MARIEKE BLOEMBERGEN AND MARTIJN EICKHOFF

Conserving the past, mobilizing the Indonesian future

Archaeological sites, regime change and heritage politics in Indonesia in the 1950s

*Sites were not my problem*¹

On 20 December 1953, during a festive ceremony with more than a thousand spectators, and with hundreds of children waving their red and white flags, President Soekarno officially inaugurated the temple of Śiwa, the largest temple of the immense Loro Jonggrang complex at Prambanan, near Yogyakarta. This ninth-century Hindu temple complex, which since 1991 has been listed as a world heritage site, was a professional archaeological reconstruction. The method employed for the reconstruction was anastylosis,² however, when it came to the roof top, a bit of fantasy was also employed. For a long time the site had been not much more than a pile of stones. But now, to a new

¹ The historian Sunario, a former Indonesian ambassador to England, in an interview with Jacques Leclerc on 23-10-1974, quoted in Leclerc 2000:43.

² Anastylosis, first developed in Greece, proceeds on the principle that reconstruction is only possible with the use of original elements, which by three-dimensional deduction on the site have to be replaced in their original position. The Dutch East Indies' Archaeological Service – which never employed the term – developed this method in an Asian setting by trial and error (for the first time systematically at Candi Panataran in 1917-1918). The Dutch thereby provided a direct example for the French in Indochina, who introduced the term anastylosis for this colonial practice of reconstruction (Bosch 1922:8-14; Bernet-Kempers 1978:93-7; Clémentin-Ojha and Manguin 2001:97).

MARIEKE BLOEMBERGEN is a Research Fellow at the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies (KITLV). She holds a PhD from the University of Amsterdam. Her research interests include the political dynamics of cultural knowledge production in (post-)colonial Indonesia, in a widening and trans-Asian context. She is the author of *Colonial spectacles: The Netherlands and the Netherlands Indies at the world exhibitions, 1880-1931*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2006, and 'The perfect policeman: Colonial policing, modernity and conscience on Sumatra's West Coast in the early 1930s', *Indonesia* 91, 2011, pp. 165-93. Dr Bloembergen may be reached at Bloembergen@kitlv.nl.

MARTIJN EICKHOFF is a researcher at the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies in Amsterdam. He holds a PhD from the University of Amsterdam. Specializing in science (and scientists), heritage and regime change in authoritarian and (post-)colonial contexts, he is the author of *In the name of science? P.J.W. Debye and his career in Nazi Germany*, Amsterdam: Aksant, 2008, and *De oorsprong van het 'eigene': Nederlands vroegste verleden, archeologie en nationaal-socialisme*, Amsterdam: Boom, 2003. Dr Eickhoff may be reached at M.Eickhoff@niod.knaw.nl.

generation of Indonesians, and also to the Dutch engineer Vincent van Romondt, who had supervised the reconstruction in the 1930s and spoke at the inauguration as well, the Śiwa temple had become manifest and visible 'in its full magnificence and greatness'.³ Muhammad Yamin, the newly appointed Minister of Education and Culture, applauded the reconstruction as the most significant national achievement since the proclamation of the Indonesian independence.⁴ The Śiwa temple stood proud as an example of the great Indonesian past, as well as proof of the potential of Indonesia in the future.⁵

Archaeological sites appeared to be effective as a means of elevating the status of post-independence Indonesia – also within an international and trans-Asian context. In the early 1950s, numerous distinguished political leaders from Asia and the Pacific paid an official visit to Prambanan and the other magnificent temple complex in Middle Java, the eighth-century Borobudur, a Buddhist sanctuary. The Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, the King of Cambodia Norodom Sihanouk (who made a tour by airplane around Borobudur), President Quirino of the Philippines, the Prime Minister of Burma U Nu, US Vice-President Richard Nixon, and the US presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson, all visited the temples.⁶ These visits were significant public performances: they helped to legitimize Indonesia as a modern independent state that seriously cared for its beautiful national (and trans-Asian) Buddhist/Hindu heritage.

In the eyes of the new Republican leaders, archaeological sites were apparently good tools for post-independence Indonesian identity politics and cultural diplomacy. Both the inauguration of the Śiwa temple and the official visits of foreign dignitaries illustrate this. However, archaeological sites could also complicate the politics of nation building, if only because of their significance as religious sites, or possible expressions of a Greater Indian civilization or pan-Asian spiritual identity.⁷ Some of the foreign visitors not only came to honour the new Republic, but also recognized, in passing, the remains and scope of the old Indian civilization, or they made a Buddhist pilgrimage to Buddhist sites to which they felt connected for religious, historical and/or political reasons. Furthermore, archaeological sites were also a colonial heritage, investigated, conserved, and reconstructed since the 1910s

³ Van Romondt quoted in Bernet Kempers 1978:110; *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954, no. 36-37:1121. See also Bernet Kempers 1955:13.

⁴ *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954, no. 36-37:1121; Yamin 1953:7.

⁵ The speeches were published in the cultural journal of the Ministry of Education and Culture, *Budaya*, December 1953 and January 1954.

⁶ *Laporan Dinas Purbakala* (1950) 1952:13; *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, 19-6-1950; *Laporan Dinas Purbakala* (1951-52) 1958: Forster 1989:181; *Laporan Dinas Purbakala* (1954) 1962:24.

⁷ On the India-centred political dimensions of Greater India as a diffusionist theory of culture, and Indianization as a civilizing mission, see Bayly 2004:715-24.

by successive Archaeological Services, under changing regimes.⁸ How did that colonial past relate to the Śiwa temple – that is, how did the reconstruction – and serve as proof of Indonesian potential? In short, the archaeological sites that the New Republic inherited from the past were not neutral. What, as we aim to figure out in this article, was the significance of the archaeological sites – scattered all over Indonesia, and selected, uncovered, investigated, conserved and partly put on display by state archaeologists under Dutch and Japanese colonial regimes – for the young Indonesian Republic in the 1950s, or for post-independence Indonesian identity?

In the historiography on Indonesian nationalist history much attention has been paid to the ways in which Indonesian historians and statesmen, such as Soekarno and Muhammad Yamin, built on colonial historical knowledge production, manifested in texts and maps, when they tried to mobilize Indonesians behind the image of a great Indonesian past.⁹ Most of these studies concentrate on the role of these key figures and key histories in the production of a nationalist version of the Indonesian past. They show how the work of these key figures in the 1950s contributed to a more or less fixed official version of the history of Indonesia, which had its origins in a great pre-colonial past, especially the pre-Islamic Majapahit era, and which provided a line of great anti-colonial and revolutionary heroes, from Gajah Mada, to Diponegoro, to the revolutionary Indonesians who established the free and independent Republic of Indonesia. However, the role of the Archaeological Service in the production of historical knowledge, state formation and nation building, as pointed out by Benedict Anderson, remains to be fully understood, as well as the implications of the transformation of ruins or religious sites into 'Indonesian' heritage sites in the 1950s and the obliteration of their colonial connotation.¹⁰

Archaeology as a tool, sites as a method

The 1950s offer a crucial moment to illuminate the continuities and discontinuities in archaeological heritage politics in Indonesia as well as the nature of the colonial legacy. In this article we focus on a selection of site-connected

⁸ These were the Dutch colonial Archaeological Service (1913-1942), the Japanese Archaeological Service (1942-1945); two Archaeological Services during the period of war and revolution, the rehabilitated Dutch colonial Service (1945-1950) and the Republican Archaeological Service (1946-1950). These two Services were combined in mid-1950 into the Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia which continued to exist after independence, albeit under different names and in changing departmental structures.

⁹ Leclerc 1973, 2000; Noer 1979; Reid 1979, 2011; Supomo 1979; Anderson 1991:163-86; Van Miert 1995; Manguin 2000; Wood 2005:33-82.

¹⁰ Anderson 1991:178-84. Compare Glover 2003; Wood 2005:44-61. On the colonial dimension of theoretical trends in Indonesian archaeology, see also Tanudirjo 1995.

interventions by successive Archaeological Services in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia, to gauge their impact on identity politics at the local and national level in the young Indonesian Republic – as well as on international perspectives relating to these sites. How did the Archaeological Services in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia contribute to the transmission of archaeological knowledge and to the skills and ethics of restoration over time? What was the effect of regime change on the development of archaeological sites into national sites – obliterating their colonial connotation – and on local and ‘foreign’ perceptions of these sites?

To frame these questions we need to take a closer look at the phenomenon of the Archaeological Service and its role in state legitimization and identity politics. In the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, many governments of old and new states in Europe, as well as those of the European empires in Asia set up centralized Archaeological Services, in addition to archaeological museums. These Services were generally devoted to the making of an inventory, to the documentation, selection, research, conservation and restoration of the archaeological remains within – as well as beyond – state boundaries. In that role they were, often with the backing of the Monument Act, the most suitable authority to define the links and cohesion between the archaeological remains – which they selected – as historical entities that could be made meaningful for the origins and legitimization of the state (or its (post)-colonial successor). Through their material conceptualizations of a national past, and as representatives of the state, these Services also legitimized the state.¹¹

Benedict Anderson was notably one of the first to point out the connection between what he calls an ‘archaeological push’ around 1900 in Asia and the formation of (post)-colonial states. He reasoned that Archaeological Services, while transforming ruins into monuments, created regalia for the colonial state, which through endless display and reproduction were transformed into recognizable signs of great national pasts for its subjects. Thus ‘generalized’, and with ‘gracefully executed reliefs and ornamentation’ erased, these monuments became symbols that would legitimize the colonial state – as benign caretaker of the previously neglected ruins of great Hindu civilizations – and the post-colonial state, for which these monuments became grand proofs of Indonesia’s past unity in diversity.¹²

With this tentative analysis Anderson offered not only an interesting framework for the study of culture and politics in Southeast Asia, but also,

¹¹ The national institutionalization of archaeology by museums and universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been studied widely since the 1990s. However, there exists no comprehensive comparative study of the history of archaeological state services in Europe and Asia. For a general overview, see Díaz-Andreu 2007. On archaeology and (post)-colonial state formation elsewhere in Asia, see among others Edwards 2007; Singh 2004; Guha-Thakurta 2004.

