

Pekka Henttonen<sup>1</sup>

## ARCHIVES AND PUBLIC AGENCIES IN FINLAND – A RELATIONSHIP IN TRANSFORMATION

### Abstract

**Purpose:** *The article analyzes how relationship between the National Archives and Finnish public agencies has changed over the course of history.*

**Method/Approach:** *The study looks the relationship as a question of power balance. It is based on research publications and professional literature.*

**Results:** *The relationship has fluctuated considerably. The power of the National Archives expanded first from archives as a physical end-product to records management, and then from management of records processes to planning phase preceding records creation. Now the National Archives is returning to a narrow cultural-historical role as a part of research infrastructure. At the same time, records profession in the agencies is gaining more independence.*

**Conclusions:** *The balance of power between an archival institution and public agencies is not fixed and can have many forms.*

**Keywords:** *archives, records management, archivists, records managers, archival history*

## ARCHIVI E AGENZIE PUBBLICHE IN FINLANDIA: UNA RELAZIONE IN TRASFORMAZIONE

### Abstract

**Scopo:** *L'articolo analizza come la relazione tra gli Archivi nazionali e le agenzie pubbliche finlandesi sia cambiata nel corso della storia.*

**Metodo/approccio:** *Lo studio considera la relazione come una questione di equilibrio di potere. Si basa su pubblicazioni di ricerca e letteratura professionale.*

<sup>1</sup> Pekka Henttonen (DSocSci, MHist), associate professor, Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences, Tampere University, Finland, pekka.henttonen@tuni.fi.

**Risultati:** *La relazione ha subito notevoli oscillazioni. Il potere degli Archivi nazionali si è espanso prima dagli archivi come prodotto finale fisico alla gestione dei documenti, e poi dalla gestione dei processi di archiviazione alla fase di pianificazione precedente la creazione dei documenti. Ora gli Archivi nazionali stanno tornando a un ruolo storico-culturale ristretto come parte dell'infrastruttura di ricerca. Allo stesso tempo, la professione di archivista nelle agenzie sta guadagnando maggiore indipendenza.*

**Conclusioni:** *L'equilibrio di potere tra un'istituzione archivistica e le agenzie pubbliche non è fisso e può avere molte forme.*

**Parole chiave:** *archivi, gestione dei documenti, archivisti, gestori dei documenti, storia degli archivi*

## ARHIVI IN JAVNE AGENCIJE NA FINSKEM – ODNOS V PROCESU PREOBRAZBE

### **Izveleček**

**Namen:** *Članek analizira kako se je skozi zgodovino spreminjal odnos med nacionalnim arhivom in finskimi javnimi agencijami.*

**Metoda/pristop:** *Študija obravnava odnose kot vprašanje ravnotežja moči. Temelji na raziskovalnih publikacijah in strokovni literaturi.*

**Rezultati:** *Razmerje je precej nihalo. Moč Državnega arhiva se je najprej razširila iz arhivov kot fizičen končni izdelka področja dokumentologije, nato pa iz vodenja dokumentacijskih procesov do faze načrtovanja pred ustvarjanjem zapisov. Sedaj se Državni arhivi vračajo k ozki kulturnozgodovinski vlogi raziskovalnega infrastrukture. Hkrati se poklic dokumentologa v agencijah vse bolj krepi in dobi na samostojnosti.*

**Sklepi:** *Razmerje moči med arhivom in javnimi agencijami ni definirano in ima lahko veliko oblik.*

**Ključne besede:** *arhivi, dokumentologija, archivisti, upravljavci dokumentov, arhivska zgodovina.*

Archives and public agencies have a multifaceted relationship. There are questions of cooperation and practical aspects. There is legislation that gives a framework for co-operation. There are questions of professional identity and borderlines between records management and archives management. In this article I discuss these issues. Although the focus is on the Finnish recordkeeping, I hope to make some notes that are universal.

