



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The shadow continuum : testing the records continuum model through the Djogdja Documenten and the migrated archives

Karabinos, M.J.

Citation

Karabinos, M. J. (2015, June 17). *The shadow continuum : testing the records continuum model through the Djogdja Documenten and the migrated archives*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33293>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33293>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/33293> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Karabinos, Michael Joseph

Title: The shadow continuum : testing the records continuum model through the Djogdja Documenten and the migrated archives

Issue Date: 2015-06-17

Chapter I:

Introduction

A: Origins

This project evolved from an interest in the effects of colonialism on recordkeeping. The initial exploration began at the Nationaal Archief (National Archives of the Netherlands). There I viewed records related to cooperation with the Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (National Archives of Indonesia, ANRI). Within these records I came across letters written in the mid-1970s from the director of ANRI to the Dutch government requesting a group of records known as the *Djogdja Documenten*. These records had been seized by the Dutch military thirty years earlier during the fight for Indonesian independence. Within a year of first reading these letters I learned of administrative records of 37 former colonies that had been found in London after fifty years of being hidden in a Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) storage facility. Known as the Migrated Archives, they were now being moved to The National Archives of the United Kingdom. These new revelations and discoveries shifted the focus of my research towards ‘missing’ or lost archival collections.

Both of these archives can be considered ‘non-traditional’ in their creation as archival collections. The individual records that form the archives were all created as a result of government business and are therefore similar to numerous other records in archives around the world. However, what makes both cases unique is their custodial history after their initial creation. For the *Djogdja Documenten* it was the decision of the Dutch military to seize certain records for intelligence purposes while leaving others behind. The Migrated Archives are the result of colonial administrators around the world making the decisions to either destroy, send to London, or leave records behind for the successor state prior to independence. The Migrated Archives are the records that were sent to London, where they became a single archive.

This research coincided, time-wise, with the public disclosure of sensitive records by Wikileaks. Contemporary secret records became a major news story, and my interest in records that exist but are unseen grew. In the age of Wikileaks and

information hidden because it is deemed ‘embarrassing’ or potentially useful to ‘enemies’, I was drawn to historical examples of such thought. Keeping certain records out of public view is not unique to contemporary society. Some of the same rationalization can be seen in the historical case studies of this dissertation as in the contemporary examples of the leaked Iraq and Afghanistan War documents, the leaked American diplomatic cables, as well as the National Security Agency surveillance exposure.

B. Research Question

Inaccessible or secret records, however, are not enough on their own to comprise an entire research project. My interest was particularly in those records which were intentionally removed from location to another. I began to think of these records in terms of records models and became interested in how a period of ‘silence’ in the archive could be represented in such models.

In the late twentieth-century Australian archivists created a new way to visualize recordkeeping in the digital world. This model, known as the records continuum model (or simply continuum model), was meant to remove the space-time constraints of a record. In the development of the continuum model no final answer has been given on how universally applicable the model is. Questions such as whether the continuum model is culturally dependent, or if all records can be interpreted using it, are still left open.

I therefore am left with three major research questions that will lead me through my work. Are there situations in which the model is not applicable? If so, what is the source of these situations being outside the continuum model’s applicability? And finally, what can be done to rectify such situations? The two case studies will allow me to deeply analyze the continuum model and its ability to interpret the nature of records.

C. Outline

Before the case studies can be analyzed I will embark upon a survey of literature on other missing or displaced archival collections and interpret them using the continuum model. Chapter II introduces such collections, both contemporary and historical. Starting with Jeanette Bastian's work on the records of the United States Virgin Islands, through seized and destroyed records of the Second World War, and ending with the recent American invasion of Iraq and the case of the Baath Party records, I will note certain elements in order to differentiate various categories of missing archives. The continuum model will then be used to interpret these examples in the same way it will for each case study in the later chapters.

Chapter II also outlines my concept of the shadow continuum. The shadow continuum was developed for cases where continuum model dimensions are followed but happen in a secretive manner, unknown to those outside the process. I link the need for the shadow continuum to the reliance of the continuum model on an open and accessible society and archive.