¹² Anderson 1990:179–8, 1991:185. Wood (2005) follows this state-centred argumentation.

more concretely, a possible explanation for the fact that, as to how a Hindu temple complex and a Buddhist temple, the ninth-century Hindu temple Prambanan and the eighth-century Borobudur – both located in Central Java, and both formally considered as ‘dead’ monuments – have become national icons in a country that is predominantly Islamic. However, our ongoing research on archaeological sites and the dynamics of heritage formation in colonial and post-colonial Indonesia, in which we follow a site-centred approach, also shows that Anderson’s (teleological) line of thought may lead to oversimplification. Archaeological sites-turned-monuments did indeed help to polish imaginations of great national pasts, but Anderson, because of his state-centred perspective, overlooked the fact that ‘sites’ accommodated alternative imaginations from the moment they were transformed into an ‘archaeological site’. In that sense, sites might also cause problems for state identity politics. While archaeological sites in Indonesia stirred up nationalist interests, they also provoked local, trans-Asian and international engagement from groups and institutions within and outside the state, which related to these sites in ways that did not necessarily overlap with the intentions of the state or state-supported academic institutions.

As the Indonesian archaeologist Daud Tanudirjo (2011) argued recently, the new Indonesian government, from the start, placed archaeology in the service of the state as well as the unification of the nation. Indeed, under the leadership of its first head R. Soekmono, an intellectual nationalist, who already during the 1940s propagated a national, Indonesia-centred and unifying history education (and would contribute to that during his long career), the Indonesian Archaeological Service would play a key role in post-Independence national heritage politics.¹³ However, we will try to make clear in this article how, apart from the state perspective we follow, local and international interests in sites, generated by archaeological interventions, were at stake as well, sometimes (but not necessarily) complicating national conservation politics.¹⁴

The Archaeological Service itself played an important role in complicating state-centred heritage dynamics: it not only took care of the material

¹³ Soekmono 1946a, 1946b, 1986, 1990. For his high school introductions to national cultural history (Soekmono 1955-61, reprinted in the 1970s and 1980s), Soekmono used photographs from the Archaeological Service’s (colonial) archive. He defended an Indonesia-centred history. By comparison, the Dutch archaeologist W.F. Stutterheim started with the history of India and the spread of the Indian civilization, in his school guidelines for the ‘Indische’ cultural history, which he wrote for the education of Indonesian students at the *kweekscholen* (teacher training schools) in the Dutch East Indies, published in 1931-1932. It was published again as a cultural history of Indonesia, in Dutch and in Indonesian, in the early 1950s. Soekmono skipped the history of Indian influences because ‘the history of the Indonesian people does not begin with the arrival of the people and influences of India [...]. Whether it has Hindu, Islamic or Western influences, from the beginning until the end Indonesian cultural history is after all Indonesian cultural history.’ (Soekmono 1955:5, translation MB.)

¹⁴ See also Bloembergen and Eickhoff forthcoming.

evidence and visualizations of the early stages of national history, but it provided counterfactual evidence as well, whether deliberately or not. What made these site-related material evidence problematic for imaginations of national Indonesian identity was precisely the fact that the moment that had been selected and re-localized, also became open to multiple interpretations and engagements, at the local, national and international level. Even worse, counterfactual evidence could also be the lack of evidence – as the continuing search for the remains of the centre of the Sriwijaya empire in Palembang, or that of the Majapahit *kraton* in Trowulan testifies.

Archaeological sites and post-colonial Indonesian identity

The 1953 inauguration of the Śiwa temple was a turning point for post-colonial nationalist archaeological heritage formation, as was Soekarno's speech. After speeches by Soekmono (as the first Indonesian head of the Indonesian Archaeological Service), Van Romondt and Yamin, President Soekarno had the final word. He presented the Śiwa temple emphatically as a national monument. Prambanan, like Borobudur and other sites around Yogyakarta, had stirred deep admiration in him – allegedly at the age of 9 – for the great skills and achievements of his Indonesian ancestors and even then he was filled with feelings of national pride. In the new era of independence, these monuments should be an inspiration to Indonesians to rise from their modest present, and build up an equally magnificent Indonesian future. But Soekarno also complicated the matter. He explicitly stated that he would not worship the stone Hindu statues, since, as he reasoned, a Muslim only worshipped Allah, the one and only god. He invited those Hindus present to conduct their prayers, if they wished. And indeed, the night before, Balinese students of the newly established Gadjah Mada University had performed 'their religious duty', as one newspaper called it, at Prambanan, and played gamelan music afterwards.¹⁵

Harmonious as this may sound, Soekarno's statement may have made the majority of his public uneasy. For – when it came to the temple's iconography and religious connotation – Soekarno implied that it was not self-evidently a national monument for Indonesian Muslims. How then could it at the same time be used as an admonishment for a great national future? Soekarno had a solution, expressed in Dutch: 'Neem de vlam, niet de as' (Take the flame, not the ashes). This national monument, so he argued, was, like Borobudur and other temples, not only *material* heritage, but also *spiritual* heritage, full of thoughts and feelings. And on the basis of this spiritual heritage – which included *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (Sanskrit for unity in diversity) which was to become

¹⁵ *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, 21-12-1953, 22-12-1953; *Merdeka*, 21-12-1953; *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954, no. 36-37:1121

Indonesia's unifying principle – Indonesians should strive to become that great nation again, as great as the builders of these monuments who were their ancestors. The present generation of Indonesians in their turn could bequeath the Panca Sila to their offspring – but only if their hearts were filled with fire when they carried out this work. Therefore: 'Neem de vlam, niet de as'.¹⁶

The inauguration ceremony at Prambanan illustrates how old Hindu temple ruins – investigated and reconstructed by successive Archaeological Services under changing regimes since the 1910s – were 'reinvented', made suitable as a modern Indonesian site, and turned into important national heritage of the new Indonesian republic. Soekarno's speech also makes it clear, however, that local material signs of the past, like Prambanan, were at first sight not an obvious tool for national identity politics, in this case for religious reasons. From that perspective, Prambanan apparently made more sense to Hindu Balinese. Another perhaps more sensitive issue at the time, seemed to be the Dutch colonial contribution to this achievement. For in the eyes of Dutch representatives of the Archaeological Service, former director August J. Bernet Kempers and Vincent van Romondt – one of the designers and head of the reconstruction in the 1930s – the beautiful silhouette of the reconstructed Śiwa temple was also a fine example of Dutch-Indonesian archaeological cooperation (Bernet Kempers 1978:169; compare Gerretson 1955).

Archaeological sites as a national Dutch responsibility

The early Indonesian Archaeological Service was also an old service, and the continuities from the past were clearly visible in the 1950s. While the new generation of Indonesian archaeologists and future heads of the Service, such as Soekmono and Satyawati Soerjono Soerjo (later on Suleiman), were being trained by Dutch archaeologists and pursuing higher education at the new Department of Archaeology at the Universitas Indonesia (UI) in Jakarta, the Service had a Dutch director until 1953, the archaeologist Bernet Kempers, and until 1957 it was partly staffed and guided by Dutch engineers and archaeologists. Most of them (all were men except one woman) had started their professional career in the colonial era.

The Indonesian Archaeological Service originated from the colonial Archaeological Commission, and its successor was the colonial Archaeological Service. Both were set up by the Dutch colonial government, respectively in 1901 and 1913. Dutch ethical and paternalistic colonial concerns, Dutch nationalist concerns, and private aesthetic worries of representatives of the Dutch colonial financial and cultural elite about the visible decay of one of the

¹⁶ *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, 22-12-1953; *Merdeka*, 21-12-1953; *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954, no. 36-37: 1121.

most admired icons of the indigenous Buddhist past, Borobudur, formed the background. From 1901 the archaeological commission therefore directed its attention mainly to the material remains from the Hindu and Buddhist past, with the restoration of Borobudur (1907-1911) as its main focus and most visible success. However, from 1913 onwards the Service officially added Islamic, Chinese and Dutch antiquities to its purview. Its official task was to make an inventory of antiquities in the whole archipelago, to keep watch over them, to prevent decay from setting in and to carry out research on antiquities in general (Bernet Kempers 1978:78). The Monument Act of 1931 was intended to support this policy.

Coming under the Department of Education and Religion, and with its office based in Batavia, the Service had – considering the field it wished to oversee – a relatively small permanent staff. However – despite continuous complaints by successive heads of the Service about the lack of budget – the influence and reach of the Service was far and wide, and the Service's insight into local archaeological activities considerable. Influence was partly due to the Service's collaboration with the esteemed Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Royal Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences) and the latter's museum in Batavia (at present Indonesia's National Museum). The head and the inspectors (trained in classical linguistics, archaeology, architecture or civil engineering, all Europeans) regularly travelled from site to site in (and in the late 1920s and 1930s also outside) the colony, as did their temporarily and permanently affiliated experts (Dutch professionals as well as Javanese higher educated elite), and their architectural draughtsmen (all educated, higher ranked Javanese). At the local level the Service enjoyed the support of the – dualistically organized – local administration to get things done. Local administrators (Europeans as well as Indonesians) were committed and involved in the projects of the Archaeological Service. Local heads also acted as intermediaries through whom local people were recruited to work on the larger projects of excavation and reconstruction. This interdependence was sometimes formalized. For example, Ario Kromo Djojo Adinegoro, the *regent* of Mojokerto (East Java, the main base for investigations into the remains of the Majapahit empire) was officially affiliated with the staff of the Service from 1914 onwards – as honorary curator of the Museum of Antiquities he had set up. Adinegoro initiated excavations in the area as well, wrote guidelines for the documentation and classification of objects for the museum, and contributed preliminary analyses to the *Oudheidkundig Verslag*, the yearly reports of the Archaeological Service.

This is not to say that the Service was exclusively in charge of the archaeological projects in the colony, since independent individuals, professionals or self-taught archaeologists – including those from abroad and from foreign academic institutions – conducted investigations into the pre-

The public waiting for the inauguration of the Śiwa temple as a national Indonesian monument, Prambanan, 20 December 1953 (KITLV 167178)

President Soekarno, delivering a speech at the inauguration of the Śiwa temple, Prambanan, 20 December 1953 (KITLV 167179)

President Soekarno and Soekmono, first head of the Indonesian Archaeological Service, visit the outer gallery of the Siwa temple after the inauguration ceremony, Prambanan, 20 December 1953 (KITLV 167181)

Vincent van Romondt, inspector of the Dutch East Indies Archaeological Service in the 1930s, on inspection tour in Central Java. In the background the ninth-century Buddhist temple Candi Sari (flower). (KITLV 77462.)