One cannot avoid discussion about concepts first. In our minds there is always some conception of what is an “archives.” However, how we conceptualize our environment is culture and language dependent. In these respects, the Nordic countries – Finland, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and Denmark – form a cluster because of their shared history, administrative traditions and (in most cases) language. In this cluster practices, legislation, and concepts are close to each other. In the Nordic countries there are archives inside the agencies. What is “archival” – and what is not – has not been defined by the value of records for permanent retention, age, and use of documents like it is customary in most English-speaking countries. In other words, regardless of age and value even records that are only “moments old” (an expression used by Margaret Cross Norton, in Upward, 2005, 214) and still actively used by the administration are considered as parts of the archives conceptually. Consequently, in Finnish public agencies there are archives and archivists who have records in their custody before transfer to the National Archives. Historically the branch of records professionals working in organizations and serving needs of the records creator is older than the branch working in cultural-historical institutions. (Duranti, 1989). From this perspective, the relationship between a public agency and (its) archives might be seen as an internal administrative affair.

In this article, however, I will ignore this and examine the issue from the perspective of relations between public agencies and “proper” archival institutions. By archival institution I mean here the current National Archives of Finland and its predecessors. From my perspective this is a question of power balance. My argument is that the power of the archival institution expanded over the years because increasing proactive intervention of records professionals was always the solution to problems at hand. Now the tide has turned, and the power is in decline.

## SUPPLIERS AND CUSTOMERS

At the bottom there is always – regardless of concepts, current legislation, existing local practices, professional identities, and distribution of work – a supplier–customer relationship: public agencies create records that are preserved in the archives. Recordkeeping in the agency takes place first, only later comes the archival phase. The “customer” sets, or would like to set, requirements for the goods it is getting. After digitalization it has become generally accepted that the needs of the archives must be considered right from the beginning of the record life cycle. An archives has interest to records it is getting from the administration, but the same is not necessarily true vice versa: serving historical research is rarely paramount to records creator (for example, see Tough, 2004). From records creator’s perspective records management is the primary function: archives are a part of records management, it is the “tail” that should not “wag the dog” (Atherton, 1985 citing Penn 1984; Penn, 1984). One has also argued that involvement of an archival institution in the record creation may actually be against the interest of the institution, for instance, because it endangers evidentiality of the records (Erlandsson, 1996; Tough, 2004).

In Finland for a long time there was no tail to do the wagging. The National Archives of Finland was gradually born in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century from the archives of the Finnish Senate (for a short history, see Rastas, 1999). In this supplier–customer chain the customer became concerned about what the supplier could deliver. In the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, it became obvious that archives were often in poor state in the administration. An example was the archives of the National Board of Customs. It was stored without inventories in disarray in an unlit attic and there was no-one having responsibility for it. In the year 1927 the National Archives adopted a resolution obliging agencies to take care of the archives in their custody (Nuorteva & Happonen, 2016, 154, 156).

Before the first Archives Act in the year 1939 the National Archives had no independent authority in archival issues. Therefore, the resolution (1927) was published in the name of the Finnish Government. The Archives Act (1939) consolidated the power of the National Archives in the field of archives management. The law expressed ongoing concerns about the state of archives. Perhaps the most important regulation was that one could destroy records only with the permis-

sion of the National Archives (6 §). The National Archives was given the right to make inspections and give instructions in archival matters (6 §). It was decreed that records are to be stored in a space that protects them from fire, moisture, and damaging (9 §).

In short, the spirit of the 1939 Archives Act was protective and preventive. Its goal was to ensure that there are records that can be transferred to The National Archives later. The focus was on the archival collection in existence (Nuorteva & Happonen, 2016, 160–164). Correspondingly, the first instructions of the National Archives were about archival storage space in the state and municipal agencies (Valtionarkisto, 1939).

## **EXPANSION OF THE POWER OF THE ARCHIVAL INSTITUTION**

The first Archives Act (1939) started a slow expansion of the power of the archival institution. Kilkki (2020) has analyzed how expertise of records professionals of the National Archives and has been constructed in instructions and regulations. She shows how the expansion took place in three phases. Each stage broadened the area of records professionals' proactive intervention and stated new areas where they were said to have expertise. Proactive intervention of the archival institution was needed because it was always seen as the solution to archival problems at hand. The Archives Act of 1939 marked the beginning of the first phase and legitimized what Kilkki calls "archival discourse." In this discourse the mandate of experts of recordkeeping was confined to the non-current phase of the life span of records. The National Archives could act proactively, but this proactive action was about "how archives were created", in other words, what was the arrangement given to records in the archives of public agencies. Once the records were annexed to an archive began the phase of the record life span that was in the domain of the National Archives (Kilkki, 2020, xiv, 255).

