Koninklijk Nederlands Historisch Genootschap

# PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR HISTORIANS

**Version August 2026**[1]

In 2023, the Royal Netherlands Historical Society (RNHS, Dutch: KNHG), as a professional body, drew up and published a code of ethics entitled 'Professional Standards for Historians'. This code is intended for all historians who are professionally involved in the production and acquisition of historical knowledge, as well as in the reflection on historical knowledge, in the Netherlands.

The *Professional Standards for Historians* are standards designed to help historians uphold and safeguard the integrity of the practice of history, and to promote the conditions for a responsible public debate about the past. They are intended to support education and prevention, to stimulate discussion on the fundamental principles of the profession, to serve as a long-term strategy to combat abuse, and to help demonstrate the professionalism of historians to the wider world, including prosecutors and judges. **They are not intended to stifle the profession of history or to impose sanctions.**

These *professional standards* are a comprehensive adaptation of the American Historical Association's (AHA) *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct*, tailored to the Dutch context, specifically the 2023 version. The AHA *Standards* themselves are the result of a focus on professional ethics dating back to 1974. The RNHS *Professional Standards* are limited as far as possible to what applies specifically to the practice of history and should therefore be used in conjunction with the broader guidelines of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (Dutch: KNAW) (see *Short Reading List*). As the *Professional Standards* are the subject of ongoing discussion within the historical community, in response to new perspectives, issues or challenges, this August 2026 edition will be revised regularly by the KNHG's General Meeting of Members as necessary.

[1] The original version was published in June 2023. A revised version was published in June 2025. This version was published in August 2026.

# Contents

**1. The profession** ..... 3
**2. Shared values** ..... 3
**2.1. Core values** ..... **7**
**3. The scientific aspects** ..... 7
**4. Plagiarism** ..... 10
**5. The transfer of knowledge** ..... 11
**6. Public debate** ..... 12
**7. Reputation and trust** ..... 13
**Short reading list (in Dutch)** ..... 15

# 1. The profession

**People ascribe meaning to the past.** They talk about it and contribute to the creation and acquisition of historical knowledge through stories, written texts, images, artefacts, traditions and rituals. This act of ascribing meaning is one of the most fundamental ways in which people seek to understand themselves and their world. It is an ongoing process in which they may interpret the past in very different ways. Dialogue on this subject is part of the human experience but has changed in form over time.

**Professional historians** benefit greatly from this long-standing and widely shared fascination with the past. Few disciplines are as accessible and engaging to the wider public as the study of history. At the same time, individuals, communities and governments often have a stake in the way the past is understood and presented. Historical knowledge and recognition can honour people and groups, but can also serve solely to legitimise policy. That is why history can provoke discussions, emotions and controversies in public debate.

People from various disciplinary backgrounds, such as journalists and amateur historians, also publish historical studies. Professional historians must therefore realise that they never have a monopoly on their own discipline, and that this is a strength rather than a weakness. The openness of historical scholarship is one of its most appealing aspects; it enables the discipline to constantly renew itself and remain socially relevant.

What defines those involved in the creation of historical knowledge? **Historians are those who investigate and interpret the past in accordance with the principles of historical scholarship.** They have usually studied history and work in a wide variety of contexts: in museums and libraries, in schools and academic institutions, and in businesses and organisations. Some earn their living exclusively from work related to the past; for others, the practice of history is a serious hobby. All these historians share certain core values that guide their activities and underpin their judgements as they contribute to the collective understanding of the past. These shared values – for conducting and assessing research, developing and evaluating interpretations, communicating new knowledge, dealing with ethical dilemmas and, last but not least, telling stories about the past – define the practice of historical scholarship.

# 2. Shared values

In their research, historians strive to deepen and broaden their knowledge and understanding of the past. **The pursuit of truth** is therefore their ultimate goal. This is not to say, however, that historians have a monopoly on the truth, or that philosophical theories of truth are directly applicable to the work of historians. Historical knowledge is never static, neutral or complete, and is always provisional. The pursuit of truth

rather expresses an aspiration: historians are characterised by their efforts to understand the past in all its diversity and multiplicity of voices, using verifiable sources that are methodically examined on the basis of a clearly formulated research question.

