, recently founded Aardrijkskundig Genootschap (Geographic Society) was as yet too inexperienced in Veth's view. KITLV, by contrast, would certainly be up to the task, he believed. Veth’s proposal was warmly welcomed by the primarily liberal board. Sadly, the minutes of the board meeting of 5 July 1873, compiled in the stenography commonly used at that time, are virtually illegible for today’s stenographers. The printed minutes, however, indicate that with only one exception, the entire board approved the proposal (BKI 1874: xliii–xliv; KITLV 100). The only disapproving vote was probably cast by Secretary T.C.L. Wijnmalen, librarian at the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Royal Library) and advisor to the leading Anti-Revolutionary politician Abraham Kuyper, who initially denounced the liberal Aceh War (Janny de Jong 1989: 188–90). The most outspoken advocate of an Aceh research team on site was the KITLV’s President, Bleeker, who had already held a powerful plea for expansion in the Outer Territories for the Indisch Genootschap in 1865 (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 48).

In his letter of 7 July 1873 to the Minister for the Colonies, Fransen van de Putte, Bleeker motivated the proposal as follows:

The area of the Aceh kingdom is still a terra incognita as it were, and research there in the areas of geography and anthropology, of linguistics and of natural history will undoubtedly render important results; this is in the interest not only of science, but also of state interests later (KITLV 239).

Fransen van de Putte’s response to the KITLV proposal was positive in principle, with support from the Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, but he left the ultimate decision on the wisdom of allowing a research team to
accompany the second expedition to Governor General Loudon. After consulting with the experienced military expedition leader General J. van Swieten, Loudon believed the mission would be too risky, as Van de Putte informed the KITLV board on 17 December 1873. The board was extremely disappointed by the refusal, but voiced its hope that the military expedition would nevertheless render scientific data on the land and its people (BKI 1874: xxxiii).

Indeed, the second military expedition certainly did. The most important discovery proved to be the fact that the people of Aceh, even after the demise of the Sultan, fanatically defended their land of birth, under the leadership of the noble elders and Islamic scholars. The ‘extremely mountainous yet completely unknown interior’ proved the ideal setting for guerrilla warfare. KITLV continued to devote regular attention to Aceh. K.F.H. van Langen, who had worked as a civil servant in Aceh, published De inrichting van het Atjehsche staatsbestuur onder het Sultanaat (The organization of the Aceh state administration under the Sultanate) both in Bijdragen and as a KITLV monograph in 1888. In his publication Van Langen described the historical evolution of the complex relations between the Sultan, the noble elders and the Islamic scholars. This was followed in 1889 by his Handleiding voor de beoefening der Atjehsche taal (Manual for using the Aceh language), in which he made the difficult Aceh language accessible. For this last book, the Ministry for the Colonies had provided a subsidy of twenty-five hundred guilders in exchange for one hundred copies (BKI 1889: xlviii). Despite his criticism of Van Langen, Snouck Hurgronje made thankful use of both publications in his position as Aceh researcher and advisor to Van Heutsz.

Snouck did not seek a solution to the draining Aceh War based on consultation with the newly elected Sultan as suggested by Van Langen, preferring subjugation of the Sultan and the adat elders. However, the irreconcilable Islamic military leaders needed to be eliminated first. Once that was achieved, the noble elders were to be actively involved in the colonial administration. In the series of eight extensive reports from the colonial administration published between 1903 and 1914 in Bijdragen as ‘Mededeelingen betreffende Atjesche Onderhoorigheden’ (Announcements regarding the Aceh dependencies), it is evident that Snouck's policy toward the elders proved difficult to effectuate, even after the military victory and subjugation of the ’pretender Sultan’. The reports repeatedly indicate that after formally submitting to Dutch authority, many elders proved disloyal or were secretly supporting ‘rebellious gangs’. The few loyal elders, like one in Pidie, were often pitifully unsuited to
administrative tasks: ‘Although well meaning, the honourable Uléëbalang (elder) continues to lack the necessary energy and diligence, moreover he is under the extremely bad influence of his wife Potjut Aman, who is just as addicted to opium as he himself is’ (BKI 1910: 168).

When Snouck Hurgronje resumed his professorship in Leiden, he had the language and literature faculty organize a contest for a comparison of historical, Malay and European sources on the administration of Aceh as a Sultanate. The contest was won by Snouck’s best Indonesian student, the Javanese aristocrat Raden Hoesein Djajadiningrat, whose ‘Critisch overzicht van de in Maleische werken vervatte gegevens over de geschiedenis van het Soeltanaat van Atjeh’ (Critical summary of the information found in Malay works about the history of the Sultanate of Aceh) was published in BKI (1911: 135–265). Hoesein Djajadiningrat strictly limited himself to the description, without passing judgement on the sometimes striking differences between the Malaysian and European sources; these respectively presented certain Sultans as devout Islamic benefactors or maligned them as cruel ‘eastern despots’.

Publications by KITLV between 1870 and 1914 discussed not only Aceh but also many other Outer Territories. Of the 84 books published through the Institute in this period, 41 discussed the Outer Territories, 23 discussed Java, only two were devoted to the West and 18 reviewed general or other subjects, for instance Snouck Hurgronje’s Mekka (Jaquet 1976: 3–13).

Not only numerous missionaries, but now also an increasing number of civil servants were submitting their linguistic or ethnological research data about their stations to the Bijdragen editors for publication. After its failed Aceh initiative in 1873, at first KITLV made no other attempts to send its own researchers to the Outer Territories. It did, however, contribute three hundred guilders to the Sumatra expedition organized by its colleague the Aardrijkskundig Genootschap in 1877: the impoverished Indisch Genootschap was able to contribute no more than fifty guilders (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 116).

The KITLV board nevertheless developed an ambitious plan between 1889 and 1892 for organizing an expedition that was to study more closely the line dividing the eastern and western halves of the Indonesian archipelago. Since the publication of The Malay Archipelago in 1868, in which British evolutionist naturalist A.R. Wallace identified this dividing line, the exact course that this line took in geographic, zoological, ethnological and linguistic terms had been a subject of debate. This was an interesting, interdisciplinary project for which KITLV requested no less than the entire sum of ten thousand guilders earmarked annually in the colonial budget
for scientific research (*BKI* 1889: xiv–xvi). The intended scientific project leaders were Leiden geologist J.K.L. Martin and ethnologist G.A. Wilken, and the project was to be situated in the Banda Sea. The Governor General's reaction to the proposal was positive in principle, and this ‘announcement met with applause’ at KITLV’s annual general assembly (*BKI* 1891: xli).

However, in the end there was nothing to applaud. After Martin had done preliminary research on site, the KITLV board proposed, after the death of Wilken, that subsequent research be performed by the Ambon Resident G.W.W.C. van Hoëvell, son of the well-known liberal politician. His exemption and involvement met with objections from the colonial administration (*BKI* 1892: xv–xx). Governor General C. Pijnacker Hordijk had lost his nerve for scientific expeditions in the Outer Territories sent by the colonial administration after the disastrous Flores expeditions in 1889 to 1890. This first scientific expedition to study alleged metal ores on the island of Flores met with fierce resistance from the local population and was followed by a military expedition that was subsequently ungloriously withdrawn due to the powerful protests voiced by parliament (Kuitenbrouwer 1985: 116–7). Generous compensation to finance Martin's research to the tune of five thousand guilders was received from the colonial administration, but cooperation for subsequent studies in the Moluccas and the Banda archipelago was refused for the time being. The KITLV board subsequently decided to abandon further research (*BI* 1893: xxvi).

In addition to Aceh and the Banda Islands, KITLV devoted a relatively large amount of attention to the great unknown island of New Guinea. Many articles, with historical sources, reports of expeditions and messages from missionaries there, were published in *Bijdragen*. The missionaries repeatedly advocated establishing permanent colonial administration due to attacks by hostile Papuas. Geographer and KITLV board member P.J.B.C. Robidé van der Aa also supported Dutch colonial administration based on the increasing interest in the eastern part of the island being shown by the British and the German. He criticized the policy of restraint, referring to his famous ancestor: ‘If Coen and his brave contemporaries had acted upon such feeble advice, then certainly the bunting of the Netherlands would not be flying over the valuable East Indian islands today!’ (Robidé van der Aa 1883: 244). The Dutch government and colonial administration did not occupy New Guinea, however, until 1898, after Van Heutsz and Snouck Hurgronje gained extensive success in their military occupation of Aceh.
At first glance, the lives of Lodewijk Christiaan van den Berg (1845–1927) and Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857–1936) were very similar. Both of these men studied in Leiden, both grew to become academic authorities in Arabic and Islamic studies, both became government advisors for Eastern languages and Islamic law, in which position both developed strategies for occupying Aceh and restricting Islam militants; both returned to the Netherlands to work as professors of Indies studies or Indology, and both were members of the KITLV board. Based on some of
their views and activities, both men can also be considered imperialists and orientalists as defined by Said.

But if we take a closer look at their lives, significant differences can be found. The two also became embroiled in a fierce polemic and grew to despise one another. The men generally represented two significantly different variations of imperialism and orientalism: Van den Berg the conservative-confessional, and Snouck Hurgronje the ethical-liberal. Snouck’s ethical-liberal variation proved to be decisive in government policy, Indology and the KITLV board.

Illustration 9. L.W.C. van den Berg, Snouck Hurgronje’s opponent as Arabist, government advisor, professor in Delft and KITLV board member.
Van den Berg was born in Haarlem and enjoyed his secondary education at a gymnasium in The Hague. He went on to study law in Leiden, electing to take the additional Indology programme. He received his doctorate degree Magna Cum Laude in 1868 based on his thesis in Latin: *De contractu ‘do ut des’ jure Mohammedano*, which was also published in a Dutch translation in 1869. Van den Berg held a variety of administrative and legal positions in the Indies, and was appointed in 1878 as the government’s first advisor in ‘Eastern languages and Mohammedan law’. In that year he also served as KITLV commissioner in the Indies. As advisor to the government, he visited Aceh and developed a thorough disgust of what he considered to be a fanatical, unreliable and ungovernable people. Nowhere in the archipelago had he seen such ‘unfavourable physionims’ and ‘mean facial features’, nowhere such a ‘low political, commercial and social morality’, and nowhere ‘so many unnatural vices’ (Van Goor 1982: 181). The government advisor developed a plan to evict the population of Aceh from the fertile areas, which would then be colonized by former military Christians like the Ambonese. Like the North American Indians and other wild natives, the inhabitants of Aceh would probably eventually become extinct under the influence of Christian civilization, according to Van den Berg. The colonial administration, however, rejected the plan as being too radical, opting instead to effectuate the awkward concentration system that limited Dutch military presence in Aceh to the immediate vicinity of the capital (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 164–71). The orthodox Christian Van den Berg also proposed that the indigenous Christians be given the same legal status as Europeans and that the Islamic pilgrimage to Mecca – a bulwark of anti-colonial Pan-Islamism – be restricted, but this proposal was also rejected. Van den Berg believed that Arab Muslims were much more civilized than the Indonesian Muslims, who displayed various uncivilized and truly barbarian flaws, but in his view this made Arabic Pan-Islamism all the more dangerous.

Van den Berg returned to the Netherlands in 1887 as professor of the ‘religious laws, traditions and customs of the Dutch East Indies’ for the Indology programme in Delft. He published numerous works on these subjects in *Bijdragen* and the KITLV monograph series. Van den Berg continued to serve as an advisor with the Ministry for the Colonies, and as publicist he continued to repeat his earlier, confidential advice regarding the people of Aceh, indigenous Christians and Muslim pilgrims. His radical solution to the Aceh issue, for example, was published in the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* on 4 March 1890 and in the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië* (Van den Berg 1890a). Van den Berg’s proposal to give
indigenous Christians the same legal status as Europeans and his warnings about the activities of the Muslims were published in *De Gids* the same year (Van den Berg 1890b).

His most imperialistic, almost racist orientalistic views, however, were voiced in his extensive review in *De Gids* of the humane, evolutionist study of the people of Aceh by the young medical doctor for the colonial administration, Julius Jacobs (1894), progressive brother of the famous Dutch feminist Aletta Jacobs. Jacobs was an Indies-based member of the KITLV and had published, in cooperation with J.J. Meijer, *De Badoej’s* – an anthropological study of a population group on West Java – in the KITLV monograph series. In his study of the Aceh inhabitants, Jacobs put the unfavourable traits assigned to them by Dutch authors, including Van den Berg, into perspective.

According to Jacobs, many of these traits were caused by the years of conflict with the Dutch. ‘Is it surprising, that the inhabitant of Aceh is reticent with us, that he misleads us if possible, that he distrusts us?’, Jacobs asked the Dutch public. ‘No, we are at fault if we judge the character of the people of Aceh based on that which we have seen.’ In comparison, Jacobs notes that during the 80 Years War, the Geuzen (the Protestant Dutch opponents of Catholic Spanish King Philip II) also perpetrated cruelties against the Spanish and Catholics, and that deviating sexual behaviour was also seen among the Dutch in the nineteenth century (Jacobs 1894, I: 372–83).

But so much understanding and tolerance was too much for Van den Berg. In his *Gids* review, Van den Berg sharply criticized Jacobs’s ‘ultramodernistic theories’. His evolutionist thesis that the people of Aceh would quickly develop a higher level of civilization in the peaceful situation under Dutch influence, Van den Berg said, lacked both racial and historical grounds. The people of Aceh had ‘hybrid origins’ in terms of race, had proven in their precolonial history to be a ‘thoroughly anarchist’ people that had adopted the Islam only superficially and incompletely, and, like the American Indians and other ‘wild natives’, had no future as western civilization continued to expand. Van den Berg repeated his Ambonese colonization plan and concluded with reference to Dutch policy in Aceh: ‘our politics must focus no longer on their subjugation, nor on their assimilation, but on their elimination’ (Van den Berg 1894: 238).

However, his recommendations regarding Aceh generally met with opposition, both in liberal circles and in his own Anti-Revolutionary party. The government and colonial administration did not adopt his social-Darwinist colonization strategy, but the selective, relatively
humane pacification strategy advocated by Snouck Hurgronje. Van den Berg’s public role was far from finished, however. He was a member of the state commission for the reformation of colonial private law from 1892 until 1910. In the correspondence between Kuyper and the ‘ethical’ Minister for the Colonies and Governor General A.W.F. Idenburg, Van den Berg was named a number of times as a possible candidate for the Colonies Ministry (De Bruijn and Puchinger 1985: 78, 372).

After the Indology programme in Delft was discontinued, Van den Berg was elected to the city council of Delft in 1901 and to the Senate in 1911, where he held a seat as a conservative member of the Anti-Revolutionary party until 1923. He warmly sympathized with the Anti-Revolutionary leader H. Colijn, former military assistant to General Van Heutsz and declared opponent of the ethical policy. Van den Berg was also appointed Mayor of Delft in 1910, an honorary position that he held despite his advanced age until 1920. However, the KITLV quickly became too ‘ethical’ for him, with too much Leiden influence. As professor in Delft, he was a board member only in the period 1890 to 1898.

Snouck Hurgronje, Van den Berg’s arch-rival in both political and scientific terms, joined the KITLV board as professor in Leiden immediately after he returned to the Netherlands in 1907, and was board President for almost the entire period from 1911 until 1927. As a son of an excommunicated pastor in Oosterhout, Snouck graduated from the HBS (a new secondary school type that prepared students for fewer academic studies than the gymnasium and did not teach Latin or Greek) and went on to study theology in Leiden in 1874. During his studies, he was strongly influenced by the liberal, modern school of theology that considered Christianity superior to other religions, including the Islam, in ethical respect, for instance as to loving one’s neighbour. After obtaining his Master’s Degree, however, Snouck lost his faith and changed to Semitic languages for his doctorate studies. He received that degree in 1880 with his dissertation on the pilgrimage to Mecca: *Het Mekkaansche feest* (The Meccan feast). In 1881 he was given a teaching position in religious law, traditions and customs in the Dutch East Indies for the Indology programme in Leiden.

Snouck soon subjected the work of the older, established authorities – including Delft Arabist and Islam specialist A.W.T. Juynboll, advisor to the government Van den Berg in Batavia and the Utrecht legal scholar J. de Louter – to a critical analysis (*BKI* 1882: 357–421; Snouck Hurgronje 1883a, 1883b, 1884). Irrespective of the many factual and grammatical errors, Snouck asserted that Van den Berg’s study of the Islam in particular was
based on the false assumption that concepts like ‘pure exegesis’ of the law of the Islam (sharia) existed, from which the religious practice of the Indonesian peoples deviated. From its very beginnings, the Islam had adjusted to local customs in every country, but that process had started earlier in the Arab countries than it had in the Indonesian archipelago, according to Snouck. Van den Berg was enraged by the ‘unscientific tone’ in which Snouck dared to ‘attack just about all of his elder colleagues […] so immediately after receiving his degree’ (Van den Berg 1884: 222). This marked the beginning of a long-standing controversy between the two Arabists and Islamists.

In KITLV circles, the new, young, sharp-tongued Leiden Arabist was met with warm sympathy. The board decided to honour his proposal for a study journey to Mecca with a financial contribution of no less than four thousand guilders. Based on a recommendation by Consul J.A. Kruyt in Jeddah, the Ministry for the Colonies hoped that with its fifteen hundred guilder subsidy more could be learned about the annual wave of pilgrims and the small, tight colony of Indonesian Muslims in the holy places who were suspected of distributing Pan-Islamic propaganda. In order to gain admittance into Mecca, Snouck converted to the Islam in 1884 after his arrival in Jeddah. His true reason for this conversion is still a topic of debate among Leiden Islamists. According to Van Koningsveld (1987: 81–93), his was purely a conversion for the sake of convenience, in order to establish contact in Mecca with Arabic scholars and to spy on Indonesian pilgrims disguised as a devout Muslim with the Arabic name Abd al-Ghaffar. Witkam (2007: 179–80), however, asserts that at the present time Snouck’s true intentions are impossible to determine.

Witkam edited the Dutch translation of the second part of Snouck’s research report, including the unique photo album, and published as an introduction Snouck’s confidential letters from Mecca to the Dutch Vice Consul in Jeddah. Yet even Witkam is forced to admit that Snouck’s letters indirectly expose something of his true intentions. In these letters, Snouck refers to earlier examples of the British consul Richard Burton and the French government advisor Leon Roches, who had converted to the Islam for purely instrumental reasons and had subsequently visited Mecca. ‘The comparisons with Burton and Roches clarify to a certain extent how Snouck Hurgronje preferred to see himself’, according to Witkam (2007: 137). In any event, the research results from Snouck’s journey to Mecca in 1884–1885 were numerous and original. KITLV published these results in 1888–1889 in the two-part study in German named Mekka. The book was printed in a large number of copies for the era – 800 – with subsidy from
the Ministry for the Colonies. Snouck therewith established a lasting scientific reputation, both in the Netherlands and elsewhere.

Leiden, Cambridge and Tübingen all offered Snouck a professorship, but after some hesitation he decided to succeed Van den Berg as advisor to the government in the Indies, under temporary contract in 1889 and under permanent contract starting in 1891. Snouck’s scientific interest was probably decisive in this choice. That interest was first and foremost empirical and practical, not theoretical and philosophical. He aptly formulated this difference in his correspondence with a former college friend, theological philosopher H. Bavinck:

Observing phenomena, placing them in sequence, searching for their causal relationships: that is what I have tried to do to the best of my ability, but always within the context of the relative, because I cannot depart from there with my science. If I have succeeded in passing on some useful knowledge, for which our government thirsts, then I have achieved my goal. (De Bruijn and Harinck 1999: 145–6.)

As advisor to the government, Snouck immediately involved himself in the draining Aceh War. For his research in Aceh and British Malaya, with

Illustration 10. C. Snouck Hurgronje (left, in white tunic) at a bivouac in Aceh in 1898, with Colonel J.B. van Heutsz and his staff.
which Aceh had close contact, he once again used his Muslim alias Abd al-Ghaffar. This research resulted in an extensive report in 1892: Verslag omtrent de religieus-politieke toestanden in Atjèh (Report on the religious-political situation in Aceh) (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, I: 7–126). The report was partially published in a revised version in 1894 as De Atjèhers. In his report, Snouck rejected the concentration system being applied. He compared the position of the Dutch garrison under siege with ‘the position of a monkey on a chain, who can be teased to insanity by a number of youths with no risk to their own well-being’ (Van ’t Veer 1969: 189). He recommended an offensive strategy of military pacification, oriented towards taking out the Muslim military leaders and forcing the noble elders into submission. These elders could then retain their positions under colonial rule. According to Snouck, it was extremely important that the military pacification be followed by reconciliation and prosperity:

> While the punishments are being prepared and executed [...] and thus trust in the power of the Company is restored among the hereditary elders and the population, everything possible must be done to restore their [...] trust in the beneficial intentions of the Company. This can be done by stimulating agriculture, industry and trade. (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, I: 96.)

Like Van den Berg, Snouck had a poor opinion of the Islam faith of the people of Aceh which he believed made it possible to isolate and take out the Muslim leaders, the vengeful Ulamas. His Aceh strategy, however, was much more selective and humane than Van den Berg’s. What is more, Snouck’s published report in particular was much more detached than Van den Berg’s Aceh publications. The Aceh report could be typified as a moderate variation of imperialism and orientalism.

In his personal correspondence with befriended foreign Arabists, however, Snouck’s views about the Aceh population were sometimes extremely negative and general. To Professor I. Goldziher in Budapest, for example, he wrote:

> The Achehnese are from the religious point of view very bad Muslims, addicted to opium, divided by eternal tribal strife like the Bedouins, and as to each other and to strangers they are perfidious, and so on. Politically it is different. The hate towards the infidels and the arrogance as to their own importance has entered their flesh and blood. (Van Koningsveld 1985a: 131.)

After the desertion of an alleged Aceh ally known as the ‘treason of Teuku Umar’, which caused considerable commotion in the Netherlands, Snouck and Van Heutsz seized the opportunity. The concentrated line was abandoned in 1896, and Van Heutsz was appointed Military Governor in 1898 with Snouck as his advisor. The military pacification proceeded successfully and the war came to an official end in 1904 with the submission of the Sultan. An entire succession of noble elders went on to sign the standard statement of submission to the colonial authority compiled by Snouck, the ‘Korte Verklaring’ (Brief Statement). Once Aceh was pacified, Snouck also advised the colonial administration with reference to the subjugation of other sovereign or semi-sovereign states and kingdoms in the Outer Territories based on the Aceh example.

In Aceh, however, some of the Muslim leaders continued their guerrilla warfare, many of the adat elders proved incompetent or unreliable, and the policy of prosperity bore insufficient fruit to reconcile the population. Against Snouck’s advice, Van Heutsz was succeeded in 1904 as Governor of Aceh by G.C.E. van Daalen, a war-monger. ‘Mr. Van Daalen has deeply rooted disgust for anything Native’, Snouck already warned in 1903 (Van ‘t Veer 1969: 247). This would soon prove true. In subjugating the neighbouring Gajo and Alas Districts in 1904, Van Daalen murdered about one-fourth of the population, including women and children. In his combat against the guerrillas in Aceh, he was so violent that parliamentary protest in the Netherlands forced Van Heutsz to dismiss Van Daalen as governor in 1907 (Witte 1976: 92–102).

Aceh resistance was never entirely defeated in the colonial period. American anthropologist Siegel (1969) rightly pointed out that Snouck underestimated the role played by Islam in Aceh society and overestimated that of the aristocratic elders. This became evident in 1945, when the population massively rebelled, chasing away or killing the elders that had cooperated with the hated Dutch administration (Reid 1979).

Nevertheless, around the turn of the twentieth century Snouck represented a relatively moderate and humane version of imperialism and orientalism. In his recommendations, he regularly objected to the racist views voiced by officers, civil servants and private citizens in the Indies, as if ‘the Native is only one third or one quarter human’ (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, III: 2002). Snouck himself was wed in secret in 1892 to a West Java woman with whom he started a family. He lied to Bavinck about the marriage, however, dismissing it as a typical rumour being spread by the Indian gossip press (De Bruijn and Harinck 1999: 141–2). He went on to wed again with a Dutch woman in the Netherlands. In the Indies, he
continually took in Indonesian students to assist them in their western education and upbringing.

Rather disappointed, Snouck left government service in 1906 and accepted a professorship for Arabic and Islam institutions with Leiden University. That position had been held by his old mentor, M.J. de Goeje, who was retiring. Snouck's perspective of the Islam continued to be based on the superiority of western civilization. He repeatedly asserted, for example, that many Islamic rules obstructed true civilization and development: ‘In many ways, they are more in keeping with the state of civilization in antiquity or in the Middle Ages than with that of today’ (Snouck Hurgronje 1911: 61). This held true, for example, for sexual discrimination: ‘The polygamy, the great looseness of the ties of marriage, the helplessness of women against the arbitrariness and unfairness of their husbands, to mention only a few major issues’. According to Snouck, in principle this lack of civilization could be remedied by western education while maintaining the religious identity. As professor, publicist and advisor to the Ministries for the Colonies and of Foreign Affairs, he continued to preach his universalistic, ethical-liberal views in the Netherlands.

As indicated in the introduction to this book, fierce debates have been waged about the man, the scientist and the government advisor Snouck Hurgronje. Striking is the unilateral, single-dimensional assessment by his supporters and opponents alike of a personality as complicated and versatile as Snouck Hurgronje’s. Van den Doel (1998), for example, exaggeratedly praised him as the ‘shining sun of the Leiden universe’ and Van der Veer (1995: 17–186) exaggeratedly criticized him as an imperialist and orientalist. The anthropologists among his students in Leiden praise his journey to Mecca as an example of ‘participating observation’, but Van Koningsveld (1987: 9–39) refers to it as ‘espionage’. Snouck was and did all this and much, much more.

At this intermittent point, we must conclude that universalism was more important to Snouck than orientalism, that he advocated military subjugation albeit followed by reconciliation and development, and that the mission of ethical civilization was more important to him than his own personal interests. In short, in the words of Van den Berg cited above, Snouck preferred ‘assimilation’ to ‘elimination’, albeit that he did not avoid ‘subjugation’. Much of the criticism voiced against Snouck Hurgronje over the years in terms of imperialism and orientalism would have been much more appropriate against his political and scientific opponent, L.W.C. van den Berg.
In 1898, the professor of Dutch language and literature in Leiden G. Kalff (1898) wrote in his *Gids* article ‘Pro Patria’ that he was pleased to conclude that patriotism had gained significant strength over the course of the nineteenth century. ‘We the people felt united when the King called “to arms” in 1830’, and instances thereafter, according to Kalff. Now that apathy had finally given way to energy, the Dutch once again swarmed overseas like their seventeenth-century ancestors.

The nationalism heralded by Kalff assumed massive proportions around the turn of the twentieth century. Thousands applauded the ousted President of Transvaal, Paul Kruger, and thousands gave a hero’s welcome to General Van Heutsz, the pacificator of Aceh, in 1904 (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 216–27; Te Velde 1992: 163–83; Bossenbroek 1996: 343–59). The increased nationalism portrayed ‘the testiness of a small nation with a large past’, as formulated by the young historian G.W. Kernkamp (Blaas 1982). Among the European powers, that testiness was primarily focused on England, former overseas rival of the Dutch, which had allegedly stolen North Borneo from the Netherlands and was attempting to conquer the kindred Boer republics. Overseas the testiness was focused in particular on the Indonesian sovereigns in the Outer Territories who had repeatedly antagonized Dutch authority over the course of the nineteenth century. The dream of a ‘New Holland’ in Transvaal was lost forever around the turn of the twentieth century, but every one of the obstinate Indonesian rulers were subjugated. This increased Dutch nationalism was also evident within KITLV, especially but not only among the historians.

Inspired by the Anglo-Boer War, KITLV President Kern penned a poem: As long as jealousy, envy/and lies reign/fratricide will never/end on Earth/Peace conferences cannot prevent war) (Bossenbroek 1996: 80). Kern was the founder and first President of the nationalist Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond (General Netherlands’ Union), the exponent of the ‘Great-Netherlands Philosophy’ and fierce anti-British pro-Boer organization established around 1900. At the peak of the Boer War, Kern – who was normally soft-spoken – privately voiced his wish that the British army would be ‘eradicated from the face of the earth’ (Te Velde 1992: 171).

Of course Kern and other nationalist scholars were more detached in their KITLV publications, but the ‘testiness of a small nation with a large past’ could still be seen to some extent. Work by the historians J.E. Heeres and J. de Hullu and by Sinologist W.P. Groeneveldt, who wrote about the
glorious era of the VOC, recalled that large past. Groeneveldt published in both *Bijdragen* and the *Werken* his source book *De Nederlanders in China*, covering the first Dutch contacts in China in the period from 1601 to 1621, in 1898. A pleasant coincidence is the fact that in about 1900, both Groeneveldt, former vice president of the Raad van Indië (Council of the Indies), and leader of the opposition Kuyper advocated the establishment of a Dutch extraterritorial concession in China based on the old VOC treaties. In 1907 Heeres provided the first, voluminous part of the *Corpus diplomaticum Neerlando-Indicum*, the collection of treaties signed by the VOC with the domestic rulers in the Indonesian archipelago. For the record, those treaties were also relevant to the sovereignty rights exercised by the Netherlands in the Outer Territories around 1900. De Hullu published a series of articles on daily life on board the VOC ships in *Bijdragen*.

The testiness of the small state that the Netherlands resounded now in the many articles published in *Bijdragen* by P.H. van der Kemp, a former civil servant, on British-Dutch relations at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In addition to sources in the archives of the Netherlands, Van der Kemp had access to the British archive documents from the India Office that E. Roosegaarde Bisschop had collected on behalf of KITLV, with a subsidy from the Ministry for the Colonies (*BKI* 1895: xviii). Everywhere he looked, Van der Kemp saw manoeuvrings by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, the anti-Dutch viceroy during the British occupation of the East Indies from 1811 to 1816.

Following suit with Baud’s *BKI* articles from the 1850s, Van der Kemp assigned to Raffles responsibility for the cowardly murders of Dutch citizens in the sultanates of Palembang and Bandjermasin in that period. After the East Indies colonies were returned, Raffles cunningly filched Singapore from the Netherlands and continued to incite the local rulers against Dutch authority. The British-Dutch treaty of 1824 that determined that the area north of the Straits of Malacca would belong to the British sphere of influence and the area south of the Straits to that of the Netherlands was Raffles’ ultimate reward. The treaty removed North Borneo and Aceh from the Dutch sphere of influence. ‘My thoughts on the composition of the treaty are highly unfavourable’, Van der Kemp said. ‘Seen from the English perspective, they took everything to be taken, but assessed from the Dutch side, it is evident here, too, that the great men of the Republic are no longer with us’ (*BKI* 1904: 4).

Van der Kemp drew a direct parallel between British policy with reference to suzerainty over North Borneo and Aceh and suzerainty over the
Boer republics: ‘There, too, it was because of negotiations of which no minutes are taken and because of a clause initially proposed merely to pacify the “opposition” but said to mean nothing that Transvaal agreed, while being ultimately destined to serve as spear of war’ (BKI 1900: 214). In De Gids Van der Kemp compared the Jameson Raid on Transvaal with the treacherous attack undertaken by Raffles, ‘a thoroughbred jingo’, with help from Malay troops against the Dutch administration in Palembang in 1818–1819 (Van der Kemp 1898).

KITLV’s Secretary Kielstra was not as anti-British as Van der Kemp, but his articles about expanding Dutch authority in the Outer Territories were of an equally nationalist nature. He, too, criticized the narrow-mindedness of the previous generation of Dutch statesmen who prescribed the skittish and short-sighted policy of restraint towards the native sovereigns in the archipelago. ‘It was clearly evident then’, Kielstra (1910: vi) wrote in the introduction to his collection of articles with the fitting title Indisch Nederland, ‘how much wrong was done by the “feeble” due to their lack of confidence and comprehension [...]. Also convincingly clear, however, was that much had changed for the good as apathy was gradually replaced by energy.’ All of the local case studies presented by Kielstra told the same story: initially the indigenous population in the (semi-)sovereign states in the Outer Territories suffered under the misadministration of the sovereigns who repeatedly antagonized Dutch authority. As all of these states were brought under Dutch authority by energetic civil servants like the Governor Generals C.H.A. van der Wijck and Van Heutsz, agriculture, trade and industry blossomed, to the gratitude of the indigenous population. This was evident in the homage paid when Queen Wilhelmina was crowned in 1898. Only a sole, astute observer like Snouck Hurgronje could escape such colonialist and nationalist arrogance around the turn of the twentieth century. With reference to the military annexation of South Celebes, executed by the Dutch under the motto ‘peace for the huts, war for the palaces’, he wrote in 1904 that the colonial administration was flattering itself with the ‘vain illusion that the majority of the population longs for our direct administration. A Native Administration may be as corrupt as it will, it is virtually never the case that its subjects are impelled to long for ours’, according to Snouck (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, III: 2108).

It is nevertheless understandable from a historic perspective that nationalist contemporaries like Kielstra looked with pride upon the expansive ‘Indies Netherlands’, established by dauntless men like Van Heutsz from Sabang to Merauke. From an objective perspective, this
empire also portrayed the increased power developed by the Dutch since 1870, both at home and in the colonies.

In a technological sense, the journey by sailing ship around the Cape, which lasted some one hundred and twenty days, had been completely replaced by steamships travelling through the Suez Canal, a journey of thirty to forty days. After steam shipping within the archipelago had been acquired from a British enterprise by the good-Dutch KPM, a tight mesh of connections was established that played a major role in both the pacification and the economic opening up of the Outer Territories. Between 1890 and 1914 the KPM fleet increased from sixteen to more than one hundred steamships, most of which were constructed at Dutch shipyards (A Campo 1992: 442–57). The Dutch East Indies Army was both better armed and better organized than it had been at the time of the first Aceh expedition. Important was the establishment of the Corps Marechaussee (Military Police Corps) in 1890, which introduced anti-guerrilla tactics in Aceh with small groups of native military fighters under European command, armed with modern carbines and traditional klewang swords (Bossenbroek 1992: 209–10).

From an economic perspective, the Netherlands had experienced strong growth since 1870 despite the economic crisis of the 1880s. The Gross National Product per capita more than doubled, from US$ 3,118 in 1870 (value in 1970) to US$ 7,851 in 1913 (Maddison 1989: 25–33). In part this was a result of the contribution the Indies made to the national income, increasing from 2 to 3 percent in 1870 to about ten percent in 1913 (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 368). After initial hesitance, Dutch investments in the Indies doubled between 1900 and 1913, from 750 million to 1,500 million guilders. Dutch investments brought phenomenal growth in Indies exports, which increased from 92.8 million guilders in 1870 to 257.5 million in 1900 and no less than 671.5 million guilders in 1913. The Outer Territories’ share of the total export also doubled between 1870 and 1913, from less than one fourth to nearly one half. In 1870, the Deli and Billiton mining companies had been the only modern public limited liability companies in the Outer Territories; in 1913 more than one hundred of such companies were active (Lindblad 1989).

The process of economic modernization also brought strong political stimuli. In the Netherlands, this resulted in a growth of the civil service sector, government authority and government expenditures, especially in the socio-economic field. National unification was also seen in phenomena including simultaneous introduction of general compulsory school attendance and general conscription around the turn of the twentieth
century (Te Velde 1999: 143–61; Knippenberg and De Pater 1988: 135–46). In the Indies, the process of economic modernization stimulated the process of colonial state formation as Dutch imperialism between 1870 and 1914 was conceptualized by an increasing number of historians (Kuitenbrouwer 1998). An indication of this process of state formation or imperialism was the growth in the number of administrative employees in the Outer Territories, from 175 in 1870 to more than 400 in 1914 (Houben 1996: 52).

The simultaneous development of both nationalism and denominalism in the Netherlands around 1900 contributed to the ethical character of Dutch imperialism in Indonesia. The mission of civilization also played a part in the imperialism of other western powers, but was perhaps even stronger in the Netherlands, a small, parochial and Christian nation. Many historians believe that the Netherlands had been involved in a Christian, parochial civilization offensive since the end of the eighteenth century that, however, did not get under way in the Indies until 1870, at the beginning of the era of modern imperialism.

'The Spiritual Conquest of the Archipelago'

A Dutch Civilization Offensive

Professor of Sanskrit and KITLV board member Kern wrote to Holle, tea grower, advisor to the government and linguist in West Java: ‘that there is still much, incredibly much to be done before we, the Dutch, can claim to have spiritually conquered the Archipelago’ (Van den Berge 1998: 158). In his speech on the occasion of KITLV’s fiftieth anniversary in 1901, Kern concluded that in that respect great progress had been made, but there was still ‘incredibly much to be done before we can claim to have completed the spiritual conquering of our overseas territories’ (BKI 1901: xxi). Kern was referring not only to increased knowledge of the linguistics, geography and anthropology of the Dutch colonies, but also to the continued education of their inhabitants ‘who, although belonging to a single human race, display the greatest diversity in terms of social and spiritual development’ (BKI 1901: vii). Following the example of English in British India, Kern believed that the Dutch language was the best tool for this mission of civilization – the ‘Gateway to the West’, as Groeneboer (1998) typified the tough politics of Kern and his comrades around the turn of the twentieth century. But Groeneboer correctly points out that in his propagation of the Dutch language, Kern also had political objectives.
'Only by not denying our Dutch, our European character can we sustain our prestige in the long term and exert a salutary influence on the population of our overseas territory,' Kern said in 1897 at the 24th Nederlands Taal- en Letterkundig Congres (Groeneboer 1998: 145). Kern’s ‘spiritual conquering of the Archipelago’ was therefore part of a parochial, Christian civilization offensive seen first in the Netherlands and then in the Dutch colonies. Following suit, for example, with the Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen or Society for the General Good, which had been active among labourers and paupers in the Netherlands since 1784, a Society for the Good of the Javanese was established in 1866 by the enlightened physician W. Bosch. At its peak in about 1870, this society had no less than two thousand members, including many liberal clergymen and liberal members of Indisch Genootschap and KITLV, among whom Bleeker and Veth (Janse 1999). Missionary work also played an important part in the parochial, Christian civilization offensive in the colonies, as shown for East Java by Boone (1997). In addition to this Christian variant, liberal, nationalist professors like Kern represented the secular variant of the Dutch civilization offensive in the Indies.

Within the KITLV, representatives of both variants worked together well despite the fact that the missionaries preferred not Dutch but Malay or the local dialect as the instrument for Christian civilization. Kern nevertheless emphatically praised the linguistic work done by Bible translator N. Adriani among the Toradjas in Central Celebes in his 1901 commemorative speech (BKI 1901: xiii). The ‘ethical’ policy that ensued from the Dutch civilization offensive around the turn of the century was also characterized by a high degree of consensus among liberals, confessionals and social democrats regarding the development of the Indonesian peoples based on the example of the West (Locher-Scholten 1981: 201).

Johan Hendrik Casper Kern (1833–1917) was President for the longest time in KITLV’s history. He held this position in the periods 1882–1886, 1887–1891, 1895–1896, 1899–1901, 1903–1906 and 1907–1911: a total of eighteen years. Kern was born in the Indies to an officer’s family and spent his first six years there (’t Hart 1989). After completing the Latin school and the gymnasium in Zutphen, at which time his linguistic skills were already evident, Kern went on to study humanities in Utrecht. His interest in the eastern languages led him to Leiden, where his studies included Sanskrit. Kern received his doctorate based on a thesis in Latin on Greek and other Old Persian sources. He furthered his studies in Sanskrit in Berlin. After teaching Dutch and ancient languages at the athenaeum in Maastricht, his Sanskrit studies led Kern to London in 1861, where he met founding
fathers of comparative linguistics such as F. Max Müller. Kern taught Sanskrit at the Brahmana College in Benares, India from 1863 until 1865. He accepted a professorship in Sanskrit in Leiden in 1865.

His acceptance speech was programmatic, in which Kern (1865) discussed three areas of research. The first of these was India’s antiquity. It had given birth to two global religions: Hinduism and Buddhism. Ancient Indian civilization had taken great leaps in linguistics, astronomy and
mathematics. The lack of political unity, however, had resulted in attacks by less civilized conquerors, causing the process of civilization to stagnate for centuries. Now, by contrast, under the benevolent British rule, ‘India appears to be slowly rising from its sleep of death’. Kern’s second area of research was the importance of Sanskrit in comparative linguistics. That language had provided the key to unlock the Indo-Germanic family of languages, to which Dutch belonged.

The general relations within this family of languages had already been scientifically determined, but the exact connections between the related languages required further comparative studies. ‘Although the nature of the relationships is not readily known’, Kern (1865: 35) said, ‘meaning that we do not know if we are dealing with a mother and daughter or with two sisters, there is not a single doubt as to the shared roots’. As last area of research, Kern discussed the extensive influence of Hinduism and Buddhism on Java’s ancient civilization, an influence that still existed on Bali. The ‘Malay-Polynesian’ family of languages had entirely different roots than the Indo-Germanic family, but according to Kern it was as well a promising area of study for comparative linguistics.

As a professor, Kern developed an insatiable desire to publish in these three related areas: the study of Sanskrit, the study of the ancient Hindu civilization on Java and neighbouring islands, and the comparative study of the Malay-Polynesian languages. His Verspreide geschriften (Collected writings), published in Kern’s honour by KITLV between 1913 and 1929, consisted of no less than sixteen parts with a total of more than five thousand pages. A number of orientalist views can be found in his work. In his oration, for example, he made a comparison between the ‘childlike nature’ of ancient Indian linguistics, with a ‘preference for magical myths and fables’ and the ‘illustrious, more mature civilization of Europe’ (Kern 1865: 31–3). His work was nevertheless dominated by the universalistic belief in progress in the development of the Indian and Indonesian peoples based on the western model. His biographer Van der Hoeven (1985: 321) agreed with Kern’s student in Leiden C.C. Uhlenbeck that he ‘always remained too much a child of the unilateral European enlightenment to ever completely understand the concentrated piety of the Oriental’. A turn of phrase, for the record, that might easily be seen as orientalism today, however. Kern's linguistic nationalism was, of course, Europe-centred: the ‘Great-Netherlands Philosophy’ that he propagated as the founder and first President of the Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond.

Kern clearly stated his universalistic belief in progress in 1883 in a presentation during the Colonial Exhibition in Amsterdam ‘on the influence
of the Indian, Arabic and European civilization on the peoples of the East Indies Archipelago. He asserted that the ‘Malay-Polynesian race’ had been highly capable of adopting higher civilizations, the highest of which was, of course, the European. The civilization history of the Malays was the same as that of our own forbearers, according to Kern. After all, they had also profited from contact with higher civilizations, like the Roman and the French. He forcefully criticized the biological racism of many of his contemporaries, who claimed that non-western people like the Malays would always remain inferior. ‘The assertion that lower races coming into contact with higher will succumb and perish is a hazy phrase that, properly considered, boils down to saying that Europeans have all too often abused their superiority to unscrupulously exterminate the weak. That does not, however, serve to prove their superiority; to the contrary.’ (Kern 1883: 30–1.

Prominent KITLV members L.W.C. van den Berg and J. Pijnappel could put that in their pipe and smoke it. For not only Van den Berg was still propagating his orientalist disbelief in the susceptibility of the Aceh race to western civilisation but Pijnappel believed the same with reference to the Malays. In ‘Enkele aanmerkingen op Wallace’s Insulinde’, a commentary on Veth’s criticism in his translation and edition of Wallace’s authoritative evolutionist study on his views of the Indies, Pijnakker disputed Veth’s views (BKI 1872: 159–71). According to Pijnappel, Wallace was still much too optimistic in that respect. Citing his geographic manual of 1863 in claiming that the Malay race simply did not have the aptitude for further development: ‘If the Malay race had an aptitude for higher development, this should have been evident’. Despite contact with higher civilizations, Pijnappel said, this had not been the case. ‘The native is like a child, with the destiny of remaining a child. He will never become a man,’ according to Pijnappel.

By means of imitating, the native might learn how to operate a steam-driven machine, but there was no use in trying to teach him how that machine worked, let alone explaining the laws of higher mechanics. Like western education, Pijnappel said, Christianity is wasted on the native, who would at best superficially conform to it. Simple labour in farming and industry: such was the destiny of the Malay race. ‘And if they do not want to work, which may very well be the case despite the honest work you offer them, they must be forced for their own good.’ In his inaugural speech as professor of Malay in Leiden when the Indology programme was relocated to the state university, Pijnappel (1877) typified Malay as an uncivilized language, the only scientific importance of which was to be
found in comparison to civilized languages. From a literary perspective, Pijnappel asserted, Malay had provided ‘nothing but fables and rhymes’, and not much else was to be expected from that language in the future.

Like Kern, Veth continued to oppose such orientalist, virtually racist views. In the first part of his influential manual *Java*, for example, Veth said: ‘There is no more unfounded delusion than that taught by some superficial ethnologists claiming that one people is the antipode of another in terms of law, morale and general understanding of the world; at least if that assertion is to mean anything other than that different peoples are at different points of development’ (Veth 1875–1882, I: 648). According to Veth, all of the peoples on the planet underwent the same stages of development, and that process could be significantly accelerated on Java under colonial administration. The fact that Veth and Kern, with their belief of universal progress, represented a majority within KITLV is evident in the appointment of both men as honorary members: Veth in 1882 in recognition of his 40th year as professor, and Kern in 1890 in recognition of his 25th year as professor. That high distinction did not, however, obstruct Kern’s functioning as President later on.

*The Growing Importance of Ethnology*

Kern’s comparative linguistics study and the later ethnological publications by Veth were strongly influenced by the theory of evolution that had slowly but surely gained ground in the Netherlands (Hegeman 1970). However, Veth was too much an old-fashioned encyclopaedic intellectual to properly apply the new evolutionistic paradigm. Moreover, as President of the Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, after 1873 he focused on geographic research in particular, for example the Sumatra expedition in which his son also participated (Van der Velde 1992: 376–80). His successor as professor of ethnology in Leiden, G.A. Wilken, was the person whose evolutionistic comparative analysis brought ethnology to the same theoretical level as comparative linguistics (Platenkamp and Prager 1994: 710–8). Naturally, from a practical perspective, ethnology gained importance based on Dutch imperialism in the Outer Territories, which strongly increased the demand for knowledge from both the government and the colonial administration regarding the newly subjugated peoples and tribes. Wilken and his successor emphatically attuned to this need.

George Alexander Wilken (1847–1891) was born in Menado as the son of a Dutch missionary and an Indo-European mother. In 1859 he came to the Netherlands to attend the Protestant boarding school for missionary
children in Rotterdam, under the guardianship of the Director of the Nederlandsch Zendelinggenootschap Society, J.C. Neurdenburg, whose daughter Wilken later married. After completing his secondary education, Wilken entered the Indology programme in Delft, where he received his degree as civil servant at the top of his class. His health proved to be poor, however, requiring a period of recuperation in Bad Godesberg before he could leave for the Indies to work for the administration. He held a number of different administrative positions in the Outer Territories, which stimulated him to attempt a comparative ethnological study.

Once again, however, Wilken demanded more than his health could bear. He returned to the Netherlands in 1880 on sick leave. Wilken quickly
resumed his studies, attending lectures in Leiden by Kern, De Goeje and Snouck Hurgronje. Against this highly widened intellectual background, he wrote a number of books and numerous articles in which he discussed the comparative-evolutionist paradigm in ethnology in more detail. His series of articles on animism among the Indonesian peoples in particular was highly acclaimed (Wilken 1883–84). Wilken was elected to the KITLV board in 1884. In that same year he was also awarded an honorary doctorate in the humanities by the Leiden University, where he was appointed to succeed Veth as professor of ethnology in 1885.

Wilken (1885) opened his programmatic oration on the importance of ethnology to comparative jurisprudence by observing:

> These days ethnologists can embrace their life’s task with thankful satisfaction. Interest in the subject of his study is increasing from all sides. Little-known and little-appreciated only a few decades ago, considered merely a part of geography, ethnology has now become an independent and powerful science.

He went on to discuss the main lines of his paradigm, derived from ‘Darwin’s hypothesis of development’. ‘According to that hypothesis’, Wilken asserted,

> the so-called wild peoples have not climbed down from a higher step on the ladder of culture to the lower one they now occupy [...] but have simply stagnated in their growth: they do not present us with degenerated but with primitive circumstances; do not show what could become of our civilization, but what the civilization of our first fathers was like [...]. Thus those who want to understand the development of society have no choice but to start with the society of the wild peoples. (Wilken 1885: 10.)

Wilken’s universalist paradigm probably also bore an element of culture relativism, of true belief in the equality of different cultures. In closing, he spoke to the Leiden Indology students with an almost apologetic plea for more understanding and tolerance towards the cultures of the Indonesian peoples that sometimes differed completely from the West: ‘Because here, too: tout comprendre, c’est tout pardonner’.

As a professor, Wilken brought forth another stream of publications on topics varying from marriage, matriarchate, couvade and circumcision to inheritance law and the right of pawn among Indonesian peoples. Many of these pieces were published in *Bijdragen* or as a KITLV book. In his comparative article ‘Oostersche en Westersche rechtsbegrippen’, comparing eastern and western concepts of law with inheritance law as concrete example, he emphatically rejected the view that fundamental differences
exist between the East and the West. According to Wilken, only gradual differences existed that would probably further diminish under the influence of colonialism and increasing global traffic (*BKI* 1888: 121–40). In later publications, moreover, Wilken increasingly used the terms ‘Indonesia’ and ‘Indonesians’ instead of ‘Indies’ and ‘natives’. But once again he grew seriously overworked, this time with fatal consequences. Wilken died at the age of 44. Had he, as an Indo Dutch, continually been motivated by the urge to have to prove himself? His friend and colleague Snouck Hurgronje wrote to Goldziher: ‘Wilken’s early demise will have saddened you too. What could he have done in ten more years, but it was too much end ended fatally. Do not follow his example!’ (Van Koningsveld 1985a: 133.)

Sinologist J.J.M. de Groot assumed Wilken’s position as professor of ethnology in Leiden and as member of the KITLV board, in which now every Leiden professor in the fields of linguistics, geography and anthropology of the Indies were represented as nearly a matter of course. As a professor, De Groot continued to focus on the Chinese culture in China and in the Indies, moving to the chair of Chinese language and literature in 1904 (Blussé 1989: 345–9). As a candidate for the vacant ethnology professorship, the first choice in Leiden was Snouck Hurgronje. He, however, decided to wait until he could succeed his mentor De Goeje as professor of Arabic. Medical anthropologist A.W. Nieuwenhuis was appointed professor instead of Snouck.

Nieuwenhuis, who had obtained his PhD based on a medical thesis, had participated in many of the scientific expeditions in the Outer Territories in service to the colonial administration, especially in the interior of Borneo (Van Goor 2000: 181–208). There he had extensively studied the culture of the head-hunting animistic Dayak people. In doing so, he made a significant contribution to introducing field work and participating observation into Dutch ethnology. Nieuwenhuis (1902), however, was also a fervent advocate of establishing colonial administration in the Borneo interior, in part to protect the Dayak people from the encroaching influence of the Islamic Malay. In general, he was highly negative about the Islamic Malay culture and highly positive about Dutch colonialism, ‘the more humane administrative principles of our so much more highly developed society’ that were ‘a blessing’ to all of the native peoples in the Indonesian archipelago, both the ‘more and less civilized’. Even Otterspeer (1996: 134–5), who accepts little of Said’s orientalism thesis in terms of Leiden, says that Nieuwenhuis ‘is in complete keeping with Said’s image of orientalism’.
From a theoretical perspective, Nieuwenhuis also based his work on the comparative evolutionistic paradigm. In his oration, for example, Nieuwenhuis (1904) compared ‘the conditions of life among peoples on the higher and on the lower steps of civilization’. In this, he contrasted the naked ‘struggle to exist’ of a primitive people like the Dayaks, who were scarcely able to survive in an unfavourable natural environment, with a society so much more materialistically and intellectually developed as the Netherlands, that had increasingly learned to control natural conditions, to that society’s own benefit. Nevertheless, subjectively speaking the Dutch were not much happier than the Dayak, because the increasing division of labour – the key to higher development – had also created class differences that led to jealousy among large parts of the society. The comparison with the Dayak could therefore increase awareness among the Dutch, according to Nieuwenhuis, ‘that man has needed such a long time and the cooperation of so many generations to arrive at our current point of civilization’ (Nieuwenhuis 1904: 21). Acquiescence in the unavoidable differences between classes in the highly civilized Netherlands and acceptance of an extremely lengthy colonial development process among the less civilized peoples of the Indies are what Nieuwenhuis continued to teach in Leiden until 1934.

In addition to serving as board member of the KITLV, Nieuwenhuis was also board member and President of the Nederlandsche Anthropologische Vereeniging (Netherlands Anthropological Association), established in 1898 and a sign of the increasing status and professionalization of ethnology (De Wolf 1998: 1–19).

The Law of Adat: Discovery or Invention?

Ethnology and colonial administration met one another during the era of modern imperialism in the area of the law of adat in particular: native customary law. When Van Vollenhoven (1928), the most important adat specialist in Leiden, looked back during the Interbellum on the ‘discovery’ of the law of adat in Indonesia, he distinguished between five periods: Incidental, fragmentary ‘western awareness’ during the VOC era (1500−1800); ‘western exploration’ (1783–1865) by pioneers like Raffles, Baud and Thorbecke, in particular in the area of Javanese land ownership; ‘western discoveries’ (1865−1900), especially in the Outer Territories by ethnologists like Wilken and Snouck Hurgronje; ‘western interpretation’ starting in 1900, in particular by Leiden intellectuals like Snouck, Van Vollenhoven himself and their students; and lastly ‘eastern awareness’ among Indonesian intellectuals since 1918.
Thus during the period of modern imperialism, according to Van Vollenhoven, the first scientifically sound study was performed of the law of *adat* and the first influential publications were authored. Van Vollenhoven’s description of the transition from ‘western discoveries’ to ‘western interpretation’ around the turn of the twentieth century displays a high content of orientalism that was enveloped in his conceptualization of the “discovery” of a traditional, virtually unchanging, typically eastern law of *adat*. ‘It is not an exaggeration to date at the beginning of this century a second discovery of the law of *adat*, a deeper discovery; one that not only collects and orders facts but begins to understand their eastern meaning’, said Van Vollenhoven. He believed that this deepening was primarily caused by the great, unexplainable fact of the intellectual school after 1900 that resolutely rejected the rationalism and materialism of the century past, opening the eyes and mind to archaic and eastern thinking, un-European and unmaterialistic thinking (Van Vollenhoven 1928: 123, 125).

These days the entire concept of a ‘discovery’ of native customary law is considered by many scientific researchers to be a colonial ‘invention of tradition’. After Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), a historian and an anthropologist, introduced this new concept, many so-called traditional African and Asian institutions have been unmasked as colonial constructions. According to these authors, in the name of tradition loyal rulers were reinforced in their power and prestige, tribal leaders were appointed among what had been stateless tribes, tax and property regulations beneficial to colonists and loyal elites were anchored in law, and previously flexible ethnic identities and religious institutions were reified. Not only western administrators and native elites, but also missionaries played an important part in this colonial process of construction by recording the malleable spoken languages of illiterate peoples in the interest of Christianization and Bible translation in written language according to western standards. According to some post-modern-oriented authors, one perverse consequence of these colonial constructions in the name of tradition is that the non-western peoples themselves ultimately started to believe in them. The invention of tradition became a self-fulfilling prophecy (Breckenridge and Van der Veer 1993; Mamdani 1996).

In the case of Indonesia, the post-modern deconstruction rage has also reached the colonial law of *adat*. American anthropologist Pemberton (1994: 46), for instance, explained when analyzing the culture of the courts of the Middle Javanese rulers:
I have translated adat here as ‘rules’ rather than, for example, ‘custom(s)’ in an attempt to treat such requirements within the specificity of the 1760s context and, thus, resist resorting to the more enflamed, quasi-ethnographic appeal of custom per se. As will become evident in this and subsequent chapters, adat would be converted into a privileged form that might then reappear, retrospectively, as custom.

Various authors have justifiably pointed out that traditions cannot be invented from nothing and that colonial constructions cannot simply be pulled from thin air. In order to seem somewhat convincing to the relevant non-western peoples, they had to be – if only partially and selectively – in keeping with existing views and customs (O’Hanlon and Washbrook 1992; Hastings 1997: 1–35). This also applies to Indonesian adat law, as recorded by administrators, ethnologists and missionaries in consultation with local leaders and other interlocuteurs valables around 1900.