"Recordkeeping discourse" was the next phase that was introduced with the new Archives Act (184/1981). Protecting and preserving records was no longer a burning issue. Instead, the problem was how to limit the influx of records to archives. To solve this problem proactive intervention of the record professionals was extended to the whole record life span starting from the records' creation.

The Archives Statute (1012/82, 6 §) stipulated that every agency must document how records' life cycle is managed in the agency from the creation to disposal. This "archives creation plan" listed record types that are created in the agency. The plan stated which records are to be registered and which are not. It defined retention times, places of storage, access restrictions, arrangement of records, and place in the archival series (if the record type was deemed permanently valuable) (Kilikki, 2020, xv).

Thus, at the second phase focus was shifted from the archives as a (physical) collection and end-product of records processes to the records processes themselves and the whole life span. The authority of the National Archives was now extended to records management (Orrman, 2019a, 80 (orig. 2010)). This shift was accompanied by discussion of how one should group record types in the archives creation plan. The older paradigm, in which records series in a fonds were organized by "record type" (incoming letter, outgoing letter, inventory, and so on) regardless of their content was replaced by a new approach in which the function behind the records' creation was the basis of classification. The advantage of the old paradigm had been that fonds in the National Archives were uniform: every agency had e.g. correspondence, regardless of its functions. Thus, it served more interests of the archival institution than those of the records creator (about discussion, see Jääskeläinen, 2000; Vartiainen, 2002).

This shift from records to functions continued at the third phase, "record management discourse", the beginning of which can be dated roughly to third Archives Act in the year 1994. Now evidentiality of electronic records was seen as the major problem. To solve this problem the scope of records professionals had to extend beyond records' processes. Planning of records management had to begin even before records' creation. The records professional had to identify needs for metadata and set requirements to information systems. Thus, his domain was extended to daily operations of the agency and details of the information systems. (Kilikki, 2020, xv–xvi.) This approach was taken to extreme in the year 2008 when the concept of "information control systems" were introduced in Finnish public sector records management. The idea was to combine records management plans and process descriptions of the agency and use this information to create and update records metadata through the record life span (Henttonen, 2023b).

## INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE AND PARALLEL DEVELOPMENTS

Although the Finnish development has indigenous features, it did not take place in isolation. Nevertheless, it is difficult to point out the international influence. Kilkki notes:

“The practices of Finnish archival management are outlined in the regulations and guidelines issued by the National Archives under the Archival Act. However, it would be futile to try to find references to the underlying archival theory in these documents – and most of the archivists implementing these guidelines probably wouldn’t be interested in that either” (Kilkki, 2002, see also 2004).

Lack of explicit theory building leaves room for interpretation. For instance, one might wonder what the role is played by Life cycle and Record continuum models both of which structure professional responsibilities and user groups of records during record life span (for a summary and a comparison, see An, 2003). The first textbook for governmental archives (Valtionarkisto, 1978) mentions neither – and, of course, Records continuum model did not exist at that time. Life cycle was introduced in a later textbook (Rastas, 1994a, 53) in a form that does not separate records and archives management. It has been argued that Finnish conception of record life cycle resembles Records continuum model (Lybeck, 2006, 21), but it seems likely that one has developed practices very pragmatically. Like Kilkki notes, the practices are not explicitly anchored to any theoretical background which allows projecting different ideas onto them. This may be useful when one tries to understand differences between archival contexts, but it hardly says anything about the conceptions of the people behind the practices. Kilkki (2002, 2004) says, for example, that ideas of David Bearman fit well into Finnish archival context, but this does not show that his thinking has influenced Finnish practices.

However, it seems clear that the challenge of digitalization was recognized early on. Development of functional requirements (for summary and comparison, see Marsden, 1997) for recordkeeping systems was followed closely (Rastas, 1994b). The requirements emphasized the need for records professionals’ early involvement in the record life span.

## OLD AND NEW PROFESSIONALS

There were other simultaneous developments. The most important was about the records profession itself.