Chapter III looks at the *Djogdja Documenten* from before the individual records were created through the seizure by the Dutch military. I will give a background on Dutch military intelligence in Indonesia, as well as the political situation during the Indonesian Revolution. Included is an overview of what information the Dutch were looking for in the records they seized.

Chapter IV continues with the *Djogdja Documenten* but instead focuses on the period after they were sent to the Netherlands. This chapter covers the political climate in post-independence Indonesia under Sukarno, and the shifts in ideology and diplomacy following the rise of Suharto in the mid-1960s. The cooperation between Indonesia and the Netherlands, and how it relates to archives and the *Djogdja Documenten* in particular, is covered by this political background. Chapter IV ends with an analysis of the *Djogdja Documenten* through the continuum model, in the same vein as the examples in Chapter II.

Chapter V begins the case study of the Migrated Archives, focusing solely on the records from Singapore and Malaysia. The chapter is a background on the

decolonization process and a literature review of the Migrated Archives. The review consists of each major academic study done thus far on the Migrated Archives, as well as an overview of coverage in the British press.

Chapter VI contextualizes the Migrated Archives in history and archival science. It begins with a look at the contents of the records and follows that with the study of two particular events that led to the creation of many records that can be found in the Migrated Archives: the Malayan Emergency and the creation of Malaysia by merging Malaya with Singapore, Sarawak and North Borneo (now Sabah). Most of the available literature on the Migrated Archives is not from archival scholars, and this chapter puts the Migrated Archives in the context of archival discourse. It covers the archival concepts of appraisal and selection, provenance and finally ends with analyzing the Migrated Archives through the continuum model.

D. Research Methods

The literature review of previous cases of missing or displaced archives in Chapter II was conducted through research in archival journals and major publications. I began with well-known cases, such as those surrounding the Second World War, where numerous records and other cultural artifacts were seized. From there I was able to find other similar cases, especially those discovered during or dating from the early twenty-first century. For each case I looked for similarities that could help me create critical elements of the different categories of missing archives. This would help me determine when, if ever, the universality of the continuum model was not applicable.

The research for my two case studies involved both archival and literature research. Archival research meant going to archives in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Singapore and Indonesia to not only see the collections in question, but also to view records that make reference to them such as newspaper articles, correspondence between government ministries and intra-departmental notes on their removal. Literature research on the case studies was done for their few mentions in previous research—either research about the cases or those using the collections as primary resources. Further research was done to place the collections

in their historical context of the decolonization of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. The majority of research was done at the national archives of the Netherlands, Indonesia, the United Kingdom and Singapore. Further work was done at the International Institute of Social History (Amsterdam), the KITLV archive (Leiden, the Netherlands), the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Netherlands Royal Library), the British Library and the National Library of Singapore.

E. Geographic Concentration and Definitions

Concentration on Singapore and Malaysia as a pair within the Migrated Archives is due to the related history of the two countries—Singapore was one of the three British colonies joined with Malaya to become Malaysia before it left the federation after two years. Singapore and Malaysia also offer a larger geographic scope that permits the dissertation to study archives and decolonization in the region. Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia have a long historical relationship, and references to Malaya and Singapore are made in the *Djogdja Documenten*, while references to Indonesia are made in the Migrated Archives.

The terminology regarding the two case studies also needs clarification. The *Djogdja Documenten*, starting in the 1960s, when work on their return began, through today, are most often known by some variation of one or two names. The first is *Buitgemaakte Archieven*, the Dutch phrase meaning ‘seized (or captured) archives’. At times this phrase is used by Indonesian archivists in correspondence with their Dutch counterparts, though it begins to fall out of favor after progress is made in their repatriation. The second most often used phrase is one that alludes to Yogyakarta, the city from which they were seized.¹ Yogyakarta is often shortened to Yogya, Jogja, or Djogja. I have chosen the spelling Djogdja for *Djogdja Documenten*, for as rare as it may be, it is how the Arsip Nasional refers to them today in their

¹ I will use the contemporary full English and Indonesian spelling of Yogyakarta when referring to the city. The spelling ‘Djogdja’ will only be used in conjunction with ‘*Documenten*’ as a proper noun. Alternative spelling (Djogjakarta, Djogja, Jogjakarta and Jogja) will be kept in quotations, as will Yogya.