*Bijdragen* contain many articles in which missionaries and civil servants describe the adat law of the peoples in the Outer Territories for which they had been assigned responsibility. How closely ‘discovery’ and ‘invention’ were related in that respect is evident from the fascinating report by A. Hueting, missionary from the Utrechtsche Zendings-vereeniging, about adat regulations among native Christians on the island of Halmahera, titled ‘Verordeningen aangaande de adat der Inlandsche Christenen op het eiland Halmahera’ (*BKI* 1910: 33–92). Now that Christianity had started to gain solid ground on Halmahera, many conflicts occurred with the old, ‘heathen adat’. The missionaries now had the task of ‘making and keeping order’, according to Hueting. To do so, the ‘leaders and elders’ were called to meet and determine which rules were to be enforced, modified or introduced. Communal property and individual usufruct of the land were primarily maintained.

Significant changes were needed in marital and family law, however, to attune more to Christian morality. One core problem was the fact that the leaders, who were responsible for enforcing compliance with the old and the new rules, originally had little power. Based on consultation between the missionaries and the leaders, their authority and privileges were increased extensively. ‘One must remember’, Hueting faithfully explained, ‘that there had never before been a direct distinction made between the leaders and their subjects. They were judges and leaders, nothing more. By establishing new villages and creating general interests, however, they have needed to become governors and as such to distinguish themselves from their subjects in terms of status as well.’ (*BKI* 1910: 79.)
That the adat law was not fixed and that certain changes were unavoidable and even desirable was something that Snouck Hurgronje also clearly understood. It was for this reason that he advised the colonial administration against codification in 1893 in the case of Sumatra’s West Coast. However, the adat law needed to be respected by the colonial administration and in colonial jurisprudence, leaving as much as possible to the hereditary adat leaders. ‘In their hands’, Snouck predicted,

the adat will certainly develop and transform in time, now more quickly than in the era when the lands that they govern were as good as isolated from general civilization and global traffic. The increasing traffic will create as a matter of course a need for uniformity and will increasingly erase the local differences. The influence of European concepts and education will clean up much of the superfluous and much that is rooted in outdated notions. (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, I:709.)

Later, as a professor in Leiden and KITLV board member, Snouck Hurgronje would work closely with his younger colleague Van Vollenhoven in his advocacy within KITLV of codification of adat law. In a letter to the KITLV board dated 12 May 1909, Van Vollenhoven proposed the establishment of a committee to systematically collect, revise and publish adat sources (KITLV 161, NB 15 May 1909). ‘As a comprehensive government study is not feasible’, Van Vollenhoven explained, ‘due to the costs and a lack of personnel, this would nevertheless significantly further our knowledge’. The KITLV board approved the proposal and two committees were established: a main committee appointed by KITLV chaired by Snouck Hurgronje with Van Vollenhoven as secretary, and an assisting committee appointed by the Bataviasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, led by the high-ranking civil servant and Bali expert F.A. Liefrinck. The first of the 45 Adatrechtbundels that the KITLV was to publish until 1955 was already published in 1910.

Javanism and Java Studies

Of the nineteen ‘adat circles’ that Van Vollenhoven subsequently distinguished in the Indies, only three pertained to Java: West Java, Central Java and East Java. During the period of modern imperialism, legal, ethnological and linguistic attention within KITLV first went to the newly opened Outer Territories. Most of the books published by KITLV between 1870 and 1914, as mentioned above, dealt with these. That does not diminish the fact that Java enjoyed constant attention because the majority of the native population lived there. Around 1900, both
Javanism – the local variation of Said’s orientalism – and Java studies – the academic study of Java and the Javanese language – therefore blossomed.

Within Javanism, Van Miert (1995: 360) made a clarifying distinction between the positive and negative Dutch image formation about the Javanese people. Negative characteristics assigned to the Javanese, he said, were docility, laziness, superstition, and a lack of both initiative and perseverance. Under the influence of Romanticism, however, a more positive image developed of the Javanese culture as being mysterious, sensitive, sensual, contemplative and artistic. Using Said’s terminology, the negative imagery might be called ‘manifest orientalism’ and the positive ‘latent orientalism’. The positive Dutch imagery was in close keeping with the self-image cultivated by the Javanese governing nobility, the priyayi. This self-image was characterized by mysticism, ascetism, loyalty, obedience and self-sacrifice. In about 1900 the priyayi started striving towards a cultural renaissance inspired by the glorious past of the Hindu Madjapahit Empire that governed Java from the late thirteenth century to the late fifteenth century. It was in this period that ancient temple ruins were excavated and the ancient odes were published. KITLV played an important part in uncovering Java’s ancient history, where Java studies and Javanism cross paths (Van Miert 1995: 27–35).

Around the turn of the nineteenth century, important temple compounds were discovered in Central Java: the ninth-century Buddhist Borobudur and the tenth-century Hindu Prambanan. As time went by, the Dutch government and the colonial administration became increasingly interested in Java’s antiquities. On behalf of the government, Leiden archaeologist Leemans, one of the first KITLV board members, published a 700-page book on Borobudur along with an atlas with 400 illustrations. In 1885, railway engineer and future KITLV President J.W. IJzerman discovered that an earthen embankment at the foot of the temple compound still covered many important reliefs.

Enthusiastic about the archaeological treasures of Central Java, in 1885 IJzerman established the Archeologische Vereeniging (Archaeological Association) in Yogjakarta. This association also undertook digging up parts of the Prambanan. Both KITLV and the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen financially supported the work of the amateur archaeologists. KITLV published the book *Tjandi Parambanan op Midden-Java, na de ontgraving* in 1893, compiled by IJzerman’s successor as chairman of the Archeologische Vereeniging, I. Groneman, including 52 photographs of the archaeological site.
The young librarian of the Bataviaasch Genootschap, J.L.A. Brandes, made an important contribution to the cataloguing of the collected antiquities and to deciphering the inscriptions found. Brandes obtained his PhD under Kern in 1884 with a thesis on comparative phonetics within the Malay-Polynesian language family – ‘a masterpiece’ according to his supervisor (Kern 1976: 17). As a civil servant, specifically with a task in the field of scientific linguistics, and KITLV commissioner in the Indies, Brandes made important contributions to the opening up, both archaeologically and linguistically, of Java’s ancient history.

He was appointed in 1901 as the first chairman of the official Commissie van Oudheidkundig Onderzoek (Commission for Archaeological Research. That commission’s task was limited as yet. To begin with, its activities were limited to Java and Madura. Secondly, its official task was defined as ‘compiling archaeological and architectural descriptions of the Antiquities [...], drawing and/or photographing these antiquities [...], making casts and indicating how deterioration of the monuments can be prevented’ (Bernet Kempers 1978: 49). Systematic excavation, restoration and reconstruction were to follow later. From the Netherlands, Kern had strongly urged the government to establish an archaeological commission of this type, based on the examples of British India and French Indochina that he regularly reported on in Bijdragen (BKI 1885: 532–56, 1899: 405–8, 1916: 381–94). He was therefore appointed as the first chairman of the Dutch assisting committee that KITLV established alongside the archaeological committee in Batavia.

From the Netherlands, Kern also stimulated knowledge of Old Javanese by writing a series of seven articles about its grammar that were published in Bijdragen between 1898 and 1906. In the meantime, Brandes was working on the publication of the first three parts of Van der Tuuk’s monumental Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch woordenboek, which were published around the turn of the century. He personally translated an old royal chronicle, the ‘Pararaton’, from Madjapahit. Even more important was his discovery of the lengthy epos ‘Nagarakertagama’, in which the court poet Prapantja sang the praises of the Madjapahit in 1365. This was found in the ‘Lombok treasure’ that came into Dutch hands when the Balinese palace on Lombok was assaulted in 1894. ‘A discovery of importance similar to that of a part of Tacitus’ lost works found while excavating a Batavian castellum!’ Fasseur (1995: 105) explained. Rather euphemistically: the excavation of a Batavian castellum is significantly more harmless than the Dutch assault that cost the lives of some two thousand Balinese men, women and children on Lombok in 1894 (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 262).
Brandes, who personally extracted the fragile manuscript written on palm leaves from the smoking ruins of the Balinese palace, suffered from a nervous breakdown according to his contemporary G.P. Rouffaer ‘due to all the ghastliness that he, the quietly-living intellectual, was forced to see and witness on Lombok’ (Vanvugt 1994: 46).

The discovery of the ‘Nagarakertagama’ among the loot was certainly extremely important to Java studies at the time. After Brandes’ early demise in 1905, the manuscript ended up in Leiden, were Kern took responsibility for its translation. He published the translation of the ‘Nagarakertagama’ in nine extensively annotated articles in *Bijdragen* between 1908 and 1914. Kern pointed out that the primary purpose of the epos was divine veneration of Hayam Wuruk, the most important Madjapahit ruler. ‘Compared to such divine worship, even the furthest extreme of Byzantinism is but child’s play’, according to Kern. About the author, Prapantja, Kern dryly commented: ‘The poet cloaked his metaphysical theories in such a cloud of profound wisdom that they require some explanation, which I shall attempt to provide in so far as I have understood the man’s intentions’ (*BKI* 1908: 397).

However, Kern also believed the poem contained much interesting historical data. In his view this included in particular the influence exercised by Majapahit outside of Java in the fourteenth century: a fact with current political meaning. For according to Kern, the authority of Majapahit covered ‘virtually the same parts of the Indonesian Archipelago as Dutch authority in the new age’. This induced the Javanese elite to believe ‘that the Dutch are the rightful heirs of the heathen Majapahit rulers’ (*BKI* 1908: 401–2). This was a bit of wishful thinking by Kern: in actuality the influence of Majapahit was rather limited outside of Java, and first the Javanese and then the Indonesian nationalists soon claimed the Majapahit myth in support of their own quest for independence (Klooster 1985: 30–44; Van Miert 1995: 92–129).

Nevertheless, thanks to Kern’s efforts as researcher and mentor, major progress was made in the factual knowledge of Java’s ancient history around 1900. His conception of that past, however, continued to be based on the assumption that Java had passively and unilaterally experienced the civilizing influence of Hinduism and Buddhism. Only the next generation, with Brandes as its first representative, was to discover the extent to which Hinduism and Buddhism had attuned in their turn to the long-existing Javanese culture.

However, Java’s recent past and present continued to bask in the limelight between 1870 and 1914. The debate about property ownership on Java
and the relevant positions of the sovereign and the tribal leaders that started in 1860 continued after the Cultivation System was ended in 1870. Initially, the liberal view that individual land ownership had originally dominated on Java appeared to be winning the debate. On behalf of the government and colonial administration, a large-scale study by three residents and some thirty inspectors had been performed from 1867 to 1869 of agricultural landownership relationships, in various parts of Java. The results were published under the editorial responsibility of the liberal civil servant W.B. Bergsma, KITLV member, in a voluminous Eindrésume, the three parts of which were published between 1876 and 1896. Like the team of researchers, he concluded that before the Cultivation System had been implemented, private land ownership was seen most often on Java. According to Boomgaard (1989a: 42), they failed to notice the long-time custom of communal property ownership in North and Central Java: ‘Either their wish to find none or the villagers’ cleverly used selective memory must have clouded the vision of the investigating officials’.

Liberal contemporaries like Veth and Pierson were naturally excited when the Eindrésume was published (Kuitenbrouwer 1981: 11–8). After some time, however, doubts grew as to the correctness of their universalistic belief in the salutary consequences of the liberal system. Javanese farmers proved to make little use of the possibility created in 1870 to convert communal property into privately owned property. The prominent British-Indian model of private land ownership applied in Bombay was strongly tainted by the famine that struck the region at the end of the nineteenth century. The sugar crisis of the 1880s under liberal administration also led to extreme poverty among the Javanese farming population. This ‘diminished prosperity’ around the turn of the century was an important cause of the new ‘ethical policy’. In the scientific field, the problems with the liberal system triggered a revival of orientalist views. For example: the young economist J.H. Boeke used the concept of a ‘dualistic economy’ with a dynamic western and a static eastern sector in his 1910 dissertation to debate Pierson’s universalistic liberal economy (Kuitenbrouwer 1981: 18–24).

For Java, L.W.C. van de Berg, the conservative Delft professor, made an important contribution to the revival of the orientalist paradigm. Highly influential was his voluminous article on native municipalities, ‘Het Inlandsche gemeentewezen op Java en Madoera’ that appeared in Bijdragen (1901: 1–140) and was published as a book by KITLV. There Van den Berg argued that the close village community and the relevant
communal property, originally introduced on Java from Hindu India, had
exercised a decisive influence on Java’s history, culture and economy.
Recognition of that determinant influence, according to Van den Berg,
was required ‘not only from a scientific but also from a state policy
perspective’.

The excellent outcome of the colonial system with reference to Java
and Madura, Van den Berg asserted:

has always been attributable to maintaining two major principles, namely:
leaving the population in so far as possible under the direct leadership of its
own […] leaders, and secondly governing not so much individuals but the
municipalities that, as ethical bodies, each keep a more or less significant
group of individuals together in a single alliance (BKI 1901: 1).

With all the reforms based on western models proposed around 1900, con-
cluded Van den Berg, this second central, authentically Javanese principle
of administration must be respected unconditionally.

Lastly, Javanese aristocrats also contributed to Javanism and Java stud-
ies within the framework of KITLV. Between 1870 and 1914, the number of
Indonesian – mostly Javanese – members of KITLV increased to twenty-
five. To an increasing degree, articles by Javanese authors were also pub-
lished in Bijdragen. The first, short article on the meaning of some Javanese
sayings, titled ‘Over de beteekenis van sommige Javaansche uitdrukkin-
gen’, was submitted by the regent of Kudus, R.M.A. Tjondronegoro (BKI
1878: 507–10). After some hesitation, Kern advised the board to publish the
article, ‘not for its intrinsic value, but as a sign of the times, as evidence of
the interest of a Javanese in studying his own language’ (KITLV 105, NB
14 December 1878). The substantial article by Raden Hoesein Djajadiningrat
on the Sultanate of Aceh was already discussed elsewhere.

Of the other articles by Javanese authors, particularly noteworthy is the
one on marriage among the Kodjas titled ‘Het huwelijk bij de Kodja’s’ (BKI
1899: 695–702). It was published under the name of R.M.A.A. Sosroningrat,
the regent of Jepara. It was written, however, by his twenty-year old,
western-oriented daughter, R.A. Kartini. As a result, not only was Kartini
the first Indonesian female author but she is still also the youngest
author to be published in Bijdragen. Her authorship was not completely
certain for a long time (Knaap 1994: 641). Her father submitted the arti-
cle to the KITLV board in his letter of 19 April 1899 as follows: ‘Together
with this letter I submitted to you a description of a Kodja marriage
ceremony, written by one of my daughters’ (KITLV 147, NB 17 June 1899).
The contents, about a marriage among eastern peoples arranged by
the family, also reflects Kartini’s own preoccupations as an emancipated daughter of a Javanese regent: ‘The parents are free to deal with their daughters, whom they give away to whomever they wish without exchanging even a single word about it with her’. Kartini brings us to the ‘ethical course’ that characterized both colonial politics and colonial science after 1900.

**The ‘Ethical Course’ in Colonial Politics and Science**

*Ethical Policy*

Former left-liberal lawyer in Semarang, C.Th. van Deventer, published his well-known article “Een eereschuld” (Debt of Honour) in *De Gids* in 1899. The article painted a dark picture of the “diminished prosperity” among the native population. In his view, the primary cause of this evil was the Netherlands’ politics of exploitation, under both conservative and liberal administration. Certainly after the Governments Accounts Act of 1867, the positive balance policy had become an indefensible injustice. The 187 million guilders that the Dutch treasury had received from the positive colonial balance after 1867 should therefore be returned to the impoverished Indies. The liberal Pierson administration rejected this...
demand for restitution, but the confessional Kuyper administration significantly conceded. ‘As a Christian power, the Netherlands must imbue the entire government policy with the understanding that we have a moral obligation to the population of these regions’, said the Queen at the opening of the parliamentary year in 1901. The Kuyper administration announced concrete financial support for the colonial administration, an investigation of the diminished prosperity and enhancement of the legal position of the native Christians. In parliament, not only the confessionals but also the liberals and socialists supported the government’s proposals. Van Deventer’s kindred spirit, former editor-in-chief of *De Locomotief* in Semarang, P. Brooshoof, assigned a name to the colonial reformation policy in a 1901 pamphlet: *De ethische koers in de koloniale politiek* (The ethical course of colonial politics) (Locher-Scholten 1981: 11–55; Janny de Jong 1989: 259–85; J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 337–63).

These ethical politics and the concepts of a debt of honour and a Christian obligation had not suddenly materialized. Anti-Revolutionary leader Kuyper had already stated in *Ons Program* in 1879 that: ‘The selfish tendency of our politics, of exploiting the colonies for state or private profit, should be replaced by a policy of moral obligation’. In the Indies, during the sugar crisis of the 1880s, Brooshoof and Van Deventer protested against the colonial administration’s cost cuts and tax increases. Before Van Deventer, socialists F. Domela Nieuwenhuis and Van Kol had already called for restitution of the ‘stolen millions’ (Janny de Jong 1989: 229–59).

Locher-Scholten (1981: 201) defined the ethical policy as follows in her dissertation: ‘Policy focusing on bringing the entire Indonesian archipelago under Dutch rule and on developing the country and population of this area towards self-administration under Dutch authority according to the western model’. Locher-Scholten (1981: 206) distinguishes between three phases of ethical policy: the Ethical Imperialism phase from 1894 to 1905, with emphasis on subjugation of the Outer Territories and on making preparations for the development policy; the blossoming phase of the development policy from 1905 to 1920, when emphasis was shifted back to Java, focusing on the triad of education, irrigation and emigration; and lastly the phase of conservative-ethical synthesis after 1920, when the radicalization of the nationalist movement and the economic crisis weakened the reformation effort.

During the blossoming phase of the ethical policy, between 1905 and 1920, an interesting intellectual debate was waged regarding the long-term objectives. Prominent KITLV members played an important part in this
debate, albeit that their discussions were again held more outside of than inside KITLV. Each of the different long-term objectives regarding the Indonesian population was supported by KITLV members. Those objectives were assimilation, as propagated by Van Deventer, association as advocated by Snouck Hurgronje, continuation – for the time being – of the dualism as urged by high-ranking civil servants such as S. de Graaff, and permanent racial subjugation as formulated by the medical anthropologist J.H.F. Kohlbrugge.

Assimilation – the objective of complete westernization – of first the Indonesian elite and then broad layers of the population, with complete equality in legal, administrative and political areas, was the most progressive objective. The assimilation objective was in keeping with the Dutch civilization offensive, the universalistic belief in progress and Kern’s linguistic nationalism of the preceding period. In the Netherlands, Van Deventer was the primary advocate of assimilation as KITLV board member since 1900 and liberal-democrat MP from 1905 until his death in 1915. His view of assimilation was based on complete faith in the superiority of western civilization. The Netherlands was the one country that had much to offer to the Indonesian population: its excellent education, successful agricultural methods, and Thorbecke’s superb constitution and municipal and provincial legislation.

‘When, after decades, after a century perhaps, a son of Insulinde studies the mentality of his country and discovers something of this wonderful harmony’, Van Deventer paternalistically philosophized in Parliament, ‘then perhaps he might say, and that would be our greatest reward: “see, this, too, we owe to the Netherlands”’ (Colenbrander and Stokvis 1916–17, I: 409). In that respect, Van Deventer welcomed the rise of the nationalist movement in Indonesia, but he believed that it would be quite some time before Indonesia could do without the guardianship of the Netherlands. In the short term, Van Deventer’s objective of assimilation differed little from the more moderate philosophy of association. For practical reasons, Van Deventer also believed that western reforms should begin with the Indonesian elite (Van Miert 1991: 9–10).

In the Indies, assimilation was advocated in particular by the impassioned Director of the Department of Education, Religious Matters and Industry, J.H. Abendanon, since 1900. Like Kern, Abendanon wanted to expand education in the Dutch language among the Indonesian elite. He was the person who stimulated Kartini’s western education. In turn inspired by Kartini’s emancipation philosophy, he also attempted to introduce schooling for girls on Java. Among the highest levels of the
administration, however, many opposed these reforms. Disappointed, Abendanon returned to the Netherlands in 1905, where he continued to be active in numerous national and international colonial organisations (Van Miert 1991). More so than the practical politician Van Deventer, the impassioned intellectual Abendanon maintained the objective of assimilation in principle, making him an outsider in Dutch organizations like the KITLV, the Indisch Genootschap and the Institut Colonial International (Janny de Jong 1996).

Snouck Hurgronje's successor as governmental advisor, Javanist G.A.J. Hazeu, who also served as Director of the Department of Education, Religious Matters and Industry for a number of years, exercised a more balanced and effective influence on the ethical education policy than Abendanon. In part based on his recommendations, education for Indonesians was strongly expanded on every level. Elementary education was primarily given in Malay or the local dialect; secondary and higher vocational education was primarily in Dutch. The association policy of Hazeu, KITLV commissioner in Batavia, will be discussed in more detail in the next Chapter. In the Netherlands, this policy of association was strongly supported by Hazeu's predecessor and mentor as governmental advisor, Snouck Hurgronje.

In theory, association was a more selective westernisation objective than assimilation. According to Snouck, western education should be expanded in particular among the Javanese elite, the old and new priyayi. This group itself was adamantly advocating increased education. As already indicated above, in practice this view did not differ significantly from the objective of assimilation. Snouck, however, showed more respect for the Islam than confessional Ethicists like Idenburg and for the law of adat than liberal Ethicists like Van Deventer, who advocated general implementation of western law. Snouck wanted to gradually reform the administrative dualism under which the indigenous administration was separate from and subordinate to Dutch administration. In time, the administrative apparatus would be more integrated, with Dutch and Indonesian administrators holding the same positions – including on the highest level – based on equal schooling and performance. Representative bodies on the local and central levels would ultimately control the administration. In the short term, Snouck advocated the ‘emancipation’ of the Javanese civilian corps by assigning greater authority on the local level (Van den Doel 1994: 270–81).

In his collection of lectures on the Netherlands and the Islam for the Indology programme in Leiden, Snouck Hurgronje (1911: 83) asserted that,
in part because of the growing Pan-Islamism, the Netherlands and the Indies stood at a crossroads.

The only true solution to that problem lies in the association of Mohammedan subjects of the state of the Netherlands with the Netherlands. If this is successful, there will no longer be an Islam issue; there will be enough unity of culture among the subjects of the Queen of the Netherlands along the coast of the North Sea and those of Insulinde to alleviate any political and social differences in religious beliefs. If this does not succeed, the unavoidable increasing intellectual development of the Indonesians will necessarily drive them further and further from us, for not we but others would take charge.

The Javanese civilian corps actually was assigned greater authority on the regional level, but the dualistic division between Dutch and Javanese administration remained. This continuation was especially advocated by the Director of the Interior Administration in Batavia and future Minister for the Colonies, S. de Graaff, who was also a KITLV member. The Anti-Revolutionary Minister for the Colonies, J.H. de Waal Malefijt, assigned responsibility for making preparations for administrative reforms to De Graaff. His legislative proposal, however, went not far enough for liberal thinkers like Snouck. ‘The entire tone of this Memorial appears to be designed to reassure those who may fear hastiness. On every page, gradually and all of its synonyms can be found with a nearly ridiculous frequency’, Snouck concluded (Brouwer 1958: 53). As Anti-Revolutionary governor, Idenburg also advocated more extensive reforms. ‘May I be so bold as to modestly draw your attention to the fact that De Graaff is extremely conservative and actually does not believe in the deepest of his heart that anything can be made of the native’, he wrote to De Waal Malefijt, recommending that he place more store in recommendations made by Snouck, ‘who certainly understands more of the soul of the native than De Graaff’ (Brouwer 1958: 53–4).

As minister and governor, however, Idenburg was also hesitant to address the administrative dualism. Many conservative advocates of continued dualism like De Graaff were true orientalists as defined by Said. Even Idenburg continued to preach orientalist views alongside his ethics inspired by Christian universalisms. For example, of the Dutch-Indonesian relationship he wrote:

The West aspires towards a higher, material culture, towards perfect technology, towards greater material prosperity; the East seeks spiritual depth in particular. The West is characterized by logic; the East lives by concentrated contemplation. The West is active, with a strong desire to proceed, thirsty
for power and money as a result; the East is passive, seeking spiritual freedom, free of material ties and worldly discomforts. (Brouwer 1958: 163.)

Idenburg’s orientalism was extraordinarily mild, however, in comparison to the racist view advocated by KITLV member Kohlbrugge. Kohlbrugge worked in the Indies as a physician and was appointed extraordinary professor of medicine in Utrecht. He published *Bläkken in het zieleleven van den Javaan en zijner overheerschers* (Glimpses of the spiritual life of the Javanese and its rulers) in 1907, describing the minds of the Javanese and their rulers, in which he asserted that the aptitude of the Javanese, formed by the tropical climate, made them completely unsuitable for western civilization. “I therefore believe it is foolish’, he continued, ‘to expect that we could ever make the native understand our concepts of honesty, diligence, obligation, philanthropy, community spirit, and the like’. Kohlbrugge believed that the ethical course was already doomed to fail: ‘We cannot make the West the East nor the warm East the cold West’. As a physician, he had discovered all kinds of neurological degeneration symptoms among western-schooled Javanese, including insomnia, listlessness, and ‘fluctuating pains in the groin or other parts of the body’. What was more: such western-schooled natives could pose a political threat by inciting the ‘mindless masses’ to rise up against Dutch authority (Van den Doel 1994: 277–28; Gouda 1995: 145–54).

In the Nederlandsche Anthropologische Vereeniging, Kohlbrugge was considered a prominent member (De Wolf 1999: 7–8, 14–5). Like in the previous period, however, this type of orientalism, bordering on racism, was an exception within KITLV. Snouck Hurgronje (1908: 441) was highly critical of Kohlbrugge’s book in his review in the *Gids*: ‘No, a series of platitudes randomly selected from books as demonstrated by Dr. Kohlbrugge in these four essays cannot “teach us to resolve many issues over which the parties are bitterly fighting”. It is worth the effort to prove this’, said Snouck ‘because the undoubtedly truly heartfelt, convincing tone with which the author presents his daft, amateur impressions as scientific assertions could impress the ignorant.’

*Ethical Leiden*

Brooshoof, Van Deventer, Snouck Hurgronje, Abedanon, Hazeu and Van Vollenhoven: all of these influential early twentieth-century Ethicists studied in Leiden. According to Otterspeer, their period of studies in liberal Leiden was a nurturing breeding ground for their later ethical views. Characteristic, in Otterspeer’s (1989b: 207) view, was the influence the
humanistic French philologist and philosopher Ernest Renan was to exert
on Snouck and Van Vollenhoven. Renan's oration on the two-hundredth
anniversary of Spinoza's death, held in The Hague in 1877, made quite an
impression on many Leiden professors and students. Snouck Hurgronje
(1911: 101), for example, concluded his plea for association between the
Christian Netherlands and Islamic Indonesia with Renan's definition of a
nation, which had made a lasting impression on him as a student: ‘le désir
d'être ensemble'.

Illustration 14. C. van Vollenhoven, voice of the law of adat, professor in Leiden
and KITLV President.
In their turn as professors in Leiden, Snouck Hurgronje and Van Vollenhoven would impress upon their students of Indology – *Indologie*, a term now in common use for the programme for colonial civil servants – their view of ethical obligation. Theirs was a monopoly position after the competing civil servant programme in Delft was disbanded in 1901. Moreover, the Leiden Indology programme received recognition as an academic study in 1922, an improvement in status for which Snouck and Van Vollenhoven had fought hard. Within KITLV, the liberal Leiden element had been dominant for much longer, as was often made clear above.

The triumph of ethical Leiden – historically the academic centre of orientalism in the Netherlands – was by no means a matter of course, however. Originally, the more conservative programme in Delft based on knowledge of facts had been much more successful. Fasseur (1993) described in detail the unpredictable and complicated road to Leiden’s victory and Delft’s demise. In addition to political differences and differing content, the competition between Leiden and Delft was also affected by the number of students, regulations for civil servant certification, and the colonial administration’s need for civil servants.

Since the 1864 legislation, three programmes existed for certification as civil servant: the state programme in Leiden, the municipal programme in Delft, and – to satisfy the Indies Dutch and Indo-Europeans – the Beta department of the Willem III Gymnasium in Batavia. Of these three programmes, Delft attracted the most students based on its practical and factual approach. Furthermore, the percentage of students to obtain certification was higher among the Delft students, in part because its Director, J. Spanjaard, was also secretary of the certification committee. He appointed primarily Delft lecturers and civil servants from Delft to the examining committee; in 1878 Kern was even the only Leiden member of the committee. The examination for the four mandatory subjects, the history, geography and anthropology of the Indies, its state organisation, and Javanese or Malay, and elective subjects like bookkeeping, was much more attuned to the practical Delft programme than to the academic programme offered by Leiden. The results from the certification examination were also decisive for the order of eligibility as civil servant to the colonial administration, which often needed far fewer civil servants than the number certified. As a result, Delft supplied 292 certified civil servants between 1864 and 1877, as compared to 169 for Leiden (Fasseur 1993: 211–36).

The academic state programme in Leiden functioned so poorly that the government disbanded it in 1877. Following suit with Delft, the Leiden municipal council decided to continue the programme as a municipal
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institution, but its doors also closed in 1891 due to a diminishing number of students and their low success rate. Although Leiden continued to provide access to the colonial administration for law and liberal arts graduates, Delft was claiming victory. Prematurely: due to the administration's diminishing need for civil servants as a result of the cuts in response to the sugar crisis, only a few of those who successfully completed the Delft programme were actually employed. Because the government subsidy decreased with the diminishing number of students, the Delft municipal council decided to disband the programme in 1901. The state programme for civil servants was moved back to Leiden. Thus it was not Delft but Leiden that profited from the strong expansion of the administrative apparatus during the period of ethical policy. This had been preceded by lengthy Leiden lobbying with the government and the colonial administration. As advisor to the government, Snouck Hurgronje played an important part (Fasseur 1992: 308–40).

In a detailed memorandum to the Governor General, Snouck explained his objections to the Delft programme and the contours of a new state programme in Leiden in 1898 (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, I: 439–512). In his view, the Delft programme had brought forth only 'superficial polyglots' who lacked any education in 'mature independence', while the latter property was so essential to civil servants. 'This institution has always limited itself to training for civil servant certification in the narrowest sense of the word, and is entirely tailored to suit the poorly educated students that the current examination programme calls for, in keeping with the mechanical, narrow-minded requirements that this programme places on candidates', was Snouck's merciless conclusion. With a few changes, such as making the Malay language mandatory, in part with a view to the Outer Territories, the examination subjects could be continued, but they needed to be taught and examined entirely differently.

In order to bring forth better civil servants who could work independently, the Delft programme required extensive change, and Snouck believed that the current teaching force was incapable of such change. Naturally, the alternative was Leiden University, where most of the relevant subjects were already taught at a high level. 'Now I believe that not a single expert taking only professional motives into account would hesitate to vote in favour of the programme at Leiden University, whose teaching force would require only minor additions', was Snouck's closing argument.

And so it was to be. In its advice to the liberal Pierson government, a state committee chaired by the liberal sinologist Groeneveldt said the
programme should be moved back to Leiden. The confessional Kuyper cabinet approved the recommendations but demanded that the programme be formally separate from the Leiden University, keeping the door open to new programmes outside of Leiden. Snouck Hurgronje was not yet satisfied, however. In 1903 he also recommended that the programme for colonial civil servants in Batavia be discontinued due to the poor quality of the candidates it produced (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, 1: 471–94).

Explaining, Snouck said it was certainly not his intention to exclude Indo-Europeans and Indonesians from the colonial administration. Requiring them to follow a programme in the Netherlands would help to increase their quality. In that respect, Snouck was consistent: in Batavia he took in Indonesian students to give them a western upbringing, and in Leiden he gave Indonesian students like Hoesein Djajadiningrat extra encouragement. He also worked fervently but unsuccessfully to get Indonesian civil servants accepted into the domestic administration. The government disbanded the programme at the Willem III Gymnasium in Batavia in 1911. Now Leiden bore sole responsibility for training civil servants for the Indies.

Ethical Imperialism

On the eve of the First World War, Van Vollenhoven (1913), professor of adat law and anthropological expert in Leiden, published a curious pamphlet on the unity of the country, De eendracht van het land. His discourse explained that with the strong political division between left and right, the Netherlands needed a common cause. According to Van Vollenhoven, that cause could be found in the international field. Since the Netherlands had hosted the first and second Peace Conference, in 1899 and 1907, the issues of world order and disarmament had gained urgency. The Netherlands should now initiate a third peace conference and suggest that an international armed force should guarantee international justice and world peace. No country in the world was better equipped to assume that worthy task that the small, neutral and selfless country of the Netherlands. ‘If now, in this day, the circles of the influential and powerful foreign bodies [...] smirk apathetically and unconvincing at this chaste and royal objective of global justice shored by a global armed force’, Van Vollenhoven (1913: 28) asserted, ‘let the Netherlands then dare to be the Joan of Arc’.

Utrecht historian Boogman (1978b: 28) typified Van Vollenhoven’s internationalist sense as ‘a pronounced expression of ethical imperialism’.
This typification is a bit too strong for Van Vollenhoven's idealistic internationalism. What is more, De Louter, professor of law in Utrecht, had explained the Netherlands' international cause in scarcely less impassioned terms: 'the task of a small state' (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 322). Ethical imperialism is, however, a fitting term for Van Vollenhoven's colonial views. According to him, the pacification of the Outer Territories clearly proved that the Netherlands was well-equipped for an international military task.

The end of the narrow-minded policy of restraint had been the Lombok Expedition in 1894, the work of Governor General Van der Wijck, 'who, after a treacherous attack, calmly but determinedly said: subjugate'. It then became evident how quickly the colonial administration, once it gained free reign, 'encouraged an island from years of mismanagement and destruction into wonderful prosperity'. ‘Then’, an inspired Van Vollenhoven continued, ‘after that hard and benevolent hand on Lombok, the iron fist (1896) in Aceh’. ‘Finally’, he summarized this glorious run of Dutch success, ‘the Lombok and new Aceh policy were continued on the rest of Sumatra, on Borneo, Celebes, Ceram, Timor, Bali’. ‘So that’, Van Vollenhoven (1913: 54–5) concluded, ‘when Van Heutz returned his mandate as Governor General into the Queen's hands, he handed over an Indies that [...] had been combined for the first time into a single, significant Indies empire'.

Cornelis van Vollenhoven (1874–1933) was born in Dordrecht as the son of the president of the district court. His mother died when he was only three. After completing his schooling at the local gymnasium, where his studies included the Bible and Renan's work, he went on to study both law and eastern languages in Leiden. In 1898 his political sciences thesis on the outline and content of international law, as well as the defence of a set of jurisprudence assertions, earned him PhDs in both fields, both cum laude. In the meantime, the doctoral student already worked as private secretary to J.T. Cremer, Director of the Deli Maatschappij, commissioner with numerous other colonial businesses, and a popular liberal Member of Parliament for Amsterdam. When Cremer was appointed as Minister for the Colonies in 1897, Van Vollenhoven continued to work as his secretary with the departmental rank of deputy officer. As minister, Cremer worked in close cooperation with Governor General Van der Wijck in the subjugation of Aceh and the economic liberation of the Outer Territories.

Van Vollenhoven was appointed professor in Leiden in 1901, with responsibility for teaching adat law of the Indies and colonial civil and administrative law. He continued in this position until his death in 1933,
beside which he was also active in international law. *Adat* law, however, enjoyed his primary interest. As publicist he impassionedly defended it against attempts to unify Indonesian law in the western sense, even when proposed by kindred liberal spirits including Van Deventer and De Louter. Close cooperation developed in Leiden between Van Vollenhoven and his elder Snouck Hurgronje, in both academic and political areas, with Van Vollenhoven recognizing Snouck as his intellectual superior. ‘He makes you feel rather worthless’, he openly said about the first time they met (Fasseur 1993: 389). Van Vollenhoven joined the KITLV board as member in 1902, acting as Vice President from 1909 on and serving as President in the periods from 1920 to 1921 and 1925 to 1926.

He personally visited the Indies in 1907. He became even more passionate about the country and its people, *adat* law and Leiden, as illustrated by the following excerpt from his journal:

> gorgeous weather, blue sky, small white clouds, nothing to disturb the harmony, […] a few good books (*adat*). Here I feel as if I am far from Europe but close to Leiden; Leiden has such a stronger relationship with the Indies than the people in Utrecht want to believe. These four days in the Indies make everything else fade […]. Egypt has become so bland and western. (De Beaufort 1954: 78.)

Van Vollenhoven’s impassioned work with *adat* law was initially of a rather orientalist nature; more so than that of the older, more sceptical Snouck Hurgronje who had spent much time in the Indies. Van Vollenhoven’s biographer, Henriëtte de Beaufort (1954: 60–1), in the decolonization period, termed his recognition of the unique character of the East as a positive merit.

His understanding, supported by his academic studies, reinforced the conviction that eastern peoples, including those of the Indies, cannot and may not be Europeanized. In his writing, his words and his teachings, he shows that they can reach for the fruits of our western civilization, but that the origin of their civilization is entirely different and that its growth will progress along different lines.

Van Vollenhoven’s orientalist interpretation of *adat* law, which generated much opposition among both Dutch businessmen and Indonesian nationalists, will be discussed in the following Chapter. As he grew older, Van Vollenhoven’s orientalism grew increasingly less distinguishable from cultural relativism: earnest belief in the equality of East and West. When he was younger, however, during his involvement with ‘ethical imperialism’, Van Vollenhoven’s orientalism was still related to his universalistic
belief in a western mission of civilization. In his 1909 collection *Miskenningen van het adatrecht*, on adat law misunderstandings, he concluded with the comment: ‘Our objective in this is not adat expertise in itself and even less obstructing Indonesia’s development to oblige pampered adat curiosa’ (Van Ossenbruggen 1976: 97).

Around the turn of the twentieth century, ethical imperialism was not a matter solely for professors in Leiden like Snouck Hurgronje, Van Vollenhoven and Nieuwenhuis. Liberal politicians, KITLV Secretary Kielstra and confessional politicians, including Idenburg, also professed it. As Anti-Revolutionary member of parliament, Idenburg, a former colonial officer, said when his kindred spirit Kuyper took office that, considering the ‘atrocities’ in the (semi-)sovereign parts of the Outer Territories: ‘Rather than imputing imperialist aims to our government, I would be inclined to criticize it for being too reluctant, worried about possibly appearing to be an evil imperialist, to interfere in the affairs of those territories which have not yet come directly under our rule’. As minister, in defence of the subjugation against socialist critics, he said that a Christian government justifiably brandished the power of the sword: ‘The government using the power of the sword can therefore be the highest requirement for love of man’, said Idenburg (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 324). Dutch imperialism, however, was not driven solely by ethical motives. The fact that economic factors also played a part was evident, including in the composition of the board and the membership of the KITLV around 1900.

The Rise and Growth of the KITLV

*An Increasing Number of Members and Contributors*

In 1870, KITLV had 278 members, including 9 donors. Of these, 126 lived in the Netherlands, 118 in the East Indies and 25 in the West Indian colonies; another 9 were foreign members. The contributors were Prince Hendrik and Prince Frederik, former Governors Generals Rochussen and A.J. Duymaer van Twist, former high-ranking colonial administrators J.C. Reynst and C. Visscher, the Nederlandsche Handelmaatschappij (NHM), and business owners H.J. van Buren and A.E. Dudok van Heel. KITLV traded publications with thirty domestic, colonial and foreign institutions. The number of members then continually grew: to 348 in 1880, 580 in 1890, and 644 in 1900. The highest level of membership achieved in the colonial period was reached in 1910, with 725 KITLV members. Their numbers included 64 member-donors, with another
11 member-institutions. Of all these members in 1910, 428 lived in the Netherlands, 260 in the East Indies, and only 2 in the Western colonies, while 35 were foreign members. The number of institutions with which KITLV exchanged publications had now grown to 159.

Compared to 1870, the growth in the number of donors and member-institutions is striking. These included not only more private individuals, including former Governors General Van der Wijck and W. Roosenboom and former ministers Cremer and Idenburg, but also large colonial enterprises: in addition to the NHM, also, for instance the Deli Maatschappij, Koninklijke Olie and the KPM. The member-institutions also included colonial businesses.

All five of the different categories of members seen at the time of the establishment of KITLV in 1851 – academic intellectuals, (former) civil servants, missionaries, business owners and foreign members – were still amply represented within KITLV in both 1870 and 1910. Women were also admitted as members starting in 1911. Initially, these were widows continuing the memberships of their deceased spouses, like Mrs. C.R. Pierson-Waller and Mrs. E.M.L. van Deventer-Maas (De Boer-Pino 1993: 13). Their number was too small as yet to warrant a separate category. This does not hold true, however, for the Indonesian members, whose number grew between 1870 and 1910 from 5 to 18, and for the growing number of Dutch politicians who were KITLV members.

In 1870 these politicians were primarily liberal: influential cabinet members or Members of Parliament including Frans van de Putte, Loudon, Cremer, Gevers Deynoot and Parliamentary chairman W.H. Dullert. In 1912 prominent liberals like Cremers, Van Deventer, IJzerman and W.H. de Beaufort were joined by the Anti-Revolutionaries Idenburg and Colijn, the socialist Van Kol and the enlightened Catholic V.E.L. de Stuers. KITLV remained mainly liberal, but was not doctrinaire in awarding membership. Of primary importance was interest in the Indies. In comparison to 1870, however, the increase in the number of businessmen in the 1910 membership is the most striking. Not only the member-donors but also the regular members included many business owners and businessmen. This impression is confirmed by the quantitative study of the situation around 1900 performed by Bossenbroek.

Bossenbroek (1996: 257–8) noted that, as a purely academic institution, KITLV had more businessmen among its members around 1900 than the Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap (KNAG), which included stimulating trade and industry as one of the objects of its establishment. Of the approximately thirteen hundred individuals in the
Netherlands who held a position on the board of an Indonesian business, 91 were members of KITLV in 1900 and 52 members of KNAG, even though KNAG had more Dutch members (475) than KITLV (352). Of the 31 leading businessmen holding the most board positions or positions as commissioner of colonial businesses, 13 were members of KITLV and 9 were members of KNAG. Using a noble title, academic degree or board membership in the business sector as indicators, according to Bossenbroek’s calculations 63 percent of Dutch KITLV members belonged to the social elite, as compared to 39 percent of KNAG. KITLV also had a larger concentration of members in the province of South Holland, which includes The Hague, Leiden and Delft, than KNAG: 65 as compared to 36 percent. These figures pertain to the Dutch members of KITLV. The Indies members around the turn of the century also included many with noble titles or academic degrees and numerous business owners, along with civil servants and missionaries with lesser distinctions.

The composition of the KITLV boards between 1870 and 1910 paints a similar picture. On the one hand there was continuity thanks to the continued dominance of Leiden intellectuals and prominent liberals. On the other hand, there was also change, coming through the appointment of board members who had close ties with the business community. This holds true in particular for Secretary Kielstra and for IJzerman, who successively became board member, treasurer and President of KITLV. Both represented the typical combination of positions among the ‘regent-capitalists’ who dominated the colonial business sector in about 1900: business owner, politician and patron (Kuitenbrouwer and Schijf 1998).

The continuity was also evident in the Institute’s Charter, which underwent minor changes in 1878, 1887, 1892, 1906 and 1913 but left the authority of the twelve board members virtually unchanged. In 1878, for example, the four departments established in 1864 were abolished. In actual practice, the departments had not been functioning for quite some time. In 1906 the position of deputy secretary was officially included in the Charter, but the person holding this position had no voting rights. Since 1898, however, G.P. Rouffaer had already been influential while holding that position (Scholtes 1979: v–vi).

The successive Presidents of KITLV between 1870 and 1914 were Gevers Deynoot (1870–1872, 1875–1878), Bleeker (1872–1875), Kern (1882–1886, 1887–1891, 1895–1896, 1899–1901, 1903–1906, 1907–1911) and Snouck Hurgronje (1911–1915). Presidents not yet mentioned elsewhere were the former prosecutor general in Batavia W. van Rappard (1878–1882, 1886–1887), former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Indies T.H. der
Kinderen (1891–1895, 1896–1899), former Governor General Pijnacker Hordijk (1901–1903) and the influential, liberal Council of State member J.E. Henny (1906–1907). All of these Presidents were political liberals, albeit not always politically active. Thus in terms of the composition of its board, as well, KITLV was not doctrinaire. As already indicated above, long-time Secretary Wijnmalen (1872–1894) was an Anti-Revolutionary, and conservative former Minister for the Colonies W. van Golstein was Vice President in the 1880s.

How, finally, can the striking growth of KITLV in terms of members and donors be explained? Bossenbroek (1996) already supplied a general answer in his fittingly titled book *Holland op zijn breedst* – Holland at its broadest, analogous to De Stuers’s well-known complaint *Holland op zijn smalst* or Holland at its narrowest. A revival of nationalism was seen around the turn of the twentieth century not only with reference to the fighting in the Indies and South Africa, but also in the academic and cultural fields (Bank 1990). ‘Things in which a small nation can be great’, is how Queen Emma and Queen Wilhelmina formulated this peaceful nationalistic objective (Kuitenbrouwer 1991: 367). In concrete terms, expansion was seen between 1870 and 1914 in three areas of growth vital to the KITLV: the academic, colonial and economic fields.

Baggen (1998: 127–49) pointed out that university science experienced stormy growth in the period from 1890 and 1930, which manifested itself in terms of both quantity and quality. The number of students increased from 2579 in 1890 (4.3% of the age category from 18 to 25) to 9465 in 1930 (8.4% of that age category). In qualitative terms, Baggen discusses the rise of purely scientific research alongside result-oriented research, which had strongly increased at an earlier stage. Baggen identifies three developments in that respect: the growth of the number of professorships, from 164 to 294 in 1930, with the strongest growth among the alpha faculties; the increase in university, laboratory-oriented research that brought spectacular results in the beta faculties, including Nobel Prizes; and the increasing scientific specialization, including Indology, in accordance with the new Academic Statute of 1921. Undoubtedly, KITLV benefited from this general growth and increased status. Presidents including Kern, Snouck Hurgronje and Van Vollenhoven were revered in their fields, both at home and abroad.

The second factor behind the growth of KITLV was the increasing importance to the Netherlands of Indonesia, irrespective of whether this development is conceptualized as imperialism, colonial state formation, or expansion into the Outer Territories. In the practice of linguistics,
geography and anthropology, new fields of study were opened for both result-oriented and purely scientific research. Relevant aspects of this Dutch imperialism, in which prominent KITLV members including Snouck Hurgronje, Van den Berg and Kielstra were closely involved, were already discussed in the first section of this Chapter. The same applies to the third growth factor: the economic. In both the Netherlands and Indonesia, strong economic expansion was seen between 1870 and 1914. On the one hand this triggered interest from the business sector in the linguistics, geography and anthropology of the new profit frontiers; on the other hand profits were so high around 1900 that the businesses could easily afford to act as munificent patrons. They were rewarded with prestige, certainly when it came to KITLV, which had grown to become the most authoritative and distinguished of the colonial societies. The Institute also profited directly from this economic growth through its own investments in shares and bonds.

Did all of these businessmen, politicians and other non-specialized members and donors actually read their free copies of *Bijdragen* and *Werken*? Publisher Martinus Nijhoff, with whom KITLV had maintained generally excellent relations since 1867, complained that they did not. Repeatedly he pointed out to the board the fact that copies of the *Werken*, especially the linguistic publications, could be purchased for ‘next to nothing’ at auctions and antiquarian bookshops. According to Nijhoff, this detrimentally affected the publishing house’s own sales, and also damaged the reputation of the Institute.

It was for this reason, he argued, that the *Werken* should no longer be supplied to members free of charge. ‘Of the number of works distributed in this manner’, Nijhoff wrote to the board in 1884, ‘it is my estimation that certainly 4/5 end up with individuals who leave them unread, and of the eastern texts, 9/10 with individuals who are not interested. As a result, these individuals utilize every opportunity to get rid of them.’ (KITLV 117, NB 20 December 1884.) The board insisted on the free distribution to members and donors. The Department of the Colonies was subsidizing the publications anyway. Thus about a century ago, many intellectuals were already writing books merely for antiquarian bookshops. But many students will have profited from that fact, even then.

**Funding, Housing and Library**

With the growing number of members and donors, KITLV’s financial position, which was already healthy at its establishment, continued to
improve. From the very beginning, KITLV prudently invested its budget surplus in shares and bonds. The 1870 budget, for example, showed $6727 revenue against $6513 expenditures, with a positive balance of $214 (KITLV 326). Important expenditures that year were the costs of printing *Bijdragen* and *Werken* after deducting subsidies from the Ministry for the Colonies ($2200), the remuneration of the authors ($600) and the cost of renting the building at Drie Hoekjes 4 in The Hague ($475). Important sources of income were membership fees ($1296), donations ($280) and the cash surplus from the year before ($794). From selling shares, however, KITLV received no less than $2323, while new shares were purchased to the amount of $618 (KITLV 326). Slowly but surely KITLV built up capital that opened the possibility of improving the housing of the Institute, its library and that of Indisch Genootschap. In 1826, on the occasion of KITLV’s 25th year, the board decided to buy a more spacious building. Secretary Wijnmalen announced the decision as follows in his commemorative speech during the extraordinary membership meeting of 19 June 1876:

‘Our attention has been repeatedly drawn to the fact that the Institute needs a more suitable space than it currently has, not only in terms of prestige but also because its collections require more space. [...] Relocation, a change from the existing situation is imperative. [...] Well then, let us devote our noblest strengths to that effort upon this silver anniversary!’ *(BKI 1876: 51–2.)* A special donation fund was established for the purchase of a building. Prince Frederik contributed one thousand guilders, President Gevers Deynoot, former Governor General Duymaer van Twist and former Minister Fransen van de Putte each donated five hundred guilders, and a large number of members added twenty-five to two hundred and fifty guilders. The Minister for the Colonies, however, denied a request for a financial contribution (KITLV 103, NB 27 December 1876). The board committee responsible for purchasing a new building took its time. A variety of buildings in The Hague were considered, but, the committee reported: ‘One was too irregular, with not a single large room, and was damp and too far from the city centre; another was already leased until 1879; the owner of the third building decided not to sell; a fourth, which was to be sold at a public auction, would probably have cost $6000 more than the committee felt could be spent, and a fifth building offered sufficient space but the price, which was not exorbitant, was beyond our means’ (KITLV 104, NB 29 September 1877). The committee eventually found a suitable building that was centrally located: Heerengracht 21. The bidding commenced, during which the committee members proved to be skilled negotiators.
The owner’s opening offer, £28,000, was rejected by the committee. When they offered £20,000, the owner reduced his price to £24,000. In the end, the owner accepted the committee’s suggestion that they split the difference. For £22,000 KITLV became the proud owner of its own building. Of the purchase price, a large share – £14,000 – was financed with a mortgage that KITLV repaid amply within the agreed period of fifteen years. The remaining sum of £8,000 and the additional costs were financed by KITLV from its own resources (KITLV 104, NB 29 September 1877).

But the Institute continued to grow, in terms of membership numbers, capital and the size of its library. Based on the growing library, the board decided to move to a more spacious building in 1902. This proved to be a profitable transaction. The building at Heerengracht 21 was sold for £37,500, and Van Galenstraat 14, where Maatschappij tot Nut van ‘t Algemeen (Society for the General Good) had a school, was purchased for only £30,000. The building needed renovations, however, meaning that KITLV eventually broke even. Now the Institute could concentrate every effort towards expanding the library (KITLV 154, NB 18 October, 29 October and 15 November 1902).

The KITLV budget for 1912, a record year in terms of the number of members, shows how strongly its financial resources had grown since 1870. Both revenues and expenditures totalled £42,654 (KITLV 365). That was six to seven times the revenue and expenditures for 1870, with scarcely any inflation in the intermittent period. Since its establishment, the fee for KITLV membership and the minimum contribution for donors had also remained unchanged: twelve and twenty-five guilder per year.

However, the option of becoming donor by means of a one-time contribution of at least one thousand guilders had been created. Both businesses and private individuals utilized this option, including board members Snouck Hurgronje, Kielstra and IJzerman, and the widow Pierson-Waller. As largest source of income in 1912, donations for the library (£24,575) exceeded the regular fees and contributions (£8,185). The largest donations for the library also came from the business sector, but there were also many gifts of books and bequests. The largest expenditure in 1912 was an exceptionally high amount for the purchase of shares (£25,510), followed by the publication of *Bijdragen* and *Werken* (£4,248) and acquisitions for the library (£1,960), and still a balance of cash at hand was left of £6,719.

The total share portfolio, safely kept with the Nederlandsche Bank and nicely distributed over Dutch, colonial and foreign funds, totalled no less than £47,896 in 1912. The value of the KITLV building was estimated at
f 36,000; the value of the library, including the ample book fund, at f70,000.
Clearly KITLV had benefited from its recruitment of Kielstra as Secretary
and IJzerman as board member: both had an established reputation in the
colonial business sector. Even more important, however, may have been
the appointment of the versatile autodidact Rouffaer as Deputy Secretary
in 1898, who was assigned special responsibility for the library.

Under his enthusiastic direction, KITLV’s library that was formally
modest but combined in actual practice with that of the Indisch
Genootschap grew to become the Institute’s most important element.
Through exchange agreements with other publishing institutions both at
home and abroad, an extensive network of donors and an active acquisi-
tion policy, the library had experienced enormous growth. According to
the Catalogus der Koloniale Bibliotheek van het Koninklijk Instituut voor
de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië en het Indisch
Genootschap, the first voluminous – 1053 pages – part of which was pub-
lished in 1908 by Rouffaer and his colleague W.C. Muller, the combined
library already contained some fourteen thousand books and about four
hundred periodicals (Jaquet 1993: 15).

Illustration 16. G.P. Rouffaer (right), KITLV’s ‘driving force’ around 1900, at the
Hotel des Indes in Batavia.
Rouffaer as Driving Force

Rouffaer’s many achievements on behalf of KITLV were recognized during his lifetime, evidenced by his appointment as honorary member in 1911. After his death in 1928, he was to be honoured as an icon of the Institute’s history on numerous occasions. On the event of his death, the archaeologist and future KITLV President N.J. Krom wrote an extensive and personal obituary in *Bijdragen* (1928: 163–299). After describing Rouffaer’s huge importance to the growth of the library, Krom said: ‘In many other ways, as well, without ever playing a prominent role in the Institute [...] he was often its driving force during this period’ (*BKI* 1928: 228). On what would have been Rouffaer’s one-hundredth birthday, historian H.J. de Graaf (*BKI* 1960: 406) wrote: ‘His encouragements, even more than the selfless example he set, were inspiring. He mobilized the deceased and living forces of the Royal Institute, whose reputation he spread to beyond the borders of our country.’ Lastly, Dorothée Buur (1990: 9) commented in the introduction to her inventory of KITLV’s Rouffaer collection: ‘Rouffaer’s spirit is still alive at the KITLV because many items in the archives still bear notes he wrote. Even in atlases and books, next to photographs and maps, the margins contain his notes, immediately recognizable by his handwriting and the fine type of crown pen he used.’

Gerret Pieter Rouffaer (1860–1928) was born in Kampen. His father was a captain in the merchant shipping industry, later wine salesman and stock broker; his mother came from a well-known family in Kampen. After completing his secondary education in Kampen, he studied mining engineering in Delft. There he was impressed by the radical Multatuli veneration and the freethinker movement that were gaining popularity in Delft, and did not complete his studies. Art came to interest him more than technology. When Rouffaer travelled to Italy to study its art treasures in 1879, it was a revelation to him. ‘I cannot describe how much I am enjoying this”, he wrote to a friend from Paestum. ‘I have travelled through all of Italy and seen much beauty, and yet I can guarantee you that these Greek temples are the highlight of all that I have enjoyed. [...] How often have I not thought: Oh, had I but lived in that glorious era!’ (*BKI* 1928: 171.)

Rouffaer started studying art history and made another trip, in part as correspondent for the *Kamper Courant*, to Italy and other parts of Europe. He went to the Indies in 1885, probably based on his interest in Multatuli’s work. He had only a small amount of capital, but lived frugally. This turned into a five-year study tour through Java, Bali and other islands, during which he saw much, read much and had many conversations with both
Dutch and Indonesian individuals. He recorded it all in his extensive ‘Indies notes’, which later served as the basis for his many publications. When Rouffaer returned to the Netherlands, he started writing a book about Multatuli but did not finish it. According to Nieuwenhuyse (1967: 207–25), he increasingly came to understand that Douwes Dekker had acted as a Europe-centred colonial in Lebak, understanding nothing of the local adat.

Later, Rouffaer also started doubting his initial universalistic belief, inspired by Pierson's _Koloniale politiek_, that liberalism was the best system for Indonesia. orientalism became increasingly evident in his work. Not cultural relativism, for as Helena Spanjaard (1998: 27–8) has demonstrated for the field of art history, classical Greek art continued to be the standard according to which he judged the classical art of Central Java. In his view, for example, modest Buddhist art was better than exorbitant Hindu art.