**Critical dialogue** – amongst ourselves, with the wider public and with historical sources – is of great importance in the pursuit of truth, whereby historians examine individuals and societies of the past in search of answers to pressing questions that were raised then and are raised today. To safeguard the integrity of historical scholarship and historical practice, it is crucial that relevant new historical interpretations and previously under-represented perspectives are incorporated into this process. Historians also engage in such a critical dialogue with themselves: **professional self-reflection** is indispensable to the pursuit of greater knowledge and understanding of the past. This means that historians are not easily satisfied. They are prepared to reconsider their insights in the light of constructive feedback and are able to reflect on their own positionality. This professional self-reflection enhances the quality of historical work.

Historians cannot carry out this work successfully without mutual **trust and respect**. By practising their profession with integrity, they can build a reputation for reliability. The trust and respect of both colleagues and the wider public are among historians' greatest and most hard-won achievements. To maintain this trust and respect, they must not allow themselves to be guided by taboos or a fear of unwelcome truths. They have a professional duty to interpret the past as accurately and thoroughly as possible – even if this leads to uncomfortable or unwelcome insights. This means that historians need the **intellectual courage** to prioritise the search for truth over what is politically, socially or otherwise expedient.

Although historians disagree on many issues, they nevertheless trust and respect each other's work provided it meets the basic criteria. All historians believe in respecting the **integrity of historical sources**. They do not fabricate evidence themselves, nor do they use technologies that could lead to falsification or deception, as this undermines the reliability of historical research. Falsification and fraud violate the very foundations upon which historians build their interpretations of the past. A falsification not only undermines the falsifier's historical arguments, but also all subsequent scholarship based on that falsification. Those who fabricate, alter, ignore, remove or destroy evidence or research findings make it difficult for historians – and indeed for the wider public – to ever fully trust their work again.

Historians respect historical sources, but recognise that their interpretation is constantly evolving as they analyse primary sources in the light of the ever-expanding body of secondary literature. By '**primary sources**', historians mean all forms of evidence – such as written texts, artefacts, images, videos, websites, statistics, oral accounts, and the built and natural environment – that have been preserved as

testimonies to past times. By '**secondary literature**', they generally mean all subsequent interpretations of that past, based on evidence found in the primary sources. This distinction between primary and secondary sources is important to historians. Drawing the line between the two is far more complicated than it seems, because whether a source is primary or secondary depends largely on the questions historians ask of it. At the most basic level, professional historical practice requires that the integrity of primary sources and secondary literature be respected, that they be critically examined, and that historians contribute honestly to the academic and public discussions about what these sources reveal about the past, as well as what they do not reveal.

An ever-increasing proportion of sources from the recent past is being created and preserved in digital form, presenting new opportunities and challenges for archivists and historians. The use of digital technologies has led to a greater volume and variety of data – including from earlier periods – which is easily searchable and accessible in online archives and on digital platforms. It has also enabled new research methods such as automated text analysis and data mining. Furthermore, it offers new possibilities for the long-term preservation of sources. At the same time, managing the vast volume of digital sources also entails risks, such as vulnerability to loss or destruction due to technological obsolescence or the lack of adequate storage and backup systems. Furthermore, it is necessary to determine which digital sources should be preserved for future research and which can be deleted, whilst ensuring the privacy and security of sensitive digital sources. Finally, digital sources and the way in which they are accessed require digital source criticism and algorithmic literacy.

Respect for sources also means that **a clear trail must be left for future historians**. Any changes made by historians when citing or using a primary source or published secondary work, whether digital or in print, must be recorded. The ease with which digitised sources can be reproduced and consulted simplifies this practice, but makes careful citation all the more important. That is why the **scholarly apparatus** – that is to say, bibliographies and annotations, and the associated institutional repositories such as archives, libraries and databases – is essential to the discipline of history. It enables other historians and the wider public to trace the steps in an argument to ensure that they are justified by the sources. A good annotation also allows readers to identify gaps in the historical sources that might cast doubt on a particular interpretation. This verifiability contributes to the reliability of historians' work. **The trust that historians place in the work of their colleagues is crucial in academia**. The evidence – the primary sources and secondary literature – contained in every individual historical work serves as an important starting point for subsequent research into the same subject. In this way, a critical contribution can be made to the collective ability to ask and answer new questions about the past. For all these reasons, historians attach great importance to the **diligence** with which sources are used and documented. The more

careless their annotation, the more difficult it is for other historians to trust their work, and the less reliable the profession will be regarded.