Early reconstruction works at the Śiwa temple at Prambanan, probably around 1919 (KITLV 111217)

Excavating at the site of the Śiwa temple at Prambanan during the reconstruction works in the 1930s, then directed by Van Romondt: squatting around the box (containing magic metal pieces) they excavated, the *tukang* (workers) Koedis and Mangoen; standing left, the assistant inspector of the Archaeological Service, Ph. van Coolwijk; with his back to the camera, Van Romondt (KITLV 77483).

Reaching the top of the Śiwa temple in reconstruction, early 1953 (KITLV 165980).

The Śiwa temple in full regalia, and the shadow play of one of its adjoining temples at Prambanan, December 1953 (KITLV 167185)

historic, Buddhist and Hindu past of the colony as well, often collaborating or exchanging information with the Archaeological Service or the Royal Batavian Society. Besides this, private individuals in Sumatra, Java and Bali set up archaeological societies and museums that benefited from moral support and membership from local elites as well as limited funding from the colonial government. These societies, such as the Majapahit Society (set up in 1914), were involved in the activities of the Archaeological Service as well, or were encouraged to do so.

The geographical scope of the Service, as well as the control it had on different locations in the colony, can be seen from the Service's many temporary informal working bases spread over the colony. In 1913 most of the projects of the Archaeological Service were in Java. An important addition was Aceh (Sumatra) which, after decennia-long colonial warfare that broke out in 1873, was incorporated into the colony in the early twentieth century. In 1914, the arabist P.J. Moquette, Hoesein Djajadiningrat and civil engineer J.J. de Vink, all assigned by the Archaeological Service, started research there into Islamic antiquities (mostly graves and grave complexes) dating from the early Islamic Pase Kingdom (thirteenth century). South Sumatra soon followed, for research concerning the Sriwijaya empire, and for prehistoric research in Pasemah, among other areas. While the head Krom, and his new assistant Bosch already went to Bali for a preliminary research in 1915, it was only in the second half of the 1920s that the Service assigned the archaeologist Willem F. Stutterheim to conduct systematic archaeological research in Bali – mainly in the Pejeng area (South Bali). In the early 1930s Pieter Vincent van Stein Callenfels broadened his scope of systematic prehistoric investigations to include Celebes.

The central focus of archaeology at the time was the reconstruction of dynastic histories and prehistoric civilizations, and the definition of sequences of periods – always from an evolutionary perspective – by classifying objects, and by comparing and connecting these with findings elsewhere, and, in some cases, with living 'prehistoric' or other 'higher' cultures (such as Hindu Bali) known from ethnographic research in the Dutch East Indies and elsewhere.¹⁷ It is ironic that, although the Archaeological Service's work in the period between the wars was indeed a state-legitimizing activity, the research and fieldwork of archaeology transcended the boundaries of national states and empires. For, whether (self-taught) scholars studied prehistoric remains (research that had taken place on an individual basis since 1900), or whether they preferred to focus on the so-called 'classical' period of Buddhist and Hindu civilizations (building on an earlier European fascination), or on the Islamic past, they were all interested in connections (compare Ali: 2009):

¹⁷ Tanudirjo 1995. On 'connecting' theories in studies on early South and Southeast Asian, see Ali 2009 and Kenneth R. Hall's review essay in this issue; on prehistoric research in the Dutch East Indies, see Heine-Geldern 1945; Soejono 1969.

in the inter-Asian relations between the islands of the Dutch East Indies archipelago with mainland Southeast and South Asia (and sometimes even East Africa/Madagascar), and in the nature and direction of migration movements in Asia and thus, in the nature of cultural transfer.

Despite the broad scope of the research that the Archaeological Service facilitated, and the booming interest in stone cultures since the beginning of the 1930s, the emphasis in the period between the wars seemed – at least in the public sphere – to be on the study and maintenance of the Buddhist and Hindu remains. This apparent preoccupation with the Buddhist and Hindu past was partly a legacy of the nineteenth century when Europeans saw in the temple ruins which they encountered and admired either moral warnings (against irresponsible colonial regimes and/or indigenous civilization presumed to be in decay) or expressions of a universal civilization. Both interpretations fitted the then merely hypothetical idea, already proposed by Raffles, that these monuments could never have been built by local people, and, because of similarities with temples in mainland Southeast and South Asia, these monuments must have been the work of Indian immigrants. In the 1910s-1920s, the scholarly debate turned to the question of not whether but how ‘Indianization’ or an ‘external civilizational activity’ (Ali 2009:5) originating from India could have taken place, and whether and to what extent older local civilizations had actively appropriated these Indian influences fusing them with local styles.¹⁸ Topical as that question was in the context of an emerging nationalist movement, as we will show below, it was picked up and discussed again in the 1950s and 1960s, both by Europeans and by newly trained Indonesian professional archaeologists (Bosch 1961; Tanudirjo 1995; Ayatrohaedi 1985).

Colonial conservation ethics: From preservation to reconstruction

With regard to conservation politics, the Archaeological Service approached antiquities that were obviously still in use – such as mosques and Chinese or Balinese temples – with an attitude that can be described as colonial pragmatism: the Service left the responsibility of the maintenance of these buildings in principle to the local religious communities but felt at liberty to intervene in conservation projects for technical and paternalistic reasons (Bernet Kempers 1978:208-11).

¹⁸ For a short overview of this scholarly discussion during the period between the wars, see Bosch 1961:3-4. The question of whether local cultural factors continued to operate in the Hindu and Buddhist remains stimulated prehistoric investigations in the 1920s-1930s. And the other way around: pre-historic research by Heine-Geldern (1945:152-3) and Stutterheim inspired Quaritch Wales (1951:2, 17-8) with his influential notion of ‘local genius’.

Apparently, the Service felt freer to restore old Hindu and Buddhist antiquities, which were deemed out of use. But sensitivities had to be taken into account as well. Investigating and preserving sites was one thing, but when it came to cleaning and conservation, site interventions became a highly debated topic within the circles of the Archaeological Service. And it was precisely the intervention at the Śiwa temple in Prambanan (which the Service embarked on in 1918), and the apparently all too free reconstruction work done by the Dutch architect P.J. Perquin, Inspector of the Archaeological Service in Java, that featured prominently in this discussion. The reconstruction work at Prambanan was interrupted because of the commotion that ensued. Following a comparable debate that had taken place in the Netherlands (and elsewhere in Europe and Asia), the points raised were: should the task of the Service be restricted to the Dutch principle 'keep as found' (of which the first director of the Archaeological Service N.J. Krom (1913-1916) was an advocate) or could it also embark on reconstruction? (put into practice by people such as Perquin, and supported by Krom's successor, F.D.K. Bosch (1916-1937)). And if the Service allowed reconstruction, where should it draw the line? What if the material remains for the reconstruction were not sufficient? Were deduction and fantasy permissible, and if so, to which degree?¹⁹

These seemingly trivial questions, were in fact fundamental, since the answers could have immense consequences. One of the main arguments for reconstruction was that the actual form and beauty of the original monument and the play of shadow on its façade would be restored, and the 'authentic' ruin, with all its often negative connotations, such as neglect, decay or even decadence would be a thing of the past. Another argument – which served as the guiding principle in the Netherlands – was the utility of the 'monument' in the present. Behind both arguments the question that mattered, was: visible for whom, and useful for whom?

Prominent Dutch colonial archaeologists at the time, such as Krom, Bosch, Stutterheim and Bernet Kempers, were well aware that their approach towards material visualizations of Indonesia's Buddhist and Hindu past did not synchronize with the 'keep-as-found' restoration ethics in the Netherlands. They also knew, on the other hand, that their work inspired the Indonesian nationalist elite. Their academic quests and debates concerning the meaning of these material remains of Java's Hindu and Buddhist past – in short whether and how they were the result of 'external civilizational activity' originating from India as well as if and how active local appropriations played a role as well – dwelled on issues that also touched upon (Javanese) nationalist interests. And it was precisely the awareness of the nationalist interest in this past which caused a clash between the most influential of the colonial archae-

¹⁹ For a short summary of this discussion, see Bernet Kempers 1978:107-12.

ologists active in the Indies with restoration experts from the Netherlands, known as the *restauratiekwestie* or restoration problem (1923-1926).

Archaeological reconstruction as a local spiritual need

The influential Dutch architect H.P. Berlage, famous for his modernist approach to architecture, phrased the Dutch viewpoint on the colonial restoration problem most clearly. In 1923, on a journey to study architecture in the Dutch East Indies, Berlage received a semi-formal request from committed and influential architects and archaeologists in the Netherlands to advise on restoration politics in the Indies. In his report of December 1923 Berlage argued that Hindu and Buddhist temples in Java 'should be approached as historical monuments'. In his view they had in the present no utility that related to their original function. Despite sporadic offerings that local Javanese placed in front of the Hindu statues, which Berlage considered as expressions of extant animistic belief, he argued that since this had nothing to do with the old Hindu civilization, these buildings 'no longer carried meaning for the spiritual life [*geestesleven*] of the Javanese people'. His conclusion was that these monuments did not merit reconstruction, and only needed 'reverent conservation, a task to be fulfilled by both Europeans and Javanese'.²⁰

Bosch, the head of the colonial Archaeological Service, on the other hand disputed the idea that Hindu and Buddhist temples on Java lacked any meaning for the spiritual life of present-day Javanese. Berlage's report prompted Bosch to request the government to form a special committee, which included a minority of highly-educated Javanese aristocrats who were also involved in colonial cultural institutions such as the Royal Batavian Society and the Java Instituut (Java Institute), to formulate a clear policy with regard to restoration or reconstruction projects for the future.²¹ Berlage's stand consti-

²⁰ Arsip Nasional Indonesia, Jakarta (hereafter ANRI), Arsip Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap (hereafter KBG), number (hereafter nr.), DIR 1026, Report H.P. Berlage, undated (before 17-12-1923).