For it is noble, the Buddhist art. Eternally sublime in its simplicity and strict dignity over the wild exuberance of the Brahmanistic schools. No more crude animism of animals presented as the images of Gods; no annoying symbols that live [...] in the imagination of the masses only as images of the mysterious but nevertheless disgusting human procreation.

Rouffaer returned from Indonesia in 1890 when the initial symptoms appeared of syphilis, an illness that troubled him for the rest of his life and eventually caused his death (Buur 1990: 3). Nevertheless, he took other trips to Europe, where he was particularly impressed by the Catholic art and culture of Spain. Indonesia remained in his thoughts, however, bringing him into contact with KITLV: first its library and then its board. Rouffaer selflessly offered to organize the growing collection of books and maps. Based on this important work, he was appointed Deputy Secretary in 1898 with an annual remuneration of six hundred guilders, of which two hundred was paid by the Indisch Genootschap and four hundred was ‘generously’ relinquished by the extremely wealthy Secretary, Kielstra, from the five hundred guilders he received each year (BKI 1899: xviii).

As already indicated, Rouffaer did an enormous amount of work for the library. In doing so, conflicts often arose with Kielstra because Rouffaer independently purchased expensive books from auctions and antiquarian bookshops at KITLV’s expense, without asking permission from the Secretary in advance. Another important initiative was the creation of a KITLV photograph collection. In an explanation in the circular to be distributed in Indonesia by the Bataviaasch Genootschap, Rouffaer suggested to the KITLV board that amateur photographers in particular should be
recruited: ‘Numerous data that could be extremely important for Geography and Anthropology can be recorded in the many areas that professional photographers never visit other than by exceptional circumstance’. ‘Also’, Rouffaer added, ‘because the artistic content of amateur photographs is often better than that of those made by professionals’ (KITLV 46, NB 19 November 1904).

Rouffaer also started to publish frequently, in *Bijdragen* as well as other periodicals, and in the *Encycopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië*. He was especially considered an expert, albeit somewhat controversial, on the four former districts on Central Java then known in Dutch as the Vorstenlanden. Rouffaer proved to be an explicit orientalist not only in terms of art history, but also from a social-historical perspective. In a report on the agricultural landownership relationships on Java in 1904, for example, intended for Van Deventer’s study of the ‘diminished prosperity’ on behalf of Minister Idenburg, he discussed the orientalist thesis of ‘eastern despotism’. According to Rouffaer, in the past the agricultural landownership relationships in Central Java, in which the sovereign owned all of the land and demanded nearly half of the harvest, were commonly seen throughout Java. ‘If a central authority then develops above a certain number of dispersed villages, this means, especially in an eastern country, that there is a landlord who is a despot’, according to Rouffaer’s reconstruction of the original landownership relationships on Java.

His demands are based on his desires and mood. The village elder, a despot himself, will redirect the pressure of these demands to the little man; and because there is little sense of individuality but authority is revered on Java, and the agricultural breadwinning is virtually the same for all, the pressure rests here on the land owned by the little people. (*BKI* 1918: 346.)

Rouffaer’s report was published in *Bijdragen* (1918: 305–98) in 1918 along with Van Vollenhoven’s critique (pp. 399–406). Van Vollenhoven accused Rouffaer of projecting relatively recent depositions by rulers in Central Java back onto the history of all of Java. Because villages still held usufruct on the land in large parts of the archipelago, with varying degrees of individualized rights of ownership and usufruct, it was probable in Van Vollenhoven’s opinion that this had also been the case on Java in the past. This discussion once again demonstrated that varying gradations and variations of orientalism existed within KITLV. But Rouffaer commented in the introduction to his 1918 article that this difference of opinion with the ethical liberal Van Vollenhoven pertained to the actual origin of agricultural landownership relationships on Java: ‘Not, of course, to what
should be desired in this matter: his and my views scarcely differ in that respect' (*BKI* 1918: 309).

In addition to his activities for KITLV, Rouffaer increasingly held other positions. He became secretary of the N.V. Buatan, for example, an idealistic enterprise that strove to stimulate Indonesian craftsmanship by selling items in the Netherlands. Rouffaer was also secretary of the Netherlands assisting committee established 1901 alongside the official archaeological committee in Batavia. In 1906 he was appointed secretary to the editorial staff of the KNAG *Tijdschrift*. Together with IJzerman he established the Linschoten-Vereeniging in 1908, which would publish old travel journals.

He resigned as Deputy Secretary of KITLV in 1909 for a second, extensive tour through the Indies, during which he also visited Singapore, British North Borneo and the Philippines. After he returned to the Netherlands in 1911, Rouffaer was made honorary member and then appointed as board member of KITLV. He was also elected as President of the Linschoten-Vereeniging and contributed to the publication of various old travel journals. Rouffaer continued to publish regularly until 1923, after which his rapidly diminishing health made this increasingly impossible. Rouffaer died in 1928. Dorothée Buur (1990: 9) concluded in the introduction to her inventory of KITLV’s Rouffaer collection: ‘Despite the time elapsed, Rouffaer’s academic work continues to be source of inspiration. […] Rouffaer is one of the “classics” in the broadest sense of the word in Indology.’

**Domestic and Foreign Contacts**

In the period from 1870 and 1914, KITLV’s most important external contacts continued to be its relations with the Department of the Colonies in The Hague and with the colonial administration in Batavia. These continued to subsidize many KITLV publications or to purchase a guaranteed number of copies. However, especially in the period of cost cutting in the late 1880s and early 1890s, requests made by KITLV were sometimes rejected. Of the large projects initiated by KITLV between 1870 and 1914, the department and administration refused to cooperate in the proposed Aceh expedition, but made financial contributions to Snouck Hurgronje’s trip to Mecca, Professor De Groot’s China tour, and the West Indies journey made by Professor Martin and his preliminary study for the proposed Banda expedition. Undoubtedly, these excellent relations benefited from the fact that many former Ministers for the Colonies and former Governors
General were appointed to the KITLV board. After 1870, however, thanks to its own growing capital KITLV grew increasingly independent of support from the department and the administration.

The rise and growth of KITLV, in terms of numbers of members, capital and academic production, also eased relations with other colonial organizations in the period from 1870 to 1914. Secretary Pijnappel’s complaints in the early years were replaced by an open approach by KITLV. After all, the Institute was now the most prestigious of all the colonial organizations, as was also evident in Bossenbroek’s comparison with the KNAG around 1900. On the competition among these organizations for the publication of important articles, Secretary Wijnmalen now magnanimously commented: ‘The unexplored area in the field of Indology, however, is still large enough to provide excessive work for more than one organization, and for the Institute’ (BKI 1881: xxi).

Of the many ‘sister institutions’, ties continued to be the closest with the Indisch Genootschap. Between 1870 and 1914, appointments to KITLV and IG boards were continually combined or exchanged. Nearly all of the presidents of the IG in this period were also KITLV board members. This holds true for Gevers Deynoot, Bleeker, Cornets de Groot, former governor of Sumatra’s West Coast, H.D. Canne, Pijnacker Hordijk, Henny and Kielstra. KITLV Secretary Wijnmalen combined his position with that of treasurer of IG for a considerable period of time. Prominent KITLV members continued to willingly discuss their more politically oriented views for IG. Aceh veteran Kielstra, for example, gave an impassioned speech for IG on 7 November 1883 advocating a powerful Aceh policy; Kern warmly recommended the general implementation of Dutch as the language of education in the Indies on 18 November 1890, and Van Deventer proposed in all seriousness on 2 April 1901 that a third parliamentary chamber of the States General in which colonies experts, to be elected by ‘former residents’ of the Indies, would effectively contribute to colonial policy (Handelingen Indisch Genootschap 1883: 117–60, 1890: 205–32, 1901: 37–88).

Within this close relationship, however, IG was completely overshadowed by KITLV. Its membership fluctuated between 250 and 300 in the period from 1870 to 1914, and IG’s financial position was always worrisome. In some years, IG could scarcely scrape together the rent of four hundred guilders and contribution to the library of one thousand guilders that it owed KITLV. The two institutions had truly changed places: while IG had initially nearly taken over KITLV, it was now gradually annexed as part of KITLV. Close personal relations, including combined board positions, also existed with KNAG, the Bataviaasch Genootschap, and some missionary
organizations. However, these organizations remained more autonomous than IG did in the period from 1870 to 1914.

KITLV’s foreign contacts also grew rapidly in this period of modern imperialism, in both academic and personal terms. The number of foreign institutions with which KITLV exchanged publications increased from 14 in 1870 to 107 in 1912. These included renowned institutions like the Royal Asiatic Society in London, the Société des études coloniales et maritimes in Paris, the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft in Berlin and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington D.C. The number of foreign members also increased sharply, from 9 in 1870 to 35 in 1910. Prominent KITLV members also maintained close personal ties with foreign colleagues, via international conferences or private correspondence, as Snouck Hurgronje did with Goldziher and Th. Nöldeke. Snouck’s correspondence indicates that some of the participants attended the regularly organized Orientalists conferences for purposes that were not solely academic, including ‘Wein, Weib und Gesang’. The international Orientalist conference organised in Stockholm in 1889 in particular acquired a notorious reputation. To begin with, a wealthy Italian prince paid a significant bribe to be included with his entourage in the conference organization. Secondly, some of the participants – including Snouck’s mentor De Goeje – seriously violated the rules. ‘Nice for his wife’, Snouck sarcastically wrote to Nöldeke regarding De Goeje’s ‘Stockholm drunkenness’ and all that it led to. ‘I hope’, Snouck continued, ‘that the Orientalists, after recovering from their Stockholm swoon, once again decide to hold a simple and serious meeting, preferably in some small town’ (Van Koningsveld 1985b: 14–6).

Such a meeting must have been the sixth international Orientalist conference held in Leiden in 1883. On the occasion of the conference, Bijdragen editorial staff published two special editions, the first on language and literature, and the second on geography and anthropology. All of Leiden’s shining stars, including Kern, Pijnappel, Wilken and Snouck, of course contributed texts. Surprising to the historian today, however, is the fact that of the total of 22 articles, only four were not written in Dutch, but in French or German. These included an article in German on the geology of the Indies by Leiden’s Professor Martin and ‘scènes tirées du wayang pourwa’ by the Director of the Leiden Anthropological Museum, L. Serrurier, as information on the exposition organized by the museum for foreign guests. Not that those foreign guests missed much in Bijdragen articles written in Dutch: even then conference collections were often short articles written for the occasion.
The article best worth reading was ‘Een en ander over het inlandsch onderwijs in de Padangsche Bovenlanden’ on native education in the Padang Uplands by Snouck Hurgronje (1883c). Even if it is for no other reason that his typical combination of universalistic and orientalist arguments, flavoured with a dash of cultural relativism. On Islamic education, for example, he wrote: ‘The efforts to make the faith reasonable, effective even in the Islam yet quickly reduced to frightening dimensions, had the consequence that everywhere that Muslims live, even in the Padang Uplands, some knowledge of dogmatism is part of the civilized upbringing’. The fact that the intentions and results of education can vary significantly in this respect, however, held true for both the Indies and the Netherlands: ‘The comparison of the results of our secondary education with the learning plan for the HBS has tempered our judgement’, according to Snouck, who attended an HBS for his secondary education. ‘Who knows whether [...] the proportion of these two factors could humble us over there?’ Snouck concluded his article with a call for more research into both the learning plan and the results of Islamic education. It was not until later, after the First World War, that cultural relativism of this type would be more emphatically formulated and more commonly seen in KITLV.
The unbridled economic growth that began in the Indies early in the twentieth century was to continue – with some fluctuating around the First World War – until the Great Depression of 1929. Between 1870 and 1913, the GNP per capita had increased only slightly, from 187 dollars (1970 value) to 227 dollars, due to the lengthy sugar crisis. However, the GNP subsequently jumped to 297 dollars per capita in 1928. The Netherlands' GNP also increased substantially, from 1,274 dollars per capita in 1913 to 1,621 dollars in 1928 (Maddison 1989).

The healthy economic climate created favourable conditions for the many reforms introduced in the Indies within the framework of ethical policies. With the reforms, government spending increased significantly from 146.1 million guilders in 1900 to 1,060.4 million guilders in 1920. With the ethical policy of prosperity and education, spending patterns also experienced extensive changes. While nearly half of the budget for the Indies was allocated to Interior Administration in 1870, this had dropped to only one-tenth in 1920. The share allocated to education and public works, however, respectively increased from 1.7 and 8.5 percent to 3.5 and no less than 39.2 percent (Creutzberg 1976). The share of the rice crops on Java irrigated on behalf of the administration increased from 4.1 percent in 1900 to 19.5 percent in 1920. This irrigation benefited not only the Dutch agricultural companies, but also the Javanese farmers (Ravesteijn 1997: 354). Van Doorn (1994) rightly typified the late-colonial period as one great big colonial development project that was continued even after ethical policies were primarily abandoned after 1920.

With the rise of Indonesian nationalism under the influence of the colonial modernization process, the political consensus that initially characterized these ethical politics was soon lost. The ethicists were positive about the establishment of Boedi Oetomo – ‘the pure endeavour’ – by the Javanese priyayi in 1908, and the subsequent establishment of the Sarekat Islam by Islamic leaders in 1911 and the political party...
Indische Partij by the Indo-European journalist E.F.E. Douwes Dekker in 1912. Even this radical Indies party, that openly advocated independence, was initially allowed by the ethicist government advisors G.A.J. Hazeu and D.A. Rinkes because its establishment was based on real complaints, and because disallowing it would make Douwes Dekker a martyr, as they explained their motives in lengthy memos to Governor General Idenburg (Van der Wal 1967: 101–37). Snouck Hurgronje welcomed the nationalism as a symptom of ‘a general awakening of the indigenous society and an endeavour to arrive at more intellectual, social and economic independence through cooperation’ (Gobée and Adriaanse 1957–1965, III: 2008). But these were the very reasons why many of the administrators, colonial businessmen and conservative confessionals like Colijn were not happy with the rise of the nationalist movement from the very start.

Governors General Van Heutsz and Idenburg generally followed the positive recommendations made by Snouck Hurgronje, Rinkes and Hazeu, initially giving the new nationalist organizations his approval. After some hesitation, however, Idenburg prohibited the Indische Partij and sent Douwes Dekker to the Netherlands in exile. Idenburg did, however, satisfy the wishes of the first, moderate Indonesian nationalists: expanded education and political participation (Brouwer 1958: 36–52; Van Goor 1994: 277–88; J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 447–65). In the Netherlands, the liberal minority cabinet Cort van der Linden took office in 1913, with Th.B. Pleyte, a member of Vrijzinnig Democratische Bond, a small left liberal party, as Minister for the Colonies. Together with Idenburg’s successor as Governor General, the liberal diplomat J.P. van Limburg Stirum, Pleyte implemented many more far-reaching political reforms than De Waal Malefijt and De Graaff had been willing to accept earlier. In particular, this pertained to the establishment of a central representative body, the Volksraad (People’s Council), albeit with limited authority and with a limited number of elected members (Locher-Scholten 1981: 55–118).

During the First World War, however, when contact between the Netherlands and the Indies was strongly limited in a variety of ways, Indonesian nationalism radicalized dramatically. In part under the influence of Dutch socialist revolutionaries like Henk Sneevliet, the Sarekat Islam – now with more than one million members – started to demand complete political autonomy, a democratically elected Volksraad and far-reaching socio-economic reforms (Korver 1982). According to Van Limburg Stirum, even the colonial experts in the Netherlands no longer understood how rapidly and extensively the nationalist movement was
changing. ‘That Professor Snouck is no longer up-to-date as advisor is something of which I have become convinced in only these few months’, he wrote to Pleyte in 1916: ‘With the youth – who will give us the most worries – he has no contact whatsoever’ (Puchinger 1993: 182).

With Hazeu, Snouck’s successor as government advisor in Batavia, however, Van Limburg Stirum maintained close contact. He primarily shared Hazeu’s opinion that extensive reforms would eventually be unavoidable. At the end of the First World War, when socialist revolution appeared to be on the verge of erupting even in the Netherlands, Van Limburg ensured the Volksraad that extensive reforms were immanent. But socialist leader Troelstra’s attempted revolution proved a huge mistake. The confessionalists gained power again in 1918. As Minister for the Colonies, Idenburg disassociated himself from Van Limburg Stirum’s ‘November Promises’, and his conservative successor De Graaff announced his own revision of the state system in the Indies. Hazeu, as government commissioner for the colonial interior the personification of the ‘flaccid ethical policies’, was the first causality of the conservative response.

**Government Advisor and KITLV Commissioner Hazeu**

Godard Arend Johannes Hazeu (1870–1929) came from an artistic family. After completing the gymnasium in Arnhem, he first studied theology in Utrecht and subsequently, starting in 1890, Arabic, Sanskrit and Indonesian languages in Leiden (Jaquet 1985). Hazeu obtained his PhD under Kern’s supervision with a thesis on Javanese theatre titled *Bijdragen tot de kennis van het Javaansche tooneel*, the first complete study of the Javanese wayang stories and their performance. In his thesis, Hazeu (1897: 5) asserted that many of the stories came from India, but ‘that both the entire Javanese stage and the Javanese plays are technically purely Javanese, showing not a single trace of Hindu influence’. He continued the theme of his thesis in two articles on wayang stories, ‘De Naga Arddhawalika’ and ‘De Lakon Arimba’, in *Bijdragen* (1898: 175–204, 333–88) in which he compared the stories to the original Indian versions.

Hazeu started teaching Javanese in the beta department of the Willem III gymnasium in 1898. He was elected to the board of the Bataviaasch Genootschap, served as KITLV commissioner and maintained close contact with the Leiden linguists. In the Bataviaasch Genootschap’s *Tijdschrift*, he published numerous articles on Javanese theatre and Javanese folklore, topics that brought him into close contact with the Javanese population. In 1904, Hazeu joined the staff of the advisor for Indigenous and
Arabic Affairs, Snouck Hurgronje, as scientific linguist. His work there included the completion of the *Gajosch-Nederlandsch woordenboek met Nederlandsch-Gajosch register* that Snouck had started in Aceh. Hazeu succeeded Snouck as government advisor in 1907. His assistant was D.A. Rinkes, who had studied Malay in Leiden and who later also served as KITLV commissioner.

In 1908, Hazeu established the Commissie, later Kantoor voor Volkslectuur (Bureau for Popular Reading, or, in Indonesian, Balai Pustaka). The objective of this government institution was both the distribution of popular reading materials in the Indonesian languages and providing information to the Indonesian press. Under Rinkes’s supervision, after 1910 the Kantoor exercised considerable influence on the shape of written Malay, which was to serve as the basis for Bahasa Indonesia, the Indonesian language (*Jedamski* 1997). As government advisor, Hazeu devoted much effort to developing understanding for the rise of the nationalist movement. He advised Van Heutsz with regard to Boedi Oetomo: ‘The best thing for the government to do, it appears to me, is to give the young movement the opportunity to develop independently without intervention, and to refrain from any direct involvement even if [the movement] makes a mistake now and then’ (*Van der Wal* 1967: 46). He made the same type of recommendations to Idenburg when the Indische Party and the Sarekat Islam were established. ‘Before our eyes is appearing a new race of natives,’ was Hazeu’s conclusion, ‘who thirst for further development, who strive for more intellectual independence, who can no longer conform to the restraining reins of an immature guardianship in which the old-fashioned priyayi has been imprisoned throughout its existence’ (*Van der Wal* 1963: 137).

In response to the justifiable desire for more education, Hazeu served as Director of Education, Religious Matters and Industry from 1912 to 1914. In that position, he introduced three new interrelated types of schools: the Hollandsch-Inlandsche School (HIS), an elementary school taught in Dutch with lessons in Malay; the Algemeene Middelbare School (AMS, General Secondary School) with the same curriculum, and the MULO, or school for more extensive elementary education, that also existed in the Netherlands (*J.J.P. de Jong* 1998: 374–6). The HIS was particularly popular as preparation for secondary and higher education in the Dutch language. The number of students more than doubled within ten years, from 22,734 in 1915 to 57,376 in 1925 (*Van der Wal* 1963: 696). *Fasseur* (1993: 409) considered the HIS ‘perhaps the greatest success in which the ethical policies could take pride’.
In the meantime, Hazeu’s deputy government advisor, Rinkes, was also advocating a more conciliatory approach to the nationalist movement. ‘In short, one could say that human rights are starting to exert themselves’, said Rinkes (Van der Wal 1967: 125). This was a development that Rinkes believed would unavoidably continue as western education grew. It would better for the Netherlands to implement reforms now, while the nationalist movement was still small and controllable, than for it to be forced to do so later. Hazeu in particular came to bear the brunt of the increasing Dutch criticism of Indonesian nationalism and the ethical policy of reform when he resumed the position of government advisor and government commissioner for the interior in 1914. The European press was particularly venomous in criticizing Hazeu, portraying him as ‘a being stripped of all firmness, a weak, hesitant, old-womanish, deficient and sentimental little man’ (Jaquet 1985: 211).

The breaking point came in what became to be known as the Garut Affair. In Garut, in the Preanger, the Dutch governor had a Javanese farmer who objected to the mandatory rice collection shot by the police in 1919. The reasons given by the governor for his severe action included indications that a secret, terrorist segment had formed within the Saraket Islam. Hazeu investigated the Garut Affair and concluded ‘that the administration’s policy is insufficient and [the] shots fired are indefensible’ (Kwantes
1975: 137). An investigative committee directed by P. de Roo de la Faille, member of the Raad van Indië and future KITLV Secretary, however, approved the governor’s decision. Hazeu decided to resign as government commissioner and accepted a position as professor of Javanese in Leiden.

In his letter of resignation to Van Limburg Stirum, he referred to ‘the blame, the injuries of many kinds and the insulting insulations that I have not been spared not only by the – not in the least objective – reactionary press but also by a number of high-ranking members of the Netherlands Indies administration’. His temporary successor as government commissioner, K.F. Creutzberg, noted ‘that Hazeu is dispirited to such an extent that he is actually departing as a broken man’ (Kwantes 1975: 138). As professor of Javanese in Leiden and KITLV board member, Hazeu never fully recovered from the traumatic end of his career with the administration. Since 1910 he had had virtually no time to keep abreast of the academic literature, let only to publish his own work. His Leiden oration in 1921, Oud en nieuw uit de Javaansche letterkunde, therefore contained a lot that was old and very little that was new. As professor, Hazeu did not publish in Bijdragen. He did write a number of letters to the editor of the NRC, either alone or with other Leiden professors, defending the ethical policy of reform (Brouwer 1958: 95). His poor health, however, forced Hazeu to reduce his work load and ultimately resign as professor in 1928. He died shortly thereafter.

When the Javanist and ethnologist W.H. Rassers dedicated his article on the origins of Javanese theatre, Over den oorsprong van het Javaansche toneel to Hazeu’s memory a few years later, his praise was for Hazeu’s 1897 dissertation, not his later work. ‘Hazeu’s book in particular’, Rassers explained, ‘continues to be important in this respect: it retains its value as the first serious attempt, as yet essentially unchallenged, to oversee the phenomenon as a whole’ (BKI 1931: 317).

Nationalist Radicalization, Conservative Response and Economic Depression

The negative interaction about which the government advisors Hazeu, Rinkes and Creutzberg and their ethical kindred spirits in the Netherlands had continuously warned, between the increasingly radical Indonesian nationalism and the increasingly conservative Dutch responses, became a reality in the 1920s and 1930s. This was immediately evident when Minister De Graaff implemented the new Indies regulations and the subsequent constitutional amendments in the early 1920s. In these, most of the
reforms proposed by the review committee under the direction of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and former professor of law in Leiden, J.H. Carpentier Alting, who had been appointed by Van Limburg Stirum, were left out. Although the Indies were no longer called a colony according to the new constitution, the desired autonomy was not granted.

On the regional and provincial level, however, new representative councils were established to be elected based on an extremely limited right to vote. In their turn, these councils elected part of the representatives in the Volksraad. De Graaff knew that abolishing the Volksraad itself was no longer an option, but he did want to keep its authority limited. Thus this Volksraad retained virtually only advisory authority, and a large share of its members were still appointed. The conservative Dutch parliamentary majority finally reduced the small majority of Indonesian members to a minority in a 1925 amendment (Van den Doel 1994: 357–70).

In the Netherlands, the professors in Leiden protested against this crippling of the preceding policy of reform. ‘The department for the Colonies, in recent years’, Van Vollenhoven wrote, ‘has continuously displayed extreme coldness towards Indonesian desires’ (Brouwer 1958: 91). Only a parliamentary minority of liberal and social democrats heard his protests.

The indignation in Indonesia was much greater. Only a minority of the nationalist movement was, after the constitutional changes, still willing to participate in the elections for the various councils. The Sarekat Islam and other nationalist organizations opted to follow India’s example of non-cooperation. The Indonesian communists had since left the Sarekat Islam and established their own Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI) (J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 473–89). Late in 1926, the PKI organized armed revolts in West Java and West Sumatra. The poorly prepared revolts were easily crushed by the colonial administration, but fanned the flames of colonial conservatism. The relatively ethical Governor General A.C.D. de Graeff had thousands of communists, guilty or not, imprisoned. Some were sent to lengthy exile in the infamous Upper Digul camp in New Guinea (J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 489–94). Snouck Hurgronje (1923) had futilely pointed out the injustice of the earlier policy of exile after the Islamic revolt in West Java in 1888, in a piercing article in the Gids.

The only positive outcome of the communist revolts was probably the study performed by government advisor and KITLV member B.J.O. Schrieke into their background. According to Vogel (1992: 79–83), that study was a balanced sociological analysis inspired by Max Weber, and in terms of the issues of modernization and acculturation one of the first
examples of a new Indocentric historical perspective. Much more influential from the political perspective, however, was the conservative manifest on present and future colonial issues, *Koloniale vraagstukken van heden en morgen*, published by Colijn (1928) after a tour through Indonesia, in which he advocated a federal administration for the Indies.

Based on the significant ethnical differences, the continuing influence of pro-Dutch rulers and Christian minorities, and their large economic importance, Colijn believed that the Outer Territories should be separated from Java. He believed that Indonesian nationalism was a superficial trend among the elite that was primarily caused by an erroneous education policy. Instead of secondary and higher education in the Dutch language, the government should have stimulated lower and vocational education in the native language. According to Colijn, it was only by the grace of Dutch dominion that the Indies formed a single state. ‘The term Indonesia, used to express this unity, is an empty term’ Colijn (1928: 59–60). ‘If we had not been there, this would have been a disconnected group of various peoples of varying natures, with different languages and entirely different levels of culture.’

In a debative pamphlet, Snouck Hurgronje (1928) countered that from an ethnological perspective, the Indies were no more heterogeneous than any large European state. Moreover, not only in political but also in socio-economic and cultural terms, the Indies were more a unity than Colijn was willing to admit. According to Snouck, Colijn’s view was too biased based on his administrative experience as Van Heutsz’s deputy in Aceh a quarter of a century earlier. ‘Colijn has therefore vastly underestimated the expansion of the [nationalist] “movement”, in terms of both scope and time’, said Snouck Hurgronje (1928: 10). ‘With more intimate knowledge of the interior, he would have noted [...] that the attitude towards Dutch authority is basically the same in all circles of the indigenous society’, namely: nationalist to one degree or another.

In fact, a new, radical nationalist party, the Partai Nasional Indonesia (PNI) was formed after the communist revolts were smothered whose young and charismatic leader, the engineer Sukarno, inspired massive numbers of followers. Not only Sukarno but also Mohammad Hatta, who organized Indonesian students in the Netherlands under nationalist banner, and the social-democratic leader Sutan Sjahrir demanded direct independence. In turn, these men were also prosecuted and exiled by the colonial administration (J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 497–504). Moderate nationalists and eventually even traditional allies were increasingly alienated by the conservative Dutch policy. Symptomatic was the Netherlands’
rejection of the Volksraad petition, submitted by the Javanese priyayi Sutardjo, requesting that a national conference be convened to discuss future independence (J.J.P. de Jong 1998: 541–4).

The wish for a future dominion status also existed among a small group of high-ranking Dutch administrators and professors at the law school Rechtshoogeschool in Batavia, who established the neo-ethical study group and periodical De Stuw (Locher-Scholten 1981: 118–50). Most of the initiators had studied in Leiden with Snouck Hurgronje or Van Vollenhoven and were KITLV members. The head of the Archaeological Department, F.D.K. Bosch, and the Director of the Kantoor voor Volkslectuur, G.W.J. Drewes, KITLV commissioners during their time in Indonesia, both became KITLV’s President upon their return to the Netherlands. J.A. Jonkman, H.J. van Mook and J.H.A. Logemann were later appointed as Minister and Governor General. During the 1930s, however, De Stuw group was actively opposed by the conservative Governors General B.C. de Jonge and A.W.L. Tjarda van Starkenborgh Stachouwer (Puchinger 1993: 274, 282). Lastly, the economic depression that hit hard on both the Indies as the the raw materials’ source, and the Netherlands as the free-trade nation also weakened the remnants of ethical policies: the prosperity and education policy. During De Jonge’s reign, government expenditures had to be cut by one-fourth. The GNP per capita in the Indies decreased from 297 dollars in 1929 to 279 dollars in 1939 (Maddison 1989). In the late 1930s, only 8 percent of the Indonesian population was literate, as compared to 29 percent in British Malacca, 12 percent in British India and 10 percent in French Indochina. There were 300 Indonesian intellectuals with an academic degree while British India – albeit much larger – had more than one hundred-thousand (Kuitenbrouwer 1998: 69).

The number of KITLV members and donor members also dropped as a result of the economic crisis. However, as will be explained later, from an academic perspective there was one bright spot: some of the civil servants on half pay in anticipation of their placement in the Indies wrote wonderful dissertations in the 1930s.

**Indology and Relevant Academic Disciplines**

**A Full-Fledged Academic Discipline**

The year 1920 was an important year for the Leiden professors united in KITLV. From a political perspective, Hazeu’s dismissal in that year marked the waning influence of their efforts of ethical reform in Dutch colonial
policy, which was becoming increasingly conservative. From an academic perspective, however, 1920 was the year in which Leiden recognized Indology as a full-fledged discipline. The 1910 amendments to the Higher Education Act made this possible. According to the new Academic Charter of 1921 and the 1922 Decree on the Indology programme for civil servants, Indology became a five-year university programme to be concluded with an exam entitling successful candidates to pursue a doctorate degree. Fasseur (1993: 390) indicated that this was primarily thanks to the work done by Snouck Hurgronje, orchestrated with a number of influential civil servants in the Colonies department and former civil servants who were KITLV members.

In 1911, Snouck Hurgronje was appointed chairman of the committee that was to make preparations for a revision of the educational programme for civil servants within the framework of De Graaff’s administrative reforms. Snouck played for high stakes. As a university programme, Indology should only be open to gymnasium graduates. HBS graduates, as Snouck himself had been, had to pass an admission exam. The new university programme was to be multi-disciplinary by nature, as a major over the existing disciplines of administrative law and the languages and literature of the Indonesian archipelago. The committee rejected the option of expanding the existing vocational programme to make it a new interdisciplinary programme. The existing programme could not be made into ‘an organic whole’ and as an independent programme it would continue to ‘suffer the plague of superficiality’. In short, future Indology students were to be educated as full-fledged ‘academic citizens’ and not as narrow-minded specialists (Fasseur 1993: 390–4).

Snouck Hurgronje also orchestrated social support for his recommendations as chairman of the committee. Under the direction of Liefrinck, who regularly exchanged places with Snouck in those years as President or Vice President of KITLV, a number of influential former civil servants addressed the Minister for the Colonies to communicate their approval of the recommendations made by the Snouck Committee. Nevertheless, the ultimate academic programme Indology was not as highly academic as Snouck wanted. HBS graduates were admitted directly, giving it more the nature of a specialized area programme than that of a general academic programme.

In Leiden, the new Indology programme was given by the united faculties of law and the arts, with the language studies and legal subjects comprising the main components. An Indology student had two options: a two-year linguistic or administrative law programme concluded
with an exam followed by a three-year major study in the other discipline, conclusion of which entitled the candidate to pursue a doctorate degree. Students completing the initial linguistic programme continued with an administrative law major, and vice versa. Thus in general the two variations were based on the same package of subjects, albeit that the major with which they graduated differed. ‘Indology was a strange programme’, said J. van Baal (1986: 48–9), who later became the Governor of New Guinea: ‘In essence, it meant that the candidate completed two exams, the second of which entitling the candidate to pursue a doctorate’.

In the linguistic variation, Malay was a mandatory major subject, with Javanese or another local language as minor. Additional subjects were comparative anthropology, Islamic institutions and history. The administrative law variation included economy, colonial administrative law, the adat law, and ancient and contemporary history. The academic Indology programme that commenced in Leiden 1922 was made additionally appealing by the scholarship system that the government had implemented in 1915, when the rapidly expanding administrative services in the Indies was experiencing recruiting difficulties. Students flocked to the Indology programme. In 1921 158 students enrolled; in 1925 their number increased to 215 (Fasseur 1993: 394–408). The political orientation of the teaching corps for the new Indology programme at Leiden continued to be primarily ethical, with a high academic calibre. Snouck Hurgronje, who taught Islamic institutions, was the absolute lord and master. ‘Snouck was feared by all of his students’, observed his student Van der Meulen (1977: 94). ‘Later I noticed that even a few of his colleague professors suffered the same. [...] He often seemed extremely hard to us, almost cruel.’ Not only his ethical kindred spirit Van Vollenhoven, but the politically less-outspoken archaeologist Krom (1919: 31) explicitly recognized Snouck as the intellectual leader in his oration.

The example that You, the greatly esteemed Snouck Hurgronje, set by combining a high vision for your academic task with practical promotion of the well-being of the Dutch East Indies, is what I am pleased to be able to strive to achieve, however much at a distance.

Professors who were not sufficiently ethical in Leiden and also demonstrated academic shortcomings, like the ethnologist Nieuwenhuis, were painfully reprimanded. His successor, J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong (1935: 23) severely reminded him in his oration ‘that we do not travel the same ethnological or pedagogic trails’.
Van Vollenhoven – second to Snouck in the Leiden professorial hierarchy – taught adat law and colonial administrative law, and was the most popular among the Indology students. ‘Van Vollenhoven’s masterly lecturing to an overflowing hall of students made a lasting impression on me even then,’ Van der Meulen (1977: 16) reminisced: ‘With his glow, his conviction, his knowledge and his prophetic vision, this gifted lecturing teacher instilled in each and every one of us a bit of the task awaiting us as civil servants in the Indies’. Van Vollenhoven also had the most PhD candidates of all the professors in Leiden: 78, six of whom were Indonesian. Language and literature as well as history also blossomed within the framework of the Indology programme. The professors involved, Hazeu and his successor C.C. Berg for Javanese, Ch.A. van Ophuijsen and his successor Ph.S. van Ronkel for Malay and the historians Krom and H.Th. Colenbrander, all also held positions on the KITLV board. Leiden University’s monopoly on the academic Indology programme was nevertheless soon lost.

‘The Attack on Leiden’

Resistance against the monopoly that ethical Leiden held on the Indology programme started to grow among conservative politicians and colonial businessmen. M.W.F. Treub, the formerly liberal-democratic but now conservative Minister of Finance and founder of the Indies corporate council Ondernemersraad van Nederlandsch-Indië, assumed the position of spokesperson for these critics after travelling to Indonesia. According to Treub, the ethical professors in Leiden were educating future civil servants in the spirit of anti-capitalism and pro-nationalism. Colijn, Conservative Protestant MP B.J. Gerretson and his ultra-conservative son, F.C. Gerretson, supported his views.

Gerretson junior’s many occupations included poet, autodidact historian and secretary of the board of the Royal Shell subsidiary in Indonesia, Bataafsche Petroleum Maatschappij (BPM) (Henssen 1983). He was the primary initiator in the establishment of a competitive Indology programme at Utrecht University. Both the colonial-commercial sector and the conservative-confessional government actively supported the establishment of this ‘petroleum faculty’. Leiden’s monopoly of the administrative studies programme came to an end late in 1925 (Feddema and Van den Muijzenberg 1978).

In comparing ethical Leiden and conservative Utrecht, Fasseur (1993: 417–8) concluded: ‘Looking back, “Leiden” was completely right in its
progressive approach to Indonesian nationalism; moderate “Utrecht” was completely wrong. This holds completely true for Utrecht but paints a somewhat overly rosy picture of ethical Leiden. In his offended and defensive response to Treub’s pamphlet in the *Gids* article ‘De aanslag op Leiden’ (Attack on Leiden), co-signed by a number of Leiden professors, Van Vollenhoven (1925) took back a lot of the progressive-ethical philosophy. With excerpts from his own work, he denied any desire to implement a parliamentary system, general voting rights and complete autonomy for the Indies. He also denied the accusation that the ‘Leiden school’ was uncooperative towards the colonial administration and colonial business sector. Regarding his contact with the Indonesian students in the Netherlands who embarked along a radical-nationalist course in 1922–1923, Van Vollenhoven (1925: 260) claimed he wanted to gain their personal trust but distanced himself from their political ideals: ‘We deny that any action on our part aggravates their frame of mind concerning the Netherlands’.

Indeed, in their position with respect to the radicalizing Indonesian nationalism, the Leiden professors were uncomfortably caught in the middle: they did not want to ignore or suppress it, as the Utrecht professors and conservative Dutch politicians wanted, but were also unwilling to support the demand for rapid independence being voiced by Dutch communists and a number of left-wing socialists. The neo-ethicist Van Mook, one of Van Vollenhoven’s best students, found himself in the same, difficult middle position after 1945 during the decolonization of Indonesia (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 28–9).

The increasingly difficult relationship between the ethicists and neo-ethicists and the radicalizing Indonesian nationalism was acutely described by former administrator and Vice President of KITLV, H.T. Damsté:

> When East began to awaken and asked for a western breakfast, this was served with love, and it was expected that once the East did rise and sit at our table, it would be our friend. This was not to be. East merely wanted our cherries so it could throw the pits at us. When these projectiles began to rain, this was initially trivialized: East was still but a child, and West had not always treated its pupil wisely and lovingly! A bit more love! A bit more friendship! Things would improve! [...] And it took a long time before some began to feel so ill at ease that they started cursing. (Korn 1955: 127.)

From an academic perspective, Utrecht’s attack had little effect on Leiden. The number of Indology students in Leiden stayed on track based on the increasing needs of the Indies administration. At its peak, the Utrecht
programme enrolled 31 new students in 1930 as compared to 44 in Leiden. The total number of Indology in Utrecht, 115, lagged far behind the 267 following the Leiden programme (Fasseur 1993: 426–7). After 1930, both programmes took heavy hits from the extensive government cutbacks brought about by the economic crisis. In terms of academic status and connections, the Leiden Indology programme was still clearly superior to the Utrecht programme. KITLV was useful in that respect.

When, in the period of ethical consensus, the colonial business sector established the Koloniaal Instituut in Amsterdam in 1910, Snouck Hurgronje was quick to establish a ‘strategic alliance’ between Leiden University and the new Institute. He had been a member of the advisory committee that made the preparations for establishing an anthropology department in the Institute. With his support, former colonial administrator J.C. van Eerde, whom Snouck had met in KITLV’s Adatrecht Committee, became the Director of this department and extraordinary professor of anthropology at the Amsterdam Municipal University (Taselaar 1998: 174–5).

Van Eerde subsequently became a board member, Vice President and even President of the KITLV in 1929–1930. Van Eerde was much more of a colonial mind than the Leiden ethicists. In his view, the advantages of colonial proprietorship were much greater than the disadvantages. ‘International position and esteem, the formation of the character of the nation by bearing responsibility […], reinforcing the power of the nation by achieving fame for good colonial results, enlarging the scope of interest […], the energetic development of young people through colonial work’ all this the Netherlands had obtained thanks to the Dutch East Indies, according to Van Eerde (1926: 403), apart from the ‘material advantages’. Amsterdam professor of Colonial Administrative Law Ph. Kleintjes, who advocated greater autonomy for Indonesia, was much more in synch with the Leiden philosophy (De Meij and Efthymiou 1999). As Amsterdam professor, he was also part of the KITLV board. Both Van Eerde and Kleintjes made prominent contributions to the book of articles published on the occasion of KITLV’s seventy-fifth anniversary (De Roo de la Faille 1926).

The Leiden Indology programme also maintained close contact with the new Rechtshoogeschool, the law school established in Batavia in 1924. Snouck’s student Hussein Djajadiningrat, the first Indonesian to obtain a PhD in Leiden – cum laude – was appointed professor of Malay in Batavia. Other Leiden alumni held academic positions, including professor of ethnology B.J.O. Schrieke, professor of adat law B. ter Haar, and professor of public law Logemann. Nevertheless, the support the Leiden professors
could give their Indonesian students, like Hoesein Djajadiningrat, had its limits.

When Rinkes resigned as KITLV commissioner in Batavia, he proposed that Hoesein Djajadiningrat be named as his successor ‘based on the rule that the oldest Doctor of Indonesian languages in the Indies be appointed as such’, but the KITLV board voiced its preference for the Dutch archaeologist Bosch, who obtained his doctorate a bit later (KITLV 202, NB 15 January 1927). Hoesein Djajadiningrat and the Javanese autodidact R.M.N. Poerbatjaraka, who published numerous linguistic and archaeological articles in Bijdragen in the Interbellum, did not receive special recognition in KITLV circles until 1945, when they were both elected as honorary members. At the time of their deaths, applauding obituaries were published in Bijdragen (Pijper 1961; Pigeaud 1966). During the Interbellum, however, the strategic position held by the leading businessman IJzerman and the Amsterdam Professor Van Eerde in the KITLV board appears to have weighed much heavier than Leiden’s sympathy for the academic work of Indonesian intellectuals.

In the meantime, conservative politicians like Colijn and De Graaff, and Utrecht professors like Louter and Kohlbrugge had each terminated their KITLV membership for no specified reason, even before the Indology programme began in Utrecht in 1925. Leiden, however, maintained ties with Utrecht, in part thanks to KITLV. This was particularly the case in the as yet virtually un politicized field of linguistics. In particular, the classicist professor J. Gonda, who served as extraordinary professor not only of Indo-Iranian but also of Javanese and Malay in Utrecht, was extremely active within KITLV as board member and publicist (Ensink 1992). Gonda, ‘the greatest Indology star in the Utrecht firmament’ (Fasseur 1993: 425), published numerous articles in Bijdragen and joined the KITLV board in 1932. Bosch who had studied and obtained his PhD in Leiden, in turn was appointed extraordinary professor of Indies Ancient History in Utrecht.

The Major Adat Law Project

One of the greatest injuries inflicted by Treub’s criticism on Van Vollenhoven was the accusation that Leiden was ignoring the ‘existing eastern diversity’ and the ‘eastern principles’ of Indonesian society, in favour of western political and legal institutions. How could one make such an accusation against the Leiden discoverers of adat law! ‘Dr. Snouck Hurgronje first, Mr. Van Vollenhoven later, have always considered it part of their life’s work to bring that diversity – which does not exclude
relationship – to light,” said Van Vollenhoven (1925: 250–1). ‘While the government suffocated or uniformized eastern communities, Leiden advocated conservation, development, flexibility.’

The opposition between Leiden and Utrecht in the field of adat law were, in fact, relative by nature, not fundamental. There were, however, characteristic differences in accent. Utrecht was especially keen on promoting the traditional pillars of the dualistic colonial system in political and cultural spheres, in support of the domestic adat authorities. In socio-economic terms, especially in agrarian field, however, adat law needed to bend to the expansion necessary for western commerce. The intention was not to turn Indonesia into an ‘open-air museum’, as Utrecht Professor Emeritus De Louter commented in a critical review of Van Vollenhoven’s Ontdekking van het adatrecht (Fasseur 1992: 253).

Van Vollenhoven claimed that he, too, did not want this. ‘The country is too good and too promising to turn it into an adat museum’, Van Vollenhoven (1919: 29) had already stated. The relevant pamphlet, however, primarily criticized the government’s intention of implementing the western concept of private landownership in Indonesia. In the name of
the law of *adat*, in particular the traditional ‘community dispositional right’ and ‘eastern property law’, Van Vollenhoven successfully contributed to the withdrawal of the relevant legislative proposal. In the political arena, by contrast, Van Vollenhoven and his ethical kindred spirits were more positive about the introduction of western institutions including elected representative bodies and a private, secret right to vote than the Utrecht professors and the conservative like-minded were. However, the support of both groups for rekindling the waning influence of the Javanese regents by making them the presidents of the new regional councils demonstrates that their differences of opinion were not fundamental in this respect, either.

It is therefore understandable that the Indonesian nationalists were equally sceptical of *adat* law as taught in Leiden by Van Vollenhoven and in Batavia by his student Ter Haar. In general, in the interest of modernization of both political and economic life in Indonesia, they advocated unification of the law based on western principles. Successive governments of the independent state of Indonesia have also maintained the colonial civil and penal codes based on the Dutch example. As an influential Indonesian member of the Volksraad once commented, the Dutch in general admired *adat* law much more than the Indonesians themselves (Fasseur 1992: 254–6).

Within the framework of the Indology programme in Leiden and KITLV, the study of and support for *adat* law grew during the Interbellum into a giant, omnipotent and interdisciplinary project. The KITLV’s establishment of the *adat* law committee in 1909, with Snouck Hurgronje as chairman and Van Vollenhoven as secretary, was already mentioned in the previous Chapter. The main objective of the committee was to collect, codify and publish the *adat* law sources in the nineteen *adat* law regions into which Van Vollenhoven had divided Indonesia. That division was based not only on legal, but also on ethnological, linguistic and historical data (Koentjaraningrat 1975: 88–94; Otto and Pompe 1989).

In addition to their differences, Van Vollenhoven believed the nineteen legal regions were also related. That was a concept of ‘unity through diversity’ *avant la lettre*, implying a federal organisation of the colonial state of Indonesia. Once again this put the Leiden *adat* specialists in an uncomfortable position between the traditional colonial divide-and-conquer policy advocated by Colijn, for example, on the one side and Sukarno’s nationalist ideal of an independent unified state on the other.

The collection, codification and publication of the *adat* law sources quickly proved to be a too voluminous enterprise for merely the
KITLV committee with its assisting committee in Batavia. No less than forty *Adatrechtbundels* were published between 1910 and 1940. In 1917, the Adatrechtstichting (Adat Law Foundation) was founded by KITLV, Thorbecke Foundation and the Leiden University Fund: a foundation that established a wider framework for a research project and a series of publications of such size. The foundation’s objectives included attracting funding and establishing a library in support of the study. The KITLV committee and the new foundation co-existed for a few years, albeit that their personnel and activities overlapped to a significant degree. The KITLV committee was completely absorbed by the Adatrechtstichting in 1922.

Chairman of the foundation was Snouck Hurgronje, until his death in 1936. His successor was F.D. Holleman, former law court chairman, professor of international law in Batavia and extraordinary professor of *adat* law in Leiden. Van Vollenhoven also continued as secretary of the foundation until his death in 1933. He was succeeded by his student F.D.E. van Ossenbruggen, who published both legal and anthropological work, while Holleman was not only the chairman of the foundation but also managed its secretariat from 1936 to 1940 (Jaquet 1973). The *Adatrechtbundels* were edited by Van Vollenhoven until 1929, and subsequently by board member and former Resident of Bali and Lombok Damsté, who also served as KITLV Vice President, secretary of the linguistic Kern Institute and secretary of the Dutch literary society Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde (Korn 1955).

According to Van Vollenhoven, ultimately *adat* law could best be interpreted by the Indonesians: ‘An *adat* law that satisfies eastern needs and that appeals to eastern hearts will only resist the short-sighted audacity of western law if its discovery, revision, fertilization is continued in the eastern spirit’, said Van Vollenhoven (1928: 167): ‘and by whom better than by Indonesians?’

Here unveiled, once again, is the contradiction noted earlier that Dutch Indology specialists were more enthusiastic about *adat* law than Indonesian intellectuals. Van Vollenhoven’s Indonesian student Soepomo published articles about *adat* law in West Java and succeeded Ter Haar in 1941 as professor of *adat* law at the Rechtshoogeschool in Batavia. However, as the first Minister of Justice of the Republic of Indonesia, exercising considerable influence on the composition of the Republican constitution in 1945, Soepomo, like most Indonesian men of law, turned away from the traditional *adat* law, opting for a western-oriented unification (Fasseur 1992: 255).
Was Van Vollenhoven's conceptualization of adat law, in which the fundamentally eastern character of the law was emphasized so strongly, an expression of orientalism or of culture relativism? This is a difficult question answered in different ways in recent literature. Van den Doel (1994: 449) calls Van Vollenhoven a culture relativist, but orientalism is an alternative option that he does not explore. Gouda (1995: 58), however, concludes: ‘In sum, Van Vollenhoven’s vision embraced the diffusionist style of early twentieth-century anthropology and constituted a striking example of what David Ludden has recently labelled “Orientalist empiricism”’. Burns (2004: 148) rejects Said’s orientalism thesis itself for epistemological reasons. Based on the postcolonial, Indonesian criticism that adat law magnified ethnical differences, obstructed rationalization of the law and combated the growth of Indonesian nationalism, however, Burns (2004: 225–6) also concludes: ‘This is to say, the Leiden construction of adat law is a paradigm example of the phenomenon which Edward Said identified as orientalism’.

Despite the risk of over-magnification, I believe that various perspectives can be distinguished in Van Vollenhoven’s conceptualization of adat law. The fundamental difference that Van Vollenhoven postulated between western and eastern law and his exaggeration of the differences between the nineteen law regions within Indonesia can, in fact, be primarily considered orientalism. Secondarily, his work contained both culture-relativistic and universalistic elements. In principle, Van Vollenhoven emphasized the equality of Indonesian law in comparison with western law, and he considered Indonesians the best interpreters of their law. However, as already indicated, even Van Vollenhoven stated that adat law had to ultimately give way if ‘the demands of actual practice’ necessitated such. In his conceptualization, a liberal, universalistic substratum was discernable: the unavoidable progress of the western-oriented process of modernization in Indonesia, in both political and economic terms.

This rather hybrid and sometimes contradictory nature of Van Vollenhoven’s conceptualization of adat law was common among many prominent KITLV members in the Interbellum. However, they were not all equally open to the increasing influence of culture relativism, characterized by recognition of the fundamental equality of eastern and western cultures. Even in anthropology, the academic discipline most open to culture relativism, the work of an authoritative professor like Van Eerde was
still dominated by universalism on the one side and orientalism on the other.

In a popular scientific publication, Van Eerde (1920: 25) made the mandatory profession of universalism in his introduction: ‘One of the most important results of anthropology can be considered the certainty recognized by many that mankind is a single whole, not only in terms of physical likeness but equally as evidenced in intellectual properties’. In his more concrete conclusion, focusing on Indonesia, however, he emphasized the numerous great differences among the various Indonesian peoples and between these collectively and the more civilized West. ‘It would appear’, said Van Eerde in his typical wording (1920: 188–9),

that the moment of inertia seen among the natives of the Indies archipelago, the fatalistic submission to various influences, the patient bearing of imposed obligations, must be ascribed not only to hereditary race characteristics but also to economic, climatological, historical and religious factors.

The representative of a new generation of anthropologists in KITLV, however, De Josselin de Jong, was a culture relativist to a much stronger degree. He wholeheartedly rejected racism, orientalism and other manifestations of the Eurocentric superiority philosophy. He also criticized the universalistic-evolutionistic paradigm of his predecessors, albeit that a core of universalism was evident in his own structuralistic paradigm in anthropology (Van Baal 1965; Locher 1976, 1978; P.E. de Josselin de Jong and Vermeulen 1989; Koentjaraningrat 1975: 137–65).

Jan Petrus Benjamin de Josselin de Jong (1886–1964) was born with the surname De Jong. His father, who taught English in Leiden, had the surname changed in 1893 by adding De Josselin. De Josselin de Jong completed the gymnasium in Leiden and went on to study Dutch language. Professor C.C. Uhlenbeck, who taught the Old Germanic languages as well as general linguistics, became his mentor. After he obtained his degree, Uhlenbeck took De Josselin de Jong to the United States in 1910 to study the languages of the Blackfoot Indians. When he returned to the Netherlands, De Josselin de Jong was appointed conservator of the Anthropological Museum in Leiden. He obtained his PhD under Uhlenbeck based on what he called an ethno-psychological study: *De waarderingsonderscheiding van ‘levend’ en ‘levenloos’ in het Indogermaansch vergeleken met hetzelfde verschijnsel in enkele Algokin-talen*. This comparative study explored the distinction between living and dead in the Indo-Germanic and the Algokin languages. This was De Josselin de Jong’s
linguistic introduction to the new structuralistic paradigm that he went on to explore in anthropology, always retaining his interest in linguistics.

De Josselin de Jong continued to be conservator for the Anthropological Museum until 1935, but in 1922 he also accepted a position as extraordinary professor in general anthropology via the Leiden University Fund. Rassers, his colleague and friend who directed the Indonesia and South Sea department of the Anthropological Museum, brought him into contact with the Indonesian culture and influenced his structural-anthropological analysis of that culture. Together with Rassers De Josselin de Jong studied the work of the French sociologists E. Durkheim and M. Mauss. The creation myth that Rassers discovered in the traditional Javanese wayang and panji tales was systematically explored for the marriage and relationship structures in all Indonesian cultures by De Josselin de Jong and his students. Within that framework, he and a number of students performed extensive field research in eastern Indonesia from 1932 to 1934 (Teeuw 1976; Koentjaraningrat 1975: 134–42).

De Josselin de Jong was a demanding taskmaster, not only for his students but also for himself, and used little diplomacy in dealing with his colleagues and the university administrators in Leiden. This is why he was not appointed as professor until 1935, when he succeeded Nieuwenhuis in the ethnology of the Indies. He was elected to the KITLV board at the same time.

In his programmatic oration, De Josselin de Jong (1935) discussed the main lines of his structural paradigm for Indonesia as a field of ethnological study. Like Van Vollenhoven, he viewed this field of study in terms of ‘unity in diversity’. He expanded this conceptualization in terms of patrilineal and matrilineal variations on a single complementary relationship system characterized as phratry-dualism. Wilken’s thesis that the matrilineal and patrilineal systems were two successive phases within the process of evolution was untenable in his view. The two systems were simply too intertwined, in Indonesia and elsewhere.

Without mentioning Colijn, De Josselin de Jong (1935: 5) also refuted the ‘superficial statement not in keeping with reality’ ‘that the people of the Indies do not form a unity in any way, that the only thing that unites this world of islands so heterogeneous in race, language and culture is Dutch authority’. In addition to the original relationship system, the Indonesian cultures were also related from the religious and linguistic perspectives through the spreading of the Islam and the Malay language. In general, he refuted ‘all attempts to divide humanity into smaller, clearly distinctive groups according to race or civilization’. ‘Civilizations are just...
like the races," explained De Josselin de Jong (1935: 3): ‘there are an infinite number, or a few, and really there is but one’.

De Josselin de Jong was an agnostic with special interest in religion. If they were not too afflicted with a sense of Eurocentric superiority, he liked to mentor missionaries pursuing their PhD because of their extraordinary understanding of specific Indonesian languages and cultures. He was not politically active prior to the Second World War, but he identified himself in the ethical tradition of Snouck Hurgronje and Van Vollenhoven in Leiden. He continued his professorship until 1955, therewith providing an important degree of continuity in the Leiden school of structuralist anthropology.
Some of De Josselin de Jong’s students encountered anomalies in his structuralistic paradigm in their postgraduate studies, but did not report these during his professorship (Vermeulen 2002: 106).

In linguistics, archaeology and history as practiced within the framework of KITLV, culture relativism was also on the rise, albeit to a lesser degree than in anthropology. Interesting in that respect is the fact that both Rinkes (Van der Wal 1967: 105) and Bosch (1938: 35) note that many of their colleague students around 1900 – and perhaps they themselves, as well – tended to romanticize the eastern cultures they studied. A romantic tendency categorized in recent orientalism literature as ‘affirmative orientalism’ because it maintained the fundamental difference between the West and the East (King 1999: 92).

Later, after actual visits to Indonesia, the Dutch orientalists began to understand that both the East and the West had their bright and dark sides, according to Rinkes and Bosch. This balanced view can be considered culture relativism. This was certainly the case with Bosch (1938) and Berg (1929), whose orations emphasized the equality of the art and literature of Javanese antiquity and Middle Ages with those of the European antiquity and Middle Ages.