A core principle of historical scholarship that may seem counter-intuitive to non-historians is the widely held conviction amongst historians that **the ethical practice of history can go hand in hand with taking a (scholarly) stance**. Since people in the past held views that often differed greatly from one another – and from those of the present day – historians seek to do justice to those views by, to a certain extent, seeing that past through the eyes of contemporaries. This is particularly true when people in the past disagreed or came into conflict with one another, as an adequate understanding of their world must encompass their differences of opinion. **Divergent and conflicting perspectives are therefore an integral part of the past itself and of the writing of history.**

Historians also regularly disagree on how to interpret that past, and sometimes these discussions even concern 'basic facts'. This can seem strange to non-historians, particularly when they believe that there is, after all, a consensus amongst historians regarding a number of established facts and immutable certainties. However, discussions amongst historians about each other's interpretations are vital to the development of the discipline. Differences of opinion can deepen and enrich historical understanding by giving rise to new questions, new arguments and new lines of research. Historians rely on their own perspectives, but they also subject these to critical scrutiny by testing them against those of others and inviting commentary from fellow historians.

The most **fundamental premise of historical science is that, within certain limits, we can indeed know and understand past worlds and earlier times, of which only traces remain in the present**. However, all knowledge must be situated within its temporal and geographical context. Furthermore, interpretations and analyses of historical phenomena are influenced by the historian's values, interests and beliefs. It is therefore desirable to take different perspectives into account when studying the past.

To sustain dialogue amongst historians, **mutual respect, constructive criticism and openness to ideas** are of crucial importance. **The practice of history therefore thrives in democratic societies where freedom of expression, freedom of association and academic freedom are respected and protected. Historians benefit from good citizenship within the societies of which they are a part, so that free research and free debate are safeguarded and encouraged.**

## 2.1. Core values

Many dilemmas in the historical profession can therefore be resolved if historians remain true to a few **core values**:

- They regard the pursuit of truth as their highest responsibility;
- They practise their profession with integrity;
- They respect their sources;
- They cite their sources carefully;
- They acknowledge where and when they are indebted to the work of others;
- They respect and welcome well-founded dissenting views, including – and indeed especially – when they subject these views to critical scrutiny;
- They recognise that historical scholarship is a collective endeavour that depends on mutual trust;
- They never betray that trust.

# 3. The scientific aspects

**Integrity** in the practice of academic history requires, on the one hand, an **awareness of one's own biases** and, on the other, a **willingness to follow sound methods and analyses**, wherever they may lead. It is therefore important that historians carefully describe and justify their findings, and make their sources available. In doing so, they must not omit any evidence that contradicts their own interpretation. They must also oppose the falsification or misuse of evidence, and any attempts to ignore or conceal such falsification or misuse.

Historians are also committed to protecting important historical evidence (sources), wherever it may be found. This is because the discipline relies on the dissemination of historical knowledge through a wide range of communication channels, such as books, articles, education, exhibitions, films, historical sites, museums, legal memoranda and testimonies.

Historians rely on free and equal access to archives, libraries and museum collections. This means they must guard against actions that could jeopardise access for future historians. Whilst historians recognise the legitimacy of restricting access to certain sources on grounds of national security, property rights and privacy, they must, as a matter of professional duty, oppose unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on the public availability of information. The profession requires the widest possible access to, and public discussion of, historical sources.