²¹ Muussens (1924) contains the key document that voiced views that opposed Berlage and Bosch, which led to the installation of the restoration committee in 1924. The committee was formed in negotiation with several cultural organizations: L.C. Westenek (member of the Raad van Indië (Indies Council)) was the chairman, who was after his retirement replaced by B. Schrieke (Royal Batavian Society). Members: philologist Hoesin Djajadiningrat (Royal Batavian Society), engineer Th. van Erp (responsible for the first restoration of Borobudur, 1907-1911), architects Thomas Karsten (also representing the Java Institute in Yogyakarta) and C.P. Wolff Schoemaker (also Chair of the Bond voor Indische Kunstkringen (BIK, Confederation of Indies' Art Circles) in Bandoeng), P.H.W. Sitsen (chair of the BIK in Yogyakarta) and Radjiman Wediodiningrat (representing the Java Institute). Secretary: archaeologist Stutterheim, replaced by philologist R. Goris (*Verslag* 1926:141). Correspondence in ANRI, KBG, DIR 1027 and Algemeene Secretarie (hereafter AS), Besluit (hereafter Bt.), 27-3-1924, 1.

tuted the theme of the second conference of the Java Institute, taking place in Yogyakarta in 1924. The conference was dedicated to assessing 'the value of old Javanese monuments for the present and future Javanese culture'. At that conference, most of the Javanese and European speakers – especially Radjiman Wediodiningrat and Bosch – unequivocally stressed the spiritual value of these monuments – 20 years before Soekarno echoed the same sentiments in his Prambanan speech.²² In his formal reaction to Berlage, Bosch further elaborated this viewpoint on the meaning that Hindu and Buddhist monuments held for the Javanese: 'The deeper meaning of [these] buildings [...] lies in the awesome, ennobling, inspiring force that comes from them and that has an effect on those Javanese who are susceptible to it, that is for the moment only the most developed [Javanese]'. He reproached Berlage for viewing this issue from a Dutch-centred perspective. While complete architectural examples of almost every epoch were found in the Netherlands, this was not the case in Java.

In Holland one can afford the luxury 'to keep what is left'. In Java one remains poor if one would act upon such a device. If the Archaeological Service would succeed in [...] returning the old lustre to a few monuments in decay, through which we can talk louder and more convincingly about times of glory gone by, [the Service] would taste the satisfaction of having contributed to the cultural awakening [*bewustwording*] of the Javanese people.

Therefore, Bosch pleaded emphatically for the interests of the Javanese cultural elite to be taken seriously in the discussion of restoration politics in the Indies.²³

In line with Bosch's argumentation the restoration committee decided in 1926 that, in view of the cultural and religious-philosophical values of the Hindu and Buddhist monuments on Java as well as overt Javanese cultural awakening, apart from preservation, reconstruction should also be the responsibility of the Archaeological Service.²⁴ The Service and its Dutch and Indonesian employees further developed their restorative technique at Prambanan in the decades that followed. With this technique, known in

²² The so-called *prae-adviezen* (propositions) presented at that conference, by Bosch, Radjiman and the architect and expert on Majapahit H. Maclaine Pont, were published in *Djâwâ* 1924:4. The architect Wolff Schoemaker (1924) disagreed. He asserted that the Javanese were not competent and he emphasized Indian authorship of the Hindu monuments in Java. He withdrew from participation.

²³ ANRI, KBG, DIR 1026, Bosch to the director of the Department of Education and Religion, 10-3-1924.

²⁴ *Hindoe-Javaansche monumenten* 1926:51; *Verslag* 1926:11-2. For the final report, see ANRI, KBG, Varia 0043, 'Vertrouwelijk verslag van de commissie van advies inzake de restauratie der Hindoe-Javaansche Monumenten, nopens reconstructie van de Çiwa-tempel te Prambanan', 11-12-1926.

archaeological circles as 'anastylosis' (the Dutch used the term 'reconstruction'), the Archaeological Service of the Dutch East Indies set an influential and meaningful example for the French in Indochina, who sent architect and director of the École française d'Extrême-Orient's Conservatoire d'Angkor Henri Marchal in 1930 to the Dutch East Indies to learn about it and to apply it in Angkor.²⁵ Significantly, the Archaeological Service of the Dutch East Indies institutionalized specific colonial restoration ethics that differed from those followed in the Netherlands.

'Cultural awakening' and colonial archaeology

As several authors have discussed, in the 1910s a generation of smart young nationalists from Java and Sumatra became fascinated by images of the old Hindu and Buddhist empires that had ruled the archipelago ages ago – images that fired their imagination of a great national Indonesian future.²⁶ Significantly, their insights into this history were initially gleaned from the publications and maps of (likewise young and smart) Dutch and French archaeologists and philologists. Less is known (or written) about how interventions at archaeological sites at the time impacted on the Indonesian regional or nationalist imagination. There are several examples that show how site-related interventions triggered forms of local or national self-awareness.

News of the government's decision to invest in the restoration of Borobudur (in the wake of the installation of the Archaeological Commission in 1901) reached readers of the (government-supported) Sumatran journal *Insulinde*, a Malay-language monthly that advocated local progress and modernity. According to the author of the article 'Boro Bodoer, Biara dan Batoe bertoelis' Borobudur was presumably built by Hindus who came from abroad. They also built the *biara* (cloister) in Padang Lawas and wrote the text on the *Batoe bertoelis* (Engraved stone) in Tanah Darat, both located in Sumatra. It was hard to imagine monuments that remained intact for a thousand years but the builders of Borobudur succeeded in constructing such monuments. The proof of the preciousness of Borobudur also lay in the fact that parts/copies of the temple were put on display at the Great Exhibition in Paris (by which the author meant the world exhibition in 1900) and museums elsewhere in Europe. If the government decided to embark on the care and conservation of Borobudur, then, he concluded while expressing a regionalist Sumatran concern, the antiquities in Sumatra deserved the same attention.²⁷

²⁵ Clémentin-Ojha and Manguin 2001:96-7; Edwards 2007:160.

²⁶ Leclerc 2000; Reid 1979, 2011; Noer 1979; Supomo 1979; Van Miert 1995:29-31; Wood 2005:37-55.

²⁷ *Insulinde* 10, January 1902:404-5.

Soekarno's story, as he recounted it during the inauguration of the Śiwa temple in 1953, about the pride he felt when he saw Prambanan and Borobudur at the age of nine, may have been apocryphal, but it is imaginable. This would have been in the year 1909, when a Dutch engineer, Th. van Erp, was in the midst of 'his' four-year restoration project at Borobudur (1907-1911), a project that may have attracted the interest of any young girl or boy at the time.²⁸ In 1918 prince Mangkunegara VII in Solo, a passionate researcher and collector of remains of the Javanese Hindu past, when he heard that Perquin had conjectured in a drawing 'how the Loro Jonggrang temple may have looked like', made his way in excitement to Prambanan with his wife, urging Perquin to view the reconstruction and to show him around.²⁹ As already mentioned Kromo Adinegoro, the *regent* of Mojokerto, founder and honorary curator of the Museum of Antiquities at his residence, played an active role in the archaeological research in this area, thereby stimulating interest and participation from the local population. Adinegoro claimed that all *regenten* of Java descended from the last king of the Majapahit empire, Browidjojo V.³⁰

Sumatran nationalists were inspired by the projects of the Archaeological Service as well. The archive of the Sumatran nationalist and historian Yamin, Indonesia's Minister of Culture and Education in the early 1950s, reveals that at some time Yamin researched and happily borrowed photographs from the archive of the Archaeological Service, to document his biography of Gajah Mada and 6000 years of the red and white national banner, the sacred Merah Putih. In an archaeological finding of a small stone image, excavated near Trowulan, Yamin officially recognized the face of Gajah Mada. He must have been inspired by a casual remark by the self-taught archaeologist F.M. Schnitger (born in Malang, East Java) that this small stone image 'might be a portrait of Gajah Mada. The most powerful face, which looks at us from Javanese history'.³¹ Another Sumatran nationalist, Sanusi Pané, wrote a poem in which he assumes the pose of Edward Gibbon, musing as he sits among the ruins of Majapahit, sad about the tedious present, and wondering when the grandeur and beauty of 'ma patrie' (my homeland) would return.³² Sanusi

²⁸ Two poetic reactions to Borobudur are found in Noto Soeroto 1916.

²⁹ Mangkunegara VII to Perquin, 12-2-1924, in: Arsip Mankunegaran, Solo, Correspondence Mangkunegara VII, inv. no. P 29.

³⁰ Kromo Djojo Adi Negoro 1913; Von Römer 1918:176.

³¹ Schnitger 1932. On this history, see 'Salah Tafsir Wajah Gajah Mada', *Suara Karya*, 27-9-1984. This image features on the frontispiece of Yamin's often reprinted biography of Gajah Mada (first published in 1945). The nationalist painter Henk Ngantung 'humanized' (in the words of S. Koperberg) the portrait in a painting in the early 1950s – which Soekarno immediately bought. This image, which since then has been endlessly reproduced as the icon of Indonesia's military police, became Gajah Mada – despite Indonesian archaeologists denying that there was proof of Gajah Mada's portrait. On the painting of Ngantung, see Koperberg 1954.

³² Published in Sanusi Pane 1957:36. Quoted (in the translation of the French linguist L.C. Damais), in Leclerc 2000:30.

Pané wrote this in 1929-1930, most probably inspired by the excavations, restoration and reconstruction works that the Archaeological Service had been carrying out in the area of Trowulan since the 1910s. Archaeological activities in Trowulan gathered greater momentum at the end of the 1920s, when, based on a reconstruction (on paper) by architect Maclaine Pont, excavations were carried out in the area to relocate the centre and settlements of a city-state.

Finally, staff members of the Archaeological Service actively stimulated the popularization of archaeological cultural knowledge among the educated indigenous elite: lectures with *lichtbeelden* (slides) of restoration works and temples, given by prominent Dutch colonial archaeologists during the 1910s-1930s, apparently drew response from Indonesian students; at least the lively lectures by the physically imposing Van Stein Callenfels did. In March 1919 he toured around Java to promote and find support for the work of the Archaeological Service. His lecture in Madioen, which dealt with the history of Java, and the how and when of the Hindu monuments and statues, was attended by enthusiastic Indonesian students from the OSVIA. According to a local reporter these students listened enthralled and they found his exposition of great importance.³³

These diverse examples indicate how site-related interventions, archaeological sites and archaeologists were used as tools to give concrete form and content to local and national(ist) imagination, tools with which a nationalist elite, from diverse backgrounds, actually connected and associated in colonial society. As Bosch's standpoint in the restoration discussion clearly shows, Dutch archaeologists and philologists who worked at the Archaeological Service were at the time well aware of the political curiosity towards archaeological findings in the Dutch East Indies, within and outside the Indies: for not only Indonesian nationalists, but also Indian scholars, sometimes operating within the framework of the Greater India Society (founded in 1926), were interested. Building on an older archaeological tradition in India the latter were in search of the remains of the Indian civilization in the archipelago, which would confirm the idea of the spread of a benign and high Indian civilization, or Greater India.³⁴ In his inaugural lecture at the University of Leiden, Krom, the first head of the Archaeological Service, remarked in 1919 to his learned audience that it was not only interesting to ask what Hindu culture had meant for the archipelago in the past but also at present. He referred to the inclination of 'certain groups', to use the old Hindu civilization that once made Java great, as the basis for a new indigenous national development for the future. He added that while one could either applaud

³³ *De Locomotief*, 10-3-1919, 14-3-1919.