inventory. The phrase Migrated Archives, though not an original or specific phrase for the records in question, has become the preferred name for these archives by The National Archives, UK, and the academic community which have written on them thus far. For that reason I have decided to continue using the phrase, with capital letters, to describe those records which were created during the colonial period by British colonial administrations around the world, sent to the Colonial Office just prior to independence, and subsequently hidden for fifty years until their discovery at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office warehouse facility at Hanslope Park in 2011.²

I use the phrase ‘decolonization process’ to describe when these archives were created as I believe it is the simplest way to label this period. I consider decolonization to be the process of removing and deconstructing the colonial system in a country. Both the former colonizer and colonized play a role, and it continues after independence—as examples in both cases will show. In both cases the archives were created during this process. The *Djogdja Documenten* were seized after the Republic of Indonesia had declared independence, though the country was not yet recognized by much of the international community. The Migrated Archives were created while the British were orchestrating the independence of Malaya and the creation of Malaysia, thus also placing them within the decolonization process.

I will also need to clarify word choice over the terms ‘archive’ and ‘record’. Most European traditions, unlike that of the United States, do not differentiate between the two linguistically. The Dutch *archieff* (plural *archieven*) means both records chosen for historical preservation, and those not chosen. To make it clearer, I will use the terms record and records to describe all ‘process-bound information’ managed by some organizational system, regardless of the decision made to preserve them for historical use.³ I will use archives to refer to groups of records as one archival collection. Archive will, of course, also refer to the institution and

² The Foreign and Commonwealth Office is the result of the merger of the Foreign Office and the Commonwealth Office, itself a successor to the Colonial Office.

³ Theo Thomassen, ‘Archivists Between Knowledge and Power: On the Independence and Autonomy of Archival Science and the Archival Profession’, *Arhivski Vjesnik*, no. 42 (1999), 165.

building that holds records for historical use and access.

F. Records Models

As the dissertation will be a study of the records continuum model, it is necessary to explain the source of the model. Models exist to explain and to simplify. Archivists have developed models because they are ways of visualizing a record—its nature, how it was formed and what can be expected after it is formed. Models take complex ideas and visualize them in a way that is recognizable and appealing. There are currently two major records models: the records continuum model and the records life cycle model. The records continuum model is seen by its proponents as an alternative or replacement for the records life cycle.⁴ The life cycle still functions as the main model used for understanding the nature of a record among many, particularly in the United States.

The life cycle model breaks a record down into three distinct stages that distinguish records from archives. The first stage is the active stage, when records are created and actively used by the creating agency. In the second stage, the dormant stage, records are no longer of current use. The third stage is when records become archives, being stored and preserved for future use.⁵ Prior to the archival stage is the selection and appraisal process, where records are discarded or 'advanced' to the archival stage.

According to the life cycle model, records are those used by the creating institution, whereas archives are those chosen from the larger group of records to be kept for historical preservation. The inability of the life cycle model to be applied to cases of missing or removed archives is exposed when the only things that can

⁴ Recent overviews of records management that describe the continuum model as a replacement of the life cycle model include:
 Patricia C. Franks, *Records and Information Management*, London: Facet Publishing, 2013 and
 Elizabeth Shepherd and Geoffrey Yeo, *Managing Records*, London: Facet Publishing, 2003.

⁵ Terry Cook, 'What's Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift', *Archivaria*, no. 43 (Spring 1997), 17-62.

happen to a record after it is created are its destruction or its placement in an archival institution.⁶

The work of archivists like Theodore Schellenberg and Margaret Cross Norton led to the development of the life cycle model—with the idea that archivists should be at the decision-making stage that separates records to be destroyed from archives to be preserved. This view of the archivist's job, and the life cycle model that came with it, was developed in part from Norton's observation on the growing problem of creating agencies' inability to preserve all their records and to make determinations on what should be kept.⁷

This perspective was in direct contrast to the philosophy of early twentieth century British archivist Sir Hilary Jenkinson. Part of the Jenkinsonian approach to archives is that rather than archivists, the records creators perform the appraisal step. Archivists instead should take a passive, custodial role in the protection, conservation, and storage of records.⁸ However, both archivist-as-custodian and archivist-as-appraiser lead to a similar 'cycle' approach, the major difference being who acts as appraiser of records. In both, records are separated between the 'current' and the 'historical'. This approach is seen as the beginning of the division between the management of records and archives into two distinct fields.⁹