At the same time, there are limits to what historians themselves can disclose. This applies in particular to research involving living individuals (interviews, oral history). In such cases, historians must respect the principle of **informed consent**. This is the

principle that no one should take part in scientific research without giving their consent, which may be withdrawn at any time if they so wish. In many disciplines, such as the medical and social sciences, written consent is the norm (in medical science, it is even a legal requirement). For historians, informed consent means that they clearly explain the nature and purpose of the research to those involved, that they check whether they have properly understood the information, that they record their consent in writing and that, where necessary, they make arrangements regarding the use of quotations in a manuscript. In doing so, they must be aware of (implicit) power dynamics between the interviewer and the interviewee. Historians must also not upload personal data or sensitive source material (such as audiovisual interviews and interview transcripts) to commercial cloud-based artificial intelligence systems without explicit consent, as this data often becomes the property of the provider and is used for further training of the systems.

In many cases, however, living individuals do not feature in historical research. In such cases, the principle of informed consent does not apply directly, but may sometimes apply indirectly. There may be a case of express non-consent (for example, a diary stating that it must not be read by third parties). If the sources are freely accessible, historians are not bound by such a prohibition, but they must nevertheless carefully weigh up the importance of disclosure against it. The same applies to implied non-consent (for example, sensitive information where it is reasonable to doubt whether those involved or their next of kin would have welcomed its disclosure). Historians have a duty to weigh the importance of disclosure against implied non-consent.

Informed consent is therefore a less rigid and broadly applicable principle in historical research than in other branches of science. At the same time, historians are bound by other socially shared norms and values, which also apply in situations where the consent of those involved is not an issue. Historians may be expected to show **respect for human dignity** at all times, as well as to engage in ethical reflection on what that respect means in a specific case.

This applies in particular when historians are faced with **issues of privacy and reputation**. When they collect personal data relating to living individuals, they must comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). When writing about living individuals, there is a tension between these individuals' right to privacy and reputation and the historian's right to freedom of expression, including academic research. A balance must be struck between these two interests. Public figures, like everyone else, have a right to privacy and reputation, but to a lesser extent than private individuals ('ordinary citizens'). Furthermore, the importance of disclosure increases rapidly the further back in time the events lie.

The situation is more complicated when it comes to the dead: the dead have privacy and reputation, but no *right* to privacy or reputation. The living, however, do have moral responsibilities towards the dead, namely **duties of respect and protection**. These also apply to historians. Here too, the importance of disclosing facts must be weighed against potential disrespect towards the dead and against harm to their next of kin (primarily their family) or the communities to which they belonged. Anonymisation and pseudonymisation are ways of protecting the privacy and reputation of both the living and the dead, but they have the disadvantage of making historical figures less visible and potentially causing them to lose recognition. (For further explanation, see zie *Privacy en reputatie: Een beknopte gids voor historici* (in Dutch).)

Historians' responsibility to document the research process transparently and meticulously also applies when working with **digital sources and datasets**. When historians use digital sources – whether 'born digital' (e.g. emails) or digitised (e.g. scans of archive documents) – they must ensure that their references to these sources are as permanently traceable as possible, for example by also citing a persistent identifier (PID). Furthermore, when using digitised sources, they must state that digital reproductions have been used.

Historians generate data based on sources – both digital and non-digital. These include, for example, compiled datasets, photographs or notes. As a general rule, this data should be published as Open Data. With Open Data, however, one must take into account the risk that historical data may be used without compensation or an ethical framework to train commercial artificial intelligence models. 'Open' can therefore also mean: available upon contact and with permission (managed access). Deviations from the general rule are only justified when compelling interests, such as legal restrictions or ethical considerations, make this necessary. Historians are not required to disclose personal notes, unless this is necessary to verify historical work. When publishing their data, historians strive for **transparency**. They therefore document the choices and methods behind data collection, processing and interpretation, so that others can understand the methodology, locate the data, reproduce it and, where appropriate, reuse it (the FAIR principles: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable).

The increased accessibility of historical sources brought about by digitisation and online publication also comes with responsibilities for historians. Together with archival institutions, which do a great deal of work in digitising sources, they must commit to clarifying and contextualising digital sources. Digitisation is a process involving decisions regarding selection, format and accessibility. Historians are accountable for this process, for example through the use of data envelopes: modular appendices that provide information on the provenance, annotation and potential sensitivities of datasets. Historians must also critically reflect on the societal impact and privacy issues associated with the publication of sources. Collaboration with archives and institutions must be geared towards the sustainable and ethical handling of digital sources.