³⁴ For a critique, see Bernet Kempers 1937. On Indian archaeologists and this Greater India perspective, see De Casparis 1954:629-33; Basa 1998. On the political visions and tools of knowledge of the Greater India Society, see Bayly 2004. See also Ramstedt 2011.

or reject this movement, academics had to remain neutral in any case, but he also stressed that one of their tasks was to search for and provide solid knowledge in this field, which besides scientific utility also had a remarkable 'practical side' (Krom 1919:32-3).

In the same lecture Krom referred to the Indonesian contribution to the Service's research itself. He welcomed the growing interest and cooperation in recent years from Indonesians from a higher educated aristocratic background as a positive development. He described this as a matter of interdependence: on the one hand there were Indonesians who were eager to know more about a past of which they vaguely knew, and on the other hand the endeavours of the Service which were enhanced by the close ties of Indonesians with their Javanese ancestors and by their knowledge of Javanese culture (Krom 1919:10).

The picture of interdependence becomes less idyllic when we look at the hierarchy within the Archaeological Service: the head was Dutch, the staff was completely Dutch, the leading guards at Prambanan and Borobudur were Dutch, three additional administrators/advisors were Dutch and even the third-ranked secretary, who signed much of the Director's correspondence, was Dutch. The 25 Indonesians that worked at the Archaeological Service in the last year before the Japanese occupation filled the lower ranks – the highest ranked Indonesian was the construction supervisor, Samingoen, in charge of overseeing the work at the Śiwa temple. The archaeologist Bernet Kempers (1954:483), who joined the Service in the 1930s, clarified this typical colonial situation with a typical colonial explanation: there were no Indonesians who had the academic training to fill the higher ranks or join the academic staff, and the pioneers who did, philologists Poerbatjaraka and Hoesein Djajadiningrat, were actually not archaeologists. Interdependence, as portrayed by Krom, and the racial hierarchy reflected upon by Bernet Kempers, in the Archaeological Service exemplified a key element of colonial state formation: cooperation with the local elite on which the colonial state depended and at the same time a racial hierarchy that generated and consolidated ethnic distinctions (compare Cooper 2005:22-3).

While Krom (talking to a Dutch audience) seemed to have spoken from the ivory tower of academics – he observed the interest, but did not take it seriously – his junior and successor Bosch was more radical. Ironically, Bosch took the Indonesian interest in pre-colonial antiquities so seriously, that he used it to legitimize a colonial heritage policy in favour of reconstruction. In that sense, Indonesian nationalists played a significantly influential role in the decision of the restoration committee to undertake not only restoration but also reconstruction as part of the Archaeological Service's responsibilities and tasks – a decision that would have a tremendous effect on post-colonial Indonesian heritage politics.

Archaeological sites and regime change in the 1940s

The Japanese regime did not bring about radical change in the aims, research focus and activities of the Archaeological Service.³⁵ Under a slightly different institutional structure, and – after the internment of all Dutch civil servants in April 1942 – a new Direction, the Archaeological Service, could continue the kind of site-related conservation and construction work which it had started in the 1930s. In need of archaeological and technical expertise, specifically in relation to the Hindu and Buddhist monuments on Java, the Japanese, in August 1942, temporarily released a few Dutch archaeologists from detention, commissioning them to continue their more narrowly described job.³⁶ Samingoen, who before the Japanese occupation had been a technical supervisor at the Archaeological Service's architectural office at Prambanan, became the new executive director. Sohamir – an ITB student trained by the architect Thomas Karsten – returned as technical supervisor.

In the first 10 months after the occupation, under the military regime, the Service's two offices (the main office in Batavia and the technical office at Prambanan) were cut off from each other, and the office at Prambanan was moreover split over different districts. At the end of 1942 the newly installed civilian regime arranged that both offices, as separate institutions, fell under Bunkyo Kyoko (the central Department of Education) in (what was now designated) Djakarta: the office in Djakarta under the new name of Kobijitu Kenkyu Sho and the office at Prambanan as Buseki Fukkya Koji Jimmu Sho. The first Japanese chef at the Department of Education was a linguist, Kayashima, and later on Isyima took over. The office at Prambanan also fell under the responsibility of the Sultanate in Yogyakarta. A third institution that came under the Bunkyo Kyoko and that had an interest in archaeological findings was the museum of the Royal Batavian Society, under the new name Hakubutukan and directed by R. Kinoshita (*Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1948:20-1).

After a caesura of almost all site-related activities shortly after the Dutch capitulation, the Service resumed conservation work in Java at a *kraton* (Ratu Boko), two temples (Candi Plaosan and Banjunibo) and the grave of one of the legendary nine founders of Islam (*wali sanga*) in Java, Sunan Drajat. During this

³⁵ This confirms the findings of recent research on archaeology in authoritarian regimes, which indicate that regime change does not immediately lead to new forms and practices of archaeology. For a collection of relevant and comparable case studies, see Galaty and Watkinson 2004.

³⁶ One of them was Stutterheim, who was commissioned to write a report on the conservation policy concerning Borobudur. He died in September 1942, leaving a 'Nota on the upkeep and repairs (restoration) of Old-Javanese monuments' – which we are still unable to locate. Others were the architect P.H. van Coolwijk who in the 1930s had also supervised the reconstruction work at the Siwa temple. He had to elaborate on the inventory of literature on Hindu and Buddhist monuments; and the archaeologist A.N.J. Thomassen à Thuessink van der Hoop, who would continue curatorial work at the museum in Batavia (renamed Djakarta), *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1949:49-50.

period the reconstruction of the Śiwa temple remained a top priority. This was the only project that was not interrupted, even in the chaotic period of March 1942.³⁷ Reports on archaeological findings written by the Kobijitu Kenkyu Sho and sent to the Hakubutukan, indicate that outside Java only privately initiated research or excavations took place; reports of which were also made.³⁸

Clearly, the new regime, as well as Japanese officials with a great interest in historical/archaeological matters, paid special attention to the work of the Archaeological Service and at Indonesian archaeological sites. The Japanese *resident* in Kedoe, Furusawa, tried to control the activities of the office at Prambanan. On his own initiative he conducted research at Borobudur, and uncovered again, half a century after J.W. IJzerman did so, the so-called Hidden Foot, making two reliefs and a hitherto unknown inscription visible. Apparently under the protest of Indonesian servants of the office at Prambanan, but with the technical help of this office, he arranged that these reliefs remained on display for visitors.³⁹ The Japanese head of the office in Prambanan, accompanied by Soehamir, often went to check on the progress of the work at the Śiwa temple; he also undertook the translation into Japanese of Krom's *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis* which was then (and now) recognized as a standard work, the obligatory introduction for all those who wanted to study the Hindu and Buddhist past of the archipelago. Furusawa did so with the help of Dutch-German and German-Japanese dictionaries.⁴⁰ While we intend to investigate this period further, these endeavours can partly be understood within the context of Japan's plans for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere as well as the propaganda of and search for a larger Asian cultural identity (Mark 2006, 2010:350-9; Koschman 1997:83-103). We also have indications that personal religious interests were at stake.

Japanese interference in the Archaeological Service and archaeological sites in Indonesia was reinforced by propaganda (including a movie on the reconstruction works at the Śiwa temple and a newsreel on the visit of the

³⁷ Report of Soehamir, in *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1948:24.

³⁸ For as far as we have collected material on this, see: ANRI, KBG, DIR 1109, several reports of found objects, offered to the museum in 1943; Arsip Mangkunegaran, Solo, Correspondence Mangkunegara VII, nr. M 52-5, Mangkoenegara VII to Mrs. Moens, 26-9-2602 [1942], about the discovery of golden Buddha statues in Palembang.

³⁹ *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1950:22; Soekmono 1992:12. News about Japanese theories of the background of the hidden foot was published in: 'Keterangan baroe tentang Borobodoer', *Kita-Sumatoro-Sinbun: Soerat Kabar Harian*, 12-2-1944.

⁴⁰ Report by Van Romondt on 1942-1945, in *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1949:49-50. Van Romondt had not seen the translation. We have yet to find it. Soehamir, in his report on the Archaeological Service during the Japanese occupation, mentioned that there were no publications during that period, *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1950:22, 40. It is likely that the translation of Krom's introduction is an unfinished ideal, in view of the Japanese capitulation and subsequent developments which put an end to this ambitious project.

Singapore-based Japanese field marshal Terauchi to Borobudur).⁴¹ Organized school visits to sites, another form of propaganda introduced by the Japanese regime, may have had an interesting side effect: a wider Indonesian engagement with these sites as Indonesian or local heritage.⁴² A reorganization of the system of guarding and surveillance of archaeological sites may have had the same effect. During this period, the indigenous administration was made responsible for reporting (twice a year) on the situation at the site, and of cleaning and guarding them (*Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1950:22-3) unlike previously, when guards were paid by the Archaeological Service to do so. This can be seen as an efficient way of involving people outside the official and professional sphere of heritage politics, and familiarizing them with the notion of heritage within regional borders, whether it be 'Asian', 'national' or 'regional'.

The period of war and revolution, which followed the Indonesian Declaration of Independence and the capitulation of Japan, exerted a great impact on the structure, research subjects, and site-related activities of the Archaeological Service. Even in this chaotic period archaeological research, conservation and reconstruction work continued. It is an indication of the legitimizing power that was related to the 'care' for archaeological monuments, not only by the colonial state but also by the Republic. During this period there were in fact two Archaeological Services. One was the Djawatan Purbakala (later Dinas Purbakala), owned by the Republic, and set up in Yogyakarta by the Ministry of Education and Culture in February 1946. Soehamir became the Executive Director, assisted by the philologist Poerbatjaraka. The other was, the 'Dutch colonial' service, which had its office in Batavia, with Van Romondt as Executive Director, until Bernet Kempers took over in 1947. Both Services tried to continue their work as far as war and civil war permitted. For the Dutch Service, formally denied access to the *candi*-rich domain of the Republican's Service, this more or less meant that the focus of interest and excavation and conservation activities moved eastwards, where they set up an office in Makassar (later under the charge of C. Krijgsman), and worked mainly in Celebes and they also conducted investigative expeditions to Bali. The Republican Service, further interested in 'Indonesian origins', extended paleontological research activities in the Sangiran River; and it continued, among other things, the work at Ratu Boko. During Soehamir's tenure, it continued the reconstruction of the Śiwa temple – the summit of archaeological

⁴¹ The Japanese Propaganda Service (Senden Bu) made a documentary on the reconstruction of the Śiwa temple. *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1950:40. We are still searching for this film. It is not in the collection of Japanese propaganda films of the NIOD. The film on Terauchi's visit is at the Beeld en Geluid Instituut, Hilversum, the Netherlands (hereafter BG), Collection Rijksvoorlichtingsdienst, no. 2731, 'Japans Journaal' (1943).