The name life cycle is in some ways a misnomer. In the life cycle records move in one direction towards destruction or preservation, and there is little to suggest any cycling back to the start. Lane and Hill have called it 'a linear [model] in which records progressively work through usefulness until they degrade into uselessness and death which becomes synonymous with the archive. As such it only offers one temporal dimension of existence for the archive'.¹⁰ This one-directional aspect of the

⁶ For an in-depth look at the creation of both the life cycle and continuum models, see Glenn Dingwall, 'Life Cycle and Continuum : A View of Recordkeeping Models from the Postwar Era', *Currents of Archival Thinking*, Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil, eds, Santa Barbara, USA: Libraries Unlimited, 2010, 140.

⁷ Cook, 'What's Past is Prologue', 26.

⁸ Ibid., 22-26.

⁹ Xiaomi An, 'An Integrated Approach to Records Management', *The Information Management Journal*, (July/August 2003), 27.

¹⁰ Victoria Lane and Jennie Hill, 'Where do we come from? What are we? Where are we going? Situating the archive and archivists', in *The Future of Archives and*

life cycle would lead in part to the records continuum.

G. The Records Continuum

The records continuum model (Fig. 1) grew out of the work of Peter Scott, Jay Atherton and, later, Frank Upward.¹¹ The development of records continuum theory was the result of work over many decades by various archivists, but the model itself is generally attributed to the work of Frank Upward of Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. Upward took the pre-existing concept of the records continuum and created the visual model. His model, and the growth of continuum theory in general, was partly a response to the increase of electronic records through the 1980s and 1990s, which changed the way decisions were made regarding creation and preservation of records. The life cycle, according to continuum theory, no longer served its old purpose.¹²

The records continuum as a theory was conceived as a way of re-connecting the two aspects of a record that were separated in the life cycle model. A distinction between records and archives no longer mattered. The continuum model, according to Upward, takes the idea of the continuum 'beyond metaphor' and shifts how information professionals treat records.¹³

Recordkeeping: A Reader, Jennie Hill ed, London: Facet Publishing, 2011, 14.

¹¹ Cook, 'What's Past is Prologue', 17-62; Sarah Flynn, 'The Records Continuum Model in Context and its Implications for Archival Practice', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 22, no. 1 (2001), 79-85; Frank Upward, 'The Records Continuum', in Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds.) *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, Wagga Wagga, Australia: Centre for Information Studies, 2005, 197-222.

¹² Frank Upward, 'Structuring the Records Continuum – Part One: Postcustodial Principles and Properties', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 24, no. 2 (1996), 268-285.

¹³ Frank Upward, 'Modelling the continuum as paradigm shift in recordkeeping and archiving processes, and beyond – a personal reflection', *Records Management Journal*, vol. 10 no. 3 (2000), 125.




Fig. 1. Original Records Continuum model. Copyright Frank Upward (1996).

Rather than being linear, the continuum model attempts to show the fluid nature of records.¹⁴ Upward has stated that part of the reason why he developed the model was to create 'a way of graphically representing the moving out from an initial communication which occurs in recordkeeping'.¹⁵ The initial communication is the creation of the record, and the continuum model is meant to visualize creation at the

¹⁴ The use of both words—'records' and 'archives'—is still seen in records continuum theory, however.

¹⁵ Frank Upward, 'Structuring the Records Continuum, Part Two: Structuration Theory and Recordkeeping', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 25, no. 1 (1997). Also available at < <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/groups/rcrg/publications/recordscontinuum-fupp2.html> >

nexus of recordkeeping.¹⁶

It is important to note the difference between the records continuum and the continuum model. The records continuum relates to recordkeeping and records management. The model, on the other hand, is meant to help understand and describe the nature of records using records continuum theory. I believe that certain misunderstandings of what the model is capable of come from conflating a new style of records management with the explanatory model meant to represent it.