Furthermore, historians strive to maintain their professional autonomy when using digital technologies and artificial intelligence, so that the interpretation of sources remains under human responsibility and control.

Finally, historians must **disclose** any **financial support**, sponsorship or unique privileges (including special access to research material) received in the course of their research, as these privileges may skew their research findings.

## 4. Plagiarism

**The ethical practice of history means that historians recognise their debt to the work of other historians.** This applies to the careful citation of both primary sources and secondary literature. Copying another person's work and presenting it as one's own constitutes plagiarism. This also includes presenting a text generated by artificial intelligence as one's own intellectual product without clear attribution. **Plagiarism** violates 'the archive' of historical sources by failing to disclose the secondary sources that have contributed to a particular line of argument. It is a form of fraud that breaches the trust upon which the profession depends.

**Appropriating another author's work and presenting it as one's own constitutes plagiarism and is a serious breach of academic ethics.** Plagiarism undermines the credibility of the plagiarist as well as that of the profession. It constitutes an infringement of the property rights of the person plagiarised and of the copyright holder. Its discovery may therefore lead not only to sanctions (such as exclusion from a history degree programme, refusal of a PhD, or termination of employment), but also to legal action. **Rejection and expulsion by the professional community are the most severe penalties for plagiarists.**

Plagiarism takes many forms. The most obvious form of misconduct is copying others' sentences word for word without using quotation marks, citations or source references. A more subtle form, but nonetheless plagiarism, is the appropriation of concepts, data or notes, disguised in new sentences, or referring to a borrowed work in a note at the beginning of the text, but then making extensive use of it without further acknowledgement of the source.

In textbooks, encyclopaedia articles, broad overviews, and some public presentations, the permissible degree of reliance on previous scholarship, as well as the standards for citation and other forms of attribution, may differ from what is expected in monographs or journal articles. But even there, historians must cite the sources of recent or significant findings and interpretations that are not yet part of the body of knowledge widely shared within the profession. And whilst some forms of historical work lend themselves less to explicit citation (for example, films and exhibitions), every effort must be made to acknowledge the scholarship that informs such work in captions,

credits or colophons. **The best way to avoid an accusation of plagiarism is to be consistently explicit, thorough and generous in acknowledging intellectual debt.**

Furthermore, historians must always **acknowledge** the **assistance and work** of colleagues, students, research assistants, memory activists, interviewees and others, and give due credit to those who have contributed to their work.

All historians – whether professional historians, students or amateurs – are obliged to oppose deception and plagiarism. This obligation applies in particular to lecturers who lead seminar groups for students. They play a crucial role in shaping young historians' understanding of academic ethics and intellectual integrity. It is therefore the duty of lecturers to ensure that these seminars also serve as training in academic integrity. After graduating, historians must, first and foremost, rely on vigilant self-criticism. Throughout their working lives, historians must question the claims to originality made by their work and the kind of credit it attributes to others.

The first line of defence against plagiarism is preventative: historians must adopt habits that protect them from plagiarism. The standard defence put forward by plagiarists – that they were misled by hastily made and inadequate notes – is only plausible in a working environment that tolerates sloppy work. A basic rule of taking good notes is that every researcher must make a clear distinction between direct quotation and paraphrasing.

The second line of defence against plagiarism is repressive and applies to institutions that penalise plagiarism. All institutions employing professional historians are obliged to draw up procedures that clarify and uphold their ethical standards. Institutions have a responsibility to uphold the integrity and reputation of their staff by investigating allegations of plagiarism promptly and impartially and, where necessary, imposing appropriate sanctions. Penalties for misconduct must be proportionate to the offence.

All historians share a responsibility to uphold high standards of intellectual integrity. When assessing manuscripts for publication, reviewing books or evaluating colleagues, academics must assess the honesty and reliability with which the historians in question use primary sources and secondary literature. The discipline of history thrives in an atmosphere of openness, which must also encompass the careful investigation and public discussion of intellectual misconduct.