⁴² In 1954 C. Krijgsman noticed a remarkable interest of the population in new excavations and archaeological sites, which he described as being much more crowded than before the war. He attributed this partly to the organized school visits to local sites (Last 1954:1142).

conservation skills (*Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1949:24-7, 36-7).

Of course military clashes and the civil war took their toll on the Service's endeared objects in the area around Yogyakarta. In early 1949 the office at Prambanan was looted in the chaotic period after the second 'clash': many unpublished reports and drawings, the work of years, were lost. Snipers had used the scaffolding around the Śiwa temple as their operation base; bullets had damaged the temple; the statues of Bogem were blown up. The ravages of war at Borobudur were however negligible. The nearby *pasanggrahan* was completely ruined, but this sparked off site-related excavations in an area that the Service had not yet touched. Bernet Kempers's sadness about the loss of all the work carried out by the office in Prambanan is understandable, but the significance of the damage done to the sites is ambivalent. The ensuing damage and destruction retarded the reconstruction of the Śiwa temple, but it also gave rise to heritage concerns (Bernet Kempers 1954:491).

Professional relationships between the two offices in 'Yogyakarta' and 'Batavia' in this period of revolution and military clashes became sensitive, and sharpened in the process of separation/detachment. To cite an example: the Dutch specialists at the Service in Batavia, who during this period communicated indirectly with the Republican Service, saw the proof of the Śiwa's temple's growing progress shortly after the ending of the first military clash – from a photograph (Bernet Kempers 1954:487). Against such a background of strained professional communication, Republican leaders and newspapers consciously used archaeological sites for propaganda purposes, not only for the local public – with *pemuda* posing in a picture in *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, under *sang merah putih* in front of Borobudur – but also earlier for foreign journalists and an international (American) public.⁴³ F.M. van Asbeck, advisor of Lieutenant Governor-General H.J. van Mook, describes in his diary how he, on 4 May 1946, went to watch Republican propaganda movies (made for the American public) at the Rijksvoorlichtingsdienst in Batavia, movies about Borobudur and Prambanan. Ironically, footage of the monuments was accompanied by Beethoven's Fifth Symphony and a Menuet by Mozart, apparently appealing to a general idea of a universal civilization. Van Asbeck was ambivalent about the effect:

Smart recording, suggestive, especially for America, but it also gives you a hang-over, for example messing about with stones at Prambanan; when you think of all the patience and deep thinking we invested in all the restored temples.⁴⁴

⁴³ 'Para wartawan loear negri melihat pemoeda', *Soeara Merdeka*, 9-2-1946; 'Di kaki Boroboe-doer', *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, 12-3-1947; 'Borobodoer', *Pandji Ra'jat*, 1-8-1947. (All three articles refer explicitly to the use of Borobudur as a special training area for the Indonesian *pemuda* fighting for the Free Indonesian Republic.)

⁴⁴ Diary of F.M. van Asbeck, 4 May 1946, Private archive of Elsbeth Locher-Scholten (translation MB); for this movie, see BG, no. 2960. Camera C.H. Breyer.

In terms of political choices there were some personal twists. The Dutch epigrapher Johannes G. de Casparis, working for the Dutch Colonial Service, exchanged archaeological information with a highly interested Soekarno during the tumultuous year of 1948, and took the side of Indonesian nationalists in 1949 (Gomperts and Klokke 2003:474-5). Even when the tide turned definitely in favour of the Republic in 1949, political sensitivity remained high; looking back Bernet Kempers realized that the way to forge collaboration with the Indonesian Dinas in Yogyakarta was not to go over and 'inspect' as he had done in 1949, by which he gave the impression of paternalistic intervening/meddling in Republican affairs, but to do so at the invitation of the Republic, for example to teach at UGM. He received this invitation in 1950, a few months after the transfer of sovereignty.⁴⁵

At the level of knowledge exchange and learning, interdependence and intellectual relations improved after 1950, perhaps also because there was so much at stake. Future heads of the Indonesian Archaeological Service Soekmono and Ms Soerjono Soerjo (later Suleiman) joined the staff at the office in Batavia, and continued their studies which they had begun before the war. Both completed their studies under Bernet Kempers in 1953. By then, in the year of the inauguration of the Śiwa temple, the Indonesian Archaeological Service also got its first Indonesian director: Soekmono, who was later to become inextricably associated with the restoration of Borobudur under the auspices of UNESCO.

Indonesian archaeological sites in the 1950s: International and local perspectives

Against the background of the national consolidation of archaeological research in the 1950s under the purview of the Archaeological Service/Dinas Purbakala, it is evident that the local and international dimensions of heritage politics in Indonesia were transformed as well. On the one hand there was the development of international heritage politics under the auspices of UNESCO, as well as the stimulation of international tourism, both of which were initiated in this period. These international developments made 'Indonesia' and its national archaeological monuments more visible on the world map.⁴⁶ On the other hand, such phenomena raised questions about the Indonesian

⁴⁵ Bernet Kempers 1954:492. Compare the report 'Het oudheidkundig instituut en de verschillende deelstaten en autonome gebieden. Strikt vertrouwelijk, 16-X-'47', in which Van Romondt follows more or less the same line of argument: as long as the Republican Service remained convinced that the Dutch Service wanted to play the leading role, cooperation would never work, he argued, in Archive Van Romondt, KITLV H 1139, 10.

⁴⁶ For a more extensive discussion of the international dimensions of post-colonial Indonesian heritage politics until the 1990s, Bloembergen and Eickhoff forthcoming

character of national monuments. Whose heritage was to be admired, preserved and reconstructed: that of a pan-Asian civilization, that of a universal civilization, a once greater Indonesia, or local concerns?

In the 1950s the Dinas Purbakala was relatively small. However in the ensuing period (1970s-1990s) it set up offices in all provinces of Indonesia. Building on an already existing structure and supported by the Royal Batavian Society's successor, the Djawatan Kebudayaan, it oversaw a wide area. It had a main office in Jakarta, an Architectural Department (Seksi Bangunan) in Prambanan, a local office (originally for East Indonesia) in Makassar, and semi-formal local offices in Mojokerto (East Java) and in Bali (Pejeng, Gianyar). Besides the architectural section, special sections specializing in prehistory and epigraphy were set up. The Dinas continued to publish, albeit with delays, the *Oudheidkundige Verslagen*, now known as *Laporan Tahunan Dinas Purbakala*, and it launched other journals such as the *Berita* and *Amerta*. The irregular publication of these serials reflected the economic and political malaise afflicting the period. The journals contained research reports by old Dutch and new Indonesian scholars, who pursued academic and research queries of the 1930s, covering all fields of archaeology, from palaeontology and prehistory (in Sumatra, Java, Bali, Flores and Sulawesi), to the epigraphic and archaeological study of Islamic graves (in Sulawesi) and Hindu and Buddhist remains (in Java as well as Sumatra), as well as the preservation of colonial remains such as Fort Rotterdam in Makassar.⁴⁷

Against the background of decolonization, support for the nationalist cause and uneasiness about the colonizing role of the West, the old question regarding the way the 'Indianization' of the archipelago had evolved became a topic of interest again. The Austrian art historian Robert Heine-Geldern, who had conducted prehistorical research in the Dutch East Indies in the 1930s, inspired the British archaeologist-historian H.G. Quaritch Wales to coin the notion of 'local genius' as a (fragmented) force in the local adaptation of Indian influences in Southeast Asia; Bosch, the former head of the Archaeological Service, in his inaugural lecture at the University of Leiden in 1946, emphasized the role of clerks instead of Brahman warriors as transmitters of Indian culture, pointing to indigenous forces that interacted with these external civilizational forces and created new cultural expressions. These – in the words of Bosch – reflected local cultural styles 'fecundated' by external Indian elements. And Bosch, as he compared the impact of 'Indianization' with that of Dutch colonialism, stressed that it was the spiritual value underlying these cultural expressions that would matter and endure.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ For a critical summary of the publications by the Dinas Purbakala in the 1950s, see Damais 1963.

⁴⁸ Heine-Geldern 1945:152-3; Quaritch Wales 1951; Bosch 1952, 1961 (the English translation of Bosch 1946).

With regard to conservation policies, it seems ironic that already in 1948 the Republican Archaeological Service had searched for the assistance of foreign, notably Indian conservation experts. The Service commissioned two young Indian experts from the Indian Department of Archaeology, K.R. Srinivasan (Superintendent of the Sub-department of the Central Circle) and C. Sivaramamurti (Superintendent of the Indian Museum of Calcutta), to investigate and estimate whether, and how urgently the Borobudur was in need of a second restoration. Looking back, Soekmono, in his farewell speech at the University of Indonesia in 1990, typified this moment as a major step for what he described as typical Indonesian 'rescue archaeology': the fact that the young Indonesian Republic took this step, in the midst of armed struggles, was, according to him, convincing proof that 'the Indonesian people', even 'under the toughest conditions' would take care of their cultural heritage (Soekmono 1990:3, 1995:11).

Whether the Indian delegation held the same interpretation as Soekmono seems doubtful. For the Indonesian Dinas, the findings of this Indian mission apparently never led to any concrete use.⁴⁹ Sivaramurta however later on published a book (translated into French with the support of Musée Guimet in Paris) in which he, with a peculiarly India-centred interest in connections, compared details of the Borobudur reliefs to old Indian art (Srinivasan 1950; Sivaramamurta 1961). The Indian archaeological interest here must have been dual-faceted; for they belonged to a tradition of Indian archaeologists and epigraphers who in the 1920s, with the idea of 'Greater India' in mind, were primarily interested in identifying the Indian influence in the Indonesian archaeological remnants. And these also fitted in with Nehru's pan-Asianist ideals.⁵⁰ Incidentally, the Director-General of the Indian Archaeological Service, N.P. Chakravarty, who was in Nehru's entourage when he visited Indonesia in 1950, also conducted research in Prambanan and Borobudur (*Laporan* 1952:13).