First signs of a records profession appear in Finland in the era of autonomy (1809–) when positions for archivists are opened in the highest authorities and provincial governments (Lybeck, 2016, 244). Nevertheless, when archives in the administration were found to be in disarray one hundred years ago, the problem was not only lack of instructions, but also of lack of people with proper skills and education. This was a problem both in the administration and in the National Archives (Nuorteva & Happonen, 2016, 160–164). Profession begins to emerge in the National Archives where first steps to create internal program of professional education were taken in the 1920s (Henttonen, 2023a, 92–93). Besides education, professional associations serve also as an indication. The oldest of these is the Society of Finnish Archivists, founded in the year 1947. The society was initially only an association of civil servants in the National Archives which suggests that the National Archives was the spearhead of professional development (Henttonen, 2023a, 94).

The emergence of the profession outside the National Archives seems to date to the post-war period. Education spread to professionals outside the National Archives in the 1960s (Henttonen, 2023a, 92–93).

Thus, there was a records profession of a kind in agencies when a presentation in the year 1972 stated that archivists in the agency are “an outpost of science” which differs them from mere “records managers” (Lybeck, 2016, 209). This is the first time when the term “records manager” appears (untranslated) in a Finnish text. In the presentation it was argued that an archivist in an agency was an integral part of the organization and not a representative of the National Archives. To me it is emblematic that one had to say this aloud. Obviously, the agency is the immediate context to which a records professional working it must adapt. At the same time, it is questionable to what degree the mission of an archivist in an agency differed at that time from the mission of an archivist in the National Archives. Records professionals in the public administration were educated in the courses of the National Archives. Taking an archival exam typically included

a period of practical training in the National Archives (Joki, 1998). Thanks to practical training records professionals had personal relations with people in the National Archives.

When the National Archives issued new instructions or gave orders to public agencies, these professionals were the ones who carried them out. Education and experience in the National Archives probably formed their professional identity and world view, although we cannot be certain of it. There are no studies about this. However, my personal feeling – and I have been working as a records professional for over 35 years – is that archival views dominated discussions at the expense of records management perspective. One is hard pressed to find in Finnish professional literature texts that are not directly or indirectly about permanently valuable records that have “archival value”. The dominance of the National Archives is shown by the fact that records professionals in the agencies generally did not about ten years ago recognize any alternatives to function-based classifications (Packalén & Henttonen, 2015) – which is the only approach advocated by the National Archives.

## **FROM RECORDKEEPING TO INFORMATION GOVERNANCE**

Kilkki (2020) shows how power of archival institution slowly expanded. Today the tide has turned. There are several reasons for this.

The legislation does not fully support what has happened. The second Archives Act (184/1981) extended the competence of the National Archives to records management of agencies, but even at that time there were different interpretations on what was the limit of this competence and how it should be used (Orrman, 2019b).

The third Archives Act (831/1994) gave the National Archives competence to give orders about registration and catalogues (16 §), and storage space, materials, and methods (11 §) if the records are permanently valuable. The National Archives could also define what records are to be preserved permanently (8 §). The agencies were obligated to define retention times of records and document them in a plan (11 §). It was also stated in a very general manner that requirements of the archives management must be considered in public sector records and information management (7 §).

The goal of the 1994 act was to emphasize the role of the National Archives in information guidance and education, but this did not happen. The requirements for electronic records management systems (2005, 2008) lead to the National Archives taking quietly a role in defining information systems for public agencies. Formally the competence of the archival institution was limited to permanently valuable information, but in reality, this limit was fictitious, because the agencies do not have one system for permanently valuable information and another for ephemeral data (Tallinen, 2020, 56). Thus, the National Archives exceeded its competence when it began to give orders about information management in agencies or stated that an agency must manage access rights to information. The same happened when the National Archives gave some auditors a right to certify compliance of information systems with its requirements for electronic records management systems. The National Archives did not have legal competence to inspect information systems in the first place, nor could it evaluate auditors of the systems and transfer use of public power to them (Tallinen, 2020, 50; Voutilainen, 2012, 18–20). Legally the *raison d'être* of the National Archives was (and is) preserving records for use in research. Here lies its interest and expertise. Thus, when the National Archives began to guide the whole record life span the result was preposterous - The tail was now wagging the dog (Tallinen, 2020, 49–52).