A more radical type of culture relativism was evident in the historical study by the young Indology specialist J.C. van Leur, Eenige beschouwingen betreffende den ouden Aziatische handel, who received his PhD in Leiden with these observations on historic Asian trade. His thesis systematically opposed the popular Eurocentric and anachronistic opinion that, from its very beginning, the VOC had been the dominant power in the Indonesian archipelago during the first phase of colonial expansion. His theoretical premises were derived from Max Weber’s work. Van Leur asserted that Weber’s neutral, sociological approach was much more suitable for analyzing the archipelago in the early modern era than the usual Netherlands-centric terminology used in colonial historiography. Thus armed, Van Leur attempted to demonstrate that the VOC did not have any political, military or economic dominance and was forced to adjust to the local trade system used by the Indonesian states in the archipelago (Vogel 1992: 109–247).

In his criticism, Van Leur minced no words with reference to the established colonial historians and prominent KITLV board members Krom, Colenbrander and F.W. Stapel. It was not they but the Amsterdam non-western sociologist and KITLV dissident Wertheim who endeavoured to introduce Van Leur’s thesis to a wider audience – after Van Leur’s early demise in the Battle of the Java Sea (1942) – and had it published in English
in 1955. At that time, after the decolonization, minds were more open to Van Leur’s radical, historical relativism than they had been during the Interbellum.

KITLV Sustains

*Difficult Times*

The increasing importance of culture relativism over the course of the twentieth century has been linked to three central events that first shocked the European sense of superiority and ultimately ended European colonization: the First World War, the Great Depression and the Second World War (Hobsbawm 1994: 210–6). As a colonial academic institution, KITLV was also affected by these three major events. Between 1914 and 1940, membership declined. With 725 members in 1910, the peak of the colonial period, the number of members and donor members steadily declined to 643 in 1920, 489 in 1930 and 380 in 1940.

The economic crisis of the 1930s clearly accelerated this decline. This held particularly true for KITLV members in the Indies, where the recession and policy of reducing costs was felt more strongly than in the Netherlands. However, the fact that the decline in membership numbers began during the First World War, despite the fact that as a small, neutral state the Netherlands was spared, indicates that not only material but also immaterial factors played a part in the decline. The extent to which the First World War jolted faith in the European mission of civilization is evident in the letter in which M.J. Tiele explained his termination of membership as a donor. ‘That I am now suddenly terminating my support,’ he wrote, ‘is caused by the fact that this horrible world war has convinced me that all efforts to the good and benefit of mankind will ultimately be for naught, because despite all of his so-called civilization, man maintains the bestial nature of centuries past, and any effort to support that civilization is therefore useless’ (KITLV 181, NB 22 June 1916).

When the smoke had finally settled from the First World War, KITLV’s financial situation was difficult due to the reduced membership numbers. Nominally, fees and contributions were about the same in 1920 as they had been in 1912: f 10,134. Inflation, however, reduced the relative value of that sum. KITLV’s portfolio of stocks and bonds was also deflated by the First World War. The financial difficulties were amplified in the two large-scale research projects that KITLV had initiated just prior to the First World War: the Borobudur study and the Coen edition. Despite royal
the late-colonial rise of indology

subsidies from the Department of the Colonies of \( \text{\textsterling} 22,000 \) and \( \text{\textsterling} 12,000 \), respectively, in 1920 the shortfall for the Borobudur monograph totalled \( \text{\textsterling} 6,000 \) and that for the Coen edition \( \text{\textsterling} 4,500 \) (KITLV 373).

Treasurer IJzerman, however, came to the rescue. He applied all of his financial skills and business contacts, and was tremendously successful in doing so. By forming a trunk capital as KITLV’s financial reserve, he succeeded in attracting no less than \( \text{\textsterling} 209,243 \) in one-off donations from the colonial business sector. The major contributors were the KPM with a coalition of steamship companies, good for \( \text{\textsterling} 42,000 \), and the BPM, IJzerman himself and his colleague Royal Shell board members H.W.A. Deterding, H. Loudon and A. Capadose, with donations of \( \text{\textsterling} 25,000 \) each (KITLV 373). These three were immediately awarded honorary membership of KITLV. The thankful Institute also elected IJzerman as honorary member and as its President in the periods 1927–1929 and 1930–1932. In addition to the competing ‘petroleum faculty’ in Utrecht, predominantly Leiden KITLV was now also a kind of ‘petroleum institute’.

Thanks to IJzerman’s well-invested trunk capital, KITLV came out of the depression relatively unscathed despite the strong decline in membership. In 1940, fees and contributions had declined to \( \text{\textsterling} 4000 \) of the total income of \( \text{\textsterling} 17,500 \), less than half of the income KITLV enjoyed in its peak year 1912 (KITLV 393). The trunk capital, however, had survived the economic crisis relatively well. Totalling \( \text{\textsterling} 298,625 \) in 1930, in 1940 the total had only decreased to \( \text{\textsterling} 282,172 \) (KITLV 383 and 393). In part thanks to the revenue from shares and bonds, the KITLV not only maintained the scope of Bijdragen and the number of monographs published but also gradually expanded its library. According to the three supplements to Rouffaer’s first catalogue, the number of titles increased from 14,000 in 1908 to 17,000 in 1915, 21,000 in 1927 and 24,000 in 1937 (Jaquet 1993: 16–7).

The impoverished Indisch Genootschap, by contrast, was forced to repeatedly ask the KITLV to reduce its financial contribution for the building and library due to a strong decline in its membership, from 366 in 1930 to 152 in 1937. That contribution decreased from one thousand guilders in 1930 to only one hundred in 1940. In 1937 IG lost its library ownership rights. “Could it be more gloomy?”, asked IG President Boeke, professor of tropical-colonial law in Leiden, during the annual meeting of 18 June 1937. Yes, that was possible. After Germany occupied the Netherlands, IG simply ceased to exist. Its last public meeting was held on 2 February 1940, chaired by Boeke. Incidentally, after 1914 he was one of the few presidents of the Indisch Genootschap who did not also hold a position on the KITLV board, such as Kielstra and Van Vollenhoven.
KITLV, however, survived the crisis, the war and decolonization. Despite the reduced number of members and donors – from 725 in 1910 to 280 in 1940 – the composition of the board and the members was still essentially the same. All the categories of members distinguished in 1910: intellectuals, (former) civil servants, missionaries, businessmen, politicians, and foreign, Indonesian and female members, were also represented in 1940, in roughly the same proportions. This means that the number of Indonesian and female members remained relatively the same, and was not increasing. With the 1910 figures in parentheses, the numbers of members and donors in 1940 in the Netherlands was 270 (428), in the Indies 92 (260) and in other countries 17 (35). These included 29 (64) member-donors, while publication exchanges existed with 176 (159) Indies and foreign institutions.

The composition of the board remained basically the same from 1910 to 1940. Leiden professors dominated, but former administrators and usually a liberal businessman were also represented in the board. After Kielstra and IJzerman, for instance, G. Vissering, President of the Nederlandsche Bank, was also a board member for a number of years. Between 1914 and 1940, the successive presidents were Snouck Hurgronje, Liefrinck, Van Vollenhoven, IJzerman, Van Eerde, Krom and Van Ronkel. The secretaries were first Kielstra, then sinologist and former labour inspector in the Outer Territories B. Hoetink, former Resident and former member of the Raad van Indië De Roo de la Faille, and finally the historian Stapel, who also served as President of the KITLV after 1945. The three historians among the KITLV presidents during the colonial period, the amateur historian IJzerman, the archaeologist Krom and the VOC historian Stapel, will be discussed in more detail below. This is justified based on the fact that along with the linguists and *adat* law specialists, these historians authored a large number of the monographs and *Bijdragen* articles published by KITLV between 1914 and 1940.

Large and Small Publications

Between 1914 and 1940, KITLV published 99 titles. Two of these appeared in the new Verhandelingen series that, unlike the individual *Werken*, has been published as a numbered series from 1938 to today. Of the 99 books, 42 were in the field of *adat* law, 25 in the field of linguistics, 21 in the field of history, 7 were general, and only 4 involved the field of ethnology. The high score for *adat* law was caused by the 33 *Adatrechtbundels*, the low score for ethnology because ethnologists were increasingly able to publish in their own professional journals (De Wolf 1998: 25–47).
The largest and most expensive editions had to do with history: the two-volume *Beschrijving van Barabudur*, the first archaeological volume of which counting 791 pages and 442 illustrations was compiled by Krom in 1920 and the second architectural volume with 570 pages and 250 illustrations was compiled by engineer corps officer Th. van Erp; the source edition and biography *Jan Pietersz. Coen; Bescheiden omtrent zijn bedrijf in Indië*, the six volumes of which were published by Colenbrander between 1919 and 1934, totalling 4500 pages; and Krom’s two-volume *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche kunst* with 750 pages and 100 illustrations published in 1920.

Including government subsidies, these wonderful KITLV editions cost ƒ 38,000, ƒ 16,000 and ƒ 7000, respectively. The fact that the second architectural volume of the Borobudur monograph took so long irritated the KITLV board. But Van Erp emphasized ‘the time-consuming coolie work’ involved in the publication: ‘Dimensioning hundreds of photographs in three different formats and expertly and rhythmically dividing and type-setting these on some two hundred plates: coolie work that must be done personally and with the greatest care’ (*KITLV* 202, NB 12 February 1927).

Heeres, former deputy keeper of the national archives, professor in Leiden of colonial history and KITLV board member, who had published the first part of the VOC contracts with Indonesian rulers in 1907, took his time, to the chagrin of KITLV board, completing the second volume of this *Corpus diplomaticum Neerlando-Indicum*. It was not published until 1931, both in *BKI* and as a book. Heeres, for the record, was also MP for the Liberale Unie from 1913 to 1918 and continued to hold numerous politico-social positions after his retirement. In turn, Heeres complained of the ‘lack of appreciation’ that the first volume had received in history circles: ‘By some merely acknowledged with a shrug of the shoulder, by others dismissed as a monster with no value, only a few historians […] utilized my contracts publication’. In the course of his source research for the second volume, however, Heeres got past his disappointment: ‘The entire, giant task executed by the men of the VOC in the seventeenth century reappeared in my mind’s eye’ (*BKI* 1931: xv–xvi).

Of the other historical publications in book editions or as articles in *Bijdragen*, particularly noteworthy is Stapel’s biography of the seventeenth-century Governor General C.J. Speelman, which is discussed in more detail below. This also holds true for IJzerman’s detailed studies in the areas of archaeology and VOC history.

Many of the linguistic books and articles published between 1914 and 1940 in the *BKI* also applied a historical perspective. Nearly all of the
publications by Leiden professor of Malay Van Ronkel pertained to Old Malay texts (Drewes 1954). Compared to Kern, Javanists like Hazeu, Rassers, Berg, Gonda and Poerbatjara placed more emphasis on the authentic Javanese character of many of the literary works and themes borrowed from the Hindu and early Islamic periods. In his article on ancient Javanese art (BKI 1923: 323–47), archaeologist W.F. Stutterheim argued against the view that the later East Javanese art was a degeneration from the earlier Hindu art in Central Java due to its more specifically Javanese, sometimes animistic nature. He emphasized the continuity of the ‘great-Javanese’ art from the first Hindu empires on Central Java to that in contemporary Bali. All of these types of art were ‘an adequate expression of Indonesian experience; that which was borrowed from the Hindus was only a means’ (BKI 1923: 344).

In an article on the thirteenth-century royal chronicle ‘Kidung Harsawijaya’, Berg continued in the spirit of the thesis he introduced in his 1927 dissertation De Middel-Javaansche historische traditie that such chronicles were often rewritten and their specifically Javanese, epic and mystic character made them unreliable sources for the history of the Majapahit. ‘It is no wonder’, said Berg, ‘that legend later mastered this, the most dramatic period in Java’s ancient history. It contains much that the historian cannot presume is true.’ (BKI 1931: 1.)

Gonda, who filled a large part of Bijdragen in the 1930s together with Berg, also voiced objections to the Eurocentric approach to Javanese and Malay texts by earlier linguistics ‘against the earlier common practice of modelling Indonesian languages based on Latin and Dutch models’ (BKI 1940: 1). According to Gonda, however, now the balance was sometimes being tipped in the other direction to the other extreme of Indocentric linguistics. The same criticism was uttered later by Bosch regarding the historical Javacentrism that in in particular Berg applied.

In the field of ethnology, only a few monographs were published by KITLV, but initially many articles appeared in Bijdragen. A.C. Kruyt, a well-known missionary and KITLV board member, for example, extensively described and analysed animism among the Toraja in Central Celebes, requiring him to distance himself from his Christian faith (BKI 1918: 233–60, 1919: 36–133). Explicitly culture-relativistic were the articles by A.P. Penard on Suriname folktales (BKI 1924: 325–63, 1926: 48–94). Another Bijdragen contribution was the dissertation with which administrator and literator H.J. Friedericy obtained his PhD under De Josselin de Jong: “De standen bij de Boegineezien en Makassaren” (BKI 1933: 447–602) on the Buginese and Makassarese classes.
In his dissertation, Friedericy supplemented the usual division of the classes – nobility, freemen and slaves – with a number of ‘intermediate classes’ among the nobility depending on the extent to which an individual’s blood lines can be traced back to the original nobility who, according to the creation myth, came directly from heaven. His analysis therefore closely followed his mentor’s structural paradigm of ‘phratry dualism’. Friedericy also challenged earlier authors whose description of the class division on South Celebes was Eurocentric. His own research indicated ‘that this society, to which we so willingly to link the terms “monarchy”, “despotism” and “feudal”, cannot be so easily characterized using a single label’ (BKI 1933: 581).

Lastly, prominent among the more general KITLV publications was the Gedenkschrift published on the occasion of the Institute’s 75th anniversary (De Roo de la Faille 1926). After a historical introduction by De Roo de la Faille, this publication included articles by Snouck Hurgronje on a recent Cairo religious history dissertation, by Van Vollenhoven on the discovery of the adat law in British India, by Krom on the Borobudur, by IJzerman on seventeenth-century Dutch lithographs as a commodity on Malacca, by Van Eerde on Javanese dance, by Poerbatjaraka on dating the Old Javanese Ramayana and by Rassers on the religious importance of Shiva and Buddha since Indonesian antiquity: none of these discussed a current colonial-political subject.

Many historians have recently pointed out that in the Netherlands, the Interbellum was a conservative, pillarized and strictly parochial period (Blom 1994: 467–8). One might think that the KITLV intellectuals, whose colonial policy of ethical reform was increasingly frustrated, sought solace in highly academic studies of a historical nature, often far removed from reality. The proclamation of Malay as the unified language for Indonesia in 1928 during the second nationalist youth conference, for example, appears to have completely passed by KITLV (Steinhauer 2000: 13–5). However, the KITLV intellectuals did not disavow their generally liberal stance in these historical publications. Subjects such as sexuality in Indonesia and Suriname were relatively candidly discussed, for example.

For instance, in the past board member and department administrator J.K.W. Quarles van Ufford had unsuccessfully proposed that the Van der Tuuk dictionaries be cleansed ‘because they include a large number of words which chastity forbids including and explaining in a dictionary’ (BKI 1881: lxxxii). The other board members rejected the proposal ‘primarily because the language should be described in a dictionary in its entirety’. Even a relatively rigid, conservative professor like Krom was able to
lyrically describe the historical celebration of the full moon that was still being customary on Borneo: ‘At the finish, after the toedan, each young man selects from these girls the one most pleasing and takes her to one of the structures known as coupling houses [...] where the loving couples spend the night’ (BKl 1926: 314).
The Bijdragen editors found it much more difficult to approve an article submitted by government administrator L. Berkhout in which the homosexual initiation rites imposed on young Papuans in southern New Guinea – a phenomenon still being studied by anthropologists today (Herdt 1984) – were described in a fiercely realistic manner. With only a few small changes, the article was published nevertheless (BKI 1919: 438–47). Berkhout, incidentally, did not oppose the initiation rites so much on moral grounds but for medical-humanitarian reasons because they were related to the venereal diseases that colonialism had brought and that threatened to decimate the population.

Three Historians as President

In a way, IJzerman, Krom and Stapel represented three generations of historians, despite the fact that the age difference between Krom and Stapel was minimal. IJzerman was still the amateur archaeologist and historian from the era of modern imperialism. Krom played a leading role in the rise of professional archaeology around the turn of the twentieth century. Stapel’s work typifies the industrious archives research that blossomed in the Interbellum.

Jan Willem IJzerman (1851–1932) was born in Leerdam and followed the engineering programme offered by the Koninklijke Militaire Academie in Breda (De Roo de la Faille 1932; Van Eerde 1926; Wieder 1934). As a young lieutenant, he started working for the public works department of the administration in the Indies in 1873 to help construct railroads in Java and Sumatra. He was appointed chief railway engineer in 1881. Stationed in Yogjakarta, IJzerman became interested in the Prambanan and the Borobudur of which he discovered important reliefs behind an earthen embankment. He was the founder of and driving force behind the Oudheidkundige Vereeniging in Yogyakarta, which did extensive exploratory studies in the vicinity. IJzerman wrote about these activities in the Tijdschrift of the Bataviaasch Genootschap in evoking, orientalist terms. ‘Lonely and deserted’, he wrote of the Prambanan, ‘it is now here, where there was so much life and movement in the past; here, where powerful rulers [...] looked down upon their subjects with disdain [...] as they constructed, as ordered, the proud temple buildings that the rulers believed would be eternal witnesses to their fame and glory’ (De Roo de la Faille 1932: ix).

IJzerman’s reputation was primarily that of a pioneer of Dutch imperialism. He succeeded in constructing the legendary railroad over extremely
difficult terrain that connected the Ombilin coal mines in West Sumatra to the coast. In 1896, the founders of the Muara Enim oil company that was mining the rich oil fields in Palembang asked IJzerman to be their director. In that position, IJzerman went to work energetically – a bit too much so, in the eyes the colonial establishment. Because the Muara Enim was only a mining company and not a commercial enterprise, IJzerman entered into an agreement with the American company Standard Oil, which was Royal Shell’s main competitor. The nationalist press in the Netherlands raised an outcry and Minister for the Colonies Cremer threatened to terminate Muara Enim’s concession. IJzerman then cancelled the agreement with Standard Oil and, after some ‘precise manoeuvring’ among the powers-that-be in the international oil world, Muara Enim was to be incorporated into Royal Shell, under conditions that were highly favourable for IJzerman and his shareholders. As commissioner with Royal Shell, his political ties enabled IJzerman to provide extremely valuable services to the multi-national oil company (Hendrix 1996: 66–74, 110–2, 139–41).

Now wealthy, IJzerman could have retired. Instead, he devoted every possible effort to politics and science. He was a member of the Amsterdam city council from 1899 until 1906 and MP for the Liberale Unie in the periods 1905–1909 and 1917–1918. Regarding his role as politician, Van Eerde (1926: 406–7) commented: ‘His strength was not public speaking. This man of deeds […] shined brightly, however, in negotiations on important matters.’ IJzerman primarily devoted his organizational talents to promoting colonial science. From 1899 to 1919 he was KNAG’s President; in 1908 he founded the Linschoten-Vereeniging together with Rouffaer, and he joined the KITLV board in 1911, serving as its President in the periods 1927–1929 and 1930–1932. Vice President Van Eerde (1926: 411) voiced his gratitude in a tribute organized on the occasion of IJzerman’s 65th birthday: ‘who, as interim treasurer, put the Institute in the Van Galenstraat on solid ground in only a few months’.

IJzerman was responsible for important source publications and wrote many articles about Dutch explorations and trading ventures in the seventeenth century. Ship journals, including that of Cornelis de Houtman, were published by the Linschoten-Vereeniging, and IJzerman’s articles appeared in Bijdragen and KNAG’s Tijdschrift. A warm example is ‘Het verzoekschrift eener Bataviasche weduwe in 1631’, in which IJzerman described the adventures of a young widow, ‘a strong, cheerful woman’, who petitioned the States General for permission to remarry or to return to the Netherlands, which the Batavian authorities would not grant.
When he died, the influential Amsterdam ‘regent capitalist’ E. Heldring (J. de Vries 1970, II: 999–1000), whose praise was scarce, wrote in his diary: ‘He was a man. Faults were attributed to him, but his glittering characteristics far outshined these. He would have been a multi-millionaire in America. Here he was a man of deeds and of science, making him a great Dutchman.’ Both the Municipal University in Amsterdam and the Technical College in Bandung, which IJzerman helped establish, had awarded him honorary doctorates for his contributions to science.

Compared to the colourful life led by IJzerman, who Van Eerde said could have stepped out of a seventeenth-century citizen's militia portrait, Krom was but a bore. He was able, however, to utilize the room that pioneers like IJzerman had created for Java's archaeology, to the highest academic standards. Historians still regularly consult Krom's work, much more so than that of IJzerman. Nicolaas Johannes Krom (1883–1945) was born as the son of the keeper of the archives in Den Bosch (Bosch 1976; ’t Hart-van den Muijzenberg 1989). After the gymnasium, he went to study law in Leiden in 1901, but soon switched to classical languages. As a student of Professor A.E.J. Holwerda, he became increasingly interested in archaeology. He was employed as assistant at the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden (National Museum of Antiquities) in Leiden and obtained his PhD under Holwerda in 1908 with a dissertation in Latin on the Germanic inhabitants of the Netherlands in the Wandering of Nations era. Krom also studied Sanskrit and Old Javanese with Kern and was appointed to succeed Brandes as Chairman of the Commissie voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera in 1910.

After research journeys in British India and French Indochina, the commission was reorganized in 1913 based on Krom's insight into a full-fledged Oudheidkundige Dienst van Nederlandsch-Indië (Archaeological Service for the Dutch Indies). Krom primarily concentrated on site diggings and the conservation and restoration of Javanese temples. The most important of these was the Borobudur, over which he compiled a monumental monograph for the KITLV together with Van Erp. Typical for his caution, Krom was extremely hesitant about the reconstruction of antiquities, in which contemporary archaeologists filled in gaps based on their own insight. This constituted a serious difference of opinion between Krom and the more adventurous Bosch, who succeeded him as head of the Oudheidkundige Dienst in 1915 (Bernet Kempers 1978: 87–90).

Having returned to the Netherlands for health reasons in 1915, Krom was contracted by the government to write a number of books on Javanese ancient art and history, including the Borobudur monograph. He was
appointed extraordinary professor of archaeology and ancient history of the Indies in Leiden in 1919. In 1925 Krom succeeded Colenbrander as professor of colonial history. In this more recent historical field, Krom published a biography of the eighteenth-century Governor General G.W. van Imhoff in 1941. Krom became a member of the KITLV board in 1920, serving as its President in the periods 1932–1936 and 1937–1941.

Fasseur (1993: 410) commented on Krom’s professorship in Leiden: ‘Krom was another sleep-inducing lecturer who, year after year, read from the same lecture dictation – available at any Leiden flea market. A great academic is simply not always a great educationist.’ His publications on ancient Java were also usually bone dry. Krom (1923) proved to be so wary of unfounded generalization that, even in a popular scientific booklet in the series published by the Volksuniversiteit on ancient Java, his
sentences were complicated on-the-one-hand-on-the-other-hand paragraphs. Regarding the influence of external Hindu cultural factors and that of the authentic Javanese culture – a topic of fierce discussion since 1900 – Krom (1923: 10) was extremely cautious.

The Indonesians of Java (and most probably also those of the other regions where Hinduism gained permanent entry) had reached a not entirely low stage of development, and the very fact that they had something of their own to compare to outside cultures made it possible for the two elements to mix and form something entirely new.

At the end of the colonial period, Krom also wrote the section on ancient Indonesia in the monumental, five-volume history *Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch-Indië*, edited by Stapel (1938–1940) who moreover wrote two volumes. Frederik Willem Stapel (1879–1957) was born into a middle-class family (Coolhaas 1957; Vogel 1989). After completing teacher training, he taught in The Hague for a number of years. After obtaining the required certificate, he studied Dutch language and literature in Leiden. The financial obligations of his marriage forced him to stop his studies after obtaining his BA and move his young family to the Indies in 1908.

There Stapel taught history at the HBS in Batavia, then Semarang and Bandung. He was elected to the Bandung municipal council in 1912 and served as deputy mayor from 1919 until 1921. Stapel obtained his PhD in 1922 while on leave in the Netherlands, based on his dissertation on the treaty of Bongaya, *Het Bongaais verdrag*, with Colenbrander in Leiden. The dissertation discussed the conflict between the VOC and the Makassar Sultanate, a theme that he further explored in his biography of Cornelis Janszoon Speelman, conqueror of Makassar and a controversial Governor General accused of corruption. This biography was published both in *Bijdragen* (1936: 1–221) and in the KITLV monograph series.

Back in the Indies, Stapel served as director of the HBS in Bandung until he retired in 1927. After returning to the Netherlands, he continued to be an active historian, a private teacher of colonial history with the Amsterdam Municipal University and a member of the KITLV board, serving as its Secretary from 1933 to 1948 and as President from 1948 to 1950. Many important source publications from the VOC era bear his name. He is known best, however, as the compiler of the *Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch-Indië*, the five-volume history with contributions by Stapel himself and by Krom, Berg, the Javanist R.A. Kern and the South Africa specialist E.C. Godée Molsbergen. In his introduction, Stapel (1938–1940, I: 1) takes a nuanced view of the Netherlands’ colonial history: ‘Much was
done by our fellow-countrymen in the last period of more than three centuries that is not considered honourable by today’s standards, even when we attempt to put their actions into the perspective of that era. ‘But much was also done’, Stapel continued, ‘of which we may be justifiably proud’.

Coen, for example, Stapel (1938–1940, III: 115–53) both praised for founding and defending Batavia and blamed for the slaughter on the
Banda islands. This was a much more balanced view of Coen than the snarling, hagiographic images painted in the works by Gerretson and Utrecht PhD student L. Kiers: *Coens eerherstel* (1944) and *Coen op Banda* (1943).

Stapel’s series of admirable volumes nevertheless had a serious construction error, as explained by Van Leur in his biting review. After two volumes of precolonial Indonesian history, the Indonesians themselves virtually disappeared from view in the third volume once the Dutch arrived in the archipelago. ‘With the arrival of West European ships, the perspective shifts one hundred and eighty degrees and the Indies are viewed from that point on from the ship deck, from over the walls of the forts and from the high gallery of the lodge’, according to Van Leur, who concluded his review by saying: ‘this is not historiography, it is national catechism’ (Vogel 1992: 227–9).

In Stapel’s defence, Coolhaas (1957: 116) noted that the last and sixth volume was not published due to the author’s illness and the state of war – a volume in which the Indonesians would have undoubtedly received more attention. Van Leur’s criticism of the Eurocentric approach applied by Stapel, however, already heralded the postwar decolonization of historiography. After 1945, Stapel became increasingly outdated, both academically and politically. He was one of the KITLV members who would later deeply regret the decolonization of Indonesia.
CHAPTER FIVE

DECOLONIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION (1940–1975)

THE DECOLONIZATION PROCESS

The Second World War was also a difficult time for KITLV. The Institute had difficulty remaining active under German occupation. From both inside and outside, for example, the Institute was seriously pressured to drop its ‘Royal’ title. During the last winter of the war, the library was only open one and a half days per week due to fuel shortages. In Indonesia, nearly all Dutch KITLV members were incarcerated in camps by the Japanese. Any books and source materials in their possession were usually lost. Only a select few were permitted to continue to work outside of the camps; one such individual was the manager of the Bataviaasch Genootschap's Museum, A.N.J. Thomassen à Thuessink van der Hoop (Bernet Kempers 1969: 420).

Dutch historiography during the German occupation was long ‘under the spell of good or evil’, as meaningfully expressed by Blom (1989: 102–21). Only small minorities, however, actually participated in the resistance or actively collaborated with the German authorities. The attitude of most Dutch was fittingly characterized by Kossmann (1986: 154) as ‘accommodating’. In historical circles today, it is sometimes said that accommodation is merely a euphemism for collaboration. That is incorrect. The extent to which accommodation on the outside during war was accompanied by disgust on the inside is highly evident, including the letter that KITLV board member Damsté wrote to Secretary Stapel on 20 May 1944 (KITLV 227).

In this letter, Damsté argued that former civil servant and former professor of administrative law D.G. Stibbe, some of whose ancestors were Jewish but who was not required to wear a yellow star, indicating he was a Jew, should be allowed to visit the library. ‘I suspect’, Damsté wrote, ‘that the board will unanimously agree to honour this request if possible without significantly damaging the Institute’s interests. The Institute has its enemies, including among its members, and so caution is warranted.’ Collaborators did not consider the German authorities and members of the pro-German Nationaal-Socialistische Beweging (NSB) to be ‘enemies’;
accommodators often did. But a spirit of courageous resistance is nevertheless absent in Damsté’s letter.

Who were these enemies among the members of KITLV as referred to by Damsté? Only five individuals were expelled as KITLV members ‘for political reasons’ in 1945 (BKI 1946: xxx). One of these, however, was the NSB Secretary General of the Department of Justice during the war, J.J. Schrieke. Having been at one time professor of colonial and administrative law in Leiden and KITLV board member, Schrieke was dubbed ‘a high-level collaborator’ (Van Anrooij 1989). His brother was B.J.O. Schrieke, Van Eerde’s successor as director of the Koloniaal Instituut’s anthropology department and extraordinary professor of anthropology in Amsterdam, who would have nothing at all to do with national socialism. Already in his Leiden oration, J.J. Schrieke (1935) had advocated following the Japanese strategy for combating a crisis, characterized by nationalization of the economy, sober education for the people and a strict labour discipline. At the end of his oration, Schrieke warmly honoured the memory of his mentor and predecessor Van Vollenhoven in both academic and personal terms.

The direction that Schrieke gave to Van Vollenhoven’s study of adat law at the beginning of the war, however, would have made his mentor turn in his grave. Schrieke, who joined the NSB in 1940, made a prominent contribution to the special edition marking the one-hundredth volume of Bijdragen in 1941 that shined a new light on the differences between adat law and civil law titled ‘Adatrecht tegenover juristenrecht; Een oude tegenstelling in nieuw licht’. Referring to Van Vollenhoven and as analogy to the Indies, in this contribution Schrieke advocated replacing the applicable law of the Netherlands, which was strongly influenced by Roman law and the French civil and penal codes, by ‘the sound and primal German Volksrecht’: the original law of the Netherlands that, thankfully, was still alive in the legal consciousness of many Dutch (BKI 1941: 425–37). Schrieke’s colleague in both law and NSB, H.A. Idema, wrote a contribution based on Van Vollenhoven discussing a trio of nineteenth-century men of law in the Indies, subtitled no less as ‘Iets uit den strijd om de legaliteit’ (An anecdote about the legality struggle) (BKI 1941: 173–233). The KITLV board was likely to have been highly relieved to receive Schrieke’s letter of resignation of 21 September 1941, in which he resigned from the board because of his appointment as Secretary General of Justice (KITLV 224). After the war, for his collaboration Schrieke was initially sentenced to death, but this sentence was commuted to twenty years of imprisonment in 1946.
The accommodation course that KITLV was forced to follow during the war meant, for example, removing books by Jewish authors while, on the other hand pretending not to notice the admission of students in hiding to the library. No easy task, considering the fact that the few NSB members among the Institute’s members regularly visited the library. Once a few students stole the golden NSB pin from the coat of one of these members. The owner went into a furious rage, as reported by Coolhaas (1957: 118). Luckily, Secretary Stapel was in the library at the time and was able to calmly settle the matter. Some board members did not have the mental stamina to endure the pressure exerted by the German authorities and NSB supporters among KITLV’s members. Van Ronkel resigned as President in 1942, mentally drained by the circumstances of the war (Drewes 1954: 291). The position was temporarily assumed by a legal historian, A.H.M.J. van Kan. When Van Kan died in 1944, Van Ronkel was sufficiently recovered to resume.

Determining how many KITLV members fell victim to the German occupation, either due to their Jewish ancestry or because they were active in the resistance, is difficult. The Institute’s 1944 annual report, however, reports that two board members, treasurer E.E. Menten and De Josselin de Jong, were among the hostages in Vught freed by the allies (BKI 1946: xxxvii). The same applies to the Leiden Javanist and future KITLV President Drewes, who was first imprisoned in Buchenwald in 1940 in retribution for the imprisonment of Germans in the Indies and subsequently held hostage in Sint-Michielsgestel (Teeuw 1994b: 32).

The ego documents left behind by prominent KITLV members regarding their imprisonment or internment during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia reflect the variety also seen in later polemics between the authors Rudy Kousbroek and Jeroen Brouwers. Depending on the time, place and Japanese commander involved, camp experiences varied significantly (Van Velde 1985; Beets 1981: 210–307). In general, the people forced to work on the construction of railways and air fields suffered the most. During the last months of the war, many succumbed to hunger or illness. While ego documents report horrific cruelties on the one hand, such as watching fellow-prisoners being bayoneted by Japanese soldiers as graphically described by Rob Nieuwenhuys (1979: 54–62), on the other they also reflect inspiring lectures and conversations with fellow-prisoners, as remembered by others including Alberts (1989: 91).

While interned on Java, the young professor of law W.F. Wertheim and a young linguist in civil service, E.M. Uhlenbeck, both enthusiastic chess players, held extensive simultaneous displays. Like the deliberations
taking in place in Sint-Michielsgestel regarding the future of the Netherlands, a smaller circle consisting of Wertheim, Uhlenbeck, professor of law and future president of the Law Court in The Hague W.F.C. van Hattum, and the doctor, future professor of health care and chairman of the Medisch Comité Nederland-Vietnam J. de Haas also discussed the future of Indonesia. All four supported rapid decolonization, but already at that time Wertheim and De Haas had more radical ideas about how that should be done than Van Hattum and Uhlenbeck. Wertheim and Uhlenbeck remained chess mates nevertheless for the rest of their lives (interview with Uhlenbeck, 1 August 2000).

Even extremely moving personal experiences took place a number of times in the Japanese camps, such as the vision of the divine mystery experienced by Van Baal one night. ‘Hallucinations caused by hunger?’, Van Baal (1986, I: 448) later wondered. Certainly at the end of the war, hunger and illness were the most common experiences found in ego documents about the Japanese camps. According to Uhlenbeck, a third of the Indonesian KITLV intellectuals did not survive the war (BKI 1967: 208). When sixteen Leiden Indologists, most of whom linguists, met on 5 August 1946 to discuss the direct consequences of the war in the Netherlands and Indonesia, the balance they drew up of lost colleagues and destroyed collections was heartbreaking (Grijns 1986: 4).

A long-standing discussion is still ongoing among Dutch historians regarding the consequences of the Second World War for the Netherlands. All agree that the war put an end to the politics of neutrality and resulted in the decolonization of Indonesia. The internal consequences, however, still give cause for differences of opinions. While older historians, including Von der Dunk, consider the German occupation to be the event with the most far-reaching consequences in the twentieth century, younger historians such as Blom (1989: 164–84) point to the initial failure of ‘breakthrough’ of the pillarization system. In his view, Dutch society did not experience extensive changes until the 1960s.

Von der Dunk (1992: 50), however, considers the contestation of the postwar generation in the 1960s to be an after-effect of the Second World War. ‘The conflicts with the system and with the police in particular that were initiated by radicals quickly grew in their imagination into a conflict with an authoritarian, semi-fascist government.’ At the time Van Baal resigned as professor of anthropology in Utrecht in 1973 to protest the democratization campaign, however, even older professors were not afraid to virtually equate the student movement with the Nazis.
In any event, the Second World War’s direct consequences on KITLV were extensive. Firstly because the Institute’s mission was directly affected by the decolonization of Indonesia. Secondly because the ‘breakthrough’ of the new Partij van de Arbeid (PvdA, Labour Party), which failed on the national level, was more successful within KITLV. Partij van de Arbeid was established in 1946 by social democrats and liberal democrats in order to force a breakthrough in the traditional system controlled by the confessional parties. Primary political preference for the PvdA after 1945 was seen not only among the Leiden professors, most of whom considered themselves liberal democrats before the war, but also among the new professors with Christian backgrounds like A. Teeuw and G.W. Locher. Among the older generation of former civil servants, however, a number of prominent KITLV members maintained their liberal or confessional preference. This resulted in greatly differing reactions to the decolonization of Indonesia within KITLV.

The Traumatic Decolonization of Indonesia

The term ‘decolonization trauma’ was introduced by the political scientist Lijphart (1966) to explain the Netherlands’ stubbornness in refusing to relinquish New Guinea between 1949 and 1962. According to Lijphart, the trauma was a result of an emotional bonding with the colonization project and of resentment against the republican government of the ‘Japanese collaborator’ Soekarno, to whom the Netherlands had been forced to transfer sovereignty in 1949 under heavy pressure from the United States. After relinquishing New Guinea in 1962, again under heavy American pressure, the decolonization trauma continued to make itself felt, as evident, for example, in protests by veteran organizations against the admission of Poncke Princen, a Dutch deserter and Indonesian human rights activist, into the Netherlands; in the critical historiography by L. de Jong regarding Dutch colonialism and decolonization policy, and in the expected official apology for the more than one hundred thousand Indonesians who died between 1945 and 1949.

Along the left wing, however, the nature of the decolonization trauma changed. Over the course of the 1960s and 1970s, the increasing leftist criticism of ‘wrongful’ colonialism and decolonization policy was accompanied by strong emotions of ‘crime and punishment’, expressed in efforts to increase the ‘compensatory’ development aid and organize a model decolonization of Suriname. In 1995, when the Queen visited Indonesia
celebrating the country's fiftieth year of independence, opinion polls indicated that opinions regarding the Netherlands' actions during the decolonization were roughly divided as follows: one-third of the population was in favour of the Netherlands offering an official apology, one-third was not, and one-third had no preference (Kuitenbrouwer 1996: 34–5).

As a backdrop for scientific research within the framework of KITLV, the varying after-effects and processing of the decolonization trauma were not decisive, but of influence. Striking is the fact that this resulted in criticism of the Dutch decolonization policy at a very early stage. In 1945, De Josselin de Jong became the first president of the progressive Vereniging Nederland-Indonesië (Netherlands-Indonesia Association), which advocated a rapprochement between the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia; in the New Guinea issue, the young linguist Teeuw (1956: 23) already urged the Netherlands to officially apologize for its repressive behaviour during the decolonization of Indonesia, which showed similarities with the behaviour of the Germans and the Japanese during the Second World War.

Lijphart and other authors rightfully point out that in the Netherlands, resistance to the decolonization of Indonesia was based not only on emotional grounds, but also on political and economic grounds (Kuitenbrouwer 1986; Wesseling 1988: 252–68; Van Goor 1994: 325–43; Fasseur 1995: 234–51; Van den Doel 2000). From an economic perspective, the traditional motto was ‘Indië verloren, rampspoed geboren’ (If the Indies are lost, disaster will follow). Although the socio-economist Jan Tinbergen calculated that only fourteen percent of the prewar national income came directly from Indonesia, but as the Catholic former Minister of the Colonies Ch.J.I.M. Welter declared in parliament: ‘For most of the population, that fourteen percent represents a visit to the theatre, a beer, a new bicycle, or a new coat. Everything that makes life worth living is in that very fourteen percent.’ (Fasseur 1995: 238.) From a political perspective, when the United Nations was established in 1945, the government of the Netherlands claimed the status of medium-sized state, based on its extensive colonies. There was a strong fear that the Netherlands would be degraded ‘to the same status as Denmark’ due to the decolonization; as ‘an overly-populated farm along the North Sea’, as phrased by Gerretson (Hans Meijer 1994: 37). It was primarily a result of external pressure, especially by the United States and Great Britain, that the question of whether Indonesia would be given independence evolved into determining how decolonization would be effectuated. In response to anti-colonial criticism from the
United States in particular, Queen Wilhelmina promised in 1942 that a national conference would be organized in the future. The Dutch government in exile, however, refused to recognize Indonesia’s right to self-determination (Fasseur 1995: 215–33). In the Netherlands, the Republic of Indonesia that declared independence on 17 August 1945 was initially considered nothing more than a move by the Japanese. In part because of the bersiap – the eruption of the people’s anger against the Dutch, Indo-Europeans and the Chinese – the new Catholic-Socialist government of the Netherlands sent conscripts to Indonesia. The government also initially banned any type of consultation with the collaborator Soekarno. Under pressure from England, which wanted to remove its occupation forces, and at the instigation of the neo-ethical Governor General Van Mook and former Prime Minister W. Schermerhorn, the Linggadjati Agreement was concluded in 1946, in principle prescribing decolonization prior to 1949. The key problem, however, remained determining the extent to which the Netherlands or the Republic would direct the transition and therewith determine the nature of Indonesia’s independence. The Netherlands wanted a federal Indonesia under the leadership of the traditional pro-Netherlands allies and minorities, which would retain its ties with the Netherlands under a strong Union. The Republic, however, seriously resisted any such efforts, as a result of which the Netherlands launched two military offensives.

The Partij van de Arbeid led by Prime Minister W. Drees ultimately approved the two military campaigns in order to maintain the coalition government. In protest, however, many party members resigned. Not only the relatively conservative leader of the Katholieke Volkspartij (KVP, Catholic People’s Party) C.P.M. Romme (KVP was the largest government party immediately after the war) and Labour’s leader Drees, but also the progressive neo-ethicists Van Mook and Schermerhorn increasingly viewed the Republic as pesthole that needed to be eliminated. While the objective of the first offensive in 1947 was merely to curtail the Republic, the second in 1948 was intended to expunge it. The campaign achieved its military objective – occupation of the republican capital Yogyakarta – but hopelessly failed from the political perspective. Under heavy pressure from the United Nations and the United States, which threatened to suspend Marshall aid, the Netherlands was forced to release the Republican leaders in 1949 and to transfer sovereignty to a federal, albeit primarily Republican, government led by President Soekarno. For the time being, New Guinea was not included in the transfer of sovereignty in order to obtain political support from the Protestant parties and the Volkspartij
voor Vrijheid en Democratie (VVD, People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy) for the constitutional amendment, which required a two-thirds majority.

Public polls indicated that a large majority of the Dutch population supported this unwilling decolonization policy. In 1948–1949, 62% of the respondents approved the second campaign but only 21% approved the forced transfer of sovereignty (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 24–35). It is therefore not surprising that opinions on the decolonization of Indonesia also differed significantly among the prominent KITLV members. A distinction can be made between three views: the explicit supporters of decolonization, those who explicitly opposed it, and a group that accepted the need for decolonization in principle but opposed the Republican result. The supporters and opponents immediately started debating the issue in 1945.

Meijer Ranneft (1945), long-standing KITLV member, former President of the Volksraad and prominent participant in the negotiations for release of hostages in Sint-Michielsgestel, accepted more autonomy for Indonesia but did not support complete independence. Within a continued political relationship, he advocated an assertive policy giving both the Prime Minister in The Hague and the Dutch Governor General in Batavia greater authority with no Minister of the Colonies. Democratic control of the policy by the Dutch parliament and the Indonesian Volksraad, however, would still be dim in his conceptualization. According to Meijer Ranneft (1945: 22–3), Indonesian nationalism was not an important factor: ‘the large majority, even among the privileged Indonesians, accepted – as did the masses – Dutch authority voluntarily, clearly and with trust’. Continuation of the racial distinctions was essential to the composition of the Volksraad, and the existence of ‘racial feelings’ among the various groups of the population should be respected. This was something entirely different from ‘racial delusions’, according to Meijer Ranneft. His orientalist conclusion was that ‘the possibility for development of the eastern cultures of all the peoples of the archipelago’ was only possible under continued Dutch rule.

De Josselin de Jong sharply criticized this ‘publication that is extremely peculiar from various perspectives’ in his own pamphlet. In his view, ‘the path for the Indies’ prescribed by Meijer Ranneft had already been made obsolete by a series of events: first the Atlantic Charter followed by Japanese occupation and the subsequent declaration of the Republic of Indonesia. In particular, the continuation of racial differentiation advocated by Meijer Ranneft was strongly criticized by the cultural anthropologist De Josselin de Jong (1945: 15): ‘How on earth is it possible that he has
never heard or discovered for himself that “racial feelings” [...] are not hereditary but learned: ‘We hear’, he continued, ‘a honey-sweet ode to the old Indies, where life was so good, and where a small rebellious minority has come to spoil it all’.

De Josselin de Jong accepted Indonesian nationalism, manifested in the Republic of Indonesia, as an important factor. Together with socialists, communists, supporters of the ‘third path’ like Professor Wertheim of Amsterdam, and members of Perhimpunun Indonesia – the organization of Indonesian students in the Netherlands – he initiated the establishment of the Vereniging Nederland-Indonesië. As the first president of this association, De Josselin de Jong declared: ‘The large majority of the Dutch population still fail to understand what it is all about [...]. A healthy, non-colonial information campaign is urgently desired [...] We have a duty to oppose reactionary powers, and we will oppose them openly and honestly.’ (De Blauw and Severin 1980: 53.)

But even De Josselin de Jong considered Soekarno to be a collaborator, with no ‘ideological motives’, who had cooperated in ‘horrible terror’. Like many of the association’s members, he strongly preferred Sutan Sjahrir, the Republic’s anti-Japanese, socialist Prime Minister (De Blauw and Severin 1980: 54–5). In addition to De Josselin de Jong, Leiden professors Berg and R.P. Cleveringa were also active association members. The association advocated a peaceful solution to the conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. Forceful protests were made against the two military campaigns. The growing opposition between the Partij van de Arbeid and the Communistische Partij Nederland (CPN, Communist Party of the Netherlands), however, magnified the division between members of the association. The Communist Party severed ties with the association late in 1948 because the board refused to condemn the suppression of the communist revolt in Madiun.

De Josselin de Jong, however, did not represent the reigning view within the KITLV board with his progressive, critical assessment of the Netherlands’ decolonization policy. Until 1950, a conservative opponent of the decolonization such as former Minister of the Colonies Welter, was still present in the KITLV board. Welter even believed that the KVP had relinquished too much to the Republic of Indonesia and was elected to parliament in 1948 for his own Katholieke Nationale Partij (KNP, Catholic National Party). In 1952, W.L.G. Lemaire was also elected as MP for KNP. Lemaire was president of the Adatrecht Foundation from 1959 to 1973. However, most KITLV board members, often former colonial civil servants who may have become professors, assumed a more intermediate stance
between the explicit supporters and opponents of Indonesia’s independence.

In his obituary of the Leiden *adat* law specialist and KITLV President V.E. Korn, the Utrecht *adat* recht specialist Prins (1970: 200) summarized that stance as follows:

By many of those who considered the birth of a sovereign state of Indonesia as the just and desired outcome of the political process, the manner in which that independence evolved and the difficult relationships that continued long thereafter have caused a certain trauma. We know that Korn is one of these.

Damsté and Stapel also voiced opposition to the hasty transfer of sovereignty to the Soekarno regime. Damsté believed that his life’s work as civil servant and *adat* law specialist was largely destroyed as a result (Korn 1955: 129). Stapel, President of KITLV from 1948 to 1950, bitterly grieved the squandering of the Indies by an incompetent Dutch government for the sake of other domestic and foreign political interests like the Marshall Aid: ‘For many in the country, it will have been a grave disappointment that the Netherlands’ interests in our future relationship with Indonesia were represented by politicians who knew nothing of the country, the people or the main lines of its history’ (Vogel 1989: 566). The same drama was to be repeated with New Guinea.

**NEW GUINEA: POINT OF CONTROVERSY AND FIELD OF RESEARCH**

The obstinate refusal by the Netherlands to relinquish New Guinea to Indonesia resulted in a serious conflict between the former colony and the colonizer. With the constitutional amendment of 1956, the Netherlands officially annexed New Guinea as an overseas territory. In response, Indonesia severed the Union with the Netherlands, which in reality only existed on paper, and terminated the 1949 debt scheme. In 1957 Indonesia placed all remaining Dutch commercial ventures under state supervision, followed by complete nationalization in 1958. Diplomatic relations were terminated in 1960 and military infiltration from Indonesia into New Guinea was increased. Attempts by the conservative KVP Foreign Minister J.M.A.H. Luns, the personification of the Netherlands’ New Guinea policy, to place the territory under a UN mandate failed. The American Kennedy Administration subsequently forced the Netherlands to relinquish New Guinea to Indonesia in 1962. Severance of Indonesia had resulted not only in the loss of more than one billion guilders of Dutch investments in Indonesia, but also in the termination of virtually all scientific and cultural contact (Hans Meijer 1994).
According to Lijphart, the New Guinea policy employed by the Netherlands had both negative and positive sides. Negative were the resentment left from the previous decolonization of Indonesia and the refusal to give New Guinea to the hated Soekarno regime. Positive were the Netherlands’ attempts to shape New Guinea into a model colony and to prepare the Melanesian Papuans, who were so different from primarily Malay Indonesians, for their own independence. This mission of civilization was aptly characterized by Lijphart (1966: 288) as ‘egocentric altruism’.

The New Guinea policy of the Netherlands employed by the Drees and De Quay cabinets was supported by a large majority of both parliament and public opinion. In 1961 only 3% of the surveyed population supported relinquishing New Guinea. Thus the viewpoint voiced by the young Leiden Professor Teeuw (1956) in a pamphlet advocating sovereignty for Indonesia was not a popular one. According to Teeuw, as successor of the Indies Indonesia had the most rights to the territory. Of the many arguments used by the Netherlands to oppose the transfer, Teeuw believed only one could be considered valid to some extent: responsibility for development for the Papuans. He also noted, however, that the Netherlands had shamelessly ignored New Guinea in the preceding period. Moreover, Indonesia would well be capable of bearing responsibility for development. Also, its language was the lingua franca in New Guinea.

Teeuw (1956: 16) explained Indonesia’s viewpoint regarding New Guinea against the backdrop of the earlier struggle for independence as follows:

This entire system of military campaigns was the clearest proof that the Indies had become police state. [...] The prisons were filled to brimming for years, and what was done to hundreds or thousands of those prisoners under our authority is in no way different from what the Dutch suffered in the German or Japanese prison camps. [...] Thousands, no tens of thousands [...] were killed in these military campaigns.

With reference to the charges against which Indonesia tried the Dutch citizens L.N.H. Jungschläger and H.C.J.G. Schmidt – political showcases that triggered mass indignation in the Netherlands – Teeuw alluded to the Biblical metaphor of the splinter and the beam. ‘Understanding of our own guilt in the arrest and treatment of Dutch citizens in Indonesia based on our own far from impeccable past,’ said Teeuw (1956: 23) ‘would give us the willingness to atone for that guilt individually and collectively: to punish the guilty, to recognize unidentifiable individual guilt, and to offer compensation to innocent victims.’ Teeuw added to the pamphlet a review
of the effects of the actions of the Netherlands during the decolonization found in recent Indonesian literature.

He claimed to have written the pamphlet more as a Dutch citizen than as an academic. What bothered him the most was the fact that he could not demonstrate his New Guinea views in the elections by voting for one of the democratic parties. That accusation targeted Partij van de Arbeid, whose members of parliament uncritically approved the New Guinea policy prescribed by Drees and Luns. Teeuw was an active member of Partij van de Arbeid, and he repeated his criticism in 1961 as co-author of a report by the left-wing Sociaal-Democratische Studie Vereniging (Social Democratic Students Association) on the New Guinea issue (Grijns 1986: 19). But again, as had been the case with criticism by De Josselin de Jong of the Dutch decolonization policy, Teeuw – who was not even a board member in 1956 – certainly did not represent the general views among the top of KITLV. There New Guinea was considered to be an appealing alternative for the loss of Indonesia as a field of research. During the sober 1950s, linguistic, anthropological and adat law research in New Guinea represented one of the few possibilities the virtually destitute KITLV had for acquiring government subsidies.

According to Korn, former civil servant in the Indies, professor of adat law in Leiden, and KITLV President from 1950 to 1952, the Netherlands was justified in keeping New Guinea. In his article ‘Nieuw-Guinea, een balans en een programma’ (BKI 1955: 385–412) discussing the present situation in and a programme for New Guinea, he quoted approvingly Minister W.J.A. Kernkamp’s statement that the Netherlands had ‘a sacred task’ to fulfil with the Papuans. That task had actually already begun in 1901 with the announcement of the ethical policy. After long neglecting ‘this wild corner of our former colonial kingdom’, a start could finally be made in developing the country and the people. ‘This time, now that we can devote all of our efforts to helping an area that is undeveloped in part due to our own neglect, may earnest work be made of the elevated view reflected in the Minister’s words’, said Korn. Linguistic, anthropological and adat law academic research could significantly contribute to this development task according to Korn.

Some future professors and KITLV board members, like the linguist J.C. Anceaux and the anthropologist Pim Schoorl, also started their careers as colonial civil servants in New Guinea. Because New Guinea justified the continuation of colonial professorships for the civil servant educational programmes and because the territory continued to be considered a sub-field of ‘Austronesian’ linguistics, anthropology and adat law, the period
of Dutch administration between 1950 and 1962 can be considered the Indian summer of Indology, even though that period was only a temporary reprieve (Fasseur 1993: 473–83).

School (1996) edited a collection of dozens of articles by former civil servants discussing their administrative and research activities in
New Guinea, published by KITLV. Regarding the relationship between anthropological research and colonial administration in New Guinea, J.J. de Wolf and S.R. Jaarsma also published articles in *Bijdragen* (1992: 103–24). Between 1950 and 1962, dozens of articles in *Bijdragen* and seven books in various KITLV series were published discussing the linguistics, anthropology and *adat* law of New Guinea written by academics in the Netherlands or colonial administrators and researchers on site. Anceaux, for example, who was sent to New Guinea in 1954 by KITLV for linguistic research and who stayed there until 1962 as a linguist in government service, published three articles in *Bijdragen* and a monograph in the Verhandelingen on Papua languages that was based on earlier linguistic research done by missionaries. He participated in an expedition to the isolated Star Mountains in 1959 (Adelaar 1989).

During this expedition, Anceaux used an extremely heavy recorder to make many audio recordings; sadly, the language recordings have been lost but the unique musical recordings still exist (*VPRO Gids*, 28 October 2000).

In 1961, when Dutch New Guinea was already in its death throes, the anthropologist in government service J. Pouwer published his programmatic article ‘New Guinea as a field for ethnological study’ in *de Bijdragen* (1961: 1–24), in which he formulated no less than fifteen desiderata for future research. Number 9, ‘Continued research into the occurrence of “cultural subareas” within New Guinea’, was specifically prescribed to be undertaken in close cooperation between KITLV and the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in the Netherlands.

Towering high above all of these young and zealous civil servants and researchers in government service was the ‘king’-anthropologist Van Baal, governor of New Guinea from 1953 to 1958. Jan van Baal (1909–1993) grew up in Scheveningen, in a family of Protestant teachers (Schoorl 1994). After his secondary schooling at the Christian HBS in The Hague, he travelled by train from his home to Leiden as a student of Indology. The enthralling stories told by his HBS geography teacher about headhunting among the primitive peoples in the Indies were decisive in his choice of study. Looking back, Van Baal considered this ‘a rather morbid type of interest’. The distanced, analytic lectures in anthropology given by De Josselin de Jong, however, deepened his interest.

De Josselin de Jong advised Van Baal to adopt New Guinea as field of research for a dissertation on headhunting, based on the premise of the creation myth. In 1934 Van Baal received his doctorate under De Josselin de Jong with his thesis *Godsdienst en samenleving in
According to Van Baal, it was not until much later, after he retired as professor of anthropology, that he was able to satisfactorily analyse this phenomenon (Van Baal 1986: 53). With his wife, Van Baal left for Java to work as a junior controleur (controller). In 1936 he was transferred as head of the Marind-Anim subdepartment on New Guinea, the people discussed in his thesis. After holding a number of positions on New Guinea, Java and Lombok, Van Baal nearly died in a Japanese camp. He experienced the decolonization that he considered ‘as unavoidable as it was premature’ as a high official on Bali and Lombok. Despite his loyalty to the colonial administration, he did not hesitate to voice his criticism of the feudal leaders on Bali and Lombok. These were gathering fortunes at the expense of the people with the help of the pro-Dutch government of the federal state of East Indonesia. This ‘triumph of the rich’ was the reason he requested to be relieved of his duties. In 1950 Van Baal went back to New Guinea, now as head of the new Kantoor Bevolkingszaken (Registrar’s Office) established in support of the administrative and development activities among the Papuans. ‘The role of researcher and
that of development worker met here’, said Schoorl (1994: 5), who had personal experience with this Kantoor.

Van Baal returned to the Netherlands in 1952, where he became MP for the Antirevolutionary Party as New Guinea expert. After some hesitation, he accepted his appointment as Governor of New Guinea in 1953. Van Baal considered his most important task finding a balance between the development of the population with its unavoidable acculturation problems and the gradual establishment of self-administration. In 1957, it was his belief that the Papua population would not be ready for political independence until 1980. When New Guinea was transferred to Indonesia in 1962, Van Baal considered this a regretful event that was unavoidable from an international perspective. ‘One can only conclude that Indonesia [...] has hastened to prove that which I have predicted from the very beginning, namely: the transfer under the name Irian has made New Guinea an Indonesian colony’, was Van Baal’s conclusion (1989: 588–9).