Upward denotes four 'dimensions' to the continuum model that he names create, capture, organize and pluralize. These dimensions are not necessarily in temporal order. Creation, for instance, 'recursively occurs in places of situated action. Historical recordkeeping tasks, for example, create the record anew'.¹⁷ In this dissertation I will use the term 'initial creation' to clarify when I mean the first instance of creation of a document. An update to the continuum model which slightly adjusted the names of the four dimensions was developed after Upward.¹⁸ However, I will keep with the four names as initially conceived, as even the most recent literature on the continuum model is fairly standardized in its use of Upward's original terminology. Defining the four dimensions is fundamental to interpreting the continuum model and, in turn, continuum theory in general:

The first dimension (1D), creation, is present when information is initially recorded. It is the beginning of a process—the action that leads to a record. Reed refers to it as 'the locus of all action' and refers to the recorded information at this point as 'documents', not yet managed as a record. It can also refer to re-creation, the start of a new process.¹⁹ This definition is extremely important in continuum thinking, as changes in context reflect re-creations.

¹⁶ Barbara Reed, 'Reading the Records Continuum: Interpretations and Explorations', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 1 (May 25), 18-43.

¹⁷ Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, 'Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces', 199.

¹⁸ 'Australian Contributions to Recordkeeping', *Understanding Society Through Its Records*, <http://john.curtin.edu.au/society/australia/index.html> (accessed 3 June 2014).

¹⁹ Barbara Reed, 'Reading the Records Continuum: Interpretations and Explorations', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 1 (May 2005), 20.

Capture, the second dimension (2D), occurs when documents are integrated into an institution's records management system. The record is now working in tandem with other records. Metadata is created and the record begins to take on a greater context.

The third dimension (3D), organization, is the process of turning a record into a part of a larger whole. The record is now part of an archive collection. Reed refers to this as 'the dimension of "the archive" or "the fonds"'.²⁰

Pluralization, the fourth dimension (4D), refers to the process that makes a record seen and used by those outside the smaller organization of the third dimension.²¹ It is the dimension of access, and of the historian and other researchers. McKemmish and Upward have both used the phrase 'collective memory' to refer to the fourth dimension.²² Using a phrase without an agreed upon definition like 'collective memory' may add to confusion, but it is meant to imply that the record is being used by those outside the recordkeeping organization.

Aside from the four dimensions in the continuum model, Upward also names four 'axial elements': transactionality, identity, evidentiality and recordkeeping containers. Transactionality is 'related to records as products of activities'. Identity is 'related to the authorities by which records are made and kept, including their authorship, establishing particularities of the actors involved in the acts of records creation, the empowerment of the actors and their identity viewed from broader social and cultural perspectives'. Evidentiality is 'related to the records as evidence with integrity and continuity', and recordkeeping containers relate 'to the objects we create in order to store records'.²³

Barbara Reed describes how records 'transition' from one dimension to the next.

²⁰ Ibid., 20.

²¹ Ibid., 20.

²² Sue McKemmish, 'Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Continuum of Responsibility', Proceedings of the Records Management Association of Australia 14th National Convention, 15-17 Sept 1997, RMAA Perth 1997. Frank Upward, 'Structuring the Records Continuum, Part One: Postcustodial Principles and Properties'.

²³ Frank Upward, 'The Records Continuum', in Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds.), *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, Wagga Wagga, Australia: Centre for Information Studies, 2005, 202.

Somewhat contradictorily she also states that a 'record exists at the same time in all dimensions, but in our day to day working lives we tend to focus on specific views suited to our particular circumstances of employment'.²⁴ She sees the third dimension as 'the dimension of the "archive" or the "fonds", the whole, extant or potential, of all of the records of an organisation cumulating to form organisational or personal memory'.²⁵ The fourth 'represents the capacity of a record to exist beyond the boundaries of a single creating entity' and ensures 'that records are able to be reviewed, accessed'.²⁶

Upward states that the model focuses 'on the recursivity of the processes involved in the formation of archives'.²⁷ He also notes the connective nature of the dimensions, that the fourth dimension 'will become little more than wishful thinking if divorced from the other three dimensions, and without it they in turn are potentially pernicious', referring to the fact that '[p]luralization is needed to provide the kind of archival neutrality that can be achieved through the coexistence of different viewpoints'.²⁸ Upward acknowledges the explanatory nature of the continuum model, while also noting that its biggest draw is also its simplest: its ability to create a 'layered and interconnected model for the ongoing management of systems and the formulation of strategies and tactics'.²⁹

H. Limits to the Records Continuum Model

Within the rich literature on the continuum model, criticism of it is generally difficult to find. But, as one might expect, the best place to find it is in the same country as its invention. In his book *Archives and Societal Provenance: Australian Essays*, Michael Piggott, an Australian archivist and contemporary of Upward, McKemmish, and Reed, sees the confusion surrounding the continuum model to be

²⁴ Reed, 'Reading the Records Continuum', 20.