By the beginning of the 2010s digitalization had made it clear that there was a need to renew information management legislation. Statutes governing public sector information management were scattered in numerous acts and it was necessary to gather them together. Perhaps as a kind of backlash to its excesses the National Archives was excluded from drafting the new Act on Public Sector Information Management (906/2019) (Tallinen, 2020, 34–35).

The act brought two important changes. Firstly, it introduced a new concept *tiedonhallinta* which roughly equals “information governance” (Brooks, 2019). What is noteworthy is that the concept ties together different aspects of managing information (creation, classification, rights management, security, aso.) without inclusion of distinct archival perspective. Secondly, the act introduced in Finland the Anglo-Saxon distinction between current information that is still relevant for a records creator and “archives” that is preserved for cultural-historical purposes only (Henttonen, 2018). Until now this meaning of the term had been unknown here in

professional vocabulary. The change is more than purely semantic, because the responsibilities of the National Archives are in the new act limited to “archives” and “archiving”. Thus, the National Archives is no longer a developer of records management. Its functional requirements for electronic records management systems are now a recommendation and have lost their status as a regulation that the agencies have must follow when developing their information systems (Suositus, 2022). The 1994 Archives Act is now clearly outdated and in contradiction with other legislation. Still, it has not been renewed. Renewing the act has proven to be a challenging task because of the complexity of the issue. There have been attempts to draft a new Archives Act for over ten years, but they have all failed (Voutilainen, 2023). As far as it is known the proposals for previous archives acts (1939, 1981, 1994) were prepared in the guidance of the National Archives and even written by its personnel, but now drafting the archives act is out of its hands.

During the past decade, the National Archives has also lost much of its monopoly in archival education. While the National Archives still has courses where practical skills are taught, higher education has been transferred to universities. This means that newcomers in the field may have a higher education, but they have not worked a day in the National Archives. In the older generation of professionals this was not possible. Together with the concept of information governance and therewith broadened duties of records professionals this may have changed essentially professional identities in the field.

Again, this is an issue that we do not have research on, but there are some signs of it. As recently as twelve years ago a presentation video of the National Archives (2012) stated that “the goal of records management is to transfer over 40 years old records to the National Archives arranged and cataloged.” Last year I pointed this out at the national conference of records professionals in Turku and asked who thinks that this is true today. No hands were raised.

Thus, it seems that there has been a major change. We have now an archival institution that is focused on cultural heritage and building a research infrastructure, and in public agencies a records profession to whom archival perspective is only one way to look at the information in their custody. This is in many ways the opposite to what has been the case until now. When we look at the power balance between the archival institution and the public agencies we have returned to time about one hundred years ago.

## REFERENCES

- An, X. (2003). An integrated approach to records management. *The Information Management Journal*, 37(4), 24–30.
- Atherton, J. (1985). From life cycle to continuum: Some thoughts on the records management – archives relationship. *Archivaria*, 21, 43–51.
- Brooks, J. (2019). Perspectives on the relationship between records management and information governance. *Records Management Journal*. Retrieved at <https://doi.org/10.1108/RMJ-09-2018-0032> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Duranti, L. (1989). The odyssey of records managers. Part I: from the dawn of civilization to the fall of Roman Empire. *Records Management Quarterly*, 23(3).
- Erlandsson, A. (1996). *Electronic records management. A literature review. April 1996*. International Council on Archives. Retrieved at [https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/ICA\\_Study-10-Electronic-records-management-literature-review\\_EN.pdf](https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/ICA_Study-10-Electronic-records-management-literature-review_EN.pdf) (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Henttonen, P. (2018). Changing Finnish archival legislation: Substantial changes in the shadow of EU regulations. *Atlanti*, 28(2), 53–59. Retrieved on <https://doi.org/10.33700/2670-451X.28.2.53-59> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Henttonen, P. (2023a). *Johdatus asiakirjahallinnan tutkimukseen*. Avain.
- Henttonen, P. (2023b). “One system to rule them all” – or how to manage records across information systems. In M. Rostgaard & G. Bak (Eds.), *The Nordic model of digital archiving* (pgs. 115–134). Routledge. Retrieved at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003325406-9> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Jääskeläinen, J. (2000). *Arkistotoimen sisällön ja toimintatapojen muotoutuminen vuoden 1981 arkistolain pohjalta* [Ylemmän arkistotutkimuksen tutkielma].
- Joki, V. (1998). *Arkistokoulutus. Koulutuksen kehittyminen Suomessa ja tilanne kansainvälisessä vertailussa 1980-luvulla* [Pro gradu]. Oulun yliopisto.
- Kilkki, J. (2002). Bearmania kansallisten arkistokäytäntöjemme tieteellisenä kuorrutuksena. *Arkisto. Arkistoyhdistyksen Julkaisuja*, 8, 51–70.
- Kilkki, J. (2004). Bearmania. Frosting Finnish archival practice with imported archival theory. *Comma*, 1, 43–53. Retrieved at <https://doi.org/10.3828/comma.2004.1.7> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).