After resigning as Governor, Van Baal continued his involvement with the Papua peoples primarily in the scientific field. Van Baal subsequently held the positions of Director of the Cultural and Physical Anthropology Department of the Royal Tropical Institute (1959–1969), extraordinary professor of cultural anthropology at the Amsterdam Municipal University (1961–1969), extraordinary professor of the anthropology of religion in Utrecht (1960–1969) and professor of anthropology, also in Utrecht (1969–1973). From the theoretical perspective, he continued to work in the Leiden tradition of structural anthropology, a paradigm that had received new impulse by the work of the well-known French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. Religion continued to be his primary research subject, providing sufficient material for dozens of publications. During his professorship Van Baal was also active as KITLV board member, Chairman of the WOTRO (Foundation for Scientific Study of the Tropics), and member of the Dutch steering committee for the Indonesian Studies Programme, a cooperative research programme with Indonesia.

To protest the democratization measures at the anthropological institute in Utrecht, he resigned as professor. In explanation, Van Baal metaphorically qualified the left-wing student activists as ‘rats’, drawing a parallel between ‘the impotency of our democracy these days and that of the Germans against an obtruding revolution around 1930’ in a newspaper article published in NRC/Handelsblad on 3 February 1973. Despite differences in methods and objectives, according to Van Baal ‘now there as well as here, there is a determined minority that is infiltrating everywhere by steady pressure.’ After resigning as professor, Van Baal continued to
publish regularly. He wrote, for instance, his extensive and enthralling memoirs as an overseas administrator (Van Baal 1986, 1989). However, it was the mystery of religion that grew to become a predominant preoccupation, not only in scientific but also in personal terms. He had already broken loose from the teachings of the Dutch Protestant Church. In his last book, *Boodschap uit de stilte; Mysterie als openbaring* (*Message from the silence; Mystery as revelation*) published in 1991, he viewed religion as a universal condition of life that could only in part be rationally explained in part. According to Schoorl (1994: 3), this marked the end of Van Baal’s ‘life-long search for the purpose of life, the background of our existence, the relationship with the Mystery’. It was a search that was closely interwoven with his career as administrator, development worker *avant la lettre* and anthropologist, according to Schoorl, who personally experienced Van Baal in each of these roles.

**The Netherlands after the Decolonization**

*The Indies are Lost, Development Aid Follows*

The year 1949, when the Netherlands transferred sovereignty to Indonesia, also marked the official beginning of development aid provided by the Netherlands within the framework of the United Nations. There was a close tie between the decolonization of Indonesia and the beginning of Dutch development aid, and this tie remained evident for a long period of time. The first Dutch contribution of one and a half million guilders to the United Nations aid programme in 1949 involved two main themes according to J.J.P. de Jong (1999: 73): ‘a desire to enter Indonesia through the international entrance, and a desire to help as many experts as possible find employment’. Pijpers (1991) pointed out that this desire to compensate for the loss of Indonesia was still evident in the progressive development policy applied by Minister Pronk. Van Doorn (1995: 147) referred within that framework to a ‘globalization of the earlier, colonial Ethical policy’. Because the cultural and scientific relations with the former colonies were organized and financed to a significant degree within the context of Dutch development cooperation, the growth in development aid, from one and a half million guilders in 1949 to one and a half billion guilders in 1975, was also extremely important for KITLV.

A number of progressive former colonial administrators who ended up at the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Overseas Territories and Agriculture during the decolonization of Indonesia took the initiative for the first
Dutch aid programme under the agricultural specialist E. de Vries in 1949. The first accompanying policy memorandum issued by Foreign Minister D.U. Stikker also dryly noted: ‘Now that Indonesia will diminish as a market territory for Dutch intellect, fields of research must be sought in other areas, such as Africa, Latin America and Asia’ (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 31). Because the large-scale bilateral development cooperation with Indonesia, which commenced in 1950 with 280 million guilders, almost immediately stranded on the New Guinea issue, the compensation motive via the UN aid programme gained importance. Between 1950 and 1956, the Netherlands assigned responsibilities to some 140 experts within the framework of the UN, putting the country in third place behind the US and England. President Korn expressed KITLV’s desire to immediately utilize the new development aid, with reference to both Indonesia and the UN. He opened the jubilee edition of *Bijdragen* (1951: 105–16) with an article on the responsibility of the Netherlands in supplying international assistance to underdeveloped countries titled ‘Neerlands taak bij het verlenen van internationale hulp aan onderontwikkelde landen’. With reference to Indonesia he commented: ‘It is my view that nothing will be achieved in Indonesia unless attempts are made to continue the course of the many good works achieved in the former Dutch East Indies, and the current Indonesian government is doing that, albeit that much is cloaked in Indonesian and English terminology’. Based on experience gained in the colonial period, Korn asserted, the Netherlands could make a useful contribution to the UN programme. In cooperation with sibling organisations like KIT, Korn believed that the future held a special task for KITLV: ‘For nearly a century now, the Royal Institute has worked to collect and dispatch knowledge regarding Indonesia and the adjacent Asian countries and the Caribbean’. As KITLV President, Korn had already taken steps in that direction with the interdepartmental committee for development aid and with sibling organisations. His hopeful conclusion was therefore ‘that the future still holds a shining work field for our Royal Institute’.

For KITLV, this proved to be a very distant future. Because the Netherlands and Indonesia rapidly became alienated, other scientific institutions were more successful in utilizing Dutch development aid within the framework of the UN. This held true for both existing institutions like the KIT, with its traditionally much more practical perspective than that of the KITLV, and new institutions. Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation (NUFFIC) was established based on an initiative by De Vries in 1956. De Vries was also the first head of the Institute for Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague, which grew to
become an internationally respected training centre for third-world students (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 31–2). Luckily for KITLV, decolonization of the scientific sector was initially limited thanks to the continued colonial ties with New Guinea, Suriname and the Antilles. The same held true for the sum total of Dutch development aid in 1962, of which only 340 million guilders was channelled through the multilateral programmes of the UN and the European Economic Community as compared to 763 million guilders for New Guinea, 280 million guilders for Indonesia, and 241 million guilders for Suriname and the Antilles.

Once New Guinea was transferred in 1962, however, development aid provided by the Netherlands directly to independent developing countries skyrocketed. Late in the 1960s, Dutch aid already totalled 0.7 percent of the GNP; late in the 1970s this had even grown to 1 percent, putting the Netherlands together with the Scandinavian countries among the leading western countries providing development aid. In 1964, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs assigned responsibility for the growing aid to the new Directorate General for International Cooperation (DGIS). The Netherlands' new premises for development aid were explained in 1966 in an extensive policy memorandum by the first Minister for Development Cooperation, former colonial administrator and KVP State Secretary for New Guinea Th.H. Bot. In addition to increasing levels of bilateral aid, bilateral aid would also be increasingly provided to what were referred to as concentration countries. After the fall of left-wing anti-western Soekarno and his replacement by the right-wing pro-western Suharto, Indonesia became the most important concentration country.

At the request of the new Indonesian government, in 1967 Minister for Development Cooperation B.J. Uddink initiated the establishment of the Inter-Governmental Group on Indonesia (IGGI), an international aid consortium chaired by the Netherlands’ Minister for Development Cooperation. Dutch aid to Indonesia increased within that framework from 66 million guilders in 1966 to 150 million guilders in 1975, putting the Netherlands in third place in terms of aid after the United States and Japan. A number of bilateral agreements between the Netherlands and Indonesia came with the increasing development aid. In 1966 an agreement was reached about the financial relationships with which Dutch businesses were partially compensated for the nationalizations that took place in 1958. This was followed by agreements that subsequently defined the technical cooperation (1967), economic cooperation (1968) and cultural cooperation (1968) (J.J.P. de Jong 1986). The new cultural agreement that was effectuated in 1970 was particularly important KITLV. Within that
framework, KITLV received increasing subsidies from the Ministry of Education and Science and the DGIS for the bilateral Indonesian Studies Programme for which the Institute was responsible for coordination on the Netherlands’ side. Within the framework of the cultural agreement, another series of other initiatives by the Netherlands was intended to retain and promote the Dutch language and culture in Indonesia, including the establishment of a Dutch department at the Universitas Indonesia, a Dutch cultural centre in Jakarta, and some ten Dutch reading rooms throughout Indonesia. With the growing interuniversity cooperation primarily financed by DGIS and coordinated by NUFFIC, more than 25 million guilders were invested between 1970 and 1980, nearly six million of which went to the social sciences and humanities (J.J.P. de Jong 1986; Van Olden 1980). In the Netherlands, however, the extensive flow of development aid being channelled to the Suharto regime – responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of real or alleged communists and the incarceration of hundreds of thousands of other political prisoners – was being increasingly criticized. After General Suharto’s bloody coup, the left-wing Komitee was established in the Netherlands in 1968 based on an initiative by Professor Wertheim and Pacifistisch-Socialistische Partij (PSP, Pacifist-Socialist Party) Member of Parliament Fred van der Spek. The critical information bulletin published by the Komitee, ‘Indonesia: feiten en meningen’ (Indonesia: facts and views), was distributed in four thousand copies. Initially, criticism in Parliament on the extensive Dutch development aid for Indonesia was only heard from the smaller left-wing parties CPN, PSP and Politieke Partij Radikalen (PPR, Radicals’ Political Party). During the progressive administration under Den Uyl, however, his PvdA also started to protest.

The extent to which the decolonization continued to play a part in this is evident in the statement made by the Labour Party’s foreign secretary Harry van den Bergh in 1975: ‘We have never defined a clear policy. I think we have been overly cautious in that respect due to the traumatic experience of the former colonial policy, for which the Labour Party was so strongly responsible. We must ask ourselves whether these extraordinarily friendly relations with Indonesia are truly justifiable.’ (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 50.) With these words, Van den Bergh voiced his support of Minister Pronk’s attempts to use development aid to pressure the Suharto government to release political prisoners. As a twentieth-century Multatuli, the young New Left representative hoped this would protect the population of Indonesia against being exploited and oppressed by its own leaders. Due to the violation of human rights perpetrated by the Netherlands itself
in Indonesia during the colonial period, the moderate Labour Foreign Minister Max van der Stoel preferred using quiet diplomacy to promote human rights in Indonesia: as former colonizers, certain sensitivities were best avoided (Malcontent 1998: 74–125).

Nevertheless, Pronk reduced development aid for Indonesia in 1975 while significantly increasing aid to progressively governed developing countries such as India and Tanzania, countries with which the Netherlands had scarcely maintained ties during the colonial period. In its campaign platform for the 1977 elections, Labour even included suspending all aid to Indonesia. But because there was never another Den Uyl cabinet, this policy intention was never implemented. Under the centre-right Van Agt cabinet, aid to Indonesia was expanded. All in all, however, the context in which KITLV endeavoured for scientific cooperation with Indonesia after 1968 was highly politicized.

The ‘Cultural Revolution’ in the Netherlands

The ‘domestication’ of foreign policy of which Pronk’s progressive development and human rights policy was an example was one of the many consequences of the ‘cultural revolution’ that many observers believed occurred in the Netherlands in the 1960s and 1970s. Heldring (1991: 240) identified six synergetic factors within this ‘cultural revolution’: growing prosperity, the rise of a postwar generation, improved educational opportunities, the new mass media, the democratization of social institutions like the universities, and ‘the secularization that led many to drift ideologically, exchanging their religious beliefs for worldly theory’. Other factors that could be included in this list are the depillarization of political and social institutions, the sexual revolution after the introduction of the anti-conception pill, and the transition from materialist values of prosperity to postmaterialist values of well-being (Woltjer 1992: 317–419; Blom 1994: 480–96; Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 248–58).

To a greater or lesser extent, all of these factors influenced the evolution of KITLV from the mid-1960s. Some of these factors are still exerting influence today. The anti-authoritarian students that made life so difficult for the old-style professors like Van Baal in the late 1960s and early 1970s, for example, became the members and board members of KITLV in the 1990s. Naturally, certain factors like improved educational opportunities more directly affected the development of KITLV than others, such as the growth of television. That factor cannot be totally ignored, however, in the
scientific understanding of Indonesia and the Caribbean – broadcasts of historical documentaries to which Leiden historians often contributed, for example. A number of factors require additional explanation.

The unprecedented economic growth experienced by the Netherlands, like most western countries after the postwar reconstruction in 1950 until the 1973 oil crisis, is seen by many experts as the basic prerequisite for the ‘cultural revolution’ of the 1960s and 1970s. Expressed in terms of consumer buying power based on the value of the dollar in 1990, the GNP per capita of the Netherlands grew from 5850 dollars in 1950 to 9660 dollars in 1965 and 13,374 dollars in 1975. That is an average annual growth of more than five percent, which is even higher based on the nominal dollar value of the GNP per capita (Maddison 2006: 441–3). This made possible, for example, an explosive increase in expenditures for development cooperation, linked since 1970 to a fixed percentage of Dutch GNP. Unlike the pre-war generations who consciously experienced the economic crisis and the Second World War, the new postwar generation of baby boomers grew up in an economy of increasing prosperity and lasting peace. Empirical studies have indicated that in many western and some developing countries, when prosperity increases significantly the materialist values of prosperity such as employment, income and family treasured by the older generations give way to new values of well-being like personal development, the environment and human rights among the younger generations. Economic crises exert only temporary influence on this changing pattern of values (Inglehart 1997). In the next Chapter, even a relatively ivory tower like KITLV will prove to experience the effects of the new values of well-being: in the choice of research themes like ecology, gender and democratization in Indonesia.

The improved educational opportunities, especially in advanced secondary education, were also stimulated by the economic growth. In the course of the 1960s, education even passed defence as the largest item on the budget of the Netherlands. For KITLV, the Ministry of Education and Science succeeded the Ministries of the Colonies and Overseas Territories as the largest subsidy provider. In the mean time, the number of university students increased from 40,700 in 1960 to 124,400 in 1975; their number tripled over a period of only fifteen years (Foppen 1989: 243). Of the disciplines involved in KITLV, the numbers of students of ‘socio-critical’ anthropology and history grew the most, while the number of students of the ‘esoteric’ eastern languages initially stagnated.

In Leiden, traditionally the university most important to KITLV – this importance continued to grow when the Institute moved from The Hague
to Leiden in 1966 – the number of students grew from 2824 immediately following the war to 12,508 in 1971–1972. In that same period, the number of university personnel grew from 660 to 3677 and the University’s budget of less than five million guilders increased to more than 184 million guilders. Between 1968–1969 and 1971–1972 the number of alpha students grew from 4302 to 5295 and the number of gamma students increased from 1531 to 2290 (Cohen 1975: 15). The number of students of cultural anthropology and non-western sociology in Leiden increased in this period from 231 to 294. The number of students of Indonesian languages and literature, however, increased from only 6 in 1968–1969 to a mere 11 in 1971–1972.

Every university and faculty experienced democratization campaigns in the late 1960s and early 1970s that also affected the content of the courses. In the social sciences, including anthropology, the most serious conflicts arose between the professors and older staff members on the one hand and students and younger staff members on the other. In Leiden, however, the conflicts were less fierce than those experienced by other universities.

In particular, some non-western sociologists and anthropologists from Amsterdam, where the campaigns were often highly radical, moved to Leiden, including Professor A.J.F. Köbben, who was already a KITLV board member. Upon returning from a sabbatical in the United States in 1972, he found a completely democratized and radicalized institute at which the left-wing professor Wertheim had served as a type of Godfather for the activist students. ‘I wanted nothing to do with the administrative body that had approved this situation,’ Köbben commented later. ‘I had always had a good relationship with Wertheim but he terminated the friendship and started to address me formally. Oh, well. Things like that happen.’ About the contesting students he then added: ‘What bothered me most was the triviality of the discussions [...]. Somewhere I had written “In a conservative estimate, this or that is the case...”. They seized upon it: “He certainly is conservative: he says so himself!”’ (De Wolf 1998: 103–4) In 1976, Köbben and his kindred spirit Peter Kloos moved from Amsterdam to Leiden.

What the consequences were of the sexual revolution after the introduction of the anti-conception pill among the KITLV membership can only be guessed. What Vredenbregt (1998) reported in his moralistic sketch of KITLV in the early 1970s is primarily fiction, in both heterosexual and homosexual terms. It is a fact, however, that the number of female members grew significantly in the 1960s and 1970s, and that a few of these members joined the board. The first woman to join the KITLV board was
Professor E. Allard of Nijmegen, professor of non-western sociology, in 1960. As board member and chair of the KITLV’s editorial committee, Leiden historian M.A.P. Meilink-Roelofsz, who published much about the VOC, held an important position in 1960 and 1970s. She was also relatively open to the ‘Tiersmondism’ that became popular in the 1960s and 1970s among students and some of the younger staff members in the non-western sciences. Within KITLV, however, this school was primarily represented by the dissident Amsterdam professor Wertheim, who had been debating a variety of historical and sociological subjects with the KITLV board and staff members since before the ‘cultural revolution’. 

Wertheim’s Occidentalism

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Wertheim’s rejection of colonialism and neocolonialism in Indonesia and his adoration of the Maoism of the People’s Republic of China contained a strong element of occidentalism: a negative, generalizing concept of the West characterized by capitalist exploitation, colonial and neocolonial imperialism and racist elitism. His student in Amsterdam and later Vice President of KITLV Willem Wolters commented at the time of his death that Wertheim: ‘believed that the course of history was a struggle for emancipation and that the development would ultimately lead in the direction of a socialist or communist society. He identified the capitalist system as the cause of poverty and oppression.’ (Wolters 1998.) During Wertheim’s Maoist period, his relationship with KITLV was relatively cold. Overseeing his entire oeuvre, however, solely emphasising his occidentalism – orientalism’s radical counterpart – does not do justice to Wertheim. Certainly in the beginning of his academic career as non-western sociologist in Amsterdam, from 1946 to the early 1960s, Wertheim’s work was still dominated by a combination of universalism and relativism that did not differ fundamentally from the theoretical premises applied by his colleagues in Leiden, including the non-western sociologist G.W. Locher. His assessment of the Netherlands’ colonialism and decolonization policy, however, was generally much more critical than the view commonly heard in Leiden. This resulted in highly interesting discussions in *Bijdragen*. Wertheim was never a member of the KITLV board, albeit that he was nominated as candidate for the board a number of times. His Amsterdam student Jan Breman, whose socio-critical publications were also published in *Bijdragen* and the Verhandelingen, did join the board later.
Willem Frederik Wertheim (1907–1998) was born in Saint Petersburg into a secular Jewish environment (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 33–4, 80–6). His father was the director of the Russian branch of a large Dutch insurance company. Thus Wertheim experienced the Russian Revolution in person as a child. In the Netherlands, he completed the gymnasium and went on to study law in Leiden. There he met his wife and obtained his PhD in 1930 based on a dissertation on liability for damages without an agreement. Because of the economic crisis in the Netherlands, he accepted a position with the legal authorities in the Indies in 1931. The only book he had read about Indonesia until then was *Max Havelaar*. His political ideology was still moderately liberal at that time. Wertheim assumed the position of professor with the Rechtshoogeschool in Batavia in 1936, and in 1940 he served as secretary for the Visman Commission, a governmental
commission that was established to explore the possibilities for future self-determination of the Indies.

Wertheim spent the period of Japanese occupation in various camps, where his political ideology significantly radicalized. He read and discussed much in this period. When a camp doctor told him that the prewar daily diet of an average Indonesian contained no more calories than the meagre camp rations, this left a deep impression. Starting in 1945, Wertheim’s lectures and writings expressed his sympathy with the struggle for independence of the Republic of Indonesia and the accompanying social revolution. Looking back, he noted that his political standpoint prevented his appointment as professor of law in Leiden (Wertheim 1998: 37). In 1946, however, he was appointed as professor of non-western sociology at the new, left-wing ‘seventh faculty’ in Amsterdam. In his oration on the position of the Indo-European population group in Indonesia, Wertheim (1947) criticized the prewar Dutch racism that made the Indo-Europeans both victims and culprits.

From a political perspective, Wertheim was not a member of any party but did play an active role in the progressive Vereniging Nederland-Indonesië, and was a major lobbyist for the ‘third path’: a group of critical intellectuals who, when the Cold War commenced, sought an alternative to both American capitalism and Soviet communism. As professor in Amsterdam, Wertheim made an important contribution to the decolonization and internationalization of the non-western sciences, which was of a significantly more critical nature than the parallel reorientation in Leiden. He helped, for example, to set up a series of English translations of works by important Dutch authors based on a KIT initiative. This series included translations of prewar publications by Van Leur, B.J.O. Schrieke and Boeke. Wertheim published own works in English: the books *Indonesian society in transition* and *East-West parallels* (Wertheim 1959 and 1964).

These books were major eyeopeners for foreign Indonesian experts during their studies, including the American Ruth McVey (1992) and the Australian Heather Sutherland (1992). Wertheim also introduced the work of important foreign Indonesian experts in the Netherlands, including that of the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz and the American historian with Czech-Jewish ancestry Harry J. Benda, who Wertheim had met in prewar Indonesia.

In his publications, Wertheim criticized the Eurocentricity of many prewar and some postwar authors, emphasizing the importance of the revolutionary emancipation struggle in Indonesia and other postcolonial
societies. It was not Marx but Weber that shaped his most important theoretical premise. Wertheim’s belief that Weber’s general sociological approach was more suitable for the analysis of both eastern and western societies than the traditional Eurocentric – Said would call it orientalist – categories still commonly seen after the decolonization was universalistic. His belief that even when differences occurred between the paths of development of the East and West, East was equitable to West was relativistic. Based on the ‘law of the handicap of a head start’ formulated by Amsterdam historian Jan Romein, Wertheim’s colleague professor and friend, Wertheim believed that Asia could very well surpass the West again in the future. Because of their great erudition and lively argumentation, these 1950s and early 1960s publications by Wertheim are still worth reading.

In his contribution ‘Asian history and the western historian’, for example, he sharply criticized the thesis asserted by the British historian John Bastin (BKI 1963: 149–60). Bastin asserted that a Eurocentric approach to Asian history was unavoidable in itself and moreover justifiable in terms of content based on the great and lengthy influence Europe had exerted on Asia. Bastin based his assertion in part on the valedictory lecture given by Utrecht historian P. Geyl, in which Geyl sharply criticized what he considered the defeatist undermining of western civilization by Marxist historians like Romein.

According to Wertheim, Bastin’s thesis was highly questionable from both a relativistic and a universalistic perspective. Since the Enlightenment, relativism had been one of the very best values of western civilisation: ‘Without the relativist attitude basic to western civilization, the writing of history would never have overcome its local, national or factional biases’. This relativist distancing in no way obstructed universalism on the level of the history of the world, however: ‘From a more universal point of view’, Wertheim concluded, ‘western supremacy has been a brief intermezzo in the long history of civilization’.

The historical-sociological views of the Leiden professor of non-western sociology, Locher, were closer to Wertheim’s views than those of Bastin and Geyl. Nevertheless, Locher was relatively critical of Wertheim’s Indonesian society in transition in his review titled: ‘The future and the past; Wertheim’s interpretation of Indonesia’s social change’ (BKI 1961: 64–79). According to Locher, who had attended the gymnasium with Wertheim, Wertheim’s view of history was, like Romein, of a finalistic nature. His approach to the history of Indonesia was oriented towards the future emancipation of the impoverished farmers and
labourers. This was, according to Locher, a major distinction that Wertheim made between western and Asian history. In the West, the bourgeois revolution had been so consolidated that a proletarian revolution was always doomed to fail; in Asia the revolutionary potential of farmers and labourers was greater than that of the weak bourgeoisie, which strongly depended on western support.

In this manner, Locher claimed, Wertheim erroneously narrowed the options available to new Asian states like Indonesia for future development. ‘As for this process,’ said Locher, ‘Wertheim is definitively wrong when he gives it only the possibility to select between a mainly nineteenth century western capitalism [...] and a communist or almost communist system, which may be adapted to the specific type of non-western society.’

In his response ‘The past revived’, Wertheim denied the finalistic nature of his historical analysis (**BKI** 1962: 183–92). The various possibilities of revolution historically seen in western and Asian societies were not about rigid principles but about more general underlying trends, to be explored in more detail in a comparative analysis. With reference to the predictive nature of such a comparative analysis, Wertheim did not agree with Locher:

> From the foregoing it will be clear that I assume a possibility of prophesying certain trends in future developments, with all due reservations regarding the actual ‘shape of things to come’. Here Locher definitely appears to disagree: he opposes a ‘possibilistic approach’ to history to what he calls my ‘finalistic’ one.

This belief in the prophesying nature of his own comparative analysis was to increase as Wertheim increasingly identified with Chinese Maoism: the revolutionary theory that he believed would ultimately emancipate mankind throughout the world by overturning the western counter-revolution in the Third World. Wertheim visited China for the first time in 1957, and enthusiastically wrote upon his return: ‘One need not purchase a ticket to travel to the moon [...] to see a miracle. [...] We discovered this miracle in the new China during our trip through Asian countries.’ (**Kuitenbrouwer** 1994: 80.) Implementation of the Maoist communal system during the Great Leap Forward that proved years later to have caused tens of millions of victims was welcomed by Wertheim as ‘possibly the greatest leap forward to date in the evolution of man’. His view of western Imperialism in the Third World, however, was increasingly negative. In addition to western military interventions, he also sharply criticized western development
aid, which he believed had the sole objective of suppressing revolutionary movements in the Third World. In the case of the Netherlands, he was particularly opposed to the sizeable aid given to the Indonesia of Suharto, ‘our most favoured Nazi’.

Wertheim’s analysis of the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution centred on the emancipation of mankind was culminated in his magnum opus on evolution and revolution, *Evolutie en revolutie*, that was published in 1971 just before his retirement as professor. This 547-page book once again gave witness to his great erudition, but his main thesis was relatively simple. According to Wertheim, the history of the world irrefutably showed a progressive trend in which the primary criterion for progress was emancipation towards a more egalitarian society. Viewed from that perspective, Mao’s Cultural Revolution was ‘the source of hope for progress in the Third World, even in the entire world’. Wertheim specifically predicted that the triumph of the western counter-revolution and its local accomplices in countries including Vietnam, Indonesia and Chile would prove to be of a temporary nature. Due to their exploitative and repressive nature, such regimes would in fact lead to successful communist revolutions in time. Seen in the light of the Vietnam War, Wertheim (1971) qualified Snouck Hurgronje’s role as Aceh researcher and government advisor as ‘counter-insurgency research at the turn of the century’. This article was an important source for Said’s typification of Snouck Hurgronje as orientalist and imperialist.

Wertheim’s participation in KITLV activities decreased as his revolutionary intellectual engagement increased. Relations between Wertheim and KITLV hit a low point when the Leiden Javanist J.J. Ras, KITLV representative in Jakarta, criticized, in an interview on Indonesian radio, Wertheim’s support of the Komitee Indonesia as politically prejudiced and unscientific. Wertheim demanded from the KITLV board repudiation of Ras. After extensive discussions Ras’ words were qualified as awkward but open repudiation was considered unnecessary, President Teeuw verbally offered Wertheim apologies (KITLV 522, NB 20 September 1969).

Later, however, the publication of the study *Production, equality and participation in rural China* compiled by Wertheim together with M. Stiefel on behalf of a UN research institute was utterly torn apart in a review in *Bijdragen*. According to H.J. Duller, the book was not based on sound research in the field but on ‘political tourism’. Wertheim and Stiefel apparently visited a number of model communes for a few weeks and spoke with carefully selected commune residents through an interpreter (*BKI* 1986: 152–4). In their indignant response, the authors denied that the
Chinese authorities had any influence on their study. Moreover, they claimed the macro-economic data confirmed that the rural population in China enjoyed significantly more prosperity than the agrarian masses in India, Pakistan and Indonesia (BKI 1986: 342–3). Duller answered that a comparison between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan would be more logical. The income per capita in Taiwan was ten times higher than in China. ‘She is also a republic’, Duller commented about Taiwan: ‘but then, of course, not a people's republic’ (BKI 1986: 345). Nevertheless, Wertheim resumed publishing review articles in Bijdragen in this period, including on colonial labour relationships (BKI 1987: 357–62) and on colonial and postcolonial cities as centres of conflicts (BKI 1987: 539–44).

Wertheim never distanced himself from his belief in the emancipating power of the people's revolution, in particular in Maoist China.

‘Did you ever believe that a revolution could be tidy?’ Wertheim commented towards the end of his life in an interview on the many victims of Maoism. ‘It cannot. It is par for the course: the relapse, the disappointments, the human shortcomings. But the process of emancipation upon which it is based – that will always continue.’ (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 86.)

FROM INDOLOGY TO INDONESIAN STUDIES

Language and Literature: The Innovators Uhlenbeck and Teeuw

Albeit not as radically as in Amsterdam, the Leiden disciplines united in KITLV also underwent a process of decolonization and internationalization. The colonial Indology was replaced by the postcolonial, multidisciplinary programmes Indonesian Studies and Caribbean Studies, in keeping with similar regional programmes in other countries. Indonesian language and literature took the lead in this process of decolonization and internationalization. This is evident in the fact that of the total of 219 books published by the KITLV between 1940 and 1975, 100 pertained to language and literature, most of which were published in English and Indonesian.

The primary innovators in this decolonization and internationalization of the Indonesian language and literature programme were the professors Uhlenbeck and Teeuw. These two professors worked in close cooperation within both the university and the KITLV. Uhlenbeck and Teeuw belonged to virtually the same generation that commenced Indonesian languages studies in Leiden before the Second World War, studied the structural paradigm of general linguistics, accepted the decolonization of Indonesia
and all of its consequences, and understood the necessity of internationalization. Evidence of this fact supply the extensive interviews Knaap and Poeze held with Uhlenbeck in 1994 and Teeuw in 1996 as well as my own interviews held in 2000.

Eugenius Marius (Bob) Uhlenbeck (1913–2003) was born in The Hague to a family that had maintained direct or indirect ties with Indonesia for two centuries. The linguistics professor C.C. Uhlenbeck referred to earlier was his uncle. His father was a lieutenant-colonel with KNIL. After completing his gymnasium studies in The Hague, Uhlenbeck started the Indology programme in Leiden in 1932. He completed his studies there in 1937 under Berg, majoring in Javanese. Doomed to unemployment due to the downsizing of the Indonesian administrative services, he also obtained a degree in Indonesian law in Utrecht. Berg helped him obtain a position as linguist in government service when he was appointed head of the Javanese department of the cultural bureau, the Balai Poestaka. In the evenings Uhlenbeck continued to study general linguistics, in particular the theoretical work by the foreign structuralists F. de Saussure, K. Bühler and R. Jakobson and the Dutch structuralists H.J. Pos and A.W. de Groot.

He spent the Second World War in various Japanese camps on Java and Sumatra. From 1946 to 1948, Uhlenbeck taught general and Indonesian linguistics at the University of Indonesia. He obtained his PhD under Berg in Leiden, cum laude, based on his thesis on the structure of the Javanese morpheme, *De structuur van het Javaanse morpheem*. In that same year he was appointed professor of Javanese language and literature in Leiden. This professorship was complemented in 1958 with a chair as professor of general linguistics in Leiden. His linguistic publications included *Critical comments on transformational generative grammar*, a critical analysis of the work of the well-known American linguist Noam Chomsky, published in 1972.

In his interviews with Knaap and Poeze (10 July and 19 September 1994), Uhlenbeck explained how, as a young professor in Leiden, he sought to achieve innovation in three related areas: the academic field, the administrative reorganization of the university, and KITLV. In each of these areas, Uhlenbeck had to deal with old-guard Indonesian linguists such as Drewes, Th.G.Th. Pigeaud and A.A. Cense (Teeuw 1994b; Drewes 1989; Noorduyn 1978). ‘Great intellectuals’, according to Uhlenbeck, ‘but a bit out of touch’. These were traditional philologists who focused solely on the Indonesian languages, unaware of the theoretical developments taking place in general linguistics. As former linguists in government colonial service, the decolonization bathed them in deep pessimism. Both Korn
and Drewes, for example, believed there was no future for the eastern languages at Leiden. Faced with the new demands that the decolonization and internationalization placed on KITLV, both Drewes as President and Cense as Secretary were ‘completely helpless’, according to Uhlenbeck. In that respect, Uhlenbeck was the man with the plan. ‘That is the kind of person I am, you see. Wake me up and I have a plan.’ From an academic perspective, Uhlenbeck placed great store in a theoretical, structuralist framework within which fruitful interaction could take place between the study of the Indonesian and that of other languages. Based on the structuralist paradigm of general linguistics, in his oration Uhlenbeck (1950: 3) discussed the differences between manners of address in Javanese: ‘That each language forms an autonomous system at any moment in its existence is one of the most central concepts of structural linguistics. [...] This means that comparing languages must be based on comparing systems and that historical comparative linguistics must sketch the development of systems.’ Also systematic was his contribution to the reform of the university’s administrative organisation in Leiden. As secretary of the language faculty, he drew up a twenty-five year programme that included details for relocating KITLV in Leiden, to be discussed in more detail in the next section. From 1957 until 1961, Uhlenbeck chaired the Presidium of Leiden University: a new administrative board in which the deans of the faculties also held a seat established as proposed by Uhlenbeck to replace the board of rector and assessors. In 1967 he joined the board of the national Raad voor Advies voor het Wetenschapsbeleid (Advisory Council for Academic Policy), where he held the position of vice-chair from 1971 to 1976. Uhlenbeck also represented Leiden in the board of the Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (ZWO, Organization for Pure Scientific Research). He also participated in many international conferences and later became secretary general of the international organization of linguists. Between these busy organizational activities, he took two sabbatical years as visiting professor in the United States, where he devised a plan at Stanford University for establishing the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS) that has since grown to become a prestigious internationally respected centre of study in Wassenaar. In the effectuation of these scientific initiatives within the academic world and KITLV, the Director General for the Sciences of the Ministry of Education at the time, A.J. Piekaar, played an important strategic role behind the scenes. Like Uhlenbeck, Piekaar had been a colonial civil servant in the Indies prior to the war. ‘That man deserves a statue, said Uhlenbeck, who became very close friends with Piekaar. Piekaar was directly responsible
for the fixed government subsidy that KITLV received since 1960 and also provided essential support and mediation for other KITLV activities. After retiring from the ministry, Piekaar was elected President of KITLV in 1975.

As a young and progressive professor – ‘My orientation has always been leftist’ – Uhlenbeck was to accept the decolonization of Indonesia better than the older professors. Unlike his learned elders, he did not believe that there was no future for eastern languages in Leiden after the decolonization. In other countries, especially the super-power the United States, interest for Indonesia, which was the world’s fifth largest country in terms of population, would only increase. Oriental Studies in the Netherlands, practiced in Leiden for centuries, had a treasure trove of information to offer, albeit that it needed to be made accessible for an English audience. ‘Internationalization was the password’, according to Uhlenbeck. He was able to make an initial start as editorial secretary of Bijdragen, a position he acquired in 1950 based on his publishing experience with Balai Poestaka. Lengthy articles were drastically reduced and were no longer automatically published if written by board members. The sombre grey cover was replaced by a more colourful version with an Indonesian ornament as logo; an addition that graced the cover of Bijdragen and the title pages of other KITLV publications for quite some time. More important, however, was the addition of book reviews and the stimulation of articles in English, by both Dutch and foreign authors. After ten years, half of the articles in the 1960 edition of Bijdragen were already in English. With this internationalization and professionalization, academic debate in Bijdragen, virtually non-existent until then, also increased significantly.

Uhlenbeck, who also became editorial secretary of the Verhandelingen and other publications in 1957, was also the primary initiator of two KITLV series in English: the Translation Series, in which important linguistic, anthropological and adat law texts including Uhlenbeck’s own Studies in Javanese morphology (1978) were translated, and the Bibliographical Series, in which Uhlenbeck (1964) published a critical survey of studies on the languages of Java and Madura. Later, the Bibliotheca Indonesica series, text editions of English translations of Indonesian texts, was added at Teeuw’s initiative. To stimulate internationalization, KITLV appointed representatives not only in Indonesia but also in Australia, Malaya and the United States. Not only Dutch scholars were awarded honorary membership of the KITLV, but also Indonesian scholars including Hoesein Djajadiningrat and Poerbatjaraka, as well as other foreign scholars including the British R.O. Winstedt, the American J.M. Echols and the German W. Aichele.
Uhlenbeck, who joined the KITLV board in 1952 and served as its President from 1962 to 1965, believed KITLV’s future role would be that of a research institute closely affiliated with Leiden University. When Uhlenbeck spoke on the occasion of the opening of the new KITLV building in Leiden in 1967, he sketched the current state of affairs in his ‘Perspective of Oriental Studies in the Netherlands’: ‘The necessary internationalization has taken place, and the current team of scholars can look to the future with hope, especially now that the possibility of Dutch research in Indonesia appears to have re-dawned’ (BKI 1967: 215). Later, in his farewell lecture as professor of Javanese, Uhlenbeck (1983: 12) summarized his academic labour as follows: ‘To learn the language, to build a workable theoretical framework, to get rid of traditional conceptions and prejudices, and to establish a sound factual basis – these are the four objectives which in my opinion have to be attained if research is to bear fruit’. As research objectives for the future study of Javanese, he specifically named socio-linguistic field work, additional linguistic analysis of Old Javanese, and further language-historical studies.

Illustration 26. KITLV President A. Teeuw, professor of Indonesian languages and literature in Leiden, opened the Institute’s new home at Stationsplein 10 in Leiden on 17 March 1967.
While Uhlenbeck primarily concentrated on contacts between KITLV and subsidy providers, including the Ministry of Education and Science and the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, Teeuw played a central part in the expansion in scientific cooperation with Indonesia after the establishment of the 1968 cultural agreement: expansion that was increasingly financed by the Department of Development Cooperation. In the field of social studies and the humanities, coordination on the Dutch side of the cooperation was the responsibility of KITLV, with Teeuw as its President from 1966 until 1975.

Andries (Hans) Teeuw (1921–2012) was born in Gorkum to a liberal-Christian family. His father taught drawing at the local vocational school (Grijns 1986). After completing his gymnasium studies in Gorkum, Teeuw went to Leiden in 1938 to study Indonesian language and literature. The war forced him to complete these studies in Utrecht. Teeuw obtained his PhD in Utrecht, cum laude, under Gonda based on his thesis *Het Bhomakawya: Een Oudjavaans gedicht* about a poem in Old Javanese. He taught Javanese at Utrecht University from 1945 until 1947. From 1946 until 1951, he studied dialects on Lombok as linguist in government service, and also taught the history of Indonesian literature at the University of Indonesia in 1950–1951. In 1949 he published the first version of his modern history of Indonesian literature in Indonesian, which was later published by the KITLV in 1967 in English and in 1979 in an updated two-volume version (Teeuw 1979). Teeuw also seriously studied general and comparative linguistics, in which he was appointed professor in Utrecht in 1951.

In his oration on the event of this appointment, Teeuw (1952) also placed his analysis of the relationship between language and versification in Malaysian and the new Bahasa Indonesian against the backdrop of the structuralist paradigm of general linguistics. He differentiated this paradigm to a stronger extent than Uhlenbeck in his oration by concluding, based on a comparison between different languages, that versification types are certainly not always determined by the structure of the language in which they originated but also by other external factors, the natures of which are culture-historical, convention and aesthetics. In 1955 Teeuw went from Utrecht to Leiden, where he became professor of Malay/Bahasa Indonesia.

In his Leiden oration, Teeuw (1955) vehemently advocated the study of the new Bahasa Indonesia and the Malay language from which it originated. He made a critical reference to the oration held by Pijnappel, the first professor of Malay in Leiden. Although Teeuw agreed with his nineteenth-century predecessor that a language like Malay should primarily
be taught on the university level based on autonomous, academic criteria, he commented on Pijnappel’s qualification of Malay as an ‘uncivilized language’ that: ‘We no longer repeat Pijnappel’s “uncivilized” as readily: our understanding of civilization has been relativized to a certain extent in recent decades’ (Teeuw 1955: 8). Continuation of the Leiden tradition in the Indonesian languages and literature was considered extremely important by Teeuw not only for scientific reasons, but also as ‘an obligation instigated by the desire for self-preservation’ in relation to the entire world. ‘Our intellectual relationships with Indonesia were not terminated when state sovereignty was transferred, and these will continue to assert themselves for quite some time, both here and there’, according to Teeuw (1955: 20).

In passing, Teeuw (1955: 6) also voiced his opinion that New Guinea should be transferred to Indonesia. The pamphlet that he published on that topic in 1956 has already been discussed. Like Uhlenbeck, Teeuw accepted the decolonization of Indonesia and all of its consequences. Also like Uhlenbeck, Teeuw made an important contribution to the internationalization of Indonesian studies by publishing extensively in English in *Bijdragen*, by publishing his modern history of Indonesian literature in the Translation Series, and by writing a critical bibliographic survey of Malay for the Bibliographical Series (Teeuw 1961). And again like Uhlenbeck, Teeuw went to the United States as visiting professor in the early 1960s. Teeuw joined the WOTRO board in 1955 and was its chairman from 1970 until 1972. At the university in Leiden, from 1970 until he retired in 1986 he was virtually continually the chairman of the new Department of the Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania. He succeeded Uhlenbeck as editorial secretary of *Bijdragen* in 1957; in 1961 he joined the KITLV board and was its President from 1966 until 1975. In that position he played a crucial part in re-establishing scientific contacts with Indonesia, a topic that will be discussed in more detail elsewhere.

Teeuw’s modern history of Indonesian literature became his best known and most cited work. Personally, he was dissatisfied with it: ‘really just a collection of various bits and pieces that I wrote over the course of time’ (interview 1 July 2000). His more recent culture-historical biography of the progressive Indonesian author Pramoedya Ananta Toer, whose *This earth of mankind*, written while in prison, and three subsequent volumes were also popular reading in the Netherlands, gave Teeuw much more satisfaction (Teeuw 1993). For the record, ‘incorrigible schoolteacher that I am’, Teeuw (1992) had more than enough comments on and criticism for
the ‘Dutch translations of Pramoedya's books, among all the gratitude and pride as Dutchman’ of their growing number.

His primary interest, however, was always philological analysis of Old Javanese and related Balinese texts. The topic of his dissertation was Teeuw’s ‘first love’ to which he finally returned after his many detours as
an ‘unfaithful lover’ (Grijns 1986: 22). In that respect, he claimed his most interesting experience was the collective English translation of the Old Javanese epos Śiwarātrikalpa by the fifteenth-century Balinese poet Mpu Tanakung (Teeuw, Galestin, Robson, Worsley and Zoetmulder 1969). After the death of the linguist J. Noorduyn in 1994, who was KITLV Secretary during his presidency, at Noorduyn’s request Teeuw continued the translation of Old Sundanese texts. Like Teeuw, Noorduyn and the linguist C.D. Grijns were also born in Gorkum, as a result of which these three men were sometimes facetiously referred to as ‘the Gorkum Mafia’ in Leiden.

Teeuw and Uhlenbeck got along exceedingly well, and this stimulated their close cooperation both at Leiden University and in KITLV. They had become friends in Jakarta just after the war, as two young linguists and fathers. As professors, they also wrote articles together, including the contribution ‘Over de interpretatie van de Nāgarakrtāgama’ (BKI 1958: 210–37). They complemented one another well not only within KITLV in organizational terms – Uhlenbeck in the contacts with the Ministry of Education and the Scientific Research organization and Teeuw in his contacts with Indonesia – but also in academic terms. Uhlenbeck placed more emphasis on linguistics, Javanese and theoretical analysis while Teeuw focused more on literature, Indonesian and empirical research, albeit that long after his involvement in structuralism he also took an interest in the newer semiological models.

Telling may be the fact that in his contribution to the symposium on the occasion of Teeuw’s retirement as emeritus professor in 1986, Uhlenbeck (1991) took a relatively critical stance regarding the new and extremely relativistic paradigm of the French poststructuralists in linguistics and literature while Teeuw thought that deconstructive text analysis was promising. Even Teeuw (1991: 223), however, dismissed the most extreme expressions of poststructuralism by ironically asking the rhetorical question: ‘no more textual criticism, no more text editions, no more textual analyses, no more translations, no more interpretations? Then there is only one conclusion: the rest is silence.’

In addition to this symposium collection, KITLV published a more personal collection with contributions from Teeuw’s colleagues in Leiden on the event of his retirement (Hellwig and Robson 1986). In this collection, Teeuw was honoured as a ‘bujangga wredatama’ in Indonesian; a ‘retired man of letters’ in English. Teeuw’s complete bibliography at that time already totalled 234 large and small publications in the period 1944 to 1986. Grijns (1986: 24) concluded his biographic introduction as follows: ‘For the time being it is our fervent hope to come across Teeuw more as an
active “bujangga” than as a typically emeritus “wredatama”. In itself Teeuw’s masterly biography of Pramoedya Ananta Toer proved that this hope was not voiced in vain.

In 1990, the KITLV board decided to use the legacy it received from the linguist Pigeaud to establish the Professor Teeuw Fonds, which foundation presents an annual award to individuals who have made a distinctive contribution to the study of the Indonesian languages and literature that is alternately awarded to a Dutch and to an Indonesian individual (KITLV 543, NB 3 November 1990). The first winner of this award was Harry Poeze, head of the KITLV publishing house.

_Cultural Anthropology and Non-Western Sociology_

Like other social sciences, cultural anthropology and non-western sociology experienced enormous growth after the war. In general, the expansion of university education and research specialization contributed to this growth. The division of the old ethnology discipline into cultural anthropology and non-western sociology in the new Academic Charter of 1953 was an early symptom of this development. Cultural anthropology was assumed to be the study of small, traditional societies; non-western sociology the study of the new, modernizing societies in the Third World. In actual practice, however, this distinction proved difficult to maintain. In subsequent amendments to the Academic Charter, the distinction was therefore gradually lessened and completely removed after 1970. This is when regional specialization and the formation of subdisciplines such as agrarian and municipal studies became the determinant criteria in university courses and research in anthropology (De Wolf 1998: 68–74).

Amidst all this specialization, however, KITLV continued to be a central meeting point for all disciplines involved with Indonesia and the Caribbean. Uhlenbeck was not only a personal and political friend of De Josselin de Jong, for example, but also like-minded in the academic sense. Both of these Leiden professors adhered to the structuralist paradigm and were interested in interdisciplinary border areas such as socio-linguistics (interview Uhlenbeck 1 August 2000). As already seen for Van Baal and Wertheim, non-Leiden anthropologists and non-western sociologists also played a part in postwar KITLV. Leiden, however, continued to provide the core membership of the KITLV board.

First and foremost, this included J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, nicknamed JPB in order to distinguish him from his nephew P.E. de Josselin de Jong, who also studied and taught anthropology in Leiden and succeeded his
uncle in 1957 as professor in Leiden. P.E. de Josselin de Jong, who had conducted his dissertation research among the Minangkabau in West Sumatra, continued the Leiden structuralist tradition. From an international perspective, that tradition had received new impulse and acquired new prestige based on the work by the well-known French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. In international forums, J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong had made a major contribution to the success of Lévi-Strauss. In turn, Lévi-Strauss praised the work done by JPB and his students. This was even referred to as a ‘mouvement structuraliste Paris-Leyde’ (Schefold 1994: 811–2). Without exception, the books written by Lévi-Strauss were enthusiastically reviewed in Bijdragen; his *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté* was mandatory reading for Leiden’s anthropology students. The highly interesting collection of autobiographical contributions by twelve former alumni of the Leidse Etnologisch Dispuut (Leiden Ethnological Fraternity) ‘Waar Dromers Ontwaken’ (Where Dreamers Awake) demonstrates the fact that for many Leiden anthropologists, the structural paradigms of both De Josselin de Jong and Lévi-Strauss strongly affected their later academic work (Van Wengen, Wassing and Trouwborst 1995).

As JPB’s student, Locher, the most important non-western sociologist in Leiden, also applied the structuralist paradigm, albeit with a more interdisciplinary orientation than his anthropological colleagues (Vermeulen 1999). His debate with Wertheim in the historical field has already been discussed. As conservator and director of the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, extraordinary professor on Indonesian anthropology and professor of non-western sociology starting in 1957, Locher often advocated ‘general cultural studies’. Like both the De Josselin de Jongs, he was a member of the KITLV board, serving as its President in 1959–1960. More than uncle and nephew De Josselin de Jong, however, he also published articles in *Bijdragen* and in other KITLV series, usually in English. Locher also wrote about current topics in *Wending*, a liberal Protestant magazine strongly sympathizing with the Labour Party.

The decolonization and internationalization of the former ethnology discipline within the framework of KITLV was less sudden than in the language and literature studies. Even before the war, J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong voiced his sympathy for Indonesian nationalism and found the Rockefeller Foundation as a subsidy provider. Although New Guinea represented a continuation of the prewar colonial project for many anthropologists under Van Baal’s direction, there, too, the administrative and research work was in keeping with the general trend of decolonization and internationalization, albeit as a separate entity and not a part of Indonesia.
The Dutch administration complied with the new UN guidelines for territories not yet colonized, and many of the academic publications about New Guinea were published in English (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 38–9).

Of the 31 Verhandelingen and other books published between 1940 and 1975 among a total of 219 published by KITLV on ethnology, cultural anthropology and non-western sociology, most were written in English or Indonesian. Moreover, the authors included an increasing number of non-Dutch, for example the Indonesian anthropologist Koentjaraningrat (1975), who compiled a critical bibliography of anthropology in Indonesia for the Bibliographical Series.

However, the decolonization and internationalization of the former ethnology discipline within the KITLV also had its more painful moments. The well-known American anthropologist Clifford Geertz, who had performed field research on both Java and Bali, fundamentally criticized the Leiden structuralist tradition in a detailed review in *Bijdragen* (1961: 498–502). His review pertained to the English translation of a number of pre-war studies performed by Leiden scholars on Bali titled *Bali; Studies in life, thought and ritual* that had been published in the KITLV Translation Series referred to above. For the English series in general, in which work by Van Leur, Schrieke and Boeke had already been published in translation, Geertz had nothing but praise. The collection about Bali also contained valuable empirical data, according to Geertz. But the preoccupation with the creation myth as premise for structuralist analysis, as introduced by Rassers and detailed by JPB and his students, made the collection hopelessly outdated: ‘For all its scholarly integrity and factual richness it has worn badly and it smells of the lamp’. Geertz explained four points on which he theoretically objected to the Leiden school. The first was the axiom of the ‘village republic’ or ‘closed community’ that was allegedly standard on Java and Bali. The second was the ‘cake of custom approach’, which took traditions outside of their changing context. The third was no less dubious: the ‘Ur-society concept’ of an archetypical pre-Hindu cultural pattern that allegedly continued into the twentieth century due to Bali’s lengthy isolation. ‘And finally’, according to Geertz:

all this is crowned by the fourth, and in my opinion the most pernicious, axiom: namely that there exists in ‘primitive society’ an exact formal congruence between the structure of social life and the pattern of cosmological ideas, such that one can predict from the first what the second will be and deduce from the second what the first is, or – more commonly – was.

Circle reasoning like this was academically irresponsible according to Geertz, resulting in ‘a distinctly antiquated look in terms of present
theoretical interests’. None of the Leiden anthropologists felt a need to respond to this fundamental criticism. The Leiden Javanist and Bali expert C. Hooykaas, however, who taught for a lengthy period at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, later showered ‘bitingly sarcastic criticism’ on the Bali studies by Geertz, who in turn made serious mistakes due to a lack of knowledge of the language (Swellengrebel 1980: 205).

Despite the support from like-minded anthropologists like Lévi-Strauss, the anthropologists and non-western sociologists in KITLV were worried by the criticism received from American and Australian colleagues, whose theoretical perspectives were often oriented towards the process of modernization. An increasing number of Indonesian anthropologists and sociologists, many of whom were educated in the United States or Australia, were also critical of the Leiden tradition with its roots in the colonial period. According to Teeuw, his Indonesian counterpart in the bilateral Programme for Indonesian Studies, the powerful sociologist-anthropologist-administrator Harsja W. Bachtiar, had a particularly low view of the theoretical content of Dutch anthropology in general and Leiden anthropology in particular (interview Teeuw 10 June 1996). Harsja Bachtiar began his studies with Wertheim in Amsterdam, but obtained his degree in the United States. The article ‘Bureaucracy and nation formation in Indonesia’ that Harsja published on invitation in *Bijdragen* (1972: 430–46) was therefore strongly inspired by American theory on modernization and ‘nation building’, complete with the manifest and latent functions of the regional, ethnical and religious pluriformity in the composition of the Indonesian government and the expansion of the administrative system.

In 1959, the KITLV board and editorial staff of *Bijdragen* had already decided, in part due to a lack of texts on Indonesia, to publish at least one special issue per year under the general title of ‘Anthropologica’. This series commenced in 1960 in cooperation with the Nederlands Antropologisch Genootschap, with Köbben as editor. According to the editorial staff, the objective of the series was to improve interaction between the formation of theory and empirical research: ‘To an increasing extent, in the field of cultural anthropology as well as in other areas of study, there is an evident need of close cohesion between the general theoretical and the regionally specialized research’ (*BKI* 1960: xi). This meant that contributions were also included about other parts of the Third World than Indonesia, for example Central America, Africa and even Lapland. It proved nevertheless difficult in actual practice to explore
the middle field between ‘grand theory’ and ‘abstracted empiricism’, as formulated by the critical American sociologist Mills (1970). In the seventeen Anthropologica issues that were published until 1975, only a few Dutch and foreign authors published articles that integrated the theoretical with the empirical well.

These were mostly historical and comparative oriented anthropologists and non-western sociologists like Locher, Wertheim, Harsja Bachtiar and Leiden’s professor H.J.M. Claessen. The latter focused in particular on the comparative analysis of precolonial nation building processes in various parts of the non-western world. In the Anthropologica issues, his articles included a critical assessment of Karl Wittfogel’s ‘hydraulic’ theory on the relationship between eastern despotism and large-scale irrigation projects based on various empirical cases (BKI 1973: 70–85). For the record, the Anthropologica issues also marked the cautious beginnings of the analysis of current political themes, for example the article written by the Leiden sinologist E. Zürcher on Chinese communes (BKI 1962: 68–90).

Contributions by other Dutch and foreign scholars in the ‘Anthropologica’ issues, however, reflected the fact that theory and empirical research tend to grow apart strongly. On the one hand the formation of structuralist theory resulted in complicated mathematical models on kinship and other subjects that were virtually impossible for non-mathematically schooled readers to understand. On the other hand, isolated articles continued to be published describing the smallest details of some Papua or Dayak tribe. The American anthropologist Barbara Ruhemann, for example, woefully presented the following paradox in the article ‘Purpose and mathematics; A problem in the analysis of classificatory kinship systems’: ‘From an almost complete lack of contact between the mathematical and the social sciences we seem to have jumped to such an advanced level of integration that in human terms the gap has, if anything, widened’ (BKI 1967: 122).

In any event, what the ‘Anthropologica’ issues did stimulate was internal debate, which also increased in the professional organizations of Dutch anthropologists and non-western sociologists as their membership increased. The debate focused not only on theoretical subjects such as the merits of structural-functionalist or neo-Marxist analyses but also on empirical themes, varying from the traditional such as kinship to new land reforms (De Wolf 1998: 75–102). Critical reviews of dissertations published in Bijdragen often triggered such debates.
Debate also characterized the historiography published in the postwar *Bijdragen*, albeit that the level of abstraction was generally lower than in the ‘Anthropologica’ issues. Sometimes the historical debate returned to prewar theses not discussed at that time in *Bijdragen*, such as Van der Kemp’s anti-Raffles, Berg’s Majapahit myth and Van Leur’s Indocentric approach. New debates also emerged, however, such as that between the Dutch-Indonesian professor G.J. Resink and the Dutch-American professor J.M. Van der Kroef on the extent of sovereignty of Indonesian states and kingdoms in the Outer Territories at the end of the nineteenth century and that between the literature historians Nieuwenhuys and Wertheim on Multatuli: a debate that will be discussed in detail below in Nieuwenhuys’ biographical sketch.

The continued attention for Multatuli, the typically Dutch icon of both the colonial administrative system and the leftist movement in the Netherlands, indicates that the decolonization and internationalization of historiography was more limited within the framework of KITLV than had been the case with language and literature and with anthropology and non-western sociology. Of the 40 Verhandelingen and other titles on history published by KITLV among a total of 219 publications between 1940 and 1975, more of the titles were also in English as compared to language and literature and to anthropology and non-western sociology. Among the English publications, the dissertation on the Peasant’s Revolt in West Java in 1888 with which Indonesian historian Sartono Kortodirdjo (1966) obtained his PhD under Wertheim was a relative exception, also in terms of content and methodology. In *Bijdragen* (1969: 207–40) this social-historical case study was followed by an article titled ‘The Samin Movement’ by American historians Harry J. Benda and Lance Castles on the agrarian protest movement in East Java early in the twentieth century. It was not until the 1970s, however, that a debate was waged on the causes and characteristics of this movement between V.T. King and A.P.E. Korver in *Bijdragen* (1976: 249–66, 1977: 350–3).