In 1954 Indonesia signed the International Convention and Protocol for the Convention of Armed Conflict that, ironically enough, was held in The Hague. According to the young Soekmono, this event stressed the fact that there were many sites in Indonesia that had the potential of becoming Indonesian national monuments; and for which it was extremely important to receive international protection in times of war.⁵¹ In 1955 the Indonesian

⁴⁹ Anom (2005:54) argues that the mission's report never reached the Indonesian authorities and that the documents got lost in the renewed armed conflict: only three months after this Indian mission was completed the Dutch army invaded Yogyakarta. The library of the India-oriented Kern Institute in Leiden has, however, a copy of the report of the mission (Srinivasan 1950) submitted to the Indian government in 1950.

⁵⁰ For the influence of the Greater India thinking on Nehru's post-independence pan-Asian ideals and the formation of the Non-Alignment movement under Indian leadership, as well as on the continuing interest of the Greater India Society in shared (racial and cultural) origins of Indonesia and India, see Bayly 2004:729, 735-40.

⁵¹ In *Laporan Dinas Purbakala* (1954) 1962:7.

government approached UNESCO for help in the restoration of Borobudur. This was a preamble to the highly publicized Save Borobudur campaign by UNESCO that started at the end of the 1960s. Indeed the restoration took place under the new Suharto regime, but previous regimes had clearly prepared the way.⁵²

At the local level, heritage interests may at times overlap and provide ballast to boost nationalist identity politics and archaeological professional aims. Here we cite the example of Pura Sada, an old temple in Kapal, South Bali. The Archaeological Service's professional conservation (and reconstruction) concerns surrounding this temple – formerly the main temple of the Mengwi kingdom, but, since the end of the nineteenth century part of the kingdom of Badung – seemed to clash with sentiments on the ground. According to the local people, restoring the Pura Sada meant meeting present-day local religious needs and notions of beauty. Both the Service and the inhabitants of Kapal, who were responsible for the maintenance of the temple, were however united by the same motive, at least, that was how the Service's engineer-in-charge, Krijgsman, understood it – the acknowledgment of the Pura Sada as significant 'heritage'. However, both differed with regard to how this should be expressed: where the Balinese wanted renewal, the Service aspired towards restoration to the original state.⁵³

Elsewhere in South Bali, in Gianyar, at the sites of Goa Gajah and Gunung Kawi (dating from the pre-Majapahit era) the work of the Service initially aroused suspicion among the local population, but in the end, when the projects were completed, these were greeted with great enthusiasm by thousands of spectators who attended the inauguration (Last 1954:1142). Moreover, local inhabitants in Gianyar, notably in the villages of Pejeng and Bedulu, were actively involved in the archaeological activities of the Service, as were their fathers in the 1930s. This was the area, rich with old stone images, where Stutterheim had done systematic research, on the basis of which he located the centre of pre-Majapahit, Hindu kingdoms in Bali. This was significant counterfactual evidence that repudiated the idea – predominant among scholars since Raffles proposed it in 1815, and popular in Bali as well – that the Hindu culture in Bali should essentially be considered as a continuation of the Majapahit empire (Bernet Kempers 1991:84). In the 1950s Krijgsman chose Pejeng – the house of the village head – as his operational centre.

⁵² We will discuss UNESCO's Save Borobudur project, and its legacies in Indonesia (and elsewhere) in more detail in Bloembergen and Eickhoff forthcoming. For a recent official, general overview of this project, see Anom 2005.

⁵³ Krijgsman to Van Romondt, 8-1-1949, Archive Van Romondt, KITLV H 1139, 17. Krijgsman quoted in an essay by Last 1954:1142. Grader 1949:412-5; *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1950:13-5; Bernet Kempers 1954:508, 1991:105-6. In January 2010 the results of the ambivalent restoration policies concerning this temple were still visible in the different styles of the *prasada* and the Candi Bentar.

Some of the children and grandchildren of the Balinese staff who worked for Krijgsman, and who are now professional archaeologists affiliated with the Archaeological Department of Udayana University, the Balai Arkeologi (Archaeological Research Centre) in Denpasar, and with the Archaeological Museum and Conservation Department (the Balai Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala Bali, BP3, installed in Pejeng in the 1970s) still remember the tall 'pak Krisman' as a sociable, talkative man who, like Stutterheim, had done great work to relocate, conserve and restore the remains of the old, pre-Majapahit, pre-Javanese temples and kingdoms of Pejeng.⁵⁴

Localized and disconnected from Java as some of the archaeological activities in Gianyar in the 1950s may have been, national interest in those projects was clearly strong: Soekarno, accompanied on one occasion by Nehru, followed the work-in-progress of the Service in Bali with great interest, informally and officially. And the Balinese school visits to these sites in the early 1950s – by bus – were modest but significant forerunners of present-day organized school trips and local and guided tours for international tourists to the old sites of Bali's precious heritage and symbols of Indonesia's unity in diversity.⁵⁵

Conclusion

We took the Śiwa temple's inauguration in December 1953 as a milestone in post-independent Indonesian archaeological heritage politics. But how new and how thoroughly modern and national is this site, and by the same token, Indonesian heritage projects?

In an important way 'the colonial' lived on in the silhouette of the Śiwa temple: the colonial Archaeological Service, by deciding on 'pro' reconstruction as a principle possibility in restoration politics, and by developing related techniques and skills, provided an important basis for future Indonesian archaeological research projects, restorations and reconstructions. These forms of site interventions are crucial for convincing visualizations of the past, be it a local past or a national past.

A further sign of continuity was the fact that until 1957 Dutch archaeologists, epigraphers and engineers carried on working for the Indonesian Archaeological Service, teaching at UI, UGM and Institut Teknologi Bandung

⁵⁴ Interviews with archaeologist and former head of the Balai Arkeologi in Den Pasar Anak Agung Oka Astawa (Den Pasar, 28-1-2010 and Bedulu, 18-2-2011), and Ida Bagus Wayahan Bun, preacher (*pedanda*) and archaeologist connected to Udayana University (Pejeng, 21-2-2011). The issue of archaeology in Pejeng and the colonial legacy will be discussed as a separate topic in our forthcoming monograph.

⁵⁵ Krijgsman to Van Romondt, 6-4-1954, Archive Van Romondt, KITLV H 1139, 17.

(ITB), or researching in the field, and publishing in the Service's *Berita*. Although they left in 1957 their teachings and writings were formative for the first and second generations of Indonesian archaeologists.

On the other hand, although the Śiwa temple was in the eyes of some Dutch and Indonesian archaeologists a good example of Dutch-Indonesian collaboration, this notion was hardly mentioned in the speeches of nationalists on the meaning of the temple, nor was it discernible in the way these speeches were reported in the national press in 1953. Republican leaders easily detached colonial connotations accompanying archaeological sites and appropriated these sites for modern Indonesian heritage politics. Neither then nor later on were their grand visions of history hindered by the paradoxes, insecurities, contradictions or lack of proof surrounding these sites. In that sense, to them, sites were 'not a problem' (to paraphrase historian and ambassador Sunario in a comparable context) (Leclerc 2000:43). Material proof and visualizations were useful if these illustrated Republican leaders' vision, less important were the actual, up-to-date academic interpretations and readings of these sites. Yamin pronounced the *topeng* found at Trowulan to be Gajah Mada. Soekarno made the Śiwa temple a spiritual, intangible national heritage. In that sense, Benedict Anderson's remark (1990:179-81) about the Indonesian new regime's need to neutralize Buddhist statues at Borobudur needs to be reconsidered. Soekarno, as well as other Javanese and Sumatran political leaders whose national consciousness was formed in the 1910s-1930s, at least, had no problem with Hindu or Buddhist statues.

Academic archaeological interests, as well as local, inter-Asian and global appropriations did not necessarily overlap with the purposes of nationalist heritage politics, as the examples of Bali and the Indian delegations may illustrate. However, to bolster this aim of national heritage development, and in return for state support, the Indonesian government pro-actively called in the expertise of the Archaeological Service, in terms of both research and conservation skills. The mission of the Archaeological Service to South Sumatra in 1954 may serve as a final example. Commissioned by the Minister of Education, Yamin, this mission aimed to investigate the location of the centre, the range and the boundaries of Sriwijaya. The Service, on its part, also used this mission to probe new aerial investigation techniques. It did so by airplane, delivered for free by the new national Garuda Indonesian Airlines.⁵⁶ In that respect, both research quests dating from old colonial times and modern surveillance techniques provided by 'the new independent 1950s' were important for transforming archaeological sites into modern Indonesian heritage.

⁵⁶ *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954, no. 36-37:1168; Soekmono 1955:2. On technical professionalization of archaeological research in this period, see Tanudirdjo 1995.

References

Unpublished sources

Arsip Mankunegaran, Solo
Correspondence Mangkunegara VII

Arsip Nasional Indonesia, Jakarta
Archief Bataviaasch Genootschap
Archief Algemeene Secretarie

Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Leiden
Archief V. van Romondt, H 1169

Private Archive E. Locher-Scholten
Diary F.M. van Asbeck

Published sources

Ali, Daud

- 2009 'Connected histories? Regional historiography and theories of cultural contact between early South and Southeast Asia', in: R. Michael Feener and Terenjit Sevea (eds), *Islamic connections: Muslim societies in South and Southeast Asia*, pp. 1-24. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. [ISEAS Series on Islam.]

Anderson, Benedict R.O'G.

- 1990 'Cartoons and monuments: The evolution of political communication under the New Order', in: Benedict R.O'G. Anderson, *Language and power: Exploring political cultures in Indonesia*, pp. 152-93. Ithaca, NY/London: Cornell University Press. [Wilder House Series in Politics, History and Culture.]
- 1991 *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised and extended edition. London/New York: Verso. [First edition 1983.]

Anom, I.G.N.

- 2005 *The restoration of Borobudur*. Paris: Unesco.

Ayatrohaedi (ed.)

- 1985 *Kepribadian Budaya Banga (local genius)*. Jakarta: Dunia Pustaka Jaya.

Basa, Kishor K.

- 1998 'Indian writings on early history and archaeology of Southeast Asia: A historiographical analysis', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 8-3:398-410.

Bayly, Susan

- 2004 'Imaging "Greater India": French and Indian visions of colonialism in the Indic mode', *Modern Asian Studies* 38-3:703-44.

Bernet Kempers, A.J.