## 5. The transfer of knowledge

Teaching is fundamental to the practice of history. It takes place not only in classrooms, but also in museums and at historical sites, in documentaries and textbooks, in newspaper articles, on websites and in popular history books. Whether it takes place in the classroom or in the public sphere, education ensures that the past remains part of

the living memory of the present. This contributes to good citizenship, which is crucial to the democratic character of societies in which the work of historians can flourish.

Good education involves presenting and processing information **carefully**, whilst always placing that information in context to explain its broader significance. Teaching with integrity means presenting competing interpretations in a balanced and intellectually honest manner. This promotes a key aim of education: to spark the interest of those encountering a new historical subject for the first time, and to help them realise that **the study of history is a process of ongoing research**, rather than a passive collection of accepted facts.

**The political, social and religious beliefs** of history teachers inevitably influence their work, and they have the right to hold and express such beliefs. However, this does not justify falsification, omission or misrepresentation. Furthermore, teachers must bear in mind that students and other listeners have the right to explain why they disagree with a particular interpretation or viewpoint, and they should encourage this dialogue. Students must come to appreciate the multitude of causes and the diversity of interpretations. Within the confines of the historical subject being studied, the free expression of legitimate and well-founded differences of opinion must always be a goal. Teachers, for their part, must assess pupils' work solely on its merits.

## 6. Public debate

Given that **accurate facts and well-founded interpretations contribute to the historical awareness that is essential for open debate and citizenship**, historians are regularly given the opportunity to publicly explain the implications of their knowledge for the present day. It is one of the privileges of the profession to share historical insights and interpretations with a wider audience. The institutions that employ historians must recognise the importance of this. On the one hand, historians must not be subjected to institutional or professional censorship solely on account of the content of their beliefs and activities in the public sphere; on the other hand, they must not wrongly present themselves as spokespeople for their institutions or professional bodies when they have not been authorised to do so. Nor should they invoke their authority as historians on subjects that fall outside their area of expertise.

Historians who engage in public debate have a responsibility to uphold the best practices of the historical profession through their actions. This means that they must strike a balance between their desire to put forward their point of view and their responsibility to uphold the standards and values that underpin their professional authority as historians. This challenge can be particularly complex for public historians, who in their day-to-day work are often accountable on multiple levels, and for activist historians who advocate for a particular cause.

Public discussions on complex historical issues inevitably **simplify** certain aspects of those issues. Whilst it is entirely acceptable for historians to share their own views with the public, they must also endeavour to demonstrate how they link evidence to arguments in order to arrive at fair, nuanced and responsible interpretations of the past. The desire to 'score points' must never tempt historians to misrepresent the past or the historical method. Furthermore, historians have a social responsibility to critically reflect on material generated by artificial intelligence systems, such as images or videos (deepfakes or 'reconstructions'), which appear in the media and may create a false sense of authenticity.

Historians working in government bodies, businesses and non-profit organisations, as well as those who occasionally act as political advisers, experts, public intellectuals, consultants, forensic experts or witnesses, journalists or commentators, may find themselves faced with a choice between professionalism and partisanship. As historians, they must be sensitive to the complexity of the past, to the diversity of historical interpretations and to the limitations of their own perspectives.

## 7. Reputation and trust

Historians are obliged to present their **achievements** carefully and honestly in all circumstances. They must ensure that their qualifications are not misrepresented or exaggerated in their **curriculum vitae** (CV), in job applications or in public. Historians must not list on their CVs, under 'achievements', any degrees or honours they have never obtained, appointments they have never held, or articles or books they have never written or published, nor must they misrepresent their creative or professional work. Historians must be transparent about their role in (research) projects in which artificial intelligence has taken over parts of the writing or analytical work. Trust in the historian rests on the guarantee that human oversight ('human-in-the-loop') over the final interpretation is always ensured.

The status of a book, article or other publications that are still in progress is often important information for committees assessing applications, (permanent) appointments, promotions or grants. However, the academic community lacks **standardised terminology** for publications in progress, which means their status is often unclear.

KNHG proposes the following **lexicon**:

- "***Submitted***" or "***under consideration***": the proposal, book, or article has been submitted to a publisher or journal, but no contract or agreement for publication has been signed yet.
- "***Under contract with …***": a publisher and an author have signed a contract for a book in progress, but the final manuscript has not yet been submitted.
- "***To be published***": a completed manuscript has been accepted by a publisher or journal.
- "***Printing***": the manuscript has been fully edited and is no longer in the author's hands. It is in the final stage of the production process.