The Utrecht historian Coolhaas (1960), who compiled the critical bibliography of Dutch colonial history for KITLV in English, was still strongly focused on the prewar, traditional historiography, including its anti-British views. He showed little appreciation for the new socio-historical publications by ‘some’ Wertheim, ‘the very left-wing lawyer and sociologist’. This characterization of Wertheim was left unabridged in the second edition revised by Gerrit Schutte in 1980, and also failed to include a new
historiographical theme: Dutch imperialism. Coolhaas had published the seventh and last volume of Colenbrander’s Coen edition, a source volume, with the KITLV in 1952–1953. The influence of the decolonization and internationalization was more evident in the historical articles in *Bijdragen*. This also held true for some debates, the most important of which will now be reviewed in chronological order.

In various prewar publications, Berg introduced the Javanist thesis that Javanese historiography from the Majapahit era had its own and highly mythical nature and could therefore not be considered an academically sound historical source. ‘Javanese historiography therefore should not be primarily judged as to what it could offer our historians’, according to Berg (1939: 147–8) in the second part of Stapel’s prewar handbook: ‘It has to be studied for its own merits’. He used as concrete example of the mythical-magical nature of Javanese historiography the rulership that Majapahit was alleged by the court chronicles to have extended outside of Java, over large parts of the archipelago. Pure fantasy, according to Berg. Krom (1938: 279) had already somewhat diminished Berg’s Javacentric Madjapahit myth in the first part of Stapel’s handbook by commenting that Majapahit most certainly did exercise influence outside of Java, but that this influence was primarily symbolic and tributary.

After the war, the archaeologist Bosch, who was President of KITLV from 1952 to 1956, and the Leiden historian H.J. de Graaf sharply and fundamentally criticized Berg’s thesis in *Bijdragen*. In the article ‘C.C. Berg and ancient Javanese history’, Bosch asserted that Berg strongly exaggerated the typically Javanese, mythical-magical nature of Javanese historiography (*BKI* 1956: 1–24). That historiography was no less reliable than the historiography of ancient and medieval Europe. According to De Graaf, Portuguese sources indicated that Majapahit was still exercising significant influence outside of Java in about 1400 (*BKI* 1956: 55–73). According to Klooster (1985: 23), Bosch and De Graaf’s criticism of Berg was confirmed by Indonesian historians. They, too, however, also had reasons for emphasising Majapahit’s reign in the archipelago as predecessor of an independent and unified Indonesian state. In actual practice, Krom’s cautious intermediate viewpoint has exercised most influence on the views in recent, prominent handbooks, including the *Cambridge history of Southeast Asia* (Taylor 1992: 176–81).

Van Leur’s prewar Indocentric thesis that the VOC was not superior to the Indonesian states in the archipelago in the early modern era was also relativized within KITLV. In his contribution on colonial history and history of Indonesia ‘Van koloniale geschiedenis en geschiedenis van...
Indonesië, van historici en taalambtenaren’ in the jubilee issue of *Bijdragen* (1951: 135–60) on the occasion of the KITLV’s one-hundredth birthday, Coolhaas fundamentally criticized Van Leur’s work. From a theoretical perspective he said it was ‘too German’, therewith also sneering Wertheim, who had worked so hard to promote Van Leur’s work after his untimely death in the Java Sea. By ‘too German’, Coolhaas meant ‘that I believe it is insufficiently in keeping with the essence of history, that it searches too hard for “laws”, for causal sequences, as a result of which the unreasonableness that characterizes the history of man is compromized’. His main objection, however, was empirical. Coolhaas claimed Van Leur often violated historical facts in his criticism of the established Eurocentric historiography. ‘Van Leur may have had a great mind; in this area he fell short due to a lack of self control’, said Coolhaas: ‘His view took charge and reigned over the facts’.

In KITLV circles, however, the prominent view became the relativized intermediate position explained by Leiden historian Meilink-Roelofsz in 1962 in her dissertation *Asian trade and European influence in the Indonesian archipelago between 1500 and about 1630*. She also corrected exaggerated assertions by Van Leur on the marginal superiority of Portuguese trading and the early VOC, at the same time fully recognizing the historiographical importance of Van Leur’s prewar thesis. Later his work, now published in English, regained its popularity because it was in keeping with the new-Marxist dependency theory. That theory asserted that precolonial non-western states like the great Indonesian kingdoms were already in a protocapitalist phase of development that would have resulted in complete modernization similar to that experienced in the West if western colonialism had not interrupted that autonomous process of development (Kuitenbrouwer 1994: 19).

Sometimes historical issues were definitively closed in *Bijdragen*. One example was the massacre of the Dutch garrison in Palembang in 1811 for which Raffles was held directly responsible first by Baud and later even more so by the chauvinistic Van der Kemp. In a two-part article, ‘Palembang in 1811 and 1812’ (*BKI* 1953: 300–20, 1954: 64–88), British historian John Bastin convincingly demonstrated based on careful source research that Raffles did not directly urge the sultan to commit murder. ‘But Raffles did encourage the Sultan to storm the Dutch factory and dispatched arms for that purpose’, was Bastin’s relativized conclusion: ‘That is a different thing from advocating the massacre of the garrison, although it may still be held that in the long run it would amount to the same thing’ (*BKI* 1954: 80).
The discussion between Resink and Van der Kroef in *Bijdragen* on the extent of sovereignty of the Indonesian states and kingdoms in the Outer Territories around the turn of the twentieth century can be seen as the introduction to the imperialism debate that was waged later in historiographical circles in the Netherlands. In the contribution on domestic states in the archipelago “‘Inlandsche staten in den Oosterschen Archipel’ (1873–1915)” (*BKI* 1960: 313–49), Resink pointed out the legal historical fact that the Dutch administration recognized these states and kingdoms as virtually sovereign until after 1900, exercising its suzerainty only with reference to foreign affairs. During the Aceh War, the traditional policy of restraint was also maintained, in part because the administration did not have the financial or military resources to enforce Dutch sovereignty elsewhere.

Illustration 28. Rob Nieuwenhuys, literator, KITLV staff member and ‘discoverer’ of ‘tempo doeloe’.
With this article Resink hoped to burst the bubble of the prewar colonial myth of three centuries of Dutch dominion over the Indonesian archipelago. Van der Kroef responded (BKI 1961: 238–66) by arguing that the international treaties signed in the course of the nineteenth century between the Netherlands and England and other European powers already referred to complete Dutch sovereignty over the Outer Territories, which were only being left in peace temporarily for pragmatic reasons. Even before the end of the Aceh War, a start had already been made in bringing the remaining Indonesian states and kingdoms in the Outer Territories into submission with the 1894 Lombok expedition.

Not yet a topic of debate, but certainly a cautious attempt to initiate decolonization of the decolonization history was De Graaf’s article ‘The Indonesian Declaration of Independence, 17th of August 1945’ (BKI 1959: 305–27), in which the declaration of the Republic of Indonesia was no longer considered to be a tool for manipulation by the Japanese. Certainly emotionally discussed both in Bijdragen and elsewhere was the ‘typical colonial figure’ Multatuli. This debate was triggered by the Indocentric thesis developed by Rob Nieuwenhuys that as Assistant Resident of Lebak, Eduard Douwes Dekker had lacked any understanding of the local adat and had erroneously identified ‘injustices’ that were in fact traditional tributes of honour to the Regent by the local population. Nieuwenhuys always defended his thesis to the outside world, but according to KITLV staff member Gerard Termorshuizen, who was extensively interviewed for the biographical sketch given below (8 May 2000), he started to doubt it after hearing the criticism from Indonesian intellectuals.

Robert Nieuwenhuys (1908–1999) was born in Semarang as the son of a Dutch father who ran various hotels on Java, including the famous Hotel des Indes in Batavia, and an Indo-European mother who taught him as young child to understand Javanese nature and culture (De Engelbewaarder 1982). A certain nostalgic longing for ‘tempo doeloe’, the period from 1870 to 1914, was always evident in Nieuwenhuys’ work. After completing his secondary schooling in Surabaya, Nieuwenhuys went to Leiden in 1927 to study Dutch. He returned to Java in 1935 to teach Dutch at various secondary schools. He became lecturer at the Dutch department of the new language and literature faculty in Batavia, where he had extensive discussions with nationalist Indonesian students. In the meantime, Nieuwenhuys struck up a friendship with E. du Perron and was an active participant in the literary world of the prewar Indies.

Nieuwenhuys was mobilized when the Pacific War erupted. After the Netherlands capitulated, he spent the war in various POW camps on Java,
most of the time working as a nursing aid. Nieuwenhuys (1979) later wrote a book about his camp experiences. In the debate between Rudy Kousbroek and Jeroen Brouwers, Nieuwenhuys defended Brouwers, who described the Japanese camps as inhumanely cruel. ‘Rudy Kousbroek suffers from a reverse camp syndrome’, said Nieuwenhuys regarding Kousbroek’s mild assessment of the Japanese camps (De Engelbewaarder 1982: 147).

After the war, Nieuwenhuys became the head of cultural affairs with the Batavia Department of Education in 1945, in addition to his many literary activities. According to Termorshuizen, Nieuwenhuys fully accepted the decolonization of Indonesia, albeit that he suffered because of the personal consequences. Nieuwenhuys was repatriated in 1952 to the Netherlands, where he taught Dutch in Amsterdam. Under the pseudonym E. Breton de Nijs, his publications included the autobiographical family chronicle *Vergeelde portretten uit een Indisch familiealbum*, and in 1957 he was one of the founders of the literary journal *Tirade*. From a political perspective, his preference was usually Labour. ZWO awarded him a two-year sabbatical in 1959, during which time he compiled his well-known photo book *Tempo doeloe*. After its publication in 1961 many reprints were to follow, and this book formed the basis for his later magnum opus: the three-part photograph collection on the period 1870–1920 (Nieuwenhuys 1998a, 1998b, 1998c).

His research for *Tempo doeloe* brought Nieuwenhuys into contact with KITLV’s rich collection of photographs, triggering his interest in the founder of this collection, Rouffaer. He was employed by KITLV in 1963 as head of what was first called the ‘Nieuwenhuys Department’ and later named the Documentation Indonesian History Department, a position that he held until his retirement in 1973. Nieuwenhuys, an unconventional and gifted literator, was relatively ambivalent about ‘science’. He primarily devoted his efforts to collecting manuscripts and photographs from ‘tempo doeloe’ and interviewing former residents of the Indies. His young assistant Frits Jaquet was given the freedom to compile an extensive and academically extremely sound archives guide on the Dutch East Indies/Indonesia over the period 1816–1942; this guide proved to be an important source for later historical studies. Nieuwenhuys’ own versatile activities with KITLV bore extensive fruit, including the voluminous history of Dutch and Indies literature that he published under the title *Oostindische Spiegel* (Nieuwenhuys 1978). With his presence at KITLV, Indies-Dutch literature enjoyed substantial and systematic attention for the first time. This study was continued at KITLV by Gerard Termorshuizen, who met...
Nieuwenhuys as colleague teacher in Amsterdam in 1961 and remained in close contact with him. Termorshuizen has since devoted himself to the study of the Netherlands Indies press.

Nieuwenhuys made an important contribution to the debate on Multatuli, according to many the greatest writer the Netherlands has ever had. Nieuwenhuys published his icon-clastic analysis of Multatuli, ‘De zaak van Lebak’ in 1957: first in *Tirade* and in the journal *Indonesië*, in which he introduced the Indocentric criticism of Multatuli’s Eurocentrism referred to above. This immediately triggered polemics with the many Multatuli admirers in the Netherlands. Nieuwenhuys (1967: 228) commented on this debate when ‘De zaak van Lebak’ was reprinted in the collection *Tussen twee vaderlanden*.

Multatuli is the perfect myth for those who feel they are progressive. Whoever attacks this symbol will be met with significant resistance [...]. As for me, I have distanced myself – let there be no mistake: with much effort and considerable pain – from ‘the man from Lebak’. [...] Particularly decisive for me was my choice for a different perspective, which could be called Indonesiacentric. To me this meant integrating the Lebak events into the Javanese patrimonial society in that era.

The Multatuli debate opened by Nieuwenhuys was also introduced into *Bijdragen* by Wertheim with a two-part article on the spirit of administration in the Indies: ‘De geest van het Oostindisch Gouvernement, honderd jaar geleden’. Here Wertheim praised Multatuli as a courageous exception in the dilatory colonial administration that was formally considered to be protecting the commoners from exploitation by their own leaders but actually encouraged that exploitation, covering up the few protests voiced against it (*BKI* 1961: 305–43, 436–63). ‘To Nieuwenhuys, only the writer Multatuli exists’, claimed Wertheim: ‘but he would not have existed without the Man from Lebak – administrator and human being but, certainly! a better human being than administrator, and a better writer than human being’ (*BKI* 1961: 460). ‘And why does that “spirit of the administration” still move us, people of 1961, so strongly?’, Wertheim continued his lively peroration: ‘Because that dilatory “spirit of the administration” of one hundred years ago in the colony is in keeping with the “spirit of the administration” virtually everywhere in the world. Everywhere and always, wheedlers can be found in high positions, scheming and conniving.’

In his response ‘Tot de hoofdzaak van Lebak’, Nieuwenhuys commented that Wertheim unjustly presents Multatuli ‘as a kind of martyr of anti-colonialism’. What Multatuli really wanted was to replace indirect colonial administration via the Javanese leaders by direct administration of
enlightened European administrators – preferably with himself as Governor General! \( (BK1 1962: 271–6) \). In that respect, Multatuli was increasingly considered a shining example for subsequent generations of administrators, a theme that Nieuwenhuys (1987) later explored in his book *De mythe van Lebak*.

In the meantime, however, an extensive debate in Jakarta in 1971 with Indonesian intellectuals, some of whom old friends, who would hear nothing of his defence of the Javanese governor on behalf of the traditional *adat*, had sown some doubt with Nieuwenhuys. According to Temorshuizen, Nieuwenhuys was not the type of man who would publicly renounce an earlier viewpoint. His value-relativistic perspective of the Lebak issue in the middle of the nineteenth century, however, did not in his view rule out that the value-universalism of human rights increasingly applied to Indonesia in the course of the twentieth century, as the modernization process there progressed. That universalistic perspective is what enabled him to deal with the decolonization of Indonesia. According to Termorshuizen, Nieuwenhuys never occupied himself with the neopatrimonialism of the Suharto regime. He did, however, hope that things would improve for the population under the New Order. Termorshuizen (interview 8 May 2000) emphasized that Nieuwenhuys’ perspective of the traditional Javanese *adat* was certainly not orientalist in the sense intended by Said. He considered it a phenomenon that was related to time and place.

*Why Still Adat Law?*

*Adat* as a phenomenon related to time and place: that time aspect of *adat* in particular was difficult for the remaining *adat* law specialists in postwar KITLV. Within the framework of KITLV, their interdisciplinary project received the heaviest blows from the decolonization and internationalization. The new nationalist leaders of the independent Republic of Indonesia distrusted *adat* law, which they considered, like federalism, to be a manifestation of the colonial politics of divide-and-rule (Otto, Dekker and De Waaij 1994: 739). Dutch New Guinea postponed the inevitable for a time for the *adat* law specialists. When that territory was also transferred to Indonesia, however, things became quiet for *adat* law – extremely quiet.

It was not until academic contacts with Indonesia were restored around 1970 that the discipline of *adat* law, now referred to as *volksrecht* or popular rights, experienced a revival. The 31 books published by the KITLV in
the area of *adat* law among a total of 219 between 1940 and 1975 included publications in Dutch such as the *Adatrechtbundels*, the last of which on New Guinea in 1955, and Indonesian translations of earlier Dutch *adat* law studies, published after 1970 in cooperation with KITLV’s Indonesian counterpart, LIPI.

Initially, after 1945, the *adat* law specialists united in Adatrechtstichting courageously faced the challenge presented by the decolonization of Indonesia. Leiden’s professor of *adat* law Korn concluded, like his mentor Van Vollenhoven, in his article on Mohammedan law in the British and Dutch Indies: ‘One thing is certain: legal practice in the Dutch Indies was much better than that of the British Indies’ (*BKI* 1948: 118). The integration of Islamic law into *adat* law had much better satisfied ‘the needs and sense of justice of the masses’. Sadly, however, the nationalist intellectuals were now the spoilsports. ‘In that light it must be pointed out’, said Korn, ‘that among many of the young intellectuals no particular interest can be found for *adat* law. They consider it an uncertain, daft legal system, and long for either the rigid system of Mohammedan law or a rigid code of law based on western principles.’

In the new unified state of Indonesia, the latter would prevail; although the Indies codes of penal and civil law were largely adopted, *adat* law was forced to take a back seat. The warning issued by professor of *adat* law in Utrecht J. Prins in his article on contemporary Indonesian politics and the future of *adat* law, ‘Hedendaagse Indonesische politiek en de toekomst van het Indonesisch Adatrecht’, (*BKI* 1951: 265–78) went unheard. Korn and Prins now doubled their efforts to long-ignored Dutch New Guinea, where the many Papua tribes offered a rich field of study for *adat* law. Once again the typical colonial trend of both the discovery and invention of *adat* law manifested itself. The key problem with the stateless Papuans was once again the lack of a clear, authoritative top of traditional leaders that could be utilized by the colonial administration. In the article ‘Nieuw-Guinea, een balans en een programma’ referred to above, Korn advocated ‘a further search for such leaders because I believe it entirely possible that a more in-depth study will reveal a variety of *adat* law authoritative bodies that could also be useful for the administration. Back in the Indies we also tended to underestimate the potential of the *adat* leaders.’ (*BKI* 1955: 399.)

Together with these leaders, the Dutch administration should concentrate more on banishing the many ‘repulsive practices’ among the heathen Papuans, such as ‘sexual excesses, head-hunting, cannibalism and the like’. The spiritual vacuum that would then be unavoidable should,
according to Korn, be filled by missionaries, like had been successfully done in the Moluccas and other parts of the Outer Territories of the Indies. Ultimately, the education of the people by the administration and missionaries would yield a new elite of nationalist leaders that would be able to govern ‘an independent South Sea state’, in which both the purified local adat law and the western principles of Christianity and civilization would be safeguarded. Thus was the administrative programme for New Guinea compiled by Leiden professor of adat law and former governor of New Guinea Korn based on ‘my lengthy administrative practice’. The extent to which Korn was still living in the colonial past was also evident in his criticism of the selective effectuation of private land ownership in parts of New Guinea, which he explained in detail while repeatedly referring to his prewar mentor Van Vollenhoven in the article ‘Nieuw agrarisch recht voor Nederlands Nieuw-Guinea’ (BKI 1958: 133–69).

A first example of the new administrative direction that adat law would ultimately successfully take was given by P.W. Van der Veur in his report in English ‘Questionnaire survey among the potential Papuan elite in 1962 West New Guinea’ (BKI 1964: 424–60). At the time of its publication, however, New Guinea had already been transferred to Indonesia and was lost as a field of research for the traditional, colonial adat law. As often seen with ageing intellectuals who must watch their trusted field of study disappear, the remaining adat law specialists turned to the even further past and argued about the texts of their great predecessors. Such was the tragi-comical state of the Adatrechtstichting around 1960. The developments were triggered by the extensive historical memorandum distributed by a board member of the Adatrechtstichting, the old social-democrat W. Middendorp, on the direction in which the foundation was headed titled ‘In welke richting koerst de Adatrechtstichting’ among his fellow-board members in the summer of 1960 (KITLV, H 1051–14e). In his memorandum, he endorsed the idea of replacing the term adat law with the term for popular law, volksrecht, in the coming Charter amendments and advocated tentative expansion of the field of study to other parts of the developing Third World, including rapidly decolonizing Africa. In his extensive historical annotation, however, he had the audacity of citing one of his own 1922 articles on the Karo-Bataks in which he had used references to the Marxist theoreticians Rosa Luxemburg and Anton Pannekoek.

This gave former Secretary and former President Korn cause to withdraw from the Adatstichting board. He wrote to Secretary J. Keuning on 25 September 1960 about Middendorp’s memorandum: ‘Apparently he belongs to the relatively large group of socialists who pursue politics when
ever they please, speaking highly of their red leaders. I will not have it. I do not want to enter into polemics over such matters or to silently accept such writings.’ Desperate letters from Middendorp to Korn in which he cited Van Vollenhoven’s praise of his article at the time, emphasized the presence of conservative board members including the former KNP MP Lemaire, and finally even used the historical example of the socialist Troelstra and the liberal Goeman Borgesius who went on fishing trips together despite their political differences, achieved nothing. Korn definitely resigned from the Adatrechtstichting. With or without Korn, however, the elderly Adatrechtstichting was sentenced to a dormant existence once New Guinea was transferred. The foundation was ultimately disbanded in 1974, at which time management of the library and any remaining funds was temporarily assigned to a KITLV committee (KITLV 812). Paradoxically, interest in adat law/volksrecht had increased again, nowhere else than in Indonesia. After Soekarno’s fall, interest in traditions in a wide variety of fields, including the local common law, revived under the right-wing authoritarian Suharto administration. For the record, here, too, a generous portion of ‘invention of tradition’ (Pemberton 1994: 189–96) was seen. As already indicated above, the government of the Netherlands established new relations with the pro-western Suharto government in a variety of areas. When relations were also restored in the legal academic field around 1970 after the establishment of the Cultural Agreement, there was still a sufficient number of older law specialists, on both the Dutch and the Indonesian side, to involve the adat law as codified by the Dutch in the exchange. Leiden professor J.F. Holleman, the last president of the Adatrechtstichting, reported in Bijdragen (1971: 492–3), for example, on a ‘broadly-based permanent education course’ in Leiden in the course of 1970 for twenty-five Indonesian legal professionals, most of whom were employed by the courts. Adat law/volksrecht was also discussed in detail during this course.

The key issue in this (extremely lively) discussion was the question: considering the emphatically accepted official viewpoint that, in our efforts to reform and innovate the legal system, the popular law (hukum adat) will serve as the basis for the modern national law, in what way can a synthesis be achieved between the concept of unity that is inherent to the term ‘national law’ and the unequivocal local diversity evident in popular law in the lively legal traffic among the large majority of the Indonesian population?

One of the Indonesian participants, military judge Sugijono, explained that the best way to achieve this was for the changing, centrally appointed
judges to actively involve the permanent, locally elected village elders in proceedings involving land ownership, water management, commercial traffic and peace and security (BKI 1971: 493–6). The Suharto government shared a preference for involving the local leaders in its autocratic administration with the former Dutch administration in Indonesia, despite the continued rejection of federalism. This continuity was fittingly characterized by Van Doorn (1973) with his book title Orde-opstand-orde (Order-Revolt-Order).

In addition to the revived historical interest in the colonial adat law among some Indonesian law and anthropology professionals, as witnessed in articles including that by M.M. Djojodigeno ‘Naar aanleiding van Ter Haar’s Diesrede van 1937’ (BKI 1972: 235–56), modern public administration moulded after the American model had also gained popularity in Indonesia. Public administration was also on the rise in the Netherlands. When the Onderzoekcentrum voor het Recht van Zuid-Oost-Azië en het Caraïbisch Gebied (ORZOAC, Research Center for the Law of Southeast Asia and the Caribbean) was established in Leiden in cooperation between the law faculty and KITLV, it was home to the studies of both traditional popular law and modern public administration. Later, the long-winded name of the research center was changed to Van Vollenhoven Institute.

**Fading Orientalism, Emerging Relativism and Permanent Universalism**

Korn’s postwar adat law practice still included elements of orientalism, for example the alleged differences between East and West and the superiority of the Christian, western civilisation, certainly in comparison with primitive heathens like the Papuans. With reference to New Guinea, he therefore quoted – with permission – an explicitly orientalist author, the missionary H. Geurtjens, KITLV member (BKI 1955: 407). Under the title Oost is Oost en West is West, borrowed from the well-known phrase used by the British imperialist writer Rudyard Kipling, Geurtjens (1946: 9) deposited the following bit of orientalist wisdom:

> Anyone travelling to the Indies will be convinced that he will encounter an entirely different type of people there than in this country. The skin colour and outward appearance makes the difference striking. However, in general we are far less aware, if at all, of the fact that the hidden inner differences of philosophy and life style are even much greater.

Similar statements made by Meijer Ranneft just after the War were discussed above. However, each and every one of these elderly orientalists as
defined by Said were to die, with Korn as one of the last of the Mohicans in 1969. What is more: their orientalist and connected Eurocentric, sometimes even racist opinions were refuted by a growing choir of culture-relativists and value-universalists, who spoke of the equality of various cultures and the universal validity of fundamental values like human rights. With varying emphasis, both relativism and universalism can be found in virtually all of KITLV’s prominent postwar intellectuals. Cultural relativism served a primarily critical function, in combating the Eurocentrism commonly seen before the war. Universalism defined the new objectives: abstract-theoretical objectives such as the structuralistic universalism of language, culture and history, and concrete philosophical objectives such as the universally applicable human rights. In anthropology, this new approach had already been manifest before the Second World War. Soon after the war the Leiden anthropologist De Josselin de Jong was one of the first opponents of orientalism as presented by Meijer Ranneft. Under the influence of the Second World War, the decolonization and the internationalization, his views spread through all of the disciplines represented in KITLV.

Culture relativism was the most prominent in anthropology, especially among students. As Ad Trouwborst, later professor of anthropology in Nijmegen, commented on his time as a student in Leiden: ‘a topic [...] that was often discussed at the time was culture relativism [...] To us, that relativism was an absolute article of faith.’ (Trouwborst 1995: 107.) The professors of anthropology and non-western sociology however, both De Josselin de Jong and Locher in Leiden, Wertheim in Amsterdam and H.Th. Fischer in Utrecht, also reminded their students of the importance of universalism. René Wassing, later conservator of the Volkenkundig Museum in Rotterdam, recalls of JPB’s lectures in Leiden:

He convinced us that, in terms of structural organization, in principle there was no difference between all of those cultures and our own western culture. In other words: human societies, codes of behaviour, material expressions are linked to universal principles, everywhere. (Wassing 1995: 112.)

In his article ‘Het ideaal-culturele’ (BKI 1958: 72–80), Fischer warned his readers ‘that although breaking through the ethnocentrism (being done with malicious race and culture delusions) can be considered the most spectacular result of modern anthropology, it could nevertheless lead us to a dangerous impasse’. According to him, general human values provided an essential supplement to culture relativism:
For this clearly demonstrates that when westerners and non-westerners reach agreement in the conflict about and in the formulation of ‘human rights’, for example, this is proof not of westernization of the easterner nor of easternization of the westerner, but of agreement in the area of the ‘known’ ideal culture that nonetheless exists nowhere.

As already explained, despite their differences of opinion on concrete historical issues both Locher and Wertheim practiced a combination of relativism and universalism, leaving aside for the moment Wertheim’s occidentalist denunciation of the capitalist West and reverence for Maoist China in the 1960s. From an entirely different, conservative Antirevolutionary viewpoint, Van Baal (1989: 341) was also sceptical of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: ‘a charter for heaven’. According to Van Baal, obligations came before rights. ‘By fulfilling obligations, man integrates into his society, the subject is implemented as part of it’. However, for Van Baal this conservative obligation theory was also a universalist supplement to his culture-relativist approach as anthropologist.

From a certain perspective, history was an even more relativizing discipline than anthropology because it emphasized not only the relationship between individuals and societies as to location but also as to time. Nevertheless, most of the historical debates waged in the postwar Bijdragen also involved universalist arguments. In his criticism of Berg’s extreme relativist perspective of Javanese historiography – Teeuw (1991: 219) would later call him ‘the first deconstructivist avant la lettre’ – Bosch asserted that Javanese historiography was equivalent to the European ancient and medieval historiography and that the Majapahit rulers were comparable to European empire builders like Julius Caesar and Charlemagne. In the Multatuli debate, Nieuwenhuys contested Multatuli’s Eurocentric intervention in the traditional patrimonial society on Java, but Wertheim also defended Multatuli as the personification of a universal quest for justice. And even Nieuwenhuys recognized that in the course of the twentieth century, the value universalism of human rights became more applicable to Indonesia as the processes of modernization and decolonization progressed.

Relativism and universalism complemented one another in language as well. In his programmatic oration ‘Perspectief der Nederlandse oriëntalistiek’ explaining his perspective on oriental studies in the Netherlands, Uhlenbeck on the one hand pointed out the important fact ‘that the limitations of the Eurocentric approach that had been accepted, either consciously or subconsciously, as self-evident are starting to be understood’ while on the other hand asserting that ‘language studies have led to the
understanding that all languages, irrespective of their widely varying structure, are equal variations on a single basic theme’ (*BKI* 1967: 205–16). According to Uhlenbeck, both language studies and anthropology should strive ‘to define a truly general concept of language and culture that covers all of the languages and cultures of the world and that serves as the vital theoretical premise for the scientific description of each individual language or culture’, certainly with the ‘growing integration and interpenetration of East and West’ after the Second World War.

While relativism and universalism were complementary in Uhlenbeck’s balance of oriental studies in the Netherlands, Teeuw also had a sharp eye for the tensions that could arise between the two perspectives. In his dissertation on an Old Javanese poem, Teeuw (1946: 1) already stated:

> Most important seems to be the question – the last question of any literature study – of the essential value of a text such as this in the history of the human mind and civilization. In this, confrontation with one’s own faith and philosophy is unavoidable, but when philology fails to address this last question sooner or later, it is without objective and therefore useless.

In the contemporary literature of the revolutionary Indonesian writers – Angkatan 45 – he was fascinated by their struggle with their political, anti-colonial engagement on the one side and their desire for universal humanism and a world culture on the other (Teeuw 1994, I: 126–9). As literary counterweight to the continued ethnocentrism and colonialism on the Dutch side in the 1950s, Teeuw included their texts as appendices to his pamphlet on the New Guinea issue.

For Pramoedya Ananta Toer, his most valued Indonesian writer, Teeuw described his evolution from ‘universal humanism’ to ‘socialist realism’ and finally back to ‘individual humanism’. ‘Justice or righteousness’, Teeuw concluded (1993: 318) ‘is the most fundamental demand that Pramoedya places on his characters and the most urgent message he wants to communicate to his reader’. A universal demand for righteousness clashes in all of Toer’s books with the particularist interests of all of the powers-that-be that Indonesia experienced in the course of the twentieth century, whether Dutch, Japanese or Indonesian. Personally, it was sometimes difficult for Teeuw to direct the scientific cooperation with a regime that imprisoned Pramoedya and his kindred spirits for long periods of time and banned their books. The scientific importance of that cooperation for researchers in both the Netherlands and Indonesia, however, was more important in his view (interview Teeuw 22 September 2000).
Shrinkage and Growth in KITLV

KITLV Survives

Comparing KITLV of 1940 to KITLV of 1975, its entire world seems to have changed. In 1940 the Institute had 380 members; in 1975 there were 1098. In 1940 the Institute’s income totalled fl 17,000, expenditures totalled fl 17,500 and the shortfall was fl 500. In 1975 income totalled fl 1,996,000, expenditures fl 2,052,000 and the shortfall fl 106,000 – it had multiplied by more than one hundred. This was due in part to inflation, however, as a result of which the membership fee grew from fl 12 in 1940 to fl 15 in 1948, fl 24 in 1966 and fl 50 in 1975. This income item, however, increasingly lost importance. While nearly all income in 1940 was generated by the Institute itself, its own income in 1975 was only fl 106,087, alongside a sum of fl 1,830,000 from the government. The incidental subsidies received from the Department of the Colonies for specific publications were replaced by permanent subsidies from the Education and Sciences department and its affiliated research institutions. The most striking growth, however, was seen in the Institute’s staff. In 1940, the Institute employed either full-time or part-time an assistant secretary (fl 1,800), a caretaker (fl 770) and an assistant treasurer (fl 600). In 1975 KITLV had a staff of 25 full-time and 10 part-time employees, who collectively represented a sum of fl 1,507,726 in wages in a sum total of expenditures of fl 2,052,843.

The Institute’s growth was also translated in the number of publications in the Verhandelingen and other series. KITLV published four books in 1940 and eighteen in 1975. With the growth of KITLV, its scientific importance also grew. Of the twelve board members in 1940, six were professors and one other had a PhD. In 1975, ten of the total of sixteen board members were professors and five others had a PhD. Sadly, soon after the war complete membership lists per year were not saved in the Institute’s archives. However, it is safe to assume that the membership also included increasing numbers of scholars, if only because of the growing number of student members. Former administrators and former missionaries represented a shrinking share of the members. One of the few continuity elements between 1940 and 1975 was the symbolic fact that the Queen, first Wilhelmina and then Juliana, continued to be KITLV’s patroness.

The enormous expansion shown by the Institute between 1940 and 1975, however, did not follow a straight line. Initially, as a result of the Second World War and the decolonization, the number of members decreased from 380 in 1940 to 374 in 1950, of whom 79 were student
members who paid only half of the membership fee. It was not until 1960 that the membership grew above the 1940 figure, with 427. In 1967, when the new KITLV housing in Leiden was officially opened, with a total membership of 741 the prewar peak of 725 in 1910 was surpassed. The library had grown in the meantime from 24,000 books in 1937 to 40,000 in 1960 and 132,600 in 1972 (Jaquet 1993: 17–9). Such growth would have been utterly impossible in the former KITLV building in The Hague. Subsidies from the government, initially awarded only per project or publication, became more permanent in the late 1950s and increased significantly in the early 1960s. Prior to that, KITLV scarcely survived, in part thanks to the old trunk capital established by IJzerman, from which the Institute received annual interest and could survive on in difficult years.

From a financial perspective, KITLV survived the Second World War very well. Its total portfolio of shares, bonds and cash actually increased from ƒ 334,000 in 1940 to ƒ 405,000 in 1945 (KITLV 393, 396 and 403). Because the paper shortage necessitated postponing publications, the 1945 budget even showed a positive balance (BKI 1948: xii). Regarding the general situation in the liberated Netherlands and Indonesia, however, the 1945 annual report reflected a spirit of desperation. ‘Murder and manslaughter were a fact of daily life’, the report stated regarding recently liberated Indonesia: ‘On Sylvester 1945, Java was the image of chaos. Is it surprising that the report over the year of liberation cannot yet resound of excitement?’ (BKI 1948: ix.) In the subsequent years, both the financial worries and the desperation caused by the rapid decolonization of Indonesia increased.

As already discussed, the first postwar KITLV boards primarily consisted of former administrators and linguists in government service, many of whom were professors. The board was presided over by the elderly scholars Van Ronkel (1944–1948) and Stapel (1948–1950). A conservative former Minister for the Colonies like Welter was still a part of the board until 1950. These boards were not very alert in their response to the new, postwar situation. In the turbulent political developments involving the decolonization, the board was instinctively hesitant, avoiding proposals for cooperation from both the conservative side – for the Comité Rijkseenheid (Committee for Empire Unity) – and the progressive side – for the new journal *Indonesië* – by calling upon the scientific nature of KITLV (BKI 1946: xlvii, 1952: 94). The board submissively implemented the necessary amendments to its Charter necessitated by Indonesia’s independence. The suffix ‘of the Dutch East Indies’ was removed from the Institute’s name and references to ‘the colonies’ were replaced by
‘overseas’ (BK I 1949: xli–xliv). Initially, sufficient remedies to the increasing financial difficulties, primarily due to increasing costs for wages and for printing Bijdragen and Verhandelingen, could not be found. Increasing the membership fee from twelve to fifteen guilders in 1948 proved insufficient. All requests for subsidy from the new Ministry of Overzeese Gebiedsdelen en Uniezaken and Ministry of Overzeese Rijksdelen, as the successors to the former trusted Ministry for the Colonies were called, were refused during the frugal years of reconstruction. The new ZWO awarded KITLV only an incidental subsidy of seven thousand guilders in 1950 to relieve the worst pain (BK I 1952: 111–2).

The Leiden Javanists Kern and Berg in particular insisted during board meetings that Bijdragen and Verhandelingen be published in a more efficient manner and that a more international orientation be adopted by stimulating publications in English – ‘now that German is off the table for the time being’, as Kern laconically commented (BK I 1948: xl). The publication of Bijdragen in particular was much too expensive due to the excessive length of the articles, the remuneration awarded to authors – most of whom were members of the board – and the expensive habit of making extensive changes in the printed proofs. Drewes, professor of Malay in Leiden, submitted a proposal to appoint an editorial committee to make the publication more efficient and more international, which was approved (KITLV 232, NB 21 May and 11 June 1949). Above, it was already explained how Uhlenbeck, as new editorial secretary, implemented the desired reforms in the 1950s, first in Bijdragen and subsequently in the Verhandelingen and in new KITLV series in English. In its interim report on the Institute’s publications in the period 1945–1955, the editorial committee wrote with justified pride: ‘Now, after five years, it can be concluded that a greater variation has been achieved and that nearly everyone active in the Netherlands in the area of the language, geography and anthropology of the Indonesian archipelago supports the journal’ (BK I 1956: 91).

Above it was also explained that Korn, as President from 1950 until 1952, developed two other initiatives: a liaison with the new development aid and participating in scientific research in Dutch New Guinea. The first initiative did not readily render tangible results. Korn did succeed, however, in getting the head of the new Bureau of International Technical Aid of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, former colonial administrator R.W. van Difffelen, to join the KITLV board in 1952. Van Difffelen departed again after only a year and half, when he was appointed Ambassador in Beirut. Much more successful were the efforts by Korn and his successors as KITLV

The KITLV received subsidy from ZWO and the New Guinea administration for various publications on New Guinea. The most important project, however, was sending Anceaux for linguistic research in New Guinea based on consultation with Governor Van Baal (KITLV 507, NB 16 January 1954). ZWO and the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences paid for the first two years of his study; the colonial administration paid for the next three years. For other expensive projects, including the completion of the Coen edition and the *Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando-Indicum*, the KITLV board also received subsidy from ZWO. Publications in the Institute’s permanent series, the Verhandelingen, the Bibliographical Series and the Translation Series, regularly received subsidy from the Netherlands Institute for International Cultural Relations, which became part of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences in 1959 as Bureau for Foreign Relations.

What the Institute still missed, however, was the certainty of permanent support from the government. As already indicated in the annual report over 1952: ‘It is increasingly clear that the Institute, currently really the only institution that regularly provides purely scientific publications in the field of the languages, geography and anthropology of Indonesia, cannot fulfil its tasks without support from the government. The Board will once again submit an urgent request to the relevant authorities.’ (BKI 1953: 389.) These requests met with more sympathy at the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences once Piekaar joined that staff in 1953 and was appointed head of the Higher Education and Sciences department in 1956. According to Uhlenbeck, Piekaar sharply understood both the necessity of internationalizing scientific research and the permanent importance of Indonesian Studies in the Netherlands (interview 19 July 1994).

Henceforth KITLV received an increasing contribution from the ministry in addition to regular subsidies from ZWO. In 1959, when the general meeting approved the relocation of KITLV to Leiden, the Ministry and the Leiden Board of Curators decided to appoint the new KITLV Secretary, the linguist P. Voorhoeve, and pay his salary (KITLV 512, NB 17 September 1959; Teeuw and Uhlenbeck 1997). In 1960, KITLV’s portfolio of shares and bonds had increased to f 760,700 (KITLV 739). As a source of income, however, the Ministry’s contribution had grown to f 35,000, more than the revenue of f 24,000 from investments.

The more ample financial resources also led to a greater growth of KITLV’s library of books, which had now virtually outgrown its space in
the old building in The Hague. Wooden poles were used to reinforce the floors to support the increasingly higher and fuller bookshelves. The increasing lack of space for the library was an important trump card for Uhlenbeck in his efforts to relocate KITLV to Leiden University. The move from The Hague to Leiden was not an easy one, however.

**FROM THE HAGUE TO LEIDEN**

On 29 October 1956 the Board of Curators of Leiden State University wrote a letter to the KITLV board that included the following:

> Our Board intends to promote the establishment of a central institute for the non-western cultural studies. [...] Both the Faculty of Languages and the Humanities and our Board believe that the interests of science, of your Institute and of our University would be served well if your institution, which has already been active in the area of eastern studies for so long, would take a place in this new centre.

The Board of Curators emphasized in particular the ‘serious lack of library space’ that plagued KITLV in The Hague. In exchange for sufficient, rent-free housing the Board of Curators only requested that students and staff members be allowed free access to the library (KITLV 579).

The draft of this letter, together with a brief explanation of the organization and history of KITLV for the Leiden curators, was compiled by Uhlenbeck as secretary of the languages faculty. It was based on a more comprehensive plan. According to Uhlenbeck, relocating to the new Leiden University complex would not only remedy KITLV’s lack of library space and dire financial situation, but also stimulate the practice of Indonesian Studies within the Institute. ‘The main point was that the Institute missed a lively background – young people, students’, said Uhlenbeck (interview 19 September 1994). Uhlenbeck hoped that in a university environment KITLV would not remain a service organisation but could grow to become a true research institute: ‘To perform real research you need young people; not twenty former Indies administrators in their twilight years.’

To which can be added, of course, that the relocation also offered the Leiden University substantial advantages, including direct access for its staff and students to the largest library on Indonesia outside of Jakarta. Utrecht professor Coolhaas also commented later during a general meeting ‘that as far as the library is concerned, other cities like Amsterdam or Rotterdam would also love to have it’, let alone Utrecht (KITLV 499, NAV 15 March 1958).
Except for a few professors outside of Leiden, like Coolhaas, who feared that Leiden would gain a monopoly within KITLV, resistance to the relocation was initially primarily seen among the ‘oldies’ – the older members who lived in The Hague. Their spokesperson was former President and former Governor Korn. They were able to postpone the relocation to Leiden for quite some time during a number of heated general meetings, but ultimately they had no choice but to accept it. In a letter to the KITLV board dated 17 April 1958, Korn protested against ‘Uhlenbeck’s obstinate manoeuvre’, suggesting they ‘might as well present the entire Institute to Leiden on a platter’ if Uhlenbeck’s proposal was approved. At the time, Uhlenbeck indignantly denied the existence of a pre-conceived ‘Uhlenbeck Plan’. Later, however, in recent interviews he proudly talked about such a plan. Together with his younger Leiden colleagues, including Locher and Teeuw, he took careful steps to achieve his relocation plan.

To begin with, the hesitant President Drewes and Secretary Cense, who were surprised by Korn’s opposition, were convinced by Piekaar, who ensured them in a meeting at the department that he warmly supported KITLV and the eastern studies programme in Leiden (KITLV 509, NB 15 September 1956). On 24 November 1956 the board decided to accept the offer made by the Leiden curators in principle, in anticipation of the details of the housing and clear safeguards for the future independence of the Institute (KITLV 509, NB 24 November 1956). It was not until 15 March 1958 that the board presented its decision to the general meeting, with a strong reaction from the opposition led by Korn. To overcome this opposition, Uhlenbeck and his supporters focused on the immediate lack of space in the old building in The Hague, which would only increase as the library continued to grow. Based on a study performed by architects, they demonstrated to the opposition that remodelling the building was beyond the Institute’s financial means. When Korn subsequently proposed a coalition with the new Institute for Social Studies in The Hague, Uhlenbeck pointed out that that Institute did not primarily focus on Indonesia and also had no interest whatsoever in linguistic studies.

In a last attempt, Korn proposed that the municipal council of The Hague be requested to make a larger building in the city available to the Institute. It was not until the municipal council failed to respond that the general meeting of 21 March 1959 voted to ratify the relocation to Leiden. With a vote of 52 for and 5 against, the meeting finally approved the necessary amendment to the Charter. To safeguard the future independence of the Institute stipulated in Article 1, the following clause was
added to Article 9: ‘In the composition of the board, every effort will be made to reflect the fact that the Institute is a national organization’ (KITLV 499, NAV 21 March 1959).

It would take many years, however, for KITLV to actually move from The Hague to Leiden. The delay was caused by the construction plans in Leiden, which were changed and postponed. The Leiden Board of Curators did not submit a finalized proposal to the KITLV board until 15 September 1964 (KITLV 709). The new location was part of a newly constructed building on the city square Stationsplein 10: a particularly ugly but functional building where the other non-western institutes of the Leiden University were to be housed. When the building construction was completed late in 1966, the KITLV moved. The new Leiden location was festively opened on 17 March 1967.

In his opening speech, Uhlenbeck concluded that the pessimists had been wrong. The KITLV had survived the decolonization and the eastern studies programme in Leiden was in perfect health. ‘The world of science and the world of politics and economy overlap one another in several places, but they are far from identical and each has its own ratio’, said Uhlenbeck (BKI 1967: 210). Moreover, the political and economic prospects had also improved now that the Netherlands had re-established relations with Indonesia after resolving the New Guinea issue. The number of KITLV members in Indonesia had since increased sharply. The only thing Uhlenbeck was worried about was the low level of bibit, young rice crops, or new students. The number of Dutch students in the Indonesian languages and literature remained small because Arabic and Sanskrit were mandatory components of the study. When this requirement was removed in the new Academic Charter, student numbers began to rise again in the course of the 1970s.

KITLV, however, experienced enormous growth in the course of the 1960s, when government funds flowed freely in a period of strong economic growth. The relocation to Leiden proved to give the Institute an enormous boost, increasing the room for further expansion in both literal and figurative terms. In 1967 the Institute’s staff consisted of 10.5 FTEs, 3.5 of which were scientific. ‘In part thanks to the relocation to Leiden, once again expanding our task, our personnel situation for the years to come must be recognized’, concluded the board in a new staff plan: ‘Expanding the number of staff members is unavoidable’. The board unabashedly asked the Department of Education and Science to approve 7.5 new staff positions (KITLV 520, NB 20 May 1967). This request and subsequent ones were immediately honoured. As a result, in 1975 KITLV had a total of
29.5 FTE staff positions, including nine scientific researchers, in addition to the Secretary who was formally employed by the Leiden University.

In addition to the library, KITLV had three different departments: the Documentation Indonesian History department led by the historian Jaquet, who succeeded Nieuwenhuys in 1973, the Caribbean department (CARAF) led by the anthropologist R.Th. Buve, which started its activities in 1972, and the Documentation Modern Indonesia department (DMI), which was established in 1968 in close cooperation with the Institute's representatives in Jakarta, led by the non-western sociologist R.S. Karni. DMI's activities included publication of the *Excerpta Indonesia* series in which hundreds of articles on Indonesia were summarized in English starting in 1970. The library also experienced spectacular growth after the move the Leiden. The increase in the number of volumes it contained from 40,000 in 1960 to 132,600 in 1972 was already mentioned. The number of visitors it welcomed increased from 642 in 1963 to 2173 in 1967 and 7155 in 1975 (*BKI* 1976: 391–2). Direction of the library was assigned to Pram Sutikno in 1975; Sutikno had studied cultural anthropology in Leiden and gained library experience in Amsterdam (Djajadiningrat-Nieuwenhuis 1993). For performing these new and the old tasks like the publication of *Bijdragen* and the Verhandelingen, by 1975 an entire network of KITLV committees had been formed with dozens of members.

At the board’s initiative under Teeuw’s direction, an amendment to the Charter was implemented in 1974 that attuned the objective and organization of the KITLV to the growing scope of the Institute’s activities. Article 2 ambitiously stated: ‘The Institute’s objective is to promote the study of the linguistics, geography and anthropology as well as the history of Southeast Asia and the South Seas and Caribbean regions and their environs’. In Article 14, the necessary organizational effectiveness was assigned to a management board consisting of a president, vice president, treasurer and the general secretary. The General Secretary – the linguist Noorduyn since 1965 – was responsible for day-to-day management based on consultation with the heads of the departments (KITLV 667).

Last but not least, most of the annual reports published in the period between 1960 and 1975 reported an increase in the number of KITLV members. The financial importance of the membership numbers proportionately decreased as subsidies from the government exponentially increased, but remained important for the scientific continuity and international contacts. In 1975 the KITLV had 1098 members, of whom 867 were regular members, 89 contributing institutions, 128 student members and only 3 donors. Of all these members, 496 were in the Netherlands, 5 in Suriname
and the Netherlands Antilles, 35 in Malaysia, 51 in Australia and no less than 324 in Indonesia: more than had ever been the case in the colonial period.

Jakarta Office

The number of KITLV members in Indonesia suffered little from the decolonization and the New Guinea issue. In 1940, when the Indies were still suffering from the economic crisis, their number was 92. In 1960, when Indonesia severed diplomatic ties with the Netherlands, there were 93. When diplomatic relations were restored in 1964, this number quickly increased, to 293 in 1967. As Teeuw, who had just accepted KITLV presidency, commented in his confidential ‘Development plan’ for KITLV: ‘These Indonesian members have often their only and highly appreciated link to the international scientific world in Bijdragen they receive based on their membership’ (KITLV 520, NB 18–11–1967). In his development plan, Teeuw also discussed the ‘expansion of the library and documentation’ and the ‘editorial activities and distribution of the publications’. Most of the plan, however, was devoted to the future scientific cooperation.
with Indonesia. Teeuw’s development plan proved to be visionary in three ways.

Firstly, Teeuw believed it to be ‘of fundamental importance that the Dutch tradition of scientific practice with reference to Indonesia be reinforced as soon as possible and attuned to the demands of this new age’. Teeuw discussed the mutual advantages for both the Netherlands and Indonesia that could result from this cooperation, including ‘within the framework of the development aid to be provided to that country’. Secondly, Teeuw emphasized the equality of the two partners in future scientific cooperation, commenting: ‘The new situation in which Indonesia acts as partner and no longer primarily as object of scientific practice demands a new approach to research’. Thirdly: ‘Establishing a scientific institute in Jakarta as a branch of the Royal Institute is the best way to go’, was Teeuw’s conclusion. According to Teeuw, this office would serve to perform four tasks: ‘a. developing and maintaining close ties with the Indonesian scientific world; b. promoting, preparing for and monitoring Dutch scientific research in Indonesia; c. acquiring books and other materials and collecting scientifically relevant information for the Institute in the Netherlands [...]; d. providing research services for the Institute’s Indonesian members’.

Early in 1968, Teeuw travelled to Indonesia for orientation purposes and submitted a detailed report of this journey to the KITLV board (KITLV 521 NB, 18 May 1968). His foremost Indonesian contact was Koentjaraningrat, professor of cultural anthropology with the University of Indonesia, while the Dutch Consul F.D. Boreel provided the necessary practical assistance. Teeuw quickly understood that LIPI was the best partner for KITLV in future scientific cooperation: ‘the LIPI (Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia), a kind of Academy of the Sciences that answers directly to the government and represents their primary body for scientific policy’. Teeuw’s discussions with Koentjaraningrat, who was also assistant director of LIPI, were fruitful. These resulted in a written pledge that LIPI would cooperate in the mission of sending two KITLV representatives to Jakarta and would obtain the necessary permission from the Ministries of Education and Foreign Affairs.

The response from LIPI regarding future scientific cooperation within the broader framework of the bilateral relations between the Netherlands and Indonesia was also particularly positive.

The most important motive for cooperation and enthusiastic approval of the Institute’s plans in a variety of circles was undoubtedly the importance
of scientific efforts in the field of social and cultural sciences in a broader sense to the nation-building and development of Indonesia.

As phrased by Teeuw: ‘Promotion of scientific research in this field is considered to be an indispensable complement to the scientific cooperation within the framework of development aid’.

The subsequent implementation of the KITLV plans went smoothly, with subsidies from the department of Education and Science and cooperation from the Embassy of the Netherlands. Late in 1968, as head of the new DMI department, Karmi went to Indonesia to explore the possibilities for acquiring Indonesian source materials for KITLV and for local distribution of KITLV publications. Once a significant subsidy was pledged by Education and Science, once again thanks to Piekaar, the Javanist Ras and A.C.M. Peeters were appointed as the first KITLV representatives in Jakarta, the first of whom was assigned the task of making preparations for further scientific cooperation; the latter was responsible for the acquisition, documentation and distribution activities (KITLV 521, NB 2 November 1968).

In the course of 1969, the new KITLV office in Jakarta assertively started its activities. The LIPI helped to find fitting office space and recruit Indonesian administrative workers. On behalf of KITLV, Ras worked with LIPI to iron out the details of a cooperative agreement. An important part was the collective translation project within the framework of which sixty publications by Dutch authors, both recent and prewar texts like the adat law collections, would be published in Indonesian in the period 1970–1975 (Erkelens 1993: 57). Ras also established contact with a number of universities throughout Indonesia and made preparations for temporary positions for Dutch intellectuals at some of these universities, both in regular teaching positions and for the purpose of permanent education. Dutch anthropologist Jacob Vredenbregt, who obtained his PhD in Leiden and regularly published in *Bijdragen*, continued his long-term stay in Indonesia when he was appointed as the first lecturer financed by KITLV at the University of Indonesia. Peeters also travelled around Indonesia for orientation purposes and to acquire Indonesian publications. In the first year he acquired more than two thousand titles for KITLV (*BKI* 1970: 321–5, 1971: 305–8). In the period from 1969 to 1992, the representatives in Jakarta acquired some ninety thousand titles for KITLV library (Erkelens 1993: 53).

The Embassy of the Netherlands provided assistance in all these activities. According to Ras, both the embassy and LIPI were already anticipating future, official scientific cooperation within the framework of the
Cultural Agreement. He urgently advised KITLV to address this and keep the initiative. ‘It is evident that the management of the Royal Institute in Leiden is the instructing authority’, he reported to the board: ‘but if we are to keep the establishment of this office from turning into a costly yet unsuccessful experiment, […] Leiden must continually take into account the expectations that these two parties have of that office’ (KITLV 522, NB 29 May 1969).

For health reasons, however, Ras was forced to resign as KITLV’s first representative in Jakarta in 1970. The anthropologist and former civil servant in New Guinea J.W. Minderhout was appointed as his successor. M.H. Dol succeeded Peeters in 1972 as second representative. In turn, Minderhout was succeeded in 1975 by Nijmegen anthropologist A.C. van der Leeden, who had studied Indology in Leiden, worked in New Guinea as anthropologist in administrative service, and served as curator of the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde in Leiden from 1960 to 1969. As second KITLV representative, Dol was soon replaced by historian Jaap Erkelens in 1974. Erkelens succeeded Van der Leeden as first representative late in 1977 and held that position till 2003. The position of second representative was discontinued. The period from 1970 to 1977 was a period of continual commotion regarding the KITLV office in Jakarta, with reference not only in terms of content to the difficulties encountered in expanding the scientific cooperation with the Indonesian world of scientific research, but also psychologically with personal problems and conflicts.

In the meantime, despite these appointment issues, the KITLV office in Jakarta amply satisfied the objectives formulated by Teeuw in 1968. In addition to the immediately successful acquisition, translation and distribution activities, long-term cooperation had been started between KITLV and the Indonesian academic world that was continued officially and on a large scale in 1975 with the Indonesian Studies Programme: the bilateral cooperative agreement between the Netherlands and Indonesia in the field of social studies and the humanities for which Teeuw chaired the Dutch steering committee and KITLV coordinated on the practical side. From that perspective, the KITLV board’s worries about the scientific functioning of the office in Jakarta were perhaps slightly exaggerated. The course of the bilateral Programme for Indonesian Studies after 1975 is described in the following Chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

POSTCOLONIAL ACADEMIC PRACTICE (1975–2001)

THE POSTCOLONIAL CONTEXT

*The Globalization Process and the Information Revolution*

The term ‘globalization’ became the master concept of the last decades of the twentieth century. Heilbron and Wilterdink (1995: 8) quantified the rapid growth in the number of publications in English with the term ‘global’ in the title: from only 11 during the first half of the twentieth century to 303 in the 1960s and 4500 in the 1970s and 1980s. It was virtually impossible to keep track of the number of such titles published in the 1990s. Powered by the information technology revolution, the most important innovations of which were the microchip, the personal computer and the Internet, the world-wide exchange of money, goods, people and ideas increased exponentially. Historians like Osterhammel and Petersson (2005: 1–5) correctly claimed that this global exchange had already been taking place for centuries, especially after the rise of the ‘gunpower empires’ in Europe and Asia. Viewed over the longer term, the process of globalization showed an erratic pattern of growth with intermittent phases of decline. Even Osterhammel and Petersson (2005: 14–150), however, recognized that the globalization process, now powered by the information revolution, underwent enormous acceleration and intensification in the last few decades. The 9/11 attacks were no exception. The worldwide ‘war on terror’ also triggered world-wide media wars in which the rise of Islamic broadcasting companies like Al Jazeera and the explosive increase in the number of Islamic sites on the Internet linked Muslims together all over the world (Bunt 2003; Miles 2005). French Islam specialist Kepel (2004), however, pointed out that this virtual ‘umma’ was being used not only to preach the violent Jihad but also to discuss a very broad range of opinions regarding the profession of the Islamic faith.