- Kilkki, J. (2020). *Asiakirjatiedon hallinnan asiantuntijuuden diskursiivinen rakentaminen Suomessa. Tutkimus normatiivisesta professionaalista diskurssista vuosina 1935–2015*. Tampere University. Retrieved at <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-1507-8> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Lybeck, J. (2006). *Arkistot yhteiskunnan toimiva muisti. Asiakirjahallinnon ja arkistotoimen oppikirja*. Arkistolaitos. Retrieved at [https://kansallisarkisto.fi/documents/141232930/150078237/asiakirjahallinnon\\_oppikirja.pdf/0d3d4ee5-da0c-caff-ef73-0f6595543ba3/asiakirjahallinnon\\_oppikirja.pdf?t=1677240609514](https://kansallisarkisto.fi/documents/141232930/150078237/asiakirjahallinnon_oppikirja.pdf/0d3d4ee5-da0c-caff-ef73-0f6595543ba3/asiakirjahallinnon_oppikirja.pdf?t=1677240609514) (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Lybeck, J. (2016). *Arkistolaitoksen suhde tutkimukseen ja hallintoon järjesty uudelleen: Vuodet 1944–1974*. Jari Lybeck & Pallosalama. Retrieved at [https://agricolaverkko.fi/hallinta/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lybeck\\_Jari\\_Arkistolaitoksen\\_suhde\\_tutkimukseen\\_ja\\_hallintoon\\_ja%CC%88rjestyuudelleen\\_esipuhe.pdf](https://agricolaverkko.fi/hallinta/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lybeck_Jari_Arkistolaitoksen_suhde_tutkimukseen_ja_hallintoon_ja%CC%88rjestyuudelleen_esipuhe.pdf) (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Marsden, P. (1997). When is the future? Comparative notes on the electronic record-keeping projects of the University of Pittsburgh and the University of British Columbia. *Archivaria*, 43, 158–173.
- Nuorteva, J., & Happonen, P. (2016). *Suomen arkistolaitos 200-vuotta*. Edita.
- Orrman, E. (2019a). *De archivis. Arkistoista—Om arkiv—On archives* (P. Henttonen, Ed.). Tampereen yliopisto. Retrieved at <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-1063-9> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Orrman, E. (2019b). Havainnot arkistotoimen murroksesta kolmen vuosikymmenen ajalta. In P. Henttonen (Ed.), *De archivis. Arkistoista—Om arkiv—On archives* (pgs. 79–85). Tampereen yliopisto. Retrieved at <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-1063-9> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Packalén, S., & Henttonen, P. (2015). Recordkeeping professionals' understanding of and justification for functional classification: Finnish public sector organizational context. *Archival Science*, 16(4), 403–419. Retrieved at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-015-9254-4> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Penn, I. A. (1984). Federal records management in the 1980's -is just like it was in the 1780's. *Records Management Quarterly*, 18(July), 10.
- Rastas, P. (1994a). *Arkistotoimi ja asiakirjahallinto* (2. uud. painos). Opetushallitus; VAPK-Kustannus.