²⁵ Ibid., 19.

²⁶ Ibid., 19.

²⁷ Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, 'Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces', 216.

²⁸ Ibid., 227.

²⁹ Upward, 'Modelling the continuum as paradigm shift'.

the source of many of its problems. Piggott states, '[t]he core texts are not always easy to understand [...] Yet even those well versed in the professional literature sometimes struggle to comprehend the intended meaning of continuum writing'.³⁰ Furthermore, he calls the continuum model an 'abstraction', one which must 'take its chances' due to its reliance 'on the viewer to draw a correct inference'.³¹ By this he means the description of the continuum model can be so confusing and vague that the onus is on the reader to make conclusions on what the model attempts to do. He is specifically referring to the image of the continuum model, the concentric circles and words floating throughout.

Piggott also mentions the model's inability to describe 'the role of records and recordkeeping in society; their true context'.³² Piggott makes mention of sweeping broad claims made by archivists—including one in a book he co-edited—such as 'there is no area of human activity not shaped in the most fundamental ways by the archival storage of information', but concludes that the continuum model is not a theory that can explain or prove such claims.³³

The continuum model is often lauded for its universality, but simply saying something is all-encompassing and actually being all-encompassing are two vastly different things. This criticism is echoed by Piggott, who says that '[t]he repeated assertion that the model is a worldview, that it can be read into any era, that it is era independent and relevant across cultures has never been seriously tested, by its supporters or anyone else'.³⁴ This draws attention to the severe lack of critical debate on the continuum model after its initial development. Following the formative years in the mid-1990s when the continuum model was being developed in Australia, its acceptance has become a foregone conclusion, without any substantial tests of the lofty claims put forth by its defenders.

A tendency to include hyperbolic and untested statements is common when

³⁰ Michael Piggott, *Archives and Societal Provenance: Australian Essays*, Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2012, 180.

³¹ Piggott, *Archives and Societal Provenance*, 183.

³² *Ibid.*, 187.

³³ *Ibid.*, 188.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 185.

discussing the model. For instance, Piggott recalls how various articles have referred to the continuum model as ‘a device, a tool, a paradigm, a theory, a metaphor, a model, a logical model, a space/time model, a space/time construct [...] a method of thinking [...] a concept and a view’.³⁵ Hence Piggott’s note on the ‘importance of clear articulation’.³⁶

While calling for tests of the continuum model and its universality, Piggott offers no suggestions of what such a test should look like, only that ‘something more substantial is needed’ than what currently exists.³⁷ No consensus exists in continuum literature or its criticism as to what a test of the continuum model would look like. This dissertation represents only one type and may not necessarily be the optimal way to test the universality of the continuum model. I describe the case studies in detail and test their applicability to the continuum model at each dimension. I made the decision to make the dimensions the central focus of my test because the fluid “movement” of records between dimensions is a major feature of the continuum model and is seen as an upgrade over the one-directional aspect of the life cycle model. Focusing on how the records fit into each dimension is also a previously standardized method of describing records using the continuum model.³⁸

Though I only use two case studies from very specific situations, this work is meant to begin the critical evaluation of the continuum model and its worldview assertion. Like Piggott I am not opposed to the concepts behind the records continuum theory or the claim that it successfully unifies records and archives management. The test focuses solely on the universality of the continuum model and its applicability.³⁹ I will pay particular attention to the idea that the continuum model is both transepochal and cross-cultural.

³⁵ Piggott, *Archives and Societal Provenance*, 183.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 175.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 185.

³⁸ Frank Upward, Sue McKemmish, and Barbara Reed, ‘Archivists and Changing Social and Information Spaces’, 197-237.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 185.