- 1937 *Cultural relations between India and Java*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- 1954 'Oudheidkundig werk in Indonesië na de oorlog', *Indonesië* 7:481-513.
- 1955 'Prambanan 1954', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 111:6-37.
- 1978 *Herstel in eigen waarde: Monumentenzorg in Indonesië*. Zutphen: Walburg.

- 1991 *Monumental Bali: Introduction to Balinese archaeology and guide to the monuments*. Singapore: Periplus.
- Bloembergen, Marieke and Martijn Eickhoff
forthcoming 'Save Borobudur! The moral dynamics of heritage formation in Indonesia across orders and borders, 1930s-ca. 1990', in: Michael Falser (ed.), *Proceedings of the 'Rebirthing Angkor' Conference*, Heidelberg, 8-10 May 2011. Springer Publishers.
- Bosch, F.D.K.
1922 'Het restaureeren van Hindoe-Javaansche bouwwerken', *Djâwâ* 2-14.
1946 *Het vraagstuk van de Hindoe-kolonisatie van den Archipel*. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese. [Inaugural Lecture, Leiden University, 15-3-1946]
1952 'Local genius en Oud-Javaanse kunst', *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie der Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde: Nieuwe reeks*, deel 15, No. 1, 1-25.
1961 'The problem of the Hindu colonisation of Indonesia', in: F.D.K. Bosch, *Selected studies in Indonesian archaeology*, pp. 3-22. The Hague: Nijhoff. [KITLV, Translation Series 5.]
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine and Pierre-Yves Manguin
2001 *A century in Asia: The history of the École française d'Extrême-Orient 1896-2006*. Singapore: Didier-Millet.
- Cooper, Frederick
2005 *Colonialism in question: Theory, knowledge, history*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Damais, L.C.
1963 'Publications du Service Archéologique de l'Indonésie', *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 51-2:535-82.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita
2007 *A world history of nineteenth-century archaeology: Nationalism, colonialism, and the past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Oxford Studies in the History of Archaeology.]
- Edwards, Penny
2007 *Cambodge: The cultivation of a nation, 1860-1945*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Forster, Harold
1989 *Flowering lotus: A view of Java in the 1950s*. Singapore: Oxford University Press. [First published 1958.]
- Galaty, Michael L. and Charles Watkinson (eds)
2004 *Archaeology under dictatorship*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Gerretson, C.
1955 'Prambanan voltooid: Monument van Nederlands-Indonesische samenwerking'. *De Telegraaf*, 7 May.
- Glover, I.C.
2003 'National and political uses of archaeology in South-East Asia', *Indonesia and the Malay World* 31-89:16-30.
- Gomperts, Amrit and Marijke J. Klokke,
2002 'In memoriam J.G. de Casparis: 31 May 1916 – 19 June 2002', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 159:471-87.

- Grader, C.J.
1949 'De rijkstempels van Mengwi', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (TBG) 83:394-423.
- Guha-Thakurta, Tapati
2004 *Monuments, objects, histories: Institutions of art in colonial and postcolonial India*. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Heine-Geldern, Robert
1945 'Prehistoric research in the Netherlands Indies', in: Pieter Honig and Frans Verdoorn (eds), *Science and scientists in the Netherlands Indies*, pp. 129-67. New York: Board for the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
- Hindoe-Javaansche monumenten*
1926 'De Hindoe-Javaansche monumenten: De arbeid der Restauratiecommissie', *Djāvā* 6:51-2.
- Koperberg, S.
1954 'Pelukis2 Indonesia', *Mimbar Indonesia* 22 (29-5-1954):22-24
- Koschman, J. Victor
1997 'Asianism's ambivalent legacy', in: Peter J. Katzenstein and Takashi Shiraishi (eds), *Network power: Japan and Asia*, pp. 83-110. Ithaca, NY/London: Cornell University Press.
- Krom, N.J.
1919 *De Sumatraansche periode der Javaansche geschiedenis*. Leiden: Brill. [Inaugural lecture, Leiden University.]
- Kromo Djojo Adi Negoro
1913 *Eene schets van de wajang poerwo en naar aanleiding hiervan het een en ander over de wajang gedek – wajang kroetjil, gamelan en gamelan melodieën – kris-sen en andere wapens*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1916 'Eene beknopte handleiding voor het onderzoek naar de hindoe- en boeddhabeelden'. [Typoscript.]
- Laporan Dinas Purbakala*
1952-62 *Laporan tahunan. Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia*. Djakarta: n.n.
- Last, Jef
1954 'Omwervingen met de archeologische dienst op Bali', *Cultureel Nieuws Indonesië* 1954:1037-1146.
- Leclerc, Jacques
1973 'Sentiment national et revendication territoriale en Indonésie', *La Pensée* 169:57-69.
- 2000 'Remarques sur l'ideologie du territoire nationale en Indonésie', in: Françoise Cayrac Blanchard, Stéphane Doyt and Frédéric Durand (eds), *Indonésie: Un demi-siècle de construction nationale*, pp. 15-48. Paris: Harmattan. [Originally published in *Culture et Développement* 7-2, 1975, pp. 283-317.]
- Manguin, Pierre-Yves
2000 'Welcome to Bumi Sriwijaya or the building of a provincial identity in contemporary Indonesia', in: Françoise Cayrac Blanchard, Stéphane Doyt and Frédéric Durand (eds), *Indonésie: Un demi-siècle de construction nationale*, pp. 199-214. Paris: Harmattan.

- Mark, Ethan
2006 "'Asia's" transwar lineage: Nationalism, Marxism, and "Greater Asia" in an Indonesian inflection', *The Journal of Asian Studies* 65-3:461-93.
- 2010 'Intellectual life and the media', in: Peter Post, William H. Frederick, Iris Heidebrink and Shigeru Sato (eds), *The encyclopaedia of Indonesia in the Pacific War*, pp. 348-63. Leiden/Boston: Brill. [Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 3, Southeast Asia 19.]
- Miert, Hans van
1995 *Een koel hoofd en een warm hart: Nationalisme, javanisme en jeugdbeweging in Nederlands-Indië, 1918-1930*. Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw.
- Muussens, Martha A.
1924 'De restauratiekwestie', *Djâwâ* 4:77-98.
- Noer, Deliar
1979 'Yamin and Hamka: Two routes to an Indonesian identity', in: Anthony Reid and David Marr (eds), *Perceptions of the past in Southeast Asia*, pp. 249-62. Singapore: Heinemann. [Southeast Asia Publications Series 4.]
- Noto Soeroto
1916 'De Boro-boedoe', in: Noto Soeroto, *De geur van moeders haarwring*, pp. 40-1. Deventer: Van Hoeve.
- Quaritch Wales, H.G.
1951 *The making of Greater India: A study in Southeast Asian culture change*. London: Quaritch.
- Ramstedt, Martin
2011 'Colonial encounters between India and Indonesia' *South Asia History and Culture* 2:522-39.
- Reid, Anthony
1979 'The nationalist quest for an Indonesian past', in: Anthony Reid and David Marr (eds), *Perceptions of the past in Southeast Asia*, pp. 281-98. Singapore: Heinemann. [Southeast Asia Publications Series 4.]
- 2011 'The quest for an Indonesian past', in: *To nation by revolution: Indonesia in the 20th century*, pp. 123-151. Singapore: NUS.
- Römer, L.S.A.M. von
1918 'Iets over het congres voor de Javaansche cultuurontwikkeling', *Wederopbouw* 1:165-97.
- Sanusi Pane
1957 *Madah Kelana*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Schmitger, F.M.
1932 'Gajah Mada', *Nederlandsch-Indië: Oud & Nieuw* 16-10:289-93.
- Singh, Upinder
2004 *The discovery of ancient India: Early archaeologists and the beginnings of archaeology*. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Sivaramamurti, S
1961 *Le stupa du Barabadur*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Soejono, R.P.
1969 'The history of prehistoric research in Indonesia to 1950', *Asian Perspectives*, 12:69-91.
- Soekmono, R.
1946a 'Sedjarah dan pendidikan nasional', *Pantja Raja* 1:103-4.

- 1946b 'Kepentingan peninggalan leloehoer kita', *Pantja raja* 1:149-50.
- 1955 'Kissah perdjalanen ke Sumatra Selatan dan Djambi', *Amerta: Warna Warta Kepurbakalaan* 3:1-40.
- 1955-61 *Pengantar sedjarah kebudayaan Indonesia*. Djakarta: Penerbit Nasional Tri-karya. Three vols.
- 1986 *Archaeologie zoals die beoefend wordt in Indonesië*. Leiden: n.n. [Inaugurele rede, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 28-11-1986.]
- 1990 *Langkah pemerintah tahun 1948 dalam bidang kepurbakalaan: Landasan untuk pengembangan arkeologi Indonesia*. [Depok]: [Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Indonesia.] [Kuliah perpisahan disampaikan dalam rangka Dies Natalis Universitas Indonesia ke-40, Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 5 Maret 1990.]
- 1992 'Sedikit riwayat: 50 years archaeological research', in: R.P. Soejono (ed.), *50 tahun Lembaga Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional 1913-1963*. Cetakan kedua, pp. 1-25. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional. [First edition 1976.]
- Srinivasan, K.R.
- 1950 'Barabudur. A report on its conditions in 1949. In two parts. Submitted to Government of India – Ministry of Education'. [Typoscript.]
- Supomo, S.
- 1979 'The image of Majapahit in later Javanese and Indonesian writing', in: Anthony Reid and David Marr (eds), *Perceptions of the past in Southeast Asia*, pp. 171-85. Singapore: Heinemann. [Southeast Asia Publications Series 4.]
- Tanudirjo, Daud
- 1995 'Theoretical trends in Indonesian archaeology', in: Peter J. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in archaeology*, pp. 61-75. London: Routledge.
- 2011 'Entering the post-colonial: Changing perspectives in the Borobudur heritage management'. Paper, Sites, Bodies, Stories Conference, Yogyakarta, 14-16 January.
- Verslag*
- 1926 *Verslag van de commissie van advies inzake de restauratie der Hindoe-Javaansche monumenten, nopens de reconstructie van de Çiwatempel te Prambanan*. Weltevreden: Kolff.
- Wolff Schoemaker, C.P.
- 1924 *Aesthetiek en oorsprong der Hindoe-kunst op Java*. Semarang: Van Dorp.
- Wood, Michael
- 2005 *Official history in modern Indonesia: New Order perceptions and counterviews*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Yamin, Mu.
- 1954 'Tjandi Loro Djonggrang', *Budaya* 12:5-10.