Historians must be mindful of any **conflicts of interest** that may arise in the course of their professional duties. A conflict of interest arises when personal interests or bias could compromise the ability to act in accordance with professional obligations. Historians may be confronted with such situations when participating in some form of peer review – for example, when reviewing books, assessing grant applications, approving manuscripts for publication, evaluating programme proposals for annual meetings and conferences, or selecting winners of prizes and awards. They must assess whether there is a conflict of interest or the appearance of one and, where appropriate, refrain from making decisions or taking other actions. They must avoid situations in which they derive, or appear to derive, a financial benefit to the detriment of their professional obligations. They should normally decline to take part in the formal assessment of work by someone to whom they have a personal obligation, towards whom they harbour a pronounced friendship or enmity, or with whom they are in direct competition.

*KNHG encourages all historians to take their professional responsibilities very seriously, to defend them, and to advocate for integrity, fairness, and high standards throughout the profession.*

# Short reading list (in Dutch)

## 1. Geschiedenis en aanverwante wetenschappen

**Koninklijk Nederlands Historisch Genootschap (KNHG)**
*Dit doen wij/kennisdelen: open science* (knhg.nl).
**Koninklijke Vereniging Archiefsector Nederland (KVAN)**
*Beroepscode voor archivarissen* (1997).
**Nederlandse Vereniging van Archeologen (NVvA)**
*Gedragscode voor beroepsarcheologen van de NVvA* (2001).
*Het handvest* (1995).

## 2. Science in general

**Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (KNAW)**
*Nederlandse gedragscode wetenschappelijke integriteit 2027* (2026).
*Vrijheid verankerd. Naar een versterkte juridische borging van academische vrijheid* (2026).
*Academische vrijheid in Nederland: Een begripsanalyse en richtsnoer* (2021).
*Gedragscode belangenverstrengeling* (2008).
*Gedragscode voor gebruik van persoonsgegevens in wetenschappelijk onderzoek* (2003).
*Goed voorbeeld doet volgen: Het nieuwe erkennen en waarderen volgens de Jonge Akademie* (2020).
*Richtlijnen voor historisch-wetenschappelijk onderzoek in opdracht* (2007).
*Sociale veiligheid in de Nederlandse wetenschap: Van papier naar praktijk* (2022).
*Vertrouwen in wetenschap* (2013).
*Vrijheid van wetenschapsbeoefening in Nederland* (2018).
*Wetenschap op bestelling: Over de omgang tussen wetenschappelijk onderzoekers en hun opdrachtgevers* (2005).
*Wetenschappelijke integriteit* (2010).
*Wetenschappelijk onderzoek: dilemma's en verleidingen* (2005).
*Zorgvuldig en integer omgaan met wetenschappelijke onderzoeksgegevens* (2012).

**Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO)**
*Code omgang met persoonlijke belangen* (2019).
*Gedragscode belangenverstrengeling NWO* (2010).

**Universiteiten van Nederland (UvNL)**[2]
*Code goed bestuur universiteiten* (2017, 2019).
*Gedragscode voor gebruik van persoonsgegevens in wetenschappelijk onderzoek* (2005).
*Handreiking aanpak bedreiging en intimidatie van wetenschappers* (2021).

[2] From 1985 until 2021 UvNL was called: Vereniging van Samenwerkende Nederlandse Universiteiten (VSNU)

*Nederlandse Gedragscode Wetenschapsbeoefening: Principes van goed wetenschappelijk onderwijs en onderzoek* (2004, 2005, 2012, 2014).
*Statement VSNU over proctoring* (2020).
*Universitaire gedragscode met betrekking tot marktactiviteiten* (2006).

**Landelijk Orgaan voor Wetenschappelijke Integriteit (LOWI)**
*Notitie wetenschappelijke integriteit: Over normen van wetenschappelijk onderzoek en een Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit* (2001).

**Other**
*UM Citation Guide: A Guide by FEM* (2022).