Less spectacular but certainly not less important were the effects of the electronic information revolution on the globalization of academic practice. The same holds true for the historical centres of the art of printing, such as publishing houses and libraries. As worded by Brown and Deguid (2000: 179) analogous to the publishing house regarding libraries:
The conventional library, with its massive weight of paper gathering dust and resisting efficient searches, is another paper-based institution that set fingers itching at the keyboard. The sense that information is “there” somewhere, but can’t be found can drive anyone to digitize. Within KITLV, the head of the department Documentation Modern Indonesia, Didi Karni, took responsibility for automation and digitization of the library catalogue and other Institute facilities. In an ‘environment of alphas’, as he referred to his working environment, this task was neither easy nor readily appreciated (interview 5 October 2000).

As described by Karni (1993), the automation and digitization of the library was performed in phases. Because the manual compilation of the supplementary catalogue became increasingly difficult as the rapid growth in the number of titles continued to accelerate, Karni initiated an automation proposal that was approved in 1972. The English OECD Macrothesaurus for the alpha and gamma sciences was to serve as the basis for the key words to be used in the annual supplementary catalogue, and a punch card machine was acquired to automatically process the data. As a pilot project, the new machine was used to compile a cumulative register of the first ten volumes of Excerpta Indonesia. After this successful start, however, came a series of disappointments. When the new supplementary catalogue for the year 1973 was finally published in 1979, it was so expensive that only 25 copies were sold. The KITLV board was tempted to terminate the entire automation project. Treasurer P.J. van Leeuwen – ‘not a true alpha’, according to Karni – submitted a memorandum on 28 January 1981 in which he successfully argued that automation was desirable in the short term and unavoidable in the longer term. The board eventually agreed to continue the process of automation (KITLV 534, NB 17 May 1981).

Two developments were particularly important in helping the Institute to catch up: technological innovations, starting with the acquisition of the first word processor and what was known as the COM machine (Computer Output on Microfiche), and the growing cooperation between the academic libraries in the Netherlands in the automation of catalogues. When the supplementary catalogue for the year 1987 was published early in 1988, the Institute was finally up to date. The actual digitization of the KITLV library was completed at high speed along the same lines of technological innovation and cooperation. The entire library was included in the On-line Public Catalogue (OPC) in 1998 (Jaarverslag 1998: 14). Ten computer terminals were made available to visitors in 2000. The improved electronic accessibility of the catalogue led to a decline in the annual increase in the
number of visitors that threatened to overload the library personnel (*Jaarverslag* 1999: 15).

Under Karni’s leadership and in cooperation with the new International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) in Leiden, a KITLV website was opened on the Internet in 1996 (*Jaarverslag* 1999: 11–3). In its first year, visitors logged in from 69 different countries. During Indonesia’s democratic transition in 1998–1999, the library started publishing a daily news bulletin in English that attracted thousands of Internet visitors from all over the world. In general, some 60% of the 1500 average pageviews per month on the KITLV site originated in the Netherlands, while Indonesia and the United States each represented some 10 percent. The digital threat that many believed would erupt on the dawn of a new millennium at the stroke of midnight passed virtually unnoticed by KITLV. All computer files had been millenium-proofed well in advance, making it unnecessary for anyone to miss that night’s celebrations to keep guard in the KITLV building.

*Modernization and Postmodernization; Modernism and Postmodernism*

Some authors, in particular Castels (1996), believe the information revolution in the West has led to an entirely new type of society: the Internet society. That is an exaggeration. Although the number of Internet users in the Netherlands rapidly increased from 3 per 1000 inhabitants in 1990 to 739 per 1000 in 2000 (*Human Development Report* 2007: 273), the new medium determined the message to only a certain degree. The widest possible variety of groups utilized the Internet: both established institutions and extremist fringe groups. To conceptualize the social context of KITLV for the Netherlands and for its primary field of study, Indonesia, the terms modernization and postmodernization will be used here. KITLV’s intellectual context will be analysed in terms of modernism, postmodernism and postcolonialism.

In 2000, the services sector represented 71% of the GNP of the Netherlands, while the agricultural and industrial sectors respectively contributed only 3% and 26% (*Human Development Report* 2002: 281). According to Kumar (1995), this type of society is better characterized as postmodern rather than postindustrial. Inglehart (1997), whose empirical analysis of the transition from materialist values of prosperity to postmaterialist values of prosperity were already mentioned in the previous Chapter, also asserted based on new empirical research in 43 western and non-western countries that the Netherlands was characterized by postmodernization, while Indonesia was still in the modernization phase. Naturally, both
Kumar and Inglehart are well aware of the many squabbles involving the terms modernization and postmodernization. Both authors refute the universalist – albeit actually Eurocentric – modernization theory launched by the well-known American economist W.W. Rostow around 1960. Kumar and Inglehart emphatically assert that modernization is not synonymous for westernisation, that the process of modernization is not one of linear progression, that modernizing countries like Indonesia already have postmodern sectors, and that postmodernizing countries still have modern sectors. However, the differences between modernization and postmodernization can be explained based on a number of empirical indicators.

Both Kumar and Inglehart consider the growth in the GNP and the growth of the services sector at the expense of the industrial sector to be major economic characteristics of postmodernization. In the Netherlands, the GNP per capita grew, corrected for purchasing power based on its value in 1992, from $13,374 in 1975 to $21,591 in 2000 (Maddison 2006: 443). A minor decline was seen only for a period of a few years in the early 1980s. The explosive growth of the services sector has already been mentioned. Although the term ‘network society’ is exaggerated, the information revolution was an important technological drive behind the relatively large services sector. Along with the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands is one of the most digitized countries of the world. According to Inglehart, the Netherlands is also growing closer to the progressive Scandinavian countries in terms of standards and values. The comparative figures published by the Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau in 2000 confirm this.

Examples include the Netherlands’ relatively high scores over the past decade in the areas of gender equality, tolerance of homosexuality and sex before marriage. Although a majority of the Dutch population still continues to believe in God, secularization has increased significantly. New social movements, for the environment, women’s rights, human rights and the Third World, for example, meet with sympathy. According to Inglehart, the pattern of postmodern values is determined from an immaterial perspective by progressive attitudes but from the material perspective by neoliberalism. According to the Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, the relative discrimination of scientific education and research seen since the early 1980s – a context of vital importance to KITLV – is a good example of the neoliberal privatization trend. What was born from a need to reduce expenditures due to the economic recession of the early 1980s was continued based on neoliberal ideology.
While the demographically corrected index figure for the number of students of higher vocational education doubled from 100 in 1985 to 217 in 1998, the same figure increased for university students from 100 to only 124. In absolute terms, the number of university students actually decreased, from 179,000 in 1990 to 159,000 in 1999 (Sociaal en Cultureel Plan Bureau 2000: 442). Demographic shrinkage and a reduction in the duration of study programmes were important causes of this decrease. The increased influence of market mechanisms in academic education led on the one hand to ‘leaner and meaner’ universities, and on the other to concentration and scale increases among research institutions, as experienced by KITLV during the 1990s in its relationship with Leiden University and KNAW.

Indonesia presented the image of a rapidly modernizing developing country after 1975, albeit still with large traditional communities and with already small postmodern enclaves. During the authoritarian Suharto regime, despite widespread corruption and nepotism Indonesia experienced impressive economic growth. Between 1967, when Suharto became President, and 1997, when the Asia crisis hit, the Indonesia's GNP per capita increased from nearly $930 to $3655, corrected for purchasing power based on 1992 values (Maddison 2006: 562). During that same period, the share of GNP represented by the agricultural sector decreased and the shares of both the industrial and services sectors increased, respectively to 24 percent, 43 percent and 41 percent. In 1997, Indonesia had only 0.1 Internet user per 1000 inhabitants. However, the small – but difficult to control – Internet sector played a strategic part in the democratization process initiated by the economic crisis (Sen and Hill 2000: 194–211). In 2005, the number of Internet users per 1000 inhabitants had increased to 73 (Human Development Report 2007: 275).

The democratization movement in Indonesia was carried by students, the new middle class and the urban masses: the products of thirty years of economic growth and modernization during the Suharto regime (Vatikiotis 1998: 218–32). The success of this movement confirms the following conclusion drawn by Inglehart (1997: 330): ‘In short, economic development leads to cultural changes that make mass publics more likely to want democracy and more skillful at getting it’.

There are no direct ties between modernization and postmodernization as social processes and modernism and postmodernism as intellectual movements. This is also evident in the fact that postmodernization had little support within KITLV, an advanced institute in an advanced society, around the turn of the twenty-first century. That lack of support
was seen in the publications in *Bijdragen* and Verhandelingen as well as during interviews with key members. Some appreciation was found for the ‘cultural turn’, but little for the ‘linguistic turn’. To a certain degree, this reflects the difference between Leiden and Amsterdam. Reservations against postmodernism was one of the issues in which KITLV held a more conservative viewpoint than the Center for Asian Studies in Amsterdam (CASA) (Sutherland 1998) and the IIAS. In the field of anthropology, a discipline that was open in general to postmodernism, Leiden did not have a declared postmodernist anthropologist as professor until Patricia Spyer was appointed in 2001. As Vermeulen (2002: 149) concluded: ‘A new paradigm – of postmodern anthropology – now entered the Leiden scene’, adding: ‘somewhat belatedly’.

The academic perspective of most of KITLV’s researchers around the turn of the twenty-first century is best characterized by what Kumar called ‘neo-modernism’: modernism informed by postmodernism. ‘Neo-modernism will, to an extent’, said Kumar (1995: 199), ‘take on some characteristics of post-modern theory. Its universalism will be qualified by a relativism that acknowledges the particularities of time and place.’ This type of neomodernism is a reflection of the academic perspective identified as characteristic within KITLV in the previous Chapter on decolonization and internationalization.

Within KITLV, postcolonialism found more support as an intellectual movement than postmodernism. This holds particularly true for Caribbean Studies, which traditionally involved multicultural societies and identities. ‘Hybrid’ – once considered a derogative term during the colonization – found new appreciation within postcolonialism. Historian Gert Oostindie, head of the KITLV’s small department of Caribbean Studies from 1983 till 2001, emphasized during his oration upon accepting the position of extraordinary professor in Utrecht in 1994 the importance of the concept of ‘Creolization’: ‘not only as an essential characteristic of the Caribbean culture, but in fact as a regional prelude to the globalization of the world culture that would characterize the late twentieth century’ (Oostindie 1994: 27). In his oration as extraordinary professor in Rotterdam, historian and KITLV board member Van Stipriaan Luïscius (2000) placed central focus on Creolization in his analysis of the Suriname minority in the Netherlands with its Suriname and African roots.

In part under the influence of the subaltern studies of Indian historians, the concept of postcolonialism has also acquired a critical if not anticolonial meaning (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1998: 187). The PhD
thesis by historian and anthropologist Henk Schulte Nordholt (1996) on relations between the Netherlands and Bali was postcolonial in that respect in particular, despite its equally critical analysis of the Balinese rulers: ‘a particularly valuable work’, according to Ricklefs (2001: 430). In his Rotterdam oration as extraordinary professor, Schulte Nordholt (2002) discussed the continuity of violence in both the colonial and the postcolonial state of Indonesia. This continuity thesis was much more critical than the thesis propounded by the sociologist Van Doorn (1973) as referred to earlier. Late in the 1990s, Schulte Nordholt was a KITLV board member. After its jubilee in 2001, respectively as Director of KITLV and as head of research for Indonesian projects (since 2005 head of the Research Department) both Oostindie and Schulte Nordholt exercised great influence on the course taken by KITLV.

*Postcolonial Relations*

When Suriname also gained its independence in 1975, the Netherlands’ foreign relations with that country were clearly postcolonial. But that did not conclude the colonial heritage. Around 2000, Indo Dutch and Moluccans were still the largest ethnic minority in the Netherlands. Groups of Moluccan youths unsuccessfully attempted to gain recognition for the Republic of the South Moluccas with a series of hostage incidents in the 1970s. Around the turn of the century, they peacefully exerted pressure on the Dutch government to provide humanitarian aid to the victims of the religious civil war in the Moluccas (Smeets and Steijlen 2006: 340–8). The Dutch government agreed to provide that aid, albeit solely through international channels. The colonial heritage continued to exercise influence in progressive circles. The socialist Jan Pronk, who served three terms as Minister for Development Cooperation, found great inspiration in Multatuli: ‘the patriarch of Dutch development cooperation’. According to Pronk, *Max Havelaar* was ‘in the heart of discussions on development cooperation’ (J.J.P. de Jong 2003: 38). Following suit with Multatuli, Pronk wanted to protect the Indonesian population from their own leaders. As already explained, this led to conflicts with the Suharto regime during his first term as minister in the 1970s. During his second term, development cooperation was terminated in 1992, and this also had extensive effects on KITLV.

Although Indonesia and India regularly traded places on the list of developing countries receiving the most development aid from the Netherlands – more than 230 million guilders in 1991 – this amounted to
only 1.9% of the total aid received by Indonesia. Japan immediately offered to compensate the loss of aid from the Netherlands (Malcontent 1998: 124). Suharto's decision to terminate all development cooperation with its former colonizer the Netherlands was based on reasons of both principle and opportunism. On the eve of national elections, the Suharto regime hoped to win votes. But it also had longstanding complaints against attempts by the Netherlands to use development aid as a means to exert political pressure in the area of human rights (Nico Schulte Nordholt 1995).

During the 1970s, moderate Minister of Foreign Affairs Van der Stoel's 'silent diplomacy' was able to successfully redirect Pronk's pressure on the Indonesian government to release political prisoners. However, when Pronk resumed his position as Minister of Development Cooperation in 1989, there was no one to counterbalance the pressure. Once again Pronk revealed to the public a series of Indonesia's human rights violations varying from the bloodshed by the regime in East Timor to its alleged efforts to control births on Java. Once again he had support in the Netherlands from leftist development experts, including Wertheim's protege and successor Jan Breman, who co-authored the Nieuw Links (New Left, the leftist wing of the Labour Party) development platform with Pronk. Breman's criticism of the Suharto regime's birth control programme as a violation of women's rights triggered a debate among members of KITLV. Breman and professor of anthropology in Wageningen Anke Niehof, both KITLV board members, continued the discussion on the pros and cons of the programme that they started in the progressive magazine Onze Wereld in Bijdragen. Niehof claimed in a book review that Breman's criticism had led Pronk to temporarily suspend the Netherlands' contribution to the birth control programme and thus contributed to the termination of the development cooperation. This was particularly painful according to Niehof because independent Australian studies had since demonstrated that there were no grounds for Breman's accusations of coercion in birth control on Java (BKI 1995: 459–61).

In his response, Breman denied that the Netherlands' criticism of the birth control programme had played such an important part in the Suharto regime's decision to terminate development relations with the Netherlands. According to him, Pronk's suspension of aid credit following the bloodbath perpetrated by Indonesian forces in Dili (East Timor) late in 1991 was what caused the termination (BKI 1996). In her subsequent response, Niehof particularly emphasized the damage caused by the termination of development cooperation to academic cooperation:
cooperation that was primarily financed with development funds. ‘An example’, said Niehof, is the discontinuation of the Indonesian Studies Programme, which among other things provided opportunities for a considerable number of Dutch students to do MA and PhD research and practical course work in Indonesia, as well as fellowships for Indonesian graduates’ (BKI 1996: 151). The discontinuation of the Indonesian Studies Programme caused by the termination of Dutch-Indonesian development cooperation was also a blow to KITLV, which had coordinated the programme since 1975.

**The Professionalization of KITLV**

*The Programme for Indonesian Studies*

The preparations for the Programme for Indonesian Studies (PRIS) started in 1970, when the Cultural Agreement between the Netherlands and Indonesia became operative. Teeuw, professor of Indonesian languages and literature in Leiden and President of the KITLV, was appointed at that time as chairman of the Netherlands Advisory Committee for effectuation of the Cultural Agreement. As recommended by Ras, the KITLV representative in Jakarta, Teeuw invited his later Indonesian counterpart Harsja Bachtiar to visit Leiden to become better acquainted with the practice of Indonesian Studies in the Netherlands. Harsja was critical of the anthropology programme in Leiden, but showed interest in the Leiden studies of Indonesian and the regional languages. According to Teeuw, this first informal meeting was the most relaxed contact he ever had with Hasja. ‘As counterpart in the PRIS, he was always extremely business-like and kept at a distance – a bit cold, even. I could not claim that he ever became my friend’; said Teeuw in an interview on 10 June 1996.

After the initial contact had been made, it took a number of years for PRIS to actually get started. DGIS in particular was skeptical in the beginning. ‘I had to negotiate with Development Cooperation for years regarding the conditions and criteria’, said Teeuw. ‘No one in the department understood the matter. They just kept asking about the economic relevance.’ Nevertheless, in the end this department provided an initial subsidy of 780,000 guilders in 1974. According to Teeuw, this was primarily thanks to Piekaar (interview 4 August 2000). Later, once PRIS got going, DGIS changed its attitude and was willing to include an item in the Education and Sciences budget to finance the scientific framework of the Cultural Agreement. For PRIS, this budget item soon generated two
million guilders a year. According to Teeuw, however, there was still resistance within DGIS that was tangible during the periodic PRIS evaluations.

PRIS was officially started in 1975 with a conference in Jakarta attended by a delegation on behalf of the Netherlands led by Teeuw and an Indonesian delegation led by the Director General of Higher Education, Samaoen Samadikin. A Dutch steering committee was appointed to be led by Teeuw and an Indonesian steering committee led by Harsja Bachtiar. For the Netherlands, responsibility for coordination and effectuation was assigned to KITLV, which received subsidy for a separate Bureau of Indonesian Studies (BIS). Ch.F. van Fraassen, anthropologist in Leiden, was appointed as head of BIS.

The PRIS had three main activities: improving the scientific infrastructure in Indonesia, in particular universities and libraries; educating Indonesian students and postgraduates in both the Netherlands and Indonesia; and organizing joint research projects in the area of social studies and the humanities. Conferences were also regularly organized per discipline, attended by both Dutch and Indonesian linguists, anthropologists, historians and legal professionals (Indonesië-werkgroep Leiden 1978: 116–8).

At that time, Teeuw commented on the rather hurried establishment of PRIS: ‘It was organized as a type of crash programme under the motto: now or never’. The Netherlands’ knowledge and knowhow regarding Indonesia primarily rested with a dying generation of scholars, and it was essential that this expertise be made as accessible as possible to Indonesia before it was too late (Van Olden 1980: 731). With that statement, Teeuw confirmed the impression already reflected in the composition of the Netherlands’ steering committee. This committee primarily consisted of older scholars whose education took place in the colonial period.

During the first three years of PRIS, more than three million guilders was spent: 1.4 million guilders for improving the scientific infrastructure, 0.9 million for training and 0.7 million for research projects (Van Olden 1980: 732). The most important of the total of 35 projects in the early phase were the joint bibliographical project, the microfilming of Indonesian manuscripts, the Dutch course in Yogyakarta, and the Madura project, a joint, multidisciplinary research project (Indonesië-werkgroep Leiden 1978: 121, 126–9).

Due to such local research projects, allegedly purposed to give the Indonesian government more effective control of the population, PRIS was soon criticized in the Netherlands, by Wertheim’s leftist Komitee
Indonesia and by local, critical groups. According to Leiden's Indonesië-werkgroep, being an anti-colonial professor, Teeuw was allowing himself to be used by both the old colonialists in the Netherlands and the technological elite of Suharto's New Order. The manner in which academics are practiced within PRIS seems very much the same as what Johan Galtung calls "academic colonialism", according to the work group. Galtung is referring to a type of academic practice in which knowledge of a people is not only collected and processed, but also – and that is the problem – without involvement of that people (Indonesië-werkgroep Leiden 1978: 132). Henk Maier, a member of that work group who had recently received his degree in Indonesian languages and literature, focused the criticism on the central part played by KITLV in PRIS: ‘In doing so, KITLV is helping to cloak the true nature of the Suharto regime and to cloud the real situation in Indonesia’ (NRC Handelsblad 27 October 1976).

Together with the other members of the Indonesië-werkgroep, in particular Hans Borkent, Maier also expressed sharp criticism within KITLV, especially regarding the functioning of Karni’s DMI department (KITLV 503, NAV 17 May 1980). In his enthusiasm for the automatization of the library, Karni was allowing the ordinary bibliographical craft to fall behind. The KITLV board was open to the opinions of this critical ‘young generation’. They were even invited to discuss their dissatisfaction with the board in more detail. Maier had since succeeded Teeuw as professor and became KITLV’s Vice President; Borkent was temporarily employed as documentalist with KITLV, and another member of the ‘young generation’, Leonard Blussé, was appointed as extraordinary professor in Leiden. The former colonial administrators in KITLV had already gained past experience in both ‘encapsulation’ and ‘repressive tolerance’.

In his response to the leftist criticism, Teeuw emphasized the academic importance and political neutrality of the PRIS. ‘Make no mistake’, Teeuw declared when PRIS was established:

There is nothing wrong with a social or cultural researcher sharing his ideas regarding the individual and the society through regular contact with his Indonesian counterpart, gradually providing his counterpart with insight and awareness of individual rights, et cetera. [...] But it is not the researcher's task to instigate unrest or rebellion in his research environment. (NRC Handelsblad, 7 February 1975.)

When Amnesty International asked KITLV to publicly declare its viewpoint regarding the many political prisoners in Indonesia, the board resisted taking a firm stand. ‘Despite our complete sympathy with the
work being done by Amnesty International’, read the minutes of the board meeting held in late October 1976 (KITLV 529, NB 30 October 1976) ‘the board believes that it is not the place of the Institute, a non-political organization, to voice an opinion in this issue’.

Mei Li Vos (2001: 107–9) points out that both the Dutch and the Indonesian authorities had already given up on PRIS even before development cooperation was terminated early in 1992. ‘A stick to hit the dog’ was a voluminous and critical external evaluation report (Dirkse and Dubbeldam 1991). The report criticized not only PRIS organization but also its results (Dirkse and Dubbeldam 1991: 23–6). From an organizational perspective, PRIS was too dependent on the support of two individuals: the steering committee chairmen Teeuw and Harsja Bachtiar. The report recommended a more collegial type of direction, with increased distinction between organizational tasks and tasks pertaining to content. The primary criticism, however, regarded content: the PRIS was too focused on the Indonesian past and was in danger of losing the balance between training and research. While 39% of the budget was allocated to research and 19% to training in 1980, in 1990 only 13% was devoted to research and 58% to training (Dirkse and Dubbeldam 1999: 9).

The consequences of this critical report were never subject of discussion as development cooperation with Indonesia was terminated, affecting not only PRIS but also NUFFIC and WOTRO. KITLV’s Bureau of Indonesian Studies was disbanded and staff members became redundant (Jaarverslag 1992: 14–5). The Ministry of Education subsequently appointed a new steering group for academic cooperation with Indonesia. However, much less money was available for the alpha and gamma studies, while the new IIAS was proving to be a strong contender in the allocation of funds. Moreover, the Ministry of Education no longer housed a powerful patron with a colonial background like Piekaar, who had helped KITLV so often in his position as Director General for the Sciences.

The Last of the Colonials

According to Uhlenbeck, Piekaar deserved a statue. That is beyond the scope of the work of a historiographer. He is, however, one of the last three KITLV board members with a colonial background deserving a biographical sketch. Alongside Piekaar as Director General for the Sciences and President of the KITLV (1975–1983), these men include General Secretary Noorduyn (1965–1992), sent to Indonesia as Bible translator, and Schoorl,

Arie Johannes Piekaar (1910–1990) was born in Rotterdam, where his father worked in the finance department of a large company. After completing HBS, Piekaar moved on to Indology in Leiden. He received his degree in 1932 and his PhD in Leiden a year later based on his thesis on the financial relationship between the Netherlands and the colonies. He worked for the Indies administration from 1934 to 1949. In Aceh Piekaar held various administrative positions from 1934 to 1942, the last few years as Residency secretary. He was held in Japanese prisoner camps from 1942 to 1945. After the war he worked from 1946 to 1947 as a secretary to the administration in Borneo, took a sabbatical in the Netherlands from 1947 to 1948 and worked as secretary to L.J.M. Beel, the last Dutch Governor General in Indonesia, from 1948 to 1949. Piekaar remained in Indonesia from 1949 to 1953 as first secretary to the Netherlands Hoge Commissariaat (High Commission).

During his sabbatical in the Netherlands Piekaar (1949) wrote a voluminous study about Aceh, in which he discussed first the Dutch prewar administration, the Japanese occupation and then the postwar revolution in great detail. With this study, Piekaar straddled the colonial period and Indonesia's independence. Most of his analysis of the land and people of Aceh was based on Snouck Hurgronje – ‘the great statesman-intellectual’ – and from other Leiden _adat_ law experts. He mourned the fact that the infamous Political Intelligence Service did not operate in Aceh, as a result of which the ‘extremists’ – primarily the _ulama_ and members of the Islamic youth movement – who were organizing rebellions in 1942, even before the Japanese arrived, were not neutralized soon enough.

Piekaar recognized, however, that the _ulama_ and Islamic youth had many more supporters than the Dutch authorities realized. The authorities also failed to understand that the position of the _adat_ leaders who cooperated with the Dutch administration was already seriously undermined. After the Japanese occupation, these leaders were brutally eliminated. ‘The tension that existed in many parts of the Aceh society in 1942 would have travelled the path of natural evolution to dissipation under normal circumstances’, according to Piekaar (1949:184). ‘It was only under the influence of the catastrophic development of the war with Japan that this tension exploded by way of revolution.’

Much later, Peter Post and Elly Touwen-Bouwsma referred to Piekaar’s study in the introduction to a bundle of conference articles on the period of Japanese occupation of Indonesia as a pioneering study: ‘Piekaar was far
ahead of his time in the historical debate generated by Benda, and he was also the first to use the regional study approach’ (BKI 1996: 528). Piekaar astutely recognized not only that the Aceh elites were manipulated by the Japanese authorities, but also that these elites manipulated those same authorities. He also predicted that the Islam-inspired nationalism that became so revolutionarily manifest after the Japanese occupation would be difficult to integrate into an independent Indonesia.

When Piekaar returned to the Netherlands in 1953, a former Indies administrator convinced him to work at the Department of Education, Arts and Sciences, as administrator with the department of secondary education. His star rose rapidly. He was appointed head of higher and university education in 1956, then Director General for higher and university education in 1960, and served from 1973 until his retirement in 1975 as Director General for academic policy. He received a special appointment as state counsellor in 1977. While Piekaar was directing academic policy from 1956 to 1975, expenditures for university education increased from 100 million guilders to 3.5 billion guilders (Knippenberg and Van der Ham 1994: 424, 593). Much was possible, including royal subsidies for KITLV and maintaining the Leiden professorships of Indonesian languages and literature that scarcely attracted students until the 1970s.

The ‘Piekaar formulae’ were legendary: ‘It used to be so easy’, commented an education journalist later. ‘The universities received funding via a system of ‘gifts’. The Director General for higher and university education, A.J. Piekaar, determined what each was to receive on the back of a box of cigars. Only a select few knew which “formulae” Piekaar used for that purpose.’ ‘You could do whatever you thought would be useful’, Piekaar ironically explained: ‘Anything was possible from the financial perspective, so nothing could go wrong’ (NRC Handelsblad, 28 November 1993).

Piekaar’s academic policy, however, was controversial. For exactly the same reasons that Leiden professors and KITLV Presidents like Uhlenbeck and Tseeuw were so appreciative of Piekaar, the younger historiographers of the Department of Education, Knippenberg and Van der Ham (1994: 548) were highly critical of him. According to these authors, Piekaar collected as many former colonial administrators as possible around him and acted like ‘an uncrowned king’ in his direction of the universities through a cloudy and informal network. His preference for secrecy earned him the title of ‘department sphinx’. His political preference was a topic of speculation. According to his wife, A.A. Piekaar-van der Aa, he always voted for the conservative-liberal VVD (interview 17 October 2000). Knippenberg and Van der Ham concluded somewhat gloatingly that Piekaar found it increasingly difficult to get along with the ever younger ministers and state secretaries. The socialist cabinet members Jos van Kemenade and Ger Klein ultimately parked him on a side track, allowing Piekaar to maintain his status until his retirement in 1975 (Knippenberg and Van der Ham 1994: 560–1).
Piekaar primarily focused his efforts as President of KITLV from 1975 to 1983 to the continuation of both PRIS and the threatened professorships for Indonesian studies. While he was President, an official committee compiled a voluminous report in 1982, the Report by the Werkgroep (Working Group) Indonesische Studies, referred to among insiders as the ‘Piekaar report’ (KITLV 969). ‘In this academic discipline the Netherlands is (still) the international centre’, was the report’s primary conclusion. Investments were required, however, to maintain that position, according to the report. Insiders claim that in that period of cuts in government spending, the report helped to continue the threatened professorships in Leiden, led to the establishment of the Stimulerings Fonds (Stimulation Fund) Indonesian Studies for postdoctorate researchers, and ensured continued government support for KITLV, albeit on a more modest scale than in Piekaar’s days of glory at the Education Department.

During both the years of affluence and the more meagre years, the linguist Noorduyn was responsible for day-to-day management of KITLV. When he joined the Institute in 1965 as General Secretary, it had 660 members, 7 employees and a budget totalling 140,000 guilders. In 1990, however, his last full year as Director Secretary, the Institute had 1896 members, 42 employees and a budget of 3.7 million guilders (Poeze and Schoorl 1991: vii).

This huge expansion was increasingly difficult for Noorduyn as KITLV Secretary. Teeuw voiced the general opinion of KITLV correctly by commenting: ‘He was fully capable of dealing with the institute anno 1965, but not with the institute anno 1990.’ Teeuw was nevertheless highly enthusiastic about Noorduyn’s academic qualifications: ‘He came to life when he was doing research. Noorduyn was an extremely intelligent detective who patiently continued to search for the last piece of the puzzle’ (interview 10 June 1996). The tragedy of Noorduyn’s career was the fact that he was given only a few years to devote himself to research after his retirement.

Jacobus (Koos) Noorduyn (1926–1994) was born in Gorkum and grew up in a Protestant environment (Grijns and Teeuw 1996). His father directed a publishing house. After receiving his (alpha) gymnasium diploma in 1944, he was forced into hiding for the last year of the war. Noorduyn commenced his study of the Indonesian languages and literature in Leiden in 1945 as an alumnus of the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap. As such he passed his first-year exam in theology. He completed his studies in 1952 specializing in Buginese based on his intended missionary work as Bible translator in South Celebes. He married a former classmate
in that same year. Noorduyn obtained his PhD under Berg in Leiden based on a thesis discussing an eighteenth-century Buginese chronicle.

In the meantime, the Bijbelgenootschap decided to relocate its missionary work to West Java due to the uncertain situation in South Celebes. From 1957 to 1961, Noorduyn worked in Bogor on a new Sundanese
translation of the Old Testament (Swellengrebel 1978, II: 252–8). However, the New Guinea issue made the status of his residence permit increasingly uncertain. When he decided to leave Indonesia, Noorduyn had three options: continuing his work as Bible translator elsewhere, an appointment as lector with the University of Sydney and a position as researcher with KITLV. He opted for the last and started his work for KITLV in 1962, initially as Assistant Secretary, then as General Secretary and finally as Director Secretary. Noorduyn's sense of duty in these positions was exemplary, but he also became increasingly wary of the administrative burdens involved with the rapidly growing Institute.

This threat of excessive pressure led Noorduyn to conclude that KITLV should solely act as a provider of services. He deflected research tasks in so far as possible. As President, Teeuw was forced to admit that Noorduyn's aversion to new tasks was sometimes discouraging: 'He was always worried, his response always deflective. It could be rather tiring.' (interview 10 June 1996.) Teeuw often suggested to Noorduyn that he should switch to the academic world, but Noorduyn believed his verbal skills were insufficient for lecturing. Nevertheless and despite his extensive activities as General Secretary, Noorduyn published a respectable number of scientific articles.

Grijns and Teeuw (1996) identified three recurring themes in Noorduyn's work: ancient Buginese historiography, the translation of Old Sundanese texts and the alleged decline of Majapahit in the fifteenth century that he put into a new perspective. Based on new source studies, Noorduyn concluded that the power of Majapahit remained primarily unaffected on Java despite its actual decline outside of Java (BKI 1978: 207–74). Internationally, Noorduyn was primarily respected as the world's expert in the languages of the Southwest Celebes and Buginese historiography: themes he discussed extensively in published articles and conference presentations, in English. His critical bibliography of the Celebes languages was published in KITLV's Bibliographical Series in 1991 (Noorduyn 1991). After his retirement, Noorduyn concentrated on the completion of his book about Governor Speelman's actions in South Celebes in the seventeenth century that, unlike Stapel's prewar study, was also based on Indonesian sources. However, Noorduyn soon passed away: in 1994. On his deathbed, Noorduyn asked Teeuw to complete the translation of Old Sundanese texts that he had already started.

Just as Noorduyn was the last eminent board member among a series of former missionaries and Bible translators, between 1983 and 1996 Schoorl was the last KITLV President who had started his career as an
administration official, in New Guinea. Johan Willem (Pim) Schoorl (1927) was born in Den Helder, where his father taught at a Protestant school. He completed HBS in Alkmaar. An administrative staff member who was a friend of the family recommended that he follow the Indology programme in Leiden, commenting: 'Utrecht is easier, but the best people come from Leiden' (interview 29 September 2000). Schoorl did in fact follow the Indology programme in Leiden from 1946 to 1951, majoring in cultural anthropology. He worked for the New Guinea administration in various positions from 1952 to 1962. In 1954, at the order of Governor Van Baal, Schoorl studied the acculturation processes among the Muyu, a people of mountain Papuans. While on sabbatical in the Netherlands, he obtained his PhD on the same subject under Locher in Leiden.

Back in New Guinea, Schoorl helped make preparations for the large-scale expedition to the Star Mountains. He was the candidate for the position of head of the Registrar’s Office in Hollandia, but the uncertain political situation involving New Guinea led him to opt in 1962 for a

Illustration 33. Pim Schoorl (left), government official in New Guinea, professor of non-western sociology at the Vrije Universiteit and KITLV President, when doing research on Buton, Indonesia, 1981.
position as professor of non-western sociology at the Protestant Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam. He retained that position until 1988. His experience in New Guinea made him thoroughly aware of, for instance, importance of field research during one’s studies, the great importance of modernization and acculturation processes in the Third World, and the possible contribution that could be made by non-western sociology and cultural anthropology in addressing Third World development issues (interview 29 September 2000; Schoorl 1995, 1996b).

In his oration, following in Locher’s steps Schoorl asserted that the concept of ‘Ecumenism’ played a central role in the new global society that had grown from western expansion since 1500. He assigned a secular meaning to this concept, based on its original meaning in Greek. In Schoorl’s view (1962: 12), the global modernization process justified a primarily universalist perspective, with cultural relativism counter-balancing the Eurocentrism that had been closely related to universalism in the colonial period. ‘The rejection of an absolute cultural-relativism may not mean that we fall back into a western ethnocentrism, with no understanding and, if possible, respect for the non-western cultures.’ A similar combination of universalism and relativism also characterized the introduction to development sociology published later by Schoorl (1974), when the American modernization theory was being attacked by the neo-Marxist dependencia theory. With reference to the contesting students in the 1960s and 1970s, Schoorl chose not to follow the path of confrontation like his former, much more conservative patron Van Baal, but he did criticize the reverence assigned to leftist revolutions in the Third World by both radical students and their radical mentors such as Wertheim. In part based on Christian morality, Schoorl (1974: 249) preferred gradual reform over violent revolution. Schoorl always remained a practising Christian, but voted for the Labour Party like his colleagues in Leiden. This preference was inspired not only by the Christian principle of solidarity, but also by human rights (interview 29 September 2000).

As professor, Schoorl devoted much effort to monitoring field research by his students, in countries varying from Scotland, Spain and Tunisia to Pakistan and Indonesia. He performed his own field research in 1981 in Buton, South Celebes, resulting in publications including the article ‘Belief in reincarnation on Buton, S.E. Sulawesi’ in Bijdragen (1985: 103–34). After his retirement, he compiled a collection on the experiences of former administrators in New Guinea (Schoorl 1996). This book was translated into Indonesian along with other publications by Schoorl.
As President of KITLV, Schoorl was forced to deal with three long-standing issues. Firstly, despite its sworn promises in the past, Leiden University was requesting a higher rent for the new, larger location at Reuvenplaats 2, to which the KITLV relocated in late 1983-early 1984. Secondly, a relatively fierce conflict arose with the Institute's Employees Council in 1994–1995 due to the dismissal of an employee. Thirdly – and by far the most important issue – the KITLV board led by Schoorl and the new Director Secretary, historian Peter Boomgaard, continued to resist growing pressure from KNAW, with which the Institute had been affiliated since 1990, to submit to its direct authority. ‘Arguments in support of this include,’ according to KNAW President Professor P.J. Drenth, ‘that KITLV benefits from a variety of regulations but gives little in return’ (KITLV, NB 24 February 1995). The initiative to place all para-university institutes like KITLV under scientific umbrella organisations, which would in turn allocate subsidies, came from the Minister of Education (KITLV 538, NB 27 April 1985). KITLV wanted to remain under the supervision of the Ministry, where it maintained excellent contacts, even after Piekaar’s departure. According to Schoorl, KITLV ultimately opted for KNAW because it appeared to offer more autonomy than Leiden University and research umbrella organisation NWO (interview 29 September 2000).

What followed was biting correspondence between the heads of KNAW and KITLV, in which KNAW did not hesitate to exert financial pressure, including reduced subsidies. Schoorl’s successor as President of KITLV, Leiden professor of anthropology Reimar Schefold, also initially resisted a takeover by KNAW, albeit less absolutely than Director Secretary Boomgaard. During a leave of research for Boomgaard in 1999, who was temporarily replaced as Director Secretary by Oostindie, a breakthrough occurred. During its regular consultation with KITLV, KNAW unexpectedly announced its willingness to cooperate in arriving at an organizational structure that would do justice to the Institute’s unique character. KITLV would be divided into a work organization and an association. The work organization would be directly controlled by KNAW, which would also appoint the Director. The association, however, would maintain ownership of the collections, the Institute’s capital and the publishing house. The KITLV board decided to accept this compromise. Boomgaard remained of the opinion that this was unacceptable and resigned his position in favour of Oostindie. During an Extraordinary General Assembly, the members unanimously approved the relevant necessary changes to the Institute’s Charter on 16 December 2000. Despite the fact that he was not an Indonesia expert, Oostindie was appointed by KNAW as Director in
2001. Every part of the organization – board, staff and members – was relieved that this long-standing conflict had finally been brought to an acceptable conclusion. Even more so when it was discovered that KNAW, as KITLV's immediate superior, was offering royal financial rewards.

KITLV at the Turn of the 21st Century

In the year 2000, KITLV had 1729 members, of which 352 lived in Indonesia and 394 in other foreign countries. However, of its total budget of more than 5.2 million guilders, only 742,300 guilders was the Institute's own income from membership fees and book sales. In terms of both research and the provision of services, the Institute was now a professional organization with a total of fifty full-time and part-time employees (Jaarverslag 2000: 12, 45–7, 67). The latest five-year external evaluation performed on behalf of KNAW in anticipation of the celebration of the Institute's 150th birthday awarded positive or extremely positive scores to nearly every aspect of the various departments (Evaluation Report 1999). The structure of that evaluation report is used here to summarize the various KITLV activities around the turn of the 21st century.
The external evaluation committee called the library ‘the jewel in the [Institute's] crown’, awarding it the highest possible distinction: A+. In addition to the successful digitization already referred to at the beginning of this Chapter, the committee was particularly impressed with the collection's international importance. ‘The Library collects more titles in the Institute's areas of study than the Library of Congress’ (Evaluation Report 1999: 4). In 1999 the entire OPC catalogue included more than 250,000 titles (Jaarverslag 1999: 14).

The linguist Roger Tol has been in charge of the library since 1992. He obtained his PhD in 1989 in Leiden based on a Buginese chronicle from the KITLV collection on the capture of the kingdom of Boni by the Dutch early in the twentieth century. Like all KITLV departmental heads, in addition to his time-consuming position Tol continued publishing articles on the languages, literature and oral sources and traditions of the South Celebes. Although the combination makes for a heavy load, it is also highly fruitful. ‘As scholar-librarian, I have access to the newest publications and I know exactly what the library's end-users want’, says Tol (interview 7 October 2000). The acquisition of some ten thousand new titles each year is based on a matrix incorporating the most important regions and disciplines – a matrix compiled by Tol based on consultation with the board, the departmental heads and the Institute's representative in Jakarta. Tol estimated that in 1999 some 60% of the library collection pertained to Indonesia, 20% to the Caribbean, 15% to Southeast Asia and the Pacific and 5% to other areas. The most important issue is the available space for the library. With the acquisition of ten thousand titles per year, it would be difficult to continue to house the entire collection within a period of five years (interview 7 October 2000).

Of those ten thousand titles per year, about half are acquired through the KITLV’s representative in Jakarta, not only in Indonesia, but also in and on Malaysia and the Philippines. As head of KITLV’s office in Jakarta since 1978, the historian Erkelens played a very important role in both the acquisition of titles and contacts with Indonesia’s academic circles. In terms of acquisition, Erkelens considers it vital to collect Indonesian newspapers and periodicals as complete as possible. The KITLV library currently has a much larger and more up-to-date collection in this respect than even Cornell University – perhaps even the largest in the world. Contacts with the academic world run primarily through the national archives and Indonesia's national library. A central part has been played in this respect by the lengthy project of translating Dutch academic publications, which was recently presented with a prize from the Indonesian
publishers association. Nevertheless, the budget available to the KITLV representatives in Indonesia progressively decreased in the 1990s. Erkelens performed much of the activities with a small staff of Indonesians (interview 20 November 2000).

According to Heather Sutherland, Professor of Indonesian History with Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam and KITLV board member at varying intervals, Erkelens was considered the best among the foreign representatives of scientific institutions in Jakarta around the turn of the century. In her view, the value assigned by KITLV since 1969 to its office in Jakarta serves as an accurate barometer of the Institute's general academic vitality (interview 6 November 2000). Sutherland and Erkelens wanted a rotating system in which KITLV staff members would serve in turn for limited periods as representative in Jakarta. With the growing work load involved in the administrative and academic activities, a second representative would be warmly welcomed (interviews 6 November 2000 and 20 November 2000). This would also partially address the comments made by KNAW’s external evaluation committee regarding the KITLV office in Jakarta: ‘Some comments have dwelt on the limited “visibility” of the Office in the Indonesian academic community. If more resources were available, the activities could be expanded and made more “visible” (Evaluation Report 1999: 7). In so far as possible, the new KITLV leaders have adhered to this policy since 2001. When Erkelens retired in 2003, he was succeeded by Tol, albeit for the time being without a second representative. However, the administrative staff has been enlarged and the office has been moved to a larger, more stately location in Jakarta (Jaarverslag 2003: 27).

The information revolution has also made itself felt in the Historical Documentation (HISDOC) department. Extremely important has been the digital cataloguing of the enormous collection of some 150,000 photographs, 13,500 maps, 3500 drawings and 2000 manuscripts. Head of HISDOC since 1990 has been the historian Gerrit Knaap, who received his PhD in Utrecht in 1985 with a dissertation on the relations between the VOC and Ambon in the seventeenth century. Within the framework of the Image Retrieval System – ‘an electronic catalogue with pictures’ according to Knaap – at the turn of the century approximately one-third of the collection of photographs had been catalogued (interview 21 October 2000). The new catalogue on the Internet was perused by more than three thousand visitors, both inside and outside of the Netherlands, in 2000. Despite the enormous amount of work involved in digitizing the collections, Knaap has continued to publish regularly. The activities of the HISDOC
department were also awarded the highest possible score – an A+ – by the evaluation committee (*Evaluation Report* 1999: 5).

HISDOC also serves as the hub of the national Oral History project, since 1996 under the direction of the Indonesian Oral History Foundation in which KITLV acts as pen holder. Heather Sutherland chairs this foundation and Knaap is its secretary. Around the turn of the twenty-first century, a research team backed with external funding had held more than twelve hundred interviews with individuals who had personally experienced the Japanese occupation and decolonization of Indonesia. An inventory and summaries of these interviews are available from HISDOC. This research project has already brought forth a variety of publications.

The story of KITLV’s publishing house is largely the personal history of Harry Poeze. Poeze studied political science in Amsterdam and obtained his PhD there in 1976 based on the first part of a biography of the Indonesian communist Tan Malaka. The last part of this biography was published in three volumes in 2007, providing a wealth of information about the Indonesian side of the decolonization process – a side long neglected by Dutch historians. Poeze was appointed as head of the small Editorial department in 1981 and established the KITLV’s publishing house in 1990. It took quite some time to convince the highly cautious KITLV board to agree (*KITLV* 543, NB 2 November 1990). As head of the now much larger Publishing and Editorial department, Poeze identified three developments that contributed to the publishing house’s success in its first decade (interview 27 September 2000).

The first of these was the continued internationalization of the Institute’s publications. Around the turn of the century, eighty percent of the books published were in English; the authors published since 1990 came from thirteen different countries. Coproductions had been published in cooperation with publishers in Singapore and Australia.

The second development involves the technological aspect of publishing, which has been rapidly accelerated and simplified thanks to the breakthrough of the personal computer since 1990. In the mid-1990s the photo-scanner was introduced: a highly important development with reference to the illustrations included in many KITLV publications. These technological developments have also enhanced the colourfulness and design of book covers – a true pleasure for bibliophiles like Poeze.

In the third place, from an organizational perspective the rest of the Institute’s activities were smoothly attuned by creating a small editorial committee under the leadership of Boomgaard, the new Director
Secretary. The contributions to the conferences organized each year by the new Research and Centre Function, for example, are now immediately published in a collection.

However, the publishing house also faced a number of problems in its first decade that Poeze expects could continue to grow in the future. Concentration of activities is the current trend in publishing. It is difficult for a small, non-commercial publishing house to retain its own niche. Nevertheless, KITLV published 339 books in the period from 1975 and 2000: 107 in the historical field, 97 in the area of linguistics and 54 in the field of anthropology. In its evaluation in 1999, the external evaluation committee commented: ‘The publishing department is internationally visible and an acknowledged and reputable player in its field of specialization. As such, its merits an ‘A’ ranking.’ (Evaluation Report 1999: 8.)

To an even greater degree, the story of the small Caribbean department CARAF is also a personal story: the successful story of historian Gert Oostindie, head of the department since 1983 who became first Director Secretary and subsequently Director of entire KITLV in 2000. Under his direction, the small CARAF department has performed interdisciplinary comparative research with external funding. ‘All the more surprising is its scholarly output’, said the evaluation committee in this respect, ‘largely realized or directed by its head’. The committee concluded: ‘At present its constraints in personnel and funding make it unrealistic to speak of “international leadership” and this is the only reason that prevents the qualification of “A+”’ (Evaluation Report 1999: 5). Between 1975 and 2000, 25 of the 339 books published by KITLV were about the Caribbean. Of the 1729 KITLV members, in 2000 a total of 299 received New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids instead of Bijdragen with primary focus on Indonesia.

As head of CARAF, Oostindie (1989) received his PhD cum laude under the Utrecht anthropologist H. Hoetink based on a thesis on the history of two Suriname plantations between 1720 and 1870. The research he performed as head of CARAF primarily focused on the decolonization process in the Caribbean. This was also the topic of his earlier oration when he was appointed extraordinary professor in Utrecht (Oostindie 1994). He is now Professor of Caribbean History in Leiden. Together with KITLV researcher Inge Klinkers, on behalf of the Dutch government, he wrote an exhaustive three-part study on the decolonization process in Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles (Oostindie and Klinkers 2001).
They concluded the project with an original and informative comparative analysis of the Dutch decolonization process in a wider, Caribbean context (Oostindie and Klinkers 2003). Oostindie has since been succeeded as head of CARAF by the historian Rosemarijn Hoefte, who therewith became the first femaleKITLV departmental head.

Illustration 35. Gert Oostindie, professor of Caribbean History in Leiden and at present KITLV Director.
Chapter Six

From Indonesian Studies to Southeast Asian Studies

Linguistics, Anthropology and Law

Under Teeuw, the 1974 KITLV board formulated ambitious objectives in the new Charter: linguistic, anthropological and historical research of Southeast Asia, the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean territory. Naturally, the most important field of research was Southeast Asia, based on the Indonesian tradition. Until 2001, that objective remained virtually unaddressed. Among all Verhandelingen and *Bijdragen* published between 1975 and 2001, only a few comparative articles within the Southeast Asian context were included. Historian Jan Bank, for example, compared the decolonization process in Indonesia with that in Vietnam (*BKI* 1985: 19–35). Van der Meer (1989) compared the economic developments in the Indies with those of independent Thailand; in that same collection, Barlow (1989) specifically compared the agrarian developments in the Indies with those of British Malacca.

The comparative analysis and interdisciplinary research that started rather early and spontaneously in the relatively small Caribbean department demanded in the case of the much broader Indonesian Studies, with its long and separate history per discipline, systematic organization from above. The KITLV board, under Schoorl’s leadership, started realizing this in about 1990. As described in detail in the following section, a number of coordinating decisions were made in the early 1990s, including the formation of a new Research and Centre Function department, the appointment of the renowned researcher Boomgaard as new Director Secretary, his efforts in starting the interdisciplinary, ecological EDEN project, and the systematic acquisition by the library of books and sources from Southeast Asian countries other than Indonesia. Even with reference to EDEN, however, the in-depth investment in Southeast Asia only began to bear fruit after 2000, in the form of a series of comparative collections and monographs. In addition to EDEN, to a certain extent within the framework of KITLV, another interdisciplinary project was launched: the Work Group Indonesian Women’s Studies. This interdisciplinary project is described in the last section of this Chapter. However, as already indicated by its name, this project placed primary focus on Indonesia. In all, of course, many important projects and valuable publications came forth from the traditional Indonesian studies in the period from 1975 to 2001. Indonesian languages and literature, anthropology and law/public administration will be discussed here, followed by history.
The collection presented to Ras (1992), Uhlenbeck’s successor as professor of Javanese, upon his retirement contained a rich variety of articles on linguistics, literature and cultural history that he had published as professor, four of which in *Bijdragen*. The activities of his successor, Bernard Arps, include the NWO Pioneer Project ‘Verbal Art in the Audio-Visual Media in Indonesia’, with field research on Java. Arps had earlier been employed to teach Indonesian and Javanese at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London. The opportunity to do field research on Java provided by this prestigious Institution resulted in his thesis: *Tembang in two traditions; Performance and interpretation in Javanese Literature*, on the basis of which he was awarded a PhD cum laude. Arps explained his PhD study as follows:

> My philological studies in Leiden led me to this subject. Virtually all modern Javanese literature in New Javanese from 1600 to the early twentieth century was written in Tembang: a verse form with a structure that is remarkable from a western perspective. For example, the last syllable of each line has a fixed vowel, which becomes much less strange when you understand that Tembang is always sung. It is a miracle that this type of verse has continued to exist for so many centuries. (Van Delft 1998: 18.)

Publications by Maier, Teeuw’s successor as professor of Malay and Indonesian, primarily discuss historical and contemporary texts in the Malay language. Maier has also translated novels and stories by Pramoedya Ananta Toer into Dutch. In his oration, Maier (1987) discussed the interrelationships of the written and oral traditions in Malaysia and Indonesia, using as starting point the Malay ‘Hikayat Hang Tuah’ written sometime around the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The modern Indonesian linguistics and literature practice within the framework of KITLV was for a large part the work of two linguists who had originally studied Slavic languages: Wim Stokhof and Hein Steinhauer. Their deviating background highlighted the practical gap between the older and newer generations caused by the lengthy period of low enrolment numbers for students of Indonesian languages and literature. It was not until Arabic and Sanskrit were finally removed as mandatory elements in the 1975 Academic Charter that the number of students opting for Indonesian languages and literature increased again in Leiden: from 21 in 1974–1975 to 131 in 1991–1992, subsequently decreasing again to 73 in 1998–1999. Stokhof and Steinhauer, both of whom became professor of Indonesian languages and literature, partially bridged the gap that had grown between the older and the younger generations with their classes and research.
Stokhof, who proved – including PRIS – to be a talented large-scale research manager, became the first director of International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS), a graduate institution in the humanities field established in 1993 collectively by KNAW and the Leiden and two Amsterdam universities. Since then, IIAS has been extremely active, including the international distribution of a tri-monthly newsletter the size of a newspaper, the editions of which reached twenty-thousand copies by the late 1990s (Van Delft 1998: 278). Succeeding Anceaux as professor of Austronesian languages in Leiden, in his oration Stokhof (1988) discussed the vast pluriformity in this language region, which roughly covers the Pacific and parts of Southeast Asia. ‘I wish there was a continent called Austronesia’, he ironically commented in comparing the region to the already highly complex African linguistics, which at least had clear geographic perimeters. Another problem was the low number of Austronesian linguists. ‘I am not exaggerating by saying that there are probably three times as many philologists in the Netherlands than Austronesians in the entire world’, according to Stokhof (1988: 17), who concluded his oration by proposing a programme for more autochthonous linguists from the region itself.

Like Maier, Stokhof was a member of the KITLV board in the 1980s, and Arps joined the board after 2000. Steinhauer’s (1994) publications include the summary article ‘The Indonesian language situation and linguistics; Problems and possibilities’ for the one hundred and fiftieth edition of *Bijdragen*. In that article Steinhauer discussed the urgent task of systematically studying the dozens of local languages before they were eradicated by Indonesian as the language for administration and education: ‘modernisation implies cultural genocide’.

This same wish also applied to a certain degree to Indonesia as a field of anthropological study as already defined in 1935 by J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong. This concept continued to serve as the general framework for the work of Leiden and other relevant anthropologists. Within the structuralist paradigm, however, a number of important modifications and innovations had been formulated, in particular by Schefold as professor of Indonesian cultural anthropology and sociology in Leiden since 1989. The necessity of critically reformulating the structuralist Leiden paradigm had already been recognized by his predecessor, P.E. Josselin de Jong. In 1982 he organized an international symposium in Leiden on ‘Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study’; the papers presented there were published by KITLV (P.E. Josselin de Jong 1988).
The debate was systematically stimulated by the structure of the symposium, summarized by De Josselin de Jong as: ‘original paper from Leiden, discussants’ from abroad’. Most of the Leiden papers were, in fact, critically discussed by outsiders. This discussion brought to light the fact that JPB’s original concept of Indonesia as a field of anthropological study was still considered valuable, but that his idea of a ‘structuralist core’ that lies in the asymmetrical kinship based on a dualistic theory of evolution had since encountered many anomalies. British anthropologist G.B. Miller described this concept in his response to De Josselin’s introductory paper as far too deterministic, rigid and generalizing. In his view, recent anthropological research had demonstrated that ‘kinship rules are open to manipulation and exploitation, and that far from being the helpless victims of an inflexible system, groups or individuals who understand the rules and principles at stake can and often do select the options which are calculated to bring them maximal advantage’ (P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1988: 17).

At about the same time, Schefold – an outsider also, having been born in Switzerland and a trained anthropologist – published his fundamental article ‘The unequal brothers-in-law; Indonesia as a “Field of Anthropological Study” and the case of Mentawai’ in Bijdragen (1986: 69–86). In this article Schefold maintained the original concept of the field of research but critically evaluated the structural core concept. ‘As to the structural core itself’, Schefold concluded, ‘our interpretation of its model implies that we may regard even highly divergent variants as transformations and thus rid them, in their development, of the old label of rudimentariness’. Schefold obtained his PhD in Basle in 1965 based on the symbolic construction styles used among the Sepik in New Guinea. He continued to study and publish on the traditional local architecture in Indonesia. After obtaining his PhD he lectured at Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam. From there he monitored field research in Indonesia, which he also regularly performed. In 1989 he was appointed professor of cultural anthropology and sociology of Indonesia in Leiden and retained that position until 2003.

As professor in Leiden, Schefold continued to modify the structuralist paradigm by systematically involving the changing symbolic meanings in the field research, to which the Indonesians involved assigned traditional relationships. This also offered an opportunity to bridge the small traditional communities that were the historical field of study of cultural anthropology and the modernizing national societies that had more
recently become the field of study of non-western sociology. According to Schefold (1994), future comparative research should systematically take the ‘participants models’ into account when anthropologists formulated ‘modelling concepts’. In other words: the Indonesian objects of Leiden anthropological research were finally given a say. In the meantime, the number of students who studied anthropology or non-western sociology in Leiden had diminished: from its highest level of 410 in 1981–1982 to 270 in 1998–1999.