- Rastas, P. (1994b). Asiankäsittelyjärjestelmät, elektroninen arkisto ja sen hallinta. *Arkisto. Arkistoyhdistyksen Julkaisuja*, 5, 67–84.
- Rastas, P. (1999). Valtionarkistosta Kansallisarkistoksi. 130-vuotta arkistolaitoksen historiaa. *Arkisto. Arkistoyhdistyksen Julkaisuja*, 6, 107–124.
- Suositus SÄHKE2-metatietomallin hyödyntämisestä 2022. (2022). Kansallisarkisto. Retrieved at <https://kansallisarkisto.fi/fi/viranomaisille/yhteystiedot-ja-palvelut/ohjepankki-2/maeaeraeykset/suositus-s%C3%A4hke2-metatietomallin-hy%C3%B6dynt%C3%A4misest%C3%A4-2022> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Tallinen, A. (2020). *Tiedonhallintalaki ja arkistotoimi* [Pro gradu, Tampereen yliopisto]. Retrieved at <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:tuni-202010167366> (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Tough, A. (2004). The post-custodial/pro-custodial argument from a records management perspective. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 25(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0037981042000199115>
- Upward, F. (2005). The records continuum. In S. McKemmish, M. Piggott, B. Reed, & F. Upward (Eds.), *Archives. Recordkeeping in society*, 1–24 (pgs. 197–222). Centre for Information Studies. Charles Stuart University.
- Valtionarkisto. (1939). *Valtionarkiston ohjeet valtion virka-arkistojen ja kunnallisten arkistojen huoneista. Valtionarkiston kiertokirje n:o 1*.
- Valtionarkisto. (1978). *Arkistonhoidon opas*. Valtionarkisto.
- Vartiainen, T. (2002). Tehtävän mukaan minäkin paperini järjestän muistikuvia ja tosiasioita arkistonmuodostussuunnitelman alkuajoilta. *Arkisto. Arkistoyhdistyksen Julkaisuja*, 8, 251–274.
- Voutilainen, T. (2012). *Julkisen hallinnon asiakirjahallinnon lainsäädännön ja toiminnan uudistaminen. Selvitystyö Mikkelin ammattikorkeakoululle 21.9.2012, versio 1.0*. Mikkelin ammattikorkeakoulu. Retrieved at [https://www.mamk.fi/instancedata/prime\\_product\\_julkaisu/mamk/embeds/mamkwwwstructure/18583\\_AsiakirjahallinnonselvitysV121.9.pdf](https://www.mamk.fi/instancedata/prime_product_julkaisu/mamk/embeds/mamkwwwstructure/18583_AsiakirjahallinnonselvitysV121.9.pdf) (accessed on 25. 9. 2024).
- Voutilainen, T. (2023). Arkistolain uudistaminen. Neljän vaalikauden ja viiden hallituksen hankeko? *Faili*, 2, 14–18.

## Summary

*Relationship between archival institutions and public agencies is not fixed. Legislation, concepts, administrative practices, and professional identities shape it. In Finland the relationship between the National Archives and public agencies has fluctuated during the last one hundred years. In this article the relationship is examined as a question of power balance. Archives have interest in public agencies because their mission depends on records that are created by public agencies. For a long time, the power of the National Archives increased slowly. This was backed by legislation in part, and by the National Archives' monopoly in professional education. The monopoly shaped records professionals in the agencies and guaranteed close ties with them. A driving force in the development was the problem of archives management at the time. The expansion of power took place in three phases all of which led to increasing proactive engagement of records professionals. At first phase it was important to protect archives as a physical collection. Thus, the National Archives was given competence over archives in the custody of the agencies. At the next phase the problem was how to reduce influx of records to the archives. Therefore, the National Archives needed competence over records management in the agencies. At the third phase, evidentiality of digital records was the problem. Now proactive action of the National Archives was extended to defining metadata and functional requirements for information systems. However, this exceeded the legal competence of the National Archives. In recent years the tide has clearly turned. The National Archives is withdrawing from records management and focusing on its role as a scientific infrastructure for research. The highest archival professional education has been transferred to universities during the last decades. Therefore, the new professionals may not have close ties with the National Archives. In addition, recent legislation has introduced a new concept, "information governance". Information governance has broadened the role of records professionals and increased their duties in the agencies.*

**Typology: 1.01 Original Scientific Article**