The study of the law and administration in Indonesia occupied a relatively small share of KITLV publications after 1975. The Leiden law scholar Bastiaan Pompe regularly wrote articles in *Bijdragen* discussing legal issues in contemporary Indonesia, often ensuing from the tension between the principles of national law and the local common law. Pompe (1999) also immediately published an analysis of the first free elections held in Indonesia after Suharto’s fall from power. In the Van Vollenhoven Institute of non-western law and administration, affiliated with KITLV, research and education under the direction of J.M. Otto devoted attention not only to Indonesia, but also to the Caribbean, China and South Africa (*Jaarverslag* 1999: 33–5).

**EDEN: Interdisciplinary and Comparative**

Peter Boomgaard was elected by the KITLV board by a large majority of 10 votes to 2 as the new Director Secretary in 1991. The choice was a direct result of the consideration that the new Director Secretary ‘must to an important degree effectuate the strengthening of the KITLV’s research profile’. The board determined that Boomgaard ‘enjoys international recognition based on his scientific achievement in his own field’ (KITLV 544, NB 9 February 1991). From an organizational perspective, these considerations were embodied in the new department Research and Centre Function, which was placed under the direct responsibility of the new Director Secretary.

The first steps after the establishment of this new department, which replaced the former Documentation Modern Indonesia department, had already been taken prior to Boomgaard’s appointment. In 1989–1990, Kees van Dijk, employed with the DMI department at the time, was released from his duties in order to make preparations for strengthening the Institute’s centre function in maintaining scientific contacts on national and international levels. His recommendations, including organizing annual workshops, the papers for which could
be published by KITLV, were unanimously approved by the board (KITLV, NB 24 February 1990).

This innovation resulted in the publication of many, often multi-disciplinary and regionally focused collections by the publishing house or in *Bijdragen*. Examples include the Madura collection edited by Van Dijk, De Jonge and Touwen-Bouwsma (1995) and the special Riau edition of *Bijdragen* (1997: 472–773). Van Dijk (1981) had obtained his PhD in Leiden based on a thesis discussing the Darul Islam, which organized regional rebellions shortly after Indonesia gained its independence. He was appointed extraordinary professor in Leiden in 1985 and professor in 1997 of the history of the Islam in Indonesia. After Boomgaard's appointment, Van Dijk continued to fulfil the centre function in close consultation with the Director Secretary by maintaining and intensifying national and international contacts. He published a number of articles in *Bijdragen* discussing the contemporary political situation in Indonesia. Van Dijk (2001) went on to publish a voluminous study on the democratic transition process, which was accompanied by many disturbances and conflicts.

Boomgaard's contribution to the centre function primarily concentrated on the establishment of the European Association for Southeast Asian Studies (EUROSEAS) in 1992. KITLV was its pen holder and Boomgaard its secretary. As coproduction by KITLV and EUROSEAS, Van Dijk was responsible for the publication of the *European Newsletter of Southeast Asian Studies*. Scientific conferences were subsequently held in locations including Leiden, Hamburg and London, attended by hundreds of participants from all over Europe. As Director Secretary, Boomgaard was also closely involved in the course of KITLV's internal affairs, including the appointment of board members and the many commissions. ‘A true balancing act’ is what he called the annual appointment of replacement members of the KITLV board, ‘in which attention had to be paid to university, as well as discipline and gender’ (interview 28 September 2000).

However, Boomgaard’s true passion was the scientific research that had played a central part earlier in his career; it was also the primary motivation behind his appointment as Director Secretary of KITLV and his primary activity as head of Research, highlighted by the interdisciplinary project EDEN. Peter Boomgaard (1946) was born to a Protestant family in The Hague, son of an official of the national Protestant labour federation. After completing his gymnasium (beta) schooling in Amsterdam, he embarked on his study of history at Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, majoring in social-economic history. He was an active member of the
university's left-wing student movement, and his radical engagement triggered his initial interest in Central and South America. His dissertation discussed the Mexican Revolution. After obtaining his degree in 1972, he was employed in Vrije Universiteit's social-economic history department. His professor, W.J. Wieringa, drew his attention to the relevancy of Indonesia as a field of study, over which so much as yet unstudied sources were available in archives in the Netherlands.

Illustration 36. Peter Boomgaard, KITLV Director Secretary and extraordinary professor of the economic and ecological history of Southeast Asia at the University of Amsterdam.
Boomgaard decided to base his PhD thesis on the relationship between demographic growth and economic development on Java in the nineteenth century. His thesis in English, based on which he obtained his PhD cum laude under Heather Sutherland in 1987, put into perspective the negative influence of the Cultivation System that many leftist authors claimed affected economic development in general and the rapid population growth in particular. Boomgaard (1989b) not only supplied the most reliable quantitative data on Java's rapid population growth to date, but also significantly broadened and deepened the discussion by including the process of colonial state formation in his analysis. In his analysis of the complicated relationships between demographic growth, economic development and colonial state formation, Boomgaard (1989b: 203) placed emphasis on the third factor. 'The ultimate cause of both population growth and economic development [...] was the fact that the colonial state was able to carry out its ambitious programme of increased production for the world market, through a combination of compulsory cultivation services, an improved infrastructure and an effective vaccination campaign.'

After obtaining his PhD, as assistant lecturer Boomgaard was 'lent out' to Koninklijk Insituut voor de Tropen (KIT) in Amsterdam for a period of four years. There he acted as editor in chief of the statistical series 'Changing economy in Indonesia'; seventeen volumes of which were published by KIT between 1975 and 1996 discussing the colonial period. Together with Hans Gooszen, Boomgaard compiled the eleventh volume on Indonesia's demographic growth. In the process, Boomgaard became familiar with both research management and various aspects of Indonesia's colonial history, contributing to his appointment in 1991 as Director Secretary of KITLV. The general philosophy behind his research policy was summarized by Boomgaard himself as follows: 'The idea was to finally make systematic use of all those wonderful collections that the Institute had compiled over the course of time' (interview 28 September 2000).

His own contribution was primarily related to the interdisciplinary EDEN project: Ecology, Demography and Economy in Nusantara. This project commenced under Boomgaard's direction in 1992. Boomgaard agreed that the choice for ecology was still somewhat related to his radical political engagement in the early years of his studies. By now, however, he was a convinced Labour voter with the leftist-liberal D66 as 'reasonable alternative'. A similar political preference was discovered from interviews with all of the KITLV departmental heads. Boomgaard's scientific views
also reflected the typifying preference for universalism ‘informed’ by relativism seen among many of KITLV’s postwar scholars. In the economic and demographic history of Java, for example, Boomgaard recognized many universalisms but was hesitant to use terms such as feudalism that were borrowed directly from European history. He had the impression however, that his academic background had made him more universalistic and less cultural relativistic than many of KITLV’s linguists and anthropologists (interview 28 September 2000).

The first EDEN research phase covering the period from 1500 to 1850 was collectively financed by KNAW and KITLV. In the selection of researchers, the interdisciplinary nature of the project had central focus. The five parts of the research were performed by two anthropologists, two historians and one geographer. Four of the monographs were nearly completed by 2000; the fifth remained unpublished because the researcher had opted for employment elsewhere after a conflict regarding its content. A central part was played in the first research phase by the international conference ‘Man and environment in Indonesia, 1500–1950’ organized by KITLV in 1996. The papers were edited by Boomgaard, Colombijn and Henley (1997) and published in a sizeable collection of fourteen contributions, from international stars like Anthony Reid as well as from young postgraduates, on topics ranging from population regimes, migration movements and sustainable development to the flora and fauna of Indonesia.

Through KITLV, Boomgaard was appointed extraordinary professor of the economic and ecological history of Southeast Asia – in particular that of Indonesia – at the University of Amsterdam. In his oration, Boomgaard (1996) used concrete examples to explain the limitations of a strictly historical textual approach to Indonesia’s ecological history. ‘Ecological history is an interdisciplinary science, however’, Boomgaard (1996: 27) concluded, ‘and where the historian offers no solution, the geographer, the agrarian or the forestry expert may’.

The second phase of EDEN concerning the period after 1850 had a more difficult start. Although the request for subsidy from WOTRO was given a positive assessment by the international referees, it was not assigned enough priority to actually be financed. Nevertheless, the second phase was able to commence with three researchers thanks to the explosive increase in stock values in the 1990s. Between 1991 and 1999, the value of KITLV’s stock portfolio increased from 1.7 million guilders to 5 million guilders (Jaarverslag 1999: 65). Thus IJzerman’s ‘trunk capital’ of some 200,000 guilders collected for KITLV in 1920 was still proving its importance to independent scientific practice within the Institute in the year 2000.
However, KNAW’s external evaluation committee was not pleased with this course of events. The committee had no difficulty with the earlier evaluation of the EDEN project as ‘good’, but the continued lack of external funding threatened the other departments in their view, especially ‘the Institute’s prime assets’, the library and HISDOC. ‘A dilemma here may well be that future success in obtaining external financing partly depends on a “critical mass” of experienced staff researchers’, was the committee’s conclusion regarding the Research and Centre Function department: ‘This has not yet been reached’ (Evaluation Report 1999: 6).

Paradoxically, Boomgaard’s resignation as Director Secretary brought a solution in 2000. Externally, his position had become untenable due to his principled refusal to allow KITLV to be placed under the immediate direction of KNAW. Internally, his actions during the conflict with the Employees Council and his lack of enthusiasm for certain administrative tasks, including lengthy meetings, also caused dissatisfaction. By resigning, Boomgaard made the best possible choice, both literally and figuratively speaking. He retained his position as extraordinary professor in Amsterdam. KNAW continued to pay his existing salary, recognizing his leading position as senior researcher with the EDEN project and subsidized moreover two additional researchers for the second project phase. Boomgaard’s own view was: ‘After ten years as Director, I drew up the balance. My conclusion was that I preferred research and research management to the direction and management of a medium-sized organisation. I wanted no direct responsibility under the new KNAW regime.’ (interview 26 September 2000.)

Boomgaard’s success as research manager within the framework of EDEN and EUROSEAS became apparent after 2000, in a series of articles, collections and books in which Indonesia was finally discussed within a Southeast Asian context. He personally published two monographs: on people and tigers in Indonesia and Malaysia (Boomgaard 2001) and on the ecological history of the entire Southeast Asian region (Boomgaard 2007a). KITLV published three comparative collections: on agriculture and animal husbandry (Boomgaard and Henley 2002), forestry and fishery (Boomgaard, Henley and Osseweijer 2005) and rains, rivers and seas in Southeast Asia (Boomgaard 2007b). Bankoff and Boomgaard (2007) also published a collection of articles on natural resources throughout Asia. More comparative studies were also published outside the context of the EDEN project, including a collection on the social influence of road construction in Southeast Asia (Colombijn 2002), which was published as a special edition of *Bijdragen* (2002: 595–860). When KITLV changed its
English name in 2003 from Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology to Royal Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies, in terms of content this was certainly justifiable. The promise made by Teeuw in 1974 had finally come true, in part thanks to Boomgaard’s and Oostindie’s efforts.

Construction and Deconstruction of the Colonial Past

As already indicated at the beginning of this Chapter, ecology was not the only new interdisciplinary project that has earned priority within KITLV. Similar developments were seen regarding the theme of gender: in particular women’s studies, discussed in a variety of KITLV publications. Pioneer in the field of Indonesian women’s studies, anthropologist Cora Vreede-de Stuers, received her PhD from Sorbonne in 1957 based on the history of women’s emancipation in Indonesia. She was already publishing regularly in Bijdragen in the 1960s, including an article on Kartini (BKI 1965: 233–44). The anthropologist Anke Niehof and historian Elsbeth Locher-Scholten, representatives of the second wave of feminists, compiled a KITLV collection of papers presented at the symposium ‘Images and ideas concerning women and the feminine in the Indonesian archipelago’, organized in Leiden in 1984 (Locher-Scholten and Niehof 1987).

This was the first collective project undertaken by the interdisciplinary and interuniversity Work Group Indonesian Women’s Studies established in 1980. The fourteen articles were primarily written by young female researchers, with a few from older colleagues including Vreede-de Stuers and the anthropologist Els Postel-Coster. In terms of discipline, the authors – including three men – primarily represented anthropology and history, but linguistics and psychology were also included.

In their introduction, Niehof and Locher-Scholten discussed not only the explorative nature of the bundle, but also the importance of new theoretical perspectives in women’s studies: ‘Recently they have been merged into a new overarching concept: the construction of gender’. This constructivist concept ‘informed’ by postmodernism emphasized ‘the cultural definitions of male and female roles, the symbolic meanings attached to them, their social construction and their social economic and political implications’. Niehof and Locher-Scholten warned of ‘methodological pitfalls’, including the fact that most historical sources represented a white and male perception of Indonesian women, and that even female sources of information often reflected the ‘mutedness’ of the subordinate group.
Specific Indonesian women's themes highlighted in the collection included 'Ibuism', the nationalistic cult of motherhood in Indonesia, the sexual dualism recognized even before the war by Leiden anthropologists in many Indonesian adat communities, and the egalitarian and hierarchical implications of that dualism. With the last two themes, some of the authors – as well as the editors to a certain extent – relied upon an anthropological paradigm that, as already indicated, had been increasingly open to discussion in recent decades. 'As this volume shows', Niehof and Locher-Scholten concluded, 'Indonesian cultures generally provide ample room for the feminine aspect. Within dualist structures, the sexual opposition turns into a flexible hierarchy, in which the context determines relative superiority.'

This innovative KITLV collection by the Work Group Indonesian Women's Studies was followed by the international workshop 'Women as mediators in Indonesia', organised by KITLV in 1988. Once again KITLV published the papers presented there (Van Bemmelen, Djajadiningrat-Nieuwenhuis, Locher-Scholten and Touwen-Bouwsma 1992). The third conference collection by the Work Group Indonesian Women's Studies, on women and households in Indonesia, was published by a British publishing house (Koning, Nolten, Rodenburg and Saptari 2000).

In the Netherlands, Locher-Scholten (2000) in particular continued to study and analyse the colonial construction of gender. She had already obtained her PhD based on ethical politics (1981), and KITLV published her well-received monograph on Dutch imperialism (1994), which was later published in an English translation (2003). 'It would not have been possible to publish any of my books without the library, the collections and the staff at the KITLV', said Locher-Schoten, who worked part-time as researcher for KITLV from 1981 to 1985 and served as board member around the turn of the twenty-first century.

Elsbeth Bodine Locher-Scholten (1944) was born in Rotterdam, to a prominent and enlightened Protestant family. Her father, Y. Scholten, was a lawyer and a CHU Protestant politician. In the centre-right cabinet De Quay, he was state secretary for cultural policy from 1959 to 1963, and in the subsequent centre-right cabinet Marijnen he served as Minister of Justice from 1963 to 1965. Her mother was an active volunteer, especially for the Young Women's Christian Association. Her mother's parents, international law scholar F.M. van Asbeck and his wife, highly influenced Locher-Scholten's later interest for the Indies and historiography. Locher-Scholten grew up in Amsterdam, where she completed her gymnasium (alpha) studies in 1961. She went on to study history in
Leiden in 1962, with a minor in media studies in Amsterdam. Locher-Scholten was an active member of the Netherlands Christian Students Association, where she met her husband. She received her degree in 1969 with a Dutch history thesis on De Stuw and a general history thesis on négritude. From the first time the party participated in elections, she voted for radical Christian Politieke Partij Radikalen (PPR). She was also a member of the emancipation movement Man Vrouw Maatchappij (Man Woman Society).

After teaching history for a time, Locher-Scholten decided to pursue her PhD under I. Schöffer in Leiden based on articles she had published on the ethical policies. ‘Academics was a late calling,’ she explains: ‘just after I received my degree I was hesitant to lock myself away for years in archives’ (interview 10 November 2000). Initially employed part-time by NWO, she went on to lecture in the History Department in Utrecht. Locher-Scholten had since left the church and tended to vote for the liberal-left D66 and sometimes for the radical GroenLinks (GreenLeft). The often-quoted definition of ethical policies – ‘invented’ by P. Brooshoof whose biography had been published earlier in Bijdragen (1976: 306–49) – used in her dissertation) was already discussed in Chapter III. This definition, emphasizing the extent to which the western example and Dutch leadership held central focus in the ethical policy of reform, was in part based on a critical discourse analysis of ‘ethical texts’. ‘Looking back, you can see a linguistic turn and a deconstruction of ethical politics in my dissertation, but I was not introduced to postmodernism until later, during a conference in 1987,’ Locher-Scholten explains (interview 10 November 2000).

Reading Said’s Orientalism had a significant and immediate effect on her work. ‘That book was an eye-opener: it enabled me to grasp the entire colonial debate on female labour, especially night labour on Java, which I had just studied’ (Locher-Scholten 2000: 49–83). Said’s orientalism thesis also served as the basis for the discourse analysis that she applied in her monograph on Dutch imperialism in the Sumatra sultanate Djambi during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Particularly orientalist was the Dutch view of the Malay state, in terms of ‘mis-administration’ and ‘eastern despotism’. This applied to a significant degree to the articles published by the liberal politician and KITLV Secretary Kielstra as already discussed in Chapter III. According to Locher-Scholten, Snouck Hurgronje was an unmistakable orientalist as evidenced by his recommendations to the administration regarding the Outer Territories and Islam policy. However, she used the term postcolonialism solely in a
heuristic, attentative sense because the anti-colonial meaning could lead to historical distortion (interview 10 November 2000).

The scope of her monograph was much larger than the colonial state and Djambi. In her closing chapter, Locher-Scholten (2003: 251–64) analysed the motives behind twelve military expeditions to the Outer Territories after 1870. In her view, in every case the initiative came from the administration in Batavia, and in only three cases combined with that of the cabinet and parliament in The Hague. The governmental motive of ‘authority’ was therefore the most important motive for eleven of the twelve expeditions. As a distant second, third and fourth came the ethical motive of ‘conscience’, the economical motive of ‘money’ and the political motive of ‘fear of foreign countries’. Interesting note, however, was the fact that the lengthy Aceh War, in which both The Hague and Batavia were intensively involved with a series of military expeditions and campaigns, was underrepresented in this list, by only two of the twelve expeditions (Kuitenbrouwer 1998: 65–6).

As the background for her collection on colonial women’s history, Locher-Scholten identified both the stimulating influence of the Work Group Indonesian Women’s Studies and her temporary appointment with the Women’s Studies Literature department in Utrecht. In this collection she combined gender with a number of other factors: power, ethnicity and class. Now the ‘linguistic turn’ and the ‘discourse analysis’ were the focus of her theoretical introduction; Said’s orientalism thesis continued to be an important source of inspiration. (Locher-Scholten 2000: 13–48). She did, however, recognize objections including the tendency towards dichotomous generalization and Said’s neglect of the gender aspect. ‘While the chapters thus underline the aforementioned fragmentation of Said’s postulates’, Locher-Scholten (2000: 29) concluded, ‘they confirm his point that western knowledge production on the Oriental other was political and geared to the purpose of governance and self-interest’. Gender, however, was to a certain degree an exception to the class-determined nature of Dutch orientalism: Dutch women in the Indies put less emphasis on the class difference with Indonesian women than the Dutch men.

To Locher-Scholten, in this collection cultural relativism played a much more important part in terms of content than the universalist concept of modernity. ‘On Java there were three different types of modernity: the modernity of the privileged Dutch housewife, the modernity of the Javanese female tea harvester in a large European enterprise, and the mixed modernity of a western-educated priyayi daughter like Kartini’, she explains. Looking back, she rejected the extreme value relativism of
some postmodernist authors but supported the value universalism of
human rights, including women's rights (interview 10 November 2000).

Elsbeth Locher-Scholten is an engaged progressive and feministic
scholar. As historian, however, she proved in her construction of colonial
women's history and deconstruction of the ethical, orientalist and imperi-
alist discourse to be thorough in her research, historical and cultural rela-
tivistic in her analysis, and discriminatory in her conclusions.

To date, she has never been involved in polemics. Other historians who
did include the Leiden historians Cees Fasseur and Wim van den Doel on
the one hand and the Amsterdam social scientists Jan Breman and Peter
van der Veer on the other. Both Fasseur and Breman were at one time
members of the KITLV board; Van den Doel was a KITLV member but Van
der Veer was not around the turn of the century. These scholars debated
historical themes including ethical politics, economic imperialism and
academic orientalism.

The cause of the controversy between Fasseur and Bremen (1987) was
Breman's study of the exploitative and oppressive labour regime on the
tobacco plantations in Deli, on Sumatra's East Coast, which triggered an
important scandal in the Netherlands – a publication in the KITLV
Verhandelingen series. According to Breman, the critical Rhemrev report,
which was integrally included as an appendix to his study, had been
hushed up by the ethical Minister for the Colonies, Idenburg. Breman was
enraged by Fasseur's laconic comment that he had long ago seen the
report in the colonial archives but saw no reason to make it public. 'His
comment that there is so much information in that area is shocking', said
Breman: 'By contrast, I believe that [...] based on our blatant Eurocentric
prejudice, we would prefer to allow unfavourable information to be lost
from the public memory. The balance of colonialism is negative, and can-
ot be redressed by repeatedly emphasizing its positive aspects.' (Remco
Meijer 1995: 150.)

In turn, Fasseur countered: 'I see myself as an objective – in so far as
possible – judge who collects and presents the relevant historical facts,
after which the reader is allowed to draw his own conclusions. [...] Breman
is acting like a lawyer defending the interests of Indonesia. What I miss
in him is the ability to put things into perspective' (Remco Meijer
Indies' – was an exception and not symptomatic for the whole of Dutch
colonialism, as Breman asserted. In Fasseur's view, the nature of Dutch
colonialism was relatively ethical. On the whole, the ethical administra-
tors educated in Leiden had mostly successfully protected the Indonesian
population on Java and the other islands from exploitation by European planters. Regarding the education enjoyed by the primarily Leiden administrators, Fasseur wrote a voluminous study – much empirical data from which have already been used above – that was fundamentally criticized at that time by the Amsterdam theological sociologist Peter van der Veer.

In his critical collection *Modern oriëntalisme*, already discussed in this book’s introduction, Van der Veer discussed Fasseur’s characterization of Snouck Hurgronje in *De Indologen* as the ‘shining sun of the Leiden universe’: ‘That type of imagery is typical of Fasseur’s book, all five hundred and fifty-two pages of which ignore what those administrators did with their training in the Indies’. According to Van der Veer, the Indology programme in Leiden was by nature orientalist, its graduates practiced imperialism in Indonesia, and in both respects Snouck Hurgronje played a prominent and active role. Snoeck Hurgronje was still the ‘figurehead’ of ‘Leiden orientalism’, according to Van der Veer. By failing to critically analyse this orientalism and the related imperialism, Van der Veer claimed that Fasseur, Wesseling, Otterspeer and other Leiden historians were simply reproducing an implicit type of contemporary orientalism.

Fasseur (1995: 47–73) certainly did write about Dutch imperialism, albeit that he primarily referred to it as a manifestation of ethical government. His student Van der Doel, who repeated Fasseur’s characterization of Snouck Hurgronje as ‘the shining sun in the Leiden universe’, described in detail what the primarily Leiden Indology graduates did as administrators on Java in his dissertation (Van der Doel 1994). In doing so he underlined Fasseur’s criticism of Breman that Deli was an exception to the rule. Van der Doel also viewed the ‘silent power’ of the administration on Java from an ethical perspective.

Critical comments cab certainly be addressed at the views of both Fasseur and Van den Doel. Evidence to that effect has been regularly provided elsewhere in this book. Certainly Fasseur and Van den Doel demonstrate a degree of Leiden, ethical-governmental local chauvinism. It cannot be denied, however, that Breman and Van der Veer also demonstrated a degree of Amsterdam local chauvinism. Amsterdam sociologist Abram de Swaan once ironically typified that Amsterdam local chauvinism using the neologism ‘leftism’, a preoccupation with all the world’s evil ‘isms’, including racism, sexism, fascism, imperialism and, more recently, orientalism. Van der Veer’s suggestion that Leiden historians like Fasseur and Van den Doel practiced an implicit, latent type of orientalism is arguable.
Fasseur's historiography is of a highly descriptive nature. Projecting schematic models back on colonial history is one of the main objections to the Amsterdam approach. Nevertheless, his many publications demonstrate about the same combination of universalism and relativism that – in all its nuances – can be found in the work of many KITLV scholars irrespective of their discipline. Fasseur's sceptical attitude towards Van Vollenhoven's *adat* law and his understanding for the western desire for unification among both Dutch and Indonesian law scholars can be characterized as universalist (Fasseur 1992). Historical and cultural relativism is evident in his criticism of the traditional colonial historiography and his appreciation for Van Leur's criticism of Stapel's Eurocentrism (Fasseur 1995: 252–73).

Van den Doel's historiography can even be accused of too much universalism and too little relativism. He appears virtually unaware of the existence of Said's orientalism in his dissertation. Under the denominator of cultural relativism, however, he rejected all colonial views that were not explicitly universalist, varying from Kohlbrugge's racism to Van Vollenhoven's *adat* law.

‘They refuse to accept that the differences and conflicts that unquestionably existed between the Dutch and the Indonesian societies were not those between the “East” and the “West”, but those between tradition and modernity (something that contemporary “progressive” cultural relativists still refuse to accept)’, was Van den Doel's (1994: 449) conclusion.

In his turn, Van den Doel sometimes appeared to be little aware of the Eurocentric connotations that went with those universalist concepts of tradition and modernity. He unreservedly described the Javanese tradition in terms of feudalism, and the Cultivation System as a type of refelandization. His perspective of modernity was always strongly focused on the colonial state formation process, with little attention for the alternative modernity projects of various nationalist movements.

However, it is impossible to characterize Van den Doel's explicit rejection of any alleged differences between the ‘East’ and the ‘West’ as ‘modern orientalism’. What was the actual importance of that orientalism with which Van der Veer was so obsessed for one hundred and fifty years of academic practice within the framework of KITLV? That is the main question formulated in the introduction, the answer to which must be given in this book's conclusion.
CONCLUSION

‘Science is foreign to partisanship! The only impulse it wishes to give is to encourage patient and thorough study’, wrote KITLV President Baud in October 1857 to Cornets de Groot van Kraaijenburg in response to his proposal of a merger between KITLV and the liberal Indisch Genootschap (KITLV: H 86). Many KITLV presidents would repeat Baud’s opinion, whether in response to requests for support from the right, as from Comité Rijkseenheid, or from the left, as from Amnesty International. Many KITLV intellectuals were therefore also relatively apolitical. And yet there has always been some level of politics within KITLV. This is primarily evident in the extracurricular activities of many KITLV intellectuals, and sometimes even in their KITLV publications. The three men who founded KITLV in 1851, Baud, Simons and Roorda, were confirmed supporters of conservative policy, especially in reference to the colonies. Baud’s articles in Bijdragen on the Outer Territories and the control of the opium trade contained an element of justification for his own conservative policy.

After Baud’s demise, the board of KITLV increasingly consisted of liberal-oriented professors, often from Leiden. KITLV presidents including Kern, Snouck Hurgronje and Van Vollenhoven actively participated in the public debate on colonial policy, and their views often echoed through the Institute. Kern, Snouck and Van Vollenhoven were all ‘ethical imperialists’ who applauded the subjugation of the Outer Territories. As advisor to the government, Snouck even played a central role in Dutch imperialism. However, Snouck, Van Vollenhoven and Hazeu continued to support the progressive, ethical school when colonial policy grew increasingly conservative in the Interbellum. After the Second World War and the decolonization, the political preference of most KITLV intellectuals was for the new Labour party. In his younger years, for example, Teeuw worked to support the view that the Netherlands should relinquish New Guinea to Indonesia. The current Director Secretary of the KITLV, Gert Oostindie, is actively involved in political debates and as an advisor to Dutch government about (post)colonial issues.

The explicit political engagement of many KITLV intellectuals, however, is not the most interesting aspect of more than 150 years of academic practice within KITLV. Much more important were the partly academic, partly ideological perspectives of KITLV intellectuals, which
include orientalism, occidentalism, universalism and relativism. These perspectives were even more evident in the scientific endeavours of these intellectuals than in their specific political viewpoints. In terms of the relationships between these four perspectives, there is first and foremost a significant difference between the colonial and postcolonial periods. During the colonial period, academic practice within KITLV was primarily Eurocentric. This applied to both orientalism – which was based on a fundamental, quasi-unchanging difference between East and West – and universalism, which presumed a gradual, bridgeable difference.

Orientalists and universalists alike were convinced of the superiority of western civilization. In the nineteenth century, a cultural relativist like Van der Tuuk was the everpresent exception to the rule. In the late colonial period, cultural relativism with its criticism of the Eurocentric approach gained in popularity, especially among anthropologists. Van Vollenhoven’s concept of adat law, which held such an important position within late-colonial KITLV, could be viewed as either orientalism or as cultural relativism. After the Second World War and the decolonization of Indonesia, cultural-relativist criticism of the Eurocentric perspective became the norm within KITLV, often combined with a wide range of universalist concepts, including structuralism, the modernization theory and human rights. Both literally and figuratively speaking, orientalism passed away, as did the influence of conservative former administrators like Korn. Occidentalism – the anti-western mirrored image of orientalism – was limited within postwar KITLV to a few dissident intellectuals, such as Wertheim.

Looking back at more than 150 years of academic practice within KITLV, it can be concluded that universalism, which was strongly Eurocentric in the colonial period, took centre stage, albeit to an increasingly lesser degree in the postcolonial period. In comparing the various types of imperialism and orientalism, it has already been demonstrated that men like Snouck Hurgronje held views that were less orientalist and more universalist than those held by men like Van den Berg. Even with Van den Berg, however, elements of universalism are found, for example in his proposals to grant Christian inhabitants the same status as Europeans and to merge the European and indigenous administrative staffs on Java (Van den Doel 1994: 276).

This conclusion will not convince the radical supporters of Said’s orientalism thesis. They believe that all orientalism practiced within a colonial or neocolonial framework is orientalist by definition. An example of this kind of wide orientalist view, cloaked in much mystifying and
postmodern jargon, can be found in an article published by De Prins (2000). This book on the history of KITLV, however, is based on a more specific definition of orientalism. At least with ‘manifest orientalism’, there must be a fundamental difference between East and West in which the western civilization is viewed as positive and the eastern society as negative. Phrased in this manner, orientalism’s importance within KITLV continually diminished: while strongly evident in the founders Baud and Roorda, it was only one view among many for Kern, Snouck Hurgronje and Van Vollenhoven, and had virtually disappeared with Korn.

From its very founding, KITLV has always been a multidisciplinary institute. Of the total of 760 works published by the Institute between 1852 and 2000, 257 pertained to languages and literature, 185 to history, 112 to ethnology, anthropology and non-western sociology, and 105 to law and administration – including 45 collections discussing adat law – with the remaining 101 categorized as general and miscellaneous. A vast majority of these publications are about Indonesia. Of the 202 books published between 1852 and 1940, only 3 discussed the West Indies colonies. After 1940, 36 of the 558 books pertained to the Caribbean area. In particular thanks to the work by the linguists Uhlenbeck and Teeuw, the Institute’s publications were strongly internationalized after the decolonization, in terms of both Bijdragen and the various series of publications.

Of the disciplines practised within KITLV, anthropology and linguistics were the most theoretical by nature. Literature, history and adat law were more descriptive. In linguistics and anthropology, the paradigm primarily applied in the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century was the theory of evolution. In both disciplines, the Interbellum brought the rise of the structuralist paradigm. To date anthropology in Leiden has maintained this structuralist nature, albeit must less exclusively in the last decade than in the past. In the field of linguistics, structuralism is now competing with a variety of poststructuralist and other paradigms.

As a multidisciplinary institute KITLV has contributed to the development of numerous interdisciplinary projects. In the colonial period, KITLV was virtually the scientific bureau for Indology: the partly multidisciplinary, partly interdisciplinary educational programme for colonial administrative staff. In the Interbellum, the interdisciplinary adat law project held an important place in both the Indology programme and KITLV. After the decolonization, as the number of academic practitioners grew in general, the various disciplines started going their separate ways with reference to Indonesia. However, Caribbean Studies, practised on a
much smaller scale, has always been relatively spontaneously interdisciplinary by nature, with practitioners such as Van Lier and Oostindie. More recent interdisciplinary projects in the broad field of Indonesian Studies, in particular EDEN and Women’s Studies, could only be established through an organized initiative.

The motives often cited in the literature for interdisciplinarity – social demand, broad intellectual identity and the taming of overspecialization – certainly apply to the three recent interdisciplinary projects: Caribbean Studies and, with reference to Indonesia, ecological history and women’s studies.

According to contemporaries, KITLV has always had a highly academic nature. Presidents including Roorda, Kern, Snouck Hurgronje, Van Vollenhoven, Uhlenbeck and Teeuw were all members of KNAW as well. By contrast, dissident intellectuals like Van den Tuuk and Wertheim were unjustly denied KNAW membership. Initially, however, KITLV was only one of the many intellectual societies in the colonial area, including Indisch Genootschap, Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Bijbelgenootschap and Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap. In about 1860, KITLV almost lost its independence in an attempted takeover by the liberal Indisch Genootschap. The tables were turned, however, and the Indisch Genootschap became the political extension of the more academically based KITLV. By the turn of the twentieth century, KITLV had grown to become the primus inter pares among the colonial societies. At that time, KITLV intellectuals were strongly represented in the boards of the other societies, and the Institute had the most members: more than 700 in 1910 as compared to the KNAG with 500 members, Indisch Genootschap with 200 and Bataviaasch Genootschap with only 50 (Bossenbroek 1996: 254). Now KITLV has more than 1700 members.

During the late-colonial and postcolonial period, Koloniaal Instituut/Royal Institute of the Tropics was also an important institution in the area of colonial studies. The less purely scientific and more practical orientation of the KI/KIT, for example in the areas of tropical hygiene and public information, however, meant that it could hardly be considered a competitor. Moreover, the two Institutes had many connections on the board level in this case as well. After the decolonization, the two Institutes were funded from different sources: KITLV by the Ministry of Education and KIT by DGIS. KIT also has a large library, but it focuses much more on the third world than that of KITLV (Taselaar 1998: 165–210; Jans and Van den Brink 1981). It is too early to determine the extent to which KITLV and
IIAS – which was primarily funded by the Ministry of Education when established in 1993 – will be competitors or will grow to complement one another. One and a half centuries of KITLV history have demonstrated the importance of funding for scientific practice in general and in the (former) colonial field in particular. In the colonial period, the Institute’s revenues from membership fees and gifts were the primary sources of KITLV’s income, supplemented by subsidies from the Ministry for the Colonies for many of its publications. This made KITLV relatively independent of the economic climate. The Institute blossomed immediately preceding the First World War, but was hit hard shortly after that war. Treasurer IJzerman then collected a ‘trunk capital’ of 200,000 guilders from the colonial business sector that enabled KITLV to subsequently survive the economic crisis of the 1930s, the Second World War and the decolonization of Indonesia.

The ‘Golden Years’, as Hobsbawn (1994: 257–86) described the 1950s and 1960s, started for KITLV in 1956, when Piekaar was the head of higher and academic education at the Ministry and the KITLV received fixed and rapidly increasing subsidies from that ministry. The Institute then moved to Leiden; the library, the collections and the staff grew rapidly, and the Institute benefited from the sizeable Programme for Indonesian Studies financed by DGIS. Those Golden Years ended for KITLV around 1990, when PRIS was suspended due to the termination of development cooperation between the Netherlands and Indonesia, universities were forced to significantly reduce their costs and KNAW became the Institute’s new source of funding as well as its supervisor. Even though KITLV’s equity grew to more than five million guilders in 2000, that sum was scarcely enough to cover the budget for a single year. After offering stiff resistance, KITLV has now accepted its status as a regular KNAW Institute.

Together with the political activities and political orientation of KITLV’s members, the Institute’s funding is one of the most important ties with the historical context within which KITLV developed. In the previous Chapters, that context has been analysed on a number of levels of abstraction. The most general was the level of world history, with general developments including modern imperialism, the two World Wars, the economic crisis, the decolonization and, most recently, the globalization process and the information revolution. On the national level, the colonial and postcolonial relations with KITLV’s fields of study – Indonesia, New Guinea, Suriname, the Antilles and Aruba – proved to be highly important. Of KITLV’s members, there were always at least 15% in the Dutch Indies/Indonesia. In the past 25 years, at least ten percent of KITLV members have come from other foreign countries. Another important
aspect of context was also the progress of the modernization process in the Netherlands. This process also rapidly progressed in the (former) colonies, while the Netherlands has also experienced the influence of postmodernization in recent decades. In terms of context, the decolonization of Indonesia in 1949 proved to be the most important caesura in the history of KITLV, completely changing the Institute’s relationship with its most important field of study.

After 1950, general prosperity rapidly increased along with government spending on higher education and academic research, although it took another ten years for KITLV to actually enjoy the benefits of this progress. Between 1880 and 1960, the number of students in the Netherlands had already increased from 1,400 to more than 40,000, a growth that was much stronger than the growth of the general population (Baggen 1998: 91; Foppen 1989: 243). Between 1960 and 1990 the number of students increased explosively to 179,000, only to subsequently decrease to 159,000 in 1998 (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2000: 442). That decrease in the neoliberal 1990s was accompanied by cuts in the universities’ budgets on the one hand and the upscaling and bureaucratization of research under the umbrella of organisations like KNAW on the other. In terms of conditions beneficial to independent scientific research as well, KITLV’s Golden Years were the period from 1960 to 1990.

What have more than 150 years of academic practice within KITLV, with its varying level of autonomy, actually produced? A question of this type leads us straight into the minefield of scientific philosophy and epistemology. A modernist or neomodernist observer would conclude that both knowledge and insight have most certainly increased in the various disciplines; a postmodernist observer would comment that in its 150 years, KITLV has produced nothing more than texts about texts. The conclusion of this book is that the history of KITLV is an excellent example in support of the assertion that although complete objectivity cannot be achieved in the humanities, the quest for that objectivity can nevertheless substantially increase empirical knowledge and theoretical insight. Once again, the decolonization of Indonesia in 1949 is the most important caesura. Decolonization and internationalization diminished the ideological, Eurocentric nature that characterized many prewar KITLV publications, whether that Eurocentric perspective was orientalist or universalist by nature. Among most postwar KITLV intellectuals, postcolonial universalism was accompanied by cultural relativism, therewith reducing the extent of its Eurocentric nature. There is a world of difference between the Eurocentric sense of superiority held by many prewar KITLV intellectuals
and the use of terms like feudalism and modernity borrowed from European history by some postwar academic practitioners. This would infer that recent decades have also been the most scientific period in the history of KITLV. However, a warning is due, of course. Each generation of academic practitioners has the tendency to award its own era the title of ‘most scientific’. Unknown are the caps and hats to be worn by future generations, the academic practitioners of the twenty-first century. Perhaps more will be learned on the occasion of future KITLV anniversaries. May many anniversaries follow for this national, internationally renowned and innovative Institute.
APPENDIX ONE

HONORARY MEMBERS, PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARY/DIRECTORS KITLV

Honorary Members (with year of appointment)
1882 P.J. Veth
1890 J.H.C. Kern
1898 G.K. Niemann
1911 G.P. Rouffaer
1915 E.B. Kielstra
1916 C. Snouck Hurgronje
1921 A. Capadose
1921 H.W.A. Deterding
1921 H. Loudon
1921 J.W. IJzerman
1951 Ph.S. van Ronkel
1951 O.L. Helfrich
1953 F.W. Stapel
1956 R.A. Kern
1957 Hoesen Djajadiningrat
1957 W.H. Rassers
1959 W. Aichele
1963 F.D.K. Bosch
1963 G. Coedès
1963 J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong
1963 V.E. Korn
1963 R.M.Ng. Purbatjaraka
1963 H. van der Veen
1963 Richard Winstedt
1967 A.A. Cense
1967 Th.G.Th. Pigeaud
1967 A.N.J. Thomassen à Thuessink van der Hoop
1967 P. Voorhoeve
1971 G.W.J. Drewes
1974 H.J. de Graaf
1976 M.A.P. Meilink-Roelofsz
1976  Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana
1976  C.R. Boxer
1983  E.M. Uhlenbeck
1991  J. van Baal
1991  S.W. de Groot-Rosbergen
1991  P.E. de Josselin de Jong
1991  R. Koentjaraningrat
1991  H.G. Schulte Nordholt
1991  A. Teeuw
1996  Sartono Kartodirdjo
1999  J.W. Schoorl
2001  Taufik Abdullah
2001  H.J.M. Claessen
2001  H. Hoetink
2001  H.A. Sutherland
2008  Thee Kian Wie
2008  Richard Price
2008  Sally Price
2010  M. Ricklefs
2010  R. Schefold

Presidents
J.C. Baud, 1851–1859
T. Roorda, 1859–1862
J.P. Cornets de Groot van Kraijenburg, 1862–1866
W.T. Gevers Deynoot, 1866–1867, 1870–1872, 1875–1878
P. Bleeker, 1867–1870, 1872–1875
W. van Rappard, 1878–1882, 1886–1887
1907–1911
T.H. der Kinderen, 1891–1895, 1896–1899
C. Pijnacker Hordijk, 1901–1903
J.E. Henny, 1906–1907
F.A. Liefbrinck, 1915–1916
C. van Vollenhoven, 1920–1921, 1925–1926
J.W. IJzerman, 1927–1929, 1930–1932
J.C. van Eerde, 1929–1930
N.J. Krom, 1932–1936, 1937–1941
A.H.M.J. van Kan, 1942–1944
F.W. Stapel, 1948–1950
V.E. Korn, 1950–1952
F.D.K. Bosch, 1952–1956
G.W.J. Drewes, 1956–1959
G.W. Locher, 1959–1960
L. Onvlee, 1960–1962
E.M. Uhlenbeck, 1962–1965
J.L. Swellengrebel, 1965–1966
A. Teeuw, 1966–1975
R. Schefold, 1996–2004
P. Nas, 2004–2011
S. Legène, 2011–

Secretaries
J. Pijnappel, 1851–1860
S. Keyzer, 1860–1864
J. Miljard, 1864–1870
P.J.C.B. Robidé van der Aa, 1870–1871
P.A.S. van Limburg Brouwer, 1871–1872
T.C.L. Wijnmalen, 1872–1894
E.B. Kielstra, 1894–1915
B. Hoetink, 1915–1923
P. de Roo de la Faille, 1923–1933
F.W. Stapel, 1933–1948
F.R.J. Verhoeven, 1948–1951
A.A. Cense, 1951–1958
G.W. Locher, 1958–1959
P. Voorhoeve, 1959–1965

Director-Secretaries
G.J. Oostindie, 2000

Director
G.J. Oostindie, 2001–
APPENDIX TWO

KITLV MEMBERSHIP FIGURES 1853–2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Caribbean</th>
<th>Other Foreign Countries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Other Foreign Countries</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(including 396 digital members)

If no figures are listed in the first four columns, this means that the data could no longer be found.
### APPENDIX THREE

#### KITLV PUBLICATIONS 1852–2010

**1852–1870**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
<th>anthropology</th>
<th>history</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>general</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publications KITLV 1870–1914**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
<th>anthropology</th>
<th>history</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>general</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>anthropology</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Publications KITLV 1914–1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
<th>anthropology</th>
<th>history</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>general</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publications KITLV 1940–1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
<th>anthropology</th>
<th>history</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>general</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>anthropology</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large number of publications in the period 1971–1975 was caused by the publication of a sizeable series of Indonesian translations of older Dutch folders and articles and a series of publications of traditional Sudanese stories.
## Publications KITLV 1975–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>linguistics</th>
<th>anthropology</th>
<th>history</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>general</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The large number of publications in the period 1971–1975 was caused by the publication of a sizeable series of Indonesian translations of older Dutch folders and articles and a series of publications of traditional Sundanese stories.
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EPILOGUE

Harry Poeze

Maarten Kuitenbrouwer was working on the final revisions of the English version of his book *Tussen orientalisme en wetenschap* when he passed away too soon and too suddenly on 9 June 2008, at the age of sixty. Understandably, determining how far along his work in progress was after Kuitenbrouwer’s death took a long time. The revisions, updates and translations, which were all in various states of completion, had to be merged into one manuscript, and in doing so, the author’s hand was sorely missed. I hope to offer some reassurance by saying that Kuitenbrouwer did revise the entire text, with the exception of the second half of the introduction (Chapter 1), which, in translation, remained unchanged. The revised text was adapted to be suitable for non-Dutch readers. Generally this meant abridgement. Particularly the last chapter was radically changed – that is where the most current information needed to be added. Compared with the Dutch version, the description of the involvement of KITLV with the Caribbean was abridged disproportionally. I find this unfortunate because the cursory nature of this information there is insufficient acknowledgement of the special and close relationship between KITLV and the Caribbean as concerns scholarly research and the development of a collection (the library). Kuitenbrouwer gives no reason for these textual cuts, and I could no longer ask him to explain. In addition, the author was no longer able to check his translation, and the check was done by me.

Kuitenbrouwer adapted his text by consulting and referring to relevant publications from 2001–2007 and giving a place in the last chapter to developments in KITLV up to 2007. Because KITLV went through turbulent times from 2007 to 2011, it is only right that I sketch the main events roughly.

Figures show a trend towards progressive growth. The number of FTEs increased from 46.2 in 2002 to 57.0 in 2010. The distribution pattern of these FTEs over the departments shows a growth in Research staff from 8.1 in 2002 to 13.9 in 2010. This increase reflected the KNAW desire to see research prioritized within its institutes.

The budget grew from € 2,900,000 in 2002 to € 4,480,000 in 2010. This growth largely derived from external funding acquired through the Research Department. In 2002 outside funds amounted to only a meager
€ 32,000, a total that in 2011 had skyrocketed to € 920,000. The number of titles acquired by the library also grew in the ten years from 2002 to 2011. In 2002 there were 8,300 titles acquired, in 2011 there were 11,300 acquired, and in the entire period a total of 102,000. No less than 57,000 of these were acquired by KITLV Jakarta.

KNAW-imposed priorities led to several organizational changes within KITLV. The Library Department and the Department of Archives & Images were merged in 2006 to become the Department of Collections, while the Department of Caribbean Studies was also divided up according to function – one part to Collections, one part to KITLV Press. In 2010 KITLV Press was also reorganized, with the objective that it would become ‘leaner and meaner’; during these years KITLV Press maintained its status as a productive publisher of high-quality texts.

Unfortunately, shortly after this reorganization, KNAW started to put pressure on KITLV to close KITLV Press altogether, arguing that publishing was no longer an acceptable activity for any KNAW institute. Resistance to these plans proved fruitless. Once the decision was made to end publishing within KITLV, a way was sought to permit the continuation of the publishing activities – activities which had been part of KITLV since its founding in 1851. Of particular interest was the continuity and continuation of the highly regarded flagship journals BKI/Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia and Oceania and NWIG/New West Indian Guide. After careful consideration of all options, an agreement was reached with Brill Publishers. Brill will take care of the English-language publications on Southeast Asia and the Caribbean, which will appear in the KITLV imprint. These titles will continue to be subjected to the usual scholarly procedures: peer reviews and an assessment by an editorial committee.

In 2005 and 2011 KITLV was evaluated by an independent, international committee of experts. Preceding the site visits, KITLV compiled extensive reports titled Deep roots, maturing shoots (2005) and Crossing borders (2011), which give a excellent picture of the activities and plans of KITLV – a treat for a future historian of KITLV. Summarized, the assessments of the committee were ‘very good’ (2006) and ‘very good to excellent’ (2012) – together with the assessment from 1999, ‘good to very good’, they showed a nice upward tendency.

The optimistic view of the future was extinguished when, unexpectedly, in March 2011 director Gert Oostindie received word from KNAW that it intended to close down KITLV and stop the funding of the institute. The reason for this was not, so KNAW assured, the quality of KITLV, but their policy of selectively implementing government-imposed budget...
cuts. Moreover, the desire to house all KNAW institutes in one location in Amsterdam played a role in the decision. KITLV had always maintained its wish to remain in Leiden.

After a short period of disbelief, followed by the acceptance that the KNAW was resolute in its stance, KITLV came into action against the plans. Scholarly, policy and political arguments were used, and prominent institutions and persons in the Netherlands and Indonesia joined in the protest. There was also legal ammunition assembled from the 2001 covenant between KNAW and KITLV. The exact course of this lobby can probably only be revealed in the commemorative book in 2051 for two hundred years KITLV. The net effect was, in any case, that the KNAW backed down, reconsidered its plans and then announced KITLV would remain a KNAW institute.

Meanwhile KNAW had let the University of Leiden know that the plans to add to the current housing for KITLV – in particular storage – could be discarded. This ended a long-standing, never-ending, slow procedure that had required a great deal of time, energy and money. The Collections Department was forced to improvise to house the growing collection.

It may be that the report by the evaluation committee played a role in the definitive decision by KNAW. It contained passages such as ‘The Netherlands is fortunate to possess what is almost certainly the leading centre for the interdisciplinary understanding of the third giant of rising Asia – Indonesia’. And furthermore, it called KITLV ‘a modern organization focused almost entirely on contemporary issues of obvious relevance, through profiting from the collections from its 150-year history’. The committee was impressed by the KITLV leadership, the quality and significance of the current research projects, and the value of the institute to the Netherlands government. KITLV occupies a unique position as an international centre for expertise on Indonesia, aptly described in the mass-circulation Tempo weekly (20 November 2011) as ‘a Mecca for researchers’.

In the last ten years the role of the Learned Society of KITLV changed. In daily affairs KNAW has taken over its role. However, in times of crisis the Learned Society joined forces with the director to safeguard KITLV interests, first under Prof. Peter Nas and as of 2011, under Prof. Susan Legène. When KITLV journals were made available through Open Access the number of KITLV members dropped dramatically – to 767 in 2011. This is unfortunate but largely inevitable. The reduction of the number of members does not mean reduced interest because the number of visits to the website and the digital files is still growing explosively.
With all this, the future of KITLV seems once again to be bright, if KNAW can keep its inconstancy in check. It is important in the near future that KITLV strengthens its position as a KNAW centre of expertise on Indonesia, Suriname and the Antilles. In addition, related KNAW institutes (NIOD, IISG, and Meertens Instituut) will move towards greater collaboration in the management of the collections, research and operations, though there will be guarantees for their internal autonomy. For KITLV there is an important place reserved within the Leiden Institute of Global and Area Studies (LIGA), which is in the process of being formed. Digitization of collections, which has already taken place on a large scale, will continue, also in collaboration with KNAW and sister institutes, to the benefit of the user, as well as to KITLV itself, so that it can remain a step ahead of its storage problems.
Maarten Kuitenbrouwer passed away unexpectedly on 10 June 2008. He was still working on the final version of the English translation of Tussen oriëntalisme en wetenschap, a commemorative book for the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (KITLV), which was published in Dutch in 2001. This book stands out among books of its kind for the depth it reaches and the approach the author takes. Kuitenbrouwer goes beyond a factual summary and links KITLV history to historiographical concepts in a broader context, such as orientalism, occidentalism, universalism and relativism. He places KITLV in the larger international setting of institutions concerned with past and present colonies in the East and West. Kuitenbrouwer himself said that his book contained a ‘contextualized history’.

The Board and director of KITLV did not hesitate in their choice of Kuitenbrouwer as the historian of the institute. There was no one who had more knowledge of the field; he was in fact one of the very few Dutch scholars doing research on both the East and the West Indies. Kuitenbrouwer accepted the request to write the book and began with an outline of his ideas, asking Koos Arens to be his research assistant. In a display of exemplary self-discipline, Kuitenbrouwer handed in his manuscript after somewhat more than two years so that it could be presented on the day of KITLV’s anniversary, 4 June 2001. Though at the outset Kuitenbrouwer was not a member of the institute, he changed that upon the completion of his work.

Maarten Kuitenbrouwer was born in Utrecht on 18 July 1947, into a family with a broad range of interests: his father worked as a civil servant, his mother had a degree in Latin and Greek, his older brother also did a law degree, worked as a writer, and for many years published in one of the most important Dutch newspapers. Incidentally, Kuitenbrouwer’s nephew became a historian specializing in the same region as his uncle.

Kuitenbrouwer began his political sciences degree at the University of Amsterdam but soon switched to a double major in sociology and history. He completed these cum laude in 1974 and supplemented them with an education degree in history. After having briefly worked at the faculty of
education at the University of Amsterdam, in 1975 he became a lecturer with the department of history at the University of Utrecht.

In his doctoral thesis, Kuitenbrouwer decided to build on the topic of his Master’s thesis. However, another researcher proved already to be further along on the same topic, so Kuitenbrouwer dropped it. It did resurface later in a few articles (1978, 1989, 1995). His second subject was the late-nineteenth-century Dutch economist and liberal politician, N.G. Pierson. But he voluntarily let another researcher have it and instead wrote only one article (1981) about Pierson and his colonial politics.

The third time was on the mark. Kuitenbrouwer ventured onto new terrain. He positioned the Netherlands as an imperial power with a role in the advent of modern imperialism: Nederland en de opkomst van het moderne imperialisme (The Netherlands and the Rise of Modern Imperialism, 1985). Till then no one had seen a connection between the tiny country of the Netherlands and imperialism, and whenever any scholar attempted to make this link, others were quick to deny its existence. Kuitenbrouwer summarized his own conclusion from 1991: ‘Dutch expansion in Indonesia can certainly be called imperialistic, with the Netherlands’ rather unusual status as a small power explaining a number of deviations from the general pattern of modern imperialism’.

With this cum laude dissertation Kuitenbrouwer caused an earthquake with a long-lasting series of aftershocks. A debate ensued, with the Leiden historian H.L. Wesseling taking a stance against Kuitenbrouwer in his article ‘Bestond er een Nederlands imperialism?’ (Dutch imperialism, did it exist?), though he later moved towards Kuitenbrouwer’s position. Kuitenbrouwer himself disputed the question with Wesseling in his article in an edited volume, ‘Het imperialisme van een kleine mogendheid’ (The imperialism of a small power, 1991).

The editorial board of ‘Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden’ asked Kuitenbrouwer for a historiographical and theoretical evaluation of the imperialism debate. After some hesitation – he was, after all, not impartial – he said yes to the request and wrote ‘Het imperialisme-debat in de Nederlandse geschiedschrijving’ (The imperialism debate in Dutch historiography, 1998). It is an article that summarizes the debate clearly and comes to the conclusion that only a multifaceted explanation does justice to the complexity of imperialism. It is noteworthy that Kuitenbrouwer’s immediate colleagues in Utrecht, Jur van Goor and Elsbeth Locher-Scholten, play an important role in the debate, so much so that they received the tag ‘the Utrecht School’. Kuitenbrouwer puts this into perspective: that ‘school’ was no more than a room in the history department shared by the threesome...
Once Kuitenbrouwer’s thesis was translated into English in 1991 it was distributed worldwide and received international recognition. In fact, internationally it became an oft-cited publication about Dutch imperialism. He returned to the topic several times, though other research fields also drew him. His presentation in 1986 to a conference in Utrecht about the Indonesian Revolution and the decolonization of India, Indochina and Indonesia illustrated how well-read he was and what a broad basis of knowledge he had of other subjects. At the same time he moved onto new terrain with the writing of his second book, *De ontdekking van de Derde Wereld; Beeldvorming en beleid in Nederland 1950–1990* (The discovery of the Third World; Conceptions and policy in the Netherlands 1950–1990), which appeared in 1994. This ‘discovery’ followed upon Indonesian sovereignty and merged seamlessly into international discussions. In the Netherlands the term was often associated with the radical Left, and government policy was supposed to give a suitable and moderate translation of it. Conceptualization and policy were strongly tied to Dutch societal changes, which he demonstrates convincingly in this thematic study.

The bibliography of this book is in fact a list of his very diverse interests. For a few years Kuitenbrouwer wrote with some regularity for the Dutch weekly *Intermediair*. In these articles he was able to give his views somewhat informally on questions concerning the Third World, especially Africa, and Dutch policy on development aid and human rights, all of them his special interests. Moreover, his private fascination with music, in particular world music (non-Western music with Western elements and Western music with non-Western elements) resulted in two articles in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* (Journal for History, 2003) in which his personal taste did not, however, hinder his scholarly analysis. His great love for music was best reflected in his sizeable collection of 5,000 CDs.

At the beginning of the 21st century Kuitenbrouwer was occupied with the present commemorative book and requests to write about Dutch development aid and human rights. He was able do both and at the same time write a portrait of Max van der Stoel, a moderate-Left foreign Minister who, in turbulent years had to walk a tightrope to bring the radical demands of his party into line with policy upholding international support for human rights and development aid. Van der Stoel also agreed to have Kuitenbrouwer write his biography. This never happened, just as a plan to write a series of books about human rights in an international and comparative perspective was nipped in the bud by his untimely death.

Maarten Kuitenbrouwer is survived by his daughter Fanny and his partner Marja Gastelaars.
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